



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR JUNE 2, 2020  
TELEPHONIC MEETING

**Meeting Contents**

<b>Agenda</b> .....	1
<b>Minutes</b>	
Draft minutes from the February 20, 2020 Meeting .....	3
<b>Discussion and Possible Action Items</b>	
<b>Item 1</b> – Workload Formula Objectives, Principles, and Measures (Action Required) .....	7
<b>Item 2</b> – Allocation Methodology of Trial Court Funding in 2020-21 May Revision (Action Required) .....	9
<b>Item 3</b> – Allocation Methodology of the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Reduction in 2020-21 May Revision (Action Required) .....	13
<b>Item 4</b> – Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Funding Shortfall (Action Required) .....	19
<b>Attachment A</b> – CIP Funding Shortfall and Update on Methodology Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS), February 20, 2020.....	23
<b>Attachment B</b> – Allocation Methodology for Interpreter Program Shortfall Report to FMS, February 20, 2020.....	30
<b>Attachment C</b> – Priority in Providing Court Interpreter Services to Parties .....	38
<b>Attachment D</b> – TCTF Fund Condition Statement .....	39



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm)  
[tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto: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](mailto: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:** June 2, 2020  
**Time:** 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.  
**Public Call-in Number:**  
<http://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/925?>

---

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](mailto: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 February 20, 2020 Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) 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](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov). Only written comments received by 1:00 p.m. on June 1, 2020 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-4)**

---

**Item 1**

**Workload Formula Objectives, Principles, and Measures (Action Required)**

Review the Workload Formula objectives, principles, and measures utilized in the development of the second phase of the Workload Formula which was adopted by the Judicial Council in January 2018.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Cochair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee  
Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Cochair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee  
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

**Item 2**

**Allocation Methodology of Trial Court Funding in 2020-21 May Revision (Action Required)**

Consider recommendation on methodologies to allocate one-time trial court funding for COVID-19 related case filing backlog included in the 2020-21 May Revision.

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

**Item 3**

**Allocation Methodology of Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Reduction in 2020-21 May Revision (Action Required)**

Consider recommendation on methodologies to allocate a TCTF funding reduction included in the 2020-21 May Revision.

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

**Item 4**

**Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Funding Shortfall (Action Required)**

Revisit the FMS recommendation from its February 20, 2020 meeting regarding a projected 2020-21 funding shortfall in the CIP and the funding reduction included in the 2020-21 May Revision.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Catravel 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](http://www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm)  
[tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov)

## TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

February 20, 2020

10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

455 Golden Gate Ave., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102; Sequoia Room

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Judges: Hon. Daniel J. Buckley (Cochair), Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, and Hon. Patricia L. Kelly

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Cochair), Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Mr. Michael D. Planet, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. B. Scott Thomsen, Ms. Nancy Eberhardt, and Mr. Neal Taniguchi.

**Others Present:** Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Ms. Michele Allan, Ms. Oksana Tuk, Mr. Catrayel Wood, Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, and Ms. Kristin Greenaway.

#### OPEN MEETING

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The cochairs called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and took roll call.

##### Approval of Minutes

The subcommittee reviewed and approved the minutes of the October 9, 2019 Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) meeting.

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-6)

##### Item 1

##### Operating Expenses and Equipment (OE&E) Review (Action Required)

Discuss findings of extensive review of OE&E for inclusion in the Workload Formula.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Business Management Services

**Action:** The FMS voted unanimously to forward the following recommendations made by the OE&E review group, effective July 1, 2020, for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) at its next meeting as follows:

1. Include or exclude the accounts as recommended and make any necessary adjustment for the

- revenue accounts;
2. Recommend that the Court Executives Advisory Committee and the Judicial Council Trial Court Administrative Services (TCAS) division include these accounts as part of existing efforts to standardize usage of the chart of accounts;
  3. Review work breakdown structure (WBS) elements periodically for new WBS elements added / eliminated each year; and
  4. Recommend that TCAS create a new general ledger (GL) specifically for Civil Transcripts so that it can be aligned with revenue for this workload. Currently, the GL being used for transcripts does not differentiate between criminal and civil.

## Item 2

### Cluster 2 Findings (Action Required)

Discuss findings regarding cluster 2.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Kristin Greenway, Supervising Analyst, Business Management Services

**Action:** The FMS voted unanimously to approve the recommendation by staff that no further work be done to evaluate the cluster 2 Bureau of Labor Statistics and small court adjustment contributions, and to share the findings report with the TCBAC as an informational item.

## Item 3

### Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Funding Shortfall and Update on Methodology (Action Required)

Consider a recommendation to address a projected 2020-21 funding shortfall in the CIP, which includes an update on the status of the Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee on its charge to continue its development of a methodology that addresses anticipated, ongoing funding shortfalls and review existing methodologies.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Catrayel Wood, Sr. Budget Analyst, Budget Services

**Action:** The FMS voted unanimously to approve the following recommendation for consideration by the TCBAC at its next meeting:

Allocate up to \$11.1 million of unrestricted fund balance from the Trial Court Trust Fund to address the projected 2020-21 shortfall in the CIP while the Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee continues its work in conjunction with the Judicial Council Budget Services and Business Management Services offices.

## Item 4

### Allocation Methodology of Trial Court Funding in 2020-21 Governor's Budget (Action Required)

Consider recommendations on methodologies to allocate trial court funding included in 2020-21 Governor's Budget.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Manager, Budget Services

**Action:** The FMS voted unanimously to approve the following recommendations for consideration by the TCBAC at its next meeting as below:

**\$61.7 Million**

Approve a recommendation that gives each trial court (except base funding and graduated funding floor courts) a three percent increase based on their 2019-20 Workload Formula allocation, including an initial reduction for security funding, and allocate the remaining dollars via pro rata based on the amount of new funding received.

**\$45.9 Million**

Approve a recommendation that first includes a reduction for security funding, and then allocates the remaining funds via the most recently approved Workload Formula methodology.

**Item 5**

**Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process (ARPs) (Action Required)**

Discuss two ARPs submitted to the Judicial Council Administrative Director.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Kristin Greenway, Supervising Analyst, Business Management Services

**Action:** The FMS voted unanimously to approve the following recommendation for consideration by the TCBAC at its next meeting:

To change San Francisco's cluster assignment, effective July 1, 2020, from cluster 4 to cluster 3 based on the court's current number of Authorized Judicial Positions and its Resource Assessment Study workload. In addition, create an ad hoc subcommittee to reevaluate the cluster system and floor funding, and add that project to the Work Plan (item 6).

**Item 6**

**Funding Methodology Subcommittee Work Plan (Action Required)**

Discuss updates to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee Work Plan.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Deputy Director, Budget Services

**Action:** The FMS voted unanimously to approve the following recommendations for consideration by the TCBAC at its next meeting:

1. Identify which items should be marked complete or removed
  - Mark as complete the following items for 2019-20: item 3, item 5, and item 6.
2. Identify any new items that should be added
  - Add new item to 2019-20 to read as follows:  
Initiate ad hoc subcommittee to reevaluate cluster system and floor funding.

---

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.

Approved by the advisory body on **enter date**.

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

(Action Item)

**Title:** Workload Formula Objectives, Principles, and Measures  
**Date:** 5/26/2020  
**Contact:** Brandy Olivera, Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services  
415-865-7195 | [brandy.sanborn@jud.ca.gov](mailto:brandy.sanborn@jud.ca.gov)

---

### **Issue**

Review of the Workload Formula objectives, principles, and measures utilized in the development of the second phase of the Workload Formula which was adopted by the Judicial Council in January 2018<sup>1</sup>.

### **Background**

#### **Objectives, principles, and measures**

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) articulated a set of objectives, principles, and measures that were later formally adopted as the basis for the modifications to the Workload Formula moving forward. The key objective of the Workload Formula for 2018–19 and beyond was to reach equity of available funding based on a model that uses workload and related factors to identify funding need. This is consistent with the underlying objectives of the Workload Formula when it was first established.

Similarly, the principles established by the subcommittee for the Workload Formula in future years echo many of the values stated by the branch when the Workload Formula was first established in 2013, but have been modified to reflect concerns expressed since then about the need for greater stability and predictability in funding. Whereas the first iteration of the Workload Formula focused mainly on equity of funding, the lack of new investment in the judicial branch in the years following had made stability and predictability of funding a higher priority (see table 1).

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (January 12, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-6A8D8502A126>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (January 12, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=559778&GUID=3553B33A-BE03-4DF3-84E1-8196225C58DB>



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

**Table 1: Principles of Workload Formula for 2018–19 and Beyond**

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Minimize volatility, maximize stability, and predictability to extent possible;</li><li>2. Committed to evaluating all submissions as submitted via the process (Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process);</li><li>3. Time for adjustment and adaptation;</li><li>4. Responsiveness to local circumstances;</li><li>5. Transparency and accountability;</li><li>6. Independent authority of the trial courts; and</li><li>7. Simplification of reporting while maintaining transparency.</li></ol> |
|---|

Finally, the subcommittee established two measures against which the updated version of the Workload Formula might be evaluated: (1) parity of funding, and (2) implementation of a data-driven funding methodology that supports branchwide advocacy efforts for trial court funding.

The subcommittee approached the work from a policy-based rather than a results-based perspective to ensure that the numbers were not driving the decision making. Currently there is not a council-approved allocation methodology in fiscal years for which a budget reduction must be implemented.

**Next Steps**

Consider these objectives, principles, and measures as it relates to trial court allocation methodology recommendations for 2020-21, which will incorporate proposed funding reductions included in the 2020-21 May Revision, for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee at its June 11, 2020 meeting, and for Judicial Council consideration at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting.

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

**(Action Item)**

**Title:** Allocation Methodology of Trial Court Funding in 2020-21 May Revision  
**Date:** 5/26/2020  
**Contact:** Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
415-865-7195 | [Oksana.Tuk@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Oksana.Tuk@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consider options on methodologies to allocate one-time \$50 million General Fund included in the 2020-21 May Revision to the trial courts for COVID-related case filing backlog for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee at its June 11, 2020 meeting. Fiscal year 2020-21 trial court allocation recommendations are scheduled to be presented to the Judicial Council for approval at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting. These recommendations assume the funding proposed in the May Revision remains in the final Budget Act and is available for expenditure in fiscal year 2020-21.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Branch has had to radically change its operations to protect court users, which include court employees, judicial officers, justice partners, attorneys, and the public, while also maintaining access to justice. Actions taken by the council include extending court deadlines, suspending jury trials, conducting proceedings remotely, and suspending evictions and foreclosures.

Trial courts have also taken actions to protect the public and court staff by closing courthouses, limiting operations to only essential court functions, and suspending collection activities.

These actions have resulted in delays in court operations and a backlog of cases that will take time for courts to process as they continue to adhere to public health and safety directives. In an effort to assist courts in addressing the backlog of filings that have accumulated due to court closures and help them resume normal operations, the May Revision includes \$50 million in one-time funding in 2020-21.

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

**Methodologies**

Based on direction from the cochairs of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee, the following methodologies are presented for consideration by the subcommittee, using the current year Workload Formula and allocations<sup>1</sup> to assist in guiding the discussion as outlined in Table 1 below.

**Table 1:**

Court	2019-20 Workload Allocation	2019-20 Workload Formula	2019-20 Workload Formula %
	G	H	I
A*	1,600,000	718,000	222.8%
B	65,092,000	62,052,000	104.9%
C**	30,199,000	29,939,000	100.9%
D	103,995,000	111,732,000	93.1%
E	925,950,000	1,093,275,000	84.7%
F	929,201,000	1,200,927,000	77.4%
	<b>2,056,037,000</b>	<b>2,498,643,000</b>	<b>82.3%</b>

\*Represents base funding floor courts.

\*\*Represents cluster 1 courts.

**Pro Rata Based on Courts' Workload Allocation**

The approach for this option keeps base funding floors funded at the current, Judicial Council-approved amount of \$800,000.<sup>2</sup> There is a separate process in place in which this allocation is reviewed annually, as requested by the applicable courts, for presentation to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee each December to determine if an inflationary adjustment is

<sup>1</sup> 1 Judicial Council meeting report (July 19, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7511221&GUID=89249166-9F19-4DFA-A00F-4DF6642BC521>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 19, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=640299&GUID=79BFCCF3-78C5-45FE-909E-190F0A45083B>

<sup>2</sup> 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**

needed.<sup>3</sup> This option also keeps cluster one court funding allocations level. All other courts would receive a portion of the new funding based on a percentage of their Workload Allocation (see column J of Table 2 below).

**Pro Rata Based on Courts' Workload Formula**

The approach for this option maintains the base funding floor amounts, keeps cluster one allocations level, and then applies a pro rata portion of the new funding based on a percent of the remaining courts' Workload Formula (see Column K of Table 2 below).

**Via the Council-Approved Workload Formula**

The current methodology for allocating funds in an equitable manner is the Workload Formula, updated most recently by the Judicial Council at its January 17, 2020 business meeting<sup>4</sup>, which outlines the method in which new funding is allocated as follows (see Column L of Table 2 below):

1. Bring all Cluster 1 courts up to 100 percent of funding need<sup>5</sup>.
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 ration.
  - 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting report beginning on page 10 (July 25, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190725-materials.pdf>; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting minutes (July 25, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190725-minutes.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (January 17, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7976128&GUID=DC14BAC5-0079-4C0C-A0E6-52C7EC068BB0>

<sup>5</sup> The non-sheriff security deduction would not occur for this one-time funding allocation.

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

**Table 2:**

Court	Workload Formula %	Pro Rata Based on Allocation	Pro Rata Based on Workload Formula	Via the Workload Formula
	I	J	K	L
A	222.8%	0	0	0
B	104.9%	1,608,000	1,257,000	0
C	100.9%	0	0	8,000
D	93.1%	2,569,000	2,264,000	1,161,000
E	84.7%	22,871,000	22,149,000	11,823,000
F	77.4%	22,952,000	24,330,000	37,008,000
	<b>82.3%</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>	<b>50,000,000</b>

**Staggered Distribution Based on Courts’ Workload Formula**

The approach for this option would initially allocate a percentage of the one-time \$50 million, such as 60 percent or an amount recommended by FMS, according to the council-approved Workload Formula described above, which outlines the method in which new funding is allocated. The remainder of the funding would be disbursed at a later date in fiscal year 2020-21 to address further COVID-19 backlog emergencies that will emerge.

**Recommendation**

Consider the following for recommendation to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee at its June 11, 2020 meeting, and for Judicial Council consideration at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting:

An allocation methodology for the one-time \$50 million proposed in the 2020-21 May Revision effective July 1, 2020, which is available for expenditure in fiscal year 2020-21.

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

**(Action Item)**

**Title:** Allocation Methodology of Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Reduction in 2020-21 May Revision

**Date:** 5/26/2020

**Contact:** Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
415-865-7195 | [Oksana.Tuk@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Oksana.Tuk@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consider options on methodologies to allocate a \$168.937 million ongoing TCTF funding reduction included in the 2020-21 May Revision to the trial courts for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) at its June 11, 2020 meeting. Fiscal year 2020-21 trial court allocation reduction recommendations are scheduled to be presented to the Judicial Council for approval at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting. These recommendations assume the funding reduction proposed in the May Revision remains in the final Budget Act.

**Background**

**2020-21 May Revision**

To address a projected \$54.3 billion budget gap due to the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent recession, the 2020-21 May Revision reflects substantial budget reductions throughout state government, including the judicial branch. In addition to the withdrawal of a number of judicial branch funding proposals that were initially included in the 2020-21 Governor’s Budget released in January, there are reductions proposed for all branch entities.

The May Revision includes a \$178.102 million General Fund (GF) reduction to the trial courts for 2020-21 based on a 10 percent reduction to base operations funding. Of this amount, the \$168.937 million reduction to the TCTF will be addressed through consideration of several allocation methodology options included in this report. The breakdown of the \$178.102 million is as follows:

-	\$168,937,000	TCTF
+	\$1,325,000	GF (prisoner hearing, service of process, and extraordinary homicide)
+	\$7,840,000	<u>Improvement and Modernization Fund</u>
-	\$178,102,000	<b>2020-21 Reduction to Trial Courts</b>

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

The May Revision also includes an additional \$28.121 million GF reduction for fiscal year 2021-22 based on a five percent reduction to base operations funding, of which \$26.674 million impacts trial courts' allocations. The breakdown of the \$28.121 million is as follows:

	<b>-\$26,674,000</b>	TCTF
+	<b>-\$210,000</b>	GF (prisoner hearing, service of process, and extraordinary homicide)
+	<b>-\$1,237,000</b>	<u>Improvement and Modernization Fund</u>
	<b>-\$28,121,000</b>	<b>Additional 2021-22 Reduction to Trial Courts</b>

### The Council-Approved Workload Formula

The Workload Formula approved by the Judicial Council in January 2018, includes the following language regarding a budget reduction:

*Allocations in fiscal years for which a budget reduction must be implemented.* Because future budget reductions cannot be predicted, [the Funding Methodology Subcommittee] FMS recommended and TCBAC unanimously approved that they will be addressed as needed, with special consideration toward those courts below the statewide average funding ratio.<sup>1</sup>

As a result, reduction methodology options are provided for subcommittee consideration, including if the methodology should be incorporated in the Workload Formula as a policy recommendation going forward.

### Methodologies

Based on direction from the cochairs of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee, the following allocation methodology options are presented for consideration by the subcommittee, using the current year Workload Formula (WF) and allocations<sup>2</sup> to assist in guiding the discussion as outlined in Table 1 below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (January 12, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-6A8D8502A126>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (January 12, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=559778&GUID=3553B33A-BE03-4DF3-84E1-8196225C58DB>

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (July 19, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7511221&GUID=89249166-9F19-4DFA-A00F-4DF6642BC521>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 19, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=640299&GUID=79BFCCF3-78C5-45FE-909E-190F0A45083B>

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

**Table 1:**

Court	2019-20 Workload Allocation	2019-20 Workload Formula	2019-20 Workload Formula %
	G	H	I
A*	1,600,000	718,000	222.8%
B	65,092,000	62,052,000	104.9%
C**	30,199,000	29,939,000	100.9%
D	103,995,000	111,732,000	93.1%
E	925,950,000	1,093,275,000	84.7%
F	929,201,000	1,200,927,000	77.4%
	<b>2,056,037,000</b>	<b>2,498,643,000</b>	<b>82.3%</b>

\*Represents base funding floor courts.

\*\*Represents cluster 1 courts.

### Pro Rata Reduction

The approach for this option keeps base funding floors funded at the current, Judicial Council-approved amount of \$800,000.<sup>3</sup> There is a separate process in place in which this allocation is reviewed annually, as requested by the applicable courts, for presentation to the TCBC each December to determine if an inflationary adjustment is needed.<sup>4</sup>

This option also keeps cluster one court funding allocations level. All other courts would receive a pro rata reduction based on either their Workload Formula or Workload Allocation (see Table 2 below).

<sup>3</sup> 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>

<sup>4</sup> Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting report beginning on page 10 (July 25, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190725-materials.pdf>; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting minutes (July 25, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190725-minutes.pdf>



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

**Table 2:**

Pro Rata Based on the 2019-20 Workload Formula				Pro Rata Based on 2019-20 Workload Allocation			
Court	Dollar Amount Reduction	Reduction Percentage		Court	Dollar Amount Reduction	Reduction Percentage	
	J	WF	Allocation		M	WF	Allocation
		K	L			N	O
A	0	0.0%	0.0%	A	0	0.0%	0.0%
B	(4,247,544)	-6.8%	-6.5%	B	(5,432,388)	-8.8%	-8.3%
C	0	0.0%	0.0%	C	0	0.0%	0.0%
D	(7,648,207)	-6.8%	-7.4%	D	(8,679,119)	-7.8%	-8.3%
E	(74,836,161)	-6.8%	-8.1%	E	(77,277,087)	-7.1%	-8.3%
F	(82,205,087)	-6.8%	-8.8%	F	(77,548,406)	-6.5%	-8.3%
<b>(168,937,000)</b>		<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>	<b>(168,937,000)</b>		<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>

**Split 50/50, 40/60, and 30/70 Reductions**

The approach for the following three options in this section applies a percentage of the reduction to courts above the statewide average, with the remaining percentage applied to all courts (excluding the base funding floor and cluster one courts) based on either the courts' Workload Formula or Workload Allocation.

The first split option applies a 50 percent reduction to courts above the statewide average, with the remaining 50 percent applied to all courts (maintaining the exclusions noted above) based on either the courts' Workload Formula or Workload Allocation (see Table 3 below).

The second split option applies a 40 percent reduction to courts above the statewide average, with the remaining 60 percent applied to all courts (maintaining the same exclusions above) based on either the courts' Workload Formula or Workload Allocation (see Table 4 below).

The third split option applies a 30 percent reduction to courts above the statewide average, with the remaining 70 percent applied to all courts (maintaining the same exclusions above) based on either the courts' Workload Formula or Workload Allocation (see Table 5 below).

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

**Table 3:**

First 50% to Courts Above, 50% to All Based on 2019-20 Workload Formula			
Court	Dollar Amount Reduction	Reduction Percentage	
	P	WF	Allocation
		Q	R
A	0	0.0%	0.0%
B	(9,533,867)	-15.4%	-14.6%
C	0	0.0%	0.0%
D	(17,166,715)	-15.4%	-16.5%
E	(101,133,987)	-9.3%	-10.9%
F	(41,102,431)	-3.4%	-4.4%
	<b>(168,937,000)</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>

First 50% to Courts Above, 50% to All Based on 2019-20 Workload Allocation			
Court	Dollar Amount Reduction	Reduction Percentage	
	S	WF	Allocation
		T	U
A	0	0.0%	0.0%
B	(11,361,355)	-18.3%	-17.5%
C	0	0.0%	0.0%
D	(18,151,818)	-16.2%	-17.5%
E	(100,649,829)	-9.2%	-10.9%
F	(38,773,998)	-3.2%	-4.2%
	<b>(168,937,000)</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>

**Table 4:**

First 40% to Courts Above, 60% to All Based on 2019-20 Workload Formula			
Court	Dollar Amount Reduction	Reduction Percentage	
	V	WF	Allocation
		W	X
A	0	0.0%	0.0%
B	(8,476,602)	-13.7%	-13.0%
C	0	0.0%	0.0%
D	(15,263,001)	-13.7%	-14.7%
E	(95,874,480)	-8.8%	-10.4%
F	(49,322,917)	-4.1%	-5.3%
	<b>(168,937,000)</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>

First 40% to Courts Above, 60% to All Based on 2019-20 Workload Allocation			
Court	Dollar Amount Reduction	Reduction Percentage	
	Y	WF	Allocation
		Z	AA
A	0	0.0%	0.0%
B	(10,175,554)	-16.3%	-15.6%
C	0	0.0%	0.0%
D	(16,257,287)	-14.6%	-15.6%
E	(95,975,361)	-8.8%	-10.4%
F	(46,528,798)	-3.9%	-5.0%
	<b>(168,937,000)</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>

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

**Table 5:**

First 30% to Courts Above, 70% to All Based on 2019-20 Workload Formula				First 30% to Courts Above, 70% to All Based on 2019-20 Workload Allocation			
Court	Dollar Amount Reduction	Reduction Percentage		Court	Dollar Amount Reduction	Reduction Percentage	
	AB	WF	Allocation		AE	WF	Allocation
		AC	AD			AF	AG
A	0	0.0%	0.0%	A	0	0.0%	0.0%
B	(7,419,338)	-12.0%	-11.4%	B	(8,989,753)	-14.5%	-13.8%
C	0	0.0%	0.0%	C	0	0.0%	0.0%
D	(13,359,287)	-12.0%	-12.8%	D	(14,362,756)	-12.9%	-13.8%
E	(90,614,973)	-8.3%	-9.8%	E	(91,300,893)	-8.4%	-9.8%
F	(57,543,403)	-4.8%	-6.2%	F	(54,283,598)	-4.5%	-5.8%
	<b>(168,937,000)</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>		<b>(168,937,000)</b>	<b>-6.8%</b>	<b>-8.2%</b>

**Second Year of Reduction**

Options to allocate the second-year reduction of \$26.674 million in fiscal year 2021-22 could include:

- i. Address now, via the same methodology chosen for the \$168.937 million reduction or a different methodology as recommended by the subcommittee; or
- ii. Address the reduction at a later date in fiscal year 2020-21.

**Recommendations**

Consider the following for recommendation to the TCBAC at its June 11, 2020 meeting, and for Judicial Council consideration at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting:

- a) An allocation methodology for the \$168.937 million reduction proposed in the 2020-21 May Revision effective July 1, 2020; and
- a) The timing and method for which the second-year reduction of \$26.674 million should be allocated in fiscal year 2021-22.

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

**(Action Item)**

**Title:** Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Funding Shortfall and 2020-21 May Revision Reduction

**Date:** 5/27/2020

**Contact:** Catrayel Wood, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-643-7008 | [Catrayel.Wood@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Catrayel.Wood@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Revisit the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommendation from its February 20, 2020 meeting regarding a projected 2020-21 funding shortfall in the CIP to take into consideration the \$6.035 million General Fund (GF) reduction proposed in the 2020-21 May Revision. Recommendations would be considered by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) at its June 11, 2020 meeting, and considered by the Judicial Council at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting. Recommendations assume the funding reduction proposed in the May Revision remains in the final Budget Act.

**Background**

**February 20, 2020 FMS Meeting**

When this item was last presented to FMS, the issue was to address a 2020-21 projected shortfall of \$11.1 million that resulted in an FMS recommendation to use Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) fund balance to address the shortfall. Concurrently, the Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee continues its work in conjunction with the Judicial Council Budget Services and Business Management Services offices to develop a methodology that addresses anticipated, ongoing funding shortfalls in the TCTF CIP and to review existing methodologies for a planned implementation date of July 1, 2021 (see Attachment A). As a reminder, the current process for providing CIP funding to courts is through a reimbursement based on actual expenditures.

The FMS recommendation was scheduled to go to TCBAC in March 2020. However, that meeting was rescheduled as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic to a telephonic meeting on June 11, 2020, which will take into consideration other operational and budget impacts as a result of the pandemic.

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

**2020-21 May Revision**

To address a projected \$54.3 billion budget gap due to the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent recession, the 2020-21 May Revision reflects substantial budget reductions throughout state government, including the judicial branch. In addition to the withdrawal of a number of judicial branch funding proposals that were initially included in the 2020-21 Governor’s Budget released in January, there are reductions proposed for all branch entities.

The May Revision includes a reduction of \$6.035 million GF for the CIP program, which reflects a five percent reduction. In addition, the May Revision includes \$9.008 million ongoing GF in 2020-21 for increased costs for court interpreters. This is an increase of \$1.032 million ongoing GF from the January budget due to updated court interpreter costs. The May Revision also includes \$315,690 one-time GF to purchase equipment for the newly established Video Remote Interpreting Program.

**February 28, 2019 FMS Meeting**

When this item was brought to FMS at its February 2019 meeting in response to a projected 2019-20 CIP shortfall, the materials included a demonstration of how projected shortfalls could impact trial courts through a pro rata reduction based on prior year expenditures (see Attachment B).

**Expenditure Projections and Appropriation Impact**

The expenditure information provided to FMS in February 2020 for discussion has been updated as of March 9, 2020 to incorporate an estimated \$1.026 million increase in 2020-21 and an estimated \$1.553 million increase in 2021-22 in response to recently ratified agreements:

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES AS OF MARCH 9, 2020					
Expenditure Categories		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
		Actuals	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated
		A	B	C	D
1	Mandated	116,664,867	123,045,757	130,375,708	138,303,082
2	Domestic Violence	1,370,252	1,305,795	1,271,695	1,255,768
3	Civil <i>(expansion at 94% of rollout)</i>	4,837,202	4,923,559	5,011,920	5,102,338
4	Estimated Wage & Benefits Increases*	-	707,580	3,069,248	3,735,358
5	Court Interpreter Data Collection System	87,000	87,000	87,000	87,000
<b>Total Projected Expenditures</b>		<b>122,959,321</b>	<b>130,069,691</b>	<b>139,815,571</b>	<b>148,483,546</b>

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

\* 2018-19 estimated wage and benefit increases included in Mandated, Domestic Violence, and Civil. The estimated 2020-21 and 2021-22 figures increased from the February 20, 2020 FMS meeting as a result of ratified agreements (three percent for region four in 2020-21, and then two percent in 2021-22). Projections do not include any potential service impacts as a result of COVID-19.

The projected program balance provided to FMS in February 2020 has been updated to reflect the impact of the 2020-21 May Revision to the CIP appropriation. The 2020-21 estimated program balance now reflects a shortfall of \$17.433 million, which increases to \$23.165 million in fiscal year 2021-22:

PROJECTED PROGRAM BALANCE AS OF MAY 26, 2020					
Description		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
		Actuals	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated
		E	F	G	H
6	Beginning Program Balance <i>(prior year carry over)</i>	4,376,981	(6,178,738)	(2,062,429)	-
7	Appropriation **	108,960,000	120,686,000	124,445,000	125,319,000
8	Appropriation Adjustment	3,443,602	13,500,000	-	-
9	Projected Expenditures	(122,959,321)	(130,069,691)	(139,815,571)	(148,483,546)
10	Surplus / (Deficit)	(10,555,719)	4,116,309	(15,370,571)	(23,164,546)
<b>Ending CIP Program Balance</b>		<b>(6,178,738)</b>	<b>(2,062,429)</b>	<b>(17,433,000)</b>	<b>(23,164,546)</b>

\*\* 2020-21 includes \$257,000 remainder of new judgeship funding from 2019-20. 2020-21 and 2021-22 assumes enactment of ongoing funding and the reduction proposed in the 2020-21 May Revision and estimated benefit costs increases; excludes Video Remote Interpreting and Language Access Program funding.

**Next Steps**

Develop a recommendation for TCBAC consideration at its June 11, 2020 meeting, and for Judicial Council consideration at its July 23-24, 2020 business meeting that addresses the shortfall for fiscal years 2020-21 and 2021-22.

The Priority in Providing Court Interpreter Services to Parties (Attachment C) and the TCTF fund condition statement (Attachment D) have been included in the materials to aide in the discussion and development of a recommendation.

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

**Attachments**

- Attachment A:** CIP Funding Shortfall and Update on Methodology Report to FMS,  
February 20, 2020
- Attachment B:** Allocation Methodology for Interpreter Program Shortfall Report to FMS,  
February 28, 2019
- Attachment C:** Priority in Providing Court Interpreter Services to Parties
- Attachment D:** TCTF Fund Condition Statement

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

**(Action Item)**

**Title:** Court Interpreter Program (CIP) Funding Shortfall and Update on Methodology

**Date:** 2/20/2020

**Contact:** Catrayel Wood, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-643-7008 | [Catrayel.Wood@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Catrayel.Wood@jud.ca.gov)

**Issue**

Consideration of a recommendation to use unrestricted fund balance from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) to address a 2020-21 projected funding shortfall amount of \$11.1 million in the CIP for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) at its March 19, 2020 meeting.

**Background**

Article I, section 14 of the California Constitution was amended in 1974 to provide that "[a] person unable to understand English who is charged with a crime has a right to an interpreter throughout the proceedings," and the enactment of Assembly Bill 1657 (Stats. 2014, ch. 721) expanded California's constitutional mandate and authorized courts to provide interpreters to all parties in civil matters, regardless of income, and set forth a priority and preference order when courts do not have sufficient resources to provide interpreters for all persons (Attachment A).

**CIP and TCTF Funding**

The CIP fund balance was depleted as of the 2018-19 fiscal year, and with expenditures continuing to exceed allocations, the fund remains insolvent.

At its September 21, 2018 business meeting, the Judicial Council approved the one-time use of the TCTF for courts to maintain the CIP at its current level through 2018-19 in an amount not to exceed the projected shortfall of \$3.4 million.<sup>1</sup>

At its May 17, 2019 business meeting, the council approved the use of TCTF again, on a one-time basis, for courts to maintain the CIP at its current level through 2019-20 in an amount not to

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (September 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6613659&GUID=D8DDBB1D-D123-410A-80B7-124C840672DB>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (September 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=559788&GUID=1AF2481A-79EE-44AD-A8E6-1D5F9E02CC7A>



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

exceed \$13.5 million.<sup>2</sup> Absent use of TCTF fund balance or state funding to shore up projected shortfalls, trial courts could have been negatively impacted through a reduction in reimbursements which would likely have resulted in a reduction in services. The full \$13.5 million is needed to cover the 2019-20 projected shortfall.

The use of TCTF fund balance has allowed courts to cover cost increases and maintain service levels while TCBC continues its development of a methodology that addresses anticipated, ongoing funding shortfalls and reviews existing methodologies. In addition, the Judicial Council continues to pursue additional funding through the budget change proposal process to address the projected shortfall in 2020-21 and beyond.

### **Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee**

The Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee is comprised of members from TCBC and the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS). Its charge is to continue its development of a methodology that addresses anticipated, ongoing funding shortfalls in the TCTF CIP and review existing methodologies for a planned implementation date of July 1, 2021.

Through the direction of the Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee, the Judicial Council Budget Services office, in collaboration with the Business Management Services office, is meeting regularly to identify and review various data sets to 1) work towards a workload methodology recommendation for staff interpreters that takes regional salary and benefit differences into consideration, and then 2) begin a methodology that pertains to contract interpreters.

### **CIP Projections**

The projected expenditures below reflect what was last provided to FMS in February of 2019 as compared to updated projections. Changes in projections are a result of:

- 1) Estimated wage growth on ratified agreements only (three percent for region four in 2020-21, and then two percent in 2021-22);
- 2) Continued civil expansion through 2020-21;
- 3) Increases in the number of mandated staff interpreters and mandated contractor usage; and
- 4) Merit Salary Adjustments.

---

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (May 17, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7213051&GUID=C4A81071-30F9-4D1C-B10A-1F56A047C3BA>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (May 17, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=640297&GUID=9C71CADA-D8FB-4AA9-A887-0260DB284273>

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

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES AS OF JANUARY 28, 2019					
Expenditure Categories		2017-18 Actuals	2018-19 Estimated	2019-20 Estimated	2020-21 Estimated
		A	B	C	D
1	Mandated	102,870,427	108,840,563	114,199,516	117,625,502
2	Domestic Violence	1,426,150	1,253,446	940,084	940,084
3	Civil <i>(expansion at 94% of rollout)</i>	4,174,854	4,240,345	4,494,766	4,809,400
4	Estimated Wage & Benefits Increases*	-	2,359,229	3,978,656	4,029,985
5	Court Interpreter Data Collection System	65,568	87,000	87,000	87,000
<b>Total Projected Expenditures</b>		<b>108,536,999</b>	<b>116,780,583</b>	<b>123,700,022</b>	<b>127,491,971</b>

\* 2017-18 estimated wage and benefit increases included in Mandated Criminal, Domestic Violence, and Civil.

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES AS OF JANUARY 31, 2020					
Expenditure Categories		2018-19 Actuals	2019-20 Estimated	2020-21 Estimated	2021-22 Estimated
		E	F	G	H
1	Mandated	116,664,867	123,045,757	130,375,708	138,303,082
2	Domestic Violence	1,370,252	1,305,795	1,271,695	1,255,768
3	Civil <i>(expansion at 94% of rollout)</i>	4,837,202	4,923,559	5,011,920	5,102,338
4	Estimated Wage & Benefits Increases**	0	707,580	2,043,709	2,181,990
5	Court Interpreter Data Collection System	87,000	87,000	87,000	87,000
<b>Total Projected Expenditures</b>		<b>122,959,321</b>	<b>130,069,691</b>	<b>138,790,032</b>	<b>146,930,178</b>

The updated projected fund balance is as follows:

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

PROJECTED FUND BALANCE AS OF JANUARY 31, 2019 **					
Description		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
		Actuals	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated
		I	J	K	L
6	Beginning Fund Balance <i>(prior year carry over)</i>	9,281,980	4,376,981	-	
7	Allocation	103,632,000	108,960,000	110,158,000	110,158,000
8	Allocation Adjustment	-	3,443,602	-	-
9	Projected Expenditures	(108,536,999)	(116,780,583)	(123,700,022)	(127,491,971)
10	Surplus / (Deficit)	(4,904,999)	(4,376,981)	(13,542,022)	(17,333,971)
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>		<b>4,376,981</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(13,542,022)</b>	<b>(17,333,971)</b>

\*\* 2019-20 and 2020-21 assumes enactment of ongoing \$4 million in 2019-20 Governor's Budget.

PROJECTED FUND BALANCE AS OF JANUARY 31, 2020 ***					
Description		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
		Actuals	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated
		M	N	O	P
6	Beginning Fund Balance <i>(prior year carry over)</i>	4,376,981	(6,178,738)	(2,062,429)	-
7	Allocation	108,960,000	120,686,000	129,817,000	130,691,000
8	Allocation Adjustment	3,443,602	13,500,000	-	-
9	Projected Expenditures	(122,959,321)	(130,069,691)	(138,790,032)	(146,930,178)
10	Surplus / (Deficit)	(10,555,719)	4,116,309	(8,973,032)	(16,239,178)
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>		<b>(6,178,738)</b>	<b>(2,062,429)</b>	<b>(11,035,461)</b>	<b>(16,239,178)</b>

\*\*\* 2020-21 and 2021-22 assumes enactment of ongoing \$8 million in 2020-21 Governor's Budget and excludes Video Remote Interpreting and Language Access Program funding.

**Basis of Projected Fund Balance Differences**

- For 2018-19, the projected expenditures were updated to reflect actuals after the prior year true up and current year Budget Revision processes, resulting in an additional \$6.2 million in reimbursements due to the courts.
- 2019-20 has been updated to reflect the \$6.2 million carry over from 2018-19, the appropriation per the 2019 Budget Act, the full allocation adjustment from the TCTF as approved by the council, and an increase in projected expenditures.

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

- The 2020-21 projections include a carry over from the prior year, an \$8 million appropriation increase as proposed in the 2020-21 Governor’s Budget, and an increase in projected expenditures.
- 2021-22 estimated expenditures have been added and reflect a shortfall of \$16.2 million, which accounts for the proposed the \$8 million appropriation increase.

**Recommendation**

The following recommendation is provided for approval by FMS to be considered by TCBAC at its March 19, 2020 meeting:

Allocate up to \$11.1 million of unrestricted fund balance from the TCTF to address the projected 2020-21 shortfall in the CIP (the current TCTF fund condition statement is provided as Attachment B) while the Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee continues its work in conjunction with the Judicial Council Budget Services and Business Management Services offices.

**Attachments**

**Attachment A:** Priority in Providing Court Interpreter Services to Parties

**Attachment B:** TCTF Fund Condition Statement

## PRIORITY IN PROVIDING COURT INTERPRETER SERVICES TO PARTIES

### MANDATORY PROVISION OF INTERPRETER SERVICES

- CRIMINAL
- TRAFFIC
- JUVENILE DELINQUENCY OR DEPENDENCY
- MENTAL COMPETENCY HEARINGS WITH APPOINTED COUNSEL
- OTHER MANDATED CIVIL

Until sufficient funds are appropriated, provide interpreters in all other case types in the following priority order:

#### PRIORITY 1

Protective order in family law case with domestic violence claim, elder or dependent adult case involving physical abuse or neglect, or civil harassment case under CCP § 527.6(w)

*Fee waiver does not have preference.*

#### PRIORITY 2

Unlawful detainer

*Fee waiver does not have preference.*

#### PRIORITY 3

Action to terminate parental rights

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 4

Conservatorship or guardianship

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 5

Actions by a parent to obtain sole legal or physical custody of child or visitation

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 6

Elder/dependent adult abuse not involving physical abuse or neglect or other civil harassment under CCP § 527.6

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 7

All other family law (not involving domestic violence/custody/visitation)

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 8

All other civil cases

*Fee waiver has preference.*

CCP = Code of Civil Procedure

**Trial Court Trust Fund  
Fund Condition Statement  
As of December 2019**

Description	YEAR END FINANCIAL STATEMENTS			ESTIMATED	
	2016-17 (Financial Statements)	2017-18 (Financial Statements)	2018-19 (Financial Statements)	2019-20	2020-21
	A	B	C	D	E
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>34,829,875</b>	<b>66,659,468</b>	<b>60,478,281</b>	<b>71,630,938</b>	<b>78,658,895</b>
Prior-Year Adjustments	5,759,000	(12,185,090)	7,380,390	-	-
<b>TOTAL REVENUES AND TRANSFERS</b>	<b>1,288,395,327</b>	<b>1,303,563,015</b>	<b>1,314,999,921</b>	<b>1,319,969,000</b>	<b>1,314,592,000</b>
<i>Total Revenues</i>	<i>1,270,421,327</i>	<i>1,283,589,015</i>	<i>1,295,031,921</i>	<i>1,300,492,000</i>	<i>1,296,277,000</i>
<b>Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements</b>					
General Fund Loan - Statewide E-Filing		671,000	491,000		(1,162,000)
Reduction Offset Transfers	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000
Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	11,894,000	13,397,000	13,397,000	13,397,000	13,397,000
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>1,328,984,203</b>	<b>1,358,037,393</b>	<b>1,382,858,593</b>	<b>1,391,599,938</b>	<b>1,393,250,895</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES/ENCUMBRANCES/ALLOCATIONS</b>					
Program 0140010 - Judicial Council (Staff)	2,306,934	2,657,200	3,446,535	3,915,000	3,856,500
Program 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,860,003,547	1,831,305,998	1,990,037,604	2,040,430,043	2,166,304,935
Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	114,699,919	136,631,250	134,062,223	156,700,000	156,700,000
Program 0150019 - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	335,384,000	348,583,021	373,931,033	429,215,000	435,002,000
Program 0150028 - Assigned Judges	25,923,351	28,063,247	22,372,129	23,812,000	29,812,000
Program 0150037 - Court Interpreters	102,282,915	108,537,000	112,773,052	120,686,000	131,222,000
Program 0150075 - Grants	8,147,000	9,554,900	9,003,519	10,329,000	10,329,000
Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	11,391,069	10,078,398	8,950,559	10,015,000	21,929,000
<i>Total Local Assistance</i>	<i>2,446,549,101</i>	<i>2,462,675,415</i>	<i>2,651,130,120</i>	<i>2,791,187,043</i>	<i>2,951,298,935</i>
<i>Less Funding Provided by General Fund:</i>	<i>1,197,922,369</i>	<i>1,177,981,000</i>	<i>1,343,623,000</i>	<i>1,482,477,000</i>	<i>1,642,998,000</i>
<b>Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments</b>	<b>1,262,324,735</b>	<b>1,297,558,112</b>	<b>1,311,227,655</b>	<b>1,312,941,043</b>	<b>1,312,617,078</b>
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>66,659,468</b>	<b>60,478,281</b>	<b>71,630,938</b>	<b>78,658,895</b>	<b>80,633,817</b>
<b>Restricted Funds</b>					
Total Restricted/Reserved Funds	26,511,727	31,502,608	30,184,382	42,582,628	28,930,785
<b>Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance</b>	<b>40,147,741</b>	<b>28,975,673</b>	<b>41,446,556</b>	<b>36,076,267</b>	<b>51,703,032</b>

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

**(Action Item)**

**Title:** Allocation Methodology for Interpreter Program Shortfall  
**Date:** 2/28/2019  
**Contact:** Catrayel Wood, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
 916-643-7008 | [catrayel.wood@jud.ca.gov](mailto:catrayel.wood@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consideration of the Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee’s recommendation to use fund balance from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) to address the 2019-20 projected shortfall amount of \$13.5 million in the Court Interpreter Program (CIP).

**Background**

The Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee was established to focus on a methodology for allocations from the TCTF CIP 0150037 (formerly known as Program 45.45) in the event of a shortfall and review existing methodologies. Current projections for the TCTF CIP indicate that the fund balance has been depleted, and with expenditures exceeding allocations, the fund is insolvent.

Article I, section 14 of the California Constitution was amended in 1974 to provide that “[a] person unable to understand English who is charged with a crime has a right to an interpreter throughout the proceedings,” and the enactment of Assembly Bill (AB)1657 (Stats. 2014, ch.721) expanded California’s constitutional mandate and authorized courts to provide interpreters to all parties in civil matters, regardless of income, and set forth a priority and preference order when courts do not have sufficient resources to provide interpreters for all persons (Attachment A).

At its August 14, 2018 meeting, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee approved the one-time use of the TCTF for courts to maintain the CIP at its current level through 2018-19 in an amount not to exceed the projected shortfall of \$3.4 million<sup>1</sup>. Taking the Governor’s Budget proposal into consideration with \$4 million ongoing beginning in 2019-20, there are not enough funds available to resolve the shortfall and maintain services in the budget year and beyond. Absent use of TCTF fund balance or state funding to shore up projected shortfalls, trial courts may be negatively impacted through a reduction in reimbursements (Attachment C).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20180814-materials.pdf>

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

**CIP Projections**

The updated projected expenditures below reflect the following:

- 1) An estimated 7.5 percent wage growth over a three-year term starting in 2018-19 for regions one, three, and four; and an estimated five percent wage growth over a two-year term starting in 2019-20 for region two;
- 2) Civil expansion under AB1657 (Stats. 2014, ch.721);
- 3) Increased interpreter coordinator expenses; and
- 4) Merit Salary Adjustments.

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES AS OF AUGUST 13, 2018					
Expenditure Categories		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
		A	B	C	D
1	Mandated Criminal	100,780,466	102,339,457	103,920,316	105,532,792
2	Domestic Violence	1,307,433	1,346,656	1,387,056	1,428,667
3	Civil <i>(expansion locked at 87% of rollout)</i>	3,802,455	3,878,504	3,956,074	4,035,196
4	Additional Interpreter Coordinator Expenses	1,000,000	2,637,215	2,637,215	2,637,215
5	Estimated Wage Increases	1,558,991	1,580,859	1,612,476	1,644,726
6	Court Interpreter Data Collection System	87,000	87,000	87,000	87,000
<b>Total Projected Expenditures</b>		<b>108,536,345</b>	<b>111,869,691</b>	<b>113,600,137</b>	<b>115,365,596</b>

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES AS OF JANUARY 28, 2019					
Expenditure Categories		2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
		Actuals	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated
		A	B	C	D
1	Mandated Criminal	102,870,427	108,840,563	114,199,516	117,625,502
2	Domestic Violence	1,426,150	1,253,446	940,084	940,084
3	Civil <i>(expansion at 93% of rollout)</i>	4,174,854	4,240,345	4,494,766	4,809,400
4	Additional Interpreter Coordinator Expenses*	---	---	---	---
5	Estimated Wage & Benefit Increases**	---	2,359,229	3,978,656	4,029,985
6	Court Interpreter Data Collection System	65,568	87,000	87,000	87,000
<b>Total Projected Expenditures</b>		<b>108,536,999</b>	<b>116,780,583</b>	<b>123,700,022</b>	<b>127,491,971</b>

\* Additional interpreter coordinator expenses included in Mandated Criminal, Domestic Violence, and Civil.

\*\* 2017-18 estimated wage and benefit increases included in Mandated Criminal, Domestic Violence, and Civil.

The updated projected fund balance is as follows:



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

PROJECTED FUND BALANCE AS OF AUGUST 13, 2018				
Description	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Beginning Fund Balance <i>(prior year carry over)</i>	5,698,434	794,089	-	-
Allocation	103,632,000	107,632,000	103,632,000	103,632,000
Projected Expenditures	(108,536,345)	(111,869,691)	(113,600,137)	(115,365,596)
Surplus / (Deficit)	(4,904,345)	(4,237,691)	(9,968,137)	(11,733,596)
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>794,089</b>	<b>(3,443,602)</b>	<b>(9,968,137)</b>	<b>(11,733,596)</b>

PROJECTED FUND BALANCE AS OF JANUARY 31, 2019*				
Description	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
Beginning Fund Balance <i>(prior year carry over)</i>	9,281,980	4,376,981	-	-
Allocation*	103,632,000	108,960,000	110,158,000	110,158,000
Allocation Adjustment	-	3,443,602	-	-
Projected Expenditures	(108,536,999)	(116,780,583)	(123,700,022)	(127,491,971)
Surplus / (Deficit)	(4,904,999)	(7,820,583)	(13,542,022)	(17,333,971)
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>4,376,981</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(13,542,022)</b>	<b>(17,333,971)</b>

\* 2019-20 and 2020-21 assumes enactment of ongoing \$4 million in 2019-20 Governor's Budget.

**Basis of Projected Fund Balance Differences**

- For 2017-18, the beginning fund balance was updated based on an audit of appropriations and actual expenditures against fund resulting in an addition of \$3.6 million.
- The allocation adjustment for 2018-19 represents the dollars approved by the council for the current year shortfall.
- For 2019-20 and 2020-21, the allocation change represents the estimated amount of funding to be received for increases in benefits costs and assumes enactment of ongoing \$4 million in 2019-20 Governor's Budget. The Judicial Council continues to pursue funding for the 2019-20 shortfall.
- The 2020-21 ending fund balance represents the fiscal year shortfall to be covered through a shortfall methodology in the event there is no new funding available.

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

**Recommendation**

1. Allocate \$13.5 million of fund balance from the TCTF to address the projected 2019-20 shortfall in the CIP (the current TCTF fund condition statement is provided as Attachment B); and
2. Charge the Interpreter Ad Hoc Subcommittee to continue its development of a methodology that addresses anticipated, ongoing funding shortfalls and review existing methodologies.

**Attachments**

**Attachment A:** Priority in Providing Court Interpreter Services to Parties

**Attachment B:** TCTF Fund Condition Statement

**Attachment C:** CIP Shortfall Projected Reductions by Court

## PRIORITY IN PROVIDING COURT INTERPRETER SERVICES TO PARTIES

### MANDATORY PROVISION OF INTERPRETER SERVICES

- CRIMINAL
- TRAFFIC
- JUVENILE DELINQUENCY OR DEPENDENCY
- MENTAL COMPETENCY HEARINGS WITH APPOINTED COUNSEL
- OTHER MANDATED CIVIL

Until sufficient funds are appropriated, provide interpreters in all other case types in the following priority order:

#### PRIORITY 1

Protective order in family law case with domestic violence claim, elder or dependent adult case involving physical abuse or neglect, or civil harassment case under CCP § 527.6(w)

*Fee waiver does not have preference.*

#### PRIORITY 2

Unlawful detainer

*Fee waiver does not have preference.*

#### PRIORITY 3

Action to terminate parental rights

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 4

Conservatorship or guardianship

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 5

Actions by a parent to obtain sole legal or physical custody of child or visitation

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 6

Elder/dependent adult abuse not involving physical abuse or neglect or other civil harassment under CCP § 527.6

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 7

All other family law (not involving domestic violence/custody/visitation)

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 8

All other civil cases

*Fee waiver has preference.*

CCP = Code of Civil Procedure

Trial Court Trust Fund - Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	YEAR END FINANCIAL STATEMENTS		ESTIMATED	
		2016-17	2017-18	2018-19 <sup>1</sup>	2019-20 <sup>2</sup>
A		B	C	D	E
1	<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>34,829,875</b>	<b>66,569,099</b>	<b>60,477,544</b>	<b>54,685,015</b>
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	5,759,000	8,556,629		-
3	<b>TOTAL REVENUES AND TRANSFERS</b>	<b>1,288,395,327</b>	<b>1,303,737,015</b>	<b>1,316,606,471</b>	<b>1,327,870,399</b>
4	<i>Total Revenues</i>	<i>1,270,421,327</i>	<i>1,283,589,015</i>	<i>1,296,638,471</i>	<i>1,308,393,399</i>
5	<b>Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements</b>				
6	General Fund Loan - Statewide E-Filing		671,000	491,000	
7	Reduction Offset Transfers	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000
8	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements <sup>3</sup>	11,894,000	13,397,000	13,397,000	13,397,000
9	<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>1,328,984,203</b>	<b>1,378,862,742</b>	<b>1,377,084,015</b>	<b>1,382,555,414</b>
10	<b>EXPENDITURES/ENCUMBRANCES/ALLOCATIONS</b>				
11	Program 30/30.05 (0140010) - Judicial Council (AOC Staff)	2,306,934	2,657,198	3,796,000	3,796,000
12	Program 30.15 (Formerly Program 45.10) (0140019) - Trial Court Operations	-	-	-	-
13	Program 45.10 (0150010) - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,860,003,547	1,857,899,805	1,983,950,000	2,022,566,000
14	Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	114,699,919	130,146,303	136,700,000	156,700,000
15	Program 45.25 (0150019) - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	335,384,000	348,583,021	369,964,000	373,261,000
16	Program 45.35 (0150028) - Assigned Judges	25,923,351	28,063,247	29,090,000	29,090,000
17	Program 45.45 (0150037) - Court Interpreters	102,282,915	108,537,000	116,781,000	123,700,000
18	Program 45.55 (0150046) - Grants	8,147,000	9,554,900	10,329,000	10,329,000
19	Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	11,391,069	9,543,398	11,207,000	10,987,000
20	<b>Total Local Assistance</b>	<b>2,446,549,101</b>	<b>2,493,406,000</b>	<b>2,658,021,000</b>	<b>2,726,633,000</b>
21	<i>FISCAL Assessment</i>		<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>
22	<i>Pro Rata</i>		<i>129,000</i>	<i>2,000</i>	<i>66,000</i>
23	<i>Supplemental Pension Payments</i>			<i>98,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>
24	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	108,368	-	-	-
25	<i>Less Funding Provided by General Fund:</i>	<i>1,197,832,000</i>	<i>1,177,981,000</i>	<i>1,339,692,000</i>	<i>1,389,967,000</i>
26	General Fund Transfer	1,021,832,000	986,281,000	1,175,492,000	1,214,267,000
27	General Fund Transfer - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	114,700,000	136,700,000	136,700,000	156,700,000
28	General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	61,300,000	55,000,000	27,500,000	19,000,000
29	Repayment of SB10-Bail Reform			0	
30	<b>Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations</b>	<b>1,262,415,104</b>	<b>1,318,385,198</b>	<b>1,322,399,000</b>	<b>1,340,778,000</b>
31	<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>66,569,099</b>	<b>60,477,544</b>	<b>54,685,015</b>	<b>41,777,414</b>
32	Urgent Needs Reserve	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
33	Revenue Backfill Reserve	4,980,451	13,488,713	13,488,713	13,488,713
34	Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts		150,000	1,666,339	711,748
35	Court Interpreter Funds Held in Reserve	9,281,980	4,376,981	-	-
36	CAC Dependency Collections Held in Reserve	542,893	498,168	454,312	806,251
37	E Filing		635,000	796,000	
38	Equal Access Fund Held in Reserve	966,609	342,531	342,531	342,531
39	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Held in Reserve	957,056	773,465	773,465	773,465
40	<b>Total Restricted Funds</b>	<b>26,728,989</b>	<b>30,264,858</b>	<b>27,521,360</b>	<b>26,122,708</b>
41	<b>Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance</b>	<b>39,840,110</b>	<b>30,212,686</b>	<b>27,163,655</b>	<b>15,654,706</b>

<sup>1</sup> 2018-19 revenues reflect projections based on actuals through November 2018; expenditures are based on JCC approved allocations and pending BR.

<sup>2</sup> 2019-20 revenues reflect projections based on actuals through November 2018; expenditures are based on projected TCTF allocations as of June 30, 2018; and currently forecasted Court Interpreter need.

Court	2017-18 Expenditures	2017-18 Percent of Total Expenditures	2019-20 Projected Reduction (-13,542,022)	2020-21 Projected Reduction (-17,333,971)
Alameda	\$ 4,747,779	4.4%	\$ (592,374)	\$ (758,247)
Alpine	\$ 1,355	0.0%	\$ (169)	\$ (216)
Amador	\$ 23,549	0.0%	\$ (2,938)	\$ (3,761)
Butte	\$ 216,028	0.2%	\$ (26,954)	\$ (34,501)
Calaveras	\$ 25,051	0.0%	\$ (3,126)	\$ (4,001)
Colusa	\$ 93,049	0.1%	\$ (11,610)	\$ (14,860)
Contra Costa	\$ 2,507,418	2.3%	\$ (312,847)	\$ (400,449)
Del Norte	\$ 46,860	0.0%	\$ (5,847)	\$ (7,484)
El Dorado	\$ 234,418	0.2%	\$ (29,248)	\$ (37,438)
Fresno	\$ 1,917,960	1.8%	\$ (239,301)	\$ (306,309)
Glenn	\$ 90,346	0.1%	\$ (11,272)	\$ (14,429)
Humboldt	\$ 166,391	0.2%	\$ (20,760)	\$ (26,574)
Imperial	\$ 483,278	0.4%	\$ (60,298)	\$ (77,182)
Inyo	\$ 42,868	0.0%	\$ (5,349)	\$ (6,846)
Kern	\$ 3,064,925	2.8%	\$ (382,407)	\$ (489,486)
Kings	\$ 444,714	0.4%	\$ (55,486)	\$ (71,023)
Lake	\$ 87,346	0.1%	\$ (10,898)	\$ (13,950)
Lassen	\$ 41,360	0.0%	\$ (5,160)	\$ (6,605)
Los Angeles	\$ 33,924,329	31.3%	\$ (4,232,695)	\$ (5,417,907)
Madera	\$ 529,677	0.5%	\$ (66,087)	\$ (84,592)
Marin	\$ 530,732	0.5%	\$ (66,219)	\$ (84,761)
Mariposa	\$ 30,743	0.0%	\$ (3,836)	\$ (4,910)
Mendocino	\$ 341,517	0.3%	\$ (42,611)	\$ (54,542)
Merced	\$ 919,078	0.8%	\$ (114,672)	\$ (146,782)
Modoc	\$ 5,043	0.0%	\$ (629)	\$ (805)
Mono	\$ 41,496	0.0%	\$ (5,177)	\$ (6,627)
Monterey	\$ 1,089,563	1.0%	\$ (135,943)	\$ (174,009)
Napa	\$ 628,876	0.6%	\$ (78,464)	\$ (100,435)
Nevada	\$ 69,743	0.1%	\$ (8,702)	\$ (11,138)
Orange	\$ 10,348,718	9.5%	\$ (1,291,196)	\$ (1,652,749)
Placer	\$ 462,261	0.4%	\$ (57,676)	\$ (73,826)
Plumas	\$ 6,141	0.0%	\$ (766)	\$ (981)
Riverside	\$ 5,051,918	4.7%	\$ (630,321)	\$ (806,820)
Sacramento	\$ 3,881,970	3.6%	\$ (484,348)	\$ (619,972)
San Benito	\$ 100,765	0.1%	\$ (12,572)	\$ (16,093)
San Bernardino	\$ 5,374,206	5.0%	\$ (670,533)	\$ (858,291)
San Diego	\$ 5,631,264	5.2%	\$ (702,606)	\$ (899,345)
San Francisco	\$ 3,206,048	3.0%	\$ (400,014)	\$ (512,024)
San Joaquin	\$ 1,659,817	1.5%	\$ (207,093)	\$ (265,082)
San Luis Obispo	\$ 654,364	0.6%	\$ (81,644)	\$ (104,506)
San Mateo	\$ 2,203,913	2.0%	\$ (274,979)	\$ (351,977)
Santa Barbara	\$ 1,819,864	1.7%	\$ (227,062)	\$ (290,643)
Santa Clara	\$ 6,708,060	6.2%	\$ (836,956)	\$ (1,071,315)

<b>Court</b>	<b>2017-18 Expenditures</b>	<b>2017-18 Percent of Total Expenditures</b>	<b>2019-20 Projected Reduction (-13,542,022)</b>	<b>2020-21 Projected Reduction (-17,333,971)</b>
Santa Cruz	\$ 779,525	0.7%	\$ (97,260)	\$ (124,495)
Shasta	\$ 302,435	0.3%	\$ (37,734)	\$ (48,301)
Sierra	\$ 4,750	0.0%	\$ (593)	\$ (759)
Siskiyou	\$ 55,307	0.1%	\$ (6,901)	\$ (8,833)
Solano	\$ 575,033	0.5%	\$ (71,746)	\$ (91,836)
Sonoma	\$ 1,114,598	1.0%	\$ (139,067)	\$ (178,008)
Stanislaus	\$ 1,275,377	1.2%	\$ (159,127)	\$ (203,685)
Sutter	\$ 260,498	0.2%	\$ (32,502)	\$ (41,603)
Tehama	\$ 161,215	0.1%	\$ (20,115)	\$ (25,747)
Trinity	\$ 49,916	0.0%	\$ (6,228)	\$ (7,972)
Tulare	\$ 1,692,091	1.6%	\$ (211,120)	\$ (270,236)
Tuolumne	\$ 48,395	0.0%	\$ (6,038)	\$ (7,729)
Ventura	\$ 1,902,869	1.8%	\$ (237,419)	\$ (303,899)
Yolo	\$ 794,855	0.7%	\$ (99,173)	\$ (126,943)
Yuba	\$ 65,338	0.1%	\$ (8,152)	\$ (10,435)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 108,536,999</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ (13,542,022)</b>	<b>\$ (17,333,971)</b>

## PRIORITY IN PROVIDING COURT INTERPRETER SERVICES TO PARTIES

### MANDATORY PROVISION OF INTERPRETER SERVICES

- CRIMINAL
- TRAFFIC
- JUVENILE DELINQUENCY OR DEPENDENCY
- MENTAL COMPETENCY HEARINGS WITH APPOINTED COUNSEL
- OTHER MANDATED CIVIL

Until sufficient funds are appropriated, provide interpreters in all other case types in the following priority order:

#### PRIORITY 1

Protective order in family law case with domestic violence claim, elder or dependent adult case involving physical abuse or neglect, or civil harassment case under CCP § 527.6(w)

*Fee waiver does not have preference.*

#### PRIORITY 2

Unlawful detainer

*Fee waiver does not have preference.*

#### PRIORITY 3

Action to terminate parental rights

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 4

Conservatorship or guardianship

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 5

Actions by a parent to obtain sole legal or physical custody of child or visitation

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 6

Elder/dependent adult abuse not involving physical abuse or neglect or other civil harassment under CCP § 527.6

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 7

All other family law (not involving domestic violence/custody/visitation)

*Fee waiver has preference.*

#### PRIORITY 8

All other civil cases

*Fee waiver has preference.*

CCP = Code of Civil Procedure

**Trial Court Trust Fund  
Fund Condition Statement  
as of May 27, 2020**

	Description	YEAR END FINANCIAL STATEMENTS		ESTIMATED	
		2017-18 (Financial Statements)	2018-19 (Financial Statements)	2019-20	2020-21
#	A	B	C	D	E
1	<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>66,659,468</b>	<b>60,478,281</b>	<b>71,630,938</b>	<b>58,103,688</b>
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	(12,185,090)	7,380,390	-	-
3	<b>TOTAL REVENUES AND TRANSFERS</b>	<b>1,303,563,015</b>	<b>1,314,999,921</b>	<b>1,238,761,252</b>	<b>1,056,638,277</b>
4	<i>Total Revenues<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>1,283,589,015</i>	<i>1,295,031,921</i>	<i>1,159,284,252</i>	<i>1,098,323,277</i>
5	<b>Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements</b>				
6	General Fund Loan - Statewide E-Filing	671,000	491,000		(1,162,000)
7	Reduction Offset Transfers	6,080,000	6,080,000	66,080,000	(53,920,000)
8	<i>From State Court Facilities Construction Fund</i>	<i>5,486,000</i>	<i>5,486,000</i>	<i>5,486,000</i>	<i>5,486,000</i>
9	<i>From Immediate and Critical Needs Account - Loan</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>60,000,000</i>	<i>(60,000,000)</i>
10	<i>From Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund</i>	<i>594,000</i>	<i>594,000</i>	<i>594,000</i>	<i>594,000</i>
11	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	13,397,000	13,397,000	13,397,000	13,397,000
12	<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>1,358,037,393</b>	<b>1,382,858,593</b>	<b>1,310,392,190</b>	<b>1,114,741,965</b>
13	<b>EXPENDITURES/ENCUMBRANCES/ALLOCATIONS</b>				
14	Program 0140010 - Judicial Council (Staff)	2,657,200	3,446,535	3,452,975	3,764,417
15	Program 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,831,305,998	1,990,037,604	2,050,886,528	1,930,977,724
16	Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	136,631,250	134,062,223	156,700,000	148,865,000
17	Program 0150019 - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	348,583,021	373,931,033	388,452,000	387,647,000
18	Program 0150028 - Assigned Judges	28,063,247	22,372,129	21,000,000	25,212,000
19	Program 0150037 - Court Interpreters	108,537,000	112,773,052	134,186,000	125,345,000
20	Program 0150075 - Grants	9,554,900	9,003,519	10,329,000	10,086,000
21	Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	10,078,398	8,950,559	10,014,999	21,186,152
22	<i>Total Local Assistance</i>	<i>2,462,675,415</i>	<i>2,651,130,120</i>	<i>2,771,568,527</i>	<i>2,649,318,876</i>
23	<i>Pro Rata/State Ops</i>	<i>128,098</i>	<i>176,000</i>	<i>240,000</i>	<i>383,643</i>
24	<i>Supplemental Pension Payments</i>		<i>98,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>
25	<b>Total Expenditures (includes State Ops and LA)</b>	<b>2,465,332,615.79</b>	<b>2,654,576,654.54</b>	<b>2,775,021,502.00</b>	<b>2,653,083,293.00</b>
26	<i>Less Funding Provided by General Fund:</i>	<i>1,177,981,000</i>	<i>1,343,623,000</i>	<i>1,523,049,000</i>	<i>1,595,713,000</i>
27	<b>Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments</b>	<b>1,297,558,112</b>	<b>1,311,227,655</b>	<b>1,252,288,502</b>	<b>1,057,829,936</b>
28	<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>60,478,281</b>	<b>71,630,938</b>	<b>58,103,688</b>	<b>56,912,029</b>
29	<b>Restricted Funds</b>				
30	<b>Total Restricted/Reserved Funds</b>	<b>26,663,679</b>	<b>29,701,648</b>	<b>28,599,894</b>	<b>28,448,051</b>
31	<b>Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance</b>	<b>33,814,602</b>	<b>41,929,290</b>	<b>29,503,794</b>	<b>28,463,978</b>

<sup>1</sup> Revenue estimates and "Less Funding Provided by General Fund" reflect the May Revise budget proposal. Revenues include possible impacts of COVID-19.