

MCILS

**August 14, 2012
Commissioner's Meeting
Packet**

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES

**AUGUST 14, 2012
COMMISSION MEETING
AGENDA**

- 1) Approval of July 10, 2012 Commission Meeting Minutes
- 2) Operations Reports Review
- 3) Budget Update and Hourly Rate Discussion
- 4) Public Comment
- 5) Set Date and Time of next Regular Meeting of the Commission
- 6) Executive Session, if needed. (Closed to Public)

(1.)
July 10, 2012
Commission Meeting
Minutes

**Maine Commission on Indigent Legal Services – Commissioners Meeting
July 10, 2012**

Minutes

Commissioners Present: Ronald Schneider, Kenneth Spirer, Susan Roy, Marvin Glazier, David Mitchell
MCILS Staff Present: John Pelletier

Agenda Item	Discussion	Outcome/Action Item/Responsible Party
Approval of June 12, 2012 Commission Meeting Minutes	Copy of minutes received by all Commissioners.	Commissioner Spirer made a motion to accept the minutes. Commissioner Glazier seconded. All present voted in favor.
Operations Report Review	Director Pelletier presented the <u>June 2012 Operations Reports</u> to the Commissioners.	
Budget Update	<p>Director Pelletier presented a <u>Budget Update</u> to the Commissioners.</p> <p>Director Pelletier stated that the Commission had received a \$914,000.00 budget infusion in June, which had enabled the Commission to pay all current expenses right up until the end of the fiscal year.</p> <p>Director Pelletier stated that the staff had submitted the Commission FY'13 work plan, which divides annual budget amounts into quarterly allocations, to the budget office. To do so, Director Pelletier had projected Commission costs for FY'13. As Director Pelletier explained, this projection differed from past projections in that it included a 2.5 per cent increase in projected costs and allocated costs to reflect higher voucher submissions in the 3rd and 4th quarters of the fiscal year. Previously, costs had been projected flat and allocated evenly among the quarters. Now that the Commission has compiled year over year data, the new projection reflects the Commission's experience during its first two years.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Outcome/Action Item/Responsible Party
Training Update	<p>Director Pelletier presented a training update, explaining that in June, MCILS ran video replays of the Minimum Standards Trainings in Criminal Law, Juvenile Law, Child Protective Law and Emancipation Law that had been video recorded in Bangor in May, 2011.</p> <p>The replays were held in the Board of Corrections Conference Room. We had (14) attorneys attend the Criminal Law training; ten (10) attorneys attend the Juvenile Law training; ten (10) attorneys attend the Child Protective training; and nine (9) attorneys attend the Emancipation training.</p> <p>Of all the attorneys who attended, only eight (8) were not previously rostered with MCILS.</p>	
Executive Session	The Commission entered executive session to discuss personnel matters. No votes were taken during executive session.	Commissioner Spirer made a motion to enter executive session. Commissioner Glazier seconded. All present voted in favor.
Adjournment of Meeting	The Commission then voted to adjourn the formal business meeting with the understanding that a discussion workshop related to proposals to raise the hourly rate, plus public comment, would follow. Next meeting will be August 14, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. at the Board of Corrections Conference Room (same wing as MCILS offices) at 32 Blossom Lane in Augusta, Maine.	Commissioner Glazier made motion to adjourn the meeting. Commission Chair Schneider seconded. All present voted in favor.
Hourly Rate Discussion	<p>The Commissioners engaged in a lengthy and wide-ranging discussion of issues related to an upward adjustment in the hourly rate.</p> <p>Consensus emerged that the Commission should engage in a rule-making process that amends Chapter 301 to increase the hourly rate paid to attorneys, and that the rule-making should be completed as soon as practical so the Commission will have flexibility over the determination of when to implement the new rates.</p> <p>There was discussion of the interrelation between the legislative budget process and the Commission's desire to raise the rates paid to attorneys, which have not changed</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Outcome/Action Item/Responsible Party
	<p>since 1999. There was discussion that the hourly rate issue should be part of the zero-based budget process, and hence, part of the Commission's budget request to the Governor for the next biennial budget covering FY'14 and FY'15. FY'14 begins on July 1, 2013.</p> <p>The issue of crafting a method to build in periodic increases in the hourly rate was also discussed. Proposals to tie increases to federal assigned counsel pay rates or to some indicator of inflation were raised. Also raised was the reality that building in periodic increases would be difficult because one Legislature cannot bind a future Legislature, and any Legislature might be leery of enacting an automatic increase scheme that would be seen as beyond their control.</p> <p>Some in the discussion felt the implementation date should be dependent upon the reception that Commission budget proposals receive in the upcoming budget process. In the view of some, should the Commission's supplemental budget request for FY'13 be met, and should the Legislature adopt a biennial budget that funds rate increases for FY'14 and FY'15, then July 1, 2013 made sense as an implementation date. Others suggested the need for the Commission to assert its statutory authority to set the rate by implementing an increase before the end of FY'13, especially if the budget requests described above were not met by the Legislature.</p> <p>The discussion then turned to more specific proposals of the level and structure of rates. One proposal was a straight increase in the hourly rate. Discussion around this proposal centered on whether any increase should be denominated an "expense supplement." Under this model, the hourly rate for legal services would remain \$50.00/hr., but attorneys would receive a supplement for each hour worked to cover overhead expenses, which have increased dramatically since the last rate increase. The other alternative was an across the board increase in the rate paid for legal services.</p> <p>Another suggestion was to vary the rate of pay between specialized panel cases and non-panel cases, with the rate of pay increasing for all cases, but to a higher rate for specialized panel cases.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Outcome/Action Item/Responsible Party
	<p>A third suggestion was to vary the rate of pay by the class of crime charged in criminal cases, as well as an increase in the base rate for the least serious criminal cases and all other case types.</p> <p>With respect to all of the proposals just discussed, various amounts for the proposed increases were floated. Director Pelletier took note of the amounts and stated that staff would model different versions of the various proposals before the next meeting so that the Commissioner's could assess the budgetary impact of the each proposal.</p> <p>No final decisions were made, and there was agreement to continue the discussion at the next meeting with the benefit of budget models to be prepared by staff.</p>	
Public Comment	<p>Robert Ruffner – Attorney – Attorney Ruffner addressed a number of issues. He suggested adopting a pay increase for implementation in Quarter 4 of FY'13 – April 1, 2013. Then if the Legislature funded an increase for FY'14 and FY'15, the Commission could, in turn, delay implementation until July 1, 2013.</p> <p>Attorney Ruffner stressed that the rate needed to be high enough for a practitioner to support an office. He also stressed that the rates should avoid complexity and should not favor certain case types over others. All indigent clients have a lot at stake and deserve the best representation regardless of the “severity” of the charge.</p> <p>If an increase is denominated an expense supplement, perhaps the Commission should formally investigate the amount of overhead expenses for attorneys in various parts of the state with a view toward setting the amount and perhaps tailoring the amount to the geographic region.</p> <p>Attorney Ruffner advocated building an automatic increase into the rule or into the statute even though a future Legislature could change it. Altering an established scheme would require that the Legislature invest political effort to do so.</p> <p>Sarah Churchill – Attorney – Attorney Churchill advocated for a system of regular review and increase to the hourly rate, stating that lawyers representing indigent clients cannot go another 13 years without a raise.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Outcome/Action Item/Responsible Party
	<p>She pointed out that to keep up with inflation since the rate went to \$50.00/hr. in 1999, the new rate would have to be set at \$72.00/hr.</p> <p>She stated that the Commission should ignore political considerations when setting the rate. Focus on what is appropriate and necessary and find a way to defend it.</p> <p>She advocated implementing any new rate on January 1, 2013. She also stated that the Commission should have a ready plan of action should the Legislature not meet its legitimate budget needs.</p> <p>She advocated denominating any increase as a hourly supplement for expenses, which is done in at least two other states. And she advocated for a higher rate for more serious cases.</p> <p>Steve Carey - Attorney – Attorney Carey stated that the history of the system demands that regular rate increases be guaranteed. He suggested that the rate be between 60-80% of the Federal assigned counsel rate, which is reviewed and raised on a regular basis.</p> <p>Attorney Carey pointed out that a higher rate will allow more attorneys to employ office support, leading to better overall quality of representation.</p> <p>Attorney Carey advocated for keeping the rate for Juvenile and Child Protection cases commensurate with other specialized panels.</p>	

(2.)
Operations Reports
Review

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES

TO: MCILS COMMISSIONERS
FROM: JOHN PELLETIER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: JULY 2012 OPERATIONS REPORTS
DATE: 8/9/2012

Attached you will find the July 2012 Operations Reports for your review and our discussion at the upcoming Commission meeting on August 14, 2012. A summary of the operations reports follows:

- 2,241 new cases were opened in the DefenderData system in July.
- The number of vouchers submitted electronically in July was 2,326, totaling \$923,994.23. We paid 2178 electronic vouchers totaling \$872,779.70.
- There were no paper vouchers submitted in July.
- The average price per voucher in July was \$400.73 and the Fiscal Year 2012 average price per voucher is \$400.73
- Appeals and Petition to Terminate Parental Rights cases were the highest average vouchers in July.

In our All Other Account, the total expenses for the month of July were \$953,054.83. Of that amount, only \$8,097.24 was devoted to the Commission's operating expenses.

In the Personal Services Account, we had \$48,341.22 in expenses for the month of July.

In the Revenue Account, our monthly transfer from the Judicial Branch for counsel fees for the month of July, which reflects June's collections, was not received in time to be posted to July's budget. The transfer has since posted, and the amount equaled \$39,849.32. This is below estimates, but we had financial screener position vacancies in two high-producing courts during June.

In July, we had conference account revenues of \$134.06. A couple of attorneys who attended only one portion of the recent minimum standards training found the materials so valuable that they purchased materials related to sessions that they did not attend. Our Conference Account balance now totals \$7,538.93

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES

Activity Report by Case Type

7/31/2012

DefenderData Case Type	Jul-12						Fiscal Year 2013			
	New Cases	Vouchers Submitted	Submitted Amount	Vouchers Paid	Approved Amount	Average Amount	Cases Opened	Vouchers Paid	Amount Paid	Average Amount
Appeal	9	14	\$ 16,713.01	16	\$ 17,118.35	\$ 1,069.90	9	16	\$ 17,118.35	\$ 1,069.90
Child Protection Petition	166	297	\$ 158,395.85	269	\$ 149,173.76	\$ 554.55	166	269	\$ 149,173.76	\$ 554.55
Drug Court	9	9	\$ 4,295.00	9	\$ 4,490.00	\$ 498.89	9	9	\$ 4,490.00	\$ 498.89
Emancipation	19	7	\$ 652.50	4	\$ 617.60	\$ 154.40	19	4	\$ 617.60	\$ 154.40
Felony	527	474	\$ 278,386.59	472	\$ 279,770.40	\$ 592.73	527	472	\$ 279,770.40	\$ 592.73
Involuntary Civil Commitment	85	60	\$ 7,809.36	81	\$ 11,458.72	\$ 141.47	85	81	\$ 11,458.72	\$ 141.47
Juvenile	148	122	\$ 45,147.27	126	\$ 35,251.91	\$ 279.78	148	126	\$ 35,251.91	\$ 279.78
Lawyer of the Day - Custody	225	219	\$ 40,160.56	199	\$ 33,372.08	\$ 167.70	225	199	\$ 33,372.08	\$ 167.70
Lawyer of the Day - Juvenile	48	42	\$ 7,556.78	49	\$ 9,678.85	\$ 197.53	48	49	\$ 9,678.85	\$ 197.53
Lawyer of the Day - Walk-in	110	107	\$ 19,349.50	102	\$ 17,300.60	\$ 169.61	110	102	\$ 17,300.60	\$ 169.61
Misdemeanor	673	674	\$ 229,649.71	585	\$ 202,805.94	\$ 346.68	673	585	\$ 202,805.94	\$ 346.68
Petition, Modified Release Treatment	0	2	\$ 435.00	2	\$ 215.00	\$ 107.50	0	2	\$ 215.00	\$ 107.50
Petition, Release or Discharge	0	1	\$ 240.00	0			0	0		
Petition, Termination of Parental Rights	11	20	\$ 17,382.80	21	\$ 20,304.28	\$ 966.87	11	21	\$ 20,304.28	\$ 966.87
Post Conviction Review	2	7	\$ 3,795.95	8	\$ 6,522.04	\$ 815.26	2	8	\$ 6,522.04	\$ 815.26
Probation Violation	152	143	\$ 44,930.47	121	\$ 38,717.68	\$ 319.98	152	121	\$ 38,717.68	\$ 319.98
Represent Witness on 5th Amendment	1	2	\$ 285.00	0			1	0		
Review of Child Protection Order	50	122	\$ 48,064.38	110	\$ 44,619.99	\$ 405.64	50	110	\$ 44,619.99	\$ 405.64
Revocation of Administrative Release	6	4	\$ 744.50	4	\$ 1,362.50	\$ 340.63	6	4	\$ 1,362.50	\$ 340.63
DefenderData Sub-Total	2,241	2,326	\$ 923,994.23	2,178	\$ 872,779.70	\$ 400.73	2,241	2,178	\$ 872,779.70	\$ 400.73
Paper Voucher Sub-Total	0	0	\$ -	0	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	2,241	2,326	\$923,994.23	2,178	\$872,779.70	\$ 400.73	2,241	2,178	\$ 872,779.70	\$ 400.73

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES
 FY13 FUND ACCOUNTING
 AS OF 07/31/2012

Account 010 95F Z112 01 (All Other)	Mo.	Q1	Mo.	Q2	Mo.	Q3	Mo.	Q4	FY13 Total
FY12 Professional Services Allotment		\$ 2,911,377.00	\$	2,714,479.00	\$	2,992,451.00	\$	953,370.00	
FY12 General Operations Allotment									
Financial Order Adjustment									
Total Budget Allotments		\$ 2,911,377.00	\$	2,714,479.00	\$	2,992,451.00	\$	953,370.00	\$ 9,571,677.00
Total Expenses	1	\$ (953,054.83)							
	2								
	3								
TOTAL REMAINING		\$ 1,958,322.17	\$	2,714,479.00	\$	2,992,451.00	\$	953,370.00	\$ 8,618,622.17

Q1 Month 1 (as of 07/31/12)	
INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES	
Counsel Payments	\$ (872,779.70)
Somerset County	\$ (21,110.50)
Subpoena Witness Fees	
Private Investigators	\$ (11,834.93)
Mental Health Expert	\$ (11,599.32)
Misc Prof Fees & Svc	\$ (5,067.00)
Transcripts	\$ (13,723.50)
Other Expert	\$ (6,928.33)
Process Servers	\$ (1,047.09)
Interpreters	\$ (867.22)
SUB-TOTAL ILS	\$ (944,957.59)
OPERATING EXPENSES	
Cell Phones	\$ (129.08)
DefenderData	\$ (4,087.00)
Subscriptions	\$ (120.00)
Mileage/Tolls/Parking	\$ (898.90)
Mailing/Postage/Freight	\$ (389.25)
Risk Management Ins.	\$ (583.37)
Registration Fees	\$ (222.00)
Office Supplies/Equip.	\$ (243.19)
Office Equipment Rental	\$ (135.15)
OIT/TELCO	\$ (1,289.30)
SUB-TOTAL OE	\$ (8,097.24)
TOTAL	\$ (953,054.83)

INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES	
Q1 Allotment	\$ 2,911,377.00
Remaining Allotment for Somerset cty PDP contract	\$ (226,875.00)
Q1 Expenses	\$ (953,054.83)
Remaining Allotment as of 7/31/12	\$ 1,731,447.17

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES
FY13 FUND ACCOUNTING
AS OF 07/31/2012

Account 010 95F Z112 01 (Personal Services)	Mo.	Q1	Mo.	Q2	Mo.	Q3	Mo.	Q4	FY13 Total
FY12 Allotment		\$ 165,613.00		\$ 146,660.00		\$ 153,265.00		\$ 112,316.00	\$ 577,854.00
Financial Order Adjustments									
Total Budget Allotments		\$ 165,613.00		\$ 146,660.00		\$ 153,265.00		\$ 112,316.00	\$ 577,854.00
Total Expenses	1	\$ (48,341.22)							
	2								
	3								
TOTAL REMAINING		\$ 117,271.78		\$ 146,660.00		\$ 153,265.00		\$ 112,316.00	\$ 529,512.78

Q1 Month 1 (as of 07/31/12)	
Per Diem Payments	
Salary	\$ (26,133.56)
Vacation Pay	\$ (3,624.99)
Holiday Pay	\$ (969.92)
Sick Pay	\$ (868.76)
Overtime Pay	
Health Insurance	\$ (8,096.92)
Dental Insurance	\$ (273.80)
Employer Retiree Health	\$ (2,581.48)
Employer Retirement	\$ (1,745.95)
Employer Group Life	\$ (189.28)
Employer Medicare	\$ (431.46)
Retiree Unfunded Liability	\$ (3,425.10)
TOTAL	\$ (48,341.22)

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES
FY13 FUND ACCOUNTING
As of 07/31/12

Account 014 95F Z112 01 (Revenue)	Mo.	Q1	Mo.	Q2	Mo.	Q3	Mo.	Q4	FY13 Total
Total Budget Allotments		\$ 149,124.00	\$	149,124.00	\$	149,124.00	\$	149,125.00	\$ 596,497.00
Financial Order Adjustment									
Financial Order Adjustment									
Financial Order Adjustment									
Total Budget Allotments		\$ 149,124.00	\$	149,124.00	\$	149,124.00	\$	149,125.00	\$ 596,497.00
Collected Revenue from JB	1								
Collected Revenue									
Transfer from conference account									
Collected Revenue from JB	2								
Collected Revenue from JB	3								
TOTAL REVENUE COLLECTED		\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
Total Expenses	1								
	2								
	3								
TOTAL REMAINING		\$ 149,124.00	\$	149,124.00	\$	149,124.00	\$	149,125.00	\$ 596,497.00

Q1 Month 1 (as of 07/31/12)	
DEFENDER DATA COUNSEL PAYMENTS	
SUB-TOTAL ILS	
OVERPAYMENT REIMBURSEMENTS	
SUB-TOTAL OE	
TOTAL	\$ -

NO ACTIVITY FOR JULY 2012

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES
FY13 FUND ACCOUNTING
 As of 07/31/12

Account 014 95F Z112 02 (Conference Account)	Mo.	Q1	Mo.	Q2	Mo.	Q3	Mo.	Q4	FY13 Total
FY12 Carry Over		\$ (7,404.87)							\$ -
Total Budget Allotments									
Actual Collected Earned Revenue	1	\$ (134.06)							
	2								
	3								
ACTUAL CASH BALANCE		\$ (7,538.93)							
Total Expenses	1								
	2								
	3								
TOTAL REMAINING		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Q1 Month 1 (as of 07/31/12)	
Collected Revenue	\$ (134.06)
Training Expenses	
TOTAL	\$ (134.06)

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES

Activity Report by Court

7/31/2012

Court	Jul-12						Fiscal Year 2013			
	New Cases	Vouchers Submitted	Submitted Amount	Vouchers Paid	Approved Amount	Average Amount	Cases Opened	Vouchers Paid	Amount Paid	Average Amount
ALFSC	108	175	\$ 89,011.80	158	\$ 81,397.45	\$ 515.17	108	158	\$ 81,397.45	\$ 515.17
AUBSC	89	86	\$ 42,701.90	84	\$ 40,457.24	\$ 481.63	89	84	\$ 40,457.24	\$ 481.63
AUGDC	74	102	\$ 39,672.86	93	\$ 32,606.17	\$ 350.60	74	93	\$ 32,606.17	\$ 350.60
AUGSC	96	70	\$ 40,327.59	87	\$ 46,972.67	\$ 539.92	96	87	\$ 46,972.67	\$ 539.92
BANDC	67	67	\$ 20,178.50	75	\$ 18,735.68	\$ 249.81	67	75	\$ 18,735.68	\$ 249.81
BANSC	8	3	\$ 2,490.11	5	\$ 1,090.11	\$ 218.02	8	5	\$ 1,090.11	\$ 218.02
BATSC	24	25	\$ 14,612.48	14	\$ 6,506.74	\$ 464.77	24	14	\$ 6,506.74	\$ 464.77
BELDC	38	40	\$ 10,880.54	28	\$ 8,207.70	\$ 293.13	38	28	\$ 8,207.70	\$ 293.13
BELSC	21	21	\$ 8,027.50	19	\$ 6,782.45	\$ 356.97	21	19	\$ 6,782.45	\$ 356.97
BIDDC	102	95	\$ 34,506.08	61	\$ 21,211.62	\$ 347.73	102	61	\$ 21,211.62	\$ 347.73
BRIDC	24	25	\$ 9,639.40	22	\$ 7,399.32	\$ 336.33	24	22	\$ 7,399.32	\$ 336.33
CALDC	18	19	\$ 8,419.57	14	\$ 8,671.64	\$ 619.40	18	14	\$ 8,671.64	\$ 619.40
CARDC	26	16	\$ 7,814.48	12	\$ 8,968.02	\$ 747.34	26	12	\$ 8,968.02	\$ 747.34
CARSC	37	36	\$ 13,157.79	13	\$ 7,968.04	\$ 612.93	37	13	\$ 7,968.04	\$ 612.93
DOVDC	19	23	\$ 5,069.00	25	\$ 5,937.15	\$ 237.49	19	25	\$ 5,937.15	\$ 237.49
DOVSC	10	4	\$ 4,320.03	5	\$ 7,373.44	\$ 1,474.69	10	5	\$ 7,373.44	\$ 1,474.69
ELLDC	69	56	\$ 26,862.44	57	\$ 26,513.41	\$ 465.15	69	57	\$ 26,513.41	\$ 465.15
ELLSC	21	28	\$ 10,568.95	25	\$ 11,443.83	\$ 457.75	21	25	\$ 11,443.83	\$ 457.75
FARDC	37	36	\$ 8,756.15	55	\$ 14,715.00	\$ 267.55	37	55	\$ 14,715.00	\$ 267.55
FARSC	19	17	\$ 8,644.88	16	\$ 6,646.44	\$ 415.40	19	16	\$ 6,646.44	\$ 415.40
FORDC	6	14	\$ 4,125.18	6	\$ 2,338.58	\$ 389.76	6	6	\$ 2,338.58	\$ 389.76
HOUDC	30	31	\$ 8,845.95	38	\$ 13,795.60	\$ 363.04	30	38	\$ 13,795.60	\$ 363.04
HOUSC	18	12	\$ 5,324.71	13	\$ 18,535.24	\$ 1,425.79	18	13	\$ 18,535.24	\$ 1,425.79
LEWDC	131	157	\$ 52,130.78	147	\$ 48,529.59	\$ 330.13	131	147	\$ 48,529.59	\$ 330.13
LINDC	14	12	\$ 7,144.30	13	\$ 6,466.42	\$ 497.42	14	13	\$ 6,466.42	\$ 497.42
MACDC	18	29	\$ 12,981.39	20	\$ 8,853.54	\$ 442.68	18	20	\$ 8,853.54	\$ 442.68
MACSC	15	17	\$ 5,832.69	18	\$ 10,657.00	\$ 592.06	15	18	\$ 10,657.00	\$ 592.06
MADDC	1	5	\$ 1,195.68	2	\$ 484.60	\$ 242.30	1	2	\$ 484.60	\$ 242.30
MILDC	3	1	\$ 140.84	0			3	0		
NEWDC	26	31	\$ 10,249.10	32	\$ 10,393.89	\$ 324.81	26	32	\$ 10,393.89	\$ 324.81
PORDC	91	107	\$ 43,292.36	113	\$ 48,924.44	\$ 432.96	91	113	\$ 48,924.44	\$ 432.96
PORSC	3	5	\$ 1,460.40	10	\$ 6,323.73	\$ 632.37	3	10	\$ 6,323.73	\$ 632.37
PREDC	26	27	\$ 11,607.09	26	\$ 9,986.00	\$ 384.08	26	26	\$ 9,986.00	\$ 384.08
RODC	49	45	\$ 11,603.18	38	\$ 11,258.89	\$ 296.29	49	38	\$ 11,258.89	\$ 296.29
ROSC	41	37	\$ 16,477.92	28	\$ 16,121.40	\$ 575.76	41	28	\$ 16,121.40	\$ 575.76
RUMDC	29	20	\$ 4,655.88	17	\$ 5,733.16	\$ 337.24	29	17	\$ 5,733.16	\$ 337.24
SKODC	10	30	\$ 13,988.32	37	\$ 16,096.20	\$ 435.03	10	37	\$ 16,096.20	\$ 435.03
SKOSC	1	1	\$ 415.00	0			1	0		
SOUDC	34	35	\$ 6,717.60	45	\$ 8,942.72	\$ 198.73	34	45	\$ 8,942.72	\$ 198.73
SOUSC	40	54	\$ 26,510.18	52	\$ 19,896.86	\$ 382.63	40	52	\$ 19,896.86	\$ 382.63
SPRDC	59	79	\$ 30,244.87	63	\$ 25,257.11	\$ 400.91	59	63	\$ 25,257.11	\$ 400.91
Law Ct	7	8	\$ 7,026.88	7	\$ 5,366.53	\$ 766.65	7	7	\$ 5,366.53	\$ 766.65
PENCD	205	179	\$ 50,935.91	123	\$ 39,627.35	\$ 322.17	205	123	\$ 39,627.35	\$ 322.17
CUMCD	285	237	\$ 111,244.22	249	\$ 100,157.82	\$ 402.24	285	249	\$ 100,157.82	\$ 402.24
WATDC	60	82	\$ 26,704.79	80	\$ 22,144.23	\$ 276.80	60	80	\$ 22,144.23	\$ 276.80
WESDC	54	62	\$ 15,219.62	58	\$ 13,044.66	\$ 224.91	54	58	\$ 13,044.66	\$ 224.91
WISDC	34	22	\$ 4,773.42	28	\$ 7,400.43	\$ 264.30	34	28	\$ 7,400.43	\$ 264.30
WISSC	23	25	\$ 21,322.70	31	\$ 20,960.41	\$ 676.14	23	31	\$ 20,960.41	\$ 676.14
YORDC	21	18	\$ 6,161.22	16	\$ 5,879.18	\$ 367.45	21	16	\$ 5,879.18	\$ 367.45
TOTAL	2,241	2,326	\$ 923,994.23	2,178	\$ 872,779.70	\$ 400.73	2,241	2,178	\$ 872,779.70	\$ 400.73

MAINE COMMISSION ON INDIGENT LEGAL SERVICES**Number of Attorneys Rostered by Court****7/31/2012**

Court	Rostered Attorneys
Alfred Superior Court	117
Auburn Superior Court	113
Augusta District Court	81
Augusta Superior Court	79
Bangor District Court	60
Bath Superior Court	74
Belfast District Court	43
Belfast Superior Court	38
Biddeford District Court	154
Bridgton District Court	103
Calais District Court	12
Caribou District Court	14
Caribou Superior Court	15
Dover-Foxcroft District Court	24
Dover-Foxcroft Superior	22
Ellsworth District Court	47
Ellsworth Superior Court	39
Farmington District Court	38
Farmington Superior Court	35
Fort Kent District Court	8
Houlton District Court	13
Houlton Superior Court	14
Lewiston District Court	140

Court	Rostered Attorneys
Lincoln District Court	22
Machias District Court	16
Machias Superior Court	15
Madawaska District Court	9
Millinocket District Court	17
Newport District Court	35
Portland District Court	172
Presque Isle District Court	11
Rockland District Court	40
Rockland Superior Court	33
Rumford District Court	29
Skowhegan District Court	29
Skowhegan Superior Court	15
South Paris District Court	61
South Paris Superior Court	60
Springvale District Court	131
Unified Criminal Docket Bangor	55
Unified Criminal Docket Portland	151
Waterville District Court	55
West Bath District Court	114
Wiscasset District Court	63
Wiscasset Superior Court	59
York District Court	120