



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR NOVEMBER 4, 2021
VIRTUAL MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the September 22, 2021 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Base Funding Floor Requests (Action Required)	5
Item 2 – Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Methodology (Action Required)	9
Attachment A: 2022-23 CIP Allocation Methodology	13



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: November 4, 2021
Time: 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/1457>

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

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

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

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

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the September 22, 2021 Funding Methodology Subcommittee meeting.

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

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by 4:00 p.m. on November 3, 2021 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1

Base Funding Floor Requests (Action Required)

Consideration of a base funding floor increase effective July 1, 2022 for two courts, Alpine and Sierra Superior Courts, currently set at \$800,000.

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

Item 2

Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Methodology (Action Required)

Consideration of recommendations from the Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee on an allocation methodology for CIP funding effective July 1, 2022.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Catrayel Wood, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

None

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

September 22, 2021
12:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/1376>

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley (Cochair), Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Hon. Kevin M. Seibert, and Hon. B. Scott Thomsen.

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Cochair), Mr. Chad Finke, Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. James Kim, Mr. Brandon E. Riley, Mr. Neal Taniguchi, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent:

Others Present: Ms. Fran Mueller, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Brandy Olivera, Ms. Michele Allan, Mr. Catrayel Wood, Ms. Audrey Fancy, and Ms. Kelly Meehleib.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The cochairs called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes of the April 12 and April 15, 2021 Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) meetings.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1)

Item 1: Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program: Funding Allocation Methodology for General Fund Supplement to Address Shortfall (Action Required)

Consideration of an allocation methodology for up to \$30 million in support of court appointed counsel in dependency cases.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Audrey Fancy, Principal Managing Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Ms. Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Action: The FMS voted to establish a working group to develop recommendations to be presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) at its October 14, 2021 meeting.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:31 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

(Action Item)

Title: Base Funding Floor Adjustment Requests
Date: 11/4/2021
Contact: Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-8027 | Oksana.Tuk@jud.ca.gov

Issue

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) work plan states that the subcommittee shall review the base funding floor amounts annually, if requested by the applicable courts, for presentation to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee no later than December, to determine whether an inflationary adjustment is needed. Alpine and Sierra Superior Courts have requested a funding floor adjustment for FMS consideration effective July 1, 2022.

Background

Base funding is currently allocated to the two smallest trial courts based on the minimum level of staffing and necessary operational costs.

When the Workload Formula was first approved, a funding floor was established for the smallest courts as there was operational funding needed above that which the Workload Formula provided. Based on staffing needs and operational costs at the time, a base funding floor amount of \$750,000 was approved by the Judicial Council at its February 20, 2014 business meeting, effective 2014-15¹.

At its March 15, 2019 business meeting, the council approved a \$50,000 inflationary adjustment, increasing the base funding floor to \$800,000, effective 2019-20². At that time, there had not been any adjustments to the initial base funding floor amount.

This increase, based on inflationary adjustments as reported by the Department of Finance (DOF) at that time, helped to account for increases to employee salaries and operating expenses and equipment. While these are factored into the Workload Formula for trial courts, the two base

¹ Judicial Council meeting report (February 20, 2014), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-itemK.pdf;
Judicial Council meeting minutes (February 20, 2014), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-minutes.pdf>

² Judicial Council meeting report (March 15, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7058011&GUID=805D0070-0C38-40C7-A8CE-F08E82D8DDD5>;
Judicial Council meeting minutes (March 15, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=640295&GUID=4C88EDD5-7207-4839-BB72-89B184E22C9B>

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

funding floor courts did not benefit from these adjustments in the model since base floor funding is allocated outside of the Workload Formula.

Base Funding Floor Requests

In July 2021, Judicial Council Budget Services staff contacted the court executive officers of Alpine and Sierra Superior Courts to ascertain the need to request an update to the base funding floor amount, and both courts expressed strong interest. The court executive officer of the Sierra Superior Court indicated an urgent need for a funding floor adjustment and is requesting a \$150,000 ongoing increase. Due to staffing challenges and the impact of wildfires in the area, Alpine Superior Court was unable to submit a formal request for a funding floor increase, but was able to provide an email request absent a targeted dollar amount and expressed a desire to align with Sierra's request, which Sierra Superior Court supports.

Sierra Superior Court

Sierra Superior Court indicated the need for a funding floor increase driven by information technology (IT), case management system (CMS) costs, benefit cost increases, staffing, recruitment, retention, security, and the impact of inflation.

IT and CMS – It has been Sierra's past practice and only option to contract out for IT management and support. Due to its rural location and small pool for human resources, Sierra is unable to bring in an in-house specialist who can adequately support its IT needs. The cost for this service has increased from \$25,000 to \$54,000 per year.

Sierra's CMS is currently hosted by Placer Superior Court because the court does not have the internal appliances/servers and on-site staff expertise necessary to manage and maintain the system. As a result, the court pays a fee for these services as well as a fee for a licensing agreement which both have increased from 1 to 3 percent each year. The current annual licensing fee for the CMS and the annual cost to host the CMS is currently \$88,000 or 46 percent of Sierra's operational expenses.

Modernization Projects – Recently, Sierra was able to participate in some court modernization projects due to the reprioritization of these critical efforts among limited court staff resources and with the additional assistance of a project manager from the Judicial Council Information Technology office. With IT management now in place, the court will use this resource to support the necessary security advancements required by the Judicial Council as well as advancements in technology to better serve the public. Sierra's cost for the project manager, labor, and equipment (not covered by grant money) is approximately \$33,000.

Benefits – The health costs for the court have increased more than 5 percent each year over the last seven years, and a recent County Board of Supervisors' decision approved the refinance of

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

the current pension obligation bond to reduce the interest rate and shorten the repayment period. Once the bond is refinanced, the payment amount is expected to increase to \$107,000, which represents a 45 percent increase. Because both Sierra and Alpine are base funding floor courts, increases in benefit costs are not provided to the court dollar-for-dollar, as they are for the other 56 trial courts.

Staffing, Recruitment, and Retention – The court is currently operating with reduced staffing to stay within budget and left 1.5 positions vacant last year. This resulted in the court operating with 3.5 full-time equivalent employees instead of 5.0, which provides difficulty in covering sick and vacation time, and is impacting the quality of service provided. Additional funds for staffing and the opportunity to retain employees through regular step increases and negotiated cost-of-living adjustments are needed.

The court must carefully balance its obligation to provide access to justice to the public with the rising operational costs of providing critical services. Investments in IT access are essential for small courts in rural areas to support public access given the unique challenges of rural locations. These include the lack of economy of scale for key services given the small size of the court, and the travel distance to the courthouse and the impact of inclement weather for court users. Adequate financial resources for staffing and IT support will ensure continued public access to justice and safety for court users and staff.

Alpine Superior Court

Alpine Superior Court has expressed a need to address deficiencies in areas of IT management and support, including a CMS upgrade, managing the ongoing cost impact of Judicial Council court modernization projects, security, disaster recovery; human resources, including training, cost-of-living adjustments, and benefits; jury and grand jury management; and accounting, finance, and audit support. The court is currently operating with three clerks instead of four to stay within budget, which is not sustainable.

Consumer Price Index (CPI)

A funding augmentation of \$150,000 represents an approximate 19 percent increase to the current base funding floor amount of \$800,000. This is intended to reflect adjustments for CPI as well as increased operational costs for managing IT, CMS, and unfunded accrued liability. For reference, the percent change in the CPI for California from 2018-19, the year following information used for the last funding floor increase, through 2022-23 is 12.3 percent for the Los Angeles region and 13.1 percent for the San Francisco region (see Table 1 below).

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
 BUDGET SERVICES
 Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

Table 1: CPI Information as Available from the DOF³

Fiscal Year	Los Angeles % Change	San Francisco % Change
2018-19	3.4	4.0
2019-20	2.5	2.4
2020-21	2.0	2.1
2021-22	1.9	2.1
2022-23	2.5	2.5
Total	12.3%	13.1%

Information as of April 2021; fiscal years 2021-22 and 2022-23 are forecasted.

Recommendation

It is requested that the FMS consider the information provided to determine if a recommendation to increase the current base funding floor amount of \$800,000 is warranted, for consideration by the TCBAC, Judicial Branch Budget Committee, and Judicial Council effective July 1, 2022.

³ Department of Finance, Consumer Price Indices, May Revision Forecast,
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Economics/Indicators/Inflation/>

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

(Action Item)

Title: Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Allocation Methodology
Date: 11/4/2021
Contact: Catrayel Wood, Senior Analyst, Budget Services
916-643-7008 | catrayel.wood@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider recommendations by the Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee (subcommittee) on an ongoing, workload-based methodology for allocation of CIP funding, including video remote interpreting (VRI), cross assignments, benefit cost changes, and unspent funds effective July 1, 2022.

Background

Judicial Council Meeting

On May 21, 2021, the Judicial Council approved the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's (TCBAC's) recommendation for a one-time CIP allocation methodology for 2021-22 to allocate the same amount of funding provided to trial courts in 2020-21; to return unspent 2020-21 funds for use in offsetting shortfalls courts experienced in 2020-21; and to revert remaining funds to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) as restricted program funding¹. The approved recommendation, which changed this appropriation from a reimbursement to an allocation methodology, recognized the need to address insufficient funding to reimburse trial courts based on actual expenditures.

The funding methodology used for current and prior year was a one-time approach to allocate available funds to provide the subcommittee additional time to develop an ongoing, workload-based methodology. This approach used available data on projected staff costs (with an added three-year Bureau of Labor statistics average) and actual contractor costs to identify projected need, and then allocated the appropriation on a proportional basis to each court as CIP expenditures have consistently exceeded the annual appropriation provided in the Budget Act.

¹ Judicial Council meeting report (May 21, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9331635&GUID=0A165B73-BAD7-4575-8D64-2A3240E3BEF2>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (May 21, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=803678&GUID=183ADEA3-1A53-4ED1-9E95-A43E3C390D21>.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee and Meetings

To ensure adequate, statewide representation dedicated to the ongoing development of the workload-based allocation methodology, the subcommittee, a subset of court executive officers of the TCBAC, was expanded effective September 15, 2021 to include additional members from the TCBAC and includes members of small, medium, and large courts as well as urban, rural, and suburban locales. A current list of subcommittee members is included in Table 1.

Table 1 – Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee Membership

#	Member Name and Court
1	Mr. Chad Finke, Alameda Superior Court
2	Mr. Shawn Landry, Yolo Superior Court
3	Ms. Krista LeVier, Lake Superior Court
4	Mr. Neal Taniguchi, San Mateo Superior Court
5	Mr. Brian Taylor, Solano Superior Court
6	Mr. David Yamasaki, Orange Superior Court

Through recent subcommittee deliberations, an allocation methodology recommendation was developed for implementation beginning in 2022-23. Due to the lack of available, consistent data in both the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (‘CIDCS’) and courts’ case management systems for a more focused workload-based approach, the subcommittee referred to historical spending to identify CIP need by court, applied a three-year average of each court’s total eligible CIP expenditures, and then recommended allocating dollars on a proportional basis up to the CIP appropriation.

Cross Assignments – In addressing cross assignments, it was determined that the current practice of a court receiving interpreter services from another “home” court, and the “home” court paying for the costs, needed to be considered and this process changed effective 2022-23 so that the receiving court reimburses the “home” court for services rendered. No updates were made to the historical figures used in the allocation methodology as there is no data currently available on historical cross assignment usage. Instead, the recommendation for receiving courts to reimburse “home” courts for interpreter services will be prospective and covered out of courts’ recommended allocation amount, with a process to be determined upon approval.

Video Remote Interpreting – In addressing VRI, it was determined that adjustments to the methodology would not be made. The goal is to provide courts with a defined allocation amount for planning purposes, and VRI efficiencies are still underway.

Benefit Cost Changes – A new consideration was made as it relates to cost benefit changes (i.e., health and retirement) for interpreters. Currently, these cost changes are tracked separately

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

for non-interpreter and interpreter staff cost changes. The non-interpreter cost changes are adjusted to each court dollar-for-dollar, while the interpreter cost change adjustment was rolled into the appropriation amount and then allocated to courts not based on their dollar-for-dollar change but rolled into the appropriation and allocated based on the reimbursement or allocation methodology in place at that time. Effective 2022-23, the recommendation is to treat these cost changes consistent with non-interpreters and provide courts their dollar-for-dollar change for interpreters going forward.

Lastly, the same approach of courts returning unspent funds are included in this methodology recommendation and is recommended for the current 2021-22 allocation as well. Returned funds can be used for reallocation as needed for courts facing a shortfall; however, courts will be responsible for its interpreter costs out of their operating budgets should the reallocation amount not be sufficient to cover the shortfall.

Attachment A provides details on the recommended methodology as if applied to the current year's allocations.

Future Allocation Methodology Items to Address

During these subcommittee deliberations, it was determined that this recommended approach is a starting point for the methodology and would need to be fine-tuned to take into consideration the COVID-19 pandemic and impact, and what data can be utilized and considered from courts' current case management systems and reporting capabilities. These items can assist in more clearly defining interpreter need by court, can provide support for budget change proposals as needed, and will be considered for a recommendation as needed beginning 2023-24 and ongoing.

Recommendations

The Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee recommends the following for approval, to be considered by the TCBAC at its November 16, 2021 meeting, followed by Judicial Branch Budget Committee consideration in December 2021 and Judicial Council consideration in January 2022:

1. Approve a proportional allocation methodology based on a three-year average of expenditure data available (2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20), up to the CIP appropriation amount effective 2022-23, while the subcommittee continues review of pandemic impact and reporting data considerations effective in 2023-24;
2. Require courts to return to the Judicial Council all unspent 2021-22, 2022-23 and ongoing CIP-allocated funds, which will first reimburse courts with a shortfall in each

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

respective year not to exceed the overall appropriation amount, with any remaining funds reverting to the TCTF as restricted program funding;

3. Allocate staff interpreter benefits dollar-for-dollar to courts reporting cost benefit changes effective 2022-23; and
4. Require receiving courts to offset extraordinary interpreter expenses to courts providing cross-assignments (or “home courts”) and charging the subcommittee with working with Judicial Council staff on development of a payment/reimbursement method.

Attachments

Attachment A: 2022-23 CIP Allocation Methodology

RECOMMENDED METHODOLOGY EFFECTIVE 2022 - 23

SCENARIO BASED ON CURRENT YEAR INFORMATION

Court	Total Reimbursed Expenditures ¹			3-Year Average D (Avg. A, B, C)	% of Total E (D / Total D)
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20 ²		
	A	B	C		
Alameda	\$ 4,994,709	\$ 5,491,760	\$ 5,360,994	\$ 5,282,488	4.414%
Alpine	1,426	2,336	-	1,254	0.001%
Amador	24,773	64,824	56,206	48,601	0.041%
Butte	227,263	210,505	197,038	211,602	0.177%
Calaveras	26,354	60,955	74,633	53,981	0.045%
Colusa	97,888	124,806	134,759	119,151	0.100%
Contra Costa	2,637,825	3,333,363	3,182,989	3,051,392	2.550%
Del Norte	49,298	61,063	53,349	54,570	0.046%
El Dorado	246,609	249,962	207,363	234,645	0.196%
Fresno	2,017,712	2,383,506	2,131,639	2,177,619	1.820%
Glenn	95,045	130,134	114,266	113,148	0.095%
Humboldt	175,045	229,942	184,169	196,385	0.164%
Imperial	508,413	569,293	580,832	552,846	0.462%
Inyo	45,097	72,353	79,793	65,748	0.055%
Kern	3,224,330	3,646,134	3,957,861	3,609,441	3.016%
Kings	467,843	470,995	544,340	494,392	0.413%
Lake	91,889	114,989	134,433	113,770	0.095%
Lassen	43,511	48,414	54,935	48,953	0.041%
Los Angeles	35,688,712	38,540,226	39,032,884	37,753,941	31.547%
Madera	557,225	592,718	578,204	576,049	0.481%
Marin	558,335	691,846	667,907	639,363	0.534%
Mariposa	32,342	41,374	21,901	31,872	0.027%
Mendocino	359,279	376,616	418,321	384,739	0.321%
Merced	966,879	1,056,300	1,089,640	1,037,606	0.867%
Modoc	5,305	7,201	3,510	5,338	0.004%
Mono	43,654	48,056	55,533	49,081	0.041%
Monterey	1,146,230	1,292,899	1,409,995	1,283,041	1.072%
Napa	661,583	679,987	699,487	680,352	0.569%
Nevada	73,370	73,507	67,586	71,488	0.060%
Orange	10,886,950	10,734,638	10,058,682	10,560,090	8.824%
Placer	486,303	549,588	477,053	504,315	0.421%
Plumas	6,460	15,036	11,446	10,980	0.009%
Riverside	5,314,665	5,301,396	6,130,551	5,582,204	4.664%
Sacramento	4,083,870	4,345,704	4,336,528	4,255,367	3.556%
San Benito	106,006	116,488	99,671	107,388	0.090%
San Bernardino	5,653,715	6,074,705	6,157,161	5,961,860	4.982%
San Diego	5,924,143	6,024,074	6,178,018	6,042,078	5.049%
San Francisco	3,372,792	3,840,708	3,771,960	3,661,820	3.060%
San Joaquin	1,746,143	1,810,602	1,689,788	1,748,844	1.461%
San Luis Obispo	688,397	814,806	954,270	819,158	0.684%
San Mateo	2,318,537	2,591,358	2,666,320	2,525,405	2.110%
Santa Barbara	1,914,515	2,136,538	2,043,928	2,031,660	1.698%
Santa Clara	7,056,941	7,289,792	5,846,426	6,731,053	5.624%
Santa Cruz	820,068	911,406	993,481	908,318	0.759%
Shasta	318,164	365,959	353,929	346,017	0.289%
Sierra	4,997	371	-	1,789	0.001%
Siskiyou	58,183	52,207	45,377	51,923	0.043%
Solano	604,941	675,939	664,477	648,452	0.542%
Sonoma	1,172,567	1,538,376	1,772,234	1,494,393	1.249%
Stanislaus	1,341,709	1,552,478	1,483,286	1,459,158	1.219%
Sutter	274,046	344,883	297,890	305,606	0.255%
Tehama	169,600	189,229	178,745	179,191	0.150%
Trinity	52,512	49,184	70,962	57,553	0.048%
Tulare	1,780,095	1,733,140	1,587,507	1,700,247	1.421%
Tuolumne	50,913	61,415	51,198	54,509	0.046%
Ventura	2,001,836	2,067,841	1,987,149	2,018,942	1.687%
Yolo	836,195	943,340	902,632	894,056	0.747%
Yuba	68,737	75,057	64,094	69,296	0.058%
Total	\$ 114,181,943	\$ 122,872,321	\$ 121,969,330	\$ 119,674,531	100.0%

Allocation of Approp. Before Benefit Changes	2020-21 Current Year Benefit Cost Changes	2021 Budget Act Benefit Cost Changes	2021-22 Current Year Benefit Cost Changes	Total Allocation
F (E * \$130.977m)	G	H	I	J (SUM F-I)
\$ 5,781,384	\$ (31,753)	\$ 21,056	TBD	\$ 5,770,686
1,372	-	-	TBD	1,372
53,191	-	-	TBD	53,191
231,587	-	-	TBD	231,587
59,079	-	-	TBD	59,079
130,404	-	-	TBD	130,404
3,339,576	(5,361)	258	TBD	3,334,473
59,724	-	-	TBD	59,724
256,805	(1)	-	TBD	256,804
2,383,281	25,336	(19,190)	TBD	2,389,427
123,834	-	-	TBD	123,834
214,933	-	-	TBD	214,933
605,059	3,523	3,214	TBD	611,796
71,957	-	-	TBD	71,957
3,950,329	44,695	8,468	TBD	4,003,492
541,085	138	280	TBD	541,502
124,515	-	-	TBD	124,515
53,577	-	-	TBD	53,577
41,319,551	(15,121)	484,332	TBD	41,788,762
630,453	2,028	8,169	TBD	640,650
699,746	(6,767)	1,310	TBD	694,288
34,883	-	-	TBD	34,883
421,075	6,076	3,324	TBD	430,475
1,135,602	4,898	4,079	TBD	1,144,579
5,843	-	-	TBD	5,843
53,717	-	-	TBD	53,717
1,404,216	(20,051)	3,424	TBD	1,387,590
744,607	5,754	(1,787)	TBD	748,574
78,239	-	-	TBD	78,239
11,557,421	17,209	177,499	TBD	11,752,129
551,944	783	2,516	TBD	555,243
12,017	-	-	TBD	12,017
6,109,406	38,120	96,219	TBD	6,243,745
4,657,259	(18,546)	34,552	TBD	4,673,265
117,530	-	-	TBD	117,530
6,524,919	(13,967)	97,882	TBD	6,608,833
6,612,713	(3,488)	52,160	TBD	6,661,385
4,007,655	(20,239)	20,908	TBD	4,008,323
1,914,011	6,991	17,270	TBD	1,938,272
896,522	-	9,158	TBD	905,680
2,763,913	630	8,163	TBD	2,772,706
2,223,537	3,838	18,965	TBD	2,246,340
7,366,757	-	2,557	TBD	7,369,314
994,103	3,109	4,039	TBD	1,001,250
378,696	-	-	TBD	378,696
1,958	-	-	TBD	1,958
56,826	-	-	TBD	56,826
709,694	177	853	TBD	710,725
1,635,528	-	13,196	TBD	1,648,724
1,596,965	11,061	2,949	TBD	1,610,975
334,469	-	-	TBD	334,469
196,115	2,373	1,333	TBD	199,821
62,988	-	-	TBD	62,988
1,860,825	286	2,674	TBD	1,863,785
59,656	-	-	TBD	59,656
2,209,618	(2,491)	4,393	TBD	2,211,519
978,493	2,702	(4,247)	TBD	976,949
75,841	1,691	-	TBD	77,532
\$ 130,977,000	\$ 43,632	\$ 1,079,979	\$ -	\$ 132,100,611

Appropriation \$ 103,545,000 \$ 108,873,000 \$ 120,599,000

\$ 130,977,000

¹ Included mandated and non-mandated costs.

² Includes 4 months of the pandemic.

CURRENT ALLOCATION INFORMATION

Court	2020-21	2020-21	2021-22
	Interim Proxy ³	Allocation ³	Allocation ⁴
	K	L	M
Alameda	\$ 5,592,314	\$ 5,371,012	\$ 5,371,012
Alpine	2,593	2,490	2,490
Amador	71,947	69,100	69,100
Butte	537,620	516,345	516,345
Calaveras	75,023	72,054	72,054
Colusa	121,085	116,293	116,293
Contra Costa	3,151,013	3,026,319	3,026,319
Del Norte	67,773	65,091	65,091
El Dorado	306,114	294,001	294,001
Fresno	2,502,964	2,403,915	2,403,915
Glenn	120,494	115,726	115,726
Humboldt	298,465	286,654	286,654
Imperial	709,930	681,836	681,836
Inyo	81,386	78,166	78,166
Kern	3,960,639	3,803,906	3,803,906
Kings	584,030	560,918	560,918
Lake	127,593	122,544	122,544
Lassen	25,196	24,199	24,199
Los Angeles	44,226,256	42,476,106	42,476,106
Madera	893,625	858,262	858,262
Marin	836,604	803,498	803,498
Mariposa	45,920	44,103	44,103
Mendocino	273,595	262,768	262,768
Merced	1,420,816	1,364,591	1,364,591
Modoc	7,992	7,675	7,675
Mono	79,204	76,069	76,069
Monterey	1,739,629	1,670,788	1,670,788
Napa	711,931	683,758	683,758
Nevada	59,056	56,719	56,719
Orange	11,074,021	10,635,793	10,635,793
Placer	708,353	680,321	680,321
Plumas	7,939	7,625	7,625
Riverside	6,568,050	6,308,135	6,308,135
Sacramento	4,551,589	4,371,471	4,371,471
San Benito	129,288	124,171	124,171
San Bernardino	5,694,815	5,469,456	5,469,456
San Diego	6,693,831	6,428,939	6,428,939
San Francisco	4,146,658	3,982,564	3,982,564
San Joaquin	1,945,076	1,868,104	1,868,104
San Luis Obispo	726,452	697,704	697,704
San Mateo	4,000,365	3,842,060	3,842,060
Santa Barbara	2,090,634	2,007,902	2,007,902
Santa Clara	7,268,113	6,980,494	6,980,494
Santa Cruz	1,027,797	987,125	987,125
Shasta	518,049	497,548	497,548
Sierra	412	396	396
Siskiyou	57,944	55,651	55,651
Solano	761,559	731,422	731,422
Sonoma	1,921,932	1,845,876	1,845,876
Stanislaus	1,699,230	1,631,987	1,631,987
Sutter	305,544	293,453	293,453
Tehama	149,509	143,593	143,593
Trinity	26,337	25,295	25,295
Tulare	2,385,366	2,290,970	2,290,970
Tuolumne	45,301	43,508	43,508
Ventura	2,166,128	2,080,409	2,080,409
Yolo	1,012,921	972,837	972,837
Yuba	59,645	57,285	57,285
Total	\$ 136,373,665	\$ 130,977,000	\$ 130,977,000

³ Based on prior, one-time allocation approved by council.

⁴ Actual 2021-22 appropriation amount is \$132.145m.