



Joint Budget Committee

Supplemental Budget Requests FY 2025-26

**Judicial Department
Independent Agencies**

Prepared by:

Scott Philip Thompson, JBC Staff

January 22, 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

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Overview of Judicial Independent Agencies..... | 1 |
| Judicial Independent Agencies..... | 1 |
| Summary of Staff Recommendations..... | 2 |
| FY 2024-25 Summary | 2 |
| FY 2025-26 Summary | 2 |
| Department Supplemental Requests | 5 |
| → OSPD S2 Judicial Officers correction (SB 25-024)..... | 5 |
| → OSPD S1 CBI DNA misconduct representation | 6 |
| → OADC S2 CBI DNA misconduct representation | 8 |
| → OADC S1 Caseload increase..... | 9 |
| → ORPC S1 Align appropriation with estimates | 10 |
| → OCPO S1 One-time reduction | 14 |
| → Bridges S1 One-time reduction | 15 |
| → Department of Law S2 Leased space..... | 16 |
| Staff Initiated Supplemental Requests | 18 |
| → OADC Staff initiated Technical Correction | 18 |
| Previously Approved Interim Supplemental Requests..... | 20 |
| → FY 2024-25 OADC Billing Site Development | 20 |
| Appendix A: Numbers Pages | A-1 |

Overview of Judicial Independent Agencies

The Judicial Department budget consists of the State Courts and 11 independent agencies. The focus of this document are the independent agencies identified below.

Judicial Independent Agencies

Each independent agency is governed by a constitutional or statutory governing board and submits its own independently determined and autonomous agency budget request. These requests are neither reviewed nor approved by the Chief Justice (nor by the Governor's Office of State Planning and Budgeting).

The independent agencies are currently comprised by the following:

- Office of State Public Defender (OSPD), established 1970
- Office of Alternate Defense Counsel (OADC), established 1996
- Office of the Child's Representative (OCR), established 2000
- Independent Ethics Commission (IEC), established 2006
- Office of the Respondent Parents' Counsel (ORPC), established 2014
- Office of the Child Protection Ombudsman (OCPO), established 2015 (originally est. 2010)
- Office of Public Guardianship (OPG), established 2017
- Commission on Judicial Discipline (CJD), established 2022
- Bridges of Colorado (BRI), established 2023
- Office of Administrative Services for Independent Agencies (OASIA), established 2023
- Office of Judicial Discipline Ombudsman (OJO), established 2023

Summary of Staff Recommendations

Alternate Defense Counsel: Recommended Changes for FY 2024-25 [1]

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|--------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|------|
| FY 2024-25 Appropriation | | | | | | |
| FY 2024-25 Appropriation | \$65,095,899 | \$65,015,899 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 40.7 |
| Current FY 2024-25 Appropriation | \$65,095,899 | \$65,015,899 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 40.7 |
| Recommended Changes | | | | | | |
| Current FY 2024-25 Appropriation | \$65,095,899 | 65,015,899 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 40.7 |
| OADC June 1331 Billing site development | 895,000 | 895,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Recommended FY 2024-25 Appropriation | \$65,990,899 | \$65,910,899 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 40.7 |
| Recommended Increase/-Decrease | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Percentage Change | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FY 2024-25 Executive Request | \$65,990,899 | \$65,910,899 | \$80,000 | \$0 | \$0 | 40.7 |
| Staff Rec. Above/-Below Request | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |

[1] Summarizes only the Office of Alternate Defense Counsel request and recommendation.

FY 2024-25 Summary

OADC June 1331 Billing site development: The recommendation includes an update to the FY 2024-25 to reflect a prior approved 1331 that was omitted during the 2026 legislative session supplemental bill. The recommendation is to reflect an increase of \$895,000 General Fund approved once in September 2024 but erroneously omitted. It was approved again in June 2025 as a 1331 to be included in this year's supplemental bill.

FY 2025-26 Summary

Judicial Department Independent Agencies: Recommended Changes for FY 2025-26 [1]

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| FY 2025-26 Appropriation | | | | | | |
| SB 25-206 (Long Bill) | \$369,683,769 | \$358,831,922 | \$2,849,659 | \$8,002,188 | \$0 | 1,479.5 |
| Other legislation | 621,337 | 621,337 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 6.7 |
| Current FY 2025-26 Appropriation | \$370,305,106 | \$359,453,259 | \$2,849,659 | \$8,002,188 | \$0 | 1,486.2 |
| Recommended Changes | | | | | | |
| Current FY 2025-26 Appropriation | \$370,305,106 | 359,453,259 | \$2,849,659 | \$8,002,188 | \$0 | 1,486.2 |
| OSPD S1 CBI DNA misconduct representation | 243,328 | 243,328 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|---------|
| OSPD S2 Judicial Officers correction | 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 SI1 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 |
| Impacts driven by other agencies [2] | 465,994 | 465,994 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Recommended FY 2025-26 Appropriation | \$381,567,855 | \$370,666,008 | \$2,849,659 | \$8,052,188 | \$0 | 1,486.2 |
| Recommended Increase/-Decrease from 2025-26 | \$11,262,749 | \$11,212,749 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Percentage Change | 3.0% | 3.1% | 0.0% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| FY 2025-26 Executive Request | \$376,240,262 | \$365,338,415 | \$2,849,659 | \$8,052,188 | \$0 | 1,486.2 |
| Staff Rec. Above/-Below Request | \$5,327,593 | \$5,327,593 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |

[1] Only includes information about the Judicial Branch independent agencies. A summary table for all parts of the Judicial Branch can be found in the supplemental recommendations for Courts and Probation anticipated to be available January 23, 2026.

[2] These requests will be discussed in presentations for requesting agency.

Changes are assumed to be one-time unless otherwise noted.

OSPD S1 CBI DNA misconduct representation: The Office of the State Public Defender's (OSPD) request includes an increase of \$243,328 General Fund for representation of individuals impacted by discovered CBI Lab misconduct. The recommendation is to approve the request.

OSPD S2 Judicial Officers correction: The request includes a net-neutral transfer of \$7,240 General Fund from the Attorney Registration Fees line item to the Training line item to correct appropriations that were identified for each but reversed. The recommendation is to approve the request.

OADC S1 caseload increase: The Office of Alternate Defense Counsel's (OADC) request includes an increase of \$6.4 million General Fund for contractor costs related to representing criminal defendants based on projections and caseload experience to date. The recommendation is to approve the request.

OADC S2 CBI DNA misconduct: The request includes an increase of \$140,000 General Fund to reflect the impact of the CBI DNA misconduct on the OADC. The recommendation is to approve the request.

OADC Staff-initiated technical correction: The request includes an increase of \$5.3 million General Fund to correct the OADC base appropriations for conflict-of-interest contracts. JBC erroneously annualized this adjustment out when it should have been built into the ongoing base appropriation. The recommendation is to correct this error and reflect an increase of \$5.3 million General Fund.

ORPC S1 Align appropriations with estimates: The Officer of Respondent Parents' Counsel's (ORPC) request includes a one-time reduction of \$738,130 total funds, including \$788,130 General Fund. The request also increases by \$50,000 reappropriated funds the appropriation from the Title IV-E Cash Fund. The recommendation is to approve the request.

OCPO S1 One-time reduction: The Office of Child Protection Ombudsman’s (OCPO) request includes a one-time reduction of \$65,000 General Fund to reflect vacancy savings achieved through a hiring freeze. The recommendation is to approve the request.

Bridges S1 One-time reduction: The Colorado Office of Bridges’ (Bridges) request includes a one-time reduction of \$560,877 General Fund to reflect vacancy savings achieved through a hiring freeze. The recommendation is to approve the request.

Impacts driven by other agencies: The request includes a net increase of \$0.5 million for requests from other state agencies. 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.

Impacts driven by other agencies

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Health, Life, and Dental supplemental | \$675,973 | \$675,973 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| OIT Real time billing | -118,704 | -118,704 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| OASIA S2 Health, life, dental | -33,924 | -33,924 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| DPA Annual fleet supplemental | -31,458 | -31,458 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| OASIA S1 Reduced OIT costs | -25,893 | -25,893 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total | \$465,994 | \$465,994 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |

Department Supplemental Requests

→ OSPD S2 Judicial Officers correction (SB 25-024)

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 error in calculating the original appropriation.

Request

The Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD) requests a net-neutral transfer of \$7,240 General Fund from the Attorney Registration Fees line item to the Training line item to appropriations calculated in the fiscal note for SB 25-024 (Judicial Officers) which reversed the amounts that should have been appropriated to each line item. The \$7,240 represents the difference between the correct appropriations and the ones assumed in the fiscal note.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve this technical correction.

Analysis

OSPD operating costs for new FTE include Training of \$1,000 per new hire and Attorney Registration Fees of \$190 per new attorney FTE. The OSPD was appropriated 6.7 FTE per SB25-024 for FY2025-26 that includes 3.7 attorneys. The Training line was appropriate for \$760 instead of \$8,000 and the Attorney Registration Fees line was appropriated for \$8,000 instead of \$760 (3.7 attorney FTE). For FY2026-27, the Training line was appropriated for \$2,280 instead of \$21,000 and the Attorney Registration Fees was appropriated \$21,000 instead of \$2,280. The true-up will place operating funding in the correct appropriation. In addition, OSPD is requesting \$204,300 General Fund for Leased Space and Utilities funding for a total of 29.2 FTE appropriated though passage of SB25-024. OSPD will lack adequate office space that will disrupt workflow within offices if funding for new FTE is not addressed.

→ OSPD S1 CBI DNA misconduct representation

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | \$243,328 | \$243,328 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | 243,328 | 243,328 | 0 | 0 | 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 data that was not available including the results of actions required by the Forensic Science Integrity Act.

Request

The Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD) is requesting an increase of \$243,328 General Fund for FY 2025-26 for work on cases related to the misconduct uncovered by Colorado Bureau of Investigation. OSPD and the Alternate Defense Counsel (OADC) have also submitted a joint request for FY 2026-27 for \$2 million General Fund split between the agencies to fund these activities in the following year.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the requested change.

Analysis

The General Assembly passed the Forensic Science Integrity Act (FSIA) in 2025, which created a duty to report wrongful actions by crime lab employees, required the crime lab director to investigate such actions, and created a process for individuals to seek post-conviction relief if their case is impacted. Implementation of the FSIA and the agencies' initial responses have helped to clarify how much work lies ahead on these cases. The FSIA's disclosure requirements have also revealed that there will be more than just the work related to Woods' misconduct at CBI.

The FSIA requires a crime laboratory director who receives a report of wrongful action by a crime laboratory employee to investigate the claim and notify district attorneys. DAs are then required to notify people whose conviction included work by the crime laboratory employee who is the subject of a wrongful action investigation. District attorneys are also required to notify OSPD if those people are in custody. The FSIA also requires crime laboratories to engage in an 11-year look-back and give notice of prior misconduct. OSPD receives notice if it represented the defendant, or if the defendant has remained in custody because of that conviction – regardless of whether OSPD represented the defendant. Defendants who are out-of-custody also seek OSPD assistance in reviewing their case and making a post-conviction claim if they are indigent. The notices

alert defendants that they have a right to counsel to investigate any claims under the FSIA, including a right to court-appointed counsel if they are in custody or are indigent and out of custody and provide contact information for OSPD.

Importantly, the statute did not limit disclosure to Woods' misconduct. It required the same disclosures for any analyst who committed misconduct in the previous 11 years. CBI did not reveal if it was aware of any such misconduct prior to passage of the FSIA, and OSPD and OADC were not aware of any such qualifying misconduct. Therefore, the agencies could not anticipate potential workload increases that would come from any such unrevealed misconduct at CBI.

The extent of the unrevealed misconduct still awaits to be seen and in some cases misconduct that may have been perpetrated by other analysts may impact some or many of the same cases due to analysts checking the work of Woods. The OSPD, OADC, and JBC staff do not have a good data set to base calculations to forecast the impact of these other cases and only become aware when the required notices are properly served.

Because of the timelines present in the act, OSPD reports it is in the midst of receiving thousands of notices and cannot know how many notices it will ultimately receive or how many defendants will request assistance of court-appointed counsel. The FSIA required that crime laboratories send notices to district attorney by September 1, 2025, as a look back into prior misconduct. The district attorney's deadline to send out notices was December 1, 2025. As discussed below, OSPD received the first notices in October and hundreds more in November. However, the receipt of notices has continued into December, with two DA offices acknowledging they are still working on providing notices, and three others that have not provided notices. Additionally, some DAs are providing OSPD courtesy copies of out of custody notices while others are not. The FSIA does not require out of custody notices be sent because these clients are only eligible for assistance of court-appointed counsel if indigent.

Increased Eligibility for Counsel Under the FSIA

OSPD has received notices related to wrongful action of three other analysts in Colorado, which revealed eligibility for hundreds more defendants than previously known. OSPD is currently aware of 1,773 cases where defendants were convicted and are eligible for counsel under the FSIA because Woods worked on their case. But there are also 813 eligible cases related to wrongful action by two other CBI agents and 115 related to wrongful action of an agent at the Northern Colorado Regional Forensic Crime Lab (NCRFCL).

While OSPD cannot discuss any information protected by attorney-client privilege or subject to confidentiality requirements under the Colorado Rules of Professional Conduct, OSPD attorneys have reported internally that there may be additional crime laboratory employees who will trigger additional notices under the FSIA.

The agencies do not believe that all those cases will result in appointment of counsel, or that all cases that result in appointment of counsel will need significant work on behalf of a client. **Eligibility for appointment of counsel under the FSIA does not mean that the analyst committed misconduct in the qualifying case. It means that an analyst who committed misconduct worked in the qualifying case, and the defendant is entitled to counsel to investigate if the analyst's misconduct had a material impact in their case.**

Due to the recent passage of the law, very few FSIA cases have progressed to significant litigation and it is difficult to predict how cases will proceed, and at what cost to the agencies. The agencies do have preliminary data from the relatively small sample size of FSIA cases that have been processed but a larger sample size is necessary to make accurate predictions of the true fiscal impact on the agencies.

OSPD and OADC continue to process all requests for counsel while also organizing the data from 2,701 DA notices and litigating FSIA cases where lawyers have been appointed. So far, there have been 40 such appointments since October 1st and these cases provide some preliminary insights.

Based on the initial cases reviewed for appointment of counsel, OSPD is able to handle approximately 25 percent of the cases and an OADC attorney must be appointed in about 75 percent. Those percentage are dependent on individual facts and legal circumstances that are subject to change, but it is clear that OADC will receive more post-conviction FSIA cases than OSPD. Those FSIA cases will pose an additional unprecedented workload for OSPD attorneys, even though OSPD will be taking a smaller percentage of the overall cases.

OSPD has been able to manage the incoming surge of data and requests for counsel by employing temporary attorneys to evaluate cases and communicate with clients. That solution is only temporary because it has been funded with part of the \$150,000 appropriated to OSPD to address forensic misconduct in FY 2025-26, and that funding will run out in the first few months of 2026. These positions are temporarily needed to manage the large amount of requests at the outset of the FSIA and OSPD does not believe this will be an ongoing cost. Requests for FSIA counsel should decline sharply following FY26-27, as long as no further widespread forensic misconduct occurs.

OSPD is utilizing temporary staff that are comprised of practitioners that have completed law school but have not yet passed the bar to become a licensed attorney. This provides meaningful experience and an employment bridge for students transitioning into the workforce while also attempting to defray costs related to the preliminary review of the notices received.

Therefore, OSPD is requesting \$243,328 for FY 2025-26 to cover costs of five temporary attorneys and one temporary paralegal.

As reported by the OSPD, not funding this request will result in significant delays in addressing the misconduct claims under the Forensic Science Integrity Act. Resolving the issues caused by this misconduct is already projected to take many years and declining to fund this request will necessarily cause delays in resolving FSIA claims. Those delays will impact defendants who are entitled to relief under the FSIA, many of whom are incarcerated. Delays in resolving those claims will also extend uncertainty for victims, require more of the General Assembly's attention and erode the public's confidence in Colorado's criminal legal system.

→ OADC S2 CBI DNA misconduct representation

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | \$140,000 | \$140,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | 140,000 | 140,000 | 0 | 0 | 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 data that was not available including the results of actions required by the Forensic Science Integrity Act.

Request

The Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel (ADC) is requesting a supplemental appropriation increase of \$140,000 for FY 2025-26 to the Agency's Conflicts-of- Interest Contracts LBLI. This funding is essential to address continuing projected cost for addressing CBI and other forensic misconduct. While there is every expectation this will not be sufficient, understanding the present budget climate, ADC limited the request to this amount.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the Office's requested change, consistent with the recommendation for OSPD.

Analysis

The FY26 Long Bill provided OSPD and ADC \$300,000 to be split between the agencies to pay a portion of the expenses created by the Missy Woods CBI misconduct. The agencies agreed to equally split that fund given the early stage in the process. The legislature unanimously passed the Forensic Science Integrity Act (FSIA) last session to attempt to deal with that misconduct. As a result of that Act, misconduct by several other actors was discovered and disclosed. So far this year, ADC has expended \$215,004 for work as a result of this Act, Missy Woods, and the CBI misconduct. To pay contractors for the upcoming work, ADC requests a supplemental \$140,000.

Please see the OSPD Supplemental Request for further detail on the overall work driven by misconduct and the Forensic Science Integrity Act.

→ OADC S1 Caseload increase

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | \$6,134,586 | \$6,134,586 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | 6,134,586 | 6,134,586 | 0 | 0 | 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 data that was not available when the original appropriation was made, specifically that caseload and case costs would exceed estimates used to estimate appropriation in FY 2025-26 initially.

Request

The Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel (ADC) is requesting a base building supplemental appropriation increase of \$6,134,586 for FY2025-26 to the Agency's Conflicts-of-Interest Contracts LBLI and a \$315,255 increase to the Mandated Costs line item for a total of \$6,449,841.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Committee approve the requested change. JBC Staff investigated recommending funding this request with an increase of only \$4 million General Fund and OADC assured JBC Staff that even attempting that compromise would result in OADC bringing an agency comeback. If the Committee wishes to trigger a discussion with OADC concerning caseload and case cost increases, it should reject the Staff recommendation. If that is the action the Committee takes, JBC Staff expects OADC to bring an agency "comeback" to request the full funding amount and Staff from OADC are prepared to submit an agency comeback if the JBC prefers to have more discussion.

Analysis

When an indigent individual is charged with a crime and the OSPD has an ethical conflict of interest, OADC is appointed. OADC contractors are appointed and assigned by the Court without any ability on our part to control the number of those appointments. Additionally, the time it takes to provide ethical representation continues to increase due in part to the surge in digital and other evidence provided by the Government to those contractors, who have an ethical obligation to review each item provided.

Methodology

The methodology OADC used in the past to estimate the budget needed for the upcoming fiscal year left everyone searching for a more accurate method to predict future costs. OADC was repeatedly asked to develop a better methodology. As shown in ADC's FY 2026-27 Budget, OADC is attempting an entirely new approach.

The OADC's old approach to creating the FY 2024-25 and FY 2025-26 budgets left OADC short the necessary funding to pay the contractors at the very end of the fiscal years. As a result, more funding is needed to pay contractors for their increased casework in FY 2025-26.

To provide a more accurate estimate of the need for the remainder of FY 2025-26, OADC leadership added team members to the budget team. This broader team used a methodology comparing what was spent through November of this fiscal year to what percentage of the year had been completed, to calculate the need for FY26.

By November 30, OADC spent 46% of our budgeted amount (combining Conflicts-of-Interest and Mandated line items) on OADC case work. This is true, even though we were only 42% of the way through the fiscal year at five months. This meant we spent 9.5% more than expected. Multiplying the FY 2025-26 allocation and combining the two line items by 1.0951 shows that we would need \$74,173,169 to cover our FY 2025-26 contractor expenses. Given our FY 2025-26 allocation of \$67,723,328 OADC is projecting an additional \$6,449,841 is needed to fully compensate the contractors through the end of FY 2025-26.

We anticipate this amount may not be sufficient to cover all FY 2025-26 expenditures on contractors. Historically, expenditures do not follow an even percentage throughout the year and increase toward the end of the fiscal year as contractors endeavor to ensure they submit all billing before the end of the fiscal year. However, ADC is dedicated to looking at cost controls in the next two quarters of the fiscal year and will endeavor to reduce the overall pace of disbursements in FY 2025-26.

JBC Staff agrees with this calculation and it assumes the JBC also adopts the JBC Staff recommendation on the staff-initiated base correction discussed on page 18. JBC Staff also compiled historic information for the Committee that shows the annual increase to appropriations since FY 2016-17.

Summary of Appropriations for Conflicts-of-Interest Contracts

| Fiscal Year | Appropriation | Change from Prior Year |
|-------------|---------------|------------------------|
| FY 2016-17 | \$27,971,145 | n/a |
| FY 2017-18 | 31,270,952 | 11.8% |
| FY 2018-19 | 39,011,564 | 24.8% |
| FY 2019-20 | 40,570,951 | 4.0% |
| FY 2020-21 | 42,262,813 | 4.2% |
| FY 2021-22 | 37,102,912 | -12.2% |
| FY 2022-23 | 44,430,264 | 19.7% |
| FY 2023-24 | 48,564,923 | 9.3% |
| FY 2024-25 | 55,100,564 | 13.5% |
| FY 2025-26 | 70,948,141 | 28.8% |

Why are Costs Increasing

OADC costs are increasing for a variety of reasons. So far this year, OADC has seen an increase in the number of cases to which our contractors have been appointed. OADC also continues to need to compensate contractors in greater amounts to review discovery material provided by the Government in cases. Then again, the need for contractors to travel to remote court hearings and to see clients in custody continues to increase. OADC youth attorneys are appointed to an increasing number of cases where youth are charged as adults. Due to the nature of juvenile brain development, and the complexity of these cases, they are some of the most expensive trial court cases OADC funds to defend. The combination of these factors drives the need for additional funding.

These increases over FY 2024-25 were not fully understood or foreseen when OADC submitted its FY 2025-26 budget in November 2024, or when the supplemental or add-on requests were provided during the budget sessions in early 2025. As explained above, OADC also pushed some of the contractor funding from FY 2024-25 into FY 2025-26, resulting in less funding availability to completely compensate contractors for work this fiscal year.

OADC took a more conservative approach to FY 2025-26 during that budget session and did not project these increases to continue at the rates seen this fiscal year. Moving forward, OADC's new leadership is committed to new approaches to understanding expenditures on cases, and to providing a better forecast in budget sessions.

Increase in Caseload

As of January 1, 2026, OADC assigned and paid contractors for work on 4.1 percent more cases than in FY 2024-25 through that same period. An increase in cases worked by contractors necessarily results in an increase in funds paid out by OADC to those contractors. Because OADC has no control over the cases to which our contractors are appointed, we presume an increase in appointments will continue through the end of the fiscal year. The rate of that increase is less predictable.

Increase in Data

The amount of data provided to contractors by the Government continues to increase. This vast data consists of terabytes of body camera footage, cell phone extractions of all the data on phones, police reports, and other evidence that comprises the Government's case against a client.

Through December 31, the number of hours contractors spent reviewing this data increased by 17.94 percent compared to the same period in the prior fiscal year. As the Legislature may recall, contractor data review time has been one of the primary drivers of OADC's cost increases over the past two fiscal years.

Although the rate of growth has slowed, from a 30.20 percent increase at this point last year to 17.94 percent this year, the total number of hours continues to rise. This directly results in higher payments to contractors.

If OADC applies this 17.94 percent increase to the total amount paid to contractors for data review in FY 2024-2025, the agency will require an additional \$1.7 million to cover this component of contractor expenses alone.

Increased Travel Costs

OADC continues to find contractors are required to travel more in representing their clients due to many factors. Areas of the state do not have sufficient attorneys to cover the cases, or types of cases, that have been charged. Some courts are requiring more in-person appearances rather than permitting virtual appearances for simpler types of court hearings. Through December 31, the cost for travel for OADC contractors increased 11.86% over the same period last fiscal year, amounting to an increase of 670 cases more than last year, where contractors traveled to work for their clients.

These increased travel costs add to the overall increase in expenditures to contractors from these budget line items. This year, OADC has paid contractors over \$350,000 more for travel than through December 31 of last fiscal year.

Some of the impact on travel costs is the effect of "returning to in-person" actions in the Court after the COVID shutdowns. The only action JBC Staff identified that could reduce the travel costs would be to require that certain proceedings must proceed virtually or to require OADC to pay reduced rates for travel time compared to the rate paid for activities that must be fulfilled by an attorney.

Increase in Direct File representation

Direct file cases are where a youth is charged as an adult. Over the past several years, the percentage of these cases where OADC is appointed to represent children charged as adults has increased from 69% of the cases in

calendar year 2022, to 88% of the total number in calendar year 2024. Final data is not yet available for 2025, we predict OADC will have been appointed to a greater number of these cases in 2025.

This analysis is based on OADC’s internal data and information from the Supreme Court Administrative Office. Typically, youth tend to be charged with committing crimes in groups, and the OSPD can only represent one person in a group of those charged, leaving the rest of the children to be assigned to OADC contractors. OADC is assigned to a higher percentage of these youth than any other type of case. Additionally, it is not uncommon for youth to be charged with committing offenses along with adults, where the OSPD would often have a conflict due to representing either the adult or one of the witnesses.

The reason these Direct File cases are often the most expensive trial level cases to defend because it is incumbent on the defense team to both prepare to defend the case and use juvenile brain scientific data, but they must also prepare mitigation to either convince the Government to permit a plea to a more youth-focused disposition or convince a court in a complicated and multi-day Reverse Transfer Hearing to send the case back to Juvenile Court. The process of collecting mitigation and presenting it is a time-consuming process, often involving experts and multiple defense team members.

→ ORPC S1 Align appropriation with estimates

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | -\$738,130 | -\$788,130 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | -738,130 | -788,130 | 0 | 50,000 | 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 data that was not available when the original appropriation was made such as trends in dependency and neglect case filing.

Request

The Office of Respondent Parents’ Counsel (ORPC) requests a FY 2025-26 net General Fund decrease of \$788,130 and Reappropriated Fund increase of \$50,000 to bring lines into alignment with current estimates which underlying data was not available at the time of the original FY 2025-26 request and to align with the FY 2026-27 request. The net decrease includes a \$1,200,000 reduction to the Court-appointed Counsel General fund appropriation, an increase of \$300,000 to the Mandated Costs General fund appropriation and an increase of \$111,870 to the Operating General Fund appropriation. The \$50,000 reappropriated funds increase is to the Operating Reappropriated Funds appropriation.

Finally, the request will require an increase of \$50,000 cash funds in the Department of Human Services to reflect anticipated spending requested in this item. The funding is from the Title IV-E Cash Fund.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the request to reflect this one-time savings.

Analysis

The Office of Respondent Parents’ Counsel (ORPC) is charged with improving the availability and quality of legal representation for parents in dependency and neglect cases in Colorado, as outlined in Section 13-92-104 (1), C.R.S. ORPC legal representation costs are affected by the number of dependency and neglect cases filed, the number of appointments made in those cases, the complexity and cost of individual appointments, economic factors, and changes in federal and state law.

Based on cost trends and current dependency and neglect filing and appointment data now available that was not available when submitting the initial FY 2025-26 budget, the ORPC anticipates a reduction in Court-appointed Counsel costs and a slight increase in Mandated Cost expenses for the near future.

At the same time the ORPC has also experienced growth in its Operating expenditures related to various economic factors that are beyond the control of the agency. These expenditures are discussed below under three categories including IT, staff administration, and Title IV-E program related costs.

In the recent past ORPC made cuts and utilized transfer authority to cover increasing operating costs instead of submitting budget requests due to State budget shortfalls. This strategy is not sustainable and is now causing financial strain on the department as the gap between cost increases and actual budget widens.

JBC Staff has and is likely to continue recommending including a Long Bill footnote that authorizes transfer authority between line items for ORPC. They are required to report on any transfers made annually, which JBC Staff reviews for anomalies.

While overall a net-reduction, the request does bring in line with expectations the operating expenses that ORPC must pay. Generally, these fall into Westlaw subscriptions, outside IT support, contractor payment portal support, and a variety of other software and subscriptions that reduce overall cost of coordinating ORPC and its contractors.

Finally, the request also includes an increase of \$50,000 reappropriated funds that originate as Title IV-E funds for operating expenses. Currently the ORPC is piloting a partnership with the Department of Human Services in Adams and Boulder counties that aims to reduce litigation and increase reunification and family placement rates for children placed in foster care. To track and analyze pilot data to determine efficacy, the ORPC is working with the Colorado Evaluation and Action Lab.

→ OCPO S1 One-time reduction

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reappropri. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | -\$65,000 | -\$65,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | -65,000 | -65,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| 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 data that was not available when the original appropriation was made, e.g. the federal enactment of H.R. 1 and actions taken by the state to respond to it.

Request

The Office of the Colorado Child Protection Ombudsman (OCPO) submitted a one-time \$65,000 negative supplemental for the FY 2025-26. While the OCPO would typically set aside these funds for a reversion at the end of the fiscal year, the agency is submitting them as a one-time negative supplemental in recognition of the current financial environment and in support of efforts to address the ongoing budget deficit.

The submitted changes solely represent vacancy savings experienced by the OCPO during quarters one and two of FY 2025-26. This submission is a one-time submission, as the positions have since been filled and the funds will be necessary to cover the salaries of the four FTE from which the vacancy savings were pulled.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the request for a one-time reduction reflecting the savings from implementation of a hiring freeze.

→ Bridges S1 One-time reduction

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | -\$560,877 | -\$560,877 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | -560,877 | -560,877 | 0 | 0 | 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 data that was not available when the original appropriation was made, e.g. the federal enactment of H.R. 1 and actions taken by the state to respond to it.

Request

The Office of Bridges of Colorado (Bridges) is submitting a one-time negative supplemental adjustment of \$560,877 for FY2025-26. While not mandated, Bridges opted to implement a hiring freeze reflective of the Executive Branch's freeze from October 1 through December 31, 2025. It is anticipated that filling those positions after the freeze will take another three months, resulting in total savings in the amount of \$560,877.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the request for a one-time reduction reflecting the savings from implementation of a hiring freeze.

→ Department of Law S2 Leased space

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | -\$607,687 | -\$163,801 | -\$81,659 | -\$362,227 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | -607,687 | -163,801 | -81,659 | -362,227 | 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 data that was not available when the original appropriation was made, specifically that the lessor of the current space occupied is unwilling to extend leases even on a short-term basis and that the OSPD would be seeking another tenant to take over its Carr Center leased space allocation.

Request

The Department requests a supplemental reduction of \$607,687 total funds, including \$163,801 General Fund in FY 2025-26 to eliminate spending authority for leased space at 1700 Lincoln because the lessor does not want to extend the current lease for any short-term bridge periods when the current lease expires.

This part of the request, and only supplemental change requested related, is to return the \$607,687 total funds, including \$163,801 General Fund that was appropriated in anticipation of extending its current lease in space owned by a private entity. It cannot extend its current lease and intends to occupy space dedicated to the Office of the State Public Defender in the Ralph L. Carr building. Lease payments in this space through the end of its current term are being paid out by the Office of Risk Management.

The request also includes adjustments to FY 2026-27 leased space to increase the amount of leased space from 208,653 square feet to 263,771 square feet, and increase of 55,118 square feet in the Ralph L. Carr Center. JBC staff will make a comprehensive recommendation for FY 2026-27 during figure setting that incorporates changes in budgets for the Office of the State Public Defender and the space landlord, the Judicial Branch appropriations.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve the requested changes for FY 2025-26 in the Department of Law. JBC staff is working with all impacted agencies to make a comprehensive recommendation for FY 2026-27 to ensure any changes are in the best interest of the state.

JBC staff initially withheld making a recommendation on this item because at the time it was believed that the change requested for the supplemental budget year was more directly tied to the request to take over space currently allocated to the Office of the State Public Defender. While both are related to leased space, the supplemental request should be viewed separately. Therefore, the Joint Budget Committee can expect a discussion and recommendation of the leased space allocation changes during figure setting.

Analysis

The current Department of Law lease term at 1700 Lincoln concludes in August 2026. Original estimates for the completion of the Carr Judicial renovation assumed a certified occupancy by July 1, 2025. This original estimate did not include a variety of unforeseen delays based upon contract development and negotiations and the discovery of additional renovation needs. The Department made an FY 2025-26 Budget Amendment request for resources and a new budget line item to cover the anticipated July and August 2025 lease payments for this property, due to the assumption that Risk Management would not cover the last two months of the lease term, because of the availability of the Carr Building. The General Assembly approved a new line item and spending authority of \$608K based on these assumptions.

Additionally, the Department requested a base budget of \$608,000 in FY 2026-27 for this line item. The purpose of this request was to maintain some spending authority as various negotiations and subsequent decisions were made. The Department has been actively working with Risk Management and the State Architects' contractors to modify the 1700 Lease to align with new information and new estimates of Carr Building renovation completion. The 1700 Lincoln lessor has stated an unwillingness to provide any short-term lease to bridge the time frame between the current end of lease term and the new estimate of January 1, 2026, for Carr Building occupancy. Additionally, the new proposed rate for each square foot is roughly 3x the current lease amount. As such, the Department cannot rationalize any lease extension for this space.

The Department is requesting the current FY 2025-26 budget for the Lease Space Line Item to be eliminated, as well as the FY 2026-27 base budget request.

Staff Initiated Supplemental Requests

→ OADC Staff initiated technical correction

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | 5,327,593 | 5,327,593 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Staff Recommendation Higher/-Lower than Request | \$5,327,593 | \$5,327,593 | \$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 a technical error in calculating the original appropriation. JBC Staff annualized out this amount of funding approved during the FY 2024-25 supplemental mistakenly when it should have been a base-building appropriation.

Request

The Office of Alternate Defense Counsel (OADC) did not request this change but alerted JBC Staff to the error after reviewing the final Long Bill as passed by the General Assembly.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee approve an increase of \$5.3 million General Fund to correct the FY 2025-26 base for the Conflicts-of-Interest line item to correct an error JBC Staff made in calculating the original appropriation.

Analysis

JBC Staff continues to work with Staff from the Judicial Branch and its independent agencies including the Office of Alternate Defense Counsel to further standardize budget requests and documentation submitted to JBC Staff to fully explain agency budgets. One place this communication broke down last year resulted in a misunderstanding that led to JBC Staff eliminating \$5,327,593 General Fund from the base of the Conflicts-of-Interest line item.

In standard practice, executive branch agencies include such base building figures requested during supplementals by including a Budget Amendment for the following year's budget that would include that additional funding requested as a supplemental. For the FY 2025-26 supplemental, the JBC approved the increase described above but did not submit a budget amendment. While this practice is standard for executive

branch agencies, OADC was not aware of this practice and was thus surprised when reviewing the final Long Bill appropriations for FY 2025-26.

To correct this miscommunication, JBC Staff has had conversations with Alternate Defense Counsel staff to ensure that this mistake can be identified earlier in the process and thus identified before the Long Bill has been introduced. We have also improved communications and standardization with Judicial Independent Agency submissions with the assistance of OASIA.

JBC Staff recommends the Committee approve the increase of \$5.3 million General Fund to the Conflicts-of-Interest line item and correct the error identified above.

Previously Approved Interim Supplemental Requests

→ FY 2024-25 OADC Billing Site Development

| Item | Total Funds | General Fund | Cash Funds | Reapprop. Funds | Federal Funds | FTE |
|---|-------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|-----|
| Request | \$895,000 | \$895,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0.0 |
| Recommendation | 895,000 | 895,000 | 0 | 0 | 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 Agency Staff agree that this request is the result of a technical error in calculating the original appropriation by omitting the prior approved 1331 in the Department's supplemental bill during the 2025 legislative session.

Request

The Office of Alternate Defense Counsel (OADC) requests a total of \$895,000 General Fund for FY 2024-25, that includes \$845,000 for the development and implementation of a new billing system and \$50,000 for the hosting expense for FY 2024-25.

This 1331 Supplemental Request was originally submitted and approved by the Joint Budget Committee in September 2024 to fund the development and implementation of a new billing, contractor, and expert tracking system for the Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel (OADC). While the request was approved through the standard interim process, it was not incorporated into the FY2024-25 Supplemental Bill for the Judicial Department. As a result, the funding is not currently recognized in CORE, and reversing the interim budget entry would result in a deficit in OADC's FY 2024-25 Operating line.

In coordination with JBC Staff and the State Controller's Office, OADC is resubmitting this request as a technical correction to ensure the originally approved \$895,000 General Fund is properly recognized and available for FY25 and beyond.

Summary

Work Completed Since Approved

The project began with onboarding, contract administration, and detailed work plan development. Key deliverables included information security documentation (aligned with state cyber policies), stakeholder intake, account provisioning, and the setup of the development environment hosted securely on Amazon Web Services (AWS).

The first phase proceeded from January through March of 2025. This phase included user research, business process mapping, and the translation of those workflows into detailed technical specifications. The developer produced high-fidelity wireframes, created database schemas, and designed a modular architecture that separates billing, contractor profiles, appointment tracking, and expert review functions. A strong emphasis was placed on auditability, usability, and long-term extensibility of the platform.

Phase two of the project was completed in April 2025 during which the team implemented the foundational components of the system. This included backend API development, role-based authentication, contractor profile management, and prototype modules for appointment entry and billing submission. Initial test environments were provisioned, and early-stage testing with internal staff began. The system is built with security and scalability in mind, leveraging industry best practices and cloud-native infrastructure.

Remaining Work

The final project phase will begin in July 2025. Planned work includes:

- Comprehensive system and user acceptance testing (UAT);
- Final feature refinement and workflow adjustments;
- Integration with internal reporting tools and audit modules;
- Implementation of access and role permissions based on user feedback;
- System-wide deployment and rollout to internal and external users; and
- Post-launch support and documentation handoff.

Original Analysis from September 2024 Request

The OADC's billing systems, the Court Appointed Attorney Payment System (CAAPS) and the Municipal Appointed Attorney Payment System (MAAPS), process approximately \$50 million annually and manage payments to about 1,100 independent contractors. Additionally, the OADC uses two contractor tracking systems, the Contractor Availability and Management Portal (CAMP) and the Expert Database. All four systems will be integrated in the single system funded by this request.

The OADC anticipated developing this project in FY 2025-26, and in September of 2023, the OADC contracted with BidLab to find a vendor that could design and create a new platform that would replace and incorporate the four systems into a single platform. An RFP was released in

February 2024; 19 bids were received; five were considered through a final presentation process in May and June; and vendor, Watkyn was selected, based on design and proposed project cost.

While the original project would have been requested for funding for FY 2025-26, the two billing systems are currently managed by a self-employed individual vendor. The current vendor gave notice to the OADC after the Long Bill of the vendor's retirement in late 2025. This necessitated an acceleration of this project development and the need for the interim supplemental request.

The proposed system will consolidate the billing systems, CAMP, and the Expert Database into a secure, stable platform. The project will involve the development of a modular invoicing system, data migration, integration with existing systems, and the implementation of more robust security measures. The new platform will significantly enhance the OADC's ability to manage data, improve user experience, and ensure compliance with legal standards.

Staff recommends funding this item as requested.

Committee Action

Staff recommended and the Committee approved the requested change.

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 |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|

Judicial Department
Brian Boatright, Chief Justice

ORPC S1 Align appropriations with current estimates

(8) Office of the Respondent Parents' Counsel

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Operating Expenses | <u>692,971</u> | <u>386,429</u> | <u>161,870</u> | <u>161,870</u> | <u>548,299</u> |
| General Fund | 162,021 | 155,479 | 111,870 | 111,870 | 267,349 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 530,950 | 230,950 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 280,950 |
| Court-appointed Counsel | <u>27,891,733</u> | <u>28,884,159</u> | <u>-1,200,000</u> | <u>-1,200,000</u> | <u>27,684,159</u> |
| General Fund | 22,891,733 | 28,884,159 | (1,200,000) | (1,200,000) | 27,684,159 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 5,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mandated Costs | <u>1,114,592</u> | <u>1,114,592</u> | <u>300,000</u> | <u>300,000</u> | <u>1,414,592</u> |
| General Fund | 1,114,592 | 1,114,592 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 1,414,592 |

Total for ORPC S1 Align appropriations with current estimates

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | 29,699,296 | 30,385,180 | (738,130) | (738,130) | 29,647,050 |
| FTE | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> |
| General Fund | 24,168,346 | 30,154,230 | (788,130) | (788,130) | 29,366,100 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 5,530,950 | 230,950 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 280,950 |
| Federal 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 |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|

OCPO S1 One-time negative supplemental

(9) Office of the Child Protection Ombudsman

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Program Costs | <u>2,525,385</u> | <u>2,565,680</u> | <u>-65,000</u> | <u>-65,000</u> | <u>2,500,680</u> |
| FTE | 14.8 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.0 |
| General Fund | 2,525,385 | 2,565,680 | (65,000) | (65,000) | 2,500,680 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Total for OCPO S1 One-time negative supplemental | 2,525,385 | 2,565,680 | (65,000) | (65,000) | 2,500,680 |
| <i>FTE</i> | <u>14.8</u> | <u>15.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>15.0</u> |
| General Fund | 2,525,385 | 2,565,680 | (65,000) | (65,000) | 2,500,680 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal 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 |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|

Bridges S1 One-time negative supplemental

(13) Statewide Behavioral Health Court Liaison (Bridges of Colorado)

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Health, Life, and Dental | <u>1,371,904</u> | <u>1,558,454</u> | <u>-560,877</u> | <u>-560,877</u> | <u>997,577</u> |
| General Fund | 1,371,904 | 1,558,454 | (560,877) | (560,877) | 997,577 |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total for Bridges S1 One-time negative supplemental | 1,371,904 | 1,558,454 | (560,877) | (560,877) | 997,577 |
| <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 | 1,371,904 | 1,558,454 | (560,877) | (560,877) | 997,577 |

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 |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| OSPD S1 CBI DNA misconduct representation | | | | | |
| (5) Office of State Public Defender | | | | | |
| Cases Impacted by CBI DNA Test Misconduct | 0 | 300,000 | 243,328 | 243,328 | 543,328 |
| General Fund | <u>0.0</u> | 300,000 | 243,328 | 243,328 | 543,328 |
| Total for OSPD S1 CBI DNA misconduct representation | | | | | |
| | 0 | 300,000 | 243,328 | 243,328 | 543,328 |
| FTE | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> |
| General Fund | 0 | 300,000 | 243,328 | 243,328 | 543,328 |

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 |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|

OSPD S2 SB 25-024 True-up

(5) Office of State Public Defender

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Attorney Registration | <u>203,100</u> | <u>166,894</u> | <u>-7,240</u> | <u>-7,240</u> | <u>159,654</u> |
| General Fund | 203,100 | 166,894 | (7,240) | (7,240) | 159,654 |
| Training | <u>886,000</u> | <u>474,000</u> | <u>7,240</u> | <u>7,240</u> | <u>481,240</u> |
| General Fund | 886,000 | 444,000 | 7,240 | 7,240 | 451,240 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 30,000 | 0 | 0 | 30,000 |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total for OSPD S2 SB 25-024 True-up | 1,089,100 | 640,894 | 0 | 0 | 640,894 |
| FTE | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> |
| General Fund | 1,089,100 | 610,894 | 0 | 0 | 610,894 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 30,000 | 0 | 0 | 30,000 |

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 |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|

ADC S2 CBI DNA misconduct

(6) Office of Alternate Defense Counsel

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Conflict-of-interest Contracts | <u>55,100,564</u> | <u>59,345,962</u> | <u>140,000</u> | <u>140,000</u> | <u>59,485,962</u> |
| General Fund | 55,100,564 | 59,345,962 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 59,485,962 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total for ADC S2 CBI DNA misconduct | 55,100,564 | 59,345,962 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 59,485,962 |
| <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 | 55,100,564 | 59,345,962 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 59,485,962 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal 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 |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|

ADC S1 Case load increase

(6) Office of Alternate Defense Counsel

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Conflict-of-interest Contracts | <u>55,100,564</u> | <u>59,345,962</u> | <u>6,134,586</u> | <u>6,134,586</u> | <u>65,480,548</u> |
| General Fund | 55,100,564 | 59,345,962 | 6,134,586 | 6,134,586 | 65,480,548 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Mandated Costs | <u>3,049,773</u> | <u>3,049,773</u> | <u>315,255</u> | <u>315,255</u> | <u>3,365,028</u> |
| General Fund | 3,049,773 | 3,049,773 | 315,255 | 315,255 | 3,365,028 |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Total for ADC S1 Case load increase | 58,150,337 | 62,395,735 | 6,449,841 | 6,449,841 | 68,845,576 |
| FTE | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| General Fund | 58,150,337 | 62,395,735 | 6,449,841 | 6,449,841 | 68,845,576 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal 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 |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
|--|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|

Staff-initiated technical correction

(6) Office of Alternate Defense Counsel

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|
| Conflict-of-interest Contracts | <u>55,100,564</u> | <u>59,345,962</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>5,327,593</u> | <u>64,673,555</u> |
| General Fund | 55,100,564 | 59,345,962 | 0 | 5,327,593 | 64,673,555 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Total for Staff-initiated technical correction | 55,100,564 | 59,345,962 | 0 | 5,327,593 | 64,673,555 |
| <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 | 55,100,564 | 59,345,962 | 0 | 5,327,593 | 64,673,555 |
| Cash Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Federal Funds | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| Totals Excluding Pending Items | | | | | |
| JUDICIAL | | | | | |
| TOTALS for ALL Departmental line items | 1,050,825,348 | 1,151,752,648 | 5,469,162 | 10,796,755 | 1,162,549,403 |
| <i>FTE</i> | <u>5,576.6</u> | <u>5,724.8</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>5,724.8</u> |
| General Fund | 636,598,577 | 878,946,616 | 5,419,162 | 10,746,755 | 889,693,371 |
| Cash Funds | 345,312,070 | 203,914,808 | 0 | 0 | 203,914,808 |
| Reappropriated Funds | 57,925,576 | 64,466,224 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 64,516,224 |
| Federal Funds | 10,989,125 | 4,425,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,425,000 |