



Judicial Council of California

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS MAY 7, 2025

VIRTUAL MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the April 16, 2025 meeting	4
Discussion and Possible Action Item (Items 1-4)	
Item 1 – AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)	7
Attachment 1A: Child Support Commissioner (CSC) Program Allocation, 2025–26.....	9
Attachment 1B: Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program Allocation, 2025–26.....	10
Item 2 – Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)	11
Attachment 2A: Fiscal Year 2025–26 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding.....	13
Attachment 2B: Fiscal Year 2025–26 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology	14
Item 3 – Pretrial Release Program Allocations for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)	15
Attachment 3A: Recommended FY 2025–26 Pretrial Release Program Ongoing Allocations	18
Item 4 – Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2025–26	20
Attachment 4A: Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2025–26	22



Judicial Council of California

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

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

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2025
Time: 12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Public Video Livestream: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/4015>

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 16, 2025, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

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

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen-only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by 12:00 p.m. on May 6, 2025, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-4)

Item 1

AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of FY 2025–26 allocations for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator programs.

Presenter: Ms. Lollie Roberts, Supervising Attorney, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 2

Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of FY 2025–26 allocations for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel.

Presenter: Ms. Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 3

Pretrial Release Program Allocations for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of FY 2025–26 allocations and funding floor adjustment for the Pretrial Release Program.

Presenter: Ms. Deirdre Benedict, Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services

Item 4

Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of FY 2025–26 allocations to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil case types.

Presenter: Mr. Marshall Comia, Associate Analyst, Judicial Council Policy & Research

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEM (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

Update of Resource Assessment Study Model and Workload Formula

Update of the Resource Assessment Study model approved by the Judicial Council at its April 2025 meeting and formula inputs to the Workload Formula.

Presenters: Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and Analytics Officer, Judicial Council Research, Analytics, and Data

Ms. Kristin Greenaway, Manager, Judicial Council Research, Analytics, and Data

Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

Ms. Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



Judicial Council of California

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm

tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

April 16, 2025

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/4014>

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Judith C. Clark, Hon. Julie A. Emede, Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab, Hon. Wendy G. Getty, Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Hon. David C. Kalemkarian, Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Hon. Michael J. Reinhart, and Hon. Lisa M. Rogan

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Vice Chair), Ms. Stephanie Cameron, Mr. Chad Finke, Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Darrel E. Parker, Mr. Brandon E. Riley, Mr. Chris Ruhl, Ms. Kim Turner, Mr. David W. Slayton, and Mr. David H. Yamasaki

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. J. Eric Bradshaw, Hon. Sonny S. Sandhu, Mr. Shawn C. Landry, and Mr. Michael M. Roddy

Others Present: Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Donna Newman, Ms. Oksana Tuk, and Ms. Rose Lane

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

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

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body approved the minutes of the February 26, 2025, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1-6)

Item 1 – Fiscal Year (FY) 2026–27 Budget Change Concepts Under Purview of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (Action Required)

Consideration of budget change concepts for FY 2026–27 from other advisory bodies under purview of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.

Action: The TCBAC unanimously voted to support the budget change concepts submitted by other advisory bodies without prioritization for Judicial Branch Budget Committee consideration at its May 16, 2025, meeting.

Item 2 – Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of allocations from the IMF in support of the trial courts for FY 2025–26

Action: The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations from the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting:

1. A total of \$47.9 million in allocations for FY 2025–26 from the IMF to fund specific programs and services for the trial courts; and
2. The delegation of authority to the Administrative Director to authorize baseline technical adjustments, up to a maximum of 10 percent of specific allocations, to allow for the efficient implementation of required budgetary adjustments.

Item 3 – Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocations for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of CARE Act allocations to the trial courts for FY 2025–26.

Action: The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the CARE Act allocations to the trial courts for FY 2025–26 as outlined in Attachment 3A, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26 for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting.

Item 4 – Funding Reallocation in FY 2025–26 with No New Money (Action Required)

Consideration of a reallocation of existing funding in FY 2025–26 to support equity for the trial courts per the Workload Formula policy regarding no new money.

Action: The TCBAC voted to approve (with one opposition) the following recommendations from the Funding Methodology Subcommittee for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting:

1. The equity-based reallocation of existing funding for the trial courts for FY 2025–26 based on specified steps in the Workload Formula policy regarding no new money as displayed in Attachment 4A. The final reallocation will be based on the new calculated need and technical adjustments for FY 2025–26 and is contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26; and
2. The sequence of funding adjustments for FY 2025–26 so that the equity-based reallocation of existing funding as noted in recommendation #1 occurs first before adding the \$40 million for increased operational costs for the trial courts, which is detailed in Item 5 of the agenda.

Item 5 – Allocation Methodology for \$40 Million for Trial Court Operational Cost Increases (Action Required)

Consideration of an allocation methodology for the ongoing \$40 million included in the FY 2025–26 Governor's Budget to address operational cost increases for the trial courts.

Action: *The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations from the Funding Methodology Subcommittee for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting:*

1. *The \$40 million allocation for operational cost increases as a proportional increase over each trial court's FY 2024–25 Workload Formula allocation as displayed in Attachment 5A, including technical adjustments to the calculation and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26; and*
2. *The sequence of funding adjustments for FY 2025–26 so that the \$40 million allocation is added after the equity-based reallocation of existing funding in the second year of no new money (as described in Item 4 of the agenda).*

Item 6 – Allocation Methodologies for Potential Future Funding Reductions and Restoration (Action Required)

Consideration of allocation methodologies for potential reductions and restoration of funding for the trial courts in future budget years.

Action: *The TCBAC voted to approve (with one opposition) the following recommendations from the Funding Methodology Subcommittee for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting:*

1. *The Reverse Workload Formula equity reduction allocation without reduction limitation calculated on each court's Workload Formula allocation for any potential future funding reduction. The steps are outlined on page 3 and utilize a 4 percent band around the statewide average funding level as displayed in Attachment 6A;*
2. *An allocation methodology for a restoration of funding that occurs in the same fiscal year the reduction took place based on a recalculation of the reduction using the initial methodology with restored funding as displayed in Attachment 6B; and*
3. *An allocation methodology for a restoration of funding in a future fiscal year that follows a reduction in a prior fiscal year based on the existing Judicial Council-approved Workload Formula methodology calculated on the Workload Formula need amount as displayed in Attachment 6C.*

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:27 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: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding for FY 2025–26

Date: 5/7/2025

Contact: Anna Maves, Principal Managing Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
916-263-8624 | anna.maves@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of Assembly Bill (AB) 1058 Child Support Commissioner (CSC) and Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program allocations for fiscal year (FY) 2025–26 totaling \$48 million for the CSC Program and \$16.3 million for the FLF Program.

Background

The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee was established by the Judicial Council in April 2015 to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 for the CSC and FLF Program, as required by AB 1058. On January 15, 2019, the Judicial Council approved a new workload-based funding methodology for the AB 1058 CSC Program while maintaining the historical FLF funding methodology until FY 2021–22 as recommended by the subcommittee.¹

On July 9, 2021, the Judicial Council approved a new population-based methodology for the FLF Program and maintained the workload-based methodology with updated workload data for the CSC Program.² The Judicial Council directed that each methodology be updated with new data every two years.

For FY 2025–26, the CSC funding methodology was updated with new workload data and the FLF funding methodology was adjusted with updated population data consistent with the previously adopted methodologies.

On April 28, 2025, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee met to review the AB

¹ More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the January 2019 meeting: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation* (Nov. 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6953308&GUID=A6F15A78-08B6-42DA-8826-19A6AF0B7CB1>.

² More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the July 2021 meeting: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Child Support: Updating Workload Data for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner Funding Methodology, Adopting a Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Methodology, and Adopting 2021–22 AB 1058 Program Funding Allocations* (May 14, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9508521&GUID=BC737E96-AFD8-4E22-A046-AE9E16A5C422>.

1058 CSC and FLF Program funding allocations for FY 2025–26, which are summarized in the Recommendation section below.

The final allocations will be updated based on any needed technical adjustments and are contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

Recommendation

1. Approve the FY 2025–26 AB 1058 CSC Program funding comprised of \$35 million in base funding allocations and \$13 million in anticipated federal drawdown funding using the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council in January 2019 as set forth in Attachment 1A, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.
2. Approve the FY 2025–26 AB 1058 FLF Program funding comprised of \$11.9 million in base funding allocations and \$4.4 million in anticipated federal drawdown funding using the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council in July 2021 as set forth in Attachment 1B, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

These recommendations will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment 1A: Child Support Commissioner (CSC) Program Allocation, 2025–26
2. Attachment 1B: Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program Allocation, 2025–26
3. Link 1: *Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation* (Nov. 21, 2018),
<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6953308&GUID=A6F15A78-08B6-42DA-8826-19A6AF0B7CBL>.
4. Link 2: *Child Support: Updating Workload Data for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner Funding Methodology, Adopting a Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Methodology, and Adopting 2021–22 AB 1058 Program Funding Allocations* (May 14, 2021),
<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9508521&GUID=BC737E96-AFD8-4E22-A046-AE9E16A5C422>.

Child Support Commissioner (CSC) Program Allocation, 2025-26							
		A	B	C	D	E	F
#	CSC Court	Base Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Federal Share 66% (Column B * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column B * .34)	Total Allocation (A + B)	Contract Amount (A + C)
1	Alameda	\$1,459,123	\$549,815	\$362,878	\$186,937	\$2,008,938	\$1,822,001
2	Alpine (see El Dorado)	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Amador	140,250	45,736	30,186	15,550	185,986	170,436
4	Butte	246,102	0	0	0	246,102	246,102
5	Calaveras	132,667	10,000	6,600	3,400	142,667	139,267
6	Colusa	45,691	15,809	10,434	5,375	61,500	56,125
7	Contra Costa	716,158	0	0	0	716,158	716,158
8	Del Norte	64,458	29,023	19,155	9,868	93,481	83,613
9	El Dorado	203,169	100,382	66,252	34,130	303,551	269,421
10	Fresno	1,773,471	1,187,832	783,969	403,863	2,961,303	2,557,440
11	Glenn	120,030	0	0	0	120,030	120,030
12	Humboldt	123,261	21,340	14,084	7,255	144,600	137,345
13	Imperial	228,895	149,031	98,360	50,670	377,926	327,255
14	Inyo	79,264	0	0	0	79,264	79,264
15	Kern	1,110,916	109,223	72,087	37,136	1,220,139	1,183,003
16	Kings	248,243	75,000	49,500	25,500	323,243	297,743
17	Lake	127,256	90,500	59,730	30,770	217,756	186,986
18	Lassen	60,000	0	0	0	60,000	60,000
19	Los Angeles	7,125,385	3,198,270	2,110,858	1,087,412	10,323,655	9,236,243
20	Madera	247,193	88,000	58,080	29,920	335,193	305,273
21	Marin	103,534	41,384	27,313	14,070	144,917	130,847
22	Mariposa	75,216	0	0	0	75,216	75,216
23	Mendocino	139,679	56,550	37,323	19,227	196,229	177,002
24	Merced	477,833	297,354	196,254	101,100	775,187	674,087
25	Modoc	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	Mono	45,974	0	0	0	45,974	45,974
27	Monterey	358,944	166,550	109,923	56,627	525,494	468,867
28	Napa	91,029	0	0	0	91,029	91,029
29	Nevada	327,593	0	0	0	327,593	327,593
30	Orange	2,039,387	595,474	393,013	202,461	2,634,861	2,432,400
31	Placer	295,988	20,870	13,774	7,096	316,858	309,763
32	Plumas	95,777	0	0	0	95,777	95,777
33	Riverside	1,683,409	41,240	27,218	14,021	1,724,648	1,710,627
34	Sacramento	1,368,625	614,817	405,779	209,038	1,983,442	1,774,405
35	San Benito	135,384	30,000	19,800	10,200	165,384	155,184
36	San Bernardino	3,323,840	954,601	630,037	324,564	4,278,441	3,953,877
37	San Diego	2,021,832	1,204,380	794,890	409,489	3,226,211	2,816,722
38	San Francisco	740,318	363,320	239,791	123,529	1,103,638	980,110
39	San Joaquin	891,914	83,046	54,810	28,236	974,960	946,724
40	San Luis Obispo	189,244	127,093	83,881	43,212	316,337	273,125
41	San Mateo	319,659	163,455	107,880	55,575	483,114	427,539
42	Santa Barbara	392,688	297,025	196,036	100,988	689,713	588,725
43	Santa Clara	1,455,040	977,183	644,941	332,242	2,432,223	2,099,981
44	Santa Cruz	160,012	99,848	65,900	33,948	259,860	225,912
45	Shasta	417,575	239,030	157,760	81,270	656,605	575,335
46	Sierra (see Nevada)	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Siskiyou	106,931	0	0	0	106,931	106,931
48	Solano	536,421	95,481	63,017	32,464	631,902	599,439
49	Sonoma	409,185	0	0	0	409,185	409,185
50	Stanislaus	687,893	406,836	268,512	138,324	1,094,729	956,405
51	Sutter	164,817	63,487	41,901	21,586	228,304	206,719
52	Tehama	114,033	56,982	37,608	19,374	171,015	151,641
53	Trinity (see Shasta)	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	Tulare	498,059	104,642	69,064	35,578	602,701	567,123
55	Tuolumne	150,638	78,346	51,708	26,638	228,984	202,346
56	Ventura	476,024	175,000	115,500	59,500	651,024	591,524
57	Yolo	205,259	15,000	9,900	5,100	220,259	215,159
58	Yuba	203,149	0	0	0	203,149	203,149
TOTAL		\$34,954,436	\$13,038,953	\$8,605,709	\$4,433,244	\$47,993,389	\$43,560,145

CSC Base Funds	\$34,954,436
CSC Federal Drawdown	\$13,038,953
Total Funding Allocated	\$47,993,389

Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program Allocation, 2025–26							
		A	B	C	D	E	F
#	FLF Court	Base Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Federal Share 66% (Column B * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column B * .34)	Total Allocation (A + B)	Contract Amount (A + C)
1	Alameda	\$433,683	\$252,301	\$166,519	\$85,782	\$685,984	\$600,202
2	Alpine (see El Dorado)	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Amador	47,097	4,701	3,103	1,598	51,798	50,200
4	Butte	88,358	61,250	40,425	20,825	149,608	128,783
5	Calaveras	70,907	8,000	5,280	2,720	78,907	76,187
6	Colusa	38,924	8,900	5,874	3,026	47,824	44,798
7	Contra Costa	325,543	0	0	0	325,543	325,543
8	Del Norte	50,155	5,971	3,941	2,030	56,126	54,095
9	El Dorado	107,111	50,384	33,253	17,131	157,495	140,364
10	Fresno	343,407	198,952	131,308	67,644	542,359	474,715
11	Glenn	75,971	0	0	0	75,971	75,971
12	Humboldt	77,145	13,414	8,854	4,561	90,559	85,998
13	Imperial	70,668	36,940	24,380	12,560	107,608	95,049
14	Inyo	57,289	0	0	0	57,289	57,289
15	Kern	309,092	214,590	141,629	72,960	523,682	450,721
16	Kings	69,080	0	0	0	69,080	69,080
17	Lake	51,014	29,180	19,259	9,921	80,194	70,273
18	Lassen	65,167	695	458	236	65,862	65,626
19	Los Angeles	2,387,923	803,431	530,264	273,167	3,191,354	2,918,187
20	Madera	73,871	27,723	18,297	9,426	101,594	92,168
21	Marin	118,424	0	0	0	118,424	118,424
22	Mariposa	45,491	0	0	0	45,491	45,491
23	Mendocino	56,611	30,722	20,277	10,445	87,333	76,888
24	Merced	103,999	72,011	47,527	24,484	176,010	151,526
25	Modoc	70,995	1,247	823	424	72,242	71,818
26	Mono	48,322	1,350	891	459	49,672	49,213
27	Monterey	140,652	63,298	41,777	21,521	203,950	182,428
28	Napa	67,876	42,148	27,817	14,330	110,024	95,694
29	Nevada	116,579	0	0	0	116,579	116,579
30	Orange	729,593	137,558	90,788	46,770	867,150	820,381
31	Placer	117,770	0	0	0	117,770	117,770
32	Plumas	55,935	596	393	203	56,531	56,328
33	Riverside	648,531	247,124	163,102	84,022	895,654	811,632
34	Sacramento	388,046	228,157	150,584	77,573	616,203	538,630
35	San Benito	60,627	30,632	20,217	10,415	91,259	80,845
36	San Bernardino	553,813	336,866	222,332	114,535	890,679	776,144
37	San Diego	784,922	287,647	189,847	97,800	1,072,569	974,769
38	San Francisco	247,878	2,144	1,415	729	250,022	249,293
39	San Joaquin	225,333	88,008	58,085	29,923	313,341	283,418
40	San Luis Obispo	90,051	32,246	21,282	10,964	122,297	111,333
41	San Mateo	186,997	94,661	62,476	32,185	281,658	249,473
42	Santa Barbara	148,643	77,323	51,033	26,290	225,966	199,676
43	Santa Clara	509,605	210,712	139,070	71,642	720,317	648,675
44	Santa Cruz	93,515	47,055	31,056	15,999	140,570	124,572
45	Shasta	186,519	114,145	75,336	38,809	300,664	261,855
46	Sierra (see Nevada)	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Siskiyou	64,228	38,032	25,101	12,931	102,259	89,328
48	Solano	143,376	39,710	26,209	13,501	183,086	169,584
49	Sonoma	154,671	0	0	0	154,671	154,671
50	Stanislaus	190,628	126,365	83,401	42,964	316,992	274,029
51	Sutter	59,169	32,131	21,207	10,925	91,300	80,376
52	Tehama	40,272	3,535	2,333	1,202	43,807	42,605
53	Trinity (see Shasta)	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	Tulare	266,381	144,866	95,612	49,255	411,248	361,993
55	Tuolumne	55,606	30,084	19,855	10,229	85,690	75,461
56	Ventura	244,107	88,735	58,565	30,170	332,842	302,672
57	Yolo	87,707	39,193	25,867	13,326	126,900	113,574
58	Yuba	56,852	44,953	29,669	15,284	101,805	86,521
TOTAL		\$11,902,126	\$4,449,685	\$2,936,792	\$1,512,893	\$16,351,811	\$14,838,918

FLF Base Funds	\$11,902,126
FLF Federal Drawdown	\$4,449,685
Total Funding Allocated	\$16,351,811

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

Title: Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding for FY 2025–26

Date: 5/7/2025

Contact: Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
916-263-1693 | kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov
Arlene Negapatan, Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts
415-865-4564 | arlene.negapatan@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of fiscal year (FY) 2025–26 allocations of court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding for the trial courts.

Background

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

Court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding is distributed to the courts based on a workload model adopted by the Judicial Council in 2016¹ and amended in 2022.² The funding methodology includes several adjustments for small courts to ensure that these courts have adequate funding to meet their needs. Small-court adjustments include (1) suspending reallocation-related budget reductions for the smallest courts with caseloads under 200, (2) adjusting the local economic index for the small courts with dependency caseloads under 400, and (3) reducing the funding allocations of all large-court budgets to offset the costs for small courts.

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Staff Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (Apr. 1, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF>.

² Judicial Council of Cal., Staff Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2022–23 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding* (June 24, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11019079&GUID=CB0A2EE1-B3CF-43AC-B92B-F4724B5D209C>.

Based on current workload and filing information, 37 courts are in the small-court category with 27 of those courts meeting the “smallest court” criteria.³

The current annual budget for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel is \$186.7 million. The proposed trial court allocations are detailed in Attachment 2A. The total funding need for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel using the methodology designated in the Judicial Council reports listed above are outlined in Attachment 2B.

The final allocations will be updated based on any needed technical adjustments and are contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

Recommendation

Approve the FY 2025–26 court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel allocations as outlined in Attachment 2A, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting.

Attachments

1. Attachment 2A: Fiscal Year 2025–26 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding
2. Attachment 2B: Fiscal Year 2025–26 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology

³ Due to downward trends in dependency filings, the small-court adjustments have applied to more courts in recent years, which has resulted in some small courts receiving increased funding despite drops in caseloads.

Fiscal Year 2025–26 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Court	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Prior Year 2024-25	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Current Year 2025-26	2016-17 Allocation	2017-18 Allocation	2018-19 Allocation	2019-20 Allocation	2020-21 Allocation	2021-22 Allocation	2022-23 Allocation	2023-24 Allocation	2024-25 Allocation	2025-26 Proposed Allocation
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Alameda	\$5,507,175	\$5,200,616	\$3,618,313	\$3,565,629	\$3,399,620	\$3,629,342	\$3,422,591	\$3,348,652	\$3,840,167	\$3,903,699	\$4,150,739	\$4,127,206
Alpine	\$19,301	\$18,488	\$399	\$1,799	\$2,628	\$7,226	\$11,439	\$19,616	\$19,850	\$25,764	\$18,999	\$18,990
Amador	\$200,569	\$195,107	\$115,233	\$143,696	\$144,678	\$145,653	\$126,205	\$128,301	\$144,314	\$158,374	\$155,513	\$162,137
Butte	\$1,276,798	\$1,173,237	\$627,554	\$794,546	\$799,814	\$926,951	\$891,346	\$872,569	\$926,321	\$945,296	\$962,319	\$931,080
Calaveras	\$258,697	\$261,689	\$142,758	\$220,822	\$191,355	\$203,567	\$202,088	\$189,010	\$161,288	\$190,388	\$231,546	\$245,673
Colusa	\$99,107	\$92,682	\$40,667	\$43,948	\$72,637	\$103,517	\$117,871	\$112,668	\$99,064	\$111,854	\$101,811	\$100,335
Contra Costa	\$3,343,233	\$3,028,870	\$2,600,337	\$2,363,610	\$2,294,410	\$2,617,772	\$2,571,073	\$2,651,024	\$2,748,197	\$2,653,306	\$2,519,783	\$2,403,710
Del Norte	\$269,344	\$259,687	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$203,096	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$256,964	\$269,768	\$275,298
El Dorado	\$601,436	\$668,438	\$655,569	\$548,764	\$505,148	\$582,746	\$560,863	\$579,296	\$553,278	\$474,903	\$601,356	\$668,438
Fresno	\$6,778,404	\$6,453,499	\$2,670,600	\$3,015,746	\$2,800,979	\$3,209,875	\$3,302,907	\$3,735,438	\$4,462,884	\$4,787,455	\$5,108,860	\$5,121,494
Glenn	\$142,637	\$140,795	\$90,417	\$111,158	\$122,690	\$140,011	\$154,825	\$164,905	\$146,444	\$143,016	\$141,039	\$146,455
Humboldt	\$988,193	\$946,581	\$462,558	\$522,682	\$657,658	\$615,068	\$665,891	\$715,427	\$778,671	\$729,831	\$744,798	\$1,011,606
Imperial	\$747,666	\$702,205	\$518,512	\$576,150	\$562,114	\$645,919	\$693,729	\$669,610	\$681,656	\$581,336	\$809,029	\$797,587
Inyo	\$88,156	\$81,884	\$72,277	\$45,459	\$51,626	\$48,006	\$39,570	\$41,562	\$58,143	\$76,990	\$85,907	\$82,589
Kern	\$5,481,045	\$5,757,583	\$2,277,753	\$2,664,810	\$2,627,276	\$2,864,207	\$2,720,713	\$2,748,308	\$3,247,790	\$3,644,535	\$4,131,045	\$4,569,215
Kings	\$1,093,705	\$1,070,376	\$443,478	\$700,757	\$713,352	\$696,307	\$659,612	\$690,969	\$791,315	\$775,408	\$824,322	\$1,023,513
Lake	\$184,195	\$188,449	\$296,119	\$272,201	\$276,158	\$285,153	\$288,934	\$280,183	\$296,119	\$277,755	\$247,103	\$246,219
Lassen	\$184,025	\$170,559	\$106,891	\$106,891	\$108,967	\$128,825	\$130,683	\$135,339	\$129,091	\$174,612	\$173,075	\$171,257
Los Angeles	\$115,214,556	\$104,063,283	\$45,149,389	\$60,560,884	\$62,434,046	\$73,864,405	\$75,809,513	\$82,722,770	\$92,946,429	\$90,982,340	\$86,836,815	\$82,584,565
Madera	\$998,990	\$906,405	\$293,833	\$535,074	\$589,946	\$674,047	\$631,797	\$643,573	\$732,094	\$844,825	\$824,032	\$797,713
Marin	\$385,919	\$398,873	\$388,488	\$311,538	\$304,984	\$270,557	\$287,842	\$288,497	\$357,163	\$386,687	\$386,687	\$398,873
Mariposa	\$86,998	\$109,316	\$38,070	\$38,070	\$41,897	\$54,019	\$48,793	\$60,059	\$67,857	\$73,918	\$75,764	\$104,702
Mendocino	\$704,430	\$666,874	\$566,908	\$440,581	\$458,911	\$527,624	\$510,212	\$529,357	\$511,024	\$608,018	\$662,845	\$678,304
Merced	\$1,548,128	\$1,619,967	\$751,397	\$844,260	\$775,718	\$825,284	\$840,466	\$894,211	\$1,031,445	\$1,052,809	\$1,166,819	\$1,285,605
Modoc	\$48,248	\$55,531	\$17,128	\$24,065	\$37,161	\$49,493	\$59,313	\$52,855	\$51,256	\$50,853	\$65,582	\$79,436
Mono	\$32,047	\$32,202	\$13,956	\$13,956	\$14,615	\$14,580	\$18,114	\$18,392	\$19,817	\$21,591	\$26,958	\$28,683
Monterey	\$694,915	\$715,812	\$494,823	\$682,574	\$715,702	\$829,349	\$797,204	\$738,059	\$670,542	\$595,734	\$528,532	\$574,546
Napa	\$469,074	\$398,461	\$232,362	\$315,051	\$311,403	\$384,039	\$417,108	\$435,215	\$449,822	\$375,955	\$356,764	\$319,824
Nevada	\$193,343	\$169,292	\$226,123	\$202,832	\$174,058	\$173,215	\$178,805	\$185,041	\$226,123	\$203,761	\$193,301	\$169,292
Orange	\$12,943,647	\$13,311,808	\$5,648,065	\$5,366,139	\$5,355,390	\$6,553,748	\$6,915,607	\$7,611,043	\$8,758,132	\$9,166,564	\$9,755,582	\$10,564,243
Placer	\$849,058	\$920,382	\$687,985	\$895,552	\$747,141	\$710,846	\$800,593	\$622,053	\$651,832	\$704,472	\$645,769	\$738,744
Plumas	\$91,447	\$98,933	\$154,059	\$151,555	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$159,634	\$128,921	\$137,275
Riverside	\$15,792,508	\$17,353,158	\$6,411,055	\$8,806,009	\$8,173,324	\$7,999,219	\$6,877,392	\$7,422,498	\$9,263,855	\$10,707,784	\$11,902,759	\$13,771,457
Sacramento	\$6,269,231	\$5,655,172	\$4,832,997	\$5,609,080	\$5,161,591	\$5,586,032	\$5,017,201	\$4,920,141	\$5,091,685	\$4,905,409	\$4,725,098	\$4,487,941
San Benito	\$124,742	\$124,179	\$89,163	\$112,410	\$104,920	\$107,040	\$109,317	\$99,288	\$103,347	\$95,270	\$94,875	\$99,672
San Bernardino	\$21,326,805	\$20,782,763	\$5,731,210	\$8,514,703	\$9,751,976	\$11,957,781	\$12,446,717	\$13,045,926	\$14,821,566	\$15,061,246	\$16,073,940	\$16,493,189
San Diego	\$8,073,185	\$7,440,278	\$7,711,177	\$6,132,621	\$5,339,513	\$5,525,422	\$5,141,307	\$5,323,538	\$6,128,460	\$6,270,441	\$6,084,732	\$5,904,600
San Francisco	\$4,131,224	\$4,328,355	\$3,296,146	\$3,060,973	\$2,754,101	\$2,926,579	\$2,698,254	\$2,671,880	\$2,907,007	\$2,841,720	\$3,113,689	\$3,434,980
San Joaquin	\$4,223,902	\$4,245,431	\$2,601,178	\$2,480,278	\$2,399,805	\$2,739,513	\$2,729,427	\$2,706,301	\$2,886,866	\$2,843,217	\$3,183,540	\$3,369,172
San Luis Obispo	\$940,973	\$954,201	\$647,980	\$703,001	\$672,046	\$795,812	\$803,509	\$797,919	\$805,354	\$700,254	\$732,191	\$765,888
San Mateo	\$952,983	\$827,243	\$668,643	\$960,903	\$934,702	\$984,479	\$837,813	\$829,202	\$829,503	\$765,432	\$724,811	\$663,986
Santa Barbara	\$1,911,090	\$1,875,853	\$1,267,448	\$979,287	\$826,760	\$865,438	\$889,172	\$1,012,943	\$1,316,470	\$1,394,843	\$1,440,382	\$1,488,676
Santa Clara	\$3,270,112	\$2,687,186	\$3,780,956	\$3,223,912	\$2,947,634	\$3,290,686	\$3,262,294	\$3,404,630	\$3,666,823	\$3,030,273	\$2,464,672	\$2,132,549
Santa Cruz	\$586,717	\$563,955	\$713,676	\$598,314	\$544,197	\$619,253	\$557,112	\$526,052	\$504,267	\$623,754	\$584,471	\$563,955
Shasta	\$1,236,665	\$1,313,197	\$621,700	\$680,076	\$614,678	\$690,857	\$662,855	\$670,839	\$753,266	\$821,850	\$932,070	\$1,042,152
Sierra	\$34,732	\$31,447	\$13,759	\$9,848	\$8,323	\$5,045	\$10,829	\$13,759	\$22,459	\$28,440	\$36,894	\$35,449
Siskiyou	\$175,297	\$172,097	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$256,552	\$255,222	\$250,588
Solano	\$1,520,292	\$1,386,404	\$801,057	\$883,349	\$805,489	\$880,251	\$868,262	\$957,238	\$1,144,763	\$1,162,244	\$1,145,839	\$1,112,796
Sonoma	\$2,170,223	\$2,060,600	\$990,021	\$918,101	\$945,770	\$1,262,354	\$1,405,793	\$1,477,889	\$1,581,093	\$1,625,196	\$1,635,689	\$1,635,291
Stanislaus	\$1,800,657	\$1,614,945	\$1,004,470	\$1,092,505	\$1,091,719	\$1,424,350	\$1,448,878	\$1,452,004	\$1,492,887	\$1,419,811	\$1,357,149	\$1,281,620
Sutter	\$418,535	\$430,755	\$146,804	\$220,511	\$260,937	\$353,444	\$374,781	\$363,107	\$345,198	\$336,571	\$337,171	\$363,813
Tehama	\$308,871	\$339,029	\$177,634	\$319,793	\$362,975	\$392,840	\$340,323	\$293,399	\$241,836	\$294,234	\$313,954	\$354,174
Trinity	\$75,925	\$65,884	\$93,829	\$96,021	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$83,204	\$83,204	\$83,204
Tulare	\$3,474,774	\$3,753,824	\$1,032,410	\$1,591,232	\$1,714,221	\$2,067,711	\$2,155,983	\$2,290,172	\$2,489,610	\$2,416,609	\$2,618,925	\$2,979,033
Tuolumne	\$325,449	\$317,223	\$110,593	\$159,147	\$168,548	\$187,463	\$257,399	\$338,350	\$313,321	\$307,665	\$300,491	\$304,674
Ventura	\$2,249,805	\$1,998,532	\$1,284,628	\$1,835,753	\$1,833,055	\$2,017,019	\$1,802,468	\$1,741,369	\$1,895,272	\$1,843,364	\$1,695,670	\$1,586,034
Yolo	\$1,681,966	\$1,473,280	\$430,429	\$596,503	\$712,428	\$1,021,991	\$1,167,029	\$1,272,273	\$1,353,723	\$1,235,231	\$1,267,692	\$1,182,527
Yuba	\$740,872	\$807,295	\$278,909	\$474,768	\$471,244	\$410,105	\$363,820	\$377,291	\$375,249	\$418,668	\$563,486	\$647,975
Reserve	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Total	\$245,342,019	\$232,480,168	\$114,700,000	\$136,700,000	\$136,700,000	\$156,700,000	\$156,700,000	\$166,700,000	\$186,700,000	\$186,700,000	\$186,700,000	\$186,700,000

Note: Allocations are based on filings data obtained from the Judicial Council Research, Analytics, and Data and caseload data obtained from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) as of July 1, 2024.

Fiscal Year 2025–26 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology*

Court	Average Original Filings FY21–FY23	Average CW Cases July 2022, 2023, 2024	Filings %	Cases %	Sum of Weighted %	Partially Redistributed Caseload	BLS Index 2021-2023	Annual Salary	Caseload Multiplied by Estimated Child-to-Parent Case Ratio	Attorneys Needed Per Caseload	Total Salaries	Total Funding Need	Allocation Pre-BLS Adjustment	Small Court Increase with BLS Adjustment	Large Court Funding Adjustment (Pro-Rata Decrease)	Proposed FY 2025-26 Allocation
	A	B	C	D	E (.3C+.7D)	F (B*E)	G	H (G*Median Salary)	I (F*1.8)	J (I/141)	K (H*J)	L (K/.45)	M	N	O	P
Alameda	491	1,126	1.65%	1.90%	1.82%	1,081	1.49	\$ 169,533	1,946	13.80	\$ 2,340,277	\$ 5,200,616	\$ 4,174,270	\$ -	\$ (47,064)	\$ 4,127,206
*Alpine	1	10	0.00%	0.02%	0.01%	7	0.78	\$ 88,097	13	0.09	\$ 8,319	\$ 18,488	\$ 14,839	\$ 4,151		\$ 18,990
*Amador	37	59	0.12%	0.10%	0.11%	63	0.96	\$ 108,893	114	0.81	\$ 87,798	\$ 195,107	\$ 156,602	\$ 5,535		\$ 162,137
Butte	189	435	0.63%	0.73%	0.70%	417	0.87	\$ 99,191	750	5.32	\$ 527,957	\$ 1,173,237	\$ 941,698	\$ -	\$ (10,617)	\$ 931,080
*Calaveras	69	78	0.23%	0.13%	0.16%	96	0.85	\$ 96,391	172	1.22	\$ 117,760	\$ 261,689	\$ 210,044	\$ 35,629		\$ 245,673
*Colusa	21	38	0.07%	0.06%	0.07%	39	0.74	\$ 83,590	70	0.50	\$ 41,707	\$ 92,682	\$ 74,391	\$ 25,944		\$ 100,335
Contra Costa	386	679	1.29%	1.14%	1.19%	705	1.33	\$ 151,363	1,270	9.00	\$ 1,362,992	\$ 3,028,870	\$ 2,431,120	\$ -	\$ (27,410)	\$ 2,403,710
*Del Norte	50	110	0.17%	0.19%	0.18%	107	0.75	\$ 85,360	193	1.37	\$ 116,859	\$ 259,687	\$ 208,437	\$ 66,861		\$ 275,298
*El Dorado	123	161	0.41%	0.27%	0.31%	186	1.11	\$ 126,504	335	2.38	\$ 300,797	\$ 668,438	\$ 536,521	\$ 131,917		\$ 668,438
Fresno	913	2,262	3.06%	3.81%	3.58%	2,127	0.94	\$ 106,928	3,829	27.16	\$ 2,904,075	\$ 6,453,499	\$ 5,179,896	\$ -	\$ (58,402)	\$ 5,121,494
*Glenn	30	56	0.10%	0.09%	0.10%	57	0.77	\$ 86,995	103	0.73	\$ 63,358	\$ 140,795	\$ 113,009	\$ 33,445		\$ 146,455
*Humboldt	209	385	0.70%	0.65%	0.66%	394	0.75	\$ 84,675	709	5.03	\$ 425,961	\$ 946,581	\$ 759,772	\$ 251,834		\$ 1,011,606
*Imperial	149	317	0.50%	0.53%	0.52%	311	0.70	\$ 79,670	559	3.97	\$ 315,992	\$ 702,205	\$ 563,624	\$ 233,963		\$ 797,587
*Inyo	16	32	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	32	0.79	\$ 89,719	58	0.41	\$ 36,848	\$ 81,884	\$ 65,724	\$ 16,865		\$ 82,589
Kern	871	2,007	2.92%	3.38%	3.24%	1,925	0.93	\$ 105,455	3,464	24.57	\$ 2,590,912	\$ 5,757,583	\$ 4,621,319	\$ -	\$ (52,104)	\$ 4,569,215
*Kings	225	378	0.75%	0.64%	0.67%	399	0.83	\$ 94,635	718	5.09	\$ 481,669	\$ 1,070,376	\$ 859,136	\$ 164,376		\$ 1,023,513
*Lake	35	79	0.12%	0.13%	0.13%	76	0.77	\$ 86,989	137	0.97	\$ 84,802	\$ 188,449	\$ 151,258	\$ 94,961		\$ 246,219
*Lassen	32	68	0.11%	0.12%	0.11%	67	0.79	\$ 90,123	120	0.85	\$ 76,752	\$ 170,559	\$ 136,899	\$ 34,358		\$ 171,257
Los Angeles	12,011	23,432	40.21%	39.48%	39.70%	23,562	1.37	\$ 155,683	42,412	300.79	\$ 46,828,478	\$ 104,063,283	\$ 83,526,302	\$ -	\$ (941,736)	\$ 82,584,565
*Madera	223	254	0.75%	0.43%	0.52%	311	0.90	\$ 102,822	559	3.97	\$ 407,882	\$ 906,405	\$ 727,525	\$ 70,187		\$ 797,713
*Marin	62	93	0.21%	0.16%	0.17%	102	1.22	\$ 138,350	183	1.30	\$ 179,493	\$ 398,873	\$ 320,155	\$ 78,718		\$ 398,873
*Mariposa	30	33	0.10%	0.06%	0.07%	41	0.83	\$ 94,479	73	0.52	\$ 49,192	\$ 109,316	\$ 87,742	\$ 16,960		\$ 104,702
*Mendocino	132	265	0.44%	0.45%	0.45%	264	0.78	\$ 88,967	476	3.37	\$ 300,093	\$ 666,874	\$ 535,266	\$ 143,038		\$ 678,304
Merced	327	632	1.10%	1.06%	1.07%	638	0.79	\$ 89,570	1,148	8.14	\$ 728,985	\$ 1,619,967	\$ 1,300,265	\$ -	\$ (14,660)	\$ 1,285,605
*Modoc	23	24	0.08%	0.04%	0.05%	31	0.56	\$ 63,260	56	0.40	\$ 24,989	\$ 55,531	\$ 44,572	\$ 34,864		\$ 79,436
*Mono	7	10	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	11	0.89	\$ 101,595	20	0.14	\$ 14,491	\$ 32,202	\$ 25,847	\$ 2,836		\$ 28,683
*Monterey	92	201	0.31%	0.34%	0.33%	195	1.14	\$ 129,322	351	2.49	\$ 322,115	\$ 715,812	\$ 574,546	\$ -		\$ 574,546
*Napa	50	97	0.17%	0.16%	0.16%	97	1.27	\$ 144,392	175	1.24	\$ 179,307	\$ 398,461	\$ 319,824	\$ -		\$ 319,824
*Nevada	33	43	0.11%	0.07%	0.08%	50	1.06	\$ 120,461	89	0.63	\$ 76,181	\$ 169,292	\$ 135,882	\$ 33,410		\$ 169,292
Orange	1,886	3,207	6.31%	5.40%	5.68%	3,369	1.23	\$ 139,272	6,065	43.01	\$ 5,990,313	\$ 13,311,808	\$ 10,684,711	\$ -	\$ (120,467)	\$ 10,564,243
*Placer	165	212	0.55%	0.36%	0.42%	247	1.16	\$ 131,458	444	3.15	\$ 414,172	\$ 920,382	\$ 738,744	\$ -		\$ 738,744
*Plumas	24	41	0.08%	0.07%	0.07%	43	0.72	\$ 81,911	77	0.54	\$ 44,520	\$ 98,933	\$ 79,409	\$ 57,867		\$ 137,275
Riverside	2,877	4,787	9.63%	8.07%	8.54%	5,066	1.06	\$ 120,741	9,119	64.68	\$ 7,808,921	\$ 17,353,158	\$ 13,928,497	\$ -	\$ (157,040)	\$ 13,771,457
Sacramento	539	1,432	1.80%	2.41%	2.23%	1,323	1.33	\$ 150,644	2,582	16.89	\$ 2,544,827	\$ 5,655,172	\$ 4,539,119	\$ -	\$ (51,177)	\$ 4,487,941
*San Benito	20	37	0.07%	0.06%	0.06%	38	1.01	\$ 114,425	69	0.49	\$ 55,881	\$ 124,179	\$ 99,672	\$ -		\$ 99,672
San Bernardino	2,611	5,822	8.74%	9.81%	9.49%	5,632	1.14	\$ 130,078	10,138	71.90	\$ 9,352,243	\$ 20,782,763	\$ 16,681,266	\$ -	\$ (188,077)	\$ 16,493,189
San Diego	781	2,133	2.62%	3.59%	3.30%	1,959	1.18	\$ 133,903	3,526	25.00	\$ 3,348,125	\$ 7,440,278	\$ 5,971,932	\$ -	\$ (67,332)	\$ 5,904,600
San Francisco	377	816	1.26%	1.37%	1.34%	796	1.69	\$ 191,746	1,432	10.16	\$ 1,947,760	\$ 4,328,355	\$ 3,474,151	\$ -	\$ (39,170)	\$ 3,434,980
San Joaquin	606	1,272	2.03%	2.14%	2.11%	1,252	1.05	\$ 118,543	2,253	15.98	\$ 1,910,444	\$ 4,245,431	\$ 3,407,591	\$ -	\$ (38,420)	\$ 3,369,172
*San Luis Obispo	148	289	0.49%	0.49%	0.49%	291	1.02	\$ 115,760	523	3.71	\$ 429,390	\$ 954,201	\$ 765,888	\$ -		\$ 765,888
*San Mateo	87	154	0.29%	0.26%	0.27%	159	1.61	\$ 183,131	287	2.03	\$ 372,259	\$ 827,243	\$ 663,986	\$ -		\$ 663,986
Santa Barbara	245	476	0.82%	0.80%	0.81%	479	1.21	\$ 137,982	863	6.12	\$ 844,134	\$ 1,875,853	\$ 1,505,651	\$ -	\$ (16,976)	\$ 1,488,676
Santa Clara	186	644	0.62%	1.09%	0.95%	561	1.48	\$ 168,702	1,011	7.17	\$ 1,209,234	\$ 2,687,186	\$ 2,156,867	\$ -	\$ (24,318)	\$ 2,132,549
*Santa Cruz	84	155	0.28%	0.26%	0.27%	159	1.10	\$ 125,362	285	2.02	\$ 253,780	\$ 563,955	\$ 452,658	\$ 111,297		\$ 563,955
Shasta	226	436	0.76%	0.74%	0.74%	440	0.93	\$ 105,214	792	5.62	\$ 590,939	\$ 1,313,197	\$ 1,054,036	\$ -	\$ (11,884)	\$ 1,042,152
*Sierra	6	14	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	14	0.71	\$ 80,275	25	0.18	\$ 14,151	\$ 31,447	\$ 25,241	\$ 10,208		\$ 35,449
*Siskiyou	47	71	0.16%	0.12%	0.13%	78	0.69	\$ 78,056	140	0.99	\$ 77,444	\$ 172,097	\$ 138,134	\$ 112,454		\$ 250,588
*Solano	163	378	0.54%	0.64%	0.61%	362	1.19	\$ 135,162	651	4.62	\$ 623,882	\$ 1,386,404	\$ 1,112,796	\$ -		\$ 1,112,796
Sonoma	218	578	0.73%	0.97%	0.90%	535	1.20	\$ 135,889	962	6.82	\$ 927,270	\$ 2,060,600	\$ 1,653,939	\$ -	\$ (18,648)	\$ 1,635,291
Stanislaus	180	541	0.60%	0.91%	0.82%	486	1.03	\$ 117,028	876	6.21	\$ 726,725	\$ 1,614,945	\$ 1,296,234	\$ -	\$ (14,615)	\$ 1,281,620
*Sutter	116	104	0.39%	0.17%	0.24%	142	0.94	\$ 107,143	255	1.81	\$ 193,840	\$ 430,755	\$ 345,745	\$ 18,068		\$ 363,813
*Tehama	87	123	0.29%	0.21%	0.23%	138	0.76	\$ 86,622	248	1.76	\$ 152,563	\$ 339,029	\$ 272,121	\$ 82,053		\$ 354,174
*Trinity	20	22	0.07%	0.04%	0.05%	27	0.75	\$ 84,999	49	0.35	\$ 29,648	\$ 65,884	\$ 52,882	\$ 30,322		\$ 83,204
Tulare	687	1,121	2.30%	1.89%	2.01%	1,194	0.97	\$ 110,796	2,150	15.25	\$ 1,689,221	\$ 3,753,824	\$ 3,013,003	\$ -	\$ (33,971)	\$ 2,979,033
*Tuolumne	100	85	0.33%	0.14%	0.20%	119	0.83	\$ 94,219	214	1.52	\$ 142,750	\$ 317,223	\$ 254,619	\$ 50,055		\$ 304,674
Ventura	230	511	0.77%	0.86%	0.83%	495	1.25	\$ 142,374	891	6.32	\$ 899,340	\$ 1,998,532	\$ 1,604,120	\$ -	\$ (18,086)	\$ 1,586,034
*Yolo	189	339	0.63%	0.57%	0.59%	350	1.30	\$ 148,210	631	4.47	\$ 662,976	\$ 1,473,280	\$ 1,182,527	\$ -		\$ 1,182,527
*Yuba	125	187	0.42%	0.31%	0.35%	205	1.22	\$ 138,557	370	2.62	\$ 363,283	\$ 807,295	\$ 647,975	\$ -		\$ 647,975
Total	29,867	59,350	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	59,350	1.00		106,829	758	\$ 104,616,076	\$ 232,480,168	\$ 186,600,000	\$ 1,952,174	\$ (1,952,174)	\$ 186,600,000

Median annual salary of county attorneys \$ 113,656

* Courts with small court adjustments

BLS= Bureau of Labor Statistics; CW = child welfare

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

Title: Pretrial Release Program Allocations for FY 2025–26
Date: 5/7/2025
Contact: Deirdre Benedict, Supervising Analyst, Criminal Justice Services
415-865-7543 | deirdre.benedict@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of fiscal year (FY) 2025–26 allocations and funding floor for the Pretrial Release Program for the trial courts.

Background

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

Each court may retain up to 30 percent of the funding for costs associated with pretrial programs and practices. Except as otherwise authorized,¹ courts must contract for pretrial services with their county’s probation department or other county department or agency and provide that department with the remainder of the funds.

Starting in FY 2021–22, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) has approved staff recommendations for the Pretrial Release Program allocations for each fiscal year for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its annual July business meeting.

Funding Floor

Since program inception, Judicial Council staff have recommended a minimum funding floor allocation of \$200,000² for small and small-medium courts, with a commitment from staff to monitor and evaluate the impact and necessity of the funding floor. Staff have continually

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

² The original \$200,000 floor is equivalent to the floor used in the funding methodology for the California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009 (Sen. Bill 678; Stats. 2009, ch. 608), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/sb678.pdf.

evaluated the need for the funding floor and brought updated recommendations for approval to this committee annually.

Last fiscal year, upon review of actual expenditures and individual discussions with the courts, staff determined 8 courts did not require the full funding floor allocation. These 8 courts received allocations of varying amounts up to \$175,000. The remaining 15 courts received the full funding floor allocation of \$200,000. These 23 courts have expressed the continued need for this funding to ensure their pretrial programs can meet the needs of the courts, their partners, and their local pretrial population.

Without this funding floor, each affected court would receive an average allocation of approximately \$57,000, an amount far below the original \$200,000 minimum funding floor. The funding floor ensures both small and small-medium courts have the resources necessary to meet the requirements of the legislation.

The 2025–26 Governor’s Budget includes \$70 million to support pretrial services of which \$68.95³ million is available for distribution to the courts. The proposed allocations are outlined in Attachment 3A.

Staff continued to review expenditures and hold individual discussions with the courts, resulting in the following recommendations for FY 2025–26:

- 20 courts to receive the full funding floor of \$200,000;
- 1 court to receive a floor of \$150,000;
- 1 court to receive a floor of \$125,000; and
- 1 court to receive a floor of \$25,000.

Staff will continue to monitor and evaluate the funding floor and bring any recommendations to rescind, retain, or adjust the floor to the TCBAC as needed.

The final allocations will be updated based on any needed technical adjustments and are contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

Recommendation

Approve the FY 2025–26 allocations for the Pretrial Release Program as outlined in Attachment 3A and funding floor allocations, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

These recommendations will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting.

³ Senate Bill 129 allowed the Judicial Council to retain up to 5 percent (\$1.05 million) of the \$70 million for costs associated with implementing, supporting, and evaluating pretrial programs across the state. In the Budget Act of 2023, the \$1.05 million allocated to the Judicial Council was transferred to item 0250-001-0001 and the original \$70 million allocated for pretrial services to the trial courts was reduced to \$68.95 million.

Attachments

1. Attachment 3A: Recommended FY 2025–26 Pretrial Release Program Ongoing Allocations

Recommended FY 2025–26 Pretrial Release Program Ongoing Allocations

Court	No. of 18–24 Yr. Olds	% of Total Population of CA 18–24 Yr. Olds.	\$ Allocation of \$68.95M Based on % of 18–24 Yr. Olds
Alameda	131,012	3.74%	\$2,416,862
Alpine	N/A*	N/A	200,000
Amador	N/A	N/A	150,000
Butte	30,289	0.86%	558,760
Calaveras	N/A	N/A	200,000
Colusa	N/A	N/A	200,000
Contra Costa	92,378	2.64%	1,704,156
Del Norte	N/A	N/A	200,000
El Dorado	12,550	0.36%	231,518
Fresno	97,144	2.77%	1,792,077
Glenn	N/A	N/A	200,000
Humboldt	16,238	0.46%	299,553
Imperial	17,621	0.50%	325,066
Inyo	N/A	N/A	200,000
Kern	89,073	2.54%	1,643,186
Kings	15,911	0.45%	293,520
Lake	N/A	N/A	200,000
Lassen	N/A	N/A	200,000
Los Angeles	878,901	25.08%	16,213,646
Madera	15,044	0.43%	277,526
Marin	17,800	0.51%	328,368
Mariposa	N/A	N/A	200,000
Mendocino	N/A	N/A	200,000
Merced	30,869	0.88%	569,460
Modoc	N/A	N/A	200,000
Mono	N/A	N/A	200,000
Monterey	43,359	1.24%	799,871
Napa	11,210	0.32%	206,798
Nevada	N/A	N/A	200,000
Orange	284,103	8.11%	5,241,029
Placer	29,724	0.85%	548,338
Plumas	N/A	N/A	125,000
Riverside	228,663	6.52%	4,218,292
Sacramento	131,286	3.75%	2,421,916
San Benito	N/A	N/A	200,000

Court	No. of 18–24 Yr. Olds	% of Total Population of CA 18–24 Yr. Olds.	\$ Allocation of \$68.95M Based on % of 18–24 Yr. Olds
San Bernardino	216,598	6.18%	3,995,721
San Diego	319,478	9.12%	5,893,614
San Francisco	52,355	1.49%	965,826
San Joaquin	73,641	2.10%	1,358,502
San Luis Obispo	41,689	1.19%	769,064
San Mateo	53,883	1.54%	994,014
Santa Barbara	65,911	1.88%	1,215,902
Santa Clara	166,358	4.75%	3,068,912
Santa Cruz	36,432	1.04%	672,084
Shasta	13,163	0.38%	242,826
Sierra	N/A	N/A	200,000
Siskiyou	N/A	N/A	200,000
Solano	37,430	1.07%	690,495
Sonoma	38,003	1.08%	701,066
Stanislaus	51,350	1.47%	947,286
Sutter	N/A	N/A	200,000
Tehama	N/A	N/A	200,000
Trinity	N/A	N/A	25,000
Tulare	47,915	1.37%	883,918
Tuolumne	N/A	N/A	200,000
Ventura	74,268	2.12%	1,370,069
Yolo	42,865	1.22%	790,758
Yuba	N/A	N/A	200,000
Total	3,505,514	100%	\$68,950,000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2023: ACS 5-Year Estimates Subject Tables, Table S0101, [https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2023.S0101?g=040XX00US06\\$0500000&tp=true](https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST5Y2023.S0101?g=040XX00US06$0500000&tp=true).

Notes: FY 2025–26 funding must be spent or encumbered by June 30, 2026.

* “N/A” designates courts that have been provided with a minimum funding floor allocation to ensure adequate funding is provided to meet the legislative mandate.

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

Title: Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2025–26

Date: 5/7/2025

Contact: Marshall Comia, Associate Analyst, Judicial Council Policy & Research
Marshall.Comia@jud.ca.gov | 415-865-4655

Issue

Consideration of fiscal year (FY) 2025–26 allocations for the \$30 million annual appropriation for the trial courts to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil law case types.

Background

Budget Language

Senate Bill 170 (Stats. 2021, ch. 240), amended the Budget Act of 2021 and included \$30 million ongoing General Fund for the trial courts to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil law cases. Beginning in FY 2022–23, the budget language expanded the use of this funding. However, these changes do not affect how these funds are allocated to the courts.

Allocation Methodology

In FY 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 the first year of funding. The recommendation was presented to the TCBAC at its November 30, 2021, meeting and to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on December 7, 2021. The Judicial Council approved the recommendation at its January 21, 2022, business meeting¹, and directed Judicial Council staff to update the allocation methodology on an ongoing basis using 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. Using the noncriminal judicial need, consistent with the requirements

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts* | Senate Bill 170: Funding for Court Reporters in Family Law and Civil Law Case Types (Jan. 21, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10358386&GUID=7F337175-0808-4A38-AC68-F7AB5C9403FD>

in the budget language to increase the number of court reporters in family law and civil case types, the proposed methodology for allocating the 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 \$25,000 funding floor to all courts. Doing so would result in an increased amount—compared to using a purely proportional calculation to 11 courts totaling \$275,000—which represents an approximate 0.25 full-time equivalent using the average salary for court reporters from the Schedule 7A;
3. After applying the funding floor amount to 11 courts, allocate the remaining \$29.725 million 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 FY 2025–26 was updated based on the 2022 JNA², and the detail of the allocations by court is included as Attachment 4A.

The final allocations will be updated based on any needed technical adjustments and are contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

Recommendation

Approve the FY 2025–26 allocation for \$30 million for court reporters on a proportional basis using the council-approved methodology with updated AJN data based on the 2022 JNA as outlined in Attachment 4A, including any technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

The recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its July 18, 2025, business meeting.

Attachments

1. Attachment 4A: Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2025–26

² Judicial Council of Cal., Workload Assessment Advisory Com. Rep. (now Data Analytics Advisory Committee), *The Need for New Judgeships in the Superior Courts: 2022 Update of the Judicial Needs Assessment* (November 8, 2022), https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-12/report-to-the-legislature_2022-update-of-the-judicial-needs-assessment.pdf.

Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2025–26

Initial Allocation of \$30M based on Noncriminal 2022 AJN				Allocation of \$30M with Funding Floor of \$25,000					
Court	Noncriminal AJN *	Proportion of Statewide AJN	Proportion of \$30M	Funding Floor Court?	Floor Funding	Revised AJN Proportion for Non-floor Courts	Allocation of Non floor Funding	Final Allocation	Change with Floor
Statewide	1,067	100%	\$30,000,000		\$275,000		\$29,725,000	\$30,000,000	\$0
Alameda	36.8	3.45%	\$1,035,628			3.47%	\$1,031,041	\$1,031,041	(\$4,588)
Alpine	0.1	0.01%	\$1,772	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$23,228
Amador	1.1	0.11%	\$31,681			0.11%	\$31,541	\$31,541	(\$140)
Butte	6.1	0.57%	\$170,509			0.57%	\$169,753	\$169,753	(\$755)
Calaveras	1.3	0.12%	\$36,871			0.12%	\$36,707	\$36,707	(\$163)
Colusa	0.5	0.04%	\$13,233	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$11,767
Contra Costa	23.2	2.18%	\$653,080			2.19%	\$650,187	\$650,187	(\$2,893)
Del Norte	1.2	0.11%	\$34,107			0.11%	\$33,956	\$33,956	(\$151)
El Dorado	4.2	0.40%	\$118,797			0.40%	\$118,271	\$118,271	(\$526)
Fresno	28.4	2.67%	\$799,663			2.68%	\$796,121	\$796,121	(\$3,543)
Glenn	0.8	0.08%	\$22,664	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$2,336
Humboldt	4.5	0.42%	\$126,583			0.42%	\$126,022	\$126,022	(\$561)
Imperial	4.4	0.41%	\$124,280			0.42%	\$123,729	\$123,729	(\$551)
Inyo	0.5	0.05%	\$14,140	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$10,860
Kern	24.9	2.33%	\$699,077			2.34%	\$695,980	\$695,980	(\$3,097)
Kings	4.5	0.42%	\$125,132			0.42%	\$124,578	\$124,578	(\$554)
Lake	2.4	0.22%	\$66,690			0.22%	\$66,394	\$66,394	(\$295)
Lassen	0.8	0.07%	\$22,384	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$2,616
Los Angeles	341.3	31.99%	\$9,595,553			32.14%	\$9,553,044	\$9,553,044	(\$42,508)
Madera	6.0	0.56%	\$167,484			0.56%	\$166,742	\$166,742	(\$742)
Marin	5.1	0.48%	\$143,271			0.48%	\$142,636	\$142,636	(\$635)
Mariposa	0.4	0.03%	\$10,220	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$14,780
Mendocino	2.7	0.25%	\$74,961			0.25%	\$74,629	\$74,629	(\$332)
Merced	7.3	0.68%	\$204,434			0.68%	\$203,529	\$203,529	(\$906)
Modoc	0.4	0.04%	\$10,649	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$14,351
Mono	0.3	0.03%	\$8,108	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$16,892
Monterey	9.4	0.88%	\$264,158			0.88%	\$262,987	\$262,987	(\$1,170)
Napa	3.6	0.34%	\$101,381			0.34%	\$100,932	\$100,932	(\$449)
Nevada	2.6	0.24%	\$72,625			0.24%	\$72,304	\$72,304	(\$322)
Orange	77.0	7.22%	\$2,165,597			7.25%	\$2,156,003	\$2,156,003	(\$9,594)
Placer	9.3	0.88%	\$262,673			0.88%	\$261,509	\$261,509	(\$1,164)
Plumas	0.6	0.06%	\$18,029	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$6,971
Riverside	62.8	5.88%	\$1,764,521			5.91%	\$1,756,704	\$1,756,704	(\$7,817)
Sacramento	43.7	4.10%	\$1,228,562			4.11%	\$1,223,119	\$1,223,119	(\$5,443)
San Benito	1.4	0.14%	\$40,658			0.14%	\$40,478	\$40,478	(\$180)
San Bernardino	69.2	6.49%	\$1,946,259			6.52%	\$1,937,637	\$1,937,637	(\$8,622)
San Diego	77.9	7.30%	\$2,188,860			7.33%	\$2,179,163	\$2,179,163	(\$9,697)
San Francisco	25.1	2.35%	\$706,220			2.37%	\$703,092	\$703,092	(\$3,129)
San Joaquin	19.9	1.87%	\$560,134			1.88%	\$557,652	\$557,652	(\$2,481)
San Luis Obispo	6.0	0.56%	\$167,914			0.56%	\$167,170	\$167,170	(\$744)
San Mateo	13.5	1.26%	\$378,323			1.27%	\$376,647	\$376,647	(\$1,676)
Santa Barbara	9.2	0.86%	\$259,174			0.87%	\$258,026	\$258,026	(\$1,148)

Court Reporter Allocations for FY 2025–26

Initial Allocation of \$30M based on Noncriminal 2022 AJN				Allocation of \$30M with Funding Floor of \$25,000					
Court	Noncriminal AJN *	Proportion of Statewide AJN	Proportion of \$30M	Funding Floor Court?	Floor Funding	Revised AJN Proportion for Non-floor Courts	Allocation of Non floor Funding	Final Allocation	Change with Floor
Statewide	1,067	100%	\$30,000,000		\$275,000		\$29,725,000	\$30,000,000	\$0
Santa Clara	30.9	2.90%	\$869,883			2.91%	\$866,029	\$866,029	(\$3,854)
Santa Cruz	5.2	0.49%	\$146,710			0.49%	\$146,060	\$146,060	(\$650)
Shasta	6.2	0.58%	\$174,268			0.58%	\$173,496	\$173,496	(\$772)
Sierra	0.1	0.01%	\$2,864	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$22,136
Siskiyou	1.5	0.14%	\$42,968			0.14%	\$42,778	\$42,778	(\$190)
Solano	11.0	1.03%	\$308,123			1.03%	\$306,758	\$306,758	(\$1,365)
Sonoma	10.8	1.01%	\$304,216			1.02%	\$302,868	\$302,868	(\$1,348)
Stanislaus	14.1	1.32%	\$395,570			1.32%	\$393,817	\$393,817	(\$1,752)
Sutter	3.0	0.28%	\$83,779			0.28%	\$83,408	\$83,408	(\$371)
Tehama	2.3	0.22%	\$65,022			0.22%	\$64,733	\$64,733	(\$288)
Trinity	0.7	0.06%	\$18,668	X	\$25,000			\$25,000	\$6,332
Tulare	13.3	1.24%	\$373,261			1.25%	\$371,607	\$371,607	(\$1,654)
Tuolumne	1.9	0.18%	\$54,387			0.18%	\$54,146	\$54,146	(\$241)
Ventura	18.0	1.68%	\$505,389			1.69%	\$503,150	\$503,150	(\$2,239)
Yolo	5.3	0.50%	\$149,071			0.50%	\$148,410	\$148,410	(\$660)
Yuba	2.5	0.23%	\$69,763			0.23%	\$69,454	\$69,454	(\$309)

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

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

Criminal case types: Felony, Misdemeanors, Infractions