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Dear Governor Lujan Grisham and Members of the New Mexico Legislature:

I am pleased to present you with the FY23 Unified Budget and Legislative Agenda. For the first time in a long time, or possibly ever, the Judiciary is seeking a significant increase in judicial salaries that would take judges from the bottom to at least the median pay for state judges nationwide. Not only does the Judiciary recommend this salary increase, the Judicial Compensation Commission strongly supports the increase.

Non-competitive compensation is one primary reason the overall number of applicants for open judgeships has been declining, and fewer applicants are coming from private practice. In addition to a judicial salary increase in the next fiscal year, the Judiciary supports creating an independent commission to establish salaries in the future. An independent commission will keep salaries on a track moving forward so that we are not left in the dust, which has been the case for so many years.

This budget seeks the funds that will enable the courts to fulfill their mission to deliver justice in a manner that reflects the full measure of New Mexico's commitment to a just society under the rule of law. The Judicial Branch values its continued partnership with Governor Lujan Grisham and the Legislature in providing the services that all New Mexicans deserve from their justice system. Thank you for consideration of our requests.

Sincerely yours,
Michael E. Vigil
Chief Justice
“One of our most important responsibilities is to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars. When it comes to our budget process, we take that responsibility very seriously.” Artie Pepin, AOC

Administrative Office of the Courts
Arthur W. Pepin, Director

Artie Pepin has served as Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) since 2006. AOC is the administrative arm of the Supreme Court.

New Mexico Supreme Court 2021

(Left to right) Justice Julie J. Vargas, Justice C. Shannon Bacon, Chief Justice Michael E. Vigil, Justice David K. Thomson, and Justice Briana H. Zamora

Please see page 20 for a list of Budget Committee and New Mexico Judicial Council members
FY23 Judiciary Budget Requests

“This budget embodies our values as a Judiciary and seeks to support judicial officers and employees where they need it most so they can continue carrying out their important missions.”

Chief Justice Michael E. Vigil

FY23 Judiciary Budget: $218,531,100
16.3% increase from the FY22 General Fund appropriation.
Our annual budget is overwhelmingly made up of personnel costs.

More than 90% of that budget goes to the salaries of judges and non-judicial staff, along with health, pension, and other fringe benefit costs.

Top Judiciary budget requests include:

- **$6,898,500** Judge Salary Increase (excludes Magistrate)
- **$9,842,100** 10% Judicial Employees Salary Increase (excludes Judges) (HB 2, Sect 8)
- **$2,210,000** Pretrial Services
- **$2,150,000** DataXchange
- **$1,570,300** Magistrate Court Security Personnel
- **$1,300,000** AOC Lease of Office Space
- **$1,036,000** Judicial Education Center Funding

Invest at least $35 million in the Judicial Retirement Plan to make the plan 100% funded within 20 years based on PERA actuarial projections, including service credit adjustment proposed by the Judiciary.

Invest at least $10 million into the Magistrate Retirement Fund to reach 100% funding within 20 years after accounting for the adjustment in Magistrate service credit.
How Does the Judiciary Develop the Unified Budget?

The Unified Budget goes through a very rigorous review process.

First, judicial entities submit funding requests to the Budget Committee. Several hearings are held in which the Committee asks the entities clarifying questions.

A Unified Budget is prepared to incorporate the funding needs of the entire judicial branch of government.

After the Budget Committee approves funding proposals, the Budget is taken to the New Mexico Judicial Council for review.
How is the Unified Budget approved by the Judicial Branch?

The final step for the Budget is a review by the Supreme Court. The Justices examine requests from each entity.

The entities are the Supreme Court, Court of Appeals, Judicial Districts (District and Magistrate Courts), Bernalillo County Metropolitan Court, the New Mexico Compilation Commission, and the Administrative Office of the Courts.

Once the budget is approved internally, it is sent to the Department of Finance and Administration for consideration in developing the governor’s funding proposals presented to the Legislature.
Judge Salary Increase

“Pay is a significant factor having an impact on the diversity of candidates who seek judicial office.” 2021 NM Judicial Compensation Commission report

The Judiciary approaches a tipping point after many years of wage stagnation for judges and ever-increasing retirements. Judicial vacancies are becoming more and more difficult to fill with candidates bringing a diversity of experience and background. Many experienced attorneys cite salary as a significant reason they do not seek to fill judicial vacancies.

Recommendation: Link the salary of Supreme Court justices to the pay of a federal magistrate court judge, who has a limited jurisdiction. (U.S. magistrates receive 92% of the salary of federal district court judges.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$201,112</td>
<td>NM Supreme Court Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$181,503</td>
<td>NM District Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,898,518</td>
<td>Recurring Cost (excluding Magistrate Judges)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the 2021 Judicial Compensation Commission report:

NM Supreme Court Justices and District Court Judges:
Rank 48 out of 55 in the United States based on salaries in other states and territories (including Guam, Northern Mariana Islands)

NM Court of Appeals Judges:
Rank 40 out of 42

Judges are paid less than lawyers in New Mexico with comparable experience as well as local and state employees. Please refer to the map and tables on the next pages.
2017 New Mexico State Bar Association Study

$210,502 Average salary of law firm partner/shareholder (27% more than a NM Supreme Court justice)

$184,457 Average salary of sole practitioners (17% more than a NM Supreme Court justice)

The report indicates that attorneys charged the highest per-hour billing rate (a median of $250) for civil litigation, business, contract law, and estate planning. This could explain why few civil practice attorneys apply for judgeships and the salary it offers.

Federal Salaries

$268,300 U.S. Supreme Court justices

$231,800 Federal appellate Circuit Court Judges

$218,600 Federal trial court District Court Judges

$201,112 Federal limited-jurisdiction Magistrate Judge

New Mexico salary for a Supreme Court justice lags far behind neighboring states in the West and Midwest.

The salaries of New Mexico Supreme Court Justices, Court of Appeals judges, and trial judges (highlighted in yellow) compared to salaries paid in local and state government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Investment Officer, State Investment Council</td>
<td>$275,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico Chief Legal Counsel</td>
<td>$272,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERB Deputy Director of Investments</td>
<td>$264,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernalillo County Attorney</td>
<td>$263,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico School of Law Dean</td>
<td>$253,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque Metropolitan County Detention Center Chief</td>
<td>$233,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Tenth Circuit Judge</td>
<td>$231,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico Offensive Coordinator (Football)</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. District Judge, New Mexico</td>
<td>$218,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Limited-Jurisdiction Magistrate Judge, New Mexico</td>
<td>$201,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe County Manager</td>
<td>$198,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dona Ana County Manager</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERA Executive Director Investments/Pensions</td>
<td>$172,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe City Manager</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Council Service Director</td>
<td>$163,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Spaceport Director</td>
<td>$159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Engineer</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Supreme Court Chief Justice</td>
<td>$155,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Supreme Court Justice</td>
<td>$153,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual salary of all NM attorneys in 2017 State Bar Salary Survey</td>
<td>$142,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico District Court Judge</td>
<td>$138,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Rancho City Manager</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Judiciary has confronted challenges in recruitment of judicial candidates with diverse practice backgrounds, especially mid-career attorneys with experience in family matters and civil law. Compensation is frequently cited by such attorneys as a reason they will not, despite the desire to do so, apply for judicial vacancies. In addition to the challenge of low salaries, retirement provisions are a critical component of judicial compensation. Judicial retirement suffers from both a low-funded ratio and from low service credit.

- Judicial Retirement Account (JRA) for lawyer judges, as of June 30, 2020, funded ratio = 51% (reduced from 6/30/19 ratio of 54%)
- Magistrate Retirement Account (MRA), as of June 30, 2020, funded ratio = 53% (reduced from 6/30/19 ratio of 56%)

Proposals to improve retirement plans for judges include modest increases to the service credit and significant investment of one-time funds.

**Invest $35 million in the Judicial Retirement Plan** to make the plan 100% funded within 20 years based on PERA actuarial projections, including service credit adjustments below.

**Invest $10 million into the Magistrate Retirement Fund**

Change service credits to accelerate judicial retirement plans to attract mid-career, qualified attorneys from diverse practice backgrounds, such as those experienced in civil and family law.

- Statutory changes in 2014 reduced service credit from 3.75% to 3.25%, and extended from 20 years to more than 23 years the needed public service to achieve a pension of 75% of salary

- Proposed for FY23: Increase annual service credit to 4% for first 10 years; 3.5% each year thereafter, effective July 2022 for all current and future judges (e.g., a judge with 5 years on the bench as of July 1, 2022 earns 4% for the following five years and 3.5% thereafter.)
Employee Salary Increase

For FY23, the Judiciary is seeking a **10%** compensation increase to bring Judicial employees closer to the compensation levels for Executive Branch workers.

Executive compensation on average exceeds Judicial Branch pay by about 10%.

$45,299 Average Judicial Employee Salary (10.3% less than Executive Branch)

$50,502 Average Executive Employee Salary

A 10% increase would lift the compensation of the largest number of NMJB employees (Pay Band GG: Average Salary $38,769) to about 175% of the federal poverty level (FPL) for a family of four, from the current 150% of FPL.

The three pay bands with the highest number of Executive employees (general pay bands 60, 65, and 70 – excluding specialty pay groups that have higher average salaries) have average pay of $48,399.38. The three pay bands with the highest number of NMJB employees (GG, HH, and II) have average salaries of $44,008.82 ($21.16 per hour), or -$4,390.56 (-9.07%) compared to the Executive pay bands with the most employees.

Inflation exceeded NMJB compensation increases by 5% in the last decade, and so far in 2021, the increase in Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI-U) is significantly higher than the legislative-approved pay increase of 1.5% for FY22.

Inflation 2010-2020 18.7%.

1,800 Judicial Employees $9,842,100 Cost
Judicial Education Center

The Supreme Court collaborates with the University of New Mexico Law School to administer judicial education for ALL judges in New Mexico. The Judicial Education Center (JEC) within the UNM Law School plans and executes training for appellate, district, metropolitan, magistrate, probate, and municipal judges.

This year, the Judiciary is facing short-term budgetary challenges for this education.

$1,036,000 Shortfall

We ask for the Legislature’s assistance to ensure education is provided to our judges.

In 2019, the Legislature in HB267 directed local Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils to facilitate sharing of criminal justice information between agencies. It also directed the New Mexico Sentencing Commission to create and maintain a data-sharing network to promote information sharing among criminal justice agencies.

DataXchange is a cloud-based platform that shares data in near real-time with justice partners throughout the state, including courts, district attorneys, public defenders, law enforcement, corrections, mental health and probation and supervision.

Different types of datasets that can be shared are domestic violence restraining orders, open/active warrants, notice of hearing information and release orders.
These funds will provide the Second Judicial District Court in Albuquerque and other courts with the resources needed to support judges making pretrial release decisions that impose the least restrictive conditions while maintaining public safety, assisting individuals in returning to court, implementing appropriate monitoring practices, and providing services for released individuals.

$880,000 Pretrial GPS Monitoring Personnel

6 Electronic Monitoring Officers

Real-time review and action 24/7 on electronic monitoring of pretrial defendants in Bernalillo County and elsewhere statewide.

$1,130,000 Technology and operational tools to sustain Pretrial Supervision Program and expand services to other judicial districts.

$200,000 Training for pretrial programs in courts and establish annual statewide conference for employees providing pretrial services

In a 2021 report, University of New Mexico researchers validated the effectiveness of the Public Safety Assessment (PSA) in evaluating the likelihood of Bernalillo County defendants returning to court if released pretrial and remaining arrest free while awaiting trial.

*2021 Bernalillo County Validation Study

69.1% Release Rate

77.1% Appearance Rate

81% Public Safety Rate

4.7% New Violent Criminal Activity Rate

“In our society, liberty is the norm, and detention prior to trial or without trial is the carefully limited exception,” Chief Justice William Rehnquist, U.S. v. Salerno (1987)
COVID-19 Response

Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, the judicial branch has been dedicated to keeping the courts open to the fullest possible extent while protecting public safety.

Judges, court staff and attorneys have risen to the occasion, adopting new technologies, finding innovative ways to keep the daily operations of civil and criminal court moving, and holding trials in courthouses not designed for a pandemic.

To provide some sense of the number of proceedings involved, the Judiciary conducted over 250,000 proceedings and hundreds of jury trials in 2020.

$399,994 AOC COVID-19-related supplies

86.3% Fully Vaccinated judicial officers and employees; defined as having two shots of Moderna or Pfizer vaccines or one shot of the J&J vaccine and submitting their vaccination record card to HR.

With the assistance of the Emergency Response Team, the Supreme Court established a number of protocols designed to ensure public health safety in courthouses. Among them:

• Judges, employees and the public entering a courthouse must wear masks, answer health screening questions and maintain physical distancing. More than 96% of jurors surveyed in 2020 and 2021 say they feel safe in the courthouse.

• Remotely conduct certain civil and criminal proceedings to lessen the need for attorneys, litigants and the public to enter courthouses.

• Due to increased COVID-19 cases statewide and new, highly transmissible variants, unvaccinated judges and staff are required to undergo weekly COVID-19 testing.

• All new hires are required to be fully vaccinated.
Legislative Priorities

Increase Judicial Pay

For long-lasting improvements to the recruitment and retention of state court judges, the Judiciary proposes linking salaries of state judges (excluding state magistrates) to the pay of the lowest level of federal judge.

- Change NMSA 1978 § 34-1-9. For example:
  - Link Supreme Court justices to federal magistrate judge pay (federal magistrate pay is 92% of the salary of federal district court judges).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NM Supreme Court Justice:</th>
<th>$201,112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NM District Judge:</td>
<td>$181,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>$6,898,518 (excl. Magistrate Judges)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Commission to Set Judicial Pay

In combination with the proposed judicial increase, the Judiciary proposes a joint resolution to establish an independent commission with authority to set judicial salaries going forward, with no legislative or executive veto.

- The Legislature can approve a bill to immediately tie NM judicial salaries to a U.S. magistrate judge's pay even if it submits a constitutional amendment to voters in 2022 to create a salary commission. The amendment could sunset the statutory salary formula if the commission's authority includes judicial pay and voters adopt the proposal.

Remove Magistrate Court Judges from Judicial Compensation Statute

Under the judicial salary formula in Section 34-1-9, a full-time state magistrate judge receives 75% of the pay of a metropolitan court judge.

In discussions with legislators about judicial pay, the statutory mandate to increase compensation for Magistrates as a percentage of pay for other state judges is often raised as an impediment to increasing pay for other judges.
New Mexico Magistrate Pay Compares Favorably with Pay in Comparable States

$98,637 New Mexico
$93,338 Pennsylvania
$87,500 Utah
$40,000 - $75,000 Nevada
$78,783 - $83,952 Delaware
$37,318 - $104,568 Arizona

Magistrates are the only state judges not required to be attorneys. Magistrates are required to have a high school diploma or its equivalency, and there are no experience or age requirements.

Removing Magistrate judges from the salary statute would not reduce Magistrate pay or prevent future increases in pay. Magistrate judges enjoy constitutional protection from a reduction in salary during the judge’s term. *N.M. Const., Article VI, Section 26.*

**Make it a felony offense to threaten judges and their families**

“Whoever intentionally causes bodily harm or threatens to cause bodily harm to the person or family member of any under all of the following circumstances is guilty of a fourth degree felony:

- At the time of the act or threat, the actor knows or should have known that the victim is a judge or a member of the judge’s family.
- The act or threat is in response to any action taken by a judge in an official capacity.
- There is no consent by the person harmed or threatened.

‘Judge’ means a person who currently is or who formerly was a supreme court justice, court of appeals judge, district court judge, magistrate court judge, metropolitan court judge, probate judge, municipal judge, tribal judge, temporary or permanent reserve judge.”

**Add Language in HB2 that would allow Warrant Enforcement Fund Balance to be used to fund the purchase of a building in Las Cruces.**

**New Expungement Proposals**

- Require persons to request expungement in accordance with the process defined by forthcoming court rules before taking any other action against DPS or AOC if they discover a record that they believe should have been automatically expunged; and
- Adjust the timelines to 5 years for DPS and AOC to accomplish the automatic expungement of cannabis-related offenses defined in Section 29-3A-8
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## FY23 Appropriation Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY21 GF Approp</th>
<th>FY22 GF Approp</th>
<th>FY23 FY23</th>
<th>Rates and Health Insurance</th>
<th>Workforce Investment Plan (WIP)</th>
<th>Total GF Request</th>
<th>Total GF Request % change from FY22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Supreme Court</td>
<td>6,267.7</td>
<td>6,585.0</td>
<td>6,791.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6,791.7</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Court of Appeals</td>
<td>6,569.6</td>
<td>6,656.1</td>
<td>6,770.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6,822.2</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Total Statewide Units</td>
<td>12,837.3</td>
<td>13,241.1</td>
<td>13,562.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13,613.9</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Courts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 First District</td>
<td>10,310.6</td>
<td>10,723.5</td>
<td>11,071.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11,083.9</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Second District</td>
<td>25,826.3</td>
<td>25,895.5</td>
<td>27,203.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>27,221.5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Third District</td>
<td>9,942.3</td>
<td>10,293.1</td>
<td>11,031.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11,031.5</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Fourth District</td>
<td>3,839.7</td>
<td>3,942.8</td>
<td>4,155.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,157.0</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Fifth District</td>
<td>10,428.0</td>
<td>10,660.5</td>
<td>11,287.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11,287.6</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sixth District</td>
<td>5,397.5</td>
<td>5,523.0</td>
<td>5,720.4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5,768.3</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Seventh District</td>
<td>4,007.2</td>
<td>4,091.4</td>
<td>4,235.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4,235.0</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Eighth District</td>
<td>4,585.2</td>
<td>4,734.3</td>
<td>5,024.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5,029.2</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Ninth District</td>
<td>5,010.6</td>
<td>5,139.5</td>
<td>5,422.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5,427.6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Tenth District</td>
<td>1,783.9</td>
<td>1,856.6</td>
<td>1,902.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,902.3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Eleventh District</td>
<td>10,417.7</td>
<td>10,940.9</td>
<td>11,271.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11,276.9</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Twelfth District</td>
<td>5,120.6</td>
<td>5,310.9</td>
<td>5,495.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5,501.8</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Thirteenth District</td>
<td>10,667.5</td>
<td>10,937.1</td>
<td>11,751.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11,751.6</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Total District Courts</td>
<td>107,337.1</td>
<td>111,049.1</td>
<td>115,571.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>115,674.2</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Metropolitan Court</td>
<td>24,965.6</td>
<td>25,392.0</td>
<td>26,030.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>26,056.0</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AOC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Admin Supp. Prg.</td>
<td>10,806.6</td>
<td>9,936.1</td>
<td>11,971.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11,977.8</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 St. Wide Auto Prg.</td>
<td>5,200.7</td>
<td>5,258.7</td>
<td>6,757.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6,757.0</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Court Operations</td>
<td>11,015.0</td>
<td>10,318.0</td>
<td>10,685.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10,685.6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Court Services</td>
<td>11,454.2</td>
<td>11,813.2</td>
<td>13,589.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13,589.2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Total AOC</td>
<td>38,456.5</td>
<td>37,326.0</td>
<td>42,802.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>42,809.6</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Compilation Comm</td>
<td>529.9</td>
<td>539.5</td>
<td>539.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>539.5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Judiciary Wide Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,346.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19,346.9</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Judiciary Grand Total</td>
<td>184,126.4</td>
<td>187,547.7</td>
<td>217,853.3</td>
<td>144.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>218,040.1</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>