



COLORADO FISCAL POLICY INSTITUTE

Justice and Economic Security for *all* Coloradans

Restored, New and Increased Programs in the Colorado State Budget Following the 2001 Recession (May 17, 2007)

Executive Summary

This paper examines the extent to which the revenue that the State of Colorado was able to retain under Referendum C, passed by voters in November 2005, have been used to restore programs eliminated or reduced during the recent recession, in the first two years of the five-year time-out in Ref. C.

The adopted budgets for Fiscal Year 2005-06 and FY 06-07, as well as the Supplemental budget for FY 05-06, were reviewed to obtain information about restored or new programs in the general fund. Decisions had to be made as to whether a given line item increase constituted a restored or new program, or whether it was merely the normal annual adjustment to maintain a given level of service. The latter were not intended to be included in this analysis.

The analysis found the following restored or new programs in the general fund:

Fiscal Year 2005-06	\$ 113,560,636
Fiscal Year 05-06 Supplementals	67,209,000
Fiscal Year 2006-07	<u>261,605,817</u>
Total	\$ 442,375,453

The total amount of money that Ref. C made available that would have been rebated to taxpayers during this time period was \$2,178,200,000. Thus, 20.3% of the retained money was able to be applied to restoration of or additions to programs.

The remainder of the retained funds were utilized to avoid further program cuts (\$751,100,000), fund additional highway construction through the SB 97-1 transfer (\$449,300,000) and highway and capital construction through the HB 02-1310 excess reserve transfer.

At the end of the five year Ref. C period, it can be expected that about one-fifth of the retained funds under Ref. C will ultimately be utilized for program restoration, with the largest portion going to fund infrastructure.

Long term, the basic problem with the State of Colorado's budget – insufficient revenue, will still be with the state after the end of the five year time out of Ref. C. Colorado is likely to return to an era of annual, systematic program cuts.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to show which state services were restored or added after the state experienced the recent recession., including after the passage of Referendum C (Ref C), passed by voters in November 2005. We deliberately included such increases approved in the FY 05-06 budget even though Ref. C hadn't passed yet at the time of its passage. This is because the original motivation for this analysis was to begin to track the policy actions taken by budget makers in Colorado as the state pulled out of the recession. This is not to say that there were no new or restored services before FY 05-06. But it was clear while observing the budget process in Colorado that that was the first year in which the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) felt that it could make any significant movement in that direction.

Referendum C

Ref. C gave the state a 5 year timeout from the revenue limits under the Taxpayer Bill of Rights (TABOR). It also set the revenue base for the following year (year 6) at the highest of the five years. It also allowed the state, in all subsequent years, to apply the TABOR formula (change in population plus change in the Consumer Price Index or CPI) to the revenue base that would have been possible from each prior year, rather than the lesser of (a) this formula, or (b) actual revenues for each prior year. Prior to Ref. C, in any year that the state received fewer dollars than the formula would have allowed, the new base would be this lower amount. In the years since the adoption of TABOR, there were only 5 years in which actual revenues met or exceeded the formula (FY 97-01). In all other years, TABOR resulted in a "ratcheting" down of the base. This meant that the revenue capacity that appeared to be present under the population and inflation formula, was not there in fact, as a result of fluctuations in the economy.

Ref. C also called for the creation of a new fund category called "general fund exempt," into which money that would have been rebated to taxpayers is to be placed. All general fund revenue received above the original TABOR limit is recorded there. In year six and beyond, the general fund exempt line will continue to receive the funds that exceed the amounts that, pre-Ref. C, the state would have been able to retain, but below any future rebates due to TABOR. It should be noted that Ref. C did not change or eliminate the TABOR revenue formula. It did modify the way in which it is applied, as described above.

Ref. C also earmarked the retained money for five categories of state appropriations: education (K-12), higher education, health care (Medicaid), transportation, and the Fire and Police Pension account that had been allowed to decline during the recent recession. Each of the first three categories are to receive equal parts of the money in a 30-30-30% share. Prior to the election, state economics staff had estimated that the annual amounts available would be between \$800 and \$900 million. In the first two fiscal years to which Ref. C applied, this meant that these three departments would be earmarked \$261.4 M, and \$256.1 M, each, respectively.

To comply with the requirements of Ref. C that retained money be placed in the general fund exempt account, but that 90% of this money be directed towards education, higher education and health care, amounts equal to those listed in the previous paragraph were deducted from the general fund (non-exempt) budgets of those three departments, and simply added to the general fund exempt lines. Thus there was no net effect in terms of the total dollars that the General Assembly had to work with. In layman's terms, the same dollars were merely renamed or redefined to fit within the Ref. C categories. This procedure is consistent with the statements by state officials that Ref. C did not add "new" money to the budget.

Expectations

During the months leading up to the 2005 election, there were a number of expectations that some in Colorado ascribed to the Ref. C proceeds. Among these were: (a) the restoration of some or all of the programs and services that were cut during the recession. JBC staff had estimated that roughly \$1 B in services were cut (in addition to the utilization of other fund balances that the General Assembly used or transferred in order to maintain service levels or minimize the cuts), (b) ensure that the retained money would be spent in the three earmarked areas of education, higher ed. and health care, stop the budget

cuts that would continue to occur in its absence, and (c) enhance service levels throughout the state budget.¹

The Colorado Fiscal Policy Institute (COFPI) supported Ref. C. Yet, at the same time we had a number of concerns. First, Ref. C did not deal with the fact that the General Assembly had been interpreting TABOR over the years to lock in place the 6% general fund spending cap embodied in the Arveschoug-Bird bill. In other words, Ref. C let stand this limit on operational appropriations in the general fund, and the apparent ratcheting effect that exists if TABOR “constitutionalized” it. While we are not sure that TABOR prohibits the General Assembly from repealing Arveschoug-Bird altogether, it has never acted to do so, thus subjecting the question to legal interpretation by the courts. One writer has recently called this assumption into question.²

Secondly, we have felt that the expectations listed above are likely in conflict with each other because most of the retained money under Ref. C is not *new money*. It is essentially money that flows into state coffers under existing (and unchanged) tax and fee rates, but that would have had to be returned to citizens, with the result that further program and service cuts would have had to be made. In the words of one state official, “there is no new money” under Ref. C. For this reason, it appeared to us unrealistic to be able to cease further cuts, restore recession-era cuts, earmark the retained money to the three named departments, and enhance services.

Restored or New Spending

In light of this apparent conflict, we undertook to comb through published state budget documents, with the intent of documenting any spending action that appeared to fall under one of two categories:

- Program restorations
- Expanded or new program spending.

The fiscal year appropriations actions that are available to us as of the publication of this paper are:

- FY 05-06 Long Bill
- FY 05-06 Supplemental Appropriations
- FY 06-07 Long Bill
- A variety of JBC staff documents that JBC members rely upon to inform their budget decisions

We did not wait to include FY 07-08, which as of this writing, is still under consideration.

We received assistance from members of the JBC staff, although any errors or omissions are completely the responsibility of COFPI. In our discussions with JBC staff, it became clear that defining what spending could be fairly deemed “new” or “restored,” was harder than first thought. For example, a particular service area, contracted to the private or nonprofit sector, had experienced a freeze in provider rates for a number of years during the recession. Would it be proper to consider an adjustment of these provider rates to be restored spending, or should it be considered merely business as usual, since it had been the practice of the state under normal economic times to make such adjustments on an annual

¹ In November 2004, the JBC staff issued a memorandum entitled “Update On Summary of Actions Taken to Balance Prior Year Budgets,” listing, to the best of their ability, the program and service cuts that had occurred during the recession. This memo is reproduced at http://www.cclponline.org/pubfiles/2004_NovJBC3yractions.pdf. The reader will note that the level of detail within this memo varies. The descriptive approach in the memo also often differs from the format of the Appropriations Report, with the result that it is not always possible to match an item in the memo with either a line in the Long Bill, or in an Appropriations Report. As a result, it is not necessarily an “automatic” task to match restored spending categories with the descriptors in the Nov. 2004 memo.

² See Ewgen, Bob, “State Budget Limit Can Be Changed,” Denver Post, April 7, 2007.

basis? These are the types of calls that we had to make in including or excluding a given appropriation in this analysis.

Another procedural matter made the project more difficult. That is, many budget decisions occur in the form of “supplemental” spending bills that do not show up in the Appropriations Report (the basic budget document of the state) of either the base year, or the following year. This statement must be clarified to say that a supplemental budget increase *does* get built into the *base* of the following year’s numbers, but it is not shown separately in the following year’s budget. The result of this is that the prior year spending figures in the Appropriations Report almost never match the numbers published in the prior year’s Appropriations Report.

Legislatures must, and do, have the authority to modify a budget partway through a fiscal year, and certainly this was true in the year immediately following Ref. C’s passage. However, from a research standpoint, it was necessary to consult a number of sources to ensure that we were counting new spending correctly.

We did not include dollars allocated towards State employee compensation adjustment (performance or market-based).

This paper does not catalog spending increases that are required under Constitutional Amendment 23 (passed in 2000), which requires certain minimum spending increases for K-12 education.

In the published budget documents, differing terminology in the narratives of the different departmental sections, could result in our misreading a given budget decision. We take full responsibility for any such errors.

Finally, this paper focuses on the general fund. Wherever we list a new or restored spending item, it will be one that has a general fund component, along with any additional non-general fund monies. There may be new or restored spending categories outside the general fund that we have not covered here, since we did not gather non-general fund increases if there were no accompanying general fund dollars.

Summary of the Data on Budget Restorations and Additions

[GF = general fund; TF = total funds -- in dollars]

Health Care Policy and Financing	GF: 68,446,828	TF: 132,362,386
Human Services	GF: 57,762,000	TF: 80,912,000
Education	GF: 45,162,620	TF: 45,762,620
Higher Education	GF: 71,900,000	TF: 71,900,000
Public Health and Environment	GF: 8,906,000	TF: 71,480,873
Corrections	GF: 54,000,000	TF: 54,000,000
Judicial	GF: 24,032,000	TF: 24,032,000
Public Safety	GF: 8,934,005	TF: 8,934,005

Natural Resources	GF: --	TF: --
Revenue	GF: 1,000,000	TF: 1,000,000
Legislature	GF: --	TF: --
Agriculture	GF: 150,000	TF: 150,000
Law	GF: 1,273,000	TF: 2,060,000
Governor	GF: --	TF: --
Local Affairs	GF: 1,000,000	TF: 1,000,000
Military and Veterans Affairs	GF: 409,000	TF: 409,000
Personnel and Administration	GF: --	TF: --
Regulatory Agencies	GF: --	TF: --
Treasury	GF: 99,400,000	TF: 99,400,000
Grand Total – All Departments	GF: 442,375,453	TF: 593,402,884

Below is a table that shows, for the general fund only, how the data breaks down by fiscal year.

Restored Cuts or New Programmatic Spending				
General Fund Only				
Department	FY 05-06	FY 05-06 Supplementals	FY 06-07	Total
Health Care Policy and Financing	\$ 15,395,131	\$ 3,523,000	\$ 49,528,697	\$ 68,446,828
Human Services	\$ 27,600,000	\$ 5,026,000	\$ 25,136,000	\$ 57,762,000
Education	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 26,610,000	\$ 16,052,620	\$ 45,162,620
Higher Education	\$ 9,900,000	\$ 30,800,000	\$ 31,200,000	\$ 71,900,000
Public Health and Environment	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 5,956,000	\$ 8,906,000
Corrections	\$ 21,900,000	--	\$ 32,100,000	\$ 54,000,000
Judicial	\$ 7,520,000	--	\$ 16,512,000	\$ 24,032,000
Public Safety	\$ 1,745,505	--	\$ 7,188,500	\$ 8,934,005
Natural Resources	--	--	--	0
Revenue	--	--	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
Legislature	--	--	--	0
Agriculture	--	--	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000
Law	--	--	\$ 1,273,000	\$ 1,273,000
Governor	--	--	--	0
Local Affairs	--	--	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
Military and Veterans Affairs	--	--	\$ 409,000	\$ 409,000
Personnel and Administration	--	--	--	0
Regulatory Agencies	--	--	--	0
Treasury	\$ 25,300,000	--	\$ 74,100,000	\$ 99,400,000
Grand Total –				
All Departments	\$ 113,560,636	\$ 67,209,000	\$ 261,605,817	\$ 442,375,453

Analysis

It can be seen from the data that over the budgeting periods for FY 05-06, the FY 05-06 Supplementals and FY 06-07, the General Assembly was able to restore, or add, some \$442,375,000 to base general fund operating programs with which it began prior to FY 05-06. This covers two full annual budgeting periods plus the supplemental changes that it made between these two fiscal years.

Recall that Ref. C passed after the adoption of the FY 05-06 Long Bill and before the adoption of the FY 06-07 Long Bill. During this two years of budgeting activity, according to the Appropriations Report of FY 06-07, the State expected to have available to it \$815,100,000 (FY 05-06 revised) + \$801,200,000 (FY 06-07) = \$1,616,300,000, or over one and a half billion dollars for the full period.

However, in the March 2007 quarterly revenue forecast in “Focus Colorado: Economic and Revenue Forecast, 2007-2011,”³ the Legislative Council economics staff shows in Table 1 that the actual amounts of “general fund exempt” money are \$1,116.1 million (FY05-06) and \$1,062.1 million (FY 06-07), respectively. These higher figures reflect a faster and deeper economic recovery for Colorado. Using these updated numbers, which total \$2,178,200,000 over the two years, one can conclude that only approximately 20.3% of the money that has been made available over the first two years of Ref. C was actually translated into restored or new programs.

The remaining portions of the general fund exempt money for the two years went to the SB 97-1 highway transfer (\$449.3 million), the HB 02-1310 excess reserve transfer into highways and capital, and towards program cut avoidance (\$751,100,000).

These figures should be interpreted as estimates, because this author made interpretations throughout the research effort to distinguish between “business as usual” increases vs. true restorations or program increases, only the fiscal years 05-06 through FY 06-07 were considered, and available published information was utilized to obtain the information.

These results seem consistent with the prognosis that state officials made regarding the extent of funds that Ref. C would be able to make available for recovering state programs after the recession. A COFPI issue brief, “Referendum C: A Small Step But Not A Panacea,” by Carol Hedges⁴ predicted that around 61% of the money for FY 06-07 would be needed for cut-avoidance, while 18.7% would be available for restored or new programs, and 19.9% would go to for highways. That the actual restored or new programs came very close to this figure, lends additional confidence to Ms. Hedges’ analysis.

Implications

What are the implications of these findings and conclusions? We offer the following:

1. Referendum C will make only a nominal dent in the damage that was done to Colorado’s general fund budget by a combination of TABOR and the recent recession
2. Without changes to the combination of restrictions that exist in the state constitution and statute, there is little hope of extracting the State of Colorado from this limitation on its ability to deliver basic public services
3. This combination of fiscal restrictions contains a bias towards transportation, and away from such services as education, health, services for vulnerable populations, criminal justice and crime prevention, etc.
4. Despite the passage of Ref. C, Colorado continues to have the most restrictive limits on revenue and spending in the nation
5. The end of the five-year time-out will likely bring new rounds of programmatic budget cuts that will rival and possibly even exceed those of the first half of this decade in their practical effect on citizens and recipients of the various programs carried out by the State.

³ http://www.state.co.us/gov_dir/leg_dir/lcsstaff/lcs/focus/2007/07Forecast0320.pdf

⁴ see online: http://www.cclponline.org/pubfiles/2006_8_17RefCPanacea.pdf

Appendix – Identifying the Budget Restorations or New Program Spending

Listed below are the restored or new appropriations that occurred in FY 05-06, the FY 05-06 Supplementals, and FY 06-07. The abbreviation “GF” stands for general fund, and the abbreviation “TF” stands for total funds, *including the general fund*. Thus, *the second figure includes the first figure* in each entry. Where the two dollar amounts are identical, this means that there were no funds other than the general fund included in the restored or new spending area considered.

Health Care Policy and Financing	
<u>FY 05-06</u>	
Med. Services Premiums – 2% rate adjustments for inpatient, physician, and HCBS	
GF: 9,430,250	TF: 18,866,499
Med. Mental Health – 3.25% COLA for capitated MH providers	
GF: 2,583,446	TF: 5,167,363
CO Indigent Care Program – Increase safety net provider payments to private hospitals	
GF: 3,144,162	TF: 6,288,324
Behavioral Health Organizations reinstate	
GF: 237,273	TF: 474,546
TOTAL FY 05-06	
GF: 15,395,131	TF: 30,796,732
<u>FY 05-06 Supplementals</u>	
SSI 65+ 1% rate increase	
GF: 1,440,000	TF: 2,880,000
SSI 60-64 1% rate increase	
GF: 160,000	TF: 320,000
SSI Disabled 1% rate increase	
GF: 1,150,000	TF: 2,300,000
Categorically Eligible Low Income Adults 1% rate increase	
GF: 93,000	TF: 186,000
Baby Care Program Adults 1% rate increase	
GF: 26,000	TF: 53,000
Services for Children 1% rate increase	
GF: 130,000	TF: 260,000
Services for Foster Children 1% rate increase	
GF: 77,000	TF: 154,000
Services for Non-Citizens	
GF: 45,000	TF: 91,000

Developmentally Disability Services - Medicaid Eligible	
GF: 402,000	TF: 804,000
TOTAL FY 05-06 Supplementals	
GF: 3,523,000	TF: 7,048,000
<u>FY 06-07</u>	
Med. Serv. Premiums - Acute care rate adjustment	
GF: 12,759,937	TF: 26,547,278
Med. Serv. Premiums - Community LT care rate adjustment	
GF: 12,475,704	TF: 24,951,408
Staffing adjustment 5.7 FTE	
GF: 332,912	TF: 332,912
Family Medicine Resident Training partial reinstatement	
GF: 127,056	TF: 127,056
Increase in Safety Net Provider program at private hospitals from interest earned on Controlled Maintenance Trust Fund	
GF: 3,100,000	TF: 6,200,000
Increase in eligibility for Medically Indigent to 250% of FPL.	
GF: 14,962,000	TF: 29,925,000
Creation of a pilot program using Telemedicine for persons with chronic diseases	
GF: 204,000	TF: 434,000
Establish Blue Ribbon Commission on Health Care Reform	
GF: 100,000	TF: 200,000
Establishes a Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facility for children placed in out-of-home settings	
GF: 5,800,000	TF: 5,800,000
TOTAL FY 06-07	
GF: 49,528,697	TF: 94,517,654
GRAND TOTAL Health Care Policy and Financing	
GF: 68,446,828	TF: 132,362,386

Human Services	
<u>FY 05-06</u>	
Increase in provider rates	
GF: 9,000,000	TF: 16,800,000
Increase funding for counties for child welfare services	
GF: 6,800,000	TF: 13,700,000
Increase Aid to Needy Disabled program	

GF: 2,300,000	TF: 2,900,000
Funds for caseload increases, Div. Youth Corrections contract placements	
GF: 2,200,000	TF: 3,400,000
Family Support services for families of children with developmental disabilities – restore program to level prior to a 50% cut in FY03-04	
GF: 2,800,000	TF: 2,800,000
Add 148 children and eliminate waiting list for Children’s Extensive Support program for children with developmental disabilities	
GF: 800,000	TF: 2,700,000
Expand services for persons with developmental disabilities	
GF: 1,200,000	TF: 2,600,000
Increase funding for the STIRRT program	
GF: 1,500,000	TF: 1,500,000
Restore funds for the SB1991-94 (youth corrections restorative justice) program	
GF: 1,000,000	TF: 1,000,000
TOTAL FY 05-06	
GF: 27,600,000	TF: 47,400,000
<u>FY 05-06 Supplementals</u>	
Mental health services - medically indigent	
GF: 1,450,000	TF: 1,450,000
Early childhood mental health services	
GF: 280,000	TF: 282,000
Alternatives to hospitalization mental health institute Ft. Logan	
GF: 230,000	TF: 230,000
Alcohol & drug abuse treatment detox contracts	
GF: 100,000	TF: 100,000
DD services - adult programs	
GF: 1,275,000	TF: 2,300,000
DD services for children & families	
GF: 741,000	TF: 741,000
Voc. Rehab programs	
GF: 450,000	TF: 2,100,000
Voc. Rehab. Independent living centers	
GF: 250,000	TF: 250,000
Senior services programs	
GF: 250,000	TF: 250,000

TOTAL FY 05-06 Supplementals**GF: 5,026,000****TF: 6,253,000****FY 06-07**

Provider rate increases of 3.25%

GF: 16,100,000

TF: 16,100,000

Addition of 79 new comprehensive residential placements and 9 supportive living placements for individuals with developmental disabilities

GF: 1,500,000

TF: 3,400,000

Increase in County Administration funding

GF: 3,100,000

TF: 3,100,000

Open a 20-bed mental health facility (Sol Vista) and provide additional treatment services for juveniles with mental health, substance abuse and sexual offender issues

GF: 1,900,000

TF: 1,900,000

Increase S.B. 91-94 programs

GF: 1,000,000

TF: 1,000,000

Additional funds for western and southwestern Colorado mental health crisis stabilization services

GF: 900,000

TF: 900,000

Add 30 new Children's extensive support placements for children with developmental disabilities

GF: 386,000

TF: 609,000

Restore substance abuse and alcohol treatment services

GF: 250,000

TF: 250,000

TOTAL FY 06-07**GF: 25,136,000****TF: 27,259,000****GRAND TOTAL Human Services****GF: 57,762,000****TF: 80,912,000****Education****FY 05-06**CSAP funds to implement new federal requirements for science assessments in 5th and 10th grades

GF: 2,500,000

TF: 3,100,000

TOTAL FY 05-06**GF: 2,500,000****TF: 3,100,000****FY 05-06 Supplementals**

Special Education, Gifted and Talented Children

GF: 1,550,000

TF: 1,550,000

School Breakfast program		
GF: 60,000	TF:	60,000
Public School capital construction		
GF: 25,000,000	TF:	25,000,000
TOTAL FY 05-06 Supplementals		
GF: 26,610,000	TF:	26,610,000
<u>FY 06-07</u>		
Public School capital construction		
GF: 15,000,000	TF:	15,000,000
Partial restoration of Library programs including courier service		
GF: 400,000	TF:	400,000
Restore School Breakfast program		
GF: 190,000	TF:	190,000
Expand home-based literacy programs for hearing impaired children		
GF: 462,620	TF:	462,620
TOTAL 06-07		
GF: 16,052,620	TF:	16,052,620
GRAND TOTAL Education		
GF: 45,162,620	TF:	45,762,620

Higher Education		
<u>FY 05-06</u>		
Increases Metro State College funding		
GF: 2,200,000	TF:	2,200,000
Funding for students attending private colleges		
GF: 1,900,000	TF:	1,900,000
Increase funding for the former state colleges		
GF: 3,700,000	TF:	3,700,000
Increase funding for community colleges		
GF: 1,100,000	TF:	1,100,000
Increase in financial aid		
GF: 1,000,000	TF:	1,000,000
TOTAL FY 05-06		
GF: 9,900,000	TF:	9,900,000
<u>FY 05-06 Supplementals</u>		

Fee for service contracts with state institutions		
GF: 30,300,000	TF:	30,300,000
Local district junior college grants - unfunded enrollment		
GF: 500,000	TF:	500,000
TOTAL FY 05-06 Supplementals		
GF: 30,800,000	TF:	30,800,000
<u>FY 06-07</u>		
Increase in stipend rate for state schools by \$180		
GF: 22,200,000	TF:	22,200,000
Increase in Financial Aid programs		
GF: 9,000,000	TF:	9,000,000
TOTAL FY 06-07		
GF: 31,200,000	TF:	31,200,000
GRAND TOTAL Higher Education		
GF: 71,900,000	TF:	71,900,000

Public Health and Environment		
<u>FY 05-06</u>		
Replace water quality fees with General Fund monies due to sunset of 2003 fee increases		
GF: 1,700,000	TF:	1,700,000
TOTAL FY 05-06		
GF: 1,700,000	TF:	1,700,000
<u>FY 05-06 Supplementals</u>		
Local, District and regional health departments per capita distributions		
GF: 1,250,000	TF:	1,250,000
TOTAL FY 05-06 Supplementals		
GF: 1,250,000	TF:	1,250,000
<u>FY 06-07</u>		
Increase in per capita local, district and regional health department distributions		
GF: 3,750,000	TF:	3,750,000
Base increase Water Quality Control Division in part to respond to EPA concerns		
GF: 760,000	TF:	816,000
Increase in immunizations		
GF: 696,000	TF:	696,000

Program for school-based health centers			
GF:	500,000	TF:	500,000
Increase in Infant Immunization Fund			
GF:	250,000	TF:	250,000
<u>Amendment 35</u> tobacco tax appropriations for prevention, early detection, independent program evaluation, breast and cervical cancer screenings, chronic disease management, prevention, detection and treatment of cancer,, cardiovascular and chronic pulmonary disease, and tobacco education and cessation:			
GF:	--	TF:	62,574,873
TOTAL FY 06-07			
GF:	5,956,000	TF:	68,530,873
GRAND TOTAL Public Health and Environment			
GF:	8,906,000	TF:	71,480,873

Corrections			
<u>FY 05-06</u>			
Caseload growth-driven increase in private prison and local jail reimbursements			
GF:	19,300,000	TF:	19,300,000
Add 18.0 FTE parole and community corrections officers			
GF:	1,500,000	TF:	1,500,000
Provider rate increases			
GF:	1,100,000	TF:	1,100,000
TOTAL FY 05-06			
GF:	21,900,000	TF:	21,900,000
<u>FY 06-07</u>			
Bring 263 female beds on line at the La Vista Correctional facility			
GF:	5,200,000	TF:	5,200,000
Bring 400 male beds on line at four correctional facilities through double-bunking			
GF:	3,500,000	TF:	3,500,000
Add 47.1 FTE parole officers and community corrections officers			
GF:	3,400,000	TF:	3,400,000
Add 13.5 FTE mental health treatment, sex offender treatment, and drug/alcohol treatment staff			
GF:	1,400,000	TF:	1,400,000
Caseload growth-driven increase in private prison reimbursements			
GF:	15,300,000	TF:	15,300,000

Provider rate adjustments for county jails, private prisons, and community correctional facilities	
GF: 3,300,000	TF: 3,300,000
TOTAL FY 06-07	
GF: 32,100,000	TF: 32,100,000
GRAND TOTAL Corrections	
GF: 54,000,000	TF: 54,000,000

Judicial	
<u>FY 05-06</u>	
Add 56.1 FTE additional probation officers	
GF: 3,000,000	TF: 3,000,000
Add 30.0 FTE including six new district court judges and support staff from HB01-1075 that were delayed during the recession	
GF: 2,600,000	TF: 2,600,000
Courthouse capital infrastructure maintenance – counties must provide the court facilities, however, the State must supply funds for operation and maintenance	
GF: 1,000,000	TF: 1,000,000
Alternate defense counsel and Public Defender’s Office for caseload growth	
GF: 920,000	TF: 920,000
TOTAL FY 05-06	
GF: 7,520,000	TF: 7,520,000
<u>FY 06-07</u>	
Increase court-appointed counsel hourly rates	
GF: 5,500,000	TF: 5,500,000
Create 3 new Court of Appeals judgeships and 4 new county judgeships (Jeffco, Douglas, Mesa and Weld) including 42.5 FTE	
GF: 3,134,000	TF: 3,134,000
Create the final 6 judgeships under HB01-1075 including 33.0 FTE, that were delayed during the recession	
GF: 2,300,000	TF: 2,300,000
Add 31.0 FTE trial court staff	
GF: 1,200,000	TF: 1,200,000
Add 20.0 FTE probation officer, supervisor and support staff	
GF: 1,200,000	TF: 1,200,000
Alternate defense counsel, and Office of Child Representative caseload increases	
GF: 1,457,000	TF: 1,457,000

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

--

Revenue

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

Increase in old age heat and fuel, and old age property tax assistance grant programs

GF: 1,000,000

TF: 1,000,000

Legislature

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

--

Agriculture

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

Reestablish matching grants to districts to fund local soil and water conservation projects

GF: 150,000

TF: 150,000

Law

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

Funds necessary to prepare for known litigation at the time the budget was prepared

GF: 1,273,000

TF: 2,060,000

Governor

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

--

Local Affairs

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

Increase grants for affordable housing loans and grants

GF: 1,000,000

TF: 1,000,000

Military and Veterans Affairs

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

Add funds for armory maintenance backlog

GF: 409,000

TF: 409,000

Personnel and Administration

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

--

Regulatory Agencies

FY 05-06

--

FY 06-07

