



Judicial Council of California

Judicial Branch Budget Committee

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MATERIALS OCTOBER 11, 2024

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the July 11, 2024 Meeting	3
Draft Minutes from the July 18, 2024 Action by Email between Meetings	4
Discussion and Possible Action Items (Items 1 - 10)	
Item 1 – 2024-25 Increased Transcript Rate Allocations (Action Required)	5
Attachment A – Transcript Funding – Recommended FY 2024–25 Allocations	7
Item 2 – 2024–25 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Pro Rata Distribution for a Mid-Cycle Allocation (Action Required)	9
Item 3 – Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program for 2024–25 Through 2025–26 (Action Required)	13
Item 4 – 2023–24 Final Adjustments for Year-end Fund Balances (Action Required)	18
Attachment A –2023–24 Final Adjustments for Year-end Fund Balances	21



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: Friday, October 11, 2024
Time: 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Public Videocast: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/3216>

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 July 11, 2024, Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting and the July 18, 2024, Action by E-mail between meetings.

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 Thursday, October 10, 2024, at 3:00 p.m. will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–4)

Item 1

2024–25 Increased Transcript Rate Allocations (Action Required)

Consideration of 2024–25 allocations for increased transcript rates.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Chris Belloli, Manager, Judicial Council Business Management Services

Item 2

2024–25 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Pro Rata Distribution for a Mid-Cycle Allocation (Action Required)

Consideration of an allocation methodology for additional grant funds to current Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program recipients.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Melanie Snider, Supervising Attorney, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 3

Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program for 2024–25 Through 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of allocations for Cycle 3 Firearm Relinquishment Grant awards for 2024–25 through 2025–26.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Frances Ho, Attorney, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 4

2023–24 Final Adjustments for Year-end Fund Balances (Action Required)

Review of final one-time adjustments for 2023–24 year-end fund balances for the trial courts.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

July 11, 2024

1:15 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.

455 Golden Gate Ave. San Francisco, CA 94102, Redwood Room

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/3214>

**Advisory Body
Members Present:**

Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Chair; Mr. David H. Yamasaki, Vice Chair; Hon. Carin T. Fujisaki; Hon. Brad R. Hill; Hon. C. Todd Bottke; Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz; Hon. Charles S. Crompton; and Ms. Rachel W. Hill

**Advisory Body
Members Absent:**

Others Present: Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Angela Cowan, Hon. Jonathan H. Conklin, Ms. Rose Lane

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 1:16 p.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The committee approved the minutes of the June 4, 2024, Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2 NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1: Budget Act of 2024

Update on the Budget Act of 2024.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Fran Mueller, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

Info 2: Funding Methodology Subcommittee Annual Work Plan

Update on the annual work plan for the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Ms. Rose Lane, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:36 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on .



JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

Thursday, July 18, 2024

11:03 a.m.

Action by Email Between Meetings

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Chair; Mr. David H. Yamasaki, Vice Chair; Hon. Carin T. Fujisaki; Hon. Brad R. Hill; Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz; Hon. C. Todd Bottke; Hon. Charles S. Crompton; Ms. Rachel W. Hill;

Advisory Body Members Absent:

Others Present: Ms. Angela Cowan

OPEN MEETING

Vote

Voting opened at 11:03 a.m.

ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-1)

Item 1: Court Reporter Allocations for 2024-25 for the Remaining \$10 Million

Consideration of a Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendation for 2024-25 allocations for the remaining \$10 million of the \$30 million in court reporter funding included in the Budget Act of 2024.

Action: The Judicial Branch Budget Committee voted, with one abstention, to approve the allocation for the remaining \$10 million in court reporter funding included in the Budget Act of 2024.

ADJOURNMENT

Voting closed at 5:00 p.m. on July 18, 2024.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee
(Action Item)

Title: 2024–25 Increased Transcript Rate Allocations
Date: 10/11/2024
Contact: Chris Belloli, Manager, Business Management Services
415-865-7658 | chris.belloli@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of a recommendation from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) of 2024–25 allocations for the ongoing \$7 million General Fund included in the Budget Act of 2024 to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates.

Background

Budget Language

Senate Bill 170 (Ch. 240, Stats. 2021), which amended the Budget Act of 2021, included \$7 million ongoing General Fund to establish a methodology to allocate funding to all trial courts to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates.

Allocation Methodology

In the first year of funding in fiscal year 2021–22, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the TCBAC established the Ad Hoc Court Reporter Funding Subcommittee consisting of members from the TCBAC to develop an allocation methodology recommendation for 2021–22. Through deliberations, the ad hoc subcommittee developed a recommendation for an allocation methodology for the \$7 million and presented it to the TCBAC at its November 30, 2021, meeting and to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on December 7, 2021. The Judicial Council approved the allocation methodology at its January 21, 2022, business meeting and directed staff to update the three-year average for the allocation methodology each year based on the most recent data available.

Annual True Up Process

Because this funding is intended solely to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates, any unspent funds are required to revert to the General Fund each fiscal year. The actual expenditures for each court from 2020–21 will be used to establish a baseline from which cost increases eligible to be covered by these funds will be determined for each court. Based on the historical baseline amount and the actual expenditures for the current fiscal year, a true up process will occur at the end of each fiscal year to pull back any remaining funds. This process and the adjustments for 2024–25 are outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Annual Reversion Calculation for 2024–25

Court	2020–21 (Baseline)	Actual Expenditures			3-Year Average	2024–25 Allocation from \$7M	2024–25 Expenditures	GF Reversion
		2021–22	2022–23	2023–24				
A	\$85,000	\$90,000	\$100,000	\$110,000	\$100,000	\$43,260	\$120,000	\$8,260

Based on the example in Table 1, Court A would receive an allocation of \$43,260 from the 2024–25 \$7 million court reporter transcript appropriation. In this example, the court’s actual expenditures for 2024–25 would be \$120,000, which is a \$35,000 increase from the 2020–21 baseline amount for 2024–25 (\$120,000 - \$85,000 = \$35,000). Comparing the \$35,000 increase to the \$43,260 allocation from the 2024–25 appropriation, the court would be required to revert the remaining \$8,260 ($\$43,260 - \$35,000 = \$8,260$) to the General Fund.

Recommendation

The TCBAC recommends the following for approval, to be considered by the Judicial Council at its November 15, 2024, business meeting:

Approve the allocation of the \$7 million appropriation to each trial court proportionally using the council-approved methodology for fiscal year 2024–25, based on an average of the prior three-year transcript expenditures, as outlined in Attachment A.

Attachments

Attachment A: Transcript Funding – Recommended FY 2024–25 Allocations

Attachment A - Transcript Funding: Recommended FY 2024-25 Allocations

Cluster	Court	Baseline * FY 2020-21	Actual Expenditures on Court Reporter Transcripts				Proportion of Average Expenditures	Proportional Allocation of \$7M
			FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	Average		
	Statewide	\$12,739,717	\$17,974,624	\$22,616,137	\$23,695,109	\$21,428,623	100.00%	\$7,000,000
4	Alameda	\$316,575	\$527,628	\$551,195	\$503,353	\$527,392	2.46%	\$172,281
1	Alpine	\$139	\$650	\$165	\$141	\$319	0.00%	\$104
1	Amador	\$18,321	\$32,359	\$31,430	\$29,888	\$31,225	0.15%	\$10,200
2	Butte	\$97,894	\$101,943	\$93,852	\$111,183	\$102,326	0.48%	\$33,426
1	Calaveras	\$26,846	\$40,629	\$32,234	\$14,406	\$29,090	0.14%	\$9,503
1	Colusa	\$8,008	\$10,812	\$8,963	\$15,937	\$11,904	0.06%	\$3,888
3	Contra Costa	\$405,961	\$522,978	\$627,384	\$641,017	\$597,126	2.79%	\$195,061
1	Del Norte	\$53,391	\$42,074	\$33,494	\$34,221	\$36,596	0.17%	\$11,955
2	El Dorado	\$49,904	\$74,572	\$109,159	\$90,783	\$91,505	0.43%	\$29,891
3	Fresno	\$431,683	\$686,268	\$675,195	\$664,453	\$675,305	3.15%	\$220,599
1	Glenn	\$7,650	\$14,521	\$4,637	\$14,282	\$11,146	0.05%	\$3,641
2	Humboldt	\$7,435	\$4,145	\$4,693	\$4,528	\$4,455	0.02%	\$1,455
2	Imperial	\$23,298	\$33,028	\$35,251	\$41,292	\$36,524	0.17%	\$11,931
1	Inyo	\$10,357	\$15,168	\$29,841	\$12,614	\$19,207	0.09%	\$6,274
3	Kern	\$709,145	\$907,055	\$1,038,791	\$1,016,539	\$987,462	4.61%	\$322,570
2	Kings	\$275,882	\$401,049	\$384,797	\$360,009	\$381,951	1.78%	\$124,771
2	Lake	\$32,336	\$44,614	\$62,402	\$70,559	\$59,192	0.28%	\$19,336
1	Lassen	\$30,822	\$32,613	\$52,085	\$32,866	\$39,188	0.18%	\$12,801
4	Los Angeles	\$3,433,513	\$5,169,252	\$7,314,385	\$7,621,806	\$6,701,814	31.28%	\$2,189,254
2	Madera	\$83,123	\$116,359	\$164,174	\$131,650	\$137,394	0.64%	\$44,882
2	Marin	\$45,711	\$108,027	\$101,811	\$115,782	\$108,540	0.51%	\$35,456
1	Mariposa	\$4,709	\$2,485	\$23,790	\$10,631	\$12,302	0.06%	\$4,019
2	Mendocino	\$134,226	\$156,358	\$136,446	\$145,340	\$146,048	0.68%	\$47,709
2	Merced	\$156,237	\$178,975	\$212,591	\$159,871	\$183,812	0.86%	\$60,045
1	Modoc	\$7,155	\$6,034	\$4,142	\$8,534	\$6,237	0.03%	\$2,037
1	Mono	\$2,806	\$10,568	\$6,890	\$12,007	\$9,822	0.05%	\$3,208
3	Monterey	\$127,556	\$143,806	\$180,729	\$202,571	\$175,702	0.82%	\$57,396
2	Napa	\$90,806	\$167,582	\$143,356	\$126,090	\$145,676	0.68%	\$47,587
2	Nevada	\$23,786	\$32,868	\$51,187	\$69,669	\$51,241	0.24%	\$16,739
4	Orange	\$982,451	\$1,041,335	\$1,664,727	\$2,041,287	\$1,582,450	7.38%	\$516,932
2	Placer	\$148,518	\$196,763	\$289,885	\$338,621	\$275,090	1.28%	\$89,862
1	Plumas	\$2,104	\$5,553	\$3,646	\$7,655	\$5,618	0.03%	\$1,835
4	Riverside	\$11,186	\$28,642	\$17,281	\$21,906	\$22,609	0.11%	\$7,386
4	Sacramento	\$623,902	\$918,902	\$1,147,043	\$1,365,936	\$1,143,961	5.34%	\$373,693
1	San Benito	\$3,766	\$14,632	\$14,587	\$16,219	\$15,146	0.07%	\$4,948
4	San Bernardino	\$636,886	\$840,984	\$1,126,530	\$1,239,641	\$1,069,052	4.99%	\$349,223
4	San Diego	\$501,181	\$1,146,404	\$1,339,811	\$1,619,341	\$1,368,519	6.39%	\$447,048
3	San Francisco	\$300,914	\$409,721	\$463,844	\$683,834	\$519,133	2.42%	\$169,583
3	San Joaquin	\$349,811	\$434,522	\$429,188	\$391,653	\$418,455	1.95%	\$136,695
2	San Luis Obispo	\$135,606	\$222,544	\$237,866	\$233,587	\$231,332	1.08%	\$75,568
3	San Mateo	\$280,961	\$295,795	\$453,091	\$352,785	\$367,224	1.71%	\$119,959
3	Santa Barbara	\$134,408	\$181,113	\$418,523	\$216,414	\$272,017	1.27%	\$88,859

Attachment A - Transcript Funding: Recommended FY 2024-25 Allocations

Cluster	Court	Baseline * FY 2020-21	Actual Expenditures on Court Reporter Transcripts				Proportion of Average Expenditures	Proportional Allocation of \$7M
			FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	FY 2023-24	Average		
	Statewide	\$12,739,717	\$17,974,624	\$22,616,137	\$23,695,109	\$21,428,623	100.00%	\$7,000,000
4	Santa Clara	\$497,743	\$644,517	\$657,972	\$619,864	\$640,784	2.99%	\$209,322
2	Santa Cruz	\$100,255	\$128,923	\$142,959	\$120,674	\$130,852	0.61%	\$42,745
2	Shasta	\$88,543	\$117,894	\$184,845	\$143,992	\$148,910	0.69%	\$48,644
1	Sierra	\$698	\$975	\$856	\$4,255	\$2,029	0.01%	\$663
2	Siskiyou	\$31,755	\$37,262	\$48,526	\$47,199	\$44,329	0.21%	\$14,481
3	Solano	\$159,262	\$288,247	\$268,888	\$311,808	\$289,648	1.35%	\$94,618
3	Sonoma	\$118,224	\$154,601	\$201,893	\$179,551	\$178,682	0.83%	\$58,369
3	Stanislaus	\$239,016	\$197,748	\$253,288	\$289,909	\$246,982	1.15%	\$80,681
2	Sutter	\$36,528	\$35,849	\$22,578	\$26,777	\$28,401	0.13%	\$9,278
2	Tehama	\$13,000	\$35,585	\$35,541	\$18,294	\$29,807	0.14%	\$9,737
1	Trinity	\$7,875	\$9,543	\$5,500	\$4,835	\$6,626	0.03%	\$2,164
3	Tulare	\$298,604	\$386,039	\$383,720	\$382,105	\$383,955	1.79%	\$125,425
2	Tuolumne	\$90,624	\$72,486	\$61,692	\$76,426	\$70,201	0.33%	\$22,932
3	Ventura	\$168,224	\$248,114	\$306,031	\$367,552	\$307,233	1.43%	\$100,362
2	Yolo	\$138,545	\$230,010	\$266,251	\$256,306	\$250,856	1.17%	\$81,946
2	Yuba	\$23,853	\$65,501	\$54,509	\$54,661	\$58,224	0.27%	\$19,020

* Total expenditures in FY 2020-21 will serve as the baseline for the true-up process at the end of FY 2024-25

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee
(Action Item)

Title: 2024–25 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Pro Rata Distribution for a Mid-Cycle Allocation

Date: 10/11/2024

Contact: Melanie Snider, Supervising Attorney, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts
916-263-5442 | Melanie.Snider@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider an allocation methodology recommendation from the Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee (Shriver Committee) and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to distribute additional grant funds in fiscal year 2024–25 to existing pilot projects on a pro rata basis from the current year Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) program allocation.

Background

Recognizing the current unmet need for legal aid services, on April 12, 2024, the Shriver Committee approved the distribution of up to \$5 million in program reserves to current pilot projects on a pro rata basis according to the award amounts for the 2023–26 grant cycle and allowed pilot projects to spend their allocation during fiscal years 2024–25 and 2025–26 (Link A). Pilot projects are operated by qualified legal service providers in partnership with their local superior courts to provide legal representation and assistance to low-income Californians in housing, domestic violence prevention, civil harassment restraining orders, probate conservatorships, guardianships of the person, elder abuse, or child custody matters.

The Shriver Committee considered opening proposals to new projects. However, they decided to focus on current pilot projects due to the time constraints of developing a new, statewide request for proposals and obtaining Judicial Council and advisory body approvals, executing contracts with new providers, and staff capacity. Additionally, existing projects have been vetted and approved by the Judicial Council allowing them to utilize funds immediately, whereas new projects would take longer to launch.

On April 25, 2024, a request for proposal was released to current pilot projects to submit revised project plans, budgets, and budget narratives to demonstrate how they would spend their proposed pro rata amounts. Of the 14 pilot projects, eight submitted proposals for their pro rata amount, three submitted a proposal for less than their pro rata share, and three pilot projects did not submit a proposal. All proposals were approved by the pilot projects and court partners, as required.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee
(Action Item)

Of the \$5 million, a total of \$3.6 million was requested by the pilot projects. On June 18, 2024¹, the Shriver Committee met and approved the eleven proposals that were received. See Attachment A, Column E for the pro rata amounts according to the award amounts for the 2023–26 grant cycle, and Column F for the actual amounts requested by the pilot projects.

On July 21, 2023, the Judicial Council approved 14 grant awards for a total of \$48.4 million for the 2023–26 grant cycle (Link B). After Judicial Council approval, the Justice and Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco reduced their pilot project’s budget, which lowered the total grant awards to \$48 million for the 2023–26 grant cycle. The following table shows the totals of the initial grant amounts and the additional \$3.6 million mid-cycle allocation.

Initial 2023–26 Total Grant Awards	Additional 2023–26 Mid-Cycle Allocation	Revised 2023–26 Total Grant Awards
\$48,033,963	\$3,568,382	\$51,602,345

On July 12, 2024, the Judicial Council approved the \$21.0 million TCTF allocation for 2024–25 for the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program, which included the \$5 million of additional funding for the mid-cycle allocation (Link C). Given that \$3.6 million of the \$5 million was requested by the pilot projects, the Shriver program will hold the unrequested amount of \$1.4 million in the program’s reserves to be allocated in the 2026–29 grant cycle. After the allocation of the \$3.6 million, total reserve funding for the program is \$20 million.

On October 4, 2024, the TCBAC approved the allocation methodology recommendation for the additional \$3.6 million as outlined in Attachment A (Link D) for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee.

Recommendation

The Shriver Committee and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Branch Budget Committee approve the mid-cycle allocation methodology to distribute an additional \$3.6 million to current pilot projects on a pro rata basis as identified in Attachment A and allow pilot projects to spend their allocations during fiscal years 2024–25 and 2025–26. This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Council at its November 15, 2024, business meeting.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Table of Mid-Cycle Allocation Pro Rata Distribution Amounts.
2. Link A: Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee meeting minutes, April 12, 2024, <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/Shriver-20240412-Minutes.pdf>.

¹ The June 18, 2024, Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee meeting was closed to the public under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(D)(9), Evaluation of individual grant applications.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee
(Action Item)

3. Link B: Judicial Council Report, July 21, 2023, Item 23-066, *Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act: Selection of Pilot Projects*,
<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12124930&GUID=FB567EA4-D0EA-4B2E-A554-6352E555984D>.
4. Link C: Judicial Council Report, July 12, 2024, Item 24-032, *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for Fiscal Year 2024-25*,
<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13077708&GUID=08C509A8-B264-4D66-AFDC-B3EC97A5D296>.
5. Link D: Funding Methodology Subcommittee, September 11, 2024, meeting materials
https://preview.courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20240911-fms-materials_0.pdf, and
meeting audio <http://wpc.1a57.edgecastcdn.net/001A57//its/jc-advisory-groups/tcbac/2024-09-11/tcbac-20240911-fms-audio.mp3>.

Mid-Cycle Allocation Pro Rata Distribution Amounts

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lead Legal Services Agency	Court Partner	Case Type	Approved 2023–26 Grant Awards	\$5M Pro Rata Amount	Amount Requested	Total Revised 2023–26 Grant Amounts ²
California Rural Legal Assistance	San Joaquin	Housing	2,456,611	255,716	255,716	2,712,327
Central California Legal Services	Fresno	Housing	1,979,657	206,068	206,068	2,185,725
Centro Legal de la Raza	Alameda	Housing	2,168,678	225,745	225,745	2,394,423
Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance	Kern	Housing	3,066,468	319,198	319,077	3,385,545
Justice & Diversity Center of the Bar Association of San Francisco	San Francisco	Child Custody	1,219,949	126,988	126,988	1,346,937
Legal Access Alameda	Alameda	Child Custody	313,938	32,679	0	313,938
Legal Aid Foundation of Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	Housing Guardianship Conservatorship	3,914,413	407,463	117,125	4,031,538
Legal Aid Society of San Diego	San Diego	Housing	10,149,125	1,056,453	0	10,149,125
Legal Services of Northern California	Yolo	Housing	1,147,846	119,483	119,483	1,267,329
Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice	Los Angeles	Child Custody	3,007,407	313,050	313,050	3,320,457
Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Housing	12,911,086	1,343,954	1,343,954	14,255,040
Public Law Center	Orange	Child Custody	489,484	50,952	0	489,484
San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program (custody) ³	San Diego	Child Custody	1,392,980	144,999	144,202	1,537,182
San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program (domestic violence)	San Diego	Domestic Violence	961,185	100,053	99,774	1,060,959
San Luis Obispo Legal Assistance Foundation	San Luis Obispo	Housing Elder Abuse Guardianship Conservatorship	2,855,136	297,200	297,200	3,152,336
TOTAL			\$48,033,963	\$5,000,000	\$3,568,382	\$51,602,345

² Total Revised 2023–26 Grant Amounts are inclusive of approved TCTF allocations for 2023–24, 2025–25 and the allocation to be requested for 2025–26.

³ San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program is one pilot project, but their funding is separated by case type to demonstrate compliance with Gov. Code 68651(2), which states that proposals to provide counsel in child custody cases should be considered among the highest priorities for funding and that up to 20 percent of available funds shall be directed to programs involving actions under the Family Code

(https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&division=&title=8.&part=&chapter=2.1.&article=)

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee
(Action Item)

Title: Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program for 2024–25 Through 2025–26
Date: 10/11/2024
Contact: Frances Ho, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
415-865-7662 | frances.ho@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider recommendations from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to allocate \$9.1 million to six trial courts to fund new or expanded firearm relinquishment programs for 2024–25 through 2025–26 and delegate authority to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to reallocate unspent funding to any of the awarded courts in Cycles 1, 2, and 3.

Background

The Budget Act of 2022 (Stats. 2022, ch. 45) appropriated \$40 million in one-time General Fund to the Judicial Council, of which \$36 million was directed for distribution to trial courts to support court-based firearm relinquishment programs. After allocations totaling \$20.1 million were made to the trial courts through fiscal year 2023–24, the Budget Act of 2024 reduced the appropriation for the remaining trial courts to \$9.1 million.

On January 20, 2023, the Judicial Council approved (1) the allocation and distribution for Cycle 1 for \$18.5 million to seven trial courts and (2) delegated authority to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to reallocate and distribute any unspent funding from these grant awards to any of the awarded courts, based on the same criteria established during the application period.¹

On May 12, 2023, the Judicial Council approved (1) the allocation and distribution for Cycle 2 for \$1.6 million to one trial court and (2) delegated authority to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to reallocate and distribute any unspent funding from these grant awards to any of the awarded courts in Cycles 1 and 2, based on the same criteria established during the application period.

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts: Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program for 2022–23 Through 2024–25* (Dec. 15, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11589761&GUID=C8033AC8-2569-4E4B-A6E7-795900CF73F9>. The seven courts included Los Angeles, Modoc, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Ventura.

Recommendation

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommend approval of the following recommendations for consideration by the Judicial Council at its November 15, 2024, business meeting:

1. Approve the allocation and distribution of \$9.1 million to six trial courts to fund new or expanded firearm relinquishment programs for 2024–25 through 2025–26; and
2. Delegate authority to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to reallocate and distribute any unspent funding allocated to any of the awarded courts in Cycles 1, 2, and 3, based on the same criteria established during the application period.

The proposed allocation for funding is listed in Attachment A.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: *Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program Proposed Funding Allocation for 2024–25 Through 2025–26*
2. Attachment B: *Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program Summary of Cycle 3 Applications*

ATTACHMENT A

Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program

Proposed Funding Allocation for 2024–25 through 2025–26

#	Recipient Court	Region/Court Size	Proposed Grant Funding Allocation
1	Alameda	Bay Area/Large	\$5,588,089 ²
2	El Dorado	Northern California/Small	\$578,993
3	Imperial	Southern California/Small	\$1,261,304 ³
4	Sacramento	Northern California/Large	\$651,901
5	Shasta	Northern California/Small	\$377,615
6	Yolo	Northern California/Small	\$655,795
Total			\$9,113,697

² The committees do not recommend funding (1) indirect costs for subcontractors; (2) food and beverages for mobile clinics; and (3) client advocacy (navigator) services. The award represents the proposed budget less the total cost of these three items (\$762,362).

³ The committees do not recommend funding leases for vehicles. The award represents the proposed budget less the cost of leasing vehicles for law enforcement (\$79,150).

ATTACHMENT B

Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program

Summary of Cycle 3 Applications

#	Court	Description
1	Alameda	New relinquishment program in partnership with the Alameda District Attorney's Office and the Oakland Police Department. The court would hire a dedicated case manager to monitor firearms compliance for domestic violence and gun violence restraining order cases. The District Attorney's Office would have dedicated staff to coordinate relinquishment activities with other law enforcement agencies; provide education for the court, law enforcement, stakeholders and the public; and update electronic databases to improve case tracking and firearms data. The Oakland Police Department would also update its electronic database to improve case management for firearms cases.
2	El Dorado	New relinquishment program in partnership with the El Dorado District Attorney's Office and Probation Department. The court would notify partners of restraining orders and cases involving noncompliance, and hold noncompliance hearings. The District Attorney's Office would have a dedicated investigator to screen domestic violence and gun violence restraining order cases; provide training; lead team meetings; and coordinate relinquishment efforts. The Probation Department would use funding to support relinquishment field operations and other relinquishment initiatives.
3	Imperial	Expand an existing relinquishment program in partnership with the Imperial District Attorney's Office and Sheriff's Office. The court would provide information on relinquishment procedures and track compliance. The District Attorney and Sheriff's Offices would have a dedicated team to review and facilitate relinquishment.
4	Sacramento	Expand an existing relinquishment program in partnership with the Sacramento District Attorney's Office. Would establish a task force to address firearms relinquishment and providing training and education to stakeholders and the public. The court would lead the task force and be responsible for notifying partners of noncompliant cases and related hearings. The District Attorney's Office would have staff to investigate possible noncompliance, be present for compliance review hearings, and provide information to parties regarding proper relinquishment.
5	Shasta	New relinquishment program. The court would dedicate Marshal staff to be responsible for reviewing domestic violence and gun violence restraining order cases to screen for possible firearms, attend compliance

#	Court	Description
		hearings, provide relinquishment information to restrained persons, follow-up with restrained persons on status of relinquishment, and refer noncompliance cases to the district attorney's office and local law enforcement.
6	Yolo	Expand an existing relinquishment program in partnership with the Yolo Sheriff's Office. The court would have dedicated staff to track compliance in court cases, and provide help with restraining orders, including understanding the firearms relinquishment process. The Sheriff's Office would provide dedicated staff to coordinate information with the court; develop relinquishment protocols tied to service of restraining orders; and investigate and enforce firearm relinquishment orders.
7	San Diego (not recommended for funding)	Expand an existing relinquishment program in partnership with the San Diego City Attorney's Office and Police Department. Relinquishment activities would be performed by current partners and other local law enforcement agencies for other firearm-prohibiting cases, including domestic violence restraining orders. The court would create a new compliance review calendar at each court location and develop new procedures to streamline restraining order processes.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee
(Action Item)

Title: 2023–24 Final Adjustments for Year-end Fund Balances
Date: 10/11/2024
Contact: Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-8027 | oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Under Government Code section 77203(b), a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the court’s operating budget from the prior fiscal year. The final one-time allocation reduction of \$25.5 million, related to the fund balance cap for 2023–24 and prior year excluded funds, nets to \$1.5 million after adjusting for \$24 million in reductions in applicable requests for Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) funds held on behalf (FHOB) of the trial courts.

Background

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the Judicial Council to make a preliminary allocation reduction in July of each fiscal year and to finalize allocations in January, which are then offset by the amount of fund balance (or reserves) in excess of the fund balance cap authorized in statute.

Beginning June 30, 2014, Government Code section 77203(b) limited the amount of funds to be carried over from one year to the next. Effective June 30, 2014, and concluding June 30, 2019, a trial court could carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 1 percent of the court’s operating budget (defined as actual expenditures including accruals and encumbrances) from the prior fiscal year. Effective June 30, 2020, a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the court’s operating budget from the prior fiscal year.

At its July 29, 2014, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved an annual process beginning in 2015–16 for courts to provide preliminary and final computations of the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the statutory cap:

- Each year, courts are required to submit the computation form with preliminary year-end information by July 15. The information provided by courts will be used by the Judicial Council to make the preliminary allocation of reductions as required by statute. Courts will not be required to provide the details related to encumbrances, prepayments, and restricted revenue when submitting the form for the preliminary allocation.

- Each year, courts are required to submit the computation form with final year-end information.
- Before February of each year, the Judicial Council’s Chief Financial Officer will report to the council the information provided by courts for the final allocation reduction, if any.

The figures in Attachment 4A reflect the trial courts’ final accounting records for fiscal year 2023–24. This information was reviewed by the Judicial Council’s Budget Services and Branch Accounting and Procurement staff and is summarized below:

- Column A displays the calculated fund balance cap amount for each court;
- Column J shows the court’s 2023–24 fund balance amounts subject to the cap, excluding statutorily restricted funds per Government Code section 77203(b), encumbrances consistent with the state contracting process, prepayments, and approved FHOB requests which are held in the TCTF;
- Column K displays the courts’ final computation of the amount above the 3 percent cap totaling \$24.4 million;
- Column M provides the 2023–24 adjustments to the courts’ 2021–22 and 2022–23 fund balance cap, totaling \$1.1 million;
- Column N displays the courts’ final total reduction computation totaling \$25.5 million, which affects 40 courts;
- Column O reflects the final TCTF FHOB requests totaling \$24 million, which are pending approval by the Judicial Council at its November 15, 2024, business meeting; and
- Column P displays the net reduction for the fund balance above the 3 percent cap after accounting for the TCTF FHOB requests. The reduction will be allocated to the trial courts in December 2024 distribution #6.

At its March 15, 2024, business meeting, the Judicial Council adopted revisions to the *Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts* policy. The revisions include implementation of a reimbursement model to distribute funding to the participating trial courts based on actual expenditures for approved projects. A copy of the updated policy and the Judicial Council report can be found [here](#).

Consistent with the new policy, Judicial Council’s Budget Services staff reduced the monthly trial court distribution for each court that received funding, that has not been expended, for approved FHOB projects in June, July, and August 2024 distributions. Once the funds were returned to be held in the TCTF, courts are reimbursed for actual expenditures related to open FHOB projects. These expenditures are reimbursed to the court in the following month via the monthly distribution process.

A total of 27 courts have submitted FHOB requests totaling \$24 million for 2023–24 (Column O) under the Judicial Council’s approved process for trial courts to request an adjustment to their TCTF allocation reduction related to the fund balance above the cap. The \$24 million will be retained in the TCTF as restricted fund balance for the benefit of those courts. This process allows the courts to prudently plan for and fund necessary court infrastructure projects such as technology or infrastructure improvements, facilities maintenance and repair allowed under rule 10.810 of the

California Rules of Court, court efficiency projects, and other court infrastructure projects that would not be possible as an unintended consequence of the 3 percent fund balance cap.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Committee recommends approval of the final 2023–24 year-end adjustment of a 3 percent fund balance cap allocation reduction of \$25.5 million, which nets to \$1.5 million after adjusting for \$24 million in applicable FHOB requests. This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Council at its November 15, 2024, business meeting.

Attachments

Attachment 4A: 2023–24 Final Adjustments for Year-end Fund Balances

2023-24 Final Adjustments for Year-end Fund Balances

Court	Fund Balance Cap	FY 2023-24 Ending Fund Balance	Encumbrance Reserves at June 30	Excluded Funds per GG 77203	Prepayments	Prepaid Expenses for CFR related to FHOB FY 2022-23 and prior	Cannabis Conviction Resentencing	FHOB Returned to Court for FY 2022-23 and prior	FHOB Related to CFR FY 2022-23 and prior	Fund Balance Subject to Cap ¹	Current Year Reduction	FHOB Returned to TCTF	Prior Year Disencumbrance	Total Final Reduction	Approved 2023-24 FHOB ²	Net Reduction after FHOB (December 2024 Dist. #6)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J (B-C-D-E+F+G-H-I)	K	L	M	N (K+L+M)	O	P (N-O)
ALAMEDA	3,685,188	12,549,761	6,481,880	2,769,270	0	0	0	0	0	3,298,611	0	0	0	0	0	0
ALPINE	32,862	119,375	0	15,734	103,640	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AMADOR	153,885	1,807,741	83,308	106,853	205,815	205,815	0	0	205,815	1,411,765	1,257,880	0	0	1,257,880	1,257,880	0
BUTTE	568,050	4,475,042	3,214,117	489,627	162,330	0	0	0	0	608,968	0	0	57,031	57,031	0	57,031
CALAVERAS	119,792	1,209,200	166,955	284,970	272,657	0	0	0	0	484,618	364,825	0	0	364,825	241,938	122,887
COLUSA	109,506	1,537,227	351,548	375,999	217,970	168,065	0	0	168,065	591,710	482,204	0	0	482,204	482,200	4
CONTRA COSTA	2,098,832	9,619,636	5,443,042	2,294,461	25,022	0	0	0	0	1,857,110	0	0	125,049	125,049	0	125,049
DEL NORTE	163,187	909,202	1,101	375,508	58,805	0	0	0	0	473,788	310,602	0	0	310,602	310,602	0
EL DORADO	373,452	509,073	0	250,732	191,441	0	0	0	0	66,900	0	0	45,000	45,000	0	45,000
FRESNO	2,495,444	6,672,578	4,006,062	857,548	0	0	0	0	0	1,808,968	0	0	0	0	0	0
GLENN	138,522	647,609	109,867	142,879	0	0	0	0	0	394,864	241,328	0	15,015	256,343	241,295	15,048
HUMBOLDT	305,982	627,123	190,971	205,213	49,384	0	0	0	0	181,554	0	0	0	0	0	0
IMPERIAL	456,991	2,743,422	1,013,942	830,631	226,637	0	0	0	0	672,212	152,001	0	63,219	215,221	152,001	63,220
INYO	124,087	523,522	15,892	353,632	0	0	0	0	0	153,997	29,910	0	0	29,910	0	29,910
KERN	3,098,530	10,350,630	2,339,781	4,574,266	452,128	0	0	0	0	2,984,455	0	0	2,001	2,001	0	2,001
KINGS	438,170	1,973,648	18,597	238,097	211,460	8,725	0	0	8,725	1,505,495	1,067,325	0	0	1,067,325	1,067,325	0
LAKE	179,607	1,050,557	187,318	330,017	0	0	0	0	0	533,222	353,614	0	0	353,614	353,614	0
LASSEN	129,414	216,710	0	121,792	0	0	0	0	0	94,918	0	0	0	0	0	0
LOS ANGELES	33,455,845	223,662,441	134,164,781	43,269,615	23,611,821	0	0	0	0	22,616,225	0	0	0	0	0	0
MADERA	498,013	1,253,663	74,019	500,717	0	0	0	0	0	678,927	148,721	0	32,192	180,914	0	180,914
MARIN	493,070	2,287,882	2,076	904,675	13,227	0	0	0	0	1,367,904	872,526	0	2,309	874,835	874,835	0
MARIPOSA	86,248	525,777	90,348	54,418	192,929	0	0	0	0	188,082	101,827	0	6	101,833	101,833	0
MENDOCINO	317,566	980,168	424,407	319,190	7,773	0	0	0	0	228,797	0	0	0	0	0	0
MERCED	697,239	4,344,698	556,240	3,110,869	0	0	0	0	0	677,589	0	0	0	0	0	0
MODOC	56,647	158,761	0	53,816	0	0	0	0	0	104,945	48,297	0	0	48,297	0	48,297
MONO	81,038	497,211	13,187	125,652	114,919	0	0	0	0	243,453	162,412	0	3	162,415	162,415	0
MONTEREY	1,004,739	5,015,348	1,721,959	1,750,124	20,000	20,000	0	0	20,000	1,523,265	505,826	0	12,700	518,526	518,526	0
NAPA	370,274	1,086,053	110,040	836,344	3,697	0	0	0	0	135,972	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEVADA ³	282,993	770,526	33,764	537,252	6,405	0	0	0	0	193,105	0	0	3,927	3,927	0	3,927
ORANGE	7,741,953	22,996,492	8,444,787	4,818,231	324,269	0	0	0	0	9,409,205	1,617,530	0	49,722	1,667,252	1,617,630	49,622
PLACER	922,143	6,338,717	1,810,203	881,406	2,159,178	0	0	0	0	1,487,930	559,673	0	6,114	565,787	409,672	156,115
PLUMAS	53,468	722,206	29,873	114,320	0	0	0	0	0	578,012	524,545	0	0	524,545	0	524,545
RIVERSIDE	6,600,811	14,909,911	1,948,411	6,330,774	0	0	0	0	0	6,630,725	29,690	0	224	29,914	29,914	0
SACRAMENTO	4,039,271	12,070,522	4,046,668	4,152,529	0	0	0	0	0	3,871,325	0	0	177,889	177,889	177,888	1
SAN BENITO	200,108	770,182	215,245	106,129	94,639	89,624	0	0	89,624	354,169	154,061	0	0	154,061	154,061	0
SAN BERNARDINO	5,552,120	26,662,838	5,680,936	1,704,662	8,503,510	0	0	0	0	10,773,729	4,816,904	0	404,705	5,221,609	5,221,609	0
SAN DIEGO	6,697,489	24,211,960	5,337,148	12,898,271	280,281	0	0	0	0	5,696,259	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAN FRANCISCO	2,713,648	4,725,976	741,240	2,987,130	0	0	0	0	0	997,606	0	0	0	0	0	0
SAN JOAQUIN	1,653,645	14,164,256	677,445	2,613,960	844,817	176,224	0	0	176,224	10,028,033	8,374,389	0	0	8,374,389	8,374,389	0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	732,939	3,105,687	19,661	2,190,895	8,857	0	0	0	0	886,274	153,334	0	0	153,334	153,334	0
SAN MATEO	1,800,546	3,257,775	88,213	828,596	749,704	0	0	0	0	1,591,262	0	0	65,083	65,083	65,083	0
SANTA BARBARA	1,223,278	1,865,859	257,209	1,443,188	110,988	0	0	0	0	54,474	0	0	0	0	0	0
SANTA CLARA	3,989,616	13,432,761	7,487,206	1,422,345	556,861	0	0	0	0	3,966,349	0	0	4,679	4,679	0	4,679
SANTA CRUZ	659,281	1,551,842	34,611	933,481	0	0	0	0	0	583,750	0	0	0	0	0	0
SHASTA	785,566	1,690,559	300,923	589,479	19,911	0	0	0	0	780,246	0	0	0	0	0	0
SIERRA	44,637	430,256	10,670	10,303	350,676	0	0	0	0	58,608	13,971	0	0	13,971	13,971	0
SISKIYOU	180,860	592,358	0	412,611	0	0	0	0	0	179,747	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOLANO	1,097,866	4,090,887	1,211,878	1,913,074	12,044	0	0	0	0	953,890	0	0	0	0	0	0
SONOMA	1,116,311	4,958,460	1,525,207	1,849,663	675,284	0	0	0	0	908,306	0	0	0	0	0	0
STANISLAUS	1,135,694	4,260,202	100,573	628,920	1,113,120	0	0	0	0	2,417,588	1,272,100	0	9,795	1,281,895	1,272,100	9,795
SUTTER	331,975	1,823,215	408,789	355,116	320,666	189,113	0	0	189,113	738,644	406,669	0	0	406,669	406,669	0
TEHAMA	245,152	1,103,367	124,750	409,379	0	0	0	0	0	569,238	322,916	0	1,171	324,087	324,087	0
TRINITY	91,412	307,976	27,006	45,720	62,262	0	0	0	0	172,987	81,575	0	0	81,575	0	81,575
TULARE	1,320,491	4,538,201	2,503,733	592,394	298,927	0	0	0	0	1,143,148	0	0	5,087	5,087	0	5,087
TUOLUMNE	206,272	364,724	0	198,438	0	0	0	0	0	166,287	0	0	0	0	0	0
VENTURA	1,860,446	2,517,001	271,124	796,188	0	0	0	0	0	1,449,689	0	0	6,312	6,312	6,312	0
YOLO	669,842	1,420,867	176,658	590,496	0	0	0	0	0	653,713	0	0	4,375	4,375	0	4,375
YUBA	240,922	547,955	0	251,725	52,908	0	0	0	0	243,322	2,400	0	0	2,400	0	2,400
TOTAL	105,922,934	477,557,595	204,295,371	118,149,325	42,686,963	857,566	0	0	857,566	112,425,937	24,429,055	-	1,093,609	25,522,665	23,991,183	1,531,482

¹ Variance in total is due to rounding.

² Approved TCTF-FHOB requests include those requests pending before the Judicial Council at its November 15, 2024 business meeting.

³ Nevada Court submitted FHOB requests that resulted in a net zero adjustment.