

Superior Court Policies & Spending Survey

2024

1

Executive Summary

Understanding the complexities of Arizona's superior court system is critical to ensuring its effective operation and sustainable funding. To shed light on these dynamics, the County Supervisors Association (CSA) surveyed the state's 15 counties, with responses from 14, to examine how the Superior Court is funded, staffed, and governed. Respondents included both court and county personnel and responses were received throughout fall 2024. The survey results offers insights into the complex relationship between state mandates and county responsibilities, providing a clearer understanding for counties of how this branch of government operates and is funded across the state. A series of visualization on the key trends from the survey is also available [here](#).

Court Budget & Personnel

- Courts participate in the county's annual budget process, though the level of coordination and procedures vary. To expend funds, including special revenues, the court must have them appropriated by the county Board of Supervisors (BOS).
- Local policies governing court employees vary across the state, with some counties using county-wide personnel manuals and others adopting court-specific manuals.
- Court employees in most counties (11 out of 14 respondents), are subject to county classification and salary ranges, however these processes differ in practice from county to county. For example, in Maricopa County the court utilizes the county's salary ranges and classifications pursuant to an Intergovernmental Governmental Agreement (IGA), while Pima County maintains common jobs titles with the county's structure but a majority of their roles are court-specific.
- In most counties, adding personnel or adjusting salaries is subject to at least county BOS approval. In most cases, courts follow the county budget or personnel processes to make these adjustments.

Judicial Officers

- Courts manage caseloads through the utilization of a variety of judicial officers, including superior court judges, court commissioners, and judges pro tempore. Statewide, there are over 700 different judicial officers, the majority of which are concentrated in the large, urban counties.
- Judicial officer salaries are typically set by the state but funded through a mix of county general funds and special revenues. These special revenues include state Fill-the-Gap funds, fee revenue from court filings, and grants, amongst other sources.

Central Services, Court Initiatives & Local Fees

- Most courts rely on county departments for support. Most often, County HR, finance, IT, and facilities functions are utilized to help support the Superior Court. However, counties differ in how costs for these services are allocated. Around half of the counties indicated that they charge the court for county services rendered, while the other half does not.
- Most courts are also required to utilize IT systems maintained by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) for case management.
- Specialty courts and programs vary across counties, with funding dependent on local resources and priorities. Drug Court, Dependency Alternative, and Veterans Court are amongst the most common special programs utilized across the state.
 - Typically, these are funded involving some court special revenues, with about half of counties providing General Fund (GF) support.
- Most courts have adopted at least one local fee to support court operations, primarily IT functions. Local fees are typically adopted by the county BOS through a board resolution.

Superior Court Policies & Spending Survey

Table of Contents

Court Budget & Personnel	3
Budget Process	4
Salaries, Benefits & Pay Adjustments	6
Policies & Procedures	9
 Judges Pro Tempore	 11
Appointments	12
Salaries	13
Funding	14
 Court Commissioners	 15
Appointments	16
Salaries	17
Funding	19
 Central Services, Court Initiatives & Local Fees	 21
Central Services	22
Court Initiatives	25
Compliance with Court Security Standards	27
Merit Selection Process	29
Other Judicial Requirements	30
Court Fees	31

Superior Court Policies & Spending Survey

Court Budget & Personnel

Overview

This section includes an overview of how the court participates in the county's budget process, along with court employee salaries, benefits, and HR policies. Overwhelmingly, court employees are subject to county salary ranges, yet some ranges are court specific and processes vary across the state. Most court employees are subject to county health care plans. In addition to statewide court codes of conduct, court personnel are subject to a mix of court and county HR manuals, although Judicial Merit Rules are typically developed locally and closely follow county policies.

Background

In addition to local policies, statewide the Arizona Code of Judicial Administration, including Codes of Conduct, governs behavior of court employees and officers.

This code is established by the Supreme Court, and the Code of Judicial Administration is available here: <https://www.azcourts.gov/AZSupremeCourt/CodeofJudicialAdministration>

Several judicial officers, including judges, judges pro tempore, the clerk of the court and court commissioners have statutory touch points for their salaries. Judges and clerks of the court have their salaries set in state statute or session law.

Survey Questions

Budget Process

- Please describe how the superior court participates in the county budget process.
- Does the county have meaningful input into determining what court requests are/are not funded and/or what fund sources are utilized?
- Does the county determine (or have meaningful input into) when to add/remove FTE within the court? Does the county help determine what fund source will be utilized to fund the FTE?

Personnel

- What personnel/HR policies or manuals are employees in the superior court subject to?
 - Is this consistent across all employees, or does it vary by role and/or fund source?
 - Is this a statewide manual, or developed by the superior court in your county?
- What salary ranges, classifications and/or step systems are employees of the superior court subject to?
 - What is the process for determining, and what entities are involved in the following:
 - when new FTE are added?
 - what classification/step/salary range an employee is in?
 - when reclassifications and/or salary adjustments are provided to employees?
- Do court employees and judicial officers participate in the state or county health insurance plan?
 - Who makes that determination and is it standard across court personnel groups?

BUDGET PROCESS

Table 1 of 2

	Please describe how the superior court participates in the county budget process.	Does the county have meaningful input into determining requests are funded and/or what fund sources are utilized?	Does the county determine when to add/remove FTE within the court?	Who determines what fund source will be utilized to fund the FTE?
Summary	Court request, County BOS approval: 13 Same process as other departments (explicit): 8 NR: 2	Yes: 13 NR: 2	Yes: 11 NR: 4	Court: 2 County: 7 NR: 4 Mixed: 2
Apache	NR	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	Court submits requests for County BOS approval	Yes	Yes	Court
Coconino	Court submits requests for County BOS approval; same structure as other departments	Yes	Yes	County
Gila	County Admin and Finance dictate budget requirements before Court submits to BOS for approval	NR	NR	NR
Graham	Court work with County Finance before submitting requests for BOS approval; same structure as other departments	Yes	Yes	County
Greenlee	Court submits requests for County BOS approval; same structure as other elected offices	Yes - County has meaningful input except when purchases are unrelated to county funding	Yes	County
La Paz	Court submits requests for County BOS approval; same structure as other departments	Yes	Yes	NR
Maricopa	Court submits requests, County & Court negotiate funding level, BOS approval	Yes	Yes	NR
Mohave	Court submits requests for County BOS approval; same structure as other departments	Yes - Courts do what they can to maximize grant funding, BOS typically approves	Yes	Mixed - County , when GF expended. Court when Special revenues/grants expended.
Navajo	Court submits requests for County BOS approval	Yes	Yes	County
Pima	NR	Yes	Yes	Court
Pinal	County budget analyst supports Court request development, submits for BOS approval	Yes	Yes	County
Santa Cruz	Court submits requests for County BOS approval; same structure as other departments	Yes	NR	County
Yavapai	Presiding Judge submits requests, County staff & Court determine funding, County BOS approval	Yes	NR	County
Yuma	Court submits requests for BOS approval; same structure as other departments	Yes	Yes	Mixed - County works with Court to determine funding.

Court Budget & Personnel

2024

BUDGET PROCESS*Table 2 of 2***Additional Context****Apache****Cochise****Coconino****Gila**

Superior Court prepares coordinated budget request for courts, per 2017 Administrative Order. County Administration / Finance communicate budget requirements prior to each fiscal year to all County departments and offices, including the courts.

Graham

Courts present their budget requests in a series of budget hearings to the Board of Supervisors and Board staff. When requests are funded through special revenues, the Board still must approve the requests and asks AOC to issue a letter committing to the funding.

Greenlee**La Paz**

Discussions have always been collaborative and striking the balance between court needs and availability of funding.
Court argued during budget deficit (2017) that because Clerk/Court/Probation employees all fall under title 12 Courts and not title 11 Counties, the County could not layoff a state employee. During that time, the Court did lean more on their special revenue funds to relieve the GF.

Maricopa**Mohave**

Budgets, once submitted, are reviewed by Finance and County manager during departmental budget meetings, and those meetings are typically where any new budget initiatives would be discussed and determined whether or not to include in preliminary budget presented to the Board of Supervisors.

Navajo**Pima****Pinal**

County assigns a county budget analyst to the Court who meets with the Court regularly throughout the year and at the end of the fiscal year to coordinate and prioritize budget for the Board of Supervisor's consideration.

Santa Cruz**Yavapai****Yuma**

SALARIES, BENEFITS & PAY ADJUSTMENTS

Table 1 of 3

	What salary ranges, classifications and/or step systems are superior court employees subject to?	What is the process for determining when new FTE are added?	What is the process for determining what classification/step/salary range an employee is in?
Summary	County: 11 Mixed: 3 NR: 1	County process & approval: 10 Mixed: 3 NR: 1	County: 7 Court: 2 Mixed: 5 NR: 1
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	Mixed, County sets market ranges and Court set/awards within parameters or funding	Requires County BOS approval	Court establishes classifications, initial salary. Subject to County market research for adjustments.
Coconino	County, excluding Judges	County budget process, or BOS approval after working with County HR/Finance	Mixed, County HR outlines the level of salary a Court Department Director can approve and works with Department Director on starting pay
Gila	County	Requires County HR or Administration approval	County HR
Graham	County	County budget process, if from special revenue County requires AOC letter of commitment	Plan set by BOS and County HR
Greenlee	County	Mixed, negotiated between Court judge or clerk and County BOS staff	Consistent with similar County positions
La Paz	County	County budget process, or through grant funding (subject to BOS approval); in conjunction with County HR	Mixed, Court appointing authority, in accordance with County and Court policies
Maricopa	County, pursuant to IGA between Court and County	Mixed, Requests determined by Court HR/Finance, approved by Court Administrator. Requests then reviewed by County Compensation/Finance. Funding requests subject to BOS approval	Mixed, Court HR and County Compensation Dept. make final determination
Mohave	County	County budget process, unless there are extraordinary circumstances	Mixed, Hiring in step system requires Court PJ approval or PJ and County BOS approval for certain steps
Navajo	County	County budget process, unless there are extraordinary circumstances	County Administration
Pima	Mixed, maintains common job titles with County, but majority of job titles are court specific.	County procedures govern process, includes County HR, Administration, BOS	County procedures govern process, includes County HR, Administration, BOS
Pinal	County	Mixed, Court HR determines staffing needs, may be approved by County BOS (or designee) or State when State is funding a position.	Mixed, Court HR, following County classifications and ranges
Santa Cruz	County	Mixed, County HR and Superior Court	County HR
Yavapai	County, excluding elected officials	County budget process, Court Admin & Presiding Judge determine need, review by County HR, Management and approval by BOS	County HR
Yuma	Mixed, Court has Judicial Pay plan that mirrors County plan	County budget process, Court request to budget review team and approval by BOS; mid-year adjustments follow county process, regular status FTE require BOS agenda item	Court

Court Budget & Personnel

2024

SALARIES, BENEFITS & PAY ADJUSTMENTS

Table 2 of 3

	What is the process for determining, and what entities are involved in when reclassifications and/or salary adjustments are provided to employees?	Do court employees and judicial officers participate in the state or county health insurance plan?	Who makes that determination and is it standard across court personnel groups?
Summary	County: 8 Court: 1 Mixed: 5 NR: 1 OUTSTANDING: 1	County: 11 Mixed: 2 NR: 2 OUTSTANDING: 1	Standard: 12 NR: 3
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	Court , given budgetary considerations	County	Standard
Coconino	Mixed , Court with County HR, unless included in county-wide adjustments	County	Standard
Gila	County HR	County	Standard , County HR/ Admin.
Graham	County budget process, merit manual sets step/probation increases	County	Standard
Greenlee	County budget process, no steps, County reviews ranges for market consistency	County	Standard
La Paz	Mixed , Court appointing authority, in accordance with County and Court policies	County , Judge option to participate in State plan	NR
Maricopa	Mixed , Performance-based increases funded by County BOS, criteria est. by BOS and Court leadership Market adjustments conducted and funded by County , occasionally requires funding from existing Court budget Critical adjustments evaluated by Court HR, approved by Court Admin. and funded from existing Court resources	County , Judge option to participate in State plan	Standard across Court employees, Judge option to participate in State plan
Mohave	Court Presiding Judge , County Staff, BOS involved through County Budget Process Court personnel on countywide step program, other salary adjustments would be for COLA, market, or reclassifications	Mixed , Court Judges on State plan, all others on County plan	Standard across Court employees, Judge option to participate in State plan
Navajo	County Administration	County	Standard
Pima	County procedures govern process, includes County HR, Administration, BOS	County , Judge option to participate in State plan	Standard across Court employees, except Judge option to participate in State plan, restrictions on Judge fringe benefits
Pinal	Mixed , Court HR and department director, following County policies/plans, work with County finance/HR as necessary	Mixed , Court Judges on State plan, all others on County plan	Standard
Santa Cruz	County HR	NR	NR
Yavapai	County BOS sets & approves COLA and performance adjustments Reclassification, other salary adjustments requested by Court department and reviewed by County HR	County	Standard , determined by County BOS policies
Yuma	Mixed , Court agency head reports changes to County HR. HR will accept requests for classification studies annually in December. Outside of December, requests are approved by HR and County Administrator.	County	Standard

SALARIES, BENEFITS & PAY ADJUSTMENTS
Table 3 of 3

Additional Context		Links
Apache		
Cochise	No reason to exclude court personnel from BOS established plan	Court Classification Plan - County Website
Coconino		
Gila		
Graham		
Greenlee	Court employees historically able to participate in county health insurance plan	
La Paz		
Maricopa		
Mohave		
Navajo		
Pima	Retained judges not eligible for vacation/sick leave, paid holidays or short-term disability	
Pinal		
Santa Cruz		
Yavapai	Health insurance for employees over 30 hours per week and considered full-time	
Yuma	Court employees historically able to participate in county health insurance plan	

Court Budget & Personnel

2024

POLICIES & PROCEDURES

Table 1 of 2

	What personnel/HR policies or manuals are employees in the superior court subject to?	Is this consistent across all employees, or does it vary by role and/or fund source?	Is this a statewide manual, or developed by the superior court in your county?
Summary	Court: 7 County: 2 Mixed: 4 NR: 2	Consistent: 9 Consistent, except Judicial Officers: 2 Varies: 1 NR: 3	Developed Locally: 13 NR: 2
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	Court	Consistent	JMR locally developed
Coconino	Court	Consistent, except for Judges	JMR locally developed, by judicial personnel committee
Gila	Mixed, Court personnel policies and merit system identical to County except Grievance/Discipline policies	NR	JMR locally developed
Graham	County	Consistent	County policies locally developed
Greenlee	Court	Consistent	JMR locally developed, by presiding judge
La Paz	Mixed, Court merit rules match County in some instances	Consistent, except for Judges & Commissioners	JMR locally developed
Maricopa	Court, but effort made to be consistent with County when possible	Consistent	JMR locally developed
Mohave	Court	Varies, by job classification	JMR locally developed, statewide court policies also apply (see summary additional context)
Navajo	Mixed, follow County policy but also subject to Court policies	Consistent	County policies locally developed
Pima	Court	Consistent	JMR locally developed, statewide court policies also apply (see summary additional context)
Pinal	Mixed, follow Court policy but County policies for items with fiscal impact	Consistent	JMR locally developed
Santa Cruz	NR	NR	NR
Yavapai	County	Consistent	County policies locally developed
Yuma	Court	Consistent	JMR locally developed

POLICIES & PROCEDURES
Table 2 of 2

Additional Context		Links
JMR = Judicial Merit Rules		
Apache	NR	NR
Cochise		JMR - County Website
Coconino		Judicial Personnel System - County Website
Gila		County Merit System Rules - County Website
Graham		
Greenlee	Personnel merit system established by the court, but court employees approach county HR for HR related questions. JMR developed over 20 years ago.	
La Paz	Examples of overlap: county leave accrual plan, recruitment process Examples of differences: disciplinary actions	
Maricopa		
Mohave	Classified employees subject to JMR Unclassified employees not subject to JMR All must comply with court or state policies and procedures.	Judicial Merit System Rules: Policies & Procedures - Court Website
Navajo		
Pima		
Pinal	Departments within courts may also have additional policies and/or procedures.	
Santa Cruz		
Yavapai		
Yuma	Departments within courts may also have additional policies and/or procedures.	Judicial Merit System - County Website

Superior Court Policies & Spending Survey

Judges Pro Tempore

Overview

The following section provides the responses from counties or the court on how judges pro tempore are or are not utilized locally. Very rural counties were more likely to utilize judges pro tempore on an ongoing basis, rather than court commissioners. While the courts in urban counties indicated a large pool of judges pro tempore that volunteer some or all of their time. Additionally, several counties appoint court commissioners to serve as judges pro tempore for no additional compensation.

Statutory Background

A.R.S § 12-141 to 12-144 generally govern the appointment, qualifications, duties, payment and funding of judges pro tempore for the Superior Court. Statute allows the Presiding Judge to request that the Chief Justice appoint a judge pro tempore for no more than a 12 month term, although they may be reappointed. All appointments are subject to approval by the county BOS.

Pursuant to A.R.S § 12-142, judges pro tempore are paid an equivalent rate to a judge, but may agree to donate some or all of their services. A.R.S § 12-143 requires the state and county to each pay half of the salary, however recently the state has not appropriated funding for its portion of judge pro tempore salaries.

Supreme Court Pro Tempore appointments available on the Supreme Court's website: <https://www.azcourts.gov/orders/ProTempore-Orders>

Survey Questions

Appointments

- Does the court currently have any pro tempore judges? If yes, how many?
- What entity(ies) determines when pro tempore judges are appointed? If available, please provide the criteria used for determining the need for additional pro temps.
- What entity(ies) determine the need for a judge pro tempore versus a commissioner?

Salaries

- Who sets the salary for each judge pro tempore?
- Are those salaries adjusted? If yes, when and by whom?
- Are salaries consistent across all judges pro tempore?
- If available, please provide current salaries or volunteer status for existing judge pro tempore.

Funding

- What is the source of funding for existing judges pro tempore?

APPOINTMENTS

Judges Pro Tempore FY 2025		What entity(ies) determines when pro tempore judges are appointed?	What entity(ies) determine the need for a judge pro tempore versus a commissioner?
Summary	Statewide full-time #: 11 Statewide part-time #: 13 Statewide volunteer #: 338 Statewide Commissioners appointed as pro tempore #: 51 None: 1 NR: 1	Court: 5 Mixed: 3 N/A or NR: 6 Criteria provided: 3 Criteria based on caseloads: 3	Court: 4 Mixed: 3 N/A or NR: 6
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	1 full-time	NR	NR
Coconino	2 full-time Additional on-call/part-time	Mixed, Court and County work together	N/A, only utilizes judges pro tempore
Gila	1 full-time	N/A, Court and County Admin would likely determine if additional divisions or pro tempores necessary	Mixed, Court in conjunction with County Admin
Graham	1 full-time	N/A, Court and County would likely determine if additional divisions or pro tempores necessary	N/A, only utilizes judges pro tempore
Greenlee	None	N/A	N/A
La Paz	1 part-time Varies	Mixed, Court determines need, County and/or AOC determines what funding is available; BOS approves appointment	Mixed, Court in conjunction with County Admin
Maricopa	270 volunteer 16 compensated, part-time Court Commissioners appointed as pro temps Varies, figure reflects FY 2025	Compensated: Presiding Judge Volunteer: Mixed, Supreme Court, Court, and County BOS determine annually Criteria: Coverage need in accordance with the need of the Court	Presiding Judge, in consultation with Court departments Need: Compensated: Coverage for assignments that can be reimbursed, or have legal timelines Volunteer: Coverage for when no other judge or commissioner can cover
Mohave	1 volunteer (Justice of the Peace) 4 Court Commissioners appointed as pro temps	Presiding Judge Criteria: Case filing statistics and weighted caseloads	N/A, Commissioners appointed as judges pro tempore
Navajo	1 Court Commissioner appointed as pro temps	Presiding Judge, Court Administration make request of Supreme Court Criteria: Case filings	Court Administration Commissioners appointed as judges pro tempore
Pima	3 full-time 66 volunteer 20 Court Commissioners appointed as pro temps	NR	NR
Pinal	3 part-time 7 Court Commissioners appointed as pro tempores	Presiding Judge, appointed by Supreme Court	Presiding Judge All Commissioners appointed as judges pro tempore, some pro tempore that are not commissioners
Santa Cruz	1.5 FTE 1 volunteer	Presiding Judge	Presiding Judge
Yavapai	2 full-time 8 part-time	Mixed, Presiding Judge in conjunction with County BOS/County Manager	Mixed, Presiding Judge in conjunction with County BOS/County Manager
Yuma	1 full-time 1 part-time 3 Commissioners appointed as pro temps		Court

Judges Pro Tempore

2024

SALARIES

	Current salaries or volunteer status	Who sets the salary for each judge pro tempore?	Are those salaries adjusted? When?	Are salaries consistent across all judges pro tempore?
Summary	Same as judge: 7 Compensated as Court Commissioners: 4 Other: 2 NR: 3	Statute, same as judge: 5 Court: 3 Mixed: 2 NR: 4	Yes, adjusted with judges' salaries: 6 No: 2 Court: 2 NR: 4	Yes: 10 NR: 4
Apache	NR	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	NR	NR	NR	NR
Coconino	Annual: \$180,000 , same as judge	Statute, same as judge	Yes, adjusted with judges' salaries	Yes
Gila	Annual: \$180,000 , same as judge	Statute, same as judge; County HR	Yes, adjusted with judges' salaries	Yes
Graham	Annual: \$180,000 , same as judge	Statute, same as judge	Yes, adjusted with judges' salaries	Yes
Greenlee	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
La Paz	0.2 FTE authorized at 80% of judge salary Judges pro tempore has agreed to this rate	Mixed, Presiding Judge & BOS, negotiated with judge pro tempore	No	Yes
Maricopa	Compensated as Court Commissioners Hourly: \$53.91 , capped at \$112,132.80 May agree to donate any or all services in advance	Court Administrative Order, in relation to statutory judicial salaries	Yes, can be adjusted by Presiding Judge when judges' salaries increase	Yes
Mohave	Compensated as Court Commissioners	Presiding Judge	Yes, adjusted with judges' salaries	Yes
Navajo	Compensated as Court Commissioners Annual: \$148,205	Court Administration	Court Administration	N/A
Pima	Annual: \$180,000 , same as judge	NR	NR	Yes
Pinal	Hourly: \$86.50 , same as judge or Compensated as Court Commissioners	Statute, same as judge, set by Administrative Order	Yes, adjusted with judges' salaries	Yes
Santa Cruz	Annual: \$180,000 , same as judge (full-time) Part time is prorated based on hours worked	Statute, same as Judge	No	Yes
Yavapai	Annual: \$180,000 , same as judge	Mixed, Presiding Judge in conjunction with County BOS/County Manager	Yes, adjusted with judges' salaries	Yes
Yuma	\$125,998	Court	As determined by the Presiding Judge	Yes

FUNDING & ADDITIONAL CONTEXT

What is the source of funding for existing judges pro tempore?

Additional Context

Summary **County General Fund: 5**
Mixed, including County GF: 5
NR:5

Apache **NR**

Cochise **County GF**

Coconino **Mixed**, primarily **County GF**, small amount from **Title IV-D funds**

Gila **County GF**

County has maintained same number of judges/pro tempores since at least 2000

Graham **County GF**
Prior to 2020, portion of Pro Tempore cost funded through fill-the-gap; funding was diverted mid-2020 to fund pre-trial services officer, per state requirement

County has maintained same number of judges/pro tempores in modern memory

Greenlee **N/A**

County utilizes conflict assignments with neighboring counties, rather than pro tempores

La Paz **NR**

County tries to utilize retired judges to reduce costs

Maricopa **Mixed, Title IV-E** (DES) for family child support cases; **County GF** for all others

Mohave **County GF**

Navajo **Mixed, County GF, court funds**

Pima **Mixed, County GF, fee funds, grants**

Pinal **NR**

Santa Cruz **County GF**

Yavapai **Mixed, County GF, fill-the-gap**

Yuma **NR**

Superior Court Policies & Spending Survey

Court Commissioners

Overview

This section outlines how court commissioners are utilized across counties. Rural counties are less likely to employ them, while all urban counties use at least one. Need for commissioners is typically determined by court administration or the presiding judge, pending county approval. Salaries are capped statutorily and determined by the presiding judge, with some considering a commissioner's experience. Funding comes from a mix of the county general fund and court special revenues, depending on availability.

Statutory Background

A.R.S § 12-211 to 12-213 govern the appointment, duties, and pay of court commissioners. In counties with three or more superior court judges, the presiding judge may appoint commissioners and set their salary (capped at 90% of a superior court judge's salary). Statute dictates that these commissioners are 100% a county expense.

Statute technically allows each superior court judge to appoint a commissioner, who must be a resident of the judge's jurisdiction, with the state and county each paying half of their salary. However, this statute is not currently utilized, as most rural counties use judge pro tempore appointments instead.

Additionally, Arizona Supreme Court Rule 96 (j) outlines the appointment and qualifications for Senior Court Commissioners. They are required to be former superior court judges with ten year or more years of experience and have the ability to hear matters governed by the Rules of Civil or Criminal Procedure. Senior Court Commissioners must be approved by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Survey Questions

Appointments

- Does the county currently have any court commissioners? If yes, how many?
- What entity(ies) determines when commissioners are appointed? If available, please provide the criteria used for determining the need for additional commissioners.
- What entity(ies) determine the need for a new superior court judge versus additional commissioners or pro tempore judges?

Salaries

- Who sets the salary for each commissioner?
- What criteria, if any, determines the level of salary for each commissioner?

- When are those salaries adjusted?
- Are salaries consistent across all commissioners?
- If available, please provide current salaries for commissioners.

Funding

- What is the source of funding for existing commissioners?
- What is the source of funding when new commissioners are appointed?
- Are additional appointments always funded with new resources, or does the court utilize existing budget capacity to fund new appointments?

APPOINTMENTS

Court Commissioners FY 2025		What entity(ies) determines when commissioners are appointed?	What entity(ies) determine the need and/or type of judicial officer to appoint?
Summary	None: 5 At least 1 full-time: 7 At least 1 part-time: 4 NR: 1 Statewide full-time #: 99 Statewide part-time #: 17+ # of counties with Senior Commissioners: 3	Court: 6 Mixed: 2 Criteria provided: 4 Criteria based on caseloads: 4 NR: 7	Court: 3 Mixed: 5 Other: 1 NR: 6
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	3 temporary Senior Commissioners	NR	NR
Coconino	Temporary Senior Commissioners	Supreme Court appoints, Court requests	NR
Gila	None	N/A	Mixed, Court would determine need, work with County
Graham	None	N/A	N/A
Greenlee	None	N/A	N/A
La Paz	None	Mixed, Presiding Judge & Clerk determine need, County admin. determine if funds available Criteria: Large conflict caseload after election, if special funding is available	Mixed, Court determine need, County determine type of appointment based on cost Note: County doesn't meet statutory requirements for additional judge
Maricopa	65 full-time 12 on-call, paid, temporary Court Commissioners (Judge Pro Temp)	Mixed, Presiding Judge appoints when vacancies occur; additional personnel requested by Court to Supreme Court or County BOS, depending on need for commissioner or judge. Criteria: Court Data Integrity and Analytics Department reports on case filings and terminations for multiple case types. Reports review by Court & Administrative leadership. If caseloads become excessive, Presiding Judge, Court Administrator, Court HR and Court leadership request additional personnel from Supreme Court or BOS, depending on need for commissioner or judge	
Mohave	4 full-time	Presiding Judge Criteria: Case filings, weighted caseloads	Mixed, Presiding Judge, new judges based on population. PJ works with County BOS to submit request to Governor Commissioners appointed as Judges Pro Tempore
Navajo	1 full-time	Presiding Judge, Court Admin. Criteria: Case filings	Court Administration
Pima	18 full-time	Presiding Judge	Statutory framework
Pinal	7 full-time	Mixed, Presiding Judge determines need, BOS approves funding & appointment	Mixed, County BOS and Presiding Judge determine need for new judges
Santa Cruz	None	N/A	N/A
Yavapai	1 full-time	N/A	Mixed, Presiding Judge with County BOS/County Manager
Yuma	3 full-time 2 part-time, temporary Senior Commissioners	Presiding Judge	Court

Court Commissioners

2024

SALARIES

Table 1 of 2

Who sets the salary for each commissioner?		Current salaries for commissioners.	What criteria, if any, determines the level of salary for each commissioner?
Summary	Court: 7 Mixed: 2 NR or N/A: 6	# commissioners with salary data: 115 # at 90% judges salary: 103 (including part-time rates equi. to 90%) # 80-89% judges salary: 10 # <80% judges salary: 2 NR or N/A: 7	<u>Criteria provided: 4</u> Judicial discretion: 1 Mixed: 1 NR or N/A: 9
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	Presiding Judge , through Administrative Order	Rate of 90% of a Superior Court Judges' Salary Part-time, as needed, basis	NR
Coconino	Mixed, Court establishes classifications, initial salary. County only utilizes Senior Court Commissioners as defined by AZ Supreme Court Rules	Rate of 90% of a Superior Court Judges' Salary Part-time, as needed, basis	NR
Gila	N/A	N/A	N/A
Graham	N/A	N/A	N/A
Greenlee	N/A	N/A	N/A
La Paz	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maricopa	Presiding Judge	\$162,000	Presiding Judge's discretion based on information requested and statutory constraints. PJ set pay for full-time Commissioners at 90% of judges' salary
Mohave	Presiding Judge	\$162,000 (3 Commissioners) \$149,000 (1 Commissioner)	Criteria: Based on experience and training attorneys have Set at 90% of judges' salary
Navajo	Presiding Judge	\$148,205	Set within statutory range
Pima	Presiding Judge	\$162,000	NR
Pinal	Presiding Judge	\$144,000 [80%] (3 Commissioners) \$153,000 [85%] (2 Commissioners) \$162,000 [90%] (1 Commissioner)	Criteria: Years of service Within statutory range
Santa Cruz	N/A	N/A	N/A
Yavapai	Mixed, Presiding Judge with County BOS/County Manager	\$162,000	Mixed , determined by Presiding Judge with County BOS/County Manager
Yuma	Court	\$156,599 (1 Commissioner) \$149,398 (1 Commissioner) \$143,998 (1 Commissioner) \$74,115 (1 Commissioner) \$70,409 (1 Commissioner)	Criteria: salaries based on years of service, funding requested by the Superior Court during the budget process.

SALARIES

Table 2 of 2

When are commissioners' salaries adjusted?

Are salaries consistent across all commissioners?

Summary

With Judicial Salaries: 4**Locally: 2***Includes step system: 1***NR or N/A: 10****Yes: 3****No: 2****N/A; Single Commissioner: 2**Consistent criteria: 1**NR or N/A: 7**

Apache

NR

NR

Cochise

NR

Yes

Coconino

NR

NR

Gila

N/A

N/A

Graham

N/A

N/A

Greenlee

N/A

N/A

La Paz

N/A

N/A

Maricopa

When State Lawmakers approve **increases for judges' salaries**

Yes

Mohave

When State Lawmakers approve **increases for judges' salaries**

No, see salaries

Navajo

Locally, County adjustments with all other staff

N/A, only 1 commissioner

Pima

NR

Yes

Pinal

Start at 80% of judges' salary, 85% after 2 years of service, 90% after 4 years of service
Also, when State Lawmakers approve **increases for judges' salaries**

Yes, consistent based on years of service criteria

Santa Cruz

N/A

N/A

Yavapai

When State Lawmakers approve **increases for judges' salaries**

N/A, only 1 commissioner

Yuma

Locally, Court manages

No, see salaries

Court Commissioners

2024

FUNDING

	What is the source of funding for existing commissioners?	What is the source of funding when new commissioners are appointed?	Are new appointments funded with new resources, or existing court budget capacity?
Summary	Mixed: 7 County GF: 1 NR: 6	County GF: 3 Mixed: 4 NR: 8	Both: 4 New resources: 3 NR: 8
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	Mixed, AOC ARPA Grant & County GF	N/A, but potentially Mixed, County GF or Court Special Revenue	Both
Coconino	NR	NR	NR
Gila	N/A	N/A	N/A
Graham	N/A	N/A	N/A
Greenlee	N/A	N/A	N/A
La Paz	Mixed, Potentially special revenues to start new program, County/Court would evaluate to continue using Court budget capacity or County GF	N/A	N/A
Maricopa	County GF	County GF, primarily Court Special Revenue or grants may be used to supplement	Both, Court tries to fund with budget capacity when possible
Mohave	Mixed County GF - 4 Fill the Gap funds - 1 Grants, as available	County GF	New resources, Court lacks budget capacity to fund new appointments
Navajo	Mixed County GF, Court Fund split funding	Mixed County GF, Court Fund split funding	New resources
Pima	Mixed County GF, Fee funds, Grants	Mixed County GF, Fee funds, Grants	Both
Pinal	Mixed County GF, Title IV-E Grant (1 Commissioner)	County GF, primarily	New resources, typically
Santa Cruz	N/A	N/A	N/A
Yavapai	Mixed, County GF, Local Fees, Title IV-D State Funding	NR	NR
Yuma	Mixed, County GF - 3.24 FTE Grants - 0.734 FTE	Mixed, Court includes funding sources in request	Both, Court may use existing budget capacity for temporary or permanent appointments, can request new resources through BOS procedures

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT

Additional Context		Links
Apache		
Cochise	Senior Commissioners established to deal with criminal and civil backlog during COVID-19 pandemic, no plan to expand number.	Commissioner Administrative Orders (2024)
Coconino		Commissioner Administrative Order (2024)
Gila		
Graham		
Greenlee		
La Paz	County has historically used retired judges or utilized Pro Temps if visiting judge not available. Commissioners viewed as permanent positions, which haven't been viewed as necessary due to temporary nature of projects.	
Maricopa		Court Administrative Orders
Mohave		
Navajo		
Pima		Example Administrative Order
Pinal		Example Administrative Order
Santa Cruz		
Yavapai		
Yuma		

Superior Court Policies & Spending Survey

Central Services, Court Initiatives & Local Fees

Overview

This section highlights the county departments and local initiatives the court utilizes. Additionally, it also includes responses from courts regarding local fees established by the courts and adopted by the county BOS.

Most courts rely on county departments, with HR, Finance, and IT being the most commonly cited. Specialty courts and programs are funded through a mix of county general fund and special revenues.

Survey Questions

Central Services

- Does the court utilize any county departments for services (HR, finance, IT, etc.)?
- Does the county charge the courts for those services?
- Does the county require the court to utilize county departments versus creating a separate court department?
- Does the court or AOC require the court to utilize separate court departments rather than utilizing county departments/infrastructure?
- If available, what fund source is utilized to cover these costs?
- Please provide departments/services and a description of how this operates in your county. If any court operations are shared with municipal courts in the region, please indicate that in your response.

Court Initiatives/Programs

- Are there special programs or initiatives not required by state law/AOC that the superior court in your county provides?
- What is the funding source for those programs?
- If available, was the county involved in the discussions around the creation and funding of the program? If so, please briefly describe the county admin/BOS role/involvement.
- Is the county involved in the approval/acceptance of grants received by departments within the court? If so, please briefly describe the county's role.

Compliance with Courthouse Security Standards

- What were the initial costs of implementing the courthouse security standards established in 2017?
- Are there any ongoing costs associated with the courthouse security standards?
- What is the fund source for those initial and ongoing costs?
- Has the court received any grants from the AOC for courthouse security implementation?

Merit Selection Process

- For counties subject to merit selection please address the following.
- If possible, please provide any cost to the county of establishing and maintaining nominating committees and performing the judicial review process. If cost estimates are not available, please describe the involvement of county staff or need for county resources in the merit selection process.

Other Judicial Requirements

- Are there any other recent administrative orders, statutory changes or requests from the judiciary that have resulted in the demand for additional county funds?
- Did the county fund those requests? If not, how was it funded?

Court Fees

- Please provide the superior court's fee schedule.
- Please indicate which fees are set locally by the superior court (rather than set in statute) and what funds those fees are deposited into.
- What are funds generated by locally set fees utilized for?

CENTRAL SERVICES

Table 1 of 3

	Does the court utilize any county departments for services (HR, finance, IT, etc.)?	Does the county charge the courts for those services?	Does the county require the court to utilize county departments versus creating a separate court department?
Summary	County HR: 12 County Finance: 12 County Facilities: 10 County Select IT: 11 NR: 1	Yes: 6 No: 7 NR: 2	Yes: 7 Mixed: 4 No: 2 NR: 2
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	Mixed - Select County HR, select IT, Finance, Facilities Court select HR	Yes - charge quarterly overhead	Mixed - Courts have separate HR for some aspects of HR, however other county internal services are coordinated, like IT, Finance, Facilities, Fleet, etc.
Coconino	Yes - County HR, Finance, Facilities, select IT	No	Yes
Gila	Yes - County HR, IT, Finance, Facilities	NR	NR
Graham	Yes - All county services centralized under the BOS	No	Yes
Greenlee	Mixed - County Finance & Maintenance Court IT	No	Yes
La Paz	Mixed - County HR and Finance only. Court utilizes their own third party IT services.	No	Mixed - Courts for IT
Maricopa	Mixed - Court largely utilizes own HR, Finance, IT, Facilities, Legal, and Security County depts: select HR, select County IT, select Facilities, Maintenance, and Risk Management functions	Yes - for IT, Facilities, Maintenance, and Risk Management, HR to a lesser extent	Mixed - utilizes a balance of county services and Court services to ensure operational consistency while maintaining judicial separation of powers
Mohave	Mixed - Court has separate IT and HR county finance, procurement, facilities, fleet	Yes - via cost allocation	No
Navajo	Yes - County HR, Finance, IT, Maintenance	Yes	Yes
Pima	Yes - County Finance, HR, IT	Yes	No
Pinal	Yes - County Budget, Finance, Select HR, Fleet, Select IT Services (Adult Probation Only)	No	Yes
Santa Cruz	Yes - County HR, IT, Finance	Yes	Yes
Yavapai	Yes - County HR, Finance, IT, Facilities, Budget	No	Yes
Yuma	Mixed - County and Court HR and IT depts County procurement database, recruitment applications, budgeting software, fleet program, and facilities management	No	No

CENTRAL SERVICES
Table 2 of 3

Does the court or AOC require the court to utilize separate court departments rather than utilizing county departments/infrastructure?		If available, what fund source is utilized to cover these costs?
Summary	No: 5 Yes: 8 NR: 2	County GF: 3 Court Special Revenue: 1 Mix: 2 N/A or NR: 9
Apache	NR	NR
Cochise	Yes - Some IT functions AOC	N/A
Coconino	Yes - Some IT functions AOC	NR
Gila	NR	NR
Graham	Yes - Some IT functions AOC	Court Special Revenue - Clerk of the Court and JP have used their special revenue funds to help, Superior Court has used enhancement fees to cover ACAP fees when available.
Greenlee	No	N/A
La Paz	No	N/A
Maricopa	No	County GF
Mohave	Yes - Some IT functions AOC	Mixed, JCEF funds, cost sharing with cities, operating transfers from Justice Courts, Court fee accounts, and a portion is County GF
Navajo	Yes - Some IT functions AOC	N/A
Pima	No	Mixed, County GF, Fee Funds and Grants
Pinal	Yes - IT, court security and some HR functions	County GF
Santa Cruz	No	NR
Yavapai	Yes - Some IT functions AOC	NR
Yuma	Yes - Some IT functions AOC	County GF

CENTRAL SERVICES
Table 3 of 3

Please provide departments/services and a description of how this operates in your county. If any court operations are shared with municipal courts in the region, please indicate that in your response.

Apache	NR
Cochise	County approves and processes Courts personnel actions, administers Benefits, provides initial orientation and compliance paperwork, performs market studies and other reporting, and provides IT services. NOT combined with Municipal courts, although Presiding Judge has oversight
Coconino	The Court has their own I.T. department, 2 of the positions are shared with the Flagstaff Municipal Court through an IGA. Other shared positions are the field trainer, court security officers, and interpreter coordinator
Gila	The court does utilize County services including HR, IT, Finance, and Facilities. The Superior Court has an MOU with the BOS whereby the courts relinquished any separate IT budget to consolidate support within the County's established unit
Graham	All services are centralized under the BOS, Court Field Operator also trains in the municipal Courts
Greenlee	Court finances operate under the county system but is controlled by Courts, similarly to some IT functions. County performs other central services. Judges cover for each other on conflict cases but otherwise resources are unshared in municipal courts
La Paz	HR and Finance support the clerk/court/probation departments as any other county department
Maricopa	Court utilizes county IT for telecoms and base infrastructure. Uses county Facilities and Fleet services for maintenance of buildings and vehicles. Courts have standalone departments but collaborate with the county. Jury functions are shared between municipal courts
Mohave	Court Automation Dept. provides resources necessary to understand the issues facing the Court, plot the future technical direction of the courts and maintain the technical skill set required to resolve issues. Provides IT Services to the Superior Court, Clerk of Court, Justice Courts, Municipal Courts and Probation Department
Navajo	Superior Court and the Justice Courts utilize County HR, Finance, IT and Maintenance for services. Court Admin does handle their own HR processes, but often in consultation with County HR
Pima	Superior Court works collaboratively with county departments for Finance, HR, IT, Security, and Facilities Maintenance for County owned buildings.
Pinal	Adult probation, Juvenile Court, Clerk of the Court, and Judicial funded through a mix of County and State funds, Family Services, Court HR, Court Admin are county funded. Court provides technical assistance to magistrate courts
Santa Cruz	NR
Yavapai	The court utilizes the county HR, payroll, facilities and finance departments.
Yuma	Court IT department oversees the courtroom JAVS systems, all of the Justice courts utilize the JAVS system

Central Services, Court Initiatives & Local Fees

2024

COURT INITIATIVES

Table 1 of 2

Are there special programs or initiatives not required by state law/AOC that the superior court in your county provides?

What is the funding source for those programs?

Summary

Yes: 12
No: 2
NR: 1

Mix of County & Court Special Revenue: 6
County only: 1
Court Special Revenue Only: 4
N/A or NR: 4

Apache

NR

NR

Cochise

No

N/A

Coconino

Yes - Recovery Court, Mental Health Court, Veterans Court, AZCourtHelp, Family Law Assistance Program, Self-Help Center, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Integrated Family Court Services

Mix of County and Court Special Revenue - State grants, Fill-the-Gap, special revenue funds, fees, and general fund.

Gila

Yes - Opiate Court, Dependency Alternative Program, Dependency Case Processing Initiative

Court Special Revenue - AOC funding and other Special Revenues like Title IV-E funds

Graham

Yes - Drug Court, Pre-trial Services, Mental Health Court

NR

Greenlee

Yes - Family Court Mediation Program, Drug Court

Court Special Revenue - AOC and Other State Funds

La Paz

No, but have had specialty courts in past

N/A

Maricopa

Yes - Drug Court, Veterans Court, Mental Health Court, Cradle to Canyon, among others

Court Special Revenue

Mohave

Yes - Drug Court, Veterans Court, Quality of Life Court, Domestic Violence Court. Specialty programs include one for Juvenile Offenders, Family Mediation Unit, Dependency Programs, and CASA program

Court Special Revenue

Navajo

Yes - Drug Court, Veterans Court

Mix of County and Court Special Revenue, including Drug Court Grant, State Aid Enhancement Grant, Community Punishment Grant, and Adult Probation Fees

Pima

Yes - Family Treatment Court (RAISE); Supportive Treatment and Engagement Program (STEPS); Probation Warrant Resolution Program; Probation Education Services; GPS Monitoring (Adult Probation); Probation Drug Court; Drug Treatment Alternative to Prison (DTAP); Mental Health Court

Mix of County and Court Special Revenue - General Fund, Fees funds, and Grants including ARPA grant.

Pinal

Yes - Unspecified Specialty courts and department programs

Mix of County and Court Special Revenue

Santa Cruz

Yes - Self Represented Litigant Program

County

Yavapai

Yes - Mental Health Court, DUI/Drug Recovery Court, Family Treatment Court, Veterans Court

Mix of County and Court Special Revenue

Yuma

Yes - Adult and Juvenile Drug Courts, Mental Health Courts, Veterans Treatment Court

Mix of County and Court Special Revenue

COURT INITIATIVES

Table 2 of 2

Was the county involved in the creation and funding of the program?

Is the county involved in grants received by court departments?

Summary

Yes: 9
N/A or NR: 6

Yes: 10
No: 4
NR: 1

Apache	NR	NR
Cochise	N/A	Yes - BOS approval
Coconino	NR	Yes
Gila	NR	Yes - BOS approval
Graham	Yes, if funds involved	Yes
Greenlee	Yes	No
La Paz	Yes	Yes - BOS approval
Maricopa	Yes	Yes - BOS approval
Mohave	NR	Yes - BOS approval
Navajo	Yes	Yes - BOS approval
Pima	Yes	No
Pinal	Yes, if funds involved	Yes
Santa Cruz	N/A	No
Yavapai	Yes, if funds involved	Yes
Yuma	Yes	No - Not necessarily, courts are encouraged to go through BOS

COMPLIANCE WITH COURT SECURITY STANDARDS

Table 1 of 2

What were the initial costs of implementing the courthouse security standards established in 2017?		Are there any ongoing costs associated with the courthouse security standards?
Summary	County provided cost estimate: 5 Unclear: 5 NR: 5	Yes: 12 No: 1 Unclear: 1 NR: 1
Apache	NR	NR
Cochise	NR	NR
Coconino	No additional costs, security measures already implemented	No.
Gila	NR	Yes - annual cost of the security services contract for entryway screening and maintenance of equipment (cameras, magnetometers)
Graham	NR	Yes - security officers is an ongoing GF cost. The security court fees pays for only a part of the cost.
Greenlee	Unclear - Paid for using AOC funds	Yes - Once security measures are installed, the county covers any ongoing costs of our modest security improvements. Should the county implement more comprehensive security measures, we anticipate that all or almost all ongoing costs, including personnel costs will be covered by the county.
La Paz	Unclear - Paid for using AOC funds	Yes - Bailiff and security personnel.
Maricopa	Unclear - Mixture of County and AOC funds	Yes - Maintenance and servicing of Smith Detection X-Ray Machines (\$260K) and Magnetometers (\$14K), CSO equipment/gear (\$200K), Arming Program (60 CSOs) - Range & Ammunition (\$20K), Servicing of Electronic Security Systems (CCTV System, Duress Alarm, Badging & Intrusion Detection): ESI & Misc. Vendors (\$100K). Multi-year CCTV Improvement Initiative: \$10M-ARPA & \$2.5M-MC General Funds Budget / JB Budget.
Mohave	Approx. 200k using grant funds	Yes - Security guard services.
Navajo	Unclear - Paid for using AOC funds	Yes - Security guard services.
Pima	NR	Yes - Personnel, technical upgrades, firearm training.
Pinal	Approx. \$1 million	Yes - Personnel, safety equipment, screening equipment.
Santa Cruz	NR	Yes
Yavapai	Approx. \$700k in-house	Yes - Security services.
Yuma	Approx. \$2.6 million	Yes - Security services.

COMPLIANCE WITH COURT SECURITY STANDARDS

Table 2 of 2

What is the fund source for those initial and ongoing costs?

Has the court received any grants from the AOC for courthouse security implementation?

Summary
County: 6
Court Special Revenue: 1
Mixed: 6
NR: 2

Yes: 12
NR: 2
Unclear: 1

Apache	NR	NR
Cochise	N/A	N/A
Coconino	Mixed, County and Court Special Revenue	Yes
Gila	County	Yes
Graham	Mixed, County and fee funds	Yes
Greenlee	Court Special Revenue	Yes
La Paz	Mixed, AOC funds for equipment, County GF for personnel	Yes
Maricopa	Mixed, County and Court Special Revenue	Yes
Mohave	Mixed, County and Court Special Revenue	Yes
Navajo	County	Yes
Pima	Mixed, County and Court Special Revenue	Yes
Pinal	Mixed, County and Court Special Revenue	Yes
Santa Cruz	County	Yes
Yavapai	County	Yes
Yuma	County	NR

MERIT SELECTION PROCESS

If possible, please provide any cost to the county of establishing and maintaining nominating committees and performing the judicial review process. If cost estimates are not available, please describe the involvement of county staff or need for county resources in the merit selection process.

Summary

Court driven: 6
Court with County: 1
NR: 8

Apache	NR
Cochise	Court driven with County support
Coconino	Court driven
Gila	N/A
Graham	NR
Greenlee	N/A
La Paz	N/A
Maricopa	Court driven
Mohave	N/A
Navajo	Court driven
Pima	Court driven
Pinal	Court driven
Santa Cruz	NR
Yavapai	NR
Yuma	Court driven

OTHER JUDICIAL REQUIREMENTS

	Are there any other recent administrative orders, statutory changes or requests from the judiciary that have resulted in the demand for additional county funds?	Did the county fund those requests? If not, how was it funded?	Additional Context
Summary	Yes: 8 No: 2 N/A or NR: 5	Yes: 7 Mixed: 1 No: 1 N/A or NR: 7	
Apache	NR	NR	
Cochise	N/A	N/A	
Coconino	Yes	Mixed	Courtroom technology project (ARPA funding) - Funded Division 7 (JA, Judge, Court Security Officer/Bailiff) & mental health clinical liaison court coordinator position - Funded Best Interest Attorneys - Not funded Court security officer (0.5 FTE) - Not funded <i>Over the years there have been other requests Some have been funded and some have not</i>
Gila	Yes	Yes	Implementation of Digital Evidence in Superior Court - Funded through County GF, FTG and local fees
Graham	Yes	Yes	The Courts want each County to have a Field Trainer in each court but only provide \$25k; ACAP fees go up 2.5% every year but funding does not go up 2.5%
Greenlee	Yes, for security measures	Yes	
La Paz	NR	N/A	
Maricopa	Yes	Yes	Court Reporter pay increase - Funded Superior Court Judge & Commissioner salaries - Funded <i>Among others in FY 2025</i>
Mohave	Yes	Yes	Superior Court Judge & Commissioner salaries - Funded
Navajo	Yes	Yes	Remote Hearing Capabilities & Digital Evidence - Funded , primarily through grant funds with some County GF
Pima	NR	NR	
Pinal	No	NR	
Santa Cruz	Yes	No	HR Manager - Not funded
Yavapai	N/A	NR	
Yuma	No	N/A	

Central Services, Court Initiatives & Local Fees

2024

COURT FEES

Please indicate which fees are set locally by the superior court (rather than set in statute) and what funds those fees are deposited into.		What are funds generated by locally set fees utilized for?	Link to Fee Schedule
Apache	NR	NR	NR
Cochise	Judicial Administrative Fee Schedule are fees set locally and are deposited into the Superior court and/or Justice court Special Revenue funds	Staffing, services, etc.	Fee Schedule
Coconino	The Court enhancement fee is deposited in the Court's special revenue fund, court enhancement. The other fees are deposited back into the program to cover the costs of those services. ADR fees go to the program to help offset the cost of the program/service same with the guardianship investigation fee. <i>Fees are all set locally, but many Clerk of Superior Court fees are determined in statute and just affirmed through the County fee setting process.</i>	Wages/salaries & ERE, particularly IT Strategic planning ADR Other IT services/ACAP overages	Fee Schedule
Gila	2 local fees Cost of Prosecution fund Local Probate fund	Enhancing court operations Attorney, expert or investigator services in probate cases	Fee Schedule
Graham	Local Court Improvement Fee - \$60 local filing fee	Wages/salaries & ERE Operating costs Capital projects Court security equipment/supplies Court IT/ACAP fees	Fee Schedule
Greenlee	Local Court Enhancement Fee - \$40 local filing fee Cost of Prosecution fund	Clerk of the Court personnel cost Clerk of the court discretion	Fee Schedule <i>Note: Cost of prosc. fund has no sustainable long-term funding.</i>
La Paz	Single locally adopted fee	Court/Clerk IT	Fee Schedule
Maricopa	<i>BOS established fees only, for others see fee schedule</i> Court Automation Fee Case Management Fee Electronic Document Management Fee Docket Fee	As appropriated by BOS	Fee Schedule
Mohave	4 court improvement fees, established by Admin. Order 2003-05	Wages/salaries & ERE IT equipment Court programs est. by AOC	Fee Schedule
Navajo	None	N/A	N/A
Pima	See fee schedule	Automation & technology Improving case processing and fee collections Family mediation & parent education Probation costs, including GPS monitoring Victim restitution	Fee Schedule
Pinal	Most set in statute, others approved by BOS	Clerk of the Court - Improving document services and electronic imaging Conciliation Court and Court Administration receive small portion	Fee Schedule
Santa Cruz	See fee schedule	Court operations	Fee Schedule
Yavapai	NR	NR	Fee Schedule
Yuma	Local fees administered by Clerk, deposited in Clerk Fund (special revenue) Drug Court fee <i>Modified by BOS through resolution</i>	Court/clerk operations	Fee Schedule