



# Judicial Council of California

## Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

### TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

#### MATERIALS JANUARY 15, 2026 VIRTUAL MEETING

### Meeting Contents

<b>Agenda</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Minutes</b>	
Draft Minutes from the October 29, 2025, meeting .....	4
<b>Discussion and Possible Action Item (Item 1-5)</b>	
<b>Item 1</b> – Trial Court Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy (Action Required) ..	6
<b>Attachment 1A:</b> Trial Court Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy.....	11
<b>Attachment 1B:</b> Government Code section 77203.....	16
<b>Attachment 1C:</b> Funding Methodology Subcommittee Fiscal Year 2025–26 Work Plan.....	17
<b>Item 2</b> – Mid-Year Reallocation and Augmentation for Court Interpreters Program for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required) .....	19
<b>Attachment 2A:</b> Mid-Year Reallocation for CIP and Augmentation Estimated Amounts for FY 2025–26 .....	22
<b>Item 3</b> – Mid-Year Reallocation for Pretrial Release Program for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required) .....	23
<b>Attachment 3A:</b> Reallocation Options for Consideration .....	28
<b>Attachment 3B:</b> Narrative Responses from Option One Courts .....	29
<b>Item 4</b> – Allocations for Dependency Counsel Collections Program and Unspent Funding for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required) .....	35
<b>Attachment 4A:</b> Recommended Fiscal Year 2025–2026 Trial Court Allocations of Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds.....	38

<b>Attachment 4B:</b> Recommended Fiscal Year 2025–2026 Trial Court Allocations of Court-Appointed Counsel Unspent Funding.....	39
<b>Item 5</b> – Trial Court Budget Change Concepts for Fiscal Year 2027–28 ( (Action Required) ..... ..	40
<b>Attachment 5A:</b> FY 2027–28 Trial Court Funding Priorities.....	45



# 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:** Thursday, January 15, 2026  
**Time:** 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.  
**Public Video Livestream:** <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/5050>

---

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 October 29, 2025, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

---

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

---

##### Remote Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(i) and (k), individuals wishing to speak about an agenda item during the public comment part of the meeting, must email a request by 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 14, 2026, to [tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov). The request must state the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents, if any, and the agenda item the speaker wishes to address. Only requests received by 12:00 p.m. on January 14, 2026, will receive a reply providing the virtual meeting link and information needed to speak during the public comment time.

**Written Comment**

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 January 14, 2026, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1-5)**

---

**Item 1**

**Trial Court Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy (Action Required)**

Consideration of revisions to the Judicial Council's trial court minimum operating and emergency fund balance requirements.

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

**Item 2**

**Mid-Year Reallocation and Augmentation for Court Interpreters Program for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required)**

Consideration of a mid-year reallocation of unspent funding for the Court Interpreters Program for fiscal year 2025–26.

Presenters: Mr. Douglas Denton, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Leadership Support Services

**Item 3**

**Mid-Year Reallocation for Pretrial Release Program for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required)**

Consideration of a mid-year reallocation of unspent funding for the Pretrial Release Program for fiscal year 2025–26.

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

**Item 4**

**Allocations for Dependency Counsel Collections Program and Unspent Funding for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required)**

Consideration of allocations for the Dependency Counsel Collections Program and reallocation of unspent funding for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel in fiscal year 2025–26.

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

**Item 5**

**Trial Court Budget Change Concepts for Fiscal Year 2027–28 (Action Required)**

Consideration of trial court funding priorities and budget change concepts for the fiscal year 2027–28 budget development process.

Presenters: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee  
Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Vice Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

---

**IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (ITEM 1) (NO ACTION REQUIRED)**

---

**Info 1**

**Governor's Budget Update for Fiscal Year 2026–27**

Update on the Governor's Budget proposal for fiscal year 2026–27.

Presenter: Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

---

**V. 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

October 29, 2025

12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/4017>

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. J. Eric Bradshaw, Hon. Christopher R. Bowen, Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Hon. David C. Kalemkarian, Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Hon. Lisa M. Rogan, and Hon. Sonny S. Sandhu

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Vice-Chair), Ms. Kate Bieker, Mr. Jake Chatters, Mr. Chad Finke, Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Chris Ruhl, Mr. David W. Slayton, Ms. Kim Turner, and Mr. David H. Yamasaki

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Hon. Judith C. Clark, Hon. Julie A. Emede, Ms. Stephanie Cameron, Mr. Shawn C. Landry, and Mr. Michael M. Roddy

**Others Present:** Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Hon. Bunmi Awoniyi, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Donna Newman, Ms. Maria Lira, Ms. Oksana Tuk, and Mr. Marshall Comia

#### OPEN MEETING

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. and took roll call.

##### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body approved the minutes of the August 25, 2025, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM (ITEM 1-4)

##### Item 1 – Increased Transcript Rate Allocations for Fiscal Year 2025–26 (Action Required)

Consideration of allocations for fiscal year 2025–26 increased transcript rates.

**Action:** The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the \$7 million allocation to each trial court proportionally using the Judicial Council–approved methodology for fiscal year (FY) 2025–26, based on an average of the prior three-year transcript expenditures, as outlined in Attachment A. The approved

*recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its December 12, 2025, business meeting.*

**Item 2 – Final Adjustments for Year-End Fund Balances for FY 2024–25 (Action Required)**

Consideration of final one-time adjustments for FY 2024–25 year-end fund balances for the trial courts.

**Action:** *The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the final FY 2024–25 year-end fund balance reduction of \$2.9 million, which reflects a total reduction of \$20.6 million above the fund balance cap offset by \$17.7 million in applicable Funds Held on Behalf requests. The \$2.9 million reduction will be allocated to the trial courts in January 2026. This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its December 12, 2025, business meeting.*

**Item 3 – Funding Methodology Subcommittee Work Plan Update for FY 2025–26 (Action Required)**

Consideration of an update to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee annual work plan for FY 2025–26.

**Action:** *The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the proposed update to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee work plan for FY 2025–26 to revise the existing allocation methodology for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding to determine an appropriate and effective way to address challenges faced by the trial courts in providing quality representation for children and families.*

**Item 4 – Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Annual Agenda for 2026 (Action Required)**

Consideration of the proposed Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee annual agenda for 2026.

**Action:** *The TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the committee’s annual agenda for 2026 and to update the fiscal year and add “as necessary” to the Community, Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment Act project on page 28 of the materials. This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Council Budget Committee on November 13, 2025.*

**Note:** *Subsequent to the action, it was determined the information on page 28 of the materials is not part of the proposed TCBAC Annual Agenda for 2026. Therefore, no changes are needed.*

---

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

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:44 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:** Trial Court Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy  
**Date:** 1/15/2026  
**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 a recommendation from the Funding Methodology Subcommittee to suspend the Judicial Council’s trial court minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy for one additional year, through June 30, 2027. This will allow time to revise the policy to appropriately reflect current conditions regarding trial court financial operations and reserve needs. The policy has been continuously suspended by the council since fiscal year 2012–13 due to statutory changes and the availability of other emergency funding options. Council action is required before the current suspension of the policy expires on June 30, 2026.

**Background**

The Judicial Council’s minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy (Attachment 1A) requires the trial courts to maintain a fund balance or reserve of approximately 3 to 5 percent of their prior year General Fund expenditures. This policy was first established in fiscal year (FY) 2006–07 to ensure that reserve funding was set aside for use in emergency situations, or when revenue shortfalls or budgetary imbalances might occur. The policy was in place through FY 2011–12.

Beginning in FY 2012–13, the policy was continuously suspended in two-year increments due to several legislative changes and advocacy efforts by the judicial branch to increase the fund balance cap for the trial courts. The current suspension of the policy will expire on June 30, 2026.

**Policy Suspension History**

Beginning in FY 2012–13, Government Code section 68502.5 required a 2 percent reserve be established in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). Each court contributed to the reserve from its base allocation for operations. On August 31, 2012, the Judicial Council suspended the minimum operating and emergency fund balance requirement for two years to determine the impact of this statutory change.

The next fiscal year, Government Code section 77203 (Attachment 1B) imposed a 1 percent cap on the fund balance that courts could carry forward from one fiscal year to the next, effective

June 30, 2014.<sup>1</sup> Previously, a trial court could carry over all unexpended funds from the court's operating budget from the previous fiscal year. On October 28, 2014, the council extended the suspension of the policy for two additional years until June 30, 2016.<sup>2</sup>

On January 19, 2017,<sup>3</sup> and May 24, 2018,<sup>4</sup> the council approved additional two-year suspensions of the policy until June 30, 2020, in recognition of the 2 percent reserve in the TCTF and advocacy efforts by the branch to eliminate or increase the 1 percent cap. In FY 2019–20, Government Code section 77203 was amended, and the fund balance cap was increased from 1 percent to 3 percent. This allowed the trial courts to carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year beginning June 30, 2020.

On July 24, 2020,<sup>5</sup> May 11, 2022,<sup>8</sup> and May 17, 2024,<sup>6</sup> the council again approved additional two-year suspensions of the policy. The last suspension expires on June 30, 2026.

### **Fund Balance Cap**

As stated, the fund balance cap for the trial courts was increased from 1 percent to 3 percent in FY 2019–20. Since that time, the Judicial Council has continued discussions with the Administration to raise the cap further in recognition of limited resources to support vital programs and services provided by the trial courts.

This resulted in a proposal in the FY 2024–25 Governor's Budget to increase the fund balance cap from 3 percent to 5 percent or \$100,000, whichever is greater, effective June 30, 2024. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations: Statewide Programs* (Aug. 31, 2012), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20120831-itemN.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20120831-itemN.pdf); mins. (Aug. 31, 2012), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20120831-minutes.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20120831-minutes.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: 2 Percent State-Level Reserve Process and Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy* (Oct. 28, 2014), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemM.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemM.pdf); mins. (Oct. 28, 2014), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-minutes.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-minutes.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy* (Jan. 19, 2017), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4885769&GUID=7E02378F-E7AC-407D-BDD2-DA81B5FEB9E8>; mins. (Jan. 19, 2017), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=523723&GUID=AAC05972-68BD-4B48-B46C-240B851E3CEF>.

<sup>4</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy* (May 24, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6246424&GUID=FD9DAD84-DD7D-448D-8C94-085FFC2FFBBF>; mins. (May 24, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=559783&GUID=1C4B0F75-3F17-4F8A-9712-034640BB460C>.

<sup>5</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy* (July 24, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8648714&GUID=DAA755CB-AD69-4C95-AB23-49AF3B15A37F>; mins. (July 24, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=711582&GUID=90001AF2-7CEE-4F0F-906B-29A03ED9CB43>.

<sup>8</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy* (May 10, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10831522&GUID=E3E6A833-3D51-41D8-B68D-225383632DEF>; mins. (May 11, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=869099&GUID=990E26C2-797D-4F24-BAE0-4945FB131549>.

<sup>6</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy* (May 6, 2024), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12906835&GUID=1BD21B0F-1766-4D49-975D-A0984E3CC680>; mins. (May 17, 2024), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=1091340&GUID=CFBAE626-CB09-4BE5-872F-ECB2BCB40B99>.

proposal was to help the trial courts maintain adequate reserve funding to support operational needs and address emergency expenditures. However, the proposal was not included in the enacted budget, and the fund balance cap remains at 3 percent.

### **Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts**

Gov. Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the Judicial Council to approve preliminary allocations to the trial courts in July and to finalize allocations in January of each fiscal year. Each court's final allocation must be offset by the amount of reserves in excess of the 3 percent cap, unless the court submits a funds held on behalf request to use some or all of this funding.

The Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts program is a Judicial Council–approved process that allows trial courts to request funding that exceeds the 3 percent cap be used to fund allowable projects or expenditures for the benefit of those courts.<sup>7</sup> The process was developed in FY 2015–16 in consultation with the Department of Finance in recognition that courts have limited resources to meet their operational needs. Funds held on behalf requests can be used for expenditures that cannot be funded by a court's annual budget or that require multiyear savings to implement.

Allowable projects include technology improvements or infrastructure (case management systems), court efficiency efforts (online or smart forms for court users), facilities maintenance or repair allowed under California Rules of Court, rule 10.810, and one-time expenditures such as vehicle, equipment, or furniture replacement. Funding for approved projects is held in the TCTF, and courts are reimbursed for actual expenses related to specific projects.

The funds held on behalf process is an important fiscal tool that allows the courts to fund necessary projects or purchases and meet contractual obligations within their limited allocations. This process maximizes available resources, especially given the fund balance cap and recent budget reductions.

### **Other Emergency Funding Options**

There are several funding options available to the trial courts to assist with funding shortfalls, unforeseen emergencies, or unanticipated expenses for existing programs or operations. These options provide flexibility to the trial courts while the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy has been suspended. These funding options include the following:

**State-Level Reserve** – Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B) authorized a one-time General Fund reserve of \$10 million in the TCTF. This reserve replaced the 2 percent reserve requirement that was in place since FY 2012–13. This reserve funding has only been used one time in FY 2018–19 by the Superior Court of Humboldt County. Assembly Bill 170 (Stats. 2024,

---

<sup>7</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Allocations: Trial Court Reserves Held in the Trial Court Trust Fund* (April 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4378277&GUID=57D6B686-EA95-497E-9A07-226CA724ADCB>; mins. (Apr. 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=463457&GUID=194A3350-D97F-452B-ACF4-1EBE6C105CCA>.

ch. 51) reduced the emergency reserve in the TCTF from \$10 million to \$5 million as a budget solution and because of the reserve's limited use by the courts.

The Judicial Council established a process for the trial courts to apply for this emergency funding.<sup>8</sup> If funding is used from the reserve, it must be replenished the following fiscal year from all trial courts' base allocations.

**Cash Advance** – Government Code section 68502.5 (c)(2)(B) and Judicial Council policy<sup>9</sup> also authorized a process by which trial courts experiencing cash flow issues can request a cash advance. Whenever possible, the cash advance will be distributed from a court's remaining TCTF allocation. The cash advance must be repaid by the borrowing court based on the repayment schedule included in the court's approved cash advance application.

**Use of Statutorily Restricted Funds** – Although statutorily restricted funds are to be used for the purpose specified in statute, there are urgent or emergency circumstances when these funds may be use by the courts. Use of these funds are also authorized under Government Code section 68502.5 (c)(2)(B) and Judicial Council policy. This option requires repayment within the same month the funds were borrowed.

### **Policy Options Considered**

The trial court minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy has been suspended for 14 consecutive years. The original policy became outdated and inoperable following statutory changes governing trial court reserves. At the same time, additional statewide mechanisms for emergency funding reduced the need for courts to maintain their own minimum emergency balances. Because of these shifts, the Judicial Council has repeatedly suspended the policy since FY 2012–13.

At its meeting on December 18, 2025, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee considered repealing the policy due to the unusually long suspension period and other means of addressing emergency situations and revenue shortages. The subcommittee also deliberated the financial and operational benefits of maintaining a policy to establish a minimum fund balance for emergencies as a best practice for the courts.

The subcommittee approved (1) an additional one-year suspension through June 30, 2027, to allow time to revise the policy to appropriately reflect current conditions regarding trial court financial operations and reserve needs and (2) adding this item to the Funding Methodology

---

<sup>8</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: \$10 Million State-Level Reserve Process* (Oct. 13, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4730556&GUID=B27BB5A7-B14B-44E8-A809-9F6FA97F6536>; mins. (Oct. 28, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=463482&GUID=71780E2D-3758-4213-B3A5-7100073AB7CF>.

<sup>9</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: \$10 Million State-Level Reserve Policy* (Dec. 16, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7972039&GUID=AD0ECA7-5B7A-41B7-8680-5D1B5D64F90D>; mins. (Jan. 17, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=711572&GUID=AC46528C-6E37-406A-A1CE-B41CC33E29EB>.

Subcommittee annual work plan.<sup>10</sup> As this item is currently on the FY 2025–26 work plan to consider repeal of the policy (Attachment 1C), it will be carried over to the FY 2026–27 work plan and updated to consider revisions to the existing policy based on the current fiscal environment for the trial courts.

### **Recommendation**

Approve a one-year suspension of the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy for the trial courts until June 30, 2027, and add this item to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee annual work plan. This will allow time to revise the policy to appropriately reflect current conditions regarding trial court financial operations and reserve needs.

This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its business meeting on April 24, 2026.

### **Attachments**

1. **Attachment 1A:** Trial Court Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy
2. **Attachment 1B:** Government Code section 77203
3. **Attachment 1C:** Funding Methodology Subcommittee Fiscal Year 2025–26 Work Plan

---

<sup>10</sup> Funding Methodology Subcommittee meeting materials (December 18, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20251218-fms-materials.pdf>

## **Trial Court Financial Policies & Procedures Fund Balance Policy**

June 2020

### **Fund Balance**

1. As publicly funded entities, and in accordance with good public policy, trial courts must ensure that the funds allocated and received from the state and other sources are used efficiently and accounted for properly and consistently. The trial courts shall account for and report fund balance in accordance with established standards, utilizing approved classifications. Additionally, a fund balance can never be negative.
2. Beginning with the most binding constraints, fund balance amounts must be reported in the following classifications:
  - a. Nonspendable Fund Balance
  - b. Restricted Fund Balance
  - c. Committed Fund Balance
  - d. Assigned Fund Balance
  - e. Unassigned Fund Balance (General Fund only)
3. When allocating fund balance to the classifications and categories, allocations must follow the following prioritization:
  - a. Nonspendable Fund Balance
  - b. Restricted Fund Balance
  - c. Contractual commitments to be paid in the next fiscal year
  - d. The minimum calculated operating and emergency fund balance
  - e. Other Judicial Council mandates to be paid in the next fiscal year
  - f. Contractual commitments to be paid in subsequent fiscal years
  - g. Assigned Fund Balance designations
  - h. Unassigned Fund Balance
4. Nonspendable Fund Balance includes amounts that cannot be spent because they are either (a) not in spendable form (not expected to be converted to cash), or (b) legally or contractually required to be maintained intact. Examples include: Inventories, prepaid amounts, Long-Term Loans and Notes Receivable, and Principal of a Permanent (e.g., endowment) Fund.
5. Restricted Fund Balance includes amounts constrained for a specific purpose by external parties, constitutional provision, or enabling legislation.

- a. Externally imposed—imposed externally by grantors, creditors, contributors, or laws or regulations of other governments (i.e., monies received by a grantor that can only be used for that purpose defined by the grant).
  - b. Imposed by Law (Statutory)—restricted fund balance that consists of unspent, receipted revenues whose use is statutorily restricted (e.g., children’s waiting room and dispute resolution program funding).
6. Committed Fund Balance includes amounts that can only be used for specific purposes pursuant to constraints imposed by formal action of the Judicial Council. These committed amounts cannot be used for any other purpose unless the Judicial Council removes or changes the specified use by taking the same type of action it employed to previously commit those amounts. Committed Fund Balance must also include contractual obligations to the extent that existing resources in the fund have been specifically committed for use in satisfying those contractual requirements. While the requirement to include contractual commitments is a policy decision of the Judicial Council, the type, number, and execution of contracts is within the express authority of presiding judges or their designee.
7. **[NOTE: The minimum operating and emergency fund requirement discussed here is temporarily suspended until the Judicial Council lifts the suspension.]** The Judicial Council has authorized a stabilization arrangement (Operating and Emergency fund category) to be set aside for use in emergency situations or when revenue shortages or budgetary imbalances might exist. The amount is subject to controls that dictate the circumstances under which the court would spend any of the minimum operating and emergency fund balance. Each court must maintain a minimum operating and emergency fund balance at all times during a fiscal year as determined by the following calculation based upon the prior fiscal year’s ending total unrestricted general fund expenditures (excluding special revenue, debt service, permanent proprietary, and fiduciary funds), less any material one-time expenditures (e.g., large one-time contracts).

Annual General Fund Expenditures

5 percent of the first \$10,000,000

4 percent of the next \$40,000,000

3 percent of expenditures over \$50,000,000

If a court determines that it is unable to maintain the minimum operating and emergency fund balance level as identified above, the court must immediately notify the Administrative Director, or designee, in writing and provide a plan with a specific time frame to correct the situation.

8. Assigned Fund Balance is constrained by the presiding judge, or designee, with the intent that it be used for specific purposes or designations that are neither unspendable,

restricted, nor committed. Constraints imposed on the use of assigned amounts are more easily removed or modified than those imposed on amounts that are classified as committed. Assigned amounts are based on estimates, and explanations of the methodology used to compute or determine the designated amount must be provided.

Assigned Fund Balances include:

- a. All remaining amounts that are reported in governmental funds, other than general funds, that are not classified as nonspendable and are neither restricted nor committed; and
- b. Amounts in the general fund that are intended to be used for a specific purpose in accordance with the provision identified by the presiding judge or designee.

Assigned Fund Balances will be identified according to the following categories:

- a. One-time Facility–Tenant Improvements. Examples include carpet and fixture replacements.
- b. One-time Facility–Other Examples include amounts paid by the Judicial Council on behalf of the courts.
- c. Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Initiatives. Statewide assessment in support of technology initiatives (e.g., Phoenix) will be identified in this designation.
- d. Local Infrastructure (technology and nontechnology needs). Examples include interim case management systems and nonsecurity equipment.
- e. One-time Employee Compensation (leave obligation, retirement, etc.). Amounts included in this category are exclusive of employee compensation amounts already included in the court’s operating budget and not in a designated fund balance category.
  - i. One-time leave payments at separation from employment. If amounts are not already accounted for in a court’s operating budget, estimated one-time payouts for vacation or annual leave to employees planning to separate from employment within the next fiscal year should be in this designated fund balance subcategory. This amount could be computed as the average amount paid out with separations or other leave payments during the last three years. Any anticipated non-normal or unusually high payout for an individual or individuals should be added to at the average amount calculated.

- ii. Unfunded pension obligation. If documented by an actuarial report, the amount of unfunded pension obligation should be included as a designated fund balance. Employer retirement plan contributions for the current fiscal year must be accounted for in the court's operating budget.
- iii. Unfunded retiree health care obligation. If documented by an actuarial report, the amount of unfunded retiree health care obligation should be included as a designated fund balance.

The current year's unfunded retiree health care obligation contains: (i) the current year Annual Required Contribution (ARC) based on a 30-year amortization of retiree health costs as of last fiscal year-end, and (ii) the prior year retiree health care obligation less (iii), the retiree health care employer contributions and any transfers made to an irrevocable trust set up for this purpose. The current year's unfunded retiree health care obligation is to be added to the prior year's obligation.

- iv. Workers' compensation (if managed locally). The amount estimated to be paid out in the next fiscal year.
  - v. Use of reserve funds for liquidation of outstanding leave balances for employees in a layoff situation, consistent with the requirements of GASB 45; other examples would include reserving funds for the implementation of "enhanced retirement" or "golden handshake" programs in the interest of eliminating salaries at the "high end" or "top step," and thereby generating salary savings or rehires at the low end of a pay scale for position(s), but realizing one-time costs in the interest of longer-term savings for the court.
- f. Professional and Consultant Services. Examples include human resources, information technology, and other consultants.
  - g. Security. Examples include security equipment and pending increases for security service contracts.
  - h. Bridge Funding. A court may choose to identify specific short or intermediate term funding amounts needed to address future needs that are otherwise not reportable, nor fit the criteria, in either restricted nor committed classifications, that it believes are necessary to identify through specific designations. These designations must be listed with a description in sufficient detail to determine their purpose and requirements.
  - i. Miscellaneous (required to provide detail). Any other planned commitments that are not appropriately included in one of the above designated fund balance subcategories

should be listed here with a description in sufficient detail to determine its purpose and requirements.

9. Unassigned Fund Balance is the residual classification for the general fund. This classification represents fund balance that has not been assigned to any other fund balance classification. The general fund is the only fund that shall report a positive unassigned fund balance amount.

**State of California**

**GOVERNMENT CODE**

**Section 77203**

---

77203. (a) Prior to June 30, 2014, a trial court may carry over all unexpended funds from the courts operating budget from the prior fiscal year.

(b) Commencing June 30, 2014, and concluding June 30, 2019, a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 1 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year. Commencing June 30, 2020, a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year. The calculation of the percentage authorized to be carried over from the previous fiscal year shall not include funds received by the court pursuant to the following:

(1) Section 470.5 of the Business and Professions Code.

(2) Section 116.230 of the Code of Civil Procedure, except for those funds transmitted to the Controller for deposit in the Trial Court Trust Fund pursuant to subdivision (h) of that section.

(3) Subdivision (f) of Section 13963, Sections 26731, 66006, 68090.8, 70640, 70678, and 76223, subdivision (b) of Section 77207.5, and subdivision (h) of Section 77209.

(4) The portion of filing fees collected for conversion to micrographics pursuant to former Section 26863, as that section read immediately before its repeal, and Section 27361.4.

(5) Sections 1027 and 1463.007, subdivision (a) of Section 1463.22, and Sections 4750 and 6005, of the Penal Code.

(6) Sections 11205.2 and 40508.6 of the Vehicle Code.

(Amended by Stats. 2019, Ch. 36, Sec. 2. (SB 95) Effective June 27, 2019. Section conditionally inoperative as provided in Section 77400. )

**Funding Methodology Subcommittee  
Fiscal Year 2025–26 Work Plan  
Approved as of October 29, 2025**

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee is responsible for (1) the ongoing review and refinement of the Workload Formula policy and (2) the development of allocation methodologies for funding augmentations and reductions for the trial courts as necessary. The subcommittee will continue its ongoing work to evaluate existing allocation methodologies and consider alternative allocation approaches based on the Workload Formula's core principles to advance the goal of funding equity, stability, and predictability to support trial court operations.

**Ongoing Through FY 2025–26**

1. Reevaluate the court cluster system, which is determined by the number of authorized judicial positions, and the impact of trial courts' cluster placement in the Resource Assessment Study (RAS).
2. Reevaluate the Trial Court Minimum Operating and Emergency Fund Balance Policy and consider if it should be repealed.
3. Evaluate the equity-based reallocation policy including technical refinements and clarification of the application of the existing methodology.
4. Evaluate the impact of the RAS data on the Workload Formula calculation and timing of implementation of new caseweights in the model.
5. Evaluate the Bureau of Labor Statistics factor and its impact on the Workload Formula calculation.
6. Consider a revised allocation methodology for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding to determine an appropriate and effective way to address challenges faced by the trial courts in providing quality representation for children and families.

**Ongoing Annual Updates**

7. Review the Workload Formula policy to address adjustments as needed to ensure that it stays current to advance the goal of funding equity, stability, and predictability to support trial court operations.
8. Review the base funding floor amounts annually, if requested by the applicable courts, for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee no later than December of each year, to determine whether an inflationary adjustment is needed.

9. Review the Workload Formula adjustment request process submissions as referred by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee chair.

The following proposals were received in response to the 2025 Workload Formula adjustment request process. As these proposals could impact the RAS, which calculates different caseweights to determine the workload-based funding need for the trial courts, the requests are under consideration by the Data Analytics Advisory Committee.

1. Superior Court of Alameda County – proposed a minimum staff-to judge ratio be factored into the RAS as a supplemental need and included in the Workload Formula calculations.
2. Superior Court of Stanislaus County – proposed a factor in the RAS model to be included in the Workload Formula calculations that accounts for the additional time and costs to conduct background checks using the Automated Firearms System for domestic violence restraining orders required by the Domestic Violence Prevention Act (AB 3083; Stats. 2024, ch. 541).

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

**Title:** Mid-Year Reallocation and Augmentation for Court Interpreters Program for Fiscal Year 2025–26

**Date:** 1/15/2026

**Contact:** Douglas Denton, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Leadership Support Services  
415-865-7870 | [douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov](mailto:douglas.denton@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consideration of the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Court Interpreters Program (CIP) mid-year reallocation of \$59,000 and proposed augmentation of \$19.1 million from program reserves for fiscal year (FY) 2025–26 to address anticipated trial court funding shortfalls due to increasing interpreter expenditures.

**Background**

The Judicial Council at its business meetings of February 21, 2025,<sup>1</sup> and April 25, 2025,<sup>2</sup> approved recommendations from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, which included a recommendation to direct council staff to conduct a mid-year survey and reallocation process in FY 2025–26 to determine if the trial courts need additional funding from the remaining program savings to support court interpreter services.

Expenditure increases in the CIP are driven by multiple factors, including increased reliance on contractors across all case types due to staffing shortages, higher contractor rates, wage increases under new agreements, merit-based salary adjustments, and the expansion of interpreter services to all case types. Courts also report that many contractors are asking for rates higher than the council’s standard rates<sup>3</sup> and closer to or above current federal rates.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Use of Court Interpreters Program Savings to Augment 2024–25 and 2025–26 Allocations for Trial Courts* (Feb. 21, 2025), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13703531&GUID=E64FD46A-FE23-43D7-BADA-96EA524836B2>.

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Court Interpreters Program Fiscal Year 2024–25 Midyear Reallocation and Augmentation* (Apr. 25, 2025), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14011686&GUID=1FE5BD1D-7EAB-4D89-83AC-08336557D1D1>.

<sup>3</sup> Payment Policies for Independent Contractor Interpreters (Effective July 1, 2021), <https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/CIP-Payment-Policies-for-Independent-Contractor-Interpreters.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> The [Trial Court Interpreters Program Expenditure Report for Fiscal Year 2023–24](#), as required by the Budget Act of 2023, found that contract interpreter expenditures in FY 2023–24 represented 34.6 percent of total expenditures, reflecting an increase from FY 2022–23, when contractor expenses were 26.7 percent of the total expenditures (see [Expenditure Report](#), table 4). Compared to FY 2022–23, expenditures for contract interpreters in FY 2023–24 increased by \$14.091 million (42 percent), and expenditures for court employees in FY 2023–24 decreased by \$2.250 million (-2.4 percent). (Ibid.) Given recent cost increases for interpreter services, courts are identifying cost saving measures to ensure prudent use of limited CIP funding.

## Mid-Year Reallocation and Augmentation Process

Based on input from the trial courts', the council staff sent the mid-year survey early—in November 2025 rather than in February 2026—to all 58 trial courts to obtain their anticipated additional funding need for FY 2025–26. Courts based their estimates on expenditure information from the Phoenix financial system through October 31, 2025. (Attachment 2A.)

All 58 trial courts participated in the mid-year survey. Of these, 36 courts requested additional funding totaling \$19.2 million. The remaining 22 courts did not request additional funding, and 3 of the 22 courts estimated unspent funds of approximately \$59,000 in FY 2025–26. After reallocation of the available \$59,000, the CIP augmentation request from the TCTF program reserves is \$19.1 million based on the survey data.<sup>5</sup>

Table 1 below demonstrates the current program savings balance of \$27.8 million and the requested \$19.1 million augmentation, which will bring the program savings balance to \$8.7 million at the end of FY 2025–26.

The final FY 2025–26 augmentation amount must be approved by the Judicial Council, the Department of Finance, and the Legislature.

The appropriation for FY 2026–27 is anticipated to be \$135.1 million.<sup>6</sup> When including savings, the total funding available for FY 2026–27 is estimated at \$143.8 million (\$135.1 million plus \$8.7 million in savings). Based on current expenditure trends, it is anticipated that the full amount of \$143.8 million will be needed in FY 2026–27 to support interpreter services, which will deplete all program reserves.

**Table 1. Mid-Year Reallocation and Augmentation Plan for FY 2025–26 (Dollars in Millions)**

CIP Detail	FY 2022–23	FY 2023–24	FY 2024–25	FY 2025–26	FY 2026–27 (Projected)
Appropriation	\$135.5	\$133.8	\$134.8	\$134.8	\$135.1
Surplus or Mid-year Augmentation Amount	\$9.8	-\$4.6	-\$11.6	-\$19.1**	-\$8.7
Program Savings Balance	\$35.0	\$30.4	\$27.8*	\$8.7	\$0
*FY 2024–25 program savings balance totaling \$27.8 million: \$18.8 million in savings as of June 30, 2025, \$1.6 million in additional savings from year-end survey, and \$7.4 million in restored funding due to inadvertent spending on ineligible activities.					
**FY 2025–26 deficit of \$19.1 million based on mid-year survey data collected from the trial courts.					

<sup>5</sup> The council-approved methodology for when courts experience a shortfall is outlined in the council report: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts: Court Interpreters Program Funding and Allocation Methodology* (Jan. 20, 2023),

<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11533862&GUID=BF5043BE-FE6C-4464-B2CE-336C36D5DB40>.

<sup>6</sup> The Judicial Council submitted a budget change proposal for increased funding in FY 2026–27 for the TCTF CIP, which was not included in the FY 2026–27 Governor's Budget released on January 9, 2026. Due to rising expenditures for the TCTF CIP, preparation of a future request for additional funding is recommended for consideration.

A final survey will be conducted by Judicial Council staff prior to the end of FY 2025–26 to identify savings for reallocation to those courts with a funding shortfall based on final expenditures for current year.

**Recommendation**

Approve the FY 2025–26 mid-year reallocation of \$59,000 and augmentation of \$19.1 million from the program savings balance of \$27.8 million, as outlined in Attachment 2A, including any technical adjustments.

This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its business meeting on April 24, 2026.

**Attachment**

**Attachment 2A:** Mid-Year Reallocation for CIP and Augmentation Estimated Amounts for FY 2025–26

Court Number	Court	Current FY 2025–26 CIP Allocation & Benefits	Estimated FY 2025–26 Funding to be Returned	Estimated FY 2025–26 Additional Funding Requested	Proposed Total CIP Allocation
		A	B	C	D = (A+B+C)
1	Alameda	\$5,802,846	\$0	\$811,000	\$6,613,846
2	Alpine	545	-	1,000	1,545
3	Amador	65,956	-	-	65,956
4	Butte	292,326	-	65,000	357,326
5	Calaveras	44,059	-	-	44,059
6	Colusa	129,857	-	25,000	154,857
7	Contra Costa	3,182,098	-	-	3,182,098
8	Del Norte	29,107	(14,500)	-	14,607
9	El Dorado	254,469	-	29,155	283,624
10	Fresno	2,766,582	-	510,000	3,276,582
11	Glenn	164,755	-	-	164,755
12	Humboldt	104,549	-	10,000	114,549
13	Imperial	778,340	-	37,000	815,340
14	Inyo	62,766	-	-	62,766
15	Kern	3,957,453	-	293,062	4,250,515
16	Kings	719,969	-	21,000	740,969
17	Lake	181,273	-	50,000	231,273
18	Lassen	57,432	-	-	57,432
19	Los Angeles	38,573,574	-	5,026,000	43,599,574
20	Madera	892,686	-	88,500	981,186
21	Marin	832,125	-	276,705	1,108,830
22	Mariposa	58,533	-	-	58,533
23	Mendocino	572,725	-	-	572,725
24	Merced	1,234,534	-	-	1,234,534
25	Modoc	4,872	-	25,000	29,872
26	Mono	72,961	-	25,000	97,961
27	Monterey	1,782,390	-	-	1,782,390
28	Napa	869,592	-	100,000	969,592
29	Nevada	106,681	-	45,000	151,681
30	Orange	9,553,836	-	1,551,386	11,105,222
31	Placer	943,843	-	-	943,843
32	Plumas	2,758	-	-	2,758
33	Riverside	6,944,728	-	971,294	7,916,022
34	Sacramento	5,230,332	-	639,525	5,869,857
35	San Benito	161,127	-	10,000	171,127
36	San Bernardino	6,725,779	-	376,786	7,102,565
37	San Diego	6,929,948	-	-	6,929,948
38	San Francisco	4,711,761	-	1,750,000	6,461,761
39	San Joaquin	2,200,736	-	1,361,049	3,561,785
40	San Luis Obispo	857,810	-	241,155	1,098,965
41	San Mateo	3,589,555	-	1,000,000	4,589,555
42	Santa Barbara	3,129,876	-	422,200	3,552,076
43	Santa Clara	6,748,121	-	1,295,957	8,044,078
44	Santa Cruz	1,025,815	-	175,000	1,200,815
45	Shasta	575,601	(20,601)	-	555,000
46	Sierra	586	-	-	586
47	Siskiyou	69,509	-	-	69,509
48	Solano	895,626	-	396,874	1,292,500
49	Sonoma	1,915,636	-	-	1,915,636
50	Stanislaus	1,744,999	-	350,000	2,094,999
51	Sutter	313,817	-	-	313,817
52	Tehama	253,456	-	-	253,456
53	Trinity	66,692	(23,680)	-	43,012
54	Tulare	2,736,760	-	419,741	3,156,501
55	Tuolumne	75,628	-	-	75,628
56	Ventura	2,930,454	-	500,023	3,430,477
57	Yolo	722,117	-	240,000	962,117
58	Yuba	98,044	-	25,000	123,044
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$134,750,000</b>	<b>-\$58,781</b>	<b>\$19,164,412</b>	<b>\$153,855,631</b>

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

**Title:** Mid-Year Reallocation for Pretrial Release Program for Fiscal Year 2025–26  
**Date:** 1/15/2026  
**Contact:** Deirdre Benedict, Supervising Analyst, Criminal Justice Services  
415-865-7543 | [deirdre.benedict@jud.ca.gov](mailto:deirdre.benedict@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Consideration of a mid-year reallocation of unspent funding for the Pretrial Release Program for the trial courts in fiscal year 2025–26.

**Background**

The Budget Act of 2021 (amended by Sen. Bill 129) provided ongoing 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”. SB 129 appropriated \$140 million one-time General Fund in fiscal year (FY) 2021–22 and \$70 million annually thereafter to the Judicial Council for distribution to the trial courts for these purposes.

In accordance with the Budget Act of 2025 (amended by Assem. Bill 102), item 0250-101-0001, provision 7, the Judicial Council is required to distribute the funding to all courts based on each county’s relative proportion of the state population that is 18 to 25 years of age.<sup>1</sup>

Each court may retain up to 30 percent of the funding for costs associated with pretrial programs and practices. Except as otherwise authorized<sup>2</sup>, 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 (Budget Committee) and then the Judicial Council.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census Bureau five-year estimates based on each county’s relative proportion of the state population 18 to 25 years of age, 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). The California Department of Finance population data age categories do not match the age categories specified in the SB 129 language. The department broke down the 18-to-25 age category into two groups: 15 to 19 years of age and 20 to 24 years of age. SB 129 specified that the age group be between 18 and 25 years of age.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

The Budget Act of 2025 added language authorizing the Judicial Council to “reallocate unspent funds from counties to other counties with demonstrated needs.”<sup>3</sup> In prior fiscal years, some courts underspent their allocation and returned sizeable amounts of funding to the state’s General Fund. The reallocation authority will provide a mechanism to ensure funding to support pretrial services are utilized fully and appropriately.

On September 2, 2025, the Judicial Council approved the FY 2025–26 allocations and directed council staff to conduct a mid-year survey and recommend a methodology for reallocating funding between trial courts based on demonstrated need.

## **Survey Results**

Council staff conducted the mid-year survey in early November 2025. Thirty-two courts confirmed that they were not requesting additional funds and were not returning any of their allocated funding. One court responded to the survey returning funds in the amount of \$194,000. Twenty-four courts responded to the survey requesting additional funds totaling approximately \$12.2 million.<sup>4</sup>

Of the 24 courts requesting additional funds, 13 requested individual amounts lower than \$194,000. Those courts were required to provide a one-page narrative detailing their specific need for additional funds, how the funds would be used to address the need, and the outcome of receiving/not receiving the funds.

Staff reviewed the one-page narratives, in addition to analyzing each court’s spending patterns from previous fiscal years. Staff focused on the spending patterns for FY 2022–23 through FY 2024–25, as many courts’ spending increased as they moved from implementation to operations. Staff also reviewed the submitted FY 2025–26 budgets for these courts.

Overall, the requests were needed to offset reductions in state pretrial funding and county reductions for probation departments. Primarily the requesting courts identified reduced services and support from the probation department for the court and the individuals released pretrial. This includes reducing the number of officers available to provide assessment reports in a timely manner to the court, the reduction of electronic and alcohol monitoring tools as well as support services to the individual released pretrial, and the reduction of court staff available to coordinate the pretrial release program.

## **Reallocation Options**

At its meeting on December 18, 2025, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee considered two different reallocation options (1) reallocation of funding based on the smallest requests and to fulfill the most complete request up to the amount available, or (2) reallocate funding equally among the requesting courts. Each option is summarized below:

**Option One: Reallocate funding based on smallest requests and fulfill the most complete requests up to the \$194,000 that was returned.**

---

<sup>3</sup> Assem. Bill 102, § 4, item 0250-101-0001, provision 12.5.

<sup>4</sup> One court did not respond to the survey.

Under this option, the Superior Courts of Plumas, Lassen, El Dorado, Modoc, and Solano Counties would be funded at the full amount of their requests. The Superior Court of San Mateo County would be funded at 55 percent of its request – to utilize every dollar of the reallocated funding.

Staff recommend this option as it allows the amount returned to have the most impact in fully funding smaller communities. Please see Attachment 3B for the narratives submitted by the courts.

---

**Plumas – \$8,583 request**

---

Restore a Deputy Probation Officer to a full-time position, restore electronic/alcohol monitoring to previous levels; make software updates, and provide support services needed.

FY 2024–25 Allocation     \$125,000

FY 2025–26 Allocation     \$115,938

In FY 2024–25, Plumas spent 92 percent of its entire pretrial allocation.

---

**Lassen - \$14,500 request**

---

Maintain probation services through the end of this fiscal year.

FY 2024–25 Allocation     \$200,000

FY 2025–26 Allocation     \$185,500

In FY 2024–25, Lassen spent 97 percent of its entire pretrial allocation.

---

**El Dorado - \$24,780 request**

---

Maintain probation services at current levels and offset the court’s salary expenditures.

FY 2024–25 Allocation     \$234,237

FY 2025–26 Allocation     \$214,729

In FY 2024–25, El Dorado spent 102 percent<sup>5</sup> of its entire pretrial allocation.

---

**Modoc - \$51,000 request**

---

Maintain probation service levels.

FY 2024–25 Allocation     \$200,000

FY 2025–26 Allocation     \$185,500

In FY 2024–25, Modoc spent 101 percent of its entire pretrial allocation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Over 100 percent spending, reflects a court’s earned interest on the pretrial program that utilized above the yearly allocation amount.

---

**Solano - \$55,452 request**

---

Make necessary technical updates to the court's pretrial case management system.

FY 2024–25 Allocation     \$695,875

FY 2025–26 Allocation     \$640,422

In FY 2024–25, Solano spent 99 percent of its entire pretrial allocation.

---

**San Mateo - \$72,000 request – Fund at 55 percent**

---

Partially funding this request would restore funding for probation staff and fund a transition to a new pretrial risk assessment tool.

FY 2024–25 Allocation     \$996,136

FY 2025–26 Allocation     \$921,931

In FY 2024–25, San Mateo spent 89 percent of its entire pretrial allocation.

**Option Two: Reallocate funding equally among all 24 courts that requested funding.**

This approach ensures that every court that requested funding receives a portion of the reallocated funds. Given the amount of funding returned this year, each court would receive approximately \$8,000 each. (See Attachment 3A, Table 2.) While this would ensure that each court receives an amount, the level of funding provided would have very limited impact on larger courts and those that requested more than the \$194,000 available.

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee also considered resurveying all courts with the known amount of reallocated funding. The initial survey conducted in November 2025 asked courts to specify the amount of reallocation funding they needed, without knowing how much funding was available. Now that there is a confirmed dollar amount, a follow-up survey with that information could be conducted. However, given the timeline to secure approval from the budget committees and ultimately the Judicial Council before the end of the fiscal year, resurveying all courts is not a practical option.

While the Funding Methodology Subcommittee acknowledged that option one is not an ideal reallocation methodology, given the limited amount of funding available for reallocation and the compact timeline to get the funding to the courts, the subcommittee approved option one as a one-time methodology for FY 2025–26 for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee.<sup>6</sup>

**Recommendation**

Approve option one as a one-time methodology for reallocation of the \$194,000 in available pretrial funding for the Pretrial Release Program in FY 2025–26, as outlined in Attachment 3A, Table 1.

---

<sup>6</sup> Funding Methodology Subcommittee meeting materials (Dec. 18, 2025)  
<https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20251218-fms-materials.pdf>.

This recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its business meeting on April 24, 2026.

**Attachments**

**Attachment 3A:** Reallocation Options for Consideration

**Attachment 3B:** Narrative Responses from Option One Courts

**Table 1:**

**Option One: Reallocate funding based on smallest requests and fulfill the most complete requests up to the \$194,000 that was returned.**

<b>Court</b>	<b>Requested Amount</b>	<b>Funding Proposed</b>
Plumas	\$8,583	\$8,583
Lassen	14,500	14,500
El Dorado	24,780	24,780
Modoc	51,000	51,000
Solano	55,452	55,452
San Mateo	72,000	39,684
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$226,316</b>	<b>\$194,000</b>

**Table 2:**

**Option Two: Reallocate funding equally among all 24 courts that requested funding.**

<b>Court</b>	<b>Requested Amount</b>	<b>Funding Proposed</b>
Plumas	\$8,583	\$8,083
Lassen	14,500	8,083
El Dorado	24,780	8,083
Modoc	51,000	8,083
Solano	55,452	8,083
San Mateo	72,000	8,083
Merced	80,000	8,083
Yuba	85,000	8,083
San Joaquin	100,000	8,083
Yolo	117,885	8,083
Marin	120,000	8,083
Sutter	140,188	8,083
Mendocino	150,000	8,083
Sonoma	200,000	8,083
Butte	252,330	8,083
Placer	327,677	8,083
Sacramento	366,000	8,083
Kern	423,270	8,083
Nevada	492,000	8,083
Santa Cruz	500,000	8,083
Madera	1,171,048	8,083
Santa Clara	1,674,380	8,083
Alameda	2,500,000	8,083
Los Angeles	3,318,512	8,083
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$12,244,606</b>	<b>\$194,0000</b>

Date: December 5, 2025

Plumas Superior Court  
FY2526 Pretrial Release Program  
RE: Narrative in Support of Pretrial Reallocation Funding Need

Plumas Superior Court respectfully requests an additional \$8,583.47 for FY2526. The additional funds which were included in our original budget will be used for the following:

- Restore FTE Pretrial Deputy Probation Officer to 1.0 FTE
- Restore Electronic Monitoring / Soberlink Program to previous levels
- Noble Software Updates
- Provide Cell Phone Service to Clients
- Drug Testing
- Ensure the ability to provide housing, inpatient treatment, and emergency shelter

The outcome of receiving the funding verse not receiving the funding will result in the following:

- The additional funding will support the need for 1.0 FTE Pretrial Deputy Probation Officer. The result in additional funding to support this position will mean more time for the deputy to attend hearings and track outcomes, not only for pretrial supervision clients, but all release categories. If the funding is not approved, it is likely the Probation Department will not have the resources to maintain pretrial services at a level that is acceptable to the Court.
- The additional funding will support the cost for Soberlink Alcohol Detection program and drug testing program for the entire fiscal year. If the funding is not approved the current funds budgeted will most likely be exhausted prior to the end of the fiscal year. The Probation Department does not have other funding sources that can supplement these services, and the services will be discontinued once the funds are exhausted.
- The additional funding will ensure that the Noble Software is updated. If the funding is not approved the software will not be updated and Probation may not be able to comply with future reporting requirements.
- The additional funding will ensure Probation can provide clients with cell phone service to ensure they stay in contact with Probation and can get their hearing reminders. If the funding is not approved Probation will not be able to support this cost for clients making it more difficult to keep in contact with them.
- The additional funding will ensure there are funds support housing, inpatient treatment, and emergency shelter needs for clients. If the funding is not approved these services will be eliminated.

Thank you for your consideration.



## Superior Court of California, County of Lassen

Mark R. Nareau  
Presiding Judge

Robert M. Burns  
Assistant Presiding Judge

Megan Reed  
Court Executive Officer

Administrative Office  
2610 Riverside Drive, Susanville, CA 96130  
Telephone: 530-251-8102

---

Date: December 5, 2025

To: Budget Committee

From: Samantha Ngotel, Administrative Services Manager

Re: Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Pretrial Reallocation Request Justification

Lassen County Superior Court received an allocation totaling \$185,500 for the Fiscal Year 2025-2026. The allocation was a decrease from the previous fiscal years' awards of \$200,000 per year, the floor allocation. Lassen Court partners with Lassen County Probation Department to facilitate and meet the goals of the Pretrial program. Allocation funds are split on a 70/30 basis between probation and the court. These funds support court and probation department staff in serving the public and achieving the mission of Pretrial as directed by the state. The decrease in allocation from past fiscal years to this current year's award did not dictate a decrease to program activity or needs. Lassen County is a generally underserved community with limited opportunities for employment and therefore great challenges exist in attracting viable candidates to the area. As a result of prior years Pretrial allocations, Probation was able to hire and dedicate staff directly supporting the program. The program continues to operate at the same level and the same cost as it did in prior years. As such, without the court's request to receive an additional \$14,500 reallocation for pretrial being granted, probation's portion of the existing allocation will be elapsed before the completion of the fiscal year. Pretrial costs for the Probation department average \$12,000 per month. The cost of the program for Probation alone is estimated to land around \$144,000 per fiscal year. As of the date of this memo, Probation has billed through October 2025 totaling \$47,804.43. A reallocation of \$14,500 will enable Probation to continue meeting service level requirements. Without the reallocation, Probation will be unable to maintain necessary staffing levels to meet service level needs required to facilitate the Pretrial program. The court and probation staff had dedicated many hours to establishing and developing our pretrial program since its installation and thank you for your consideration in awarding the requested reallocation amount of \$14,500. If awarded this amount, Lassen Court and Probation department will continue to foster and grow our Pretrial program in support of our county and constituents to the level they so deserve.

Sincerely,

*Samantha Ngotel*

Samantha Ngotel  
Administrative Services Manager



# SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF EL DORADO

2850 Fairlane Court, Suite 110  
Placerville, California 95667

December 4, 2025

Judicial Council of California  
2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Ste 490  
Sacramento, CA 95833

Re: Pretrial Reallocation

To Whom It May Concern:

Since Fiscal Year 21/22, the Courts have been receiving (and utilizing) an average of \$322,465.36 in Pretrial funding. With this funding, the El Dorado Superior Court (Court), in conjunction with the El Dorado County Department of Probation (EDC Probation), have offset salary expenditures for eight probation officers, where 100% of their regularly scheduled hours were exclusively assigned to pretrial activities. Probation uses these funds to enhance the EDC Probation's Pretrial Services Program, which includes providing information to the Court about a defendant's risk and establishing conditions for release if they are granted pretrial release. They utilize a weighted risk factor tool (Virginia Pretrial Risk Assessment Instrument - VPRAI) to help identify the party's level of risk by examining all charges and identifying the most serious charge category and its impact on the individual's overall risk. There are six levels of risk assessed and four levels of pretrial monitoring or supervision.

Along with this, the Court has offset salary expenditures for 13 Court employees, amounting to approximately \$75,543.42 in salaries allocated to staff's pretrial program hours (data from fiscal year (FY) 24/25). Program hours are dedicated to support staff who are committed to assisting judicial officers with determining pretrial release, assessing a defendant's risk of failing to appear in court or committing a new crime, and providing supervision or other release conditions.

The total allocation amount of \$214,728.76 for FY 25/26 limits the amount of funding provided to Probation necessary to sustain and expand the County's Pretrial Services Program, as well as support the Court in continuing to offset the salaries, benefits, and indirect costs of Court staff assigned to and actively working on the pretrial program.

The additional ask of \$24,780.49 for FY 25/26 will allow the Court to maintain its commitment to the EDC Probation as well as offset the Court's expenditures. This will put us in alignment with the exact amount that the Court received in funding for FY 24/25 (\$239,509.25).

Should the Court not receive the additional funding for FY 25/26, we would limit the level of support we have been able to maintain with EDC Probation since 2021, as well as restrict the full support of Court staff assigned to the pretrial program.

If you have any further questions or need further explanation of our requested additional funding amount, please contact us.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Shelby Wineinger  
Court Executive Officer



## MODOC COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

326 South Main Street - Alturas, California 96101

(530) 233-6324 - FAX (530) 233-6363

Chief Probation Officer Stephen Svetich



### Response for Additional Pretrial Funding

For the past several fiscal years, Modoc County Probation has been entirely dependent on state funding for its budget; this has consisted primarily of realignment (AB109), SB678, and Pretrial funds. Our net General Fund monies make up an insignificant part of our annual revenues.

Historically, the costs of meeting the needs of our Pretrial client base have exceeded our Pretrial allocation of \$140,000 (decreasing to \$130,000 for the current FY), such that we have been forced to make use of our other two funding streams to pay for services rendered to our Pretrial client population.

Of those two funding sources, one, AB109, is a limited line-item which typically only covers Probation costs associated with GPS and alcohol monitoring. Therefore, the majority of our excess Pretrial funding is drawn from SB678. For the past three fiscal years, we have used the entirety of our SB678 grant and been forced to budget from our savings. This year, the state decreased our SB678 funding, a decrease which comes at the same time that we have budgeted the last of our savings.

In order to stay within our budget, we have already begun to limit the amount of alcohol and GPS tracking services recommended by the Court. As this has been one of our court's preferred options for Pretrial services, this has necessarily decreased our scope of Pretrial service. We have also decreased the number and length of housing services we have offered to clients, partly as a result of the changes in California's residency laws and partly due to funding concerns.

Our request for additional funding, therefore, is primarily intended to allow us to continue the same scope of services that we have previously been able to meet: GPS tracking, continuous alcohol monitoring, and the labor costs for same. The amount requested reflects not only the difference in allocation amounts between this fiscal year and the previous, but the historic shortfalls we have incurred in meeting our clients' needs. With these additional funds, we also hope to be able to expand our scope to include other services we have been financially unable to provide, such as transportation to court and clothing vouchers for clients.

Without this additional funding, we project that we may be unable to offer the equivalent scope of services as in previous years, or may be forced to request the county pay for services out of the general fund, thereby reducing services offered elsewhere.

A blue ink signature of Stephen Svetich.

Stephen Svetich  
Chief Probation Officer  
Modoc County Probation



Superior Court of California  
County of Solano

Hall of Justice  
600 Union Avenue  
Fairfield, California 94533

Sara J. MacCaughey  
Assistant Court Executive Officer

December 1, 2025

Judicial Council of California  
Via Email: [pretrial@jud.ca.gov](mailto:pretrial@jud.ca.gov)

Re: Pretrial Reallocation

To Whom It May Concern,

The Court is requesting a reallocation of \$55,452 to support the ongoing need for IT troubleshooting and technical support associated with our pretrial system. Our Court IT staff have been working closely with our justice partners, and continued adjustments to the system configuration have been required. In addition, several requests have arisen that fall outside the original scope of the project, resulting in the need for additional staff time and technical resources. This funding will allow Court IT to continue implementing necessary enhancements to improve system performance and streamline processes for all users.

Without this reallocation, the Court would face delays in system updates, reduced capacity to respond to technical issues, and potential impacts on the efficiency and reliability of pretrial operations. Access to these funds ensures we can maintain a fully functional system that supports timely and accurate justice partner collaboration.

If any funds remain after covering Court IT staff time, the Court will use the balance to support county probation expenses, if necessary.

Sincerely,

Sara MacCaughey

Assistant Court Executive Officer  
Superior Court of California, County of Solano  
Email: [sjmaccaughey@solano.courts.ca.gov](mailto:sjmaccaughey@solano.courts.ca.gov)

Cc: Brian Taylor, CEO  
Agnes Shappy, CFO

San Mateo Superior Court  
FY 25-26 Pretrial Allocation  
Justification for Additional MYR Funding

Requested MYR Funding:  
\$72,000

**Background:**

All courts experienced a 7.25% statewide cut to Pretrial Services (PTS) funding, which amounted to an estimated \$72,000 locally for the San Mateo Superior Court. A majority of that funding cut was absorbed through our county probation department despite probation fully utilizing their allocated pretrial funds in prior fiscal years. Consequentially, probation had to make the difficult decision to absorb the cuts by reducing funding in a critical area—probation staffing.

**Justification:**

Our court has experienced significant delays in receiving timely notification of condition violations due to probation being understaffed in their PTS division. The delay between when the defendant failed to abide by their conditions of supervised release and when the court was notified by way of memo and warrant request was noted in nearly every case being reviewed between September-November 2025. Some of these cases posed a grave threat to public safety, involving serious alcohol-related offenses where the defendant failed to test or tested positive on the Continuous Alcohol Monitoring electronic device. If the court must release defendants on non-financial conditions then it must be insured that the conditions are being abided by. This may be accomplished with more adequate funding and/or restoration of funds for probation staff.

Alternatively, our court is interested in exploring new or improved pretrial risk assessment tools as our bench has identified gaps in information and risk assessment with our current tool. San Mateo current uses VPRAI-R and would like to explore other risk assessment systems that might better meet our needs. The \$72,000 also can be used to fund this targeted project aimed at finding the best pretrial risk assessment tool to meet our local needs.

Additional funding in either of these two areas would have a positive impact to public safety and improving PTS. Therefore, San Mateo requests restoration of funding for FY 25-26 up to the funding cut we experienced at the beginning of the fiscal year of \$72,000.

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

**Title:** Allocations for Dependency Counsel Collections Program and Unspent Funding for Fiscal Year 2025–26

**Date:** 1/15/2026

**Contact:** Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts | [kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov](mailto:kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov) | 916-263-1693

Irene Balajadia, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts | [irene.balajadia@jud.ca.gov](mailto:irene.balajadia@jud.ca.gov) | 415-865-8833

---

**Issue**

Consideration of the following recommendations for the redistribution of funding for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel for fiscal year (FY) 2025–26:

- (1) Under the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP), and as authorized in Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.1, courts collect reimbursements from parents and other responsible persons liable for the cost of dependency-related legal services based on ability to pay. Allocate \$125,145, which is the FY 2024–25 statutorily restricted JDCCP funds remitted in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs to trial courts according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its August 23, 2013, business meeting.
- (2) Reallocate \$980,733 in unspent court-appointed dependency counsel (CAC) funding from courts that have identified funds they do not intend to spend to courts funded at below the average statewide funding level pursuant to Judicial Council action in April 2015.

**Background**

**Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program**

At its meeting on October 26, 2012, the Judicial Council adopted the JDCCP guidelines,<sup>1</sup> which fulfilled the council’s legislative mandate to establish a program to collect reimbursement from parents or minors demonstrating an ability to pay.<sup>2</sup> Additional amendments were adopted by the council at its meeting on August 23, 2013, regarding the issue of equitable allocation of funds remitted through the JDCCP.<sup>3</sup> The council then allocated

---

<sup>1</sup> The guidelines took effect January 1, 2013, and are published as Appendix F of the California Rules of Court. See [https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-08/appendix\\_f.pdf](https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-08/appendix_f.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program* (Sept. 14, 2012), <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-12/jc-20121026-itema20.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program Guidelines* (Aug. 15, 2013), <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20130823-itemf.pdf>.

funds remitted through the JDCCP for the first time at its meeting on February 20, 2014.<sup>4</sup> Since then, the council has allocated available funds to eligible trial courts annually.

In FY 2024–25, the trial courts remitted a total of \$357,189. The statute requires the council to allocate the remitted monies in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs to the trial courts for the purpose of reducing court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council’s approved standard.

To receive an allocation of these funds, a court must meet the participation and funding need requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines.<sup>5</sup> Each court that satisfies those requirements receives an allocation. The amount of JDCCP funds each eligible court receives is determined by the court’s share of the aggregate funding need of all eligible courts. Estimates of courts’ funding needs are computed using the dependency workload model approved by the council in April 2016<sup>6</sup>, and then updated in July 2016<sup>7</sup> and July 2022.<sup>8</sup>

Attachment 4A displays the recommended allocation amount for each court.

### **Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Reallocation**

At its business meeting on April 17, 2015, the council approved a methodology for reallocating funds unspent by courts for court-appointed counsel in dependency cases.<sup>9</sup>

As part of the annual CAC reallocation process, program staff surveyed trial courts<sup>10</sup> to inquire about anticipated unspent CAC funding for FY 2025–26. Two courts confirmed that they would not spend the full allocation and provided an estimate of unspent funding. Attachment 4B, column F shows the total \$45,000 estimate.

In September 2025<sup>11</sup>, the council approved the allocation of fiscal year 2025–26 CAC funds identified by courts through a spending plan survey, making those funds available to assist

---

<sup>4</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., *Trial Court Allocations: Criminal Justice Realignment, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel, and Workers’ Compensation Liabilities* (Feb. 10, 2014), <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20140220-itemj.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> As described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines, a court can demonstrate its participation in the program by submitting annual reports as required by section 13 and adopting a local rule or policy to inquire regarding a responsible person’s ability to reimburse the cost of appointed counsel at each dispositional hearing.

<sup>6</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., *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>.

<sup>7</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology Options* (Jul. 18, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4572873&GUID=C33C7410-DDA2-451A-9004-024D84910504>.

<sup>8</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2022–23 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding* (Jun. 24, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11019079&GUID=CB0A2EE1-B3CF-43AC-B92B-F4724B5D209C>.

<sup>9</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed-Counsel Funding Reallocation* (Apr 8, 2015), <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20150417-itemi.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> Program staff contacted 38 of the 58 trial courts as the Judicial Council administers the court-appointed dependency counsel budget for the remaining 20 courts through the Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training program.

<sup>11</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2025-26 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Council Funding* (Aug. 25, 2025),

small courts in adjusting to fiscal year 2025–26 funding reductions. The council approved the allocation of available funds to impacted small courts that required assistance, with any remaining funds to be allocated to all eligible courts through the regular mid-year reallocation process. A total of \$935,773 remained available for reallocation, increasing the total available reallocation amount to \$980,773. Attachment 4B shows the total funding available and proposed reallocation.

Under the reallocation methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its April 17, 2015, business meeting, funds are reallocated proportionally by workload to courts that (1) did not remit unspent funds, and (2) are not fully funded to their need.

To ensure use of the reallocation funds, additional outreach to eligible trial courts was conducted to confirm the court’s ability to completely expend funds during the fiscal year. Declined funds were placed back in the pool and reallocated to courts eligible for and accepting additional funds.<sup>12</sup>

### **Recommendation**

Approve the following FY 2025–26 allocations for court-appointed counsel funding for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council at its April 24, 2026, business meeting:

1. Allocate Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program funds of \$121,145 remitted in FY 2024–25 (Attachment 4A); and
2. Allocate FY 2025–26 estimated unspent dependency counsel funding of \$980,773 from courts that have identified funds they do not intend to spend to courts that are not fully funded to their need (Attachment 4B).

### **Attachments**

1. **Attachment 4A:** Recommended Fiscal Year 2025–2026 Trial Court Allocations of Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds
2. **Attachment 4B:** Recommended Fiscal Year 2025–2026 Trial Court Allocations of Court-Appointed Counsel Unspent Funding

---

<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=A&ID=1335073&GUID=7EA97284-5FF5-49CA-A5BD-A86123AB9CCD>.

<sup>12</sup> On an annual basis, a small amount of court-appointed counsel funds remain unspent at the end of the fiscal year.

## Recommended Fiscal Year 2025-26 Trial Court Allocations of Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

Court	Estimated Funding Need (Circulating Order - September 2025)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2025-26	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2025-26	Eligible for JDCCP Funding <sup>1</sup>	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col F Total)	Recommended Allocation of 2024-25 JDCCP Collections (Col. G x \$125,145)
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H
Alameda	\$ 5,200,616	2.24%	\$ 4,137,757	2.23%	N	\$ -	0%	\$ -
Alpine	18,488	0.01%	18,488	0.01%	N	-	0%	-
Amador	195,107	0.08%	162,137	0.09%	N	-	0%	-
Butte	1,173,237	0.50%	933,460	0.50%	N	-	0%	-
Calaveras	261,689	0.11%	245,673	0.13%	N	-	0%	-
Colusa	92,682	0.04%	72,682	0.04%	N	-	0%	-
Contra Costa	3,028,870	1.30%	2,409,855	1.30%	N	-	0%	-
Del Norte	259,687	0.11%	275,298	0.15%	N	-	0%	-
El Dorado	668,438	0.29%	668,438	0.36%	N	-	0%	-
Fresno	6,453,499	2.78%	4,936,000	2.66%	N	-	0%	-
Glenn	140,795	0.06%	146,455	0.08%	N	-	0%	-
Humboldt	946,581	0.41%	946,581	0.51%	N	-	0%	-
Imperial	702,205	0.30%	797,587	0.43%	N	-	0%	-
Inyo	81,884	0.04%	81,884	0.04%	N	-	0%	-
Kern	5,757,583	2.48%	4,580,896	2.47%	Y	5,757,583.28	4.10%	5,128.78
Kings	1,070,376	0.46%	1,023,513	0.55%	N	-	0%	-
Lake	188,449	0.08%	246,219	0.13%	N	-	0%	-
Lassen	170,559	0.07%	170,559	0.09%	N	-	0%	-
Los Angeles	104,063,283	44.76%	82,795,685	44.57%	Y	104,063,283.47	74.07%	92,698.23
Madera	906,405	0.39%	797,713	0.43%	N	-	0%	-
Marin	398,873	0.17%	398,873	0.21%	N	-	0%	-
Mariposa	109,316	0.05%	104,702	0.06%	N	-	0%	-
Mendocino	666,874	0.29%	666,874	0.36%	N	-	0%	-
Merced	1,619,967	0.70%	1,288,891	0.69%	N	-	0%	-
Modoc	55,531	0.02%	79,436	0.04%	N	-	0%	-
Mono	32,202	0.01%	28,683	0.02%	N	-	0%	-
Monterey	715,812	0.31%	574,546	0.31%	N	-	0%	-
Napa	398,461	0.17%	319,824	0.17%	N	-	0%	-
Nevada	169,292	0.07%	169,292	0.09%	N	-	0%	-
Orange	13,311,808	5.73%	10,591,250	5.70%	N	-	0%	-
Placer	920,382	0.40%	738,744	0.40%	N	-	0%	-
Plumas	98,933	0.04%	137,275	0.07%	N	-	0%	-
Riverside	17,353,158	7.46%	13,806,662	7.43%	Y	17,353,157.66	12.35%	15,457.97
Sacramento	5,655,172	2.43%	4,499,414	2.42%	N	-	0%	-
San Benito	124,179	0.05%	99,672	0.05%	N	-	0%	-
San Bernardino	20,782,763	8.94%	16,535,353	8.90%	N	-	0%	-
San Diego	7,440,278	3.20%	5,919,695	3.19%	Y	7,440,277.58	5.30%	6,627.70
San Francisco	4,328,355	1.86%	3,443,762	1.85%	N	-	0%	-
San Joaquin	4,245,431	1.83%	3,377,785	1.82%	N	-	0%	-
San Luis Obispo	954,201	0.41%	765,888	0.41%	N	-	0%	-
San Mateo	827,243	0.36%	663,986	0.36%	N	-	0%	-
Santa Barbara	1,875,853	0.81%	1,492,481	0.80%	N	-	0%	-
Santa Clara	2,687,186	1.16%	2,138,001	1.15%	N	-	0%	-
Santa Cruz	563,955	0.24%	563,955	0.30%	N	-	0%	-
Shasta	1,313,197	0.56%	1,044,817	0.56%	Y	1,313,196.89	0.93%	1,169.78
Sierra	31,447	0.01%	31,447	0.02%	N	-	0%	-
Siskiyou	172,097	0.07%	250,588	0.13%	N	-	0%	-
Solano	1,386,404	0.60%	1,112,796	0.60%	N	-	0%	-
Sonoma	2,060,600	0.89%	1,639,472	0.88%	N	-	0%	-
Stanislaus	1,614,945	0.69%	1,284,896	0.69%	N	-	0%	-
Sutter	430,755	0.19%	363,813	0.20%	N	-	0%	-
Tehama	339,029	0.15%	339,029	0.18%	N	-	0%	-
Trinity	65,884	0.03%	83,204	0.04%	N	-	0%	-
Tulare	3,753,824	1.61%	1,984,956	1.07%	Y	3,753,823.94	2.67%	3,343.86
Tuolumne	317,223	0.14%	304,674	0.16%	N	-	0%	-
Ventura	1,998,532	0.86%	1,590,089	0.86%	N	-	0%	-
Yolo	1,473,280	0.63%	1,182,527	0.64%	N	-	0%	-
Yuba	807,295	0.35%	600,000	0.32%	Y	807,295.11	0.57%	719.13
Reserve	-	-	100,000					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 232,480,168</b>		<b>\$ 185,764,227</b>			<b>\$ 140,488,617.95</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 125,145</b>
Reserved for admin.								\$ 232,043
Distribution amount available to courts								\$ 125,145
Total collected								\$ 357,189

1. A court is eligible for an allocation if the court has met both the Funding Need and Participation requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines.

This table indicates a court's eligibility to receive an allocation based on the Funding Need criteria. Courts that meet the Funding Need criteria must also meet the Participation requirements in order to receive an allocation.

	Estimated Funding Need (Circulating Order - September 2025)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need  (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court-Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2025-26	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2025-26  (Col. C Total)	Estimated Unspent CAC Funding 2025-26	Eligible for and Accepted Reallocated Funding	Funding Need of Eligible Courts  (Col. A when Col. F equals "Y")	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts  (Col. G Total)	Recommended 2025-26 CAC Reallocation
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Alameda	\$ 5,200,616	2.24%	\$ 4,137,757	2.23%	\$ -	Y	\$ 5,200,615.94	2.76%	\$ 27,108.24
Alpine	18,488	0.01%	18,488	0.01%	-	N	-	0%	-
Amador	195,107	0.08%	162,137	0.09%	-	N	-	0%	-
Butte	1,173,237	0.50%	933,460	0.50%	-	Y	1,173,236.95	0.62%	6,115.50
Calaveras	261,689	0.11%	245,673	0.13%	-	N	-	0%	-
Colusa	92,682	0.04%	72,682	0.04%	15,000	N	-	0%	-
Contra Costa	3,028,870	1.30%	2,409,855	1.30%	-	Y	3,028,870.19	1.61%	15,788.00
Del Norte	259,687	0.11%	275,298	0.15%	-	N	-	0%	-
El Dorado	668,438	0.29%	668,438	0.36%	-	N	-	0%	-
Fresno	6,453,499	2.78%	4,936,000	2.66%	-	N	-	0%	-
Glenn	140,795	0.06%	146,455	0.08%	-	N	-	0%	-
Humboldt	946,581	0.41%	946,581	0.51%	-	N	-	0%	-
Imperial	702,205	0.30%	797,587	0.43%	-	N	-	0%	-
Inyo	81,884	0.04%	81,884	0.04%	-	N	-	0%	-
Kern	5,757,583	2.48%	4,580,896	2.47%	-	Y	5,757,583.28	3.06%	30,011.44
Kings	1,070,376	0.46%	1,023,513	0.55%	-	N	-	0%	-
Lake	188,449	0.08%	246,219	0.13%	-	N	-	0%	-
Lassen	170,559	0.07%	170,559	0.09%	-	N	-	0%	-
Los Angeles	104,063,283	44.76%	82,795,685	44.57%	-	Y	104,063,283.47	55.31%	542,430.48
Madera	906,405	0.39%	797,713	0.43%	-	N	-	0%	-
Marin	398,873	0.17%	398,873	0.21%	-	N	-	0%	-
Mariposa	109,316	0.05%	104,702	0.06%	-	N	-	0%	-
Mendocino	666,874	0.29%	666,874	0.36%	-	N	-	0%	-
Merced	1,619,967	0.70%	1,288,891	0.69%	-	Y	1,619,966.66	0.86%	8,444.09
Modoc	55,531	0.02%	79,436	0.04%	-	N	-	0%	-
Mono	32,202	0.01%	28,683	0.02%	-	N	-	0%	-
Monterey	715,812	0.31%	574,546	0.31%	30,000	N	-	0%	-
Napa	398,461	0.17%	319,824	0.17%	-	N	-	0%	-
Nevada	169,292	0.07%	169,292	0.09%	-	N	-	0%	-
Orange	13,311,808	5.73%	10,591,250	5.70%	-	Y	13,311,807.60	7.07%	69,387.88
Placer	920,382	0.40%	738,744	0.40%	-	N	-	0%	-
Plumas	98,933	0.04%	137,275	0.07%	-	N	-	0%	-
Riverside	17,353,158	7.46%	13,806,662	7.43%	-	N	-	0%	-
Sacramento	5,655,172	2.43%	4,499,414	2.42%	-	Y	5,655,171.79	3.01%	29,477.62
San Benito	124,179	0.05%	99,672	0.05%	-	N	-	0%	-
San Bernardino	20,782,763	8.94%	16,535,353	8.90%	-	Y	20,782,762.98	11.05%	108,330.28
San Diego	7,440,278	3.20%	5,919,695	3.19%	-	Y	7,440,277.58	3.95%	38,782.49
San Francisco	4,328,355	1.86%	3,443,762	1.85%	-	Y	4,328,355.30	2.30%	22,561.58
San Joaquin	4,245,431	1.83%	3,377,785	1.82%	-	Y	4,245,431.00	2.26%	22,129.33
San Luis Obispo	954,201	0.41%	765,888	0.41%	-	N	-	0%	-
San Mateo	827,243	0.36%	663,986	0.36%	-	N	-	0%	-
Santa Barbara	1,875,853	0.81%	1,492,481	0.80%	-	Y	1,875,852.58	1.00%	9,777.89
Santa Clara	2,687,186	1.16%	2,138,001	1.15%	-	Y	2,687,185.81	1.43%	14,006.97
Santa Cruz	563,955	0.24%	563,955	0.30%	-	N	-	0%	-
Shasta	1,313,197	0.56%	1,044,817	0.56%	-	Y	1,313,196.89	0.70%	6,845.05
Sierra	31,447	0.01%	31,447	0.02%	-	N	-	0%	-
Siskiyou	172,097	0.07%	250,588	0.13%	-	N	-	0%	-
Solano	1,386,404	0.60%	1,112,796	0.60%	-	N	-	0%	-
Sonoma	2,060,600	0.89%	1,639,472	0.88%	-	Y	2,060,600.31	1.10%	10,740.89
Stanislaus	1,614,945	0.69%	1,284,896	0.69%	-	Y	1,614,945.33	0.86%	8,417.91
Sutter	430,755	0.19%	363,813	0.20%	-	N	-	0%	-
Tehama	339,029	0.15%	339,029	0.18%	-	N	-	0%	-
Trinity	65,884	0.03%	83,204	0.04%	-	N	-	0%	-
Tulare	3,753,824	1.61%	1,984,956	1.07%	-	N	-	0%	-
Tuolumne	317,223	0.14%	304,674	0.16%	-	N	-	0%	-
Ventura	1,998,532	0.86%	1,590,089	0.86%	-	Y	1,998,532.23	1.06%	10,417.36
Yolo	1,473,280	0.63%	1,182,527	0.64%	-	N	-	0%	-
Yuba	807,295	0.35%	600,000	0.32%	-	N	-	0%	-
Unallocated	-		100,000		-		-		-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 232,480,168</b>		<b>\$ 185,764,227</b>		<b>\$ 45,000</b>		<b>\$ 188,157,675.89</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 980,773.00</b>
<b>Funding Remaining for Reallocation as of September 2025</b>					<b>\$ 935,773</b>				
<b>Total Returned</b>					<b>\$ 980,773</b>				

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

**Title:** Trial Court Budget Change Concepts for Fiscal Year 2027–28

**Date:** 1/15/2026

**Contact:** Maria Lira, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-263-7320 | [maria.lira@jud.ca.gov](mailto:maria.lira@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

Determine trial court funding priorities and budget change concept proposals for consideration during the fiscal year (FY) 2027–28 budget development process for the judicial branch.

**Background**

The Judicial Council gathers input on budget priorities for the judicial branch through a structured and collaborative process that relies on advisory committees, court leadership groups, and the Judicial Branch Budget Committee. This process is designed to ensure that the courts have a direct role in shaping statewide budget requests and funding priorities.

In December 2016, the Judicial Council approved a revised process for preparing, approving, and submitting budget change proposals (BCPs) to the Department of Finance. The new approach formally incorporated the Judicial Branch Budget Committee into the workflow<sup>1</sup>.

During the initial phase of the annual budget development cycle, advisory committees—representing the operational needs and priorities of the courts—submit recommendations for potential budget change concepts. The Judicial Branch Budget Committee evaluates the concepts, selects those that align with branchwide priorities, and approves them for advancement. The selected proposals are then presented to the Judicial Council for final review and approval before submission to the Department of Finance.

**Trial Court Funding Priorities and Budget Proposals**

**FY 2027–28 Budget Development Process**

To prepare for discussions about potential statewide BCPs for FY 2027–28, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) asked each of its members to reach out to two or three

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (December 16, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4817140&GUID=6165243B-1678-4074-B1D7-AB5A1467CA6F>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (December 16, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=463484&GUID=8E4B8E76-2D88-480D-843A-6576CC996914>.

trial courts. The goal was to gather each court's top budget priorities, in addition to the priorities identified by the members' own courts. All of this input has been compiled and summarized in Attachment 5A.

Beyond reviewing the budget concepts generated within the TCBAC itself, the committee will also evaluate BCP concepts submitted by other judicial branch committees—specifically those for which the TCBAC has been identified as having oversight or advisory responsibility. This cross-committee review will take place at a future TCBAC meeting.

### **FY 2026–27 Budget Change Proposals**

For the FY 2026–27 budget development process, the TCBAC met on January 22, 2025<sup>2</sup>, and prioritized the top two budget concepts for the trial courts for recommendation to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee. The proposals included (1) an inflationary adjustment (Consumer Price Index) to address operational cost increases and (2) equity funding to bring all courts below the statewide average funding level up to the average.

The TCBAC also affirmed support for additional funding for the following trial court budget priorities submitted through other committees:

- New and deferred facility maintenance (including facility modifications, upgrades, and deferred maintenance);
- Courthouse construction (including courthouses not managed by the Judicial Council and associated security measures);
- Unfunded mandates (including AB 1058, California Family Code 3150 counsel for minors, mental health diversion, conservatorship changes, and post-conviction work);
- Technology (including information technology modernization, equipment purchases, staff, support, licensing, and infrastructure); and
- Self-help services.

In addition to the aforementioned priorities, on November 22, 2024, the TCBAC directed Judicial Council staff to work with the trial courts to develop a FY 2026–27 funding request for additional court interpreter resources.

On July 18, 2025<sup>3</sup>, the Judicial Council approved the following judicial branch BCPs, without prioritization, for submission to the Department of Finance for consideration in the FY 2026–27 Governor's Budget.

---

<sup>2</sup> TCBAC meeting materials (January 22, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250122-materials.pdf>; TCBAC meeting minutes (January 22, 2025), <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250122-minutes.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council meeting report (July 18, 2025), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14500158&GUID=61E77613-7EA9-4A71-B2D5-9D7A26A3233E>; Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 18, 2025), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=1191558&GUID=70D73DAF-105B-4EDD-A9EB-DFFB0F5AA66D>

- Inflationary Adjustment for Trial Courts (Consumer Price Index)
- Trial Court Equity Funding to Statewide Average
- Language Access in the California Courts
- Litigation Management Program
- Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal Court-Appointed Counsel Programs
- Courts of Appeal Security: Judicial Protection and Unarmed Guard Coverage
- Racial Justice Act Retroactivity for California Courts
- Continuation of Courts of Appeal Workload
- Capital Outlay Funding: Fiscal Years 2026–27 through 2030–31
- Capital Outlay Projects Prioritization and Reassessment
- Orange Central Justice Center – Facility Modifications
- Support for Judicial Branch Facility Modifications
- Support for Judicial Branch Facilities Maintenance and Utilities
- Trial Court Physical Security Assessment and Evaluation
- Los Angeles Spring Street Courthouse – Courtrooms Relocation
- Workload Assessment for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel

### **Funding in the Budget for Trial Courts**

For reference, the following information details specific funding and proposals for the trial courts included in the Budget Act of 2025 and the Governor’s Budget proposal for FY 2026–27.

#### **Budget Act of 2025**

The Budget Act of 2025 included the following for the trial courts:

- \$42 million ongoing General Fund to partially restore the \$97 million reduction to trial court operations included in the Budget Act of 2024;
- \$40 million ongoing General Fund to help trial courts address increases in operational costs and mitigate potential reductions to core programs and services;
- \$20 million one-time General Fund available over three fiscal years (FY 2025–26 through FY 2027–28) for the Judicial Council and the trial courts to implement Proposition 36;
- \$19.8 million ongoing General Fund for trial court employee health benefits and retirement costs;
- \$1.7 million General Fund and 3 positions in FY 2025–26 and \$1.6 million ongoing to implement SB 910 (Stats. 2024, ch. 641), which requires counties and courts that opt to have treatment court programs ensure they are designed and operated according to state and national guidelines;
- \$1.0 million ongoing General Fund to implement SB 42 (Stats. 2024, ch. 640), which requires courts to provide ongoing notice of hearings to original petitioners who are related to or reside with the respondent throughout the Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act proceedings;

- \$5 million one-time General Fund (\$2.7 million in FY 2025–26, \$1.5 million in FY 2026–27, and \$800,000 in FY 2027–28) for the Superior Court of Sacramento County to implement the requirements of the Tribal Nations Access to Justice Act (SB 549, Stats. 2024, ch. 860);
- \$16.6 million for superior court judges’ compensation;
- Trailer bill language to allow trial courts to use court interpreter funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for the total number of court interpreter coordinators required by each court and remove the requirement for coordinators to be certified or registered interpreters; and
- Civil fee and criminal fine and penalty revenues are sufficient to address current funding needs. Therefore, there is no projected need for a revenue backfill. Budget bill language provides authority to request additional resources as needed.

The Budget Act of 2025 also included the following budget solutions to address the state’s fiscal deficit:

- \$38 million of the unrestricted fund balance reserves in the Trial Court Trust Fund will be transferred to the General Fund;
- \$5 million General Fund reduction in FY 2025–26 and \$20 million ongoing reduction for the Pretrial Release Program. This will result in total funding of \$65 million General Fund in FY 2025–26 and \$50 million General Fund annually beginning in FY 2026–27. Budget bill language provides authority for a midyear reallocation of unspent funding to courts in need of additional funding to support pretrial services;
- \$34.3 million in unspent funding will be returned to the State Court Facilities and Construction Fund from various completed project phases (\$5.9 million) and interest generated from the funding deposits (\$28.4 million);
- \$36.6 million will be returned to the General Fund from previous appropriations to the judicial branch. This includes a portion of the funding for incompetent to stand trial evaluations received from the Department of State Hospitals (\$9.1 million) and funding to implement AB 1981 (Stats. 2022, ch. 326) to conduct a study on the effect of increased juror compensation on juror diversity and participation (\$27.5 million). Trailer bill language eliminates the requirement to conduct the juror study; and
- Commencement of the Tracy Courthouse project (\$2.9 million) for the Superior Court of San Joaquin County will be deferred to a future fiscal year.

### **FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget**

The FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget includes the following proposals for the trial courts:

- \$70 million ongoing General Fund to help the trial courts address increases in operational costs and mitigate potential reductions to core program and services;
- \$4.3 million General Fund annually for four years (FYs 2026–27 through 2029–30), to implement SB 820 (Stats. 2025, ch. 330), which requires new incompetency to stand trial and involuntary medication order procedures for the trial courts;
- \$21.7 million ongoing General Fund for increased trial court employee health benefits and retirement costs;
- \$2.1 million for compensation of superior court judges; and

- Civil fee and criminal fine and penalty revenues are sufficient to address current funding needs. Therefore, there is no projected need for a revenue backfill at this time. Budget bill language provides authority to request additional resources as needed.

### **Recommendation**

Approve and prioritize the budget change concept submissions for FY 2027–28, taking into account the proposals included in the FY 2026–27 Governor’s Budget. The final prioritized list will serve as the basis for recommendations submitted to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee for consideration in the upcoming budget development process for the judicial branch.

### **Attachments**

**Attachment 5A:** FY 2027–28 Trial Court Funding Priorities

**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**FY 2027–28 Trial Court Funding Priorities**  
January 15, 2026

	2027-28 Budget Change Proposal Concept Title	#1 Priority submissions	#2 Priority submissions	#3 Priority submissions
<b>Cost of Court Operations</b>				
	Inflationary Adjustment (Consumer Price Index)	44	9	
	Equity Funding	3	11	2
	Restoration	4	1	
<b>Facilities</b>				
	Ongoing Facility Lease Funding		2	1
	New and Deferred Facility Maintenance Funding (including facility modifications, upgrades, and deferred maintenance)	1		3
	Funding for Courthouse Construction (including courthouses not managed by the Judicial Council and associated security measures)	1	7	6
<b>General Operations</b>				
	Increased Court Reporter Funding		1	5
	Court Interpreter Funding		1	3
	Court Appointed Dependency Counsel	1	2	
	Funding for Unfunded Mandates (including AB 1058, California Family Code 3150 counsel for minors, mental health diversion, conservatorship changes, and post-conviction work)	1	1	5
	Mental Health Funding (including caseload, reports, and doctor costs; forensic and psychological evaluations; and competency to stand trial evaluations)		2	4
	Self-Help Funding		7	6
<b>Information Technology (IT)</b>				
	Increased and Ongoing Technology Funding (including IT modernization, equipment purchases, staff, support, licensing, and infrastructure)	2	11	13
	Funding for Remote Courtroom and Public Services		1	2
<b>Security</b>				
	Increased Non-Sheriff Court Security Funding (including perimeter and marshal security)	1	2	5
	Trial Court Physical Security Assessment and Evaluation			
<b>Other</b>				
	New Judgeships and Related Staff Funding		1	
	Revenue Backfill for Declining Funding			1
	Automation/Case Management System Licensing			1
	Security: Increased Costs for Sheriff's Services			1

Includes input from 58 trial courts