

Agency: 050 Commission On Judicial Conduct
Decision Package Code/Title: AC Spending Authority Adjustment
Budget Period: 2015-17
Budget Level: M2 - Inflation and Other Rate Changes

Recommendation Summary Text:

The Commission on Judicial Conduct (CJC) requests an adjustment of its operating budget in the supplemental 2015-17 biennium. This would correct uneven funding that currently results in more funds available in fiscal year 2016 than fiscal year 2017.

Fiscal Detail

	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
Operating Expenditures			
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	(29,000)	29,000	0
Total Cost	(29,000)	29,000	

Package Description:

The CJC's enacted 2015-17 budget reflects \$58,000 more spending authority in FY 16 than in FY 17. The supplemental budget requests to move \$29,000 from FY 16 to FY 17. This would adjust spending authority to a consistent level for the entire biennium.

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

The CJC operates under a lean, focused budget to fulfill its singular constitutional mandate- to enforce the ethics code for state judges. Distributing operating funds evenly between both fiscal years of the biennium will allow the agency to fulfill its mandate consistently and efficiently for the entire biennium.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity:

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

In order to investigate and, where necessary, prosecute cases of judicial misconduct, the CJC needs to have access to funding at consistent levels.

Does this DP provide essential support to one or more of the Governor's Results Washington priorities?

Not applicable

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

Not applicable

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

One alternative is to keep funding at current levels. This option would make budgeting existing funds difficult with the risk of the CJC having to request additional funding for contested cases in the second year of the biennium. The other alternative is the currently proposed solution which would allow the CJC to better manage its resources and significantly reduce or eliminate the possibility of requests for additional funding in the second year of the biennium.

What are the consequences of adopting or not adopting this package?

Without this correction, the CJC will have to reduce allotments in discretionary but critical spending for legal expenses, court reporters, and training. It will also lack sufficient funding to hold a single contested legal cases during the second fiscal year of the biennium. Training is essential to keep Commission members updated and trained in the areas of judicial conduct and ethics so they reach appropriate decisions on complaints of alleged ethical misconduct in an impartial, efficient, effective, and timely manner.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

Not applicable

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

The CJC's enacted 2015-17 budget includes \$58,000 more spending authority in FY 16 than in FY 17. The supplemental budget requests to move half of that difference, \$29,000, from FY 16 to FY 17.

\$58,000 divided by 2 = \$29,000

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

The requested change would be on-going change in future biennia.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2016</u>	<u>FY 2017</u>	<u>Total</u>
E Goods\Other Services	(29,000)	29,000	0