

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
(Action Item)

Title: Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27

Date: 6/3/2026

Contact: Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
916-263-1693 | kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of revised allocations for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel (CAC) funding for fiscal year (FY) 2026–27, taking into account court spending plans to ensure the funding is maximized to serve children and families in dependency proceedings.

Background

Court-appointed dependency counsel became a state fiscal responsibility in 1989 through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (Sen. Bill 612; Stats. 1988, ch. 945). The act added Government Code section 77003, defining “court operations” to include court-appointed dependency counsel and provide an appropriation for trial court operations.

The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850) funded and detailed the transition to full state trial court funding. The proposed judicial branch budget for FY 2026–27 includes \$186.7 million for court-appointed dependency counsel.¹ The appropriation has not changed since FY 2022–23 and the funding is intended to cover all aspects of providing legal representation to children and parents in juvenile dependency cases.

Funding is distributed using a workload model adopted by the Judicial Council in 2016² and as amended in 2022.³ The key factors (for each court) used in this methodology are:

- A three-year rolling average of original dependency filings;
- A three-year rolling average of children in foster care;⁴ and

¹ The judicial branch budget also includes up to \$66 million in federal reimbursement for those court-appointed dependency counsel providers participating in the Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program.

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (Apr. 1, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF>.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2022–23 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding* (June 24, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11019079&GUID=CB0A2EE1-B3CF-43AC-B92B-F4724B5D209C>.

⁴ On February 27, 2020, the California Child Welfare Indicators Project site was updated to improve navigation and offer new features. With these changes, some previously available views of the data were removed. Cases opened and not identified to a specific court are assigned to the service component “Missing.” To comply with California Department of Social Services (CDSS) data de-identification guidelines, “masking” is performed to protect the privacy of individuals served by CDSS. In reporting the number of children served, any service component with a

- Median county counsel of the first two salary ranges reported by counties and the current U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics index.

The methodology also includes adjustments for small courts to ensure adequate funding.⁵ These adjustments include (1) suspending reallocation-related reductions for the smallest courts with caseloads under 200; (2) adjusting the local economic index for the small courts with caseloads under 400; and (3) reducing large-court funding allocations to offset small court costs. If these adjustments result in a small court receiving more than 100 percent of the total calculated need, calculated through the workload and funding methodology, the allocation is capped at 100 percent of total need. Currently, 38 courts fall within the small-court category and 28 of them meet the “smallest court” criteria.⁶

For FY 2025–26, the initial \$186.7 million allocation considered by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) on May 7, 2025⁷, contained a calculation error involving the 100 percent cap for small courts. Although corrected allocations were approved by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on May 16, 2025,⁸ the recalculation caused significant and unexpected funding reductions for a number of courts. As a result, the proposed FY 2025–26 allocations were withdrawn from the Judicial Council’s July 18, 2025, business meeting agenda. The allocations were deferred back to the committee process to consider options to advance the goal of funding equity, stability, and predictability for the trial courts.

On August 11, 2025⁹, TCBAC directed Judicial Council staff to conduct a spending plan survey of all trial courts to identify any courts that did not intend to spend their full FY 2025–26 allocation. Any resulting savings would be made available to impacted small courts, up to their proposed allocation, with remaining funds to be distributed through the midyear reallocation process.

Staff consulted courts on their funding needs and the impact of the technical corrections to determine—based on courts’ spending plans—whether funds could be made available to assist courts needing a glide path to accommodate the impact of the technical correction for FY 2025–26. On August 18, 2025,¹⁰ the Judicial Branch Budget Committee approved recommendations from the TCBAC to allocate FY 2025–26 funding based on the existing methodology and the survey results.

value between 1 and 10 is masked. Three courts, Alpine, Mono, and Sierra had total values between 1 and 10; therefore, the number of children served was masked and identified with (M). With the aim of maintaining confidentiality and allocating funds to each of these courts, each was allotted a value of 10 as of reporting period July 1, 2025.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Law: Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Methodology for Small Courts* (Dec. 20, 2018),

<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6913216&GUID=4DEB6A82-B007-46D8-9885-8D11D907DBF5>.

⁶ Due to downward trends in dependency filings, the small-court adjustments have applied to more courts in recent years, which has resulted in some small courts receiving increased funding despite drops in caseloads.

⁷ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Materials (May 7, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250507-materials.pdf>.

⁸ Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting Materials (May 16, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/jbbc-20250516-materials.pdf>.

⁹ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Materials (Aug. 11, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250811-materials.pdf>.

¹⁰ Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting Materials (Aug. 18, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/jbbc-20250811-materials.pdf>.

On September 2, 2025¹¹, the Judicial Council approved the allocations and directed TCBAC to add an additional item to its FY 2025–26 work plan to consider a revised methodology to address concerns raised by stakeholders and the courts that the existing methodology may no longer meet the needs of the program to support juvenile dependency proceedings.

On December 18, 2025¹², the Funding Methodology Subcommittee reviewed the factors used in the current allocation methodology and recommended that a working group be established to consider revisions to the methodology. The TCBAC chair authorized a working group, which convened in early 2026.

Due to the impact of the existing methodology, several small courts will have funding reductions for FY 2026–27 and may require a glide path to further adjust to these reductions. On May 7, 2026¹³, the TCBAC approved a recommendation to allocate the FY 2026–27 funding according to the existing court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding methodology, as included in column F of Attachment 1A.

The TCBAC also directed Judicial Council staff to conduct a spending plan survey of all trial courts in May 2026 to determine whether any courts did not anticipate fully spending their proposed FY 2026–27 allocation, in order to redistribute funds. Any identified funds will first be made available to small courts impacted by reductions resulting from the application of the current methodology, with any remaining funds made available to large courts anticipating to fully exhaust their allocation. The TCBAC directed staff to bring updated proposed allocations back to the committee for consideration once the survey results were available.

In May 2026, council staff conducted the CAC spending plan survey. Fifty-four courts responded to the survey. Of those courts, 52 indicated that they would fully expend their proposed allocation, and 37 of those courts requested additional funding, if available. Two courts reported that they would not fully expend their proposed allocations, making a total of \$520,000 available for allocation to other courts.

Council staff recommend allocating funds identified through the spending plan survey first to small courts impacted by funding reductions to help them adjust to FY 2026–27 reductions. Any remaining funding will be allocated to large courts to offset reductions to their funding for the small court adjustments. Aligning allocations based on court spending plans will better maximize the use of CAC funding and provide assistance to small courts in need.

The proposed trial court allocations are detailed in Attachment 1A, and total calculated funding need based on the approved methodology is shown in Attachment 1B. Based on this methodology, of the reallocated \$520,000, \$185,561 went to small courts and \$334,439 went to large courts.

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.

¹¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2025-26 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Council Funding* (Aug. 25, 2025), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=A&ID=1335073&GUID=7EA97284-5FF5-49CA-A5BD-A86123AB9CCD>.

¹² Funding Methodology Subcommittee Meeting Materials (Dec. 18, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20251218-fms-materials.pdf>.

¹³ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Materials (May 7, 2026), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20260507-materials.pdf>.

Recommendation

1. Approve the FY 2026–27 allocations for CAC which reflect the results of the spending plan survey conducted in May 2026, as detailed in Attachment 1A, column H, including any needed technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the final enacted budget. The savings identified in the survey are available for allocation to:
 - a. Small courts impacted by funding reductions due to the existing methodology to provide a glide path to adjust to FY 2026–27 reductions, up to 50 percent of the difference, if any, between their proposed allocation and the allocation calculated after applying small court adjustments, but before being capped at 100 percent of their total need as detailed in Attachment 1C, column D; and
 - b. Large courts, based on available remaining funding, to offset funding for small court adjustments.
2. Authorize Judicial Council staff to (1) conduct a midyear survey of trial courts in FY 2026–27 to assess projected CAC expenditures and determine if any courts will not fully spend their allocations and how much funding is available to reallocate to courts that need additional resources, and (2) implement a reallocation of this funding based on the existing methodology to maximize the appropriation to serve children and families in dependency proceedings.
3. Direct Judicial Council staff to report the results of the FY 2026–27 reallocation at the time the council considers the next year’s proposed allocations, ensuring transparency in how the funds were redistributed to meet program needs.

These recommendations will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its business meeting on July 17, 2026.

Attachments

Attachment 1A: Fiscal Year 2026–27 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Attachment 1B: Fiscal Year 2026–27 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology

Attachment 1C: Fiscal Year 2026–27 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding: Small Court Eligibility for Additional Funding Requests

Fiscal Year 2026-27 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Court	2025-26 Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need (Prior Year) A	2026-27 Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need (Current Year) B	2023-24 Allocation C	2024-25 Allocation D	2025-26 Allocation E	2026-27 Proposed Allocation ¹ F (as approved by TCBCAC)	2026-27 CAC Adjustments to Allocation Based On Court Spending Plans G	2026-27 CAC Allocation Considering Court Spending Plans H
Alameda	\$ 5,200,616	\$ 5,267,582	\$ 3,903,699	\$ 4,150,739	\$ 4,137,757	\$ 4,238,495	\$ 10,447	\$ 4,248,942
Alpine	18,488	18,842	25,764	18,999	18,488	18,842	-	18,842
Amador	195,107	197,298	158,374	155,513	162,137	171,210	-	171,210
Butte	1,173,237	1,113,327	945,296	962,319	933,460	1,031,012	-	1,031,012
Calaveras	261,689	283,738	190,388	231,546	245,673	264,817	-	264,817
Colusa	92,682	82,811	111,854	101,811	72,682	82,811	(20,000)	62,811
Contra Costa	3,028,870	2,891,154	2,653,306	2,519,783	2,409,855	2,326,331	5,734	2,332,065
Del Norte	259,687	238,188	256,964	269,768	275,298	238,188	8,401	246,589
El Dorado	668,438	789,307	474,903	601,356	668,438	789,307	-	789,307
Fresno	6,453,499	5,962,358	4,787,455	5,108,860	4,936,000	4,797,538	11,825	4,809,363
Glenn	140,795	150,136	143,016	141,039	146,455	150,135	-	154,946
Humboldt	946,581	946,913	729,831	744,798	946,581	946,913	10,000	956,913
Imperial	702,205	705,469	581,336	809,029	797,587	705,469	57,677	763,146
Inyo	81,884	58,458	76,990	85,907	81,884	58,459	6,246	64,705
Kern	5,757,583	6,055,032	3,644,535	4,131,045	4,580,896	4,872,106	12,009	4,884,115
Kings	1,070,376	1,067,882	775,408	824,322	1,023,513	1,048,984	-	1,048,984
Lake	188,449	252,714	277,755	247,103	246,219	252,714	27,181	279,895
Lassen	170,559	155,516	174,612	173,075	170,559	155,516	2,577	158,093
Los Angeles	104,063,283	97,222,771	90,982,340	86,836,815	82,795,685	78,229,100	192,813	78,421,913
Madera	906,405	963,539	844,825	824,032	797,713	881,306	-	881,306
Marin	398,873	446,963	358,761	386,687	398,873	408,419	-	408,419
Mariposa	109,316	123,325	73,918	75,764	104,702	119,874	-	119,874
Mendocino	666,874	635,040	608,018	662,845	666,874	635,041	11,625	646,666
Merced	1,619,967	1,688,336	1,052,809	1,166,819	1,288,891	1,358,498	-	1,358,498
Modoc	55,531	78,163	50,853	65,582	79,436	78,163	16,335	94,498
Mono	32,202	37,383	21,591	26,958	28,683	32,924	-	32,924
Monterey	715,812	734,859	595,734	528,532	574,546	596,999	-	596,999
Napa	398,461	401,278	375,955	356,764	319,824	325,998	-	325,998
Nevada	169,292	179,215	203,761	193,301	169,292	179,216	-	179,216
Orange	13,311,808	13,868,839	9,166,564	9,755,582	10,591,250	11,159,390	-	11,159,390
Placer	920,382	1,010,654	704,472	645,769	738,744	821,055	-	821,055
Plumas	98,933	116,896	159,634	128,921	137,275	116,896	22,049	138,945
Riverside	17,353,158	19,777,368	10,707,784	11,902,759	13,806,662	15,913,614	-	15,913,614
Sacramento	5,655,172	5,751,369	4,905,409	4,725,098	4,499,414	4,627,768	11,406	4,639,174
San Benito	124,179	118,842	95,270	94,875	99,672	96,547	-	96,547
San Bernardino	20,782,763	20,802,200	15,061,246	16,073,940	16,535,353	16,738,233	41,255	16,779,488
San Diego	7,440,278	7,024,273	6,270,441	6,084,732	5,919,695	5,651,994	13,931	5,665,925
San Francisco	4,328,355	4,761,070	2,841,720	3,113,689	3,443,762	3,830,936	9,442	3,840,378
San Joaquin	4,245,431	4,371,331	2,843,217	3,183,540	3,377,785	3,517,338	8,669	3,526,007
San Luis Obispo	954,201	964,094	700,254	732,191	765,888	783,230	-	783,230
San Mateo	827,243	775,782	765,432	724,811	663,986	630,245	-	630,245
Santa Barbara	1,875,853	2,117,904	1,394,843	1,440,382	1,492,481	1,704,145	-	1,704,145
Santa Clara	2,687,186	3,315,200	3,030,273	2,464,672	2,138,001	2,667,534	6,575	2,674,109
Santa Cruz	563,955	538,795	623,754	584,471	563,955	538,795	-	538,795
Shasta	1,313,197	1,327,756	821,850	932,070	1,044,817	1,068,362	-	1,068,362
Sierra	31,447	30,828	28,440	36,894	31,447	30,828	-	30,828
Siskiyou	172,097	190,087	256,552	255,222	250,588	190,087	10,000	200,087
Solano	1,386,404	1,274,691	1,162,244	1,145,839	1,112,796	1,035,559	-	1,035,559
Sonoma	2,060,600	1,929,529	1,625,196	1,635,689	1,639,472	1,552,571	3,827	1,556,398
Stanislaus	1,614,945	1,451,691	1,419,811	1,357,149	1,284,896	1,168,085	2,879	1,170,964
Sutter	430,755	440,977	336,571	337,171	363,813	374,503	-	374,503
Tehama	339,029	364,213	294,234	313,954	339,029	364,213	-	364,213
Trinity	65,884	65,886	83,204	83,204	83,204	65,886	8,659	74,545
Tulare	3,753,824	3,964,201	2,416,609	2,618,925	1,984,956	3,189,745	(500,000)	2,689,745
Tuolumne	317,223	356,598	307,665	300,491	304,674	344,880	-	344,880
Ventura	1,998,532	1,828,854	1,843,364	1,695,670	1,590,089	1,471,565	3,627	1,475,192
Yolo	1,473,280	1,540,857	1,235,231	1,267,692	1,182,527	1,251,792	-	1,251,792
Yuba	807,295	861,422	418,668	563,486	600,000	699,819	-	699,819
Reserve	-	-	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	-	100,000
Total	\$ 232,480,168	\$ 229,689,803	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 185,764,227	\$ 186,700,000	\$ -	\$ 186,700,000

¹ Allocation under existing methodology, as approved by TCBCAC at its May 7, 2026 meeting.

Note: Allocations are based on filings data obtained from the Judicial Council Research, Analytics, and Data and caseload data obtained from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) as of July 1, 2025.

Fiscal Year 2026-27 Total Funding Need for Court Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology*

Court	3 YR Average Original Filings (FY 2022, 2023, 2024) A	3 YR Average CWS Cases (July 2023, July 2024, July 2025) B	Filings % C	Cases % D	Sum of Weighted % (3C+7D) E	Partially Redistributed Caseload (B'E) F	BLS Index 2022, 2023, 2024 G	Annual Salary (G * Median Salary) H	Caseload Multiplied by Estimated Child-Parent Case Ratio (F*1.8) I	Attorneys Needed Per Caseload (I/141) J	Total Attorney Salaries (H*J) K	Total Funding Need (K/45) L	Allocation Pre-BLS Adjustment M	Small Court Increase with BLS Adjustment N	Large Court Funding Adjustment (Pro-Rata Decrease) O	2026-27 Proposed Allocation P	2026-27 CAC Allocation Based On Court Spending Plan Q
Alameda	468	1,079	1.63%	1.96%	1.87%	1021	148	\$ 181,812	1,838	13.04	\$ 2,370,412	\$ 5,267,582	\$ 4,279,384	\$ -	\$ (40,889)	\$ 4,238,495	\$ 4,248,942
*Alpine	0	10	0.00%	0.02%	0.01%	7	0.75	92,382	13	0.09	8,479	18,842	15,307	3,535	-	18,842	18,842
*Amador	38	56	0.13%	0.10%	0.11%	61	0.93	113,955	110	0.78	88,784	197,298	160,285	10,925	-	171,210	171,210
*Butte	165	391	0.57%	0.72%	0.67%	368	0.87	106,782	662	4.69	500,997	1,113,327	904,467	126,545	-	1,031,012	1,031,012
*Calaveras	72	77	0.25%	0.14%	0.17%	94	0.86	105,552	170	1.21	127,682	283,738	230,509	34,308	-	264,817	264,817
*Colusa	18	31	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	32	0.75	92,647	37	0.40	37,265	82,811	67,276	15,535	-	82,811	82,811
Contra Costa	315	647	1.10%	1.19%	1.16%	632	1.31	161,284	1,137	8.07	1,301,019	2,891,154	2,348,773	-	(22,442)	2,326,331	2,332,065
*Del Norte	43	95	0.15%	0.17%	0.17%	91	0.75	92,371	164	1.16	107,185	238,188	193,504	44,684	-	238,188	246,589
*El Dorado	143	170	0.50%	0.31%	0.37%	200	1.13	138,925	360	2.56	355,188	789,307	641,233	148,074	-	789,307	789,307
Fresno	798	1,915	2.77%	3.51%	3.29%	1794	0.95	117,135	2,230	22.91	2,683,061	5,962,358	4,843,820	-	(46,282)	4,797,538	4,809,363
*Glenn	35	53	0.12%	0.10%	0.10%	57	0.76	92,931	103	0.73	67,561	150,136	121,970	28,165	-	150,136	154,946
*Humboldt	219	344	0.76%	0.63%	0.67%	365	0.74	91,334	668	4.67	426,111	946,913	789,272	177,641	-	946,913	956,913
*Imperial	156	291	0.54%	0.53%	0.54%	293	0.69	84,960	527	3.74	317,461	705,469	573,123	132,346	-	705,469	763,146
*Inyo	7	24	0.02%	0.04%	0.04%	20	0.82	101,232	37	0.26	26,306	58,458	47,492	10,967	-	58,458	64,705
Kern	816	1,985	2.84%	3.64%	3.40%	1854	0.94	115,154	3,336	23.66	2,724,765	6,055,032	4,919,108	-	(47,002)	4,872,106	4,884,115
*Kings	228	349	0.79%	0.64%	0.69%	374	0.82	100,669	673	4.77	480,547	1,067,882	867,548	181,436	-	1,048,984	1,048,984
*Lake	53	91	0.19%	0.17%	0.17%	94	0.77	94,991	169	1.20	113,721	252,714	205,305	47,409	-	252,714	279,895
*Lassen	24	62	0.06%	0.11%	0.11%	57	0.78	95,715	103	0.73	69,982	155,516	126,341	29,175	-	155,516	158,093
Los Angeles	11,081	20,368	38.51%	37.06%	37.06%	20437	1.36	167,693	36,788	260.98	43,750,247	97,222,771	78,323,779	-	(754,679)	78,229,100	78,421,913
*Madera	251	405	0.87%	0.45%	0.58%	314	0.88	108,114	565	4.01	433,592	963,539	782,779	-	-	881,306	881,306
*Marin	68	99	0.24%	0.18%	0.20%	108	1.19	146,270	194	1.38	201,134	446,963	363,113	45,306	-	408,419	408,419
*Mariposa	32	35	0.11%	0.06%	0.08%	43	0.83	101,734	77	0.55	55,496	123,325	100,189	19,685	-	119,874	119,874
*Mendocino	114	243	0.40%	0.45%	0.43%	235	0.78	95,394	422	3.00	285,768	635,040	515,907	119,134	-	635,041	646,666
Merced	325	618	1.13%	1.13%	1.13%	617	0.78	96,401	1,111	7.88	759,751	1,688,336	1,371,604	-	(13,106)	1,358,498	1,358,498
*Modoc	31	31	0.11%	0.06%	0.07%	40	0.57	69,738	71	0.50	35,173	78,163	63,500	14,663	-	78,163	94,499
*Mono	8	10	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	12	0.91	112,680	21	0.15	16,822	37,383	30,370	7,013	-	32,294	32,924
*Monterey	92	191	0.32%	0.35%	0.34%	186	1.13	139,102	335	2.38	330,686	734,859	596,999	-	-	596,999	596,999
*Napa	53	85	0.18%	0.16%	0.16%	89	1.29	158,163	161	1.14	180,575	401,278	325,988	-	-	325,988	325,988
*Nevada	32	43	0.11%	0.09%	0.09%	49	1.06	130,199	87	0.62	80,647	179,215	145,595	33,621	-	179,216	179,216
Orange	1,900	3,097	6.60%	5.68%	5.96%	3248	1.23	150,529	5,846	41.46	6,240,978	13,868,839	11,267,045	-	(107,655)	11,159,390	11,159,390
*Placer	177	213	0.62%	0.39%	0.46%	250	1.16	142,699	449	3.19	454,794	1,010,654	821,055	-	-	821,055	821,055
*Plumas	27	44	0.09%	0.08%	0.08%	46	0.73	89,210	83	0.59	52,603	116,896	94,966	21,930	-	116,896	138,945
Riverside	3,153	5,093	10.96%	9.34%	9.23%	5357	1.06	130,130	9,843	68.39	8,899,815	19,777,368	16,067,134	-	(163,520)	15,913,614	15,913,614
Sacramento	550	1,329	1.91%	2.44%	2.28%	1243	1.33	163,146	2,237	15.86	2,988,116	6,672,412	5,751,369	-	(44,644)	4,627,768	4,638,174
*San Benito	17	34	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	33	1.03	126,794	59	0.42	53,479	118,842	96,547	-	-	96,547	96,547
San Bernardino	2,461	5,419	8.55%	9.94%	9.53%	5192	1.15	141,220	9,346	66.29	9,360,990	20,802,200	16,899,708	-	(161,475)	16,738,233	16,779,488
San Diego	663	1,881	2.30%	3.45%	3.11%	1693	1.19	146,228	3,048	21.62	3,160,923	7,024,273	5,706,519	-	(54,525)	5,651,994	5,665,925
San Francisco	396	809	1.38%	1.48%	1.45%	791	1.73	212,085	1,424	10.10	2,142,481	4,761,070	3,867,893	-	(36,957)	3,830,936	3,840,378
San Joaquin	575	1,208	2.00%	2.22%	2.15%	1173	1.07	131,383	2,111	14.97	1,967,099	4,371,371	3,551,270	-	(33,932)	3,517,338	3,526,007
*San Luis Obispo	138	277	0.48%	0.51%	0.50%	272	1.02	124,769	490	3.48	433,842	964,094	783,230	-	-	783,230	783,230
*San Mateo	82	133	0.29%	0.24%	0.26%	140	1.59	195,478	282	1.79	349,102	775,782	630,245	-	-	630,245	630,245
Santa Barbara	276	488	0.96%	0.90%	0.91%	498	1.22	149,829	897	6.36	953,057	2,117,904	1,720,585	-	(16,440)	1,704,145	1,704,145
Santa Clara	318	666	1.11%	1.22%	1.19%	647	1.47	180,702	1,164	8.26	1,491,840	2,693,268	2,667,534	-	(25,734)	2,641,800	2,674,109
*Santa Cruz	73	137	0.25%	0.25%	0.25%	138	1.12	137,814	248	1.76	242,458	538,795	437,717	101,078	-	538,795	538,795
Shasta	205	412	0.71%	0.76%	0.74%	405	0.94	115,535	729	5.17	597,490	1,327,756	1,078,669	-	(10,307)	1,068,362	1,068,362
*Sierra	5	14	0.02%	0.03%	0.02%	13	0.70	85,664	23	0.16	13,873	30,828	25,045	5,783	-	30,828	30,828
*Siskiyou	49	72	0.17%	0.13%	0.14%	78	0.70	85,593	141	1.00	85,539	190,087	154,427	35,660	-	190,087	200,087
*Solano	135	332	0.47%	0.61%	0.57%	309	1.18	145,443	556	3.94	573,611	1,274,691	1,035,559	-	-	1,035,559	1,035,559
Sonoma	191	502	0.66%	0.92%	0.84%	460	1.20	147,936	828	5.87	868,288	1,929,529	1,567,549	-	(14,978)	1,552,571	1,556,398
Stanislaus	151	453	0.52%	0.83%	0.74%	403	1.03	126,929	726	5.15	653,261	1,451,691	1,179,354	-	(11,269)	1,168,085	1,170,964
*Sutter	104	106	0.36%	0.19%	0.24%	133	0.95	116,439	240	1.70	198,440	440,977	358,250	16,253	-	374,503	374,503
*Tehama	81	124	0.28%	0.23%	0.24%	133	0.79	96,649	239	1.70	163,896	364,213	295,887	68,326	-	364,213	364,213
*Trinity	19	20	0.07%	0.04%	0.05%	25	0.76	93,653	45	0.32	29,649	65,886	53,526	12,360	-	65,886	74,545
Tulare	703	1,137	2.44%	2.09%	2.19%	1195	0.95	116,933	2,151	15.26	1,783,891	3,964,201	3,220,517	-	(30,772)	3,189,745	2,689,745
*Tuolumne	108	88	0.38%	0.16%	0.23%	123	0.83	102,247	221	1.57	160,469	356,598	289,701	55,179	-	344,880	344,880
Ventura	208	432	0.72%	0.79%	0.77%	421	1.25	153,284	757	5.37	822,984	1,828,854	1,485,761	-	(14,196)	1,471,565	1,475,192
*Yolo	197	330	0.68%	0.61%	0.63%	343	1.29	158,261	618	4.38	693,386	1,540,857	1,251,792	-	-	1,251,792	1,251,792
*Yuba	125	190	0.43%	0.35%	0.37%	204	1.21	149,125	367	2.60	387,640	861,422	699,819	-	-	699,819	699,819
Total	28,772	54,509	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	54,509			98,116	695.86	\$ 103,360,411	\$ 229,689,803	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 1,640,804	\$ (1,640,804)	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 186,700,000

Median annual salary of county attorneys \$ 122,864

Fiscal Year 2026-27 Court Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding: Small Court Eligibility for Additional Funding Requests

Court*	2026-27 Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need (Current Year) A	2026-27 Proposed Allocation B	Allocation Based on Small Court Adjustments (Before cap at 100% of funding need) C	Difference between Proposed Allocation and Allocation Based on Small Court Adjustments (Before cap at 100% of funding need) D	Maximum Additional Funding For Small Court Requests (50% of col D) E	2026-27 CAC Allocation Based On Court Spending Plan F
*Alpine	\$ 18,842	\$ 18,842	\$ 20,169	\$ 1,327	\$ 664	\$ 18,842
*Amador	197,298	171,210	171,210	0	0	171,210
Butte	1,113,327	1,031,012	1,031,012	0	0	1,031,012
*Calaveras	283,738	264,817	264,817	0	0	264,817
*Colusa	82,811	82,811	88,388	5,577	2,789	62,811
*Del Norte	238,188	238,188	254,989	16,801	8,401	246,589
*El Dorado	789,307	789,307	789,307	0	0	789,307
*Glenn	150,136	150,135	159,757	9,622	4,811	154,946
Humboldt	946,913	946,913	1,025,223	78,310	39,155	956,913
Imperial	705,469	705,469	820,822	115,353	57,677	763,146
*Inyo	58,458	58,459	70,951	12,492	6,246	64,705
Kings	1,067,882	1,048,984	1,048,984	0	0	1,048,984
*Lake	252,714	252,714	307,076	54,362	27,181	279,895
*Lassen	155,516	155,516	160,670	5,154	2,577	158,093
Madera	963,539	881,306	881,306	0	0	881,306
*Marin	446,963	408,419	408,419	0	0	408,419
*Mariposa	123,325	119,874	119,874	0	0	119,874
Mendocino	635,040	635,041	658,291	23,250	11,625	646,666
*Modoc	78,163	78,163	110,833	32,670	16,335	94,498
*Mono	37,383	32,924	32,924	0	0	32,924
*Monterey	734,859	596,999	596,999	0	0	596,999
*Napa	401,278	325,998	325,998	0	0	325,998
*Nevada	179,215	179,216	179,216	0	0	179,216
Placer	1,010,654	821,055	821,055	0	0	821,055
*Plumas	116,896	116,896	160,994	44,098	22,049	138,945
*San Benito	118,842	96,547	96,547	0	0	96,547
San Luis Obispo	964,094	783,230	783,230	0	0	783,230
*San Mateo	775,782	630,245	630,245	0	0	630,245
*Santa Cruz	538,795	538,795	538,795	0	0	538,795
*Sierra	30,828	30,828	35,587	4,759	2,380	30,828
*Siskiyou	190,087	190,087	256,552	66,465	33,233	200,087
Solano	1,274,691	1,035,559	1,035,559	0	0	1,035,559
*Sutter	440,977	374,503	374,503	0	0	374,503
*Tehama	364,213	364,213	372,647	8,434	4,217	364,213
*Trinity	65,886	65,886	83,204	17,318	8,659	74,545
*Tuolumne	356,598	344,880	344,880	0	0	344,880
Yolo	1,540,857	1,251,792	1,251,792	0	0	1,251,792
*Yuba	861,422	699,819	699,819	0	0	699,819
Reserve	-	100,000	-	-	-	-
Total	\$ 18,310,986	\$ 16,616,652	\$ 17,112,644	\$ 495,992	\$ 247,999	\$ 16,682,213

* = smallest courts

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

Title: Court Interpreter Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27

Date: 6/5/2026

Contact: Douglas G. Denton, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Leadership Support Services | 415-865-7870 | douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of revised recommendations for fiscal year (FY) 2026–27 Court Interpreters Program (CIP) allocations to trial courts due to an additional \$20 million included in the May Revision to address the growing costs of court interpreter services.

Background

The Governor’s FY 2026–27 proposed budget, released in January 2026, included an appropriation of \$135.1 million for court interpreter services. The May Revision, released on May 14, 2026, included an additional \$20 million annually in FYs 2026–27 and 2027–28 from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) to address rising interpreter costs. This increase is based on recent spending patterns for the TCTF CIP, including the \$19.1 million shortfall for FY 2025–26.¹ With the \$20 million augmentation, the total appropriation for FY 2026–27 is \$155.1 million.²

Over the past three fiscal years, the Judicial Council has utilized most of the \$35 million in program savings that accumulated during the COVID-19 pandemic. As court interpreter costs continue to rise and program savings decline, the council is working closely with the administration to secure sufficient funding to maintain current levels of court interpreter services. The council-approved methodology for allocation of funding and addressing court shortfalls is outlined in the January 2023 Judicial Council report.³ The proportional allocation methodology is based on each court’s most recent three-year average of available expenditure data, up to the appropriation amount, as reflected in Attachment 2A, Column E.

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Circulating Order Number [CO-26-01](#) (March 19, 2026). The request to augment the FY 2025–26 appropriation with \$19.1 million from program savings requires approval from the Department of Finance and Legislature. The distribution will likely occur in early FY 2026–27, following the 30-day notification to the Legislature.

² For FY 2026–27, \$8.7 million from program savings and \$11.3 million from surplus civil filing revenues will be used for the \$20 million augmentation. In FY 2027–28, the \$20 million is all from surplus civil filing revenues. Each fiscal year, \$87,000 is set aside for improvements to the Court Interpreter Data Collection System. Total funding available to courts in FY 2026–27 is \$155.034 million.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts: Court Interpreters Program Funding and Allocation Methodology (Jan. 20, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11533862&GUID=BF5043BE-FE6C-4464-B2CE-336C36D5DB40>.

On May 7, 2026, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) approved the initial CIP allocation recommendations as part of the overall trial court operations allocation for FY 2026–27 based on funding included in Governor’s January budget proposal and prior to the May Revision’s proposed augmentation.⁴ The proposed allocations for FY 2026–27 have been updated to incorporate the additional \$20 million included in the May Revision, with the distribution calculated using the existing proportional allocation methodology.

On June 3, 2026, the TCBAC approved the updated allocations via an action by email between meetings.⁵ The updated allocations are presented in Attachment 2A, and the specific changes reflected in the revised FY 2026–27 proposed allocations are described below:

- The CIP allocations approved by the TCBAC on May 7, 2026, are shown in Column F and Column G (interpreter benefits), which reflect the initial \$135.0 million to be allocated to the trial courts based on the CIP appropriation in the Governor’s Budget.
- After the May 7 TCBAC meeting, updated FY 2024–25 eligible expenditure data was incorporated to ensure the methodology used the most current information, affecting the three-year expenditure average in column D and each courts’ percentage of total expenditures in Column E.
- Adjustments to the prior year expenditures were recalculated using the updated FY 2024–25 expenditure data. These adjustments are reflected in Column G.
- Allocation of the \$20 million augmentation in the May Revision, distributed proportionally based on each courts’ share of the three-year average eligible interpreter expenditures is shown in Column H.
- The final proposed allocation, totaling \$155.0 million, is shown in Column J.

The Judicial Council will continue working with courts to implement cost containment measures regarding court interpreter expenditures and will also collaborate with the administration to secure additional long-term funding for the TCTF CIP program for FY 2028–29 and out years.

To continue monitoring court interpreter expenditures, it is recommended that staff conduct a midyear survey on the TCTF CIP funding in FY 2026–27 to gauge court expenditures under the new allocation. The current process will also remain in place whereby excess funding from courts is reallocated to courts with a shortfall, as available, up to the appropriation amount.

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.

⁴ See Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee report, Item 3, Allocations for Trial Court Operations for Fiscal Year 2026–27, p. 23 (May 7, 2026): <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20260507-materials.pdf>.

⁵ See Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee report, Item 2, Court Interpreter Allocations for Fiscal Year 2026–27 (Jun. 3, 2026): https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20260603-materials-r_version3.pdf.

Recommendation

1. Approve the FY 2026–27 allocations for CIP, which reflect the \$20 million augmentation, as detailed in Attachment 2A, including any needed technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the final enacted budget; and
2. Direct Judicial Council staff to conduct a midyear survey of trial courts in FY 2026–27 to identify court expenditures and any courts experiencing a shortfall for a potential reallocation of available funds, up to the appropriated amount.

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

Attachment

Attachment 2A: Court Interpreter Allocations for FY 2026–27

Court	FY 2022-23 Eligible Expenditures	FY 2023-24 Eligible Expenditures	FY 2024-25 Eligible Expenditures	3-Year Expenditure Average	% of Total	FY 2026-27 Allocation of Governor's Budget CIP Funding ¹	Adjustments to Base for Prior Year Expenditure Updates ²	FY 2026-27 Proposed Augmentation of \$20 million	FY 2026-27 Benefits Cost Change ³	FY 2026-27 CIP Allocation (based on May Revision)
	A	B	C	D (Avg. A, B, C)	E (D / Total D)	F (as approved by TCBAC)	G = (E x \$135M)-F	H = E x \$20M	I	J = F+G+H+I
Alameda	\$ 5,572,339	\$ 5,964,654	\$ 6,288,474	\$ 5,941,822	4.343%	\$ 5,815,753	\$ 23,268	\$ 868,519	\$ 34,362	\$ 6,741,901
Alpine	\$ 48	\$ 1,459	\$ 1,443	\$ 983	0.001%	\$ 951	\$ 16	\$ 144	\$ -	\$ 1,110
Amador	\$ 68,168	\$ 60,198	\$ 69,896	\$ 66,088	0.048%	\$ 64,956	\$ (12)	\$ 9,660	\$ -	\$ 74,604
Butte	\$ 241,121	\$ 286,681	\$ 225,305	\$ 251,036	0.183%	\$ 270,391	\$ (23,698)	\$ 36,694	\$ -	\$ 283,387
Calaveras	\$ 50,714	\$ 24,070	\$ 23,597	\$ 32,794	0.024%	\$ 32,164	\$ 62	\$ 4,794	\$ -	\$ 37,020
Colusa	\$ 114,057	\$ 139,143	\$ 143,892	\$ 132,364	0.097%	\$ 143,820	\$ (13,746)	\$ 19,348	\$ -	\$ 149,421
Contra Costa	\$ 2,923,436	\$ 3,677,458	\$ 3,268,429	\$ 3,289,774	2.404%	\$ 3,230,947	\$ 1,909	\$ 480,868	\$ 19,186	\$ 3,732,910
Del Norte	\$ 35,603	\$ 19,924	\$ 21,533	\$ 25,687	0.019%	\$ 25,242	\$ 1	\$ 3,755	\$ -	\$ 28,997
El Dorado	\$ 251,451	\$ 249,078	\$ 283,625	\$ 261,384	0.191%	\$ 256,605	\$ 257	\$ 38,207	\$ -	\$ 295,069
Fresno	\$ 2,570,644	\$ 2,771,072	\$ 3,031,918	\$ 2,791,211	2.040%	\$ 2,744,045	\$ (1,125)	\$ 407,993	\$ 21,068	\$ 3,171,980
Glenn	\$ 175,101	\$ 161,154	\$ 122,629	\$ 152,961	0.112%	\$ 161,357	\$ (11,042)	\$ 22,358	\$ -	\$ 172,673
Humboldt	\$ 103,925	\$ 89,109	\$ 146,563	\$ 113,199	0.083%	\$ 77,496	\$ 33,744	\$ 16,546	\$ (71)	\$ 127,716
Imperial	\$ 759,570	\$ 846,439	\$ 803,920	\$ 803,310	0.587%	\$ 787,261	\$ 2,150	\$ 117,420	\$ 3,089	\$ 909,921
Inyo	\$ 66,536	\$ 73,179	\$ 78,386	\$ 72,700	0.053%	\$ 71,456	\$ (13)	\$ 10,627	\$ -	\$ 82,069
Kern	\$ 3,822,586	\$ 3,808,574	\$ 4,078,148	\$ 3,903,103	2.853%	\$ 3,832,612	\$ 2,961	\$ 570,518	\$ 16,139	\$ 4,422,231
Kings	\$ 655,237	\$ 748,444	\$ 772,282	\$ 725,321	0.530%	\$ 712,880	\$ (108)	\$ 106,021	\$ 3,313	\$ 822,106
Lake	\$ 189,100	\$ 212,696	\$ 230,733	\$ 210,843	0.154%	\$ 207,234	\$ (39)	\$ 30,819	\$ -	\$ 238,014
Lassen	\$ 52,702	\$ 64,121	\$ 40,253	\$ 52,359	0.038%	\$ 51,462	\$ (10)	\$ 7,653	\$ -	\$ 59,106
Los Angeles	\$ 35,445,376	\$ 38,502,132	\$ 40,836,712	\$ 38,261,407	27.963%	\$ 37,610,069	\$ (10,639)	\$ 5,592,688	\$ 424,673	\$ 43,616,790
Madera	\$ 922,361	\$ 870,812	\$ 1,034,722	\$ 942,632	0.689%	\$ 926,496	\$ (173)	\$ 137,785	\$ 8,044	\$ 1,072,152
Marin	\$ 861,126	\$ 809,134	\$ 838,915	\$ 836,392	0.611%	\$ 892,503	\$ (70,582)	\$ 122,256	\$ 9,763	\$ 953,940
Mariposa	\$ 60,799	\$ 55,728	\$ 46,622	\$ 54,383	0.040%	\$ 53,624	\$ (182)	\$ 7,949	\$ -	\$ 61,391
Mendocino	\$ 526,570	\$ 679,323	\$ 452,012	\$ 552,635	0.404%	\$ 543,175	\$ (102)	\$ 80,779	\$ (0)	\$ 623,852
Merced	\$ 1,190,720	\$ 1,311,064	\$ 1,507,039	\$ 1,336,274	0.977%	\$ 1,313,418	\$ (263)	\$ 195,324	\$ 13,253	\$ 1,521,732
Modoc	\$ 4,004	\$ 6,737	\$ 18,367	\$ 9,703	0.007%	\$ 9,390	\$ 145	\$ 1,418	\$ -	\$ 10,953
Mono	\$ 63,477	\$ 66,452	\$ 84,289	\$ 71,406	0.052%	\$ 70,184	\$ (13)	\$ 10,437	\$ -	\$ 80,608
Monterey	\$ 1,676,285	\$ 1,832,741	\$ 1,755,990	\$ 1,755,005	1.283%	\$ 1,721,699	\$ 2,942	\$ 256,530	\$ 4,106	\$ 1,985,277
Napa	\$ 774,734	\$ 954,082	\$ 1,152,650	\$ 960,488	0.702%	\$ 944,047	\$ (177)	\$ 140,395	\$ 7,321	\$ 1,091,586
Nevada	\$ 100,455	\$ 119,181	\$ 140,324	\$ 119,987	0.088%	\$ 117,584	\$ 326	\$ 17,538	\$ (54)	\$ 135,396
Orange	\$ 8,857,130	\$ 9,014,165	\$ 9,197,418	\$ 9,022,904	6.594%	\$ 9,082,350	\$ (215,554)	\$ 1,318,882	\$ 11,973	\$ 10,197,650
Placer	\$ 825,025	\$ 1,146,546	\$ 886,496	\$ 952,689	0.696%	\$ 936,107	\$ 99	\$ 139,255	\$ 2,681	\$ 1,078,143
Plumas	\$ 3,512	\$ 1,863	\$ 4,922	\$ 3,432	0.003%	\$ 3,374	\$ (1)	\$ 502	\$ -	\$ 3,875
Riverside	\$ 6,879,661	\$ 7,215,270	\$ 7,349,891	\$ 7,148,274	5.224%	\$ 7,026,214	\$ (1,615)	\$ 1,044,867	\$ 22,116	\$ 8,091,581
Sacramento	\$ 5,304,991	\$ 5,248,074	\$ 5,496,362	\$ 5,349,809	3.910%	\$ 5,258,233	\$ (983)	\$ 781,984	\$ (115,937)	\$ 5,923,297
San Benito	\$ 154,800	\$ 159,978	\$ 154,868	\$ 156,549	0.114%	\$ 153,869	\$ (29)	\$ 22,883	\$ -	\$ 176,723
San Bernardino	\$ 6,388,126	\$ 6,115,910	\$ 6,427,485	\$ 6,310,507	4.612%	\$ 6,202,106	\$ (780)	\$ 922,410	\$ 8,837	\$ 7,132,573
San Diego	\$ 6,666,245	\$ 6,875,713	\$ 7,087,347	\$ 6,876,435	5.026%	\$ 6,758,113	\$ (651)	\$ 1,005,132	\$ (121,455)	\$ 7,641,139
San Francisco	\$ 4,250,681	\$ 5,228,778	\$ 5,966,135	\$ 5,148,531	3.763%	\$ 5,060,401	\$ (946)	\$ 752,563	\$ 39,222	\$ 5,851,240
San Joaquin	\$ 2,005,088	\$ 2,297,666	\$ 2,948,246	\$ 2,417,000	1.766%	\$ 2,390,998	\$ (15,815)	\$ 353,294	\$ 4,413	\$ 2,732,890
San Luis Obispo	\$ 815,221	\$ 880,783	\$ 961,145	\$ 885,716	0.647%	\$ 870,555	\$ (163)	\$ 129,466	\$ 5,109	\$ 1,004,967
San Mateo	\$ 3,302,921	\$ 3,769,405	\$ 3,725,505	\$ 3,599,277	2.631%	\$ 3,543,519	\$ (6,515)	\$ 526,108	\$ 40,450	\$ 4,103,563
Santa Barbara	\$ 2,776,137	\$ 3,153,259	\$ 3,415,741	\$ 3,115,046	2.277%	\$ 3,061,592	\$ (442)	\$ 455,328	\$ 36,898	\$ 3,553,376
Santa Clara	\$ 5,883,009	\$ 7,792,193	\$ 9,157,875	\$ 7,611,026	5.563%	\$ 7,414,354	\$ 64,990	\$ 1,112,507	\$ 27,232	\$ 8,619,083
Santa Cruz	\$ 863,863	\$ 1,147,228	\$ 1,050,489	\$ 1,020,527	0.746%	\$ 1,002,981	\$ (111)	\$ 149,171	\$ 1,781	\$ 1,153,822
Shasta	\$ 554,384	\$ 632,690	\$ 400,182	\$ 529,085	0.387%	\$ 491,362	\$ 28,570	\$ 77,337	\$ -	\$ 597,268
Sierra	\$ 796	\$ 83	\$ 718	\$ 532	0.000%	\$ 523	\$ (0)	\$ 78	\$ -	\$ 601
Siskiyou	\$ 64,769	\$ 65,721	\$ 74,889	\$ 68,460	0.050%	\$ 70,700	\$ (3,425)	\$ 10,007	\$ -	\$ 77,282
Solano	\$ 837,997	\$ 933,208	\$ 1,290,816	\$ 1,020,673	0.746%	\$ 1,003,202	\$ (188)	\$ 149,192	\$ 7,020	\$ 1,159,226
Sonoma	\$ 1,759,630	\$ 2,458,124	\$ 2,510,895	\$ 2,242,883	1.639%	\$ 2,204,490	\$ (412)	\$ 327,843	\$ 8,846	\$ 2,540,767
Stanislaus	\$ 1,523,150	\$ 1,806,126	\$ 2,234,884	\$ 1,854,720	1.356%	\$ 1,822,856	\$ (225)	\$ 271,105	\$ 4,736	\$ 2,098,471
Sutter	\$ 332,995	\$ 327,820	\$ 289,143	\$ 316,653	0.231%	\$ 311,232	\$ (58)	\$ 46,285	\$ -	\$ 357,459

Court	FY 2022-23 Eligible Expenditures A	FY 2023-24 Eligible Expenditures B	FY 2024-25 Eligible Expenditures C	3-Year Expenditure Average D (Avg. A, B, C)	% of Total E (D / Total D)	FY 2026-27 Allocation of Governor's Budget CIP Funding ¹ F (as approved by TCBAC)	Adjustments to Base for Prior Year Expenditure Updates ² G = (E x \$135M)-F	FY 2026-27 Proposed Augmentation of \$20 million H = E x \$20M	FY 2026-27 Benefits Cost Change ³ I	FY 2026-27 CIP Allocation (based on May Revision) J = F+G+H+I
Tehama	\$ 228,205	\$ 243,641	\$ 215,472	\$ 229,106	0.167%	\$ 225,184	\$ (42)	\$ 33,489	\$ 3,778	\$ 262,408
Trinity	\$ 64,455	\$ 60,828	\$ 13,728	\$ 46,337	0.034%	\$ 45,544	\$ (9)	\$ 6,773	\$ -	\$ 52,309
Tulare	\$ 2,593,772	\$ 3,052,386	\$ 3,093,434	\$ 2,913,197	2.129%	\$ 2,863,330	\$ (536)	\$ 425,823	\$ 8,377	\$ 3,296,995
Tuolumne	\$ 60,893	\$ 79,080	\$ 76,975	\$ 72,316	0.053%	\$ 71,078	\$ (13)	\$ 10,570	\$ -	\$ 81,635
Ventura	\$ 2,726,099	\$ 3,131,828	\$ 4,096,068	\$ 3,317,998	2.425%	\$ 3,216,686	\$ 43,907	\$ 484,993	\$ 13,191	\$ 3,758,776
Yolo	\$ 677,063	\$ 802,170	\$ 802,384	\$ 760,539	0.556%	\$ 572,271	\$ 175,109	\$ 111,168	\$ 1,296	\$ 859,845
Yuba	\$ 84,916	\$ 130,381	\$ 111,905	\$ 109,067	0.080%	\$ 107,200	\$ (20)	\$ 15,942	\$ -	\$ 123,123
Total	\$ 125,763,779	\$ 138,175,755	\$ 146,540,086	\$ 136,826,540	100.0%	\$ 134,459,244	\$ (0)	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 574,756	\$155,034,000

¹ As reflected in the Allocations for Trial Court Operations for Fiscal Year 2026-27 in attachment 3B, column T, as approved by TCBAC at its May 7, 2026 meeting. Reflective of allocation within budget authority of \$135,121,000.

² Updates to FY 2024-25 expenditures incorporated, leading to revised percent to total by court.

³ As reflected in the Allocations for Trial Court Operations for Fiscal Year 2026-27 in attachment 3B, column U, as approved by TCBAC at its May 7, 2026 meeting.