

CB.00
Office of the Public Defender

Operating Budget Data

(\$ in Thousands)

	<u>FY 00</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 01</u> <u>Working</u>	<u>FY 02</u> <u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>% Change</u> <u>Prior Year</u>
General Fund	\$45,793	\$47,519	\$53,899	\$6,380	13.4%
Special Fund	248	212	198	(14)	(6.6%)
Federal Fund	64	23	28	5	22.6%
Reimbursable Fund	<u>1,104</u>	<u>1,009</u>	<u>1,125</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>11.6%</u>
Total Funds	\$47,209	\$48,762	\$55,250	\$6,488	13.3%

- Despite annual deficiencies since fiscal 1995, there is currently no fiscal 2001 deficiency appropriation. Review of the agency's budget suggests that current and proposed spending levels may be inadequate.
- An apparent \$2 million increase for turnover relief is offset by underfunding of information technology costs in fiscal 2002.

Personnel Data

	<u>FY 00</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 01</u> <u>Working</u>	<u>FY 02</u> <u>Allowance</u>	<u>Change</u>
Regular Positions	646.50	727.30	763.30	36.00
Contractual FTEs	<u>213.40</u>	<u>127.50</u>	<u>91.50</u>	<u>(36.00)</u>
Total Personnel	859.90	854.80	854.80	0.00

Vacancy Data: Regular

Budgeted Turnover: FY 02	48.32	6.33%
Positions Vacant as of 12/31/00	28.80	3.96%

- 36 new positions in fiscal 2002 are all contractual conversions resulting in a net increase of only \$191,000 in additional fiscal 2002 personnel expenses.

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

For further information contact: Cynthia M. Boersma

Phone: (410) 946-5530

Analysis in Brief

Issues

Underfunding Continues in Fiscal 2002: Underfunding of the Office of the Public Defender (OPD) occurs in several ways: a history of deficiency appropriations, unrealistic budgeted turnover rates, and incommensurate attorney salaries. This year, underfunding continues, as apparent turnover relief in the fiscal 2002 allowance is offset by significant reductions in information technology support. **The Public Defender should discuss whether the OPD expects a fiscal 2001 deficiency and whether the fiscal 2002 allowance provides sufficient support for fiscal 2002 estimated panel attorney fees, legal services support fees, and baseline information technology costs. A representative from the Department of Budget and Management should explain to the budget committees the reasons for continual underfunding of the OPD.**

Recommended Actions

1. Concur with Governor's allowance.

Updates

Representation at Bail Legislation Re-introduced: SB 78/HB 703 provides for public defender representation at bail review hearings for all indigent defendants statewide, contingent upon funding. The OPD projects that enactment of this legislation would add approximately \$1.3 million to annual personnel and operating expenses.

CB.00
Office of the Public Defender

Operating Budget Analysis

Program Description

The Office of the Public Defender (OPD) provides counsel and related services to indigent persons. Representation is provided in criminal trials, appeals, juvenile causes, post-conviction proceedings, parole and probation revocations, disposition of detainees, and involuntary commitments to mental institutions. The office is supported by five divisions: general administration, district operations, appellate and inmate services, involuntary institutionalization, and capital defense.

Governor's Proposed Budget

The fiscal 2002 allowance for the OPD is \$55.25 million, increasing \$6.49 million, or 13.3%, over the fiscal 2001 working appropriation. General funds comprise 97.6% of OPD's fiscal 2002 allowance. **Exhibit 1** illustrates the notable changes in the fiscal 2002 allowance.

The OPD receives reimbursable funds from the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services' Divisions of Parole and Probation (DPP) and Pretrial Detention and Services (DPDS) for its representation of defendants in Baltimore City's Drug Court and for representation of defendants through the Quality Case Review program at the Central Booking and Intake Facility (CBIF). The OPD also receives reimbursable funds from the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) for representation of detained juveniles.

Anne Arundel County provides special funds reimbursement for public defender representation through the Inmate Services, Criminal Justice Drug Intervention, and Circuit Court Case Management Projects. Federal funds are disbursed through the Drug Control and System Improvement Formula Grant.

Personnel

The fiscal 2002 allowance includes 36 new regular positions and a corresponding decrease of 36 contractual positions. All new fiscal 2002 positions are conversions of contractual positions to regular positions with full fringe benefits. Converting contractual employees to regular employees continues an initiative to adequately compensate OPD attorneys and staff. Although new positions add approximately \$1 million in personnel expenses, this increase is offset by a decrease of \$823,000 in contractual expenses.

The significant fiscal 2002 increase in personnel expenses occurs in turnover adjustments with a \$2.22 million increase over the fiscal 2001 working appropriation. The fiscal 2001 budgeted turnover of nearly 11% was unrealistically high compared to the OPD's 6.42% vacancy rate in December 1999. The agency's vacancy rate has dropped to 3.96% as of December 31, 2000. As a result, OPD salaries are underfunded by as much as \$3 million in fiscal 2001. While the fiscal 2002 allowance provides some

Exhibit 1

CB.00 - Office of the Public Defender

**Governor's Proposed Budget
Office of the Public Defender
(\$ in Thousands)**

How Much It Grows:	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>Special Fund</u>	<u>Federal Fund</u>	<u>Reimbursable Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
2001 Working Appropriation	\$47,519	\$212	\$23	\$1,009	\$48,762
2002 Governor's Allowance	53,899	198	28	1,125	55,250
Amount Change	\$6,380	(\$14)	\$5	\$117	\$6,488
Percent Change	13.4%	(6.6%)	22.6%	11.6%	13.3%

Where It Goes:

Personnel Expenses

Net cost of new positions	\$191
Fiscal 2002 general salary increase	747
Increments, fiscal 2001 increase phase-in and other	1,791
Employee and retiree health insurance rate change	(301)
Retirement contribution rate change	(323)
Workers' compensation premium assessment	(61)
Turnover adjustments	2,216
Other fringe benefit adjustments	321

Additional Operating Expenses

Panel attorney compensation	839
Transcript fees	373
Expert witness and forensic evidence expenses	138
Rent increases	160
Information technology	115
Telephone charge increase due to decentralized telecommunications	115
Office equipment replacement	71
Two replacement vehicles	23
Miscellaneous adjustments	72

Total **\$6,488**

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

relief, it nonetheless represents a budgeted turnover rate of 6.33% -- still notably higher than the agency's actual vacancy rate. The relationship between the OPD's budgeted turnover and consistent underfunding

CB.00 - Office of the Public Defender

of its operations is discussed in more detail in the Issues section of this analysis.

Community Court

The OPD fiscal 2002 allowance includes six positions held vacant pending the beginning of Community Court. As a result, \$112,000 in general funds was reverted in fiscal 2000, and a corresponding amount is likely to remain unexpended in fiscal 2001. The Greater Baltimore Council, sponsor of the Community Court initiative, has decided not to implement the project as originally conceived. All Community Court participants, the OPD included, are examining the feasibility of adapting Community Court's resources and mission to the expedited programs operating through the courtroom at the CBIF and through the Baltimore City District Court.

The OPD reports that it can make use of the Community Court positions to promote long-term contractual employees by hiring them into these existing vacancies. Although the Department of Legislative Services (DLS) has recommended deleting vacant Community Court positions in the Judiciary budget, it would be counterproductive to delete positions and reduce funding in the OPD's budget, given continued underfunding of its operations. **DLS recommends the OPD be permitted to fill the vacant Community Court positions. DLS recommends that in exchange for keeping these Community Court positions, the OPD not receive any new positions for the Early Disposition Program or the new incarnation of Community Court until a plan for Community Court's incorporation into existing programs is implemented and a documented increase in caseloads warrants additional positions.**

Panel Attorney Compensation, Expert Witness Fees, and Transcript Fees

Increases in panel attorney compensation, expert witness fees, and transcript fees expenses are only apparent, as the fiscal 2002 allowance is essentially equivalent in each area with fiscal 2000 actual expenditures, indicating that these costs may have been underfunded in fiscal 2001.

Information Technology

The fiscal 2002 allowance for information technology includes approximately \$500,000; an increase of approximately \$115,000 over the fiscal 2001 working appropriation. However, the OPD's fiscal 2002 information technology project request (ITPR) documents a need for nearly \$1.1 million to maintain baseline information technology operations. Potential underfunding in fiscal 2002 of necessary information technology maintenance is discussed in the Issues section of the analysis.

Performance Analysis: Managing for Results

Exhibit 2 depicts workload data for the OPD divisions. The OPD's workload data shows continuing increases in caseloads for criminal trial representation, appellate and inmate services, and a significant rise in active capital cases. Appellate services and capital caseloads are exceeding initial 2001 projections. On the other hand, use of panel attorneys appears to be declining, despite predicted increases related to revisions of the Child in Need of Assistance (CINA) statute. **The Public Defender should comment at the budget hearings on the decline in the use of panel attorneys and explain why these declines are not accompanied by corresponding reductions in panel attorney expenses in fiscal 2002.**

While the OPD reports workload data associated with all of its activities, it does not provide sufficient measures of quality. The OPD has indicated that it is developing attorney caseload standards; however, these standards have yet to emerge. This point is repeated in the Issues section of the analysis, as relevant attorney caseload standards will assist in assessing attorney staffing needs at the OPD. The Managing for Results submission also does not include strategies which link the OPD goals and objectives to the OPD annual budget. **The OPD should develop performance measures reflecting the quality of the OPD representation, including attorney caseload standards for each type of case the OPD attorneys handle. The OPD should submit the performance measures and strategies with its fiscal 2003 budget request.**

CB.00 - Office of the Public Defender

Exhibit 2

Program Measurement Data
Office of the Public Defender
Fiscal Years

	<u>Actual</u> <u>1998</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>1999</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>2000</u>	<u>Est.</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Current</u> <u>Est.</u> <u>2001</u>	<u>Est.</u> <u>2002</u>	<u>Ann.</u> <u>Chg.</u> <u>98-00</u>	<u>Ann.</u> <u>Chg.</u> <u>00-02</u>
Workload								
Criminal trials and appeals	154,728	158,388	166,407	168,300	170,567	174,831	3.71%	2.50%
Other hearings and defense services	10,981	9,163	10,102	9,660	10,607	11,137	-4.09%	5.00%
Total workload	165,709	167,551	176,509	177,900	181,174	185,968	3.21%	2.64%
District Operations								
Trial representation	153,886	157,502	163,611	167,000	167,702	171,894	3.11%	2.50%
Panel attorneys utilized	539	434	438	475	415	392	-9.85%	-5.40%
Cases completed by panel attorneys	8,531	6,640	7,053	6,000	6,682	6,311	-9.07%	-5.41%
Appellate/Inmate Services								
Appellate cases accepted	842	886	934	850	984	1,020	5.32%	4.50%
Appellate cases closed	813	843	830	770	850	900	1.04%	4.13%
Certiori opinions reviewed	557	557	550	500	562	600	-0.63%	4.45%
Certiori petitions filed	94	95	81	88	85	90	-7.17%	5.41%
Inmate cases accepted	3,965	2,861	3,500	4,000	3,750	4,000	-6.05%	6.90%
Inmate cases closed	4,054	2,946	3,100	3,400	3,806	3,400	-12.55%	4.73%
Involuntary Institutionalization								
Patient contacts	6,174	6,302	6,302	6,290	6,302	6,302	1.03%	0.00%
Patient hearings	2,146	1,918	2,150	2,050	2,150	2,200	0.09%	1.16%
Cases concluded without hearing	4,028	4,384	4,384	4,250	4,400	4,400	4.33%	0.18%
Capital Defense								
Cases active	47	44	59	45	60	60	12.04%	0.84%
Cases closed	18	20	25	13	20	20	17.85%	-10.56%

Source: Office of the Public Defender; Governor's Fiscal 2002 Budget Books

Issues

1. Underfunding Continues in Fiscal 2002

Underfunding of the OPD occurs in several ways: a history of deficiency appropriations since fiscal 1995, unrealistic budgeted turnover rates, and incommensurate attorney salaries. There is also a possibility that the Public Defender is understaffed. This year, underfunding continues, as apparent turnover relief in the fiscal 2002 allowance is offset by significant reductions in information technology support.

Annual Deficiency Appropriations

Exhibit 3 displays the history of the OPD deficiency appropriations. The costs of panel attorneys and expert witness fees routinely exceed the OPD's annual appropriation for these expenses. These costs are

Exhibit 3

General Fund Deficiency Detail Office of the Public Defender Fiscal 1995 through 2000

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1995	\$449,984	The legal representation of CINA cases required a deficiency of \$249,984. The agency also received \$200,000 for salaries for additional contractual employees.
1996	400,000	A deficiency appropriation in the amount of \$400,000 was provided for cost overruns related to contractual panel attorney payments.
1997	68,352	Funds supported contractual staff and computer equipment for the Domestic Violence Unit in Baltimore City District Court.
1998	2,181,700	A total of \$2,076,489 was provided for general operating expenses including: panel attorney payments, rent, contractual employee salaries, and turnover. An additional \$105,211 was made available for panel attorney payments for CINA cases.
1999	128,000	Funds provided immediate operating funds for eight additional public defender positions added for the fiscal 2000 budget.
2000	2,977,000	\$400,000 is for increased costs for 45 contractually converted attorney positions; \$300,000 for panel attorney payments for CINA cases; and \$277,000 for costs attributable to increased use of medical experts. \$2 million was provided in Supplemental Budget Number 2 for personnel, panel attorneys and legal support services fees, and overall expense increases.
Total	\$6,205,036	

CB.00 - Office of the Public Defender

not discretionary; the OPD is required to compensate outside counsel whenever OPD representation creates an impermissible conflict. For example, cases arising from CINA laws routinely require panel attorneys who must be compensated from the OPD appropriation. Similarly, competent representation requires use of expert testimony whenever relevant to a client's defense; particularly when expert testimony is employed by the prosecution. Increasing use of sophisticated scientific evidence in criminal cases, (e.g., DNA evidence) has generated increasing expert witness fees. Nonetheless, the OPD must keep its annual budget request within limits dictated by DBM. Such limits do not appear to account for these increasing costs. Although increasing expenses in these areas are expected, the OPD's allowance has not kept pace, as demonstrated by the need for annual deficiencies to pay for these costs.

This allowance is the first since fiscal 1995 which does not include a deficiency allowance for the OPD. However, DLS estimates that the OPD should have a fiscal 2001 deficiency of nearly \$4 million due to unrealistic budgeted turnover in fiscal 2001, plus any deficiencies associated with unfunded panel attorney and expert witness expenses.

The Public Defender should discuss with the budget committees whether the OPD currently expects a fiscal 2001 deficiency; brief the committees on the extent of any anticipated deficiency; explain measures undertaken to limit expenditures; and discuss the success of those measures. The OPD should discuss with the budget committees whether the fiscal 2002 allowance provides sufficient support for fiscal 2002 estimated panel attorney, expert witness, and other legal services support costs.

Unrealistic Turnover

In fiscal 2001, the OPD allowance and appropriation included a significant increase in the budgeted turnover rate, from 5.31% in fiscal 2000 to 10.8% in fiscal 2001. In contrast, the OPD has experienced declining vacancy rates over this same period. The net result is significant underfunding for employee salaries, estimated to be \$4 million in fiscal 2001.

The fiscal 2002 allowance includes a nearly \$4.3 million over-the-budget request in turnover relief for the OPD, resulting in a \$2.2 million increase in personnel funding over the fiscal 2001 working appropriation. However, this increase is offset by dramatic reductions to the OPD's ITPR of at least \$1.04 million, plus a reduction in the contractual payroll request of \$1.24 million, some of which also implicates information technology projects. Even as adjusted, the agency's budgeted fiscal 2002 turnover rate is 6.33%, notably higher than its most recent vacancy rate of 3.96%.

Furthermore, the budgeted turnover rate in the fiscal 2002 allowance for the agency's new positions, which are all contractual conversions, is also 6.33%. Since employees already exist for these positions, a 6.33% turnover for these new positions seems high. A 3.00% turnover rate would be a reasonable rate to apply to new positions resulting from contractual conversions; less than half the budgeted turnover rate.

The OPD should brief the budget committees on the impact on its operations of turnover adjustments and corresponding information technology adjustments provided in the fiscal 2002 allowance.

Information Technology Receives Inadequate Baseline Support

Year 2000 remediation efforts coordinated through the Department of Planning resulted in installation of a new OPD case management system which crashed during this interim. The collapse of the OPD's case management system required the OPD to expend much of its information technology resources on reviving its old case management system and will require the OPD to expend future resources on redeveloping an adequate case management system. Thus, although the fiscal 2002 allowance provides a modest increase in information technology support, the approximately \$500,000 allocated to the OPD information systems division is less than half the documented need for baseline information technology support in fiscal 2002.

The OPD should brief the budget committees on what information technology projects, including baseline information technology maintenance and case management system development, are funded in the fiscal 2002 allowance.

Incommensurate Attorney Compensation

Effective in fiscal 2001, attorneys employed by the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) received a two-grade increase in the State standard pay plan. The OPD attorneys did not receive a salary increase in fiscal 2001 or in the fiscal 2002 allowance. As a result of the recent two-grade increase for the OAG attorneys, attorneys with the OPD occupy positions which are two-grades lower in the State standard pay plan than the OAG attorneys performing similar jobs with similar levels of responsibility. Thus, an Assistant Public Defender arguing the same case in the same court is paid the equivalent of two grades less than the Assistant Attorney General with the same amount of experience serving as opposing counsel. The resulting salary disparities range from \$5,700 annually for entry level attorneys to \$13,000 annually for senior attorneys. The disparities persist in the Executive Pay Plan, resulting in executive attorney salary disparities ranging from \$12,000 to \$17,000 annually.

Attorney Caseloads and Standards of Representation

Although the OPD asserts that its attorney caseload exceeds established standards for competence, the OPD has not systematically assessed its attorney caseloads against relevant standards. **The Public Defender should discuss with the budget committees the status of developing caseload standards for the OPD attorneys with reference to relevant national standards.**

A representative from DBM should explain to the budget committees the reasons for continual underfunding of the OPD.

Recommended Actions

1. Concur with Governor's allowance.

Updates

1. Representation at Bail Legislation Re-Introduced

SB 78/HB 703 provides for public defender representation at bail review hearings for all indigent defendants. Similar legislation failed during the 2000 session, despite a successful University of Maryland pilot project demonstrating bail reductions for represented defendants. The bill's requirement is contingent upon an appropriation of general funds to the OPD for bail review representation. The fiscal 2002 allowance does not include additional funds for this proposed legislation. The OPD estimates that enactment of this legislation would require an \$898,000 increase in fiscal 2002 general fund support, reaching an additional \$1.3 million annually in operating expenses by fiscal 2006.

The OPD currently provides bail review representation in Baltimore City, Anne Arundel, Harford and Montgomery counties. Baltimore City bail review representation is funded by general funds added to the OPD's budget in fiscal 1999 and 2000. Anne Arundel and Harford counties fund bail review representation. The fiscal impact of the proposed legislation will depend upon how cooperative counties are in scheduling hearing times and locations and in providing attorney access to incarcerated clients. For example, one reason Baltimore City bail representation is more expensive than in other counties is the difficulty attorneys have in gaining access to their clients in the CBIF and the scheduling of bail reviews in the Westside District Courthouse, requiring attorneys to travel from CBIF on the eastside to the courthouse on the westside of the city.

Current and Prior Year Budgets

**Current and Prior Year Budgets
Office of the Public Defender
(\$ in Thousands)**

	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>Special Fund</u>	<u>Federal Fund</u>	<u>Reimb. Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal 2000					
Legislative Appropriation	\$42,247	\$121	\$91	\$1,105	\$43,564
Deficiency Appropriation	2,977	0	0	0	2,977
Budget Amendments	680	127	0	0	808
Reversions and Cancellations	(112)	0	(27)	0	(139)
Actual Expenditures	\$45,792	\$248	\$64	\$1,105	\$47,209
Fiscal 2001					
Legislative Appropriation	\$47,146	\$212	\$23	\$1,009	\$48,390
Budget Amendments	372	0	0	0	372
Working Appropriation	\$47,518	\$212	\$23	\$1,009	\$48,762

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

CB.00 - Office of the Public Defender

Fiscal 2000 Deficiency

As discussed in the Issues section of the analysis, the fiscal 2000 legislative appropriation was insufficient to cover the OPD operating costs in almost all areas; \$2 million of this deficiency was appropriated through Supplemental Budget Number 2. Funding supported increased panel attorney fees, expert witness fees, transcript fees, CINA representation costs, turnover, and other operating expenses.

Fiscal 2000 Budget Amendments

General Funds

New State pay plan and deferred compensation	\$680,485
--	-----------

Special Funds

Anne Arundel County Juvenile Intervention Project	24,398
Inmate Services Projects	48,690
Circuit Court Case Management Project	43,560
Miscellaneous grants	10,763
Total special funds amendments	\$127,411

Fiscal 2000 Reversion

The \$112,000 general fund reversion represents funding for Community Court personnel withheld by fiscal 2000 budget bill language pending implementation of the project. The cancellation of \$27,000 in federal funds occurred because the juvenile intervention grant award was \$27,000 less than expected in the fiscal 2000 appropriation.

CB.00 - Office of the Public Defender

Object/Fund Difference Report
Office of the Public Defender

Object/Fund	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY01 - FY02	Percent Change
	Actual	Working Appropriation	Allowance	Amount Change	
Positions					
01 Regular	646.50	727.30	763.30	36.00	4.9%
02 Contractual	213.40	127.50	91.50	(36.00)	(28.2%)
Total Positions	859.90	854.80	854.80	0	0%
Objects					
01 Salaries and Wages	\$ 34,714,069	\$ 38,986,977	\$ 44,391,553	\$ 5,404,576	13.9%
02 Technical & Spec Fees	7,471,669	5,283,351	5,727,844	444,493	8.4%
03 Communication	612,958	432,525	575,386	142,861	33.0%
04 Travel	208,773	160,266	174,691	14,425	9.0%
06 Fuel & Utilities	7,758	9,348	7,758	(1,590)	(17.0%)
07 Motor Vehicles	58,312	53,387	81,615	28,228	52.9%
08 Contractual Services	1,633,516	1,253,226	1,447,336	194,110	15.5%
09 Supplies & Materials	565,610	395,031	443,440	48,409	12.3%
10 Equip - Replacement	19,412	9,185	79,983	70,798	770.8%
11 Equip - Additional	307,123	408,715	395,610	(13,105)	(3.2%)
13 Fixed Charges	1,609,765	1,770,192	1,924,790	154,598	8.7%
Total Objects	\$ 47,208,965	\$ 48,762,203	\$ 55,250,006	\$ 6,487,803	13.3%
Funds					
01 General Fund	\$ 45,792,603	\$ 47,518,728	\$ 53,898,692	\$ 6,379,964	13.4%
03 Special Fund	248,386	212,183	198,222	(13,961)	(6.6%)
05 Federal Fund	63,555	22,563	27,653	5,090	22.6%
09 Reimbursable Fund	1,104,421	1,008,729	1,125,439	116,710	11.6%
Total Funds	\$ 47,208,965	\$ 48,762,203	\$ 55,250,006	\$ 6,487,803	13.3%

Note: Full-time and contractual positions and salaries are reflected for operating budget programs only.

**Fiscal Summary
Office of the Public Defender**

<u>Unit/Program</u>	FY00	FY01	FY01	FY00 - FY01	FY02	FY01 - FY02
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Legislative Appropriation</u>	<u>Working Appropriation</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Allowance</u>	<u>% Change</u>
01 General Administration	\$ 1,650,266	\$ 1,884,750	\$ 1,884,750	14.2%	\$ 2,263,554	20.1%
02 District Operations	39,792,568	40,414,051	40,786,459	2.5%	46,737,070	14.6%
03 Appellate and Inmate Services	4,213,303	4,245,282	4,245,282	0.8%	4,381,559	3.2%
04 Involuntary Institutionalization Services	823,637	1,146,215	1,146,215	39.2%	1,076,851	(6.1%)
05 Capital Defense Division	729,191	699,497	699,497	(4.1%)	790,972	13.1%
Total Expenditures	\$ 47,208,965	\$ 48,389,795	\$ 48,762,203	3.3%	\$ 55,250,006	13.3%
General Fund	\$ 45,792,603	\$ 47,146,320	\$ 47,518,728	3.8%	\$ 53,898,692	13.4%
Special Fund	248,386	212,183	212,183	(14.6%)	198,222	(6.6%)
Federal Fund	63,555	22,563	22,563	(64.5%)	27,653	22.6%
Total Appropriations	\$ 46,104,544	\$ 47,381,066	\$ 47,753,474	3.6%	\$ 54,124,567	13.3%
Reimbursable Fund	\$ 1,104,421	\$ 1,008,729	\$ 1,008,729	(8.7%)	\$ 1,125,439	11.6%
Total Funds	\$ 47,208,965	\$ 48,389,795	\$ 48,762,203	3.3%	\$ 55,250,006	13.3%