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# BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING 

August 3, 2023
Meeting: 9:00 AM - 4:00 PM, Eastern
Location: Orange County Courthouse - Room 255 (425 N. Orange Ave, Orlando)
WebEx Link: https://flclerks.webex.com/flclerks/i.php?MTID=ma5583b2d1aa681496cf23c1b4accd63d
Meeting Code: 2301783 2183; Password: CCOC
Conference Call: 1-866-469-3239; Access Code: 23017832183

1) Call to Order and Introduction

Hon. Tiffany Moore Russell
2) Approve Agenda .Hon. Tiffany Moore Russell
3) Approve Minutes from 6/22/23 Hon. Tiffany Moore Russell
4) Revenue and Expenditures Update
.Griffin Kolchakian
5) Revenue Estimating Conference (REC) Results Update Jason L. Welty
6) Surplus Revenue Collections Distribution Workgroup Report ...Hon. Brandon J. Patty
7) Budget Presentations .Hon. Tiffany Moore Russell
8) Budget Deliberations - Approve Revenue-Limited Budget Hon. Tiffany Moore Russell
9) Jury Funding Discussion $\qquad$ Hon. Angela Vick
10) Needs-Based Budget $\qquad$ .Hon. Tiffany Moore Russell
11) Other Business $\qquad$ Hon. Tiffany Moore Russell
a) Committee Membership
b) Public Comment

Committee Members: Tiffany Moore Russell, Esq., Chair; Greg Godwin, Vice-Chair; Joseph Abruzzo; Nikki AlvarezSowles, Esq.; Tom Bexley; Ken Burke, CPA; Stacy Butterfield, CPA; Pam Childers, CPA; Gary Cooney, Esq.; John Crawford; Nadia K. Daughtrey; Brenda Forman; Tara S. Green; Carla Hand, CPA, CGFO; Bill Kinsaul; Crystal K. Kinzel; Grant Maloy; Brandon J. Patty; Clayton O. Rooks, III; Rachel M. Sadoff; Donald C. Spencer; Cindy Stuart; Carolyn Timmann; and Angela Vick


JOHN DEW EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OPERATIONS CORPORATION

ROB BRADLEY
BRADLEY, GARRISON \& KOMANDO, P.A. GENERAL COUNSEL

JOHN A. CRAWFORD NASSAU COUNTY
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## Minutes of June 22, 2023, Budget Committee Meeting

Committee Action: Review and approve the minutes with amendments, as necessary.
The Budget Committee of the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation (CCOC) held a meeting on June 22, 2023. An agenda and materials were distributed in advance of the meeting and posted on the CCOC website. Provided below is a summary of staff notes from the meeting. These staff notes are designed to document committee action, not to be a full record of committee discussions. All motions adopted by the committee are in bold text.

## Agenda Item 1 - Call to Order and Introduction

Clerk Tiffany Moore Russell, Chair of the Budget Committee, called the meeting to order at 1:08 PM. The meeting was turned over to Rafael Ali, CCOC Budget Manager, to conduct roll call. Mr. Ali called the roll.

Present in-Person: Clerk Tiffany Moore Russell, Clerk Nikki Alvarez-Sowles, Clerk Ken Burke, Clerk Stacy Butterfield, Clerk Gary Cooney, Clerk John Crawford, Clerk Nadia Daughtrey, Clerk Bill Kinsaul, Clerk Grant Maloy, Clerk Brandon Patty, Clerk Clayton Rooks, III, Clerk Rachel Sadoff, Clerk Cindy Stuart, Clerk Carolyn Timmann, Clerk Angela Vick.

Present via WebEx: Clerk Greg Godwin, Clerk Pam Childers, Clerk Tara Green, Clerk Carla Hand, Clerk Crystal Kinzel, Clerk Don Spencer.

Absent from meeting: Clerk Joseph Abruzzo, Clerk Tom Bexley, Clerk Brenda Forman.

## Agenda Item 2 - Approve Agenda

A motion was made to approve the agenda by Clerk Kinsaul and seconded by Clerk Vick; the motion was adopted without objection.

Agenda Item 3 - Approve Minutes from 5/17/23 Meeting
Chair Russell presented the minutes of the May 17, 2023, meeting to committee members. Clerk Kinzel provided a proposed revision to the minutes.

A motion was made to adopt the minutes with Clerk Kinzel's revision by Clerk Vick and seconded by Clerk Maloy; the motion was adopted without objection.

## Agenda Item 4 - Revenue and Expenditures Update

Chair Russell called on Griffin Kolchakian, CCOC Budget and Communications Director, to give the revenue and expenditures update. Mr. Kolchakian stated that, through the first eight months of the fiscal year, clerks collected just over $\$ 315$ million which included over $\$ 64$ million in March. This is $\$ 23.5$ million above the year-to-date REC projection. There are seven months of actual expenditures data totaling \$242.9 million, which is $8 \%$ below the year-to-date projections.

## Agenda Item 5 - Funding Allocation Deliberation

Chair Russell stated that the goal of this discussion is to select the funding methodology for setting the upcoming budget. Chair Russell laid out the projected available funding using the February REC estimate as well as the clerks' priority bill.

Clerk Vick asked if the FRS number will change if we adopt the FRS blended rate proposal made by Clerk Cooney. Chair Russell confirmed. Chair Russell proposed using weighted cases to allocate the available funding. Chair Russell stated that the weighted cases included in the packet have not yet been validated by Clerk Cooney's Case Counting Workgroup. Chair Russell referenced previous years and the implementation of weighted cases in budget allocations. Clerk Burke asked if what Chair Russell is proposing ends with everyone receiving an increase. Chair Russell stated that it depends on which option is selected. Clerk Vick asked if this proposal would potentially allocate more than what a clerk is asking for. Chair Russell answered that there could be a motion to implement a cap. Mr. Kolchakian stated that the excess can also be rolled into the Reserve Fund like the committee did last year. Clerk Crawford pointed out the impact to Peer Groups 7 and 8 in options \#5.1 and \#5.2. Clerk Kinzel raised concerns with using the entire allocation for weighted cases because it is not the most recent data. Clerk Kinzel stated that we should start with the Needs-Based Budget. Clerk Burke asked if we implemented a 70\%/30\% distribution if every clerk would still get the minimum $4.2 \%$ increase. Mr. Kolchakian said that the new low would be $3.3 \%$ with a high of $9.9 \%$ and there will still be funds left to allocate. Clerk Kinzel stated that the weighted workload formula has not been updated regularly and that can make a big difference to some clerks. Clerk Kinzel stated that using weighted cases can create winners and losers because you are using average funding across-the-board without looking at what each clerk needs to stay whole. Clerk Kinzel stated that we should not rely on just one allocation method.

Clerk Patty presented a 5\% salary and benefits increase to match the state's pay increase. Clerk Butterfield asked if we had a calculation of how much that was going to be. Mr. Kolchakian stated that it will be $\$ 22.6$ million. Clerk Vick asked Clerk Patty if he would be open to negotiating that amount at any point. Clerk Patty stated that we get our funding from state dollars, and this will allow them to stay competitive with other state employees that are receiving this increase. Clerk Cooney stated that if we
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select weighted cases, you will have the option to increase salaries if you choose to do so. Clerk Patty stated that it also helps with messaging so that our employees can keep up with what the state is offering. Clerk Green stated that she likes the idea of funding a $5 \%$ increase, but she wants more flexibility on what to do with those additional funds. Clerk Patty agreed but stated that $50 \%$ of the available funds can still be allocated to something else as well.

Clerk Cooney presented a blended FRS rate for the estimated rate increase in Quarter 4 of the upcoming fiscal year. Clerk Cooney stated that the committee approved the calculated FRS rate to be included in the Base Budget; this blended rate is to account for three months of FRS changes in Quarter 4. Clerk Cooney stated that it is a more realistic funding amount. Clerk Kinzel stated that the blended rate does not help her out when she is having to do the actual rate. Clerk Cooney stated that this is a way to not fall short in the last three months of the fiscal year.

Clerk Alvarez-Sowles presented a proposed funding allocation option that raises salaries to meet a county's MIT living wage as well as to address compression. Clerk Alvarez-Sowles stated that most of us can agree that we have struggled to compete with other state agencies and organizations when it comes to compensation. Clerk Alvarez-Sowles stated that this proposal puts all counties on an equal playing field, regardless of local challenges. This rate is updated annually. Clerk Alvarez-Sowles stated that option \#1 brings up those counties that are below their cost-of-living calculation, and option \#2 brings up all employees with calculated compression. Clerk Kinsaul stated that weighted cases are the fairest way to distribute funding. Clerk Alvarez-Sowles stated that weighted cases only consider cases, not local needs and requirements. Clerk Alvarez-Sowles stated that she will bring this option applied to all 67 clerks to the next meeting for committee review. Clerk Kinzel stated that this is the kind of information that needs to be looked at.

Clerk Patty presented a proposed funding allocation option to fund the current year's Needs-Based Budget. Clerk Patty stated that the Needs-Based Budget was used to show the Legislature the true needs of the clerks and that is what should be used to allocate the redirects included in the clerks' priority bill. Clerk Patty stated that these budget requests were vetted and voted on by the committee. Chair Russell clarified that the Needs-Based Budget was approved by the committee but was not vetted. Chair Russell is concerned with funding last year's Needs-Based Budget since a clerk's needs are different from what was submitted last year. Clerk Daughtrey stated that last year it was clearly communicated for clerks to submit their Needs-Based Budget and request anything needed. Clerk Kinzel stated that we need to get every clerk whole and that we must consider all factors when approving the budget. Clerk Burke stated that this committee needs to do a better job explaining what the Needs-Based Budget is and to provide training. Chair Russell stated that a workgroup chaired by Clerk Burke could address this issue and create a training.

Clerk Kinzel presented a proposed funding allocation option to fund depositary clerks based on amounts sent to the Trust Fund. Clerk Kinzel stated that, with the surplus,
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we can fund the clerks that have been cut the most. Clerk Kinzel stated that some clerks got more than their requested Needs-Based Budget.

Clerk Stuart presented a proposed funding allocation option to address the impact from the tort reform legislation. The spreadsheet shows the cases for March, the average cases for the 12-months prior, and calculates the difference by county compared to the statewide increase. Clerk Cooney stated that we should calculate the impact by looking at the average cases per year and the percentage increase by county. Clerk Burke stated that we must look at the lifespan of these cases and the impact of funding in the long run. Chair Russell stated that this is a worthwhile discussion for the future because Orange experienced a huge rise in windshield cases. Clerk Green stated that we should look at the individual cost by county and not the cost across the state.

Clerk Alvarez-Sowles presented a proposed funding allocation option to address indigency. Clerk Alvarez-Sowles reviewed indigency data, as well as all no-fee cases, and the estimated corresponding loss of revenue. Clerk Patty agreed that this is something the committee needs to highlight.

Clerk Alvarez-Sowles presented the idea to consider the financial impact of additional courthouse locations. Clerk Alvarez-Sowles would like to create a workgroup that can study the impact of having multiple courthouses and then bring something back to the committee.

Clerk Butterfield presented the idea to consider senior judges in funding allocations, including considering how the courts allocate senior judge days. Clerk Butterfield stated that senior judges in Polk County do not just handle cases when a judge is sick or on vacation. Clerk Butterfield recommended a simple approach that if a senior judge is used, then there is some kind of associated allocation. Clerk Burke stated that it is important to note that this year we did have a legislative victory.

Clerk Patty presented the Surplus Revenue Collections Distribution Workgroup's proposal for a compliance grant program. Clerk Patty stated that the goal of the program is to provide funding to clerks' offices to increase collections efforts which will ultimately lead to more funding. Clerk Patty stated that having a program like this could also show the Legislature that we are doing everything we can in collections. If approved, CIS will assist in the verification process. Clerk Green asked if the proposed $\$ 2$ million issue would come out of the total available funding. Clerk Patty confirmed. Clerk Green stated that Clay County had already reallocated resources into compliance, so her issues are no longer in compliance but in other areas. Clerk Patty answered that there is potentially always something that can be done in compliance. Chair Russell asked if Orange County could participate in the grant program to automate calling people. Clerk Patty stated that collection is one area within the budget that we can take funds and invest in and potentially see a positive ROI.
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Jennifer Barker, CFO in Flagler County, read a statement on behalf of Clerk Bexley. This letter referenced operational struggles with existing unfunded needs as well as Clerk Bexley's support of using weighted cases in funding allocations.

Clerk Spencer made a recommendation to go with a hybrid distribution option and combine five of the different options.

A motion was made to distribute funding using the weighted workload statewide after ensuring there is a $5 \%$ increase to every clerk, adoption of the blended FRS allocation, allocation of the compliance grant funding for $\$ 1$ million, appropriation capped at the submitted budget request and any surplus to be transferred to the CCOC contingency fund by Clerk Vick and seconded by Clerk Crawford; the motion failed with eight yeas and eight nays.

Clerk Sadoff asked for clarification on the funding cap. Clerk Vick stated that the allocation would be capped based on what each clerk requested in the budget request. The remainder of the funds would go into the Reserve Fund. Clerk Maloy stated that every one of our offices should have a starting pay of $\$ 20$ an hour. Clerk Patty asked if any counties submitted a Needs-Based Budget that is under a 5\% year-over-year increase. Mr. Kolchakian confirmed and stated that the CCOC is currently going through and validating the issue requests. Clerk Kinzel stated that we are going in a good direction by selecting some of the proposals, but disagrees with the Needs-Based Budget training because many clerks have been here for a while and understand how to submit their Needs-Based Budget. Clerk Kinzel does not agree with the grant funding workgroup because some offices have been meeting standards even with budget cuts. Clerk Crawford requested to call the vote and see what this committee thinks. Clerk Butterfield does not agree with the capping portion of the motion.

A motion was made to distribute funding using the weighted workload statewide after ensuring there is a $5 \%$ increase to every clerk, adoption of the blended FRS allocation, allocation of the compliance grant funding for $\$ 1$ million, and any surplus would be transferred to the CCOC contingency fund by Clerk Cooney; the motion was adopted with Clerk Kinzel voting nay.

Clerk Kinzel asked if clerks can now get more than what they identified in their Budget Issue Request. Chair Russell confirmed. Clerk Stuart asked about the plan for the August meeting since the REC has not met yet. Chair Russell asked the committee what they wish to do for the August meeting. Clerk Kinzel supports the three-day meeting for August. Clerk Butterfield asked when the REC was scheduled to meet. Jason L. Welty, CCOC Deputy Executive Director, responded that the REC is planning to meet on July 20th.

Clerk Chorvat stated that we need to make it clear if the grant funding will be recurring or if counties will have to request funding for the following year. Clerk Kinzel stated that the committee is deciding funding allocations without having the numbers in front of us and without giving clerks the opportunity in August to present their Needs-Based
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Budget. Chair Russell stated that the recommendation of the committee is to meet one day.

A motion was made to have a one-day Budget Committee meeting in August after the July $20^{\text {th }}$ REC meeting by Clerk Daughtrey and seconded by Clerk Green; the motion was adopted without objection.

Chair Russell wants to reestablish Clerk Vick's Jury Workgroup to review the clerks' jury reimbursement funding.

## Agenda Item 6 - Other Business

Clerk Chorvat stated that this is always a painful process, and he appreciates the work that is being done. Clerk Maloy stated that this system is at the beginning of collapsing because you can't hire people at $\$ 15$ an hour to do some of the complex tasks we have in our offices.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 PM.
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|  | HOUSE APPOINTEE | MICHELLE R. MILLER SAINT LUCIE COUNTY |  |
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REVENUE UPDATE - Through May 2023
The July Article V Revenue Estimating Conference (REC) projected the clerks to collect a total statewide revenue of \$441.0 million for CFY 2022-23.


Total revenues reported for May 2023 were $\$ 38.3$ million

- This amount is about $\$ 1.8$ million, or 4.7 percent, above the REC monthly projection
- Through the first nine months of the CFY, the REC expected clerks to collect $\$ 328.1$ million; the actual revenue is $\$ 353.4$ million, which is $\$ 25.3$ million, or 7.7 percent, above YTD expectations
- September, October, December, March, April, and May actuals came in above the REC monthly estimate
- November, January, and February actuals came in below the REC monthly estimate

EXPENDITURES UPDATE - Through May 2023
The Budget Committee and Executive Council approved the \$453.2 million budget for CFY 2022-23.


Total expenditures reported for May 2023 were $\$ 34.9$ million

- This amount is about $\$ 2.9$ million, or 7.7 percent, below the monthly average projection
- Actual YTD expenditures are $\$ 24.5$ million, or 8.1 percent, below the eight-month average
* Note: expenditures may be much higher because some offices report on a cash and not accrual basis as well as some annual contracts are paid later in the fiscal year
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AGENDA ITEM 5
DATE:
August 3, 2023
SUBJECT: Revenue Estimating Conference (REC) Results
COMMITTEE ACTION: Informational

## OVERVIEW:

The Article V Revenue Estimating Conference (REC or Conference) met on July 20, 2023, in Tallahassee. The Conference consists of representatives from the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Executive Office of the Governor (EOG), and the Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR). In addition, state entities affected by the Conference participate in the discussion and present projections, including the Office of the State Courts Administrator (OSCA) and the Clerks of Court Operations Corporation (CCOC). However, these entities do not have a vote on final numbers. Jason L. Welty, CCOC Deputy Executive Director, represented the clerks at the Conference.

## RESULTS:

The Conference estimated $\$ 458.5$ million of collected revenue available for the clerks' CFY 2023-24 budget. While this is just under $\$ 300,000$ less than the February estimate, it is $\$ 17.5$ million higher than last year's estimate. The main drivers of the forecast include the continuing return to normal in civil traffic revenue, the slight increase in claims filings over previous levels, a reduction in the projected foreclosure filings, and the increased collections efforts by the clerks.

The total available revenue estimate for the CFY 2023-24 clerks' court-side budget is $\$ 486.1$ million.

LEAD STAFF: Jason L. Welty, Deputy Executive Director

## ATTACHMENTS:

1. Article V REC Conference Results - Clerks Summary
2. Article V REC Conference Results - Foreclosure Filings

## Article V REC <br> 7/20/2023

## Local Government Fines/Fees/Charges Schedule for Clerks

(Millions)

|  | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFY23/24 | 38.3 | 38.1 | 39.1 | 37.8 | 39.1 | 33.7 | 35.1 | 36.3 | 36.0 | 44.3 | 39.3 | 38.3 | 455.3 |
| SFY24/25 | 40.8 | 38.4 | 39.4 | 38.1 | 39.4 | 34.0 | 35.4 | 36.7 | 36.3 | 44.6 | 39.6 | 38.6 | 461.4 |
| SFY25/26 | 41.1 | 38.7 | 39.8 | 38.4 | 39.7 | 34.3 | 35.7 | 37.0 | 36.6 | 45.0 | 39.9 | 39.0 | 465.3 |
| SFY26/27 | 41.5 | 39.1 | 40.1 | 38.8 | 40.1 | 34.6 | 36.0 | 37.3 | 36.9 | 45.4 | 40.3 | 39.3 | 469.5 |
| SFY27/28 | 41.6 | 39.2 | 40.2 | 38.9 | 40.2 | 34.7 | 36.1 | 37.4 | 37.0 | 45.5 | 40.4 | 39.4 | 470.5 |
| SFY28/29 | 41.8 | 39.3 | 40.4 | 39.0 | 40.3 | 34.8 | 36.2 | 37.5 | 37.1 | 45.7 | 40.5 | 39.6 | 472.2 |


|  | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LFY 23/24 | 37.8 | 39.1 | 33.7 | 35.1 | 36.3 | 36.0 | 44.3 | 39.3 | 38.3 | 40.8 | 38.4 | 39.4 | 458.5 |
| LFY 24/25 | 38.1 | 39.4 | 34.0 | 35.4 | 36.7 | 36.3 | 44.6 | 39.6 | 38.6 | 41.1 | 38.7 | 39.8 | 462.4 |
| LFY 25/26 | 38.4 | 39.7 | 34.3 | 35.7 | 37.0 | 36.6 | 45.0 | 39.9 | 39.0 | 41.5 | 39.1 | 40.1 | 466.4 |
| LFY 26/27 | 38.8 | 40.1 | 34.6 | 36.0 | 37.3 | 36.9 | 45.4 | 40.3 | 39.3 | 41.6 | 39.2 | 40.2 | 469.7 |
| LFY 27/28 | 38.9 | 40.2 | 34.7 | 36.1 | 37.4 | 37.0 | 45.5 | 40.4 | 39.4 | 41.8 | 39.3 | 40.4 | 471.0 |
| LFY 28/29 | 39.0 | 40.3 | 34.8 | 36.2 | 37.5 | 37.1 | 45.7 | 40.5 | 39.6 | 41.8 | 39.3 | 40.4 | 472.2 |

Adopted Monthly Foreclosure Filings
7/20/2023

## Article V REC

| FY | 2023-24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL | Claim Value Categories |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |  | < \$50,000 | \$50,000-\$250,000 | > \$250,000 |
| FY 2023-24 Mo. Filings | 3,913 | 3,485 | 3,543 | 3,191 | 3,520 | 3,113 | 3,283 | 3,168 | 3,171 | 3,619 | 3,227 | 3,283 | 40,516 | 41.4\% | 42.6\% | 16.0\% |


| FY | 2024-25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL | Claim Value Categories |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |  | < \$50,000 | \$50,000-\$250,000 | > \$250,000 |
| FY 2024-25 Mo. Filings | 4,310 | 3,784 | 3,855 | 3,422 | 3,827 | 3,327 | 3,535 | 3,393 | 3,397 | 3,949 | 3,467 | 3,535 | 43,800 | 33.2\% | 48.8\% | 18.0\% |


| FY | 2025-26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL | Claim Value Categories |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |  | < \$50,000 | \$50,000-\$250,000 | > \$250,000 |
| FY 2025-26 Mo. Filings | 4,484 | 3,938 | 4,012 | 3,564 | 3,983 | 3,465 | 3,681 | 3,534 | 3,538 | 4,109 | 3,610 | 3,681 | 45,600 | 29.1\% | 51.9\% | 19.0\% |


| FY | 2026-27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL | Claim Value Categories |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |  | < \$50,000 | \$50,000-\$250,000 | > \$250,000 |
| FY 2026-27 Mo. Filings | 4,580 | 4,024 | 4,100 | 3,643 | 4,070 | 3,542 | 3,762 | 3,612 | 3,616 | 4,199 | 3,690 | 3,762 | 46,600 | 27.0\% | 53.5\% | 19.5\% |


| FY | 2027-28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL | Claim Value Categories |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |  | < \$50,000 | \$50,000-\$250,000 | > \$250,000 |
| FY 2027-28 Mo. Filings | 4,677 | 4,110 | 4,187 | 3,722 | 4,157 | 3,619 | 3,843 | 3,691 | 3,694 | 4,288 | 3,769 | 3,843 | 47,600 | 26.0\% | 54.2\% | 19.7\% |


| FY | 2028-29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL | Claim Value Categories |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun |  | < \$50,000 | \$50,000-\$250,000 | > \$250,000 |
| FY 2028-29 Mo. Filings | 4,774 | 4,196 | 4,275 | 3,800 | 4,244 | 3,696 | 3,924 | 3,769 | 3,773 | 4,377 | 3,849 | 3,924 | 48,600 | 25.0\% | 55.0\% | 20.0\% |

## Increasing Court Revenue

Enhancing
Customer
Service


Delivering
Operational
Efficiency

The Compliance Grant Program

## Compliance Workgroup Members

- The Honorable Kevin C. Karnes, Lee County
- The Honorable Brandon J. Patty, St. Johns County
- Kim Wilson, Desoto County
- Rick VanArsdall, Hillsborough County
- John Bodner, Lee County
- Mike Freeman, Nassau County
- Dwala Anderson, St. Johns County
- Chuck Crigler, Orange County
- Jessica Padilla, Orange County
- Kimberly Thompson, Pasco County
- Griffin Kolchakian, CCOC
- Don Murphy, CIS
- Doug Isabelle, CIS


## Program Overview

- Would provide grant funding to "opted-in" Clerk Offices to implement identified opportunities to increase court revenues through collection and compliance efforts.
- Clerks who decide to participate will work with CIS to review current operations and identify personnel, technology, and training solutions that adhere to best practices.
- Counties will estimate the cost to implement the recommendation, which will be presented to CCOC Budget Committee for approval
- As collection revenue increases, the participating Clerk will retain dollars until the grant is "paid back".
- Serves as a good news story to show the Legislature that Clerks are maximizing collection efforts to retain revenue.
- CCOC and CIS will monitor efforts to ensure success.


## "A Rising Tide Lifts All Boats"

## "Revenue on the Table"

## As CFY 2021-2022:

- Civil Traffic - $\$ 279.1 \mathrm{~m}$ collected out of $\$ 346.1$ million assessed ( $80.1 \%$ ). Clerks keep approx. $39 \%$ of the total collected. A $1 \%$ increase would bring clerks an additional $\$ 1.4 \mathrm{~m}$
- Criminal Traffic - $\$ 53,549,213.18$ collected of $\$ 79,428,814.31$ assessed ( $67.4 \%$ ) Clerks keep the majority of these fines. A $1 \%$ increase would bring clerks an additional $\$ 780 \mathrm{k}$.
- County Criminal - $\$ 25,198,776.09$ collected of $\$ 58,486,618.22$ assessed (43.1\%) Similar to Circuit Criminal below (clerks keep a super-majority of the fine money and about a quarter of the court costs). A $1 \%$ increase would bring clerks an additional $\$ 500 \mathrm{k}$.
- Circuit Criminal - $\$ 24,096,929.21$ collected of $\$ 228,928,289.96$ assessed ( $10.5 \%$ ) Generally, clerks keep a super-majority of the revenue generated in Circuit Criminal (clerks keep all of the fine money and about half of the court costs). A $0.5 \%$ increase would bring clerks an additional $\$ 1.1$ million.


## Prev Year Submitted Budgetary Needs

| County Fiscal Year 2019-2020 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | Request | Estimate | Recurring | Notes |
| Alachua | Outbound texting nofication system (ITR) | \$5,500 | yes |  |
| Citrus | 1 position to address increase in \# of payment plans started in prior years | \$51,000 | yes |  |
| Columbia | 1 postion to send more cases to collections | \$38,530 | yes |  |
| Duval | Creation of In-house Collection Program 57 positions | \$691,715 | yes |  |
| Escambia | Staffing needed to centralize collections in-house | \$100,000 | yes | looking for future software notification system |
| Hamilton | 1 positionto support collections | \$20,000 | yes |  |
| Hardee | 1 position to consolodate collection efforts | \$51,500 | yes |  |
| Lake | 4 positions to build a collections unit | \$1,146,488 | yes | estimating 5\% increase in revenues year one |
| Leon | 2 postions to enhance in-house collections program | \$114,682 | yes |  |
| Martin | 2 positions to enhance compliance efforts | \$83,600 | yes |  |
| Orange | 4 positions to enhance collections | \$159,648 | yes |  |
| Osceola | 9 positions to enhance collection support activities | \$450,000 | yes |  |
| Pinellas | 9 positions to reestablish outbound calls, send reminders e | \$481,694 | yes |  |
| Santa Rosa | 3 postions for collections | \$157,615 | yes | in-house collections started in 2014 |
| Sumter | 1 positon for payment plans | \$70,000 | yes | estimate based on explanation |
| 15 counties | 14 counties requesting positions | \$3,621,972 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | County Fiscal Year 2021-2022 |  |  |  |
| County | Request | Estimate | Recurring | Notes |
| Citrus | Half a positonn to assist online payment plans | \$14,966 | yes |  |
| Highlands | 1 position to establish in-house collection program | \$47,092 | yes | in discussionwith RevQ for compliance software system |
| Lake | 2 postions to create a dedicated compliance team | \$88,350 | yes |  |
| Walton | 1 position for collections clerk | \$15,021 | yes |  |
| 4 counties | all requesting positions | \$165,429 |  |  |

## Funding Model



## Roles

## Budget Committee

- Create a new line or budget allocation as grant funding and fund with recurring revenue
- Distribute to Clerks already meeting standards and/or who present a plan to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant.


## Clerks Opt-In

- CIS meets with Clerks to identify gaps and needs to meet collection standards.
- Clerks present a proposal at the August Budget Committee meeting outlining the funding request and estimated increase in collections.



## Clerk Participation

Clerks interested in the Compliance Grant Program must submit a request for participation. At the direction of the Program, CIS contacts counties for a program review. Reviews consist of data collection, on-site interviews, and the development of a project plan that outlines the purpose, approach, and intended benefit.

Included in the review is an agreed project status schedule that tracks milestone progress. This completed initial review and all status updates are submitted to CCOC on behalf of the Program. At the completion of a program review results are summarized in a final report delivered to the Compliance Grant Program and CCOC.

## Compliance Grant Program Outcomes

1. Provide seed funding for Clerk's collection efforts, recurrence contingent on available dollars.
2. Perform annual review of all Clerks in Compliance Grant Program to ensure project progress.
3. Oversee satisfactory progress made toward increased court revenues and operational compliance efficiency.

## Resources

At the direction of CCOC, CIS will provide consulting services to prepare and complete a county review of compliance services and a project plan for planned improvements. Future CIS participation includes virtual meetings to monitor progress and assistance with a final project report. Hours estimates are subject to the level of support required in the program. The following is a list of recommended deliverables:

| Deliverable | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| County Participation List for <br> current grant year | Listing of all counties interested in participating in the Compliance Grant <br> Program. Includes primary name and contact information. |
| Initial Site Review \& Report | Site visit with CIS and County that concludes with a written review for each <br> county visit that includes current compliance program, current challenge, goals <br> for improvement, and resources required. |
| Project Status Meeting | Virtual Visit that monitors progress in compliance plan with recommended next <br> steps. |
| Grant Program Final Report | Summary of county accomplishments for each participating county that <br> reviews purpose, approach, and results of project. |

## Timeline \& Next Steps

June Budget Committee Meeting
Approve plan and disseminate to Clerks

June - August
Clerks who wish to opt-in begin working with CIS to develop proposals.

August Budget Committee Meeting Clerks present funding requests and proposals.

## Approve Plan and Timeline

Identify and allocate initial grant funding of $\$ 2$ million in recurring revenue

## Santa Rosa

## PROBLEM STATEMENT

Please provide background information for the identified funding request, including how this need developed and all pertinent historical information.
We began an internal collections department in 2014 at the cost to other departments. Over the years, we have requested funding for these positions in order to add those expenditures related to collections back to the departments where it was taken.

## REQUEST

Please provide a clear description of the funding requested and how the previously identified problem will be resolved with this funding.
We are requesting the funding above for our collections department in order to relieve funding being taken away from other departments. We are also requesting funding for an additional person in order to increase our collections efforts.

## FISCAL IMPACT

Please provide information on the fiscal impact of the funding request.
Without our collections deparment, Santa Rosa County would have been a deficit County the past 5 fiscal years and would most likely be a deficit County this fiscal year. The total benefit to the CCOC Trust fund as a result of Santa Rosa County's collections department over the past 5 fiscal years was approximately $\$ 7.8$ million and on track to be about $\$ 1.3$ million this fiscal year.

Santa Rosa County Courts Revenue (less Jury)
Less: Revenue generated from Collections
Total Revenue without collections
Santa Rosa Budget
Funding Santa Rosa would have required from Trust Fund
Revenue from Trust Fund
Contributions to Trust Fund with Collections
Funding received from Trust Fund
Total Benefit to CCOC Trust Fund

Supporting Documentation for Santa Rosa County

| 2019 est | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3,928,710$ | $3,735,136$ | $3,464,909$ | $3,242,319$ | $3,028,666$ | $2,820,310$ |  |
| $(1,403,289)$ | $(1,697,728)$ | $(1,642,691)$ | $(1,455,625)$ | $(1,126,994)$ | $(455,558)$ |  |
| $2,525,421$ | $2,037,408$ | $1,822,218$ | $1,786,694$ | $1,901,672$ | $2,364,752$ |  |
| $2,830,132$ | $2,725,998$ | $2,820,722$ | $2,842,235$ | $3,105,399$ | $3,105,399$ |  |
| $(304,711)$ | $(688,590)$ | $(998,504)$ | $(1,055,541)$ | $(1,203,727)$ | $(740,647)$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 304,711 | 688,590 | 998,504 | 929,409 | $1,203,727$ | 740,647 |  |
| $1,010,000$ | $1,006,641$ | 797,596 | 566,926 | 411,434 | 478,405 |  |
| - | - | - | $(126,132)$ | $(329,744)$ | $(746,256)$ |  |
| $1,314,711$ | $1,695,231$ | $1,796,100$ | $1,496,335$ | $1,615,161$ | $1,219,052$ | $9,136,590.00$ |

## Martin

## PROBLEM STATEMENT

Please provide background information for the identified funding request, including how this need developed and all pertinent historical information.
This office assumed approximately a $\$ 39,000,000$ liability of stagnant files. Additional staff is needed to research the old cases for compliance and collections history and renew collection efforts. Our office needs additional these resources to provide the necessary focus on continued collections and compliance efforts while adequately staffing our court proceedings and meeting our service and compliance standards in the various court divisions. In addition, we face the challenge of degrading paper court files without adequate staff to dedicate to backscanning and verifying the file contents. We are also faced with increased requests for historic court records and the challenge of providing rapid access while maintaining timeliness standards in our active case files.

## REQUEST

Please provide a clear description of the funding requested and how the previously identified problem will be resolved with this funding.
We are requesting 2 additional FTEs to enhance our compliance and collections efforts and support the workload associated with our existing judicial partners. In addition, we are requesting
funding of 1.2 FTEs in our Court Records Management division to support the back-scanning, verilying and production of our historic paper court files. To further assist in access to court
records, we are requesting operating funds for the purchase and implementation of artificial intelligence software.

## FISCAL IMPACT

Please provide information on the fiscal impact of the funding request.
The associated personnel and benefit cost would be on-going and would continue for the duration of the positions' existence. The requested artificial intelligencice funding provides for the irimplementation and first year cost of the software.

The Clerk's Office in Martin County has implemented an outbound call service to alert customers of upcoming Payment dates and collection funds for payment plan installments avoiding default actions.

## Highlands

## Compliance and Collections Specialist Issue

Our Criminal Division requests funding for a compliance/collection position including benefits. Currently, we are managing 1,094 cases (excluding Salvation Army plans - currently 833 ) for payment (see attachment 6.1). The case count fluctuates as a result of the constant intake of failed partial payment plans. The court orders all partial payment plans greater than 90 days to be handled by the Salvation Army per contractual agreement with the Board of County Commissioners, and partial payment plans of 90 days or less to the Criminal Division. Also, anyone that fails to comply with the Salvation Army partial payment program are redirected to the Criminal Division for full monitoring and collection.

Current collection rates for these plans are $19 \%$ below the state average for county criminal, and $15 \%$ below the state average for criminal traffic (see attachment 6.2 ). If this position is approved, all partial payments will be handled by the Clerk's office, significantly increasing compliance case volume, phone calls received and in person customers. This is a time-consuming process with multiple steps required. Increased collections and statutory collection fees should more than offset the cost of the requested position and improve collection rates to the state average at a minimum.

The Clerk's office has recently initiated an internal audit of the partial payment process with the Salvation Army, and internally. Collection cases and rates will be detailed at the conclusion of this audit. A compliance/collection position could also assist with evidence destruction which needs attention after the completion of a recent internal audit.

The Clerk's office is also in discussions with Ontario Systems (Rev-Q) to enhance collection efforts. The Clerk will sill be responsible for updating compliances, drivers' license D6's, judgment liens and customer support phone calls. With four or five court days per week, daily work, meeting time standards, and the large volume of cases currently being monitored for payment, compliances are continually backlogged at

|  | Case Processing | Revenue Collection and Distribution | Financial Processing | Requests for Records and | Provide Ministerial Pro Se Assistance | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Technology Services } \\ \text { for External Users } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Mandated Reporting } \\ \text { Services } \end{array}$ | Jury Management | Administration | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FTE |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Personnel |  | \$47,092 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$47,092 |
| Operating |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| Capital |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$47,092 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$47,092 |

## FLORIDA CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION

## CFY 2023-24 Budget Presentations

## 9:30-11:00 AM, In-Person

1. Lake County, page 105
2. Orange County, page 146
3. Collier County, page 30
4. Citrus County, page 22
5. Marion County, page 128
6. Brevard County, page 11
7. Duval County, page 38
8. Martin County, page 131
9. Palm Beach County, page 152

11:00-11:50 AM, WebEx

10. Okaloosa County, page 142
11. Manatee County, page 124
12. Bradford County, page 10
13. Broward County, page 15
14. Jefferson County, page 101

* times are estimated

Revised: 7/26/2023 2:33:12 PM

## CFY 2023-24 Budget Issue Requests Summary

- 66 counties requested an additional budget issue over Base Budget: \$52,893,758
- FRS increase already included in the approved Base Budget: \$5,404,099
- Total issue requests including FRS increase: $\mathbf{\$ 5 8 , 2 9 7 , 8 5 7}$
- Base Budget + Total Requests = \$511,507,654
- This is a $11.5 \%$ increase over Base Budget and $12.9 \%$ over the current year budget
- Additional employee benefits:
- 52 counties requested additional health insurance funding: \$6,821,630
- 12 counties requested an additional amount for FRS funding over what was provided in the Base Budget: \$685,936
- 58 counties requested funding for pay increases, including merit increases, cost-of-living adjustments, hourly raises, inflation adjustments, etc.: \$27,167,547
- 36 counties requested funding for new FTE: $\$ 12,039,649204$ FTE
- 11 counties requested funding for compliance services: $\$ 1,096,78719$ FTE
- Note: these totals are included in the requested FTE issue total above
- 20 counties requested funding for other issues, included IT funding, local AOs, and cost shifts
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AGENDA ITEM 8

## DATE:

August 3, 2023
SUBJECT: Budget Deliberations to Establish the Revenue-Limited Budget
COMMITTEE ACTION: Approve the CFY 2023-24 Revenue-Limited Budget

## OVERVIEW:

In May, the Budget Committee approved the $\$ 458.6$ million Base Budget, which includes the prior year Revenue-Limited Budget of $\$ 453.2$ million and $\$ 5.4$ million for the calculated FRS increase. In July, the REC established the projected total revenues for CFY 2023-24. Based on this, there is $\$ 15.8$ million of remaining available funding to build the clerks' CFY 2023-24 Revenue-Limited Budget.

In June, the committee considered and deliberated on multiple funding allocation methodologies to distribute any available funding above the Base Budget. The committee approved the following allocation methodologies to establish the clerks' CFY 2023-24 Revenue-Limited Budget:

- $\quad \$ 1.4$ million for a blended FRS rate to cover the estimated rate increase for Quarter 4 of CFY 2023-24 (July 2024 - September 2024)
- $\$ 1$ million for the proposed Compliance Grant Program
- Any remaining funding will be allocated using the Weighted Workload Measure (statewide distribution)
- Each clerk shall receive no less than a 5\% year-over-year increase

Once the Revenue-Limited Budget is approved by the Budget Committee and the Executive Council, this will be the final approved operational budget implemented for CFY 2023-24.

COMMITTEE ACTION: Approve the CFY 2023-24 Revenue-Limited Budget
LEAD STAFF: Griffin Kolchakian, Budget and Communications Director Rafael Ali-Lozano, Budget Manager

## ATTACHMENTS:

- CFY 2023-24 Budget Spreadsheets


## New Revenue Summary

| REC Revenue Estimate (CFY 2023-24) [July 2023] | $\$$ | $458,473,245$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Additional Cumulative Excess (CFY 2021-22) | $\$$ | $1,007,444$ |
| Unspent Budgeted Funds (CFY 2021-22) | $\$$ | $14,955,360$ |

Revenue-Limited Budget (CFY 2022-23)
Net Budget Increase $\quad \$ \quad 21,226,252$

| County | Peer Group | CFY 2022-23 Revenue-Limited Budget |  | FRS Increase |  | CFY 2023-24 Base Budget |  | ADD <br> Blended FRS Rate for Q4 Projected Increase |  | ADD <br> Compliance Grant Program | PROVISIONAL Weighted Workload Measure (CFY 2021-22) | ADD <br> Weighted <br> Workload <br> Measure <br> Allocation |  | CFY 2023-24 Revenue-Limited Budget |  | Year-over-year Increase |  | Increase Over Base Budget | Increase <br> Over <br> Current <br> Year <br> Budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Calhoun | 1 | \$ | 459,015 | \$ | 5,692 | \$ | 464,707 | \$ | 1,597 |  | 13,239.0 | \$ | 10,034 | \$ | 476,338 | \$ | 17,323 | 3.7\% | 3.8\% |
| Lafayette | 1 | \$ | 315,037 | \$ | 3,109 | \$ | 318,146 | \$ | 978 |  | 4,538.0 | \$ | 3,440 | \$ | 322,564 | \$ | 7,527 | 2.4\% | 2.4\% |
| Liberty | 1 | \$ | 322,497 | \$ | 5,480 | \$ | 327,977 | \$ | 1,491 |  | 7,148.5 | \$ | 5,418 | \$ | 334,886 | \$ | 12,389 | 3.8\% | 3.8\% |
| Union | 1 | \$ | 498,165 | \$ | 7,139 | \$ | 505,304 | \$ | 1,985 |  | 7,861.5 | \$ | 5,958 | \$ | 513,247 | \$ | 15,082 | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |
| Baker | 2 | \$ | 725,439 | \$ | 11,888 | \$ | 737,327 | \$ | 3,127 |  | 19,218.0 | \$ | 14,566 | \$ | 755,020 | \$ | 29,581 | 4.0\% | 4.1\% |
| Dixie | 2 | \$ | 501,450 | \$ | 7,162 | \$ | 508,613 | \$ | 1,933 |  | 12,808.5 | \$ | 9,708 | \$ | 520,254 | \$ | 18,803 | 3.7\% | 3.7\% |
| Franklin | 2 | \$ | 674,135 | \$ | 9,406 | \$ | 683,540 | \$ | 2,507 |  | 12,254.0 | \$ | 9,288 | \$ | 695,335 | \$ | 21,201 | 3.1\% | 3.1\% |
| Gilchrist | 2 | \$ | 557,818 | \$ | 7,215 | \$ | 565,033 | \$ | 1,979 |  | 12,406.5 | \$ | 9,403 | \$ | 576,415 | \$ | 18,597 | 3.3\% | 3.3\% |
| Glades | 2 | \$ | 579,028 | \$ | 6,754 | \$ | 585,782 | \$ | 1,859 |  | 11,559.5 | \$ | 8,761 | \$ | 596,402 | \$ | 17,374 | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |
| Gulf | 2 | \$ | 502,570 | \$ | 6,608 | \$ | 509,178 | \$ | 1,835 |  | 11,107.0 | \$ | 8,418 | \$ | 519,431 | \$ | 16,861 | 3.3\% | 3.4\% |
| Hamilton | 2 | \$ | 609,839 | \$ | 6,679 | \$ | 616,518 | \$ | 1,838 |  | 15,370.5 | \$ | 11,650 | \$ | 630,006 | \$ | 20,167 | 3.3\% | 3.3\% |
| Holmes | 2 | \$ | 604,124 | \$ | 8,099 | \$ | 612,223 | \$ | 2,190 |  | 16,678.5 | \$ | 12,641 | \$ | 627,054 | \$ | 22,930 | 3.7\% | 3.8\% |
| Jefferson | 2 | \$ | 513,902 | \$ | 5,297 | \$ | 519,199 | \$ | 1,515 |  | 12,499.0 | \$ | 9,473 | \$ | 530,187 | \$ | 16,285 | 3.1\% | 3.2\% |
| Taylor | 2 | \$ | 574,286 | \$ | 6,599 | \$ | 580,885 | \$ | 1,739 |  | 19,523.0 | \$ | 14,797 | \$ | 597,421 | \$ | 23,135 | 4.0\% | 4.0\% |
| Washington | 2 | \$ | 805,838 | \$ | 10,884 | \$ | 816,722 | \$ | 2,864 |  | 20,364.0 | \$ | 15,435 | \$ | 835,021 | \$ | 29,183 | 3.6\% | 3.6\% |
| Bradford | 3 | \$ | 873,912 | \$ | 11,400 | \$ | 885,312 | \$ | 3,063 |  | 30,987.0 | \$ | 23,486 | \$ | 911,861 | \$ | 37,949 | 4.3\% | 4.3\% |
| DeSoto | 3 | \$ | 823,615 | \$ | 9,946 | \$ | 833,561 | \$ | 2,661 |  | 26,500.5 | \$ | 20,086 | \$ | 856,308 | \$ | 32,693 | 3.9\% | 4.0\% |
| Gadsden | 3 | \$ | 1,365,042 | \$ | 20,823 | \$ | 1,385,865 | \$ | 5,174 |  | 35,454.5 | \$ | 26,872 | \$ | 1,417,911 | \$ | 52,869 | 3.8\% | 3.9\% |
| Hardee | 3 | \$ | 924,370 | \$ | 9,984 | \$ | 934,354 | \$ | 2,649 |  | 20,386.0 | \$ | 15,451 | \$ | 952,454 | \$ | 28,084 | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |
| Hendry | 3 | \$ | 1,306,755 | \$ | 13,330 | \$ | 1,320,085 | \$ | 3,599 |  | 28,223.5 | \$ | 21,392 | \$ | 1,345,076 | \$ | 38,321 | 2.9\% | 2.9\% |
| Jackson | 3 | \$ | 1,128,978 | \$ | 14,359 | \$ | 1,143,337 | \$ | 3,860 |  | 32,334.0 | \$ | 24,507 | \$ | 1,171,704 | \$ | 42,726 | 3.7\% | 3.8\% |
| Levy | 3 | \$ | 1,148,148 | \$ | 14,700 | \$ | 1,162,848 | \$ | 3,858 |  | 39,743.5 | \$ | 30,123 | \$ | 1,196,829 | \$ | 48,681 | 4.2\% | 4.2\% |
| Madison | 3 | \$ | 568,909 | \$ | 6,153 | \$ | 575,062 | \$ | 1,719 |  | 24,042.0 | \$ | 18,222 | \$ | 595,003 | \$ | 26,094 | 4.5\% | 4.6\% |
| Okeechobee | 3 | \$ | 1,298,780 | \$ | 15,679 | \$ | 1,314,459 | \$ | 4,136 |  | 34,476.0 | \$ | 26,131 | \$ | 1,344,726 | \$ | 45,946 | 3.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Suwannee | 3 | \$ | 1,199,403 | \$ | 18,649 | \$ | 1,218,052 | \$ | 4,768 |  | 30,781.0 | \$ | 23,330 | \$ | 1,246,150 | \$ | 46,747 | 3.8\% | 3.9\% |
| Wakulla | 3 | \$ | 704,723 | \$ | 8,837 | \$ | 713,560 | \$ | 2,398 |  | 23,389.5 | \$ | 17,728 | \$ | 733,686 | \$ | 28,963 | 4.1\% | 4.1\% |
| Citrus | 4 | \$ | 3,063,819 | \$ | 48,750 | \$ | 3,112,570 | \$ | 12,481 |  | 102,654.5 | \$ | 77,805 | \$ | 3,202,856 | \$ | 139,036 | 4.5\% | 4.5\% |
| Columbia | 4 | \$ | 1,557,902 | \$ | 18,454 | \$ | 1,576,356 | \$ | 4,880 |  | 65,278.0 | \$ | 49,476 | \$ | 1,630,712 | \$ | 72,810 | 4.6\% | 4.7\% |
| Flagler | 4 | \$ | 1,857,621 | \$ | 24,461 | \$ | 1,882,082 | \$ | 6,257 |  | 71,591.0 | \$ | 54,261 | \$ | 1,942,600 | \$ | 84,979 | 4.5\% | 4.6\% |
| Highlands | 4 | \$ | 2,009,733 | \$ | 30,990 | \$ | 2,040,723 | \$ | 7,874 |  | 61,752.5 | \$ | 46,804 | \$ | 2,095,401 | \$ | 85,668 | 4.2\% | 4.3\% |
| Indian River | 4 | \$ | 3,029,670 | \$ | 41,440 | \$ | 3,071,109 | \$ | 10,657 |  | 87,914.5 | \$ | 66,633 | \$ | 3,148,399 | \$ | 118,730 | 3.9\% | 3.9\% |
| Nassau | 4 | \$ | 1,593,029 | \$ | 21,019 | \$ | 1,614,048 | \$ | 5,321 |  | 53,930.0 | \$ | 40,875 | \$ | 1,660,244 | \$ | 67,215 | 4.2\% | 4.2\% |
| Putnam | 4 | \$ | 2,193,536 | \$ | 32,193 | \$ | 2,225,729 | \$ | 8,044 |  | 59,943.5 | \$ | 45,433 | \$ | 2,279,206 | \$ | 85,670 | 3.8\% | 3.9\% |
| Sumter | 4 | \$ | 1,941,030 | \$ | 29,639 | \$ | 1,970,669 | \$ | 7,724 |  | 72,197.5 | \$ | 54,721 | \$ | 2,033,114 | \$ | 92,084 | 4.7\% | 4.7\% |
| Walton | 4 | \$ | 1,687,871 | \$ | 22,803 | \$ | 1,710,675 | \$ | 5,875 |  | 70,373.5 | \$ | 53,338 | \$ | 1,769,888 | \$ | 82,016 | 4.8\% | 4.9\% |
| Alachua | 5 | \$ | 5,924,259 | \$ | 76,809 | \$ | 6,001,068 | \$ | 19,283 |  | 185,378.0 | \$ | 140,504 | \$ | 6,160,855 | \$ | 236,596 | 3.9\% | 4.0\% |
| Charlotte | 5 | \$ | 3,607,349 | \$ | 42,080 | \$ | 3,649,428 | \$ | 10,810 |  | 140,392.5 | \$ | 106,408 | \$ | 3,766,646 | \$ | 159,298 | 4.4\% | 4.4\% |
| Clay | 5 | \$ | 3,737,553 | \$ | 54,637 | \$ | 3,792,190 | \$ | 13,807 |  | 142,202.0 | \$ | 107,780 | \$ | 3,913,777 | \$ | 176,224 | 4.6\% | 4.7\% |
| Hernando | 5 | \$ | 3,487,927 | \$ | 44,983 | \$ | 3,532,910 | \$ | 11,570 |  | 128,656.5 | \$ | 97,513 | \$ | 3,641,993 | \$ | 154,066 | 4.4\% | 4.4\% |
| Martin | 5 | \$ | 3,572,365 | \$ | 40,073 | \$ | 3,612,438 | \$ | 10,122 |  | 104,015.0 | \$ | 78,836 | \$ | 3,701,396 | \$ | 129,031 | 3.6\% | 3.6\% |
| Monroe | 5 | \$ | 3,577,729 | \$ | 52,866 | \$ | 3,630,596 | \$ | 13,517 |  | 114,504.5 | \$ | 86,787 | \$ | 3,730,900 | \$ | 153,170 | 4.2\% | 4.3\% |
| Okaloosa | 5 | \$ | 3,716,895 | \$ | 50,568 | \$ | 3,767,463 | \$ | 12,599 |  | 154,122.5 | \$ | 116,815 | \$ | 3,896,877 | \$ | 179,982 | 4.8\% | 4.8\% |
| Saint Johns | 5 | \$ | 3,655,585 | \$ | 50,896 | \$ | 3,706,480 | \$ | 12,693 |  | 160,469.0 | \$ | 121,625 | \$ | 3,840,798 | \$ | 185,214 | 5.0\% | 5.1\% |
| Santa Rosa | 5 | \$ | 3,243,589 | \$ | 46,153 | \$ | 3,289,742 | \$ | 11,761 |  | 119,938.5 | \$ | 90,905 | \$ | 3,392,408 | \$ | 148,819 | 4.5\% | 4.6\% |
| Bay | 6 | \$ | 3,941,758 | \$ | 50,195 | \$ | 3,991,954 | \$ | 12,538 |  | 214,929.0 | \$ | 162,902 | \$ | 4,167,394 | \$ | 225,635 | 5.7\% | 5.7\% |
| Brevard | 6 | \$ | 11,517,992 | \$ | 138,125 | \$ | 11,656,116 | \$ | 34,353 |  | 388,680.0 | \$ | 294,594 | \$ | 1,985,063 | \$ | 467,072 | 4.0\% | 4.1\% |
| Collier | 6 | \$ | 6,549,607 | \$ | 92,475 | \$ | 6,642,082 | \$ | 23,546 |  | 230,443.5 | \$ | 174,661 | \$ | 6,840,289 | \$ | 290,682 | 4.4\% | 4.4\% |
| Escambia | 6 | \$ | 7,108,406 | \$ | 75,755 | \$ | 7,184,161 | \$ | 19,139 |  | 246,362.5 | \$ | 186,726 | \$ | 7,390,026 | \$ | 281,620 | 3.9\% | 4.0\% |
| Lake | 6 | \$ | 6,312,466 | \$ | 81,177 | \$ | 6,393,643 | \$ | 20,616 |  | 230,984.0 | \$ | 175,071 | \$ | 6,589,330 | \$ | 276,864 | 4.3\% | 4.4\% |
| Leon | 6 | \$ | 6,023,069 | \$ | 72,412 | \$ | 6,095,481 | \$ | 18,464 |  | 205,593.0 | \$ | 155,826 | \$ | 6,269,771 | \$ | 246,702 | 4.0\% | 4.1\% |
| Manatee | 6 | \$ | 6,050,341 | \$ | 71,889 | \$ | 6,122,230 | \$ | 18,186 |  | 240,170.0 | \$ | 182,033 | \$ | 6,322,449 | \$ | 272,108 | 4.4\% | 4.5\% |
| Marion | 6 | \$ | 6,684,670 | \$ | 78,538 | \$ | 6,763,207 | \$ | 20,229 |  | 239,539.5 | \$ | 181,555 | \$ | 6,964,991 | \$ | 280,322 | 4.1\% | 4.2\% |
| Osceola | 6 | \$ | 7,898,791 | \$ | 86,696 | \$ | 7,985,486 | \$ | 22,005 |  | 291,815.5 | \$ | 221,177 | \$ | 8,228,668 | \$ | 329,878 | 4.1\% | 4.2\% |
| Pasco | 6 | \$ | 11,837,845 | \$ | 157,974 | \$ | 11,995,819 | \$ | 40,384 |  | 333,213.0 | \$ | 252,553 | \$ | 2,288,756 | \$ | 450,911 | 3.8\% | 3.8\% |


| County | Peer Group |  | CFY 2022-23 Revenue-Limited Budget |  | FRS Increase |  | CFY 2023-24 Base Budget |  | ADD lended FRS Rate for Q4 Projected Increase | ADD <br> Compliance Grant Program | PROVISIONAL Weighted Workload Measure (CFY 2021-22) |  | ADD Weighted Workload Measure Allocation |  | CFY 2023-24 evenue-Limited Budget |  | ear-over-year Increase | Increase Over Base Budget | Increase <br> Over Current Year Budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saint Lucie | 6 | \$ | 6,804,946 | \$ | 68,533 | \$ | 6,873,479 | \$ | 17,823 |  | 230,593.5 | \$ | 174,775 | \$ | 7,066,077 | \$ | 261,131 | 3.8\% | 3.8\% |
| Sarasota | 6 | \$ | 8,275,601 | \$ | 98,785 | \$ | 8,374,385 | \$ | 24,739 |  | 304,616.0 | \$ | 230,879 | \$ | 8,630,003 | \$ | 354,403 | 4.2\% | 4.3\% |
| Seminole | 6 | \$ | 9,024,814 | \$ | 105,849 | \$ | 9,130,663 | \$ | 26,974 |  | 313,164.0 | \$ | 237,358 | \$ | 9,394,995 | \$ | 370,181 | 4.1\% | 4.1\% |
| Duval | 7 | \$ | 19,939,648 | \$ | 215,052 | \$ | 20,154,700 | \$ | 55,014 |  | 1,012,593.0 | \$ | 767,478 | \$ | 20,977,192 | \$ | 1,037,544 | 5.1\% | 5.2\% |
| Lee | 7 | \$ | 11,903,367 | \$ | 155,743 | \$ | 12,059,110 | \$ | 39,663 |  | 483,019.5 | \$ | 366,097 | \$ | 12,464,870 | \$ | 561,503 | 4.7\% | 4.7\% |
| Pinellas | 7 | \$ | 23,037,307 | \$ | 264,178 | \$ | 23,301,485 | \$ | 65,803 |  | 725,922.0 | \$ | 550,201 | \$ | 23,917,489 | \$ | 880,182 | 3.8\% | 3.8\% |
| Polk | 7 | \$ | 12,626,653 | \$ | 149,053 | \$ | 12,775,707 | \$ | 37,207 |  | 571,055.0 | \$ | 432,822 | \$ | 13,245,736 | \$ | 619,082 | 4.8\% | 4.9\% |
| Volusia | 7 | \$ | 11,847,283 | \$ | 135,970 | \$ | 11,983,254 | \$ | 34,515 |  | 536,057.5 | \$ | 406,296 | \$ | 12,424,065 | \$ | 576,781 | 4.8\% | 4.9\% |
| Broward | 8 | \$ | 39,664,380 | \$ | 465,357 | \$ | 40,129,738 | \$ | 116,246 |  | 1,513,921.5 | \$ | 1,147,453 | \$ | 41,393,437 | \$ | 1,729,056 | 4.3\% | 4.4\% |
| Hillsborough | 8 | \$ | 30,825,591 | \$ | 340,601 | \$ | 31,166,192 | \$ | 85,936 |  | 1,420,920.0 | \$ | 1,076,964 | \$ | 32,329,092 | \$ | 1,503,501 | 4.8\% | 4.9\% |
| Miami-Dade | 8 | \$ | 71,990,695 | \$ | 834,110 | \$ | 72,824,805 | \$ | 208,547 |  | 3,160,436.0 | \$ | 2,395,402 | \$ | 75,428,754 | \$ | 3,438,059 | 4.7\% | 4.8\% |
| Orange | 8 | \$ | 29,521,041 | \$ | 341,544 | \$ | 29,862,585 | \$ | 85,205 |  | 1,357,461.0 | \$ | 1,028,865 | \$ | 30,976,655 | \$ | 1,455,614 | 4.9\% | 4.9\% |
| Palm Beach | 8 | \$ | 30,780,285 | \$ | 343,406 | \$ | 31,123,691 | \$ | 85,992 |  | 1,084,405.5 | \$ | 821,907 | \$ | 32,031,590 | \$ | 1,251,305 | 4.0\% | 4.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STATEWIDE TOTAL |  | \$ | 453,209,797 | \$ | 5,404,099 | \$ | 458,613,896 | \$ | 1,365,721 | \$ 1,000,000 | 17,754,101.0 | \$ | 13,456,432 | \$ | 473,436,049 | \$ | 20,226,252 | 3.2\% | 4.5\% |

Blended FRS calculation for CFY Q4 estimated rate increase

| 24-25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23-24 | 0.1357 | 1.139378673 | 0.3452 | 1.093443142 | 0.2113 | 1.136021505 | 0.5868 | 1.029473684 |
| 22-23 | 0.1191 | 1.100739372 | 0.3157 | 1.088245433 | 0.1860 | 1.014176663 | 0.5700 | 1.108518086 |
| 21-22 | 0.1082 | 1.082000 | 0.2901 | 1.06302675 | 0.1834 | 1.080094229 | 0.5142 | 1.04554697 |
| 20-21 | 0.1000 | 1.180637544 | 0.2729 | 1.073986619 | 0.1698 | 1.163013699 | 0.4918 | 1.007374027 |
| 19-20 | 0.0847 | 1.025423729 | 0.2541 | 1.056110 | 0.1460 | 1.040627227 | 0.4882 | 1.002464066 |
| 18-19 | 0.0826 | 1.042929293 | 0.2406 | 1.059445178 | 0.1403 | 1.058069382 | 0.4870 | 1.070330 |
| 17-18 | 0.0792 | 1.053191489 | 0.2271 | 1.043178686 | 0.1326 | 1.020785219 | 0.4550 | 1.071344478 |
| 16-17 | 0.0752 | 1.035812672 | 0.2177 | 1.015865609 | 0.1299 | 1.008540 | 0.4247 | 1.004731488 |
| 15-16 | 0.0726 |  | 0.2143 |  | 0.1288 |  | 0.4227 |  |


| Average Increases | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { State } \\ & \text { Fiscal } \\ & \text { Year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Regular | Annual \% Increase | SMSC | Annual \% Increase | Drop | Annual \% Increase | County Clerk | Annual \% Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 23-24 | 0.1357 | 1.139379 | 0.3452 | 1.093443 | 0.2113 | 1.136022 | 0.5868 | 1.029474 |
|  | 22-23 | 0.1191 | 1.100739 | 0.3157 | 1.088245 | 0.1860 | 1.014177 | 0.5700 | 1.108518 |
|  | 21-22 | 0.1082 | 1.082000 | 0.2901 | 1.063027 | 0.1834 | 1.080094 | 0.5142 | 1.045547 |
|  | 20-21 | 0.1000 | 1.180638 | 0.2729 | 1.073987 | 0.1698 | 1.163014 | 0.4918 | 1.007374 |
|  | 19-20 | 0.0847 | 1.025424 | 0.2541 | 1.056110 | 0.1460 | 1.040627 | 0.4882 | 1.002464 |
|  | 18-19 | 0.0826 | 1.042929 | 0.2406 | 1.059445 | 0.1403 | 1.058069 | 0.4870 | 1.070330 |
|  | 17-18 | 0.0792 | 1.053191 | 0.2271 | 1.043179 | 0.1326 | 1.020785 | 0.4550 | 1.071344 |
|  | 16-17 | 0.0752 | 1.035813 | 0.2177 | 1.015866 | 0.1299 | 1.008540 | 0.4247 | 1.004731 |
|  | 15-16 | 0.0726 |  | 0.2143 |  | 0.1288 |  | 0.4227 |  |


| Last 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Last 3 |
| Last 4 |
| Last 5 |
| Last 6 |
| Last 7 |
| Last 8 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Citrus Total |  | 2,737,463.55 | 410,868.39 | 344,714.05 | 127,385.91 | 472,099.96 | 472,099.96 | 61,231.57 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clay | Reg EE | 2,124,519.33 | 253,030.25 | 216,222.95 | 81,133.26 | 297,356.21 |  |  |
| Clay | SMS | 507,140.80 | 160,104.35 | 131,298.75 | 47,253.35 | 178,552.10 |  |  |
| Clay | DROP | 107,801.17 | 20,051.02 | 17,083.79 | 6,254.53 | 23,338.32 |  |  |
| Clay | Clerk | 100,142.25 | 57,081.08 | 44,072.60 | 15,392.04 | 59,464.64 |  |  |
| Clay Total |  | 2,839,603.55 | 490,266.70 | 408,678.10 | 150,033.17 | 558,711.27 | 558,711.27 | 68,444.57 |
| Collier | Reg EE | 4,811,350.67 | 573,031.86 | 489,675.21 | 183,740.65 | 673,415.87 |  |  |
| Collier | SMS | 207,360.19 | 65,463.61 | 53,685.55 | 19,320.99 | 73,006.55 |  |  |
| Collier | DROP | 205,534.57 | 38,229.43 | 32,572.09 | 11,924.93 | 44,497.02 |  |  |
| Collier | Clerk | 76,768.48 | 43,758.03 | 33,785.81 | 11,799.45 | 45,585.26 |  |  |
| Collier Total |  | 5,301,013.91 | 720,482.94 | 609,718.67 | 226,786.02 | 836,504.69 | 836,504.69 | 116,021.75 |
| Columbia | Reg EE | 871,227.81 | 103,763.23 | 88,669.21 | 33,271.32 | 121,940.53 |  |  |
| Columbia | SMS | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Columbia | DROP | 93,162.47 | 17,328.22 | 14,763.92 | 5,405.20 | 20,169.12 |  |  |
| Columbia | Clerk | 97,311.48 | 55,467.54 | 42,826.78 | 14,956.94 | 57,783.72 |  |  |
| Columbia Total |  | 1,061,701.76 | 176,559.00 | 146,259.92 | 53,633.46 | 199,893.38 | 199,893.38 | 23,334.38 |
| DeSoto | Reg EE | 447,475.00 | 53,294.27 | 45,541.77 | 17,088.62 | 62,630.39 |  |  |
| Desoto | SMS | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| DeSoto | DROP | 55,385.30 | 10,301.67 | 8,777.19 | 3,213.41 | 11,990.59 |  |  |
| DeSoto | Clerk | 66,455.40 | 37,879.58 | 29,247.02 | 10,214.31 | 39,461.33 |  |  |
| DeSoto Total |  | 569,315.70 | 101,475.52 | 83,565.98 | 30,516.34 | 114,082.31 | 114,082.31 | 12,606.79 |
| Dixie | Reg EE | 191,547.00 | 22,813.25 | 19,494.70 | 7,314.99 | 26,809.68 |  |  |
| Dixie | SMS | 62,380.00 | 19,693.37 | 16,150.18 | 5,812.32 | 21,962.50 |  |  |
| Dixie | DROP | 38,480.00 | 7,157.28 | 6,098.12 | 2,232.57 | 8,330.69 |  |  |
| Dixie | Clerk | 69,586.80 | 39,664.48 | 30,625.15 | 10,695.61 | 41,320.76 |  |  |
| Dixie Total |  | 361,993.80 | 89,328.37 | 72,368.15 | 26,055.49 | 98,423.64 | 98,423.64 | 9,095.27 |
| Duval | Non-FRS(Invst \& Per | 11,070,963.85 | 1,318,551.79 | 1,126,747.35 | 422,788.99 | 1,549,536.34 |  |  |
| Duval | Non-FRS (SMS-Equiv | 964,538.99 | 304,504.96 | 249,719.14 | 89,871.88 | 339,591.02 |  |  |
| Duval | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Duval | Clerk | 167,858.96 | 95,679.61 | 73,874.73 | 25,800.21 | 99,674.94 |  |  |
| Duval Total |  | 12,203,361.80 | 1,718,736.36 | 1,450,341.22 | 538,461.08 | 1,988,802.30 | 1,988,802.30 | 270,065.94 |
| Escambia | Reg EE | 3,849,510.70 | 458,476.72 | 391,783.95 | 147,008.95 | 538,792.90 |  |  |
| Escambia | SMS | 63,211.20 | 19,955.78 | 16,365.38 | 5,889.77 | 22,255.15 |  |  |
| Escambia | DROP | 350,071.07 | 65,113.22 | 55,477.51 | 20,310.81 | 75,788.32 |  |  |
| Escambia | Clerk | 67,345.78 | 38,387.09 | 29,638.88 | 10,351.16 | 39,990.04 |  |  |
| Escambia Total |  | 4,330,138.75 | 581,932.81 | 493,265.72 | 183,560.69 | 676,826.41 | 676,826.41 | 94,893.59 |
| Flagler | Reg EE | 1,139,674.11 | 135,735.19 | 115,990.33 | 43,523.01 | 159,513.34 |  |  |
| Flagler | SMS | 168,343.42 | 53,146.02 | 43,584.11 | 15,685.57 | 59,269.68 |  |  |
| Flagler | DROP | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Flagler | Clerk | 34,275.12 | 19,536.82 | 15,084.48 | 5,268.14 | 20,352.62 |  |  |
| Flagler Total |  | 1,342,292.65 | 208,418.02 | 174,658.92 | 64,476.72 | 239,135.64 | 239,135.64 | 30,717.62 |
| Franklin | Reg EE | 329,115.63 | 39,197.67 | 33,495.74 | 12,568.60 | 46,064.34 |  |  |
| Franklin | SMS | 50,689.31 | 16,002.62 | 13,123.46 | 4,723.03 | 17,846.49 |  |  |
| Franklin | DROP | 49,471.50 | 9,201.70 | 7,840.00 | 2,870.29 | 10,710.29 |  |  |
| Franklin | Clerk | 71,154.08 | 40,557.82 | 31,314.91 | 10,936.50 | 42,251.41 |  |  |
| Franklin Total |  | 500,430.52 | 104,959.81 | 85,774.11 | 31,098.42 | 116,872.53 | 116,872.53 | 11,912.72 |
| Gadsden | Reg EE | 614,127.69 | 73,142.61 | 62,502.85 | 23,452.92 | 85,955.77 |  |  |
| Gadsden | SMS | 180,323.92 | 56,928.26 | 46,685.86 | 16,801.86 | 63,487.72 |  |  |
| Gadsden | DROP | 167,778.51 | 31,206.80 | 26,588.70 | 9,734.36 | 36,323.06 |  |  |
| Gadsden | Clerk | 63,358.50 | 36,114.35 | 27,884.08 | 9,738.31 | 37,622.39 |  |  |
| Gadsden Total |  | 1,025,588.62 | 197,392.02 | 163,661.48 | 59,727.45 | 223,388.93 | 223,388.93 | 25,996.92 |
| Gilchrist | Reg EE | 371,964.32 | 44,300.95 | 37,856.67 | 14,204.94 | 52,061.61 |  |  |
| Gilchrist | SMS | 7,386.08 | 2,331.79 | 1,912.26 | 688.21 | 2,600.46 |  |  |
| Gilchrist | DROP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gilchrist | Clerk | 48,931.26 | 27,890.82 | 21,534.65 | 7,520.82 | 29,055.47 |  |  |
| Gilchrist Total |  | 428,281.66 | 74,523.55 | 61,303.57 | 22,413.97 | 83,717.54 | 83,717.54 | 9,193.99 |
| Glades | Reg EE | 274,261.15 | 32,664.50 | 27,912.93 | 10,473.76 | 38,386.69 |  |  |
| Glades | SMS | 42,133.10 | 13,301.42 | 10,908.26 | 3,925.79 | 14,834.05 |  |  |
| Glades | DROP | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |
| Glades | Clerk | 57,059.50 | 32,523.92 | 25,111.89 | 8,770.14 | 33,882.03 |  |  |
| Glades Total |  | 373,453.75 | 78,489.84 | 63,933.07 | 23,169.70 | 87,102.77 | 87,102.77 | 8,612.93 |
| Gulf | Reg EE | 294,195.55 | 35,038.69 | 29,941.75 | 11,235.03 | 41,176.78 |  |  |
| Gulf | SMS | 25,440.01 | 8,031.41 | 6,586.42 | 2,370.40 | 8,956.82 |  |  |
| Gulf | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Gulf | Clerk | 57,950.00 | 33,031.50 | 25,503.80 | 8,907.02 | 34,410.81 |  |  |
| Gulf Total |  | 377,585.56 | 76,101.60 | 62,031.97 | 22,512.45 | 84,544.41 | 84,544.41 | 8,442.81 |
| Hamilton | Reg EE | 264,187.56 | 31,464.74 | 26,887.69 | 10,089.06 | 36,976.75 |  |  |
| Hamilton | SMS | 45,136.00 | 14,249.44 | 11,685.71 | 4,205.59 | 15,891.30 |  |  |
| Hamilton | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Hamilton | Clerk | 57,277.48 | 32,648.16 | 25,207.82 | 8,803.65 | 34,011.47 |  |  |
| Hamilton Total |  | 366,601.04 | 78,362.34 | 63,781.22 | 23,098.30 | 86,879.52 | 86,879.52 | 8,517.18 |
| Hardee | Reg EE | 402,636.94 | 47,954.06 | 40,978.37 | 15,376.30 | 56,354.67 |  |  |
| Hardee | SMS |  | - |  | - | - |  |  |
| Hardee | DROP | 82,891.95 | 15,417.90 | 13,136.30 | 4,809.32 | 17,945.62 |  |  |


| Hardee | Clerk | 71,606.40 | 40,815.65 | 31,513.98 | 11,006.03 | 42,520.00 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hardee Total |  | 557,135.29 | 104,187.61 | 85,628.65 | 31,191.64 | 116,820.30 | 116,820.30 | 12,632.69 |
| Hendry | Reg EE | 656,663.90 | 78,208.67 | 66,831.97 | 25,077.33 | 91,909.30 |  |  |
| Hendry | SMS | 39,508.00 | 12,472.68 | 10,228.62 | 3,681.20 | 13,909.82 |  |  |
| Hendry |  |  |  |  | - | - |  |  |
| Hendry | Clerk | 75,249.60 | 42,892.27 | 33,117.35 | 11,565.99 | 44,683.34 |  |  |
| Hendry Total |  | 771,421.50 | 133,573.62 | 110,177.94 | 40,324.53 | 150,502.46 | 150,502.46 | 16,928.85 |
| Hernando | Reg EE | 2,234,484.20 | 266,127.07 | 227,414.63 | 85,332.71 | 312,747.34 |  |  |
| Hernando | SMS | 185,829.40 | 58,666.34 | 48,111.23 | 17,314.84 | 65,426.07 |  |  |
| Hernando | DROP | 44,782.40 | 8,329.53 | 7,096.89 | 2,598.23 | 9,695.13 |  |  |
| Hernando | Clerk | 75,951.00 | 43,292.07 | 33,426.04 | 11,673.80 | 45,099.83 |  |  |
| Hernando Total |  | 2,541,047.00 | 376,415.01 | 316,048.79 | 116,919.58 | 432,968.37 | 432,968.37 | 56,553.36 |
| Highlands | Reg EE | 1,231,106.68 | 146,624.81 | 125,295.88 | 47,014.73 | 172,310.61 |  |  |
| Highlands | SMS | 313,205.90 | 98,879.10 | 81,089.01 | 29,183.27 | 110,272.28 |  |  |
| Highlands | DROP | 14,209.50 | 2,642.97 | 2,251.85 | 824.42 | 3,076.27 |  |  |
| Highlands | Clerk | 56,791.98 | 32,371.43 | 24,994.15 | 8,729.03 | 33,723.18 |  |  |
| Highlands Total |  | 1,615,314.06 | 280,518.30 | 233,630.89 | 85,751.45 | 319,382.34 | 319,382.34 | 38,864.03 |
| Hillsborough | Reg EE | 18,084,379.79 | 2,153,849.63 | 1,840,537.75 | 690,624.30 | 2,531,162.06 |  |  |
| Hillsborough | SMS | 136,751.29 | 43,172.38 | 35,404.91 | 12,741.94 | 48,146.85 |  |  |
| Hillsborough | DROP | 1,359,272.59 | 252,824.70 | 215,410.72 | 78,863.77 | 294,274.49 |  |  |
| Hillsborough | Clerk | 117,644.40 | 67,057.31 | 51,775.30 | 18,082.15 | 69,857.45 |  |  |
| Hillsborough Total |  | 19,698,048.07 | 2,516,904.02 | 2,143,128.69 | 800,312.16 | 2,943,440.85 | 2,943,440.85 | 426,536.82 |
| Holmes | Reg EE | 216,216.28 | 25,751.36 | 22,005.41 | 8,257.08 | 30,262.49 |  |  |
| Holmes | SMS | 112,860.34 | 35,630.01 | 29,219.54 | 10,515.87 | 39,735.42 |  |  |
| Holmes | DROP | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |
| Holmes | Clerk | 70,269.00 | 40,053.33 | 30,925.39 | 10,800.47 | 41,725.85 |  |  |
| Holmes Total |  | 399,345.62 | 101,434.70 | 82,150.34 | 29,573.42 | 111,723.76 | 111,723.76 | 10,289.07 |
| Indian River | Reg EE | 2,031,189.03 | 241,914.61 | 206,724.26 | 77,569.07 | 284,293.33 |  |  |
| Indian River | SMS | 103,564.54 | 32,695.33 | 26,812.86 | 9,649.73 | 36,462.59 |  |  |
| Indian River | DROP | 123,587.88 | 22,987.35 | 19,585.59 | 7,170.46 | 26,756.05 |  |  |
| Indian River | Clerk | 91,660.38 | 52,246.41 | 40,339.73 | 14,088.36 | 54,428.09 |  |  |
| Indian River Total |  | 2,350,001.83 | 349,843.70 | 293,462.44 | 108,477.61 | 401,940.06 | 401,940.06 | 52,096.36 |
| Jackson | Reg EE | 698,671.20 | 83,211.74 | 71,107.26 | 26,681.55 | 97,788.81 |  |  |
| Jackson | SMS | 49,835.02 | 15,732.91 | 12,902.29 | 4,643.43 | 17,545.71 |  |  |
| Jackson | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Jackson | Clerk | 76,837.80 | 43,797.55 | 33,816.32 | 11,810.10 | 45,626.42 |  |  |
| Jackson Total |  | 825,344.02 | 142,742.20 | 117,825.86 | 43,135.08 | 160,960.94 | 160,960.94 | 18,218.74 |
| Jefferson | Reg EE | 260,844.48 | 31,066.58 | 26,547.45 | 9,961.39 | 36,508.84 |  |  |
| Jefferson | SMS | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Jefferson | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Jefferson | Clerk | 57,548.52 | 32,802.66 | 25,327.10 | 8,845.31 | 34,172.41 |  |  |
| Jefferson Total |  | 318,393.00 | 63,869.23 | 51,874.55 | 18,806.70 | 70,681.25 | 70,681.25 | 6,812.01 |
| Lafayette | Reg EE | 119,572.91 | 14,241.13 | 12,169.53 | 4,566.37 | 16,735.90 |  |  |
| Lafayette | SMS | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Lafayette | DROP | - |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Lafayette | Clerk | 66,908.94 | 38,138.10 | 29,446.62 | 10,284.02 | 39,730.64 |  |  |
| Lafayette Total |  | 186,481.85 | 52,379.23 | 41,616.16 | 14,850.39 | 56,466.55 | 56,466.55 | 4,087.32 |
| Lake | Reg EE | 4,031,947.98 | 480,205.00 | 410,351.51 | 153,976.04 | 564,327.55 |  |  |
| Lake | SMS | 180,659.56 | 57,034.22 | 46,772.76 | 16,833.13 | 63,605.89 |  |  |
| Lake | DROP | 286,879.22 | 53,359.53 | 45,463.18 | 16,644.47 | 62,107.66 |  |  |
| Lake | Clerk | 98,756.02 | 56,290.93 | 43,462.52 | 15,178.97 | 58,641.50 |  |  |
| Lake Total |  | 4,598,242.78 | 646,889.69 | 546,049.97 | 202,632.62 | 748,682.60 | 748,682.60 | 101,792.90 |
| Lee | Reg EE | 8,344,051.10 | 993,776.49 | 849,215.80 | 318,650.93 | 1,167,866.73 |  |  |
| Lee | SMS | 292,261.80 | 92,267.05 | 75,666.58 | 27,231.78 | 102,898.36 |  |  |
| Lee | DROP | 283,101.55 | 52,656.89 | 44,864.52 | 16,425.30 | 61,289.81 |  |  |
| Lee | Clerk | 86,190.50 | 49,128.59 | 37,932.44 | 13,247.63 | 51,180.07 |  |  |
| Lee Total |  | 9,005,604.95 | 1,187,829.01 | 1,007,679.34 | 375,555.64 | 1,383,234.98 | 1,383,234.98 | 195,405.97 |
| Leon | Reg EE | 3,330,573.72 | 396,671.33 | 338,969.14 | 127,191.27 | 466,160.41 |  |  |
| Leon | SMS | 384,573.46 | 121,409.84 | 99,566.07 | 35,833.01 | 135,399.08 |  |  |
| Leon | DROP | 147,694.11 | 27,471.10 | 23,405.82 | 8,569.08 | 31,974.90 |  |  |
| Leon | Clerk | 121,590.88 | 69,306.80 | 53,512.15 | 18,688.73 | 72,200.87 |  |  |
| Leon Total |  | 3,984,432.17 | 614,859.08 | 515,453.18 | 190,282.09 | 705,735.27 | 705,735.27 | 90,876.19 |
| Levy | Reg EE | 628,950.80 | 74,908.04 | 64,011.47 | 24,019.00 | 88,030.47 |  |  |
| Levy | SMS | 110,486.75 | 34,880.67 | 28,605.02 | 10,294.71 | 38,899.73 |  |  |
| Levy | DROP | - |  | - | - | - |  |  |
| Levy | Clerk | 59,512.81 | 33,922.30 | 26,191.59 | 9,147.22 | 35,338.81 |  |  |
| Levy Total |  | 798,950.36 | 143,711.01 | 118,808.07 | 43,460.93 | 162,269.01 | 162,269.01 | 18,558.00 |
| Liberty | Reg EE | 101,545.60 | 12,094.08 | 10,334.80 | 3,877.92 | 14,212.73 |  |  |
| Liberty | SMS | 96,668.00 | 30,518.09 | 25,027.35 | 9,007.14 | 34,034.48 |  |  |
| Liberty | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Liberty | Clerk | 56,132.00 | 31,995.24 | 24,703.69 | 8,627.59 | 33,331.28 |  |  |
| Liberty Total |  | 254,345.60 | 74,607.41 | 60,065.84 | 21,512.65 | 81,578.49 | 81,578.49 | 6,971.08 |
| Madison | Reg EE | 318,442.15 | 37,926.46 | 32,409.45 | 12,160.99 | 44,570.44 |  |  |
| Madison | SMS | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |


| Madison | DROP | - | - |  | - | . |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Madison | Clerk | 51,600.00 | 29,412.00 | 22,709.16 | 7,931.01 | 30,640.17 |  |  |
| Madison Total |  | 370,042.15 | 67,338.46 | 55,118.61 | 20,091.99 | 75,210.60 | 75,210.60 | 7,872.14 |
| Manatee | Reg EE | 3,335,995.92 | 397,317.11 | 339,520.98 | 127,398.33 | 466,919.32 |  |  |
| Manatee | SMS | 314,902.39 | 99,414.68 | 81,528.23 | 29,341.34 | 110,869.57 |  |  |
| Manatee | DROP | 226,797.12 | 42,184.26 | 35,941.67 | 13,158.56 | 49,100.24 |  |  |
| Manatee | Clerk | 88,327.01 | 50,346.40 | 38,872.72 | 13,576.01 | 52,448.73 |  |  |
| Manatee Total |  | 3,966,022.44 | 589,262.46 | 495,863.61 | 183,474.26 | 679,337.86 | 679,337.86 | 90,075.40 |
| Marion | Reg EE | 4,252,783.88 | 506,506.56 | 432,827.08 | 162,409.55 | 595,236.63 |  |  |
| Marion | SMS | 153,421.00 | 48,435.01 | 39,720.70 | 14,295.15 | 54,015.85 |  |  |
| Marion | DROP | 71,677.00 | 13,331.92 | 11,359.01 | 4,158.63 | 15,517.65 |  |  |
| Marion | Clerk | 95,353.92 | 54,351.73 | 41,965.26 | 14,656.06 | 56,621.32 |  |  |
| Marion Total |  | 4,573,235.80 | 622,625.23 | 525,872.05 | 195,519.40 | 721,391.45 | 721,391.45 | 98,766.22 |
| Martin | Reg EE | 1,731,085.33 | 206,172.26 | 176,181.21 | 66,108.41 | 242,289.62 |  |  |
| Martin | SMS | 145,156.73 | 45,825.98 | 37,581.08 | 13,525.12 | 51,106.20 |  |  |
| Martin | DROP | 223,845.77 | 41,635.31 | 35,473.96 | 12,987.33 | 48,461.29 |  |  |
| Martin | Clerk | 82,832.40 | 47,214.47 | 36,454.54 | 12,731.48 | 49,186.02 |  |  |
| Martin Total |  | 2,182,920.23 | 340,848.02 | 285,690.78 | 105,352.35 | 391,043.13 | 391,043.13 | 50,195.11 |
| Miami-Dade | Reg EE | 42,322,742.80 | 5,040,638.67 | 4,307,397.15 | 1,616,263.05 | 5,923,660.20 |  |  |
| Miami-Dade | SMS | 537,134.04 | 169,573.22 | 139,064.00 | 50,048.00 | 189,112.00 |  |  |
| Miami-Dade | DROP | 4,454,705.30 | 828,575.19 | 705,959.42 | 258,457.99 | 964,417.41 |  |  |
| Miami-Dade | Clerk | 178,732.09 | 101,877.29 | 78,659.99 | 27,471.43 | 106,131.42 |  |  |
| Miami-Dade Total |  | 47,493,314.23 | 6,140,664.36 | 5,231,080.57 | 1,952,240.46 | 7,183,321.03 | 7,183,321.03 | 1,042,656.67 |
| Monroe | Reg EE | 2,603,603.40 | 310,089.16 | 264,981.74 | 99,429.00 | 364,410.74 |  |  |
| Monroe | SMS | 239,900.00 | 75,736.43 | 62,110.11 | 22,352.92 | 84,463.03 |  |  |
| Monroe | DROP | 57,122.00 | 10,624.69 | 9,052.41 | 3,314.17 | 12,366.58 |  |  |
| Monroe | Clerk | 66,914.50 | 38,141.27 | 29,449.07 | 10,284.87 | 39,733.95 |  |  |
| Monroe Total |  | 2,967,539.90 | 434,591.55 | 365,593.33 | 135,380.96 | 500,974.29 | 500,974.29 | 66,382.74 |
| Nassau | Reg EE | 1,079,089.30 | 128,519.54 | 109,824.31 | 41,209.34 | 151,033.65 |  |  |
| Nassau | SMS | 42,833.82 | 13,522.64 | 11,089.68 | 3,991.08 | 15,080.76 |  |  |
| Nassau | DROP | 64,106.97 | 11,923.90 | 10,159.35 | 3,719.43 | 13,878.78 |  |  |
| Nassau | Clerk | 13,120.98 | 7,478.96 | 5,774.54 | 2,016.72 | 7,791.26 |  |  |
| Nassau Total |  | 1,199,151.07 | 161,445.03 | 136,847.88 | 50,936.57 | 187,784.45 | 187,784.45 | 26,339.42 |
| Okaloosa | Reg EE | 2,233,847.13 | 266,051.19 | 227,349.79 | 85,308.38 | 312,658.17 |  |  |
| Okaloosa | SMS | 372,686.14 | 117,657.01 | 96,488.44 | 34,725.40 | 131,213.84 |  |  |
| Okaloosa | DROP | 98,499.67 | 18,320.94 | 15,609.73 | 5,714.86 | 21,324.60 |  |  |
| Okaloosa | Clerk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Okaloosa Total |  | 2,705,032.94 | 402,029.15 | 339,447.97 | 125,748.64 | 465,196.61 | 465,196.61 | 63,167.46 |
| Okeechobee | Reg EE | 903,473.00 | 107,603.63 | 91,950.96 | 34,502.73 | 126,453.69 |  |  |
| Okeechobee | SMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Okeechobee | DROP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Okeechobee | Clerk | 40,544.46 | 23,110.34 | 17,843.62 | 6,231.75 | 24,075.37 |  |  |
| Okeechobee Total |  | 944,017.46 | 130,713.98 | 109,794.58 | 40,734.48 | 150,529.06 | 150,529.06 | 19,815.09 |
| Orange | Reg EE | 15,870,732.80 | 1,890,204.28 | 1,615,243.83 | 606,087.35 | 2,221,331.18 |  |  |
| Orange | SMS | 992,536.65 | 313,343.82 | 256,967.74 | 92,480.59 | 349,448.33 |  |  |
| Orange | DROP | 1,800,801.60 | 334,949.10 | 285,382.03 | 104,480.89 | 389,862.92 |  |  |
| Orange | Clerk | 193,419.20 | 110,248.94 | 85,123.79 | 29,728.86 | 114,852.65 |  |  |
| Orange Total |  | 18,857,490.25 | 2,648,746.14 | 2,242,717.39 | 832,777.69 | 3,075,495.08 | 3,075,495.08 | 426,748.94 |
| Osceola | Reg EE | 4,120,907.53 | 490,800.09 | 419,405.36 | 157,373.32 | 576,778.68 |  |  |
| Osceola | SMS | 385,326.97 | 121,647.72 | 99,761.15 | 35,903.22 | 135,664.38 |  |  |
| Osceola | DROP | 205,668.84 | 38,254.40 | 32,593.37 | 11,932.72 | 44,526.09 |  |  |
| Osceola | Clerk | 102,262.20 | 58,289.45 | 45,005.59 | 15,717.88 | 60,723.47 |  |  |
| Osceola Total |  | 4,814,165.54 | 708,991.67 | 596,765.48 | 220,927.14 | 817,692.62 | 817,692.62 | 108,700.95 |
| Palm Beach | Reg EE | 17,031,348.90 | 2,028,433.65 | 1,733,365.53 | 650,410.11 | 2,383,775.65 |  |  |
| Palm Beach | SMS | 602,687.02 | 190,268.29 | 156,035.67 | 56,155.96 | 212,191.63 |  |  |
| Palm Beach | DROP | 1,617,797.31 | 300,910.30 | 256,380.43 | 93,863.14 | 350,243.57 |  |  |
| Palm Beach | Clerk | 117,622.70 | 67,044.94 | 51,765.75 | 18,078.81 | 69,844.56 |  |  |
| Palm Beach Total |  | 19,369,455.93 | 2,586,657.19 | 2,197,547.38 | 818,508.03 | 3,016,055.41 | 3,016,055.41 | 429,398.23 |
| Pasco | Reg EE | 8,679,962.21 | 1,033,783.50 | 883,403.15 | 331,479.04 | 1,214,882.19 |  |  |
| Pasco | SMS | 308,310.54 | 97,333.64 | 79,821.60 | 28,727.14 | 108,548.74 |  |  |
| Pasco | DROP | 138,984.55 | 25,851.13 | 22,025.58 | 8,063.76 | 30,089.33 |  |  |
| Pasco | Clerk | 75,879.76 | 43,251.46 | 33,394.68 | 11,662.85 | 45,057.53 |  |  |
| Pasco Total |  | 9,203,137.06 | 1,200,219.73 | 1,018,645.01 | 379,932.79 | 1,398,577.80 | 1,398,577.80 | 198,358.08 |
| Pinellas | Reg EE | 13,338,644.11 | 1,588,632.51 | 1,357,540.50 | 509,389.42 | 1,866,929.93 |  |  |
| Pinellas | SMS | 182,294.32 | 57,550.32 | 47,196.00 | 16,985.45 | 64,181.45 |  |  |
| Pinellas | DROP | 1,477,405.70 | 274,797.46 | 234,131.87 | 85,717.75 | 319,849.62 |  |  |
| Pinellas | Clerk |  | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Pinellas Total |  | 14,998,344.13 | 1,920,980.29 | 1,638,868.37 | 612,092.63 | 2,250,961.00 | 2,250,961.00 | 329,980.71 |
| Polk | Reg EE | 7,471,544.32 | 889,860.93 | 760,416.42 | 285,330.77 | 1,045,747.20 |  |  |
| Polk | SMS | 256,631.86 | 81,018.68 | 66,441.99 | 23,911.93 | 90,353.92 |  |  |
| Polk | DROP | 689,925.85 | 128,326.21 | 109,336.00 | 40,028.88 | 149,364.88 |  |  |
| Polk | Clerk | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Polk Total |  | 8,418,102.03 | 1,099,205.81 | 936,194.41 | 349,271.58 | 1,285,465.99 | 1,285,465.99 | 186,260.18 |
| Putnam | Reg EE | 1,204,414.03 | 143,445.71 | 122,579.24 | 45,995.36 | 168,574.60 |  |  |


| Putnam | SMS | 180,819.85 | 57,084.83 | 46,814.26 | 16,848.07 | 63,662.33 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Putnam | DROP | 223,603.11 | 41,590.18 | 35,435.50 | 12,973.25 | 48,408.75 |  |  |
| Putnam | Clerk | 71,902.05 | 40,984.17 | 31,644.09 | 11,051.47 | 42,695.56 |  |  |
| Putnam Total |  | 1,680,739.04 | 283,104.88 | 236,473.09 | 86,868.15 | 323,341.24 | 323,341.24 | 40,236.36 |
| Santa Rosa | Reg EE | 2,205,882.79 | 262,720.64 | 224,503.72 | 84,240.45 | 308,744.17 |  |  |
| Santa Rosa | SMS | 87,000.31 | 27,466.00 | 22,524.38 | 8,106.34 | 30,630.72 |  |  |
| Santa Rosa | DROP | 214,364.80 | 39,871.85 | 33,971.46 | 12,437.25 | 46408.71 |  |  |
| Santa Rosa | Clerk | 91,972.80 | 52,424.49 | 40,477.23 | 14,136.38 | 54,613.61 |  |  |
| Santa Rosa Total |  | 2,599,220.69 | 382,482.98 | 321,476.79 | 118,920.42 | 440,397.21 | 440,397.21 | 57,914.22 |
| Sarasota | Reg EE | 4,694,651.35 | 559,132.98 | 477,798.14 | 179,284.02 | 657,082.16 |  |  |
| Sarasota | SMS | 300,975.94 | 95,018.10 | 77,922.67 | 28,043.73 | 105,966.40 |  |  |
| Sarasota | DROP | 437,251.56 | 81,328.79 | 69,293.44 | 25,368.94 | 94,662.38 |  |  |
| Sarasota | Clerk | 54,310.08 | 30,956.75 | 23,901.87 | 8,347.55 | 32,249.42 |  |  |
| Sarasota Total |  | 5,487,188.93 | 766,436.62 | 648,916.12 | 241,044.25 | 889,960.37 | 889,960.37 | 123,523.75 |
| Seminole | Reg EE | 5,320,852.88 | 633,713.58 | 541,529.80 | 203,198.03 | 744,727.83 |  |  |
| Seminole | SMS | 291,656.60 | 92,075.99 | 75,509.89 | 27,175.39 | 102,685.29 |  |  |
| Seminole | DROP | 268,518.57 | 49,944.45 | 42,553.48 | 15,579.21 | 58,132.69 |  |  |
| Seminole | Clerk | 126,516.61 | 72,114.47 | 55,679.96 | 19,445.82 | 75,125.78 |  |  |
| Seminole Total |  | 6,007,544.66 | 847,848.49 | 715,273.14 | 265,398.45 | 980,671.58 | 980,671.58 | 132,823.10 |
| St. Johns | Reg EE | 2,413,460.61 | 287,443.16 | 245,629.95 | 92,167.64 | 337,797.59 |  |  |
| St. Johns | SMS | 147,314.54 | 46,507.20 | 38,139.73 | 13,726.18 | 51,865.91 |  |  |
| St. Johns | DROP | 245,676.60 | 45,695.85 | 38,933.60 | 14,253.93 | 53,187.53 |  |  |
| St. Johns | Clerk | 16,116.19 | 9,186.23 | 7,092.74 | 2,477.09 | 9,569.82 |  |  |
| Saint Johns Total |  | 2,822,567.94 | 388,832.44 | 329,796.02 | 122,624.84 | 452,420.86 | 452,420.86 | 63,588.42 |
| St. Lucie | Reg EE | 3,885,508.27 | 462,764.03 | 395,447.60 | 148,383.66 | 543,831.26 |  |  |
| St. Lucie | SMS | 78,616.60 | 24,819.26 | 20,353.84 | 7,325.18 | 27,679.02 |  |  |
| St. Lucie | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| St. Lucie | Clerk | 102,059.46 | 58,173.89 | 44,916.37 | 15,686.72 | 60,603.08 |  |  |
| Saint Lucie Total |  | 4,066,184.33 | 545,757.19 | 460,717.81 | 171,395.55 | 632,113.36 | 632,113.36 | 86,356.18 |
| Sumter | Reg EE | 1,497,600.00 | 178,364.16 | 152,418.24 | 57,191.84 | 209,610.08 |  |  |
| Sumter | SMS | 120,500.00 | 38,041.85 | 31,197.45 | 11,227.71 | 42,425.16 |  |  |
| Sumter | DROP | - |  |  | - | - |  |  |
| Sumter | Clerk | 72,845.50 | 41,521.94 | 32,059.30 | 11,196.48 | 43,255.78 |  |  |
| Sumter Total |  | 1,690,945.50 | 257,927.95 | 215,674.99 | 79,616.03 | 295,291.02 | 295,291.02 | 37,363.08 |
| Suwannee | Reg EE | 739,176.18 | 88,035.88 | 75,229.66 | 28,228.40 | 103,458.05 |  |  |
| Suwannee | SMS | 192,421.69 | 60,747.53 | 49,817.98 | 17,929.08 | 67,747.06 |  |  |
| Suwannee | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Suwannee | Clerk | 41,794.83 | 23,823.05 | 18,393.90 | 6,423.94 | 24,817.84 |  |  |
| Suwannee Total |  | 973,392.70 | 172,606.46 | 143,441.54 | 52,581.42 | 196,022.95 | 196,022.95 | 23,416.49 |
| Taylor | Reg EE | 290,457.59 | 34,593.50 | 29,561.32 | 11,092.28 | 40,653.60 |  |  |
| Taylor | SMS | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Taylor | DROP | 44,927.44 | 8,356.50 | 7,119.88 | 2,606.65 | 9,726.53 |  |  |
| Taylor | Clerk | 38,157.57 | 21,749.81 | 16,793.15 | 5,864.88 | 22,658.03 |  |  |
| Taylor Total |  | 373,542.60 | 64,699.82 | 53,474.34 | 19,563.82 | 73,038.16 | 73,038.16 | 8,338.34 |
| Union | Reg EE | 263,222.38 | 31,349.79 | 26,789.46 | 10,052.20 | 36,841.66 |  |  |
| Union | SMS | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Union | DROP | 54,500.42 | 10,137.08 | 8,636.95 | 3,162.07 | 11,799.02 |  |  |
| Union | Clerk | 82,787.00 | 47,188.59 | 36,434.56 | 12,724.51 | 49,159.07 |  |  |
| Union Total |  | 400,509.80 | 88,675.46 | 71,860.97 | 25,938.77 | 97,799.74 | 97,799.74 | 9,124.29 |
| Volusia | Reg EE | 6,489,817.81 | 772,937.30 | 660,501.21 | 247,839.63 | 908,340.83 |  |  |
| Volusia | SMS | 539,814.66 | 170,419.49 | 139,758.02 | 50,297.77 | 190,055.78 |  |  |
| Volusia | DROP | 374,181.41 | 69,597.74 | 59,298.40 | 21,709.67 | 81,008.07 |  |  |
| Volusia | Clerk | 169,534.53 | 96,634.68 | 74,612.15 | 26,057.75 | 100,669.90 |  |  |
| Volusia Total |  | 7,573,348.41 | 1,109,589.21 | 934,169.77 | 345,904.81 | 1,280,074.58 | 1,280,074.58 | 170,485.37 |
| Wakulla | Reg EE | 375,490.59 | 44,720.93 | 38,215.55 | 14,339.61 | 52,555.16 |  |  |
| Wakulla | SMS | 53,128.68 | 16,772.72 | 13,755.02 | 4,950.32 | 18,705.33 |  |  |
| Wakulla | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Wakulla | Clerk | 61,674.81 | 35,154.64 | 27,143.08 | 9,479.52 | 36,622.61 |  |  |
| Wakulla Total |  | 490,294.08 | 96,648.30 | 79,113.65 | 28,769.45 | 107,883.10 | 107,883.10 | 11,234.81 |
| Walton | Reg EE | 1,024,438.30 | 122,010.60 | 104,262.21 | 39,122.27 | 143,384.48 |  |  |
| Walton | SMS | 167,789.60 | 52,971.18 | 43,440.73 | 15,633.96 | 59,074.69 |  |  |
| Walton | DROP | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |
| Walton | Clerk | 50,466.80 | 28,766.08 | 22,210.44 | 7,756.83 | 29,967.27 |  |  |
| Walton Total |  | 1,242,694.70 | 203,747.85 | 169,913.37 | 62,513.07 | 232,426.44 | 232,426.44 | 28,678.59 |
| Washington | Reg EE | 352,960.00 | 42,037.54 | 35,922.50 | 13,479.19 | 49,401.69 |  |  |
| Washington | SMS | 88,920.00 | 28,072.04 | 23,021.39 | 8,285.21 | 31,306.60 |  |  |
| Washington | DROP | 47,406.46 | 8,817.60 | 7,512.74 | 2,750.48 | 10,263.22 |  |  |
| Washington | Clerk | 71,541.00 | 40,778.37 | 31,485.19 | 10,995.98 | 42,481.17 |  |  |
| Washington Total |  | 560,827.46 | 119,705.55 | 97,941.82 | 35,510.85 | 133,452.68 | 133,452.68 | 13,747.13 |


|  | Stacy M. Butterfield, CPA POLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL CHAIR | Tiffany Moore Russell, ESQ. ORANGE COUNTY VICE-CHAIR | Laura E. Roth, ESQ. VOLUSIA COUNTY SECRETARY/TREASURER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CRYSTAL K. KINZEL COLLIER COUNTY SENATE APPOINTEE | TODD NEWTON GILCHRIST COUNTY | JODY PHILLIPS DUVAL COUNTY |
|  | TOM BEXLEY <br> FLAGLER COUNTY | JOHN A. CRAWFORD NASSAU COUNTY | JOHN DEW |
| $4$ | HOUSE APPOINTEE | MICHELLE R. MILLER SAINT LUCIE COUNTY |  |
| $2$ | RON FICARROTTA 13TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT JUDGE SUPREME COURT APPOINTEE | JD PEACOCK, II OKALOOSA COUNTY | ROB BRADLEY <br> BRADLEY, GARRISON \& KOMANDO, P.A. GENERAL COUNSEL |
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## AGENDA ITEM 9

## DATE:

August 3, 2023
SUBJECT: Jury Management Reimbursement Funding
COMMITTEE ACTION: Informational

## OVERVIEW:

For State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2023-24, the clerks are appropriated $\$ 11.7$ million of State General Revenue for jury reimbursement costs (these funds are released quarterly). Based on recent average quarterly actual costs, clerks' quarterly reimbursement costs will likely exceed the quarterly budget amount in SFY Quarter 3 (reimbursement request due by April 10) and SFY Quarter 4 (reimbursement request due by July 10).

The approved Juror Management Policy states that "should there be an insufficient amount of funds available to meet the needs of requested reimbursement from the clerks, CCOC will prorate the amount statewide for reimbursement to meet the available funds pursuant to subsection 40.29(5), F.S. Each county would share this reduction percentage proportionally. This reduction will be done each quarter of the State Fiscal Year, as necessary."

Subsection 40.29(5), F.S., states that "the clerks of the court are responsible for any compensation to jurors, for payments for meals or lodging provided to jurors, and for juryrelated personnel costs that exceed the funding provided in the General Appropriations Act for these purposes."

Therefore, if total jury-related costs exceed the statewide available funding for a given quarter, each clerk is responsible to cover any excess costs from their CCOC court-related budget. The CCOC will proportionately reduce each clerk's quarterly reimbursement amount to match the available budget. When establishing your budget for the upcoming fiscal year, please plan to use your CCOC budget to cover these projected costs, which could be as high as 20-30\% of your jury expenditures (based on current projections).

LEAD STAFF: Griffin Kolchakian, Budget and Communications Director
Rafael Ali-Lozano, Budget Manager

## ATTACHMENTS:

1. Juror Management Policy

# FLORIDA CLERKS OF COURT OPERATIONS CORPORATION 

CCOC Juror Management Funds Policy<br>[Adopted June 2022]

1) PURPOSE
a) Provide the Florida Clerks of Court Operations Corporation's (CCOC) Budget Committee an official policy and procedure for the administration of General Revenue allocated to the clerks by the Legislature for the management of the juror process. This policy will provide guidance to the Committee.
2) AUTHORITY
a) Section 40.24, F.S.
b) Subsection 40.29(5), F.S.
c) Section 40.011, F.S.
d) Section 40.221, F.S.
e) Section 40.231, F.S.
f) Section 40.23, F.S.
3) POLICY/PROCEDURES
a) Compensation to Jurors
i) Juror service constitutes being summoned and reporting for jury service as well as actual service on a jury, per subsection 40.24(2), F.S.
ii) A juror who is regularly employed and continues to receive regular wages while serving as a juror is not entitled to receive compensation from the Clerk of the Circuit Court for the first three days of juror service. Regular employment includes full-time employment and part-time, temporary, and casual employment, if the employment hours can be reasonably determined by a schedule or by custom and practice established during the three months preceding the term of service as a juror.
iii) A juror who is not regularly employed or does not continue to receive regular wages while serving as a juror is entitled to receive $\$ 15$ per day for the first three days of juror service.
iv) Each juror who serves more than three days is entitled to be paid by the Clerk of the Circuit Court for the fourth day of service and each day after that at the rate of \$30 per day of service.
v) A juror is not entitled to additional reimbursement by the Clerk of the Circuit Court for travel and other out-of-pocket expenses.
vi) A juror who is present on any of the days when the presiding judge is absent or, being present, does not hold the session of the court, shall be entitled to receive the
same compensation as if the court were in session, if the entitlement requirements stated in number ii and iii above are met.
vii) A juror on call by the court in a jury pool, as provided in section 40.231, F.S., is entitled to compensation for only those days the juror actually attended court and not for the days on call.
viii) A juror who is excused from jury service at their own request is not entitled to compensation.
ix) In accordance with subsection 40.24(8), F.S., jurors are permitted to irrevocably donate their juror service compensation in circuits that elect to allow this.
b) Juror Meals and Lodging - In circumstances requiring extended attendance by a jury in court, such as a major felony case, the court may order meals and lodging for jurors to be provided by the Sheriff pursuant to section 40.26 , F.S. These expenses are to be paid by the Clerk of the Circuit Court reimbursable by the State.

Guidelines for payment of these expenses:
i) When the court has directed that the jury be kept together, due to deliberations, sequestration, or an extended voir dire, meals and/or lodging may be provided. When required by order of the court, the Sheriff shall provide juries with meals and lodging to be paid by the Clerk of the Circuit Court.
ii) Lodging should be paid only if appropriate, such as when the jury is sequestered.
iii) Reasonably priced meals should be obtained for jurors. A statement of justification is required on invoices for meal reimbursements that are substantially above the standard state employee allowance for meals: \$6 for breakfast, \$11 for lunch, and $\$ 19$ for dinner, as prescribed in subsection 112.061(6)(b), F.S.
iv) A reasonable tip, gratuity, or delivery fee may be paid when jurors are restricted in movement, such as being sequestered or when requiring an escort by the bailiff, to obtain a meal when such meal is served by wait staff or the meal is delivered onsite.
v) Coffee and water for the jurors is an allowable expenditure if it is located in a public area.
vi) Transportation costs must be borne by the county. This includes the cost of transportation to relocate a jury from one county to another.
vii) No other jury-related costs are reimbursable by the State. All costs associated with the bailiff or other Sheriff's office personnel must be borne locally.
viii) Any additional unique expenditures for meals and/or lodging may be addressed on a case-by-case basis by CCOC.
c) Personnel - All personnel costs attributable to managing the juror process are reimbursable.
d) Direct Operational Costs - Printing summonses, mailing summonses, securing jury lists, etc. are reimbursable.
4) REPORTING:
a) Clerks must submit the completed Jury Management Expenditure Report (Excel file) and the Justice Administrative Commission (JAC) signed certification letter (PDF file) to the

CCOC quarterly by the $10^{\text {th }}$ of the month following the end of the requesting quarter (i.e., submit October-December expenditures by January 10).
i) The clerk must sign the JAC Certification form and cannot delegate this authority.
ii) Electronic signatures must show a visible signature.
iii) Clerks must submit the expenditure report and the certification letter as an e-mail attachment to reports@fIccoc.org.
b) The quarterly report will capture jury management expenditures in the following categories:
i) Jury-Related Personnel Costs
ii) Direct Operational Costs Associated with the Processing of Jurors
iii) Compensation to Jurors
iv) Meals and Lodging Provided to Jurors
c) Exclusions - The reimbursement request should NOT include cost estimates for jury management software (initial cost or maintenance) or cost for providing juror parking. The quarterly requests for reimbursement should not include expenditures associated with county obligations or local requirements deemed the county's responsibility pursuant to section 29.008, F.S.
5) REVIEW AMOUNTS, REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTS, AND PAYMENT
a) CCOC will prepare and submit a statewide summary per county to the JAC by the first day of the subsequent month the reports were submitted. The report submitted to the JAC will reflect the cost per clerk by the expenditure categories listed above. This report is used for clerks to request reimbursement of actual costs each quarter of the State Fiscal Year (July 1 through June 30).
i) Should there be an insufficient amount of funds available to meet the needs of requested reimbursement from the clerks, CCOC will prorate the amount statewide for reimbursement to meet the available funds pursuant to subsection 40.29(5), F.S. Each county would share this reduction percentage proportionally.
(1) This reduction will be done each quarter of the State Fiscal Year, as necessary.
(2) If actual total costs exceed the statewide available funding for reimbursement at the end of the State Fiscal Year, each clerk is responsible to cover any jury-related costs that exceed the total available statewide funding for reimbursement from their CCOC court-related budget.
b) Pursuant to subsection $40.29(5)$, F.S., the JAC will review the request for reimbursement to determine the sufficiency of funds for each quarter and receipt of the required clerk's signed and dated certification letter.
c) Upon completing the review, JAC will submit the request for reimbursement to the State's Chief Financial Officer who will directly provide these funds to the individual clerk offices.
d) For auditing purposes, detailed jury management data to support reimbursement requests, such as payroll, payments to jurors, etc., should be retained at the local level.
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AGENDA ITEM 10

DATE:
August 3, 2023
SUBJECT: Establish the Needs-Based Budget
COMMITTEE ACTION: Approve CFY 2023-24 Needs-Based Budget

## OVERVIEW:

The Needs-Based Budget is an important tool that the clerks' legislative team can use to relay the clerks' true budget need to operate to the Legislature. This is a separate amount from the Revenue-Limited Budget and is not a reflection of the actual budget available. However, this is a way for the clerks to reflect the actual budgetary need to operate offices statewide and perform the statutorily required duties.

In June, each clerk's office submitted any budget issues requested above the approved $\$ 458.6$ million Base Budget. Clerks requested $\$ 52.9$ million and 204.3 FTE above this amount. Requested issues include additional health insurance funding, additional FRS funding, salary increases (cost of living increases, merit increases, retention issues, inflation adjustments, promotions, etc.), staffing for a newly approved judge, compliance services funding, new positions, costs shifts, IT funding, and other various operational issues. These issues added to the Base Budget establish the proposed Needs-Based Budget totaling $\$ 526.7$ million; this amount includes State appropriated funds for jury reimbursement.

Included in the meeting packet is the proposed Needs-Based Budget reflecting the requested issues in rolled-up categories, including requested FTE. The total Needs-Based Budget for CFY 2022-23 was $\$ 501.4$ million, including State appropriated funding. The proposed $\$ 526.7$ million for CFY 2023-24 would be a $5.0 \%$ increase year-over-year.

COMMITTEE ACTION: Approve CFY 2023-24 Needs-Based Budget
LEAD STAFF: Griffin Kolchakian, Budget and Communications Director
Rafael Ali-Lozano, Budget Manager

## ATTACHMENTS:

1. CFY 2023-24 draft Needs-Based Budget Spreadsheet

| County | Peer Group | CFY 2023-24 Base Budget |  | ADD <br> Additional Benefits (Health Insurance, FRS, etc.) |  | ADD <br> Pay Increases, COLA, New FTE |  |  | D <br> iance <br> ement <br> es |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ADD } \\ \text { FTE } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 023-24 } \\ & \text { s-Based } \\ & \text { Idget } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Calhoun | 1 | \$ | 464,707 | \$ | 5,074 | \$ | 19,492 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 489,273 | 5.29\% |
| Lafayette | 1 | \$ | 318,146 | \$ | 2,664 | \$ | 6,807 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 327,617 | 2.98\% |
| Liberty | 1 | \$ | 327,977 | \$ | 4,883 | \$ | 15,993 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 348,853 | 6.37\% |
| Union | 1 | \$ | 505,304 | \$ | 6,011 | \$ | 35,336 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 546,651 | 8.18\% |
| Baker | 2 | \$ | 737,327 | \$ | 34,408 | \$ | 37,896 |  |  |  | 1.00 | \$ | 809,631 | 9.81\% |
| Dixie | 2 | \$ | 508,613 | \$ | 11,220 | \$ | 69,234 |  |  |  | 1.00 | \$ | 589,067 | 15.82\% |
| Franklin | 2 | \$ | 683,540 | \$ | 6,681 | \$ | 25,109 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 715,330 | 4.65\% |
| Gilchrist | 2 | \$ | 565,033 | \$ | 8,890 | \$ | 56,792 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 630,715 | 11.62\% |
| Glades | 2 | \$ | 585,782 | \$ | 9,100 | \$ | 34,131 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 644,950 | 10.10\% |
| Gulf | 2 | \$ | 509,178 | \$ | - | \$ | - | \$ | 46,131 | \$ | 1.00 | \$ | 555,309 | 9.06\% |
| Hamilton | 2 | \$ | 616,518 | \$ | - | \$ | - |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 616,518 | 0.00\% |
| Holmes | 2 | \$ | 612,223 | \$ | 8,742 | \$ | 26,586 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 658,251 | 7.52\% |
| Jefferson | 2 | \$ | 519,199 | \$ | 8,559 | \$ | 12,123 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 539,881 | 3.98\% |
| Taylor | 2 | \$ | 580,885 | \$ | - | \$ | 38,237 |  |  | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 735,020 | 26.53\% |
| Washington | 2 | \$ | 816,722 | \$ | - | \$ | 30,067 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 846,789 | 3.68\% |
| Bradford | 3 | \$ | 885,312 | \$ | 26,377 | \$ | - |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 911,689 | 2.98\% |
| DeSoto | 3 | \$ | 833,561 | \$ | 868 | \$ | 117,701 |  |  | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 952,130 | 14.22\% |
| Gadsden | 3 | \$ | 1,385,865 | \$ | 38,935 | \$ | 31,185 | \$ | 56,999 | \$ | 1.00 | \$ | 1,527,984 | 10.25\% |
| Hardee | 3 | \$ | 934,354 | \$ | 12,798 | \$ | 24,352 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 971,504 | 3.98\% |
| Hendry | 3 | \$ | 1,320,085 | \$ | 28,999 | \$ | 87,571 | \$ | 49,000 | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 1,485,655 | 12.54\% |
| Jackson | 3 | \$ | 1,143,337 | \$ | 15,426 | \$ | 79,128 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 1,237,891 | 8.27\% |
| Levy | 3 | \$ | 1,162,848 | \$ | 13,212 | \$ | 78,104 |  |  | \$ | 0.22 | \$ | 1,268,434 | 9.08\% |
| Madison | 3 | \$ | 575,062 | \$ | 10,000 | \$ | 19,700 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 604,762 | 5.16\% |
| Okeechobee | 3 | \$ | 1,314,459 | \$ | 17,500 | \$ | 109,090 |  |  | \$ | 2.50 | \$ | 1,441,049 | 9.63\% |
| Suwannee | 3 | \$ | 1,218,052 | \$ | 7,949 | \$ | 63,484 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 1,368,190 | 12.33\% |
| Wakulla | 3 | \$ | 713,560 | \$ | 9,725 | \$ | 15,761 | \$ | 58,352 | \$ | 1.00 | \$ | 797,398 | 11.75\% |
| Citrus | 4 | \$ | 3,112,570 | \$ | 60,914 | \$ | 682,294 |  |  | \$ | 10.72 | \$ | 4,804,936 | 54.37\% |
| Columbia | 4 | \$ | 1,576,356 | \$ | - | \$ | 48,457 |  |  | \$ | 1.00 | \$ | 1,624,813 | 3.07\% |
| Flagler | 4 | \$ | 1,882,082 | \$ | 42,720 | \$ | 288,800 |  |  | \$ | 3.00 | \$ | 2,283,602 | 21.33\% |
| Highlands | 4 | \$ | 2,040,723 | \$ | 15,714 | \$ | 315,035 | \$ | 71,616 | \$ | 5.00 | \$ | 2,443,088 | 19.72\% |
| Indian River | 4 | \$ | 3,071,109 | \$ | 10,716 | \$ | 82,196 |  |  | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 3,259,551 | 6.14\% |
| Nassau | 4 | \$ | 1,614,048 | \$ | - | \$ | 137,515 | \$ | 96,236 | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 1,847,799 | 14.48\% |
| Putnam | 4 | \$ | 2,225,729 | \$ | 24,630 | \$ | 98,686 | \$ | 71,444 | \$ | 1.00 | \$ | 2,420,489 | 8.75\% |
| Sumter | 4 | \$ | 1,970,669 | \$ | 33,556 | \$ | 98,686 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 2,407,212 | 22.15\% |
| Walton | 4 | \$ | 1,710,675 | \$ | 33,660 | \$ | 68,845 |  |  | \$ | 0.85 | \$ | 2,044,191 | 19.50\% |
| Alachua | 5 | \$ | 6,001,068 | \$ | 55,786 | \$ | 309,431 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 6,366,285 | 6.09\% |
| Charlotte | 5 | \$ | 3,649,428 | \$ | 32,060 | \$ | 185,410 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 3,866,898 | 5.96\% |
| Clay | 5 | \$ | 3,792,190 | \$ | 6,505 | \$ | 199,344 |  |  | \$ | 1.00 | \$ | 3,998,039 | 5.43\% |
| Hernando | 5 | \$ | 3,532,910 | \$ | 87,734 | \$ | 440,285 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 4,060,929 | 14.95\% |
| Martin | 5 | \$ | 3,612,438 | \$ | 23,835 | \$ | 307,688 |  |  | \$ | 2.00 | \$ | 4,069,739 | 12.66\% |
| Monroe | 5 | \$ | 3,630,596 | \$ | 445,830 | \$ | 261,620 |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 4,467,832 | 23.06\% |
| Okaloosa | 5 | \$ | 3,767,463 | \$ | 35,659 | \$ | - |  |  | \$ |  | \$ | 4,325,746 | 14.82\% |


| County | Peer <br> Group |  | CFY 2023-24 Base Budget |  | ADD <br> Additional efits (Health urance, FRS, etc.) |  | ADD <br> Increases, A, New FTE |  | D <br> liance <br> cement ues |  | ADD <br> Shifts, IT ues, Local s, Other | $\begin{gathered} \text { ADD } \\ \text { FTE } \end{gathered}$ |  | CFY 2023-24 <br> Needs-Based <br> Budget |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saint Johns | 5 | \$ | 3,706,480 | \$ | 61,660 | \$ | 926,580 |  |  | \$ | - | 8.00 | \$ | 4,694,720 | 26.66\% |
| Santa Rosa | 5 | \$ | 3,289,742 | \$ | 87,594 | \$ | 297,879 | \$ | 134,154 | \$ | 918,585 | 17.68 | \$ | 4,727,954 | 43.72\% |
| Bay | 6 | \$ | 3,991,954 | \$ | 24,054 | \$ | 310,007 |  |  | \$ | - | 1.00 | \$ | 4,326,015 | 8.37\% |
| Brevard | 6 | \$ | 11,656,116 | \$ | 166,864 | \$ | 663,000 |  |  | \$ | - | 1.00 | \$ | 12,485,980 | 7.12\% |
| Collier | 6 | \$ | 6,642,082 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,508,319 |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | 8,150,401 | 22.71\% |
| Escambia | 6 | \$ | 7,184,161 | \$ | - | \$ | 315,018 |  |  | \$ | - | 3.00 | \$ | 7,499,179 | 4.38\% |
| Lake | 6 | \$ | 6,393,643 | \$ | 239,589 | \$ | 357,874 | \$ | 98,730 | \$ | - | 2.00 | \$ | 7,089,836 | 10.89\% |
| Leon | 6 | \$ | 6,095,481 | \$ | 66,217 | \$ | 197,742 |  |  | \$ | 52,000 |  | \$ | 6,411,440 | 5.18\% |
| Manatee | 6 | \$ | 6,122,230 | \$ | 12,290 | \$ | 423,118 |  |  | \$ | - | 0.50 | \$ | 6,557,638 | 7.11\% |
| Marion | 6 | \$ | 6,763,207 | \$ | 29,106 | \$ | 400,746 |  |  | \$ | - | 0.75 | \$ | 7,193,059 | 6.36\% |
| Osceola | 6 | \$ | 7,985,486 | \$ | 258,719 | \$ | 512,004 |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | 8,756,209 | 9.65\% |
| Pasco | 6 | \$ | 11,995,819 | \$ | 381,882 | \$ | 706,527 |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | 13,084,228 | 9.07\% |
| Saint Lucie | 6 | \$ | 6,873,479 | \$ | 84,860 | \$ | 1,074,872 |  |  | \$ | - | 3.00 | \$ | 8,033,211 | 16.87\% |
| Sarasota | 6 | \$ | 8,374,385 | \$ | 53,510 | \$ | 938,274 |  |  | \$ | - | 8.50 | \$ | 9,366,169 | 11.84\% |
| Seminole | 6 | \$ | 9,130,663 | \$ | 135,621 | \$ | 1,086,467 |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | 10,352,751 | 13.38\% |
| Duval | 7 | \$ | 20,154,700 | \$ | 491,007 | \$ | 713,636 | \$ | 310,144 | \$ | 1,110,256 | 5.00 | \$ | 22,779,743 | 13.02\% |
| Lee | 7 | \$ | 12,059,110 | \$ | - | \$ | 660,000 |  |  | \$ | 360,000 | 17.00 | \$ | 13,079,110 | 8.46\% |
| Pinellas | 7 | \$ | 23,301,485 | \$ | 1,261,215 | \$ | 2,643,040 |  |  | \$ | - | 18.55 | \$ | 27,205,740 | 16.76\% |
| Polk | 7 | \$ | 12,775,707 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,696,853 |  |  | \$ | - | 11.00 | \$ | 14,472,560 | 13.28\% |
| Volusia | 7 | \$ | 11,983,254 | \$ | 32,289 | \$ | 1,788,102 | \$ | 103,981 | \$ | - | 21.00 | \$ | 13,907,626 | 16.06\% |
| Broward | 8 | \$ | 40,129,738 | \$ | 998,161 | \$ | 3,870,661 |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | 44,998,560 | 12.13\% |
| Hillsborough | 8 | \$ | 31,166,192 | \$ | 586,000 | \$ | 1,206,700 |  |  | \$ | 1,598,451 |  | \$ | 34,557,343 | 10.88\% |
| Miami-Dade | 8 | \$ | 72,824,805 | \$ | 484,578 | \$ | 6,086,748 |  |  | \$ | - | 44.00 | \$ | 79,396,131 | 9.02\% |
| Orange | 8 | \$ | 29,862,585 | \$ | 348,999 | \$ | 3,199,674 |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | 33,411,258 | 11.88\% |
| Palm Beach | 8 | \$ | 31,123,691 | \$ | 506,011 | \$ | 647,575 |  |  | \$ | - |  | \$ | 32,277,277 | 3.71\% |
| STATEWIDE TOTAL |  | $\$ \quad 458,613,896$ |  | $\$ \quad 7,507,566$ |  | \$ | 36,690,901 | \$ | ,096,787 | \$ | 6,816,676 | 204.27 | \$ | 510,725,826 | 11.36\% |


| Jury Reimbursement Funding: | $\$$ | $11,700,000$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Jury Deficit Funding: | $\$$ | $4,300,000$ |
| TOTAL NEEDS-BASED BUDGET: | $\$$ | $526,725,826$ |

Amount Above Revenue-Limited Budget: \$ 24,589,777



## To: CCOC Budget Committee Members

From: Stacy M. Butterfield, CPA
Polk County Clerk of the Court \& Comptroller firs

## Subject: Budget Allocations

Date: July 25, 2023

I request that you consider four cost factors for budget allocation. At our last meeting, we discussed many options. This committee is task with allocation of the limited resources available and make decisions on the allocation to support our performance and workload in a fair and equitable manner. The committee has focused on the weighted - workload measures and made substantial strides on refining the process. I appreciate all the Clerks efforts to ensure we are counting cases according to the rules, and especially the task of the workgroup lead by Clerk Gary Cooney to provide us with the confidence in the numbers we rely on to make decisions. I strongly feel the weighted workload measure should be a primary factor in decisions, however I also strongly feel there are other cost factors impacting clerks' costs that are not accounted for in the weighted workload measure. These factors should be taken into consideration in the decisions on allocating resources. These factors have been identified in the past years by this committee and independent studies by other entities. I am asking the committee to consider four factors that impact costs and not accounted for in the weighted workload.

## 1. Costs of staff to support Senior Judges.

a. In this packet you will find a cost calculation that takes the number of proposed senior judge day by circuit for FY 23/24 from the TCBC 6/23/23 meeting documents and divide it by 260 weekdays in a year to get FTE's per Circuit.
b. We then allocated those FTE's across the counties in those circuits using weighted cases.
c. The formula then uses the FTE's needed per new judge calculations from the New Judges Funding Workgroup rounded up to the next whole FTE.
d. The formula then uses the FTE's needed per new judge calculations from the New Judges Funding Workgroup rounded up to the next whole FTE.
e. Next, we multiplied the fractional senior judge FTE per county times the FTE's needed to support a new judge times $\$ 65,775$, the statewide average FTE cost approved by the CCOC Budget Committee
2. Costs to operate multiple branches- We calculated ours using the following formula.
a. Using total budgeted cost for the branch we split it between court and non-court.
b. We then determined the court costs that would be eliminated if you closed the branch. We eliminated the branch manager and $25 \%$ of the staff because we needed the remaining $75 \%$ to handle the workload that would be forced on the other locations. $25 \%$ is a conservative estimate as you may be able to eliminate more than $25 \%$ by consolidating the workload into fewer locations.
c. We then determined the court costs that would be eliminated if you closed the branch. We eliminated the branch manager and $25 \%$ of the staff because we needed the remaining $75 \%$ to handle the workload that would be forced on the other locations. $25 \%$ is a conservative estimate as you may be able to eliminate more than $25 \%$ by consolidating the workload into fewer locations.
d. The resulting "eliminated costs" are the incremental cost to maintain services at the branches.

## 3. Cost Differential per County

a. We used the DMS CAD table that has annual cost differentials per position by county. We divided the annual CAD difference by the max annual salary for that position's paygrade to get a percentage of CAD to total or percentage increase the CAD represents for that position in that county.
b. The data was then separated by County.
c. The total annual maximum CAD amounts were divided by the total of the Maximum annual salaries for each county to determine an average percentage of CAD/Max annual salaries.

## 4. Small County Salaries and Benefits

a. In our previous meeting one of the allocation options considered was $5 \%$ of Salaries or Salaries and Benefits. I recommend that we ensure that the counties in peer groups 1,2 and 3 receive an increase of at least the agreed upon percentage of their salaries and benefits. Even ensuring this amount doesn't give additional funding to keep the lights on in their counties.

Senior Judge Analysis

1. Take the number of proposed senior judge days by circuit for $F Y 23 / 24$ from the $\operatorname{TCBC} 6 / 23 / 23$ meeting documents and divide it by 260 week days in a year to get FTE's per Circuit.
2. Allocate those FTE's across the counties in those circuits using weighted cases.
3. Use the FTE's needed per new judge calculations from the New Judges Funding Workgroup rounded up to the next whole FTE.
4. Multiply the fractional senior judge FTE per county times the FTE's needed to support a new judge times $\$ 65,775$, the statewide average FTE cost approved by the CCOC Budget Committee.



Weighted Cases - PROVISIONAL Weighted Workload Measure (CFY 2021-22) from CCOC Budget Development spreadsheet
Sr Judges - From the TCBC 6/23/23 meeting documents (chart attached)

Average FTE - $\$ 65,775$, the statewide average FTE cost approved by the CCOC Budget Committee.

## Trial Court Budget Commission

 June 23, 2023Tampa, FL

Agenda Item V.A.: FY 2023-24 Allocations
Continuation Base Budget Allocations

FY 2023-24 Trial Court Budget Allocations
Senior Judget Days - General Revenue Fund
Cost Center - 630

| Approved FY 2022-23 |  |  | Proposed FY 2023-24 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Circuit | Days | Comp. to Senior <br> Judges 100630 | Days | Comp. to Senior Judges 100630 |
| Statewide | 50 | 25,720.25 | 50 | 25,720.25 |
| 1 | 154 | 78,116.50 | 154 | 78,116.50 |
| 2 | 104 | 52,754.00 | 104 | 52,754.00 |
| 3 | 60 | 30,435.00 | 60 | 30,435.00 |
| 4 | 232 | 117,682.00 | 232 | 117,682.00 |
| 5 | 193 | 97,899.25 | 193 | 97,899.25 |
| 6 | 301 | 152,682.25 | 301 | 152,682.25 |
| 7 | 192 | 97,392.00 | 192 | 97,392.00 |
| 8 | 90 | 45,652.50 | 90 | 45,652.50 |
| 9 | 313 | 158,769.25 | 313 | 158,769.25 |
| 10 | 168 | 85,218.00 | 168 | 85,218.00 |
| 11 | 463 | 234,856.75 | 463 | 234,856.75 |
| 12 | 132 | 66,957.00 | 132 | 66,957.00 |
| 13 | 269 | 136,450.25 | 269 | 136,450.25 |
| 14 | 95 | 48,188.75 | 95 | 48,188.75 |
| 15 | 239 | 121,232.75 | 239 | 121,232.75 |
| 16 | 33 | 16,739.25 | 33 | 16,739.25 |
| 17 | 370 | 187,682.50 | 370 | 187,682.50 |
| 18 | 181 | 91,812.25 | 181 | 91,812.25 |
| 19 | 121 | 61,377.25 | 121 | 61,377.25 |
| 20 | 221 | 112,102.25 | 221 | 112,102.25 |
|  | 3,981 | 2,019,720.00 | 3,981 | 2,019,720.00 |

FTE's (Sr Judge Days/260)

1. Take total budgeted cost for the branch and split it between court and non-court.
2. From the portion related to courts, determine the costs that would be eliminated if you closed the branch. We eliminated the branch manager and $25 \%$ of the staff assuming that the remaining $75 \%$ would be needed to handle the workload that would be forced on the other locations. $25 \%$ is a conservative estimate as you may be able to eliminate more than $25 \%$ by consolidating the workload into fewer locations.
3. The resulting costs determined in \#2 are what the branch cost to keep it open

|  |  |  | Cost of branch <br> (Could save if <br> branch closed) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Total Cost | Non-Court | Court |  |
| Lakeland Branch |  |  |  |  |
| Personal (Salary \& Benefits) |  |  |  |  |
| Manager | $\$ 109,433$ | $\$ 35,019$ | $\$ 74,414$ | $\$ 74,414$ |
| Staff | $\$ 792,037$ | $\$ 253,452$ | $\$ 538,585$ | $\$ 134,646$ |
| Operating | $\$ 71,430$ | $\$ 22,858$ | $\$ 48,572$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Capital | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| Total | $\$ 972,900$ | $\$ 311,329$ | $\$ 661,571$ | $\$ 209,060$ |


|  |  |  | Cost of branch <br> (Could save if |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total Cost | Non-Court | Court | branch closed) |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 91,511$ | $\$ 29,284$ | $\$ 62,227$ | $\$ 62,227$ |
| $\$ 770,853$ | $\$ 246,673$ | $\$ 524,180$ | $\$ 131,045$ |
| $\$ 78,095$ | $\$ 24,990$ | $\$ 53,105$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\$ 940,459$ | $\$ 300,947$ | $\$ 639,512$ | $\$ 193,272$ |


| Class Code | Class Title | County | Pay Plan | Pay Grade | Hourly Max | Monthly Max | Annual Max | Annual Max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0001 | CLERK | Broward | 01 | 004 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$32,760.00 |
|  | CLERK | Dade | 01 | 004 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$32,760.00 |
|  | CLERK | Monroe | 01 | 004 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$32,760.00 |
|  | CLERK | Palm Beach | 01 | 004 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$32,760.00 |
| 0003 | CLERK SPECIALIST | Broward | 01 | 007 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$35,938.53 |
|  | CLERK SPECIALIST | Palm Beach | 01 | 007 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$35,938.53 |
|  | CLERK SPECIALIST | Monroe | 01 | 007 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$35,938.53 |
|  | CLERK SPECIALIST | Dade | 01 | 007 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$35,938.53 |
| 0004 | SENIOR CLERK | Broward | 01 | 011 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$42,712.93 |
|  | SENIOR CLERK | Monroe | 01 | 011 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$42,712.93 |
|  | SENIOR CLERK | Palm Beach | 01 | 011 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$42,712.93 |
|  | SENIOR CLERK | Dade | 01 | 011 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$42,712.93 |
| 0005 | CLERK SPECIALIST - F/C | Broward | 01 | 008 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$37,494.03 |
|  | CLERK SPECIALIST - F/C | Dade | 01 | 008 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$37,494.03 |
|  | CLERK SPECIALIST - F/C | Monroe | 01 | 008 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$37,494.03 |
|  | CLERK SPECIALIST - F/C | Palm Beach | 01 | 008 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$37,494.03 |
| 0008 | SENIOR CLERICAL SPECIALIST | Broward | 01 | 012 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$44,792.81 |
|  | SENIOR CLERICAL SPECIALIST | Dade | 01 | 012 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$44,792.81 |
|  | SENIOR CLERICAL SPECIALIST | Palm Beach | 01 | 012 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$44,792.81 |
|  | SENIOR CLERICAL SPECIALIST | Monroe | 01 | 012 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$44,792.81 |
| 0011 | RECEPTIONIST | Broward | 01 | 005 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$33,608.59 |
|  | RECEPTIONIST | Dade | 01 | 005 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$33,608.59 |
|  | RECEPTIONIST | Palm Beach | 01 | 005 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$33,608.59 |
|  | RECEPTIONIST | Monroe | 01 | 005 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$33,608.59 |
| 0045 | RECORDS TECHNICIAN | Broward | 01 | 013 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$49,888.01 |
|  | RECORDS TECHNICIAN | Dade | 01 | 013 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$49,888.01 |
|  | RECORDS TECHNICIAN | Monroe | 01 | 013 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$49,888.01 |
|  | RECORDS TECHNICIAN | Palm Beach | 01 | 013 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$49,888.01 |
| 0073 | CLERK TYPIST | Broward | 01 | 005 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$33,608.59 |
|  | CLERK TYPIST | Dade | 01 | 005 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$33,608.59 |
|  | CLERK TYPIST | Monroe | 01 | 005 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$33,608.59 |
|  | CLERK TYPIST | Palm Beach | 01 | 005 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$33,608.59 |
| 0078 | CLERK TYPIST SPECIALIST | Broward | 01 | 008 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$37,494.03 |
|  | CLERK TYPIST SPECIALIST | Palm Beach | 01 | 008 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$37,494.03 |
|  | CLERK TYPIST SPECIALIST | Monroe | 01 | 008 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$37,494.03 |
|  | CLERK TYPIST SPECIALIST | Dade | 01 | 008 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$37,494.03 |

CAD \% |

| Class Code | Class Title | County | Pay Plan | Pay Grade | Hourly Max | Monthly Max | Annual Max | Annual Max | CAD \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8445 | CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION TECHNICIAN | Broward | 01 | 011 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$42,712.93 | 2.97\% |
|  | CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION TECHNICIAN | Monroe | 01 | 011 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$42,712.93 | 2.97\% |
|  | CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION TECHNICIAN | Dade | 01 | 011 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$42,712.93 | 2.97\% |
|  | CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION TECHNICIAN | Palm Beach | 01 | 011 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$42,712.93 | 2.97\% |
| 8448 | SENIOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION TECH | Broward | 01 | 014 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$52,516.89 | 2.42\% |
|  | SENIOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION TECH | Dade | 01 | 014 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$52,516.89 | 2.42\% |
|  | SENIOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION TECH | Monroe | 01 | 014 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$52,516.89 | 2.42\% |
|  | SENIOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION TECH | Palm Beach | 01 | 014 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$52,516.89 | 2.42\% |
| 8459 | FORENSIC TECHNOLOGIST | Broward | 01 | 018 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$65,482.44 | 1.94\% |
|  | FORENSIC TECHNOLOGIST | Dade | 01 | 018 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$65,482.44 | 1.94\% |
|  | FORENSIC TECHNOLOGIST | Monroe | 01 | 018 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$65,482.44 | 1.94\% |
|  | FORENSIC TECHNOLOGIST | Palm Beach | 01 | 018 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$65,482.44 | 1.94\% |
| 9000 | DRIVER LICENSES EXAMINER I | Broward | 01 | 013 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$49,888.01 | 2.54\% |
|  | DRIVER LICENSES EXAMINER I | Dade | 01 | 013 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$49,888.01 | 2.54\% |
|  | DRIVER LICENSES EXAMINER I | Monroe | 01 | 013 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$49,888.01 | 2.54\% |
|  | DRIVER LICENSES EXAMINER I | Palm Beach | 01 | 013 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$49,888.01 | 2.54\% |
| 9002 | DRIVER LICENSES EXAMINER II | Broward | 01 | 015 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$55,297.55 | 2.29\% |
|  | DRIVER LICENSES EXAMINER II | Dade | 01 | 015 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$55,297.55 | 2.29\% |
|  | DRIVER LICENSES EXAMINER II | Palm Beach | 01 | 015 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$55,297.55 | 2.29\% |
|  | DRIVER LICENSES EXAMINER II | Monroe | 01 | 015 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$55,297.55 | 2.29\% |
| 9055 | LICENSE \& REGISTRATION INSPECTOR | Broward | 01 | 012 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$44,792.81 | 2.83\% |
|  | LICENSE \& REGISTRATION INSPECTOR | Dade | 01 | 012 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$44,792.81 | 2.83\% |
|  | LICENSE \& REGISTRATION INSPECTOR | Monroe | 01 | 012 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$44,792.81 | 2.83\% |
|  | LICENSE \& REGISTRATION INSPECTOR | Palm Beach | 01 | 012 | 0.61 | 105.73 | 1,268.80 | \$44,792.81 | 2.83\% |
| 9132 | RESEARCH MANAGER A | Broward | 01 | 026 | 0.60 | 104.00 | 1,248.00 | \$104,833.74 | 1.19\% |
|  | RESEARCH MANAGER A | Dade | 01 | 026 | 0.60 | 104.00 | 1,248.00 | \$104,833.74 | 1.19\% |
|  | RESEARCH MANAGER A | Monroe | 01 | 026 | 0.60 | 104.00 | 1,248.00 | \$104,833.74 | 1.19\% |
|  | RESEARCH MANAGER A | Palm Beach | 01 | 026 | 0.60 | 104.00 | 1,248.00 | \$104,833.74 | 1.19\% |

