



**Judicial Council of California**  
**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**

**TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**MATERIALS FOR MAY 24, 2024  
 VIRTUAL MEETING**

**Meeting Contents**

Agenda.....	1
<b>Minutes</b>	
Draft Minutes from the May 1, 2024 meeting.....	3
<b>Discussion and Possible Action Items (Items 1-3)</b>	
<b>Item 1</b> – Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required).....	7
<b>Attachment A:</b> Allocation Tables 2–5.....	11
<b>Item 2</b> – Court Reporter Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required).....	15
<b>Attachment 2A:</b> Court Reporter Funding: Recommended 2024–25 Allocations for Option A.....	18
<b>Attachment 2B:</b> Court Reporter Funding: Recommended 2024–25 Allocations for Option B.....	20
<b>Item 3</b> – Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for 2024–25 (Action Required).....	22
<b>Attachment 3A:</b> Pro Rata Reduction Allocation – Workload Formula.....	26
<b>Attachment 3B:</b> Pro Rata Reduction Allocation – Workload Formula Need.....	27
<b>Attachment 3C:</b> Reverse Workload Formula Equity Reduction Allocation.....	28
<b>Attachment 3D:</b> Reverse Workload Formula Equity Reduction Allocation with Band.....	29



Judicial Council of California  
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

[www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm)  
[tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov)

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

**TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**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:** Friday, May 24, 2024  
**Time:** 12:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.  
**Public Video Livestream:** <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/3589>

---

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](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov).

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

---

**I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))**

---

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

**Approval of Minutes**

Approve minutes of the May 1, 2024, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

---

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

---

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen-only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to [tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov). Only written comments received by 12:00 p.m. on May 23, 2024 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)**

---

**Item 1**

**Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of revised recommendations for 2024–25 allocations for the CARE Act due to caseload adjustments included in the May Revision.

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

**Item 2**

**Court Reporter Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of revised recommendations for 2024–25 allocations for court reporters due to the funding reduction included in the May Revision.

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

**Item 3**

**Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of revised recommendations for 2024–25 allocations from the TCTF due to the funding reduction included in the May Revision.

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

---

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

---

**Adjourn**



Judicial Council of California  
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

[www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm)

[tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov)

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

May 1, 2024

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/3263>

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Judith C. Clark, Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab, Hon. Wendy G. Getty, Hon. Maria D. Hernandez, Hon. David C. Kalemkarian, Hon. Erick L. Larsh, Hon. Michael J. Reinhart, Hon. Michael A. Sachs, and Hon. Kevin M. Seibert.

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Vice Chair), Ms. Stephanie Cameron, Mr. Chad Finke, Mr. Shawn Landry, Ms. Krista LeVier, Mr. Brandon E. Riley, Mr. Chris Ruhl, Mr. Lee Seale, Mr. David W. Slayton, Mr. Neal Taniguchi, and Mr. David H. Yamasaki.

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Patricia L. Kelly and Mr. James Kim.

**Others Present:** Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Mr. Adam Dorsey, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Donna Newman, and Ms. Rose Lane.

---

OPEN MEETING

---

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

The chair welcomed the members, called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m. and took roll call.

**Approval of Minutes**

The committee approved minutes from the March 27, 2024, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

---

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-10)

---

**Item 1 – Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee recommendations on 2024–25 allocations from the IMF.

**Action:** The TCBCAC unanimously voted to approve a total of \$46.6 million in allocations for 2024–25 from the IMF for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee), and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting.

**Item 2 – State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) Allocation Increase for 2023–24 for Judicial Council Legal Services (Action Required)**

Consideration of a R&E Subcommittee recommendation to increase the 2023–24 IMF allocation for Legal Services to address increased legal support for the trial courts.

**Action:** The TCBCAC unanimously voted to approve a \$2 million 2023–24 IMF allocation for Judicial Council Legal Services to address trial court-related litigation expenses and settlements for consideration by the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its May 17, 2024, business meeting.

**Item 3 – Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of R&E Subcommittee recommendations on 2024–25 allocations from the TCTF.

**Action:** The TCBCAC unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations which assume that the funding proposed in the Governor’s Budget will remain in the final Budget Act of 2024:

- Consumer Price Increase (CPI) funding included in the budget to address inflationary costs for the trial courts is not considered “new money” for the purpose of allocating funding via the Workload Formula (WF) and, therefore, revise the definition of “new money” in the policy to exclude CPI funding;
- Base, discretionary, and nondiscretionary program allocations from the TCTF in the amount of \$3.1 billion (Attachment 3B, column AD), including:
  - TCTF allocation of \$50 million for support for operation of the trial courts (Attachment 3B, column B)
  - General Fund allocation of \$68.8 million for employee benefits (Attachment 3B, column U); and
- As a subset of the \$3.1 billion total allocation, approve a WF allocation of \$2.6 billion based on methodologies approved by the Judicial Council (Attachment 3C, column Y).

**Item 4 – AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of the 2024–25 methodologies and allocations for the child support commissioner and family law facilitator programs.

**Action:** The TCBCAC unanimously voted to approve the following allocation recommendations for 2024–25 for consideration by the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting:

- Child Support Commissioner Program – \$35 million base allocations and \$13 million in federal drawdown funding using the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council in January 2019 as set forth in Attachment A; and

- *Family Law Facilitator Program – \$11.9 million base allocations and \$4.4 million in federal drawdown funding using the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council in July 2021 as set forth in Attachment B.*

**Item 5 – Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommendations on 2024–25 allocations for the CARE Act.

**Action:** *The TCBCAC unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations for consideration by the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting:*

- *Continue all elements of the fiscal year 2023–24 approved allocation methodology (Link A);*
- *Approve an allocation, for Cohort One courts and Los Angeles, based on the amount required for a full year of CARE Act implementation (Attachment B); and*
- *Approve an allocation, for Cohort Two courts, prorated to the amount required for a full year of CARE Act implementation (Attachment B).*

**Item 6 – Model Self-Help Pilot Program—Technology Model Project Allocation Methodology (Action Required)**

Consideration of FMS recommendations to revise the allocation methodology for Model Self-Help Pilot Program funding.

**Action:** *The TCBCAC unanimously voted to approve the following revisions to the allocation methodology for the Model Self-Help Pilot Program—Technology Model Project for consideration by the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting:*

- *Require that proposed projects be limited to enabling courts to collaborate in providing self-help services remotely;*
- *Award three-year grants through a competitive solicitation process open to all courts and conducted every three years;*
- *Make one grant award for the project; and*
- *If a responsive proposal is not received in the fiscal year 2024–25 solicitation process, allocate funding through the methodology prescribed in Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts: Model Self-Help Pilot Program Reallocation (Feb. 18, 2021).*

**Item 7 – Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of the 2024–25 methodologies and allocations for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel.

**Action:** *The TCBCAC voted (with one abstention) to approve the recommended court-appointed dependency counsel allocations as outlined in Attachment A for consideration by the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting.*

**Item 8 – Pretrial Release Program Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of the 2024–25 allocations and funding floor adjustment for the Pretrial Release Program.

***Action:** The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the 2024–25 allocations for Pretrial Release funding as outlined in Attachment A, for consideration by the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting.*

**Item 9 – Court Reporter Allocations for 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of the 2024–25 allocations for \$30 million to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil case types.

***Action:** The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the allocation of the \$30 million to the trial courts on a proportional basis using the council-approved methodology with updated Assessed Judicial Need data based on the 2022 Judicial Needs Assessment as outlined in Attachment 9A for consideration by the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting.*

**Item 10 – Self-Help Program Allocations for 2024–25 through 2026–27 (Action Required)**

Consideration of the 2024–25 through 2026–27 allocations for the Self-Help Program.

***Action:** The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the allocation recommendations for the Self-Help Program for 2024–25 and ongoing for consideration by the Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting.*

---

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

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on  enter date.

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

**Title:** Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocations for 2024–25

**Date:** 5/24/2024

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

---

**Issue**

Consideration of revised recommendations for 2024–25 allocations to the trial courts for the CARE Act due to caseload adjustments included in the May Revision.

**Background**

On July 21, 2023, the Judicial Council approved the allocation methodology recommended by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to distribute \$20 million for fiscal year 2023–24 in implementation and planning funds to all courts.<sup>1</sup> On September 19, 2023, the Judicial Council approved the allocation of an additional \$9.4 million included in the Budget Act of 2023 for the Superior Court of Los Angeles County to participate as a Cohort One court implementing the CARE Act in 2023–24.<sup>2</sup>

The approved methodology for 2023–24 included these elements:

1. For Cohort One courts<sup>3</sup> implementing the CARE Act, an allocation for court operations that employs the Workload Formula with a base of 25 CARE Act cases calculated at \$93,225;
2. For Cohort One courts implementing the CARE Act, an allocation for staff and other operational costs that employs the Workload Formula with a base of \$98,000, prorated to

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2023–24 Allocation of Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Funding* (June 7, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12125820&GUID=BB56211B-2F20-4BB8-8E94-B0909B17F695>.

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2023–24 Allocation of CARE Act Funding* (Aug. 23, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12246630&GUID=64A38B92-D51B-4459-BF69-F16D534D0541>.

<sup>3</sup> The Superior Courts of Glenn, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne Counties implemented the CARE Act in October 2023, and the Superior Court of Los Angeles County implemented in December 2023.



the amount that Cohort One courts are estimated to receive in 2024–25 when all courts are implementing the CARE Act;

3. For Cohort Two courts, an allocation that employs the Workload Formula with a base of \$98,000, prorated to the amount that remains after the allocation described in recommendation 2 and after reduction by 0.5 percent to hold as a reserve for Cohort One courts that require additional program funding, with any unspent funding from the court allocations and this reserve redistributed through the reallocation process via the approved methodology; and
4. A method to reallocate unspent funds during the fiscal year.

In fiscal year (FY) 2024–25, all courts are required to implement the CARE Act. Cohort One, including Los Angeles, will be in full implementation for all 12 months of the year. Cohort Two courts are required to implement the CARE Act by December 1, 2024, but may implement it sooner.

On May 1, 2024, TCBAC approved an allocation of funding to the courts based on the 2024–25 Governor’s Budget which included \$52.7 million for court operations in 2024–25 and \$66.0 million in 2025–25 and ongoing<sup>4</sup>. This funding was based on an estimate of 14,300 CARE Act petitions in 2024–25 and 18,000 petitions in 2025–26.

Updated caseload information provided to the Judicial Council estimates that 3,350 petitions will be received by the courts in FY 2024–25 and 3,500 petitions in FY 2025–26. Therefore, the May Revision proposes \$26.5 million General Fund in FY 2024–25 and \$32.9 million ongoing for CARE Act implementation and program support for the trial courts. This is a reduction of \$26.2 million in FY 2024–25 and \$33.1 million ongoing compared to the Governor’s Budget.

The budget adjustment reflects a proportionate reduction in petitions for the funding budgeted for hearing costs. Funding for court operations, including clerk and self-help staff, has not been reduced.

The initial cost estimate methodology in 2022–23 assumed that approximately 33 percent of petitions would be dismissed at the initial review. Six months of CARE Act implementation data by the Cohort One courts indicates a dismissal rate of 10 percent. Therefore, the budget has been updated to reflect this higher proportion of cases resulting from petitions.

---

<sup>4</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocations for 2024–25* (May 1, 2024). <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20240501-materials.pdf>

**Table 1. May Budget Revisions to CARE Act Funding for Hearings and Court Operations**

Description	Fiscal year	Petitions	Cases	Court Review	Hearings	Court Ops	Total	% Decrease
Current Funding level	2024-25	14,296	9,531	1,057,874	34,480,987	17,173,800	52,712,661	
	2025-26	18,000	12,000	1,332,000	43,416,000	21,228,000	65,976,000	
Revised Estimate with dismissed petitions lowered to 10%	2024-25	3,350	2,502	247,900	9,051,259	17,173,800	26,472,959	
	2025-26	3,500	3,150	259,000	11,396,700	21,228,000	32,883,700	
Difference	2024-25	-10,946	-7,029	-809,974	-25,429,728	0	-26,239,702	-50%
	2025-26	-14,500	-8,850	-1,073,000	-32,019,300	0	-33,092,300	-50%

The allocation methodology proposed for consideration for 2024–25 (Attachment A, Allocation Tables 2 and 3) retains the base funding and Workload Formula elements of the 2023–24 methodology and is updated to reflect a full year of implementation funding for Cohort One and a partial year for Cohort Two. This is calculated as follows:

- Table 2 uses the Workload Formula and base amounts to calculate the allocations to all courts at the \$32.9 million in full funding (Table 2, columns F, H & I).
- Table 3 sets the allocation of Cohort One and Los Angeles to the full year of implementation calculated in Table 1 (Table 3, columns F, H & I).
- Table 3 prorates the remaining funding to Cohort Two courts.
- Note that in FY 2025–26, the allocations of all courts will be those in Table 2 included in Attachment A.

**Alternatives Considered**

Alternative One is shown in Tables 2 and 3. This alternative makes no changes to the methodology. Under this method, 41 courts continue to receive the total base amounts of \$191,225 and there is no change to the proposed allocation. Larger courts receive an average reduction of 57 percent, compared to the overall 50 percent reduction in the May Revision.

Alternative Two is shown in Tables 4 and 5. This alternative lowers the hearings cost base by 50% to \$46,610 and keeps the operations base unchanged at \$98,000. In this case, 31 courts received the minimum total base allocation of \$144,610, a reduction of 24 percent. The average percent reduction of the larger courts was 54.7 percent, somewhat reduced from the reduction in Alternative 1.

While Alternative Two provides some additional funding to larger courts, it does not mitigate the reduction substantially; while the reduction to small courts receiving only the base amount under this scenario receive a reduction of 24 percent. Therefore, this report recommends Alternative One.

**Reallocation.** Judicial Council staff were directed to survey courts and conduct a reallocation of unspent CARE Act funding in the second half of 2023–24. This process was incorporated into the survey conducted by Budget Services in March 2023 to determine the amount of unspent funding in 2023–24.

### **Recommendations**

The TCBAC is asked to consider the following recommendations for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024 business meeting:

1. Continue all elements of the allocation methodology approved in fiscal year 2023–24, including employing the Workload Formula and the funding base already defined;
2. Approve, for Cohort One courts and Los Angeles, an allocation based on the amount required for a full year of CARE Act implementation; and
3. Approve, for Cohort Two courts, an allocation prorated to the amount required for a full year of CARE Act implementation.

### **Attachments**

1. **Link A:** Budget Request 0250-197-BCP-2023-MR, Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act, [https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/2324/FY2324\\_ORG0250\\_BCP7012.pdf](https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/2324/FY2324_ORG0250_BCP7012.pdf)
2. **Attachment A:** Allocation Tables 2—5.

Table 2. Allocation of Court Operations Budget When Fully Funded in FY 2025—2026

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Court	Final Workload Allocation			Staff/Other		Court/Ops		Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Final Staff/Other Costs	Base	Final Hearing Costs	Total Allocation
Alameda	89,736,650	3.56%	755,454	98,000	\$ 683,150	93,225	\$ 327,363	\$ 1,010,513
Alpine	978,500	0.04%	8,238	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Amador	4,508,080	0.18%	37,952	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Butte	13,971,923	0.55%	117,624	98,000	\$ 189,107	93,225	\$ 129,680	\$ 318,787
Calaveras	3,478,322	0.14%	29,282	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Colusa	2,506,641	0.10%	21,102	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Contra Costa	53,284,741	2.11%	448,581	98,000	\$ 445,456	93,225	\$ 232,254	\$ 677,710
Del Norte	3,867,969	0.15%	32,563	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
El Dorado	9,526,802	0.38%	80,202	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Fresno	63,747,461	2.53%	536,662	98,000	\$ 513,681	93,225	\$ 259,553	\$ 773,234
Glenn	2,997,045	0.12%	25,231	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Humboldt	8,921,029	0.35%	75,102	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Imperial	10,504,343	0.42%	88,431	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Inyo	2,549,184	0.10%	21,460	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Kern	64,062,338	2.54%	539,313	98,000	\$ 515,734	93,225	\$ 260,375	\$ 776,109
Kings	11,101,306	0.44%	93,457	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 122,190	\$ 220,190
Lake	5,096,756	0.20%	42,907	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Lassen	2,800,148	0.11%	23,573	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Los Angeles	732,713,543	29.06%	6,168,396	98,000	\$ 4,875,837	93,225	\$ 2,005,001	\$ 6,880,838
Madera	12,403,858	0.49%	104,423	98,000	\$ 178,882	93,225	\$ 125,589	\$ 304,471
Marin	14,327,907	0.57%	120,620	98,000	\$ 191,429	93,225	\$ 130,609	\$ 322,038
Mariposa	1,853,846	0.07%	15,607	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mendocino	7,646,197	0.30%	64,370	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Merced	17,012,600	0.67%	143,222	98,000	\$ 208,935	93,225	\$ 137,614	\$ 346,549
Modoc	1,406,022	0.06%	11,837	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mono	2,439,556	0.10%	20,538	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Monterey	26,329,671	1.04%	221,658	98,000	\$ 269,689	93,225	\$ 161,924	\$ 431,613
Napa	9,282,739	0.37%	78,147	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Nevada	6,639,488	0.26%	55,895	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Orange	188,291,022	7.47%	1,585,140	98,000	\$ 1,325,798	93,225	\$ 584,509	\$ 1,910,306
Placer	25,173,615	1.00%	211,926	98,000	\$ 262,151	93,225	\$ 158,907	\$ 421,058
Plumas	1,915,282	0.08%	16,124	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Riverside	137,769,526	5.46%	1,159,822	98,000	\$ 996,360	93,225	\$ 452,689	\$ 1,449,049
Sacramento	108,993,944	4.32%	917,573	98,000	\$ 808,722	93,225	\$ 377,609	\$ 1,186,331
San Benito	4,808,390	0.19%	40,480	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
San Bernardino	144,252,144	5.72%	1,214,396	98,000	\$ 1,038,631	93,225	\$ 469,604	\$ 1,508,235
San Diego	173,468,681	6.88%	1,460,357	98,000	\$ 1,229,145	93,225	\$ 545,835	\$ 1,774,979
San Francisco	63,222,900	2.51%	532,246	98,000	\$ 510,260	93,225	\$ 258,184	\$ 768,445
San Joaquin	51,550,851	2.04%	433,984	98,000	\$ 434,150	93,225	\$ 227,730	\$ 661,880
San Luis Obispo	18,799,273	0.75%	158,263	98,000	\$ 220,585	93,225	\$ 142,276	\$ 362,861
San Mateo	43,346,545	1.72%	364,916	98,000	\$ 380,652	93,225	\$ 206,324	\$ 586,975
Santa Barbara	27,473,608	1.09%	231,288	98,000	\$ 277,148	93,225	\$ 164,908	\$ 442,057
Santa Clara	96,100,018	3.81%	809,024	98,000	\$ 724,644	93,225	\$ 343,966	\$ 1,068,610
Santa Cruz	17,003,334	0.67%	143,144	98,000	\$ 208,874	93,225	\$ 137,590	\$ 346,464
Shasta	16,359,995	0.65%	137,728	98,000	\$ 204,679	93,225	\$ 135,911	\$ 340,590
Sierra	978,500	0.04%	8,238	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Siskiyou	4,337,464	0.17%	36,515	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Solano	29,080,663	1.15%	244,817	98,000	\$ 287,628	93,225	\$ 169,101	\$ 456,729
Sonoma	30,554,838	1.21%	257,228	98,000	\$ 297,240	93,225	\$ 172,948	\$ 470,188
Stanislaus	32,303,460	1.28%	271,949	98,000	\$ 308,643	93,225	\$ 177,510	\$ 486,153
Sutter	8,164,586	0.32%	68,734	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tehama	6,113,757	0.24%	51,469	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Trinity	2,142,278	0.08%	18,035	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tulare	32,165,439	1.28%	270,787	98,000	\$ 307,743	93,225	\$ 177,150	\$ 484,893
Tuolumne	4,989,596	0.20%	42,005	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Ventura	44,799,399	1.78%	377,147	98,000	\$ 390,125	93,225	\$ 210,114	\$ 600,240
Yolo	15,477,215	0.61%	130,296	98,000	\$ 198,923	93,225	\$ 133,608	\$ 332,531
Yuba	6,239,055	0.25%	52,524	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,521,570,045</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>21,228,000</b>	<b>5,684,000</b>	<b>\$ 21,228,000</b>	<b>5,407,050</b>	<b>\$ 11,655,700</b>	<b>\$ 32,883,700</b>

Table 3. Allocation of Court Operations Budget FY 2024—2025

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Court	Final Workload Allocation			Staff/Other		Court Ops		Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Final Staff/Other Costs	Base	Final Hearing Costs	Total Allocation
Alameda	89,736,650	3.56%	273,779	98,000	\$ 414,453	93,225	\$ 138,803	\$ 553,256
Alpine	978,500	0.04%	2,985	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Amador	4,508,080	0.18%	13,754	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Butte	13,971,923	0.55%	42,627	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Calaveras	3,478,322	0.14%	10,612	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Colusa	2,506,641	0.10%	7,648	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Contra Costa	53,284,741	2.11%	162,567	98,000	\$ 285,907	93,225	\$ 120,289	\$ 406,196
Del Norte	3,867,969	0.15%	11,801	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
El Dorado	9,526,802	0.38%	29,065	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Fresno	63,747,461	2.53%	194,488	98,000	\$ 322,803	93,225	\$ 125,603	\$ 448,406
Glenn	2,997,045	0	25,231	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Humboldt	8,921,029	0.35%	27,217	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Imperial	10,504,343	0.42%	32,048	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Inyo	2,549,184	0.10%	7,777	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Kern	64,062,338	2.54%	195,449	98,000	\$ 323,914	93,225	\$ 125,763	\$ 449,677
Kings	11,101,306	0.44%	33,869	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Lake	5,096,756	0.20%	15,550	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Lassen	2,800,148	0.11%	8,543	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Los Angeles	732,713,543	0	6,168,396	98,000	\$ 4,875,837	93,225	\$ 2,005,001	\$ 6,880,838
Madera	12,403,858	0.49%	37,843	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Marin	14,327,907	0.57%	43,713	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mariposa	1,853,846	0.07%	5,656	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mendocino	7,646,197	0.30%	23,328	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Merced	17,012,600	0.67%	51,904	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Modoc	1,406,022	0.06%	4,290	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mono	2,439,556	0.10%	7,443	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Monterey	26,329,671	1.04%	80,330	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Napa	9,282,739	0.37%	28,321	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Nevada	6,639,488	0.26%	20,257	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Orange	188,291,022	0	1,585,140	98,000	\$ 1,325,798	93,225	\$ 584,509	\$ 1,910,306
Placer	25,173,615	1.00%	76,803	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Plumas	1,915,282	0.08%	5,843	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Riverside	137,769,526	0	1,159,822	98,000	\$ 996,360	93,225	\$ 452,689	\$ 1,449,049
Sacramento	108,993,944	4.32%	332,531	98,000	\$ 482,363	93,225	\$ 148,584	\$ 630,948
San Benito	4,808,390	0.19%	14,670	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
San Bernardino	144,252,144	5.72%	440,101	98,000	\$ 606,700	93,225	\$ 166,492	\$ 773,192
San Diego	173,468,681	0	1,460,357	98,000	\$ 1,229,145	93,225	\$ 545,835	\$ 1,774,979
San Francisco	63,222,900	0	532,246	98,000	\$ 510,260	93,225	\$ 258,184	\$ 768,445
San Joaquin	51,550,851	2.04%	157,277	98,000	\$ 279,792	93,225	\$ 119,408	\$ 399,200
San Luis Obispo	18,799,273	0.75%	57,355	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
San Mateo	43,346,545	1.72%	132,247	98,000	\$ 250,860	93,225	\$ 115,241	\$ 366,101
Santa Barbara	27,473,608	1.09%	83,820	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Santa Clara	96,100,018	3.81%	293,193	98,000	\$ 436,893	93,225	\$ 142,035	\$ 578,929
Santa Cruz	17,003,334	0.67%	51,876	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Shasta	16,359,995	0.65%	49,913	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Sierra	978,500	0.04%	2,985	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Siskiyou	4,337,464	0.17%	13,233	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Solano	29,080,663	1.15%	88,723	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Sonoma	30,554,838	1.21%	93,220	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Stanislaus	32,303,460	0	271,949	98,000	\$ 308,643	93,225	\$ 177,510	\$ 486,153
Sutter	8,164,586	0.32%	24,909	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tehama	6,113,757	0.24%	18,653	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Trinity	2,142,278	0.08%	6,536	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tulare	32,165,439	1.28%	98,134	98,000	\$ 211,430	93,225	\$ 109,562	\$ 320,992
Tuolumne	4,989,596	0	42,005	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Ventura	44,799,399	1.78%	136,679	98,000	\$ 255,983	93,225	\$ 115,979	\$ 371,963
Yolo	15,477,215	0.61%	47,220	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Yuba	6,239,055	0.25%	19,035	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Reserve					\$ 38,659		\$ 25,445	\$ 64,104
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,521,570,045</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>14,862,966</b>	<b>4,900,000</b>	<b>\$ 17,173,800</b>	<b>4,661,250</b>	<b>\$ 9,299,159</b>	<b>\$ 26,472,959</b>

Table 4. Allocation of Court Operations Budget When Fully Funded in FY 2025—2026

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Court	Final Workload Allocation			Staff/Other		Court/Ops		Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Final Staff/Other Costs	Base	Final Hearing Costs	Total Allocation
Alameda	89,736,650	3.56%	755,454	98,000	\$ 683,150	46,610	\$ 372,128	\$ 1,055,278
Alpine	978,500	0.04%	8,238	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Amador	4,508,080	0.18%	37,952	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Butte	13,971,923	0.55%	117,624	98,000	\$ 189,107	46,610	\$ 97,293	\$ 286,400
Calaveras	3,478,322	0.14%	29,282	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Colusa	2,506,641	0.10%	21,102	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Contra Costa	53,284,741	2.11%	448,581	98,000	\$ 445,456	46,610	\$ 239,899	\$ 685,356
Del Norte	3,867,969	0.15%	32,563	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
El Dorado	9,526,802	0.38%	80,202	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 81,168	\$ 179,168
Fresno	63,747,461	2.53%	536,662	98,000	\$ 513,681	46,610	\$ 277,853	\$ 791,534
Glenn	2,997,045	0.12%	25,231	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Humboldt	8,921,029	0.35%	75,102	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 78,971	\$ 176,971
Imperial	10,504,343	0.42%	88,431	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 84,714	\$ 182,714
Inyo	2,549,184	0.10%	21,460	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Kern	64,062,338	2.54%	539,313	98,000	\$ 515,734	46,610	\$ 278,995	\$ 794,729
Kings	11,101,306	0.44%	93,457	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 86,880	\$ 184,880
Lake	5,096,756	0.20%	42,907	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Lassen	2,800,148	0.11%	23,573	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Los Angeles	732,713,543	29.06%	6,168,396	98,000	\$ 4,875,837	46,610	\$ 2,704,514	\$ 7,580,352
Madera	12,403,858	0.49%	104,423	98,000	\$ 178,882	46,610	\$ 91,605	\$ 270,487
Marin	14,327,907	0.57%	120,620	98,000	\$ 191,429	46,610	\$ 98,584	\$ 290,013
Mariposa	1,853,846	0.07%	15,607	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Mendocino	7,646,197	0.30%	64,370	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 74,346	\$ 172,346
Merced	17,012,600	0.67%	143,222	98,000	\$ 208,935	46,610	\$ 108,323	\$ 317,258
Modoc	1,406,022	0.06%	11,837	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Mono	2,439,556	0.10%	20,538	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Monterey	26,329,671	1.04%	221,658	98,000	\$ 269,689	46,610	\$ 142,120	\$ 411,809
Napa	9,282,739	0.37%	78,147	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 80,283	\$ 178,283
Nevada	6,639,488	0.26%	55,895	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 70,695	\$ 168,695
Orange	188,291,022	7.47%	1,585,140	98,000	\$ 1,325,798	46,610	\$ 729,632	\$ 2,055,430
Placer	25,173,615	1.00%	211,926	98,000	\$ 262,151	46,610	\$ 137,927	\$ 400,078
Plumas	1,915,282	0.08%	16,124	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Riverside	137,769,526	5.46%	1,159,822	98,000	\$ 996,360	46,610	\$ 546,366	\$ 1,542,726
Sacramento	108,993,944	4.32%	917,573	98,000	\$ 808,722	46,610	\$ 441,983	\$ 1,250,705
San Benito	4,808,390	0.19%	40,480	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
San Bernardino	144,252,144	5.72%	1,214,396	98,000	\$ 1,038,631	46,610	\$ 569,882	\$ 1,608,513
San Diego	173,468,681	6.88%	1,460,357	98,000	\$ 1,229,145	46,610	\$ 675,864	\$ 1,905,009
San Francisco	63,222,900	2.51%	532,246	98,000	\$ 510,260	46,610	\$ 275,950	\$ 786,210
San Joaquin	51,550,851	2.04%	433,984	98,000	\$ 434,150	46,610	\$ 233,610	\$ 667,760
San Luis Obispo	18,799,273	0.75%	158,263	98,000	\$ 220,585	46,610	\$ 114,804	\$ 335,389
San Mateo	43,346,545	1.72%	364,916	98,000	\$ 380,652	46,610	\$ 203,849	\$ 584,500
Santa Barbara	27,473,608	1.09%	231,288	98,000	\$ 277,148	46,610	\$ 146,270	\$ 423,418
Santa Clara	96,100,018	3.81%	809,024	98,000	\$ 724,644	46,610	\$ 395,211	\$ 1,119,855
Santa Cruz	17,003,334	0.67%	143,144	98,000	\$ 208,874	46,610	\$ 108,289	\$ 317,164
Shasta	16,359,995	0.65%	137,728	98,000	\$ 204,679	46,610	\$ 105,956	\$ 310,635
Sierra	978,500	0.04%	8,238	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Siskiyou	4,337,464	0.17%	36,515	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Solano	29,080,663	1.15%	244,817	98,000	\$ 287,628	46,610	\$ 152,100	\$ 439,727
Sonoma	30,554,838	1.21%	257,228	98,000	\$ 297,240	46,610	\$ 157,447	\$ 454,687
Stanislaus	32,303,460	1.28%	271,949	98,000	\$ 308,643	46,610	\$ 163,790	\$ 472,433
Sutter	8,164,586	0.32%	68,734	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 76,227	\$ 174,227
Tehama	6,113,757	0.24%	51,469	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 68,788	\$ 166,788
Trinity	2,142,278	0.08%	18,035	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Tulare	32,165,439	1.28%	270,787	98,000	\$ 307,743	46,610	\$ 163,290	\$ 471,032
Tuolumne	4,989,596	0.20%	42,005	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Ventura	44,799,399	1.78%	377,147	98,000	\$ 390,125	46,610	\$ 209,119	\$ 599,244
Yolo	15,477,215	0.61%	130,296	98,000	\$ 198,923	46,610	\$ 102,753	\$ 301,676
Yuba	6,239,055	0.25%	52,524	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 69,242	\$ 167,242
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,521,570,045</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>21,228,000</b>	<b>5,684,000</b>	<b>\$ 21,228,000</b>	<b>2,703,380</b>	<b>\$ 11,655,700</b>	<b>\$ 32,883,700</b>

Table 5. Allocation of Court Operations Budget FY 2024—2025

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Court	Final Workload Allocation			Staff/Other		Court Ops		Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Final Staff/Other Costs	Base	Final Hearing Costs	Total Allocation
Alameda	89,736,650	3.56%	273,779	98,000	\$ 414,453	46,610	\$ 202,057	\$ 616,510
Alpine	978,500	0.04%	2,985	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Amador	4,508,080	0.18%	13,754	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Butte	13,971,923	0.55%	42,627	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Calaveras	3,478,322	0.14%	10,612	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Colusa	2,506,641	0.10%	7,648	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Contra Costa	53,284,741	2.11%	162,567	98,000	\$ 285,907	46,610	\$ 138,913	\$ 424,820
Del Norte	3,867,969	0.15%	11,801	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
El Dorado	9,526,802	0.38%	29,065	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Fresno	63,747,461	2.53%	194,488	98,000	\$ 322,803	46,610	\$ 157,037	\$ 479,840
Glenn	2,997,045	0	25,231	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Humboldt	8,921,029	0.35%	27,217	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Imperial	10,504,343	0.42%	32,048	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Inyo	2,549,184	0.10%	7,777	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Kern	64,062,338	2.54%	195,449	98,000	\$ 323,914	46,610	\$ 157,583	\$ 481,496
Kings	11,101,306	0.44%	33,869	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Lake	5,096,756	0.20%	15,550	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Lassen	2,800,148	0.11%	8,543	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Los Angeles	732,713,543	0	6,168,396	98,000	\$ 4,875,837	46,610	\$ 2,704,514	\$ 7,580,352
Madera	12,403,858	0.49%	37,843	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Marin	14,327,907	0.57%	43,713	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Mariposa	1,853,846	0.07%	5,656	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Mendocino	7,646,197	0.30%	23,328	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Merced	17,012,600	0.67%	51,904	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 76,080	\$ 174,080
Modoc	1,406,022	0.06%	4,290	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Mono	2,439,556	0.10%	7,443	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Monterey	26,329,671	1.04%	80,330	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 92,220	\$ 190,220
Napa	9,282,739	0.37%	28,321	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Nevada	6,639,488	0.26%	20,257	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Orange	188,291,022	0	1,585,140	98,000	\$ 1,325,798	46,610	\$ 729,632	\$ 2,055,430
Placer	25,173,615	1.00%	76,803	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 90,217	\$ 188,217
Plumas	1,915,282	0.08%	5,843	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Riverside	137,769,526	0	1,159,822	98,000	\$ 996,360	46,610	\$ 546,366	\$ 1,542,726
Sacramento	108,993,944	4.32%	332,531	98,000	\$ 482,363	46,610	\$ 235,416	\$ 717,779
San Benito	4,808,390	0.19%	14,670	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
San Bernardino	144,252,144	5.72%	440,101	98,000	\$ 606,700	46,610	\$ 296,492	\$ 903,192
San Diego	173,468,681	0	1,460,357	98,000	\$ 1,229,145	46,610	\$ 675,864	\$ 1,905,009
San Francisco	63,222,900	0	532,246	98,000	\$ 510,260	46,610	\$ 275,950	\$ 786,210
San Joaquin	51,550,851	2.04%	157,277	98,000	\$ 279,792	46,610	\$ 135,910	\$ 415,702
San Luis Obispo	18,799,273	0.75%	57,355	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 79,175	\$ 177,175
San Mateo	43,346,545	1.72%	132,247	98,000	\$ 250,860	46,610	\$ 121,698	\$ 372,558
Santa Barbara	27,473,608	1.09%	83,820	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 94,201	\$ 192,201
Santa Clara	96,100,018	3.81%	293,193	98,000	\$ 436,893	46,610	\$ 213,080	\$ 649,974
Santa Cruz	17,003,334	0.67%	51,876	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 76,064	\$ 174,064
Shasta	16,359,995	0.65%	49,913	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 74,950	\$ 172,950
Sierra	978,500	0.04%	2,985	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Siskiyou	4,337,464	0.17%	13,233	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Solano	29,080,663	1.15%	88,723	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 96,985	\$ 194,985
Sonoma	30,554,838	1.21%	93,220	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 99,539	\$ 197,539
Stanislaus	32,303,460	0	271,949	98,000	\$ 308,643	46,610	\$ 163,790	\$ 472,433
Sutter	8,164,586	0.32%	24,909	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Tehama	6,113,757	0.24%	18,653	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Trinity	2,142,278	0.08%	6,536	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Tulare	32,165,439	1.28%	98,134	98,000	\$ 211,430	46,610	\$ 102,329	\$ 313,759
Tuolumne	4,989,596	0	42,005	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Ventura	44,799,399	1.78%	136,679	98,000	\$ 255,983	46,610	\$ 124,214	\$ 380,198
Yolo	15,477,215	0.61%	47,220	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 73,421	\$ 171,421
Yuba	6,239,055	0.25%	19,035	98,000	\$ 98,000	46,610	\$ 46,610	\$ 144,610
Reserve					\$ 38,659		\$ 20,549	\$ 59,208
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,521,570,045</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>14,862,966</b>	<b>4,900,000</b>	<b>\$ 17,173,800</b>	<b>2,330,500</b>	<b>\$ 9,299,159</b>	<b>\$ 26,472,959</b>

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

**Title:** Court Reporter Allocations for 2024–25  
**Date:** 5/17/2024  
**Contact:** Chris Belloli, Manager, Business Management Services  
415-865-7658 | [chris.belloli@jud.ca.gov](mailto:chris.belloli@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consideration of revised recommendations for 2024–25 allocations for court reporters due to the funding reduction included in the May Revision. The May Revision proposal will reduce the level of funding from \$30 million to \$20 million annually for trial courts to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil law case types. The approved recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting.

**Background**

**Budget Language**

Senate Bill 170 (Stats. 2021, ch. 240), which amended the 2021 Budget Act, included \$30 million ongoing General Fund to the Judicial Council for establishing a methodology to allocate funding to all trial courts to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil cases. The budget language in the 2022 Budget Act and ongoing expanded the use of this funding but did not affect how these funds are allocated to the courts. The May Revision for the 2024–25 budget reduced the level of funding to \$20 million ongoing but has no impact on how these funds could be used.

**Allocation Methodology**

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



The council-approved allocation methodology was developed based on the 2020 Judicial Needs Assessment (JNA), which was the most current study at the time. Judicial workload, as described by the JNA, is measured by a court’s assessed judicial need (AJN) and was identified as the best metric for the allocation methodology because of the parallel workload drivers between judgeships and court reporters. In addition, the AJN data includes separate noncriminal and criminal judicial workload metrics by court. Focusing on noncriminal judicial need, consistent with the requirements in the budget language, the proposed methodology for allocating funds to the trial courts is as follows:

1. Identify the proportion of judicial workload, as measured by the AJN, for noncriminal need by court;
2. Apply a funding floor to all courts. Given the reduced level of funding this year from \$30 million to \$20 million, two options for the funding floor have been developed for consideration:
  - a. **Option A: no change to the previous \$25,000 funding floor amount.**  
Doing so will result in an increased amount—compared to using a purely proportional calculation to 14 courts totaling \$350,000—which represents an approximate 0.25 full-time equivalent using the average salary for court reporters from the Schedule 7A. The reduction in funding for this year to \$20 million increased the number of courts eligible to receive the \$25,000 funding floor allocation from 11 to 14 courts;
  - b. **Option B: adjust the previous funding floor from \$25,000 to \$16,667.**  
This adjustment will reflect the one-third reduction in funding this year from \$30 million to \$20 million. This adjustment does not change the 11 courts that currently receive the funding floor.
3. After applying the funding floor amount to the courts based on Option A or Option B, allocate the remaining funding proportionally to all other courts based on their noncriminal judicial need; and
4. Allocate the funding in one lump sum, on council approval.

The AJN data used in the allocation methodology for 2024–25 was updated based on the 2022 JNA, and the detail of the allocations by court is included as Attachment 2A for the \$25,000 funding floor amount outlined in Option A and Attachment 2B for the \$16,667 funding floor amount outlined in Option B.

### **Potential Impacts to Allocations**

Allocation changes may be necessary if there are changes to the court reporter appropriation and associated language in the 2024 Budget Act.

## **Recommendation**

The TCBAC is asked to consider two options for the Court Reporter allocation of the \$20 million to the trial courts:

1. Option A will allocate the \$20 million to courts as outlined in Attachment 2A based on no changes to the \$25,000 funding floor amount;
2. Option B will allocate the \$20 million to courts as outlined in Attachment 2B based on a change to the funding floor amount from \$25,000 to \$16,667, consistent with the one-third reduction in funding from \$30 million to \$20 million.

## **Attachments**

**Attachment 2A:** Court Reporter Funding: Recommended 2024–25 Allocations for Option A

**Attachment 2B:** Court Reporter Funding: Recommended 2024–25 Allocations for Option B

**Court Reporter Funding: FY 2024-25 Allocations**

Cluster	Court	Initial Allocation of \$20M based on Noncriminal AJN			Allocation of \$20M with Funding Floor of \$25,000				
		Noncriminal AJN *	Proportion of Statewide AJN	Proportion of \$20M	Funding Floor Court?	Floor Funding	Revised AJN Allocation of		Final Allocation
							Proportion for Non-floor Courts	Non floor Funding	
Statewide	1,067	100%	\$20,000,000		\$350,000		\$19,650,000	\$20,000,000	
4	Alameda	36.8	3.45%	\$690,419			3.48%	\$683,931	\$683,931
1	Alpine	0.1	0.01%	\$1,181	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
1	Amador	1.1	0.11%	\$21,121	X **	\$25,000	0.11%		\$25,000
2	Butte	6.1	0.57%	\$113,673			0.57%	\$112,604	\$112,604
1	Calaveras	1.3	0.12%	\$24,580	X **	\$25,000	0.12%		\$25,000
1	Colusa	0.5	0.04%	\$8,822	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
3	Contra Costa	23.2	2.18%	\$435,387			2.19%	\$431,295	\$431,295
1	Del Norte	1.2	0.11%	\$22,738	X **	\$25,000	0.11%		\$25,000
2	El Dorado	4.2	0.40%	\$79,198			0.40%	\$78,454	\$78,454
3	Fresno	28.4	2.67%	\$533,109			2.69%	\$528,099	\$528,099
1	Glenn	0.8	0.08%	\$15,110	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
2	Humboldt	4.5	0.42%	\$84,388			0.43%	\$83,595	\$83,595
2	Imperial	4.4	0.41%	\$82,853			0.42%	\$82,075	\$82,075
1	Inyo	0.5	0.05%	\$9,427	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
3	Kern	24.9	2.33%	\$466,051			2.35%	\$461,672	\$461,672
2	Kings	4.5	0.42%	\$83,421			0.42%	\$82,637	\$82,637
2	Lake	2.4	0.22%	\$44,460			0.22%	\$44,042	\$44,042
1	Lassen	0.8	0.07%	\$14,922	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
4	Los Angeles	341.3	31.99%	\$6,397,035			32.25%	\$6,336,921	\$6,336,921
2	Madera	6.0	0.56%	\$111,656			0.56%	\$110,607	\$110,607
2	Marin	5.1	0.48%	\$95,514			0.48%	\$94,617	\$94,617
1	Mariposa	0.4	0.03%	\$6,814	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
2	Mendocino	2.7	0.25%	\$49,974			0.25%	\$49,505	\$49,505
2	Merced	7.3	0.68%	\$136,290			0.69%	\$135,009	\$135,009
1	Modoc	0.4	0.04%	\$7,099	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
1	Mono	0.3	0.03%	\$5,405	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
3	Monterey	9.4	0.88%	\$176,105			0.89%	\$174,450	\$174,450
2	Napa	3.6	0.34%	\$67,587			0.34%	\$66,952	\$66,952
2	Nevada	2.6	0.24%	\$48,417			0.24%	\$47,962	\$47,962
4	Orange	77.0	7.22%	\$1,443,731			7.28%	\$1,430,164	\$1,430,164
2	Placer	9.3	0.88%	\$175,115			0.88%	\$173,470	\$173,470
1	Plumas	0.6	0.06%	\$12,020	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
4	Riverside	62.8	5.88%	\$1,176,347			5.93%	\$1,165,293	\$1,165,293
4	Sacramento	43.7	4.10%	\$819,041			4.13%	\$811,345	\$811,345
1	San Benito	1.4	0.14%	\$27,105			0.14%	\$26,851	\$26,851
4	San Bernardino	69.2	6.49%	\$1,297,506			6.54%	\$1,285,313	\$1,285,313
4	San Diego	77.9	7.30%	\$1,459,240			7.36%	\$1,445,527	\$1,445,527
3	San Francisco	25.1	2.35%	\$470,814			2.37%	\$466,389	\$466,389
3	San Joaquin	19.9	1.87%	\$373,422			1.88%	\$369,913	\$369,913
2	San Luis Obispo	6.0	0.56%	\$111,942			0.56%	\$110,890	\$110,890
3	San Mateo	13.5	1.26%	\$252,215			1.27%	\$249,845	\$249,845

**Court Reporter Funding: FY 2024-25 Allocations**

Cluster	Court	Initial Allocation of \$20M based on Noncriminal AJN			Allocation of \$20M with Funding Floor of \$25,000				
		Noncriminal AJN *	Proportion of Statewide AJN	Proportion of \$20M	Funding Floor Court?	Floor Funding	Revised AJN Proportion for Non-floor Courts	Allocation of Non floor Funding	Final Allocation
	Statewide	1,067	100%	\$20,000,000		\$350,000		\$19,650,000	\$20,000,000
3	Santa Barbara	9.2	0.86%	\$172,783			0.87%	\$171,159	\$171,159
4	Santa Clara	30.9	2.90%	\$579,922			2.92%	\$574,472	\$574,472
2	Santa Cruz	5.2	0.49%	\$97,806			0.49%	\$96,887	\$96,887
2	Shasta	6.2	0.58%	\$116,178			0.59%	\$115,087	\$115,087
1	Sierra	0.1	0.01%	\$1,909	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
2	Siskiyou	1.5	0.14%	\$28,646			0.14%	\$28,376	\$28,376
3	Solano	11.0	1.03%	\$205,416			1.04%	\$203,485	\$203,485
3	Sonoma	10.8	1.01%	\$202,811			1.02%	\$200,905	\$200,905
3	Stanislaus	14.1	1.32%	\$263,713			1.33%	\$261,235	\$261,235
2	Sutter	3.0	0.28%	\$55,853			0.28%	\$55,328	\$55,328
2	Tehama	2.3	0.22%	\$43,348			0.22%	\$42,940	\$42,940
1	Trinity	0.7	0.06%	\$12,445	X	\$25,000			\$25,000
3	Tulare	13.3	1.24%	\$248,841			1.25%	\$246,502	\$246,502
2	Tuolumne	1.9	0.18%	\$36,258			0.18%	\$35,917	\$35,917
3	Ventura	18.0	1.68%	\$336,926			1.70%	\$333,760	\$333,760
2	Yolo	5.3	0.50%	\$99,381			0.50%	\$98,447	\$98,447
2	Yuba	2.5	0.23%	\$46,508			0.23%	\$46,071	\$46,071

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

\*\* New funding floor courts in 2024-25

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

**Criminal case types:** Felony, Misdemeanors, Infractions

**Court Reporter Funding: FY 2024-25 Allocations**

Cluster	Court	Initial Allocation of \$20M based on Noncriminal AJN			Allocation of \$20M with Funding Floor adjusted from \$25,000 to \$16,667 based on one-third reduction in statewide funding (i.e., from \$30M to \$20M)				
		Noncriminal AJN *	Statewide AJN	Proportion of \$20M	Funding Floor Court?	Floor Funding	Revised AJN	Allocation of	Final Allocation
							Proportion for Non- floor Courts	Non floor Funding	
Statewide	1,067	100%	\$20,000,000		\$183,337		\$19,816,663	\$20,000,000	
4	Alameda	36.8	3.45%	\$690,419			3.47%	\$687,360	\$687,360
1	Alpine	0.1	0.01%	\$1,181	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
1	Amador	1.1	0.11%	\$21,121			0.11%	\$21,027	\$21,027
2	Butte	6.1	0.57%	\$113,673			0.57%	\$113,169	\$113,169
1	Calaveras	1.3	0.12%	\$24,580			0.12%	\$24,471	\$24,471
1	Colusa	0.5	0.04%	\$8,822	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
3	Contra Costa	23.2	2.18%	\$435,387			2.19%	\$433,458	\$433,458
1	Del Norte	1.2	0.11%	\$22,738			0.11%	\$22,638	\$22,638
2	El Dorado	4.2	0.40%	\$79,198			0.40%	\$78,847	\$78,847
3	Fresno	28.4	2.67%	\$533,109			2.68%	\$530,747	\$530,747
1	Glenn	0.8	0.08%	\$15,110	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
2	Humboldt	4.5	0.42%	\$84,388			0.42%	\$84,015	\$84,015
2	Imperial	4.4	0.41%	\$82,853			0.42%	\$82,486	\$82,486
1	Inyo	0.5	0.05%	\$9,427	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
3	Kern	24.9	2.33%	\$466,051			2.34%	\$463,987	\$463,987
2	Kings	4.5	0.42%	\$83,421			0.42%	\$83,052	\$83,052
2	Lake	2.4	0.22%	\$44,460			0.22%	\$44,263	\$44,263
1	Lassen	0.8	0.07%	\$14,922	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
4	Los Angeles	341.3	31.99%	\$6,397,035			32.14%	\$6,368,695	\$6,368,695
2	Madera	6.0	0.56%	\$111,656			0.56%	\$111,162	\$111,162
2	Marin	5.1	0.48%	\$95,514			0.48%	\$95,091	\$95,091
1	Mariposa	0.4	0.03%	\$6,814	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
2	Mendocino	2.7	0.25%	\$49,974			0.25%	\$49,753	\$49,753
2	Merced	7.3	0.68%	\$136,290			0.68%	\$135,686	\$135,686
1	Modoc	0.4	0.04%	\$7,099	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
1	Mono	0.3	0.03%	\$5,405	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
3	Monterey	9.4	0.88%	\$176,105			0.88%	\$175,325	\$175,325
2	Napa	3.6	0.34%	\$67,587			0.34%	\$67,288	\$67,288
2	Nevada	2.6	0.24%	\$48,417			0.24%	\$48,202	\$48,202
4	Orange	77.0	7.22%	\$1,443,731			7.25%	\$1,437,335	\$1,437,335
2	Placer	9.3	0.88%	\$175,115			0.88%	\$174,339	\$174,339
1	Plumas	0.6	0.06%	\$12,020	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
4	Riverside	62.8	5.88%	\$1,176,347			5.91%	\$1,171,136	\$1,171,136
4	Sacramento	43.7	4.10%	\$819,041			4.11%	\$815,413	\$815,413
1	San Benito	1.4	0.14%	\$27,105			0.14%	\$26,985	\$26,985
4	San Bernardino	69.2	6.49%	\$1,297,506			6.52%	\$1,291,758	\$1,291,758
4	San Diego	77.9	7.30%	\$1,459,240			7.33%	\$1,452,775	\$1,452,775
3	San Francisco	25.1	2.35%	\$470,814			2.37%	\$468,728	\$468,728
3	San Joaquin	19.9	1.87%	\$373,422			1.88%	\$371,768	\$371,768
2	San Luis Obispo	6.0	0.56%	\$111,942			0.56%	\$111,446	\$111,446
3	San Mateo	13.5	1.26%	\$252,215			1.27%	\$251,098	\$251,098
3	Santa Barbara	9.2	0.86%	\$172,783			0.87%	\$172,017	\$172,017
4	Santa Clara	30.9	2.90%	\$579,922			2.91%	\$577,353	\$577,353
2	Santa Cruz	5.2	0.49%	\$97,806			0.49%	\$97,373	\$97,373
2	Shasta	6.2	0.58%	\$116,178			0.58%	\$115,664	\$115,664
1	Sierra	0.1	0.01%	\$1,909	X	\$16,667			\$16,667

**Court Reporter Funding: FY 2024-25 Allocations**

Cluster	Court	Initial Allocation of \$20M based on Noncriminal AJN			Allocation of \$20M with Funding Floor adjusted from \$25,000 to \$16,667 based on one-third reduction in statewide funding (i.e., from \$30M to \$20M)				
		Noncriminal AJN *	Statewide AJN	Proportion of \$20M	Funding Floor Court?	Floor Funding	Revised AJN	Allocation of	
							Proportion for Non- floor Courts	Non floor Funding	Final Allocation
Statewide	1,067	100%	\$20,000,000		\$183,337		\$19,816,663	\$20,000,000	
2	Siskiyou	1.5	0.14%	\$28,646			0.14%	\$28,519	\$28,519
3	Solano	11.0	1.03%	\$205,416			1.03%	\$204,506	\$204,506
3	Sonoma	10.8	1.01%	\$202,811			1.02%	\$201,912	\$201,912
3	Stanislaus	14.1	1.32%	\$263,713			1.32%	\$262,545	\$262,545
2	Sutter	3.0	0.28%	\$55,853			0.28%	\$55,605	\$55,605
2	Tehama	2.3	0.22%	\$43,348			0.22%	\$43,156	\$43,156
1	Trinity	0.7	0.06%	\$12,445	X	\$16,667			\$16,667
3	Tulare	13.3	1.24%	\$248,841			1.25%	\$247,738	\$247,738
2	Tuolumne	1.9	0.18%	\$36,258			0.18%	\$36,098	\$36,098
3	Ventura	18.0	1.68%	\$336,926			1.69%	\$335,433	\$335,433
2	Yolo	5.3	0.50%	\$99,381			0.50%	\$98,940	\$98,940
2	Yuba	2.5	0.23%	\$46,508			0.23%	\$46,302	\$46,302

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

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

**Criminal case types:** Felony, Misdemeanors, Infractions

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

**Title:** Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for 2024–25  
**Date:** 5/24/2024  
**Contact:** Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-643-8027 | [oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov](mailto:oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consideration of allocation methodology options for the \$97 million reduction to trial court operational funding included in the 2024–25 May Revision. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee’s recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting.

**Background**

To address the state’s projected multiyear budget deficit, the 2024–25 May Revision reflects budget reductions throughout state government, including the judicial branch. Specifically, the May Revision includes a \$97 million ongoing General Fund reduction to the trial courts beginning in 2024–25. The reduction was calculated by applying a 7.95 percent reduction to the General Fund that supports baseline funding for trial court operations.

The Judicial Council allocates the majority of the funding to the trial courts according to its approved allocation methodology, known as the Workload Formula. The Workload Formula determines the need for funding based on workload measures.

Currently, the Workload Formula policy states that allocations in fiscal years for which a budget reduction must be implemented will be addressed as needed, with special consideration toward those courts below the statewide average funding level. A methodology for applying a funding reduction will be determined in the year a reduction occurs.

To prepare for potential funding reductions given the state’s projected deficit, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) discussed allocation methodology options for a budget reduction at its March 7, 2024, meeting.<sup>1</sup> Two recent examples of funding reductions that occurred in 2020–21 and 2023–24 were presented to the FMS members for background and discussion.

These funding reductions are described below:

---

<sup>1</sup> FMS meeting materials (March 7, 2024), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20240307-fms-materials.pdf>

The 2020 Budget Act included a \$167.8 million reduction to trial court baseline funding due to the sizeable budget deficit projected as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The council-approved methodology<sup>2</sup> to allocate this reduction is described as follows:

- Courts within the established band around the statewide average funding level take a proportional reduction, but do not fall outside of the band;
- Courts above the band take an additional 1 percent cut from those within the band without falling into the band;
- Courts below the band take less of a cut than those within the band, scaled by their size and distance from the statewide average, not taking more of a cut than those inside of the band; and
- Cluster 1 courts take the same percentage reduction as courts within the band but are not required to take the additional percentage reduction as those other courts above the band.

This reduction was restored in the 2021 Budget Act and the funding was allocated to the courts in the same amounts as the initial reduction.

Per the 2022 Budget Act, effective 2023–24, the civil assessment backfill amount decreased by \$10 million to \$100 million ongoing, due to the elimination of one-time funding for prior uncollected debt. In addition, the backfill amount was reduced by an additional \$2.5 million for debt service obligation payments as approved by the council at its May 12, 2023, business meeting.<sup>3</sup> As a result, there was a total reduction of \$12.5 million ongoing to the amount of civil assessment backfill funding allocated to the trial courts beginning in 2023–24.

The \$12.5 million was reduced proportionally based on courts' percentage of 2022–23 civil assessment backfill funding – with additional adjustments to three courts funded over 100 percent and a redirection of \$421,000 to five courts below the statewide average funding level.<sup>4</sup> As approved by the council at its July 21, 2023, business meeting, the \$12.5 million ongoing reduction was reflected in the trial court allocations beginning in 2023–24.<sup>5</sup>

### **Options for Budget Reductions**

The 2024–25 Governor's Budget released in January did not include new funding or reductions for the trial courts. However, due to the state's significant multiyear budget deficit, the May Revision includes a \$97 million ongoing General Fund reduction to trial court operational funding.

---

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (July 24, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8651228&GUID=27A3B6D8-9783-4865-8C5A-F6697EB58734>.

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (May 12, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11916929&GUID=4F4B033A-9A14-4C88-8654-8CF355F8E8D5>.

<sup>4</sup> Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting report (June 6, 2023), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbbc-20230606-materials.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (July 21, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12124713&GUID=2A166CFF-E318-4E77-AA91-C06AE38FDFC2>.



The table below reflects the 2024–25 Workload Formula allocation prior to the proposed May Revision (MR) reduction and the available funding after the reduction. After applying the \$97 million reduction, the statewide funding level decreases from 94.9 percent to 91.3 percent.

2024–25 Workload Formula Allocation	2024–25 Workload Formula Need	2024–25 Workload Formula Statewide %	2024–25 MR Reduction	2024–25 MR Workload Formula Allocation	2024–25 MR Workload Formula Statewide %	2024–25 MR Workload Formula % Change
\$2.579	\$2.718	94.9%	(\$97)	\$2.482	91.3%	(3.8%)

(Dollars in Millions)

Possible allocation options for the \$97 million reduction include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. ***Pro rata reduction allocation (Attachments 3A and 3B).*** This approach will allocate the reduction proportionally to all trial courts based on each court’s Workload Formula allocation amount or each court’s Workload Formula need amount. Courts with a greater allocation amount will receive a larger share of the reduction. Attachment 3A applies the reduction to the Workload Formula allocation and Attachment 3B applies it to the Workload Formula need.
2. ***Reverse Workload Formula equity reduction allocations***
  - a. ***Reverse Workload Formula equity reduction allocation (Attachment 3C).*** This approach will allocate the first 50 percent, or a specified portion, of the reduction to courts above the statewide average funding level scaled by each court’s distance from the statewide average and size based on the courts’ Workload Formula need. The allocated reduction will bring courts down to but not below the statewide average funding level. The other 50 percent, or balance of the reduction, will be allocated to all courts based on the Workload Formula.  
This methodology is the reverse of the existing Workload Formula allocation methodology used to distribute new money when it is included in the budget for trial courts. Consistent with the Workload Formula policy, this methodology gives special consideration to courts below the statewide average funding level to support the goal of workload-based equitable funding.
  - b. ***Reverse Workload Formula equity reduction allocation with band (Attachment 3D).*** This approach will establish a funding band with specific criteria and a sequence of steps in which the reduction is allocated. The band will be established around a determined funding level (i.e.: statewide average funding level) and a specified reduction methodology, such as a proportional reduction, will be allocated to courts within the band. An additional reduction will be allocated to courts that are above the band and a smaller reduction will be allocated to courts that are below the band. Similar to option 2a,

this methodology also gives special consideration to courts below the statewide average to support the goal of workload-based equitable funding.

This methodology was the approach used in 2020–21 to allocate the \$167.8 million reduction due to the COVID-19 pandemic as described in the background section of this report on page 2. For option 2b, all of the same steps described for the \$167.8 million reduction will be used with a 4 percent band above and below the statewide funding level.

The recommended allocation methodology to distribute the \$97 million ongoing reduction to the trial courts will be incorporated into the larger Trial Court Trust Fund allocations. The final allocation amounts are subject to change based on the funding included in the 2024 Budget Act.

### **Recommendation**

Consider the various options and recommend an allocation methodology for the \$97 million ongoing reduction to trial court operational funding for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 12, 2024, business meeting.

### **Attachments**

Attachment 3A: Pro Rata Reduction Allocation – Workload Formula

Attachment 3B: Pro Rata Reduction Allocation – Workload Formula Need

Attachment 3C: Reverse Workload Formula Equity Reduction Allocation

Attachment 3D: Reverse Workload Formula Equity Reduction Allocation with Band

Court	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation	2024-25 Workload Formula Need	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (BEFORE Reduction)
Alameda	92,771,185	94,645,177	98.02%
Alpine	952,915	549,681	173.36%
Amador	4,485,969	4,684,703	95.76%
Butte	14,290,796	14,689,951	97.28%
Calaveras	3,410,497	3,767,570	90.52%
Colusa	2,548,958	2,635,032	96.73%
Contra Costa	53,336,440	59,907,816	89.03%
Del Norte	4,621,814	3,875,339	119.26%
El Dorado	9,840,777	10,819,495	90.95%
Fresno	66,162,075	66,287,167	99.81%
Glenn	3,105,736	3,237,289	95.94%
Humboldt	9,326,193	9,318,361	100.08%
Imperial	10,531,943	8,073,327	130.45%
Inyo	2,607,930	2,676,571	97.44%
Kern	69,415,149	68,776,330	100.93%
Kings	11,203,859	12,025,488	93.17%
Lake	5,250,155	6,056,222	86.69%
Lassen	2,673,991	2,580,519	103.62%
Los Angeles	741,516,966	791,102,381	93.73%
Madera	13,154,899	13,875,025	94.81%
Marin	14,553,616	15,677,866	92.83%
Mariposa	1,926,873	1,846,094	104.38%
Mendocino	8,027,864	7,775,002	103.25%
Merced	17,152,008	18,264,043	93.91%
Modoc	1,424,962	1,480,959	96.22%
Mono	2,490,708	2,038,771	122.17%
Monterey	27,022,244	28,560,984	94.61%
Napa	9,807,477	10,740,134	91.32%
Nevada	6,792,392	7,425,652	91.47%
Orange	192,506,749	209,526,287	91.88%
Placer	25,839,006	27,355,659	94.46%
Plumas	1,955,747	1,629,248	120.04%
Riverside	139,429,602	155,691,163	89.56%
Sacramento	113,543,787	122,332,264	92.82%
San Benito	4,928,959	4,197,092	117.44%
San Bernardino	140,481,254	156,640,095	89.68%
San Diego	183,465,714	189,500,353	96.82%
San Francisco	66,985,214	55,305,114	121.12%
San Joaquin	52,382,255	53,533,653	97.85%
San Luis Obispo	19,413,865	19,492,482	99.60%
San Mateo	44,437,598	49,033,290	90.63%
Santa Barbara	27,719,036	29,058,002	95.39%
Santa Clara	97,831,068	97,354,039	100.49%
Santa Cruz	17,137,610	16,940,790	101.16%
Shasta	16,747,818	18,198,452	92.03%
Sierra	1,006,553	623,149	161.53%
Siskiyou	4,459,639	4,841,098	92.12%
Solano	29,791,462	31,445,139	94.74%
Sonoma	31,884,596	30,732,916	103.75%
Stanislaus	32,496,801	37,054,820	87.70%
Sutter	8,468,489	9,485,325	89.28%
Tehama	6,105,750	6,426,611	95.01%
Trinity	2,054,724	2,276,992	90.24%
Tulare	33,784,161	38,548,955	87.64%
Tuolumne	5,050,850	5,085,552	99.32%
Ventura	46,324,991	46,999,346	98.57%
Yolo	15,858,062	17,504,806	90.59%
Yuba	6,351,667	7,883,564	80.57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,578,849,415</b>	<b>2,718,089,203</b>	<b>94.88%</b>

statewide average

Pro Rata Reduction Allocation - Workload Formula			
Total Reduction	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation (AFTER Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (AFTER Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage CHANGE
(3,491,470)	89,279,714	94.33%	-3.69%
-	952,915	173.36%	0.00%
(168,831)	4,317,138	92.15%	-3.60%
(537,838)	13,752,957	93.62%	-3.66%
(128,355)	3,282,142	87.12%	-3.41%
(95,931)	2,453,028	93.09%	-3.64%
(2,007,332)	51,329,108	85.68%	-3.35%
(173,943)	4,447,870	114.77%	-4.49%
(370,361)	9,470,417	87.53%	-3.42%
(2,490,029)	63,672,046	96.05%	-3.76%
(116,885)	2,988,851	92.33%	-3.61%
(350,994)	8,975,199	96.32%	-3.77%
(396,373)	10,135,571	125.54%	-4.91%
(98,150)	2,509,780	93.77%	-3.67%
(2,612,459)	66,802,689	97.13%	-3.80%
(421,660)	10,782,199	89.66%	-3.51%
(197,591)	5,052,564	83.43%	-3.26%
(100,636)	2,573,354	99.72%	-3.90%
(27,907,206)	713,609,760	90.20%	-3.53%
(495,088)	12,659,810	91.24%	-3.57%
(547,730)	14,005,887	89.34%	-3.49%
(72,518)	1,854,354	100.45%	-3.93%
(302,131)	7,725,733	99.37%	-3.89%
(645,521)	16,506,487	90.38%	-3.53%
(53,629)	1,371,333	92.60%	-3.62%
(93,739)	2,396,969	117.57%	-4.60%
(1,016,990)	26,005,254	91.05%	-3.56%
(369,107)	9,438,369	87.88%	-3.44%
(255,634)	6,536,759	88.03%	-3.44%
(7,245,047)	185,261,702	88.42%	-3.46%
(972,458)	24,866,548	90.90%	-3.55%
(73,605)	1,882,142	115.52%	-4.52%
(5,247,473)	134,182,128	86.18%	-3.37%
(4,273,253)	109,270,534	89.32%	-3.49%
(185,503)	4,743,456	113.02%	-4.42%
(5,287,053)	135,194,202	86.31%	-3.38%
(6,904,785)	176,560,928	93.17%	-3.64%
(2,521,008)	64,464,206	116.56%	-4.56%
(1,971,421)	50,410,833	94.17%	-3.68%
(730,646)	18,683,219	95.85%	-3.75%
(1,672,422)	42,765,177	87.22%	-3.41%
(1,043,214)	26,675,822	91.80%	-3.59%
(3,681,901)	94,149,167	96.71%	-3.78%
(644,979)	16,492,632	97.35%	-3.81%
(630,309)	16,117,509	88.57%	-3.46%
-	1,006,553	161.53%	0.00%
(167,840)	4,291,799	88.65%	-3.47%
(1,121,210)	28,670,252	91.18%	-3.57%
(1,199,986)	30,684,610	99.84%	-3.90%
(1,223,027)	31,273,775	84.40%	-3.30%
(318,714)	8,149,775	85.92%	-3.36%
(229,792)	5,875,958	91.43%	-3.58%
(77,330)	1,977,393	86.84%	-3.40%
(1,271,477)	32,512,684	84.34%	-3.30%
(190,090)	4,860,760	95.58%	-3.74%
(1,743,454)	44,581,537	94.86%	-3.71%
(596,823)	15,261,239	87.18%	-3.41%
(239,047)	6,112,620	77.54%	-3.03%
<b>(96,982,000)</b>	<b>2,481,867,415</b>	<b>91.31%</b>	<b>-3.57%</b>

new statewide average

Floor courts (2)  
Cluster 1 courts (13)

Court	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation	2024-25 Workload Formula Need	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (BEFORE Reduction)
Alameda	92,771,185	94,645,177	98.02%
Alpine	952,915	549,681	173.36%
Amador	4,485,969	4,684,703	95.76%
Butte	14,290,796	14,689,951	97.28%
Calaveras	3,410,497	3,767,570	90.52%
Colusa	2,548,958	2,635,032	96.73%
Contra Costa	53,336,440	59,907,816	89.03%
Del Norte	4,621,814	3,875,339	119.26%
El Dorado	9,840,777	10,819,495	90.95%
Fresno	66,162,075	66,287,167	99.81%
Glenn	3,105,736	3,237,289	95.94%
Humboldt	9,326,193	9,318,361	100.08%
Imperial	10,531,943	8,073,327	130.45%
Inyo	2,607,930	2,676,571	97.44%
Kern	69,415,149	68,776,330	100.93%
Kings	11,203,859	12,025,488	93.17%
Lake	5,250,155	6,056,222	86.69%
Lassen	2,673,991	2,580,519	103.62%
Los Angeles	741,516,966	791,102,381	93.73%
Madera	13,154,899	13,875,025	94.81%
Marin	14,553,616	15,677,866	92.83%
Mariposa	1,926,873	1,846,094	104.38%
Mendocino	8,027,864	7,775,002	103.25%
Merced	17,152,008	18,264,043	93.91%
Modoc	1,424,962	1,480,959	96.22%
Mono	2,490,708	2,038,771	122.17%
Monterey	27,022,244	28,560,984	94.61%
Napa	9,807,477	10,740,134	91.32%
Nevada	6,792,392	7,425,652	91.47%
Orange	192,506,749	209,526,287	91.88%
Placer	25,839,006	27,355,659	94.46%
Plumas	1,955,747	1,629,248	120.04%
Riverside	139,429,602	155,691,163	89.56%
Sacramento	113,543,787	122,332,264	92.82%
San Benito	4,928,959	4,197,092	117.44%
San Bernardino	140,481,254	156,640,095	89.68%
San Diego	183,465,714	189,500,353	96.82%
San Francisco	66,985,214	55,305,114	121.12%
San Joaquin	52,382,255	53,533,653	97.85%
San Luis Obispo	19,413,865	19,492,482	99.60%
San Mateo	44,437,598	49,033,290	90.63%
Santa Barbara	27,719,036	29,058,002	95.39%
Santa Clara	97,831,068	97,354,039	100.49%
Santa Cruz	17,137,610	16,940,790	101.16%
Shasta	16,747,818	18,198,452	92.03%
Sierra	1,006,553	623,149	161.53%
Siskiyou	4,459,639	4,841,098	92.12%
Solano	29,791,462	31,445,139	94.74%
Sonoma	31,884,596	30,732,916	103.75%
Stanislaus	32,496,801	37,054,820	87.70%
Sutter	8,468,489	9,485,325	89.28%
Tehama	6,105,750	6,426,611	95.01%
Trinity	2,054,724	2,276,992	90.24%
Tulare	33,784,161	38,548,955	87.64%
Tuolumne	5,050,850	5,085,552	99.32%
Ventura	46,324,991	46,999,346	98.57%
Yolo	15,858,062	17,504,806	90.59%
Yuba	6,351,667	7,883,564	80.57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,578,849,415</b>	<b>2,718,089,203</b>	<b>94.88%</b>

statewide average

Pro Rata Reduction Allocation - Workload Formula Need			
Total Reduction	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation (AFTER Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (AFTER Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage CHANGE
(3,378,418)	89,392,767	94.45%	-3.57%
-	952,915	173.36%	0.00%
(167,223)	4,318,745	92.19%	-3.57%
(524,367)	13,766,429	93.71%	-3.57%
(134,486)	3,276,011	86.95%	-3.57%
(94,059)	2,454,899	93.16%	-3.57%
(2,138,446)	51,197,994	85.46%	-3.57%
(138,333)	4,483,481	115.69%	-3.57%
(386,209)	9,454,569	87.38%	-3.57%
(2,366,161)	63,795,914	96.24%	-3.57%
(115,557)	2,990,179	92.37%	-3.57%
(332,625)	8,993,568	96.51%	-3.57%
(288,182)	10,243,761	126.88%	-3.57%
(95,542)	2,512,388	93.87%	-3.57%
(2,455,013)	66,960,135	97.36%	-3.57%
(429,257)	10,774,602	89.60%	-3.57%
(216,181)	5,033,974	83.12%	-3.57%
(92,113)	2,581,878	100.05%	-3.57%
(28,238,886)	713,278,080	90.16%	-3.57%
(495,278)	12,659,621	91.24%	-3.57%
(559,631)	13,993,985	89.26%	-3.57%
(65,897)	1,860,975	100.81%	-3.57%
(277,533)	7,750,331	99.68%	-3.57%
(651,946)	16,500,062	90.34%	-3.57%
(52,864)	1,372,098	92.65%	-3.57%
(72,775)	2,417,933	118.60%	-3.57%
(1,019,502)	26,002,742	91.04%	-3.57%
(383,376)	9,424,101	87.75%	-3.57%
(265,063)	6,527,329	87.90%	-3.57%
(7,479,170)	185,027,579	88.31%	-3.57%
(976,477)	24,862,529	90.89%	-3.57%
(58,157)	1,897,590	116.47%	-3.57%
(5,557,492)	133,872,110	85.99%	-3.57%
(4,366,725)	109,177,062	89.25%	-3.57%
(149,818)	4,779,141	113.87%	-3.57%
(5,591,364)	134,889,890	86.11%	-3.57%
(6,764,332)	176,701,382	93.25%	-3.57%
(1,974,150)	65,011,064	117.55%	-3.57%
(1,910,917)	50,471,338	94.28%	-3.57%
(695,796)	18,718,069	96.03%	-3.57%
(1,750,273)	42,687,325	87.06%	-3.57%
(1,037,243)	26,681,793	91.82%	-3.57%
(3,475,112)	94,355,956	96.92%	-3.57%
(604,712)	16,532,899	97.59%	-3.57%
(649,605)	16,098,213	88.46%	-3.57%
-	1,006,553	161.53%	0.00%
(172,806)	4,286,833	88.55%	-3.57%
(1,122,454)	28,669,008	91.17%	-3.57%
(1,097,030)	30,787,565	100.18%	-3.57%
(1,322,695)	31,174,107	84.13%	-3.57%
(338,585)	8,129,904	85.71%	-3.57%
(229,402)	5,876,348	91.44%	-3.57%
(81,279)	1,973,445	86.67%	-3.57%
(1,376,029)	32,408,132	84.07%	-3.57%
(181,532)	4,869,318	95.75%	-3.57%
(1,677,671)	44,647,321	95.00%	-3.57%
(624,845)	15,233,217	87.02%	-3.57%
(281,409)	6,070,259	77.00%	-3.57%
<b>(96,982,000)</b>	<b>2,481,867,415</b>	<b>91.31%</b>	<b>-3.57%</b>

new statewide average

Floor courts (2)  
Cluster 1 courts (13)

Court	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation	2024-25 Workload Formula Need	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (BEFORE Reduction)
Alameda	92,771,185	94,645,177	98.02%
Alpine	952,915	549,681	173.36%
Amador	4,485,969	4,684,703	95.76%
Butte	14,290,796	14,689,951	97.28%
Calaveras	3,410,497	3,767,570	90.52%
Colusa	2,548,958	2,635,032	96.73%
Contra Costa	53,336,440	59,907,816	89.03%
Del Norte	4,621,814	3,875,339	119.26%
El Dorado	9,840,777	10,819,495	90.95%
Fresno	66,162,075	66,287,167	99.81%
Glenn	3,105,736	3,237,289	95.94%
Humboldt	9,326,193	9,318,361	100.08%
Imperial	10,531,943	8,073,327	130.45%
Inyo	2,607,930	2,676,571	97.44%
Kern	69,415,149	68,776,330	100.93%
Kings	11,203,859	12,025,488	93.17%
Lake	5,250,155	6,056,222	86.69%
Lassen	2,673,991	2,580,519	103.62%
Los Angeles	741,516,966	791,102,381	93.73%
Madera	13,154,899	13,875,025	94.81%
Marin	14,553,616	15,677,866	92.83%
Mariposa	1,926,873	1,846,094	104.38%
Mendocino	8,027,864	7,775,002	103.25%
Merced	17,152,008	18,264,043	93.91%
Modoc	1,424,962	1,480,959	96.22%
Mono	2,490,708	2,038,771	122.17%
Monterey	27,022,244	28,560,984	94.61%
Napa	9,807,477	10,740,134	91.32%
Nevada	6,792,392	7,425,652	91.47%
Orange	192,506,749	209,526,287	91.88%
Placer	25,839,006	27,355,659	94.46%
Plumas	1,955,747	1,629,248	120.04%
Riverside	139,429,602	155,691,163	89.56%
Sacramento	113,543,787	122,332,264	92.82%
San Benito	4,928,959	4,197,092	117.44%
San Bernardino	140,481,254	156,640,095	89.68%
San Diego	183,465,714	189,500,353	96.82%
San Francisco	66,985,214	55,305,114	121.12%
San Joaquin	52,382,255	53,533,653	97.85%
San Luis Obispo	19,413,865	19,492,482	99.60%
San Mateo	44,437,598	49,033,290	90.63%
Santa Barbara	27,719,036	29,058,002	95.39%
Santa Clara	97,831,068	97,354,039	100.49%
Santa Cruz	17,137,610	16,940,790	101.16%
Shasta	16,747,818	18,198,452	92.03%
Sierra	1,006,553	623,149	161.53%
Siskiyou	4,459,639	4,841,098	92.12%
Solano	29,791,462	31,445,139	94.74%
Sonoma	31,884,596	30,732,916	103.75%
Stanislaus	32,496,801	37,054,820	87.70%
Sutter	8,468,489	9,485,325	89.28%
Tehama	6,105,750	6,426,611	95.01%
Trinity	2,054,724	2,276,992	90.24%
Tulare	33,784,161	38,548,955	87.64%
Tuolumne	5,050,850	5,085,552	99.32%
Ventura	46,324,991	46,999,346	98.57%
Yolo	15,858,062	17,504,806	90.59%
Yuba	6,351,667	7,883,564	80.57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,578,849,415</b>	<b>2,718,089,203</b>	<b>94.88%</b>

statewide average

Reverse Workload Formula Equity Reduction Allocation			
Total Reduction	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation (AFTER Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (AFTER Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage CHANGE
(5,254,552)	87,516,633	92.47%	-5.55%
-	952,915	173.36%	0.00%
(151,506)	4,334,463	92.52%	-3.23%
(704,610)	13,586,185	92.49%	-4.80%
(83,824)	3,326,673	88.30%	-2.22%
(111,560)	2,437,398	92.50%	-4.23%
(1,310,913)	52,025,527	86.84%	-2.19%
(374,926)	4,246,887	109.59%	-9.67%
(241,868)	9,598,909	88.72%	-2.24%
(4,896,750)	61,265,325	92.42%	-7.39%
(110,617)	2,995,119	92.52%	-3.42%
(714,405)	8,611,787	92.42%	-7.67%
(854,362)	9,677,582	119.87%	-10.58%
(132,570)	2,475,360	92.48%	-4.95%
(5,631,027)	63,784,122	92.74%	-8.19%
(275,371)	10,928,489	90.88%	-2.29%
(129,039)	5,121,116	84.56%	-2.13%
(216,917)	2,457,074	95.22%	-8.41%
(18,225,140)	723,291,825	91.43%	-2.30%
(323,324)	12,831,575	92.48%	-2.33%
(357,701)	14,195,915	90.55%	-2.28%
(156,310)	1,770,563	95.91%	-8.47%
(651,228)	7,376,636	94.88%	-8.38%
(421,565)	16,730,443	91.60%	-2.31%
(54,891)	1,370,071	92.51%	-3.71%
(202,049)	2,288,659	112.26%	-9.91%
(664,158)	26,358,086	92.29%	-2.33%
(241,050)	9,566,427	89.07%	-2.24%
(166,945)	6,625,448	89.22%	-2.25%
(4,731,466)	187,775,283	89.62%	-2.26%
(635,076)	25,203,930	92.13%	-2.32%
(158,652)	1,797,095	110.30%	-9.74%
(3,426,926)	136,002,675	87.35%	-2.20%
(2,790,700)	110,753,087	90.53%	-2.28%
(399,842)	4,529,117	107.91%	-9.53%
(3,452,774)	137,028,480	87.48%	-2.20%
(8,182,165)	175,283,548	92.50%	-4.32%
(5,433,908)	61,551,306	111.29%	-9.83%
(2,878,435)	49,503,820	92.47%	-5.38%
(1,397,084)	18,016,782	92.43%	-7.17%
(1,092,195)	43,345,403	88.40%	-2.23%
(830,874)	26,888,162	92.53%	-2.86%
(7,868,702)	89,962,366	92.41%	-8.08%
(1,390,220)	15,747,390	92.96%	-8.21%
(411,631)	16,336,187	89.77%	-2.26%
-	1,006,553	161.53%	0.00%
(109,610)	4,350,029	89.86%	-2.26%
(732,220)	29,059,242	92.41%	-2.33%
(2,586,510)	29,298,085	95.33%	-8.42%
(798,712)	31,698,089	85.54%	-2.16%
(208,140)	8,260,349	87.09%	-2.19%
(158,423)	5,947,326	92.54%	-2.47%
(50,501)	2,004,222	88.02%	-2.22%
(830,353)	32,953,807	85.49%	-2.15%
(349,957)	4,700,893	92.44%	-6.88%
(2,871,869)	43,453,122	92.45%	-6.11%
(389,762)	15,468,300	88.37%	-2.23%
(156,112)	6,195,555	78.59%	-1.98%
<b>(96,982,000)</b>	<b>2,481,867,415</b>	<b>91.31%</b>	<b>-3.57%</b>

new statewide average

Floor courts (2)  
Cluster 1 courts (13)

Court	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation	2024-25 Workload Need Formula	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (BEFORE Reduction)
Alameda	92,771,185	94,645,177	98.02%
Alpine	952,915	549,681	173.36%
Amador	4,485,969	4,684,703	95.76%
Butte	14,290,796	14,689,951	97.28%
Calaveras	3,410,497	3,767,570	90.52%
Colusa	2,548,958	2,635,032	96.73%
Contra Costa	53,336,440	59,907,816	89.03%
Del Norte	4,621,814	3,875,339	119.26%
El Dorado	9,840,777	10,819,495	90.95%
Fresno	66,162,075	66,287,167	99.81%
Glenn	3,105,736	3,237,289	95.94%
Humboldt	9,326,193	9,318,361	100.08%
Imperial	10,531,943	8,073,327	130.45%
Inyo	2,607,930	2,676,571	97.44%
Kern	69,415,149	68,776,330	100.93%
Kings	11,203,859	12,025,488	93.17%
Lake	5,250,155	6,056,222	86.69%
Lassen	2,673,991	2,580,519	103.62%
Los Angeles	741,516,966	791,102,381	93.73%
Madera	13,154,899	13,875,025	94.81%
Marin	14,553,616	15,677,866	92.83%
Mariposa	1,926,873	1,846,094	104.38%
Mendocino	8,027,864	7,775,002	103.25%
Merced	17,152,008	18,264,043	93.91%
Modoc	1,424,962	1,480,959	96.22%
Mono	2,490,708	2,038,771	122.17%
Monterey	27,022,244	28,560,984	94.61%
Napa	9,807,477	10,740,134	91.32%
Nevada	6,792,392	7,425,652	91.47%
Orange	192,506,749	209,526,287	91.88%
Placer	25,839,006	27,355,659	94.46%
Plumas	1,955,747	1,629,248	120.04%
Riverside	139,429,602	155,691,163	89.56%
Sacramento	113,543,787	122,332,264	92.82%
San Benito	4,928,959	4,197,092	117.44%
San Bernardino	140,481,254	156,640,095	89.68%
San Diego	183,465,714	189,500,353	96.82%
San Francisco	66,985,214	55,305,114	121.12%
San Joaquin	52,382,255	53,533,653	97.85%
San Luis Obispo	19,413,865	19,492,482	99.60%
San Mateo	44,437,598	49,033,290	90.63%
Santa Barbara	27,719,036	29,058,002	95.39%
Santa Clara	97,831,068	97,354,039	100.49%
Santa Cruz	17,137,610	16,940,790	101.16%
Shasta	16,747,818	18,198,452	92.03%
Sierra	1,006,553	623,149	161.53%
Siskiyou	4,459,639	4,841,098	92.12%
Solano	29,791,462	31,445,139	94.74%
Sonoma	31,884,596	30,732,916	103.75%
Stanislaus	32,496,801	37,054,820	87.70%
Sutter	8,468,489	9,485,325	89.28%
Tehama	6,105,750	6,426,611	95.01%
Trinity	2,054,724	2,276,992	90.24%
Tulare	33,784,161	38,548,955	87.64%
Tuolumne	5,050,850	5,085,552	99.32%
Ventura	46,324,991	46,999,346	98.57%
Yolo	15,858,062	17,504,806	90.59%
Yuba	6,351,667	7,883,564	80.57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,578,849,415</b>	<b>2,718,089,203</b>	<b>94.88%</b>

statewide average

Reverse Workload Formula Equity Reduction Allocation w/Band			
Total Reduction	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation (AFTER Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (AFTER Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage CHANGE
(4,458,461)	88,312,724	93.31%	-4.71%
-	952,915	173.36%	0.00%
(179,427)	4,306,542	91.93%	-3.83%
(583,710)	13,707,086	93.31%	-3.97%
(93,890)	3,316,607	88.03%	-2.49%
(100,923)	2,448,035	92.90%	-3.83%
(1,468,338)	51,868,102	86.58%	-2.45%
(148,428)	4,473,386	115.43%	-3.83%
(270,914)	9,569,863	88.45%	-2.50%
(3,201,710)	62,960,365	94.98%	-4.83%
(123,990)	2,981,746	92.11%	-3.83%
(450,082)	8,876,110	95.25%	-4.83%
(389,947)	10,141,997	125.62%	-4.83%
(102,514)	2,505,415	93.61%	-3.83%
(3,321,938)	66,093,210	96.10%	-4.83%
(460,583)	10,743,276	89.34%	-3.83%
(144,535)	5,105,619	84.30%	-2.39%
(98,835)	2,575,155	99.79%	-3.83%
(30,299,700)	711,217,266	89.90%	-3.83%
(531,422)	12,623,477	90.98%	-3.83%
(400,657)	14,152,959	90.27%	-2.56%
(70,707)	1,856,166	100.55%	-3.83%
(375,537)	7,652,327	98.42%	-4.83%
(699,524)	16,452,484	90.08%	-3.83%
(56,722)	1,368,240	92.39%	-3.83%
(78,086)	2,412,622	118.34%	-3.83%
(1,093,903)	25,928,341	90.78%	-3.83%
(269,997)	9,537,479	88.80%	-2.51%
(186,993)	6,605,399	88.95%	-2.52%
(5,299,661)	187,207,088	89.35%	-2.53%
(1,047,738)	24,791,268	90.63%	-3.83%
(62,401)	1,893,346	116.21%	-3.83%
(3,838,461)	135,591,141	87.09%	-2.47%
(3,125,831)	110,417,956	90.26%	-2.56%
(160,751)	4,768,208	113.61%	-3.83%
(3,867,412)	136,613,842	87.22%	-2.47%
(7,257,978)	176,207,735	92.99%	-3.83%
(2,671,270)	64,313,943	116.29%	-4.83%
(2,430,393)	49,951,861	93.31%	-4.54%
(941,499)	18,472,367	94.77%	-4.83%
(1,223,356)	43,214,243	88.13%	-2.49%
(1,112,939)	26,606,097	91.56%	-3.83%
(4,702,259)	93,128,809	95.66%	-4.83%
(818,250)	16,319,360	96.33%	-4.83%
(461,063)	16,286,755	89.50%	-2.53%
-	1,006,553	161.53%	0.00%
(122,773)	4,336,867	89.58%	-2.54%
(1,204,368)	28,587,094	90.91%	-3.83%
(1,484,418)	30,400,177	98.92%	-4.83%
(894,628)	31,602,173	85.28%	-2.41%
(233,135)	8,235,353	86.82%	-2.46%
(246,143)	5,859,606	91.18%	-3.83%
(56,566)	1,998,158	87.75%	-2.48%
(930,069)	32,854,091	85.23%	-2.41%
(245,635)	4,805,215	94.49%	-4.83%
(2,270,097)	44,054,894	93.74%	-4.83%
(436,568)	15,421,494	88.10%	-2.49%
(174,860)	6,176,807	78.35%	-2.22%
<b>(96,982,000)</b>	<b>2,481,867,415</b>	<b>91.31%</b>	<b>-3.57%</b>

new statewide average

Floor courts (2)  
Cluster 1 courts (13)