

Judiciary - Superior Court

JLBC: Kim Hohman
 OSPB: Keith Fallstrom

Subcommittee: Assets

DESCRIPTION	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	
	ACTUAL	ESTIMATE	OSPB	JLBC
PROGRAM BUDGET				
Judges Compensation	12,407,300	12,647,600	12,647,600	13,374,500
Adult Probation Services				
<i>Standard Probation</i>	26,427,900	24,345,800	24,345,800	26,287,800
<i>Intensive Probation</i>	19,639,200	20,194,900	20,194,900	18,246,000
<i>Community Punishment</i>	4,132,800	5,278,600	5,278,600	5,280,000
<i>Interstate Compact</i>	1,302,600	1,346,600	1,346,600	1,348,200
<i>Program Subtotal - Adult Probation Services</i>	51,502,500	51,165,900	51,165,900	51,162,000
Juvenile Probation Services				
<i>Standard Probation</i>	7,855,500	7,455,900	7,455,900	6,925,700
<i>Intensive Probation</i>	12,920,900	13,233,100	13,233,100	12,190,500
<i>Treatment Services</i>	23,041,000	23,307,800	23,307,800	23,315,600
<i>Family Counseling</i>	656,300	660,400	660,400	660,400
<i>Progressively Increasing Consequences</i>	8,948,000	9,268,100	9,268,100	9,268,100
<i>Juvenile Crime Reduction</i>	4,298,700	5,061,100	5,061,100	5,126,200
<i>Program Subtotal - Juvenile Probation Services</i>	57,720,400	58,986,400	58,986,400	57,486,500
6th SS Lump Sum Reduction SLI	0	(4,968,300)	(4,968,300)	(4,968,300)
AGENCY TOTAL	121,630,200	117,831,600	117,831,600	117,054,700

OPERATING BUDGET

<i>Full Time Equivalent Positions</i>	199.0	199.3	199.3	199.3
Personal Services	12,585,900	12,476,200	12,476,200	12,476,200
Employee Related Expenditures	1,442,900	1,470,500	1,470,500	1,434,300
Professional and Outside Services	228,300	75,700	75,700	75,700
Travel - In State	84,900	66,300	66,300	66,300
Travel - Out of State	6,300	11,000	11,000	11,000
Other Operating Expenditures	107,125,700	108,688,200	108,688,200	107,764,100
Equipment	156,200	12,000	12,000	195,400
OPERATING SUBTOTAL	121,630,200	122,799,900	122,799,900	122,023,000
Special Line Items (SLI)	0	(4,968,300)	(4,968,300)	(4,968,300)
AGENCY TOTAL	121,630,200	117,831,600	117,831,600	117,054,700

FUND SOURCES

General Fund	116,502,500	110,940,100	110,940,100	109,098,100
<u>Other Appropriated Funds</u>				
Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund	5,127,700	6,891,500	6,891,500	6,956,600
State Aid to the Courts Fund	0	0	0	1,000,000
SUBTOTAL - Other Appropriated Funds	5,127,700	6,891,500	6,891,500	7,956,600
SUBTOTAL - Appropriated Funds	121,630,200	117,831,600	117,831,600	117,054,700
TOTAL - ALL SOURCES	121,630,200	117,831,600	117,831,600	117,054,700

CHANGE IN FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY 2003 to FY 2004 JLBC	
	\$ Change	% Change
General Fund	(1,842,000)	(1.7%)
Other Appropriated Funds	1,065,100	15.5%
Total Appropriated Funds	(776,900)	(0.7%)

monitor the juvenile's compliance with the terms and conditions of probation imposed by the court.

Increase Probation Officer

Caseload Ratios GF (6,373,300)

The JLBC recommends a General Fund decrease associated with changing probation officer caseload ratios. The JLBC recommends increasing the caseload ratios for the Adult Standard, Adult Intensive, Juvenile Standard, and Juvenile Intensive Probation programs, resulting in each officer or probation officer team handling 5 additional probationers. The following table compares the current statutory caseload ratios with the recommended ratios.

Probation Program	Current Statutory Caseload Ratio	Recommended Caseload Ratio
Adult Standard ^{1/}	1 to 60	1 to 65
Adult Intensive ^{2/}	2 to 25	2 to 30
Juvenile Standard	1 to 35	1 to 40
Juvenile Intensive	2 to 25	2 to 30

1/ The national caseload average is 1 to 139.
2/ The national caseload average is 2 to 29.

The change to current caseload ratios results in the following savings:

- Adult Standard – A reduction of 41 state-funded officers, 4 supervisors, and 8 support staff positions for a total savings of \$(1,901,300).
- Adult Intensive – A reduction of 21 probation officer teams, 2 supervisors, and 4 support staff positions for a total savings of \$(1,954,200).
- Juvenile Standard – A reduction of 28 state-funded officers, 2 supervisors, and 5 support staff positions for a total savings of \$(1,471,900).
- Juvenile Intensive – A reduction of 12 probation officer teams, 1 supervisor, and 2 support staff positions for a total savings of \$(1,045,900).

In addition, the JLBC recommends a change to statute to allow increased caseloads for the Standard and Intensive Probation programs. (See *JLBC Recommended Statutory Changes for more information.*)

Probation Cost Sharing GF 3,770,100

The JLBC recommends requiring the counties to pay 50% of the cost of Adult and Juvenile Probation. Currently, the state pays approximately 60% (approximately \$100 million) of all probation costs, while the counties pay 40% (approximately \$60 million). The new cost sharing arrangement will generate savings of \$(22,337,900) to the state.

Cost savings will be achieved by proportionately billing each county for its share of the \$22.3 million cost shift. The counties will reimburse the AOC on a quarterly basis and these monies will then be deposited in the General

Fund. Each county will be required to make its payment within 30 days of the request by the AOC. The Director of the AOC will be required to notify the State Treasurer if a county has not made its reimbursement within this timeframe. The State Treasurer will then withhold the corresponding amount of state shared sales tax revenue distribution for that county.

Included in the \$22.3 million in cost savings is approximately \$3.8 million that was paid by Maricopa and Pima Counties in FY 2003. This savings was achieved by reducing Superior Court General Fund monies and requiring the counties to reimburse the AOC on a quarterly basis. These monies were not deposited in the General Fund but instead credited to the Superior Court budget in FY 2003. The JLBC recommends restoring these funds to the AOC budget in FY 2004 and retaining these cost savings by including these monies in the \$22.3 cost reimbursement plan which will be deposited in the General Fund as revenue.

* * *

JLBC RECOMMENDED FORMAT — Detailed Line Item by Agency. (In the FY 2003 budget, the agency had a Lump Sum by Program/Subprogram format.)

JLBC RECOMMENDED FOOTNOTES

Standard Footnotes

All Community Punishment subprogram receipts received by the Administrative Office of the Courts in excess of \$5,280,000 in FY 2004 are appropriated to the Community Punishment Subprogram. Before the expenditure of any Community Punishment receipts in excess of \$5,280,000 in FY 2004, the Administrative Office of the Courts shall submit the intended use of the monies for review by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

Up to 4.6% of the amounts appropriated for Juvenile Probation Services – Treatment Services and Progressively Increasing Consequences may be retained and expended by the Supreme Court to administer the programs established by A.R.S. § 8-322, and to conduct evaluations as needed. The remaining portion of the Treatment Services and Progressively Increasing Consequences programs shall be deposited in the Juvenile Probation Services Fund established by A.R.S. § 8-322.

All Juvenile Crime Reduction Fund receipts received by the Administrative Office of the Courts in excess of \$5,126,200 in FY 2004 are appropriated to the Juvenile Crime Reduction Subprogram. Before the expenditure of any Juvenile Crime Reduction Fund receipts in excess of \$5,126,200 in FY 2004, the Administrative Office of the Courts shall submit the intended use of the monies for review by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

Of the 199.3 FTE Positions, 158 FTE Positions represent Superior Court judges. One-half of their salaries are

provided by state General Fund appropriations pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-128. This is not meant to limit the counties' ability to add additional judges pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-121.

Receipt of state probation monies by the counties is contingent on the county maintenance of ~~FY 1995~~ FY 2004 expenditure levels for each probation program. State probation monies are not intended to supplant county dollars for probation programs.

Deletion of Prior Year Footnotes

The JLBC recommends deleting the one-time footnote related to the Maricopa and Pima County Lump Sum Reduction implemented in FY 2003. The footnote specified that the lump sum reduction shall not be implemented in any county with a population of less than 500,000 persons. The reduction is continued in the Superior Court budget.

[Click here to return to the Table of Contents](#)

The JLBC recommends deleting the one-time footnotes related to funding for probation growth in rural counties. The footnotes specified that the monies appropriated for probation program growth in FY 2003 be used in counties with populations of less than 500,000 persons.

JLBC RECOMMENDED STATUTORY CHANGES

The JLBC recommends: 1) billing approximately \$22.3 million in probation costs to the counties. These monies will then be deposited in the General Fund; 2) changing the Adult and Juvenile Probation statutes to increase the caseload ratios for the Adult Standard, Adult Intensive, Juvenile Standard, and Juvenile Intensive Probation programs. (*See the "Increase Probation Officer Caseload Ratios" policy issue for more information.*); and 3) suspending the statute specifying that counties add new Superior Court Judgeships for every 30,000 additional residents.