

Proposed Court Technology Modernization Funding Models FY 2021-22
for Judicial Council Technology Committee

Available Program Amount

\$15,000,000

Court	Pro Rata Based on Workload Formula (WF) Allocation*	No CMS Projects Funded	CMS Projects Funded First			CMS & Small Court Priority 1 Projects Funded First
		Option A- Workload Only	Option B1- Workload	Option B2-Workload & Small Court Priority 1 Projects [†]	Option B3- Workload & Flat \$40K to Small Courts	Option C- Workload [†]
CA Tyler User Group CMS Request [‡]	---	---	\$855,374	\$855,374	\$855,374	\$855,374
Alameda	3.8%	\$617,852	\$471,009	\$471,009	\$471,009	\$442,166
Alpine	0.0%	---	---	---	---	---
Amador	0.2%	\$28,314	\$21,585	\$210,000	\$40,000	\$210,000
Butte	0.6%	\$91,866	\$70,032	\$70,032	\$70,032	\$65,744
Calaveras	0.1%	---	---	---	---	---
Colusa	0.1%	\$17,304	\$13,192	\$27,601	\$40,000	\$27,601
Contra Costa	2.2%	\$364,565	\$277,920	\$277,920	\$277,920	\$260,901
Del Norte	0.2%	\$25,751	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000
El Dorado	0.4%	\$62,387	\$47,560	\$47,560	\$47,560	\$44,647
Fresno	2.6%	\$431,052	\$328,606	\$328,606	\$328,606	\$308,483
Glenn	0.1%	\$20,735	\$15,807	\$165,280	\$40,000	\$165,280
Humboldt	0.4%	\$57,079	\$43,513	\$43,513	\$43,513	\$40,849
Imperial	0.5%	\$76,479	\$58,302	\$58,302	\$58,302	\$54,732
Inyo	0.1%	\$17,362	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000
Kern	2.8%	\$462,532	\$352,604	\$352,604	\$352,604	\$331,011
Kings	0.4%	---	---	---	---	---
Lake	0.2%	\$31,798	\$24,241	\$30,000	\$40,000	\$30,000
Lassen	0.1%	\$19,330	\$14,736	\$33,000	\$40,000	\$33,000
Los Angeles	27.5%	\$4,478,214	\$3,981,893	\$3,981,893	\$3,981,893	\$3,772,836
Madera	0.4%	\$69,992	\$53,358	\$53,358	\$53,358	\$50,090
Marin	0.6%	\$105,692	\$80,573	\$80,573	\$80,573	\$75,639
Mariposa	0.1%	\$12,688	\$9,672	\$25,000	\$40,000	\$25,000
Mendocino	0.3%	\$51,167	\$39,006	\$39,006	\$39,006	\$36,617
Merced	0.7%	\$109,638	\$83,581	\$83,581	\$83,581	\$78,463
Modoc	0.1%	\$9,144	\$6,971	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$40,000
Mono	0.1%	---	---	---	---	---
Monterey	1.0%	\$168,390	\$128,369	\$128,369	\$128,369	\$120,508
Napa	0.4%	\$64,585	\$49,236	\$49,236	\$49,236	\$46,221
Nevada	0.2%	\$39,596	\$30,185	\$51,000	\$40,000	\$51,000
Orange	7.3%	\$1,191,390	\$908,236	\$908,236	\$908,236	\$852,619
Placer	0.9%	\$149,847	\$114,233	\$114,233	\$114,233	\$107,238
Plumas [§]	0.1%	\$13,026	\$9,930	\$9,930	\$40,000	\$9,322
Riverside	5.6%	---	---	---	---	---
Sacramento	4.2%	\$685,218	\$891,854	\$891,854	\$891,854	\$859,866
San Benito	0.2%	---	---	---	---	---
San Bernardino	5.3%	\$860,512	\$655,997	\$655,997	\$655,997	\$615,826
San Diego	7.5%	\$1,214,662	\$925,977	\$925,977	\$925,977	\$869,273
San Francisco	2.9%	\$465,880	\$355,156	\$355,156	\$355,156	\$333,407
San Joaquin	1.9%	\$308,920	\$235,500	\$235,500	\$235,500	\$221,078

Proposed Court Technology Modernization Funding Models FY 2021-22
for Judicial Council Technology Committee

Court	Pro Rata Based on Workload Formula (WF) Allocation*	No CMS Projects Funded	CMS Projects Funded First			CMS & Small Court Priority 1 Projects Funded First
		Option A- Workload Only	Option B1- Workload	Option B2-Workload & Small Court Priority 1 Projects [†]	Option B3- Workload & Flat \$40K to Small Courts	Option C- Workload [‡]
San Luis Obispo	0.8%	\$123,643	\$94,257	\$94,257	\$94,257	\$88,485
San Mateo	1.9%	\$310,504	\$236,708	\$236,708	\$236,708	\$222,213
Santa Barbara	1.2%	\$192,277	\$146,579	\$146,579	\$146,579	\$137,603
Santa Clara	3.9%	\$637,195	\$485,755	\$485,755	\$485,755	\$456,009
Santa Cruz	0.7%	\$110,836	\$84,494	\$84,494	\$84,494	\$79,320
Shasta	0.6%	\$101,008	\$77,002	\$77,002	\$77,002	\$72,286
Sierra	0.0%	\$6,673	\$5,087	\$49,158	\$40,000	\$49,158
Siskiyou	0.2%	\$25,106	\$619,139	\$600,000	\$640,000	\$600,000
Solano	1.2%	\$198,897	\$151,626	\$151,626	\$151,626	\$142,341
Sonoma	1.2%	\$202,265	\$154,193	\$154,193	\$154,193	\$144,751
Stanislaus	1.3%	\$209,145	\$159,438	\$159,438	\$159,438	\$149,675
Sutter	0.3%	\$50,669	\$38,626	\$38,626	\$38,626	\$36,261
Tehama	0.2%	\$38,298	\$29,196	\$55,000	\$40,000	\$55,000
Trinity	0.1%	---	---	---	---	---
Tulare	1.2%	\$192,834	\$147,004	\$147,004	\$147,004	\$138,002
Tuolumne	0.2%	\$31,663	\$24,137	\$179,735	\$40,000	\$179,735
Ventura	1.9%	---	---	---	---	---
Yolo	0.6%	\$95,642	\$72,911	\$72,911	\$72,911	\$68,446
Yuba	0.3%	\$42,871	\$32,682	\$32,682	\$32,682	\$30,681
100.0%		\$14,892,490	\$14,913,043	\$15,564,869	\$15,209,165	\$14,884,755

Case Management System (CMS) Projects	
CA Tyler User Group CMS Request	\$855,374
Del Norte	\$600,000
Inyo	\$600,000
Los Angeles	\$568,000
Sacramento	\$369,490
Siskiyou	\$600,000
\$3,592,864	

Key
Small courts defined as courts with .2% or less of WF
Did not apply

* WF policy on new money includes:

1. Bring all Cluster 1 courts up to 100 percent of funding need.
2. Allocate up to 50 percent of remaining funding to courts under the statewide average funding ratio. Allocated funds will bring courts up to but not over the statewide average funding ratio.
 - a. The first 50 percent allocation of new funding to courts below the statewide average will be scaled by courts' distance from the statewide average and size based on the courts' Workload Formula need.
3. Allocate remaining funding to all courts based on the Workload Formula.
4. Allow no court's allocation to exceed 100 percent of its need unless it is the result of a funding floor calculation.

[†] Estimated amounts pending final recommendation of projects and confirmation of project budget estimates.

[‡] CMS enhancement request for 32 courts

[§] Court was unable to submit RFA by deadline due to wildfire evacuation.