

2017-19 Biennium Budget Decision Package

Agency: **050 Commission on Judicial Conduct**

Decision Package Code/Title: **AH Salary Adjustments**

Budget Period: **2017-19**

Budget Level: **PL – Performance Level**

Agency Recommendation Summary Text:

The Commission on Judicial Conduct requests an adjustment of its operating budget to bring salaries to an appropriate level.

Fiscal Summary: Decision package total dollar and FTE cost/savings by year, by fund, for 4 years. Additional fiscal details are required below.

Operating Expenditures	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Fund 001-1 General Fund	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
Total Cost	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000	\$35,000
Staffing	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
FTEs	0	0	0	0
Revenue	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
	0	0	0	0
Object of Expenditure	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021
Obj. A - Salaries	\$29,500	\$29,500	\$29,500	\$29,500
Obj. B – Benefits	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500

Package Description

Pursuant to Article IV, Section 31 of the Washington State Constitution, the Commission on Judicial Conduct (Commission) is charged with receiving complaints lodged against judicial officers, conducting investigations as appropriate, and imposing sanctions within the range set forward by the constitution. The complexity, importance, and potential consequences of the work of the Commission are critical to the overall fairness, credibility, and effectiveness of the justice system in Washington State. A skilled, knowledgeable, and credible Executive Director and staff are required to support the volunteer members of the commission in the conduct of this work.

Despite performance that is consistently assessed as excellent by the Personnel Committee, due to budget limitations, the Executive Director has received only one merit increase since 2008. The Commission is committed to keeping staff pay commensurate with similar positions and retaining its highly skilled and knowledgeable staff with national expertise in the field of judicial ethics and discipline.

Retaining its highly skilled and knowledgeable staff will help the Commission to administer justice and work toward improving the safety of the people of Washington State. It will also facilitate accomplishing the strategic goal to impartially, efficiently and timely investigate and, where appropriate, publicly prosecute complaints of alleged ethical misconduct by (or disability of) Washington judicial officers (and certain state judicial branch employees).

The Commission therefore requests funding to increase the salary of the Executive Director by six percent to reach the maximum salary level approved by the Commission on August 1, 2008 and salaries of its administrative staff by four percent.

Base Budget: If the proposal is an expansion or alteration of a current program or service, provide information on the resources now devoted to the program or service.

This is not an expansion or alteration of a current program or service.

Decision Package expenditure, FTE and revenue assumptions, calculations and details:

Position	Current Salary	Percentage Increase		Total Annual Increase
		4%	6%	
Executive Director	139,008		8,340	8,340
Executive Assistant	76,416	3,057		3,057
Case Manager	81,384	3,255		3,255
Admin/IT Support Tech.	51,480	2,059		2,059
Senior Info. Sys. Mgr.	88,596	3,544		3,544
Sr. Invest Counsel	124,368	4,975		4,975
Invest. Counsel	106,308	4,252		4,252
Total Salaries	\$ 667,560	\$ 21,142	\$ 8,340	\$ 29,483
OASI (6.2%)	41,389	1,311	517	1,828
Retirement (11.18%)	74,633	2,364	932	3,296
Medicare (1.45%)	9,680	307	121	427
Total Benefits	\$ 125,702	\$ 3,981	\$ 1,571	\$ 5,552
Total Cost	\$ 793,262	\$ 25,123	\$ 9,911	\$ 35,034

Decision Package Justification and Impacts

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

N/A

Performance Measure detail:

Fully describe and quantify expected impacts on state residents and specific populations served.

Modestly rewarding staff with monetary recognition of outstanding work will help ensure retention of quality employees. Retaining existing well trained and experienced staff will ensure state residents are provided a quality response to the allegations brought to the Commission to investigate."

What are other important connections or impacts related to this proposal? Please complete the following table and provide detailed explanations or information below:

Impact(s) To:		Identify / Explanation
Regional/County impacts?	No	Identify:
Other local gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Tribal gov't impacts?	No	Identify:
Other state agency impacts?	No	Identify:
Responds to specific task force, report, mandate or exec order?	No	Identify:
Does request contain a compensation change?	Yes	Identify: Salary Increases for agency staff.
Does request require a change to a collective bargaining agreement?	No	Identify:
Facility/workplace needs or impacts?	No	Identify:
Capital Budget Impacts?	No	Identify:
Is change required to existing statutes, rules or contracts?	No	Identify:
Is the request related to or a result of litigation?	No	Identify lawsuit (please consult with Attorney General's Office):

Is the request related to Puget Sound recovery?	No	If yes, see budget instructions Section 14.4 for additional instructions
Identify other important connections		

Please provide a detailed discussion of connections/impacts identified above.

See package description.

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

The alternative is to keep funding at current levels. This option would make budgeting for salary adjustments difficult because of the risk of the Commission having to request additional funding for contested cases, which may arise at any time. The Commission runs no collateral programs and operates on an extremely lean budget.

What are the consequences of not funding this request?

Without additional funding, it would be difficult for the Commission to remain competitive in retaining the most knowledgeable and skilled staff in the very specialized field of judicial ethics and discipline.

How has or can the agency address the issue or need in its current appropriation level?

Current appropriation levels reflect current fixed and discretionary costs. Without additional funding, the Commission would have to reduce allotments in discretionary but critical spending for legal expenses, court reporters, and training. Addressing the issue at the current appropriation level would result in a lack of funding to hold a hearing for a single contested legal case in either fiscal year of the biennium.

Other supporting materials: N/A

Information technology: Does this Decision Package include funding for any IT-related costs, including hardware, software, services (including cloud-based services), contracts or IT staff?

- No 
- Yes Continue to IT Addendum below and follow the directions on the bottom of the addendum to meet requirements for OCIO review.)