

Judiciary - Superior Court

	FY 2014 ACTUAL	FY 2015 ESTIMATE	FY 2016 APPROVED
OPERATING BUDGET			
<i>Full Time Equivalent Positions</i>	137.5	137.5	137.5 ^{1/}
Personal Services	0	0	2,767,400
Employee Related Expenditures	0	0	955,700
Professional and Outside Services	0	0	32,000
Travel - In State	0	0	46,900
Travel - Out of State	0	0	9,200
Other Operating Expenditures	0	0	514,500
OPERATING SUBTOTAL	0	0	4,325,700
SPECIAL LINE ITEMS			
Centralized Service Payments	0	0	3,458,000 ^{2/}
Judges Compensation	8,180,100	7,614,000	8,231,000
Adult Standard Probation	13,421,000	17,659,000	15,109,200 ^{3/}
Adult Intensive Probation	10,649,400	12,417,600	9,910,000 ^{3/}
Community Punishment	1,451,400	2,310,300	2,310,300
Interstate Compact	647,600	748,600	416,700 ^{3/}
Drug Court	1,013,600	1,013,600	993,600
Court Ordered Counseling	0	250,000	0
Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison	0	250,000	0
Probation Surcharge	6,019,200	0	0
Juvenile Standard Probation	4,575,000	4,756,300	3,745,700 ^{3/}
Juvenile Intensive Probation	8,809,300	9,175,700	5,532,700 ^{3/}
Juvenile Treatment Services	22,341,400	22,341,600	19,937,800 ^{4/}
Juvenile Family Counseling	653,400	660,400	500,000
Juvenile Diversion Consequences	9,024,900	9,024,900	8,039,300 ^{4/}
Juvenile Crime Reduction	3,883,300	5,192,100	3,308,000
Mental Health Court Report	18,700	0	0
Special Water Master	94,000	220,000	160,000
AGENCY TOTAL	90,782,300	93,634,100	85,978,000 ^{3/9/11}
FUND SOURCES			
General Fund	79,428,400	80,102,500	73,911,400
Other Appropriated Funds			
Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund	4,834,700	7,002,200	5,542,000
Drug Treatment and Education Fund	500,000	500,200	502,400
Judicial Collection Enhancement Fund	6,019,200	6,029,200	6,022,200
SUBTOTAL - Other Appropriated Funds	11,353,900	13,531,600	12,066,600
SUBTOTAL - Appropriated Funds	90,782,300	93,634,100	85,978,000
Other Non-Appropriated Funds	986,700	752,100	752,100
TOTAL - ALL SOURCES	91,769,000	94,386,200	86,730,100

AGENCY DESCRIPTION — The Superior Court, which has a division in every county, is the state's only general jurisdiction court. Superior Court judges hear all types of cases except small claims, minor offenses, or violations of city codes and ordinances. In addition, the responsibility for supervising adults and juveniles who have been placed on probation resides in the Superior Court.

^{1/} Of the 137.5 FTE Positions, 82 FTE Positions represent Superior Court judges in counties with a population of less than 2,000,000 persons. 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 judges pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-121. (General Appropriation Act footnote)

Operating Budget

The budget includes \$4,325,700 and 55.5 FTE Positions in FY 2016 for the operating budget. These amounts consist of:

	FY 2016
General Fund	\$3,879,400
Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund (CJEF)	423,900
Drug Treatment and Education Fund	2,200
Judicial Collection Enhancement Fund (JCEF)	20,200

These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Administrative Cost Centralization

The budget includes an increase of \$4,567,300 and 55.5 FTE Positions in FY 2016 to shift all administrative costs incurred by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) while overseeing Superior Court line items to a new operating budget. These amounts consist of:

General Fund	4,009,400
CJEF	530,700
JCEF	27,200

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(130,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the operating budget appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line other than statewide adjustments. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016

General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(130,000) reduction is part of that shift.

(Please see Tables 1 and 2 for more information on these shifts.)

Statewide Adjustments

The budget includes a decrease of \$(111,600) in FY 2016 for statewide adjustments. This amount consists of:

CJEF	(106,800)
Drug Treatment and Education Fund	2,200
JCEF	(7,000)

(Please see the Agency Detail and Allocations section.)

Background – These monies represent the administrative costs incurred by the AOC while overseeing the various line items of the Superior Court budget. In prior years, these monies were included in the individual line items. In order to increase the clarity of expenditure sourcing, these monies have been shifted to a centralized operating budget leaving the monies passed through to the county Superior Courts in their respective line items.

Centralized Service Payments

The budget includes \$3,458,000 in FY 2016 for centralized service payments. This amount consists of:

General Fund	3,008,100
JCEF	449,900

- 2/ All centralized service payments made by the Administrative Office of the Courts on behalf of counties shall be funded only from the Centralized Service Payments line item. Centralized service payments include only training, motor vehicle payments, CORP review board funding, LEARN funding, research, operational reviews and GPS vendor payments. This footnote does not apply to treatment or counseling services payments made from the Juvenile Treatment Services and Juvenile Diversion Consequences line items. Monies in the operating lump sum appropriation or other line items intended for centralized service payments shall be transferred to the Centralized Service Payments line item before expenditure. (General Appropriation Act footnote)
- 3/ All monies in the Adult Standard Probation, Adult Intensive Probation, Interstate Compact, Juvenile Standard Probation and Juvenile Intensive Probation line items shall be used only as pass-through monies to county probation departments. Monies in the operating lump sum appropriation or other line items intended as pass-through for the purpose of administering a county probation program shall be transferred to the appropriate probation line item before expenditure. (General Appropriation Act footnote)
- 4/ Up to 4.6% of the amounts appropriated for Juvenile Treatment Services and Juvenile Diversion Consequences may be retained and expended by the Supreme Court to administer the programs established pursuant to A.R.S. § 8-322, and to conduct evaluations as needed. The remaining portion of the Juvenile Treatment Services and Juvenile Diversion Consequences appropriations shall be deposited in the Juvenile Probation Services Fund established by A.R.S. § 8-322. (General Appropriation Act footnote)
- 5/ General Appropriation Act funds are appropriated as an Operating Lump Sum with Special Line Items by Agency.
- 6/ Receipt of state probation monies by the counties is contingent on the county maintenance of FY 2004 expenditure levels for each probation program. State probation monies are not intended to supplant county dollars for probation programs. (General Appropriation Act Footnote)
- 7/ On or before November 1, 2015, the Administrative Office of the Courts shall report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee the FY 2015 actual, FY 2016 estimated and FY 2017 requested amounts for the following:
 1. On a county-by-county basis, the number of authorized and filled case carrying probation positions and non-case carrying positions, distinguishing between Adult Standard, Adult Intensive, Juvenile Standard and Juvenile Intensive. The report shall indicate the level of state probation funding, other state funding, county funding and probation surcharge funding for those positions.
 2. Total receipts and expenditures by county and fund source for the Adult Standard, Adult Intensive, Juvenile Standard and Juvenile Intensive Probation line items, including the amount of Personal Services expended from each revenue source of each account.
 3. The amount of monies from the Adult Standard, Adult Intensive, Juvenile Standard and Juvenile Intensive Probation line items that the office does not distribute as direct aid to counties. The report shall delineate how the office expends these monies that are not distributed as direct aid to counties. (General Appropriation Act footnote)

These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(670,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Centralized Service Payments line item appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(670,000) reduction is part of that shift.

Service Payment Centralization

The budget includes an increase of \$4,128,000 in FY 2016 to shift all centralized payments paid by AOC on behalf of Superior Courts to an individual line item. This amount consists of:

General Fund	3,678,100
JCEF	449,900

(Please see Tables 1 and 2 for more information on these shifts.)

Background – In order to facilitate payment for services that are offered by all Superior Courts, AOC pays for various services centrally. These services include training, motor vehicle payments, Corrections Officer Retirement Plan review board funding, Literacy Education and Resource Network program funding (an online G.E.D. preparation program), research, operational reviews and GPS vendor payments.

These monies have been shifted to this newly-created line item to improve the transparency of expenditure purposes.

Judges Compensation

The budget includes \$8,231,000 and 82 FTE Positions from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Judges Compensation. These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Judges Compensation Shift

The budget includes an increase of \$617,000 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the shifting of Probation line item monies to the Judges Compensation line item. In FY 2014, the AOC transferred \$100,000 from the Adult Standard Probation line item, \$100,000 from the Adult Intensive Probation line item, and \$417,000 from the Juvenile Intensive Probation line item to the Judges Compensation line item to cover salary and Employee Related Expenditures expenses in excess of the \$7,614,000 FY 2014 appropriation. This shift realigns

these monies with their expenditure for no net overall change. *(Please see Table 2 for more information on this shift.)*

Background – This line item provides funding for the state’s 50% share of the salary and Elected Officials Retirement Plan costs for Superior Court Judges. The line item also funds 100% of the costs of Superior Court Judges that elect state benefits, although some opt to participate in county programs. In the latter circumstance, the county pays 100% of the cost.

A.R.S. § 12-128 requires the state General Fund to pay for one-half of Superior Court Judges’ salaries, except for Maricopa County judges. Maricopa County is responsible for 100% of the salary and benefits of its Superior Court Judges. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-121, each county receives one judge for the first 30,000 of population. Additional judges may be created for every additional 30,000 person increment upon approval by the Governor.

Probation Programs

The state and non-Maricopa Counties share the costs of probation. For the intensive programs, the state pays 100% of the costs (although the counties may provide offices and other support services). Counties typically contribute through Probation Service Fee collections, outside grants, and office space. Since FY 2004, Maricopa County has assumed the state’s share of its probation costs. *(Please see the Other Issues section for more information on probation funding.)*

Adult Standard Probation

The budget includes \$15,109,200 in FY 2016 for Adult Standard Probation. This amount consists of:

General Fund	11,335,100
JCEF	3,774,100

These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Judges Compensation Shift

The budget includes a decrease of \$(100,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the shifting of monies to the Judges Compensation line item. *(Please see the Judges Compensation line item for more information.)*

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of \$(2,449,800) and (10.4) FTE Positions in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget. This amount consists of:

General Fund (2,108,200)
 JCEF (341,600)

(Please see Table 2 for more information on this shift.)

Background – This line item provides funding for community supervision services for adults placed on standard probation by the Adult Division of the Superior Court. Supervision is intended to monitor compliance with the terms and conditions of probation imposed by the court. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-251A, an adult probation officer shall not supervise more than 65 adults on standard probation at one time.

As required by a General Appropriation Act footnote, the monies in the Adult Standard Probation line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

Adult Intensive Probation

The budget includes \$9,910,000 in FY 2016 for Adult Intensive Probation. This amount consists of:

General Fund 8,374,800
 JCEF 1,535,200

These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(20,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Adult Intensive Probation line item appropriation. Laws 2015, Chapter 276 shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(20,000) reduction is part of that shift.

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of \$(2,387,600) and (7.8) FTE Positions in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget. This amount consists of:

General Fund (2,259,800)
 JCEF (127,800)

(Please see Tables 1 and 2 for more information on these shifts.)

Judges Compensation Shift

The budget includes a decrease of \$(100,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the shifting of monies to the

Judges Compensation line item. *(Please see the Judges Compensation line item for more information.)*

Background – This line item provides funding for a sentencing alternative intended to divert serious, non-violent offenders from prison. Supervision is intended to monitor compliance with the terms and conditions of probation imposed by the court. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-916, 1 team shall not supervise more than 25 intensive probationers at one time.

As required by a General Appropriation Act footnote, the monies in the Adult Intensive Probation line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

Community Punishment

The budget includes \$2,310,300 in FY 2016 for Community Punishment. This amount consists of:

CJEF 1,810,100
 Drug Treatment and Education Fund (DTEF) 500,200

These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of (0.9) FTE Positions from CJEF in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget. *(Please see Table 2 for more information on this shift.)*

Background – This line item provides behavioral treatment services for adult probationers and for enhanced supervision, such as electronic monitoring and specialized probation caseloads. The funding is intended to provide for diversion of offenders from prison and jail, as well as to enhance probation programs, excluding Maricopa County.

The monies in the Community Punishment line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

Interstate Compact

The budget includes \$416,700 in FY 2016 for Interstate Compact. This amount consists of:

General Fund 323,900
 JCEF 92,800

These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(10,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Interstate Compact line item appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line other than a transfer of funds for the centralization of AOC expenditures. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(10,000) reduction is part of that shift.

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of \$(321,900) and (4.8) FTE Positions in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget. This amount consists of:

General Fund	(314,200)
JCEF	(7,700)

(Please see Tables 1 and 2 for more information on these shifts.)

Background – This line item provides funding for supervision and intervention to probationers transferring to Arizona and monitors the supervision of probationers transferred to other states from Arizona.

As required by a General Appropriation Act footnote, the monies in the Interstate Compact line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

Drug Court

The budget includes \$993,600 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Drug Court programs. This amount funds the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(20,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Drug Court line item appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(20,000) reduction is part of that shift. *(Please see the Additional Legislation section for more information on this shift.)*

Background – This line item provides funding for juvenile and adult drug courts within the Superior Court throughout the state. It provides funding for prosecuting, adjudicating and treating drug-dependent offenders. Superior Court divisions in 12 counties have implemented or are planning the implementation of drug courts. These programs utilize drug education, intensive therapy, parent support, case management, socialization alternatives, aftercare and compliance monitoring for drug abstinence.

Court Ordered Counseling

The budget includes no funding in FY 2016 for Court Ordered Counseling. This amount funds the following adjustments:

Remove One-Time Funding

The budget includes a decrease of \$(250,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the elimination of a one-time appropriation to allow the Maricopa County Family Drug Court to contract with a provider offering integrated delivery of services from testing to treatment, as needed, using evidence-based treatment standards, and providing the option of an online case management system to report progress of clients to the court. The FY 2015 appropriation is non-lapsing through June 30, 2016.

Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison

The budget includes no funding in FY 2016 for the Pima County Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison Program. This amount funds the following adjustments:

Remove One-Time Funding

The budget includes a decrease of \$(250,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the elimination of a one-time appropriation to provide additional funding to the Pima County Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison Program. The program allows drug addicted criminals that plead guilty to receive residential therapeutic treatment as an alternative to prison. The FY 2015 appropriation is non-lapsing through June 30, 2016.

Juvenile Standard Probation

The budget includes \$3,745,700 in FY 2016 for Juvenile Standard Probation. This amount consists of:

General Fund	3,595,700
JCEF	150,000

These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(210,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Juvenile Standard Probation line item appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line other than a transfer of funds for the centralization of AOC expenditures. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(210,000) reduction is part of that shift.

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of \$(800,600) and (3.6) FTE Positions from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget.

(Please see Tables 1 and 2 for more information on these shifts.)

Background – This line item provides funding for community supervision services for juveniles placed on standard probation by the Juvenile Division of the Superior Court. Supervision is intended to monitor compliance with the terms and conditions of probation imposed by the court. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 8-203B, a juvenile probation officer shall not supervise more than an average of 35 juveniles on standard probation at one time.

As required by a General Appropriation Act footnote, the monies in the Juvenile Standard Probation line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

Juvenile Intensive Probation

The budget includes \$5,532,700 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Juvenile Intensive Probation. This amount funds the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(470,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Juvenile Intensive Probation line item appropriation. Laws 2015, Chapter 276 shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(470,000) reduction is part of that shift.

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of \$(2,756,000) and (5.4) FTE Positions from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget.

(Please see Tables 1 and 2 for more information on these shifts.)

Judges Compensation Shift

The budget includes a decrease of \$(417,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the shifting of monies to the Judges Compensation line item. *(Please see the Judges Compensation line item for more information.)*

Background – This line item provides funding for a sentencing alternative to divert serious, non-violent juvenile offenders from incarceration or residential care and to provide intensive supervision for high-risk offenders already on probation. Supervision is intended to monitor compliance with the terms and conditions of probation imposed by the court. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 8-353B, 1 JIPS team shall not supervise more than an average of 25 juveniles on intensive probation at one time.

As required by a General Appropriation Act footnote, the monies in the Juvenile Intensive Probation line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

Juvenile Treatment Services

The budget includes \$19,937,800 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Juvenile Treatment Services. This amount funds the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(560,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Juvenile Treatment Services line item appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line other than a transfer of funds for the centralization of AOC expenditures. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(560,000) reduction is part of that shift.

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of \$(1,843,800) and (15.6) FTE Positions from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget.

(Please see Tables 1 and 2 for more information on these shifts.)

The FY 2016 budget moves monies from other Superior Court line items to the Juvenile Treatment Services line item to allow for the centralization of probation treatment services payments. Going forward, juvenile probation treatment service costs will be solely funded from the Juvenile Treatment Services line item. Any additional monies expended from other line items for probation treatment services will be transferred to the Juvenile Treatment Services line item.

Background – This line item provides funding to the juvenile courts to meet the requirements of A.R.S. § 8-321 relating to the assignment of youths referred for delinquency or incorrigibility to treatment programs, residential treatment centers, counseling, shelter care and other programs.

The monies in the Juvenile Treatment Services line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their treatment programs and central treatment service payments made by AOC on behalf of the counties and are not available for AOC expenses.

Juvenile Family Counseling

The budget includes \$500,000 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Juvenile Family Counseling. This amount funds the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(160,400) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Juvenile Family Counseling line item appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(160,400) reduction is part of that shift. *(Please see the Additional Legislation section for more information.)*

Background – This line item provides funding to the Juvenile Division of the Superior Court for prevention of delinquency among juvenile offenders by strengthening family relationships. These monies are predominantly for non-adjudicated juveniles and their families and require a 25% county match.

Juvenile Diversion Consequences

The budget includes \$8,039,300 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Juvenile Diversion Consequences. This amount funds the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(500,100) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Juvenile Diversion Consequences line item appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line other than a transfer of funds for the centralization of AOC expenditures. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(500,100) reduction is part of that shift.

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of \$(485,500) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget.

(Please see Tables 1 and 2 for more information on these shifts.)

Background – This program diverts youth from formal court proceedings in order to reduce court costs and prevent re-offending. A juvenile diversion probation officer assigns consequences for the juvenile to complete, such as substance abuse education, graffiti abatement, counseling, or other community service programs. In FY 2014, there were approximately 11,355 juveniles diverted from formal court proceedings. Monies in this line item are distributed to all counties.

The monies in the Juvenile Diversion Consequences line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their diversion programs and central treatment service payments made by AOC on behalf of the counties and are not available for AOC expenses.

Juvenile Crime Reduction

The budget includes \$3,308,000 from CJEF in FY 2016 for Juvenile Crime Reduction. This amount funds the following adjustments:

Centralization

The budget includes a decrease of \$(1,884,100) and (7) FTE Positions from CJEF in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget. *(Please see Table 2 for more information on this shift.)*

Background – This line item provides funding for the design and implementation of community-based strategies for reducing juvenile crime. Strategies include prevention, early intervention, effective intermediate sanctions, and rehabilitation. Through a grant process, AOC distributes monies in this line item to approximately 23 public and private entities.

The monies in the Juvenile Crime Reduction line item shall be used only as pass-through monies to the counties for their crime reduction programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

Special Water Master

The budget includes \$160,000 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the Special Water Master line item. These amounts fund the following adjustments:

Appropriation Reduction

The budget includes a decrease of \$(60,000) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for a reduction to the Special Water Master line item appropriation. The FY 2016 General Appropriation Act included no reductions to this line. Laws 2015, Chapter 276, however, shifted \$(3,392,500) of the \$(3,590,500) General Fund reduction to the Automation line item in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act to other lines in the Supreme Court and Superior Court budgets. This \$(60,000) reduction is part of that shift. *(Please see the Additional Legislation section for more information.)*

Background – This line item provides funding for the Special Water Master assigned by the court in 1990 to the Little Colorado River and Gila River water rights adjudications. The adjudication of water rights for the Little Colorado River and Gila River were petitioned in 1978 and 1980, respectively. In FY 2014, 179 water rights claims were filed by individuals, communities, governments, and companies. The Special Water Master conducts hearings for each claimant and makes recommendations to a Superior Court judge.

Pursuant to statute, the costs of the Water Master are funded from claimant fees. If claimant fees are insufficient, statute requires the state General Fund to pay for these expenses in a special line item within the Superior Court budget. *(Please see the Other Issues section for more information.)*

Additional Legislation

Appropriation Shift

Laws 2015, Chapter 276 shifts \$2,810,500 in General Fund monies in FY 2016 from the Superior Court to the

Automation line item in the Supreme Court to mitigate a \$(3,590,500) FY 2016 General Fund reduction in the Automation line item included in the FY 2016 General Appropriation Act (Laws 2015, Chapter 8). The bill also shifts \$582,000 in General Fund monies in FY 2016 from other line items in the Supreme Court to the Automation line item to further decrease the reduction included in the General Appropriation Act. The total remaining reduction to the Automation line item is \$(198,000) in FY 2016. *Table 1* displays how Laws 2015, Chapter 276 distributed the \$3,392,500 General Fund shift in FY 2016 from Supreme and Superior Court line items to the Automation line item.

<u>Budget Line</u>	<u>FY 2016 Change</u>
Supreme Court	
Operating Lump Sum	\$ (140,000)
Automation	3,392,500
CASA	(102,000)
Domestic Relations	(10,000)
Foster Care Review Board	(300,000)
Commission on Judicial Conduct	(10,000)
Judicial Nominations and Performance Review	(10,000)
Model Court	(10,000)
Supreme Court Total	\$2,810,500
Superior Court	
Operating Lump Sum	\$ (130,000)
Centralized Service Payments	(670,000)
Adult Intensive Probation	(20,000)
Interstate Compact	(10,000)
Drug Court	(20,000)
Juvenile Standard Probation	(210,000)
Juvenile Intensive Probation	(470,000)
Juvenile Treatment Services	(560,000)
Juvenile Family Counseling	(160,400)
Juvenile Diversion Consequences	(500,100)
Special Water Master	(60,000)
Superior Court Total	\$(2,810,500)
TOTAL	\$0

County Non-Supplanting Provisions

The FY 2016 Criminal Justice Budget Reconciliation Bill (Laws 2015, Chapter 17) continues to suspend county non-supplanting requirements associated with funding for probation services, criminal case processing, and alternative dispute resolution programs and requires the counties to report on reductions in county funding as a result of the elimination of the non-supplanting provisions.

Other Issues

Budget Centralization

In an effort to better align expenditures with appropriations, the budget includes shifts from Superior Court line items to the newly-created Superior Court Operating Budget and Centralized Service Payments line item as well as the existing Superior Court Judges Compensation, Superior Court Juvenile Treatment Services and Supreme Court Automation line items. *Table 2* includes the shifts by line item for the FY 2016 budget.

Fund Transfers

The budget includes the following FY 2016 transfers from this agency's funds to the General Fund:

CJEF	\$650,000
Drug Treatment and Education Fund	250,000
JCEF	500,000
Juvenile Probation Services Fund	3,000,000

Probation Caseloads

The budget includes \$28,838,300 in General Fund and \$5,459,300 in JCEF monies in FY 2016 to support non-Maricopa County adult and juvenile probation services. In addition to this amount, in the FY 2016 budget, a total of \$8,541,600 General Fund and \$469,400 JCEF is transferred from the probation line items to the newly-created Superior Court Operating Budget, the Centralized Service Payments line item, and the existing Superior Court Judges Compensation, Superior Court Juvenile Treatment Services and Supreme Court Automation line items for increased transparency of expenditures.

Prior to this shift, In FY 2014, the state appropriated \$38,079,500 in General Fund and \$5,928,700 in Other Fund monies to support non-Maricopa County adult and juvenile probation services. Additionally, counties provided \$32,381,600 in funding for these purposes. *Table 3* below displays total funding and probation officer expenditures from both county and state sources in FY 2014.

In FY 2014 the average non-Maricopa County probation caseload was 17,563. This represents a year-over-year decline of (3.0)%. While aggregate caseloads have been declining over the past several years, the Adult Standard category has seen multi-year increases. Additionally, the Adult Intensive category has recently started to see consistent caseload gains as well. *Table 4* shows the caseloads for FY 2012 - FY 2016 by probation category. The FY 2015 and FY 2016 figures represent estimated caseloads.

Special Water Master

In FY 2014, revenue and interest to the Gila River water rights adjudication, including a \$74,000 General Fund appropriation, totaled \$86,233 and expenditures were \$160,164 leaving an ending balance of \$23,411. The revenue consists of filing fees paid by claimants initiating water rights claims, interest, and monies appropriated by the Legislature. The FY 2015 budget included an additional \$126,000, or \$200,000 total, to ensure that the fund remains balanced. Laws 2015, Chapter 276 reduced this amount by \$(54,500) leaving a total of \$145,500 in General Fund support.

The FY 2014 revenue, interest and appropriations to the Little Colorado River water rights adjudication totaled \$21,489 and expenditures were \$28,913. The FY 2014 ending balance was \$86,761. Laws 2015, Chapter 276 reduced this amount by \$(5,500) in FY 2016 leaving a total of \$14,500 in General Fund support. *Table 5* displays a short history of the revenues and expenditures to the Gila River and Little Colorado River Water Masters from FY 2012 through FY 2016.

Table 2

FY 2016 Budget Shifts by Line Item^{1/}

Original Line Items and Fund Source	Recipient Line Item					Total
	Superior Court Operating Budget	Superior Court Centralized Service Payments	Superior Court Judges Compensation	Supreme Court Automation	Juvenile Treatment Services	
Adult Standard Probation (GF)	\$814,300	\$638,600	\$100,000	\$655,300	\$0	\$2,208,200
Adult Standard Probation (JCEF)	27,200	314,400	0	0	0	341,600
Adult Intensive Probation (GF)	708,600	926,400	100,000	624,800	0	2,359,800
Adult Intensive Probation (JCEF)	0	127,800	0	0	0	127,800
Interstate Compact (GF)	286,400	27,800	0	0	0	314,200
Interstate Compact (JCEF)	0	7,700	0	0	0	7,700
Juvenile Standard Probation (GF)	297,000	251,500	0	92,100	160,000	800,600
Juvenile Intensive Probation (GF)	473,700	1,091,100	417,000	290,700	900,500	3,173,000
Juvenile Treatment Services (GF)	1,429,400	477,200	0	997,700	(1,060,500)	1,843,800
Juvenile Diversion Consequences (GF)	0	265,500	0	220,000	0	485,500
Juvenile Crime Reduction (JCEF)	<u>530,700</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,353,400</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,884,100</u>
Total	\$4,567,300	\$4,128,000	\$617,000	\$4,234,000	\$0	\$13,546,300
Fund Source						
Total General Fund	\$4,009,400	\$3,678,100	\$617,000	\$2,880,600	\$0	\$11,185,100
Total CJEF	530,700	449,900	0	0	0	980,600
Total JCEF	<u>27,200</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,353,400</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,380,600</u>
Total Funding	\$4,567,300^{2/}	\$4,128,000^{2/}	\$617,000^{3/}	\$4,234,000^{3/}	\$0^{4/}	\$13,546,300

^{1/} These shifts reflect the Centralization and Judges Compensation policy issues. Laws 2015, Chapter 276 further reallocates monies from some of these shifts for the "Appropriation Reduction" policy issue. That reallocation is excluded from these figures.

^{2/} Reflects total funding for line item.

^{3/} Reflects the marginal change in line item funding.

^{4/} This amount does not include the \$(1,843,800) reduction to the line item for shifts to other Superior and Supreme Court line items reflected above.

Table 3

FY 2014 Non-Maricopa County Probation Funding

	<u>Adult Standard</u>	<u>Adult Intensive</u>	<u>Juvenile Standard</u>	<u>Juvenile Intensive</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Probation Officers</u>					
Case Carrying Positions	198.0	107.5	70.0	53.0	428.5
Non-Case Carrying Positions	<u>335.3</u>	<u>58.1</u>	<u>237.4</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>663.1</u>
Total Filled Positions	533.3	165.6	307.4	85.3	1,091.6
<u>Probation SLI Expenditures</u>					
Amount Distributed to Counties	\$11,350,800	\$8,404,600	\$3,978,500	\$5,836,500	\$29,570,400
Amount Retained by AOC	<u>2,070,200</u>	<u>2,244,800</u>	<u>596,500</u>	<u>2,972,800</u>	<u>7,884,300</u>
Total SLI Expenditures	\$13,421,000	\$10,649,400	\$4,575,000	\$8,809,300	\$37,454,700^{1/}
<u>County Probation Expenditures</u>					
State General Fund	\$11,350,800	\$8,816,100	\$3,968,600	\$6,619,800	\$30,755,300
Other State Funds	3,853,800	1,619,300	0	0	5,473,100
County Funding	<u>17,413,200</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14,968,400</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>32,381,600</u>
Total Expenditures	\$32,617,800	\$10,435,400	\$18,937,000	\$6,619,800	\$68,610,000^{2/}

^{1/} Represents the amount expended by AOC in support of non-Maricopa County probation programs.

^{2/} Represents the amount expended by the counties from all sources, including current and prior years' monies received from the state.

Table 4

Non-Maricopa County Average Annual Probation Caseloads

	<u>FY 2013 Actual</u>	<u>FY 2014 Actual</u>	<u>FY 2015 Estimate</u>	<u>FY 2016 Estimate</u>
<u>Probation Category</u>				
Adult Standard ^{1/}	13,682	13,727	14,442	14,975
Adult Intensive	1,351	1,363	1,328	1,377
Juvenile Standard	2,102	1,738	1,750	1,815
Juvenile Intensive	<u>547</u>	<u>511</u>	<u>459</u>	<u>475</u>
Total Caseload	17,683	17,339	17,979	18,642

^{1/} Does not include Interstate Compact participants. In FY 2014 there was an average of 223 individuals in Pima and Yavapai Counties that were funded from the Interstate Compact line item.

Table 5

Special Water Master Funding

	<u>FY 2012 Actual</u>	<u>FY 2013 Actual</u>	<u>FY 2014 Actual</u>	<u>FY 2015 Estimated^{1/}</u>	<u>FY 2016 Estimated^{1/}</u>
<u>Gila River</u>					
Beginning Balance	\$392,903	\$250,543	\$97,342	\$23,411	\$75,144
Revenues ^{2/}	17,687	3,042	86,233	212,233	157,733
Expenditures	<u>160,047</u>	<u>156,243</u>	<u>160,164</u>	<u>160,500</u>	<u>160,500</u>
Ending Balance	\$250,543	\$97,342	\$23,411	\$75,144	\$72,377
<u>Little Colorado River</u>					
Beginning Balance	\$104,261	\$99,753	\$94,185	\$86,761	\$79,250
Revenues ^{2/}	23,894	22,004	21,489	21,489	15,989
Expenditures	<u>28,402</u>	<u>27,572</u>	<u>28,913</u>	<u>29,000</u>	<u>29,000</u>
Ending Balance	\$99,753	\$94,185	\$86,761	\$79,250	\$66,239

^{1/} Estimated amounts were provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts.

^{2/} Includes an annual appropriation of \$74,000 for the Gila River Water Master in FY 2014 and \$200,000 in FY 2015. Laws 2015, Chapter 276 reduced this amount to \$145,500 in FY 2016 and beyond. The Little Colorado River Water Master revenues include an annual appropriation of \$20,000 through FY 2015. Laws 2015, Chapter 276 reduced this amount to \$14,500 in FY 2016 and beyond.