



# Fiscal Note

## Legislative Council Staff

Nonpartisan Services for Colorado's Legislature

### SB 26-037: MODIFICATION OF BOND HEARING OFFICER PROCESS

**Prime Sponsors:**

Sen. Rich; Roberts

Rep. Soper; Espenoza

**Fiscal Analyst:**

Aaron Carpenter, 303-866-4918

aaron.carpenter@coleg.gov

**Published for:** Senate Judiciary**Drafting number:** LLS 26-0312**Version:** Initial Fiscal Note**Date:** February 9, 2026

**Fiscal note status:** The fiscal note reflects the introduced bill.

---

### Summary Information

**Overview.** The bill allows eligible judicial districts to opt out of the use of a bond hearing officer.

**Types of impacts.** The bill is projected to affect the following areas on an ongoing basis:

- State Expenditures

**Appropriations.** No appropriation required.

---

**Table 1**  
**State Fiscal Impacts**

Type of Impact	Budget Year FY 2026-27	Out Year FY 2027-28
State Revenue	\$0	\$0
State Expenditures	Potential Increase	Potential Increase
Transferred Funds	\$0	\$0
Change in TABOR Refunds	\$0	\$0
Change in State FTE	0.0 FTE	0.0 FTE

## **Summary of Legislation**

---

Under current law, certain judicial districts are eligible to utilize centralized bond hearing offices to conduct weekend and holiday bond hearings. The bill allows these districts to utilize judicial officers from their own district, instead of bond hearing officers, to preside over weekend and holiday bond hearings, with upon-request administrative support from bond hearing office staff.

## **Background**

---

Table 2 presents the three bond hearing offices and the districts that participate.

**Table 2**  
**Counties Utilizing Bond Hearing Offices**

<b>Bond Office 1</b>	<b>Bond Office 2</b>	<b>Bond Office 3</b>
5 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	3 <sup>rd</sup> Judicial District	6 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District
9 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	7 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	8 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District
12 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	11 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	22 <sup>nd</sup> Judicial District
14 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	13 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	
21 <sup>st</sup> Judicial District	16 <sup>th</sup> Judicial District	

## **State Expenditures**

---

Starting in FY 2026-27, the bill has the potential to increase state expenditures in the Office of the State Public Defender (OSPD), and impacts workload in the Judicial Department.

## **Office of the Public Defender**

Starting in FY 2026-27, the bill may impact expenditures in the OSPD to the extent a judicial district opts out of using a bond hearing office magistrate and instead holds a hearing for that district at the same time as any bond hearing office. Currently, the OSPD has attorneys that follow the combined schedule of the three bond hearing offices. If a judicial district were to opt

out of using a bond hearing office, and then scheduled a bond hearing at the same time as another jurisdiction in the bond hearing offices' schedule, then the OSPD would require additional attorneys to cover both schedules. It is unknown how many districts will opt out of the using bond hearing offices and, if there is an opt-out, when those hearings would occur. For informational purposes, each judicial district that opts out would require the OSPD to hire an attorney at a cost of about \$575 per shift per week.

## **Judicial Department**

The bill increases workload in the department to ensure that judicial officers are able to access the various platforms bond hearing officers use. In addition, to the extent more judicial officers hear weekend or holiday bond hearings, workload to that officer will increase while workload to the bond hearing officer will decrease.

## **Effective Date**

---

The bill takes effect upon signature of the Governor, or upon becoming law without his signature.

## **State and Local Government Contacts**

---

District Attorneys

Office of State Public Defender

Judicial