

**STATEMENT OF  
HONORABLE JULIA S. GIBBONS, CHAIR  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET OF THE  
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES  
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE  
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

March 26, 2014

**INTRODUCTION**

Chairman Crenshaw, Representative Serrano, and members of the Committee, I am Judge Julia Gibbons of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Our court sits in Cincinnati, Ohio, and my resident chambers are in Memphis, Tennessee. As the Chair of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Budget, I will testify on the Judiciary's appropriations requirements for fiscal year 2015. In addition, I will look back at the sequestration cuts of fiscal year 2013 and summarize the impacts of those cuts on the federal courts, discuss fiscal year 2014 appropriations for the Judiciary, provide an update on our cost-containment program, including a detailed discussion of efforts underway to reduce the Judiciary's space footprint, and highlight our concerns regarding a new space rent appraisal process being considered by the Administration. This is my tenth appearance before an appropriations subcommittee on behalf of the federal Judiciary and my eighth appearance before the Financial Services and General Government panel. Appearing with me today is Judge John D. Bates, the new Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

**STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD**

In addition to my statement and Judge Bates', I ask that the entire statements of the Federal Judicial Center, the U.S. Sentencing Commission, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and the U.S. Court of International Trade be included in the hearing record.

**ROLE OF THE JUDICIAL BRANCH**

Chairman Crenshaw and Representative Serrano, each year in my appearance before this Committee I ask that as you consider funding levels for the upcoming fiscal year that you take into account the nature and importance of the work of the federal courts, and I do so again this year because it is a point that bears repeating. The Judiciary performs Constitutionally-mandated core government functions that are a pillar of our democratic system of government. The scope and volume of our work is attributable to carrying out functions assigned to us by the Constitution and by statute. We must adjudicate all cases that are filed with the courts, we must protect the community by supervising defendants awaiting trial and offenders on post-conviction release, we must provide qualified defense counsel for defendants who cannot afford representation, we must pay jurors for costs associated with performing their civic duty, and we

must ensure the safety and security of judges, court staff, litigants, and the public in federal court facilities. This is a broad mission and one that all of us in the Judiciary take very seriously.

As I will describe in my testimony, sequestration had a devastating impact on federal court operations in fiscal year 2013, and the funding Congress provided in fiscal year 2014 will stabilize our financial position. I am very concerned, however, about the longer-term funding prospects for the Judiciary in what will be a constrained federal budget environment for the foreseeable future. As you know, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 – the budget agreement that modifies the Budget Control Act to set government-wide discretionary spending caps for fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 – provides essentially no growth from fiscal year 2014 to 2015, increasing only \$2 billion with the increase split equally between defense and non-defense spending. Beyond fiscal year 2015, in the absence of additional deficit reduction, the spending caps will rise by an inflationary rate of about 2.4 percent annually through fiscal year 2021. Flat funding in fiscal year 2015 and nominal increases in the out-years will present a new round of difficult funding decisions for Congress. We ask the Committee to take into account the nature and importance of our work and to make the Judicial Branch a funding priority again in fiscal year 2015 as well as in future years.

### **IMPACT OF SEQUESTRATION**

Chairman Crenshaw and Representative Serrano, a year ago I appeared before this Committee as sequestration cuts government-wide were going into effect. At that time, I conveyed to the Committee in strong terms the dire circumstances the federal Judiciary would find itself in under sequestration. A year later, I can report that our fears were in fact realized. Sequestration cuts resulted in delays in case processing and reduced public services at courthouses nationwide. We experienced large staffing losses in clerks of court, probation and pretrial services offices, and federal defender organizations, and widespread furloughs were implemented. The cuts in probation and pretrial services offices could have adversely impacted public safety. We reduced funding for court security systems and equipment, and court security officers were required to work fewer hours, thus creating security vulnerabilities throughout the federal court system.

Perhaps the most significant impact was in our Defender Services program, which provides court-appointed counsel for defendants accused of a federal crime who cannot afford legal representation. Federal defender organizations (FDOs) downsized by 400 staff (11 percent) during fiscal year 2013 and implemented 165,000 furlough hours, and two weeks of voucher payments to private panel attorneys had to be deferred into fiscal year 2014. In addition, a \$15 per hour temporary rate cut to panel attorney hourly rates was implemented on an emergency basis on September 1, 2013.

In the District of Arizona, staffing losses caused the federal defender to withdraw from Operation Streamline immigration cases – which generate approximately 70 immigration defendants per day – and from representing indigent defendants in veterans' courts. The federal defender office in New York City asked the federal district court to postpone the trial of Sulaiman Abu Ghaith (Osama bin Laden's son-in-law) because of staff cutbacks. Federal courts in the District of Columbia, the District of New Mexico, the Western District of Texas, and the

Western District of New York stopped scheduling criminal matters on alternating Fridays because of FDO staffing shortages in those districts. These were all unprecedented actions and are representative of the impact of sequestration cuts on FDOs nationwide.

Although fiscal year 2013 is certainly not a year that will be remembered fondly by those of us in the Judiciary, the tough times were met with hard work and resourcefulness by the 33,000 judges, probation and pretrial services officers, clerks of court staff, federal defenders, law clerks, and other personnel who comprise the Judicial Branch. The nation is fortunate to have such a dedicated group of individuals working in the federal courts.

### **FISCAL YEAR 2014 FUNDING FOR THE JUDICIARY**

Turning to fiscal year 2014 funding, I would like to thank the Committee for the funding the Judiciary received in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014, the 12-bill omnibus spending measure that funds the federal government for fiscal year 2014. The omnibus bill provided the Judiciary with a 5.1 percent increase in discretionary appropriations above the fiscal year 2013 sequestration level, essentially restoring Judiciary appropriations to a pre-sequestration funding level. Sequestration resulted in deep cuts to court staffing levels and operating budgets, as I just discussed. The funding provided in the omnibus will allow us to reverse most of the emergency measures that were put in place because of sequestration. It will allow us to backfill some vacancies in clerks of court, probation and pretrial services offices, and federal defender organizations, and will provide sufficient funding to meet operational expenses for fiscal year 2014. I will describe how we intend to utilize fiscal year 2014 funding for the Judiciary's four major accounts.

The Salaries and Expenses account is funded at the Judicial Conference's appeal level. Fiscal year 2014 funding will provide for an overall 6 percent increase in decentralized court operating budgets above the fiscal year 2013 level for clerks of court and probation and pretrial services offices nationwide. Flat budgets for several years, followed by sequestration, reduced court staffing levels in clerks of court and probation and pretrial services offices by over 3,200 staff (15 percent) since July 2011, including 1,200 (6 percent) lost in fiscal year 2013 alone. In fact, current staffing levels in those offices are at 1997 levels. The fiscal year 2014 funding level will enable courts to backfill some, but not all, of those vacancies. In our probation and pretrial services program, funding for drug and mental health testing and treatment services for defendants awaiting trial and offenders released from prison, and related electronic and GPS location monitoring services for those individuals, are fully restored for fiscal year 2014. We were very concerned about the impact of these cuts on public safety and made restoring them a top priority.

The Defender Services program is funded at the Judicial Conference's appeal level for fiscal year 2014. All payments to private panel attorneys providing defense representation to eligible clients can be paid in fiscal year 2014. This includes two weeks of fiscal year 2013 payments that had to be deferred into fiscal year 2014 because of sequestration cuts. Federal defender organizations will be able to backfill a significant number of the 400 staff lost in fiscal year 2013 as a result of sequestration. We intend to utilize the no-year funding authority in this account to add back staff over a two-year period. The Judiciary was also able to fully restore,

effective March 1, 2014, the \$15 per hour temporary rate reduction to panel attorney hourly rates that was implemented on September 1, 2013, as well as provide a 1 percent cost-of-living adjustment to panel attorney rates consistent with the adjustment provided to all federal workers for 2014. Panel attorney rates as of March 1, 2014, are \$126 per hour for non-capital work and \$180 per hour for capital work.

The Court Security and Fees of Jurors accounts are also funded at the appeal level. Sequestration resulted in a 30 percent cut in funding for court security systems and equipment, and court security officers were required to work reduced hours. Those funds have been restored for fiscal year 2014. Fiscal year 2013 funding to pay petit and grand jurors was exhausted in August 2013 and the Judiciary had to request an expedited funding transfer to ensure that jurors could be paid for performing their civic duty and that criminal and civil jury trials could continue as scheduled. This funding is restored for fiscal year 2014.

### **COST CONTAINMENT**

The Judiciary is 10 years into an intensive cost-containment effort. Over this period many cost-cutting initiatives have been implemented that have helped limit growth in the Judiciary's budget. We believe that cost containment has achieved all that could be done relatively easily, and we are now embarking on a new round of cost-containment initiatives. This new round will be more difficult as it will challenge long established Judiciary customs and practices. Some initiatives are likely to be controversial within the Judiciary, may be complex and involve many stakeholders, and could be difficult to implement quickly. However, we are committed to doing everything we can to conserve resources and be good stewards of the taxpayers' money. Our cost-containment efforts are essential to positioning the Judiciary for the fiscal realities of today and the future.

We continue to look for ways to streamline Judiciary operations. Specifically, we continue to expand the use of shared administrative services among the courts of appeals, district courts, bankruptcy courts, probation and pretrial services offices, and federal defender organizations. In fiscal year 2014, nearly 30 percent of all courts have formal sharing arrangements of some kind. The decision to migrate to a shared services model is up to each circuit/district although we have reduced staffing requirements slightly in anticipation of further sharing. We believe shared services will reduce duplication caused by multiple human resources, procurement, financial management, and information technology staffs in a single judicial district or circuit. Shared services should allow courts to partially absorb budget cuts by reducing administrative staffing and overhead costs, and streamlining administrative processes, enabling them to minimize cuts to staff performing core operations.

We will continue our efforts to reduce cost growth in the Judiciary's budget, but no amount of cost containment will offset budget cuts or even flat funding in fiscal year 2015. We look to Congress to provide the resources we need to do our work.

## REDUCING THE JUDICIARY'S SPACE FOOTPRINT

Chairman Crenshaw, this Committee has expressed concern in recent years regarding the Judiciary's space footprint so I will next update the Committee on our efforts in this area.

One of the Judiciary's most significant cost-containment successes to date has been limiting the growth in space rent costs. As a result of cost-containment initiatives put in place in recent years, our fiscal year 2015 budget request for rent payments to the General Services Administration (GSA) reflects a cost avoidance of approximately \$400 million below estimates made prior to implementation of our cost-containment initiatives. We have revised our long-range space planning process to better prioritize space needs with an eye towards cost. With strong controls in place to limit the growth in space rent costs, we are now focusing on reducing the Judiciary's overall space footprint.

Space reduction and the resulting savings in rent paid to GSA remain the Judiciary's top cost-containment priority. The Judiciary continues to pursue a multi-faceted strategy to achieve footprint reductions. At its September 2013 session, the Judicial Conference approved three new initiatives:

- 3 Percent Space Reduction Target. The Judicial Conference set a 3 percent space reduction target by the end of fiscal year 2018. This target will be prorated nationwide based on the square footage occupied by each federal judicial circuit, subject to exclusions for new courthouse construction, renovation, or alterations projects approved by Congress. The baseline for this policy is space holdings within each circuit as of the beginning of fiscal year 2013.
- "No Net New" Policy. Under this policy, any increase in square footage within a circuit would need to be offset by an equivalent reduction in square footage within the same fiscal year. Similar exclusions to the 3 percent reduction target described above apply.
- Space and Rent Management Plans. Each circuit judicial council is required to formulate a space and rent management plan by May 2014, articulating how the new space reduction policy will be implemented.

The Judiciary's space reduction efforts will be accomplished partly through the Integrated Workplace Initiative (IWI), which seeks to create a smaller and more efficient workplace that reflects changing work practices, such as mobile work or telework for some court employees. For example, probation offices generally require less space now because of the nature of the work that most probation officers currently perform (i.e., they use mobile devices while working in the field). As a result, some probation offices could reduce the amount of commercial space that they lease, or they could move out of commercial space and into courthouses, while occupying less space in the courthouses than previously needed. This is just one example.

The Judiciary's ability to reduce space will require up front investments to reconfigure space and relocate staff. Accordingly, the Judiciary's fiscal year 2014 financial plan includes \$30 million for space reduction efforts and \$25 million is planned for fiscal year 2015. I will describe briefly five space reduction efforts currently underway in fiscal year 2014:

- Chicago, Illinois. The probation office is planning to relocate from commercial leased space (which will be released back to GSA) to a federal building and reduce its space needs by more than 50 percent through the adoption of mobile work styles, desk sharing, and an open space configuration, resulting in annual rent savings of at least \$1.4 million. Project costs are estimated to be \$3.4 million.
- Miami, Florida. The bankruptcy court is planning to relocate from space in a federal building (which will be released back to GSA) to a courthouse resulting in \$1.1 million in annual rent savings. Project costs are estimated to be \$230,000.
- Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Three resident circuit chambers for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit are being reconfigured to accommodate 12 non-resident circuit judges (and staff) in lieu of expansion into the adjacent federal building or a new courthouse. This solution results in significant cost avoidance to the Judiciary. Project costs are estimated to be \$1.5 million.
- Fayetteville, Arkansas. The district and bankruptcy clerks of court offices are being reconfigured to co-locate those offices in order to provide space for a district judge's chambers. Project costs and estimated savings are not yet available.
- Albuquerque, New Mexico. The bankruptcy court is planning to relocate from a federal building into circuit court library space. Project costs and estimated savings are not yet available.

The Judiciary also continues to look at closing non-resident judicial facilities where practicable. Since 1996, the Judiciary, as a cost-containment effort, has identified court facilities without a full-time resident judge that could potentially be closed. Non-resident judicial facilities are considered for closure by the Judicial Conference based on specific criteria and upon the recommendation of the appropriate circuit judicial council. The most recent space reductions that were approved by the Conference at its September 2012 session will eventually result in the release of 56,000 square feet of space in six non-resident facilities with projected annual rent savings of approximately \$1.0 million. The Judicial Conference will consider new closures at its September 2014 session.

I will close on this topic by assuring the Committee that we take seriously your concerns regarding the Judiciary's space inventory, but I must also emphasize that GSA's cooperation is essential to our ability to reduce space. As the Judiciary's landlord, we will need GSA to work closely with us on space reduction, including taking back excess space from us in a timely manner.

## **NEW RENT APPRAISAL PROCESS WOULD ADD MILLIONS TO RENT BILL**

I would like to mention briefly our concern regarding a new space rent appraisal methodology that the Administration is considering as the basis for determining agency rent charges. We have communicated our concerns to both GSA and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which is currently reviewing the policy.

The new methodology introduces a subjective element into the rental rate that could increase Judiciary space rental costs significantly. Previously, GSA appraisers used a straightforward mathematical calculation to compute the rental rate in order to meet market averages. The new methodology shifts a greater portion of a building's common area costs from GSA to the building's tenants. We find this new methodology unfair. The new pricing would force the Judiciary to pay more for common areas and wide hallways necessary to accommodate the public consistent with the First and Sixth Amendment guarantees to publicly accessible judicial proceedings. Further, the Judiciary is essentially a permanent tenant of courthouses and relocating to less expensive space is generally not an option. If the Judiciary is charged rent based on the new methodology, *preliminary estimates indicate our rent bill would go up by tens of millions of dollars annually.*

We understand that rent bills using the new methodology, if approved for implementation by OMB, would not take effect prior to fiscal year 2017; however, we want to bring our concerns to the attention of the Committee at this time. I just described for the Committee efforts underway to reduce the Judiciary's space footprint. If the new policy is implemented, we would find ourselves in the paradoxical position of reducing our space footprint at the same time our rent bill is increasing dramatically. We will continue our discussions with GSA and OMB officials on this issue and will keep the Committee apprised of the progress of those talks.

## **FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET REQUEST**

For fiscal year 2015, the Judiciary is seeking \$6.7 billion in discretionary appropriations, a 3.4 percent (\$219.5 million) overall increase above the fiscal year 2014 enacted appropriations level. We believe the requested funding level represents the minimum amount required to meet our Constitutional and statutory responsibilities.

The Judiciary's fiscal year 2015 request is a current services budget that simply seeks to maintain the fiscal year 2014 level of operations in the courts. The request includes \$216.2 million for adjustments to base for standard pay and non-pay changes, including a 1 percent cost-of-living adjustment for Judiciary personnel consistent with the President's recommendation for Executive Branch personnel, and a total of \$3.3 million for two small program increases in the Supreme Court Building and Grounds account. I will summarize the 2015 requests for our four major accounts.

The Judiciary's largest account, courts' Salaries and Expenses, funds the bulk of federal court operations nationwide including the regional courts of appeals, district courts, bankruptcy courts, and probation and pretrial services offices. For this account, we are requesting a 3.6 percent increase in fiscal year 2015 to \$4.8 billion in discretionary appropriations. I note that we

are not requesting any new staff in clerks of court or probation and pretrial services offices above the level funded in fiscal year 2014. In addition, we are requesting an increase of \$26.7 million for additional chambers staff associated with newly confirmed judges and judges taking senior status. Adjustments in our space program net to zero after combining upward adjustments with reductions in base rent costs and savings from our space footprint reduction initiative. After “re-basing” fiscal year 2014 funding for space reduction, we are requesting an additional \$10 million to provide \$25 million for space reduction projects to configure Judiciary space where possible to reduce space needs. The request also includes \$2.8 million to restore Second Chance Act funding for probation officers to assist offenders released from prison with emergency and transitional services and assistance. The Salaries and Expenses request includes no program increases.

The Defender Services program, which provides court-appointed criminal defense representation under the Criminal Justice Act to financially eligible defendants, requires a 0.8 percent increase to \$1.05 billion in fiscal year 2015 to handle an estimated 212,442 weighted representations. No additional staff are requested above the level funded in fiscal year 2014, but federal defender organizations will have the ability to continue backfilling vacancies. The fiscal year 2015 request provides for inflationary pay and benefits adjustments for federal defender organizations, general inflation, and payments to panel attorneys, including a 1 percent cost-of-living adjustment to hourly rates, raising the capital rate from \$180 to \$181, and the non-capital rate from \$126 to \$127. The small percentage increase requested for this account (0.8 percent) is attributable to (1) low caseload growth projected for fiscal year 2015 (about 1 percent), and (2) high staff vacancy rates in federal defender organizations (as a result of sequestration) and lower than anticipated panel attorney payments this fiscal year that are expected to generate higher than normal carryforward balances that will reduce fiscal year 2015 appropriations needs. The request includes no program increases.

Our Court Security account funds protective guard services and security systems and equipment at federal courthouses and requires a 6.7 percent increase to \$531 million for fiscal year 2015. The \$33 million increase is primarily comprised of two items. Approximately half (\$15 million) of the requested increase is associated with a projected decline in no-year carryforward balances available in fiscal year 2014 but not fiscal year 2015. A 3 percent collective bargaining wage rate adjustment for contract court security officers accounts for \$13 million of the increase. The remaining increase is for 10 additional court security officers, higher Federal Protective Service costs, and other standard adjustments. The request includes no program increases.

The Fees of Jurors and Commissioners account funds statutory fees and allowances for grand and petit jurors, and land commissioners. This includes the daily compensation paid to jurors as well as related costs for meals and incidental expenses. This account requires \$55.8 million in fiscal year 2015, a 3.6 percent increase above fiscal year 2014. The bulk of the increase – \$1.3 million of \$1.9 million – is associated with a projected decline in no-year carryforward balances available in fiscal year 2014 but not fiscal year 2015. The remaining increase is for standard inflation and an increase in projected petit juror requirements. The request includes no program increases.



A summary of fiscal year 2015 adjustments to base and program increases and appropriations requirements for each Judiciary account is included at Appendix A.

### **CONCLUSION**

Chairman Crenshaw and Representative Serrano, I hope that my testimony today provides you with some insight into the funding needs of the federal courts. You both have been tremendous supporters of the Judiciary and I am hopeful that support will continue. As you make decisions on fiscal year 2015 funding for the agencies under the Committee's jurisdiction, we ask that you take into account the Judiciary's unique Constitutional role in our system of government. In return, we commit to you that we will continue to be good fiscal stewards, cutting costs where possible, spending each dollar wisely, and making smart investments to achieve long-term savings.

Thank you for your continued support of the federal Judiciary. I would be happy to answer any questions the Committee may have.

**The Federal Judiciary's Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request**

- The Judiciary's fiscal year 2015 budget request of \$6.7 billion in discretionary appropriations reflects a 3.4 percent increase above fiscal year 2014 to support the Constitutional and statutory mission of the federal courts. This budget will help the Judiciary continue to recover from several years of essentially flat funding followed by sequestration cuts in fiscal year 2013. The request is a current services budget that primarily reflects adjustments to base for standard pay and non-pay inflationary increases.
- In fiscal year 2014, Congress provided the Judiciary with \$6.5 billion in discretionary appropriations – a 5.1 percent increase – stabilizing the Judiciary's financial position following a year in which sequestration reduced overall Judiciary funding by nearly \$350 million. Fiscal year 2014 funding approximates 2013 appropriations *prior* to sequestration and enables the Judiciary to restore most sequestration cuts, including the following:
  - cuts to mental health and drug testing and treatment services for offenders released from prison and defendants awaiting trial, and related GPS location monitoring of those individuals;
  - reductions in information technology and essential network infrastructure;
  - cuts to the court security and fees of jurors programs; and
  - the \$15 per hour panel attorney temporary rate cut (restored effective March 1, 2014).
- In addition, clerks of court, probation and pretrial services offices, and federal defender organizations have funding to begin backfilling some vacancies in fiscal year 2014, and \$30 million is available for the Judiciary's top cost containment initiative: reducing the Judiciary's space footprint by a targeted 3 percent by the end of fiscal year 2018.
- The Judiciary's fiscal year 2015 request is a current services budget that simply seeks to maintain the full year fiscal year 2014 level of operations in the courts. No new staff are requested but clerks of court, probation and pretrial offices, and federal defender organizations will have the ability to continue backfilling some vacancies. The request funds projected workload requirements in defender services, provides for a sufficient level of security at federal court facilities nationwide, and ensures funds are available for juror costs associated with criminal and civil jury trials.

**Details of the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request**

- The Judiciary's fiscal year 2015 appropriations request totals \$7.3 billion. The request includes \$6.7 billion in discretionary appropriations, an increase of \$219.5 million (3.4 percent) above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level. The request also includes \$565.6 million in mandatory appropriations, an increase of \$42.9 million above fiscal year 2014.

### **Discretionary Appropriations**

- A total of \$216.2 million (98 percent) of the \$219.5 million increase requested will provide for pay adjustments, inflation, and other adjustments to base necessary to maintain current services. Of this amount:
  - An increase of \$97.1 million will provide for inflationary pay and benefit rate increases for magistrate and claims judges and support personnel, including annualization of fiscal year 2014 pay adjustments, expected January 2015 pay adjustments (e.g. 1.0% ECI adjustment for federal workers), changes in benefits costs, a cost-of-living adjustment for panel attorneys, and a wage rate adjustment for court security officers;
  - An increase of \$62.6 million is necessary to replace non-appropriated sources of funds used to support base requirements in fiscal year 2014 with direct appropriations;
  - An increase of \$26.7 million is associated with additional chambers staff for newly confirmed judges and judges taking senior status;
  - An increase of \$22.8 million will provide for increases in contract rates and other standard inflationary increases;
  - An increase of \$10.0 million is requested for the Integrated Workplace Initiative to pay upfront costs incurred by local courts to reconfigure existing space into a smaller space footprint;
  - An increase of \$5.0 million is for security-related adjustments;
  - An increase of \$2.9 million is to restore the sequestration cut for Second Chance Act funding for probation officers to assist offenders released from prison with emergency and transitional services and assistance; and
  - A net decrease of \$10.9 million is associated with fiscal year 2014 non-recurring requirements and other minor adjustments.
- The remaining \$3.3 million (2 percent) of the requested increase is for program enhancements for building exterior façade restoration and security systems maintenance at the Supreme Court.

### **Mandatory Appropriations**

- A \$42.9 million increase is requested for Judiciary mandatory appropriations, as follows:
  - An increase of \$14.2 million is for pay adjustments for mandatory judges' salaries for the Supreme Court, Federal Circuit, International Trade, and courts' Salaries and Expenses, including annualization of fiscal year 2014 pay adjustments, expected January 2015 pay adjustments (e.g. 1.0% ECI adjustment for federal workers), and changes in benefits costs;

- An increase of \$12.0 million is for salary costs associated with 70 projected judge confirmations and 36 judges taking senior status in fiscal year 2015; and
- An increase of \$16.7 million is required for the Judiciary retirement trust funds accounts based on requirements calculated by an independent actuary.

**Judiciary Appropriations  
(\$000)**

**Discretionary Appropriations:**

Appropriation Account	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Request	\$ Change FY 2015 vs. FY 2014	% Change FY 2015 vs. FY 2014
U.S. Supreme Court				
Salaries & Expenses	\$72,625	\$74,967	\$2,342	3.2%
Care of Building and Grounds	<u>\$11,158</u>	<u>\$11,640</u>	\$482	4.3%
Total	\$83,783	\$86,607	\$2,824	3.4%
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	\$29,600	\$30,212	\$612	2.1%
U.S. Court of International Trade	\$19,200	\$17,807	(\$1,393)	-7.3%
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services				
Salaries & Expenses - Direct	\$4,658,830	\$4,827,588	\$168,758	
Vaccine Injury Trust Fund	<u>\$5,327</u>	<u>\$5,423</u>	\$96	
Total	\$4,664,157	\$4,833,011	\$168,854	3.6%
Defender Services	\$1,044,394	\$1,053,158	\$8,764	0.8%
Fees of Jurors & Commissioners	\$53,891	\$55,827	\$1,936	3.6%
Court Security	<u>\$497,500</u>	<u>\$530,763</u>	<u>\$33,263</u>	<u>6.7%</u>
Subtotal	\$6,259,942	\$6,472,759	\$212,817	3.4%
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	\$81,200	\$84,399	\$3,199	3.9%
Federal Judicial Center	\$26,200	\$26,959	\$759	2.9%
U.S. Sentencing Commission	\$16,200	\$16,894	\$694	4.3%
Direct Vaccine Injury Trust Fund	<u>\$6,510,798</u> <u>\$5,327</u>	<u>\$6,730,214</u> <u>\$5,423</u>	<u>\$219,416</u> <u>\$96</u>	
<b>Total Discretionary Appropriations</b>	<b>\$6,516,125</b>	<b>\$6,735,637</b>	<b>\$219,512</b>	<b>3.4%</b>

**Mandatory Appropriations:**

Salaries of Judges <sup>1</sup>	\$395,820	\$422,006	\$26,186	
Judiciary Retirement Trust Funds	\$126,931	\$143,600	\$16,669	
<b>Total Mandatory Appropriations</b>	<b>\$522,751</b>	<b>\$565,606</b>	<b>\$42,855</b>	<b>8.2%</b>

<b>Total Judiciary Appropriations</b>	<b>\$7,038,876</b>	<b>\$7,301,243</b>	<b>\$262,367</b>	<b>3.7%</b>
---------------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	------------------	-------------

<sup>1</sup> Mandatory salaries include the salaries of justices of the Supreme Court, judges of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and Court of International Trade, and Article III and bankruptcy judges funded in the Courts' Salaries and Expenses account. (Magistrate judges and Court of Federal Claims judges are funded in the Courts' Salaries and Expenses account through discretionary appropriations.)