Gabel, Patricia

From: Balivet, Toby
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2009 2:32 PM
To: Gabel, Patricia
Subject: RE: LT to the Chief
Attachments: Letter to Chief Justice.doc

If I hit the right buttons, here it is!

From: Gabel, Patricia
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2009 1:44 PM
To: Balivet, Toby
Subject: RE: LT to the Chief

Toby, I checked with the Chief, and he hasn't seen the letter yet. [They've were sitting this morning and have an administrative meeting this afternoon.] I'll ask Deb Laferriere if she has seen it yet. Could you email to me an electronic version? [Several weeks ago, Greeny revised some charts in response to a request from Judge Belcher, and I did send out to the Commission the fact that the Probate Judges requested changes to the report and the revised chart that Greeny put together in response to that request. Since you said you wrote the letter yesterday, however, I'm assuming that this is new correspondence.]

From: Balivet, Toby
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2009 1:31 PM
To: Gabel, Patricia
Subject: RE: LT to the Chief

Tnx!

From: Gabel, Patricia
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2009 1:29 PM
To: Balivet, Toby
Subject: RE: LT to the Chief

Thanks for the heads-up, Toby. I will speak to the Chief about this. Pat

---

From: Balivet, Toby
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2009 1:27 PM
To: Gabel, Patricia
Subject: LT to the Chief

Pat: I wrote a letter yesterday on behalf of the probate judges to the Chief in his capacity as Chair of the Commission on Judicial Operation. Because of the subject matter, we are requesting that all of the Commission members be provided with copies of the letter, for informational purposes. Thank you. Toby

Gabel, Patricia

From: Gabel, Patricia
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2009 6:36 AM
To: 'Wvjmpr@aol.com'
Cc: cnprobate@myfairpoint.net; Bruce, Larry; Pu, Robert; Balivet, Toby; Reiber, Paul
Subject: RE: Court Data for the Commission
Attachments: Commission Court Data BGreemore Update 06222009.xls

Here it is. 'sorry about that. [I need a week off in a warm climate, which, unfortunately, is not yet Vermont]

From: Wvjmpr@aol.com [mailto:Wvjmpr@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2009 10:57 PM
To: Gabel, Patricia
Cc: cnprobate@myfairpoint.net; Bruce, Larry; Pu, Robert; Balivet, Toby; Reiber, Paul
Subject: Re: Court Data for the Commission

Hi Patricia:
The revised chart was not attached. Please send it when you get a chance and thanks for your help.
George Belcher

Gabel, Patricia

From: Wvjmpr@aol.com
Sent: Friday, June 19, 2009 3:55 PM
To: Gabel, Patricia
Cc: cnprobate@myfairpoint.net; Bruce, Larry; Hon. Robert Pu; Balivet, Toby
Subject: Court Data for the Commission

Hello Pat:

' Sounds like you've had a busy week.

I doubt this will seem important, late on a Friday afternoon, but I was looking at the data for the Commission as Appendices on the web-site concerning the different courts. On the "Probate Courts" data sheet, it appears that one judge is listed for each of the probate courts and it also appears that the salary and benefits of the judge are included in the personnel costs of the court. When one turns to the Family, District and Superior Court data descriptions, the assigned judge time and magistrate time is rated in tenths and it appears that the judge and magistrate time is not included in the personnel costs. For example, the Washington Superior Court lists state personnel expense as $136,134 with one County Clerk and .9 assigned judge time. Clearly, if you include the salary and benefits of the County Clerk and .9 Trial Judge, the amount would be higher than this.

The result of the different treatment is that a warped picture is given of the probate courts. It appears that the probate courts are more top-heavy, and expensive than the other courts. In Grand Isle, if the probate judge is paid one-fifth of a trial judge and one-third of a full time probate judge, why should that court be shown as having a full time judge? Shouldn't it be .2 assigned judges like the trial courts are shown? Similarly, if we are comparing the courts generally, does it make sense to leave off the expense of the trial judge assigned to the court in superior court but include that for the probate courts? Maybe I am missing something, but I think the data sheets are not consistent.

I would appreciate your thoughts, or maybe you could put me in touch with the creator of the data sheets. Maybe they should eb amended to give a more accurate picture of reality. Thanks for listening. George Belcher

---

PROBATE COURTS

	Cases Added				Staff (All State Paid)			Assigned	Budget						
									State			County (est. from 08 budgets)			Total
	Estates/Trusts	Guardianships	Adoptions	Total	Judge	Clerical	Total	Judge Time	Personnel	Operating	Subtotal	Personnel	Operating	Subtotal	Budget
ADDISON	127	70	28	225	1.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	157,615	62,412	220,027	0	12,100	12,100	232,127
BENNINGTON	135	84	19	238	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	137,899	3,472	141,371	0	5,900	5,900	147,271
MANCHESTER	63	19	3	85	1.0	1.5	2.5	0.0	133,619	5,090	138,709	0	5,400	5,400	144,109
Total-BENNINGTON	198	103	22	323	2.0	2.5	4.5	0	271,518	8,562	280,080	0	11,300	11,300	291,380
CALEDONIA	124	61	27	212	1.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	188,134	33,346	221,480	0	5,300	5,300	226,780
CHITTENDEN	424	181	122	727	1.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	306,646	11,373	318,019	0	11,969	11,969	329,988
ESSEX	35	7	3	45	1.0	0.7	1.7	0.0	81,238	1,607	82,845	0	10,936	10,936	93,781
FRANKLIN	115	86	30	231	1.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	181,969	4,312	186,281	0	2,650	2,650	188,931
GRAND ISLE	23	10	9	42	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	52,438	1,763	54,201	0	0	0	54,201
LAMOILLE	82	42	7	131	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	124,658	5,416	130,074	0	5,240	5,240	135,314
ORANGE	122	55	10	187	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	131,685	4,600	136,285	0	0	0	136,285
ORLEANS	148	48	16	212	1.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	130,527	2,469	132,996	0	2,600	2,600	135,596
RUTLAND	174	108	26	308	1.0	2.6	3.6	0.0	257,316	5,646	262,962	0	10,000	10,000	272,962
FAIR HAVEN	72	43	3	118	1.0	1.0	2.0		110,955	3,028	113,983	0	2,000	2,000	115,983
Total-RUTLAND	246	151	29	426	2.0	3.6	5.6	0	368,271	8,674	376,945	0	12,000	12,000	388,945
WASHINGTON	238	103	55	396	1.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	203,861	8,669	212,530	0	2,682	2,682	215,212
MARLBORO	144	42	16	202	1.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	167,801	3,687	171,488	0	29,302	29,302	200,790
WESTMINSTER	77	33	0	110	1.0	1.0			102,353	1,948	104,301	0	9,588	9,588	113,889
Total-WINDHAM	221	75	16	312	2.0	3.0	3.0	0	270,154	5,635	275,789	0	38,890	38,890	314,679
WINDSOR	167	73	28	268	1.0	1.5	2.5	0.0	132,201	2,105	134,306	0	21,450	21,450	155,756
HARTFORD	126	37	26	189	1.0	1.5	2.5	0.0	186,233	3,063	189,296	0	14,005	14,005	203,301
Total-WINDSOR	293	110	54	457	2.0	3	5	0	318,434	5,168	323,602	0	35,455	35,455	359,057
	2,396	1,102	428	3,926	18	27	43	0	2,787,148	164,006	2,951,154	0	151,122	151,122	3,102,276

FAMILY & DISTRICT COURTS

	District Court Cases Added					Family Court Cases Added						District	Family	Clerical	Assigned	Assigned	Budget State				
	Felony	Misdemeanor	Civ Suspend	Traffic/F&Game	Total	Domestic	Juvenile	Mental Health	Child Support	RFA	Total	Court	Court	Staff	Judge Time	Magist Time	Judges	Magistrates	Personnel	Operating	Total
ADDISON	129	531	68	69	797	443	106	11	361	195	1,116	1.6	3.3	4.9	1.0	0.2	153,803	24,540	428,099	234,313	840,755
BENNINGTON	298	1,023	110	16	1,447	523	189	7	552	263	1,534	2.9	5.1	8.0	2.0	0.2	307,606	24,540	694,131	241,269	1,267,546
CALEDONIA	119	772	74	56	1,021	517	89	10	436	227	1,279	2.8	5.1	7.8	1.4	0.2	215,324	24,540	523,176	281,833	1,044,873
CHITTENDEN	999	4,033	532	144	5,708	1,959	551	88	1,737	710	5,045	12.6	12.4	25.0	5.8	1.0	892,057	122,698	1,917,294	1,723,950	4,655,999
ESSEX	27	59	1	16	103	82	12	2	89	30	215	1.3	1.3	2.6	0.2	0.1	30,761	6,135	245,718	19,821	302,435
FRANKLIN	329	1,101	154	73	1,657	749	166	2	739	319	1,975	4.4	4.4	8.8	2.0	0.2	307,606	24,540	685,188	372,121	1,389,455
GRAND ISLE	34	103	28	19	184	64	12	1	48	41	166	0.8	1.5	2.3	0.2	0.1	30,761	6,135	202,493	13,606	252,995
LAMOILLE	115	652	85	22	874	385	84	23	321	154	967	1.7	3.7	5.4	0.8	0.2	123,042	18,405	362,513	35,000	538,960
ORANGE	83	435	68	29	615	307	63	29	306	148	853	1.6	3.4	5.0	0.9	0.2	130,733	18,405	390,991	37,784	577,912
ORLEANS DISTRICT	140	582	44	88	854	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.8	0.0	3.8	0.7		107,662	0	272,325	100,911	480,898
ORLEANS FAMILY	0	0	0	0		455	62	22	403	229	1,171	0.0	4.0	4.0	0.5	0.2	76,902	24,540	296,250	20,185	417,876
RUTLAND	305	1,476	176	59	2,016	902	249	54	793	642	2,640	5.4	7.4	12.8	2.3	0.4	353,747	49,079	906,421	467,320	1,776,567
WASHINGTON	237	1,259	172	47	1,715	860	178	332	920	313	2,603	5.1	6.5	11.6	2.2	0.4	338,367	49,079	802,265	267,725	1,457,436
WINDHAM DISTRICT	297	1,228	183	43	1,751	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	153,803		309,117	166,731	629,651
WINDHAM FAMILY	0	0	0	0		678	148	48	705	222	1,801	0.0	5.5	5.5	1.0	0.4	153,803	49,079	411,561	147,436	761,879
WINDSOR	299	1,197	188	104	1,788	801	123	9	701	323	1,957	2.9	5.4	8.3	2.0	0.4	307,606	49,079	730,135	277,175	1,363,995
	3,411	14,451	1,883	785	20,530	8,725	2,032	638	8,111	3,816	23,322	52	69	121	24.0	4.0	3,683,582	490,792	9,177,677	4,407,180	17,759,231

SUPERIOR COURTS

	Cases Added				Staff			Assigned	FY 2008 Expenditures							
									State				County (est. from 08 budgets)			Total
	Court/Jury	Appeal/Review	Small Claims	Total	State	County	Total	Judge Time	Judges	Personnel	Operating	Subtotal	Personnel	Operating	Subtotal	Budget
ADDISON	316	20	591	927	1.0	2.4	3.4	0.2	30,761	103,895	138,041	272,697	131,407	22,925	154,332	427,029
BENNINGTON	430	24	905	1,359	1.0	3.0	4.0	0.5	76,902	111,973	14,899	203,774	221,858	70,606	292,464	496,238
CALEDONIA	380	16	569	965	0.2	3.0	3.2	0.2	23,070	19,915	128,032	171,017	226,668	18,400	245,068	416,085
CHITTENDEN	1,663	86	2,525	4,274	1.0	8.0	9.0	1.1	169,183	146,316	54,641	370,140	721,575	326,996	1,048,571	1,418,711
ESSEX	90	3	89	182	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0	19,999	3,086	23,085	101,063	44,170	145,233	168,318
FRANKLIN	614	20	738	1,372	1.0	2.0	3.0	0.6	92,282	135,769	9,438	237,489	200,921	142,750	343,671	581,160
GRAND ISLE	91	3	121	215	0.2	1.6	1.8	0.0	0	21,954	2,640	24,594	141,714	35,680	177,394	201,988
LAMOILLE	304	8	534	846	1.0	3.0	4.0	0.2	30,761	91,247	12,232	134,240	210,855	56,975	267,830	402,070
ORANGE	287	11	471	769	1.0	0.8	1.8	0.2	23,070	101,628	10,797	135,495	176,213	89,406	265,619	401,114
ORLEANS	308	39	614	961	0.2	2.4	2.6	0.1	15,380	21,994	10,375	47,750	146,446	73,020	219,466	267,216
RUTLAND	867	32	1,483	2,382	1.0	4.0	5.0	0.8	123,042	159,332	27,440	309,814	318,817	105,387	424,204	734,018
WASHINGTON	747	53	1,137	1,937	1.0	4.0	5.0	0.9	138,423	136,134	22,921	297,478	339,601	105,479	445,080	742,558
WINDHAM	616	25	1,027	1,668	1.0	2.0	3.0	0.5	76,902	88,254	20,809	185,965	186,030	67,171	253,201	439,166
WINDSOR	825	46	982	1,853	1.0	5.0	6.0	0.8	123,042	133,838	19,452	276,332	408,899	98,680	507,579	783,911
	7,538	386	11,786	19,710	11	41	52.0	6.0	922,818	1,292,248	474,803	2,689,869	3,532,067	1,257,645	4,789,712	7,479,581