



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR MAY 5, 2022 VIRTUAL MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the April 21, 2022 Meeting	4
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – 2022-23 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocations (Action Required)	6
Attachment 1A: Recommended 2022-23 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocations	11
Attachment 1B: Impact of Recommendation on Court Allocations	12
Item 2 – Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for 2022-23 (Action Required)	13
Attachment 2A: Judicial Council of California Approved 2021-22 and Proposed 2022-23 Allocations from the IMF- State Operations and Local Assistance Appropriations	18
Attachment 2B: IMF Summary of Programs	19
Attachment 2C: IMF Fund Condition Statement	21
Item 3 – Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and Trial Court Allocations for 2022-23 (Action Required)	22
Attachment 3A: Judicial Council Approved 2021-22 and Proposed 2022-23 State Operations and Local Assistance Allocations from the TCTF	28
Attachment 3B: 2022-23 TCTF Recommended Preliminary Allocation	29
Attachment 3C: 2022-23 Workload Formula Allocation	31
Attachment 3D: TCTF Fund Condition Statement	34
Item 4 – 2022-23 Pretrial Allocations and Funding Floor (Action Required)	35

Attachment 4A: Recommended 2022-23 Pretrial Release Ongoing Allocations	38
Item 5 – Workload Formula Impact from Remote Appearance Fee Revenue (Action Required)	40
Information Only Items (No Action Required)	
Info 1 – 2022-23 Self-Help Annual Update	43
Info 2 – TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Expenditure Reporting	47
Attachment Info 2A: <i>Summary of Recommended Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts</i>	49
Attachment Info 2B: Fund Held on Behalf of the Court Project Completion Reporting	53



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

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: May 5, 2022
Time: 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/1548>

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 April 21, 2022 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) virtual 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 12:00 p.m. on May 4, 2022 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM (ITEMS 1-5)

Item 1

2022-23 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocations (Action Required)

Consideration of the 2022-23 allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for court-appointed dependency counsel.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Don Will, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Ms. Audrey Fancy, Principal Managing Attorney, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 2

Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for 2022-23 (Action Required)

Consideration of recommendations of the Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee regarding allocations from the IMF for 2022-23.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Shirley Mohammed, Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Item 3

Allocations from the TCTF and Trial Court Allocations for 2022-23 (Action Required)

Consideration of recommendations of the R&E Subcommittee and the Funding Methodology Subcommittee regarding allocations from the TCTF for 2022-23, and consideration of 2022-23 trial court allocations, including proposed funding, interpreter funding, and the Workload Formula from the TCTF, State Court Facilities Construction Fund, and General Fund.

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

Item 4

2022-23 Pretrial Allocations and Funding Floor (Action Required)

Consideration of 2022-23 pretrial allocations and funding floor adjustment.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Deirdre Benedict, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services

Item 5

Workload Formula Impact from Remote Appearance Fee Revenue (Action Required)

Consideration of the impact to the Workload Formula from fees imposed under Government Code section 70630.

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

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

2022-23 Self-Help Annual Update

Annual informational update of the three-year average population data from the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, and population estimates for cities and counties and the state.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Nick Armstrong, Senior Research Analyst, Judicial Council Business Management Services

Info 2

TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Expenditure Reporting

Quarterly report to the TCBAC on how funds were expended for projects and planned expenditures that are complete.

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

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

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

April 21, 2022

12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

<http://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/1712>

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Jill C. Fannin, Hon. Kimberly Gaab, Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Hon. Deborah A. Ryan, Hon. Scott B. Thomsen, and Hon. Theodore C. Zayner.

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Vice Chair), Mr. Chad Finke, Mr. James Kim, Mr. Shawn Landry, Ms. Krista LeVier, Mr. Brandon E. Riley, Mr. Chris Ruhl, Mr. Brian Taylor, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Erick L. Larsh, Hon. Michael A. Sachs, Hon. Kevin M. Seibert, Ms. Kim Bartleson, Mr. Kevin Harrigan, and Mr. Neal Taniguchi.

Others Present: Mr. John Wordlaw, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Brandy Olivera, Mr. Douglas Denton, Ms. Anna Maves, Mr. Catrayel Wood, and Mr. Joseph Glavin.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair welcomed the members, called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved minutes of March 14, 2022 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) virtual meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1-2)

Item 1 - Prioritization of Trial Court Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Concepts for 2023-24 (Action Required)

Review and prioritize trial court BCP concept submissions in which the TCBAC was identified as having purview and the opportunity to provide input, for submission to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee for its review.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Vice Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the recommendation to submit the additional concepts outlined in Table 1 to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) with support and without prioritization, and continue forward with previously identified priorities in Table 2 with an added notation that the submissions are in recognition that there may be adjustments between now and completion of the 2022-23 budget process for consideration by the Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting.

Item 2 - Remote Appearance Fee (Action Required)

Deliberation on how fees imposed under Government Code 70630 should be allocated.

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

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the recommendation that these fees should be distributed back to courts on an ongoing, dollar for-dollar basis, retroactive to January 1, 2022 when California Rules of Court rule 3.672 became effective, and to determine at a later time if this would impact the Workload Formula's "Other Local Revenues" effective July 1, 2022.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:26 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

(Action Item)

Title: 2022-23 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocations

Date: April 29, 2022

Contact: Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts
kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov | 916-263-1693
Vida Terry, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts
vida.terry@jud.ca.gov | 415-865-7721

Issue

The current anticipated annual budget for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$156.7 million. Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) staff presents three recommendations for Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) consideration: (1) amend the court-appointed dependency counsel funding allocation methodology as it relates to small court funding adjustments; (2) clarify the court-appointed dependency counsel funding allocation methodology as it relates to the survey of entry-level county counsel; and (3) approve the 2022-23 funding allocations for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and the Judicial Council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting.

The allocations may change based on final appropriations included in the final 2022 Budget Act.

Background

Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel and Allocations

Court-appointed dependency counsel became a state fiscal responsibility in 1989 through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (SB 612/AB 1197; Stats. 1988, ch. 945). The Act added section 77003 to the Government Code, defined “court operations” in that section as including court-appointed dependency counsel, and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. In 1997, the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (AB 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850) provided the funding for, and delineated the parameters of, the transition to state trial court funding that had been outlined in the earlier legislation.

In 2015, the council approved recommendations of the TCBAC to reallocate funding for court-appointed dependency counsel among the trial courts based on a caseload funding model in an effort to provide a more equitable allocation of funding among the courts. Rather than using historical funding levels dating back to the adoption of state trial court funding, the new funding

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

methodology is based on the caseload-based calculation of funding for each court provided by the workload model previously approved by the council in October 2007.¹

Another recommendation approved by the council at this time was that a joint subcommittee of the TCBCAC and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be formed to review that workload model for possible updates and revisions. After a year of research and analysis, the methodology recommended by this joint subcommittee was approved by the council.²

Based on discussion at the April and June 2016 council meetings, in July 2016, the council directed the Executive and Planning Committee to form a working group to consider changes to the court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding methodology as it relates to small courts.

The working group determined that changes were justified in light of the unique costs faced by small courts. It recommended that the funding methodology be modified for 2017-18 and 2018-19 to suspend reallocation-related budget reductions for the smallest courts with caseloads under 200, adjust the local economic index for the small courts with dependency caseloads under 400, and slightly reduce the funding allocations of the larger courts receiving increases related to the reallocation to compensate for these increases to the small court budget.³

The council adopted the modified funding methodology for small courts in May 2017 for 2017-18 and 2018-19, and as ongoing effective July 1, 2019.⁴ Based on current workload and filing information, 31 courts remain in the small court category; however, caseload changes have resulted in only 24 courts meeting the “smallest” court criteria.

Proposed Small Court Funding Offset Methodology

The council’s allocation methodology for dependency counsel includes several adjustments to ensure that small courts have adequate allocations to meet their needs. The cost of these adjustments requires a transfer of approximately \$1 million from the larger courts to the small court allocations. The current methodology specifies that this offset be provided by reducing the budgets of larger courts receiving increases. In 2021-22, the council received a one-time funding

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed-Counsel Funding Reallocation* (April 17, 2015), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150417-itemI.pdf.

² Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (April 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF>.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Small Court Dependency Workload Working Group Final Recommendations* (May 19, 2017), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5150554&GUID=7D8E5F4F-6D83-4C73-A246-4F11E877A411>.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Law: Court Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Methodology for Small Courts* (January 15, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6913216&GUID=4DEB6A82-B007-46D8-9885-8D11D907DBF5>.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

augmentation of \$10 million for COVID-related expenses in dependency counsel.⁵ As a result, in 2022-23, almost all large courts will be receiving allocation decreases, and those few courts receiving an increase would be heavily impacted by the small court adjustments. Since the “reallocation” referenced in the January 2019 report is completed, and all courts are currently funded at the same percentage of need, staff recommend that the current methodology be revised so that funding for all large courts be adjusted to offset the costs for small court funding. Staff recommend that the council make this change even if additional funding is provided in the enacted 2022 Budget Act, since the current methodology is based on offsetting the impact of a statewide reallocation which is now completed.

Proposed Clarification to County Counsel Survey Updates used in Methodology

The council’s allocation methodology includes this element used for calculating local and statewide funding need:

That attorney salaries used in the model be updated for each county using the statewide median county counsel salary and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Category 92 index. [Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (April 15, 2016) Recommendation 2, page 2.)]

The method used for the county counsel survey is described in the rationale section as:

The subcommittee determined that two data sources should be used: current county counsel salaries at the median of the first two salary ranges reported by counties, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics current index. County counsel represent the child welfare department in dependency proceedings and are roughly parallel in skills and experience to court-appointed dependency counsel. County counsel salary information is publicly available and can be used to update the workload model on a regular basis. (page 8).

However, the update cycle was not specified in the report and the salary survey has not been updated since the 2016 report. Updating the survey will result in a county counsel median statewide salary figure that will increase the total funding need reported to the council each year. It will not increase the amount allocated to courts, which is dependent on the funding provided in the Budget Act every year. The median salary is used in conjunction with the Bureau of Labor Statistics index to estimate a statewide need for dependency counsel funding.

Staff recommend that the methodology be clarified to specify that the county counsel median salary be updated on an annual basis.

⁵ The 2021 Budget Act augmented the annual court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel \$156.7 million budget to include \$10 million in additional funding for Court-Appointed Counsel to address COVID-19 pandemic-related operational and caseload increase costs, bringing the Court-Appointed Counsel allocation to \$166.7 million; https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB129.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Update on Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding for 2021-22 (Informational)

In March 2022, the council approved the allocation of \$1,543,180 in Family First Prevention Services Act augmentation funding to eligible courts, contingent upon actual receipt of the funding,⁶ to support legal activities by attorneys representing children and their parents at a new juvenile court hearing. At this hearing, the court will approve or disapprove any new placement of a child or nonminor dependent in a short-term residential therapeutic program held under AB 153.⁷

In consultation with the California Department of Social Services, council staff have determined that this grant will need to be administered as a federal Title IV-E match program. Similar to the existing Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program⁸ (FFDRP), program implementation requires a lengthy sequence of steps and approvals before this funding can be made available to the courts. The funding will be incorporated into the council’s interbranch agreement with the California Department of Social Services for 2022-23 and courts and dependency counsel providers will have access to these funds in 2022-23 and ongoing.

While the new funding is being implemented, courts and dependency providers can recover costs for the new hearing under the court-appointed counsel general fund allocation to the courts and the FFDRP program. In 2022-23, the new funds will add additional funds to the Title IV-E reimbursement program to defray the costs of these hearings.

Recommendation

It is recommended that TCBCAC approve the following for consideration by the Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting, as outlined in Attachment 1A, Column J:

1. Revising the current court-appointed dependency counsel funding allocation methodology to specify that the cost of the small court adjustment be funded by a pro-rata adjustment to the funding allocations of all courts not falling under the definition of “small court” in this methodology;
2. Specifying that the county counsel median salary survey be updated on an annual basis beginning in 2022-23; and
3. 2022-23 funding allocations based on the recommended amended methodology.

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Law: 2021–22 Allocations for Dependency Counsel Program, Expected Unspent Program Funding, and Family First Prevention Services Act Funding* (February 22, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10544371&GUID=5B28EB35-9464-4A92-8B00-6D5DE8EF2578>

⁷ Assembly Bill 153 (Committee on Budget; Stats. 2021, ch. 86), accessible at https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB153.

⁸ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Law: Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program* (September 3, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8766467&GUID=17E19209-5AA7-4382-B7A7-257AAEE206F2>.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Alternatives Considered

CFCC staff considered two alternatives to recommendation (1):

1. *Utilize the current methodology, using 2021-22 allocations at the \$156.7 million funding level.*

This alternative requires a calculation that nets out the 2021-22 one-time allocation of \$10 million. This alternative does not address the issue that the current methodology refers to increases based on the statewide reallocation of funds. Now that the reallocation is complete, all large courts are funded at the same percentage of need and a pro-rated share of the small court transfer of funding has the same relative impact on all large courts.

2. *Utilize the current methodology.*

In 2021-22, the council received a one-time funding augmentation of \$10 million for COVID-related expenses for dependency counsel. Utilizing the current methodology would result in almost all large courts receiving allocation decreases, and the few courts receiving an increase carrying disproportionate reductions to fund the small court transfer.

Attachments

Attachment 1A: Recommended 2022-23 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocations

Attachment 1B: Impact of Recommendation on Court Allocations

2022-23 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Court	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Prior Year 21-22	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Current Year 22-23	2016-17 Allocation	2017-18 Allocation	2018-19 Allocation	2019-20 Allocation	2020-21 Allocation	2021-22 Allocation	2022-23 Allocation Current Methodology	2022-23 Allocation Revised Methodology Offset with All Lrg Courts Recommended
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Alameda	\$4,075,144	\$4,165,251	\$3,618,313	\$3,565,629	\$3,399,620	\$3,629,342	\$3,422,591	\$3,348,652	\$3,234,465	\$3,212,968
Alpine	\$15,513	\$17,400	\$399	\$1,799	\$2,628	\$7,226	\$11,439	\$19,616	\$19,850	\$19,850
Amador	\$151,319	\$155,965	\$115,233	\$143,696	\$144,678	\$145,653	\$126,205	\$128,301	\$124,450	\$124,450
Butte	\$1,061,873	\$1,004,737	\$627,554	\$794,546	\$799,814	\$926,951	\$891,346	\$872,569	\$780,214	\$775,028
Calaveras	\$191,018	\$172,781	\$142,758	\$220,822	\$191,355	\$203,567	\$202,088	\$189,010	\$161,288	\$161,288
Colusa	\$100,499	\$93,171	\$40,667	\$43,948	\$72,637	\$103,517	\$117,871	\$112,668	\$99,064	\$99,064
Contra Costa	\$3,248,232	\$2,980,842	\$2,600,337	\$2,363,610	\$2,294,410	\$2,617,772	\$2,571,073	\$2,651,024	\$2,314,730	\$2,299,345
Del Norte	\$189,259	\$200,553	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$203,096	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$214,730
El Dorado	\$704,974	\$597,947	\$655,569	\$548,764	\$505,148	\$582,746	\$560,863	\$579,296	\$464,327	\$464,327
Fresno	\$4,576,938	\$4,840,683	\$2,670,600	\$3,015,746	\$2,800,979	\$3,209,875	\$3,302,907	\$3,735,438	\$3,484,547	\$3,733,979
Glenn	\$136,523	\$133,326	\$90,417	\$111,158	\$122,690	\$140,011	\$154,825	\$164,905	\$146,444	\$146,444
Humboldt	\$876,594	\$844,588	\$462,558	\$522,682	\$657,658	\$615,068	\$665,891	\$715,427	\$655,853	\$651,494
Imperial	\$814,882	\$739,360	\$518,512	\$576,150	\$562,114	\$645,919	\$693,729	\$669,610	\$574,139	\$570,323
Inyo	\$32,686	\$36,120	\$72,277	\$45,459	\$51,626	\$48,006	\$39,570	\$41,562	\$46,352	\$46,352
Kern	\$3,367,432	\$3,522,727	\$2,277,753	\$2,664,810	\$2,627,276	\$2,864,207	\$2,720,713	\$2,748,308	\$2,735,523	\$2,717,342
Kings	\$846,627	\$858,302	\$443,478	\$700,757	\$713,352	\$696,307	\$659,612	\$690,969	\$666,502	\$662,072
Lake	\$210,846	\$173,416	\$296,119	\$272,201	\$276,158	\$285,153	\$288,934	\$280,183	\$236,139	\$236,139
Lassen	\$128,016	\$131,299	\$106,891	\$106,891	\$108,967	\$128,825	\$130,683	\$135,339	\$129,091	\$129,091
Los Angeles	\$101,358,111	\$100,814,675	\$45,149,389	\$60,560,884	\$62,434,046	\$73,864,405	\$75,809,513	\$82,722,770	\$78,286,168	\$77,765,865
Madera	\$731,363	\$791,199	\$293,833	\$535,074	\$589,946	\$674,047	\$631,797	\$643,573	\$666,476	\$666,476
Marin	\$288,497	\$289,720	\$388,488	\$311,538	\$304,984	\$270,557	\$287,842	\$288,497	\$284,732	\$284,732
Mariposa	\$65,070	\$73,336	\$38,070	\$38,070	\$41,897	\$54,019	\$48,793	\$60,059	\$63,977	\$63,977
Mendocino	\$506,668	\$521,132	\$566,908	\$440,581	\$458,911	\$527,624	\$510,212	\$529,357	\$511,024	\$511,024
Merced	\$1,095,655	\$1,118,760	\$751,397	\$844,260	\$775,718	\$825,284	\$840,466	\$894,211	\$868,757	\$862,983
Modoc	\$36,516	\$37,755	\$17,128	\$24,065	\$37,161	\$49,493	\$59,313	\$52,855	\$51,256	\$51,256
Mono	\$20,508	\$21,416	\$13,956	\$13,956	\$14,615	\$14,550	\$18,114	\$18,392	\$18,368	\$18,368
Monterey	\$898,182	\$724,678	\$494,823	\$682,574	\$715,702	\$829,349	\$797,204	\$738,059	\$570,105	\$570,105
Napa	\$529,636	\$486,138	\$232,362	\$315,051	\$311,403	\$384,039	\$417,108	\$435,215	\$377,504	\$377,504
Nevada	\$185,041	\$185,860	\$226,123	\$202,832	\$174,058	\$173,215	\$178,805	\$185,041	\$184,256	\$184,256
Orange	\$9,325,618	\$9,499,539	\$5,648,065	\$5,366,139	\$5,355,390	\$6,553,748	\$6,915,607	\$7,611,043	\$7,376,729	\$7,327,702
Placer	\$757,007	\$704,457	\$687,985	\$895,552	\$747,111	\$710,846	\$600,593	\$622,053	\$552,459	\$552,459
Plumas	\$116,804	\$106,378	\$154,059	\$151,555	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$152,458	\$152,458
Riverside	\$9,094,598	\$10,048,073	\$6,411,055	\$8,806,009	\$8,173,324	\$7,999,219	\$6,877,392	\$7,422,498	\$7,233,067	\$7,750,827
Sacramento	\$5,987,569	\$5,522,714	\$4,832,997	\$5,609,080	\$5,161,591	\$5,586,032	\$5,017,201	\$4,920,141	\$4,288,583	\$4,260,080
San Benito	\$120,828	\$111,691	\$89,163	\$112,410	\$104,920	\$107,040	\$109,317	\$99,288	\$89,163	\$89,163
San Bernardino	\$15,984,841	\$16,076,265	\$5,731,210	\$8,514,703	\$9,751,976	\$11,957,781	\$12,446,717	\$13,045,926	\$12,483,789	\$12,400,820
San Diego	\$6,522,796	\$6,647,256	\$7,711,177	\$6,132,621	\$5,339,513	\$5,525,422	\$5,141,307	\$5,323,538	\$5,161,830	\$5,127,523
San Francisco	\$3,251,547	\$3,153,096	\$3,296,146	\$3,060,973	\$2,754,101	\$2,926,579	\$2,698,254	\$2,671,880	\$2,448,491	\$2,432,218
San Joaquin	\$3,293,435	\$3,131,249	\$2,601,178	\$2,480,278	\$2,399,805	\$2,739,513	\$2,729,427	\$2,706,301	\$2,431,526	\$2,415,366
San Luis Obispo	\$971,029	\$873,531	\$647,980	\$703,001	\$672,046	\$795,812	\$803,509	\$797,919	\$678,327	\$673,819
San Mateo	\$1,009,098	\$896,472	\$668,643	\$960,903	\$934,702	\$984,479	\$837,813	\$829,202	\$696,143	\$696,143
Santa Barbara	\$1,241,134	\$1,427,914	\$1,267,448	\$979,287	\$826,760	\$865,438	\$889,172	\$1,012,943	\$1,027,879	\$1,101,457
Santa Clara	\$4,171,607	\$3,977,233	\$3,780,956	\$3,223,912	\$2,947,634	\$3,290,686	\$3,262,294	\$3,404,630	\$3,088,462	\$3,067,936
Santa Cruz	\$640,179	\$544,979	\$713,676	\$598,314	\$544,197	\$619,253	\$557,112	\$526,052	\$423,773	\$423,773
Shasta	\$821,962	\$817,032	\$621,700	\$680,076	\$614,678	\$690,857	\$662,855	\$670,839	\$634,454	\$630,238
Sierra	\$0	\$0	\$13,759	\$9,848	\$8,323	\$5,045	\$10,829	\$13,759	\$22,459	\$22,459
Siskiyou	\$177,189	\$173,714	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373
Solano	\$1,172,880	\$1,241,671	\$801,057	\$883,349	\$805,489	\$880,251	\$868,262	\$957,238	\$893,813	\$957,794
Sonoma	\$1,810,820	\$1,714,938	\$990,021	\$918,101	\$945,770	\$1,262,354	\$1,405,793	\$1,477,889	\$1,331,710	\$1,322,859
Stanislaus	\$1,779,104	\$1,619,266	\$1,004,470	\$1,092,505	\$1,091,719	\$1,424,350	\$1,448,878	\$1,452,004	\$1,257,417	\$1,249,060
Sutter	\$433,392	\$373,067	\$146,804	\$220,511	\$260,937	\$353,444	\$374,781	\$363,107	\$299,810	\$299,810
Tehama	\$281,284	\$240,370	\$177,634	\$319,793	\$362,975	\$392,840	\$340,323	\$293,399	\$241,836	\$241,836
Trinity	\$77,181	\$74,230	\$93,829	\$96,021	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829
Tulare	\$2,806,090	\$2,700,364	\$1,032,410	\$1,591,232	\$1,714,221	\$2,067,711	\$2,155,983	\$2,290,172	\$2,096,928	\$2,082,992
Tuolumne	\$337,668	\$326,761	\$110,593	\$159,147	\$168,548	\$187,463	\$257,399	\$338,350	\$313,321	\$313,321
Ventura	\$2,119,160	\$2,055,714	\$1,284,628	\$1,835,753	\$1,833,055	\$2,017,019	\$1,802,468	\$1,741,369	\$1,596,335	\$1,585,725
Yolo	\$1,558,884	\$1,468,321	\$430,429	\$596,503	\$712,428	\$1,021,991	\$1,167,029	\$1,272,273	\$1,140,203	\$1,132,625
Yuba	\$436,672	\$405,544	\$278,909	\$474,768	\$471,244	\$410,105	\$363,820	\$377,291	\$329,504	\$329,504
Reserve	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Total	\$202,743,998	\$201,664,975	\$114,700,000	\$136,700,000	\$136,700,000	\$156,700,000	\$156,700,000	\$166,700,000	\$156,700,000	\$156,700,000

Note: Allocations are based on filings data obtained from the Office of Court Research and caseload data obtained from the California Child Welfare

Indicators Project (CCWIP) as of July 1, 2021.

2022-23 Impact of Recommendation on Court Allocations

Court	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Current Year 22-23	Allocation without Small Court Adjustment Current Year 22-23	Small Court Adjustment Current Year 22-23	Current Methodology Courts funding adjustment	Current Methodology 2022-23 Allocation	Recommended Methodology Courts funding adjustment	Recommended Methodology 2022-23 Allocation
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Alameda	\$4,165,251	\$3,234,465	\$0	\$0	\$3,234,465	-\$21,497	\$3,212,968
Alpine	\$17,400	\$13,512	\$6,338		\$19,850		\$19,850
Amador	\$155,965	\$121,112	\$3,337		\$124,450		\$124,450
Butte	\$1,004,737	\$780,214	\$0	\$0	\$780,214	-\$5,185	\$775,028
Calaveras	\$172,781	\$134,170	\$27,118		\$161,288		\$161,288
Colusa	\$93,171	\$72,351	\$26,713		\$99,064		\$99,064
Contra Costa	\$2,980,842	\$2,314,730	\$0	\$0	\$2,314,730	-\$15,384	\$2,299,345
Del Norte	\$200,553	\$155,737	\$58,994		\$214,730		\$214,730
El Dorado	\$597,947	\$464,327	\$0		\$464,327		\$464,327
Fresno	\$4,840,683	\$3,758,962	\$0	-\$274,415	\$3,484,547	-\$24,983	\$3,733,979
Glenn	\$133,326	\$103,532	\$42,911		\$146,444		\$146,444
Humboldt	\$844,588	\$655,853	\$0	\$0	\$655,853	-\$4,359	\$651,494
Imperial	\$739,360	\$574,139	\$0	\$0	\$574,139	-\$3,816	\$570,323
Inyo	\$36,120	\$28,049	\$18,304		\$46,352		\$46,352
Kern	\$3,522,727	\$2,735,523	\$0	\$0	\$2,735,523	-\$18,181	\$2,717,342
Kings	\$858,302	\$666,502	\$0	\$0	\$666,502	-\$4,430	\$662,072
Lake	\$173,416	\$134,664	\$101,475		\$236,139		\$236,139
Lassen	\$131,299	\$101,958	\$27,132		\$129,091		\$129,091
Los Angeles	\$100,814,675	\$78,286,168	\$0	\$0	\$78,286,168	-\$520,303	\$77,765,865
Madera	\$791,199	\$614,394	\$52,082		\$666,476		\$666,476
Marin	\$289,720	\$224,978	\$59,754		\$284,732		\$284,732
Mariposa	\$73,336	\$56,948	\$7,029		\$63,977		\$63,977
Mendocino	\$521,132	\$404,677	\$106,347		\$511,024		\$511,024
Merced	\$1,118,760	\$868,757	\$0	\$0	\$868,757	-\$5,774	\$862,983
Modoc	\$37,755	\$29,318	\$21,938		\$51,256		\$51,256
Mono	\$21,416	\$16,631	\$1,738		\$18,368		\$18,368
Monterey	\$724,678	\$562,738	\$7,367		\$570,105		\$570,105
Napa	\$486,138	\$377,504	\$0		\$377,504		\$377,504
Nevada	\$185,860	\$144,327	\$39,930		\$184,256		\$184,256
Orange	\$9,499,539	\$7,376,729	\$0	\$0	\$7,376,729	-\$49,027	\$7,327,702
Placer	\$704,457	\$547,036	\$5,423		\$552,459		\$552,459
Plumas	\$106,378	\$82,606	\$69,852		\$152,458		\$152,458
Riverside	\$10,048,073	\$7,802,685	\$0	-\$569,617	\$7,233,067	-\$51,858	\$7,750,827
Sacramento	\$5,522,714	\$4,288,583	\$0	\$0	\$4,288,583	-\$28,503	\$4,260,080
San Benito	\$111,691	\$86,732	\$2,431		\$89,163		\$89,163
San Bernardino	\$16,076,265	\$12,483,789	\$0	\$0	\$12,483,789	-\$82,969	\$12,400,820
San Diego	\$6,647,256	\$5,161,830	\$0	\$0	\$5,161,830	-\$34,306	\$5,127,523
San Francisco	\$3,153,096	\$2,448,491	\$0	\$0	\$2,448,491	-\$16,273	\$2,432,218
San Joaquin	\$3,131,249	\$2,431,526	\$0	\$0	\$2,431,526	-\$16,160	\$2,415,366
San Luis Obispo	\$873,531	\$678,327	\$0	\$0	\$678,327	-\$4,508	\$673,819
San Mateo	\$896,472	\$696,143	\$0		\$696,143		\$696,143
Santa Barbara	\$1,427,914	\$1,108,826	\$0	-\$80,947	\$1,027,879	-\$7,369	\$1,101,457
Santa Clara	\$3,977,233	\$3,088,462	\$0	\$0	\$3,088,462	-\$20,526	\$3,067,936
Santa Cruz	\$544,979	\$423,195	\$578		\$423,773		\$423,773
Shasta	\$817,032	\$634,454	\$0	\$0	\$634,454	-\$4,217	\$630,238
Sierra	\$0	\$0	\$22,459		\$22,459		\$22,459
Siskiyou	\$173,714	\$134,895	\$110,478		\$245,373		\$245,373
Solano	\$1,241,671	\$964,202	\$0	-\$70,389	\$893,813	-\$6,408	\$957,794
Sonoma	\$1,714,938	\$1,331,710	\$0	\$0	\$1,331,710	-\$8,851	\$1,322,859
Stanislaus	\$1,619,266	\$1,257,417	\$0	\$0	\$1,257,417	-\$8,357	\$1,249,060
Sutter	\$373,067	\$289,700	\$10,110		\$299,810		\$299,810
Tehama	\$240,370	\$186,656	\$55,180		\$241,836		\$241,836
Trinity	\$74,230	\$57,643	\$36,187		\$93,829		\$93,829
Tulare	\$2,700,364	\$2,096,928	\$0	\$0	\$2,096,928	-\$13,937	\$2,082,992
Tuolumne	\$326,761	\$253,742	\$59,579		\$313,321		\$313,321
Ventura	\$2,055,714	\$1,596,335	\$0	\$0	\$1,596,335	-\$10,610	\$1,585,725
Yolo	\$1,468,321	\$1,140,203	\$0	\$0	\$1,140,203	-\$7,578	\$1,132,625
Yuba	\$405,544	\$314,919	\$14,585		\$329,504		\$329,504
Reserve	\$0	\$100,000	\$0		\$100,000		\$100,000
Total	\$201,664,975	\$156,700,000	\$995,369	-\$995,369	\$156,700,000	-\$995,369	\$156,700,000

Note: Allocations are based on filings data obtained from the Office of Court Research and caseload data obtained from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) as of July 1, 2021.

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

Title: Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for 2022-23

Date: 5/5/2022

Contact: Shirley Mohammed, Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-263-1933 | shirley.mohammed@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider adopting recommendations from the Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee for the preliminary 2022-23 allocations from the IMF for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and then the Judicial Council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting.

Proposed 2022-23 Preliminary Allocations

Over the last two fiscal years, the IMF was facing possible insolvency as early as 2022-23 due to estimated declining revenues. However, with a one-time influx of \$5 million from audit findings in 2021-22, there are no insolvency concerns in 2022-23 even if revenues continue to decline. In addition, the proposed Budget Bill Language included in the 2022-23 Governor’s Budget ensures that revenue declines would be backfilled in the amount necessary to support the fund.

As approved by the Judicial Council at its June 24, 2016 business meeting, the IMF fund condition also includes a reserve of \$2 million to protect against possible further declines in revenue and should be considered available for expenditure since the revenues in the fund have declined¹. This reserve is not expected to be needed to support 2022-23 allocation recommendations included in Attachment 2A. Attachment 2B provides narrative descriptions of the programs receiving IMF funding allocations.

The following are the proposed 2022-23 allocation requests by Judicial Council offices:

1. **Audit Services** – Conducts operational audits, risk assessments, and recommends improvements to all judicial branch entities.
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$354,000; a decrease of \$6,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for conducting performance and compliance audits of the 58 trial courts.

¹ Judicial Council meeting (June 24, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4496693&GUID=FE6C1F1D-A68F-4CB8-B4E7-0596B5A59994>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (June 24, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=463476&GUID=26AF2EFA-74F7-4F01-AE8D-2A556C3986CD>.

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

- ii. The decrease is due to lower forecasted operational expenses, offset by increased staffing costs.

- 2. **Branch Accounting and Procurement** – Supports the trial courts’ financial and human resources Phoenix System.
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$169,000; an increase of \$12,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for one accounting staff and for providing contract-related services to produce statewide leveraged procurement agreements.
 - ii. The increase is due to increased staffing costs.

- 3. **Business Management Services** – Supports the judicial branch research, data, and analytic programs and manages the Temporary Assigned Judges Program.
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$9,000; a decrease of \$200,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for committee meeting expenses for court personnel and judges related to workload studies.
 - ii. The decrease is due to the one-time funding of \$200,000 in 2021-22 for the Juror Source List Update program as required by SB 592.

- 4. **Budget Services** – Supports meetings of various committees and subcommittees as they relate to trial court funding, policies, and other issues.
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$150,000; a decrease of \$209,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) and subcommittees meetings, two budget staff, and annual trainings for Revenue Distribution and the Collections Reporting Template.
 - ii. The decrease is due to a technical adjustment for the agency to utilize the ongoing General Fund backfill, in lieu of IMF, to cover the cost of the 5 percent general salary increase that all council positions received in July 2021.

- 5. **Center for Families, Children & the Courts** – Supports various programs within the courts for litigants.
 - a. *Approve an allocation of \$6,429,000; a decrease of \$247,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for providing Domestic Violence forms in languages other than English to all courts; enabling all courts to use Hotdocs Document Assembly Applications while filing documents; court-based assistance to self-represented litigants; supporting the Beyond the Bench conference, Child & Family Focused Education Conference, and Youth Summit; funding for legal

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

services agencies and their court partners to provide representation to indigent persons; updating the Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support Program and expanding the online California Courts Self-Help Center on the judicial branch website; and for recruitment of new interpreters.

- ii. The decrease is for the specific use of funds for the Shriver Civil Counsel Program from cy pres funds that are held in reserve in the fund and may only be used for this purpose. This statutorily provided funding was expected to only be collected in 2019-20; however, some revenue has continued to come in after the planned sunset date. This request represents the use of the remaining available balance of that revenue.
 - iii. Provisional language in the budget requires unspent funds for Self-Help to revert to the General Fund.
6. **Center for Judicial Education and Research** – Provides education to judges, court leaders, court staff faculty, managers, supervisors, and lead staff.
- a. *Approve an allocation of \$1,705,000; an increase of \$639,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for faculty development participant expenses, training for court leaders, the Court Clerks Training Institute, and for newly elected or appointed judges and subordinate judicial officers’ education programs.
 - ii. The increase is due to an additional, mandatory in-person training for judicial officers that was postponed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
7. **Criminal Justice Services** – Supports the Judicial Council’s Criminal Jury Instructions Advisory Committee.
- a. *Approve an allocation of \$9,000; this is an increase of \$9,000 as there was no 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for the criminal portion of the Jury Instructions and is self-funded by royalties generated from their sales.
 - ii. The increase is due to a portion of the Jury System Improvement Project being transferred to Criminal Justice Services from Legal Services.
8. **Human Resources** – Supports the Trial Court Labor Relations Academy to provide assistance to trial court staff in addressing various labor issues (not mandated).
- a. *Approve \$0; a decrease of \$23,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for the Labor Relations Academy and Forums to provide court management staff with comprehensive labor relations knowledge to assist the courts in addressing their labor needs.
 - ii. The decrease is due to the Trial Court Labor Relations Academy and Forum to be held every other year; therefore, funding is not needed for 2022-23.

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

9. **Information Technology** – Supports information technology systems for the 58 trial courts.
- a. *Approve an allocation of \$33,877,000; a reduction of \$3,805,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for the Data Center and Cloud Service to host some level of services for the 58 California trial courts, the appellate courts, and the Supreme Court; the distribution and mandated reporting of uniform civil fees collected by all 58 trial courts; the California Courts Protective Order Registry; for developing and supporting a standardized level of network infrastructure for the trial courts; the Enterprise Policy and Planning program which provides a variety of Oracle products to the courts; Data Integration; the Jury Management System; and case management system replacement budget change proposal funding which provides one-time funding to 10 courts to replace legacy systems.
 - ii. The reduction is primarily due to the expiration of the 2016-17 budget change proposal funding, one-time identified savings, and phasing out of a software program.
10. **Legal Services** – Supports the Judicial Council staff divisions and the courts, manages litigation, and is responsible for rules and projects including the California Rules of Court and Judicial Council forms as well as the Judicial Council’s Civil Jury Instructions Advisory Committee.
- a. *Approve an allocation of \$870,000; a decrease of \$7,600,000 from the 2021–22 allocation.*
 - i. The allocation is for the Regional Office Assistance Group of Legal Services to provide direct services to the trial courts; the Litigation Management Program of Legal Services to pay settlement, judgments, and litigation costs; and for the civil portion of the Jury Instructions which is self-funded by royalties generated from their sales.
 - ii. The reduction is due to \$9,000 of the Jury System Improvement Project transferred to the Criminal Justice Services; \$1,509,000 in Judicial Performance Defense Insurance costs transferred to Leadership Support Services; and \$6,119,000 for one-time 2021-22 costs for litigation that resulted in an expense to the IMF. Of the \$6,119,000, only \$3,000,000 was utilized for expenditure from the IMF and \$3,119,000 was returned to the IMF fund balance in 2021-22. The office is retaining \$100,000 as final litigation costs are confirmed.
 - iii. The reductions are offset by increased staffing costs of \$37,000.
11. **Leadership Support Services** – Supports the trial court judicial officers for the Commission on Judicial Performance defense master insurance policy.

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

- a. *Approve an allocation of \$1,812,000; this is an increase of \$1,812,000 as there was no 2021–22 allocation.*
- i. The allocation is for the Judicial Performance Defense Insurance program which is used to pay the insurance premium for trial court judges and judicial officers for the Commission on Judicial Performance defense master insurance policy.
 - ii. The increase is due to the Judicial Performance Defense Insurance program being transferred to Leadership Support Services from Legal Services including increased premium costs.

The 2022–23 IMF allocation request of \$45,384,000 is reflected in the IMF Fund Condition Statement (Attachment 2C). Based on current revenue estimates, the fund is estimated to have a sufficient balance for the requested allocations (see Attachment 2C, Row 19).

Recommendation

The following recommendation is presented to the TCBAC for consideration:

Adopt a recommendation to approve a total of \$45,384,000 in preliminary allocations for 2022-23 from the IMF for consideration by the Budget Committee and then the council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting.

Attachments

Attachment 2A: Judicial Council of California Approved 2021-22 and Proposed 2022-23 Allocations from the IMF – State Operations and Local Assistance Appropriations

Attachment 2B: IMF Summary of Programs

Attachment 2C: IMF Fund Condition Statement

Judicial Council of California
Approved 2021-22 and Proposed 2022-23 Allocations
State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
State Operations and Local Assistance Appropriations

#	Program Name and Adjustments	Office	2021-22 Allocations	Recommended 2022-23 Allocations			\$ Change from 2021-22	% Change from 2021-22
			Judicial Council Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G = (E + F)	H = (G - D)	I = (H/D)
1	Audit Services	AS	\$ 360,000	\$ 354,000	\$ -	\$ 354,000	\$ (6,000)	-1.7%
2	Trial Court Master Agreements	BAP	157,000	169,000	-	169,000	12,000	7.6%
3	Workload Assessment Advisory Committee	BMS	9,000		9,000	9,000	-	0.0%
4	Juror Source List Update	BMS	200,000		-	-	(200,000)	100.0%
5	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	BS	30,000		30,000	30,000	-	0.0%
6	Treasury Services - Cash Management	BS	319,000	110,000		110,000	(209,000)	-65.5%
7	Revenue Distribution Training	BS	10,000		10,000	10,000	-	0.0%
8	Domestic Violence Forms Translation	CFCC	17,000		17,000	17,000	-	0.0%
9	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	60,000		60,000	60,000	-	0.0%
10	Self-Help Center	CFCC	5,000,000		5,000,000	5,000,000	-	0.0%
11	Statewide Multidisciplinary Education	CFCC	67,000		67,000	67,000	-	0.0%
12	Shriver Civil Counsel- Cy Pres Funding	CFCC	1,289,000		1,042,000	1,042,000	(247,000)	-19.2%
13	Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs	CFCC	100,000		100,000	100,000	-	0.0%
14	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	CFCC	143,000		143,000	143,000	-	0.0%
15	CJER Faculty	CJER	48,000		48,000	48,000	-	0.0%
16	Essential Court Management Education	CJER	40,000		40,000	40,000	-	0.0%
17	Essential Court Personnel Education	CJER	130,000		130,000	130,000	-	0.0%
18	Judicial Education	CJER	848,000		1,487,000	1,487,000	639,000	75.4%
19	Jury System Improvement Projects	CJS	-		9,000	9,000	9,000	100.0%
20	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	23,000		-	-	(23,000)	-100.0%
21	Data Center and Cloud Service	IT	8,582,000	2,139,000	4,957,000	7,096,000	(1,486,000)	-17.3%
22	Uniform Civil Filing Services	IT	437,000	429,000	3,000	432,000	(5,000)	-1.1%
23	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	IT	1,200,000	400,000	551,000	951,000	(249,000)	-20.8%
24	Telecommunications	IT	12,470,000		13,470,000	13,470,000	1,000,000	8.0%
25	Enterprise Policy & Planning (Statewide Planning and Dev Support)	IT	3,887,000	1,035,000	2,870,000	3,905,000	18,000	0.5%
26	Data Integration	IT	1,879,000	791,000	992,000	1,783,000	(96,000)	-5.1%
27	Jury Management System	IT	665,000		665,000	665,000	-	0.0%
28	Case Management System Replacement	IT	3,053,000		66,000	66,000	(2,987,000)	-97.8%
29	Telecom	IT	5,509,000	1,125,000	4,384,000	5,509,000	-	0.0%
30	Jury System Improvement Projects	LS	19,000		10,000	10,000	(9,000)	-47.4%
31	Regional Office Assistance Group	LS	823,000	860,000	-	860,000	37,000	4.5%
32	Litigation Management Program	LS	6,119,000		-	-	(6,119,000)	-100.0%
33	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LS	1,509,000		-	-	(1,509,000)	-100.0%
34	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSS	-		1,812,000	1,812,000	1,812,000	100.0%
35	Total		\$ 55,002,000	\$ 7,412,000	\$ 37,972,000	\$ 45,384,000	\$ (9,618,000)	-17.5%

Totals by Office		Office	Judicial Council Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total	\$ Change from 2021-22	% Change from 2021-22
Legend		C	D	E	F	G = (E + F)	H = (G - D)	I = (H/D)
36	Audit Services	AS	\$ 360,000	\$ 354,000	\$ -	\$ 354,000	\$ (6,000)	-1.7%
37	Branch Accounting and Procurement	BAP	157,000	169,000	-	169,000	12,000	7.6%
38	Business Management Services	BMS	209,000	-	9,000	9,000	(200,000)	-95.7%
39	Budget Services	BS	359,000	110,000	40,000	150,000	(209,000)	-58.2%
40	Center for Families, Children and the Courts	CFCC	6,676,000	-	6,429,000	6,429,000	(247,000)	-3.7%
41	Center for Judicial Education and Research	CJER	1,066,000	-	1,705,000	1,705,000	639,000	59.9%
42	Criminal Justice Services	CJS	-	-	9,000	9,000	9,000	100.0%
43	Human Resources	HR	23,000	-	-	-	(23,000)	-100.0%
44	Information Technology	IT	37,682,000	5,919,000	27,958,000	33,877,000	(3,805,000)	-10.1%
45	Legal Services	LS	8,470,000	860,000	10,000	870,000	(7,600,000)	-89.7%
46	Leadership Services	LSS	-	-	1,812,000	1,812,000	1,812,000	100.0%
Total Allocations			\$ 55,002,000	\$ 7,412,000	\$ 37,972,000	\$ 45,384,000	\$ (9,618,000)	-17.5%

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
Summary of Programs**

Row #	Program Name	Office	Program Description
A	B	C	D
1	Audit Services	AS	Conducts performance and compliance audits of the State's 58 trial courts per the annual audit plan.
2	Trial Court Procurement/TCAS-MSA-IMF	BAP	Pays for personal services, phone services, and rent allocation for one position in Branch Accounting and Procurement to provide contract related services for the production of statewide leveraged procurement agreements.
3	Workload Assessment Advisory Committee	BMS	Pays for meeting expenses of the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee and travel expenses for court personnel and judges related to workload studies.
4	Juror Source List Update	BMS	Senate Bill (SB) 592 mandates beginning on January 1, 2022, the list of resident state tax filers be added to the juror source list. The funds being requested will be used to assist with the cost of updating the jury source lists of each county to include the Franchise Tax Board data.
5	Budget Focused Training and Meetings	BS	Supports meetings of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and associated subcommittees on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for trial courts and provides input to the Judicial Council on policy issues affecting Trial Court Funding.
6	Treasury Services - Cash Management	BS	Used for the compensation, operating expenses and equipment costs for two accounting staff.
7	Revenue Distribution Training	BS	Pays for annual training on Revenue Distribution to all the collection programs as well as annual CRT training.
8	Domestic Violence Forms Translation	CFCC	This program makes available to all courts, translation of domestic violence protective order forms in languages other than English. Since 2000, these forms have been translated into Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese and Korean based on data from various language needs studies.
9	Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	CFCC	This program enables all courts to use Hotdocs Document Assembly Applications, which present court users with a Q&A format that automatically populates fields across all filing documents.
10	Self-Help Center	CFCC	Provides court-based assistance to self-represented litigants.
11	Statewide Multidisciplinary Education	CFCC	Supports the biannual Beyond the Bench Conference, biannual Child & Family Focused Education Conference and annual Youth Summit.
12	Shriver Civil Counsel- Cy Pres Funding	CFCC	This program provides funding for legal services agencies and their court partners to provide representation to indigent persons in cases involving housing, child custody, guardianship, conservatorships, and domestic violence.
13	Statewide Support for Self-Help Programs	CFCC	The Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support Program updates and expands the online California Courts Self-Help Center on the judicial branch website. Further, this program facilitates the translating of over 50 Judicial Council forms that are used regularly by self-represented litigants.
14	Court Interpreter Testing etc.	CFCC	Pays for the testing, orientation, and recruitment of new interpreters.
15	CJER Faculty	CJER	Lodging, meals, and travel for faculty development participants. Primarily development of pro bono judge and court staff faculty who will teach all CJER programs for the trial courts.
16	Essential Court Management Education	CJER	National and statewide training for court leaders, including Institute for Court Management (ICM) courses, CJER Core 40 and Core 24 courses, & other local & regional courses for managers, supervisors and lead staff.
17	Essential Court Personnel Education	CJER	The Court Clerks Training Institute - courtroom and court legal process education in civil, traffic, criminal, probate, family, juvenile, appellate. Regional and local court personnel courses. The biennial Trial Court Judicial Attorneys Institute.
18	Judicial Education	CJER	Programs for all newly elected or appointed judges and subordinate judicial officers required by Rule of Court 10.462 (c)(1) to complete the new judge education programs offered by CJER; Judicial Institutes, courses for experienced judges; programs for PJs, CEOs & Supervising Judges.
19, 30	Jury System Improvement Projects	CJS/ LS	This program is related to Jury Instructions and is a "self-funding" PCC. Funds in this account are generated by royalties generated from sales of criminal and civil jury instructions. The funds are deposited pursuant to the Government Code.
20	Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	HR	The Labor Relations Academy and Forums provide court management staff with comprehensive labor relations knowledge that assists the courts in meeting its labor challenges. The Academies are held once per year in the spring and the Forums are held once per year in the fall. The allocation pays for costs tied to the setup and operations of HR's annual Labor Relations Academies and Forums. Typical expenses include: reimbursement of travel expenses for trial court employees who participate as faculty; lodging for all trial court attendees (including those who serve as faculty); meeting room/conference room rental fees; books/reference materials if needed; and meals for trial court participants of the Labor Relations Forum. Following each Academy, program staff send out surveys to gather feedback and receive suggestions for future events. In addition, participant attendance is gathered and reported to the Judicial Council as part of the Administrative Director's Report to the Council.

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
Summary of Programs**

Row #	Program Name	Office	Program Description
A	B	C	D
21	Data Center and Cloud Service (formerly CCTC and/or CCTC Operations)	IT	<p>The CCTC hosts some level of services for the 58 California superior courts, all the Courts of Appeal and the Supreme Court and has over 10,000 supported users. Major installations in the CCTC include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appellate Court Case Management System (ACCMS) • California Court Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) • Phoenix - Trial Court Financial and Human Resources System • Computer Aided Facilities Management (CAFM) system • Civil, Small Claims, Probate, and Mental Health Trial Court Case Management System (V3) • Integration Services Backbone (ISB) <p>This program provides consistent, cost effective, and secure hosting services, including ongoing maintenance and operational support, data network management, desktop computing and local server support, tape back-up and recovery, help desk services, email services, and a disaster recovery program.</p>
22	Uniform Civil Filing Services	IT	<p>This program supports the distribution and mandated reporting of uniform civil fees collected by all 58 superior courts, with an average of \$43 million distributed per month. The system generates reports for the State Controller's Office and various entities that receive the distributed funds. There are over 200 fee types collected by each court, distributed to 23 different entities (e.g. Trial Court Trust Fund, County, Equal Access Fund, Law Library, etc.), requiring 65,502 corresponding distribution rules that are maintained by UCFS. UCFS benefits the public by minimizing the amount of penalties paid to the state for incorrect or late distributions and ensuring that the entities entitled to a portion of the civil fees collected, as mandated by law, receive their correct distributions.</p>
23	California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR)	IT	<p>The California Courts Protective Order Registry (CCPOR) is a statewide repository of protective orders containing both data and scanned images of orders that can be accessed by judges, court staff, and law enforcement officers. CCPOR allows judges and law enforcement officers to view orders issued by other court divisions and across county lines.</p>
24, 29	Telecommunications Support	IT	<p>This program develops and supports a standardized level of network infrastructure for the California superior courts. This infrastructure provides a foundation for local systems (email, jury, CMS, VOIP, etc.) and enterprise system applications such as Phoenix, via shared services at the CCTC provides operational efficiencies, and secures valuable court information resources.</p>
25	Enterprise Policy & Planning (Statewide Planning and Dev Support)	IT	<p>The Enterprise Policy and Planning program provides the trial courts access to a variety of Oracle products (e.g., Oracle Enterprise Database, Real Application Clusters, Oracle Security Suite, Oracle Advanced Security, Diagnostic Packs, Oracle WebLogic Application Server) without cost to the courts.</p>
26	Data Integration	IT	<p>Data Integration provides system interfaces between Judicial Council systems and the computer systems of our justice partners, be they courts, law enforcement agencies, the department of justice and others. Without the Integrated Services Backbone (ISB), the current systems for sharing protective orders, for example, would not function.</p>
27	Jury Management System	IT	<p>The allocation for the Jury Program is used to distribute funds to the trial courts in the form of grants to improve court jury management systems. All trial courts are eligible to apply for the jury funding. The number of courts receiving grants varies according to the amount of grant funding available and the number of jury grant requests received.</p>
28	Case Management System Replacement	IT	<p>The CMS Replacement – BCP funding provides one-time funding to ten courts to replace their legacy case management systems with a more modern CMS. Additionally, this budget also includes funding for two Sr. BSA's to support the CMS Planning and Administration Unit with the oversight of the CMS deployments as well as administration of the Judicial Council's statewide CMS master service agreements.</p>
31	Regional Office Assistance Group	LS	<p>The allocation for the Regional Office Assistance Group is used to pay for attorneys and support personnel to provide direct legal services to the trial courts in the areas of transactions/business operations, legal opinions, ethics, and labor and employment law.</p>
32	Litigation Management Program	LS	<p>The allocation for the Litigation Management Program is used to pay settlements, judgments (if any), and litigation costs, including attorney fees, arising from claims and lawsuits brought against trial courts.</p>
33,34	Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	LSS	<p>The allocation for the Judicial Performance Defense Insurance program is used to pay the insurance premium for trial court judges and judicial officers for the Commission on Judicial Performance (CJP) defense master insurance policy. The program (1) covers defense costs in CJP proceedings related to CJP complaints; (2) protects judicial officers from exposure to excessive financial risk for acts committed within the scope of their judicial duties, and (3) lowers the risk of conduct that could lead to complaints through required ethics training for judicial officers.</p>

**State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund
Fund Condition Statement
April 2022**

Updated: April 27, 2022

#	Description	Estimated					
		2018-19 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2019-20 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2020-21 (Year-end Financial Statement)	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
		A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Beginning Balance	14,796,514	15,864,292	21,152,288	16,886,263	19,416,426	16,448,426
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	-973,149	5,086,942	2,422,584	6,651,663	0	0
3	Adjusted Beginning Balance	13,823,364	20,951,234	23,574,872	23,537,926	19,416,426	16,448,426
4	REVENUES¹:						
5	Subtotal Revenues	25,761,957	19,653,661	17,262,862	14,169,000	12,303,000	12,146,000
6	Transfers and Other Adjustments						
7	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Gov. Code, § 77209(j))	-13,397,000	-13,397,000	-13,397,000	-13,397,000	-13,397,000	-13,397,000
8	To Trial Court Trust Fund (Budget Act)	-594,000	-594,000	-594,000	-594,000	-594,000	-594,000
9	Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	11,770,957	5,662,661	3,271,862	178,000	-1,688,000	-1,845,000
10	Total Resources	25,594,322	26,613,895	26,846,734	23,715,926	17,728,426	14,603,426
11	EXPENDITURES²:						
12	Judicial Branch Total State Operations	4,724,200	4,538,757	4,635,013	5,517,000	7,412,000	7,581,000
13	Judicial Branch Total Local Assistance	49,813,207	70,316,604	47,825,123	45,746,500	37,972,000	38,211,000
14	Total Expenditures	54,537,407	74,855,362	52,460,136	51,263,500	45,384,000	45,792,000
15	Expenditure Adjustments:						
16	Pro Rata and Other Adjustments	305,622	105,746	288,335	308,000	181,000	308,000
17	Less funding provided by General Fund (Local Assistance)	-45,114,000	-69,501,000	-42,788,000	-47,272,000	-44,285,000	-44,285,000
18	Total Expenditures and Adjustments	9,729,029	5,460,608	9,960,471	4,299,500	1,280,000	1,815,000
19	Fund Balance	15,864,292	21,152,288	16,886,263	19,416,426	16,448,426	12,788,426
20	Fund Balance - less restricted funds	9,860,057	16,261,964	12,592,172	15,735,335	13,781,335	10,253,789
21	Structural Balance	2,041,928	202,054	-6,688,609	-4,121,500	-2,968,000	-3,660,000

¹ Revenue estimates include actuals through February 2022. Approximately \$3 million of audit finding revenue is under appeal by the counties.

² Expenditures for 2021-22 reflect estimates as of April 2022. Expenditure data for 2022-23 ties to proposed allocations. Expenditure data for 2023-24 reflect estimates from the programs.

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

Title: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and Trial Court Allocations for 2022-23

Date: 5/5/2022

Contact: Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-8027 | oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the Judicial Council to make a preliminary allocation to the trial courts in July and finalize allocations in January of each fiscal year. Included for the committee’s review and approval is the 2022-23 trial court TCTF, State Court Facilities Construction Fund (SCFCF) and General Fund (GF) allocations for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and then the Judicial Council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting.

2022-23 Governor’s Budget Proposals

The 2022-23 Governor’s Budget includes \$5.2 billion in operating and facility funds for the judiciary, which is the largest budget ever for the judicial branch. The proposed budget reflects critical investments to advance equal access for all Californians.

In recognition of trial court operational cost pressures due to inflation, the proposed budget includes \$84.2 million ongoing GF to benefit all trial courts, which represents an overall increase of 3.8 percent of Workload Formula (WF) allocations from 2021-22.

The proposed budget also includes \$100 million ongoing GF to expand equal access, promote greater fiscal equity, and materially reduce the funding gap between trial courts.

To further expand access to justice by addressing judicial workload needs, the proposed budget includes \$39.9 million GF in 2022-23 and \$39.1 million annually thereafter for 23 additional superior court judgeships. The budget also proposes funding to address the increased security needs placed on counties due to the additional judgeships. With this augmentation, the judicial branch would be fully funded to fill all authorized judgeships.

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommends allocating trial court funding proposed in the 2022-23 Governor’s Budget in the following manner:

- First, allocate the inflationary funding of \$84.2 million as a 3.8 increase over each court’s 2021-22 WF allocation, consistent with how the \$84.2 million was calculated.

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

- Next, allocate the equity funding of \$100 million by bringing courts below the statewide average as close to the statewide average funding level as calculated for 2022-23, where each court is brought up to the same WF percentage.
- Lastly, allocate the judgeship funding of \$31.2 million based on the Judicial Council-approved WF methodology, with non-sheriff security funding reduced from the funding amount prior to allocation.

Base, Discretionary, and Non-Discretionary Programs

1. Program 0140010 – Judicial Council
 - a. Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee recommendations¹ for Judicial Council staff in the amount of \$3.364 million (Attachment 3A, column J, line 31).
2. Program 0150010 – Support for Operation of the Trial Courts
 - a. TCTF allocation in the amount of \$2.339 billion (Attachment 3B, column W).
 - b. New allocations include:
 - i. \$21.693 million for non-court interpreter benefits cost change for 2022-23 (Attachment 3B, column J);
 - ii. Proposed inflationary increase funding of \$84.176 million for trial court operations included in the 2022-23 Governor’s Budget (Attachment 3B, column D);
 - iii. Proposed \$100 million equity funding (Attachment 3B, column E); and
 - iv. Proposed 23 judgeships funding of \$31.166 million with non-sheriff security reduction (Attachment 3B, columns F, G, H, I).
 - c. R&E Subcommittee recommendation for Support of Operation of Trial Courts in the amount of \$44.481 million (Attachment 3A, column J, line 32).
3. Program 0150011 – Court Appointed Dependency Counsel
 - a. An allocation in the amount of \$156.7 million for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (Attachment 3A, column J, line 33).
 - i. Assumes the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommendation to the Judicial Council as presented under Item 1 of this meeting’s agenda.
4. Program 0150010 – Pretrial Funding
 - a. An allocation in the amount of \$68.950 million for pretrial (Attachment 3B, column Z).
 - i. Assumes the TCBAC recommendation to the Judicial Council as presented under Item 4 of this meeting’s agenda.

¹ R&E meeting materials (April 14, 2022), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20220414-rande-materials.pdf>.

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

5. Program 0150037 – Court Interpreters
 - a. R&E Subcommittee recommendation in the amount of \$87,000 for the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (Attachment 3A, column J, line 34). For 2022-23, there is a technical adjustment to shift this allocation from Local Assistance to State Operations to align the budget.

6. Program 0150095 – Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts
 - a. R&E Subcommittee recommendation in the amount of \$15.411 million for expenditures incurred by the Judicial Council on behalf of the trial courts (Attachment 3A, column J, line 35).

State Court Facilities Construction Fund

Approve \$50.0 million from the SCFCF for support for operation of the trial courts (Attachment 3B, column X).

General Fund

Approve \$68.819 million GF for employee benefits (Attachment 3B, column Y).

2022-23 Workload Formula Allocation

The 2022-23 WF allocation includes allocations, revenues, and adjustments in the amount of \$2.444 billion (Attachment 3C, column AB).

Changes to the prior year WF allocation include:

- a. Reduction for subordinate judicial officer (SJO) conversions totaling \$25,000 (Attachment 3C, column L);
- b. Adjustment to the SJO allocation totaling -\$950,000 (Attachment 3C, column M);
- c. A change of -\$59,000 in Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics collections from fiscal year 2019-20 to 2020-21 (Attachment 3C, column N);
- d. 2022-23 non-interpreter benefits cost changes totaling \$21.693 million (Attachment 3C, column O);
- e. Criminal Justice Realignment funding of \$9.223 million (Attachment 3C, column P);
- f. 2020-21 revenues collected totaling \$88.018 million (Attachment 3C, column Q)²;
- g. Proposed funding as outlined in the ‘2022-23 Governor’s Budget Proposal’ section above totaling \$214.859 million (Attachment 3C, columns R through V);
- h. An increase to the base funding floor amount for two courts, Alpine and Sierra, to \$950,000 as approved by the council effective 2022-23 (Attachment 3C, column X); and

² Includes all other applicable revenue sources as recommended by the FMS. Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trial courts but is used in the calculation of the Workload Allocation.

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

- i. 2022-23 funding floor adjustment, with all other courts sharing a pro rata reduction in the funding floor allocation (Attachment 3C, column Y). The funding floor adjustment may change based on final appropriations included the 2022 Budget Act.

Resource Assessment Study (RAS) Model Update and Workload Formula

For 2022-23, the RAS model, which is the foundation of the Workload Formula, uses the most recent three-year average filings (2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21).

The 2019-20 filings include the first four months of the pandemic (March-June 2020), a period of time when many courts had to close suddenly and retool their operations to adjust to new physical distancing requirements and modes of serving the public. Temporary emergency orders were put into place to extend statutory timeframes for processing court workload while these adjustments took place.

Since many courts were unable to process filings during that period of time, the former Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) approved replacing the four months of pandemic-impacted data with data that is more representative of the expected trend in filings for that four-month period of time.³

For the 2020-21 filings, the most recent year of the three-year average, no adjustments to filings were made. Modification of filings during the early onset of the pandemic was necessary because of the radical disruption in those early months. Although total filings are still down and pandemic impacts continue, court operations have adapted and stabilized. Additionally, the RAS measures high-level, long-term changes (changes in law, processes, technology advances) and is not responsive enough for short-term need. Because of these reasons, WAAC elected to not make any adjustments to 2020-21 filing counts.

Pending Allocations

Items pending allocation from the Program 0150010 appropriation include:

- a. Under Government Code section 77203(b), a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year, effective June 30, 2021. Because the courts have until July 15, 2022 to provide their preliminary 2021-22 ending fund balances, the preliminary reduction amounts related to trial court reserves above the 3 percent cap referenced in Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) will not be available for consideration by the TCBAC prior to recommendation to the council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting. The TCBAC will consider the final allocation reductions for fund balances above the 3 percent cap prior to recommendation to the Judicial Council before January 2023.

³ Workload Assessment Advisory Committee materials (April 23, 2021), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/waac-20210423-materials.pdf>

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

- b. In 2021-22, an ongoing \$30 million in funding was provided for increasing the number of court reporters in family law and civil cases as well as an ongoing \$7 million to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates. An update to the funding methodology and allocation recommendation for 2022-23 is planned to be presented to the council for consideration in the fall of 2022.
- c. The allocation of funding, using the council-approved formula, collected through the dependency counsel collections program will be brought to the TCBAC and council once final 2021–22 collections are known.
- d. Various revenue distributions as required by statute or as authorized charges for the cost of programs or cash advances.

Potential Impacts to Allocations

- a. Any changes to appropriations provided for in the final 2022 Budget Act.
- b. Final TCTF allocation amounts for 2022-23 will be based on available state revenues and final budget decisions. Additional modifications may be necessary based on potential changes in state revenue and budget priorities.
- c. The \$10 million in urgent needs funding assumes no allocations in 2022–23. If funding is allocated in 2022-23, courts would need to replenish the funding up to what was allocated by the council from their 2023-24 base allocation⁴.

The projected 2022–23 ending TCTF fund balance is \$105.103 million (Attachment 3D, column F, row 27). Approximately \$31.166 million of this amount is either statutorily restricted or restricted by the council (Attachment 3D, column F, row 29). The estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$73.937 million (Attachment 3D, column F, row 30). The 2022-23 preliminary allocation requests totaling \$2.853 billion can be supported by the TCTF based on current revenue projections and 2021-22 projected savings.

Recommendation

The following recommendations presented to the TCBAC for consideration include FMS allocation methodologies, R&E subcommittee recommendations, an informational update on RAS filings data related to the WF, and assume the funding proposed in the 2022-23 Governor’s Budget will remain in the final 2022 Budget Act:

- Approve base, discretionary, and non-discretionary programs from the TCTF in the amount of \$2.853 billion (Attachment 3B, column AH), including:
 - SCFCF allocation in the amount of \$50.0 million for support for operation of the trial courts (Attachment 3B, column X); and
 - GF allocation in the amount of \$68.8 million for employee benefits (Attachment 3B, column Y).

⁴ Judicial Branch Budget Committee report (March 18, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbbc-20190318-materials.pdf>.

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

- As a subset of the \$2.853 billion total allocation, approve a Workload Allocation of \$2.444 billion based on methodologies approved by the Judicial Council (Attachment 3C, column AB).

Attachments

Attachment 3A: Judicial Council Approved 2021-22 and Proposed 2022-23 State Operations and Local Assistance Allocations from the TCTF

Attachment 3B: 2022-23 TCTF Recommended Preliminary Allocation

Attachment 3C: 2022-23 Workload Formula Allocation

Attachment 3D: TCTF Fund Condition Statement

Judicial Council of California
Approved 2021-22 and Proposed 2022-23 Allocations
State Operations and Local Assistance
Trial Court Trust Fund

#	Program Name	Program Number	Office	2021-22 Allocations			Recommended 2022-23 Allocations			\$\$ Change from 2021-22	% Change from 2021-22
				State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Proposed Allocations		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G (E + F)	H	I	J (H + I)	K (J - G)	L (K / G)
1	SCO Audit - Pilot program per GC 77206 (h)(4)	0150095	AS		\$ 540,000	\$ 540,000		\$ 540,000	\$ 540,000	-	0%
2	California State Auditor Audits	0150010	AS		-	-		325,000	325,000	325,000	
3	Phoenix Financial Services	0140010	BAP	80,332		80,332	86,857		86,857	6,525	8%
4	Phoenix HR Services	0140010	BAP	1,521,818		1,521,818	1,623,808		1,623,808	101,990	7%
5	Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations	0150095	BAP		600,300	600,300		122,750	122,750	(477,550)	-80%
6	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	0140010	BS	656,000		656,000	551,000		551,000	(105,000)	-16%
7	Jury	0150010	BS		14,500,000	14,500,000		14,500,000	14,500,000	-	0%
8	Elder Abuse	0150010	BS		650,000	650,000		650,000	650,000	-	0%
9	SCO Administrative Costs per GC 68085(g)	0150010	BS			-		275,000	275,000	275,000	
10	Children in Dependency Case Training	0150095	CFCC		113,000	113,000		113,000	113,000	-	0%
11	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	0140010	CFCC	596,000		596,000	596,000		596,000	-	0%
12	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	0150095	CFCC		18,094,937	18,094,937		12,265,725	12,265,725	(5,829,212)	-32%
13	Equal Access Fund	0140010	CFCC	246,000		246,000	246,000		246,000	-	0%
14	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	0140010	CFCC	260,000		260,000	260,000		260,000	-	0%
15	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	0150011	CFCC		166,700,000	166,700,000		156,700,000	156,700,000	(10,000,000)	-6%
16	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement Rollover	0150010	CFCC			-			-	-	
17	Juvenile Dependency Collections Reimbursement	0150010	CFCC		331,541	331,541		1,144,748	1,144,748	813,207	245%
18	Self-Help Center	0150010	CFCC		25,300,000	25,300,000		25,300,000	25,300,000	-	0%
19	Screening Equipment Replacement	0150010	FS		2,000,000	2,000,000		2,286,000	2,286,000	286,000	14%
20	Court Interpreters Data Collections System (CIDCS)	0150037	IT		87,000	87,000	87,000		87,000	-	0%
21	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	0150095	IT		1,656,088	1,656,088		1,680,998	1,680,998	24,910	2%
22	Data Center and Cloud Services	0150095	IT		688,803	688,803		688,803	688,803	-	0%
23	Statewide E-Filing Implementation	0140010	IT	448,793		448,793			-	(448,793)	-100%
24	Total Allocations			\$ 3,808,943	\$ 231,261,669	\$ 235,070,612	\$ 3,450,665	\$ 216,592,024	\$ 220,042,689	\$ (15,027,923)	-6.39%

Totals by Office			State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Proposed Allocations	\$\$ Change from 2021-22	% Change from 2021-22
Legend			E	F	G (E + F)	H	I	J (H + I)	K (J - G)	L (K / G)
25	Audit Services	AS	\$ -	\$ 540,000	\$ 540,000	\$ -	\$ 865,000	\$ 865,000	\$ 325,000	60.19%
26	Branch Accounting and Procurement	BAP	1,602,150	600,300	2,202,450	1,710,665	122,750	1,833,415	(369,035)	-16.76%
27	Budget Services	BS	656,000	15,150,000	15,806,000	551,000	15,425,000	15,976,000	170,000	1.08%
28	Center for Families, Children and the Courts	CFCC	1,102,000	210,539,478	211,641,478	1,102,000	195,523,473	196,625,473	(15,016,005)	-7.10%
29	Facility Services	FS	-	2,000,000	2,000,000	-	2,286,000	2,286,000	286,000	14.30%
30	Information Technology	IT	448,793	2,431,891	2,880,684	87,000	2,369,801	2,456,801	(423,883)	-14.71%
	Total Allocations		\$ 3,808,943	\$ 231,261,669	\$ 235,070,612	\$ 3,450,665	\$ 216,592,024	\$ 220,042,689	\$ (15,027,923)	-6.39%

Totals by Program		State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Proposed Allocations	\$\$ Change from 2021-22	% Change from 2021-22	
Legend		E	F	G (E + F)	H	I	J (H + I)	K (J - G)	L (K / G)	
31	Judicial Council (Staff)	\$ 3,808,943	\$ -	\$ 3,808,943	\$ 3,363,665	\$ -	\$ 3,363,665	\$ (445,278)	-11.69%	
32	Support for the Operation of the Trial Courts	-	42,781,541	42,781,541	-	44,480,748	44,480,748	1,699,207	3.97%	
33	Court Appointed Dependency Counsel	-	166,700,000	166,700,000	-	156,700,000	156,700,000	(10,000,000)	-6.00%	
34	Court Interpreters	-	87,000	87,000	87,000	-	87,000	-	0.00%	
35	Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	-	21,693,128	21,693,128	-	15,411,276	15,411,276	(6,281,852)	-28.96%	
	Total Allocations		\$ 3,808,943	\$ 231,261,669	\$ 235,070,612	\$ 3,450,665	\$ 216,592,024	\$ 220,042,689	\$ (15,027,923)	-6.39%

Court	2021-22 Ending Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation	2021-22 ONGOING BASE ADJUSTMENTS		2021-22 Adjusted TCTF Ongoing Base Allocation	2022-23 ONGOING BASE ALLOCATIONS								OTHER ONE-TIME TCTF ALLOCATIONS				
		General Ledger (GL) 812110			GL 812110								GL 812110				
		2021-22 Current Year Non-Interpreter Benefits			2022-23 Consumer Price Index Funding of \$84.2m (3.8 Percent)	2022-23 Equity Funding of \$100m	23 New Judgeships (Cluster 1 Courts to 100%)	23 New Judgeships (Courts Below Statewide Average)	23 New Judgeships (Courts Below 100%)	23 New Judgeships Non-Sheriff Security (1.12%)	2022-23 Non-Interpreter Benefit Cost Change Funding ¹	Total Ongoing Allocations	Telephonic Appearances	Criminal Justice Realignment	Court Reporters SB 170 Funding	Increased Transcript Rates SB 170 Funding	Total One-Time Base Allocations
		A	B		C (A+B)	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K (D-J)	L	M	N	O
Alameda	78,583,535	526,485	79,110,019	3,148,432	-	-	-	521,192	37,160	1,913,100	5,619,883	-	210,769	-	-	210,769	
Alpine	783,264	(10,248)	773,017	30,400	-	-	-	-	-	2,042	32,442	-	239	-	-	239	
Amador	3,468,151	13,570	3,481,721	144,854	-	-	-	-	-	13,570	158,424	5,790	5,729	-	-	11,519	
Butte	12,393,323	30,001	12,423,324	482,086	-	-	23,900	86,892	5,462	266,858	865,199	15,210	132,477	-	-	147,687	
Calaveras	2,859,082	(36,954)	2,822,127	118,309	-	55,105	-	-	-	29,919	203,333	791	8,354	-	-	9,146	
Colusa	2,111,710	988	2,112,697	90,117	-	-	-	-	-	5,240	95,357	-	6,684	-	-	6,684	
Contra Costa	41,977,002	154,331	42,131,333	1,920,928	-	-	-	335,181	-	462,980	2,719,089	-	64,209	-	-	64,209	
Del Norte	3,150,048	1,546	3,151,594	132,546	-	44,798	-	-	-	44,476	221,819	-	11,457	-	-	11,457	
El Dorado	7,927,762	35,814	7,963,576	338,998	-	-	-	60,842	-	147,977	547,817	24,418	45,830	-	-	70,248	
Fresno	50,707,929	(104,277)	50,603,652	2,224,878	1,808,275	-	563,050	413,715	-	(108,710)	4,901,207	75,930	152,288	-	-	228,218	
Glenn	2,463,534	(15,202)	2,448,332	106,224	-	107,530	-	-	114	(989)	212,880	1,230	11,219	-	-	12,449	
Humboldt	7,058,085	62,645	7,120,730	300,947	-	-	-	53,409	1,962	168,762	525,080	12,250	35,805	-	-	48,055	
Imperial	9,647,695	(136,886)	9,510,810	398,723	-	-	-	-	4,917	104,624	508,264	25,465	19,096	-	-	44,561	
Inyo	2,258,462	1,757	2,260,219	89,068	-	-	-	-	-	2,183	62,844	1,395	10,025	-	-	11,420	
Kern	54,066,314	(145,459)	53,920,855	2,386,746	-	-	535,649	418,788	767	(2,241,087)	1,100,863	38,700	278,798	-	-	317,498	
Kings	8,468,368	(114,959)	8,353,408	364,797	886,099	-	94,277	69,272	4,934	(35,807)	1,383,572	5,935	67,790	-	-	73,725	
Lake	4,317,533	(1,661)	4,315,872	162,902	301,198	-	43,703	32,112	2,298	55,423	597,634	-	10,264	-	-	10,264	
Lassen	2,433,204	(961)	2,432,243	97,035	-	-	-	-	-	3,436	109,206	4,241	11,219	-	-	15,460	
Los Angeles	586,678,646	(1,064,417)	585,614,229	23,333,694	46,325,905	-	6,377,069	4,685,713	167,148	10,951,724	91,841,253	-	3,077,993	-	-	3,077,993	
Madera	8,563,804	21,209	8,585,013	361,518	1,702,970	-	105,818	77,752	4,460	46,165	2,298,683	-	40,578	-	-	40,578	
Marin	11,763,982	(36,894)	11,727,088	531,495	-	-	-	88,629	113	77,032	697,269	42,540	27,211	-	-	69,751	
Mariposa	1,527,595	28,369	1,555,963	62,312	-	79,287	-	-	-	6,704	148,303	-	7,638	-	-	7,638	
Mendocino	6,526,913	62,522	6,589,436	268,395	-	-	-	44,947	3,500	273,563	590,406	8,520	51,797	-	-	60,317	
Merced	13,448,905	(51,295)	13,397,610	574,095	442,609	-	145,925	107,222	-	(13,298)	1,256,553	13,095	64,687	-	-	77,782	
Modoc	1,133,585	8,611	1,142,196	48,502	-	-	-	-	9	8,999	57,510	776	3,103	-	-	3,879	
Mono	2,053,071	(2,794)	2,050,277	88,862	-	-	-	-	-	282	5,539	-	239	-	-	239	
Monterey	21,873,298	(49,057)	21,824,241	874,475	324,383	-	222,610	163,568	10,173	145,128	1,740,337	-	47,739	-	-	47,739	
Napa	7,944,206	(19,462)	7,924,744	333,903	-	-	-	58,627	3,456	120,030	516,015	14,590	17,902	-	-	32,492	
Nevada	5,726,696	37,036	5,763,732	209,859	418,746	-	57,617	42,335	5,068	221,575	955,200	-	2,626	-	-	2,626	
Orange	144,339,233	(186,003)	144,153,230	6,119,541	9,797,271	-	1,619,233	1,189,772	31,967	2,280,244	21,038,028	-	572,395	-	-	572,395	
Placer	18,781,113	75,611	18,856,724	775,476	2,389,175	-	212,643	156,245	-	421,080	3,954,619	24,920	43,204	-	-	68,124	
Plumas	1,633,412	11,655	1,645,067	66,997	-	-	-	-	-	16,104	83,101	2,448	5,490	-	-	7,938	
Riverside	112,698,017	(775,332)	111,922,684	4,744,498	-	-	878,511	859,094	22,586	2,113,228	8,617,917	-	915,879	-	-	915,879	
Sacramento	87,409,299	67,930	87,477,229	3,495,781	6,274,439	-	929,483	682,961	21,801	158,620	11,563,086	43,920	155,392	-	-	199,312	
San Benito	4,031,075	23,858	4,054,933	165,238	-	166,028	-	-	-	9,748	341,014	-	19,812	-	-	19,812	
San Bernardino	113,875,532	(18,009)	113,857,523	4,401,502	17,788,721	-	1,223,653	899,110	38,230	(2,809,827)	21,541,389	239,760	1,153,382	-	-	1,393,142	
San Diego	152,067,724	336,184	152,403,908	6,307,885	-	-	-	1,084,999	7,685	1,584,220	8,984,789	-	230,104	-	-	230,104	
San Francisco	52,632,943	(153,535)	52,479,408	2,421,942	-	-	-	-	-	620,123	3,042,065	17,515	104,788	-	-	122,303	
San Joaquin	39,813,018	(123,056)	39,689,963	1,583,675	4,928,229	-	441,942	324,728	3,365	441,263	7,723,203	51,955	72,564	-	-	124,519	
San Luis Obispo	15,393,059	32,229	15,425,288	625,042	429,233	-	159,687	117,334	2,826	145,588	1,479,709	18,700	41,772	-	-	60,472	
San Mateo	38,263,938	(40,516)	38,223,422	1,614,412	-	-	-	280,894	5,181	90,554	1,991,041	39,742	48,694	-	-	88,437	
Santa Barbara	23,732,015	98,928	23,830,943	998,553	-	-	-	165,584	12,338	(18,898)	1,157,576	44,719	16,231	-	-	60,950	
Santa Clara	80,440,878	164,869	80,605,747	3,259,803	-	-	125,476	587,677	-	562,687	4,535,644	-	134,625	-	-	134,625	
Santa Cruz	14,070,098	73,111	14,143,208	586,266	-	-	57,581	105,738	-	199,910	949,494	21,904	38,669	-	-	60,573	
Shasta	16,055,425	91,689	16,147,114	534,593	63,041	-	137,314	100,895	30,798	287,495	1,154,136	9,190	102,401	-	-	111,591	
Sierra	761,941	1,549	763,490	30,400	-	-	-	-	-	43,614	74,014	630	-	-	-	630	
Siskiyou	3,280,374	16,887	3,297,261	130,761	325,592	-	37,189	27,326	-	144,131	664,999	-	7,877	-	-	7,877	
Solano	24,728,222	2,578	24,730,800	1,041,422	-	-	-	182,947	5,091	673,973	1,903,433	42,765	158,972	-	-	201,737	
Sonoma	25,472,647	(508,570)	24,964,077	1,024,962	1,157,174	-	263,451	193,578	5,145	376,970	3,021,280	14,895	77,099	-	-	91,994	
Stanislaus	26,018,290	32,525	26,050,814	1,078,937	213,652	-	272,704	200,376	109	288,949	2,054,726	-	126,509	-	-	126,509	
Sutter	6,202,336	3,543	6,205,879	256,075	583,371	-	69,477	51,050	2,889	88,381	1,051,242	2,795	15,754	-	-	18,549	
Tehama	4,858,601	(19,072)	4,839,530	206,997	-	-	-	-	-	126,507	370,881	1,340	22,199	-	-	23,539	
Trinity	2,292,374	428	2,292,802	72,844	-	-	-	-	6,021	64,396	143,260	400	3,342	-	-	3,742	
Tulare	23,680,305	76,701	23,757,006	974,860	2,993,359	-	271,697	199,636	182	311,694	4,751,428	12,890	87,602	-	-	100,492	
Tuolumne	4,276,999	28,944	4,305,943	169,000	-	-	-	29,756	2,579	106,854	308,188	6,280	13,367	-	-	19,647	
Yuba	39,111,136	(258,745)	38,852,391	1,551,008	-	-	112,552	280,213	18,232	129,437	2,091,441	-	583,375	-	-	583,375	
Yolo	12,787,986	96,823	12,884,809	488,278	846,560	-	133,000	97,725	6,816	416,681	1,989,060	-	15,038	-	-	15,038	
Yuba	5,428,194	4,145	5,432,339	224,154	-	-	-	-	1,550	76,450	302,154	9,456	32,701	-	-	42,157	
Unallocated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000,000	7,000,000	37,000,000	
Total	2,056,051,885	(1,648,295)	2,054,403,589	84,176,000	100,000,000	452,748	15,115,211	15,115,211	482,830	21,693,293	237,035,293	897,100	9,223,000	30,000,000	7,000,000	47,120,100	

¹ Benefits funding reflects actual cost changes as identified by the court and is fiscally neutral.

Court	2021-22 Adjusted Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation	Trial Court Operations Allocation Funded from State Court Facilities Construction Fund	General Fund Employee Benefits	Total Adjusted Total Base Allocation	2021-22 NON-BASE ADJUSTMENTS USED TO CALCULATE WORKLOAD ALLOCATION			2021-22 BASE ADJUSTMENTS USED TO CALCULATE WORKLOAD ALLOCATION		
					Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics	2% Automation Replacement	Self-Help	Security Base Adjustment	Subordinate Judicial Officer (SJO) Adjustment	Total Workload Formula Related Adjustments
					E	F	G	H	I	J (E:I)
Alameda	79,110,019	2,104,111	3,102,046	84,316,176	93,224	424,792	1,009,970	(3,317,864)	(2,266,802)	(4,056,680)
Alpine	773,017	21,282	20,340	814,639	29	2,034	34,675	-	-	36,738
Amador	3,481,721	62,182	51,756	3,595,659	717	11,006	56,263	-	(146,296)	(78,310)
Butte	12,423,324	273,524	124,077	12,820,925	11,295	59,332	163,674	(487,716)	(408,500)	(661,915)
Calaveras	2,822,127	58,645	50,506	2,931,278	842	18,652	60,407	-	-	79,901
Colusa	2,112,697	48,701	24,773	2,186,171	311	13,708	46,905	-	-	60,924
Contra Costa	42,131,333	1,132,213	1,396,191	44,659,737	64,611	218,186	709,092	-	(844,523)	147,367
Del Norte	3,151,594	69,702	94,130	3,315,426	408	11,208	49,989	-	-	61,605
El Dorado	7,963,576	186,535	213,120	8,363,231	3,269	54,374	145,931	-	(133,917)	69,657
Fresno	50,603,652	1,211,523	3,340,363	55,155,538	59,419	181,080	629,073	-	(1,262,388)	(392,816)
Glenn	2,448,332	52,813	54,665	2,555,810	424	19,264	51,045	(10,210)	-	60,523
Humboldt	7,120,730	172,432	73,084	7,366,246	6,864	48,160	112,977	(175,189)	(155,032)	(162,219)
Imperial	9,510,810	237,510	125,539	9,873,859	8,907	67,678	145,188	(438,995)	(157,902)	(375,124)
Inyo	2,260,219	57,003	75,586	2,392,808	305	30,402	44,882	(194,877)	(31,681)	(150,969)
Kern	53,920,855	1,122,339	3,544,268	58,587,462	59,073	277,328	568,760	(68,454)	(2,039,547)	(1,202,840)
Kings	8,353,408	185,312	45,118	8,583,838	7,745	57,026	123,584	(440,497)	(229,592)	(481,734)
Lake	4,315,872	93,356	9,123	4,418,351	1,246	20,328	71,903	(205,146)	(72,161)	(183,830)
Lassen	2,432,243	65,929	7,839	2,506,011	450	20,156	51,546	(306,775)	-	(234,623)
Los Angeles	585,614,229	14,700,731	18,887,968	619,202,928	943,743	3,144,530	6,028,083	(14,923,924)	(20,112,654)	(24,920,222)
Madera	8,585,013	200,598	384,825	9,170,436	3,034	52,502	127,019	(398,201)	-	(215,646)
Marin	11,727,088	337,855	644,511	12,709,454	12,807	114,766	187,724	(10,049)	(67,262)	237,985
Mariposa	1,555,963	33,001	22,301	1,611,265	267	3,904	44,591	-	(40,903)	7,860
Mendocino	6,589,436	139,029	311,771	7,040,236	4,713	30,068	85,968	(312,531)	-	(191,782)
Merced	13,397,610	312,868	774,827	14,485,305	14,702	55,652	199,206	-	(383,412)	(113,851)
Modoc	1,142,196	26,220	31,967	1,200,383	249	6,134	39,618	(824)	-	45,177
Mono	2,050,277	43,038	85,641	2,178,956	187	12,446	41,983	(25,220)	(25,384)	4,013
Monterey	21,824,241	472,462	277,496	22,574,199	19,536	183,464	293,559	(908,310)	(385,072)	(796,824)
Napa	7,924,744	199,584	309,795	8,434,123	2,506	30,550	116,203	(308,567)	(220,549)	(379,857)
Nevada	5,763,732	139,614	95,495	5,998,841	4,564	49,946	91,807	(452,517)	(385,274)	(691,474)
Orange	144,153,230	3,891,207	6,929,920	154,974,357	227,468	923,882	1,915,141	(2,854,158)	(4,119,960)	(3,907,627)
Placer	18,856,724	410,174	634,796	19,901,694	23,192	77,378	266,252	-	(1,074,293)	(707,471)
Plumas	1,645,067	36,529	14,929	1,696,525	302	9,206	45,284	-	-	54,792
Riverside	111,922,684	2,296,005	923,656	115,142,345	55,702	532,226	1,458,505	(2,016,574)	(3,612,829)	(3,582,970)
Sacramento	87,477,229	2,090,813	3,560,591	93,128,633	114,659	340,254	937,891	(1,946,524)	(2,190,917)	(2,744,638)
San Benito	4,054,933	70,059	34,642	4,159,634	1,103	14,700	69,472	-	(47,767)	37,507
San Bernardino	113,857,523	2,569,673	1,264,732	117,691,928	150,574	435,474	1,311,982	(3,413,416)	(3,825,306)	(5,340,693)
San Diego	152,403,908	3,882,649	2,853,598	159,140,155	209,558	718,442	1,992,172	(686,131)	(4,424,847)	(2,190,807)
San Francisco	52,479,408	1,531,727	5,487,134	59,498,269	63,134	272,528	554,282	-	(508,436)	381,508
San Joaquin	39,689,963	859,541	1,245,356	41,794,860	49,517	201,698	483,455	(300,418)	(1,192,546)	(758,294)
San Luis Obispo	15,425,288	376,713	298,957	16,100,958	15,661	130,020	197,513	(252,318)	(477,668)	(386,792)
San Mateo	38,223,422	932,577	2,411,112	41,567,111	12,950	329,518	487,187	(462,551)	(1,244,585)	(877,481)
Santa Barbara	23,830,943	569,017	1,597,661	25,997,621	24,208	162,858	299,425	(1,101,574)	(631,892)	(1,246,975)
Santa Clara	80,605,747	2,129,236	2,309,466	85,044,449	95,376	452,782	1,180,269	-	(973,644)	754,783
Santa Cruz	14,143,208	321,970	203,558	14,668,736	11,768	113,210	194,628	-	(256,008)	63,598
Shasta	16,147,114	337,674	262,221	16,747,009	3,601	44,394	138,439	(2,749,839)	(248,276)	(2,811,681)
Sierra	763,490	21,571	9,616	794,677	28	1,830	35,878	-	-	37,736
Siskiyou	3,297,261	85,800	91,038	3,474,099	743	37,000	60,087	-	(212,921)	(115,090)
Solano	24,730,800	559,362	353,778	25,643,940	30,936	119,364	291,897	(454,573)	(686,914)	(699,290)
Sonoma	24,964,077	643,923	1,172,049	26,780,049	28,375	119,004	326,183	(459,375)	(630,280)	(616,093)
Stanislaus	26,050,814	540,457	1,305,229	27,896,500	33,273	88,718	360,402	(9,737)	(605,969)	(133,312)
Sutter	6,205,878	127,407	159,761	6,493,046	1,837	37,382	91,672	(257,951)	-	(127,060)
Tehama	4,839,530	98,606	108,184	5,046,320	1,238	28,100	71,778	-	(2,619)	98,498
Trinity	2,292,802	47,850	53,679	2,394,331	654	7,648	41,977	(537,593)	-	(487,313)
Tulare	23,757,006	457,506	33,744	24,248,256	24,299	204,932	314,070	(16,262)	(594,066)	(67,027)
Tuolumne	4,305,943	85,983	50,352	4,442,278	972	16,642	66,058	(230,226)	(36,107)	(182,661)
Ventura	38,852,391	914,809	968,752	40,735,952	49,353	205,304	533,382	(1,627,814)	(821,109)	(1,660,885)
Yolo	12,884,809	245,500	210,076	13,340,385	9,363	48,556	163,904	(608,557)	(287,338)	(674,071)
Yuba	5,432,339	105,550	90,867	5,628,756	1,597	15,788	79,190	(138,407)	-	(41,832)
Unallocated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	2,054,403,589	50,000,000	68,818,575	2,173,222,164	2,566,892	10,907,514	25,300,000	(43,109,863)	(58,075,147)	(62,410,604)

¹ Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trial courts, but is used in the calculation of the Workload Formula allocation.

WORKLOAD ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENTS

Court	2022-23 Beginning Workload Allocation	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Fiscal Neutral Offset	Change in Revenue Collected	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Current Methodology	Revenue Collected	Proposed CPI	Proposed Equity Funding	Proposed Judgeship Funding	Proposed Judgeship Funding	Proposed Judgeship Funding	2022-23 Workload Allocation (Prior to Implementing Funding Floor)
		Reduction for SJO Conversion	SJO Adjustment (Change from Prior Year)	Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics (Change from Prior Year)	2022-23 Non-Interpreter Benefit Cost Change Funding	Criminal Justice Realignment	All Other Applicable Revenue Sources ¹	2022-23 Consumer Price Index Funding of \$84.2m (3.8 Percent)	2022-23 Equity Funding of \$100m	23 New Judgeships (Cluster 1 Courts to 100%)	23 New Judgeships (Courts Below Statewide Average)	23 New Judgeships (Courts Below 100%)	
		K (D+)	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	
Alameda	80,259,497	-	(31,934)	(3,892)	1,913,100	210,769	1,958,911	3,148,432	-	-	-	521,192	87,976,074
Alpine	851,376	-	-	(14)	2,042	239	17,866	30,400	-	-	-	-	901,909
Amador	3,517,349	-	379	7	13,570	5,729	304,830	144,854	-	-	-	-	3,986,718
Butte	12,159,010	-	(35,958)	(630)	266,858	132,477	176,248	482,086	-	-	23,900	86,892	13,290,884
Calaveras	3,011,179	-	-	7	29,919	8,354	64,970	118,309	-	55,105	-	-	3,287,845
Colusa	2,247,095	-	-	32	5,240	6,684	85,805	90,117	-	-	-	-	2,434,972
Contra Costa	44,807,104	-	42,575	(8,914)	462,980	64,209	4,174,563	1,920,928	-	-	-	335,181	51,798,626
Del Norte	3,377,031	-	-	27	44,476	11,457	111,556	132,546	-	44,798	-	-	3,721,891
El Dorado	8,432,888	-	21,403	133	147,977	45,830	531,308	338,998	-	-	-	60,842	9,579,378
Fresno	54,762,722	-	25,384	(551)	(108,710)	152,288	3,069,714	2,224,878	1,808,275	-	563,050	413,715	62,910,764
Glenn	2,616,334	-	-	21	(989)	11,219	72,999	106,224	-	107,530	-	-	2,913,338
Humboldt	7,204,026	-	8,176	726	168,762	35,805	957,887	300,947	-	-	-	53,409	8,729,738
Imperial	9,498,735	-	(11,646)	441	104,624	19,096	759,766	398,723	-	-	-	-	10,769,739
Inyo	2,241,838	-	31,681	(39)	62,844	10,025	101,616	89,068	-	-	-	-	2,537,035
Kern	57,384,622	-	(6,565)	(4,585)	(2,241,087)	278,798	4,941,604	2,386,746	-	-	535,649	418,788	63,693,969
Kings	8,102,104	-	(98,575)	96	(35,807)	67,790	1,083,699	364,797	886,099	-	94,277	69,272	10,533,751
Lake	4,234,521	-	4,999	(31)	55,423	10,264	37,928	162,902	301,198	-	43,703	32,112	4,883,018
Lassen	2,271,387	-	-	(66)	8,735	11,219	209,168	97,035	-	-	-	-	2,597,480
Los Angeles	594,282,706	(24,886)	(539,861)	(56,664)	10,951,724	3,077,993	24,110,516	23,333,694	46,325,905	-	6,377,069	4,685,713	712,523,910
Madera	8,954,790	-	-	(466)	46,165	40,578	534,115	361,518	1,702,970	-	105,818	77,752	11,823,241
Marin	12,947,439	-	11,318	934	77,032	27,211	409,095	531,495	-	-	-	88,629	14,093,153
Mariposa	1,619,125	-	1	49	6,704	7,638	84,821	62,312	-	79,287	-	-	1,809,937
Mendocino	6,848,454	-	-	(109)	273,563	51,797	161,544	268,395	-	-	-	44,947	7,648,591
Merced	14,371,454	-	3,184	(276)	(13,298)	64,687	608,924	574,095	442,609	-	145,925	107,222	16,304,526
Modoc	1,245,560	-	-	(19)	8,999	3,103	42,539	48,502	-	-	-	-	1,348,684
Mono	2,182,968	-	25,384	27	5,539	239	149,103	88,862	-	-	-	-	2,452,122
Monterey	21,777,375	-	(2,499)	(292)	145,128	47,739	1,320,238	874,475	324,383	-	222,610	163,568	24,872,726
Napa	8,054,266	-	220,549	355	120,030	17,902	562,672	333,903	-	-	-	58,627	9,368,304
Nevada	5,307,367	-	(5,037)	595	221,575	2,626	181,962	209,859	418,746	-	57,617	42,335	6,437,645
Orange	151,066,729	-	90,101	21,943	2,280,244	572,395	8,163,216	6,119,541	9,797,271	-	1,619,233	1,189,772	180,920,444
Placer	19,194,224	-	(21,380)	337	421,080	43,204	588,080	775,476	2,389,175	-	212,643	156,245	23,759,084
Plumas	1,751,317	-	-	14	16,104	5,490	11,662	66,997	-	-	-	-	1,851,584
Riverside	111,559,376	-	(219,955)	(1,153)	2,113,228	915,879	9,908,055	4,744,498	-	-	878,511	859,094	130,757,534
Sacramento	90,383,995	-	(210,142)	(6,253)	158,620	155,392	1,988,920	3,495,781	6,274,439	-	929,483	682,961	103,853,196
San Benito	4,197,141	-	22,966	(38)	9,748	19,812	81,543	165,238	-	166,028	-	-	4,662,438
San Bernardino	112,351,235	-	(20,056)	512	(2,809,827)	1,153,382	1,733,170	4,401,502	17,788,721	-	1,223,653	899,110	136,721,401
San Diego	156,949,348	-	(58,077)	12,244	1,584,220	230,104	6,491,614	6,307,885	-	-	-	1,084,999	172,602,336
San Francisco	59,879,777	-	(17,243)	(5,551)	620,123	104,788	1,725,215	2,421,942	-	-	-	-	64,729,050
San Joaquin	41,036,566	-	(15,686)	(1,848)	441,263	72,564	567,690	1,583,675	4,928,229	-	441,942	324,728	49,379,123
San Luis Obispo	15,714,166	-	(2,531)	(301)	145,588	41,772	612,158	625,042	429,233	-	159,687	117,334	17,842,147
San Mateo	40,689,630	-	(6,154)	169	90,554	48,694	1,428,129	1,614,412	-	-	-	280,894	44,146,328
Santa Barbara	24,750,646	-	(8,532)	(2,142)	(18,898)	16,231	1,072,668	998,553	-	-	-	165,584	26,974,110
Santa Clara	85,799,232	-	36,355	(6,634)	562,687	134,625	(532,264)	3,259,803	-	-	125,476	587,677	89,966,958
Santa Cruz	14,732,335	-	27,987	636	199,910	38,669	383,214	586,266	-	-	57,581	105,738	16,132,335
Shasta	13,935,328	-	(89,942)	21	287,495	102,401	271,264	534,593	63,041	-	137,314	100,895	15,342,410
Sierra	832,413	-	-	21	43,614	-	3,839	30,400	-	-	-	-	910,287
Siskiyou	3,359,009	-	(20,535)	78	144,131	7,877	143,784	130,761	325,592	-	37,189	27,326	4,155,213
Solano	24,944,650	-	19,886	(3,238)	673,973	158,972	2,048,519	1,041,422	-	-	-	182,947	29,067,130
Sonoma	26,163,956	-	(88,098)	730	376,970	77,099	266,174	1,024,962	1,157,174	-	263,451	193,578	29,435,995
Stanislaus	27,763,188	-	1,770	(1,463)	288,949	126,509	525,164	1,078,937	213,652	-	272,704	200,376	30,469,786
Sutter	6,365,987	-	-	17	88,381	15,754	332,696	256,075	583,371	-	69,477	51,050	7,762,806
Tehama	5,144,818	-	2,619	(14)	126,507	22,199	369,822	206,997	-	-	-	37,377	5,910,325
Trinity	1,907,018	-	-	138	64,396	3,342	15,659	72,844	-	-	-	-	2,063,396
Tulare	24,181,229	-	79,367	(674)	311,694	87,602	1,258,549	974,860	2,993,359	-	271,697	199,636	30,357,319
Tuolumne	4,259,617	-	(38,039)	(98)	106,854	13,367	192,679	169,000	-	-	-	29,756	4,733,136
Ventura	39,075,068	-	(55,901)	6,328	129,437	583,375	1,119,745	1,551,008	-	-	112,552	280,213	42,801,825
Yolo	12,666,314	-	(21,963)	649	416,681	15,038	218,118	488,278	846,560	-	133,000	97,725	14,860,401
Yuba	5,586,924	-	-	(65)	76,450	32,701	253,346	224,154	-	-	-	-	6,173,510
Unallocated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	2,110,811,560	(24,886)	(950,231)	(58,728)	21,693,293	9,223,000	88,018,395	84,176,000	100,000,000	452,748	15,115,211	15,115,211	2,443,571,573

¹ Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trail courts, but is used in the calculation of the Workload Formula allocation.

Court	WORKLOAD ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENTS					WORKLOAD FORMULA	
	2022-23 Workload Funding Floor Adjustment				2022-23 Final Workload Allocation	2022-23 Workload Formula	Workload Formula Percentage
	Applied Funding Floor	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Percentage Share of Reduction	Reduction Allocation			
X	Y	Z	AA	AB (W+Y+AA)	AC	AD (AB/AC)	
Alameda			3.60%	(3,164)	87,972,910	88,721,292	99.2%
Alpine	950,000	48,091	-	-	950,000	449,772	211.2%
Amador			0.16%	(143)	3,986,574	3,977,456	100.2%
Butte			0.54%	(478)	13,290,406	14,791,477	89.9%
Calaveras			0.13%	(118)	3,287,727	3,287,845	100.0%
Colusa			0.10%	(88)	2,434,884	2,241,285	108.6%
Contra Costa			2.12%	(1,863)	51,796,764	57,057,062	90.8%
Del Norte			0.15%	(134)	3,721,757	3,721,891	100.0%
El Dorado			0.39%	(344)	9,579,034	10,356,971	92.5%
Fresno			2.58%	(2,262)	62,908,502	70,425,780	89.3%
Glenn			0.12%	(105)	2,913,234	2,913,338	100.0%
Humboldt			0.36%	(314)	8,729,424	9,091,694	96.0%
Imperial			0.44%	(387)	10,769,351	9,180,484	117.3%
Inyo			0.10%	(91)	2,536,943	2,257,443	112.4%
Kern			2.61%	(2,290)	63,691,679	71,289,380	89.3%
Kings			0.43%	(379)	10,533,373	11,792,062	89.3%
Lake			0.20%	(176)	4,882,842	5,466,319	89.3%
Lassen			0.11%	(93)	2,597,386	2,332,455	111.4%
Los Angeles			29.18%	(25,622)	712,498,288	797,638,572	89.3%
Madera			0.48%	(425)	11,822,816	13,235,588	89.3%
Marin			0.58%	(507)	14,092,647	15,087,150	93.4%
Mariposa			0.07%	(65)	1,809,872	1,809,937	100.0%
Mendocino			0.31%	(275)	7,648,316	7,651,217	100.0%
Merced			0.67%	(586)	16,303,940	18,252,186	89.3%
Modoc			0.06%	(48)	1,348,636	1,284,287	105.0%
Mono			0.10%	(88)	2,452,034	2,037,226	120.4%
Monterey			1.02%	(894)	24,871,831	27,843,901	89.3%
Napa			0.38%	(337)	9,367,967	9,979,950	93.9%
Nevada			0.26%	(231)	6,437,414	7,206,655	89.3%
Orange			7.41%	(6,506)	180,913,938	202,532,326	89.3%
Placer			0.97%	(854)	23,758,230	26,597,230	89.3%
Plumas			0.08%	(67)	1,851,517	1,663,727	111.3%
Riverside			5.36%	(4,702)	130,752,832	146,241,646	89.4%
Sacramento			4.25%	(3,734)	103,849,462	116,258,997	89.3%
San Benito			0.19%	(168)	4,662,270	4,662,438	100.0%
San Bernardino			5.60%	(4,916)	136,716,485	153,053,479	89.3%
San Diego			7.07%	(6,207)	172,596,130	184,697,021	93.4%
San Francisco			2.65%	(2,328)	64,726,722	56,836,452	113.9%
San Joaquin			2.02%	(1,776)	49,377,347	55,277,714	89.3%
San Luis Obispo			0.73%	(642)	17,841,505	19,973,484	89.3%
San Mateo			1.81%	(1,587)	44,144,741	47,815,932	92.3%
Santa Barbara			1.10%	(970)	26,973,140	28,186,948	95.7%
Santa Clara			3.68%	(3,235)	89,963,722	100,038,958	89.9%
Santa Cruz			0.66%	(580)	16,131,755	17,999,527	89.6%
Shasta			0.63%	(552)	15,341,858	17,175,140	89.3%
Sierra	950,000	39,713	-	-	950,000	392,700	241.9%
Siskiyou			0.17%	(149)	4,155,063	4,651,574	89.3%
Solano			1.19%	(1,045)	29,066,085	31,142,713	93.3%
Sonoma			1.21%	(1,059)	29,434,937	32,952,277	89.3%
Stanislaus			1.25%	(1,096)	30,468,690	34,109,559	89.3%
Sutter			0.32%	(279)	7,762,527	8,690,114	89.3%
Tehama			0.24%	(213)	5,910,112	6,362,648	92.9%
Trinity			0.08%	(74)	2,063,322	1,926,810	107.1%
Tulare			1.24%	(1,092)	30,356,228	33,983,658	89.3%
Tuolumne			0.19%	(170)	4,732,965	5,065,303	93.4%
Ventura			1.75%	(1,539)	42,800,285	47,700,002	89.7%
Yolo			0.61%	(534)	14,859,867	16,635,553	89.3%
Yuba			0.25%	(222)	6,173,288	5,301,565	116.4%
Unallocated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1,900,000	87,804	100.00%	(87,804)	2,443,571,573	2,679,306,170	91.2%

¹ Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trail courts, but is used in the calculation of the Workload Formula allocation.

Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Condition Statement April 2022						
Description		YEAR END FINANCIAL STATEMENTS			ESTIMATES	
		2018-19 (Financial Statements)	2019-20 (Financial Statements)	2020-21 (Financial Statements)	2021-22	2022-23
#	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Beginning Fund Balance	60,478,281	71,630,938	84,663,432	162,032,593	118,958,000
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	7,380,390	(17,503,309)	21,449,000	1,407	-
3	TOTAL REVENUES AND TRANSFERS	1,314,999,921	1,332,994,770	1,200,868,158	1,101,138,000	1,199,017,000
4	<i>Total Revenues¹</i>	<i>1,295,031,921</i>	<i>1,213,958,770</i>	<i>1,182,553,158</i>	<i>1,181,661,000</i>	<i>1,179,540,000</i>
5	Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements					
6	General Fund Loan - Statewide E-Filing	491,000		(1,162,000)		
7	Reduction Offset Transfers	6,080,000	119,036,000	19,477,000	(80,523,000)	19,477,000
8	<i>FISCAL Assessment</i>		<i>(359,000)</i>			
9	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	13,397,000	13,315,000	13,397,000	13,397,000	13,397,000
10	Total Resources	1,382,858,593	1,387,122,399	1,306,980,590	1,263,172,000	1,317,975,000
11	EXPENDITURES/ENCUMBRANCES/ALLOCATIONS					
12	Program 0140010 - Judicial Council (Staff)	3,446,535	3,346,279	3,688,354	4,627,000	4,627,000
13	Program 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,990,037,604	2,073,267,359	1,966,753,144	2,202,105,000	2,501,990,000
14	Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	134,062,223	156,700,000	156,525,184	166,700,000	156,700,000
15	Program 0150019 - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	373,931,033	423,408,027	380,761,790	400,267,000	422,654,000
16	Program 0150028 - Assigned Judges	22,372,129	14,773,788	14,218,450	53,275,000	30,505,000
17	Program 0150037 - Court Interpreters	112,773,052	134,228,000	110,584,015	162,145,000	135,827,000
18	Program 0150075 - Grants	9,003,519	10,328,980	10,328,980	10,529,000	10,329,000
19	Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	8,950,559	9,139,535	12,703,251	21,952,000	21,952,000
20	Total Local Assistance	2,651,130,120	2,821,845,689	2,652,100,000	3,016,973,000	3,279,957,000
21	<i>FISCAL Assessment</i>		<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>
22	<i>Pro Rata/State Ops</i>	<i>176,000</i>	<i>66,000</i>	<i>209,643</i>	<i>210,000</i>	<i>185,000</i>
23	<i>Supplemental Pension Payments</i>	<i>98,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>
24	Total Expenditures (includes State Ops and LA)	2,654,576,655	2,825,191,967	2,655,788,354	3,021,600,000	3,284,584,000
25	<i>Less Funding Provided by General Fund:</i>	<i>1,343,623,000</i>	<i>1,523,049,000</i>	<i>1,511,300,000</i>	<i>1,877,846,000</i>	<i>2,072,147,000</i>
26	Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	1,311,227,655	1,302,458,967	1,144,947,997	1,144,214,000	1,212,872,000
27	Ending Fund Balance²	71,630,938	84,663,432	162,032,593	118,958,000	105,103,000
28	Restricted Funds					
29	Total Restricted/Reserved Funds	33,808,846	27,720,455	48,473,051	39,429,613	31,166,084
30	Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance	37,822,092	56,942,977	113,559,542	79,528,387	73,936,916

¹ Revenues reflect current projections as of February 2022 actuals.

² 2019-20 Fund Balance includes \$100M loan from the ICNA that was paid back in 2021-22.

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

Title: 2022–23 Pretrial Allocations and Funding Floor
Date: 4/27/2022
Contact: Deirdre Benedict, Supervising Analyst, Criminal Justice Services
415-865-7543 | deirdre.benedict@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Senate Bill (SB) 129 provides \$70 million in ongoing funding beginning in 2021-22 to the Judicial Council for distribution to the courts for the implementation and operation of ongoing court programs and practices that promote the safe, efficient, fair, and timely pretrial release of individuals booked into jail.

Each court may retain up to 30 percent of their annual allocation for costs associated with pretrial release programs and practices. Courts are required to contract for pretrial services with their county’s probation department or other county department or agency—except for those that have primary responsibility for making arrests or prosecuting criminal offenses¹—and provide that department with the remainder of the funds.

The Judicial Council receives five percent of the courts’ annual appropriation for administration of the Pretrial Release Program (Program) and reporting to the Legislature. The current annual budget available to the courts in 2022–23 for the Program is \$68.95 million.

Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services (CJS) staff present the 2022–23 allocations of the Program funding for approval and submission to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and then the Judicial Council for consideration at its business meeting on July 15, 2022.

Background

SB 129 (Stats. 2021, ch. 69), which amended the 2021 Budget Act, provided funding for “the implementation and operation of ongoing court programs and practices that promote the safe, efficient, fair, and timely pretrial release of individuals booked into jail.” (SB 129, sec. 4, item 0250-101-0001, provision 9.) SB 129 appropriated funding of \$140 million in 2021–22 and \$70 million in ongoing funding to the Judicial Council for distribution to the courts for these purposes.

¹ SB 129 specifically provides that the Santa Clara Superior may contract with the Office of Pretrial Services in that county, and that the San Francisco Superior Court may contract with the Sheriff’s Office and the existing not-for-profit entity that is performing pretrial services in the city and county for pretrial assessment and supervision services.

At its meeting on August 13, 2021, the Budget Committee approved the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee’s (TCBAC’s) recommendation to present the allocations to the Judicial Council for approval. At its October 1, 2021 business meeting, the Judicial Council approved the 2021–22 allocations of \$137.9 million for the trial courts in accordance with methodologies outlined in SB 129 and including minimum funding floors.²

2021–22—One-Time Pretrial Release Funding for Non-Pretrial Pilot Program Courts

Half of the 2021–22 funding (\$70 million) was distributed to the 41 courts that did not receive Pretrial Pilot Program funding provided in the 2019 Budget Act. The funding was allocated based on each county’s relative proportion of the state population 18 to 25 years of age. These funds are available for encumbrance or expenditure until June 30, 2024.

2021–22 and ongoing—Pretrial Release Funding for All Courts

The Judicial Council is required to distribute \$70 million each year, beginning in 2021–22, to all courts based on each county’s relative proportion of the state population 18 to 25 years of age.³ Funding allocated in 2022–23 must be encumbered or expended by June 30, 2023. The breakdown for these ongoing allocation recommendations is reflected in Attachment A.

Funding Floor

A minimum funding floor of \$200,000 is recommended for ongoing funding in 2022–23. This recommendation is based on analysis of planned budgets versus actual spending by small courts⁴ participating in the Pretrial Pilot Program in 2019–20 and 2020–21. It is also equivalent to the floor used in the funding methodology for the California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009 (SB 678).⁵ CJS staff continue to monitor and evaluate whether the floor provides small and small-medium courts with the resources necessary to meet the mandates of the legislation. If this analysis changes, staff will return to the TCBAC with a recommendation to rescind or adjust the floor.

For 2021–22, the adequacy of this floor has been difficult to fully evaluate because several important factors have delayed all trial courts and their partners from fully utilizing these funds. The COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant, direct impact on the starting of pretrial release

² Judicial Council of Cal., Budget Com. Rep., *Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts: Pretrial Release Funding and Allocation Methodology* (Oct. 1, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9814613&GUID=7AB3D35B-705F-4527-BFE9-C78FC9442FF6>.

³ The U.S. Census Bureau five-year estimates based on each county’s relative proportion of the state population 18 to 25 years of age is complete and has all 58 counties’ population: <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=age%20by%20county&g=0400000US06.050000&tid=ACSST5Y2019.S0101&hidePreview=true&tp=true>.

The California Department of Finance (DOF) population data age categories do not match the age categories specified in the SB 129 language. The DOF broke down the 18 to 25 age category into two groups: 15 to 19 years of age and 20 to 24 years of age. SB 129 specified that the age group be between 18 and 25 years of age.

⁴ The court-size category is based on the number of authorized judicial positions (AJPs) within a county: small (2–5 AJPs), small-medium (6–15 AJPs), medium (16–47 AJPs), and large (48+ AJPs).

⁵ Stats. 2009, ch. 608, www.courts.ca.gov/documents/sb678.pdf.

programs, their continuing operations, or both. This impact has led to delays in staffing as well as operational and logistical challenges. Many courts have not yet been able to secure memorandums of understanding with their pretrial services providers which has significantly delayed spending during the first fiscal year of the program. Hiring of pretrial officers—a substantial funding component—has also been delayed or curtailed in many instances. Physical access to defendants in the jails for pretrial interviews has been delayed and/or modified to adapt to COVID protocols and continues to limit the number of people eligible to be assessed and to participate in the Program.

Recommendation

CJS staff recommend that the TCBAC approve the 2022–23 allocations for Pretrial Release funding, as outlined in Attachment 4A, for consideration by the Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 15, 2022 business meeting.

Attachments

Attachment 4A: Recommended 2022–23 Pretrial Release Ongoing Allocations

Attachment 4A: Recommended 2022–23 Pretrial Release Ongoing Allocations

Court	Total no. of 18–24 yr. olds*	% of 18–24 yr. olds in CA population	\$ allocation of \$68.95M, based on % of 18–24 yr. olds
Alameda	136,997	3.749%	\$ 2,412,294
Alpine	N/A†	N/A†	200,000
Amador	N/A	N/A	200,000
Butte	32,344	0.885%	569,525
Calaveras	N/A	N/A	200,000
Colusa	N/A	N/A	200,000
Contra Costa	93,037	2.546%	1,638,230
Del Norte	N/A	N/A	200,000
El Dorado	13,341	0.365%	234,913
Fresno	97,886	2.678%	1,723,613
Glenn	N/A	N/A	200,000
Humboldt	17,036	0.466%	299,976
Imperial	18,338	0.502%	322,902
Inyo	N/A	N/A	200,000
Kern	90,462	2.475%	1,592,888
Kings	16,621	0.455%	292,669
Lake	N/A	N/A	200,000
Lassen	N/A	N/A	200,000
Los Angeles	952,944	26.076%	16,779,791
Madera	15,152	0.415%	266,802
Marin	16,964	0.464%	298,708
Mariposa	N/A	N/A	200,000
Mendocino	N/A	N/A	200,000
Merced	30,639	0.838%	539,503
Modoc	N/A	N/A	200,000
Mono	N/A	N/A	200,000
Monterey	43,083	1.179%	758,621
Napa	12,011	0.329%	211,494
Nevada	N/A	N/A	200,000
Orange	289,774	7.929%	5,102,448
Placer	28,723	0.786%	505,765
Plumas	N/A	N/A	200,000
Riverside	236,238	6.464%	4,159,766
Sacramento	130,962	3.584%	2,306,027
San Benito	N/A	N/A	200,000
San Bernardino	223,409	6.113%	3,933,868
San Diego	340,813	9.326%	6,001,161
San Francisco	60,846	1.665%	1,071,399
San Joaquin	72,485	1.983%	1,276,343

Court	Total no. of 18–24 yr. olds*	% of 18–24 yr. olds in CA population	\$ allocation of \$68.95M, based on % of 18–24 yr. olds
San Luis Obispo	42,626	1.166%	750,574
San Mateo	56,002	1.532%	986,104
Santa Barbara	69,751	1.909%	1,228,201
Santa Clara	161,684	4.424%	2,846,992
Santa Cruz	40,529	1.109%	713,650
Shasta	13,633	0.373%	240,055
Sierra	N/A	N/A	200,000
Siskiyou	N/A	N/A	200,000
Solano	38,611	1.057%	679,877
Sonoma	40,081	1.097%	705,761
Stanislaus	51,695	1.415%	910,265
Sutter	N/A	N/A	200,000
Tehama	N/A	N/A	200,000
Trinity	N/A	N/A	200,000
Tulare	46,977	1.285%	827,188
Tuolumne	N/A	N/A	200,000
Ventura	78,658	2.152%	1,385,039
Yolo	44,160	1.208%	777,586
Yuba	N/A	N/A	200,000
Total	3,654,512		\$ 68,950,000

* Source:

<https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=age%20by%20county&q=0400000US06.050000&tid=ACSSST5Y2019.S0101&hidePreview=true&tp=true>.

† For courts that indicate “N/A,” a minimal funding floor of \$200,000 has been imposed to ensure adequate funding for small and small-medium courts to meet the legislative mandate.

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

Title: Workload Formula Impact from Remote Appearance Fee Revenue

Date: 5/5/2022

Contact: Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-8027 | oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov

Issue

On April 21, 2022, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) voted to approve a recommendation that remote appearance fees under Government Code (GC) section 70630, for videoconferencing or remote appearance, should be distributed back to courts on an ongoing, dollar-for-dollar basis, retroactive to January 1, 2022 when California Rules of Court (CRC) rule 3.672 became effective.¹

The determination if this would impact the Workload Formula’s “Other Local Revenues” portion of the methodology, effective July 1, 2022, was deferred and is brought back to the TCBAC for consideration.

Background

Government Code

GC section 70630 states:

If the court has made videoconferencing services available, the clerk of the court shall charge a reasonable fee to cover the costs of permitting parties to appear by videoconferencing. This fee shall be deposited into the Trial Court Trust Fund.

GC section 70630 fees are currently deposited into the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) on a statewide level and are dispersed to courts through the regular council-approved allocation process. It is the authority of the council to allocate funds from the TCTF, and since GC section 70630 does not prescribe the specific distribution of fees collected for these appearances, the TCBAC’s recommendation to return these funds to courts dollar-for-dollar will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and the Judicial Council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting.

¹ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting report (April 21, 2022), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20220421-materials.pdf>.

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

Prior Judicial Council Action

In January 2020, the council considered a recommendation regarding court reporter fees in hearings lasting more than one hour pursuant to GC section 68086(a)(2).²

The TCBAC recommended, and the council approved, that fees collected under GC section 68086(a)(2)—court reporter services in civil proceedings lasting *more than one hour*—be distributed back to trial courts on a dollar-for-dollar basis after deposit into the TCTF and that this revenue stream be excluded from the Workload Formula, for consistency in allowing courts to offset costs as provided in GC section 68086(a)(1)—court reporter services in civil proceedings lasting *less than one hour*.

Workload Formula Impact

On July 19, 2019, the council approved a recommendation to adjust each court’s workload allocation to include net civil assessments and specific general ledger accounts as part of the Workload Formula effective with 2019-20 allocations.³

The Workload Formula is for standard, core business operations. Costs associated with activities that are not captured in the Resource Assessment Study and/or not included in the Workload Formula (e.g., interpreter staff and court reporter staff in non-mandated areas) are excluded. Therefore, it was determined that revenues due to court reporter proceedings under one hour would not be included in the Workload Formula.

Revenues

The revenues collected under GC section 70630 have ranged in the hundreds of dollars statewide in recent years as shown in Table 1 below. However, it is anticipated that these revenue amounts will increase based on the change in CRC rule 3.672.

Table 1 – GC 70630 Remote Appearance Fee Revenues Deposited into the TCTF

2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22*
\$930	\$831	\$139	\$589	\$361

**Revenues through February 2022.*

² Judicial Council meeting report (January 17, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7972056&GUID=D1E7E13B-D919-4FE6-91B6-008A003F8672;> Judicial Council meeting minutes (January 17, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=711572&GUID=AC46528C-6E37-406A-A1CE-B41CC33E29EB.>

³ Judicial Council meeting report (July 19, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7338800&GUID=9284F0B3-BCAE-4C0C-A110-49AA99D8A139;> 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 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
(Action Item)

Trial Court Impact

Excluding GC section 70630 fees for remote appearances from the Workload Formula allocation is consistent with other fees such as court reporter fees and would enable courts to offset the costs of these services with the associated fees without the amount impacting how their Workload Formula allocation is calculated.

Recommendation

The TCBAC is asked to consider the information provided to determine how GC section 70630 fees should impact the Workload Formula for consideration by the Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 14-15, 2022 business meeting, effective July 1, 2022.

1. Exclude revenues collected under GC section 70630 as a funding category in the Workload Formula methodology for “Other Local Revenues;” or
2. Include revenues collected under GC section 70630 as a funding category in the Workload Formula methodology for “Other Local Revenues.”

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

Title: 2022-23 Self-Help Annual Update
Date: 4/27/2022
Contact: Nicholas Armstrong, Senior Research Analyst, Office of Court Research,
Business Management Services

Issue

This report is to inform the trial courts of the latest three-year population average derived from data published by the California Department of Finance. Specifically, this report serves to keep the courts aware of population shifts and how those shifts could impact self-help funding allocations when the next three-year update is conducted in 2024-25.

Background

At its September 21, 2018 business meeting, the Judicial Council adopted the following policy recommendations for the allocation of self-help funding effective for the 2019–20 allocations and ongoing¹:

1. Adopt a three-year population update schedule using rolling three-year average population data;
2. Provide annual population updates to trial courts using rolling three-year average data for informational purposes only; and
3. Maintain the current self-help allocation baseline of \$34,000 per court and revisit in 2021 after the November 30, 2020 report to the Legislature.

On July 9, 2021, the council voted to approve the continued use of the \$34,000 base with the remainder of the funds allocated by proportion of state population.² The three previous recommendations were retained.

This report responds to #2 of the approved council recommendations to provide a yearly, informational only update of the rolling three-year population average. This will keep courts aware of population shifts and allow preparation for potential funding changes that could occur

¹ Judicial Council meeting report (September 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6631465&GUID=98405B9A-39EF-4D54-8C11-BAC963D1239D>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (September 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=559788&GUID=1AF2481A-79EE-44AD-A8E6-1D5F9E02CC7A>.

² Judicial Council meeting report (July 9, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9481308&GUID=D05A08D1-E39B-4880-BCA1-A551C9B8F20C>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 9, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=803683&GUID=7A91FDD5-4839-4018-9831-79E23D4383BF>.

from the allocation recalculation done every three years. The next allocation recalculation is scheduled for 2024-25.

Population Update

The allocation methodology for self-help funding has two components; a baseline level of funding and then a proportionate share of funding based on county population relative to the total state population. The allocation of self-help funds through 2023-24 will remain unchanged and is based on the three-year average of population data using 2018, 2019, and 2020 data³. For purposes of informing the courts of population changes that may impact future allocations, an informational update of the most current three-year average of population data (2019, 2020, 2021) is provided.

Table 1 shows the current three-year population average used for the self-help allocation (2018-2020) with the corresponding percentage of the state total. This is followed by the updated three-year population average (2019-2021) with the new corresponding percentage of the state population. The population averages are shown in columns A and C, while the proportions to the state total are shown in columns B and D. Column E shows the percent change in population, whereas column F shows the change in the percentage of the state total.

Table 1: Population Average, Percentage of State Total, Percent Change in Population Average, and Change in State Population

County	Allocation Population (3-Year Avg. 2018-20)	(%) of State Population	Informational Population Update (3-Year Avg. 2019-21)	(%) of State Population	(%) Change in Population Avg.	Change in (%) of State Population (D - B)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alameda	1,666,779	4.184%	1,659,771	4.194%	-0.42%	0.010%
Alpine	1,153	0.003%	1,143	0.003%	-0.81%	0.000%
Amador	38,021	0.095%	37,602	0.095%	-1.10%	0.000%
Butte	221,459	0.556%	210,825	0.533%	-4.80%	-0.023%
Calaveras	45,099	0.113%	45,048	0.114%	-0.11%	0.001%
Colusa	22,039	0.055%	22,073	0.056%	0.16%	0.000%
Contra Costa	1,152,934	2.894%	1,150,443	2.907%	-0.22%	0.013%
Del Norte	27,307	0.069%	27,108	0.069%	-0.73%	0.000%
El Dorado	191,158	0.480%	192,857	0.487%	0.89%	0.008%
Fresno	1,016,276	2.551%	1,019,993	2.577%	0.37%	0.027%
Glenn	29,109	0.073%	29,307	0.074%	0.68%	0.001%
Humboldt	134,879	0.339%	132,464	0.335%	-1.79%	-0.004%
Imperial	189,889	0.477%	187,669	0.474%	-1.17%	-0.002%
Inyo	18,585	0.047%	18,572	0.047%	-0.07%	0.000%

³ E-1: California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, Population Estimates for Cities and Counties and the State.

County	Allocation Population (3-Year Avg. 2018-20)	(%) of State Population	Informational Population Update (3-Year Avg. 2019-21)	(%) of State Population	(%) Change in Population Avg.	Change in (%) of State Population (D - B)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Kern	913,273	2.292%	912,695	2.306%	-0.06%	0.014%
Kings	152,993	0.384%	152,831	0.386%	-0.11%	0.002%
Lake	64,731	0.162%	64,044	0.162%	-1.06%	-0.001%
Lassen	29,965	0.075%	28,491	0.072%	-4.92%	-0.003%
Los Angeles	10,236,799	25.695%	10,114,404	25.558%	-1.20%	-0.136%
Madera	158,859	0.399%	158,348	0.400%	-0.32%	0.001%
Marin	262,532	0.659%	259,880	0.657%	-1.01%	-0.002%
Mariposa	18,088	0.045%	18,059	0.046%	-0.16%	0.000%
Mendocino	88,751	0.223%	87,527	0.221%	-1.38%	-0.002%
Merced	282,142	0.708%	282,876	0.715%	0.26%	0.007%
Modoc	9,595	0.024%	9,563	0.024%	-0.33%	0.000%
Mono	13,634	0.034%	13,423	0.034%	-1.55%	0.000%
Monterey	443,279	1.113%	439,303	1.110%	-0.90%	-0.003%
Napa	140,387	0.352%	138,748	0.351%	-1.17%	-0.002%
Nevada	98,724	0.248%	97,646	0.247%	-1.09%	-0.001%
Orange	3,212,644	8.064%	3,173,211	8.018%	-1.23%	-0.045%
Placer	396,645	0.996%	399,785	1.010%	0.79%	0.015%
Plumas	19,271	0.048%	18,220	0.046%	-5.45%	-0.002%
Riverside	2,432,794	6.106%	2,438,076	6.161%	0.22%	0.054%
Sacramento	1,543,680	3.875%	1,550,742	3.919%	0.46%	0.044%
San Benito	60,579	0.152%	62,483	0.158%	3.14%	0.006%
San Bernardino	2,182,559	5.478%	2,172,403	5.490%	-0.47%	0.011%
San Diego	3,344,199	8.394%	3,326,667	8.406%	-0.52%	0.012%
San Francisco	888,546	2.230%	883,893	2.234%	-0.52%	0.003%
San Joaquin	767,587	1.927%	773,804	1.955%	0.81%	0.029%
San Luis Obispo	279,251	0.701%	275,280	0.696%	-1.42%	-0.005%
San Mateo	773,961	1.943%	769,155	1.944%	-0.62%	0.001%
Santa Barbara	453,297	1.138%	447,159	1.130%	-1.35%	-0.008%
Santa Clara	1,957,618	4.914%	1,941,357	4.906%	-0.83%	-0.008%
Santa Cruz	274,323	0.689%	267,770	0.677%	-2.39%	-0.012%
Shasta	178,363	0.448%	177,655	0.449%	-0.40%	0.001%
Sierra	3,207	0.008%	3,199	0.008%	-0.24%	0.000%
Siskiyou	44,552	0.112%	44,461	0.112%	-0.21%	0.001%
Solano	440,441	1.106%	438,648	1.108%	-0.41%	0.003%
Sonoma	498,996	1.253%	490,493	1.239%	-1.70%	-0.013%
Stanislaus	557,435	1.399%	554,677	1.402%	-0.49%	0.002%
Sutter	98,493	0.247%	101,770	0.257%	3.33%	0.010%
Tehama	64,518	0.162%	65,006	0.164%	0.76%	0.002%

	Allocation Population (3-Year Avg. 2018-20)	(%) of State Population	Informational Population Update (3-Year Avg. 2019-21)	(%) of State Population	(%) Change in Population Avg.	Change in (%) of State Population (D - B)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Trinity	13,624	0.034%	13,574	0.034%	-0.36%	0.000%
Tulare	478,308	1.201%	478,890	1.210%	0.12%	0.010%
Tuolumne	54,749	0.137%	54,307	0.137%	-0.81%	0.000%
Ventura	852,852	2.141%	840,234	2.123%	-1.48%	-0.017%
Yolo	221,852	0.557%	219,702	0.555%	-0.97%	-0.002%
Yuba	77,177	0.194%	78,380	0.198%	1.56%	0.004%
Total	39,839,959	100%	39,573,718	100%		

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

Title: Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Funds Held on Behalf Expenditure Reporting

Date: 5/5/2022

Contact: Catrayel Wood, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-7008 | Catrayel.Wood@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Upon completion of TCTF Funds Held on Behalf (FHOB) projects or planned expenditures, courts are required to report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) within 90 days on the project or planned expenditure and how the funds were expended.

Background

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the Judicial Council, when setting the allocations for trial courts, to set a preliminary allocation in July of each fiscal year. In January of each fiscal year, after review of available trial court reserves as of June 30 of the prior fiscal year, the Judicial Council is required to finalize allocations and each court's final allocation is offset by the amount of reserves that exceed the amount authorized to be carried over pursuant to Government Code section 77203(b). Under this section, a trial court may, beginning June 30, 2014 and concluding June 30, 2019, carryover unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 1 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year. Effective June 30, 2020, the carryover amount increased to 3 percent.

At its business meeting on July 29, 2014, the Judicial Council approved an annual process beginning in 2015-16 for courts to provide preliminary and final computations of the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap.¹

At its business meeting on April 15, 2016, the Judicial Council adopted a process, criteria, and procedures for trial courts to request that TCTF-reduced allocations related to the 1 percent fund balance cap be retained in the TCTF as restricted fund balance for the benefit of those courts that make the request. The FHOB process is intended only for expenditures that cannot be funded by a court's annual budget or three-year encumbrance term and that require multiyear savings to implement. The process also requires reporting on the use of the funds.²

¹ Judicial Council meeting report (July 29, 2014), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140729-itemC.pdf>;
Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 29, 2014), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140729-minutes.pdf>.

² Judicial Council meeting report (April 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4378277&GUID=57D6B686-EA95-497E-9A07-226CA724ADCB>;
Judicial Council meeting minutes (April 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=463457&GUID=194A3350-D97F-452B-ACF4-1EBE6C105CCA>.

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

The Judicial Council adopted revisions to the policy, including streamlining the submission schedule, making a change to the recipient of the request, and providing language corrections to better align with court year-end closing, trial court allocation offsets, and requests to amend previously reviewed requests at its business meeting on January 17, 2020 (see Attachment 2A).³

Judicial Council Budget Services staff submitted its initial expenditure report to the TCBCAC at its July 25, 2019 meeting and established quarterly reporting on the status of FHOB projects or planned expenditures from those courts that indicate completion.⁴

Report of Status

In April 2022, Judicial Council Budget Services staff requested a status on projects or planned expenditures from those courts that indicated completion through April 29, 2022:

Court	Council Approval Date	Project or Planned Expenditure	Completion Date	Approved FHOB	Expended FHOB	Unspent FHOB Returning to TCTF
Orange	1/22/21	Case Management System	09/13/21	\$885,469	\$885,469	\$0
				\$885,469	\$885,469	\$0

Details of the funds held on behalf process are included as Attachment Info 2A and the project completion form for Orange Superior Court is included as Attachment Info 2B.

Attachments

Attachment Info 2A: *Summary of Recommended Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts*

Attachment Info 2B: Funds Held on Behalf of the Court Project Completion Reporting

³ Judicial Council meeting report (January 17, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7977186&GUID=6B519461-BD50-4F19-9B80-CD40F8FD64FE>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (January 17, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=711572&GUID=AC46528C-6E37-406A-A1CE-B41CC33E29EB>.

⁴ TCBCAC meeting report (July 25, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190725-materials.pdf>; TCBCAC meeting minutes (July 25, 2019), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20190725-minutes.pdf>.

Summary of Recommended Process, Criteria, and Required Information for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

Recommended Process for Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

1. Trial Court Trust Fund fund balance will be held on behalf of trial courts only for expenditures or projects that cannot be funded by a court's annual budget or three-year encumbrance term and that require multiyear savings to implement.
 - a. Categories or activities include, but are not limited to:
 - i) Projects that extend beyond the original planned three-year term process such as expenses related to the delayed opening of new facilities or delayed deployment of new information systems;
 - ii) Technology improvements or infrastructure such as installing a local data center, data center equipment replacement, case management system deployment, converting to a VoIP telephone system, desktop computer replacement, and replacement of backup emergency power systems;
 - iii) Facilities maintenance and repair allowed under rule 10.810 of the California Rules of Court such as flooring replacement and renovation as well as professional facilities maintenance equipment;
 - iv) Court efficiencies projects such as online and smart forms for court users and RFID systems for tracking case files; and
 - v) Other court infrastructure projects such as vehicle replacement and copymachine replacement.

2. The submission, review, and approval process is as follows:
 - a. All requests will be submitted to the Judicial Council for consideration.
 - b. Requests will be submitted to the *director of Budget Services* by the court's presiding judge or court executive officer.
 - c. *Budget Services* staff will review the request, ask the court to provide any missing or incomplete information, draft a preliminary report, share the preliminary report with the court for its comments, revise as necessary, and issue the report to the *Fiscal Planning Subcommittee* of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC); the *subcommittee* will meet to review the request, hear any presentation of the court representative, and ask questions of the representative if one participates on behalf of the court; and *Budget Services* office staff will issue a final report on behalf of the *subcommittee* for the council.
 - d. The final report to the *subcommittee* and the Judicial Council will be provided to the requesting court before the report is made publicly available on the California Courts website.
 - e. The court may send a representative to the *subcommittee* and Judicial Council meetings to present its request and respond to questions.

3. To be considered at a scheduled Judicial Council business meeting, requests must be submitted to the *director of Budget Services* at least 40 business days (approximately eight weeks) before that business meeting.
4. The Judicial Council may consider including appropriate terms and conditions that courts must accept for the council to approve designating TCTF fund balance on the court's behalf.
 - a. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions would result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
5. Approved requests that courts subsequently determine need to be revised to reflect a change (1) in the amounts by year to be distributed to the court for the planned annual expenditures and/or encumbrances, (2) in the total amount of the planned expenditures, or (3) of more than 10 percent of the total request among the categories of expense will need to be amended and resubmitted following the submission, review, and approval process discussed in 1–3 above.
 - a. Denied revised requests will result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
6. Approved requests that courts subsequently determine have a change in purpose will need to be amended and resubmitted following the submission, review, and approval process discussed in 1–3 above, along with a request that the TCTF funds held on behalf of the court for the previously approved request continue to be held on behalf of the court for this new purpose.
 - a. Denied new requests tied to previously approved requests will result in the immediate change in the designation of the related TCTF fund balance from restricted to unrestricted and no longer held on behalf of the court unless the council specifies an alternative action.
7. On completion of the project or planned expenditure, courts are required to report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee within 90 days on the project or planned expenditure and how the funds were expended.
8. As part of the courts' audits in the scope of the normal audit cycle, a review of any funds that were held on behalf of the courts will be made to confirm that they were used for their stated approved purpose.

Recommended Criteria for Eligibility for TCTF Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

TCTF fund balance will be held on behalf of the trial courts only for expenditures or projects that cannot be funded by the court's annual budget or three-year encumbrance term and that require multiyear savings to implement.

Recommended Information Required to Be Provided by Trial Courts for TCTF Fund Balance Held on Behalf of the Courts

Below is the information required to be provided by trial courts on the *Application for TCTF Funds Held on Behalf of the Court*:

SECTION I

General Information

- Superior court
- Date of submission
- Person authorizing the request
- Contact person and contact information
- Time period covered by the request (includes contribution and expenditure)
- Requested amount
- A description providing a brief summary of the request

SECTION II

Amended Request Changes

- Sections and answers amended
- A summary of changes to request

SECTION III

Trial Court Operations and Access to Justice

- An explanation as to why the request does not fit within the court's annual operational budget process and the three-year encumbrance term
- A description of how the request will enhance the efficiency and/or effectiveness of court operations, and/or increase the availability of court services and programs
- If a cost efficiency, cost comparison (*table template provided*)
- A description of the consequences to the court's operations if the court request is not approved
- A description of the consequences to the public and access to justice if the court request is not approved
- The alternatives that the court has identified if the request is not approved, and the reason why holding funding in the TCTF is the preferred alternative

SECTION IV

Financial Information

- Three-year history of year-end fund balances, revenues, and expenditures (*table template provided*)
- Current detailed budget projections for the fiscal years during which the trial court would either be contributing to the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf or receiving distributions from the TCTF fund balance held on the court's behalf (*table template provided*)
- Identification of all costs, by category and amount, needed to fully implement the project (*table template provided*)
- A specific funding and expenditure schedule identifying the amounts to be contributed and expended, by fiscal year (*table template provided*)

FUNDS HELD ON BEHALF OF THE COURT PROJECT COMPLETION REPORTING

REQUEST NUMBER: 30-2015-1	
SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
SUPERIOR COURT: Orange	
JC APPROVED DATE: 1/22/2021	JC APPROVED AMOUNT: \$885,469
REASON PROVIDED ON APPLICATION:	
<p>In support of the Court's long-term business objectives, cost savings measures, and technology goals, the Court's leadership initiated the implementation of a new Case Management System ("CMS") from Tyler Technologies ("Tyler") to replace the Court's outdated Banner CMS, which supports Family Law and Juvenile case types. The implementation plan also included the conversion of the Civil Cashiering System ("CCS"). As such, the Court required professional and consulting services to assist with a gap analysis, configuration, data conversion, testing, and implementation. Services included technical project management support; inventory, assessment, and recommendations for Family Law, Juvenile Dependency, Juvenile Delinquency, and CCS data conversion; programming; and other services to ensure the Court's successful conversion to Tyler's Odyssey CMS.</p>	
SECTION II: PROJECT STATUS OF COMPLETION (TO BE COMPLETED BY COURT)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROJECT COMPLETE	
<p><i>Per Judicial Council policy, "On completion of the project or planned expenditure, courts are required to report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee within 90 days on the project or planned expenditure and how the funds were expended."</i></p>	
PLEASE PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE FUNDS WERE EXPENDED:	
Tyler deliverables: \$445,116 Tyler software maintenance for FY 2020-21 and FY 2021-22: \$440,353	
TOTAL COST OF PROJECT OR PLANNED EXPENDITURE: \$885,469	
COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT: 9/13/2021	
<input type="checkbox"/> PROJECT NOT COMPLETED	
PLEASE PROVIDE A PROGRESS REPORT:	
ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION: Click here to enter a date.	
CONTACT PERSON AND CONTACT INFO:	
Katrina Coreces kcoreces@occourts.org	
PERSON AUTHORIZING REQUEST (<i>Presiding Judge or Court Executive Officer</i>):	