

MEMORANDUM



JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE

TO Joint Budget Committee Members
FROM Carolyn Kampman, JBC Staff (303-866-4959)
DATE March 16, 2017
SUBJECT Judicial Branch, Office of the Respondent Parents' Counsel

On February 16 the Committee considered the budget requests submitted by Judicial Branch agencies. This memorandum concerns the request from the Office of the Respondent Parents' Counsel. The Committee has not yet taken action on this agency's request, including all four of the agency's decision items and the line item detail. I have pasted below the relevant excerpt from my February 16 figure setting document (pages 137 through 147).

(8) OFFICE OF THE RESPONDENT PARENTS' COUNSEL

Senate Bill 14-203 and H.B. 15-1149 established the Office of the Respondent Parents' Counsel (ORPC) as a new independent agency within the Judicial Branch, as of January 1, 2016. The ORPC is charged with ensuring the provision and availability of high-quality legal representation for respondent parents involved in dependency and neglect proceedings. All existing and new state paid respondent parent counsel appointments were transferred from the State Court Administrator's Office (SCAO) to the ORPC by July 1, 2016.

The ORPC is governed by the nine-member Respondent Parents' Counsel Governing Commission, whose members are appointed by the Supreme Court. Commission members serve on a voluntary basis and receive no compensation for their time. The Commission appoints an individual to serve as the Executive Director of the Office. The compensation for this individual is fixed by the General Assembly (through a Long Bill footnote) and may not be reduced during his or her five-year term of appointment.

The ORPC is an independent agency within the Judicial Branch that employs 10.0 FTE. The ORPC is located in the Ralph L. Colorado Judicial Center, and the associated lease payment is covered through a single line item appropriation in the Courts Administration section of the Judicial Branch budget. The Office of the State Court Administrator provides free administrative support to the ORPC, including: procurement; fiscal year-end transfers; workers' compensation and risk management; payroll and benefits; and a server room. With the exception of a small amount of cash funds from training-related fees and federal grant funding that is transferred from the Department of Human Services, the ORPC is supported by General Fund appropriations.

OFFICE OF THE RESPONDENT PARENTS' COUNSEL

	TOTAL FUNDS	GENERAL FUND	CASH FUNDS	REAPPROPRIATED FUNDS	FEDERAL FUNDS	FTE
FY 2016-17 Appropriation						
HB 16-1405 (Long Bill)	\$12,879,472	\$12,849,472	\$30,000	\$0	\$0	10.0
SB 17-164 (Supplemental bill)	2,365,756	2,342,001	0	23,755	0	0.0

OFFICE OF THE RESPONDENT PARENTS COUNSEL						
	TOTAL FUNDS	GENERAL FUND	CASH FUNDS	REAPPROPRIATED FUNDS	FEDERAL FUNDS	FTE
TOTAL	\$15,245,228	\$15,191,473	\$30,000	\$23,755	\$0	10.0
FY 2017-18 RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION						
FY 2016-17 Appropriation	\$15,245,228	\$15,191,473	\$30,000	\$23,755	\$0	10.0
Reverse supplemental action	(6,890)	(6,890)	0	0	0	0.0
ORPC BA2 Social worker pilot program	301,033	301,033	0	0	0	0.0
ORPC BA3 Reflect grant expenditures	7,340	0	0	7,340	0	0.0
ORPC R1 Conversion to hourly billing	785,902	785,902	0	0	0	0.0
ORPC R2/BA1 Increase in case filings	219,354	219,354	0	0	0	0.0
Staff-initiated R1 Compensation alignment	5,808	5,808	0	0	0	0.0
Centrally appropriated line items	14,126	14,126	0	0	0	0.0
Annualize prior year legislation	(337,500)	(337,500)	0	0	0	0.0
TOTAL	\$16,234,401	\$16,173,306	\$30,000	\$31,095	\$0	10.0
INCREASE/(DECREASE)	\$989,173	\$981,833	\$0	\$7,340	\$0	0.0
Percentage Change	6.5%	6.5%	0.0%	30.9%	n/a	0.0%
FY 2017-18 EXECUTIVE REQUEST	\$16,523,901	\$16,462,806	\$30,000	\$31,095	\$0	10.0
Request Above/(Below) Recommendation	\$289,500	\$289,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.0

DECISION ITEMS – OFFICE OF THE RESPONDENT PARENTS’ COUNSEL

→ ORPC R1 CONVERSION TO HOURLY BILLING

REQUEST: The ORPC requests \$785,902 General Fund to convert to a consistent hourly payment system, eliminating flat fee payments to attorneys in eight jurisdictions.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends approving the request.**

ANALYSIS: The ORPC is statutorily charged with ensuring the provision and availability of high quality legal representation for parents in dependency and neglect proceedings, and establishing fair and realistic rates by which to compensate contract attorneys.

The ORPC inherited a mixed payment system that involves both hourly and flat-fee payments. In those jurisdictions where attorneys are paid hourly, they receive \$75 per hour, and these attorneys are required to submit invoices detailing the time spent on the appointment in order to be paid. In flat-fee jurisdictions, an attorney is paid a flat fee of \$1,125 when he or she is appointed to a case (the equivalent of 15 hours of work), and the attorney is paid an additional \$1,262 upon the filing of a motion for the termination of parental rights. These attorneys are not required to submit any

invoiced accounting for their time or expenses. There are currently eight judicial districts in which attorneys are generally paid on a flat fee basis:

- 2nd (Denver)
- 4th (El Paso and Teller)
- 8th (Larimer and Jackson)
- 9th (Garfield, Pitkin, and Rio Blanco)
- 10th (Pueblo)
- 17th (Adams and Broomfield)
- 18th (Arapahoe, Douglas, Elbert, and Lincoln)
- 19th (Weld)
- 20th (Boulder)

In some cases, attorneys in the above jurisdiction may be paid hourly. For example, hourly payments are made for cases that qualify for a family treatment drug court.

The ORPC requests additional funding to implement a consistent hourly payment system that reimburses attorneys representing indigent parent clients for actual services rendered. The ORPC indicates that conversion to a consistent hourly payment method will:

- Result in better representation and better outcomes for families;
- Provide accountability measures for case billing; and
- Create parity with attorneys who contract with the OADC and the OCR, who are generally paid hourly for their work.

The ORPC notes that the flat-fee payment system makes it impossible to monitor compliance with minimum practice standards, such as regularly communicating with their client and attending all out-of-court meetings. The flat-fee system does not allow the ORPC to implement practices that have been proven effective in other states, or to track the impact of such practice changes on family outcomes. The ORPC also notes that the payment of a supplemental flat fee once a motion to terminate parental rights is filed (by the county department) is inconsistent with best practices of conducting thorough and early investigations and front-loading services. This practice incentivizes an attorney to adopt case strategies that might run counter to a client's interest. For example, if a client wishes to relinquish his or her parental rights, an attorney could delay filing a motion to relinquish until a motion to terminate has been filed in order to receive a second payment. This would unnecessarily delay the resolution of the case and delay permanency for the child in question.

The ORPC's request is based on comparing the average amount paid per appointment in FY 2015-16 under each payment system (\$1,421 for hourly cases compared to \$ 1,240 for flat-fee cases = a difference of \$181 per appointment). Based on the number of appointments paid in FY 2015-16 (4,342), this is anticipated to require \$785,902. The ORPC notes that if approval of this request is successful in reducing the amount of time that some children spend in foster care, it would reduce the costs incurred by counties for out-of-home care.

Staff recommends approving the request. This is one of the primary issues identified by the group that recommended the creation of this independent office. Converting to a consistent hourly payment method will allow the ORPC to monitor attorney activities and compliance with minimum practice standards. It will also allow the ORPC to collect consistent, statewide data to evaluate the relationship between attorney practice and case outcomes.

→ ORPC R2/BA1 INCREASE IN CASE FILINGS

REQUEST: The Committee recently approved mid-year increases totaling \$2,335,111 General Fund (including \$2,173,497 for Court-appointed Counsel and \$161,614 for Mandated Costs) to address an increase in the number of case filings, changes in appellate rules, and changes in respondent parent counsel practices and supports. The ORPC requests that this funding continue in FY 2017-18. In addition, the ORPC requests an additional \$513,069 General Fund (including \$491,787 for Court-appointed Counsel and \$21,282 for Mandated Costs) to address a projected 3.8 percent increase in case filings.

RECOMMENDATION: **Based on more recent information provided by the ORPS staff, staff recommends an increase of \$219,354 General Fund** (including \$100,281 for Court-appointed Counsel and \$119,253 for Mandated Costs). Based on more recent expenditures and caseload data, the ORPC is now projecting a 2.1 percent increase in case filings in FY 2017-18 (rather than 3.8 percent), which caused the ORPC projection of Court-appointed Counsel expenses to decrease by \$391,506 compared to the request that was submitted last month. The ORPC's projection for Mandated Costs increased by \$97,791, particularly in the areas of transcripts and expert witnesses.

Staff recommends approving the request for increases in each of these line items for FY 2017-18 to ensure that the ORPC has sufficient funding to cover the costs of court appointments and the associated mandated costs. However, staff recommends using the ORPC's most recent projections.

→ ORPC BA2 SOCIAL WORKER PILOT PROGRAM

REQUEST: The ORPC requests \$301,033 General Fund to implement a Social Worker Pilot Program.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends approving the request.**

ANALYSIS:

The ORPC is requesting funding for a Social Worker Pilot Program to be tested in the 1st (Gilpin and Jefferson counties) and the 21st (Mesa county) judicial districts. The program is based on a multidisciplinary approach to parent representation from other states, and is expected to improve outcomes for parents and children in Colorado.

The ORPC assumed oversight for respondent parent counsel (RPC) attorneys on July 1, 2016, and adopted formal billing policies in September 2016. The billing policies allowed RPCs in hourly jurisdictions to request access to social workers on individual cases. In flat-fee jurisdictions, RPCs were given access to social workers only as experts on a case. Although the ORPC was aware of the demand for social workers in child welfare cases at the time of the adoption of the billing policies, the presumption was that the cost for social workers would be absorbable in the court appointed counsel line.

In addition to the ability to request access to social workers, RPC attorneys were given the option to consult with the Social Worker Coordinator on staff with the ORPC to provide guidance and

support related to a variety of case issues. Through this process, the ORPC has learned that there is a demand for access to well-trained social workers with familiarity of dependency law. On average, the Social Worker Coordinator has consulted on three cases a week.

As the demand for social workers grew, the ORPC began to research multidisciplinary models incorporating social workers in other states. As demonstrated in the narrative below, the research shows that a social worker must be part of a multidisciplinary family defense team from the inception of a child welfare case in order to make the greatest impact on outcomes for Colorado families. After conducting this research, the ORPC then came up with a plan for a pilot social worker program in Colorado. The costs for this plan would not be absorbable in the current budget for Court Appointed Counsel.

The ORPC indicates that research also shows that high-quality legal representation for parents in child welfare cases results not only in improved outcomes for families, but a potential cost savings for taxpayers because children spend less time in foster care and children are reunified with their families more quickly. The ORPC cites the Center for Family Representation (CFR) in New York City, which employs the “cornerstone advocacy approach” to family defense, meaning that each parent is represented by a multidisciplinary advocacy team, which includes a social worker, parent advocate, and attorney. Using this model of representation, which begins when the dependency petition is filed, CFR data shows that more than 50 percent of children of CFR clients avoided foster care altogether and, of the children who were in foster care, the median length of stay in foster care was 2.2 months—much lower than the New York state average of two years.

Further, the ORPC indicates that other available data from the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges supports the conclusion that a family’s chance of successful reunification improves dramatically when provided with a multidisciplinary approach that includes a zealous attorney, an appropriate clinical assessment, timely and effective services, and strong advocacy within the child welfare system by a social worker.

The ORPC proposes contracting with social workers in two jurisdictions (the 1st and the 21st judicial districts) in FY 2017-18. The pilot program will focus on only “expedited permanency planning” cases, which reduce to 12 months the legal time frames for achieving permanency for children who are the subjects of a dependency case. Based on the EPP case filing numbers and an anticipated full-time case load, the ORPC anticipates that the pilot program for the 1st judicial district will incorporate two contract social workers, while the 21st judicial district will incorporate one contract social worker. All of the cases will be funneled through the ORPC Social Worker Coordinator, who will be responsible for supervision and oversight of all three social workers.

To request a social worker under the pilot program, attorneys will be asked to complete a social worker referral form for each of their cases that qualify as EPP immediately after appointment. The Social Worker Coordinator will then make a determination about which cases qualify for a referral to a social worker. The cases with the highest risk and need will receive social work intervention. The Social Worker Coordinator will manage the data for all of the cases in each district including cases that are not selected for participation in the program.

The Social Worker Pilot Program is anticipated to increase respondent parent engagement at the onset of the case, which will produce better permanency outcomes for families. The program will

potentially reduce the time children spend in out-of-home placement, reduce the overall length of the case, increase the rates of reunification, and produce better permanency outcomes. These outcomes will be measured through the program evaluation that will be prepared by the Social Worker Coordinator at the conclusion of the fiscal year.

The program evaluation will utilize two separate hourly judicial districts to serve as the control group. The control group for the 1st Judicial District will be the 13th Judicial District and the control group for the 21st Judicial District will be the 7th Judicial District. The program evaluation will assess the efficacy of the program to determine if the anticipated outcomes are achieved. This will provide insight into whether expanding the program statewide would be beneficial and effective.

Staff recommends approving the request to allow the ORPC to evaluate whether and how the inclusion of social workers on certain cases affects case outcomes. The pilot program appears to be well designed, and will allow the existing Social Worker Coordinator to engage with contract attorneys, county departments of human services, and behavioral health providers in two judicial districts to evaluate the impact of this model. This model is consistent with previous actions taken by the General Assembly to allow the other independent agencies (OSPD, OADC, and OCR) to include social workers in certain types of cases.

→ ORPC BA3 REFLECT GRANT EXPENDITURES

REQUEST: The ORPC requests that the Long Bill include a line item to reflect anticipated training expenditures using federal grant funding that is transferred from the Department of Human Services (DHS). The ORPC estimates that it will spend \$31,095 grant funds in FY 2017-18 (an increase of \$7,340 compared to FY 2016-17).

RECOMMENDATION: **Consistent with the Committee's action on a corresponding supplemental request, staff recommends reflecting \$31,095 reappropriated funds as requested.** This amount includes two grants:

- The DHS has earmarked \$40,000 of federal Children's Justice Act funds for use by the ORPC. The ORPC is required to use \$24,500 in the period January through September 2017, and the remaining \$15,500 in the period October through December 2017. The ORPC will use the funds to: provide additional training for rural contract attorneys and ORPC staff; send staff to the American Bar Association (ABA) National Parent Attorney Conference; and provide scholarships for a limited number of contract attorneys to attend this ABA Conference.
- Federal Title IV-E funds are available to reimburse up to 33 percent of training-related expenditures. The ORPC estimates that it will have \$20,000 of qualified expenses in FY 2016-17 and \$25,000 of qualified expenses in FY 2017-18. The grant funds would allow the ORPC to provide additional training for contract attorneys.

Even though this amount is informational, the new line item provides a more accurate depiction of the total amount of funding that is available for the ORPC to carry out its statutory mandate to improve the quality of legal representation for parents involved in dependency and neglect proceedings. In future fiscal years, the new line item also provides a consistent and transparent way to track actual training-related expenditures.

LINE ITEM DETAIL – OFFICE OF THE RESPONDENT PARENTS' COUNSEL

PERSONAL SERVICES

This line item provides funding to support a central administrative office in Denver. The following table details the types of employees that are supported by this line item.

STAFFING SUMMARY				
OFFICE OF THE RESPONDENT PARENTS' COUNSEL	15-16 ACTUAL	16-17 APPROP.	17-18 REQUEST	17-18 RECOMMEND.
Executive Director	0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0
Deputy Director	0.3	1.0	1.0	1.0
Chief Financial Officer	0.4	1.0	1.0	1.0
Staff Attorneys	0.7	2.0	3.0	3.0
Social Worker Coordinator	0.2	0.0	1.0	1.0
Executive Assistant	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.0
Attorney Reimbursement Specialist	0.2	1.0	1.0	1.0
Paralegal	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Accountant	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.6
Staff Assistant	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
IT Specialist	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Marketing Specialist	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.4
Total	2.8	10.0	10.0	10.0

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 13-92-101 et seq., C.R.S.

REQUEST: The ORPC requests \$1,177,365 General Fund and 10.0 FTE, which is the same as the FY 2016-17 appropriation.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends approving the request**

HEALTH, LIFE, AND DENTAL

This line item provides funding for the employer's share of the cost of group benefit plans providing health, life, and dental insurance for ORPC staff.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Pursuant to Section 24-50-611, C.R.S., and defined in Section 24-50-603 (9), C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$85,931 General Fund.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends appropriating \$84,338 General Fund**, consistent with Committee policy with respect to employer contribution rates (these were the adjusted rates proposed by the Department of Personnel through a budget amendment). This amount includes funding for two positions that were recently filled.

SHORT-TERM DISABILITY

This line item provides funding for the employer's share of ORPC employees' short-term disability insurance premiums.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Pursuant to Section 24-50-611, C.R.S., and defined in Section 24-50-603 (9), C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$1,609 General Fund, based on applying a rate of 0.19 percent.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff's recommendation for this line item is pending** the Committee's common policy for Salary Survey and Merit Pay. Staff's recommendation includes \$9 for Staff-initiated R1 (Compensation alignment), which is discussed at the beginning of this packet.

S.B. 04-257 AMORTIZATION EQUALIZATION DISBURSEMENT (AED)

Pursuant to S.B. 04-257, this line item provides additional funding to increase the state contribution for Public Employees' Retirement Association (PERA) for ORPC staff.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Pursuant to Section 24-51-411, C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$42,332 General Fund, based on applying a rate of 5.0 percent.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff's recommendation for this line item is pending** the Committee's common policy for Salary Survey and Merit Pay. Staff's recommendation includes \$239 for Staff-initiated R1 (Compensation alignment), which is discussed at the beginning of this packet.

S.B. 06-235 SUPPLEMENTAL AMORTIZATION EQUALIZATION DISBURSEMENT (SAED)

Pursuant to S.B. 06-235, this line item provides additional funding to increase the state contribution for PERA for ORPC staff.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Pursuant to Section 24-51-411, C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$42,332 General Fund, based on applying a rate of 5.0 percent.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff's recommendation for this line item is pending** the Committee's common policy for Salary Survey and Merit Pay. Staff's recommendation includes \$239 for Staff-initiated R1 (Compensation alignment), which is discussed at the beginning of this packet.

SALARY SURVEY

The ORPC uses this line item to pay for annual salary increases.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Pursuant to Section 24-50-104, C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$23,045 General Fund for a 2.5 percent across-the-board salary increase for all employees based on existing salaries (including the Executive Director).

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff's recommendation is pending** the Committee's common policy for this line item. Staff's recommendation includes \$5,321 for Staff-initiated R1 (Compensation alignment), which is discussed at the beginning of this packet. In addition, staff requests permission to adjust this line item to maintain the alignment of the salary for the Executive Director with that of a District Court Judge.

MERIT PAY

The ORPC uses this line item to pay for performance-related pay increases.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Pursuant to Section 24-50-104 (1) (c), C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$0 General Fund.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff's recommendation for this line item is pending** the Committee's common policy for Salary Survey and Merit Pay.

OPERATING EXPENSES

This line item provides funding for operating and travel expenses, and for reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred by members of the Respondent Parents' Counsel Governing Commission.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 13-92-101 et seq., C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$61,833 General Fund. The request includes \$1,033 for ORPC BA2 (Social worker pilot program).

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends appropriating \$87,221 General Fund.** The recommendation includes \$1,033 for ORPC BA2. In addition, staff recommends transferring \$25,388 from the Mandated Costs line item to this line item. This is the amount that is used to pay for independent contractor access to Westlaw services. This expense does not appear to fall under the definition of "mandated costs" that staff has provided below, so staff recommends reflecting it with other ORPC operating expenses.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

This line item provides funding for the one-time costs associated with new employees (office furniture, a computer and software, etc.).

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 13-92-101 et seq., C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$0 General Fund.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approving the request.

LEGAL SERVICES

This line item provides funding for the Department to purchase legal services from the Department of Law.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Pursuant to 24-31-101 (1) (a), C.R.S., and defined in Section 24-75-112 (1) (i), C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$1,901 General Fund to purchase 20.0 hours of legal services.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approving the request, which reflects a continuation level of funding. The actual dollar amount of the appropriation will be calculated after the Committee sets the common policy for the legal services rate.

CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

This line item provides funding for the development and implementation of an information system that allows the ORPC to manage cases and billing functions.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 13-92-101 et seq., C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$0 General Fund.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approving the request.

TRAINING

This line item provides funding for the ORPC to offer training opportunities for contract attorneys and other individuals as appropriate to ensure the provision and availability of high-quality legal representation for parents involved in dependency and neglect proceedings.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 13-92-101 et seq., C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$60,000 total funds, including \$30,000 General Fund and \$30,000 cash funds from training fees.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends approving the request, which is the same appropriation as for FY 2016-17.

COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

This line item provides funding for contract attorneys who are appointed to represent respondent parents. Payments cover flat payments or hourly rates, as well as reimbursement for costs such as mileage, copying, postage, and travel expenses.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 13-92-101 et seq., C.R.S.

REQUEST: The request includes \$14,219,440 General Fund. Compared to the amended FY 2016-17 appropriation, the request includes \$785,902 for ORPC R1 (Conversion to hourly billing) and \$491,787 for ORPC R2/BA1 (Increase in case filings).

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends appropriating \$13,827,934 General Fund.** The recommendation includes:

- \$785,902 for ORPC R1; and
- \$100,281 for ORPC R2/BA1.

MANDATED COSTS

This is one of several line item appropriations for "mandated costs". These costs are associated with activities, events, and services that accompany court cases that are required in statute and/or the U.S. and Colorado Constitutions to ensure a fair and speedy trial, and to ensure the right to legal representation. For the ORPC, these costs are anticipated to include the following:

- expert witnesses and expert witness travel reimbursement;
- transcripts; and
- interpreters - out of court.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 13-92-101 et seq., C.R.S.

REQUEST: The ORPC requests \$777,018 General Fund. Compared to the amended FY 2016-17 appropriation, the request includes \$21,282 for ORPC R2/BA1 (Increase in case filings) and \$300,000 for ORPC BA2 (Social worker pilot program).

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends appropriating \$849,421 General Fund.** The recommendation includes:

- \$119,073 for ORPC R2/BA1; and
- \$300,000 for ORPC BA2.

In addition, staff recommends transferring \$25,388 from this line item to the Operating Expenses line item. This is the amount that is used to pay for independent contractor access to Westlaw services. This expenses does not appear to fall under the definition of "mandated costs" that staff has provided above, so staff recommends reflecting it with other ORPC operating expenses.

GRANTS

This is a new line item that was added through the supplemental bill for the Judicial Branch to reflect federal grant funds that the ORPC receives from the Department of Human Services. Similar to the Title IV-E funds that are reflected in the Office of the Child's Representative budget, this amount includes an "I" notation indicating that it is not an appropriation and is reflected for informational purposes only.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: Section 13-92-101 et seq., C.R.S.

DHS BEHAVIORAL HEALTH TABLED ITEM
MARCH 16, 2017

REQUEST: The ORPC estimates that it will spend \$31,095 grant funds in FY 2017-18.

RECOMMENDATION: **Staff recommends reflecting \$31,095 reappropriated funds as requested.**