



Judicial Council of California
 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
 FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

**MATERIALS FOR APRIL 20, 2023
 VIRTUAL MEETING**

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the March 23, 2023 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocation Methodology (Action Required)	5
Attachment 1A: Allocation Tables 1 through 3b	9
Item 2 – FMS Work Plan (Action Required)	13
Attachment 2A: Approved FMS Work Plan	16
Attachment 2B: TCBAC 2023 Annual Agenda	17
Attachment 2C: Workload Formula Adjustment Request Procedures	28



Judicial Council of California

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

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

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: Thursday, April 20, 2023
Time: 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/2691>

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 emailed 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 March 23, 2022 Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) meeting.

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

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen-only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by 1:00pm on April 19, 2023, 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

Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocation Methodology (Action Required)

Consideration of a recommendation on a methodology for 2023-24 CARE Act allocations.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Don Will, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 2

FMS Work Plan (Action Required)

Discuss updates to the FMS Work Plan.

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

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

None

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



Judicial Council of California
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm

tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

March 23, 2023
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/2677>

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Cochair), Hon. Wendy G. Getty, Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, and Hon. Kevin M. Seibert.
Executive Officers: Mr. Chad Finke (Cochair), Mr. James Kim, Ms. Krista LeVier, Mr. Brandon E. Riley, Mr. Neal Taniguchi, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Kimberly Merrifield

Others Present: Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Brandy Olivera, and Ms. Rose Lane.

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 subcommittee reviewed and approved minutes from the November 2, 2022 Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1 – Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process (ARP) (Action Required)

Consideration of recommendations on the Santa Clara Superior Court ARP submission effective July 1, 2023.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Brandy Olivera, Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: *The FMS voted to approve (with one abstention) the following recommendation to address the Santa Clara ARP request, to be considered by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its May 11-12, 2023 business meeting:*

Increase the \$1.5 million currently funded from the civil assessment backfill funding to the full \$4 million debt service obligation amount effective July 1, 2023.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:39 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on .

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee
(Action Item)

Title: 2023-24 Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocation Methodology

Date: 4/20/2023

Contact: Don Will, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts
415-865-7557 | don.will@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider methodology options for allocating the funding included in the 2023-24 Governor’s Budget for court operations related to the CARE Act, and provisions for reallocating the funding among courts during the fiscal year.

Background

On January 20, 2023, the Judicial Council approved an allocation methodology to distribute \$2.8 million in planning funds to the seven courts making up the first cohort of courts implementing the CARE Act in 2022-23.¹ The council also directed the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to develop an allocation methodology for CARE Act funding to the courts in 2023-24 and subsequent years.

The 2023-24 Governor’s Budget includes a total of \$20 million to fund court operations related to the CARE Act in 2023-24 (Attachment 1A). This funding consists of \$8.7 million to support hearing-related costs for courts in Cohort One that will hear CARE Act cases in 2023-24 (Glenn, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne), and \$11.3 million to support other court staff and operations for all courts. Attachment 1A includes the detail on how the hearing-related and other court operations costs were estimated.

This section presents methodology options for three allocations of the 2023-24 funds to the courts:

1. All hearing-related funds allocated to Cohort One courts;
2. Other court staff and operations funds allocated to Cohort One courts, and
3. Other court staff and operations funds allocated to Cohort Two courts for planning.

¹ Judicial Council meeting report (January 20, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11534097&GUID=9FC7F7C5-8C5F-4D79-970C-FC1A78752C5A>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (January 20, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=989262&GUID=469D83CC-3971-47BE-B5FC-22D1052C8643>.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee
(Action Item)

Consistent with the January 2023 council report, all three allocations are presented with the following methodology options:

1. Allocation by county population;
2. Allocation by total filings;
3. Allocation by the 2022-23 Workload Formula data; and
4. Allocation by the 2022-23 Workload Formula with a floor to ensure that small courts have sufficient resources to plan implementation.

Workload Formula estimate. The allocation estimates in this report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee are based on the 2022-23 Workload Formula. The estimates will be revised when 2023-24 Workload Formula metrics are available, prior to the full TCBC meeting to consider these recommendations.

Option 1: Allocate \$8.7 million for hearing-related funds to the courts in Cohort One.

Table 1 compares the four allocation methodologies for Option 1. In the fourth methodology, Workload Formula with a floor funding amount, the floor selected was 25 CARE Act cases at an estimated cost of \$93,225.

Option 2: Allocate an additional approximate amount of \$3.6–\$4.5 million in other court operations funds to the courts in Cohort One.

In the CARE Act Budget Change Proposal (Link A), the Department of Finance has proposed that other court operations funds be estimated at a statewide amount of \$21.2 million which is approximately 116 full time equivalent positions in the courts. This amount is phased in over three fiscal years: \$11.3 million in 2023-24; \$17.2 million in 2024-25; and \$21.2 million in 2025-26.

The \$11.3 million allocated in 2023-24 is for two purposes. The first is to fund the operations other than hearing-related costs of the Cohort One courts that will be hearing cases in the fiscal year. The second is to fund planning activities of the Cohort Two courts that will begin hearing cases in 2024-25.

Staff estimated what the range of methodologies would be to allocate to all courts when the operations funds, totaling \$17.2 million for 2024-25 are available in Table 2. Allocating this amount for operations to the Cohort One courts only would ensure that their allocation does not drop when Cohort Two begins operations in 2024-25. Table 3a shows the Cohort One courts with this “full” operations amount allocated.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee
(Action Item)

Since the council approved the recommendation of a \$98,000 floor in allocating the operations funds to ensure that small courts have sufficient resources, this floor was retained in Table 2 and following.

Option 3: Allocate an additional approximate amount of \$6.7–\$7.7 million in other court operations funds to the courts in Cohort Two.

This option is presented in Table 3b. The available funds distributed by the four different methodologies were arrived at by netting out the amount distributed to the Cohort One courts in Option 2.

Los Angeles Superior Court.

The 2023-24 Governor’s Budget does not include estimates for 2023-24 implementation costs for Los Angeles to join Cohort One. For Los Angeles beginning December 1, 2023, staff estimate that hearing-related costs and other court operation costs to serve CARE Act cases will be an additional \$9.4 million.

Reallocation. Judicial Council staff are currently engaged with court leadership of Cohort One courts that are planning implementation while executive branch and county leadership also plan CARE Act implementation. The number of CARE Act petitions, CARE Act cases, and the cost of the workload associated for the courts is uncertain. Staff recommends that Cohort One courts be surveyed in the event that case numbers and costs from January–February 2024 change, and for there to be a proposal for reallocating unspent funds that is brought to the TCBAC for March 2024 Judicial Council action.

Recommendations

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee is asked to consider the following recommendations for consideration by the TCBAC, the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council:

1. Approve, for Cohort One courts implementing the CARE Act, an allocation methodology that employs the Workload Formula with a base of 25 CARE Act cases, calculated at \$93,225, for 2023-24.
2. Approve, for Cohort One courts implementing the CARE Act, an allocation methodology that employs the Workload Formula with a base of \$98,000, pro-rated to the amount of funding Cohort One courts are estimated to receive in 2024-25 when all courts are implementing the CARE Act.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee
(Action Item)

3. Approve, for Cohort Two courts, an allocation methodology that employs the Workload Formula with a base of \$98,000, pro-rated to the amount that remains after the allocation described in Recommendation 2.
4. Direct Judicial Council staff to survey Cohort One courts by February 2024 and bring a reallocation proposal to the TCBAC for March 2024 Judicial Council action.

Attachments

1. **Link A:** Budget Request 0250-107-BCP-2023-GB Ongoing CARE Act Court Implementation,
https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/2324/FY2324_ORG0250_BCP6672.pdf.
2. **Attachment 1A:** Allocation Tables 1 through 3b.

Table 1. Allocating Hearing-Related Funds to Cohort 1 Courts

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M
Court	Allocated by County Population			Allocated by Total Filings			Allocated by Final Workload Allocation			Allocated by Final Workload Allocation with 50 Case Base		
	Population	Percent	Distribution	Total Filings	Percent	Distribution	Final Workload Allocation	Percent	Distribution	Base: 25 Cases	Final Workload Allocation	Total Distribution
Glenn	28,750	0.28%	\$ 24,212	825	0.08%	\$ 7,049	\$ 2,913,222	0.49%	\$ 43,109	\$ 93,225	\$ -	\$ 93,225
Orange	3,162,245	30.52%	2,663,103	356,727	34.93%	3,048,070	184,275,447	31.25%	2,726,826	\$ 93,225	2,556,271	2,649,496
Riverside	2,435,525	23.51%	2,051,091	270,180	26.46%	2,308,565	133,058,980	22.56%	1,968,948	\$ 93,225	1,845,795	1,939,020
San Diego	3,287,306	31.73%	2,768,424	268,198	26.26%	2,291,630	169,972,330	28.82%	2,515,175	\$ 93,225	2,357,858	2,451,083
San Francisco	842,754	8.13%	709,730	57,681	5.65%	492,858	63,648,431	10.79%	941,841	\$ 93,225	882,932	976,157
Stanislaus	549,466	5.30%	462,736	60,913	5.96%	520,474	31,028,662	5.26%	459,148	\$ 93,225	430,430	523,655
Tuolumne	55,291	0.53%	46,564	6,696	0.66%	57,214	4,785,485	0.81%	70,813	\$ 93,225	-	93,225
Total	10,361,337	100.00%	\$ 8,725,860	1,021,220	100.00%	\$ 8,725,860	\$ 589,682,557	100.00%	\$ 8,725,860	\$ 652,575	\$ 8,073,285	\$ 8,725,860

Total Court Allocation 2022-23 \$ 8,725,860

Notes. Base. \$93,225 is an estimate of the cost of 25 Case Filings (including cost of 38 Petitions)

Table 2. Estimating Allocation of Court Operations Budget when all Courts Participate in FY 2024-2025

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M
Court	Allocated by County Population			Allocated by Total Filings			Allocated by Final Workload Allocation			Allocated by Final Workload Allocation with 50 Case Base		
	Population	Percent	Distribution	Total Filings	Percent	Distribution	Final Workload Allocation	Percent	Distribution	Base: 0.50 FTE	Final Workload Allocation	Total Distribution
Alameda	1,651,979	4.22%	724,010	175,241	3.98%	683,341	88,428,121	3.58%	614,634	98,000	\$ 439,397	\$ 537,397
Alpine	1,200	0.00%	526	1,578	0.04%	6,153	950,000	0.04%	6,603	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Amador	40,297	0.10%	17,661	5,664	0.13%	22,086	3,977,297	0.16%	27,645	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Butte	201,608	0.51%	88,358	26,130	0.59%	101,892	13,410,373	0.54%	93,211	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Calaveras	45,049	0.11%	19,744	3,879	0.09%	15,126	3,287,713	0.13%	22,852	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Colusa	21,807	0.06%	9,557	6,785	0.15%	26,458	2,369,916	0.10%	16,472	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Contra Costa	1,156,555	2.95%	506,881	96,049	2.18%	374,537	51,913,765	2.10%	360,835	98,000	\$ 257,958	\$ 355,958
Del Norte	27,218	0.07%	11,929	6,026	0.14%	23,498	3,721,741	0.15%	25,869	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
El Dorado	190,465	0.49%	83,475	16,195	0.37%	63,151	9,404,309	0.38%	65,366	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Fresno	1,011,273	2.58%	443,209	111,680	2.54%	435,489	64,077,386	2.59%	445,381	98,000	\$ 318,399	\$ 416,399
Glenn	28,750	0.07%	12,600	825	0.02%	3,217	2,913,222	0.12%	20,249	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Humboldt	135,168	0.34%	59,240	16,127	0.37%	62,886	8,405,177	0.34%	58,422	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000

Imperial	179,329	0.46%	78,594	38,108	0.87%	148,600	10,127,636	0.41%	70,394	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Inyo	18,978	0.05%	8,317	10,431	0.24%	40,675	2,464,602	0.10%	17,131	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Kern	909,813	2.32%	398,742	123,000	2.79%	479,631	64,863,139	2.63%	450,842	98,000	\$ 322,303	\$ 420,303
Kings	152,023	0.39%	66,627	20,962	0.48%	81,740	10,729,090	0.43%	74,574	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Lake	67,407	0.17%	29,542	9,247	0.21%	36,058	4,973,569	0.20%	34,570	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Lassen	30,274	0.08%	13,268	4,809	0.11%	18,752	2,505,447	0.10%	17,415	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Los Angeles	9,861,224	25.17%	4,321,860	1,198,563	27.21%	4,673,721	725,737,009	29.37%	5,044,356	98,000	\$ 3,606,168	\$ 3,704,168
Madera	157,396	0.40%	68,982	21,984	0.50%	85,725	12,042,492	0.49%	83,703	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Marin	257,135	0.66%	112,694	32,466	0.74%	126,599	14,107,438	0.57%	98,056	98,000	\$ 70,099	\$ 168,099
Mariposa	17,045	0.04%	7,470	2,163	0.05%	8,434	1,809,864	0.07%	12,580	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Mendocino	89,999	0.23%	39,444	18,539	0.42%	72,292	7,650,910	0.31%	53,179	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Merced	284,338	0.73%	124,616	48,719	1.11%	189,977	16,606,878	0.67%	115,429	98,000	\$ 82,519	\$ 180,519
Modoc	8,690	0.02%	3,809	1,723	0.04%	6,719	1,328,965	0.05%	9,237	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Mono	13,379	0.03%	5,864	6,843	0.16%	26,684	2,346,825	0.09%	16,312	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Monterey	433,716	1.11%	190,084	50,844	1.15%	198,263	25,333,968	1.03%	176,088	98,000	\$ 125,884	\$ 223,884
Napa	136,179	0.35%	59,683	13,821	0.31%	53,894	9,313,261	0.38%	64,733	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Nevada	101,242	0.26%	44,371	11,036	0.25%	43,034	6,557,026	0.27%	45,576	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Orange	3,162,245	8.07%	1,385,911	356,727	8.10%	1,391,035	184,275,447	7.46%	1,280,837	98,000	\$ 915,660	\$ 1,013,660
Placer	409,025	1.04%	179,263	35,657	0.81%	139,042	24,199,675	0.98%	168,204	98,000	\$ 120,248	\$ 218,248
Plumas	18,942	0.05%	8,302	2,262	0.05%	8,821	1,851,510	0.07%	12,869	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Riverside	2,435,525	6.22%	1,067,413	270,180	6.13%	1,053,550	133,058,980	5.39%	924,849	98,000	\$ 661,167	\$ 759,167
Sacramento	1,576,618	4.02%	690,981	203,094	4.61%	791,952	105,779,058	4.28%	735,235	98,000	\$ 525,613	\$ 623,613
San Benito	65,479	0.17%	28,697	6,235	0.14%	24,313	4,662,251	0.19%	32,406	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
San Bernardino	2,187,665	5.58%	958,784	242,713	5.51%	946,444	139,256,773	5.64%	967,927	98,000	\$ 691,963	\$ 789,963
San Diego	3,287,306	8.39%	1,440,721	268,198	6.09%	1,045,821	169,972,330	6.88%	1,181,421	98,000	\$ 844,588	\$ 942,588
San Francisco	842,754	2.15%	369,352	57,681	1.31%	224,923	63,648,431	2.58%	442,399	98,000	\$ 316,267	\$ 414,267
San Joaquin	784,298	2.00%	343,733	80,765	1.83%	314,938	50,294,813	2.04%	349,582	98,000	\$ 249,914	\$ 347,914
San Luis Obispo	280,721	0.72%	123,031	40,157	0.91%	156,590	18,173,013	0.74%	126,315	98,000	\$ 90,301	\$ 188,301
San Mateo	744,662	1.90%	326,362	93,767	2.13%	365,639	43,973,166	1.78%	305,643	98,000	\$ 218,501	\$ 316,501
Santa Barbara	445,164	1.14%	195,101	55,658	1.26%	217,035	26,471,746	1.07%	183,996	98,000	\$ 131,537	\$ 229,537
Santa Clara	1,894,783	4.84%	830,423	143,331	3.25%	558,910	91,565,262	3.71%	636,440	98,000	\$ 454,985	\$ 552,985
Santa Cruz	266,564	0.68%	116,826	29,207	0.66%	113,891	16,360,281	0.66%	113,715	98,000	\$ 81,294	\$ 179,294
Shasta	180,531	0.46%	79,121	36,616	0.83%	142,782	15,598,180	0.63%	108,418	98,000	\$ 77,507	\$ 175,507
Sierra	3,229	0.01%	1,415	498	0.01%	1,942	950,000	0.04%	6,603	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Siskiyou	43,830	0.11%	19,209	9,527	0.22%	37,150	4,232,267	0.17%	29,417	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Solano	447,241	1.14%	196,011	46,447	1.05%	181,117	28,242,066	1.14%	196,301	98,000	\$ 140,334	\$ 238,334
Sonoma	482,404	1.23%	211,422	45,596	1.04%	177,799	29,981,859	1.21%	208,394	98,000	\$ 148,979	\$ 246,979
Stanislaus	549,466	1.40%	240,813	60,913	1.38%	237,526	31,028,622	1.26%	215,670	98,000	\$ 154,180	\$ 252,180
Sutter	99,145	0.25%	43,452	14,733	0.33%	57,450	7,906,760	0.32%	54,957	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Tehama	65,052	0.17%	28,510	11,045	0.25%	43,069	5,771,135	0.23%	40,113	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Trinity	16,023	0.04%	7,022	2,535	0.06%	9,885	2,063,314	0.08%	14,341	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Tulare	475,014	1.21%	208,183	67,667	1.54%	263,863	30,920,268	1.25%	214,916	98,000	\$ 153,642	\$ 251,642
Tuolumne	55,291	0.14%	24,232	6,696	0.15%	26,111	4,785,485	0.19%	33,262	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Ventura	833,652	2.13%	365,363	104,140	2.36%	406,087	43,304,972	1.75%	300,998	98,000	\$ 215,181	\$ 313,181
Yolo	221,165	0.56%	96,930	22,826	0.52%	89,009	15,135,973	0.61%	105,205	98,000	\$ 75,210	\$ 173,210
Yuba	82,275	0.21%	36,059	9,866	0.22%	38,472	5,992,602	0.24%	41,653	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Total	39,185,605	100.00%	17,173,800	4,404,174	100.00%	17,173,800	2,470,813,378	100.00%	17,173,800	5,684,000	11,489,800	17,173,800

Total Court Alloca FY 2024-25 \$ 17,173,800

Table 3. Allocation of Court Operations Budget for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2

Table 3a. Cohort 1 Allocation

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M
Court	Allocated by County Population			Allocated by Total Filings			Allocated by Final Workload Allocation			Allocated by Final Workload Allocation with 50 Case Base		
	Population	Percent	Distribution	Total Filings	Percent	Distribution	Final Workload Allocation	Percent	Distribution	Base: 0.50 FTE	Final Workload Allocation	Total Distribution
Glenn	28,750	0.07%	12,600	825	0.02%	3,217	2,913,222	0.12%	20,249	98,000	0	98,000
Orange	3,162,245	8.07%	1,385,911	356,727	8.10%	1,391,035	184,275,447	7.46%	1,280,837	98,000	915,660	1,013,660
Riverside	2,435,525	6.22%	1,067,413	270,180	6.13%	1,053,550	133,058,980	5.39%	924,849	98,000	661,167	759,167
San Diego	3,287,306	8.39%	1,440,721	268,198	6.09%	1,045,821	169,972,330	6.88%	1,181,421	98,000	844,588	942,588
San Francisco	842,754	2.15%	369,352	57,681	1.31%	224,923	63,648,431	2.58%	442,399	98,000	316,267	414,267
Stanislaus	549,466	1.40%	240,813	60,913	1.38%	237,526	31,028,622	1.26%	215,670	98,000	154,180	252,180
Tuolumne	55,291	0.14%	24,232	6,696	0.15%	26,111	4,785,485	0.19%	33,262	98,000	0	98,000
Total	10,361,337	26.44%	4,541,043	1,021,220	23.19%	3,982,183	589,682,517	23.87%	4,098,687	686,000	2,891,862	3,577,862

Table 3b. Cohort 2 Allocation

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M
Court	Allocated by County Population			Allocated by Total Filings			Allocated by Final Workload Allocation			Allocated by Final Workload Allocation with 50 Case Base		
	Population	Percent	Distribution	Total Filings	Percent	Distribution	Final Workload Allocation	Percent	Distribution	Base: 0.50 FTE	Final Workload Allocation	Total Distribution
Alameda	1,651,979	5.73%	387,943	175,241	5.18%	379,590	88,428,121	4.70%	338,989	98,000	\$ 152,558	\$ 250,558
Alpine	1,200	0.00%	282	1,578	0.05%	3,418	950,000	0.05%	3,642	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Amador	40,297	0.14%	9,463	5,664	0.17%	12,269	3,977,297	0.21%	15,247	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Butte	201,608	0.70%	47,345	26,130	0.77%	56,600	13,410,373	0.71%	51,409	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Calaveras	45,049	0.16%	10,579	3,879	0.11%	8,402	3,287,713	0.17%	12,603	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Colusa	21,807	0.08%	5,121	6,785	0.20%	14,697	2,369,916	0.13%	9,085	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Contra Costa	1,156,555	4.01%	271,600	96,049	2.84%	208,052	51,913,765	2.76%	199,011	98,000	\$ 89,562	\$ 187,562
Del Norte	27,218	0.09%	6,392	6,026	0.18%	13,053	3,721,741	0.20%	14,267	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
El Dorado	190,465	0.66%	44,728	16,195	0.48%	35,080	9,404,309	0.50%	36,051	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Fresno	1,011,273	3.51%	237,483	111,680	3.30%	241,910	64,077,386	3.41%	245,641	98,000	\$ 110,547	\$ 208,547
Humboldt	135,168	0.47%	31,742	16,127	0.48%	34,933	8,405,177	0.45%	32,221	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Imperial	179,329	0.62%	42,113	38,108	1.13%	82,546	10,127,636	0.54%	38,824	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Inyo	18,978	0.07%	4,457	10,431	0.31%	22,595	2,464,602	0.13%	9,448	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Kern	909,813	3.16%	213,656	123,000	3.64%	266,430	64,863,139	3.45%	248,653	98,000	\$ 111,903	\$ 209,903
Kings	152,023	0.53%	35,700	20,962	0.62%	45,406	10,729,090	0.57%	41,130	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Lake	67,407	0.23%	15,830	9,247	0.27%	20,030	4,973,569	0.26%	19,066	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Lassen	30,274	0.11%	7,109	4,809	0.14%	10,417	2,505,447	0.13%	9,605	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Los Angeles	9,861,224	34.21%	2,315,764	1,198,563	35.43%	2,596,207	725,737,009	38.58%	2,782,112	98,000	\$ 1,252,053	\$ 1,350,053
Madera	157,396	0.55%	36,962	21,984	0.65%	47,620	12,042,492	0.64%	46,165	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Marin	257,135	0.89%	60,384	32,466	0.96%	70,325	14,107,438	0.75%	54,081	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Mariposa	17,045	0.06%	4,003	2,163	0.06%	4,685	1,809,864	0.10%	6,938	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Mendocino	89,999	0.31%	21,135	18,539	0.55%	40,157	7,650,910	0.41%	29,330	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000

Merced	284,338	0.99%	66,773	48,719	1.44%	105,530	16,606,878	0.88%	63,662	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Modoc	8,690	0.03%	2,041	1,723	0.05%	3,732	1,328,965	0.07%	5,095	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Mono	13,379	0.05%	3,142	6,843	0.20%	14,823	2,346,825	0.12%	8,997	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Monterey	433,716	1.50%	101,852	50,844	1.50%	110,133	25,333,968	1.35%	97,118	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Napa	136,179	0.47%	31,980	13,821	0.41%	29,938	9,313,261	0.50%	35,702	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Nevada	101,242	0.35%	23,775	11,036	0.33%	23,905	6,557,026	0.35%	25,136	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Placer	409,025	1.42%	96,054	35,657	1.05%	77,237	24,199,675	1.29%	92,769	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Plumas	18,942	0.07%	4,448	2,262	0.07%	4,900	1,851,510	0.10%	7,098	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Sacramento	1,576,618	5.47%	370,246	203,094	6.00%	439,922	105,779,058	5.62%	405,504	98,000	\$ 182,492	\$ 280,492
San Benito	65,479	0.23%	15,377	6,235	0.18%	13,506	4,662,251	0.25%	17,873	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
San Bernardino	2,187,665	7.59%	513,741	242,713	7.17%	525,741	139,256,773	7.40%	533,841	98,000	\$ 240,248	\$ 338,248
San Joaquin	784,298	2.72%	184,181	80,765	2.39%	174,945	50,294,813	2.67%	192,805	98,000	\$ 86,769	\$ 184,769
San Luis Obispo	280,721	0.97%	65,923	40,157	1.19%	86,984	18,173,013	0.97%	69,666	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
San Mateo	744,662	2.58%	174,873	93,767	2.77%	203,109	43,973,166	2.34%	168,571	98,000	\$ 75,863	\$ 173,863
Santa Barbara	445,164	1.54%	104,540	55,658	1.65%	120,561	26,471,746	1.41%	101,479	98,000	\$ 45,669	\$ 143,669
Santa Clara	1,894,783	6.57%	444,962	143,331	4.24%	310,469	91,565,262	4.87%	351,015	98,000	\$ 157,970	\$ 255,970
Santa Cruz	266,564	0.92%	62,599	29,207	0.86%	63,265	16,360,281	0.87%	62,717	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Shasta	180,531	0.63%	42,395	36,616	1.08%	79,314	15,598,180	0.83%	59,796	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Sierra	3,229	0.01%	758	498	0.01%	1,079	950,000	0.05%	3,642	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Siskiyou	43,830	0.15%	10,293	9,527	0.28%	20,636	4,232,267	0.22%	16,224	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Solano	447,241	1.55%	105,028	46,447	1.37%	100,609	28,242,066	1.50%	108,266	98,000	\$ 48,724	\$ 146,724
Sonoma	482,404	1.67%	113,286	45,596	1.35%	98,765	29,981,859	1.59%	114,935	98,000	\$ 51,725	\$ 149,725
Sutter	99,145	0.34%	23,283	14,733	0.44%	31,913	7,906,760	0.42%	30,311	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Tehama	65,052	0.23%	15,277	11,045	0.33%	23,925	5,771,135	0.31%	22,124	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Trinity	16,023	0.06%	3,763	2,535	0.07%	5,491	2,063,314	0.11%	7,910	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Tulare	475,014	1.65%	111,550	67,667	2.00%	146,573	30,920,268	1.64%	118,533	98,000	\$ 53,344	\$ 151,344
Ventura	833,652	2.89%	195,771	104,140	3.08%	225,578	43,304,972	2.30%	166,010	98,000	\$ 74,710	\$ 172,710
Yolo	221,165	0.77%	51,937	22,826	0.67%	49,443	15,135,973	0.80%	58,024	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Yuba	82,275	0.29%	19,321	9,866	0.29%	21,371	5,992,602	0.32%	22,973	98,000	\$ -	\$ 98,000
Total	28,824,268	100.00%	6,768,957	3,382,954	100.00%	7,327,817	1,881,130,861	100.00%	7,211,313	4,998,000	2,734,138	7,732,138

Department of Finance, Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State (E1)

<https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates-e1/>

Judicial Council, June 28, 2022. Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for 2022-23.

Attachment C: 2022-23 Workload Formula Allocation

Judicial Council, Court Statistics Report. Appendix G. County Tables. Caseloads and Judicial Positions, by County Superior Courts Fiscal Year 2021-22

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

Title: Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) Work Plan

Date: 4/13/2023

Contact: Rose Lane, Senior Analyst, Budget Services
916-643-6926 rosemary.lane@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of updates to the annual FMS Work Plan for 2023-24 and beyond.

Background

The FMS prepares an annual work plan to direct its efforts in developing and refining the Workload Formula as well as other methodologies—including self-help and interpreter funding and methodologies for new funding—for approval by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) every July.

The current work plan, as approved by the TCBAC on July 18, 2022, is provided as Attachment 2A.

The 2023 TCBAC Annual Agenda, which highlights items included in the FMS work plan, retained ‘Court Cluster System’, ‘Base Floor Funding Adjustments’, and ‘Judicial Council-Provided Services Review’ at a priority 2 level. The 2023 agenda is included as Attachment 2B.

Recommendation

It is recommended that FMS review each of the items for the current work plan and consider the following:

- Determine if items should be marked complete, moved, or removed;
- Determine in which fiscal year each item should be addressed, in order of priority; and
- Identify any new items that should be added.

Ongoing Through 2022-23

- 1. Identify and evaluate the impact of Judicial Council-provided services versus those that are funded by local trial court operations funds, including Judicial Council staff internal research on what services are used by which trial courts.**

Consider moving item 1 to 2023-24 to provide Judicial Council Budget Services staff additional time to continue its internal research for reporting back to the subcommittee.

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

- 2. Develop an ongoing, workload-based methodology for allocation of Court Interpreter Program funding, including but not limited to video remote interpreting and cross assignments, effective in 2023-24.**

Consider moving item 2 to 2023-24 with an effective date of 2024-25. The Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee continues to collaborate with the Center for Families, Children & the Courts Language Access Services Program on 1) possible enhancements with the data collected in the Court Interpreter Data Collection System, 2) how that data could be utilized in the allocation methodology, and 3) development of a recommendation on the inclusion of data for video remote interpreting in the allocation methodology.¹

- 3. Initiate an ad hoc subcommittee to reevaluate the cluster system.**

Consider moving item 3 to 2023-24 to be addressed by the new Data Analytics Advisory Committee as the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee has sunsetted.

- 4. Initiate an ad hoc subcommittee to reevaluate the floor funding to include Judicial Council staff developed options for FMS consideration that provides an inflationary increase for the base funding floor courts not in excess of the inflationary percentage provided to all other courts and not to the base funding floor courts' detriment.**

Consider removal of this item as the council approved an ongoing inflationary adjustment for these courts beginning in July 2023 as defined.² In addition, it is recommended that Item 6 remain intact to address future needs for the base funding floor courts.

- 5. Evaluate the Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process request submitted in January 2022.**

Consider removal of this item as it is scheduled for Judicial Council consideration at its May 2023 business meeting.

Annual Updates

- 6. Review the base funding floor amounts annually, if requested by the applicable courts, for presentation to the TCBAC no later than December, to determine whether an inflationary adjustment is needed.**

¹ Judicial Council meeting report (January 20, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11533862&GUID=BF5043BE-FE6C-4464-B2CE-336C36D5DB40>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (January 20, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=989262&GUID=469D83CC-3971-47BE-B5FC-22D1052C8643>.

² Judicial Council meeting report (March 14, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11695190&GUID=BB0B0101-F2C4-4E59-A1EC-59301CF1CE4B>.

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

Consider retaining this item on the work plan as an ongoing avenue for the base funding floor courts to request augmentations as needed.

7. Review of Workload Formula Adjust Request Process (ARP) submission(s) as referred by the TCBAC chair.

Consider adding ARP submissions as an annual item for review as the policy, included as Attachment 2C, requires the FMS to review ARP referrals and prioritize the requests into its work plan. Please note that there were no submissions received this year by the January 2023 due date.

The updated work plan will be presented to TCBAC for consideration at its July 6, 2023 meeting for consideration.

Attachments

Attachment 2A: Approved FMS Work Plan

Attachment 2B: TCBAC 2023 Annual Agenda

Attachment 2C: Workload Formula Adjustment Request Procedures

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORK PLAN
As approved by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on July 18, 2022

Charge of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee

Focus on the ongoing review and refinement of the Workload Formula, develop a methodology for allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund Court Interpreter Program (0150037) in the event of a funding shortfall, and consider funding allocation methodologies for other non-discretionary dollars as necessary.

Ongoing Through 2022-23

1. Identify and evaluate the impact of Judicial Council-provided services versus those that are funded by local trial court operations funds, including Judicial Council staff internal research on what services are used by which trial courts.
2. Develop an ongoing, workload-based methodology for allocation of Court Interpreter Program funding, including but not limited to video remote interpreting and cross assignments, effective in 2023-24.
3. Initiate an ad hoc subcommittee to reevaluate the cluster system.
4. Initiate an ad hoc subcommittee to reevaluate the floor funding to include Judicial Council staff developed options for FMS consideration that provides an inflationary increase for the base funding floor courts not in excess of the inflationary percentage provided to all other courts and not to the base funding floor courts' detriment.
5. Evaluate the Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process request submitted in January 2022.

Annual Updates

6. Review the base funding floor amounts annually, if requested by the applicable courts, for presentation to the TCBAC no later than December, to determine whether an inflationary adjustment is needed.

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**Annual Agenda¹—2023****Approved by Judicial Branch Budget Committee: January 18, 2023****I. COMMITTEE INFORMATION**

Chair:	Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Judge, Superior Court of Fresno County
Lead Staff:	Ms. Brandy Olivera, Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services
<p>Committee's Charge/Membership:</p> <p>Rule 10.64(a) of the California Rules of Court states the charge of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, which is to make recommendations to the council on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for trial courts and provides input to the council on policy issues affecting trial court funding. Rule 10.64(b) sets forth additional duties of the committee.</p> <p>Rule 10.64(c) sets forth the membership position of the committee. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee currently has 24 members. The current committee roster is available on the committee's web page.</p>	
<p>Subcommittees/Working Groups²: <i>List the names of each subcommittee or working group, including groups made up exclusively of committee/task force members and joint groups with other advisory committees/task forces. To request approval for the creation of a new subgroup, include "new" after the name of the proposed subgroup and describe its purpose.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fiscal Planning Subcommittee (FPS) – Review recommendations regarding trial court requests to set aside funds on their behalf that have reverted to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) pursuant to Government Code section 77203. This group also reviews requests from trial courts that relate to Children's Waiting Room funding. 2. Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) – Ongoing review and refinement of the Workload Formula, develop a methodology for allocations from the TCTF Court Interpreters Program (CIP) (0150037) in the event of a funding shortfall, and consider funding allocation methodologies for other non-discretionary dollars as necessary. 3. Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee – Ongoing review of TCTF and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) allocations supporting trial court projects and programs as well as any systematic cash flow issues affecting the trial courts. 4. Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee – Develop a methodology for allocations from the TCTF CIP in the event of a funding shortfall and review existing methodologies. 	

¹ The annual agenda outlines the work a committee will focus on in the coming year and identifies areas of collaboration with other advisory bodies and the Judicial Council staff resources.

² California Rules of Court, rule 10.30 (c) allows an advisory body to form subgroups, composed entirely of current members of the advisory body, to carry out the body's duties, subject to available resources, with the approval of its oversight committee.

Meetings Planned for 2023³ (Advisory body and all subcommittees and working groups)

Date/Time/Location or Teleconference:

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee usually holds six meetings annually, four of which are in-person meetings. The Funding Methodology Subcommittee holds two in-person meetings. A budget allocation is provided to the committee to cover the costs of travel and per diem to allow these budget discussions to occur in-person. Beginning with the COVID-19 pandemic and in recognition of ongoing public health guidance and safety protocols, the committee is holding videoconferences in lieu of in-person meetings. Additional meetings to address budget issues will be scheduled as needed.

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

January 2023/Videoconference; March 2023/Videoconference; April 2023/Videoconference; May 2023/ Videoconference; July 2023/Videoconference; November 2023/Videoconference

Funding Methodology Subcommittee

April 2023/Videoconference; October 2023/Videoconference

Fiscal Planning Subcommittee

April 2023/Videoconference; August 2023/Videoconference; October 2023/Videoconference

Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee

April 2023/Teleconference

Check here if exception to policy is granted by Executive Office or rule of court.

³ Refer to [Operating Standards for Judicial Council Advisory Bodies](#) for governance on in-person meetings.

COMMITTEE PROJECTS

#	New or One-Time Projects ⁴	
1.	Project Title: Court Interpreter Employee Incentive Grant Funding	Priority 1⁵ Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII
<p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated as a result of new, one-time \$30 million included in the 2021 Budget Act to establish a Court Interpreter Employee Incentive Grant program intended to increase the number of new interpreters in trial courts, and to increase language access services to court users inside courthouses. Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) completed one phase of the application process for trial courts consistent with the requirements of the Budget Act resulting in \$2.5 million in grants to nine courts awarded by the Judicial Council in May 2022. A second round of grant applications will be reviewed in the spring of 2023 by CFCC staff with recommendations to be presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, and the Judicial Council for approval. The expected outcome is to assist the courts with funding for staff interpreters based on approved grant applications.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: One-time; targeted completion date is spring of 2023 for allocating funds to approved trial courts in 2022-23.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>		
2.	Project Title: Court Cluster System	Priority 2⁵

⁴ All proposed projects for the year must be included on the Annual Agenda. If a project implements policy or is a program, identify it as *implementation* or a *program* in the project description and attach the Judicial Council authorization/assignment or prior approved Annual Agenda to this Annual Agenda.

⁵ For non-rules and forms projects, select priority level 1 (must be done) or 2 (should be done). For rules and forms proposals, select one of the following priority levels: 1(a) Urgently needed to conform to the law; 1(b) Urgently needed to respond to a recent change in the law; 1(c) Adoption or amendment of rules or forms by a specified date required by statute or council decision; 1(d) Provides significant cost savings and efficiencies, generates significant revenue, or avoids a significant loss of revenue; 1(e) Urgently needed to remedy a problem that is causing significant cost or inconvenience to the courts or the public; 1(f) Otherwise urgent and necessary, such as a proposal that would mitigate exposure to immediate or severe financial or legal risk; 2(a) Useful, but not necessary, to implement statutory changes; 2(b) Helpful in otherwise advancing Judicial Council goals and objectives.

⁶ Indicate which goal number of The Strategic Plan for California’s Judicial Branch the project most closely aligns.

⁷ A key objective is a strategic aim, purpose, or “end of action” to be achieved for the coming year.

#	New or One-Time Projects ⁴	
	<p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from a Funding Methodology Subcommittee recommendation made on February 20, 2020 to initiate an ad hoc subcommittee to reevaluate the cluster system to identify any opportunities for refinement or change. The expected outcome could impact the statewide four-cluster system and/or its criteria.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: One-time.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Business Management Services and Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Data Analytics Advisory Committee; Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII
3.	<p>Project Title: Judicial Council-Provided Services Review</p> <p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from the Funding Methodology Subcommittee work plan to identify and evaluate the impact of Judicial Council-provided services versus those that are funded by local trial court operations funds. The expected outcome is to determine if any services should be shifted or combined along with any associated funding.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: One-time.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Various Judicial Council offices that provide services to trial courts.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Various advisory bodies that have programs that provide an array of court services; Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	<p>Priority 2⁵</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII</p>
4.	<p>Project Title: Civil Assessment Allocation Methodology</p>	<p>Priority 2⁵</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII</p>

#	New or One-Time Projects ⁴
	<p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated as a result of new, ongoing funding included in the 2022 Budget Act to backfill civil assessment fee revenue loss due to the reduction in the amount of the civil assessment from \$300 to \$100 and elimination of prior debt. Civil assessment revenues are now deposited into the General Fund rather than the TCTF. A methodology for the \$110 million provided in the 2022 Budget Act was approved by the Judicial Council in July 2022. Beginning in 2023-24, the amount is \$100 million ongoing. The expected outcome is an ongoing methodology recommendation for the \$100 million beginning in 2023-24.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: One-time.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ⁴	
1.	<p>Project Title: Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process (ARP)</p>	<p>Priority 1⁵</p> <p>Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII</p>
	<p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. At its August 22, 2013 meeting, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation made by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to approve the Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process to allow courts an annual opportunity to submit recommendations for changes to the Workload Formula. The expected outcome is to assist the courts and the council with ongoing review and refinements to the Workload Formula to support trial court operations.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Business Management Services and Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>This project may result in an allocation or distribution of funds to the courts. We will coordinate with Budget Services to ensure their review of relevant materials.</i></p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities⁴	
	<p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: The Data Analytics Advisory Committee oversees the Resource Assessment Study model, which informs the Workload Formula and is often the area for recommendation submissions by trial courts.</p>	
2.	Project Title: Court Interpreter Funding Methodology	Priority 2⁵
	<p>Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII</p> <p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated due to the declining fund balance in the TCTF CIP (0150037). The Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee was established to develop a methodology for allocations from the CIP in the event of a funding shortfall and to review existing methodologies. The Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee made a recommendation to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee that was approved by the Judicial Council on July 24, 2020, to allocate the 2020 Budget Act appropriation to the trial courts, replacing the prior reimbursement process. This same methodology will continue for 2022-23. Effective July 1, 2022, the Judicial Council approved an update to the methodology that incorporates the prior three years' interpreter expenditures and allocates funds up to the appropriation amount. Unspent funds will reimburse courts with a shortfall. On January 20, 2023, the Judicial Council will consider additional recommendations to the methodology to exclude the 2020-21 pandemic year in the three-year average expenditure data indefinitely, utilize CIP fund balance to make courts whole in the event court savings are insufficient up to the appropriation amount, and approve a cross-assignment reimbursement process. The Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee will continue its work to refine the allocation methodology for Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and Judicial Branch Budget Committee consideration for the 2023-24 fiscal year. The Subcommittee will also consider what other data can be utilized from current case management systems, reporting capabilities, and if data on video remote interpreting can be utilized in the methodology. The expected outcome is to continue to allocate funds that do not exceed the CIP appropriation via a workload-based methodology using the most reliable data available.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: The latest refinements to this project are scheduled to be considered by the Judicial Council at its January 20, 2023 business meeting.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Service.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	
3.	Project Title: Increased Transcript Rates	Priority 1⁵

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities ⁴	
		<i>Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII</i>
	<p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated as a result of new, ongoing funding included in the 2021 Budget Act; \$7 million to address the costs associated with increased transcript rates, which cannot be used to supplant existing expenditures. The Ad Hoc Court Reporter Funding Subcommittee was established to develop a methodology for allocating these funds to all trial courts. A recommendation by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on December 7, 2021 was approved to allocate the \$7 million proportionally in one lump sum using an average of the prior three-year transcript expenditures. The recommendation also established a baseline for identifying cost increases based on the most-recently published Assessed Judicial Need after a funding floor is provided, beginning in 2021-22. The expected outcome is to assist the courts with covering increased costs for transcript rates.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing; this item was considered and approved by the Judicial Council at its September 20, 2022 business meeting.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Business Management Services and Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Service.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	
4.	Project Title: Court Reporter Funding	Priority 1⁵
	<p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated as a result of new, ongoing funding included in the 2021 Budget Act; \$30 million to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil law case types, which cannot be used to supplant existing expenditures. The Ad Hoc Court Reporter Funding Subcommittee was established to develop a methodology for allocating these funds to all trial courts. A recommendation by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee was approved on December 7, 2022 to allocate the \$30 million proportionally based on the most-recently published Assessed Judicial Need, after a funding floor is provided, beginning in 2021-22. The expected outcome is to assist the courts with costs for increasing the number of court reporters in family and civil law case types.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: Ongoing; this item was considered and approved by the Judicial Council at its September 20, 2022 business meeting.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: Business Management Services and Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Service.</i></p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities⁴	
	<p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	
5.	Project Title: Base Funding Floor Adjustments	Priority 2⁵
	<p>Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII</p> <p><i>Project Summary⁷:</i> Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from the Funding Methodology Subcommittee work plan to review the trial court base funding floor amounts annually, if requested by the applicable courts. These requests are presented to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee no later than December, to determine whether an inflationary adjustment is needed. Two requests were received from Alpine and Sierra Superior Courts for an ongoing increase effective July 1, 2023 and were approved by the Judicial Council in July 2023. Additional consideration continues in an effort to provide automatic inflationary adjustments to the base funding floor courts. The expected outcome is to provide these two courts with adequate funding to maintain core operations and provide access to justice.</p> <p><i>Status/Timeline:</i> This item is scheduled to be considered by the Judicial Council at its March 24, 2023 business meeting.</p> <p><i>Fiscal Impact/Resources:</i> Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Service.</i></p> <p><i>Internal/External Stakeholders:</i> External stakeholders include the two smallest trial courts, Alpine and Sierra.</p> <p><i>AC Collaboration:</i> Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	
6.	Project Title: Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act	Priority 1⁵
	<p>Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII</p> <p><i>Project Summary⁷:</i> Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated as a result of a new court-based mental health services engagement and oversight program. The 2022 Budget Act includes \$2.8 million for staff or other administrative costs for seven trial courts; Glenn, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne, for implementation no later than October 1, 2023. A new funding methodology for 2022-23 CARE Act allocations was recommended by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and approved on November 16, 2022.</p>	

#	Ongoing Projects and Activities⁴	
	<p>Status/Timeline: This item is scheduled to be considered by the Judicial Council at its January 20, 2023 business meeting.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Service.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	
7.	<p>Project Title: Firearms Relinquishment Grant Program</p>	<p>Priority 1⁵</p>
	<p>Strategic Plan Goal⁶ VII</p> <p>Project Summary⁷: Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated as a result of \$40 million in one-time funding to the Judicial Council in the 2022 Budget Act, of which \$36 million must be distributed to trial courts to support court-based firearm relinquishment programs. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommended that the Judicial Council approve the allocation and distribution of \$18.5 million to seven trial courts for Firearm Relinquishment Grant awards for 2022-23 through 2024-25. The allocations for funding were recommended by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on November 16, 2022.</p> <p>Status/Timeline: This item is scheduled to be considered by the Judicial Council at its January 20, 2023 business meeting.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact/Resources: CFCC and Budget Services staff.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>The project includes allocations or distributions of funds to the courts, which have been reviewed and approved by Budget Service.</i></p> <p>Internal/External Stakeholders: External stakeholders include the trial courts.</p> <p>AC Collaboration: Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee; Judicial Branch Budget Committee.</p>	

LIST OF 2022 PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
1.	<p>Workload Formula, IMF, and TCTF Allocations</p> <p>The Judicial Branch Budget Committee and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee made 2022-23 recommendations to the Judicial Council that included IMF and TCTF allocations to the trial courts. The recommendations included a \$45.4 million allocation from the IMF and a \$2.8 billion allocation from the TCTF, which included new funding of \$84.2 million for inflationary costs, \$100 million to promote funding equity, \$31.2 million for new judgeships, \$110 million civil assessment backfill, \$137.8 million General Fund for employee benefits and pretrial funding, and \$50 million in State Court Facilities Construction Fund for support of trial court operations.</p>
2.	<p>Court Interpreter Funding Methodology</p> <p>The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee made a recommendation to the Judicial Council that was approved on May 21, 2021 for a one-time return of unspent CIP funding for 2020-21, as well as a one-time allocation methodology for 2021-22 while the Ad Hoc Interpreter Subcommittee continued development of a workload-based methodology recommendation effective July 1, 2022.</p>
3.	<p>Pretrial Release Funding and Allocation Methodology</p> <p>The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee made a recommendation to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee that was approved on August 13, 2021 to allocate 2021-22 one-time and ongoing Pretrial Release funding of \$140 million according to the methodologies outlined in SB 129, which included minimum funding floors for trial courts to contract with probation departments or other county departments for the provision of pretrial monitoring and services. The recommendation was approved by the Judicial Council on October 1, 2021.</p>
4.	<p>Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program Allocation Methodology</p> <p>The project originated as a result of \$30 million General Fund included in the 2021 Budget Act for court-appointed counsel in dependency cases to address a shortfall between the amount estimated to be claimed from Federal Title IV-E funding and the amount that was actually claimed once federal guidance on eligible activities for Title IV-E reimbursement was provided. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee made a recommendation to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee that was approved on November 4, 2021 to proportionally allocate and distribute funds in 2021-22 to Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program providers based on Judicial Council CFCC invoicing and monitoring criteria. The expected outcome is to address funding shortfalls timely and accurately so that dependency counsel providers can provide critical services. The recommendation was approved by the Judicial Council on May 10, 2022.</p>

#	Project Highlights and Achievements
5.	<p data-bbox="201 177 856 209">Delegation of Trial Court Trust Fund Authority</p> <p data-bbox="201 253 1948 475">The project originated from an identified opportunity to increase efficiencies to meet the critical funding needs of trial courts and enable council staff to commit funding on a timely basis by delegating authority to the Judicial Council Administrative Director to transfer TCTF funding allocations approved by the Judicial Council between programs or projects. This approach is consistent with the council’s past practice in delegating limited authority to the Administrative Director to transfer allocations funded from the IMF. A recommendation by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee for the TCTF delegated authority was approved by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on December 7, 2021 and by the Judicial Council on January 21, 2022.</p>
6.	<p data-bbox="201 492 1297 524">State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund Allocation Adjustment</p> <p data-bbox="201 565 1927 751">Part of the charge of the committee pursuant to rule 10.64. The project originated from a request from Judicial Council Information Technology to transfer approved IMF funds from Local Assistance to State Operations, which the office utilized for staff employees in lieu of contractors for telecommunications, statewide planning, and development support programs. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee approved the recommendation for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and the Judicial Council. The recommendation was approved by the Judicial Council on March 11, 2022.</p>
7.	<p data-bbox="201 768 638 800">AB 177 Allocation Methodology</p> <p data-bbox="201 841 1948 1027">The Funding Methodology Subcommittee recommended an allocation methodology for trial court backfill funding developed in consultation with the Department of Finance related to the repeal of fees authorized by AB 177. The Trial Court Budget Advisory approved the recommendation for a two-year average revenue collection methodology to allocate the \$10.3 million included in the 2022 Budget Act for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and Judicial Council. The recommendation was approved by the Judicial Council on September 20, 2022.</p>

***Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
Adjustment Request Procedures***

The submission, review and approval process shall be under the direction of the Judicial Council and would be as follows:

1. Initial requests shall be submitted to the Administrative Director either by the trial court's Presiding Judge or Executive Officer no later than January 15 of each year, commencing January 15, 2018.
2. The Administrative Director shall forward the request to the Director of Judicial Council Budget Services. The Director of the Judicial Council Budget Services, in consultation with the Chair of the TCBAC shall review each request and refer the request to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee at the April meeting of the TCBAC.
3. The Funding Methodology Subcommittee shall review the referral from TCBAC and prioritize the request into the proposed annual work plan to be submitted back to TCBAC in July of the new fiscal year.
4. Once prioritized, requests will be evaluated by the TCBAC's Funding Methodology Subcommittee. The review of WAFM Adjustment Requests shall include a three-step process including:
 - a) initial review to determine whether the factor identified in a court's request should form the basis of a potential modification to WAFM;
 - b) evaluation of whether and how the modification should occur; and
 - c) evaluation of whether, for those circumstances where it is determined that the factor should ultimately be included in the underlying Resource Assessment Study model (RAS), an interim adjustment should be made to a trial court's WAFM funding need pending a more formal adjustment to the RAS model.
5. The Funding Methodology Subcommittee shall review any requests and present its recommendation(s) to the TCBAC no later than January prior to the year proposed for implementation.
6. The TCBAC shall make final recommendations to the Judicial Council for consideration no later than March/April Judicial Council meeting. Requested adjustments that are approved by the Judicial Council shall be included in the allocation based on the timing included in the recommendation. TCBAC will make no further recommendations for changes to the WAFM formulae impacting the next fiscal year after the March/April Judicial Council meeting of the current fiscal year.

Upon approval by the Judicial Council of an adjustment to WAFM, the Director of the Budget Services, in consultation with the TCBAC, shall notify all trial courts. (In some circumstances, the nature of the adjustment will automatically apply to all courts.

7. Adjustments to WAFM will impact the funding need for each trial court that is subject to the adjustment, along with the overall statewide funding need. Therefore, final allocations will be implemented consistent with the WAFM allocation implementation plan as approved by the Judicial Council or as amended in the future. Because funding need is currently greater than available funding and because only a portion of trial court funding

***Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
Adjustment Request Procedures***

is currently allocated under the WAFM, allocated funding will not equal, and may be substantially less than, the funding need identified for the adjustment being made, just as the allocated funding is substantially less than the entire WAFM funding need.

8. This policy does not preclude the Funding Methodology subcommittee from taking expedited action per the direction of the TCBAC committee.

Trial courts requesting an adjustment in accordance with the WAFM Adjustment Request Process shall be required to submit detailed information documenting the need for such adjustment. The Director of Budget Services shall develop an application form that solicits at minimum, the following information:

1. A description of how the factor is not currently accounted for in WAFM.
2. Identification and description of the basis for which the adjustment is requested.
3. A detailed analysis of why the adjustment is necessary.
4. A description of whether the unaccounted for factor is unique to the applicant court(s) or has broader applications.
5. Detailed description of staffing need(s) and/or costs required to support the factor that is unaccounted for by WAFM.
6. Description of the consequence to the public and access to justice without the funding.
7. Description of the consequences to the requesting court(s) of not receiving the funding.
8. Any additional information requested by the JCC Budget Services, Funding Methodology Subcommittee, and/or TCBAC deemed necessary to fully evaluate the request.