



Judicial Council of California
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR MAY 18, 2023
VIRTUAL MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the April 20, 2023 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items (Item 1)	
Item 1 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding Allocation (Action Required).....	5
Attachment A: 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Summary	9
Attachment B: 2023 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Detail	11



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, May 18, 2023
Time: 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/2791>

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 April 20, 2023 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 12:00pm on May 17, 2023, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1

2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding Allocation (Action Required)

Deliberate allocation methodologies for the civil assessment backfill funding for 2023-24.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Oksana Tuk, 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

April 20, 2023
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/2691>

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Cochair), Hon. Kimberly Merrifield, Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, and Hon. Wendy G. Getty.
Executive Officers: Mr. Chad Finke (Cochair), Ms. Krista LeVier, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Kevin M. Seibert, Mr. James Kim, Mr. Brandon E. Riley, and Mr. Neal Taniguchi.

Others Present: Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Brandy Olivera, Ms. Rose Lane, and Mr. Don Will.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair welcomed the members, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The subcommittee reviewed and approved minutes from the March 23, 2023 Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1 – Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocation Methodology (Action Required)

Consideration of recommendations 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

Action: *The FMS voted to approve the following recommendations to be considered by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC), followed by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 20-21, 2023 business meeting:*

- 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.*
- 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 as well as a holdback of half of 1 percent of the funding for Cohort 1 courts requiring additional program funding. Unspent funding, including the holdback, will be redistributed via the approved methodology.*
- 4. Direct Judicial Council staff to survey Cohort One courts by February 2024 and bring a reallocation proposal to the TCBAC for the March 2024 Judicial Council meeting.*

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

Action: *The FMS unanimously voted to update the annual work plan and present the following recommendations for TCBAC at its July 2023 meeting for consideration:*

- 1. Remove items 1, 4, and 5 from the work plan.*
- 2. Move items 2 and 3 to 2023-24.*
- 3. Retain items 6 and 7 on the work plan.*

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:24 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 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding Allocation
Date: 5/12/2023
Contact: Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-8027 | oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider allocation methodologies for the \$100 million civil assessment backfill funding for 2023-24 and ongoing. This should take into account the \$10 million decrease to the allocation from 2022-23, and the additional \$2.5 million proposed to fully fund Santa Clara Superior Court’s annual debt service obligation. The proposed methodology will be considered by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC), the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee), and then the Judicial Council at its July 20-21, 2023 business meeting.

Background

On June 15, 2022, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS)¹ approved a \$110 million civil assessment backfill allocation methodology for 2022-23 that was considered by the TCBAC, the Budget Committee, and approved by the council as follows:

1. Maintain the current allocation of the \$48.3 million maintenance of effort (MOE) in the Workload Formula;
2. Fund the remaining civil assessment obligations for those impacted courts from the amount of retained civil assessments after the MOE obligation is met;
3. Allocate the remaining amount of civil assessment revenue via the Workload Formula and without a security reduction;
4. Remove retained civil assessment dollars from the Workload Formula model’s “Other Local Revenues” column and identify each courts’ new position in the Workload Formula as it relates to percentage funded; and
5. Recalculate funding proposed in the 2022-23 Governor’s Budget including inflationary, equity, and new judgeship funding, and then civil assessment redistribution funding.

¹ FMS meeting materials (June 15, 2022), [tcbac-20220615-fms-materials.pdf \(ca.gov\)](#); FMS meeting minutes (June 15, 2022), [Minutes Open \(ca.gov\)](#).

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

On May 4, 2023, the TCBAC met to consider 2023-24 allocation recommendations from the Trial Court Trust Fund as well as trial court allocations that included the \$100 million for civil assessment backfill funding. The committee approved the proposed allocations as presented excluding the 2023-24 civil assessment backfill allocation, which was directed back to the FMS to further deliberate options for an ongoing allocation methodology.

Methodology Scenarios for Allocation of the Civil Assessment Backfill Funding

Each scenario assumes the \$74.1 million inflationary funding proposed in the 2023-24 Governor's Budget will be included in the 2023 Budget Act, zeroes out figures for the two base funding floor courts, Alpine and Sierra, due to the fixed funding amount for those courts, and does not yet account for funding floor adjustments for these two base funding floor courts.

Two of the scenarios assume that the amount to be allocated is \$46.8 million (*\$110 million in 2022-23 – \$10 million ongoing reduction effective 2023-24 – \$48.3 million MOE already included in the Workload Formula – \$4.9 million for proposed debt service obligations = \$46.8 million remaining*). The other two scenarios assume that the amount to be allocated is a reduction of \$12.5 million (*\$10 million ongoing reduction effective 2023-24 + \$2.5 million increase for a proposed debt service obligation = a \$12.5 million reduction*).

A summary of the four scenarios described below is included as Attachment A. Detailed calculations and comparisons of the scenarios are included as Attachment B.

Scenario 1 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation via the Workload Formula

This scenario was presented to the TCBAC at its May 4, 2023 meeting and is an allocation of the \$46.8 million via the Workload Formula methodology as follows:

1. Bring all Cluster 1 courts up to at least 100 percent of funding need.
2. Allocate up to 50 percent of remaining funding to courts under the statewide average funding ratio. Allocated funds will bring courts up to but not over the statewide average funding ratio.
3. Allocate remaining funding to all courts based on the Workload Formula.
4. Allow no court's allocation to exceed 100 percent of its need unless it is the result of a funding floor calculation².

² Due to the proposed \$74.1 million inflationary funding included in the allocations, in which all 58 courts receive the same percentage increase, some courts are exceeding 100 percent of funding prior to applying any of the civil assessment backfill methodology scenarios.

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

Using this method, courts that received civil assessment funding in 2022-23 may not receive funding in 2023-24 and, conversely, courts that did not receive civil assessment funding in 2022-23 could receive funding. This is due to the equity approach in the Workload Formula and where courts potentially land in the methodology based on being a Cluster 1 court or where courts fall in the methodology based on their percentage of funding received prior to adding in the civil assessment backfill funding. The lowest funded court would be at 92.3 percent of workload need.

As presented to the TCBAC, this scenario was concerning for the committee due to the volatility and lack of stability of funding in relation to the allocations that were made in 2022-23. As a result, the committee asked that the methodology be revisited and for additional scenarios to be provided. While the Workload Formula statewide funding percentage increased 2.6 percent from 92.2 percent in 2022-23 to 94.8 percent in 2023-24—even with a reduction in workload need—the individual court allocations for the civil assessment backfill funding varied from decreases of up to 100 percent and increases up to 552.6 percent.

Scenario 2 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation of the \$12.5 Million Reduction Only via the Workload Formula

This scenario treats 2023-24 as a reduction in base funding from 2022-23 and allocates the \$12.5 million reduction in civil assessment backfill funding via the Workload Formula methodology. The lowest funded court would be at 86.8 percent of workload need.

As this scenario reduces 2022-23 civil assessment backfill allocations by \$12.5 million, courts that did not receive civil assessment backfill funding in 2022-23 are excluded from the calculation. In addition, the volatility in allocations to individual courts compared to the prior year is less than in Scenario 1 with decreases ranging from 8.6 to 20.9 percent.

Scenario 3 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Proportional Allocation based on the Workload Formula Allocation

This scenario allocates the \$46.8 million (as described above) on a proportional basis based on 2023-24 Workload Formula allocations as approved by the TCBAC. With this approach, all courts (except the base funding floor courts) would receive a portion of the civil assessment backfill funding, including Cluster 1 courts, with the lowest funded court at 86.5 percent of workload need.

Using this method, those courts with a civil assessment backfill allocation decrease from the prior year ranges from 35 to 137.3 percent. This approach would allow other courts that did not receive any of this funding in 2022-23 to receive an allocation in 2023-24.

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

Scenario 4 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation of the \$12.5 Million Reduction Only based on a Proportional Adjustment of the Reduction Only

This scenario treats 2023-24 as a reduction in base funding from 2022-23 and allocates the \$12.5 million reduction in civil assessment backfill funding proportionally based on courts' percentage of 2022-23 civil assessment funding. This method would only apply to those courts that received civil assessment backfill funding in 2022-23. The lowest funded court would be at 86.8 percent of workload need. With this scenario, all courts that received civil assessment backfill funding would receive the same percentage decrease of 21.1 percent.

Recommendations

The FMS is asked to evaluate the four scenarios and develop an allocation recommendation effective 2023-24, which would then be added to trial courts' base allocation going forward, for consideration by the TCBAC, the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council.

Attachments

1. **Attachment A:** 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Summary
2. **Attachment B:** 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Detail

2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios - Summary¹

Court	2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Nov 22)	2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 1		SCENARIO 2		SCENARIO 3		SCENARIO 4	
			SCENARIO 1 (Allocation via Workload Formula methodology)	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 2 (Reduction using Workload Formula methodology)	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 3 (Proportional based on Workload Formula allocation)	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 4 (Proportional reduction on the decrease)	Workload Formula Percentage
Alameda	1,023,593	99.6%	479,311	100.0%	803,637	100.4%	1,688,569	101.3%	807,332	100.4%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	100.0%	-	104.4%	-	104.4%	85,284	106.4%	-	104.4%
Butte	223,924	90.6%	172,505	93.0%	139,107	92.8%	260,980	93.6%	176,614	93.0%
Calaveras	-	100.0%	-	101.3%	-	101.3%	65,803	103.2%	-	101.3%
Colusa	-	105.7%	128,917	100.0%	-	95.1%	47,421	96.9%	-	95.1%
Contra Costa	1,511,254	90.9%	2,288,839	92.5%	1,185,908	90.6%	985,491	90.3%	1,191,962	90.6%
Del Norte	-	100.0%	-	101.2%	-	101.2%	73,174	103.1%	-	101.2%
El Dorado	129,338	90.8%	303,163	92.3%	70,720	90.1%	178,298	91.1%	102,012	90.4%
Fresno	1,865,347	90.9%	613,103	95.0%	1,703,106	96.7%	1,178,141	95.9%	1,471,244	96.3%
Glenn	-	100.0%	225,179	100.0%	-	93.0%	56,698	94.8%	-	93.0%
Humboldt	104,892	92.4%	83,308	99.2%	82,847	99.2%	167,203	100.1%	82,731	99.2%
Imperial	-	110.3%	-	125.6%	-	125.6%	198,721	128.0%	-	125.6%
Inyo	-	109.2%	-	102.0%	-	102.0%	48,225	103.9%	-	102.0%
Kern	1,888,221	90.9%	612,560	95.5%	1,726,124	97.2%	1,183,756	96.4%	1,489,285	96.9%
Kings	312,333	90.9%	191,706	92.5%	245,303	93.0%	205,354	92.7%	246,344	93.0%
Lake	144,785	90.9%	117,321	92.4%	113,914	92.3%	94,260	91.9%	114,195	92.3%
Lassen	-	107.4%	-	120.0%	-	120.0%	52,973	122.3%	-	120.0%
Los Angeles	21,126,821	90.9%	10,259,424	92.8%	16,716,346	93.6%	13,546,233	93.2%	16,663,232	93.6%
Madera	350,567	90.9%	200,196	92.6%	275,740	93.2%	229,425	92.8%	276,501	93.2%
Marin	174,063	93.5%	145,988	93.6%	87,140	93.2%	268,458	94.4%	137,288	93.5%
Mariposa	-	100.0%	-	102.7%	-	102.7%	35,071	104.6%	-	102.7%
Mendocino	58,932	100.0%	-	105.7%	41,206	106.3%	144,651	107.7%	46,481	106.4%
Merced	483,440	90.9%	202,237	93.0%	381,228	94.0%	314,631	93.7%	381,301	94.0%
Modoc	-	103.5%	-	109.9%	-	109.9%	26,599	112.0%	-	109.9%
Mono	-	115.2%	-	118.3%	-	118.3%	46,151	120.6%	-	118.3%
Monterey	737,493	90.9%	319,197	93.0%	579,207	93.9%	487,100	93.6%	581,679	93.9%
Napa	115,140	93.3%	453,612	92.6%	57,786	88.8%	173,433	89.9%	90,814	89.1%
Nevada	190,881	90.9%	694,505	94.0%	149,820	86.8%	121,995	86.5%	150,552	86.8%
Orange	5,364,415	90.9%	11,709,412	93.1%	4,209,567	89.5%	3,478,436	89.1%	4,231,043	89.5%
Placer	704,473	90.9%	273,346	93.3%	553,406	94.3%	465,723	94.0%	555,635	94.3%
Plumas	-	111.3%	-	123.7%	-	123.7%	36,233	126.0%	-	123.7%
Riverside	3,873,460	90.9%	2,901,326	92.4%	3,039,667	92.5%	2,548,526	92.2%	3,055,091	92.5%
Sacramento	3,079,318	90.9%	1,569,922	92.7%	2,422,707	93.5%	2,016,000	93.1%	2,428,732	93.5%
San Benito	-	100.0%	-	121.6%	-	121.6%	90,965	123.9%	-	121.6%
San Bernardino	4,053,883	90.9%	1,410,211	93.9%	3,191,014	95.0%	2,668,472	94.7%	3,197,395	95.0%
San Diego	2,130,881	92.0%	1,741,675	93.7%	1,079,176	93.3%	3,249,884	94.5%	1,680,677	93.7%

¹ See Attachment B for additional information.

Court	2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Nov 22)	2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 1		SCENARIO 2		SCENARIO 3		SCENARIO 4	
			SCENARIO 1 (Allocation via Workload Formula methodology)	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 2 (Reduction using Workload Formula methodology)	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 3 (Proportional based on Workload Formula allocation)	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 4 (Proportional reduction on the decrease)	Workload Formula Percentage
San Francisco	-	112.0%	-	119.9%	-	119.9%	1,196,050	122.2%	-	119.9%
San Joaquin	1,464,125	90.9%	487,800	96.6%	1,335,042	98.2%	953,392	97.5%	1,154,790	97.9%
San Luis Obispo	529,032	90.9%	177,741	96.7%	481,998	98.3%	347,751	97.6%	417,260	98.0%
San Mateo	551,661	91.9%	3,600,398	93.8%	281,567	87.1%	809,593	88.2%	435,108	87.4%
Santa Barbara	325,198	93.9%	263,262	96.7%	255,533	96.7%	514,893	97.6%	256,491	96.7%
Santa Clara	1,154,167	92.5%	898,157	99.1%	916,494	99.1%	1,800,798	100.0%	910,319	99.1%
Santa Cruz	439,448	90.8%	158,320	98.4%	397,553	99.8%	315,112	99.3%	346,603	99.5%
Shasta	388,554	90.7%	158,042	95.0%	346,732	96.1%	303,701	95.9%	306,461	95.9%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	123,205	90.9%	185,101	92.5%	96,725	90.6%	80,218	90.3%	97,175	90.7%
Solano	573,749	90.6%	421,134	92.7%	397,357	92.7%	541,587	93.1%	452,530	92.8%
Sonoma	872,797	90.9%	283,614	98.5%	797,747	100.1%	565,013	99.4%	688,396	99.8%
Stanislaus	889,759	90.9%	417,712	92.9%	695,314	93.7%	597,840	93.4%	701,775	93.7%
Sutter	230,173	90.9%	637,404	93.7%	180,138	88.7%	150,103	88.3%	181,543	88.7%
Tehama	121,923	90.6%	59,130	95.2%	106,276	95.9%	113,841	96.0%	96,164	95.8%
Trinity	-	107.1%	-	100.0%	-	100.0%	40,528	101.9%	-	100.0%
Tulare	900,115	90.9%	1,351,267	92.5%	703,722	90.7%	595,075	90.3%	709,943	90.7%
Tuolumne	58,439	94.4%	-	102.1%	46,465	103.1%	94,393	104.1%	46,092	103.1%
Ventura	601,850	90.7%	435,232	95.3%	486,678	95.4%	838,534	96.1%	474,694	95.3%
Yolo	440,621	90.9%	149,737	94.5%	400,997	96.1%	286,223	95.4%	347,528	95.7%
Yuba	-	113.0%	-	106.5%	-	106.5%	118,030	108.5%	-	106.5%
Total	59,312,271	92.1%	46,781,014	94.8%	46,781,014	94.8%	46,781,014	94.8%	46,781,014	94.8%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor courts zeroed out

¹ See Attachment B for additional information.

Court	2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Updated November 2022)				Total 2022-23 Workload Formula Allocation (as of Nov 22)	2022-23 Workload Formula	2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage
	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Cluster 1 Courts to 100%)	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below Statewide Average)	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below 100%)	Total			
	A	B	C	D (A + B + C)			
Alameda	-	-	1,023,593	1,023,593	88,386,879	88,721,292	99.6%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	3,977,297	3,977,456	100.0%
Butte	-	53,273	170,652	223,924	13,403,821	14,791,477	90.6%
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	3,287,713	3,287,845	100.0%
Colusa	-	-	-	-	2,369,916	2,241,285	105.7%
Contra Costa	-	852,977	658,277	1,511,254	51,852,508	57,057,062	90.9%
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	3,721,741	3,721,891	100.0%
El Dorado	-	9,848	119,490	129,338	9,400,356	10,356,971	90.8%
Fresno	-	1,052,833	812,514	1,865,347	64,001,776	70,425,780	90.9%
Glenn	-	-	-	-	2,913,222	2,913,338	100.0%
Humboldt	-	-	104,892	104,892	8,400,951	9,091,694	92.4%
Imperial	-	-	-	-	10,127,636	9,180,484	110.3%
Inyo	-	-	-	-	2,464,602	2,257,443	109.2%
Kern	-	1,065,743	822,478	1,888,221	64,786,602	71,289,380	90.9%
Kings	-	176,286	136,047	312,333	10,716,430	11,792,062	90.9%
Lake	-	81,719	63,066	144,785	4,967,700	5,466,319	90.9%
Lassen	-	-	-	-	2,505,447	2,332,455	107.4%
Los Angeles	-	11,924,329	9,202,493	21,126,821	724,880,656	797,638,572	90.9%
Madera	-	197,866	152,701	350,567	12,028,282	13,235,588	90.9%
Marin	-	-	174,063	174,063	14,100,425	15,087,150	93.5%
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	1,809,864	1,809,937	100.0%
Mendocino	-	-	58,932	58,932	7,650,910	7,651,217	100.0%
Merced	-	272,862	210,579	483,440	16,587,283	18,252,186	90.9%
Modoc	-	-	-	-	1,328,965	1,284,287	103.5%
Mono	-	-	-	-	2,346,825	2,037,226	115.2%
Monterey	-	416,253	321,240	737,493	25,304,074	27,843,901	90.9%
Napa	-	-	115,140	115,140	9,308,622	9,979,950	93.3%
Nevada	-	107,736	83,144	190,881	6,549,288	7,206,655	90.9%
Orange	-	3,027,765	2,336,650	5,364,415	184,058,006	202,532,326	90.9%
Placer	-	397,616	306,857	704,473	24,171,119	26,597,230	90.9%
Plumas	-	-	-	-	1,851,510	1,663,727	111.3%
Riverside	-	2,186,245	1,687,215	3,873,460	132,901,973	146,241,646	90.9%
Sacramento	-	1,738,018	1,341,300	3,079,318	105,654,241	116,258,997	90.9%
San Benito	-	-	-	-	4,662,251	4,662,438	100.0%
San Bernardino	-	2,288,079	1,765,804	4,053,883	139,092,454	153,053,479	90.9%
San Diego	-	-	2,130,881	2,130,881	169,886,475	184,697,021	92.0%
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	63,648,429	56,836,452	112.0%
San Joaquin	-	826,376	637,748	1,464,125	50,235,466	55,277,714	90.9%
San Luis Obispo	-	298,594	230,437	529,032	18,151,569	19,973,484	90.9%
San Mateo	-	-	551,661	551,661	43,950,939	47,815,932	91.9%
Santa Barbara	-	-	325,198	325,198	26,458,643	28,186,948	93.9%
Santa Clara	-	-	1,154,167	1,154,167	92,486,457	100,038,958	92.5%
Santa Cruz	-	231,784	207,664	439,448	16,342,609	17,999,527	90.8%
Shasta	-	190,401	198,153	388,554	15,583,110	17,175,140	90.7%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	69,539	53,666	123,205	4,227,273	4,651,574	90.9%
Solano	-	214,450	359,299	573,749	28,222,823	31,142,713	90.6%
Sonoma	-	492,621	380,176	872,797	29,946,481	32,952,277	90.9%
Stanislaus	-	496,232	393,528	889,759	30,992,431	34,109,559	90.9%
Sutter	-	129,913	100,259	230,173	7,897,431	8,690,114	90.9%
Tehama	-	48,516	73,407	121,923	5,766,918	6,362,648	90.6%
Trinity	-	-	-	-	2,063,314	1,926,810	107.1%
Tulare	-	508,040	392,075	900,115	30,883,782	33,983,658	90.9%
Tuolumne	-	-	58,439	58,439	4,783,130	5,065,303	94.4%
Ventura	-	51,527	550,323	601,850	43,286,773	47,700,002	90.7%
Yolo	-	248,694	191,927	440,621	15,118,113	16,635,553	90.9%
Yuba	-	-	-	-	5,992,602	5,301,565	113.0%
Total	-	29,656,136	29,656,136	59,312,271	2,467,496,113	2,678,463,698	92.1%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor courts zeroed out

¹ Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.

Court	SCENARIO 1 Proposed 2023-24 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Allocation via the Workload Formula Methodology as presented to TCBC)				Difference L (K - D)	Workload Formula % Difference M (L / D)	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation N	2023-24 Workload Formula O	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage P (N / O)	Workload Formula % Difference Q (P - G)
	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Cluster 1 Courts to 100%)	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below Statewide Average)	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below 100%)	Total						
	H	I	J	K (H + I + J)						
Alameda	-	-	479,311	479,311	(544,281)	-53.2%	89,736,951	89,736,951	100.0%	0.4%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,508,095	4,318,194	104.4%	4.4%
Butte	-	33,376	139,129	172,505	(51,420)	-23.0%	13,967,859	15,020,326	93.0%	2.4%
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,478,334	3,434,244	101.3%	1.3%
Colusa	128,917	-	-	128,917	128,917	-	2,635,567	2,635,567	100.0%	-5.7%
Contra Costa	-	1,744,265	544,574	2,288,839	777,585	51.5%	54,381,796	58,792,180	92.5%	1.6%
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,867,982	3,822,121	101.2%	1.2%
El Dorado	-	205,566	97,597	303,163	173,825	134.4%	9,727,986	10,536,589	92.3%	1.6%
Fresno	-	-	613,103	613,103	(1,252,245)	-67.1%	62,889,533	66,190,564	95.0%	4.1%
Glenn	225,179	-	-	225,179	225,179	-	3,222,234	3,222,234	100.0%	0.0%
Humboldt	-	-	83,308	83,308	(21,584)	-20.6%	8,921,636	8,993,983	99.2%	6.8%
Imperial	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,504,378	8,363,980	125.6%	15.3%
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,549,192	2,499,943	102.0%	-7.2%
Kern	-	-	612,560	612,560	(1,275,661)	-67.6%	63,185,827	66,131,988	95.5%	4.7%
Kings	-	81,131	110,575	191,706	(120,627)	-38.6%	11,046,705	11,937,681	92.5%	1.7%
Lake	-	66,172	51,149	117,321	(27,464)	-19.0%	5,099,899	5,522,043	92.4%	1.5%
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,800,158	2,332,823	120.0%	12.6%
Los Angeles	-	3,007,563	7,251,860	10,259,424	(10,867,398)	-51.4%	726,312,192	782,911,052	92.8%	1.9%
Madera	-	76,886	123,310	200,196	(150,371)	-42.9%	12,327,594	13,312,566	92.6%	1.7%
Marin	-	4,104	141,885	145,988	(28,075)	-16.1%	14,336,656	15,317,860	93.6%	0.1%
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,853,852	1,805,697	102.7%	2.7%
Mendocino	-	-	-	-	(58,932)	-100.0%	7,646,223	7,231,739	105.7%	5.7%
Merced	-	34,666	167,571	202,237	(281,203)	-58.2%	16,833,593	18,090,994	93.0%	2.2%
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,406,026	1,279,449	109.9%	6.4%
Mono	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,439,564	2,061,575	118.3%	3.1%
Monterey	-	59,598	259,599	319,197	(418,296)	-56.7%	26,067,278	28,026,310	93.0%	2.1%
Napa	-	357,402	96,210	453,612	338,472	294.0%	9,621,242	10,386,823	92.6%	-0.6%
Nevada	-	624,111	70,394	694,505	503,625	263.8%	7,143,135	7,599,777	94.0%	3.1%
Orange	-	9,762,638	1,946,774	11,709,412	6,344,997	118.3%	195,579,266	210,173,824	93.1%	2.2%
Placer	-	26,171	247,175	273,346	(431,127)	-61.2%	24,891,411	26,685,022	93.3%	2.4%
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,915,288	1,548,909	123.7%	12.4%
Riverside	-	1,521,723	1,379,603	2,901,326	(972,134)	-25.1%	137,616,222	148,941,935	92.4%	1.5%
Sacramento	-	489,808	1,080,114	1,569,922	(1,509,397)	-49.0%	108,135,499	116,609,120	92.7%	1.9%
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,808,406	3,952,945	121.6%	21.6%
San Bernardino	-	4,235	1,405,976	1,410,211	(2,643,672)	-65.2%	142,465,444	151,789,230	93.9%	3.0%
San Diego	-	26,201	1,715,473	1,741,675	(389,207)	-18.3%	173,530,260	185,202,539	93.7%	1.7%
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	-	-	63,223,112	52,730,196	119.9%	7.9%
San Joaquin	-	-	487,800	487,800	(976,324)	-66.7%	50,884,034	52,662,950	96.6%	5.7%
San Luis Obispo	-	-	177,741	177,741	(351,291)	-66.4%	18,559,817	19,188,902	96.7%	5.8%
San Mateo	-	3,142,338	458,060	3,600,398	3,048,737	552.6%	46,395,428	49,452,194	93.8%	1.9%
Santa Barbara	-	-	263,262	263,262	(61,936)	-19.0%	27,480,471	28,421,722	96.7%	2.8%
Santa Clara	-	-	898,157	898,157	(256,010)	-22.2%	96,088,178	96,965,024	99.1%	6.6%
Santa Cruz	-	-	158,320	158,320	(281,128)	-64.0%	16,815,108	17,092,256	98.4%	7.6%
Shasta	-	-	158,042	158,042	(230,511)	-59.3%	16,211,631	17,062,242	95.0%	4.3%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	140,783	44,318	185,101	61,896	50.2%	4,425,405	4,784,619	92.5%	1.6%
Solano	-	130,980	290,154	421,134	(152,615)	-26.6%	29,049,365	31,325,060	92.7%	2.1%
Sonoma	-	-	283,614	283,614	(589,183)	-67.5%	30,150,159	30,618,988	98.5%	7.6%
Stanislaus	-	98,435	319,277	417,712	(472,048)	-53.1%	32,019,505	34,469,129	92.9%	2.0%
Sutter	-	552,637	84,766	637,404	407,231	176.9%	8,571,845	9,151,367	93.7%	2.8%
Tehama	-	-	59,130	59,130	(62,793)	-51.5%	6,076,743	6,383,645	95.2%	4.6%
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,142,285	2,141,889	100.0%	-7.1%
Tulare	-	1,022,670	328,597	1,351,267	451,152	50.1%	32,806,872	35,475,356	92.5%	1.6%
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-	(58,439)	-100.0%	4,989,613	4,885,338	102.1%	7.7%
Ventura	-	-	435,232	435,232	(166,618)	-27.7%	44,760,088	46,987,643	95.3%	4.5%
Yolo	-	-	149,737	149,737	(290,884)	-66.0%	15,279,476	16,165,652	94.5%	3.6%
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,239,076	5,858,507	106.5%	-6.5%
Total	354,096	23,213,459	23,213,459	46,781,014	(12,531,257)	-21.1%	2,519,621,494	2,658,241,455	94.8%	2.7%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor cou

¹ Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.

Court	SCENARIO 2 Proposed 2023-24 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Reduction using Workload Formula methodology)					Difference W (V - D)	Workload Formula % Difference X (D - V / D)	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation Y	2023-24 Workload Formula Z	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage AA (Y / Z)	Workload Formula % Difference AB (AA - G)
	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Cluster 1 Courts to 100%)	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below Statewide Average)	Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below 100%)	Civil Assessment Workload Formula Reduction U (R + S + T)	Total V (D + U)						
	R	S	T	U	V						
Alameda	-	-	(219,956)	(219,956)	803,637	(219,956)	-21.5%	90,061,277	89,736,951	100.4%	0.7%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,508,095	4,318,194	104.4%	4.4%
Butte	-	(48,001)	(36,817)	(84,817)	139,107	(84,817)	-37.9%	13,934,462	15,020,326	92.8%	2.2%
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,478,334	3,434,244	101.3%	1.3%
Colusa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,506,650	2,635,567	95.1%	-10.6%
Contra Costa	-	(181,239)	(144,107)	(325,345)	1,185,908	(325,345)	-21.5%	53,278,865	58,792,180	90.6%	-0.3%
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,867,982	3,822,121	101.2%	1.2%
El Dorado	-	(32,791)	(25,826)	(58,618)	70,720	(58,618)	-45.3%	9,495,543	10,536,589	90.1%	-0.6%
Fresno	-	-	(162,241)	(162,241)	1,703,106	(162,241)	-8.7%	63,979,537	66,190,564	96.7%	5.8%
Glenn	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,997,055	3,222,234	93.0%	-7.0%
Humboldt	-	-	(22,045)	(22,045)	82,847	(22,045)	-21.0%	8,921,175	8,993,983	99.2%	6.8%
Imperial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,504,378	8,363,980	125.6%	15.3%
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,549,192	2,499,943	102.0%	-7.2%
Kern	-	-	(162,097)	(162,097)	1,726,124	(162,097)	-8.6%	64,299,391	66,131,988	97.2%	6.4%
Kings	-	(37,769)	(29,261)	(67,029)	245,303	(67,029)	-21.5%	11,100,303	11,937,681	93.0%	2.1%
Lake	-	(17,336)	(13,535)	(30,871)	113,914	(30,871)	-21.3%	5,096,492	5,522,043	92.3%	1.4%
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,800,158	2,332,823	120.0%	12.6%
Los Angeles	-	(2,491,468)	(1,919,007)	(4,410,476)	16,716,346	(4,410,476)	-20.9%	732,769,114	782,911,052	93.6%	2.7%
Madera	-	(42,196)	(32,631)	(74,827)	275,740	(74,827)	-21.3%	12,403,139	13,312,566	93.2%	2.3%
Marin	-	(49,377)	(37,546)	(86,923)	87,140	(86,923)	-49.9%	14,277,808	15,317,860	93.2%	-0.2%
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,853,852	1,805,697	102.7%	2.7%
Mendocino	-	-	(17,726)	(17,726)	41,206	(17,726)	-30.1%	7,687,429	7,231,739	106.3%	6.3%
Merced	-	(57,869)	(44,343)	(102,212)	381,228	(102,212)	-21.1%	17,012,584	18,090,994	94.0%	3.2%
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,406,026	1,279,449	109.9%	6.4%
Mono	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,439,564	2,061,575	118.3%	3.1%
Monterey	-	(89,590)	(68,696)	(158,286)	579,207	(158,286)	-21.5%	26,327,288	28,026,310	93.9%	3.1%
Napa	-	(31,895)	(25,459)	(57,354)	57,786	(57,354)	-49.8%	9,225,415	10,386,823	88.8%	-4.5%
Nevada	-	(22,433)	(18,628)	(41,061)	149,820	(41,061)	-21.5%	6,598,450	7,599,777	86.8%	-4.1%
Orange	-	(639,687)	(515,161)	(1,154,848)	4,209,567	(1,154,848)	-21.5%	188,079,421	210,173,824	89.5%	-1.4%
Placer	-	(85,659)	(65,408)	(151,067)	553,406	(151,067)	-21.4%	25,171,470	26,685,022	94.3%	3.4%
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,915,288	1,548,909	123.7%	12.4%
Riverside	-	(468,719)	(365,074)	(833,793)	3,039,667	(833,793)	-21.5%	137,754,563	148,941,935	92.5%	1.6%
Sacramento	-	(370,789)	(285,823)	(656,611)	2,422,707	(656,611)	-21.3%	108,988,284	116,609,120	93.5%	2.6%
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,808,406	3,952,945	121.6%	21.6%
San Bernardino	-	(490,815)	(372,053)	(862,869)	3,191,014	(862,869)	-21.3%	144,246,247	151,789,230	95.0%	4.2%
San Diego	-	(597,752)	(453,953)	(1,051,705)	1,079,176	(1,051,705)	-49.4%	172,867,762	185,202,539	93.3%	1.4%
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63,223,112	52,730,196	119.9%	7.9%
San Joaquin	-	-	(129,083)	(129,083)	1,335,042	(129,083)	-8.8%	51,731,275	52,662,950	98.2%	7.4%
San Luis Obispo	-	-	(47,034)	(47,034)	481,998	(47,034)	-8.9%	18,864,074	19,188,902	98.3%	7.4%
San Mateo	-	(148,880)	(121,213)	(270,093)	281,567	(270,093)	-49.0%	43,076,597	49,452,194	87.1%	-4.8%
Santa Barbara	-	-	(69,665)	(69,665)	255,533	(69,665)	-21.4%	27,472,742	28,421,722	96.7%	2.8%
Santa Clara	-	-	(237,673)	(237,673)	916,494	(237,673)	-20.6%	96,106,515	96,965,024	99.1%	6.7%
Santa Cruz	-	-	(41,895)	(41,895)	397,553	(41,895)	-9.5%	17,054,341	17,092,256	99.8%	9.0%
Shasta	-	-	(41,822)	(41,822)	346,732	(41,822)	-10.8%	16,400,321	17,062,242	96.1%	5.4%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	(14,753)	(11,728)	(26,480)	96,725	(26,480)	-21.5%	4,337,028	4,784,619	90.6%	-0.2%
Solano	-	(99,610)	(76,781)	(176,392)	397,357	(176,392)	-30.7%	29,025,588	31,325,060	92.7%	2.0%
Sonoma	-	-	(75,051)	(75,051)	797,747	(75,051)	-8.6%	30,664,291	30,618,988	100.1%	9.3%
Stanislaus	-	(109,958)	(84,488)	(194,445)	695,314	(194,445)	-21.9%	32,297,108	34,469,129	93.7%	2.8%
Sutter	-	(27,603)	(22,431)	(50,034)	180,138	(50,034)	-21.7%	8,114,579	9,151,367	88.7%	-2.2%
Tehama	-	-	(15,647)	(15,647)	106,276	(15,647)	-12.8%	6,123,889	6,383,645	95.9%	5.3%
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,142,285	2,141,889	100.0%	-7.1%
Tulare	-	(109,439)	(86,954)	(196,393)	703,722	(196,393)	-21.8%	32,159,327	35,475,356	90.7%	-0.2%
Tuolumne	-	-	(11,975)	(11,975)	46,465	(11,975)	-20.5%	5,036,078	4,885,338	103.1%	8.7%
Ventura	-	-	(115,172)	(115,172)	486,678	(115,172)	-19.1%	44,811,534	46,987,643	95.4%	4.6%
Yolo	-	-	(39,624)	(39,624)	400,997	(39,624)	-9.0%	15,530,736	16,165,652	96.1%	5.2%
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,239,076	5,858,507	106.5%	-6.5%
Total	-	(6,265,629)	(6,265,629)	(12,531,257)	46,781,014	(12,531,257)	-21.1%	2,519,621,494	2,658,241,455	94.8%	2.7%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor cou

¹ Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.

Court	SCENARIO 3 Proposed 2023-24 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Proportional based on Workload Formula allocation)			Difference	Workload Formula % Difference	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation	2023-24 Workload Formula	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage	Workload Formula % Difference
	Proposed Workload Formula Allocation (Before Civil Assessment Funding)	Percent of 2023-24 Proposed Workload Formula Allocation	Total						
	AC	AD (AC / TOTAL AC)	AE (AD * 46.8m)						
Alameda	89,257,640	3.6%	1,688,569	664,977	-35.0%	90,946,209	89,736,951	101.3%	1.7%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	4,508,095	0.2%	85,284	85,284	-	4,593,379	4,318,194	106.4%	6.4%
Butte	13,795,355	0.6%	260,980	37,055	-83.5%	14,056,334	15,020,326	93.6%	3.0%
Calaveras	3,478,334	0.1%	65,803	65,803	-	3,544,137	3,434,244	103.2%	3.2%
Colusa	2,506,650	0.1%	47,421	47,421	-	2,554,070	2,635,567	96.9%	-8.8%
Contra Costa	52,092,957	2.1%	985,491	(525,763)	-134.8%	53,078,448	58,792,180	90.3%	-0.6%
Del Norte	3,867,982	0.2%	73,174	73,174	-	3,941,156	3,822,121	103.1%	3.1%
El Dorado	9,424,822	0.4%	178,298	48,960	-62.1%	9,603,120	10,536,589	91.1%	0.4%
Fresno	62,276,431	2.5%	1,178,141	(687,206)	-136.8%	63,454,572	66,190,564	95.9%	5.0%
Glenn	2,997,055	0.1%	56,698	56,698	-	3,053,753	3,222,234	94.8%	-5.2%
Humboldt	8,838,328	0.4%	167,203	62,310	-40.6%	9,005,531	8,993,983	100.1%	7.7%
Imperial	10,504,378	0.4%	198,721	198,721	-	10,703,099	8,363,980	128.0%	17.6%
Inyo	2,549,192	0.1%	48,225	48,225	-	2,597,418	2,499,943	103.9%	-5.3%
Kern	62,573,268	2.5%	1,183,756	(704,465)	-137.3%	63,757,024	66,131,988	96.4%	5.5%
Kings	10,854,999	0.4%	205,354	(106,979)	-134.3%	11,060,353	11,937,681	92.7%	1.8%
Lake	4,982,578	0.2%	94,260	(50,525)	-134.9%	5,076,838	5,522,043	91.9%	1.1%
Lassen	2,800,158	0.1%	52,973	52,973	-	2,853,131	2,332,823	122.3%	14.9%
Los Angeles	716,052,768	29.0%	13,546,233	(7,580,588)	-135.9%	729,599,002	782,911,052	93.2%	2.3%
Madera	12,127,398	0.5%	229,425	(121,142)	-134.6%	12,356,824	13,312,566	92.8%	1.9%
Marin	14,190,668	0.6%	268,458	94,395	-45.8%	14,459,126	15,317,860	94.4%	0.9%
Mariposa	1,853,852	0.1%	35,071	35,071	-	1,888,923	1,805,697	104.6%	4.6%
Mendocino	7,646,223	0.3%	144,651	85,719	-	7,790,873	7,231,739	107.7%	7.7%
Merced	16,631,356	0.7%	314,631	(168,810)	-134.9%	16,945,986	18,090,994	93.7%	2.8%
Modoc	1,406,026	0.1%	26,599	26,599	-	1,432,625	1,279,449	112.0%	8.5%
Mono	2,439,564	0.1%	46,151	46,151	-	2,485,716	2,061,575	120.6%	5.4%
Monterey	25,748,081	1.0%	487,100	(250,393)	-134.0%	26,235,181	28,026,310	93.6%	2.7%
Napa	9,167,629	0.4%	173,433	58,292	-49.4%	9,341,062	10,386,823	89.9%	-3.3%
Nevada	6,448,630	0.3%	121,995	(68,886)	-136.1%	6,570,625	7,599,777	86.5%	-4.4%
Orange	183,869,854	7.4%	3,478,436	(1,885,979)	-135.2%	187,348,290	210,173,824	89.1%	-1.7%
Placer	24,618,065	1.0%	465,723	(238,750)	-133.9%	25,083,787	26,685,022	94.0%	3.1%
Plumas	1,915,288	0.1%	36,233	36,233	-	1,951,522	1,548,909	126.0%	14.7%
Riverside	134,714,896	5.4%	2,548,526	(1,324,934)	-134.2%	137,263,423	148,941,935	92.2%	1.3%
Sacramento	106,565,577	4.3%	2,016,000	(1,063,319)	-134.5%	108,581,577	116,609,120	93.1%	2.2%
San Benito	4,808,406	0.2%	90,965	90,965	-	4,899,371	3,952,945	123.9%	23.9%
San Bernardino	141,055,233	5.7%	2,668,472	(1,385,411)	-134.2%	143,723,705	151,789,230	94.7%	3.8%
San Diego	171,788,586	6.9%	3,249,884	1,119,003	-47.5%	175,038,470	185,202,539	94.5%	2.5%
San Francisco	63,223,112	2.6%	1,196,050	1,196,050	-	64,419,162	52,730,196	122.2%	10.2%
San Joaquin	50,396,234	2.0%	953,392	(510,733)	-134.9%	51,349,626	52,662,950	97.5%	6.6%
San Luis Obispo	18,382,076	0.7%	347,751	(181,281)	-134.3%	18,729,827	19,188,902	97.6%	6.7%
San Mateo	42,795,030	1.7%	809,593	257,933	-53.2%	43,604,623	49,452,194	88.2%	-3.7%
Santa Barbara	27,217,209	1.1%	514,893	189,696	-41.7%	27,732,102	28,421,722	97.6%	3.7%
Santa Clara	95,190,021	3.8%	1,800,798	646,631	-44.0%	96,990,819	96,965,024	100.0%	7.6%
Santa Cruz	16,656,788	0.7%	315,112	(124,336)	-128.3%	16,971,900	17,092,256	99.3%	8.5%
Shasta	16,053,589	0.6%	303,701	(84,853)	-121.8%	16,357,289	17,062,242	95.9%	5.1%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	4,240,304	0.2%	80,218	(42,987)	-134.9%	4,320,521	4,784,619	90.3%	-0.6%
Solano	28,628,231	1.2%	541,587	(32,162)	-105.6%	29,169,818	31,325,060	93.1%	2.5%
Sonoma	29,866,544	1.2%	565,013	(307,784)	-135.3%	30,431,558	30,618,988	99.4%	8.5%
Stanislaus	31,601,794	1.3%	597,840	(291,919)	-132.8%	32,199,634	34,469,129	93.4%	2.6%
Sutter	7,934,441	0.3%	150,103	(80,069)	-134.8%	8,084,544	9,151,367	88.3%	-2.5%
Tehama	6,017,613	0.2%	113,841	(8,082)	-106.6%	6,131,454	6,383,645	96.0%	5.4%
Trinity	2,142,285	0.1%	40,528	40,528	-	2,182,812	2,141,889	101.9%	-5.2%
Tulare	31,455,605	1.3%	595,075	(305,040)	-133.9%	32,050,680	35,475,356	90.3%	-0.5%
Tuolumne	4,989,613	0.2%	94,393	35,954	-38.5%	5,084,006	4,885,338	104.1%	9.6%
Ventura	44,324,856	1.8%	838,534	236,684	-60.7%	45,163,390	46,987,643	96.1%	5.4%
Yolo	15,129,739	0.6%	286,223	(154,398)	-135.0%	15,415,962	16,165,652	95.4%	4.5%
Yuba	6,239,076	0.3%	118,030	118,030	-	6,357,106	5,858,507	108.5%	-4.5%
Total	2,472,840,480	100.0%	46,781,014	(12,531,257)	-21.1%	2,519,621,494	2,658,241,455	94.8%	2.7%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor cou

¹ Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.

Court	SCENARIO 4 Proposed Civil Assessment Redistribution (Proportional reduction on the decrease)			Difference	% Difference	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation	2023-24 Workload Formula	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage	Workload Formula % Difference
	Percent of 2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution	2023-24 Civil Assessment Proportional Reduction	Total						
	AL (D / TOTAL D)	AM (AL * -12.5m)	AN (D + AM)						
Alameda	1.7%	(216,261)	807,332	(216,261)	-21.1%	90,064,972	89,736,951	100.4%	0.7%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	0.0%	-	-	-	-	4,508,095	4,318,194	104.4%	4.4%
Butte	0.4%	(47,310)	176,614	(47,310)	-21.1%	13,971,969	15,020,326	93.0%	2.4%
Calaveras	0.0%	-	-	-	-	3,478,334	3,434,244	101.3%	1.3%
Colusa	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,506,650	2,635,567	95.1%	-10.6%
Contra Costa	2.5%	(319,292)	1,191,962	(319,292)	-21.1%	53,284,919	58,792,180	90.6%	-0.2%
Del Norte	0.0%	-	-	-	-	3,867,982	3,822,121	101.2%	1.2%
El Dorado	0.2%	(27,326)	102,012	(27,326)	-21.1%	9,526,834	10,536,589	90.4%	-0.3%
Fresno	3.1%	(394,103)	1,471,244	(394,103)	-21.1%	63,747,675	66,190,564	96.3%	5.4%
Glenn	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,997,055	3,222,234	93.0%	-7.0%
Humboldt	0.2%	(22,161)	82,731	(22,161)	-21.1%	8,921,059	8,993,983	99.2%	6.8%
Imperial	0.0%	-	-	-	-	10,504,378	8,363,980	125.6%	15.3%
Inyo	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,549,192	2,499,943	102.0%	-7.2%
Kern	3.2%	(398,936)	1,489,285	(398,936)	-21.1%	64,062,553	66,131,988	96.9%	6.0%
Kings	0.5%	(65,988)	246,344	(65,988)	-21.1%	11,101,344	11,937,681	93.0%	2.1%
Lake	0.2%	(30,590)	114,195	(30,590)	-21.1%	5,096,773	5,522,043	92.3%	1.4%
Lassen	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,800,158	2,332,823	120.0%	12.6%
Los Angeles	35.6%	(4,463,590)	16,663,232	(4,463,590)	-21.1%	732,716,000	782,911,052	93.6%	2.7%
Madera	0.6%	(74,066)	276,501	(74,066)	-21.1%	12,403,899	13,312,566	93.2%	2.3%
Marin	0.3%	(36,775)	137,288	(36,775)	-21.1%	14,327,956	15,317,860	93.5%	0.1%
Mariposa	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1,853,852	1,805,697	102.7%	2.7%
Mendocino	0.1%	(12,451)	46,481	(12,451)	-21.1%	7,692,704	7,231,739	106.4%	6.4%
Merced	0.8%	(102,139)	381,301	(102,139)	-21.1%	17,012,657	18,090,994	94.0%	3.2%
Modoc	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1,406,026	1,279,449	109.9%	6.4%
Mono	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,439,564	2,061,575	118.3%	3.1%
Monterey	1.2%	(155,815)	581,679	(155,815)	-21.1%	26,329,760	28,026,310	93.9%	3.1%
Napa	0.2%	(24,326)	90,814	(24,326)	-21.1%	9,258,443	10,386,823	89.1%	-4.1%
Nevada	0.3%	(40,328)	150,552	(40,328)	-21.1%	6,599,182	7,599,777	86.8%	-4.0%
Orange	9.0%	(1,133,372)	4,231,043	(1,133,372)	-21.1%	188,100,897	210,173,824	89.5%	-1.4%
Placer	1.2%	(148,838)	555,635	(148,838)	-21.1%	25,173,699	26,685,022	94.3%	3.5%
Plumas	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1,915,288	1,548,909	123.7%	12.4%
Riverside	6.5%	(818,369)	3,055,091	(818,369)	-21.1%	137,769,987	148,941,935	92.5%	1.6%
Sacramento	5.2%	(650,586)	2,428,732	(650,586)	-21.1%	108,994,310	116,609,120	93.5%	2.6%
San Benito	0.0%	-	-	-	-	4,808,406	3,952,945	121.6%	21.6%
San Bernardino	6.8%	(856,488)	3,197,395	(856,488)	-21.1%	144,252,628	151,789,230	95.0%	4.2%
San Diego	3.6%	(450,204)	1,680,677	(450,204)	-21.1%	173,469,263	185,202,539	93.7%	1.7%
San Francisco	0.0%	-	-	-	-	63,223,112	52,730,196	119.9%	7.9%
San Joaquin	2.5%	(309,334)	1,154,790	(309,334)	-21.1%	51,551,024	52,662,950	97.9%	7.0%
San Luis Obispo	0.9%	(111,772)	417,260	(111,772)	-21.1%	18,799,336	19,188,902	98.0%	7.1%
San Mateo	0.9%	(116,553)	435,108	(116,553)	-21.1%	43,230,138	49,452,194	87.4%	-4.5%
Santa Barbara	0.5%	(68,706)	256,491	(68,706)	-21.1%	27,473,701	28,421,722	96.7%	2.8%
Santa Clara	1.9%	(243,848)	910,319	(243,848)	-21.1%	96,100,340	96,965,024	99.1%	6.7%
Santa Cruz	0.7%	(92,845)	346,603	(92,845)	-21.1%	17,003,391	17,092,256	99.5%	8.7%
Shasta	0.7%	(82,092)	306,461	(82,092)	-21.1%	16,360,050	17,062,242	95.9%	5.2%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	0.2%	(26,030)	97,175	(26,030)	-21.1%	4,337,478	4,784,619	90.7%	-0.2%
Solano	1.0%	(121,219)	452,530	(121,219)	-21.1%	29,080,761	31,325,060	92.8%	2.2%
Sonoma	1.5%	(184,401)	688,396	(184,401)	-21.1%	30,554,941	30,618,988	99.8%	8.9%
Stanislaus	1.5%	(187,985)	701,775	(187,985)	-21.1%	32,303,568	34,469,129	93.7%	2.9%
Sutter	0.4%	(48,630)	181,543	(48,630)	-21.1%	8,115,984	9,151,367	88.7%	-2.2%
Tehama	0.2%	(25,759)	96,164	(25,759)	-21.1%	6,113,777	6,383,645	95.8%	5.1%
Trinity	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,142,285	2,141,889	100.0%	-7.1%
Tulare	1.5%	(190,173)	709,943	(190,173)	-21.1%	32,165,547	35,475,356	90.7%	-0.2%
Tuolumne	0.1%	(12,347)	46,092	(12,347)	-21.1%	5,035,705	4,885,338	103.1%	8.6%
Ventura	1.0%	(127,156)	474,694	(127,156)	-21.1%	44,799,549	46,987,643	95.3%	4.6%
Yolo	0.7%	(93,093)	347,528	(93,093)	-21.1%	15,477,267	16,165,652	95.7%	4.9%
Yuba	0.0%	-	-	-	-	6,239,076	5,858,507	106.5%	-6.5%
Total	100.0%	(12,531,257)	46,781,014	(12,531,257)	-21.1%	2,519,621,494	2,658,241,455	94.8%	2.7%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor cou

¹ Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.