



**Joint Budget Committee**

# **Supplemental Budget Requests**

## **FY 2025-26**

**Judicial Department**  
**Courts and Probation**

Prepared by:  
Amanda Bickel, JBC Staff  
January 23, 2026

Joint Budget Committee Staff  
200 E. 14th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
Telephone: (303) 866-2061  
[leg.colorado.gov/agencies/joint-budget-committee](http://leg.colorado.gov/agencies/joint-budget-committee)

# Contents

Overview of Judicial (Courts & Probation) .....	2
Summary of Staff Recommendations.....	3
FY 2025-26 Summary .....	3
Department Supplemental Requests .....	6
→ C&P S1 Courthouse Furnishings and Infrastructure.....	6
→ C&P S2 Offender Treatment and Services.....	11
→ C&P S3 Technical Adjustments.....	16
JBC Initiated Supplemental Requests.....	17
→ JBC initiated Security Planning FTE.....	17
→ Staff-recommended letter requesting hiring freeze/chill .....	20
Appendix A: Numbers Pages .....	22

# Overview of Judicial (Courts & Probation)

The Judicial Department consists of the traditional Judicial Branch, comprised of the courts and probation, and 11 independent agencies created in statute. This supplemental packet addresses solely the courts and probation. Courts include the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, district courts (including the Denver probate and juvenile courts), and county courts (except Denver county court). Each of the 23 judicial districts also provides probation services for individuals sentenced to probation as an alternative to incarceration.

# Summary of Staff Recommendations

## FY 2025-26 Summary

### Judicial Department ALL Divisions: Recommended Changes for FY 2025-26

Item	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reaprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
<b>FY 2025-26 Appropriation</b>						
SB 25-206 (Long Bill)	\$1,148,010,817	\$875,204,785	\$203,914,808	\$64,466,224	\$4,425,000	5,696.7
Other legislation	3,741,831	3,741,831	\$0	\$0	\$0	28.1
<b>Current FY 2025-26 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$1,151,752,648</b>	<b>\$878,946,616</b>	<b>\$203,914,808</b>	<b>\$64,466,224</b>	<b>\$4,425,000</b>	<b>5,724.8</b>
<b>Recommended Changes</b>						
Current FY 2025-26 Appropriation	\$1,151,752,648	878,946,616	\$203,914,808	\$64,466,224	\$4,425,000	5,724.8
C&P S1 Courthouse furnishings and infrastructure	1,215,700	1,215,700	0	0	0	0.0
C&P S2 Offender treatment and services	-76,201	-276,201	200,000	0	0	0.0
C&P S3 Technical adjustments	607,205	0	0	607,205	0	0.0
C&P JBC-initiated security planning FTE	40,103	0	40,103	0	0	0.3
OSPD S1 CBI DNA misconduct representation	243,328	243,328	0	0	0	0.0
OSPD S2 SB 25-024 true-up	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
OADC S1 Caseload increase	6,449,841	6,449,841	0	0	0	0.0
OADC S2 CBI DNA misconduct	140,000	140,000	0	0	0	0.0
OADC S1 Technical correction	5,327,593	5,327,593	0	0	0	0.0
ORPC S1 Align appropriations with estimates	-738,130	-788,130	0	50,000	0	0.0
OCPO S1 One-time reduction	-65,000	-65,000	0	0	0	0.0
Bridges S1 One-time reduction	-560,877	-560,877	0	0	0	0.0
<b>Impacts driven by other agencies</b>	<b>1,896,401</b>	<b>1,753,622</b>	<b>142,779</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Recommended FY 2025-26 Appropriation</b>	<b>\$1,166,232,611</b>	<b>\$892,386,492</b>	<b>\$204,297,690</b>	<b>\$65,123,429</b>	<b>\$4,425,000</b>	<b>5,725.1</b>
<b>Recommended Increase/-Decrease from 2025-26</b>						
Percentage Change	1.3%	1.5%	0.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>FY 2025-26 Executive Request</b>	<b>\$1,161,525,416</b>	<b>\$887,519,400</b>	<b>\$204,457,587</b>	<b>\$65,123,429</b>	<b>\$4,425,000</b>	<b>5,724.8</b>
<b>Staff Rec. Above/-Below Request</b>	<b>\$4,707,195</b>	<b>\$4,867,092</b>	<b>-\$159,897</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0.3</b>

### Judicial Department Courts and Probation ONLY: Recommended Changes for FY 2025-26

Item	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reaprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
<b>FY 2025-26 Appropriation</b>						
SB 25-206 (Long Bill)	\$778,327,048	\$516,372,863	\$201,065,149	\$56,464,036	\$4,425,000	4,217.2
Other legislation	3,120,494	3,120,494	\$0	\$0	\$0	21.4

Item	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reaprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
Current FY 2025-26 Appropriation	\$781,447,542	\$519,493,357	\$201,065,149	\$56,464,036	\$4,425,000	4,238.6
<b>Recommended Changes</b>						
Current FY 2025-26 Appropriation	\$781,447,542	519,493,357	\$201,065,149	\$56,464,036	\$4,425,000	4,238.6
C&P S1 Courthouse furnishings and infrastructure	1,215,700	1,215,700	0	0	0	0.0
C&P S2 Offender treatment and services	-76,201	-276,201	200,000	0	0	0.0
C&P S3 Technical adjustments	607,205	0	0	607,205	0	0.0
C&P JBC-initiated security planning FTE	40,103	0	40,103	0	0	0.3
Impacts driven by other agencies	1,430,407	1,287,628	142,779	0	0	0.0
Recommended FY 2025-26 Appropriation	\$784,664,756	\$521,720,484	\$201,448,031	\$57,071,241	\$4,425,000	4,238.9
Recommended Increase/-Decrease from 2025-26	\$3,217,214	\$2,227,127	\$382,882	\$607,205	\$0	0.3
Percentage Change	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%
FY 2025-26 Executive Request	\$785,285,154	\$522,180,985	\$201,607,928	\$57,071,241	\$4,425,000	4,238.6
Staff Rec. Above/-Below Request	-\$620,398	-\$460,501	-\$159,897	\$0	\$0	0.3

**C&P S1 Courthouse furnishings and infrastructure:** The request includes \$1,400,000 General Fund for furniture, cubicles, and audiovisual infrastructure equipment for courtrooms, chambers, and office space occupied by State employees in county courthouse and probation office facilities. The request is largely driven by capital outlay associated with S.B. 25-024 (Judicial Officers). The recommendation is for \$1,215,700 General Fund.

**C&P S2 Offender treatment and services:** The Department requests an increase of \$400,000 cash funds for Offender Treatment and Services expenditures for FY 2025-26. This includes an increase of \$200,000 cash funds spending authority to align spending authority for cost recoveries (amounts recovered from offenders for services paid upfront by the Department) with actual cost recoveries and \$200,000 from the Offender Services Fund in FY 2025-26. The recommendation is for a net reduction of \$76,201, including the requested increase from cost recoveries, offset by a General Fund decrease that eliminates the General Fund appropriated in the line item.

**C&P S3 Technical adjustments:** The request and recommendation include technical corrections to the FY 2025-26 Long Bill, including a change to a letternote and an increase of \$607,205 reappropriated funds in the Correctional Treatment Cash Fund Expenditures line item 2025-2026 to align appropriations with Correctional Treatment Board-approved projected expenditures.

**C&P JBC-initiated security planning FTE:** The staff recommendation, based on JBC member interest, includes an increase of \$40,103 cash funds and 0.3 FTE for FY 2025-26 for a position that would support a taskforce working on judicial district security issues. The analyst would work with a taskforce comprised of state and local officials to identify security risks, opportunities for improved security, potential statutory changes to promote security, and state and local resources to implement the recommendations. The Department requested this as a General Fund position beginning in FY 2026-27 but did not request a supplemental.

**Impacts driven by other agencies:** The Department request includes a net increase of \$1.9 million for requests from other state agencies. This includes \$1.4 million for Courts and Probation changes. These are also called “non-prioritized requests.” The amounts shown in the table below reflect the impacts of requests made by other agencies. These requests are discussed during supplemental presentations for the lead requesting agency, at which point a staff recommendation will be made. Staff will update these figures to reflect the Committee’s decisions on these requests.

**Recommended Letter to Judicial Department:** Staff recommends that the Committee consider drafting a letter requesting the Department institute a hiring freeze or chill to drive General Fund reversions in FY 2025-26 based on vacancy savings.

# Department Supplemental Requests

## → C&P S1 Courthouse Furnishings and Infrastructure

Item	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reapprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
Request	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0
Recommendation	1,215,700	1,215,700	0	0	0	0.0
Staff Recommendation Higher/-Lower than Request	-\$184,300	-\$184,300	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0

**Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? YES**

An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforeseen contingency.

**Explanation:** JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of data that was not available when the original appropriation was made.

### Request

The Judicial Department (Courts and Probation) requests a FY 2025-26 supplemental appropriation of \$1,400,000 General Fund for furniture, cubicles, and audiovisual infrastructure equipment for courtrooms, chambers, and office space occupied by State employees in county courthouse and probation office facilities. Consistent with previous practice, the Department requests 2-year spending authority for each appropriation to ensure funding is available throughout the project timelines.

The request would increase the appropriation for this line item to \$1,802,200 for FY 2025-26.

The Department also submitted a January 2 budget amendment that *reduces* its FY 2026-27 request for courthouse furnishings and infrastructure by \$1.7 million. With this adjustment, the request for FY 2027-28 for this line item is \$2,303,300. This will be addressed during figure setting, but is noted for context.

### Recommendation

Staff recommends \$1,215,700, which includes two adjustments to the request: (1) reducing \$150,000 for Ancillary New Judge-related projects; (2) eliminating some architect travel costs; and (3) related rounding-down. As discussed further below, most of the FY 2025-26 costs are related to the new judges added in S.B. 25-024. These costs are greater than the amounts included in the fiscal note or appropriated in the bill for S.B. 25-024 but consistent with past experience when new judges have been added.

Staff is also highlighting some options for reducing costs in this line item in the future so that the JBC can consider these prior to figure setting.

# Analysis

## Background

### County versus State Responsibility – Options to Reduce/Shift Costs

Statute<sup>1</sup> requires counties to provide and maintain adequate courtrooms and other court facilities and requires the State to pay for court operations. Based on this, the General Assembly annually appropriates funds for courthouse facilities for furnishings and IT network and A/V systems. The State Court Administrator's Office provides technical support for judicial districts for planning, design, and construction of new or remodeled court and probation facilities. The annual appropriation for the Courthouse Furnishings and Infrastructure Maintenance line item is a one-time project appropriation with two years of spending authority and varies annually based on the number and size of county construction projects.

The statutory basis for this structure is based on broad language, rather than detailed. There is no statutory direction addressing exactly what expenses are assigned to the State versus counties. **The Department indicates that its approach for furnishings and equipment is based on arrangements that are typical in commercial real estate. Specifically, counties are responsible for constructing courthouse, while the State is responsible for “furniture, fixtures, and equipment” that is not permanently attached to the buildings.** This includes desks, chairs, and furniture in judge's chambers and jury meeting rooms. It also includes “pews” (seating) in courtrooms, because these are bolted to the floor but could theoretically be moved. It does not include permanently installed lighting fixtures or plumbing, or built-in furniture including the bench and the jury box. The State also takes responsibility for IT audio-visual and network costs, and the personnel and contractors needed to ensure these materials are properly installed.

**JBC Staff believes this is generally reasonable, but also believes that there may be some room for expecting counties to cover additional costs and/or for trimming the costs paid by the State.** Examples staff is exploring for FY 2026-27 figure setting include:

- *Requiring counties to cover some additional costs.*
  - *Furniture and some IT costs when a county initiates a move.* In many cases the furniture and equipment in question may be old, but it might have worked for multiple additional years if the question of moving had not arisen. When should counties take responsibility for changes that they are driving?
  - *“Pews” for courtrooms.* Gallery seating for courtrooms is budgeted by the Department at \$385/square foot of \$33,550 for 8 pews with costume finish. Counties pay for built-in jury boxes and the bench. Could the State ask counties to also cover public seating in courtrooms that matches?
- *Trimming the allowances for furniture.* Staff notes that the “standard” costs used by the Judicial branch for furniture appear to be greater than the “standard” costs used for other parts of state government. In fiscal notes, the capital outlay allowed for an office suite is \$5,000. The Judicial branch's “standard” costs for a workstation for support staff is \$6,000, and a probation officer's suite of furniture is \$6,500. The Department does not appear to use statewide purchasing agreements as is expected for other parts of state government. Could costs be reduced if they did?

---

<sup>1</sup> . Section 13-3-104, C.R.S. [State shall fund state courts, except county courts in Denver and municipal courts] and Section 13-3-108, C.R.S. [Each county shall provide and maintain adequate courtrooms and other court facilities].

- *Architect travel costs:* Calculations consistently build in money for Judicial's architect to travel to the various sites. Staff sees no justification for this for sites that are close to Denver (and has removed these from the supplemental), but even for other sites, shouldn't such costs be covered in the Department's operating expenses budget?

In response to a JBC request, the Department has now provided a multi-year plan that includes information about projects that are being discussed at counties, although exact timing/ realization are uncertain. **The out year plan identifies \$41.0 million in potential out-year costs for this line item**, including \$13.4 million related to a potential Jefferson County remodel of courtrooms and \$13.4 million related to a potential new Adams County justice center. **Future costs for the State at these levels seem untenable.**

The current allocation of responsibilities between the state and counties is broad, rather than specific. There is a long history of legislation that has sought to formally shift state court-related costs between counties and the State but that did not make it across the finish line. But even without new legislation it may be able to make some adjustments to costs borne by the State. **Staff is raising the above options for Committee consideration so that staff has some feedback before making figure setting recommendations and Committee members have the opportunity to think about these potential adjustments prior to figure setting.**

#### **FY 2025-26 Funds available and Costs for S.B. 25-024 (Judicial Officers)**

The current funding available for furnishings includes solely \$402,200, appropriated in S.B. 25-024 (Judicial Officers), and \$543,000 appropriated in FY 2024-25, which is rolled forward into FY 2025-26. However, the Department did not request funding for this line item in the Long Bill for FY 2025-26 and no funding was included in the Long Bill on this basis.

**The bill and fiscal note for S.B. 25-024 (Judicial Officers) did not include the full cost of furnishings costs associated with the bill, but only part of them.** The bill included an appropriation of \$402,200 for FY 2025-26 and indicated that this would annualize to \$701,200, with almost all of this discontinued in FY 2027-28, i.e., **total one-time furnishings costs were reflected in the fiscal note for S.B. 25-024 at a total of \$1.1 million over two years.** Staff understands this was based on a limited number of courtroom renovations that would be required. **The Department's most recent submission reflects \$1,944,511 for the new judges plus \$801,800 in "ancillary new judge-related projects"** between FY 2025-26 and FY 2026-27, for total costs of \$2.75 million, with most costs in FY 2025-26. According to LCS fiscal notes staff, as the bill went through the General Assembly, there was discussion about whether capital outlay for furnishings should be funded within the bill or through the Long Bill as more information became available. It appears that the final version of S.B. 25-024 was somewhere in between.

**The revised cost estimates related to new judges appear to be within the range for past practice and experience. Excluding "ancillary projects", the total is similar to the costs in the last judge's bill and lower than the Department's "common policy" calculation.**

- The Department notes that its "common policy" on the capital outlay costs associated with new judicial officers dictates costs of \$201,100 per new judicial officer<sup>2</sup>, and, on this basis, the fiscal note could have

---

<sup>2</sup> Department "common policy" includes: \$67,700 for courtroom furniture, \$30,000 for chambers furniture, \$75,000 for courtroom AV, \$25,000 for jury room, and \$4,100 conference room, for a total of \$201,100 per judge.

reflected a total of \$3,016,500. Instead, more careful efforts to calculate impacts by county results in a lower total than “common policy”.

- JBC Staff notes that the last time a judge’s bill was adopted—S.B. 19-043—15 new judgeships were also added with a similar (slightly lower) total number of new staff for the courts. That bill included an appropriation of \$1.672 million in the courthouse furnishings line item. In current dollars (adjusted by the Denver-Aurora-Lakewood CPI) that figure would be \$2.099 million.

Thus, even if the Department’s \$3.0M “common policy” overstates costs, the \$1.1 million furnishings estimate in the fiscal note was clearly low. The updated request for \$1.9 million associated solely with the judges is more in line with 2019 costs, adjusted for inflation. **However, if “ancillary projects” are included, the total capital outlay cost associated with the judges bill now appears to be \$2.75 million, which is greater than even the Department anticipated.** Staff understands that these “ancillary projects” were not communicated to the Department when it discussed the fiscal impact of new judges with counties.

### Long Bill, JBC Policy, and Long-term Plan

Staff presumes the \$0 request for the Long Bill for FY 2025-26 reflected the best available information at the time. In response to the \$0 request for the Long Bill, JBC Staff recommended, and the Committee approved, a *JBC policy* for the Courthouse Furnishings and Infrastructure line item. That policy included provisions intended to ensure the JBC was warned about significant future increases for this line item. This policy included a provision that “General Fund will not be provided for this item for years with a forecasted General Fund deficit”. *Staff’s current recommendation is not consistent with this policy. However, based on further discussion with the prior analyst, staff understands that this guidance was intended to be “soft” and that the JBC did not discuss it extensively.*

The policy adopted last year does appear to have achieved the goal of ensuring the Department submits a multi-year spending plan for this line item. This was submitted November 1 and revised for the January 2 request.

### Department 3 year plan

	FY 2025-26 to-date*	FY 2025-26 supplemental [as requested]	FY 2026-27	FY 2028-29 (rough est)	FY 2029-30 (rough est)	Potential future projects
January 2, 2026 submission (revision)	\$945,200	\$1,380,764	\$1,720,400	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000	\$40,985,000

\*Funded by amount in S.B. 25-024 appropriation + roll-forward from prior year. Primarily used for new judge-related projects.

### Staff recommendation details

The staff recommendation is based on detail included to support the Department request, with the following adjustments:

- Staff has eliminated some architect travel costs that did not seem warranted. As submitted, the request included architect travel of \$1,500 to \$2,500 per project, even for metro areas like Adams and Arapahoe counties. Staff has retained travel amounts solely for more remote parts of the state.
- Staff has also reduced the amount by \$150,000, which is the amount for “Ancillary New Judge-related Projects”. Staff understand that the Department has sufficient vacancy savings to cover this amount of the

total (and transfer authority to make this feasible). However, staff hopes that not funding this amount will highlight the JBC's interest in containing costs in this line item, receiving adequate warning about costs from counties, and potentially not funding projects that are driven by internal county decisions.

#### FY 2025-26 COURTHOUSE FURNISHINGS AND INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

Location	Brief description of project	Architect Travel	Audio Visual	Furnishing	Technology	Network	Total General Fund
<b>NEW JUDGE-RELATED PROJECTS</b>							
4th JD Trial Courts	New hearing rooms with judges' chambers		\$240,000	\$150,000	\$8,000	\$2,200	<b>\$400,200</b>
5th JD Trial Courts	New judge relocation	\$1,500	\$91,100	\$100,000	\$6,000	\$2,500	<b>\$201,100</b>
7th JD Trial Courts	New judge chambers	\$1,500	\$0	\$30,000	\$1,000	\$0	<b>\$32,500</b>
8th JD Trial Courts	New judge chambers		\$0	\$30,000	\$1,000	\$0	<b>\$31,000</b>
13th JD Trial Courts	New judge chambers	\$1,500	\$0	\$30,000	\$1,000	\$0	<b>\$32,500</b>
17th JD Trial Courts	New judge hearing rooms and chambers		\$128,000	\$110,000	\$30,000	\$7,500	<b>\$275,500</b>
18th JD Trial Courts	New judge courtroom, chambers, conference		\$82,000	\$150,000	\$6,000	\$5,000	<b>\$243,000</b>
19th JD Trial Courts	New judge chambers		\$0	\$30,000	\$1,000	\$0	<b>\$31,000</b>
23rd JD Trial Courts	New judge furniture		\$0	\$30,000	\$1,000	\$0	<b>\$31,000</b>
<b>Subtotal, New Judge-related Projects</b>							<b>\$1,277,800</b>
<b>ANCILLARY NEW JUDGE-RELATED PROJECTS</b>							
7th JD Trial Courts	Clerks and auxiliary spaces	\$1,500	\$0	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$0	<b>\$9,500</b>
8th JD Trial Courts	Clerks and auxiliary spaces		\$0	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$0	<b>\$6,000</b>
13th JD Trial Courts	Clerks and auxiliary spaces	\$1,500	\$0	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$0	<b>\$9,500</b>
14th JD Trial Courts	Clerks and auxiliary space furniture		\$0	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	<b>\$20,000</b>
18th JD Trial Courts	Clerks and auxiliary spaces		\$0	\$55,000	\$29,000	\$5,000	<b>\$89,000</b>
19th JD Trial Courts	Clerks and auxiliary spaces		\$0	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$0	<b>\$8,000</b>
23rd JD Trial Courts	Clerks and auxiliary spaces		\$0	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$0	<b>\$8,000</b>
<b>Subtotal, Ancillary New Judge-related Projects</b>							<b>\$150,000</b>
<b>OTHER PROJECTS</b>							
8th JD Trial Courts	Remodel courthouse to improve security	\$0	\$0	\$55,000	\$0	\$0	<b>\$55,000</b>
<b>Subtotal, Other Projects</b>							<b>\$55,000</b>
<b>Total Projects</b>							<b>\$1,482,800</b>
<b>Reduce for "Ancillary New Judge-related Projects"</b>							<b>-\$150,000</b>
<b>Remaining Funding, FY 2025-26, after Other Paid Projects</b>							<b>-\$117,036</b>
<b>Total Cost</b>							<b>\$1,215,764</b>

## → C&P S2 Offender Treatment and Services

Item	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reapprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
Request	\$400,000	\$0	\$400,000	\$0	\$0	0.0
Recommendation	-76,201	-276,201	200,000	0	0	0.0
Staff Recommendation Higher/-Lower than Request	-\$476,201	\$276,201	-\$200,000	\$0	\$0	0.0

### Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? **NO**

An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforeseen contingency.

**Explanation:** The Department's request appears to be based on "data that was not available when the original appropriation was made", but staff does not see evidence of such new data.

## Request

The Department reports that it is experiencing increased Offender Treatment and Services expenditures primarily due to increased service utilization and vendor contract rates associated with drug testing services and supplies and monitoring services. To maintain services and address the projected ongoing increase in Offender Treatment and Services Long Bill line item expenditures, the Department requests:

- An increase of \$200,000 cash funds spending authority in FY 2025-26 and ongoing to align cost recoveries spending authority with actual cost recoveries. "Cost recoveries" refers to amounts that are recovered from offenders after the Department has paid for services for them.<sup>3</sup>
- An increase of \$200,000 cash fund spending authority from the Offender Services Fund in FY 2025-26.

The request also includes a budget amendment for FY 2026-27 and ongoing that would increase funding in the Offender Treatment and Services line item by \$800,000 cash funds, including \$200,000 from cost recoveries and \$600,000 cash fund spending authority from the Offender Services Fund.

## Recommendation

**Staff does not recommend increasing this line item on a supplemental basis.**

- *Expenditures:* While the Department is projecting an increase in expenditures, that is largely because local probation departments will spend any amount they are allocated, rather than due to an unexpected increase in program demand. Expenditures have fluctuated significantly in recent years, driven largely by revenue *expectations*. A mid-year adjustment seems likely to further confuse expectations.

<sup>3</sup> The Department notes that its ability to pay for services upfront for offenders is an important component of case management. "Over time, however, a probationer's financial situation may improve, making it appropriate to recover some or all of the funds expended on the probationer's behalf."

- *Revenue:* Revenue from the Offender Services Fund is currently expected to be at or below the FY 2024-25 revenue level. Fund receipts from July through November 2025 (\$5.9 million) are almost identical to receipts for the same period in 2024. However, since TABOR refunds for FY 2024-25 that are paid out in spring 2026 are likely to be lower than the refunds paid in spring 2025, amounts for this fund that are collected from intercepting tax refunds may be lower than last year. The Department is currently expecting receipts similar to FY 2023-24, rather than the higher FY 2024-25 level.

**Instead, for FY 2025-26, Staff recommends that the Committee increase the cost recovery spending authority by \$200,000 as requested but eliminate the General Fund appropriation of \$276,201 in this line item.**

According to the Department, if there is no additional spending authority for “cost recoveries” the money collected will instead revert to the General Fund. The recommendation is to eliminate the General Fund currently included in this line item. This will provide more—and more explicit—General Fund savings than leaving the line item unchanged, though the impact is modest.

Staff believes there may be justification for increasing funding in this line item in FY 2026-27, but any such decision should be made at figure setting.

## Analysis

### Supplemental Criteria + Revenue and Expenditure Expectations

Staff’s primary reason for rejecting the proposed increase is that it does not meet supplemental criteria.

Further, based on recent history, establishing a consistent expectation regarding available spending authority seems important. Staff does not wish to confuse expectations on available spending authority by increasing funding mid-year. In recent years, both revenue and expenditures from the Offender Services Fund have swung substantially.

- *Revenue* has swung primarily due to changes in the Department’s ability to intercept TABOR refunds. This became an option during the pandemic based on 2022 legislation on TABOR refunds. This lapsed in subsequent years and was not feasible in FY 2023-24, but S.B. 24-067 authorized the Department to intercept TABOR refunds going forward. This led to a spike in revenue in FY 2024-25.
- According to Department staff, *expenditures* appear to have swung largely based on local judicial districts’ *perceptions (and misperceptions)* of available revenue. As shown, expenditures increased sharply in FY 2023-24, leading to an over-expenditure, which was covered through transfers from other department line items. Expenditures were then brought back down in FY 2024-25, at the same time revenue was actually increasing.

#### Offender Services Expenditures and Spending Authority

	FY 2021-22 (actuals)	FY 2022-23 (actuals)	FY 2023-24 (actuals)	FY 2024-25 (actuals)	FY 2025-26 (Estimate)
Offender Treatment and Services Spending Authority					
General Fund	276,201	276,201	276,201	276,201	276,201
Offender Services Fund	14,683,293	15,096,588	15,509,883	17,009,883	15,509,883

	FY 2021-22 (actuals)	FY 2022-23 (actuals)	FY 2023-24 (actuals)	FY 2024-25 (actuals)	FY 2025-26 (Estimate)
Correctional Treatment Cash Fund	3,258,278	4,776,052	4,927,067	4,343,205	4,561,926
Sex Offender Surcharge	302,029	302,029	302,029	503,044	603,044
Persistent Drunk Driving RF from DHS	1,045,693	1,045,693	1,045,693	1,107,000	1,107,000
Cost Recoveries	350,000	350,000	350,000	410,000	610,000
<b>Total Offender Treatment and Services line item Spending Authority</b>	<b>19,915,494</b>	<b>21,846,563</b>	<b>22,410,873</b>	<b>23,649,333</b>	<b>22,668,054</b>
<b>Total Offender Treatment and Services line item expenditures</b>	<b>16,308,547</b>	<b>19,853,583</b>	<b>25,522,597</b>	<b>17,855,502</b>	<b>22,868,000*</b>
(Over)/Under Expenditures	3,606,947	1,992,980	(3,111,724)	5,793,831	(199,946)
Use of footnote transfer authority	-	-	3,111,724	-	-
<b>Final (over)/under expenditures</b>	<b>3,606,947</b>	<b>1,992,980</b>		<b>5,793,831</b>	<b>(199,946)</b>

\*Based on FY24, it is evident that when granted the authority, districts are successfully able to meet the spending authority with their services. Due to the overspend in FY24, districts overcompensated in reducing their expenditures in FY25 which resulted in fewer services for the population. We are expecting around a 28% increase in spending from FY25 due to better communication on spending authority with the districts.

- As described above, monthly revenue data indicates that Offender Services Fund is currently expected to be at or below the FY 2024-25 revenue level. Fund receipts from July through November 2025 are almost identical to receipts for the same period in 2024. FY 2025-26 receipts may be lower due to lower TABOR refunds and thus less opportunity to intercept refunds.

## Local Flexibility and Lack of Data on Offender Population Needs or Outcomes

In response to staff questions, the Department reports that local judicial districts have broad authority in how they allocate the offender services funds they receive. As indicated in a recent response to staff questions.

“The Department does not have statewide policy outlining when the cost of a probationer’s services should be paid by probation. Local Probation Departments generally create their own guidance/policy. However, there is a statute that mandates costs for monitoring be paid from OTSF. Specifically, Probation departments are statutorily mandated to pay for continuous alcohol monitoring for individuals represented by court-appointed counsel, pursuant to §42-4-130713(b).”

Furthermore, the Department’s data systems are so limited that it has no meaningful capacity to track the impact of local expenditures on offender services. It recently commissioned an external analysis on this issue, which looked closely at six judicial districts. As highlighted in the resulting report (Colorado Offender Treatment Services Fund Evaluation, Omni, October 2025):

“Significant data system limitations preclude the ability to effectively answer questions about the OTSF’s impact on probationer outcomes and recidivism, including limitations relating to: what data are collected, the level at which data can be queried, how data are managed and stored, and the capacity to extract and link data across systems.”

According to this report:

- Only recommended services, but not services actually received by clients, are documented.
- Data cannot be queried at the individual level to indicate whether clients are using offender services vouchers and/or out-of-pocket payments to cover their costs. Thus, there is no way to tie this information to outcomes.
- Probation staff are currently using nine or ten different systems to track different pieces of client data. The result is poor quality data, duplicate data entry, and limited ability to use the data that exists.

## Use and Impact of Offender Services Money

As reflected in the Omni report, due to the lack of useful data systems, there is no data that clearly demonstrates the impact of Offender Treatment Services Funds. There is, however, some indication that probation services make a positive impact and that Offender Treatment Services Funds contribute.

The Department has provided various reports that highlight the benefits of probation services based on both national and local research. As described in the staff budget briefing, the annual recidivism report notes that of the 36,387 individuals who terminated from probation in FY 2022-23, most completed probation successfully and remained crime free post-termination. It is reasonable to assume that successful terminations are related to the treatment services offenders receive while on probation, including those paid by the State, though this is still an assumption.

While the Omni study notes the severe limitations in probation data systems, the data it collected from interviews and surveys is informative.

### *Probationer Access to Offender Treatment Funds:*

- Probation staff estimate that 75-90% of probationers receive some type of assistance from the Offender Treatment and Services Fund, which combines revenue from multiple sources, but primarily the Offender Services Fund.
- Districts receive \$438-\$1,122 per probationer, with rural districts receiving more.
- Offenders must pay costs that are not covered by the state treatment services funds. Across the judicial district clients surveyed (43), 52% of probationers reported paying for services out of pocket, with 58% reporting that they paid up to \$100 in the last 30 days, while 42% paid \$101 or more.
- Probation staff perceive that Medicaid coverage has increased client access to services and reduced demand on offender treatment services funds.
- Access to services in rural areas is a particular challenge.
- The most common use of the funds is substance use services, including required urinalysis. This is also evident from aggregated multi-year statewide data, shown below. The statewide data also shows large expenditures for sex offender treatment.

**Expenditure Actuals**  
**FY 2021-22 through FY 2024-25**

Expenditure Type	FY 2021-22 (actuals)	FY 2022-23 (actuals)	FY 2023-24 (actuals)	FY 2024-25 (actuals)	Monetary Change FY22 - FY25	Percent Change FY22 - FY25
Persistent Drunk Driving	1,069,728	1,078,759	1,119,494	847,848	(221,880)	-21%
Adult Sex Offender Assessment, Polygraph, and Treatment	2,955,770	3,378,969	3,550,291	2,582,728	(373,042)	-13%
Domestic Violence Treatment	1,875,368	2,278,735	2,752,922	1,748,490	(126,878)	-7%
Drug Testing Services and Supplies	3,616,837	4,590,606	7,973,148	5,168,672	1,551,835	43%
Juvenile Sex Offender Assessment, Polygraph, and Treatment	575,443	624,426	587,053	557,874	(17,569)	-3%
Mental Health Treatment - Outpatient	837,411	938,822	1,109,092	834,437	(2,974)	0%
Monitoring Services	389,566	484,803	653,623	653,221	263,655	68%
Special Needs Services	934,172	997,625	1,232,262	985,306	51,134	5%
Sober Living	691,317	1,012,689	1,430,473	910,217	218,900	32%
Substance Abuse Treatment - Outpatient	1,519,481	1,844,129	2,122,247	1,186,950	(332,531)	-22%
Veterans Treatment Court	270,325	571,921	575,522	747,511	477,185	177%
All Other Treatment Services	1,573,127	2,052,100	2,416,469	1,632,248	59,121	4%
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>16,308,547</b>	<b>19,853,583</b>	<b>25,522,597</b>	<b>17,855,502</b>	<b>1,546,956</b>	<b>9%</b>

*Satisfaction:*

- Probationers indicated high levels of satisfaction with their probation experience, including their probation officer, ability to get connected to treatment and services, and convenience of the meeting locations.
- Probationers were particularly satisfied with services covered by the Offender Treatment and Services Fund, with 95% satisfied or very satisfied with all funded treatment and 89% satisfied or very satisfied with their treatment provider.
- 77% of probationers agreed or strongly agreed that treatment and services had helped them make progress toward court-ordered probation goals.

## FY 2026-27 Budget

While staff does not recommend an FY 2025-26 supplemental increase, given the (limited) data available, staff believes that increases in Offender Treatment Services funding may be justified for FY 2026-27. However, for FY 2026-27, staff anticipates that the Committee will need to balance competing demands on this fund for: (1) funding probation officers; (2) offender services funds; and (3) General Fund relief.

## → C&P S3 Technical Adjustments

Item	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reapprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
Request	\$607,205	\$0	\$0	\$607,205	0	0.0
Recommendation	\$607,205	0	0	\$607,205	0	0.0
Staff Recommendation Higher/-Lower than Request	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0

### Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? **YES**

An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforeseen contingency.

**Explanation:** JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of technical errors in the original appropriation.

## Request

The Department requests the following technical corrections for FY 2025-26:

- Removal of the Office of Public Guardianship Cash Fund from the Central Appropriations Long Bill letternote a; and
- An increase of \$607,205 reappropriated funds in the Correctional Treatment Cash Fund Expenditures line item 2025-2026 to align appropriations with Correctional Treatment Board-approved projected expenditures.

## Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the Department's request for these technical corrections

## Analysis

*Letternote (no \$0 change):* As noted in the request, letternote a in the Central Appropriations subdivision includes the Office of Public Guardianship Cash Fund as a fund source for the Department's centrally appropriated (pots) line items. The Office of Public Guardianship is no longer supported by the State Court Administrator's Office; therefore, the cash fund is not an available source of funds for the Department. The Department therefore requests that this source be removed from the list of fund sources.

*Correctional Treatment Board funding:* As also noted in the request, pursuant to Section 18-19-103, C.R.S., the Correctional Treatment Board oversees use of the Correctional Treatment Cash Fund and consists of representative members from multiple agencies. The Board exists to ensure a fair and reasonable allocation of funding for use by the member agencies for funding for various substance abuse treatment services. Funding is initially appropriated in a central line in the Judicial Department and then reappropriated in the agencies that receive the funds. The request is to correct a mismatch between funding allocated to the Judicial Department and the Board's decisions.

# JBC Initiated Supplemental Requests

## → JBC initiated Security Planning FTE

Item	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reapprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
Request	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0
JBC Option/Staff Recommendation	40,103	0	40,103	0	0	0.3
JBC Option Higher/-Lower than Request	\$40,103	\$0	\$40,103	\$0	\$0	0.3

**Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? n/a**

An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforeseen contingency.

**Explanation:** The JBC expressed interest in this option during the Department's hearing. Information provided was data of which the Committee was unaware when the original appropriation was made.

## Request

The Department submitted a request for a new 1.0 FTE position for FY 2026-27 to help develop a statewide security plan for judicial districts, but it did not request a supplemental budget change.

## JBC Option/Staff Recommendation

During the Department's budget hearing, JBC members expressed interest in adding the requested new security planning position sooner than the beginning of FY 2026-27, so long as the position was supported with cash funds. The JBC option/staff recommendation therefore includes an increase of \$40,103 cash funds and 0.3 FTE for FY 2025-26.

Staff concurs that security concerns expressed by the Department and Chief Justice are compelling. The Department's original request was for ongoing General Fund. The Committee is interested in cash-funding the position, which translates to using temporary cash fund reserves. Given this, the staff recommendation would be to fund the position for three+ years (through FY 2028-29) using cash funds and then reevaluate whether it should be continued. The funding could be accompanied by an RFI, with reporting beginning November 1, 2026.

The \$40,103 shown is based on four months of funding for FY 2025-26, including personal services, operating, and capital outlay. It would annualize for FY 2026-27 to \$96,749. The staff recommendation would not include a budget adjustment for centrally appropriated amounts for either FY 2025-26 or FY 2026-27, but the estimated centrally appropriated amounts are shown for FY 2026-27 in the table below for informational purposes.

Based on the JBC interest in cash funds, staff recommends use of the Judicial Stabilization Cash Fund. Staff has reflected that funding source, but the JBC should be aware that this represents spending from cash fund

reserves, and these reserves could also be used to offset General Fund otherwise required. Thus, in this case funding from cash funds is essentially the equivalent of funding from the General Fund.

Please note, in addition, that "Security Analyst I" does not appear as a standard position for LCS fiscal notes purposes. However, since the salary level appeared reasonable for the position described, staff has reflected the fiscal impact of the position as included in the Department's FY 2026-27 request. The monthly salary included is between the level for an Analyst IV (\$5,962) and an Analyst V (\$7,610) under LCS fiscal note/state personnel categories.

PERSONAL SERVICES	FY 2025-26	FY 2026-27
Number of FTE per Class Title – Security Analyst I	1.00	1.00
Monthly Base Salary	\$ 7,036	\$ 7,036
Number of Months	4	12
Salary	28,142	84,426
PERA (Staff, GF)	3,273	9,819
Medicare (Staff, GF)	408	1,224
SUBTOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES	\$ 31,823	\$ 95,469
# of Positions	1.0	1.0
 OPERATING		
Telephone	450	450
Supplies	500	500
Software (Microsoft 365 & Win 10)	330	330
SUBTOTAL OPERATING	\$ 1,280	\$ 1,280
 CAPITAL OUTLAY		
Office Furniture	5,000	
Computer / Laptop	2,000	
Printer	-	
SUBTOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY	\$ 7,000	\$ -
PERSONAL SERVICES / OPERATING TOTAL	\$ 33,103	\$ 96,749
TOTAL (not including Central Approp.)	\$ 40,103	\$ 96,749
 <i>Central Appropriations Subtotal [will not be appropriated in FY 2025-26 or FY 2026-27—informational only]</i>		
Health/Life/Dental	-	16,152
Short-Term Disability	-	59
Family Medical Leave	-	380
ULAED	-	8,443
Central Appropriations Subtotal	\$ -	\$ 25,034
GRAND TOTAL - ALL COSTS – Judicial Stabilization Cash Fund	\$ 40,103	\$ 121,783

## Analysis

### FY 2026-27 R7 Request

The Department's R7 request for FY 2026-27 is to add 1.0 FTE, funded from the General Fund, for a security analyst to work with a taskforce and compile recommendations to address physical security for court and probation facilities and judicial officers and staff statewide.

For FY 2026-27, the request includes an increase of \$118,741 General Fund and 1.0 FTE. The ongoing cost was calculated at \$121,783 General Fund ongoing, including centrally appropriated amounts.

The analyst would work with a taskforce comprised of a member of the Supreme Court, judicial district representatives including chief judges, court executives, and chief probation officers, county government representatives including county commissioners and sheriffs, members of the judicial security office, and other stakeholders as needed. The goal is to identify security risks, opportunities for improved security, potential statutory changes to promote security, and state and local resources to implement the recommendations. The Department anticipates that the task force recommendations will be based on risk assessments and best practices and will include cost analyses and required changes to statute.

While not discussed in the request, staff understands that after the task force work is complete, the new position would continue to work with judicial districts on an ongoing basis on security planning and management.

### Department Hearing

During the Department's hearing, the Chief Justice provided compelling testimony explaining the need for the new position. She noted that she and members of the Supreme Court had visited each judicial district in the State to obtain feedback on the areas of greatest concern. "Every district expressed concern about security for judges, court staff, probation staff, litigants, attorneys and the public."

The Chief Justice noted that after a judge in Maryland was murdered by a litigant in a family law matter, Maryland initiated a task force to address security. She would like to address these issues proactively in Colorado, "leaning on broad representation on the task force to ensure state and local stakeholders have a voice in the process and agreement concerning recommendations to address the security concerns faced by Colorado's court system."

She anticipates that the task force recommendations will be significant, ambitious and require several years to fully implement. This will likely include statutory changes and efforts toward continuous quality improvement.

The Chief Justice indicated that she has personally been working on assembling the task force, including late into the night, but her time is very constrained.

## → Staff-recommended letter requesting hiring freeze/chill

Staff recommends that the Committee consider writing a letter to the Judicial Department requesting a hiring freeze or “chill” for the remainder of FY 2025-26.

### Background

For agencies that are under the Governor’s authority, the Governor instituted a hiring freeze, with various exceptions, effective August 27, 2025. The original 3-month freeze was expected to save \$3.0 million. The hiring freeze has now been extended an additional three months through February 2026. The Governor’s Office does not have statutory authority to adjust funding for the Judicial Department through executive orders, and it has not attempted to do so.

The Judicial Department indicates that it has not instituted a hiring freeze in FY 2025-26. **It estimates a savings of approximately \$0.8 million per month (including salaries and benefits) if it were to do so;** “however, instituting a hiring freeze for more than two months has a significantly negative impact on essential Courts and Probation services.”

The Department notes that other actions already taken by the Department and the General Assembly reduced its personal services funding for FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26.

**FY 2024-25 Hiring Freeze:** In response to a letter from the JBC in spring 2025 that requested agencies take steps to reduce expenditures and increase FY 2024-25 reversions, the Judicial Department proactively instituted an *FY 2024-25* hiring freeze.

“The Chief Justice instituted a hiring freeze from February through mid-April 2025. This freeze allowed us to revert \$1.9 million General Fund.”

JBC Staff notes that other departments did not institute a hiring freeze in FY 2024-25; the Judicial Department was simply very proactive in responding to the JBC’s request.

**FY 2025-26 Health, Life, Dental (HLD) Reduction:** In response to JBC Staff questions, the Department notes that it has been disproportionately impacted by the FY 2025-26 HLD reduction, which reduced funding for departments based on personal services costs but exempted direct-care staff.

“As a result of the HLD base reduction approved by the JBC, the Courts and Probation budget was reduced by \$3.0 million in FY26 at figure setting. The methodology used to calculate this reduction was created by OSPB without consulting us and resulted in the Judicial Department (including the independent agencies) shouldering 39.8 percent of the statewide General Fund cut. While the Courts and Probation Departments provide Constitutionally and statutorily required essential services, it is shouldering 22.6 percent of the statewide General Fund cut.... The department is managing to the reduced budget as necessary while attempting to balance both access to justice and critical services to the public.”

**Staff concurs with the Department’s assessment, but also notes that a hiring freeze or even “chill” can be very effective in driving General Fund savings in this Department.** If the JBC is interested in driving some additional

General Fund savings in this Department for the remainder of FY 2025-26, it could consider a letter to the Branch requesting that it take action to drive state savings through vacancies to the extent feasible.

## Appendix A: Numbers Pages

Appendix A details the supplemental changes recommended by staff, including the actual expenditures for the previous state fiscal year, the appropriation for the current fiscal year, and the requested and recommended appropriation changes for the current fiscal year. Appendix A organizes this information by line item and fund source.

***JBC Staff Supplemental Recommendations - FY 2025-26***  
***Staff Working Document - Does Not Represent Committee Decision***

**Appendix A: Numbers Pages**

	FY 2024-25 Actual	FY 2025-26 Appropriation	FY 2025-26 Requested Change	FY 2025-26 Rec'd Change	FY 2025-26 Total w/Rec'd Change
<b>Judicial Department</b>					
<b>Monica Marquez, Chief Justice</b>					
<b>C&amp;P JBC-initiated Security Planning FTE</b>					
<b>(2) State Courts Administration</b>					
<b>(C) Centrally Administered Programs</b>					
Judicial Security Office	<u>292,904</u>	<u>408,839</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>40,103</u>	<u>448,942</u>
FTE	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.3	3.3
General Fund	292,904	408,839	0	0	408,839
Cash Funds	0	0	0	40,103	40,103
<b>Total for C&amp;P JBC-initiated Security Planning FTE</b>	<b>292,904</b>	<b>408,839</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40,103</b>	<b>448,942</b>
FTE	<u>3 .0</u>	<u>3 .0</u>	<u>0 .0</u>	<u>0 .3</u>	<u>3 .3</u>
General Fund	292,904	408,839	0	0	408,839
Cash Funds	0	0	0	40,103	40,103

***JBC Staff Supplemental Recommendations - FY 2025-26***  
***Staff Working Document - Does Not Represent Committee Decision***

---

	FY 2024-25 Actual	FY 2025-26 Appropriation	FY 2025-26 Requested Change	FY 2025-26 Rec'd Change	FY 2025-26 Total w/Rec'd Change
--	----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------

**C&P S1 Courthouse Furnishings and Infrastructure Maintenance**

**(2) State Courts Administration**

**(C) Centrally Administered Programs**

Courthouse Furnishings and Infrastructure

Maintenance	<u>2,862,470</u>	<u>402,200</u>	<u>1,400,000</u>	<u>1,215,700</u>	<u>1,617,900</u>
General Fund	2,862,470	402,200	1,400,000	1,215,700	1,617,900
Cash Funds	0	0	0	0	0

**Total for C&P S1 Courthouse Furnishings and Infrastructure Maintenance**

<i>FTE</i>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
General Fund	2,862,470	402,200	1,400,000	1,215,700	1,617,900
Cash Funds	0	0	0	0	0

***JBC Staff Supplemental Recommendations - FY 2025-26***  
***Staff Working Document - Does Not Represent Committee Decision***

---

	FY 2024-25 Actual	FY 2025-26 Appropriation	FY 2025-26 Requested Change	FY 2025-26 Rec'd Change	FY 2025-26 Total w/Rec'd Change
<b>C&amp;P S2 Offender Treatment and Services</b>					
<b>(4) Probation and Related Services</b>					
Offender Treatment and Services	<u>17,855,502</u>	<u>22,468,054</u>	<u>400,000</u>	<u>-76,201</u>	<u>22,391,853</u>
FTE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
General Fund	276,201	276,201	0	(276,201)	0
Cash Funds	13,119,174	17,253,853	400,000	200,000	17,453,853
Reappropriated Funds	4,460,127	4,938,000	0	0	4,938,000
<b>Total for C&amp;P S2 Offender Treatment and Services</b>	<b>17,855,502</b>	<b>22,468,054</b>	<b>400,000</b>	<b>(76,201)</b>	<b>22,391,853</b>
FTE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
General Fund	276,201	276,201	0	(276,201)	0
Cash Funds	13,119,174	17,253,853	400,000	200,000	17,453,853
Reappropriated Funds	4,460,127	4,938,000	0	0	4,938,000

**JBC Staff Supplemental Recommendations - FY 2025-26**  
**Staff Working Document - Does Not Represent Committee Decision**

---

	FY 2024-25 Actual	FY 2025-26 Appropriation	FY 2025-26 Requested Change	FY 2025-26 Rec'd Change	FY 2025-26 Total w/Rec'd Change
--	----------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------

**C&P S3 Technical Adjustments**

**(4) Probation and Related Services**

Correctional Treatment Cash Fund Expenditures	<u>22,891,954</u>	<u>26,389,629</u>	<u>607,205</u>	<u>607,205</u>	<u>26,996,834</u>
FTE	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Cash Funds	211,181	0	0	0	0
Reappropriated Funds	22,680,773	26,389,629	607,205	607,205	26,996,834
<b>Total for C&amp;P S3 Technical Adjustments</b>	<b>22,891,954</b>	<b>26,389,629</b>	<b>607,205</b>	<b>607,205</b>	<b>26,996,834</b>
FTE	<u>1.0</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1.0</u>
Cash Funds	211,181	0	0	0	0
Reappropriated Funds	22,680,773	26,389,629	607,205	607,205	26,996,834

**Totals Excluding Pending Items**

**JUDICIAL**

<b>TOTALS for ALL Departmental line items</b>	<b>1,050,825,348</b>	<b>1,151,752,648</b>	<b>2,407,205</b>	<b>1,786,807</b>	<b>1,153,539,455</b>
FTE	<u>5,576.6</u>	<u>5,724.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.3</u>	<u>5,725.1</u>
General Fund	636,598,577	878,946,616	1,400,000	939,499	879,886,115
Cash Funds	345,312,070	203,914,808	400,000	240,103	204,154,911
Reappropriated Funds	57,925,576	64,466,224	607,205	607,205	65,073,429
Federal Funds	10,989,125	4,425,000	0	0	4,425,000