| Agency Name: | Commission On Indigent Defense | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Agency Code: | E230 Section: 61 | | | | |



Fiscal Year FY 2025-2026 Agency Budget Plan

FORM A - BUDGET PLAN SUMMARY

| OPERATING | For FY 2025-2026, my agency is (1 | nark): | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| REQUESTS | | | | | | |
| TEL QUESTS | | Requesting Federal/Other Authorization. | | | | |
| (FORM B1) | Not requesting any changes. | | | | | |
| ON-RECURRING | For FY 2025-2026, my agency is (r | mark): | | | | |
| REQUESTS | Requesting Non-Recurring A | | | | | |
| 1111 Q 0 20 10 | Requesting Non-Recurring Fe | deral/Other Authorization. | | | | |
| (FORM B2) | X Not requesting any changes. | | | | | |
| CAPITAL | For FY 2025-2026, my agency is (1 | nark): | | | | |
| REQUESTS | Requesting funding for Capita | ll Projects. | | | | |
| | X Not requesting any changes. | | | | | |
| (FORM C) | | | | | | |
| | E. EV 2025 2026 | 1 | | | | |
| PROVISOS | For FY 2025-2026, my agency is (1 | nark): /or substantive changes to existing | ng provisos | | | |
| (EODICE) | | viso changes (such as date referen | | | | |
| (FORM D) | X Not requesting any proviso changes. | | | | | |
| (2 0 2 2 2) | A Trot requesting any proviso er | 8 | | | | |
| ease identify your ager | ncy's preferred contacts for this <u>Name</u> | years budget process. <u>Phone</u> | <u>Email</u> | | | |
| , | ncy's preferred contacts for this | years budget process. | Email rgrizzle@sccid.sc.gov | | | |
| ease identify your age | ncy's preferred contacts for this <u>Name</u> | years budget process. <u>Phone</u> | | | | |
| PRIMARY CONTACT: SECONDARY CONTACT: | ncy's preferred contacts for this Name Rodney Grizzle Donna Bridges | years budget process. Phone (803) 734-1168 (803) 734-1451 | rgrizzle@sccid.sc.gov | | | |
| PRIMARY CONTACT: SECONDARY CONTACT: | ncy's preferred contacts for this Name Rodney Grizzle Donna Bridges | years budget process. Phone (803) 734-1168 (803) 734-1451 (803) 734-1451 (926) Agency Budget Plane | rgrizzle@sccid.sc.gov dbridges@sccid.sc.gov | | | |
| PRIMARY CONTACT: SECONDARY CONTACT: | Name Rodney Grizzle Donna Bridges Droved the enclosed FY 2025-2 | years budget process. Phone (803) 734-1168 (803) 734-1451 (803) 734-1451 (926) Agency Budget Plane | rgrizzle@sccid.sc.gov dbridges@sccid.sc.gov , which is complete and accurate to | | | |

This form must be signed by the agency head $\hat{a} \in \text{``}$ not a delegate.

NAME:

| Agency Name: | Commission On Indigent Defense |
|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Agency Code: | E230 |
| Section: | 61 |

| BUDGET | REQUESTS | } | FUNDING | | | FTES | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------|---|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|-----------|-------|---------|-----------|------------|-------|
| Priority | Request Type | Request Title | State | Federal | Earmarked | Restricted | Total | State | Federal | Earmarked | Restricted | Total |
| 1 | B1 - Recurring | Recurring General Fund Increase for Office of Circuit Public Defender; Defense of Indigents/Per Capita | 2,980,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,980,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| TOTALS | • | | 2,980,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,980,000 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| Agency Name: | Commission On Indigent Defense | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|----|--|--|--|
| Agency Code: | E230 | 61 | | | |

FORM B1 RECURRING OPERATING REQUEST

AGENCY PRIORITY 1

Provide the Agency Priority Ranking from the Executive Summary.

TITLE

Recurring General Fund Increase for Office of Circuit Public Defender; Defense of Indigents/Per Capita

Provide a brief, descriptive title for this request.

General:\$2,980,000

Total: \$2,980,000

AMOUNT

Federal: \$0 Other: \$0

What is the net change in requested appropriations for FY 2025-2026? \hat{A} This amount should correspond to the total for all funding sources on the Executive Summary.

NEW POSITIONS

0.00

Please provide the total number of new positions needed for this request.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE REQUEST

Mark X for all that apply:

Change in cost of providing current services to existing program audience

Change in case load/enrollment under existing program guidelines

Non-mandated change in eligibility/enrollment for existing program

Non-mandated program change in service levels or areas

Proposed establishment of a new program or initiative

Loss of federal or other external financial support for existing program $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left$

Exhaustion of fund balances previously used to support program

IT Technology/Security related

HR/Personnel Related

Consulted DTO during development

Related to a Non-Recurring request â€" If so, Priority #

STATEWIDE ENTERPRISE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Mark X for primary applicable Statewide Enterprise Strategic Objective:

Education, Training, and Human Development

Healthy and Safe Families

Maintaining Safety, Integrity, and Security

Public Infrastructure and Economic Development

Government and Citizens

Strategy 1.1 Enhance the Circuit Public Defender System.

ACCOUNTABILITY OF FUNDS

Continuing to recruit and retain public defenders by offering competitive salaries and hiring and retaining critical staff to support the additional attorneys. Objective measurements of success will be a more efficient criminal justice system resulting in a reduction in the number of pending warrants, more timely resolution of cases and increased quality of client representation.

What specific strategy, as outlined in the most recent Strategic Planning and Performance Measurement template of agency $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{TM}$ accountability report, does this funding request support? How would this request advance that strategy? How would the use of these funds be evaluated?

RECIPIENTS OF

Funding will be allocated to the 16 Circuit Public Defender Offices on a per capita basis as established by proviso 61.1 (FY 24-25 Appropriations Act H. 5100)

FUNDS

What individuals or entities would receive these funds (contractors, vendors, grantees, individual beneficiaries, etc.)? \hat{A} How would these funds be allocated $\hat{a} \in \mathcal{C}$ using an existing formula, through a competitive process, based upon predetermined eligibility criteria?

Once again, the South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense (SCCID) and the Commission on Prosecution Coordination (SCCPC) have worked together in preparation of budget proposals to maintain a balanced approach to managing the criminal docket in South Carolina.

An effective and efficient criminal justice system will best serve clients, victims, county correctional facilities, courts, and the citizens (taxpayers) of South Carolina.

JUSTIFICATION OF REQUEST

Recurring funding appropriated in FY 24 (SCCID made no request for additional funding for FY 25) for assistant public defender recruitment and retention has resulted in a statewide increase of approximately 78 additional public defenders over a two-year period. However, 27 vacancies remain as competitive pay is still a struggle while competing against private industry and better funded government entities. The average pay of attorneys employed by the State of S.C. with 6-10 years of experience is \$106,215 versus a salary of \$93,264 of public defenders with the equivalent experience.

While the FY24 recurring, funding has allowed PD offices to make significant attorney hires there is now a critical need to hire staff to support these attorneys. Currently there is a ratio of 3 attorneys to 1 staff member. These positions include investigators, paralegals, litigation support specialist (who can provide IT support, body camera downloads, trial support and other assigned tasks in the critical technology realm) and other administrative staff.

This funding is critical as PDs continue to handle huge caseloads averaging approximately 400 warrants per PD and continue to work through the huge COVID created court backlog.

Please thoroughly explain the request to include the justification for funds, potential offsets, matching funds, and method of calculation. \hat{A} Please include any explanation of impact if funds are not received. \hat{A} If new positions have been requested, explain why existing vacancies are not sufficient.

| Agency Name: | Commission On Indigent Defense |
|----------------|--|
| Agency Code: | E230 Section: 61 |
| | |
|] | FORM D €" PROVISO REVISION REQUEST |
| | |
| NUMBER | 61.NEW |
| | Cite the proviso according to the renumbered list (or mark $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$). |
| TITLE | Public Defender Tier-System Grant Carryforward |
| IIILL | Provide the title from the renumbered list or suggest a short title for any new request. |
| | |
| BUDGET | III. Office of Circuit Public Defender |
| PROGRAM | |
| | Identify the associated budget program(s) by name and budget section. |
| RELATED | #2 |
| BUDGET | |
| REQUEST | |
| | Is this request associated with a budget request you have submitted for FY 2025-2026? If so, cite it here. |
| | |
| REQUESTED | Add |
| ACTION | Choose from: Add, Delete, Amend, or Codify. |
| | Choose from. Add, Detete, Amend, or Codify. |
| OTHER AGENCIES | n/a |
| AFFECTED | |
| | Which other agencies would be affected by the recommended action? How? |
| | This new proviso will allow the Commission on Indigent Defense to carryforward any |
| | unexpended balance on June thirtieth of the prior year into the new year to be spent on |
| | the Public Defender Tier-System Grant program. This proviso will conform to funding. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| SUMMARY & | |
| EXPLANATION | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Summarize the existing proviso. If requesting a new proviso, describe the current state of affairs without it. Explain the need for your requested action. For deletion requests due to recent codification, please identify SC Code section where language now appears.

FISCAL IMPACT

The request for funding is \$5,600,000 in recurring State Funds will support the creation of a grant administered by the Commission on Indigent Defense (SCCID) to work in conjunction and collaboration with a three-tier prosecution grant being proposed by the Commission on Prosecution Coordination (SCCPC) for those Offices of Circuit Solicitor implementing or planning to implement a tier-based docket management system. The goal is to fulfill the intent of the S. C. Supreme Court's Docket Management Order (as Amended January 15, 2025) that states "because public defenders must also have adequate time to prepare for court, it would be beneficial for Chief Public Defenders to create a similar system [docket management] tailored to their respective Solicitor's system".

Provide estimates of any fiscal impacts associated with this proviso, whether for state, federal, or other funds. Explain the method of calculation.

61.NEW (INDEF: Public Defender Tier-System Grant Carryforward) Any unexpended balance from the Public Defender Tier-System Grant program on June Thirtieth of the prior year, may be carried forward into the current fiscal year and expended for the Public Defender Tier-System Grant program. **PROPOSED PROVISO TEXT**

Paste existing text above, then bold and underline insertions and strikethrough deletions. For new proviso requests, enter requested text above.

| Agency Name: | Commission On Indigent Defense | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Agency Code: | E230 Section: 61 | | | | |

FORM E €" AGENCY COST SAVINGS AND GENERAL FUND REDUCTION CONTINGENCY PLAN

TITLE

Agency Cost Savings and General Fund Reduction Contingency Plan

AMOUNT

\$1,500,581

What is the General Fund 3% reduction amount? This amount should correspond to the reduction spreadsheet prepared by EBO.

ASSOCIATED FTE REDUCTIONS

No reduction in State Authorized FTE's. However, a reduction in Rule 608 funding would result in a loss of the agency's ability to pay contract and Court appointed attorneys for representation of indigent clients.

How many FTEs would be reduced in association with this General Fund reduction?

PROGRAM / ACTIVITY IMPACT

1. Administration

Rule 608 Appointment

What programs or activities are supported by the General Funds identified?

If the 3% General fund reduction were to be implemented, SCCID would take the cuts from our budget lines as follows:

Rule 608 Appointment (1,500,581)

SCCID 3% Reduction (1,500,581)

This reduction would decrease this agency's ability to fund the much-needed legal representation for the indigent citizens of South Carolina. The reduction of Rule 608 Appointment funds would restrict the ability to pay private contract and/or court appointed attorneys representing the indigent citizens of South Carolina and would also increase the backlog of cases in General Sessions, Family Court (DSS cases), Sexual Violent Predator and Post Conviction Relief (PCR) cases.

SUMMARY

Please provide a detailed summary of service delivery impact caused by a reduction in General Fund Appropriations and provide the method of calculation for anticipated reductions. Agencies should prioritize reduction in expenditures that have the least significant impact on service delivery.

SCCID continues to look for ways to be more efficient with less resources. In FY24, SCCID

did not fill four FTE positions within the agency and have absorbed those job responsibilities within the existing staff.

AGENCY COST SAVINGS PLANS

What measures does the agency plan to implement to reduce its costs and operating expenses by more than \$50,000? \hat{A} Provide a summary of the measures taken and the estimated amount of savings. \hat{A} How does the agency plan to repurpose the savings?