



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR AUGUST 18, 2022 TELECONFERENCE MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the July 18, 2022 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – 2022-23 Court Reporter Funding Allocation (Action Required)	5
Attachment 1A – Court Reporter Funding – Recommend Allocation 2022-23	8
Item 2 – 2022-23 Increased Transcript Rate Funding Allocation (Action Required)	10
Attachment 1B – Court Reporter Transcript – Recommend Allocation 2022-23	13



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

Request for ADA accommodations
should be made at least three business
days before the meeting and directed to:
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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: August 18, 2022
Time: 4:30 p.m. – 5:15 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: 1-877-820-7831; passcode: 1884843 (Listen Only)

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 July 18, 2022 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

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

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by 4:30 p.m. on August 17, 2022 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

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

Item 1

2022-23 Court Reporter Funding Allocation (Action Required)

Consideration of the 2022-23 allocations for the \$30 million court reporter funding.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Chris Belloli, Manager, Judicial Council Business Management Services

Item 2

2022-23 Increased Transcript Rate Funding Allocation (Action Required)

Consideration of the 2022-23 allocations for the \$7 million increased transcript rate funding.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Chris Belloli, Manager, Judicial Council Business Management Services

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

None

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm

tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

July 18, 2022

4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

<http://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/1854>

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Kimberly Gaab, Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Hon. Erick L. Larsh, Hon. Deborah A. Ryan, Hon. Michael A. Sachs, Hon. Kevin M. Seibert, and Hon. Theodore C. Zayner.

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

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Jill C. Fannin, Hon. B. Scott Thomsen, and Mr. Shawn Landry.

Others Present: Hon. David Kalemkarian, Mr. John Wordlaw, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Brandy Olivera, Ms. Michele Allan, and Ms. Oksana Tuk.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair welcomed the members, called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved minutes of the June 21, 2022 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) virtual meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

Item 1 - AB 177 Allocation Methodology (Action Required)

Consideration of a Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommendation on the development of an allocation methodology for trial court backfill funding related to the repeal of fees authorized by AB 177.

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

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the recommendation by the FMS to approve the two-year average revenue collection methodology for allocation of the \$10.3 million backfill funding to trial courts for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and Judicial Council effective September 20, 2022.

Item 2 - Annual FMS Work Plan Update (Action Required)

Consideration of an FMS recommendation to update items on the annual work plan.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Michele Allan, Supervisor, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the recommendation by FMS for updates to the annual FMS work plan as follows:

- A. Move item 1, Judicial Council-provided services, and item 2, Court Interpreter Program funding methodology, to 2022-23;
- B. Separate item 3 into two parts, reevaluation of the cluster system and reevaluation of floor funding, and move to 2022-23;
- C. Mark item 4, tracking the work of the AB 1058 methodologies, as complete; and
- D. Add a new item for 2022-23 to evaluate the Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process request submitted in January 2022.

Item 3 - Trial Court Executive Summary Display (Action Required)

Discussion on updates needed for the 2022-23 allocation summary for distribution to all 58 trial courts.

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

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to reconvene in September 2022 to review two items:

1. A 2022-23 trial court executive summary display that maintains the current format but includes updated allocation information as proposed by Judicial Council Budget Services staff; and
2. A proposed document to outline the data needed from trial courts for meeting the February 1, 2023 legislative reporting requirement included in the 2022 Budget Act on the operations of each trial court that includes various operational and budgetary metrics.

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1 - 2022 Budget Act

Update on the funding provided for trial courts in the 2022 Budget Act.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Fran Mueller, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: No action taken

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on .

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

Title: 2022-23 Court Reporter Funding Allocation
Date: 8/18/2022
Contact: Chris Belloli, Manager, Business Management Services
415-865-7658 | chris.belloli@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of 2022-23 allocations in the amount of \$30 million included in the 2022 Budget Act to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil law case types. The approved recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and then the Judicial Council at its September 19-20, 2022 business meeting

Background

Budget Language

On September 23, 2021, the Governor signed SB 170 which amended the 2021 Budget Act and included \$30 million ongoing General Fund to the Judicial Council for establishing a methodology to allocate funding to all trial courts to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil cases. The initial 2021-22 budget language for the \$30 million funding contained requirements and certain restrictions on how these funds could be used by courts.

The budget language in the 2022 Budget Act expanded the use of this funding; however, these changes do not impact how these funds are allocated to the courts. The new budget language authorizing the \$30 million funding in 2022-23 is as follows:

\$30,000,000 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council in a manner that ensures all courts are allocated funds to be utilized to increase the number of official court reporters in family and civil law cases. This funding may be used for recruitment and retention purposes, filling existing vacancies, converting part-time positions to full-time positions, increasing salary schedules, and providing signing and retention bonuses to enable trial courts to compete with private employers in the labor market. This funding shall not supplant existing trial court expenditures on court reports in family law and civil law cases. Any unspent funds shall revert to the General Fund.

After receiving several inquiries from courts about the use of the \$30 million for court reporters in the 2022-23 state budget, staff reached out to the Department of Finance (DOF) for clarification on how the funding could be used given the changes in the budget language. DOF

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

reported that they consulted with the Legislature and their intent is that the funds are only to be used for court reporters in civil and family cases.

Allocation Methodology Approved for 2021-22 Funding

Last fiscal year, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) established the Ad Hoc Court Reporter Funding Subcommittee consisting of members from the TCBAC to develop an allocation methodology recommendation for the first year of funding in 2021-22. Through deliberations, the ad hoc subcommittee developed a recommendation for an allocation methodology for the \$30 million funding and presented that recommendation to the TCBAC at its meeting on November 30, 2021 and the Budget Committee on December 7, 2021. The Judicial Council approved the allocation methodology at its January 21, 2022 business meeting and directed Judicial Council staff to update the allocation methodology used for this ongoing funding based on the most recent data available.

Policy Principles of Methodology

The council-approved allocation methodology was developed based on the Judicial Needs Assessment (JNA). Judicial workload, as described by the JNA, is measured by a court's Assessed Judicial Need (AJN) and was identified as the best metric for the allocation methodology because of the parallel workload drivers between judgeships and court reporters. In addition, the AJN data includes separate non-criminal and criminal judicial workload metrics by court. Focusing on non-criminal judicial need, consistent with the requirements in the budget language, the proposed methodology for allocating funds to all trial courts includes:

- a) Identifying the proportion of judicial workload, as measured by the AJN, for non-criminal need by court;
- b) Applying a \$25,000 funding floor to all courts. This would result in an increased amount, compared to using a purely proportional calculation to 11 courts totaling \$275,000, which represents an approximate 0.25 full-time equivalent (FTE) using the average salary for court reporters from the Schedule 7A. This would provide funding for these courts to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil law case types through the hiring of a part-time court reporter position, increasing the time for an existing part-time court reporter position, or utilizing shared services among other courts;
- c) After applying the funding floor amount to 11 courts, allocating the remaining \$29.7 million proportionally to all other courts based on their non-criminal judicial need; and
- d) Funds would be allocated in one lump sum upon approval by the council.

The AJN data used in the allocation methodology for 2022-23 was updated based on the 2022 JNA and the detail of the allocations by court is included as Attachment 1A.

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

Annual Reconciliation Process

Because this funding is intended solely to cover the costs associated with increasing court reporters in family law and civil law cases, any unspent funds are required to revert to the General Fund each fiscal year. Judicial Council staff has already developed a reconciliation process to pull back any remaining funds not spent on new court reporters in family law and civil law cases.

Recommendation

Approve an allocation methodology that allocates the \$30 million to each trial court proportionally, based on the council-approved methodology with updated AJN data based on the 2022 JNA as outlined in Attachment 1A.

Attachments

Attachment 1A: Court Reporter Funding – Recommended 2022-23 Allocations

Court Reporter Civil and Family Positions: FY 2022-23 Allocations

Cluster	Court	Initial Allocation of \$30M based on Noncriminal AJN			Allocation of \$30M with Funding Floor of \$25,000					
		Noncriminal AJN *	Proportion of Statewide AJN	Proportion of \$30M	Funding Floor Court?	Floor Funding	Revised AJN Proportion for Non-floor Courts	Allocation of Non floor Funding	Final Allocation	Change with Floor
	Statewide	1,067	100%	\$30,000,000		\$275,000		\$29,725,000	\$30,000,000	\$0
4	Alameda	36.8	3.45%	\$1,035,628			3.47%	\$1,031,041	\$1,031,041	(\$4,588)
1	Alpine	0.1	0.01%	\$1,772	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$23,228
1	Amador	1.1	0.11%	\$31,681			0.11%	\$31,541	\$31,541	(\$140)
2	Butte	6.1	0.57%	\$170,509			0.57%	\$169,753	\$169,753	(\$755)
1	Calaveras	1.3	0.12%	\$36,871			0.12%	\$36,707	\$36,707	(\$163)
1	Colusa	0.5	0.04%	\$13,233	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$11,767
3	Contra Costa	23.2	2.18%	\$653,080			2.19%	\$650,187	\$650,187	(\$2,893)
1	Del Norte	1.2	0.11%	\$34,107			0.11%	\$33,956	\$33,956	(\$151)
2	El Dorado	4.2	0.40%	\$118,797			0.40%	\$118,271	\$118,271	(\$526)
3	Fresno	28.4	2.67%	\$799,663			2.68%	\$796,121	\$796,121	(\$3,543)
1	Glenn	0.8	0.08%	\$22,664	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$2,336
2	Humboldt	4.5	0.42%	\$126,583			0.42%	\$126,022	\$126,022	(\$561)
2	Imperial	4.4	0.41%	\$124,280			0.42%	\$123,729	\$123,729	(\$551)
1	Inyo	0.5	0.05%	\$14,140	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$10,860
3	Kern	24.9	2.33%	\$699,077			2.34%	\$695,980	\$695,980	(\$3,097)
2	Kings	4.5	0.42%	\$125,132			0.42%	\$124,578	\$124,578	(\$554)
2	Lake	2.4	0.22%	\$66,690			0.22%	\$66,394	\$66,394	(\$295)
1	Lassen	0.8	0.07%	\$22,384	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$2,616
4	Los Angeles	341.3	31.99%	\$9,595,553			32.14%	\$9,553,044	\$9,553,044	(\$42,508)
2	Madera	6.0	0.56%	\$167,484			0.56%	\$166,742	\$166,742	(\$742)
2	Marin	5.1	0.48%	\$143,271			0.48%	\$142,636	\$142,636	(\$635)
1	Mariposa	0.4	0.03%	\$10,220	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$14,780
2	Mendocino	2.7	0.25%	\$74,961			0.25%	\$74,629	\$74,629	(\$332)
2	Merced	7.3	0.68%	\$204,434			0.68%	\$203,529	\$203,529	(\$906)
1	Modoc	0.4	0.04%	\$10,649	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$14,351
1	Mono	0.3	0.03%	\$8,108	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$16,892
3	Monterey	9.4	0.88%	\$264,158			0.88%	\$262,987	\$262,987	(\$1,170)
2	Napa	3.6	0.34%	\$101,381			0.34%	\$100,932	\$100,932	(\$449)
2	Nevada	2.6	0.24%	\$72,625			0.24%	\$72,304	\$72,304	(\$322)
4	Orange	77.0	7.22%	\$2,165,597			7.25%	\$2,156,003	\$2,156,003	(\$9,594)
2	Placer	9.3	0.88%	\$262,673			0.88%	\$261,509	\$261,509	(\$1,164)
1	Plumas	0.6	0.06%	\$18,029	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$6,971
4	Riverside	62.8	5.88%	\$1,764,521			5.91%	\$1,756,704	\$1,756,704	(\$7,817)
4	Sacramento	43.7	4.10%	\$1,228,562			4.11%	\$1,223,119	\$1,223,119	(\$5,443)
1	San Benito	1.4	0.14%	\$40,658			0.14%	\$40,478	\$40,478	(\$180)
4	San Bernardino	69.2	6.49%	\$1,946,259			6.52%	\$1,937,637	\$1,937,637	(\$8,622)
4	San Diego	77.9	7.30%	\$2,188,860			7.33%	\$2,179,163	\$2,179,163	(\$9,697)
3	San Francisco	25.1	2.35%	\$706,220			2.37%	\$703,092	\$703,092	(\$3,129)
3	San Joaquin	19.9	1.87%	\$560,134			1.88%	\$557,652	\$557,652	(\$2,481)
2	San Luis Obispo	6.0	0.56%	\$167,914			0.56%	\$167,170	\$167,170	(\$744)
3	San Mateo	13.5	1.26%	\$378,323			1.27%	\$376,647	\$376,647	(\$1,676)
3	Santa Barbara	9.2	0.86%	\$259,174			0.87%	\$258,026	\$258,026	(\$1,148)
4	Santa Clara	30.9	2.90%	\$869,883			2.91%	\$866,029	\$866,029	(\$3,854)
2	Santa Cruz	5.2	0.49%	\$146,710			0.49%	\$146,060	\$146,060	(\$650)
2	Shasta	6.2	0.58%	\$174,268			0.58%	\$173,496	\$173,496	(\$772)

Court Reporter Civil and Family Positions: FY 2022-23 Allocations

Cluster	Court	Initial Allocation of \$30M based on Noncriminal AJN			Allocation of \$30M with Funding Floor of \$25,000					
		Noncriminal AJN *	Proportion of Statewide AJN	Proportion of \$30M	Funding Floor Court?	Floor Funding	Revised AJN Proportion for Non-floor Courts	Allocation of Non floor Funding	Final Allocation	Change with Floor
	Statewide	1,067	100%	\$30,000,000		\$275,000		\$29,725,000	\$30,000,000	\$0
1	Sierra	0.1	0.01%	\$2,864	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$22,136
2	Siskiyou	1.5	0.14%	\$42,968			0.14%	\$42,778	\$42,778	(\$190)
3	Solano	11.0	1.03%	\$308,123			1.03%	\$306,758	\$306,758	(\$1,365)
3	Sonoma	10.8	1.01%	\$304,216			1.02%	\$302,868	\$302,868	(\$1,348)
3	Stanislaus	14.1	1.32%	\$395,570			1.32%	\$393,817	\$393,817	(\$1,752)
2	Sutter	3.0	0.28%	\$83,779			0.28%	\$83,408	\$83,408	(\$371)
2	Tehama	2.3	0.22%	\$65,022			0.22%	\$64,733	\$64,733	(\$288)
1	Trinity	0.7	0.06%	\$18,668	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$6,332
3	Tulare	13.3	1.24%	\$373,261			1.25%	\$371,607	\$371,607	(\$1,654)
2	Tuolumne	1.9	0.18%	\$54,387			0.18%	\$54,146	\$54,146	(\$241)
3	Ventura	18.0	1.68%	\$505,389			1.69%	\$503,150	\$503,150	(\$2,239)
2	Yolo	5.3	0.50%	\$149,071			0.50%	\$148,410	\$148,410	(\$660)
2	Yuba	2.5	0.23%	\$69,763			0.23%	\$69,454	\$69,454	(\$309)

* Assessed Judicial Need (AJN) based on the updated 2022 data.

Noncriminal case types: Civil, Family, Juvenile, Probate, Mental Health

Criminal case types: Felony, Misdemeanors, Infractions

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

Title: 2022-23 Increased Transcript Rate Funding Allocation

Date: 8/18/2022

Contact: Chris Belloli, Manager, Business Management Services
415-865-7658 | chris.belloli@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of 2022-23 allocations in the amount of \$7 million included in the 2022 Budget Act to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates. The approved recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and then the Judicial Council at its September 19-20, 2022 business meeting.

Background

Budget Language

On September 23, 2021, the Governor signed SB 170 which amended the 2021 Budget Act and included \$7 million ongoing General Fund to the Judicial Council for establishing a methodology to allocate the funding to all trial courts to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates pursuant to AB 177 (Committee on Budget; ch. 257, stats. 2021).

Allocation Methodology Approved for 2021-22 Funding

Last fiscal year, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) established the Ad Hoc Court Reporter Funding Subcommittee consisting of members from the TCBAC to develop an allocation methodology recommendation for the first year of funding in 2021-22. Through deliberations, the ad hoc subcommittee developed an implementation recommendation that helps courts cover increased transcript costs and presented that recommendation to the TCBAC at its meeting on November 30, 2021 and the Budget Committee on December 7, 2021. The Judicial Council approved the allocation methodology at its January 21, 2022 business meeting and directed Judicial Council staff to update the allocation methodology used for this ongoing funding based on the most recent data available.

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

Policy Principles of Methodology

The council-approved allocation methodology was developed for implementation that helps courts cover increased transcript costs. Focusing on an equitable approach for allocating funds to all trial courts, consistent with the budget language, the methodology includes:

- a) Averaging actual transcript expenditures by court for the last three fiscal years (i.e., 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22);
- b) Applying a proportional allocation of the \$7 million to each court based on the three-year average of transcript expenditures. The allocation methodology for 2022-23 would provide each court with additional funding representing the same 45 percent increase for each court from their historical three-year average expenditures; and
- c) Funds would be allocated in one lump sum upon approval by the Judicial Council.

The three-year average is updated each year based on the most recent data available for actual expenditures for court reporter transcripts, which is consistent with other workload methodologies for other funding sources. Detail of the allocations by court is included as Attachment 1B.

Annual Reconciliation Process

Because this funding is intended solely to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates, any unspent funds are required to revert to the General Fund each fiscal year. The actual expenditures for each court from 2020-21 will be used to establish a baseline from which cost increases eligible to be covered by these funds will be determined for each court. Based on the historical baseline amount and the actual expenditures for the current fiscal year, a reconciliation process will occur at the end of each fiscal year to pull back any remaining funds. This process for 2022-23 is outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Annual Reversion Calculation for 2022-23

Court	Actual Expenditures			3-Year Average	2022-23 Allocation from \$7M	2022-23 Expenditures	GF Reversion
	2019-20	2020-21 (Baseline)	2021-22				
A	\$110,000	\$85,000	\$100,000	\$98,333	\$43,260	\$110,000	\$18,260

Based on the example in Table 1, Court A would receive an allocation of \$43,260 from the 2022-23 \$7 million court reporter transcript appropriation. In this example, the court’s actual expenditures for 2022-23 would be \$110,000, which is a \$25,000 increase from the baseline amount for 2020-21 (\$110,000 - \$85,000 = \$25,000). Comparing the \$25,000 increase to the

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

\$43,260 allocation from the 2022-23 appropriation, the court would be required to revert the remaining \$18,260 ($\$43,260 - \$25,000 = \$18,260$) to the General Fund.

Recommendation

Approve an allocation methodology that allocates the \$7 million to each trial court proportionally, based on the methodology approved last year updated with the average transcript expenditures from the most-recent three fiscal years (i.e., 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22) as outlined in Attachment 1B.

Attachments

Attachment 1B: Court Reporter Transcripts – Recommended 2022-23 Allocations

Court Reporter Transcripts: FY 2022-23 Allocations

Cluster	Court	Actual Expenditures on Court Reporter Transcripts				Proportion of Average Expenditures	Proportional Allocation of \$7M	New Funding as a Percent of Expenditures
		FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21 *	FY 2021-22	Average			
	Statewide	\$15,996,562	\$12,739,717	\$17,974,624	\$15,570,301	100.00%	\$7,000,000	45%
4	Alameda	\$462,789	\$316,575	\$527,628	\$435,664	2.80%	\$195,863	45%
1	Alpine	\$71	\$139	\$650	\$287	0.00%	\$129	45%
1	Amador	\$32,387	\$18,321	\$32,359	\$27,689	0.18%	\$12,448	45%
2	Butte	\$91,273	\$97,894	\$101,943	\$97,037	0.62%	\$43,625	45%
1	Calaveras	\$27,309	\$26,846	\$40,629	\$31,595	0.20%	\$14,204	45%
1	Colusa	\$14,533	\$8,008	\$10,812	\$11,118	0.07%	\$4,998	45%
3	Contra Costa	\$509,894	\$405,961	\$522,978	\$479,611	3.08%	\$215,621	45%
1	Del Norte	\$81,558	\$53,391	\$42,074	\$59,007	0.38%	\$26,528	45%
2	El Dorado	\$85,149	\$49,904	\$74,572	\$69,875	0.45%	\$31,414	45%
3	Fresno	\$502,569	\$431,683	\$686,268	\$540,173	3.47%	\$242,848	45%
1	Glenn	\$10,673	\$7,650	\$14,521	\$10,948	0.07%	\$4,922	45%
2	Humboldt	\$3,742	\$7,435	\$4,145	\$5,107	0.03%	\$2,296	45%
2	Imperial	\$22,759	\$23,298	\$33,028	\$26,362	0.17%	\$11,852	45%
1	Inyo	\$11,028	\$10,357	\$15,168	\$12,184	0.08%	\$5,478	45%
3	Kern	\$797,067	\$709,145	\$907,055	\$804,422	5.17%	\$361,647	45%
2	Kings	\$316,901	\$275,882	\$401,049	\$331,277	2.13%	\$148,934	45%
2	Lake	\$30,351	\$32,336	\$44,614	\$35,767	0.23%	\$16,080	45%
1	Lassen	\$36,511	\$30,822	\$32,613	\$33,316	0.21%	\$14,978	45%
4	Los Angeles	\$4,589,304	\$3,433,513	\$5,169,252	\$4,397,356	28.24%	\$1,976,936	45%
2	Madera	\$75,441	\$83,123	\$116,359	\$91,641	0.59%	\$41,199	45%
2	Marin	\$64,012	\$45,711	\$108,027	\$72,583	0.47%	\$32,632	45%
1	Mariposa	\$1,737	\$4,709	\$2,485	\$2,977	0.02%	\$1,339	45%
2	Mendocino	\$148,140	\$134,226	\$156,358	\$146,241	0.94%	\$65,746	45%
2	Merced	\$122,600	\$156,237	\$178,975	\$152,604	0.98%	\$68,607	45%
1	Modoc	\$28,306	\$7,155	\$6,034	\$13,831	0.09%	\$6,218	45%
1	Mono	\$5,300	\$2,806	\$10,568	\$6,225	0.04%	\$2,798	45%
3	Monterey	\$165,151	\$127,556	\$143,806	\$145,504	0.93%	\$65,415	45%
2	Napa	\$135,651	\$90,806	\$167,582	\$131,346	0.84%	\$59,050	45%
2	Nevada	\$35,114	\$23,786	\$32,868	\$30,589	0.20%	\$13,752	45%
4	Orange	\$1,015,335	\$982,451	\$1,041,335	\$1,013,040	6.51%	\$455,436	45%
2	Placer	\$170,553	\$148,518	\$196,763	\$171,945	1.10%	\$77,302	45%
1	Plumas	\$4,740	\$2,104	\$5,553	\$4,132	0.03%	\$1,858	45%
4	Riverside	\$24,959	\$11,186	\$28,642	\$21,596	0.14%	\$9,709	45%
4	Sacramento	\$754,751	\$623,902	\$918,902	\$765,852	4.92%	\$344,307	45%
1	San Benito	\$6,206	\$3,766	\$14,632	\$8,201	0.05%	\$3,687	45%
4	San Bernardino	\$737,088	\$636,886	\$840,984	\$738,320	4.74%	\$331,929	45%
4	San Diego	\$1,058,891	\$501,181	\$1,146,404	\$902,159	5.79%	\$405,587	45%

Court Reporter Transcripts: FY 2022-23 Allocations

Cluster	Court	Actual Expenditures on Court Reporter Transcripts				Proportion of Average Expenditures	Proportional Allocation of \$7M	New Funding as a Percent of Expenditures
		FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21 *	FY 2021-22	Average			
	Statewide	\$15,996,562	\$12,739,717	\$17,974,624	\$15,570,301	100.00%	\$7,000,000	45%
3	San Francisco	\$464,089	\$300,914	\$409,721	\$391,575	2.51%	\$176,042	45%
3	San Joaquin	\$330,322	\$349,811	\$434,522	\$371,552	2.39%	\$167,040	45%
2	San Luis Obispo	\$117,302	\$135,606	\$222,544	\$158,484	1.02%	\$71,250	45%
3	San Mateo	\$221,966	\$280,961	\$295,795	\$266,241	1.71%	\$119,695	45%
3	Santa Barbara	\$182,937	\$134,408	\$181,113	\$166,153	1.07%	\$74,698	45%
4	Santa Clara	\$706,321	\$497,743	\$644,517	\$616,193	3.96%	\$277,024	45%
2	Santa Cruz	\$145,513	\$100,255	\$128,923	\$124,897	0.80%	\$56,150	45%
2	Shasta	\$89,173	\$88,543	\$117,894	\$98,537	0.63%	\$44,299	45%
1	Sierra	\$2,256	\$698	\$975	\$1,310	0.01%	\$589	45%
2	Siskiyou	\$20,518	\$31,755	\$37,262	\$29,845	0.19%	\$13,418	45%
3	Solano	\$170,800	\$159,262	\$288,247	\$206,103	1.32%	\$92,659	45%
3	Sonoma	\$157,135	\$118,224	\$154,601	\$143,320	0.92%	\$64,433	45%
3	Stanislaus	\$152,415	\$239,016	\$197,748	\$196,393	1.26%	\$88,293	45%
2	Sutter	\$42,100	\$36,528	\$35,849	\$38,159	0.25%	\$17,155	45%
2	Tehama	\$19,604	\$13,000	\$35,585	\$22,730	0.15%	\$10,219	45%
1	Trinity	\$29,273	\$7,875	\$9,543	\$15,563	0.10%	\$6,997	45%
3	Tulare	\$402,174	\$298,604	\$386,039	\$362,272	2.33%	\$162,868	45%
2	Tuolumne	\$47,574	\$90,624	\$72,486	\$70,228	0.45%	\$31,573	45%
3	Ventura	\$292,846	\$168,224	\$248,114	\$236,395	1.52%	\$106,277	45%
2	Yolo	\$197,301	\$138,545	\$230,010	\$188,619	1.21%	\$84,798	45%
2	Yuba	\$25,100	\$23,853	\$65,501	\$38,151	0.25%	\$17,152	45%

* Total expenditures in FY 2020-21 will serve as the baseline for the true-up process at the end of FY 2022-23

GL Accounts

- 938701 Court Transcripts
- 938702 Non-Felony Appeals
- 938703 Felony Appeals
- 938705 Civil Transcripts
- 938711 Electronic Reporting