

Judiciary - Superior Court

	FY 2014 ACTUAL	FY 2015 ESTIMATE	FY 2016 BASELINE
OPERATING BUDGET			
<i>Full Time Equivalent Positions</i>	137.5	137.5	137.5
Personal Services	0	0	2,767,400
Employee Related Expenditures	0	0	1,069,500
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	642,300
OPERATING SUBTOTAL	0	0	4,567,300
SPECIAL LINE ITEMS			
Centralized Service Payments	0	0	4,128,000
Judges Compensation	8,180,100	7,614,000	8,231,000
Adult Standard Probation	13,421,000	17,659,000	15,109,200
Adult Intensive Probation	10,649,400	12,417,600	9,930,000
Community Punishment	1,451,400	2,310,300	2,310,300
Interstate Compact	647,600	748,600	426,700
Drug Court	1,013,600	1,013,600	1,013,600
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	3,955,700
Juvenile Intensive Probation	8,809,300	9,175,700	6,002,700
Juvenile Treatment Services	22,341,400	22,341,600	20,497,800
Juvenile Family Counseling	653,400	660,400	660,400
Juvenile Diversion Consequences	9,024,900	9,024,900	8,539,400
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	220,000
AGENCY TOTAL	90,782,300	93,634,100	88,900,100
FUND SOURCES			
General Fund	79,428,400	80,102,500	76,721,900
<u>Other Appropriated Funds</u>			
Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund	4,834,700	7,002,200	5,648,800
Drug Treatment and Education Fund	500,000	500,200	500,200
Judicial Collection Enhancement Fund	6,019,200	6,029,200	6,029,200
SUBTOTAL - Other Appropriated Funds	11,353,900	13,531,600	12,178,200
SUBTOTAL - Appropriated Funds	90,782,300	93,634,100	88,900,100
Other Non-Appropriated Funds	986,700	752,100	752,100
TOTAL - ALL SOURCES	91,769,000	94,386,200	89,652,200

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.

Operating Budget

The Baseline includes \$4,567,300 and 55.5 FTE Positions in FY 2016 for the operating budget. These amounts consist of:

	FY 2016
General Fund	\$4,009,400
Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund (CJEF)	530,700
Judicial Collection Enhancement Fund (JCEF)	27,200

FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Administrative Cost	GF	4,009,400
Centralization	OF	557,900

The Baseline 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

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 in the FY 2016 Baseline.

Centralized Service Payments

The Baseline includes \$4,128,000 in FY 2016 for centralized service payments. This amount consists of:

General Fund	3,678,100
JCEF	449,900

FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Service Payment	GF	3,678,100
Centralization	OF	449,900

The Baseline 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

In order to facilitate payment for services that are offered by all Superior Courts, AOC pays for various services centrally. These services include state motor vehicle payments, employee training, research, firearms training, and other associated costs.

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

Judges Compensation

The Baseline includes \$8,231,000 and 82 FTE Positions from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Judges Compensation. FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Judges Compensation Shift	GF	617,000
----------------------------------	-----------	----------------

The Baseline 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.

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 in 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 for Legislative Consideration section for more information on probation funding.*)

Adult Standard Probation

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

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

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

(Please see Table 1 in the Other Issues for Legislative Consideration section for more information on this shift.)

The monies remaining in the Interstate Compact line item are intended as pass-through monies to the counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

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.

Drug Court

The Baseline includes \$1,013,600 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Drug Court programs. This amount is unchanged from FY 2015.

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 Baseline includes no funding in FY 2016 for Court Ordered Counseling. FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Remove One-Time Funding GF (250,000)

The Baseline 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 client progress to the court. The FY 2015 appropriation is non-lapsing through June 30, 2016.

Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison

The Baseline includes no funding in FY 2016 for the Pima County Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison Program. FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Remove One-Time Funding GF (250,000)

The Baseline 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 Baseline includes \$3,955,700 in FY 2016 for Juvenile Standard Probation. This amount consists of:

General Fund 3,805,700
 JCEF 150,000

FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Centralization GF (800,600)

The Baseline 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 Table 1 in the Other Issues for Legislative Consideration section for more information on this shift.)*

The monies remaining in the Juvenile Standard Probation line item are intended as pass-through monies to the counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

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.

Juvenile Intensive Probation

The Baseline includes \$6,002,700 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Juvenile Intensive Probation. FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Judges Compensation Shift GF (417,000)

The Baseline 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.)*

Centralization GF (2,756,000)

The Baseline 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 Table 1 in the Other Issues for Legislative Consideration section for more information on this shift.)*

The monies remaining in the Juvenile Intensive Probation line item are intended as pass-through monies to the

counties for their probation programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

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.

Juvenile Treatment Services

The Baseline includes \$20,497,800 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Juvenile Treatment Services. FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Centralization **GF (1,843,800)**

The Baseline 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 Table 1 in the Other Issues for Legislative Consideration section for more information on this shift.)*

The monies remaining in the Juvenile Treatment Service line item are intended as pass-through monies to the counties for their treatment programs and central treatment service payments made by AOC on behalf of the counties. These monies are not available for AOC expenses.

The FY 2016 Baseline includes monies from other Superior Court line items in 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.

Juvenile Family Counseling

The Baseline includes \$660,400 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Juvenile Family Counseling. This amount is unchanged from FY 2015.

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 Baseline includes \$8,539,400 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for Juvenile Diversion Consequences. FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Centralization **GF (485,500)**

The Baseline includes a decrease of \$(485,500) from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the realignment of the Superior Court budget. *(Please see Table 1 in the Other Issues for Legislative Consideration section for more information on this shift.)*

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

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.

Juvenile Crime Reduction

The Baseline includes \$3,308,000 from CJEF in FY 2016 for Juvenile Crime Reduction. FY 2016 adjustments would be as follows:

Centralization **OF (1,884,100)**

The Baseline 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 1 in the Other Issues for Legislative Consideration section for more information on this shift.)*

The monies remaining in the Juvenile Crime Reduction line item are intended as pass-through monies to the counties for their treatment programs and are not available for AOC expenses.

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.

Special Water Master

The Baseline includes \$220,000 from the General Fund in FY 2016 for the Special Water Master line item. This amount is unchanged from FY 2015.

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. (*See the Other Issues for Legislative Consideration section for more information.*)

* * *

FORMAT — Operating Lump Sum with Special Line Items by Agency

FOOTNOTES

Standard Footnotes

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.

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 must be deposited in the Juvenile Probation Services Fund established by A.R.S. § 8-322.

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.

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 must delineate how the office expends these monies that are not distributed as direct aid to counties.

New Footnotes

All centralized service payments made by the Administrative Office of the Courts on behalf of counties shall be funded solely from the Centralized Service Payments line item. 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 budget or other line items intended for centralized service payment purposes shall be transferred to the Centralized Service Payments line item prior to expenditure.

All monies in the Adult Standard Probation, Adult Intensive Probation, Interstate Compact, Juvenile Standard Probation, and Juvenile Intensive Probation line items are to be used solely as pass-through money to county probation departments. Monies in the operating budget 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 prior to expenditure.

Deletion of Prior Year Footnotes

The Baseline would delete the footnotes concerning the one-time appropriations for Court Ordered Counseling and Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison line items.

STATUTORY CHANGES

The Baseline would, as session law, continue the FY 2015 suspension of 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

Table 1

FY 2016 Baseline Shifts by Line Item

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	814,300	\$638,600	\$100,000	\$655,300	\$0	\$2,208,200
Probation (GF)						
Adult Standard Probation (JCEF)	27,200	314,400	0	0	0	341,600
Adult Intensive	708,600	926,400	100,000	624,800	0	2,359,800
Probation (GF)						
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	297,000	251,500	0	92,100	160,000	800,600
Probation (GF)						
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	0	2,904,300 ^{1/}
Juvenile Diversion Consequences (GF)	0	265,500	0	220,000	0	485,500
Juvenile Crime Reduction (CJEF)	530,700	0	0	1,353,400	0	1,884,100
Total	\$4,567,300	\$4,128,000	\$617,000	\$4,234,000	\$1,060,500	\$14,606,800
Fund Source						
Total General Fund	\$4,009,400	\$3,678,100	\$617,000	\$2,880,600	\$1,060,500	\$12,245,600
Total CJEF	530,700	449,900	0	0	0	980,600
Total JCEF	27,200	0	0	1,353,400	0	1,380,600
Total Funding	\$4,567,300^{2/}	\$4,128,000^{2/}	\$617,000^{3/}	\$4,234,000^{3/}	\$1,060,500^{4/}	\$14,606,800

1/ This amount is \$1,060,500 higher than the aggregate change to the Juvenile Treatment Services line item due to the amount not reflecting additional monies transferred to the line item.

2/ Reflects total funding for line item.

3/ Reflects the marginal change in line item funding.

4/ Reflects additional funding to the Juvenile Treatment Services line item. This amount does not include the \$(2,904,300) reduction to the line item for shifts to other Superior and Supreme Court line items reflected above.

in county funding as a result of the elimination of the non-supplanting provisions.

OTHER ISSUES FOR LEGISLATIVE CONSIDERATION

Budget Centralization

In an effort to better align expenditures with appropriations, the Baseline 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 1* above includes the shifts by line item for the FY 2016 Baseline.

Probation Caseloads

The Baseline includes \$35,517,100 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 Baseline, 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. *Table 2* 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 3* shows the caseloads for FY 2012 - FY 2016 by probation category. The FY 2015 and FY 2016 figures represent estimated caseloads.

Probation Adjustment

The changes to the FY 2016 probation line items for budget centralization do not address potential caseload

changes in non-Maricopa County probation departments. If the state adjusted probation officer and support staff funding based on the estimated caseload changes from FY 2015 to FY 2016, the state would realize net aggregate savings of \$(325,500) in FY 2016. This amount includes increases of \$656,100 for Adult Standard Probation and \$225,400 for Adult Intensive Probation as well as decreases of \$(656,100) for Juvenile Standard Probation and \$(550,900) for Juvenile Intensive Probation. This potential decrease only addresses probation officer and supporting staff positions that are related to the projected changes in caseloads and would not affect centralized probation department payments made by AOC.

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. This balance and an annual appropriation of \$20,000 in General Fund monies will allow sufficient funding for the Little Colorado Water Master through at least FY 2016. *Table 4* 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.

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.

Table 2

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
<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

Table 3

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	13,942	14,242
Adult Intensive	1,351	1,363	1,378	1,400
Juvenile Standard	2,102	1,738	1,603	1,457
Juvenile Intensive	<u>547</u>	<u>511</u>	<u>463</u>	<u>430</u>
Total Caseload	17,683	17,339	17,386	17,529

^{1/} Does not included 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.

	Special Water Master Funding				
	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated^{1/}	Estimated¹
<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	212,233
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	\$126,877
<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	21,489
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	\$71,739
^{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 and beyond. The Little Colorado River Water Master revenues include an annual appropriation of \$20,000 for all years displayed.				

SUMMARY OF FUNDS	FY 2014	FY 2015
	Actual	Estimate
Community Punishment Program Fines Fund (SPA2119/A.R.S. § 13-821)		Non-Appropriated
Source of Revenue: Discretionary fines imposed by the courts on drug offenders.		
Purpose of Fund: To provide drug treatment services to adult probationers through the Community Punishment Program.		
Funds Expended	0	0
Year-End Fund Balance	190,900	190,900
Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund (SPA2075/A.R.S. § 41-2401)		Appropriated
Source of Revenue: Includes allocations of the Criminal Justice Enhancement Fund (CJEF). CJEF consists of a 47% penalty assessment on fines, violations, forfeitures, and penalties imposed by the courts for criminal offenses and civil motor vehicle statute violations.		
Purpose of Fund: 9.35% of CJEF monies allocated to the courts are used to reduce juvenile crime, 6.02% is used to enhance the court's ability to process criminal and delinquency cases and salaries of Superior Court judges, and 2.13% is used to provide drug treatment services to adult probationers. The portions of the fund dedicated to juvenile crime reduction and drug treatment are included in the Superior Court's budget, while the case processing portion is part of the Supreme Court's budget.		
Funds Expended	4,834,700	7,002,200
Year-End Fund Balance	4,087,000	2,106,500
Drug and Gang Enforcement Account (SPA2074/A.R.S. § 41-2402)		Non-Appropriated
Source of Revenue: Federal grant monies passed through the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission's Drug and Gang Enforcement Account.		
Purpose of Fund: To fund programs that enhance the ability of the courts to process drug offenses and related cases.		
Funds Expended	0	0
Year-End Fund Balance	0	0
Drug Treatment and Education Fund (SPA2277/A.R.S. § 13-901.02)		Partially-Appropriated
Source of Revenue: The fund receives 7% of tax revenue collected on spirituous liquors and 18% of tax revenue collected on vinous and malt liquor. Of this amount, 50% is allocated to this fund and 50% is allocated to the Arizona Parents Commission on Drug Education and Prevention.		
Purpose of Fund: To place persons in drug education and treatment programs. Such monies are allocated to Superior Court probation departments according to a formula based on probation caseloads.		
Appropriated Funds Expended	500,000	500,200
Non-Appropriated Funds Expended	884,700	752,100
Year-End Fund Balance	2,416,200	2,017,300

SUMMARY OF FUNDS	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Estimate
Grants and Special Revenue (SPA2084/A.R.S. § 35-142)		Non-Appropriated
Source of Revenue: Monies provided from various sources, private and public, for specific programs and projects.		
Purpose of Fund: To expend grants as required by the contribution.		
Funds Expended	95,100	0
Year-End Fund Balance	8,800	6,800
Judicial Collection Enhancement Fund (SPA2246/A.R.S. § 12-113)		Appropriated
Source of Revenue: Electronic case filing and access fees; 27.78% of Supreme Court fees, 17.07% of Superior Court fees, 19.42% of Court of Appeals fees, 19.18% of Municipal Court fees, and 14.02% to 15.58% of Justice of the Peace fees; time payment fees assessed for late court payments; fees paid for court-ordered diversion programs, and a \$20 probation surcharge on fines, penalties, and forfeitures imposed by the courts for criminal offenses and civil motor vehicle statute violations. Maricopa County retains any probation surcharge imposed in its county.		
Purpose of Fund: To train court personnel, improve and enhance the court's ability to collect and manage monies assessed or received by the court, to fund court automation projects likely to improve case processing or the administration of justice, and for probation services. Funds represented here reflect the shift from the Supreme Court budget to the Superior Court budget of monies for probation officer salaries and programs.		
Funds Expended	6,019,200	6,029,200
Year-End Fund Balance	2,265,900	1,213,900
Juvenile Probation Services Fund (SPA2193/A.R.S. § 8-322)		Non-Appropriated
Source of Revenue: Monies appropriated to Juvenile Probation Services - Treatment Services and Juvenile Diversion Consequences and allocated by the Administrative Office of the Courts.		
Purpose of Fund: To fund programs for juvenile probationers required as conditions of diversion. These programs are intended to reduce the number of repetitive juvenile offenders and provide services, including treatment, testing, independent living programs, residential foster and shelter care, and for juveniles referred to the juvenile court for incorrigibility or delinquency offenses. Expenditures from this fund are not displayed to avoid double counting General Fund monies.		
Funds Expended	0	0
Year-End Fund Balance	8,268,300	5,845,700
State Aid to Detention Fund (SPA2141/A.R.S. § 41-2417)		Non-Appropriated
Source of Revenue: General Fund monies appropriated by the Legislature.		
Purpose of Fund: To provide state assistance to counties in maintaining, expanding, and operating juvenile detention centers. On behalf of the juvenile court, the Administrative Office of the Courts may use monies in the fund to enter into agreements with public agencies or private entities to acquire land for, build, purchase, lease-purchase, lease, maintain, expand, or operate juvenile detention centers. Expenditures from this fund are not displayed below to avoid double counting.		
Funds Expended	6,900	0
Year-End Fund Balance	0	0