

“It is now time to address this issue cooperatively on a statewide level avoiding the blame, vituperation and parochialism that have prevented proper discussion and meaningful solutions in the past”

**- FROM THE “LANDRIEU COMMISSION”
STUDY BY THE STATE SUPREME COURT -
(JANUARY 1992)**

(The following pages contain the introduction and findings of the study)

INTRODUCTION

The Commission to Study the Orleans Parish Judicial System was convened by the Orleans Intercommunity Council to investigate the structure and financing of the Orleans Parish judicial system and to develop findings and make recommendations for its improvement. The Commission consisted of two non-elected officials recommended by Governor Buddy Roemer, two non-elected officials recommended by Mayor Sidney Barthelemy, and a Chairman agreed upon by the Governor and the Mayor. Both Governor Roemer and Mayor Barthelemy agreed to support the findings and recommendations of the Commission in an effort to resolve differences between certain elements of state and city government concerning the causes of and solutions to the on-going fiscal crisis facing the City of New Orleans.

In 1991 the City funded only half the requested needs of the criminal judicial system, because the mayor contended that the system was the responsibility of the state. Some members of the legislative and executive branches of the state countered that a large part of the City's financial problem was caused by the dual judicial system existing in Orleans Parish and by the excessive number of elected public officials in the City compared to other parishes and cities in the state.

Over a period of six months, the Commission held public and private hearings and interviewed knowledgeable persons in and out of the system including public officials in all branches and levels of government, lawyers who work in the system, academicians from many disciplines, and average citizens. The Commission also reviewed the many constitutional, statutory and charter provisions affecting the system, the reports of the Judicial Council and various studies previously made. Of particular help were the studies by the National Center for State Court Administration and the Bureau of Governmental Research.

The Commission established in August 1991 a general schedule, which targeted early January 1992 as the tentative time for formal release of its report. Before it could reach a consensus on its findings and recommendations, however, the gubernatorial primary was held and Governor Roemer was defeated. With the defeat of the Governor, the entire context and set of agreements, within which the Commission was established, fundamentally changed. One of the essential parties involved in the Commission and essential to the reception of its findings and the implementation of its recommendations was no longer an effective element in its

life. The Governor's appointees ceased their involvement, as they sought to readjust their careers; and, with the election of Governor Edwards, the City found other opportunities for communicating its fiscal concerns and for exploring funding options.

After the collapse of the Commission, the Orleans Intercommunity Council requested the Commission's chairperson to issue a report containing his personal findings and recommendations.

This report, therefore, represents his best efforts to:

- Define the problem.
- Place it in the proper context and perspective.
- Suggest changes that are meaningful and politically achievable.

If one were able to start with a clean canvas and a perfect world, the challenge to produce a better judicial system for the City of New Orleans would be relatively easy. That, of course, is not the case. One must deal with 271 years of history and tradition, economic, social, cultural and racial change, parish boundaries, existing judicial structures, constitutional and statutory provisions, jurisprudence, incumbency and political power. In general, one must deal with the real world.

Submitted: _____
Moon Landrieu

Finding # 3 THE STATEWIDE PROBLEM.

The present judicial structures throughout the State were created more by accidents in historical development and by the arbitrary use of political power than by the application of coherent organizing principles. As a consequence, the present structures resemble fiefdoms containing significant disparities in size of jurisdiction, workloads, level and type of funding, fee structures number of officials and other characteristics. They exhibit, for the most part, a lack of accountability to their funding sources, which frustrates all efforts at effective planning and management. They are unnecessarily complex and, therefore, difficult for citizens to understand. They pose unnecessary obstacles to litigants, prevent integrated, holistic approaches to the solution of crime, civil disputes, and family matters. They create competition among the different functions within the

system and hinder cooperative approaches to improvement. In short, they imperil the uniform administration of justice throughout the state.

Finding # 4. INADEQUATE AND INAPPROPRIATE FUNDING.

We find that the judicial system throughout most of the State is inadequately and inappropriately funded; and that the present funding crisis, which is manifest in Orleans and other districts, will grow significantly worse unless addressed now and addressed properly.

The present structures place the primary financial responsibility for the system on local government, even though the judicial system, as established in the State Constitution, is not a function of local government, should not be controlled by local government, and cannot be adequately funded by local government. In many areas of the State, the financial burden on local governments is reaching the limits of their funding capacities.

The present structures encourage an over reliance by the various judicial functions within the system on fees, fines, entrepreneurial activity and other forms of self-generated revenues, either imposed, sometimes heavily, on litigants, or charged to those filing land records or other documents having little or nothing to do with the courts.

It is unfair and fiscally improper to require those filing land records or other non court-related documents to subsidize the justice system through exorbitant fees and charges. Requiring such subsidization is a form of selective taxation in the guise of a fee system; and, therefore, is violative not only of good public finance theory but also, probably of the equal protection clauses of the federal and state constitutions.

More importantly, the right to justice should never be contingent upon either a person's ability to pay or a local jurisdiction's capacity to pay. As a consequence, the price of justice should be uniform throughout the State and should be set primarily with justice, not funding needs, in mind. The right to justice should never be compromised over money because the fundamental mission of government, beyond all other considerations, is to render justice.

Finding # 5. LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY.

The present judicial structures lack adequate systems of accountability and control. It is improper for either the executive or legislative branches of state government to attempt to exercise control over the courts. The Louisiana Constitution clearly provides that such supervision should be exercised by the State Supreme Court and that it should require proper accountability from all courts and court-related functions.

Neither the executive or legislative branches of state or local government exercise sufficient control over non-court judicial functions, such as the district attorneys, the clerks of court, the indigent defense systems, the sheriffs and the coroners, even though many of these functions are funded by the state and local governments. It is good public policy and good sense to require that new systems of accountability need to be developed for these functions.

Finding # 6. UNITARY NOTION OF JUDICIAL POWER.

The notion of a court system, divided into state courts and local courts, is contrary to the State Constitution. The Louisiana Constitution of 1974 establishes a unitary judicial power, vested in different types of courts under the supervision of the State Supreme Court.

Finding # 7. SEPARATION OF POWERS.

A major cause of the fragmentation and divisiveness that exists among the various judicial agencies is due to an imprecise and unclear separation of governmental powers. The Clerks of Court exercise a judicial function in the maintenance of court records, but an executive function in the maintenance of land records. The Sheriffs exercise a judicial function in the provision of bailiff and process service to the courts, but exercise an executive function in the provision of tax collection, law enforcement and incarceration of prisoners. The governor and the legislature often attempt to micro-manage certain court functions and yet provide a small portion of the funds needed to operate such agencies. Local governments provide a substantial part of the funding of these judicial agencies but can exercise little or no effective management control over them. In short, there is no systematic management because there is no system. The functions spill over the various powers and branches of government with very little coherence and without any systematic frameworks for accountability

Finding # 8. LACK OF INFORMATION.

There is an incredible lack of statewide information on the revenues provided to the judicial system by local governments and by fees, fines, forfeitures and other self-generated funds. There is also a general lack of uniform information on the expenditures made by the various units of the judicial system for different items. If the State were willing to assume full funding of the judicial system, it would be extremely difficult in the current environment for it to estimate and project what that cost might be.

Finding # 9. PRINCIPLES OF RESTRUCTURING.

Throughout the past twenty years, there have been numerous attempts to reform aspects of state and local government. The number of state departments have been reduced; the system of legislative oversight has been vastly improved; government must now operate in the sunshine; its records are available to the public; the state has an inspector general and a legislative auditor; fiscal reform has been partially addressed; and various systems of management control and accountability have been introduced. The one area that has not been and still is not on anyone's active agenda for reform is the statewide judicial system (or non-system as previously shown), comprising the courts, clerks of court, the district attorneys, the sheriffs, the coroners, and the indigent defense functions.

Numerous studies of Louisiana's judicial system, from 1972 to the present, as well as several national judicial studies, have clearly and strongly called for such reform and have also indicated the basic principles to be used in restructuring the State's antiquated judicial system. But these studies have not been seriously addressed or acted upon primarily because of the political and financial difficulties in implementing them. All political elements in the State have failed to address the issues presented in these reports cooperatively. Instead, the various factions of the State have unfairly and unproductively blamed one another for their existence. A major target for such blame has been the Orleans Parish judicial system, which, as noted earlier, does in fact have many problems. What has not been heretofore understood much less addressed is how these problems need to be solved as part of a total statewide revamping of the judicial system in terms of its funding, its management, its accountability and its coordination.

It is now time to address this issue cooperatively on a statewide level avoiding the blame, vituperation and parochialism that have prevented proper discussion and meaningful solutions in the past.

Chapter 5 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and other information presented in this Report and the information contained in other reports, the following recommendations are offered for consideration and implementation.

1. STATE FUNDING OF THE COURT SYSTEM. The State should assume full responsibility for the funding of the entire court system, including: the Louisiana Supreme Court; the State Courts of Appeal; the State District Courts; all Courts of Limited and Special Jurisdiction including Juvenile and Family Courts, Parish and City Courts, Magistrate Courts, Mayor's Courts, and Justices of the Peace; Constables; the indigent defense system and the court-related functions of the Clerks of Court.

All fees, fines, forfeitures and cost reimbursements, generated by the State court system, as defined above, should be made uniform throughout the State at a cost level recommended by the Louisiana Supreme Court and based primarily on principles of justice. Such fees, fines, forfeitures and cost reimbursements should no longer be used as a vehicle for the collection of hidden taxes.

As a means of initiating state assumption of the funding of the court system, a pilot program of full state funding, involving a minimum of ten judicial districts, should be established by the Louisiana Supreme Court on the basis of the following criteria: (1) the needs of the courts in each district; (2) the willingness of the local district, as expressed in a resolution of the affected local governing authority or authorities, to relinquish local funding of the court system; and (3) the willingness of the local district, as expressed in a resolution of the affected local governing authority or authorities, to have all courts in the area (district courts, juvenile and family courts, parish courts, city courts, mayor's courts and justices of the peace) placed under the supervision and control of the Louisiana Supreme Court, as provided in Recommendation 2 below.

2. SUPERVISION OF COURTS BY THE LOUISIANA SUPREME COURT. The Louisiana Supreme Court should be encouraged and assisted by the Legislature and the Governor to exercise fully its constitutional supervisory authority over all courts and court-related functions included in the new system of funding within the State. The Supreme Court should establish and supervise a uniform budgetary and financial system for the proper management of the funds generated by the courts and the court-related functions of the Clerks of Court and the

Constables. It should require the courts, the court-related functions of the Clerks of Court, and the Constables to have a uniform chart of accounts and uniform budget formats. It should require each court to submit budget requests, which it could evaluate and possibly modify on the basis of written policies and guidelines. It should submit a single budgetary request on behalf of the courts and all court-related functions to the Legislature. It should establish a judicial audit system to ensure that adequate financial and operating controls are in place in each court and in each court-related function. It should establish and supervise a uniform personnel system based on uniform compensation plans and sound human resource development policies. It should set a uniform schedule of fees generated by the courts or by the court-related functions of the Clerks of Court and the Constables, basing its recommendations primarily on principles of justice, not funding. It should make recommendations, through the Judicial Council or other appropriate subordinate bodies, to the Legislature regarding the elimination, consolidation or expansion of judicial districts; and it should determine the number of judges, including justices of the peace and constables, needed in each jurisdiction, and the level of staffing needed to support each judge. It should also sponsor studies and make recommendations to the Legislature regarding additional court improvements.

The State executive and legislative branches should remove themselves from the business of supervising and managing the courts, except in so far as elections and other explicit constitutional requirements are involved.

Local governments should not be involved in either the funding or the supervision of the court system, except as landlords of the buildings in which the courts are housed. As landlords, they should be compensated by the State for the services they provide on the basis of a uniform cost schedule set by the Legislature for the entire State.

3. FUNDING OF DISTRICT ATTORNEYS AND CORONERS. The State should assume greater responsibility for the funding of the operations of the district attorneys and the coroners.

Local governments should continue to fund each of these functions, but at a much smaller level and on the basis of a fixed easily calculable funding formula. Local governments should continue to have the responsibility for housing and maintaining the facilities of the district attorneys, the coroners, and the indigent defense functions. The costs of such services should be in addition to funds paid to the State on the basis of the funding formula.

4. **FUNDING OF PRISONERS.** The State should reimburse all sheriffs for the costs, including capital costs, which they incur in incarcerating and feeding prisoners charged with state offenses from the time of the arraignment of such prisoners to the end of their imprisonment. The reimbursement should be comparable to the costs incurred by the State in incarcerating and feeding prisoners in state facilities. Local governments should pay the total costs of incarcerating and feeding prisoners who violate local ordinances.

5. **FUNDING OF LAND RECORDS OFFICES.** The land records offices of the various Clerks of Court, including the Register of Conveyances, the Recorder of Mortgages and the Custodian of Notarial Archives in Orleans Parish, should operate, to the extent possible, on the basis of self-generated revenues. Local governments should pay for the cost of housing and maintaining the facilities of such offices, as well as the cost of making up the difference between their actual needs and their self-generated revenues.

6. **ORLEANS PARISH SHORT-TERM REFORMS.** The Legislature should enact legislation to enable the following changes to be accomplished as soon as possible or as specified below:

- (a) **Supervision of Supreme Court.** As a pilot and as a model of the statewide reforms recommended above, all trial courts within Orleans Parish, including the Civil District Court, the Criminal District Court, the Juvenile Court, the First and Second City Courts (or their successor) the Traffic Court and the Municipal Court should be placed under the supervision of Louisiana Supreme Court. All fees, fines, forfeitures and cost reimbursements generated by these courts and by their respective Clerks of Court should be centrally deposited in an interim account to be maintained by the Louisiana Supreme Court until such time as the statewide reforms are implemented as indicated above. Each court and each Clerk should submit a budget to the Supreme Court in a format specified by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court should analyze the operations of each of the affected courts and should initiate a process of restructuring designed to establish a uniform personnel and financial management system for all of courts. The Supreme Court should also begin the process of designing systems for coordinating and consolidating court functions more effectively. On the basis of such restructuring and a careful

analysis of the budgets submitted to it by each affected court, the Supreme Court should develop and submit recommendations to the Legislature for the following matters: (1) continued restructuring of the courts in Orleans Parish; (2) revision of the schedule of fees, fines, forfeitures and cost reimbursements of the courts and Clerks, where needed; and (3) a requested appropriation for State funding of the Orleans Court System.

- (b) **Jury Commission.** The Orleans Parish Jury Commission should be changed and brought into conformity with the systems operating throughout the rest of the State. The Jury Commission should be appointed by the Clerk of the Orleans Parish Criminal District Court and the Clerk of the Orleans Parish Civil District Court. The Commission should be co-chaired on a rotating basis by each Clerk and should consist of other members.

7. Orleans Parish Long-Term Reforms. The long-term reform and restructuring of the Orleans Parish court system should be directed and supervised by the Louisiana Supreme Court on the basis of sound principles of judicial management and in an evolutionary manner. The long-term reform and restructuring of the land record functions currently performed by the Register of Conveyances, the Recorder of Mortgages and the Custodian of Notarial Archives should be addressed by the legislature as soon as possible but with an effective date set in the year 2002. Among the reforms which should be considered by the Supreme Court and the Legislature are the following:

- (a) **First and Second City Courts.** Effective in the year 2002, the First and Second City Courts should be merged into one City Court, having the same number of judges but only one elected clerk. This change need not preclude the continued use of the Algiers Courthouse by the Judges of the consolidated City Court on some sort of rotating basis.
- (b) **Register of Conveyances, Recorder of Mortgages, and Custodian of Notarial Archives.** Effective in the year 2002, the elective offices of the Register of Conveyances and the Recorder of Mortgages should be abolished and their functions assumed by appointive officers under the supervision of the Clerk of the Orleans Parish Civil District Court. The appointive office of the Custodian of

Notarial Archives should also be abolished and its functions transferred to the office of the Clerk of the Orleans Parish Civil District Court.

8. PLANNING. In order to plan properly for the reforms and restructuring recommended above, the Legislature should enact legislation as soon as possible to provide the following:

- (a) **System of Accounts.** The Legislature should encourage and assist the executive and judicial branches to establish cooperatively a uniform system of accounts for documenting the total revenues derived from all sources and the total expenses incurred by all entities provided for in Article V of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974, to wit, : the courts; jury commissions; the clerks of court; the sheriffs; the district attorneys; the coroners; the indigent defense system; the marshals; and the constables.
- (b) **Judicial Auditor.** The Legislature should encourage and assist the Louisiana Supreme Court to create an office of the Judicial Auditor, which could work with the Legislative Auditor and auditors from the Division of Administration to establish the system of accounts recommended above and to plan the development of a fully integrated court and judicial agency financial system.
- (c) **Legislative Committee.** The Legislature should establish a standing legislative committee to oversee the process of court and judicial restructuring and reform as called for in the above recommendations.

ESTIMATE OF TOTAL COURT FINANCING IN FY 1994/1995 (IN MILLIONS)

Type of Court	State General Fund Direct	Note: 1	Local General Fund Direct	Note: 7	User Fee/Cost Funding	Note: 12	Total Court Funding
Supreme Court	\$15,625,467	2	\$0		\$1,032,710	13	\$16,658,177
Courts of Appeal	\$20,960,050	3	\$0		\$1,391,122	14	\$22,251,171
District Courts	\$18,342,447	4	\$18,507,032	8	\$17,312,898	15	\$54,162,377
Family & Juvenile Cts.	\$1,636,800	5	\$4,240,150	9	\$913,779	16	\$6,790,729
Parish & City Courts	\$1,476,634	6	\$10,200,000	10	\$16,952,122	17	\$28,628,756
Mayor's Courts	\$0		\$0		\$2,250,000	18	\$2,250,000
Justices of the Peace	\$0		\$1,700,000	11	\$7,880,000	19	\$9,580,000
Total	\$58,041,398		\$34,647,182		\$47,732,631		\$140,321,210

ESTIMATE OF TOTAL COURT FINANCING,
FY 1994/1995 (IN MILLIONS)

NOTES

1. State General Fund Direct means funding from the State's general fund.
2. The information has been obtained from the 1994 financial audit of the Supreme Court and from the 1994/95 Judicial Appropriations Bill. The amount includes: funding for the basic salaries of the justices; the operations of the offices of the Justices, the Clerk of Court, the Judicial Council (Judicial Administrator), the Judiciary Commission, the Law Library of Louisiana, the Louisiana Judicial College, and the Supreme Court's court reporter pool; all judicial retirement; judges' widows' pensions and cost-of-living adjustments; the compensation of ad hoc and temporary judges; and other minor expenses. The amount does not include the funding derived from the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund and CMIS, which is included under User Fee/Cost Funding.
3. The information has been obtained from the 1994 financial audits of the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal and from the 1994/1995 Judicial Appropriations Bill. The amount includes funding for the basic salary of the judges and for most of the operations of the Courts of Appeal.
4. The information has been obtained from the 1994 financial audit of the Supreme Court and from the 1994/1995 Judicial Appropriations Bill. The amount includes funding for the basic salaries of the district judges and some of the operational costs of the larger district courts, including the costs of law clerks and court reporters.
5. The information has been obtained from the 1994 financial audit of the Supreme Court and from the 1994/95 Judicial Appropriations Bill. The amount includes funding for the basic salaries of the family and juvenile courts and for some of their operational costs.
6. The information has been obtained from the 1994 financial audit of the Supreme Court and from the 1994/95 Judicial Appropriations Bill. The amount includes funding for part of the salaries of the parish and city courts.
7. Local General Fund Direct means funding from the general funds of the local governments. The category excludes the funding provided through the criminal court funds, other fees and court costs and the special taxes of the local governments.

8. The information is based on the data from the 1990 and 1991 surveys of the Police Jury Association. The data has been updated and estimated for 1994/1995 for those local governments responding to the surveys. Additional data has been gathered for estimating the funding provided by those local governments not responding to the Police Jury Association's surveys. The amount includes funding for most of the operations of the district courts and for the costs of court reporters, attendance and witness fees, and juror costs.

9. The information is based on the data from the 1990 and 1991 surveys of the Police Jury Association. The data has been updated and estimated for 1994/1995 for those local governments responding to the surveys. Additional data has been gathered for estimating the funding provided by those local governments not responding to the Police Jury Association's surveys. The amount includes funding for most of the operations of the family and juvenile courts.

10. The information is based on the data from the 1990 and 1991 surveys of the Police Jury Association. The data has been updated and estimated for 1994/1995 for those local governments responding to the surveys. Additional data has been gathered for estimating the funding provided by those local governments not responding to the Police Jury Association's surveys. The amount includes funding for part of the salaries of the parish and city court judges and for a large part of the operations of these courts.

11. The information is based on the data from the 1990 and 1991 surveys of the Police Jury Association. The data has been updated and estimated for 1994/1995 for those local governments responding to the surveys. Additional data has been gathered for estimating the funding provided by those local governments not responding to the Police Jury Association's surveys. The amount includes funding for part of the salaries and operations of the justices of the peace.

12. User Fee/Cost Funding means funding obtained from filing fees, court costs, forfeitures, and self-generated revenues. The category includes the funding provided by the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund to all judges in the state and the CMIS funding provided to the Supreme Court.

13. The information has been primarily obtained from the 1994 financial audit of the Supreme Court. The amount includes the funding generated from filing fees and court costs and deposited in the Clerk of Court's Fee Account, as well as the supplemental funding paid to the justices from the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund, and the funding derived from CMIS, the Judicial College's Seminar Fund, the

Law Library Self-Generated Fee Fund, the Alternative Dispute Resolution Task Force Fund, and other small funds associated with specific projects.

14. The information has been primarily obtained from the 1994 financial audits of the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal. The amount includes the supplemental funding provided to the judges from the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund, and the funding derived from the fee accounts of the various courts of appeal, interest income, and a small amount of grant funds.

15. The information has been primarily obtained from the financial audits of the judicial expense funds of the district courts. The amounts include funding for all of the operations of the Civil District Court of Orleans and for some of the operations of the other district courts. The amount includes the supplemental funding provided to the judges from the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund, and the funding derived from the criminal court funds of the local governments, the judicial expense funds of the district courts, and other sources (grant funds, special court costs, etc.

16. The information has been primarily obtained from the financial audits of the judicial expense funds of the family and juvenile courts. The amounts include the supplemental funding provided to the judges from the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund, and the funding derived from the judicial expense funds of the family and juvenile courts, special court costs, and federal grants.

17. The information has been primarily obtained from the financial audits of the parish and city courts. The amounts include the supplemental funding provided to judges from the Judges' Supplemental Compensation Fund, and the funding derived from the expense funds of the parish and city courts, the criminal court funds of the local governments, federal grants, and special court costs and filing fees.

18. The information has been estimated by multiplying the maximum court costs available to mayor's courts (\$50) times an adjusted base of convictions estimated to be 500,000 annually.

19. The information has been estimated by multiplying an average fee of \$50 times a base of transactions estimated to be 157,600 per year.

DISTRICT JUDGES' SUPPORT UNIT COSTS

1. Recurring Monthly Costs

Law Clerk Salary	2,500
Law Clerk Fringe	625
Secretary Salary	2,000
Secretary Fringe	500
Court Reporter	3,000
Court Reporter Fringe	750
Supplies	400
Telephone (Local)	100
Telephone (LD)	400
Contract Maintenance	90
Parking	300
Travel/Mileage	1,000
Postage	150
Miscellaneous	300
CLE, Memberships, Training	240
Library Maintenance	50
CD-ROM Legal Services	<u>25</u>
Total	12,430

2. One-Time Costs

Executive Desk (1)	1,700
Secretarial Desks (3)	1,500
Bookcase (6)	654
File Cabinet (4)	2,000
Executive Chair (1)	500
Secretarial Chairs (3)	420
Side Chairs (3)	300
Computer (4)	8,000
Printer (2)	2,778
Printer Table (2)	176
Copy Machine (1)	2,500
FAX Machine (1)	220
Telephones (5)	250
Chair Mats (4)	240
Trash Basket (6)	30
Law Library	<u>5,000</u>
Total One-Time	26,268

Capital Allowance = 1/5 of Total one-time costs: \$26,268/5 =
5,254

3. Annual Costs

Annual Recurring Costs: 12,430*12 =	149,160
Annual Capital Allowance =	5,254
Total Annual Support Costs	154,414
Use 155,000 per judge	
Judges' Salaries: \$75,000 * 195 =	14,625,000
Salary Supplements: 9,300 * 195 =	1,813,500
Fringe = 16.45% of Salaries =	2,704,133
Annual Support Costs =	30,225,000
Total Costs	49,367,633
Plus Cost of Jurors	1,700,000
Plus Witness and Attendance Costs	1,877,549
Total Cost	52,945,182

ESTIMATE OF TOTAL COURT FINANCING FY 1994/95 (IN MILLIONS)

	STATE	LOCAL	SELF-GEN	TOTAL
Courts				
Supreme Court	15.6	0.0	1.0	16.6
Courts of Appeal	21.0	0.0	1.4	22.3
District Courts	18.3	18.5	17.3	54.1
Family & Juvenile	1.6	4.2	0.9	6.7
Parish/City Courts	1.5	10.2	16.9	28.6
Mayors Courts	0.0	0.0	2.3	2.3
Justices of Peace	0.0	1.7	7.9	9.6
Subtotal	58.0	34.6	47.7	140.3
Clerks of Court	0.2	4.6	61.9	66.7
Indigent Defense	5.0	0.0	12.0	17.0
District Attorneys	14.1	14.8	23.4	52.3
Coroners	0.0	5.4	0.5	5.9
Corrections:				
State Prisoners: Sentenced	67.6	0.0	10.0	77.6
State Prisoners: Arraigned	0.0	62.5	10.0	72.5
TOTAL	144.9	121.9	165.5	432.2