

**STATEMENT OF  
HONORABLE ROBERT J. CONRAD, JR.  
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 14, 2025

**INTRODUCTION**

Chairman Joyce, Ranking Member Hoyer, 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 fiscal year (FY) 2026 budget request and update the Subcommittee on a number of important AO activities and initiatives.

I was appointed AO Director by Chief Justice Roberts in March 2024. I served as a federal district court judge in the Western District of North Carolina from 2005 until I retired from judicial service on February 28, 2025. As AO Director, I am also the Secretary to the Judicial Conference of the United States (Judicial Conference), which is the policymaking 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 Judicial 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 expressing our concerns about the hard freeze funding level across Judiciary appropriations in the recently enacted FY 2025 full-year continuing resolution (CR). For most Judiciary accounts, this represents a second year at a hard freeze, which means operating at a FY 2023 funding level for three consecutive years. Judge St. Eve covers the impacts of FY 2025 funding shortfalls in more detail in her testimony.

As background, the AO was created by Congress in 1939 to serve as 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 organizations nationwide. Support areas include human resources, budget, procurement, space management, security, information technology (IT), and auditing and internal controls. AO staff also support national programs and provide critical services to the courts in areas including jury administration, court interpreting and reporting, legal research, and records administration. We also staff the Judicial Conference 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 85 years, and I am fortunate to lead this organization of 1,300 dedicated professionals.

**INCREASING THREATS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGES**

I begin my testimony today by expressing deep concern with the increasing threats being

made against federal judges and courthouses. In our free society, public policy matters can and should be vigorously debated in the public sphere and, when parties feel necessary, through the legal process. And judicial decisions may of course be criticized by parties to the litigation, politicians, pundits, and the public. But the rhetoric has escalated to a degree that is threatening the safety of federal judges and their families, as well as the safety of court personnel, litigants, and the public in federal courthouses. As Chief Justice Roberts said in his [2024 Year End Report on the Federal Judiciary](#):

“In recent years, there has been a significant uptick in identified threats at all levels of the judiciary. According to United States Marshals Service statistics, the volume of hostile threats and communications directed at judges has more than tripled over the past decade. In the past five years alone, the Marshals report that they have investigated more than 1,000 serious threats against federal judges. In several instances, these threats have required the assignment of full-time U.S. Marshals Service security details for federal judges, and approximately fifty individuals have been criminally charged.”

The independence of the Judicial Branch is jeopardized when judges are threatened with harm or impeachment for their rulings. Our constitutional system depends on judges who can make decisions free from threats and intimidation. This is essential not just for the safety of judges and their families, but also to protect our democracy. Threats of reprisals and retribution will only serve to erode the rule of law, a bedrock founding principle of our nation that laws are publicly promulgated, apply equally to all, and independently adjudicated.

We are sufficiently concerned about these threats that we recently created a Judicial Security and Independence Task Force, comprising federal judges and court executives from around the country. The task force will identify, analyze, and propose responses to ensure the continued security and independence of federal courts and judges.

Ensuring the physical safety of judges and courthouses also requires funding. As Judge St. Eve discusses in her testimony, the Judiciary’s Court Security program is operating for the second consecutive year at a hard freeze, which impacts our ability to secure federal courthouses when significant budget balancing cuts have to be made to courthouse security systems and equipment funding, as was done for FY 2024 and again in FY 2025. The Subcommittee’s support of our FY 2026 Court Security request will enable us to rebuild our security capabilities. In addition, although outside of this Subcommittee’s jurisdiction, we urge the appropriations subcommittee of jurisdiction to increase funding for the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) to hire additional deputy marshals to improve judicial security.

## **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 Chief Justice Roberts in 2018, and comprising judges and senior court executives. For the past seven years, the Working Group, in coordination with the Judicial Conference, the courts and circuits, the Federal Judicial Center (FJC), and the AO, have 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 effectively address workplace conduct concerns. In 2019, the Judiciary expanded workplace protections to include an express prohibition against abusive conduct even when it is not discriminatory. A national Office of Judicial Integrity was established in 2018. 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.

Significantly, at the request of the Working Group, the FJC conducted the first national workplace survey of Judiciary employees in 2023. The results provide valuable feedback that allows us to understand Judiciary employees' experiences and guide the Judiciary's continued efforts to foster an exemplary workplace for all.

In March 2025, the report of the survey results was provided to Judiciary employees nationwide, as well as to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and Judiciary Committees pursuant to a FY 2024 Financial Services and General Government (FSGG) appropriations subcommittee reporting directive (S. Rept. 118-61). In addition, in furtherance of the Judiciary's commitment to transparency on workplace conduct issues, the Working Group's report and detailed survey data from the FJC [were made available to the public](#).

The survey was sent to 27,904 Judiciary employees, and 13,895 completed the survey, for a 50 percent response rate. A large majority of respondents (91 percent) indicated they had not experienced wrongful conduct of any kind (i.e., discriminatory harassment, employment discrimination, or abusive conduct). Of those who did indicate experiencing wrongful conduct (1,157, 8.3 percent), the most common type was abusive conduct (922, 6.6 percent), which is a protection unique to Judiciary employees and goes beyond protections afforded under federal employment statutes. Of the 13,895 respondents, 277 (2.0 percent) indicated experiencing some form of discriminatory harassment, of which 67 (0.5 percent) indicated experiencing sexual harassment. A total of 291 (2.1 percent) indicated experiencing employment discrimination.

The results highlight areas where the Judiciary can do more toward its goal of ensuring a safe and harassment-free workplace, particularly with respect to addressing employees' reluctance to report misconduct, bolstering confidence in the reporting and complaint systems, and addressing instances of inappropriate behaviors. To that end, the Working Group's March 2025 report makes recommendations to build on the substantial steps the Judiciary has already taken, designed to improve and further refine the extensive system that is already in place and to provide greater transparency to both Judiciary employees and the public on how workplace conduct concerns are addressed. The Working Group's report also makes recommendations in response to workplace conduct issues raised in two independent reports issued in July 2024, [one by the Federal Judicial Center and the National Academy of Public Administration](#), and the [other by the Government Accountability Office](#).

## CYBERSECURITY

In recent years we have discussed at length with the Appropriations Committees 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. We have a classified briefing scheduled for next week (May 20) to share some additional details with House and Senate Appropriations Committee leadership and FSGG subcommittee leadership. The Judiciary is a high-value target for nation-state bad actors and cyber criminals seeking to disrupt the judicial process in the United States. The Judiciary has been modernizing its cybersecurity operations and is continually strengthening its cybersecurity posture. Sustaining these efforts and implementing additional security-related initiatives continues to require significant resources. Judiciary cyber defenses blocked approximately 200 million harmful events from reaching court local area networks in FY 2024. This number was nearly identical to the previous year, although the sophistication of the attacks indicate new approaches are being deployed in attempts to disrupt Judiciary operations.

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. We work closely with our Executive Branch partners, including the Department of Justice's National Security Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation cybersecurity experts, and the Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, to bolster our cyber defenses and investigate cyber-attacks on our IT systems. This inter-branch coordination and information sharing is critical to addressing comprehensively the cyber challenges facing the federal government as a whole.

As we look to strengthen our cyber defenses, our challenge continues to be one of resources. Judge St. Eve discusses our cybersecurity/IT modernization resource needs in her testimony. We look forward to working closely with the Subcommittee to further strengthen the Judicial Branch's cybersecurity defenses to ensure the safety and integrity of our IT systems and the sensitive information those systems contain.

## **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES**

In addition to our efforts to strengthen cybersecurity defenses, the Judiciary also has a number of IT initiatives in various stages of development and implementation. I will highlight several in my testimony today.

### **Court Case Management System Modernization**

Among many important IT initiatives underway, the AO's top priority is modernizing the Judiciary's case management/electronic case files (CM/ECF) system and its portal, the Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER) system. 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, and others to access public court records.

Based on extensive internal and external analyses, the consensus opinion is both CM/ECF and PACER are outdated, unsustainable, and require replacement. Intensive efforts to

modernize these systems are underway. Our strategy is for new case management and PACER systems to be developed and rolled out on an incremental basis, meaning functionality of a modernized system is implemented in waves versus the past model of implementation only after a system is fully designed, developed, and tested. This “agile” software development and implementation approach is consistent with current industry best practices.

The first incremental delivery of the modernized case management system to pilot courts is scheduled to begin in FY 2026 and continue in increments through FY 2027. Consistent with the funding structure for the existing CM/ECF system, we intend to fund CM/ECF modernization efforts from the user fees we collect from providing electronic access to court documents via PACER, rather than appropriated dollars. Approximately 84 percent of active PACER users qualified for a fee waiver in FY 2024 and were therefore able to access court records for free. Of the remaining users who do incur fees, many are high-volume commercial users, some of which monetize or otherwise recoup the costs of data accessed from PACER as the foundation of their own business models.

Recent Congresses have considered legislation related to CM/ECF and PACER modernization, including the timing and technical requirements of a modernized system and changes to the structure of PACER user fees. The Judiciary is fully committed to CM/ECF and PACER modernization as well as to continued broad public access to court records. We have no preference for PACER user fees as the funding source for CM/ECF and PACER; however, it is critical that 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.

### **Modernizing the Probation/Pretrial Services Case Management System**

The Probation and Pretrial Services Automated Case Tracking System (PACTS) is used by approximately 8,000 probation and pretrial services officers and staff to conduct and manage investigations, risk assessments, and supervision of defendants and individuals on pretrial or post-conviction release. The current system relies on 30 separate IT applications to enable probation and pretrial services offices to perform their official duties. The complexity of integrating so many applications has resulted in recurring outages, slowdowns, and increasing costs to maintain an outdated system architecture. We have taken steps to stabilize the current system while we develop a new one, which we are calling PACTS360. PACTS360 is a cloud-based application that will modernize system architecture, strengthen cybersecurity defenses, and improve system functionality and reliability for probation and pretrial services officers. PACTS360 implementation in all probation/pretrial services offices nationwide is on track to be completed by the end of FY 2027.

### **Upgrades to the Judiciary’s Financial Management System**

We are in the process of completing significant upgrades to the Judiciary Integrated Financial Management System (JIFMS), the Judiciary’s official budget, accounting, and procurement system. The upgrade is critical to address technical obsolescence of third-party support tools, and security and performance concerns. Recommendations for improvements to internal controls will be addressed with the upgrade, improving both operational and technical

efficiencies while strengthening the Judiciary's cybersecurity posture. The upgrade will facilitate compliance with both regulations regarding inter-governmental funds transfers between federal agencies for goods and services procured, as well as future upgrades that will further improve Judiciary financial management. The JIFMS upgrade is scheduled to be fully implemented across the Judiciary in June 2025.

### **Artificial Intelligence**

The rapid proliferation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in everyday life has magnified AI's implications for the Judiciary. While AI has the potential to improve productivity in court operations, create more efficient ways to engage with the public, and support judicial decision making, the use of AI also poses privacy, security, and other risks that must be considered. In January 2025, I established an AI Task Force to serve a central coordinating role within the branch on AI issues. The task force comprises judges and Judiciary personnel to ensure broad representation in considering AI-related issues on Judiciary operations. The goal of the task force is to balance the Judiciary's ongoing pursuit of leveraging cutting-edge technologies to improve operations and create efficiencies, with the need to address very real privacy and security issues presented by AI. This initiative is just getting underway, and we will keep the Subcommittee updated on our efforts to employ AI in Judiciary operations.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE'S FY 2026 BUDGET REQUEST**

Before turning to the AO's FY 2026 request, I will briefly discuss our FY 2025 funding. The FY 2025 full-year CR funds the AO at \$102.7 million, \$6.3 million below the Judiciary's funding appeal submitted to Congress in December 2024 for consideration during conference discussions on a final FY 2025 FSGG appropriations bill. The FY 2025 CR represents a second year of flat funding for the AO at the FY 2023 appropriations level. Because staff salaries and benefits comprise 96 percent of the AO budget, the impact of funding shortfalls rests almost entirely on our ability to retain and hire staff. For FY 2025, we can maintain current on-board staff and backfill a limited number of critical vacancies as a result of higher than anticipated fee balances carried forward from FY 2024 that mitigates the impact of a second year at a hard freeze. But we will be forced to leave a number of important positions unfilled, which could impact services we provide to support the day-to-day operations of courts and federal defender organizations nationwide.

The AO's FY 2026 request seeks \$110.5 million, a 7.6 percent increase above the FY 2025 enacted level. The requested \$7.8 million appropriations increase is comprised of \$6.2 million for adjustments to base for standard budgetary increases, and \$1.6 million for program enhancements. A primary cost driver for base adjustments is a \$4.0 million request for appropriated funds to replace the projected loss of fees available to finance AO operations in FY 2026. Other base adjustments include a 2.1 percent inflation rate on goods and services and increases in government contributions for employee benefits.

The \$1.6 million in program increases will provide 16 new positions to improve AO operations and enable us to better support the courts and federal defender organizations. Half of these positions are re-requests from FY 2025. The 16 positions include a Deputy Chief Information Officer to focus on bringing strategic IT priorities from the planning phase to implementation. Two positions in the Judicial Conference Secretariat office will address the office's growing workload in coordinating policy initiatives among the 25 Judicial Conference

committees and numerous subcommittees, as well as court advisory groups and working groups. The AO requests five new positions in the Acquisition Management Office to implement needed procurement and acquisition improvements identified in internal and independent reviews, with the new positions focusing on policy development, training, certification, and oversight. A new senior auditor position will improve the AO's Office of Audit's ability to provide special request audit services to courts and federal public defender organizations, such as an audit request when a new clerk of court comes on board. A new position in the AO's Office of General Counsel will advise on and litigate employment matters. The AO seeks two new positions in the Financial Management Office to prevent and resolve improper payments and address new requirements for intergovernmental financial transactions. One new position in the AO's Human Resources Office will work on the Judiciary's employment suitability program to ensure potential and provisional hires meet background screening and other applicable employment standards. The AO requests three new positions in the Probation and Pretrial Services Office to provide national support to probation and pretrial services offices in supervising the approximately 20,000 people charged with or convicted of a sexual offense, address cybercrime aspects of the sex offender supervision program, and support national efforts to implement evidence-based supervision practices to reduce recidivism.

I ask the Subcommittee to consider the critical role the AO plays in supporting the operations of courts and federal defender organizations nationwide and fully fund the AO's FY 2026 request.

## **OTHER JUDICIAL CONFERENCE PRIORITIES**

The Judicial Conference has several important priorities that are relevant to the Subcommittee. On behalf of the Judicial Conference, I ask for your support for critically needed additional judgeships which, if authorized, would require discretionary appropriations for staffing and operating expenses to fully implement. And beyond the Judiciary's own budget, I ask for your support for Judiciary space and construction priorities within the General Services Administration's (GSA) budget.

### **Additional 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 Article III and bankruptcy judgeships are needed from Congress, those recommendations are communicated by the Judicial Conference to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees for consideration.

It has been *more than 30 years* since the enactment of a comprehensive Article III judgeship bill. During the 118<sup>th</sup> Congress, the House and Senate passed the "Judicial Understaffing Delays Getting Emergencies Solved (JUDGES) Act," (S. 4199) authorizing 63 new permanent district judgeships in six tranches staggered over ten years, and three temporary judgeships for Oklahoma for five years each to address the substantial increases in felony criminal prosecutions resulting from the Supreme Court ruling in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*. Unfortunately, President Biden vetoed the JUDGES Act legislation in December 2024.

The Judicial Conference's [updated judgeship recommendations](#) for the 119<sup>th</sup> Congress call for two new permanent judgeships in the Ninth Circuit and 69 new permanent district judgeships. We encourage Congress to build on the momentum achieved in the last Congress and again pass a comprehensive judgeship bill to address the urgent workload needs of the branch.

We are grateful for the conversions of the 10 temporary district judgeships to permanent status accomplished through enactment of the “Federal Judiciary Stabilization Act of 2024” (Pub.L. 118-203). We relied for many years on this Subcommittee to extend the authorizations of the temporary judgeships in one-year increments in the FSGG appropriations bill to keep the judgeships active pending congressional action on our request to convert temporary judgeships to permanent, which has now been achieved.

### **Judiciary Space and Courthouse Construction Priorities**

With over 800 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 funding from Congress to ensure that GSA can execute our space priorities and adequately maintain the infrastructure in buildings housing Judiciary operations. The Judicial 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, which is divided into two parts. Part I consists of the Judiciary's highest courthouse construction funding priorities for the budget year and Part II identifies outyear courthouse construction priorities. In addition, the Judicial Conference has designated a new courthouse project in San Juan, Puerto Rico as a space emergency. Space emergencies are tracked outside of the CPP priority rankings and are intended to convey urgency resulting from unexpected and/or catastrophic conditions. The space emergency designation makes the San Juan courthouse project the de facto top construction priority of the Judicial Branch.

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, which adjoins the Clemente Ruiz-Nazario U.S. Courthouse and houses some court staff and operations, as structurally deficient and at extremely high risk of seismic activity. Due to increasing concerns about the safety of the Degetau Federal Building in a seismic event, in September 2023 the Judiciary vacated the Degetau Federal Building. In order to safely perform the necessary seismic work on the Degetau Federal Building, a new annex to the Ruiz-Nazario Courthouse needs to be constructed first to provide not only necessary permanent expansion space for the court but also temporary swing space for



all tenants during the seismic upgrade to the Degetau Federal Building.

The Judiciary requests \$863 million in FY 2026 for the San Juan space emergency project and CPP Part I new courthouse priorities for: (1) Hartford, Connecticut; (2) Chattanooga, Tennessee; (3) Bowling Green, Kentucky; and (4) Anchorage, Alaska as reflected in the table below. I urge the Subcommittee to fund these projects in the FY 2026 FSGG bill.

**FY 2026 Courthouse Construction Priorities  
(\$ in millions)**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>Funded to Date</b>	<b>FY 2026 Request</b>
San Juan, PR	Space Emergency	\$394.2	\$50.8	\$343.4
Hartford, CT	CPP Part I	\$492.6	\$335.0	\$157.6
Chattanooga, TN	CPP Part I	\$319.8	\$239.3	\$80.5
Bowling Green, KY	CPP Part I	\$219.4	\$0	\$219.4
Anchorage, AK	CPP Part I	TBD	\$0	\$62.1 <sup>1</sup>
			<b>FY 2026 Total:</b>	<b>\$863.0</b>

<sup>1</sup>Reflects site & design funding only.

CPP Part II priorities, for which we are not seeking funding for in FY 2026, are: (1) Macon, Georgia; (2) Dallas, Texas; (3) Sherman/Plano, Texas; (3) McAllen, Texas; (4) Greensboro/Winston-Salem, North Carolina; (5) Rochester, New York; and (6) Norfolk, Virginia. Cost estimates for Part II projects will not be available until the project advances to Part I of the CPP.

*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, CSP projects include constructing additional secure corridors; adding or reconfiguring elevators; constructing USMS sally ports; and reconfiguring security screening areas. This valuable program has resulted in greater security at federal courthouses in the selected locations at a fraction of the cost of new courthouse construction. 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 17 projects in 12 states or territories, including Arkansas, Georgia, North Carolina, and Texas.

At a time when threats against judges and courthouses are increasing, the basic security improvements made possible by the CSP are more important than ever. GSA manages CSP projects as a portfolio, prioritizing funding for those projects that are ready for construction or requiring additional funds to address unforeseen costs. Our FY 2026 budget request seeks \$30 million for GSA for the CSP program which, unless projects underway require additional funding, will be used to fully fund construction costs for the Augusta, Georgia, project based on current estimates. CSP did not receive funding in FY 2025.

### *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 programs 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. Deferred maintenance in some Judiciary facilities has resulted in water intrusion problems, broken elevators and HVAC systems, and other conditions that negatively impact the ability of the courts to operate as needed. I urge the Subcommittee to ensure that sufficient funds are available to properly maintain Judiciary facilities and deliver safe and functional working environments.

### *GSA Organizational Changes*

Over the past few months, GSA has taken a number of actions and made significant organizational changes. These actions have raised significant concerns and questions among local courts and court units regarding GSA's ability to continue to provide the facility-related services the Judiciary depends on for daily court operations. During this time, AO, local court, and GSA staff have been in regular communication to troubleshoot any issues that have arisen as a result of these actions. We will continue to work closely with GSA to address our concerns, however, to the extent future GSA organizational changes or actions impact the Judiciary's ability to fulfill its constitutional mission, the Judiciary may need to seek additional authorities or resources and will communicate those requests appropriately.

## **CONCLUSION**

Chairman Joyce, Ranking Member Hoyer, and members of the Subcommittee, I recognize that FY 2026 could be another challenging budget year. As you draft a FY 2026 FSGG appropriations bill, I ask that you take into account the critical importance of a properly resourced Judiciary. By providing the funding requested by the AO and the rest of the branch, you will be addressing the important priorities Judge St. Eve and I outline in our testimonies and enable the Judiciary to perform its vital role in the administration of justice and the effective functioning of our democracy.

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