



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET
COMMITTEE

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR JANUARY 5, 2021

Meeting Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Notice and Agenda | 1 |
| Minutes | |
| Draft Minutes from the November 12, 2020 Meeting | 3 |
| Discussion and Possible Action Items | |
| Item 1 – COVID-19 Backlog Funding (Action Required) | |
| • COVID-19 Backlog Funding Data – TCBAC Recommendation..... | 5 |
| • COVID-19 Backlog Funding Alternative Methodology..... | 15 |



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET
COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jbbc.htm
JBBC@jud.ca.gov

Request for ADA accommodations
should be made at least three business
days before the meeting and directed to:
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1) and (e)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: January 5, 2021
Time: 12:00 to 2:00 p.m.
Public Videocast: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/1142>

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be e-mailed to JBBC@jud.ca.gov.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the November 12, 2020, Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(1))

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to JBBC@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by January 4, at 12:00 pm will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-1)

Item 1

COVID-19 Backlog Funding (Action Required)

Consider recommendations as it relates to the \$50 million one-time COVID-19 backlog funding received in the 2020 Budget Act.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Various

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET
COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/jbbc.htm
JBBC@jud.ca.gov

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 12, 2020

9:20 a.m. to 11:35 a.m.

<http://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/1095?>

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. David. M. Rubin, Chair; Hon. Ann Moorman, Vice Chair; Hon. C. Todd Bottke; Hon. Brad R. Hill; Hon. Harold W. Hopp; Mr. Kevin Harrigan

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Carin T. Fujisaki

Others Present: Mr. John Wordlaw; Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic; Ms. Fran Mueller; Hon. Jon Conklin, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Ms. Laura Speed; Ms. Angela Cowan; Ms. Brandy Olivera; Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin; Ms. Shima Mirzaei; Ms. Marcela Eggleton; Mr. Jake Chatters; Ms. Kimberly Flener

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 9:22 a.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of May 28, 2020, Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1 - 2021 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Annual Agenda (Action Required)

Review draft annual agenda of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Ms. Brandy Olivera, Lead Staff, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Action: *The committee unanimously approved the 2021 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Annual Agenda.*

Item 2 – COVID-19 Backlog Funding (No Action Required)

Review Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendations as it relates to the \$50 million one-time COVID-19 backlog funding received in the 2020 Budget Act and alternative recommendations on \$50 million one-time COVID-19 backlog funding.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Various Presenters

Action: *No action taken.*

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:12 a.m. to begin a closed session.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee

(Action Item)

Title: COVID-19 Backlog Funding Data

Date: 1/5/2021

Contact: Ms. Brandy Olivera, Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services
415-865-7195 | brandy.sanborn@jud.ca.gov
Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Judicial Council Business Management
Services 415-865-7708 | leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider recommendations from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) on a definition, reporting requirements, and methodology for allocating the remaining \$25 million from the one-time \$50 million COVID-19 backlog funding received in the Budget Act of 2020, and in response to the Judicial Council-motion from July 24, 2020.

Background

Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting

On November 12, 2020, TCBAC presented its recommendations to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) related to COVID-19 backlog funding for trial courts; eligible expenditures; a definition for COVID-19 workload backlog; a proposed methodology and distribution of funding for the remaining \$25 million; expenditure and reporting requirements; data collection, tracking, and reporting; guiding principles; alternatives considered; data reporting considerations; and public comment received to date¹.

In addition, it was recognized that there are other factors for future consideration such as the application of a “delay factor” as it relates to workload delays for all new cases filed due to limitations imposed by physical distancing and other COVID-19 impacts. As a result, the Ad Hoc COVID-19 Backlog Funding Subcommittee (subcommittee) will continue its work to evaluate a potential statewide case-processing delay factor to determine the need for potential additional funding to address the continued impact of the pandemic on court operations and service to the public.

In regard to the public comment received, the subcommittee proposed incorporating the feedback into its further review of all COVID-19 related backlog impacts, noting that this subsequent work may help inform further refinements to the initial methodology to the extent additional

¹ Judicial Branch Budget Committee report (November 12, 2020), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbbc-20201112-materials.pdf>.

funding is provided for COVID-19 related backlog or other operational impacts.

Definition, Reporting Requirements, and Methodology

Initial \$25 Million Allocation and Judicial Council Motion

At its July 24, 2020 business meeting, the Judicial Council approved a four-part motion:

1. Of the \$50 million appropriated to the Judicial Branch for trial court COVID-19 related backlogs, the Judicial Council allocates \$25 million immediately using the pro rata method proposed by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC)².
2. TCBAC will develop more precise definitions and practices for documenting and reporting COVID-19 related backlogs and report its recommendations to the council prior to distribution of any of the second \$25 million.
3. TCBAC will gather from trial courts data regarding how trial courts spent the first \$25 million. Report that data back to the council prior to allocation of the second \$25 million.
4. Have TCBAC develop, in consultation with the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee), recommendations for allocating the remaining \$25 million on a data and needs basis. TCBAC will report the recommendations to the council.

Allocation of First \$25 Million

The first \$25 million was approved for allocation to the trial courts at the July 24, 2020 Judicial Council meeting, on a pro rata basis as shown in Table 1 below.

Definition of COVID-19 Backlog

Dispositions are defined as the termination of a proceeding whether before or after a trial or other non-trial dispositive event. The Judicial Branch will measure the COVID-19 related backlog using the net change in average dispositions from the pre pandemic period (March 1, 2019 to August 31, 2019) compared to the pandemic period (March 1, 2020 through August 31, 2020) using weighted disposition data reported by the courts in the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System. Weighted dispositions are dispositions in which Resource Assessment Study (RAS) caseweights are applied to the data.

² Judicial Council report (July 24, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8651228&GUID=27A3B6D8-9783-4865-8C5A-F6697EB58734>; Judicial Council minutes (July 24, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=711582&GUID=90001AF2-7CEE-4F0F-906B-29A03ED9CB43>.

Reporting Requirements

The first \$25 million in one-time COVID-19 funding, already distributed for the preparation and implementation of COVID-19 strategies, can be used for COVID-19-related costs (including but not limited to equipment, personal protective equipment, remote technologies, and personnel costs directly related to COVID-19).

The second \$25 million can be used for COVID-19 backlog as defined and calculated from a comparison of court-specific disposition information from the established pre and current pandemic time periods.

Two Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) elements have been established in the Phoenix accounting system for tracking backlog expenditures and are currently being utilized by courts to ensure information can be made available for reporting purposes.

First \$25 Million Data

In reviewing expenditures in which the WBS elements are assigned for the period July 1, 2020 through October 31, 2020, there are five categories that make up 75 percent of expenditures to date. These include, in order of expenditures from largest to smallest, minor equipment, janitorial services, computers, alterations and improvements, and office expenses. The remaining 25 percent of expenditures to date include 60 categories ranging from computer accessories and major information technology equipment to signs and related supplies. It is anticipated that personnel costs will be included as expenditures continue and with distribution of the remaining \$25 million.

Allocation Methodology

The second \$25 million has been allocated proportionally based on each court's share of the total statewide backlog as displayed in Attachment A.

Only courts that have a calculated backlog consistent with the above definition are eligible for a funding allocation from the remaining \$25 million available for distribution. Each court's COVID-related backlog is the net difference between the average March 1, 2019 to August 31, 2019 weighted dispositions compared to average March 1, 2020 to August 31, 2020 weighted dispositions. In the event courts were unable to enter the disposition data, proxies based on statewide averages were applied and are noted accordingly³.

³ Statewide proxies were established for each RAS casetype category by quantifying the relationship between statewide filings and dispositions for the pre-pandemic period (March to August 2019) by casetype and also measuring the percent change from the pre-pandemic to pandemic period for statewide dispositions for each casetype. Since all courts that required proxies had been able to report filings data in 2019, these two factors were sufficient for creating proxies. Proxies were used for only 2% of all data elements needed.

\$50 Million One-Time COVID-19 Backlog Funding Allocation

The chart below provides allocation information by court of the first \$25 million pro rata allocation and the second \$25 million allocation as recommended by TCBAC, to reflect the total \$50 million one-time allocation:

| Court | First \$25m Allocation (Pro Rata) | Second \$25m Allocation (Recommendation) | Total \$50m Allocation |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Alameda | 842,169 | 813,228 | 1,655,397 |
| Alpine | 4,099 | 239 | 4,338 |
| Amador | 34,576 | 18,704 | 53,280 |
| Butte | 142,826 | 113,759 | 256,585 |
| Calaveras | 27,720 | 11,540 | 39,259 |
| Colusa | 21,131 | 9,834 | 30,966 |
| Contra Costa | 539,671 | 371,038 | 910,709 |
| Del Norte | 30,804 | 65,619 | 96,423 |
| El Dorado | 91,925 | 31,687 | 123,612 |
| Fresno | 677,260 | 735,671 | 1,412,931 |
| Glenn | 25,321 | 25,102 | 50,423 |
| Humboldt | 85,802 | 105,945 | 191,746 |
| Imperial | 98,417 | 166,725 | 265,142 |
| Inyo | 20,493 | 13,369 | 33,863 |
| Kern | 687,911 | 594,690 | 1,282,601 |
| Kings | 102,879 | 104,101 | 206,981 |
| Lake | 52,118 | 87,094 | 139,212 |
| Lassen | 21,101 | 30,170 | 51,271 |
| Los Angeles | 7,326,544 | 7,731,749 | 15,058,292 |
| Madera | 116,120 | 104,395 | 220,515 |
| Marin | 139,187 | 140,447 | 279,633 |
| Mariposa | 15,494 | 11,277 | 26,771 |
| Mendocino | 71,110 | 47,466 | 118,577 |
| Merced | 166,730 | 136,047 | 302,777 |
| Modoc | 11,089 | 11,166 | 22,254 |
| Mono | 17,595 | 17,848 | 35,443 |
| Monterey | 254,246 | 176,649 | 430,895 |
| Napa | 96,689 | 73,796 | 170,485 |

| Court | First \$25m Allocation (Pro Rata) | Second \$25m Allocation (Recommendation) | Total \$50m Allocation |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Nevada | 60,945 | 31,775 | 92,719 |
| Orange | 1,831,901 | 2,275,907 | 4,107,808 |
| Placer | 238,483 | 201,434 | 439,917 |
| Plumas | 15,906 | 7,696 | 23,603 |
| Riverside | 1,329,084 | 1,324,242 | 2,653,326 |
| Sacramento | 1,175,581 | 1,209,326 | 2,384,907 |
| San Benito | 38,657 | 21,759 | 60,416 |
| San Bernardino | 1,400,914 | 1,695,486 | 3,096,399 |
| San Diego | 1,697,402 | 1,691,380 | 3,388,782 |
| San Francisco | 585,040 | 373,064 | 958,104 |
| San Joaquin | 513,099 | 515,539 | 1,028,638 |
| San Luis Obispo | 192,206 | 204,807 | 397,013 |
| San Mateo | 436,824 | 361,829 | 798,653 |
| Santa Barbara | 292,697 | 289,809 | 582,506 |
| Santa Clara | 953,930 | 719,218 | 1,673,148 |
| Santa Cruz | 172,052 | 142,631 | 314,683 |
| Shasta | 156,752 | 39,910 | 196,662 |
| Sierra | 2,760 | - | 2,760 |
| Siskiyou | 39,716 | 27,326 | 67,041 |
| Solano | 303,021 | 206,289 | 509,310 |
| Sonoma | 298,558 | 235,830 | 534,388 |
| Stanislaus | 329,931 | 366,158 | 696,089 |
| Sutter | 81,203 | 54,716 | 135,919 |
| Tehama | 57,335 | 67,252 | 124,587 |
| Trinity | 17,235 | 13,969 | 31,204 |
| Tulare | 305,728 | 322,334 | 628,062 |
| Tuolumne | 45,126 | 42,163 | 87,289 |
| Ventura | 495,230 | 620,641 | 1,115,871 |
| Yolo | 162,774 | 151,534 | 314,308 |
| Yuba | 48,879 | 36,624 | 85,503 |
| | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 50,000,000 |

Recommendations

The TCBAC has identified dispositions as one point of data analysis for evaluation of the backlog for the branch. With further analysis in the future, the TCBAC will include more data points that will display additional impacts to courts through the continued work of the subcommittee. The recommendations below are to address the one-time allocation of the remaining \$25 million this fiscal year and are intended to address the courts most impacted at this point in time.

Further, the following recommendations are presented to the Budget Committee for approval to be considered by the Judicial Council at its January 21-22, 2021 business meeting, following a short period for appeals to be considered:

- A. COVID-19 backlog is defined as workload that was not disposed of during the pandemic period, March 1, 2020 through August 31, 2020.
- B. The methodology of establishing COVID-19 backlog is the net difference between the average of each court's COVID-19 backlog from March 1, 2019 to August 31, 2019 weighted dispositions, compared to average March 1, 2020 to August 31, 2020 weighted dispositions, allocated proportionally based on each court's share of the backlog. The results for all courts have been applied to the available \$25 million in remaining funding and allocated proportionally as displayed in Attachment A.
- C. In the event there were courts unable to enter the disposition data by case type for the time periods noted in recommendation B, proxies based on statewide averages were applied to those courts for each time period to establish those courts' COVID-19 backlog and proportional allocation of the remaining \$25 million.
- D. Reporting on progress in reducing the COVID-19 related backlog will occur no less than quarterly and will continue to be reevaluated. A redistribution of the second \$25 million to take place in March 2021 in the event courts are unable to project the expenditure of their full allocation.
- E. Request that Judicial Branch staff create and distribute a template to all 58 courts to report non-dispositional information on how courts have addressed COVID-19 related challenges.

Attachments

Attachment A: TCBAC Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 \$25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 \$25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
December 2020

| Court | # of Dispositions, Pre Pandemic, March 2019 through August 2019 (Period 1) | | | | | | | # of Dispositions, Pandemic Period, March 2020 through August 2020 (Period 2) | | | | | | | Change in Dispositions O (N - G) | % +/- P ((N - G) / G) |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | March | April | May | June | July | August | Total | March | April | May | June | July | August | Total | | |
| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G (A THRU F) | H | I | J | K | L | M | N (H THRU M) | | |
| Alameda | 19,060 | 18,625 | 18,740 | 18,145 | 21,398 | 19,703 | 115,671 | 13,457 | 7,293 | 6,691 | 6,533 | 10,480 | 12,641 | 57,095 | (58,576) | -50.6% |
| Alpine | 84 | 65 | 105 | 106 | 120 | 114 | 594 | 97 | 81 | 117 | 60 | 71 | 75 | 501 | (93) | -15.7% |
| Amador | 423 | 407 | 468 | 560 | 590 | 584 | 3,032 | 378 | 276 | 257 | 309 | 424 | 470 | 2,114 | (918) | -30.3% |
| Butte | 2,701 | 2,459 | 2,598 | 2,325 | 2,763 | 2,568 | 15,414 | 2,168 | 1,441 | 1,440 | 1,640 | 1,959 | 1,886 | 10,534 | (4,880) | -31.7% |
| Calaveras | 464 | 381 | 371 | 424 | 521 | 412 | 2,573 | 415 | 200 | 201 | 467 | 268 | 250 | 1,801 | (772) | -30.0% |
| Colusa** | 375 | 437 | 528 | 438 | 421 | 316 | 2,515 | 366 | 146 | 168 | 596 | 599 | 293 | 2,168 | (347) | -13.8% |
| Contra Costa** | 9,008 | 9,354 | 9,460 | 9,715 | 10,486 | 9,527 | 57,547 | 4,980 | 3,481 | 3,280 | 4,416 | 7,323 | 8,881 | 32,360 | (25,187) | -43.8% |
| Del Norte | 1,094 | 1,352 | 1,456 | 1,399 | 1,302 | 1,118 | 7,721 | 979 | 507 | 320 | 770 | 842 | 967 | 4,385 | (3,336) | -43.2% |
| El Dorado | 1,065 | 988 | 1,060 | 1,115 | 1,274 | 1,252 | 6,754 | 992 | 487 | 692 | 765 | 901 | 1,125 | 4,962 | (1,792) | -26.5% |
| Fresno | 14,271 | 14,495 | 14,247 | 12,690 | 15,401 | 14,072 | 85,176 | 11,394 | 4,494 | 6,590 | 6,875 | 9,766 | 10,358 | 49,477 | (35,699) | -41.9% |
| Glenn* | 430 | 430 | 430 | 430 | 430 | 430 | 2,578 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 243 | 1,459 | (1,119) | -43.4% |
| Humboldt | 1,705 | 1,781 | 2,098 | 1,932 | 2,069 | 2,027 | 11,612 | 1,545 | 800 | 661 | 859 | 798 | 930 | 5,593 | (6,019) | -51.8% |
| Imperial | 3,904 | 3,817 | 4,095 | 4,103 | 4,520 | 4,627 | 25,066 | 3,172 | 2,898 | 2,294 | 2,033 | 2,065 | 2,230 | 14,692 | (10,374) | -41.4% |
| Inyo | 909 | 715 | 862 | 644 | 886 | 789 | 4,805 | 961 | 446 | 366 | 553 | 402 | 668 | 3,396 | (1,409) | -29.3% |
| Kern | 13,994 | 13,517 | 14,468 | 13,042 | 13,682 | 13,412 | 82,115 | 10,317 | 4,463 | 6,401 | 9,287 | 10,068 | 9,219 | 49,755 | (32,360) | -39.4% |
| Kings | 2,036 | 1,941 | 2,077 | 1,879 | 2,113 | 2,074 | 12,120 | 1,967 | 1,252 | 905 | 1,209 | 1,352 | 1,559 | 8,244 | (3,876) | -32.0% |
| Lake | 1,189 | 1,087 | 899 | 1,049 | 1,095 | 1,087 | 6,406 | 630 | 226 | 227 | 717 | 561 | 792 | 3,153 | (3,253) | -50.8% |
| Lassen** | 536 | 484 | 542 | 518 | 595 | 681 | 3,356 | 521 | 435 | 545 | 565 | 379 | 382 | 2,827 | (529) | -15.8% |
| Los Angeles | 129,582 | 123,308 | 126,760 | 121,246 | 142,415 | 142,176 | 785,487 | 94,474 | 52,152 | 48,333 | 57,840 | 66,889 | 80,304 | 399,992 | (385,495) | -49.1% |
| Madera | 2,241 | 2,330 | 2,483 | 2,201 | 2,440 | 2,561 | 14,256 | 1,827 | 873 | 735 | 1,387 | 1,294 | 1,556 | 7,672 | (6,584) | -46.2% |
| Marin | 4,187 | 4,286 | 4,227 | 3,904 | 2,451 | 4,131 | 23,186 | 2,185 | 1,509 | 1,423 | 1,909 | 2,062 | 1,976 | 11,064 | (12,122) | -52.3% |
| Mariposa | 247 | 303 | 314 | 306 | 272 | 317 | 1,759 | 184 | 136 | 85 | 64 | 125 | 161 | 755 | (1,004) | -57.1% |
| Mendocino | 1,787 | 1,523 | 1,744 | 1,525 | 1,770 | 1,608 | 9,957 | 1,647 | 1,132 | 858 | 1,073 | 1,223 | 1,166 | 7,099 | (2,858) | -28.7% |
| Merced** | 3,877 | 3,665 | 3,966 | 3,497 | 4,210 | 3,955 | 23,170 | 3,249 | 1,401 | 1,720 | 2,526 | 2,514 | 2,217 | 13,625 | (9,545) | -41.2% |
| Modoc | 137 | 117 | 149 | 239 | 204 | 190 | 1,036 | 137 | 160 | 129 | 224 | 148 | 147 | 945 | (91) | -8.8% |
| Mono | 589 | 636 | 617 | 595 | 753 | 764 | 3,954 | 688 | 574 | 488 | 418 | 327 | 413 | 2,908 | (1,046) | -26.5% |
| Monterey | 5,123 | 4,835 | 5,404 | 4,409 | 5,020 | 4,942 | 29,733 | 4,372 | 2,522 | 2,658 | 3,184 | 3,689 | 3,465 | 19,890 | (9,843) | -33.1% |
| Napa** | 2,139 | 1,621 | 1,858 | 1,520 | 1,429 | 1,548 | 10,114 | 653 | 124 | 400 | 1,186 | 840 | 780 | 3,980 | (6,133) | -60.6% |
| Nevada | 1,188 | 971 | 928 | 1,242 | 1,410 | 1,362 | 7,101 | 1,008 | 655 | 535 | 1,019 | 1,015 | 991 | 5,223 | (1,878) | -26.4% |
| Orange | 36,606 | 35,780 | 37,427 | 35,273 | 37,185 | 39,519 | 221,790 | 25,199 | 7,951 | 12,139 | 18,494 | 18,365 | 19,475 | 101,623 | (120,167) | -54.2% |
| Placer | 2,400 | 2,611 | 2,503 | 2,364 | 2,939 | 2,770 | 15,587 | 1,879 | 606 | 973 | 1,390 | 1,402 | 882 | 7,132 | (8,455) | -54.2% |
| Plumas | 261 | 233 | 239 | 225 | 335 | 299 | 1,592 | 234 | 148 | 651 | 424 | 225 | 217 | 1,899 | 307 | 19.3% |
| Riverside | 26,735 | 26,643 | 27,716 | 25,839 | 28,753 | 28,993 | 164,679 | 19,496 | 7,224 | 5,531 | 13,128 | 16,753 | 16,679 | 78,811 | (85,868) | -52.1% |
| Sacramento | 8,275 | 11,254 | 23,350 | 18,303 | 23,538 | 20,144 | 104,864 | 6,467 | 798 | 3,873 | 4,255 | 5,500 | 7,537 | 28,430 | (76,434) | -72.9% |
| San Benito | 471 | 540 | 580 | 513 | 553 | 571 | 3,228 | 378 | 181 | 144 | 176 | 280 | 297 | 1,456 | (1,772) | -54.9% |
| San Bernardino | 29,930 | 27,067 | 26,869 | 24,418 | 26,647 | 26,408 | 161,339 | 16,647 | 4,991 | 10,128 | 21,854 | 21,894 | 23,289 | 98,803 | (62,536) | -38.8% |
| San Diego | 29,282 | 28,381 | 28,291 | 27,278 | 31,106 | 31,620 | 175,958 | 15,287 | 10,163 | 11,449 | 12,258 | 12,231 | 12,681 | 74,069 | (101,889) | -57.9% |
| San Francisco | 9,078 | 10,397 | 8,094 | 8,955 | 11,383 | 9,440 | 57,347 | 2,996 | 1,502 | 1,447 | 2,470 | 2,284 | 2,881 | 13,580 | (43,767) | -76.3% |
| San Joaquin | 7,237 | 7,531 | 8,102 | 6,909 | 9,093 | 9,705 | 48,577 | 4,922 | 1,912 | 1,481 | 3,246 | 4,296 | 4,104 | 19,961 | (28,616) | -58.9% |
| San Luis Obispo | 3,877 | 3,886 | 4,073 | 3,752 | 4,094 | 4,173 | 23,855 | 2,651 | 1,718 | 1,279 | 1,919 | 2,054 | 2,303 | 11,924 | (11,931) | -50.0% |
| San Mateo | 11,363 | 10,892 | 11,907 | 11,047 | 12,507 | 12,766 | 70,482 | 8,846 | 4,929 | 3,317 | 4,477 | 5,029 | 5,091 | 31,689 | (38,793) | -55.0% |
| Santa Barbara | 6,217 | 5,778 | 6,107 | 5,926 | 6,114 | 5,907 | 36,049 | 4,606 | 2,676 | 2,150 | 2,299 | 2,240 | 2,142 | 16,113 | (19,936) | -55.3% |
| Santa Clara | 12,701 | 12,528 | 14,518 | 15,320 | 15,581 | 14,865 | 85,513 | 11,302 | 5,869 | 8,002 | 6,123 | 7,706 | 6,564 | 45,566 | (39,947) | -46.7% |

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 \$25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
December 2020

| Court | # of Dispositions, Pre Pandemic, March 2019 through August 2019 (Period 1) | | | | | | | # of Dispositions, Pandemic Period, March 2020 through August 2020 (Period 2) | | | | | | | Change in Dispositions O (N - G) | % +/- P ((N - G) / G) |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | March | April | May | June | July | August | Total | March | April | May | June | July | August | Total | | |
| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G (A THRU F) | H | I | J | K | L | M | N (H THRU M) | | |
| Santa Cruz | 2,892 | 2,825 | 3,090 | 2,888 | 3,560 | 3,677 | 18,932 | 2,241 | 1,266 | 1,796 | 1,887 | 2,546 | 2,147 | 11,883 | (7,049) | -37.2% |
| Shasta | 3,562 | 3,076 | 3,386 | 3,138 | 3,266 | 3,308 | 19,736 | 2,568 | 3,830 | 1,794 | 2,543 | 2,632 | 2,254 | 15,621 | (4,115) | -20.9% |
| Sierra | 28 | 48 | 36 | 48 | 64 | 64 | 288 | 35 | 14 | 43 | 52 | 29 | 24 | 197 | (91) | -31.6% |
| Siskiyou | 923 | 790 | 980 | 985 | 1,152 | 961 | 5,791 | 967 | 162 | 466 | 735 | 729 | 861 | 3,920 | (1,871) | -32.3% |
| Solano | 6,105 | 5,182 | 5,345 | 4,454 | 5,408 | 4,813 | 31,307 | 3,873 | 3,076 | 2,336 | 2,879 | 4,094 | 4,052 | 20,310 | (10,997) | -35.1% |
| Sonoma | 7,283 | 7,486 | 7,197 | 7,090 | 8,108 | 7,469 | 44,633 | 5,098 | 3,830 | 4,116 | 5,861 | 7,129 | 6,910 | 32,944 | (11,689) | -26.2% |
| Stanislaus | 5,547 | 5,434 | 5,482 | 5,209 | 5,535 | 5,358 | 32,565 | 4,642 | 1,954 | 2,046 | 2,722 | 3,054 | 3,877 | 18,295 | (14,270) | -43.8% |
| Sutter | 1,417 | 1,343 | 1,506 | 1,374 | 1,465 | 1,519 | 8,624 | 1,259 | 620 | 809 | 1,194 | 1,169 | 1,105 | 6,156 | (2,468) | -28.6% |
| Tehama** | 1,192 | 1,141 | 1,193 | 999 | 1,315 | 1,137 | 6,977 | 886 | 587 | 456 | 457 | 804 | 877 | 4,067 | (2,910) | -41.7% |
| Trinity | 203 | 233 | 211 | 281 | 229 | 358 | 1,515 | 178 | 120 | 181 | 102 | 145 | 170 | 896 | (619) | -40.9% |
| Tulare | 5,384 | 5,383 | 5,518 | 5,678 | 5,855 | 6,219 | 34,037 | 4,137 | 1,570 | 2,849 | 2,957 | 4,561 | 5,646 | 21,720 | (12,317) | -36.2% |
| Tuolumne | 708 | 649 | 861 | 819 | 934 | 760 | 4,731 | 691 | 628 | 368 | 397 | 451 | 443 | 2,978 | (1,753) | -37.1% |
| Ventura | 11,222 | 11,674 | 21,954 | 11,394 | 12,671 | 11,995 | 80,910 | 8,541 | 2,766 | 2,877 | 7,417 | 8,344 | 8,019 | 37,964 | (42,946) | -53.1% |
| Yolo | 2,189 | 2,326 | 3,033 | 2,592 | 3,060 | 2,511 | 15,711 | 1,304 | 720 | 922 | 999 | 1,018 | 1,178 | 6,141 | (9,570) | -60.9% |
| Yuba | 684 | 752 | 808 | 676 | 773 | 699 | 4,392 | 559 | 142 | 512 | 529 | 603 | 583 | 2,928 | (1,464) | -33.3% |
| | 458,116 | 447,792 | 483,329 | 444,944 | 505,262 | 496,374 | 2,835,816 | 322,894 | 162,359 | 172,896 | 231,970 | 266,193 | 288,433 | 1,444,746 | (1,391,071) | -49.1% |

Floor courts
Cluster 1 courts

*Proxy applied to all data.
**Proxy applied to some data.

**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 \$25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
December 2020**

| Court | Calculated Dispo | Calculated Dispo | Change in Backlog | % +/- | Percent of Change | Second \$25m Allocation |
|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| | Mins in Period 1 | Mins in Period 2 | Minutes | | | |
| | (Weights Reflected Here) | | | | | |
| | Q | R | S (R - Q) | T ((R - Q) / Q) | U (S / TOTAL S) | V (U * \$25M) |
| Alameda | 17,883,665 | 9,698,757 | (8,184,908) | -45.8% | 3.25% | 813,228 |
| Alpine | 43,015 | 40,609 | (2,406) | -5.6% | 0.001% | 239 |
| Amador | 616,966 | 428,719 | (188,247) | -30.5% | 0.07% | 18,704 |
| Butte | 3,817,659 | 2,672,706 | (1,144,953) | -30.0% | 0.46% | 113,759 |
| Calaveras | 687,161 | 571,018 | (116,143) | -16.9% | 0.05% | 11,540 |
| Colusa** | 369,577 | 270,599 | (98,978) | -26.8% | 0.04% | 9,834 |
| Contra Costa** | 9,436,357 | 5,701,968 | (3,734,389) | -39.6% | 1.48% | 371,038 |
| Del Norte | 1,806,138 | 1,145,699 | (660,439) | -36.6% | 0.26% | 65,619 |
| El Dorado | 1,762,976 | 1,444,055 | (318,921) | -18.1% | 0.13% | 31,687 |
| Fresno | 16,166,752 | 8,762,424 | (7,404,328) | -45.8% | 2.94% | 735,671 |
| Glenn* | 578,069 | 325,424 | (252,645) | -43.7% | 0.10% | 25,102 |
| Humboldt | 2,528,781 | 1,462,476 | (1,066,305) | -42.2% | 0.42% | 105,945 |
| Imperial | 3,407,249 | 1,729,210 | (1,678,039) | -49.2% | 0.67% | 166,725 |
| Inyo | 475,368 | 340,810 | (134,558) | -28.3% | 0.05% | 13,369 |
| Kern | 15,994,498 | 10,009,111 | (5,985,387) | -37.4% | 2.38% | 594,690 |
| Kings | 2,805,070 | 1,757,319 | (1,047,751) | -37.4% | 0.42% | 104,101 |
| Lake | 1,870,993 | 994,416 | (876,577) | -46.9% | 0.35% | 87,094 |
| Lassen** | 733,770 | 430,115 | (303,655) | -41.4% | 0.12% | 30,170 |
| Los Angeles | 167,557,586 | 89,739,693 | (77,817,893) | -46.4% | 30.93% | 7,731,749 |
| Madera | 2,778,429 | 1,727,725 | (1,050,704) | -37.8% | 0.42% | 104,395 |
| Marin | 3,288,561 | 1,875,006 | (1,413,555) | -43.0% | 0.56% | 140,447 |
| Mariposa | 274,542 | 161,046 | (113,496) | -41.3% | 0.05% | 11,277 |
| Mendocino | 2,078,227 | 1,600,494 | (477,733) | -23.0% | 0.19% | 47,466 |
| Merced** | 3,659,587 | 2,290,314 | (1,369,273) | -37.4% | 0.54% | 136,047 |
| Modoc | 284,159 | 171,779 | (112,380) | -39.5% | 0.04% | 11,166 |
| Mono | 445,321 | 265,684 | (179,637) | -40.3% | 0.07% | 17,848 |
| Monterey | 5,607,782 | 3,829,861 | (1,777,921) | -31.7% | 0.71% | 176,649 |
| Napa** | 1,947,121 | 1,204,387 | (742,734) | -38.1% | 0.30% | 73,796 |
| Nevada | 1,307,084 | 987,282 | (319,802) | -24.5% | 0.13% | 31,775 |
| Orange | 44,665,088 | 21,758,720 | (22,906,368) | -51.3% | 9.10% | 2,275,907 |
| Placer | 4,539,693 | 2,512,320 | (2,027,373) | -44.7% | 0.81% | 201,434 |
| Plumas | 355,846 | 278,383 | (77,463) | -21.8% | 0.03% | 7,696 |
| Riverside | 29,964,834 | 16,636,704 | (13,328,130) | -44.5% | 5.30% | 1,324,242 |
| Sacramento | 21,638,646 | 9,467,120 | (12,171,526) | -56.2% | 4.84% | 1,209,326 |
| San Benito | 614,116 | 395,116 | (219,000) | -35.7% | 0.09% | 21,759 |
| San Bernardino | 41,492,501 | 24,427,912 | (17,064,589) | -41.1% | 6.78% | 1,695,486 |
| San Diego | 34,136,170 | 17,112,902 | (17,023,268) | -49.9% | 6.77% | 1,691,380 |
| San Francisco | 9,115,994 | 5,361,206 | (3,754,789) | -41.2% | 1.49% | 373,064 |
| San Joaquin | 11,282,400 | 6,093,647 | (5,188,753) | -46.0% | 2.06% | 515,539 |
| San Luis Obispo | 4,453,302 | 2,391,980 | (2,061,322) | -46.3% | 0.82% | 204,807 |
| San Mateo | 8,331,325 | 4,689,619 | (3,641,706) | -43.7% | 1.45% | 361,829 |
| Santa Barbara | 6,336,987 | 3,420,137 | (2,916,851) | -46.0% | 1.16% | 289,809 |
| Santa Clara | 16,355,620 | 9,116,896 | (7,238,724) | -44.3% | 2.88% | 719,218 |

**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 \$25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
December 2020**

| Court | Calculated Dispo | Calculated Dispo | Change in Backlog | % +/- | Percent of | Second \$25m |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Mins in Period 1 | Mins in Period 2 | Minutes | | Change | Allocation |
| | (Weights Reflected Here) | | | | U | V |
| | Q | R | S (R - Q) | T ((R - Q) / Q) | (S / TOTAL S) | (U * \$25M) |
| Santa Cruz | 4,133,651 | 2,698,109 | (1,435,542) | -34.7% | 0.57% | 142,631 |
| Shasta | 4,511,643 | 4,109,959 | (401,684) | -8.9% | 0.16% | 39,910 |
| Sierra | 56,136 | 56,136 | - | 0.00% | 0.00% | - |
| Siskiyou | 999,173 | 724,148 | (275,025) | -27.5% | 0.11% | 27,326 |
| Solano | 5,781,170 | 3,704,924 | (2,076,246) | -35.9% | 0.83% | 206,289 |
| Sonoma | 6,383,454 | 4,009,887 | (2,373,567) | -37.2% | 0.94% | 235,830 |
| Stanislaus | 8,528,854 | 4,843,575 | (3,685,279) | -43.2% | 1.46% | 366,158 |
| Sutter | 1,791,150 | 1,240,452 | (550,699) | -30.7% | 0.22% | 54,716 |
| Tehama** | 1,537,783 | 860,910 | (676,873) | -44.0% | 0.27% | 67,252 |
| Trinity | 316,694 | 176,101 | (140,593) | -44.4% | 0.06% | 13,969 |
| Tulare | 7,973,857 | 4,729,658 | (3,244,199) | -40.7% | 1.29% | 322,334 |
| Tuolumne | 1,143,850 | 719,491 | (424,359) | -37.1% | 0.17% | 42,163 |
| Ventura | 12,051,994 | 5,805,414 | (6,246,580) | -51.8% | 2.48% | 620,641 |
| Yolo | 3,221,283 | 1,696,134 | (1,525,149) | -47.3% | 0.61% | 151,534 |
| Yuba | 1,305,707 | 937,098 | (368,609) | -28.2% | 0.15% | 36,624 |
| | 563,231,384 | 311,613,360 | (251,618,024) | -44.7% | 100.00% | 25,000,000 |

Floor courts
Cluster 1 courts

*Proxy applied to all d
**Proxy applied to son

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee

(Action Item)

Title: COVID-19 Backlog Funding Alternative Methodology Data
Date: 12/1/2020
Contact: Ms. Brandy Olivera, Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services
415-865-7195 | brandy.sanborn@jud.ca.gov
Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Judicial Council Business Management
Services 415-865-7708 | leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of an alternative methodology, or portions thereof, for allocation of the remaining \$25 million one-time COVID-19 backlog funding included in the Budget Act of 2020.

Background

Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting

On November 12, 2020, Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer, Placer Superior Court presented an alternative methodology to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) on behalf of a 26-court group that provided comment to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee’s (TCBAC) original proposal for allocating the remaining \$25 million one-time COVID-19 backlog funding via a “threshold” approach¹.

Methodology

Allocation Methodology

This methodology is based on a workload-based funding share allocation of funds, adjusted by factors that assess each court’s COVID-19 backlog ‘impact.’ Elements of the TCBAC recommendation are used to determine the impact on courts. These elements include the average change in weighted dispositions and the application of a proxy model to courts that do not have data entered in the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System so that they can be included in the allocation methodology.

The methodology establishes conceptual thresholds that place courts under various funding impact levels. In addition, there are various outcomes determined based on the threshold that a court falls into (see Table 1).

¹ Judicial Branch Budget Committee PowerPoint (November 12, 2020), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbbc-20201112-materials-additional.pptx>.

Table 1:

| Impact | Threshold | Outcome |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Minimal | Less than -2.5% | No funding |
| Moderate | -2.5% to -14.9% | Reduced, scaled proportion from the first \$25m |
| Significant | -15% to -24.9% | Equal to the first \$25m allocation |
| Severe | More than -25% | Equal to first \$25m plus additional supplement |

Based on this information, a court with minimal impact, defined as having less than a 2.5 percent average disposition change when comparing last year to current year, would not receive any of the second \$25 million allocation.

A court with a moderate impact of 2.5 percent to 14.9 percent would receive a reduced, scaled proportion of funding based on the first \$25 million received (e.g., a court that received \$100,000 from the first \$25 million allocation and has a 2.5 percent impact would receive \$2,500 from the second \$25 million; a court that received \$100,000 from the first \$25 million allocation and has a 14.9 percent impact would receive \$97,500 from the second \$25 million).

A court with a significant impact would receive an allocation equivalent to what it received from the first \$25 million, and a court with a severe impact would receive an allocation equivalent to what it received from the first \$25 million as well as an additional, proportional supplement funded by courts that receive zero funds and by courts receiving a reduced allocation. Details of the proposed threshold and application outcomes are included in Attachment B.

Methodology Considerations

The following information highlights similarities and differences between the two methodologies for the Budget Committee to consider:

- a) The TCBAC-recommended allocation methodology is based on the average, weighted differences in dispositions between two time periods. The alternative model uses a workload-based funding share allocation as the foundation for distribution.
- b) Both models use the same COVID-19 disposition dataset for parts of their funding methodologies.
- c) The alternative methodology considers the severity impact of the pandemic on courts by providing them with additional funding, which is funded by courts with a minimum to moderate impact. The TCBAC-recommended methodology distributes funding proportionally to all courts that have a data-based backlog impact as a result of COVID-19.
- d) The thresholds, proportional reductions, and reference to the first \$25 million allocation

in this alternative methodology are suggested and could be adjusted at the discretion of the Budget Committee.

\$50 Million One-Time COVID-19 Backlog Funding Allocation

The chart below provides allocation information by court of the first \$25 million pro rata allocation and the second \$25 million allocation alternative presented here, to reflect the total \$50 million one-time allocation:

| Court | First \$25m Allocation (Pro Rata) | Second \$25m Allocation (Recommendation) | Total \$50m Allocation |
|--------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Alameda | 842,169 | 844,972 | 1,687,141 |
| Alpine | 4,099 | 1,076 | 5,175 |
| Amador | 34,576 | 34,691 | 69,267 |
| Butte | 142,826 | 143,302 | 286,128 |
| Calaveras | 27,720 | 27,720 | 55,440 |
| Colusa | 21,131 | 21,202 | 42,333 |
| Contra Costa | 539,671 | 541,467 | 1,081,139 |
| Del Norte | 30,804 | 30,906 | 61,710 |
| El Dorado | 91,925 | 91,925 | 183,851 |
| Fresno | 677,260 | 679,513 | 1,356,773 |
| Glenn | 25,321 | 25,406 | 50,727 |
| Humboldt | 85,802 | 86,087 | 171,889 |
| Imperial | 98,417 | 98,745 | 197,162 |
| Inyo | 20,493 | 20,562 | 41,055 |
| Kern | 687,911 | 690,201 | 1,378,112 |
| Kings | 102,879 | 103,222 | 206,101 |
| Lake | 52,118 | 52,292 | 104,410 |
| Lassen | 21,101 | 21,171 | 42,271 |
| Los Angeles | 7,326,544 | 7,350,924 | 14,677,468 |
| Madera | 116,120 | 116,506 | 232,627 |
| Marin | 139,187 | 139,650 | 278,836 |
| Mariposa | 15,494 | 15,545 | 31,039 |
| Mendocino | 71,110 | 71,110 | 142,221 |
| Merced | 166,730 | 167,285 | 334,015 |
| Modoc | 11,089 | 11,126 | 22,214 |
| Mono | 17,595 | 17,653 | 35,248 |

| Court | First \$25m Allocation (Pro Rata) | Second \$25m Allocation (Recommendation) | Total \$50m Allocation |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Monterey | 254,246 | 255,093 | 509,339 |
| Napa | 96,689 | 97,011 | 193,701 |
| Nevada | 60,945 | 60,945 | 121,889 |
| Orange | 1,831,901 | 1,837,997 | 3,669,898 |
| Placer | 238,483 | 239,277 | 477,759 |
| Plumas | 15,906 | 15,906 | 31,813 |
| Riverside | 1,329,084 | 1,333,507 | 2,662,591 |
| Sacramento | 1,175,581 | 1,179,493 | 2,355,074 |
| San Benito | 38,657 | 38,786 | 77,443 |
| San Bernardino | 1,400,914 | 1,405,576 | 2,806,489 |
| San Diego | 1,697,402 | 1,703,051 | 3,400,453 |
| San Francisco | 585,040 | 586,987 | 1,172,027 |
| San Joaquin | 513,099 | 514,807 | 1,027,906 |
| San Luis Obispo | 192,206 | 192,846 | 385,052 |
| San Mateo | 436,824 | 438,278 | 875,102 |
| Santa Barbara | 292,697 | 293,671 | 586,368 |
| Santa Clara | 953,930 | 957,105 | 1,911,035 |
| Santa Cruz | 172,052 | 172,624 | 344,676 |
| Shasta | 156,752 | 80,778 | 237,530 |
| Sierra | 2,760 | - | 2,760 |
| Siskiyou | 39,716 | 39,848 | 79,564 |
| Solano | 303,021 | 304,029 | 607,050 |
| Sonoma | 298,558 | 299,551 | 598,109 |
| Stanislaus | 329,931 | 331,029 | 660,960 |
| Sutter | 81,203 | 81,473 | 162,677 |
| Tehama | 57,335 | 57,526 | 114,861 |
| Trinity | 17,235 | 17,292 | 34,527 |
| Tulare | 305,728 | 306,745 | 612,473 |
| Tuolumne | 45,126 | 45,276 | 90,402 |
| Ventura | 495,230 | 496,878 | 992,108 |
| Yolo | 162,774 | 163,315 | 326,089 |
| Yuba | 48,879 | 49,042 | 97,921 |
| | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 50,000,000 |

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Budget Committee approve one of the following methodologies for consideration by the Judicial Council at its January 21-22, 2021 business meeting, following a short period for appeals to be considered:

1. Move the alternative methodology forward (with any adjustments deemed by the Budget Committee); or
2. Move forward a hybrid model that incorporates components from the alternative model and the TCBAC model (with any adjustments deemed by the Budget Committee).

Attachments

Attachment B: Alternative Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 \$25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding

Alternative Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 \$25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding

December 2020

| Court | First \$25m Allocation (Pro Rata) | Percent of Allocation | Threshold (carried over from column T of the TCBAC Model) | Impact | Outcome | Outcome In Dollars | % for Supplement | Supplement In Dollars | Second \$25m Allocation |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| | W | X (W / TOTAL W) | Y | Z | AA | BB (VARIES) | CC (VARIES) | DD (CC * \$81,758) | EE (BB + DD) |
| Alameda | 842,169 | 3.37% | -45.8% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 842,169 | 3.4% | 2,803 | 844,972 |
| Alpine | 4,099 | 0.02% | -5.6% | Moderate | Reduced | 1,076 | 0.0% | - | 1,076 |
| Amador | 34,576 | 0.14% | -30.5% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 34,576 | 0.1% | 115 | 34,691 |
| Butte | 142,826 | 0.57% | -30.0% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 142,826 | 0.6% | 475 | 143,302 |
| Calaveras | 27,720 | 0.11% | -16.9% | Significant | Equal | 27,720 | 0.0% | - | 27,720 |
| Colusa | 21,131 | 0.08% | -26.8% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 21,131 | 0.1% | 70 | 21,202 |
| Contra Costa | 539,671 | 2.16% | -39.6% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 539,671 | 2.2% | 1,796 | 541,467 |
| Del Norte | 30,804 | 0.12% | -36.6% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 30,804 | 0.1% | 103 | 30,906 |
| El Dorado | 91,925 | 0.37% | -18.1% | Significant | Equal | 91,925 | 0.0% | - | 91,925 |
| Fresno | 677,260 | 2.71% | -45.8% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 677,260 | 2.8% | 2,254 | 679,513 |
| Glenn | 25,321 | 0.10% | -43.7% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 25,321 | 0.1% | 84 | 25,406 |
| Humboldt | 85,802 | 0.34% | -42.2% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 85,802 | 0.3% | 286 | 86,087 |
| Imperial | 98,417 | 0.39% | -49.2% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 98,417 | 0.4% | 328 | 98,745 |
| Inyo | 20,493 | 0.08% | -28.3% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 20,493 | 0.1% | 68 | 20,562 |
| Kern | 687,911 | 2.75% | -37.4% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 687,911 | 2.8% | 2,289 | 690,201 |
| Kings | 102,879 | 0.41% | -37.4% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 102,879 | 0.4% | 342 | 103,222 |
| Lake | 52,118 | 0.21% | -46.9% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 52,118 | 0.2% | 173 | 52,292 |
| Lassen | 21,101 | 0.08% | -41.4% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 21,101 | 0.1% | 70 | 21,171 |
| Los Angeles | 7,326,544 | 29.31% | -46.4% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 7,326,544 | 29.8% | 24,381 | 7,350,924 |
| Madera | 116,120 | 0.46% | -37.8% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 116,120 | 0.5% | 386 | 116,506 |
| Marin | 139,187 | 0.56% | -43.0% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 139,187 | 0.6% | 463 | 139,650 |
| Mariposa | 15,494 | 0.06% | -41.3% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 15,494 | 0.1% | 52 | 15,545 |
| Mendocino | 71,110 | 0.28% | -23.0% | Significant | Equal | 71,110 | 0.0% | - | 71,110 |
| Merced | 166,730 | 0.67% | -37.4% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 166,730 | 0.7% | 555 | 167,285 |
| Modoc | 11,089 | 0.04% | -39.5% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 11,089 | 0.0% | 37 | 11,126 |
| Mono | 17,595 | 0.07% | -40.3% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 17,595 | 0.1% | 59 | 17,653 |
| Monterey | 254,246 | 1.02% | -31.7% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 254,246 | 1.0% | 846 | 255,093 |
| Napa | 96,689 | 0.39% | -38.1% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 96,689 | 0.4% | 322 | 97,011 |
| Nevada | 60,945 | 0.24% | -24.5% | Significant | Equal | 60,945 | 0.0% | - | 60,945 |
| Orange | 1,831,901 | 7.33% | -51.3% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 1,831,901 | 7.5% | 6,096 | 1,837,997 |
| Placer | 238,483 | 0.95% | -44.7% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 238,483 | 1.0% | 794 | 239,277 |
| Plumas | 15,906 | 0.06% | -21.8% | Significant | Equal | 15,906 | 0.0% | - | 15,906 |
| Riverside | 1,329,084 | 5.32% | -44.5% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 1,329,084 | 5.4% | 4,423 | 1,333,507 |
| Sacramento | 1,175,581 | 4.70% | -56.2% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 1,175,581 | 4.8% | 3,912 | 1,179,493 |

Alternative Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 \$25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding

December 2020

| Court | First \$25m Allocation (Pro Rata) | Percent of Allocation |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| | W | X (W / TOTAL W) |
| San Benito | 38,657 | 0.15% |
| San Bernardino | 1,400,914 | 5.60% |
| San Diego | 1,697,402 | 6.79% |
| San Francisco | 585,040 | 2.34% |
| San Joaquin | 513,099 | 2.05% |
| San Luis Obispo | 192,206 | 0.77% |
| San Mateo | 436,824 | 1.75% |
| Santa Barbara | 292,697 | 1.17% |
| Santa Clara | 953,930 | 3.82% |
| Santa Cruz | 172,052 | 0.69% |
| Shasta | 156,752 | 0.63% |
| Sierra | 2,760 | 0.01% |
| Siskiyou | 39,716 | 0.16% |
| Solano | 303,021 | 1.21% |
| Sonoma | 298,558 | 1.19% |
| Stanislaus | 329,931 | 1.32% |
| Sutter | 81,203 | 0.32% |
| Tehama | 57,335 | 0.23% |
| Trinity | 17,235 | 0.07% |
| Tulare | 305,728 | 1.22% |
| Tuolumne | 45,126 | 0.18% |
| Ventura | 495,230 | 1.98% |
| Yolo | 162,774 | 0.65% |
| Yuba | 48,879 | 0.20% |
| 25,000,000 | 100.00% | |

0%

Floor courts
Cluster 1 courts

| Threshold (carried over from column T of the TCBAC Model) | Impact | Outcome | Outcome In Dollars | % for Supplement | Supplement In Dollars | Second \$25m Allocation |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Y | Z | AA | BB (VARIES) | CC (VARIES) | DD (CC * \$81,758) | EE (BB + DD) |
| -35.7% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 38,657 | 0.2% | 129 | 38,786 |
| -41.1% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 1,400,914 | 5.7% | 4,662 | 1,405,576 |
| -49.9% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 1,697,402 | 6.9% | 5,648 | 1,703,051 |
| -41.2% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 585,040 | 2.4% | 1,947 | 586,987 |
| -46.0% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 513,099 | 2.1% | 1,707 | 514,807 |
| -46.3% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 192,206 | 0.8% | 640 | 192,846 |
| -43.7% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 436,824 | 1.8% | 1,454 | 438,278 |
| -46.0% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 292,697 | 1.2% | 974 | 293,671 |
| -44.3% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 953,930 | 3.9% | 3,174 | 957,105 |
| -34.7% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 172,052 | 0.7% | 573 | 172,624 |
| -8.9% | Moderate | Reduced | 80,778 | 0.0% | - | 80,778 |
| 0.0% | Minimal | None | - | 0.0% | - | - |
| -27.5% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 39,716 | 0.2% | 132 | 39,848 |
| -35.9% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 303,021 | 1.2% | 1,008 | 304,029 |
| -37.2% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 298,558 | 1.2% | 994 | 299,551 |
| -43.2% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 329,931 | 1.3% | 1,098 | 331,029 |
| -30.7% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 81,203 | 0.3% | 270 | 81,473 |
| -44.0% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 57,335 | 0.2% | 191 | 57,526 |
| -44.4% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 17,235 | 0.1% | 57 | 17,292 |
| -40.7% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 305,728 | 1.2% | 1,017 | 306,745 |
| -37.1% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 45,126 | 0.2% | 150 | 45,276 |
| -51.8% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 495,230 | 2.0% | 1,648 | 496,878 |
| -47.3% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 162,774 | 0.7% | 542 | 163,315 |
| -28.2% | Severe | Equal + Supplement | 48,879 | 0.2% | 163 | 49,042 |
| -44.7% | | | 24,918,242 | 100.0% | 81,758 | 25,000,000 |

0%

0

| THRESHOLD AMOUNTS AND OUTCOME USED IN METHODOLOGY | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Impact | Threshold | Outcome |
| Minimal | Less than -2.5% | No Funding |
| Moderate | -2.5% to -14.9% | Reduced, Scaled Proportion from First \$25m* |
| Significant | -15% to -24.9% | Equal to First \$25m |
| Severe | More than -25% | Equal to First \$25m Plus Additional Supplement** |

*Courts on the lower end of moderate impact receive a larger reduction; courts on the higher end receive less of a reduction.

**Proportional using funds remaining from courts receiving zero funds and courts receiving a reduced allocation.