

STATEMENT OF
HONORABLE ROSLYNN R. MAUSKOPF, DIRECTOR
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 12, 2022

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Quigley, Ranking Member Womack, and members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to appear before you today as Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (AO). In this capacity, I am here to present the AO's FY 2023 budget request and to provide an update on a number of important AO activities and initiatives that are of interest to the Subcommittee. In addition to serving as the AO Director, I am also the Secretary to the Judicial Conference of the United States, which is the policy making and governance body for the Judiciary and, in that role, I offer my support for the budget request of the entire Judicial Branch and ask for the Subcommittee's assistance on several Conference priorities beyond the Judiciary's own budget.

I appear today with Judge Amy St. Eve, Chair of the Judicial Conference Committee on the Budget. I join Judge St. Eve in thanking the Subcommittee for the funding it provided the Judicial Branch in the FY 2022 omnibus appropriations bill given the funding constraints you faced in drafting a final Financial Services and General Government bill.

I would like to begin my testimony today with a discussion of the important role of the AO in support of the branch, an update on several important ongoing initiatives of interest, and some details on the AO's FY 2023 funding priorities.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS

Created by an Act of Congress in 1939, the Administrative Office (AO) is the central support entity for the Judicial Branch. The AO provides a long list of direct services and support to appellate, district, and bankruptcy courts, probation and pretrial services offices, and federal defender offices nationwide. Administrative support areas include human resources, budget, procurement, space management, security, information technology, and auditing and internal controls. AO staff also support national programs and provide critical services to the courts in a number of areas including jury administration, court interpreting and reporting, legal research, and records administration. We also staff the Judicial Conference of the United States and its 25 committees, develop and implement Judicial Conference policies and applicable federal statutes and regulations, and have central responsibility for communication and coordination within the Judiciary and with Congress, the Executive Branch, and the public. The AO has proudly served the courts for more than 80 years and I am fortunate to lead this organization of 1,200 dedicated professionals.

Supporting the Courts During COVID-19

Since March 2020, the AO has played a central role supporting the courts, probation and pretrial services offices, and federal defenders as they navigate the challenges of timely and efficient administration of justice during the COVID-19 pandemic. The Judiciary's COVID-19 Task Force (Task Force) serves as a centralized entity to monitor the pandemic's impact on Judiciary operations, identify and address emerging issues, and coordinate the Judiciary's pandemic-related guidance to courts and federal defender offices. It is led by the AO's experts

in emergency management, with assistance from subject matter experts throughout the AO. Task Force members include chief judges and staff from around the country, as well as representatives from our external partners, such as the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS), other Department of Justice components, the Federal Protective Service (FPS), and the General Services Administration (GSA).

The Task Force's focus in recent months has shifted from responding to the pandemic to a focus on long-term recovery and returning the Judiciary to a pre-pandemic operational environment. This includes providing policy guidance to assist the courts in managing the return of personnel to Judiciary facilities and workspaces, producing public service announcements for courts to put on their websites detailing public health measures taken to ensure the safety of jurors while in the courthouse, providing the latest guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Safer Federal Workforce Task Force, and regular consultation with independent epidemiologists to provide courts and federal defenders with expert advice on COVID-19 issues to facilitate expanded in-person operations.

With regard to the AO's own operations, after two years of largely remote operations, AO employees began returning to on-site work at the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building in late February 2022. We reconstituted in-person operations incrementally, guided by a range of gating criteria to ensure a safe return for our employees. In late April 2022, we completed the transition to in-person operations, with opportunities for increased telework going forward compared to pre-pandemic. AO employees have performed exceptionally over the last two years supporting the courts and federal defenders during the pandemic.

Workplace Conduct

The federal Judiciary is committed to a safe and respectful workplace for all of its employees. As AO Director, I chair the Federal Judiciary Workplace Conduct Working Group (Working Group) created by the Chief Justice in 2018, and comprised of judges and other senior court executives. For the past four years, the Working Group, in coordination with the Judicial Conference, the courts and circuits, the Federal Judicial Center, and the AO, have been engaged in a substantive and deliberative effort to ensure a safe, respectful, and professional environment. We have made significant improvements to our workplace conduct policies and practices, such as streamlining employment dispute resolution processes, which include formal and informal avenues to encourage reporting and to address workplace conduct concerns. Workplace protections were significantly expanded to include an express prohibition against abusive conduct even when it is not discriminatory. A national Office of Judicial Integrity was established. Every judicial circuit now has a Director of Workplace Relations to provide confidential guidance and assistance to Judiciary employees and to work in coordination with the Office of Judicial Integrity to identify and address national trends and needs. Codes of Conduct have been updated to emphasize the responsibility of all judges and Judiciary employees to take appropriate action upon learning of potential misconduct, and rules for judicial officers were expanded to include a mandatory “bystander” reporting obligation.

A great deal has been accomplished and we continue to look to refine and improve our workplace conduct policies. The Working Group [issued a report on March 16, 2022](#), recommending that the Judiciary adopt more tools and policies to build on the progress to date. The report is posted on www.uscourts.gov, the Judiciary’s public facing website. The Working Group’s recommendations include:

- Conducting a nationwide climate survey of Judiciary employees at regular intervals.

- Collecting additional data to measure the utilization and effectiveness of workplace conduct resources available to Judiciary employees.
- In addition to existing recusal requirements, amending Judiciary policies to require that employee complaints about wrongful conduct always be reviewed by judges outside the court where a complaint originates, which will foster greater employee trust and confidence in the complaint process.
- Assessing the incorporation of additional monetary remedies into the employee dispute resolution framework.
- Conducting regular reviews of the Judiciary’s workplace conduct policies to ensure comprehensive implementation nationwide across courts and circuits.
- Issuing an annual report on workplace conduct that will be publicly available on www.uscourts.gov.

These recommendations have been referred to the appropriate Judicial Conference committee(s) of jurisdiction for consideration.

The actions we have taken, and continue to take demonstrate our strong and ongoing commitment to ensuring a safe and harassment-free workplace for all Judiciary employees. I note that several of the actions we are pursuing, such as the climate survey and additional reporting on complaints, are responsive to the concerns expressed by the Subcommittee. I assure the Subcommittee that workplace conduct will remain a top priority for the branch, and I commit to keeping the Subcommittee apprised of the Working Group’s ongoing work.

Cybersecurity

In recent months we have discussed at length with the Subcommittee our need for additional resources to address the sharp increase in the number of cyber-attacks on Judiciary IT systems, and our need to modernize aging legacy applications critical to court operations and public access to court records. These cyber-attacks on the branch are increasing in both frequency and sophistication. Because of the sensitivity of the information, I am constrained in what I can say in this setting about vulnerabilities and cyber-attacks on the Judicial Branch, and

we have shared some of that information with this Subcommittee's leadership. The Judiciary is clearly a high-value target for nation-state bad actors and cyber-criminals seeking to disrupt the administration of justice in the United States.

I cannot overstate the gravity of the broad impacts across our society of cyber-attacks on the Judicial Branch. These attacks pose risks to our entire justice system, including civil and criminal court proceedings, law enforcement and national security investigations planned or underway, and trade secrets for businesses involved in bankruptcy proceedings or patent and trademark litigation. But more broadly, cyber-attacks on the branch are an attack on our democracy itself, seeking to sow distrust in the institutions of American government at home and abroad. Over the last two years, we have been working closely with Executive Branch partners, including the Department of Justice, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and others. We recently met with White House cybersecurity officials to discuss our cyber concerns and resource needs. We look forward to continuing those discussions as inter-branch coordination and information sharing is critical to addressing comprehensively the cyber challenges facing the federal government.

In June 2021, I established the Judiciary IT Security Task Force (Task Force) comprised of 23 judges and court executives from around the country to examine the Judiciary's current IT security posture and make recommendations to ensure that the Judiciary's IT infrastructure is protected to the maximum extent possible. Our funding requests for cybersecurity and modernization are consistent with recommendations to date from the Task Force, as well as recommendations from a 2021 security review of our case management system by DHS's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, and our own internal reviews.

As we look to bolster our cyber-defenses our central challenge is one of resources. Judge St. Eve discusses our resource needs in more detail in her testimony, noting that we have

requested additional funding through the budget reconciliation and supplemental appropriations processes for cybersecurity and IT modernization, but to date these needs remain unmet so we are now seeking that funding through the annual appropriations process. I am confident that with the Subcommittee's support we can strengthen the Judicial Branch's cybersecurity posture and ensure the integrity of and public trust in the operation and administration of the federal courts.

Administrative Office Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Request

For FY 2022, Congress provided the AO with an appropriation of \$98.5 million, a 3.0 percent increase above FY 2021 but well below the 8.8 percent increase we requested. Together with applicable Judiciary fees and reimbursements from other appropriations, final FY 2022 funding falls well short of the level needed to maintain a current services operating level for FY 2022. Within this resource level, we will fill the seven new positions requested to strengthen our procurement, financial management, internal controls, risk management, and compliance programs. These positions are essential to our ability to continue to protect taxpayer funds and enhance confidence in the integrity and efficiency of our systems and processes. But we will be unable to fill dozens of other positions that are necessary to fulfilling the AO's mission.

Due to delays in enacting FY 2022 appropriations bills, the Judiciary's FY 2023 budget request is based on assumptions of what Congress would provide in a final FY 2022 bill. Final funding for the AO in the FY 2022 omnibus appropriations bill is significantly below the level we assumed in constructing the AO's FY 2023 budget request. Accordingly, the Judiciary's upcoming budget re-estimate for the AO will reflect a "rebased" FY 2023 request built on the lower, and much more constrained, FY 2022 enacted level.

The AO's FY 2023 budget request as presented to Congress in March 2022 totals \$111.3 million. That is an increase of \$7.1 million, or 6.9 percent, over the FY 2022 assumed level. Of

this increase, \$6.8 million – 96 percent of the total requested increase – is necessary just to maintain current services. The AO also requests \$306,000 for several new positions.

The AO's current services level for FY 2023 will fund standard pay and non-pay increases, most of which are outside of our control. A primary cost driver of our current services increase for FY 2023 is \$3.6 million for a 4.6 percent pay adjustment for federal civilian workers as proposed by the Administration which, if implemented, would be the highest federal pay adjustment since 2002. Since salaries and benefits are 94 percent of the AO's total budget, it is vital that Congress provide sufficient funding to maintain current services at a minimum. Base adjustments include an assumed 2.0 percent inflation rate on goods and services, and \$1.3 million as a result of lower fees and carryforward balances compared to the level available to finance FY 2022 AO operations. The request also includes \$703,000 to annualize in FY 2023 the seven new positions we requested and plan to fill in FY 2022.

The AO requests two program increases totaling \$306,000 for FY 2023. We request \$102,000 for one additional position in our Office of Compliance and Risk (OCR) to increase staffing in that office to four positions. This office was established in 2020 to assess financial and other risks across the AO and enhance the AO's ability to track and implement findings, recommendations, and corrective actions identified in audits, internal control reviews, and other studies, including GAO studies. The OCR also monitors legislation and regulations to ensure compliance and the requested position will focus on compliance activities.

We also request \$204,000 for two positions in the AO's Office of Human Resources for contractor suitability/background investigations. The AO currently only has sufficient staff to support suitability and background investigations for AO direct hires. The two requested positions will manage contractor personnel security actions and develop contractor suitability and background investigation policies and procedures.

OTHER JUDICIAL CONFERENCE PRIORITIES

As noted in my introduction, the Judicial Conference has several important priorities beyond the Judiciary's own budget that are relevant to the Subcommittee. On behalf of the Judicial Conference, I ask for your support to address vulnerabilities in judicial security, extend critical temporary district judgeships at risk of expiration, and provide sufficient funding of Judiciary construction priorities within GSA's budget. In addition, I would like to update the Subcommittee on an issue of great interest both to the Judiciary and the Congress, namely the necessary upgrade and replacement of our core case management and electronic case filing system.

Judicial Security

Judicial security continues to be a top priority of the Judicial Conference in light of the increasing number of acts of violence and vandalism on and off courthouse premises over the last several years. In July 2020, a disgruntled litigant, posing as a delivery courier, went to the New Jersey home of U.S. District Judge Esther Salas and murdered her son and critically wounded her husband. An FPS guard was shot to death in May 2020 while posted outside the federal courthouse in Oakland, California. A court security officer was shot and wounded in September 2020 while on-duty outside the federal courthouse in Phoenix, Arizona. And more than 50 federal courthouses sustained damage during public disturbances and violent incidents occurring at or near federal courthouses in 2020.

According to the USMS, the threat to federal courts is getting worse. USMS reports that the number of threats and inappropriate communications targeting judges and other personnel essential to court proceedings rose from 926 in 2015, to 4,511 in 2021, a 387 percent increase. Our constitutional system depends on judges who can make decisions without fear of reprisal or

retribution. This is essential not just for the safety of judges and their families, but also to protect our democracy.

I thank the Subcommittee for its leadership in addressing our security needs by fully funding our Court Security program in the FY 2022 omnibus appropriations bill. We particularly appreciate the temporary authority the Subcommittee provided in Court Security appropriations bill language to enable the AO's new Vulnerability Management Program to assist judges and their families in limiting the availability of personally identifiable information on the internet. The "Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2021" (S. 2340/H.R. 4436), named in honor of Judge Salas's son, has been introduced in both chambers. The bill would, among other security improvements, provide permanent authority for redacting/removing judges' personal information from the internet and we urge prompt passage of this important legislation. The temporary authority in the FY 2022 omnibus bill will enable us to take immediate action to improve the safety of judges and their families while we pursue the permanent authority. We request that this temporary authority continue to be included in Court Security bill language until the permanent authority is attained.

We ask for the Subcommittee's continued commitment to judicial security by fully funding our FY 2023 Court Security request as well as funding our pending supplemental appropriations request for \$112.5 million for courthouse hardening. In addition, although outside of this Subcommittee's purview, we also urge the appropriations subcommittees of jurisdiction to increase funding for the USMS to hire additional deputy marshals to improve judicial security, as well as for FPS to replace its aging inventory of exterior perimeter security cameras at federal courthouses.

Temporary District Judgeships

Having the necessary number and distribution of judicial officers is critical to the effective administration of justice. The Judicial Conference regularly reviews the number and location of circuit, district, magistrate, and bankruptcy judges to assess whether existing judgeships are sufficient and deployed in the appropriate judicial districts. To the extent that these assessments determine additional judgeships are needed from Congress, those recommendations are communicated by the Judicial Conference to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees for action, such as the Judicial Conference's March 2021 request for adding two permanent judgeships to the courts of appeals, and 77 permanent judgeships to the district courts, as well as converting nine temporary district court judgeships to permanent status. In September 2021, the Judicial Conference amended its recommendation to request five additional permanent Article III district judgeships – two for the Northern District of Oklahoma and three for the Eastern District of Oklahoma – to address the substantial increases in felony criminal prosecutions resulting from the Supreme Court ruling in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, 591 U.S. , (2020).

We urge Congress to provide these much needed judgeships. It has been *more than 30 years* since the enactment of a comprehensive Article III judgeship bill, and the absence of legislation has left the branch with a group of temporary judgeships that are continuously vulnerable to expiration. In order to avoid the significant disruptions and workload burdens that would follow from the loss of these important judgeships, this Subcommittee has worked with us to preserve them by including one-year extensions in the annual Financial Services and General Government appropriations bill. We are grateful for your past support for these extension

requests, including the FY 2022 omnibus appropriations bill that preserved 10 temporary district judgeships.

Uncertainty about the potential for permanent judgeship legislation in the upcoming year causes us to include in our FY 2023 request the legislative language needed to extend for one year nine temporary district judgeships that meet the Judicial Conference’s standard for conversion to permanent status or, in the absence of conversion, continued extension. These temporary judgeships are in the following districts: Alabama-Northern, Arizona, California-Central, Florida-Southern, Kansas, Missouri-Eastern, New Mexico, North Carolina-Western, and Texas-Eastern. We continue to ask for your support for these requested extensions, without which the administration of justice in the affected districts would be disrupted and delayed.

Judiciary Construction Priorities

With over 700 federally owned or leased court facilities, the Judiciary is one of GSA’s three largest tenants. We rely on GSA to rent us sufficient space for our operations; to maintain and improve that space as needed; and to construct new space for our use when required. The Judicial Conference supports the provision of the necessary resources to ensure that GSA can execute our space priorities and adequately maintain the infrastructure in the buildings where we are housed. The Conference’s space priorities are reflected in three significant programs funded within GSA’s Federal Buildings Fund: new courthouse construction, the Judiciary Capital Security Program (CSP), and Basic and Major Repairs and Alterations.

New Courthouse Construction

The new courthouse construction program is designed to address Judiciary space needs when a court facility lacks sufficient courtroom or chambers space, deteriorated building infrastructure, chronic maintenance issues, and security problems to a degree that a new courthouse or an annex to an existing courthouse is required. The construction of those new

facilities or annexes is funded by GSA in accordance with the priorities of the Judicial Conference as expressed in our *Federal Judiciary Courthouse Project Priorities (CPP)* plan.

We are very grateful to the Subcommittee for its strong support of our new courthouse construction priorities in recent years. Since FY 2016, the Subcommittee has fully funded 11 new courthouse projects from our *CPP*, four of which are open and operational (Charlotte, North Carolina (annex); Savannah, Georgia (annex); Greenville, South Carolina, and San Antonio, Texas) and three that will be completed in 2022 (Nashville, Tennessee; Anniston, Alabama; and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania). The remaining four projects are in various stages of design and construction (Des Moines, Iowa; Toledo, Ohio; Huntsville, Alabama; and Fort Lauderdale, Florida), as well as follow-on repairs and alterations projects in Charlotte and Savannah. The improved working environments in these courts will benefit the Judiciary and the public in the form of increased capacity, efficiency, accessibility, and security.

The recently enacted FY 2022 omnibus appropriations bill included \$223.5 million in additional funding for the top two new courthouse projects on Part I of the *CPP*: Hartford, Connecticut, and Chattanooga, Tennessee. We appreciate the Subcommittee's ongoing support of our courthouse priorities, however, both projects are short of the full funding needed for GSA to put the projects out for bids and award construction contracts. An additional \$99.9 million is required to fully fund the Hartford and Chattanooga projects and we urge the Subcommittee to include this funding in its FY 2023 bill. The projects that remain on Part II, which tracks outyear courthouse priorities, include Bowling Green, Kentucky; Anchorage, Alaska; McAllen, Texas; Greensboro/Winston-Salem, North Carolina; and Norfolk, Virginia.

We also appreciate the \$22.5 million the Subcommittee included in the FY 2022 omnibus appropriations bill for design costs for the space emergency courthouse project in San Juan,

Puerto Rico. GSA requires an additional \$239.7 million in FY 2023 to fund construction costs for the Puerto Rico project. Space emergencies are tracked outside of the *CPP* priority rankings and are intended to convey urgency resulting from unexpected and/or catastrophic conditions. In 2016, the Judicial Conference added the San Juan courthouse project to Part II of the *CPP*; however, the project was elevated to a space emergency in 2020 due to GSA's designation of the Degetau Federal Building in San Juan as structurally deficient and at extremely high risk of seismic activity. These seismic vulnerabilities combined with logistical challenges of housing court operations during the seismic retrofitting of the Degetau building necessitated the project being designated as a space emergency, thus making the San Juan project the de facto top construction priority of the Judicial Branch.

Capital Security Program

The CSP is a GSA special emphasis program designed to address serious security deficiencies in existing courthouse buildings where physical renovations are viable alternatives to new construction. Substantial improvements in the overall security of our court facilities can be achieved with relatively modest alterations and at far lower cost than wholesale new construction. For example, the Theodore Levin U.S. Courthouse in Detroit, Michigan has a security score of 17.0 on a scale of 1 to 100 (with 100 representing the ideal courthouse). A CSP project costing \$9.0 million is underway that will significantly improve courthouse security by constructing an enclosed USMS sally port; providing new screening stations and queuing areas at both public and staff lobbies; providing courtroom holding cells on two floors; and adding two new prisoner elevators to improve prisoner movement.

Projects in the CSP are selected through a collaborative process involving the Judiciary, USMS, and GSA, and then implemented with GSA funding. Since its inception in FY 2012, the

CSP has supported 16 projects in 10 states or territories, including Arkansas, Georgia, and Illinois.

At a time when threats against judges are increasing and violent incidents in and around federal courthouses have become more common, the basic security improvements made possible by the CSP are more important than ever. After several years of not receiving a congressional appropriation, the Subcommittee provided GSA \$19.8 million specifically for the CSP program in the FY 2022 omnibus appropriations bill.¹ We understand from GSA that supply chain and COVID-19 disruptions and inflationary pressures on materials and labor are driving up costs across the construction industry, including for GSA managed construction projects. Accordingly, GSA intends to allocate the \$19.8 million of FY 2022 appropriations to fully fund construction costs for the previously approved Alexandria, Louisiana, CSP project, which has been impacted by escalating costs.

Our FY 2023 budget request seeks \$35.9 million to fund construction costs for CSP projects in Augusta, Georgia, and Fort Wayne, Indiana, and we urge the Subcommittee to build on the FY 2022 momentum for this important program by funding our FY 2023 CSP request.

Repairs and Alterations

In addition to the CSP and new courthouse construction priorities, the Judiciary also supports sufficient funding for GSA's Basic and Major Repairs and Alterations (R&A) program to ensure safe, secure, and functional space for Judiciary employees. The Judiciary pays GSA \$1.2 billion in annual rent, a portion of which is intended to cover the costs of maintaining and upgrading facilities as necessary to support the conduct of our operations. Years of deferred

¹ The Subcommittee also included in its final FY 2022 bill \$27.0 million in GSA's Major Repair and Alterations program for a CSP project and other building improvements at the William M. Colmer U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building in Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

maintenance in many Judiciary facilities, however, have resulted in significant mold and water intrusion problems, broken elevators and HVAC systems, and other conditions that negatively impact the ability of the courts to operate as needed. In some cases, these conditions impacted the health and safety of employees and the public, requiring the Judiciary to vacate into temporary space while remedial measures were taken. GSA's FY 2023 budget request seeks \$1.8 billion for Basic and Major R&A. I urge the Subcommittee to ensure that sufficient funds are available to properly maintain court and defender facilities and deliver safe and functional working environments.

Case Management System Modernization

I am pleased to update the Subcommittee on our ongoing efforts to modernize our case management/electronic case files (CM/ECF) system and its portal, the Public Access to Court Electronic Records (or PACER) system, and to ask for your assistance to ensure we continue to have a reliable funding stream to operate and modernize the systems. CM/ECF is the backbone system the federal courts depend on for mission critical, day-to-day operations. It is used by electronic filers to submit filings in all cases and proceedings, including criminal, civil, and bankruptcy matters. And it is used by judges and court staff to conduct all manner of tasks related to case management. PACER is the front-end portal to CM/ECF used by individuals, businesses, federal entities (e.g., Department of Justice), and others to access public court records.

Based on extensive internal and external analyses of these systems, the AO has concluded that both CM/ECF and PACER are outdated, unsustainable, and require replacement. Initial steps toward modernization have already been taken, including our work with GSA's IT consultancy, 18F, while others are now underway, such as a market research project that will help us further define requirements and improve cost estimates for the project. Consistent with

the funding structure for the existing CM/ECF system, we expect to fund the bulk of our CM/ECF modernization efforts from the user fees we collect from providing electronic access to court documents via PACER, rather than appropriated dollars.

The Judiciary is fully committed to CM/ECF and PACER modernization as well as to continued broad public access to court records. As Congress considers legislation related to CM/ECF and PACER modernization, our primary concern is funding. We have no inherent preference for PACER user fees as the funding source for CM/ECF and PACER, however, it is critical that going forward there is a stable, predictable funding stream to ensure we can modernize and operate the systems.

We will continue to keep the Subcommittee apprised as to the progress of our CM/ECF and PACER modernization efforts, as well as the impact of any legislation that changes the current PACER fee structure on our ability to finance CM/ECF and PACER activities.

CONCLUSION

Chairman Quigley, Ranking Member Womack, and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for your ongoing support of the AO and the Judicial Branch as a whole. I realize you face many challenges as you allocate resources among the many priorities within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction. As you draft a FY 2023 appropriations bill, I ask that you keep in mind the unique constitutional role of the Judiciary and the importance of its effective functioning to our democracy. By providing the resources requested by the AO and the rest of the branch, you will be addressing the important funding priorities Judge St. Eve and I discuss in our testimonies and enable the Judiciary to perform its vital role as intended and required.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify today. I would be pleased to answer your questions.