



Judicial Council of California
 Judicial Branch Budget Committee

JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

**MATERIALS APRIL 23, 2026
 OPEN ELECTRONIC MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION**

Meeting Contents

Page

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the February 19, 2026, and March 5, 2026 meetings	4
Discussion and Possible Action Item (Item 1-5)	
Item 1 – Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment Act Funding Allocation for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Action Required)	8
Attachment 1A: CARE Act Allocation of Court Operations Budget FY 2026–27	10
Item 2 – Pretrial Release Program Allocation for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Action Required)	11
Attachment 2A: Recommended FY 2026–27 Pretrial Release Program Allocations	14
Item 3 – AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Action Required)	16
Attachment 3A: Child Support Commissioner (CSC) Program Allocation, FY 2026–27	18
Attachment 3B: Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program Allocations, FY 2026–27	19
Item 4 – Court Reporter Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Action Required)	20
Attachment 4A: Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2026–27	23
Item 5 – Additional Judicial Branch Budget Change Concepts for Fiscal Year 2027–28 (Action Required)	25



Judicial Council of California
Judicial Branch Budget Committee

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 ELECTRONIC MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

Open to the public unless indicated as closed (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c), (d), and (e)(1))
THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS
OPEN PORTION OF THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date:	Thursday, April 23, 2026
Time:	12:45 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.
Public Access:	https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/5097

Meeting materials for open portions of the meeting will be posted on the advisory body webpage 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 open meeting portion of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be emailed 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 February 19, 2026, Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting and March 5, 2026, action by e- mail between meetings.

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

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means. As such, the public may make comments in writing, in person, or remotely.

Written Comment

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 must be emailed to JBBC@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by 12:45 p.m. on April 22, 2026, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

Remote Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(i) and (k), individuals wishing to speak about an agenda item during the public comment part of the meeting, must email a request by 12:45 p.m. on Wednesday, April 22, 2026, to JBBC@jud.ca.gov. The request must state the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents, if any, and the agenda item the speaker wishes to address. Only requests received by 12:45 p.m. on April 22, 2026, will receive a reply providing the virtual meeting link and information needed to speak during the public comment time.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–5)

Item 1

Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment Act Funding Allocation for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Action Required)

Consideration of Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment Act allocations for fiscal year 2026–27.

Presenters: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Ms. Kelly Ragsdale, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Ms. Cassandra McTaggart, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 2

Pretrial Release Program Allocation for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Action Required)

Consideration of Pretrial Release Program allocations for fiscal year 2026–27.

Presenters: Hon Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Ms. Deirdre Benedict, Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services

Item 3

AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Action Required)

Consideration of AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program allocations for fiscal year 2026–27.

Presenters: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Ms. Lollie Roberts, Supervising Attorney, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 4

Court Reporter Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Action Required)

Consideration of court reporter allocations for fiscal year 2026–27 for family law and civil case types.

Presenters: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Ms. Rose Lane, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Leadership Support Services

Item 5

Additional Judicial Branch Budget Change Concepts for FY 2027–28 (Action Required)

Review of additional fiscal year 2027–28 budget change concepts for the judicial branch.

Facilitator: Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to Closed Session

V. CLOSED SESSION (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(D))

Item 1

Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 10.75 (D)(5)

Security plans, procedures, or other matters.

Review and discussion of security aspects of fiscal year 2027–28 budget change concepts for the judicial branch.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn Closed Session



JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

Thursday, February 19, 2026

1:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, Redwood Room

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/5096>

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Chair; Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Vice Chair; Hon. Brad R. Hill; Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz; and Hon. Michael Rhoads

Advisory Body Members Absent: Mr. Darrel E. Parker and Ms. Rachel W. Hill

Others Present: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Mr. John Yee, Ms. Francine Byrne, Ms. Amber Barnett, Mr. Tamer Ahmed, Mr. Eric Schnurpfeil, Ms. Fran Mueller, Mr. John Larson, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Ms. Kelly Meehleib, Mr. Douglas Denton, Ms. Angela Cowan, Ms. Deirdre Benedict, and Ms. Oksana Tuk

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body approved the minutes of the November 13, 2025, Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-5)

Item 1: Trial Court Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy (Action Required)

Consideration of revisions to the Judicial Council's trial court minimum operating and emergency fund balance requirement.

Action: *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to approve a one-year suspension of the Judicial Council's minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy for the trial courts until June 30, 2027, and add this item to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee's annual work plan. This will allow time to revise the policy to appropriately reflect current conditions regarding trial court financial operations and reserve needs. This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on April 24, 2026.*

Item 2: Mid-Year Reallocation and Augmentation for Court Interpreters Program for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of a mid-year reallocation of unspent funding for the Court Interpreters Program for fiscal year 2025–26.

Action: *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to approve the FY 2025–26 mid-year reallocation of \$59,000 and augmentation of \$19.1 million from the program savings balance of \$27.8 million, as outlined in Attachment 2A, including any technical adjustments, for consideration by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on April 24, 2026.*

Item 3: Mid-Year Reallocation for Pretrial Release Program for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of a mid-year reallocation of unspent funding for the Pretrial Release Program for fiscal year 2025–26.

Action: *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to approve the mid-year reallocation of \$194,000 in unspent funding for the Pretrial Release Program in FY 2025–26, as outlined in Attachment 3A, Table 1, for consideration by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on April 24, 2026.*

Item 4: Allocations for Dependency Counsel Collections Program and Unspent Funding for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of allocations for the Dependency Counsel Collections Program and reallocation of unspent funding for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel in fiscal year 2025–26.

Action: *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to approve the following fiscal year 2025–26 allocations for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding for consideration by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on April 24, 2026:*

1. *Allocate Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program funds of \$125,145 remitted in FY 2024–25 (Attachment 4A); and*
2. *Allocate FY 2025–26 estimated unspent dependency counsel funding of \$980,773 from courts that have identified funds they do not anticipate spending to courts that are not fully funded to their need (Attachment 4B).*

Item 5: Judicial Branch Budget Change Concepts for Fiscal Year 2027–28 (Action Required)

Review of budget change concepts for the judicial branch for fiscal year 2027–28.

Action: *No action was taken on the concepts presented. The Chair of the Judicial Branch Budget Committee requested that Judicial Council staff develop a budget change concept for a comprehensive*

workload assessment of dependency representation for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel to be presented at the Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting in April 2026.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

Governor's Budget Update for Fiscal Year 2026–27

Action: *No action taken.*

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:03p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

DRAFT



JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY EMAIL

Thursday, March 5, 2026

11:04 a.m.

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Chair; Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Vice Chair, Hon. Brad R. Hill, Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz, Hon. Michael Rhoads, Mr. Charles Johnson, and Ms. Rachel W. Hill

Advisory Body Members Absent: None

Others Present: Ms. Angela Cowan

ACTION BY EMAIL

As provided in the California Rules of Court, rule 10.75 (o)(1)(B), the chair concluded that prompt action was needed. This action by email concerned matters that would otherwise be discussed in an open meeting; therefore, in accordance with rule 10.75(o)(2), public notice and the proposal were posted on Tuesday, March 3 at 4:52 p.m., to allow at least one complete business day for public comment before the committee took action.

ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1: Reallocation of Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment Act Funding for Fiscal Year 2025-26

Consideration of a one-time reallocation of unspent Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Funding for Fiscal Year 2025-26.

Action: *The Judicial Branch Budget Committee unanimously voted to approve the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendation to reallocate of \$72,960 of unspent CARE Act funding in fiscal year 2025–26 to the Superior Court of El Dorado County, as outlined in Attachment A. This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on April 24, 2026.*

CLOSURE OF ACTION

Voting closed at 5:00 p.m. on March 5, 2026.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

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

Title: Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment Act Funding Allocation for Fiscal Year 2026–27

Date: 4/23/2026

Contact: Kelly Ragsdale, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts | 415-865-7659 | kelly.ragsdale@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act allocations to the trial courts for fiscal year (FY) 2026–27.

Background

The CARE Act established a civil court process that provides treatment, housing support, and other services to individuals with schizophrenia or other psychotic disorders and bipolar I with psychotic features. The Budget Act of 2025 included \$32.9 million to fund trial court operations related to the CARE Act in FY 2025–26 for the 58 trial courts. The program was rolled out in two cohorts, and all courts were required to implement the CARE Act by December 1, 2024.

At its business meeting on July 21, 2023¹, the Judicial Council approved an allocation methodology for FY 2023–24 and subsequent years that included the following:

1. For Cohort One courts implementing the CARE Act, an allocation for court operations that employs the Workload Formula with a base of 25 CARE Act cases calculated at \$93,225;
2. For Cohort One courts implementing the CARE Act, an allocation for staff and other operational costs that employs the Workload Formula with a base of \$98,000, prorated to the amount that Cohort One courts are estimated to receive in FY 2024–25 when all courts are implementing the CARE Act;
3. For Cohort Two courts, an allocation that employs the Workload Formula with a base of \$98,000, prorated to the amount that remains after the allocation described in step 2 and after reduction by 0.5 percent to hold as a reserve for Cohort One courts that require additional program funding, with any unspent funding from the court

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2023–24 Allocation of Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Funding (June 7, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12125820&GUID=BB56211B-2F20-4BB8-8E94-B0909B17F695>.

allocations and this reserve redistributed through the reallocation process via the approved methodology; and

4. A method to reallocate unspent funds during the fiscal year.

At its business meeting on July 18, 2025², the Judicial Council approved the allocation of CARE Act funding for FY 2025–26 that included the following:

1. Continuation of all elements of the allocation methodology approved in fiscal year (FY) 2023–24, including employing the Workload Formula and the funding base already defined; and
2. An allocation of \$32.9 million, with base funding and pro rata distribution of remaining funds, to fund trial court operations related to the CARE Act for FY 2025–26.

The methodology applies the most current data available, utilizing the FY 2025–26 Workload formula for the proposed FY 2026–27 CARE Act allocations.³

Proposed CARE Act Allocations for FY 2026–27

The FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget included \$32.9 million for CARE Act trial court operations, and it is recommended to be allocated consistent with the approved methodology outlined above. The proposed allocations to the trial courts are displayed in Attachment 1A.

The final allocation of the \$32.9 million will be updated based on any needed technical adjustments and is contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2026–27.

Recommendation

Approve the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendation for CARE Act allocations to the trial courts for FY 2026–27 as outlined in Attachment 1A, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2026–27.

This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on July 17, 2026.

Attachments

Attachment 1A: CARE Act Allocation of Court Operations Budget FY 2026–27

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2025–26 Allocation of Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Funding (June 16, 2025), jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14303297&GUID=B2BE5DD8-5130-493A-B0DE-5538B320D61D.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (June 24, 2025), jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14317995&GUID=ECD8C9DA-C4D0-4251-9D6E-F59B81DF112E.

CARE Act Allocation of Court Operations Budget FY 2026–27

Court	Final Workload Allocation	Final Workload Allocation	Final Workload Allocation	Staff/Other	Staff/Other	Staff/Other	Court Operations	Court Operations	Court Operations	Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Distribution of Funds to Courts Above \$98,000	Final Staff/Other Allocation	Base	Distribution of Funds to Courts Above \$93,225	Final Court Operations Allocation	Total Allocation
	A	B	C	D	E	F (D+E)	G	H	I (G+H)	J (F+I)
Alameda	\$ 91,128,909	3.54%	\$ 748,728	\$ 98,000	\$ 579,236	\$ 677,236	\$ 93,225	\$ 232,277	\$ 325,502	\$ 1,002,738
Alpine	\$ 994,000	0.04%	\$ 8,168	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Amador	\$ 4,708,708	0.18%	\$ 38,687	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Butte	\$ 14,117,483	0.55%	\$ 115,991	\$ 98,000	\$ 89,734	\$ 187,734	\$ 93,225	\$ 35,984	\$ 129,209	\$ 316,943
Calaveras	\$ 3,496,238	0.14%	\$ 28,726	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Colusa	\$ 2,619,720	0.10%	\$ 21,523	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Contra Costa	\$ 53,813,756	2.09%	\$ 442,142	\$ 98,000	\$ 342,054	\$ 440,054	\$ 93,225	\$ 137,165	\$ 230,390	\$ 670,444
Del Norte	\$ 4,061,613	0.16%	\$ 33,370	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
El Dorado	\$ 10,262,799	0.40%	\$ 84,321	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Fresno	\$ 64,916,965	2.53%	\$ 533,367	\$ 98,000	\$ 412,627	\$ 510,627	\$ 93,225	\$ 165,466	\$ 258,691	\$ 769,318
Glenn	\$ 3,313,806	0.13%	\$ 27,226	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Humboldt	\$ 8,848,774	0.34%	\$ 72,704	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Imperial	\$ 10,126,650	0.39%	\$ 83,201	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Inyo	\$ 2,647,940	0.10%	\$ 21,756	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Kern	\$ 66,230,485	2.58%	\$ 544,160	\$ 98,000	\$ 420,976	\$ 518,976	\$ 93,225	\$ 168,814	\$ 262,039	\$ 781,015
Kings	\$ 11,035,848	0.43%	\$ 90,672	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Lake	\$ 5,358,110	0.21%	\$ 44,022	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Lassen	\$ 2,729,185	0.11%	\$ 22,423	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Los Angeles	\$ 740,942,433	28.82%	\$ 6,087,692	\$ 98,000	\$ 4,709,603	\$ 4,807,603	\$ 93,225	\$ 1,888,578	\$ 1,981,803	\$ 6,789,406
Madera	\$ 12,674,580	0.49%	\$ 104,137	\$ 98,000	\$ 80,562	\$ 178,562	\$ 93,225	\$ 32,306	\$ 125,531	\$ 304,093
Marin	\$ 14,371,061	0.56%	\$ 118,075	\$ 98,000	\$ 91,346	\$ 189,346	\$ 93,225	\$ 36,630	\$ 129,855	\$ 319,201
Mariposa	\$ 1,923,719	0.07%	\$ 15,805	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mendocino	\$ 8,106,845	0.32%	\$ 66,608	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Merced	\$ 17,058,992	0.66%	\$ 140,158	\$ 98,000	\$ 108,429	\$ 206,429	\$ 93,225	\$ 43,481	\$ 136,706	\$ 343,135
Modoc	\$ 1,401,986	0.05%	\$ 11,520	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mono	\$ 2,496,681	0.10%	\$ 20,514	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Monterey	\$ 26,860,459	1.04%	\$ 220,690	\$ 98,000	\$ 170,732	\$ 268,732	\$ 93,225	\$ 68,465	\$ 161,690	\$ 430,422
Napa	\$ 9,908,912	0.39%	\$ 81,412	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Nevada	\$ 6,891,620	0.27%	\$ 56,623	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Orange	\$ 193,023,589	7.51%	\$ 1,585,910	\$ 98,000	\$ 1,226,902	\$ 1,324,902	\$ 93,225	\$ 491,995	\$ 585,220	\$ 1,910,122
Placer	\$ 25,813,359	1.00%	\$ 212,087	\$ 98,000	\$ 164,076	\$ 262,076	\$ 93,225	\$ 65,796	\$ 159,021	\$ 421,097
Plumas	\$ 1,952,409	0.08%	\$ 16,042	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Riverside	\$ 142,997,227	5.56%	\$ 1,174,887	\$ 98,000	\$ 908,924	\$ 1,006,924	\$ 93,225	\$ 364,484	\$ 457,709	\$ 1,464,633
Sacramento	\$ 110,077,841	4.28%	\$ 904,415	\$ 98,000	\$ 699,679	\$ 797,679	\$ 93,225	\$ 280,575	\$ 373,800	\$ 1,171,479
San Benito	\$ 4,945,003	0.19%	\$ 40,628	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
San Bernardino	\$ 140,906,737	5.48%	\$ 1,157,710	\$ 98,000	\$ 895,635	\$ 993,635	\$ 93,225	\$ 359,155	\$ 452,380	\$ 1,446,015
San Diego	\$ 181,653,988	7.07%	\$ 1,492,496	\$ 98,000	\$ 1,154,635	\$ 1,252,635	\$ 93,225	\$ 463,015	\$ 556,240	\$ 1,808,875
San Francisco	\$ 66,426,781	2.58%	\$ 545,772	\$ 98,000	\$ 422,224	\$ 520,224	\$ 93,225	\$ 169,314	\$ 262,539	\$ 782,763
San Joaquin	\$ 51,347,519	2.00%	\$ 421,880	\$ 98,000	\$ 326,378	\$ 424,378	\$ 93,225	\$ 130,879	\$ 224,104	\$ 648,482
San Luis Obispo	\$ 19,302,588	0.75%	\$ 158,593	\$ 98,000	\$ 122,692	\$ 220,692	\$ 93,225	\$ 49,200	\$ 142,425	\$ 363,117
San Mateo	\$ 45,437,979	1.77%	\$ 373,325	\$ 98,000	\$ 288,815	\$ 386,815	\$ 93,225	\$ 115,816	\$ 209,041	\$ 595,856
Santa Barbara	\$ 27,920,101	1.09%	\$ 229,396	\$ 98,000	\$ 177,467	\$ 275,467	\$ 93,225	\$ 71,166	\$ 164,391	\$ 439,858
Santa Clara	\$ 96,557,774	3.76%	\$ 793,333	\$ 98,000	\$ 613,744	\$ 711,744	\$ 93,225	\$ 246,115	\$ 339,340	\$ 1,051,084
Santa Cruz	\$ 16,624,343	0.65%	\$ 136,589	\$ 98,000	\$ 105,669	\$ 203,669	\$ 93,225	\$ 42,374	\$ 135,599	\$ 339,268
Shasta	\$ 18,691,499	0.73%	\$ 153,573	\$ 98,000	\$ 118,809	\$ 216,809	\$ 93,225	\$ 47,643	\$ 140,868	\$ 357,677
Sierra	\$ 994,000	0.04%	\$ 8,168	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Siskiyou	\$ 4,552,702	0.18%	\$ 37,405	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Solano	\$ 29,999,978	1.17%	\$ 246,484	\$ 98,000	\$ 190,687	\$ 288,687	\$ 93,225	\$ 76,467	\$ 169,692	\$ 458,379
Sonoma	\$ 31,619,946	1.23%	\$ 259,795	\$ 98,000	\$ 200,984	\$ 298,984	\$ 93,225	\$ 80,596	\$ 173,821	\$ 472,805
Stanislaus	\$ 32,500,571	1.26%	\$ 267,029	\$ 98,000	\$ 206,580	\$ 304,580	\$ 93,225	\$ 82,840	\$ 176,065	\$ 480,645
Sutter	\$ 8,482,346	0.33%	\$ 69,692	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tehama	\$ 6,061,097	0.24%	\$ 49,799	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Trinity	\$ 2,163,974	0.08%	\$ 17,780	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tulare	\$ 34,261,177	1.33%	\$ 281,495	\$ 98,000	\$ 217,772	\$ 315,772	\$ 93,225	\$ 87,328	\$ 180,553	\$ 496,325
Tuolumne	\$ 5,189,615	0.20%	\$ 42,639	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Ventura	\$ 45,211,978	1.76%	\$ 371,468	\$ 98,000	\$ 287,378	\$ 385,378	\$ 93,225	\$ 115,240	\$ 208,465	\$ 593,843
Yolo	\$ 16,284,295	0.63%	\$ 133,794	\$ 98,000	\$ 103,511	\$ 201,511	\$ 93,225	\$ 41,506	\$ 134,731	\$ 336,242
Yuba	\$ 6,725,291	0.26%	\$ 55,255	\$ 98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Reserve	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 164,420
Total	\$ 2,570,773,982	100.00%	\$ 21,121,860	\$ 5,684,000	\$ 15,437,860	\$ 21,121,860	\$ 5,407,050	\$ 6,190,670	\$ 11,597,720	\$ 32,884,000

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

Title: Pretrial Release Program Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27
Date: 4/23/2026
Contact: Deirdre Benedict, Supervising Analyst, Criminal Justice Services
415-865-7543 | deirdre.benedict@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of fiscal year (FY) 2026–27 allocations including the funding floor for the Pretrial Release Program for the trial courts.

Background

The Budget Act of 2021¹ provided ongoing funding for “the implementation and operation of ongoing court programs and practices that promote the safe, efficient, fair, and timely pretrial release of individuals booked into jail.” The budget appropriated \$140 million one-time General Fund in FY 2021–22 and \$70 million annually thereafter to the Judicial Council for distribution to the trial courts for these purposes.

Budget bill language since FY 2021–22 requires the Judicial Council to distribute the funding to all courts based on each county’s relative proportion of the state population that is 18 to 25 years of age.² Each court may retain up to 30 percent of the funding for costs associated with pretrial programs and practices. Except as otherwise authorized,³ courts must contract for pretrial services with their county’s probation department or other county department or agency and provide that department with the remainder of the funds.

Starting in FY 2021–22, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) has approved staff recommendations for the Pretrial Release Program allocations for each fiscal year for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and then the

¹ Senate Bill 129, § 4, item 0250-101-0001, provision 9,
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB129

² U.S. Census Bureau. "Age and Sex." American Community Survey, ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S0101, [https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2024.S0101?g=040XX00US06\\$0500000&tp=true](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2024.S0101?g=040XX00US06$0500000&tp=true). Accessed on 4 Feb 2026. The 18 to 25 age category specified in statute does not match available population data age categories used by the California Department of Finance. The department broke down the 18 to 25 age category into two groups of available data: 15 to 19 years of age and 20 to 24 years of age.

³ Budget bill language provides that the Superior Court of Santa Clara County may contract with the Office of Pretrial Services in that county and the Superior Court of San Francisco County may contract with the sheriff’s office and the existing not-for-profit entity that is performing pretrial services in the city and county for pretrial assessment and supervision services.

Judicial Council. On May 7, 2025, TCBAC approved initial FY 2025–26 allocations based on the funding proposed in the January 2025 budget. However, the final Budget Act of 2025 reduced the appropriation by \$5 million resulting in a new allocation to the courts of \$63.95 million.⁴ Following enactment of the Budget Act of 2025, TCBAC approved the allocations for consideration by the Budget Committee.

The FY 2026–27 Governor’s budget proposed \$48.95 million for pretrial services in FY 2026–27, a reduction of \$15 million from the prior year. Since FY 2024–25, the Pretrial Release Program budget available for allocation to the trial courts has been reduced by 29 percent.

Funding Floor

Since the program’s inception, Judicial Council staff have recommended a funding floor allocation for small and small-medium courts, with a commitment to monitor and evaluate the impact and necessity of the funding floor. The funding floor allocations allow small and small-medium courts to implement and operate pretrial programs that promote court appearance and public safety.

The original funding floor allocation was \$200,000 and was equivalent to the floor used in the funding methodology in the California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009.⁵ In FY 2023–24, staff surveyed each funding floor court to determine if the funding floor was still necessary. Some courts responded to the survey and voluntarily agreed to allocations below the original \$200,000, explaining that they did not require the full allocation to operate their programs.

Since FY 2023–24, council staff have adopted a sliding scale model based on program need, in which each funding floor court could receive up to \$200,000. In FY 2025–26, the program allocation was reduced by \$5 million or 7.25 percent. Accordingly, the funding floor allocation was adjusted by 7.25 percent, resulting in a new funding floor allocation of \$185,500. For FY 2026–27, the proposed funding floor allocation is \$141,987, which again reflects a proportional reduction of the \$15 million decrease to the program.

At the TCBAC meeting on August 11, 2025,⁶ committee members requested that staff further investigate the costs of operating a basic pretrial program, especially in small courts. Utilizing the 23 funding floor court actuals for FY 2024–25, council staff determined that operating a basic pretrial program requires approximately \$204,000. In the analysis, staff reviewed the minimum requirements to successfully operate a basic pretrial services program. In accordance with statute, 70 percent of program funding must be allocated to the pretrial service provider. The analysis included at least one deputy probation officer to both assess individuals and provide monitoring services as ordered by the court, and costs for court ordered services. The analysis

⁴ The Budget Act of 2025 provides \$63.95 million to the trial courts for pretrial programs. Of this amount, \$48.95 million must be expended or encumbered by June 30, 2026, with the remaining \$15 million available for expenditure or encumbrance through June 30, 2028.

⁵ Sen. Bill 678; Stats. 2009, ch. 608, www.courts.ca.gov/documents/sb678.pdf

⁶ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting minutes (August 11, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250811-minutes.pdf>

also included a small percentage of court staff time to reflect the court's 30 percent of the funding.

Although the analysis yielded a minimum operating cost of \$204,000, staff recommend that all 23 courts that have previously received a funding floor receive the updated funding floor allocation of \$141,987 in FY 2026–27. This recommendation aims to ensure a proportional reduction across all courts.

Staff will continue to monitor and evaluate small and small-medium courts to determine if the recommended floor allocations provide the necessary resources for the courts to meet the mandates of the Pretrial Release Program. Staff will bring recommendations to adjust the funding floor to the TCBAC and Budget Committee, as needed.

The final allocations will be updated based on any needed technical adjustments and is contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2026–27.

Recommendation

1. Approve the FY 2026–27 allocations, including funding floor allocations, for the Pretrial Release Program as outlined in Attachment 2A, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2026–27.
2. Direct Judicial Council staff to conduct a mid-year survey of expenditures and spending plans in November 2026 to determine which jurisdictions anticipate having unspent funding and which jurisdictions anticipate a demonstrated need for additional funding and recommend a methodology for reallocating funding between the trial courts based on demonstrated need.

These recommendations will be considered by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on July 17, 2026.

Attachments

Attachment 2A: Recommended FY 2026–27 Pretrial Release Program Allocations

Recommended FY 2026–27 Pretrial Release Program Allocations

County	Population 18 - 24 yrs old	% 18 - 24 yrs old	Proposed Allocation
Alameda	130,760	3.72%	\$1,700,596
Alpine	N/A*	N/A	141,987
Amador	N/A	N/A	141,987
Butte	30,289	0.86%	393,923
Calaveras	N/A	N/A	141,987
Colusa	N/A	N/A	141,987
Contra Costa	92,860	2.64%	1,207,688
Del Norte	N/A	N/A	141,987
El Dorado	12,593	0.36%	163,778
Fresno	98,003	2.79%	1,274,575
Glenn	N/A	N/A	141,987
Humboldt	16,209	0.46%	210,806
Imperial	17,729	0.50%	230,574
Inyo	N/A	N/A	141,987
Kern	90,016	2.56%	1,170,701
Kings	15,901	0.45%	206,800
Lake	N/A	N/A	141,987
Lassen	N/A	N/A	141,987
Los Angeles	872,040	24.83%	11,341,293
Madera	15,806	0.45%	205,564
Marin	18,230	0.52%	237,090
Mariposa	N/A	N/A	141,987
Mendocino	N/A	N/A	141,987
Merced	32,744	0.93%	425,851
Modoc	N/A	N/A	141,987
Mono	N/A	N/A	141,987
Monterey	43,949	1.25%	571,577
Napa	11,123	0.32%	144,660
Nevada	N/A	N/A	141,987
Orange	282,770	8.05%	3,677,558
Placer	30,238	0.86%	393,259
Plumas	N/A	N/A	141,987
Riverside	231,396	6.59%	3,009,414
Sacramento	132,077	3.76%	1,717,724
San Benito	N/A	N/A	141,987
San Bernardino	215,164	6.13%	2,798,309

County	Population 18 - 24 yrs old	% 18 - 24 yrs old	Proposed Allocation
San Diego	320,072	9.11%	4,162,688
San Francisco	54,969	1.56%	714,898
San Joaquin	74,737	2.13%	971,990
San Luis Obispo	41,959	1.19%	545,697
San Mateo	54,440	1.55%	708,018
Santa Barbara	65,938	1.88%	857,555
Santa Clara	164,705	4.69%	2,142,066
Santa Cruz	37,310	1.06%	485,234
Shasta	13,391	0.38%	174,156
Sierra	N/A	N/A	141,987
Siskiyou	N/A	N/A	141,987
Solano	37,447	1.07%	487,016
Sonoma	37,982	1.08%	493,974
Stanislaus	52,244	1.49%	679,458
Sutter	N/A	N/A	141,987
Tehama	N/A	N/A	141,987
Trinity	N/A	N/A	141,987
Tulare	48,582	1.38%	631,832
Tuolumne	N/A	N/A	141,987
Ventura	73,952	2.11%	961,781
Yolo	45,073	1.28%	586,196
Yuba	N/A	N/A	141,987
TOTAL	3,512,698	100%	\$48,950,000

Notes:

*“N/A” designates courts that have been provided with a funding floor allocation to ensure adequate funding is provided to meet the legislative mandate.

Allocations based on proposed FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget (AB 1563/SB 879, item 0250-101-0001, provision 7).

The 18 to 25 age category specified in statute does not match available population data age categories used by the California Department of Finance. The department broke down the 18 to 25 age category into two groups of available data: 15 to 19 years of age and 20 to 24 years of age.

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

Title: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27

Date: 4/23/2026

Contact: Lollie Roberts, Supervising Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
916-643-6969 | Lollie.Roberts@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of the Assembly Bill (AB) 1058 Child Support Commissioner (CSC) and Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program funding allocations for fiscal year (FY) 2026–27, totaling \$48 million for the CSC program and \$16.4 million for the FLF program.

Background

The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee was established in 2015 to review the historical funding methodology for the AB 1058 program. On January 15, 2019, the Judicial Council approved a workload-based funding methodology for the AB 1058 CSC program.¹ On July 9, 2021, the Judicial Council approved a population-based methodology for the FLF program and continued the workload-based methodology for the CSC program, with updated workload data.²

The Judicial Council directed that both methodologies be refreshed with new data every two years. For FY 2025–26, the CSC funding methodology was refreshed using updated workload data, and the FLF funding methodology was updated using current population data, consistent with the approved methodologies.

On March 26, 2026, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee reviewed AB 1058 CSC and FLF Program allocations for FY 2026–27 and recommends that the Judicial Branch Budget Committee approves the allocations contained in Attachments A and B.³

Recommendation

¹ More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the January 2019 meeting: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation (Nov. 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6953308&GUID=A6F15A78-08B6-42DA-8826-19A6AF0B7CB1>.

² More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the July 2021 meeting: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Child Support: Updating Workload Data for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner Funding Methodology, Adopting a Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Methodology, and Adopting 2021–22 AB 1058 Program Funding Allocations (May 14, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9508521&GUID=BC737E96-AFD8-4E22-A046-AE9E16A5C422>.

³ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting audio (March 26, 2026), jccav.akamaized.net/001A57/itso/jc-advisory-groups/tcbac/2026-03-26/tcbac-20260326-zoom-audio.m4a

1. Approve CSC allocations for FY 2026–27 using the existing workload-based methodology, as described in this report and reflected in Attachment A.
2. Approve FLF allocations for FY 2026–27 using the existing population-based methodology, as described in this report and reflected in Attachment B.
3. Authorize distribution of federal draw-down funding consistent with the methodology previously adopted by the Judicial Council and based on the court’s surveyed request for these funds.

These recommendations will be considered by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on July 17, 2026.

Attachments

Attachment 3A: Child Support Commissioner (CSC) Program Allocation, FY 2026–27

Attachment 3B: Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program Allocation, FY 2026–27

Child Support Commissioner (CSC) Program Allocation, 2026-27

Court	FINAL FY 2026-27 CSC Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	FEDERAL SHARE Column B*66%	COURT SHARE Column B*34%	TOTAL ALLOCATION Column A+B	CONTRACT AMOUNT Column A+C
Alameda	\$1,386,167	\$549,815	\$362,878	\$186,937	\$1,935,982	\$1,749,045
Alpine	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Amador	\$140,250	\$45,736	\$30,186	\$15,550	\$185,986	\$170,436
Butte	\$233,797	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$233,797	\$233,797
Calaveras	\$132,667	\$10,000	\$6,600	\$3,400	\$142,667	\$139,267
Colusa	\$45,691	\$15,809	\$10,434	\$5,375	\$61,500	\$56,125
Contra Costa	\$680,349	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$680,349	\$680,349
Del Norte	\$64,458	\$29,023	\$19,155	\$9,868	\$93,481	\$83,613
El Dorado*	\$203,169	\$100,382	\$66,252	\$34,130	\$303,551	\$269,421
Fresno	\$1,795,392	\$1,187,832	\$783,969	\$403,863	\$2,983,224	\$2,579,361
Glenn	\$120,030	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$120,030	\$120,030
Humboldt	\$127,394	\$21,451	\$14,158	\$7,293	\$148,845	\$141,552
Imperial	\$231,171	\$149,078	\$98,391	\$50,687	\$380,249	\$329,562
Inyo	\$79,264	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$79,264	\$79,264
Kern	\$1,144,138	\$109,530	\$72,290	\$37,240	\$1,253,668	\$1,216,428
Kings	\$235,831	\$75,000	\$49,500	\$25,500	\$310,831	\$285,331
Lake	\$120,893	\$90,500	\$59,730	\$30,770	\$211,393	\$180,623
Lassen	\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000	\$60,000
Los Angeles	\$7,410,640	\$3,198,270	\$2,110,858	\$1,087,412	\$10,608,910	\$9,521,498
Madera	\$247,256	\$88,000	\$58,080	\$29,920	\$335,256	\$305,336
Marin	\$98,357	\$41,336	\$27,282	\$14,054	\$139,693	\$125,639
Mariposa	\$75,216	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,216	\$75,216
Mendocino	\$132,694	\$56,550	\$37,323	\$19,227	\$189,244	\$170,017
Merced	\$477,907	\$297,354	\$196,254	\$101,100	\$775,261	\$674,161
Modoc	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Mono	\$45,974	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,974	\$45,974
Monterey	\$373,315	\$166,499	\$109,889	\$56,610	\$539,814	\$483,204
Napa	\$86,478	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$86,478	\$86,478
Nevada*	\$327,593	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$327,593	\$327,593
Orange	\$1,937,419	\$594,515	\$392,380	\$202,135	\$2,531,934	\$2,329,799
Placer	\$295,996	\$20,870	\$13,774	\$7,096	\$316,866	\$309,770
Plumas	\$95,777	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$95,777	\$95,777
Riverside	\$1,750,802	\$41,704	\$27,525	\$14,179	\$1,792,506	\$1,778,327
Sacramento	\$1,300,194	\$614,141	\$405,333	\$208,808	\$1,914,335	\$1,705,527
San Benito	\$135,384	\$30,000	\$19,800	\$10,200	\$165,384	\$155,184
San Bernardino	\$3,354,446	\$955,238	\$630,457	\$324,781	\$4,309,684	\$3,984,903
San Diego	\$2,046,396	\$1,204,899	\$795,233	\$409,666	\$3,251,295	\$2,841,629
San Francisco	\$703,303	\$363,320	\$239,791	\$123,529	\$1,066,623	\$943,094
San Joaquin	\$927,621	\$83,046	\$54,810	\$28,236	\$1,010,667	\$982,431
San Luis Obispo	\$179,782	\$127,093	\$83,881	\$43,212	\$306,875	\$263,663
San Mateo	\$303,676	\$163,455	\$107,880	\$55,575	\$467,131	\$411,556
Santa Barbara	\$373,054	\$296,845	\$195,918	\$100,927	\$669,899	\$568,972
Santa Clara	\$1,382,288	\$977,183	\$644,941	\$332,242	\$2,359,471	\$2,027,229
Santa Cruz	\$152,011	\$99,848	\$65,900	\$33,948	\$251,859	\$217,911
Shasta*	\$417,575	\$239,038	\$157,765	\$81,273	\$656,613	\$575,340
Sierra	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Siskiyou	\$101,584	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$101,584	\$101,584
Solano	\$537,111	\$95,481	\$63,017	\$32,464	\$632,592	\$600,128
Sonoma	\$388,726	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$388,726	\$388,726
Stanislaus	\$713,119	\$406,836	\$268,512	\$138,324	\$1,119,955	\$981,631
Sutter	\$156,576	\$63,487	\$41,901	\$21,586	\$220,063	\$198,477
Tehama	\$114,033	\$56,982	\$37,608	\$19,374	\$171,015	\$151,641
Trinity	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Tulare	\$517,999	\$104,461	\$68,944	\$35,517	\$622,460	\$586,943
Tuolumne	\$143,106	\$78,346	\$51,708	\$26,638	\$221,452	\$194,814
Ventura	\$452,223	\$175,000	\$115,500	\$59,500	\$627,223	\$567,723
Yolo	\$194,997	\$15,000	\$9,900	\$5,100	\$209,997	\$204,897
Yuba	\$203,147	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$203,147	\$203,147
TOTAL	\$34,954,436	\$13,038,953	\$8,605,707	\$4,433,246	\$47,993,389	\$43,560,143

*The county courts with Intra-Branch Agreements according to July 18, 2025 approved methodology, are identified as cluster size 1.

CSC Base Funds	\$34,954,436
CSC Federal Drawdown	\$13,038,953
Total Funding Allocated	\$47,993,389

Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program Allocation, 2026–27

Court	FINAL FY 2026-27 FLF Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	FEDERAL SHARE Column B*66%	COURT SHARE Column B*34%	TOTAL ALLOCATION Column A+B	CONTRACT AMOUNT Column A+C
Alameda	\$438,084	\$252,364	\$166,560	\$85,804	\$690,448	\$604,644
Alpine	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Amador	\$47,097	\$4,701	\$3,103	\$1,598	\$51,798	\$50,200
Butte	\$85,955	\$61,250	\$40,425	\$20,825	\$147,205	\$126,380
Calaveras	\$70,907	\$8,000	\$5,280	\$2,720	\$78,907	\$76,187
Colusa	\$39,067	\$8,900	\$5,874	\$3,026	\$47,967	\$44,941
Contra Costa	\$325,592	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$325,592	\$325,592
Del Norte	\$50,155	\$5,971	\$3,941	\$2,030	\$56,126	\$54,096
El Dorado*	\$107,111	\$50,384	\$33,253	\$17,131	\$157,495	\$140,364
Fresno	\$326,237	\$198,952	\$131,308	\$67,644	\$525,189	\$457,545
Glenn	\$75,971	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,971	\$75,971
Humboldt	\$73,288	\$13,371	\$8,825	\$4,546	\$86,659	\$82,113
Imperial	\$71,502	\$36,940	\$24,380	\$12,560	\$108,442	\$95,882
Inyo	\$57,289	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$57,289	\$57,289
Kern	\$293,637	\$214,416	\$141,515	\$72,901	\$508,053	\$435,152
Kings	\$69,895	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$69,895	\$69,895
Lake	\$51,012	\$29,167	\$19,250	\$9,917	\$80,179	\$70,262
Lassen	\$65,167	\$694	\$458	\$236	\$65,861	\$65,625
Los Angeles	\$2,416,099	\$803,431	\$530,264	\$273,167	\$3,219,530	\$2,946,363
Madera	\$73,938	\$27,724	\$18,298	\$9,426	\$101,662	\$92,236
Marin	\$112,503	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$112,503	\$112,503
Mariposa	\$45,491	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,491	\$45,491
Mendocino	\$56,647	\$30,722	\$20,277	\$10,445	\$87,369	\$76,924
Merced	\$104,587	\$72,021	\$47,534	\$24,487	\$176,608	\$152,121
Modoc	\$70,995	\$1,247	\$823	\$424	\$72,242	\$71,818
Mono	\$48,322	\$1,350	\$891	\$459	\$49,672	\$49,213
Monterey	\$141,545	\$63,314	\$41,787	\$21,527	\$204,859	\$183,332
Napa	\$67,982	\$42,149	\$27,818	\$14,331	\$110,131	\$95,800
Nevada*	\$116,579	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$116,579	\$116,579
Orange	\$738,201	\$137,665	\$90,859	\$46,806	\$875,866	\$829,060
Placer	\$119,160	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$119,160	\$119,160
Plumas	\$55,935	\$596	\$393	\$203	\$56,531	\$56,328
Riverside	\$649,392	\$247,138	\$163,111	\$84,027	\$896,530	\$812,503
Sacramento	\$392,625	\$228,214	\$150,621	\$77,593	\$620,839	\$543,246
San Benito	\$60,627	\$30,632	\$20,217	\$10,415	\$91,259	\$80,844
San Bernardino	\$560,347	\$336,947	\$222,385	\$114,562	\$897,294	\$782,732
San Diego	\$794,183	\$287,762	\$189,923	\$97,839	\$1,081,945	\$984,106
San Francisco	\$247,872	\$2,144	\$1,415	\$729	\$250,016	\$249,287
San Joaquin	\$227,289	\$88,041	\$58,107	\$29,934	\$315,330	\$285,396
San Luis Obispo	\$91,114	\$32,246	\$21,282	\$10,964	\$123,360	\$112,396
San Mateo	\$189,203	\$94,689	\$62,495	\$32,194	\$283,892	\$251,698
Santa Barbara	\$146,621	\$77,323	\$51,033	\$26,290	\$223,944	\$197,654
Santa Clara	\$511,182	\$210,712	\$139,070	\$71,642	\$721,894	\$650,252
Santa Cruz	\$94,619	\$47,069	\$31,066	\$16,003	\$141,688	\$125,685
Shasta*	\$186,519	\$114,145	\$75,336	\$38,809	\$300,664	\$261,855
Sierra	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Siskiyou	\$61,017	\$37,995	\$25,077	\$12,918	\$99,012	\$86,094
Solano	\$144,300	\$39,710	\$26,209	\$13,501	\$184,010	\$170,509
Sonoma	\$154,943	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$154,943	\$154,943
Stanislaus	\$181,097	\$126,257	\$83,330	\$42,927	\$307,354	\$264,427
Sutter	\$59,168	\$32,118	\$21,198	\$10,920	\$91,286	\$80,366
Tehama	\$40,748	\$3,535	\$2,333	\$1,202	\$44,283	\$43,081
Trinity	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Tulare	\$253,062	\$144,717	\$95,513	\$49,204	\$397,779	\$348,575
Tuolumne	\$52,825	\$30,084	\$19,855	\$10,229	\$82,909	\$72,680
Ventura	\$244,095	\$88,722	\$58,557	\$30,165	\$332,817	\$302,652
Yolo	\$88,275	\$39,202	\$25,873	\$13,329	\$127,477	\$114,148
Yuba	\$55,053	\$44,953	\$29,669	\$15,284	\$100,006	\$84,722
TOTAL	\$11,902,126	\$4,449,684	\$2,936,791	\$1,512,893	\$16,351,810	\$14,838,917

*The county courts with Intra-Branch Agreements according to July 18, 2025 approved methodology, are identified as cluster size 1.

FLF Base Funds	\$11,902,126
FLF Federal Drawdown	\$4,449,684
Total Funding Allocated	\$16,351,810

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

Title: Court Reporter Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27
Date: 4/23/2026
Contact: Rose Lane, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Leadership Support Services
916-643-6926 | rosemary.lane@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of allocations for the \$30 million annual appropriation to the trial courts for fiscal year (FY) 2026–27 to support court reporters in family law and civil case types.

Background

The Budget Act of 2021 included \$30 million ongoing General Fund for the trial courts to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil cases and must not supplant existing trial court expenditures for those purposes.

Allocation Methodology

In FY 2021–22, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) established the Ad Hoc Court Reporter Funding Subcommittee, consisting of members from the TCBAC, to develop an allocation methodology recommendation for the first year of funding. The Judicial Council approved this recommendation at its January 21, 2022, business meeting,¹ and directed Judicial Council staff to update the allocation methodology on an ongoing basis using the most recent data available.

The council-approved allocation methodology was developed based on the 2020 Judicial Needs Assessment, which was the most current study at the time. Judicial workload is measured by a court’s assessed judicial need (AJN) and was identified as the best metric for the allocation methodology because of the parallel workload drivers between judgeships and court reporters. In addition, the AJN data includes separate noncriminal and criminal judicial workload metrics by court.

Using the noncriminal judicial need, consistent with the requirements in the budget language, the proposed methodology for allocating the funds to the trial courts is as follows:

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts | Senate Bill 170: Funding for Court Reporters in Family Law and Civil Law Case Types* (Jan. 21, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10358386&GUID=7F337175-0808-4A38-AC68-F7AB5C9403FD>.

1. Identify the proportion of judicial workload, as measured by the AJN, for noncriminal need by court;
2. Apply a funding floor of \$51,000 to all courts. This would result in 16 courts receiving a combined total of \$816,000, which is higher than what they would receive under a purely proportional allocation. This amount (\$51,000) is approximately equivalent to 0.25 of one full-time court reporter, based on the average salary and benefits from the Schedule 7A for FY 2025–26;
3. After applying the funding floor amount to 16 courts, allocate the remaining \$29.2 million proportionally to all other courts based on their noncriminal judicial need; and
4. Allocate the funding in one lump sum upon council approval.

The allocations for FY 2026–27 are based on the AJN data from the current 2022 Judicial Needs Assessment.² Additionally, Schedule 7A data for FY 2025–26, the most current dataset available, is used to calculate the funding floor amounts. The Schedule 7A is an annual, standardized report that includes authorized positions, budgeted salaries and benefits for each position, and full-time equivalent counts for each classification. This report is used to develop each court’s annual operating budget.

The Judicial Needs Assessment is anticipated to be updated in FY 2026–27, and the updated data will be incorporated into the allocations for the following fiscal year.

On March 26, 2026,³ the TCBAC approved the proposed allocations to the trial courts using the existing methodology outlined above and as displayed in Attachment 4A. The committee also approved a modification to include a recommendation that directs staff to conduct a midyear survey in FY 2026–27 and carry out a reallocation process to ensure that available funds are used as effectively as possible.

The final allocations will be updated based on any needed technical adjustments and are contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2026–27.

Recommendation

Approve the following recommendations for consideration by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on July 17, 2026:

1. Allocate \$30 million for court reporters on a proportional basis using the council-approved methodology with AJN data based on the 2022 Judicial Needs Assessment as outlined in

² Judicial Council of Cal., Workload Assessment Advisory Com. Rep. (now Data Analytics Advisory Committee), *The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: 2022 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment* (November 8, 2022), https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-12/report-to-the-legislature_2022-update-of-the-judicial-needs-assessment.pdf.

³ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting materials (Mar. 26, 2026), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20260326-materials.pdf> (Item 5).

Attachment 4A, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2026–27; and

2. Direct council staff to conduct a midyear survey in FY 2026–27 and authorize a corresponding reallocation process to ensure maximum use of available funds to support court reporters in family law and civil case types.

Attachments

Attachment 4A: Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2026–27

Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2026–27

Court	Noncriminal AJN ¹	AJN Proportion for Non-floor ² Courts	Allocation of Non-floor Funding	Final Allocation
Alameda	36.8	3.49%	\$ 1,018,631	\$ 1,018,631
Alpine	0.1	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Amador	1.1	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Butte	6.1	0.57%	\$ 167,710	\$ 167,710
Calaveras	1.3	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Colusa	0.5	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Contra Costa	23.2	2.20%	\$ 642,361	\$ 642,361
Del Norte	1.2	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
El Dorado	4.2	0.40%	\$ 116,847	\$ 116,847
Fresno	28.4	2.70%	\$ 786,539	\$ 786,539
Glenn	0.8	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Humboldt	4.5	0.43%	\$ 124,505	\$ 124,505
Imperial	4.4	0.42%	\$ 122,240	\$ 122,240
Inyo	0.5	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Kern	24.9	2.36%	\$ 687,603	\$ 687,603
Kings	4.5	0.42%	\$ 123,078	\$ 123,078
Lake	2.4	0.22%	\$ 65,595	\$ 65,595
Lassen	0.8	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Los Angeles	341.3	32.34%	\$ 9,438,063	\$ 9,438,063
Madera	6.0	0.56%	\$ 164,736	\$ 164,736
Marin	5.1	0.48%	\$ 140,920	\$ 140,920
Mariposa	0.4	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Mendocino	2.7	0.25%	\$ 73,731	\$ 73,731
Merced	7.3	0.69%	\$ 201,079	\$ 201,079
Modoc	0.4	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Mono	0.3	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Monterey	9.4	0.89%	\$ 259,822	\$ 259,822
Napa	3.6	0.34%	\$ 99,717	\$ 99,717
Nevada	2.6	0.24%	\$ 71,433	\$ 71,433
Orange	77.0	7.30%	\$ 2,130,053	\$ 2,130,053
Placer	9.3	0.89%	\$ 258,362	\$ 258,362
Plumas	0.6	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Riverside	62.8	5.95%	\$ 1,735,560	\$ 1,735,560
Sacramento	43.7	4.14%	\$ 1,208,398	\$ 1,208,398
San Benito	1.4	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
San Bernardino	69.2	6.56%	\$ 1,914,316	\$ 1,914,316
San Diego	77.9	7.38%	\$ 2,152,935	\$ 2,152,935
San Francisco	25.1	2.38%	\$ 694,629	\$ 694,629
San Joaquin	19.9	1.89%	\$ 550,940	\$ 550,940
San Luis Obispo	6.0	0.57%	\$ 165,158	\$ 165,158
San Mateo	13.5	1.28%	\$ 372,113	\$ 372,113
Santa Barbara	9.2	0.87%	\$ 254,921	\$ 254,921

Court	Noncriminal AJN¹	AJN Proportion for Non-floor² Courts	Allocation of Non-floor Funding	Final Allocation
Santa Clara	30.9	2.93%	\$ 855,606	\$ 855,606
Santa Cruz	5.2	0.49%	\$ 144,302	\$ 144,302
Shasta	6.2	0.59%	\$ 171,407	\$ 171,407
Sierra	0.1	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Siskiyou	1.5	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Solano	11.0	1.04%	\$ 303,066	\$ 303,066
Sonoma	10.8	1.03%	\$ 299,223	\$ 299,223
Stanislaus	14.1	1.33%	\$ 389,077	\$ 389,077
Sutter	3.0	0.28%	\$ 82,404	\$ 82,404
Tehama	2.3	0.22%	\$ 63,954	\$ 63,954
Trinity	0.7	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 51,000
Tulare	13.3	1.26%	\$ 367,135	\$ 367,135
Tuolumne	1.9	0.18%	\$ 53,495	\$ 53,495
Ventura	18.0	1.70%	\$ 497,094	\$ 497,094
Yolo	5.3	0.50%	\$ 146,624	\$ 146,624
Yuba	2.5	0.24%	\$ 68,618	\$ 68,618
Total	1,067.2	100.00%	-	\$ 30,000,000

¹ Assessed judicial need (AJN) based on the updated 2022 Judicial Needs Assessment data.

² Funding Floor of \$51,000 based on FY 2025–26 Schedule 7A data, cost inclusive of salaries and benefits.

Noncriminal case types:

Civil, Family, Juvenile, Probate, Mental Health

Criminal case types:

Felony, Misdemeanor, Infraction

**Judicial Branch
2027–28 BCC Tracking List**

April 16, 2026

BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget and was denied.

Concept submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee in FY 2026–27 and was denied.

Tracking #	JCC Office/ Branch Entity	Concept Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate (thousands)	Fund Source	JCC Committee Impacted by this concept	Proposed Lead Advisory Committee	Comments
27-01	Budget Services	Inflationary Adjustment for Trial Courts (Consumer Price Index)	Requests \$82.3 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2027–28 and ongoing to address general inflationary costs for the trial courts based on the estimated consumer price index published by the Department of Finance.	0.0	\$ 82,300	GF	TCBAC	TCBAC	N/A
27-02	IT	Trial Courts Technology Ongoing Support	Requests \$42.5 million in FY 2027–28 to provide financial relief for increased technology cost at the trial courts.	0.0	\$ 42,500	GF	JCTC, TCBAC	TCBAC	N/A
27-03	LSSACS	Language Access in the California Courts	Requests \$23.5 million in FY 2027–28, and with incrementally increased annual amounts through FY 2030–31, to address rising court interpreter costs and support the ongoing efforts of the Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts and ensure trial courts are fully funded for the provision of interpreter services in all case types.	0.0	\$ 23,500	GF	TCBAC	TCBAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget and was denied.
27-04	TCBAC	Improving Branchwide Cybersecurity	Requests \$16.4 million ongoing in FY 2027–28, and an additional \$2.7 million annually through FY 2031–32 to improve the Branch’s cybersecurity programs in the supreme court, appellate courts, trial courts and the Judicial Council: provide supplemental funds to extend current cybersecurity programs to enroll additional courts; provide funding to support three new cybersecurity programs for all the courts; provide local assisting funds to support the trial courts’ cost of cybersecurity programs; and provide temporary staffing assistance to support the implementation of the cybersecurity programs. The purpose is to ensure the cybersecurity programs provide the necessary security services to protect the Courts of California and Judicial Council.	0.0	\$ 19,100	GF	TCBAC, APJAC	JCTC	N/A
27-05	IT	Appellate Court Technology Modernization and Ongoing Cost Adjustment	Requests 6.0 positions and \$4.5 million ongoing General Fund; and an additional \$300,000 annually through FY 2031–32. To provide application maintenance, enhancement and support of the Appellate Courts Case Management System (ACCMS). The funding will cover the increased operational, software and hosting cost of the ACCMS application. Funding for local assistance is needed for the Courts of Appeals to ensure the courts’ equipment and software are maintained, secured, and kept up to date.	6.0	\$ 4,500	GF	Tech, APJAC	APJAC	N/A
27-06	CJS	Addressing the Impact of the Disproportionate Increase in Competency Evaluations	Requests 1.0 position and \$10.4 million General Fund in FY 2027–28, increasing annually through FY 2031–32 up to \$16.3 million ongoing to support; 1) trial courts in addressing the increased number and rising costs of Penal Code (PC) section 1368 competency to stand trial evaluations required throughout the state; and 2) the development of resources to assist courts in identifying and maintaining qualified competency evaluators.	1.0	\$ 10,400	GF	CJCAC, TCBAC	CJCAC	N/A
27-07	LS	Litigation Management Program	Requests an ongoing augmentation of \$3 million in FY 2027–28 for the Litigation Management Program to support the defense and indemnity of all judicial branch entities.	0.0	\$ 3,000	GF	LMC	LMC	Concept submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee in FY 2026–27 and was denied.

**Judicial Branch
2027–28 BCC Tracking List**

April 16, 2026

Tracking #	JCC Office/ Branch Entity	Concept Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate (thousands)	Fund Source	JCC Committee Impacted by this concept	Proposed Lead Advisory Committee	Comments
27-08	RAD	Judicial Branch Data Analytics Modernization	Requests 9.0 positions and \$9.8 million in FY 2027–28; 9.0 positions and \$7.24 million in FY 2028–29; 7.0 positions and \$7.24 million in FY 2029–30; and \$5.12 million in FY 2030–31 to improve and modernize branch data collection, enhance data reporting, improve accountability and transparency, and better serve the public.	9.0	\$ 9,800	GF	DAAC, TCBAC	DAAC	N/A
27-09	HCRC	HCRC Case Team Staffing	Requests 30.0 positions and \$7.3 million General Fund in FY 2027–28; 20.0 positions and \$12.2 million General Fund in FY 2028–29; and 20.0 positions and \$17.4 million General Fund in FY 2029–30, for a total request of 70.0 positions to increase staff to address delays and backlog of unrepresented capital defendants in habeas corpus cases.	30.0	\$ 7,300	GF	HCRC	HCRC	Concept submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee in FY 2026–27 and was denied.
27-10	LSSACS	Appellate Court Unarmed Security Guard – Expanded Coverage	Requests \$707,000 ongoing General Fund in FY 2027–28 to provide additional unarmed security guards for the evenings and weekends for the state-owned courthouses for the Courts of Appeal which include: the Fifth Appellate District, the Fourth Appellate District, Divisions Two and Three, and the Second Appellate District, Division Six. In FY 2029–30, the Judicial Council requests an additional permanent augmentation of \$199,000 for the Sixth Appellate District’s new courthouse scheduled to be completed by 2030.	0.0	\$ 707	GF	APJAC	APJAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget and was denied.
27-11	LSSACS	Proposition 66 in Courts of Appeal	Requests 14.5 positions and \$10 million General Fund in FY 2027–28 and \$9.4 million ongoing General Fund for the Courts of Appeal to address the new workload associated with the implementation of Proposition 66, Death Penalty Reform and Savings Act of 2016.	14.5	\$ 10,000	GF	APJAC	APJAC	N/A
27-12	LSSACS	Racial Justice Act Retroactivity (AB 256) for the Appellate Courts and Trial Courts	Requests 17.0 positions and \$22.6 million General Fund in FY 2027–28 and \$28.1 million in FY 2028–29 and ongoing to support statewide appellate court operations for adjudicating cases pursuant to the Racial Justice Act (RJA). Requests funding for the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal, Supreme and Appellate Court Appointed Counsel Programs, and the trial courts to address the costs related to RJA support.	17.0	\$ 22,600	GF	APJAC	APJAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget and was denied.
27-13	LSSACS	Appellate Court Facilities Staff	Requests 6.0 positions and \$1.3 million General Fund in FY 2027–28; 2.0 additional positions and an additional \$0.4 million General Fund in FY 2030–31 for a total ongoing amount of 8.0 positions and \$1.6 million to oversee building maintenance for four state-owned Courts of Appeal facilities.	6.0	\$ 1,300	GF	APJAC	APJAC	Concept submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee in FY 2026–27 and was denied.
27-14	LSSACS	Increase Appellate Court Staffing	Requests 18.0 positions and \$5.3 million in FY 2027–28 to continue to address the courts’ existing workload, reduce backlogs, and prevent case delays in appellate districts.	18.0	\$ 5,300	GF	APJAC	APJAC	N/A
27-15	LSSACS	Courts of Appeal Court Appointed Counsel Program	Requests \$24.2 million ongoing to support a \$40 per hour rate increase for non-capital appeal appointments, for costs associated with the provision of electronic trial court transcripts, and for a 30 percent increase in annual contracts for the Courts of Appeal Court-Appointed Counsel Program.	0.0	\$ 24,200	GF	APJAC	APJAC	N/A
27-16	LSSACS	Supreme Court Capital Court-Appointed Counsel Program	Requests \$3.3 million ongoing to support the Supreme Court’s Capital Court-Appointed Counsel Program by providing a \$55 per hour rate increase for capital appeal appointments, and a 30 percent increase in the contract for California Appellate Court Project Office.	0.0	\$ 3,300	GF	CA - Supreme Court	APJAC	N/A

**Judicial Branch
2027–28 BCC Tracking List**

April 16, 2026

Tracking #	JCC Office/ Branch Entity	Concept Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate (thousands)	Fund Source	JCC Committee Impacted by this concept	Proposed Lead Advisory Committee	Comments
27-17	LSSACS	Seven California Highway Patrol – Judicial Protection Section (CHP-JPS) Officers	Requests \$2.7 million ongoing for California Highway Patrol Judicial Protection Section (CHP- JPS) officers.	0.0	\$ 2,700	GF	APJAC	APJAC	Concept submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee in FY 2026–27 and was denied.
27-18	FS	Trial Court Facility Modifications	Requests 6.0 positions and \$49.3 million General Fund in FY 2027–28 through FY 2029–30, then \$47 million ongoing thereafter. The request includes \$45 million to address essential facility modifications of trial court buildings. Requests \$525,000 to support the Computer Added Facilities Management (CAFM) software, \$2.2 million one-time funding for three fiscal years to install water leak detection equipment and software in 160 courthouses statewide, and \$1.6 million in personnel services.	6.0	\$ 49,300	GF, SCFCF	TCFMAC, TCBAC	TCFMAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor's Budget and was denied.
27-19	FS	Trial Courts Facilities Maintenance and Utilities	Requests 6.0 positions and \$29.5 million in FY 2027–28, and \$22.7 million ongoing to provide industry standard facility operation and maintenance and utilities for the existing portfolio.	6.0	\$ 29,500	GF, CFTF, Reimb.	TCFMAC, TCBAC	TCFMAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor's Budget and was denied.
27-20	FS	Trial Court Physical Security Assessment and Evaluation	Requests 3.0 positions and \$2.7 million in FY 2027–28 and \$684,000 ongoing to conduct assessments, evaluations, and identification of physical security deficiencies in trial court facilities statewide.	3.0	\$ 2,700	GF	CSAC, TCBAC	CSAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor's Budget and was denied.
27-21	FS	Orange Central Justice Center - Facility Modification	Requests \$78 million one-time to address cost increases and to recoup the counties share for the completion of the active facility modification at the Central Justice Center in Orange County. The amount of this request is dependent upon funds being appropriated in the 2026–27 enacted State budget. In the proposed Governor's budget for BY 2026–27 includes \$39.6 million in FY 2026–27 and \$38.5 million in FY 2027–28.	0.0	\$ 78,000	GF, SCFCF, Reimb.	TCFMAC, TCBAC	TCFMAC	N/A
27-22	FS	Trial Court Deferred Maintenance	Requests 6.0 positions and \$152.7 million in FY 2027-28, then \$18.7 ongoing starting in FY 2028–29. Of this, \$101.4 million GF and \$32.5 million SCFCF for a total of \$133.9 million one-time funding will address deferred maintenance backlogs for trial courts. An additional \$11.7 million GF and \$3.6 million SCFCF annually for five years totaling \$76.4 million will support energy efficiency-optimized lifecycle replacement deferred maintenance backlog work at five courthouses. The proposal also includes \$2 million ongoing GF to conduct a review of Facilities Services Building Management System (BMS) guidelines and to conduct an initial assessment of fifteen facilities as a pilot program to establish ongoing annual BMS program in existing facilities, and \$1.5 million for program support staffing.	6.0	\$ 152,700	GF, SCFCF	TCFMAC, TCBAC	TCFMAC	N/A
27-23	FS	Courts of Appeal Facility Modification	Requests \$1.1 million ongoing to address urgent and emergency facility modifications at Court of Appeal facilities.	0.0	\$ 1,100	GF	APJAC	APJAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor's Budget and was denied.
27-24	FS	Courts of Appeal Maintenance and Utilities	Requests \$955,000 one-time and \$760,000 ongoing for the maintenance and utility needs of Court of Appeal facilities and \$195,000 one-time to conduct electrical power systems arc-flash studies at the Court of Appeal facilities.	0.0	\$ 1,000	GF	APJAC	APJAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor's Budget and was denied.

**Judicial Branch
2027–28 BCC Tracking List**

April 16, 2026

Tracking #	JCC Office/ Branch Entity	Concept Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate (thousands)	Fund Source	JCC Committee Impacted by this concept	Proposed Lead Advisory Committee	Comments
27-25	FS	Courts of Appeal Deferred Maintenance	Requests \$10.5 million one-time to address vital deferred maintenance needs at the Court of Appeal (COA) facilities. This one-time targeted investment protects state assets, avoids higher long-term costs from emergency repairs, and ensures COA buildings remain safe, reliable, and accessible to the public.	0.0	\$ 10,500	GF	APJAC	APJAC	Concept submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee in FY 2026–27 and was denied.
27-26	FS	Superior Court Public Lactation Rooms (AB 1576)	Requests \$16.9 million in FY 2027–28, and \$15 million in FY 2028–29 to construct 92 court user lactation spaces in superior court facilities. This request addresses the statutory requirement to provide public lactation rooms pursuant to Assembly Bill 1576 (Ch. 200, Stats. 2022), as amended by Senate Bill 133 (Ch. 34, Stats. 2023). This request includes provisional language to allow the Judicial Council to encumber and expend funds for three years, to provide the necessary flexibility to manage contraction schedules and payment obligations to successfully complete these projects.	0.0	\$ 16,900	GF	TCFMAC, TCBAC	TCFMAC	N/A
27-27	FS	Los Angeles Spring Street Courthouse - Courtrooms Relocation	Requests \$4.6 million in one-time General Fund to relocate 17 courtrooms and associated operations from the Spring Street Courthouse in Los Angeles County to other existing courthouses within the county. The amount of this request is dependent upon funds being appropriated in the FY 2026–27 enacted State budget. In the proposed Governor’s budget for BY 2026-27 includes \$4.6 million in FY 2026–27.	0.0	\$ 4,600	GF	TCFMAC, TCBAC	TCFMAC	N/A
27-28	CFCC	Workload Assessment for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Requests 2.0 limited term positions and \$807,000 in General Fund in FY 2027–28, and 1.0 limited term position and \$217,000 General Fund in FY 2028–29, to support the development of a comprehensive workload assessment on court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel practice in California. This request includes provisional language to allow the Judicial Council to encumber and expend funds for two years from the existing Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel appropriation, providing the flexibility needed to schedule contract payments and reimbursements.	2.0	\$ 807	GF	Family Juvenile, TCBAC	Family Juvenile	N/A
27-29	FS	Funding for 26 New Judgeships*	Requests \$350–425 million one-time General Fund over three fiscal years beginning in FY 2027–28 and \$12–\$52 million ongoing General Fund beginning in FY 2027–28 for 26 new trial court judgeships in courts that show a need for new judicial positions according to the upcoming 2026 Judicial Needs Assessment.	0.0	\$ 109,000	GF	TCBAC	TCBAC	N/A
27-51	FS	Capital Outlay Project Reassessment and Program Support	Requests 4.0 positions and \$14 million General Fund in FY 2027–28 and \$4.9 million ongoing in FY 2028–29 to provide court facilities planning services and oversight for facility modifications and capital projects.	4.0	\$ 14,000	GF	CFAC, TCBAC	CFAC	BCP Proposed for the FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget and was denied.
27-52	FS	Capital Outlay Funding: FY 2027–28 through 2031–32	Requests \$1.5 billion in FY 2027–28 for eight capital outlay projects, including four new and four continuing projects.	0.0	\$ 1,500,000	GF, PBFC	CFAC, TCBAC	CFAC	One new and continuing phases of other project has been included in the Governor’s Budget.
27-53	FS	Los Angeles Spring Street Courthouse - Chatsworth Buildout	Requests \$34.8 million in FY 2027–28 for the Construction phase of the buildout of six courtrooms, support space, and upgraded holding facilities at the Chatsworth Courthouse for relocating six courtrooms and associated operations from the Spring Street Courthouse in the County of Los Angeles.	0.0	\$ 34,800	GF	CFAC, TCBAC	CFAC	N/A

**Judicial Branch
2027–28 BCC Tracking List**

April 16, 2026

Tracking #	JCC Office/ Branch Entity	Concept Title	Description	# Positions	\$ Estimate (thousands)	Fund Source	JCC Committee Impacted by this concept	Proposed Lead Advisory Committee	Comments
27-54	FS	Statewide: Budget Packages and Advanced Planning	Requests \$500,000 ongoing for statewide planning and studies for completion of planning studies and budget packages for capital outlay projects.	0.0	\$ 500	GF	CFAC, TCBAC	CFAC	N/A
Total				128.5	\$ 2,277,914	-	-	-	-

*Concept reflects maximum amount within the range for the first year.

Internal Committees	
Executive & Planning Committee	
Judicial Branch Budget Committee	
Technology Committee	
Legislation Committee	
Litigation Management Committee	
Rules Committee	

Acronym	Offices
AS	Audit Services
BAP	Branch Accounting & Procurement
BS	Budget Services
CFCC	Center for Families, Children & the Courts
CJER	Center for Judicial Education & Resources
CJS	Criminal Justice Services
EO	Executive Office
FS	Facilities Services
GA	Governmental Affairs
HR	Human Resources
IT	Information Technology
LSSACS	Leadership Support Services/Appellate Court Services
LS	Legal Services
PA	Public Affairs
RAD	Research, Analytics, and Data

Acronym	Advisory Committees
APJ	Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee
AFA	Advisory Committee on Audits and Financial Accountability for the Judicial Branch
PAF	Advisory Committee on Providing Access & Fairness
AAC	Appellate Advisory Committee
CJERAC	Center for Judicial Education and Resources Advisory Committee
CSCAC	Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee
CACI	Civil Jury Instructions Advisory Committee
CJCAC	Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee
CEAC	Court Executives Advisory Committee
CFAC	Court Facilities Advisory Committee
CIAP	Court Interpreters Advisory Panel
CSAC	Court Security Advisory Committee
CALCRIM	Criminal Jury Instructions Advisory Committee
CLAC	Criminal Law Advisory Committee
DAAC	Data Analytics Advisory Committee, formerly Workload Assessment Advisory Committee
Family Juvenile	Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
ITAC	Information Technology Advisory Committee
JBWCP	Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program Advisory Committee
PMHAC	Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee
Shriver	Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee
TAC	Traffic Advisory Committee
TCBAC	Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
TCFMAC	Trial Court Facility Modification Advisory Committee
TCPJAC	Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee
Forum	Tribal Court–State Court Forum

Judicial Branch 2027–28 Budget Change Concept

Requesting Entity	Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
--------------------------	--

Proposal Title	Workload Assessment for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel
-----------------------	--

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council requests 2.0 limited term positions and \$807,000 General Fund in fiscal year (FY) 2027–28 and 1.0 limited term positions and \$217,000 General Fund in FY 2028–29 to support costs of producing a comprehensive workload assessment on court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel practice in California. The Judicial Council also requests to add provisional language in the Budget Act to allow the Judicial Council to encumber and expend the ongoing \$186.7 million appropriated for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel for two years to provide greater flexibility to schedule contract payments and reimbursements.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes No

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes No

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes No

Proposed fund source: General Fund

Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) *

Fiscal Year	2027–28 (BY)	2028–29 (BY+1)	2029–30 (BY+2)	2030–31 (BY+3)	2031–32 (BY+4)
Positions	2.0	1.0			
Personal Services	\$357,000	\$181,000			
Operating Expenses & Equipment	\$450,000	\$36,000			
Local Assistance					
Total	\$807,000	\$217,000			
One-time	\$807,000	\$217,000			
Ongoing					

*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

Problem or Issue

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (CAC) is a legislatively mandated service¹ which ensures that children and parents in foster care proceedings are represented by counsel. The Judicial Council is appropriated \$186.7 million annually in the state budget to fund CAC in all 58 trial courts. The CAC funding methodology used to allocate this funding to trial courts, approved by the Judicial Council in [2016](#) and as amended in [2022](#), is outdated based on several changes to federal and state laws that impact juvenile dependency practice and workload.

The current methodology assumes a standard caseload of 141 clients per full-time dependency attorney, based on a workload study published in 2004. This caseload is widely acknowledged to be too high. Attorney caseloads are one of several key factors used in the current CAC funding methodology to determine the total statewide funding need for dependency counsel.

It is urgent that the council conduct a workload assessment on dependency representation to update data that is more than two decades old, account for the many new hearings and procedures required in dependency cases since 2004 and revise the current CAC funding methodology. The judicial branch's ongoing long-term assessment of how to appropriately allocate resources to meet the needs of one of California's most vulnerable populations requires an in-depth understanding of current workload requirements alongside short-term steps to address immediate needs. Establishing reasonable dependency caseload standards will also help ensure the consistent provision of high-quality legal services for dependent children and their parents in trial courts statewide.

The Judicial Council requests funding to support the costs for a contractor to conduct a comprehensive workload assessment and two temporary analyst positions (1.0 Senior Analyst and 1.0 Associate Analyst) for 18 months as the Judicial Council currently does not have the staffing or resources to perform this work.

The Judicial Council also requests to add provisional language in the Budget Act to allow the Judicial Council to encumber and expend the ongoing \$186.7 million appropriated in the Budget Act for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel over two years, to provide greater flexibility to schedule contract payments and reimbursements including costs associated with attorney transitions, unbudgeted necessary attorney services, insufficient attorney coverage for complex cases, and sudden increases in caseloads.

¹ Welf. & Inst. Code, § 317.

Background/History of Problem

The Judicial Council has received requests from court leadership and legal service providers to establish a new caseload standard, in recognition that 141 is not viable based on current dependency representation in California.

One of the key factors used in the current CAC funding methodology to determine the total statewide funding need for dependency counsel is attorney caseloads. The current methodology assumes a standard caseload of 141 clients per full-time dependency attorney, based on a workload study published in 2004.²

Since the workload study was published in 2004, there have been several federal and state changes to laws that impact juvenile dependency practice. These changes include the introduction of a new category of foster youth aged 19 to 21 (non-minor dependents), the widespread implementation of the Indian Child Welfare Act, extensive new responsibilities for attorneys related to psychotropic medication orders for children, Continuum of Care reform, court oversight of educational outcomes, and most recently the federal legislation promoting family connections and preventive services (the Family First Prevention Services Act), which have all contributed to a change in the workload of dependency attorneys. In addition, while filings dropped by approximately 30 percent over the past 10 years, courts and attorneys report that much of the decline is due to keeping relatively simple cases out of the dependency system, and workload has increased due to a growing proportion of complex cases. Lastly, increased challenges confronting families across our state and nation such as increased incidence of serious mental health challenges, increasing rates of teen suicide, substance use disorders at younger ages and more have a disproportionately negative impact on families impacted by the child welfare system.

Because the workload standards utilized in the methodology have not been revisited since 2004, it does not accurately reflect the current juvenile dependency attorney workload. Determining appropriate caseload standards will help to ensure more effective representation. The Judicial Council's target caseload of 141 is significantly higher than reasonable caseload standards recommended by the American Bar Association, National Association of Counsel for Children, and Family Justice Initiative.

- American Bar Association – recommends a caseload of no more than 50-100 for attorneys [representing parents](#); and a caseload of no more than 60 for attorneys [representing children](#).
- [National Association of Counsel for Children](#) – recommends a caseload of no more than 40-60 individual clients, assuming one case equals one client (not an entire sibling set), at a time.
- [Family Justice Initiative](#) – recommends a caseload of no more than 60 clients at a time for a full-time attorney, assuming a caseload that includes clients at various stages of the case.

An assessment focusing on cases and attorneys in California will consider how California laws, policies, and standards, which may create heavier burdens than other states, further define a reasonable caseload for dependency attorneys. A new workload assessment will assist the Judicial Council in determining

² In 2002, the Judicial Council and the American Humane Association conducted a time study of all dependency attorneys in California. Caseload study results published in 2004 indicated an optimal practice standard maximum caseload of 77 cases or clients per full-time dependency attorney, and a basic practice standard caseload of 141 clients per full-time dependency attorney.

appropriate workload standards for the important and critical representation that court-appointed counsel provide in dependency cases. The assessment would collect and review time-study data from a sample of large, medium and small California courts. It will account for factors that both drive and mitigate the workload of a case in California. These include: determining the proportion of cases with multiple siblings or sibling groups; accounting for time spent by attorneys on best practices including family finding and early efforts and family reunification; unique characteristics of non-minor dependent representation; hearings related to psychotropic medication orders; and notice and hearings related to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

The assessment will also determine workload differences among court sizes and whether caseloads and other factors should differ between, for example, a small court with a panel of part time attorneys and legal services agencies in a large court with economies of scale allowing them to deploy paralegals, investigators and social workers. Finally, the assessment will identify any strategies that could improve cost efficiency including the use of remote proceedings or the use of non-attorney professionals for certain parts of the work which might be prioritized in a revised workload methodology.

In addition, this request seeks to add provisional language in Provision 1 of Item 0250-102-0932, permitting the encumbrance and expenditure of the \$186.7 million, appropriated annually for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel, to extend through June 30, 2029, and be adjusted annually with each subsequent Budget Act to provide greater flexibility in management of payments for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel expenses. The ability to encumber funds over two fiscal years is significant in allowing the most efficient and maximum use of the allocated funds and eases the budget demands for each fiscal year as well as easing the contracting burdens related to the provision of court-appointed dependency counsel services.

Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion: CAC providers serve clients that cannot afford representation; client populations include those that have been historically overrepresented in the child welfare system as compared to their portion of California’s population. In California, all parents and children in dependency proceedings have a statutory right to representation by an attorney. Court-appointed counsel services ensure that children and parents receive access to fair, understandable judicial proceedings leading to timely, well-informed, and just permanency outcomes. Almost all families are appointed counsel funded by the CAC appropriation. A very small number of families reimburse some of the costs through the Judicial Council’s Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) which was established to collect reimbursements from parents or minors demonstrating an ability to pay for representation. However, on average, JDCCP recovers less than one percent of dependency representation costs annually.

Impact of Denial of Proposal

If this proposal is denied, the total funding need for court-appointed dependency counsel used to allocate CAC funding will continue to be incorrect and result in an understated total funding need for CAC statewide and individual courts. Underestimating the funding need can result in attorneys carrying unrealistic caseloads and impact their ability to provide quality representation. Courts and the Judicial Council continue to have difficulty both retaining and attracting new attorneys into the profession. In addition, an understated funding need—based on inaccurate workload and caseload standards—directly affects access to justice for dependency clients who cannot afford representation. High turnover and

excessive caseloads can cause inconsistent representation, leaving attorneys with inadequate time to prepare for hearings and ultimately leading to more continuances.

Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal

The Judicial Council is reviewing all components of the CAC funding methodology to ensure it is current and accurate. Conducting a comprehensive workload assessment on dependency counsel practice is an important component of that review and will enable the Judicial Council to establish a caseload standard that accurately captures current dependency practice based on current data to determine how additional factors or metrics to the CAC funding methodology can better support the workload to provide counsel to children and families and strengthen access to justice for vulnerable dependency populations.

Required Review/Approval

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion
Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public
Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch

Approval

I certify that I have reviewed this concept, and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.

Director Signature:



Contact Name: Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Judicial Branch 2027–28 Budget Change Concept

Requesting Entity	Judicial Council of California
--------------------------	--------------------------------

Proposal Title	Funding for 26 New Judgeships
-----------------------	-------------------------------

Proposal Summary

The Judicial Council of California seeks \$350–425 million one-time General Fund over three fiscal years beginning in FY 2027–28 and \$12–\$52 million ongoing General Fund beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2027–28 for 26 new trial court judgeships, as authorized in 2023 by Senate Bill (SB) 75 (Stats. 2023, ch. 482) and subject to appropriation for operational and facility costs, in courts that show a need for new judicial positions according to the upcoming 2026 Judicial Needs Assessment. Facilities funding is divided over three fiscal years for six judgeships in FY 2027–28, 10 additional judgeships in FY 2028–29, and 10 additional judgeships in FY 2029–30.

Does this proposal require a statutory change? Yes No

Does this proposal have an information technology component? Yes No

Does this proposal require data collection or reporting? Yes No

Proposed fund source: General Fund

Estimated Cost (Enter whole dollars rounded to thousands) *

Fiscal Year	2027–28 (BY)	2028–29 (BY+1)	2029–30 (BY+2)	2030–31 (BY+3)	2031–32 (BY+4)
Positions					
Personal Services					
Operating Expenses & Equipment	\$80,000– 97,000	\$135,000– 164,000	\$135,000– 164,000		
Local Assistance	\$12,000	\$32,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000
Total	\$92,000– 109,000	\$167,000– 196,000	\$187,000– 216,000	\$52,000	\$52,000
One-time	\$80,000– 97,000	\$135,000– 164,000	\$135,000– 164,000		
Ongoing	\$12,000	\$32,000	\$52,000	\$52,000	\$52,000

*Please include all costs associated with request including costs for other offices and courts.

Problem or Issue

The public's right to timely access to justice is contingent on having adequate judicial resources in every jurisdiction. For many years, the judicial branch has lacked an adequate number of judgeships to meet the workload need identified by the judicial branch's approved workload measures. The most recently published Judicial Needs Assessment (2022) showed that 17 courts needed a total of 98 judicial positions to meet workload need. In 2023, the Senate authorized 26 new judgeships with SB 75 (Stats. 2023, ch. 482), subject to appropriation. Most recently, the branch received funding for 50 judgeships authorized by AB 159 (Stats. 2007, ch. 722). That funding has greatly minimized the gap between the number of authorized judgeships and judicial need. However, there continues to be a workload-based judicial need in some superior courts.

Background/History of Problem

The methodology for determining the number of judgeships needed in the trial courts, and the methodology for allocating new judgeships, was first approved by the Judicial Council in August 2001 and is outlined in Government Code section 69614 (b), which states that judges shall be allocated, in accordance with the uniform standards for factually determining additional judicial need in each county, as updated and approved by the Judicial Council, pursuant to the Update of Judicial Needs Study, based on the following criteria: (1) Court filings data averaged over a period of three years; (2) Workload standards that represent the average amount of time of bench and non-bench work required to resolve each case type; (3) A ranking methodology that provides consideration for courts that have the greatest need relative to their current complement of judicial officers. The council's methodology will direct new judicial resources to the courts that are in greatest need of judgeships and therefore will help equalize access to justice more expeditiously.

Government Code Section 69614(C)(1) & (3) further requires the Council to quantify the need for new judgeships biennially, in the even-numbered years. These updates form the basis for assessing judicial need relative to authorized positions and updated workload inputs and have been used to identify courts that need additional judicial officers based on workload.

The upcoming 2026 Judicial Needs Assessment (JNA) report, expected to be approved by the Judicial Council in November 2026, will update the needs analysis using more current filings data and workload measures.

Costs

Operational Costs

One judgeship is approximately \$2 million per year and includes funding for approximately 9.28 clerical staff (this ratio will be updated when the 2026 JNA is published).

Facility Costs

The cost of providing facilities for a new judgeship varies depending on the circumstances and existing conditions of the locations, which are still to be determined. A reasonable budget to build out planned, unfinished, shelled-courtroom space is approximately \$9 million. Providing a courtroom by other project scopes, such as renovating preexisting non-courtroom space, adding onto existing buildings, or leasing

facilities/completing tenant improvements, is estimated to cost \$13.5–17 million (or more) depending on the existing conditions. Existing building or site conditions, such as the presence of hazardous materials, code required improvements due to change in use and occupancy, inadequate utility capacity, or ongoing costs to lease space, or required support spaces, such as in-custody sally port and holding facilities, can add greatly to the cost. Facility costs to accommodate space for all 26 new judgeships and support staff are estimated in the range of \$350–425 million.

Impact of Denial of Proposal

Timely access to justice for all Californians is a judicial branch priority. Without adequate judgeships, court users must wait longer to get a case assigned to a judge, to receive a judgment, or to have their matter resolved. While funding in recent years has provided additional judicial resources across the state, reducing overall need from a statewide perspective, the biennial Judicial Needs Assessments continue to show a need for new judgeships in some counties. The 2026 JNA is expected to similarly show a need for new resources.

Outcomes and Accountability of Proposal

New judgeships should be directed to the courts with the greatest resource need as described in the upcoming 2026 JNA report. The determination of which courts are to receive judgeships is based on the Judicial Council’s prioritization and ranking methodology, which considers courts with the greatest need relative to the current complement of judicial officers and the goal to improve access to courts for the greatest number of users. With the proposed additional funding for 26 judgeships, courts with the greatest need would be able to reduce their case processing times and would improve access to courts, along with enhancing and improving the quality of justice and improved service for court users.

Required Review/Approval

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Proposal is Consistent with the Following Strategic Plan Goals/Other Considerations

Goal I: Access, Fairness, Diversity, and Inclusion
Goal IV: Quality of Justice and Service to the Public
Goal VII: Adequate, Stable, and Predictable Funding for a Fully Functioning Branch

Approval

I certify that I have reviewed this concept, and an accurate, succinct, well written, and effectively justified request is being submitted.

Director Signature: *Leah Rose-Goodwin*

Contact Name: Leah Rose-Goodwin