

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688 www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 20-053

For business meeting on: July 24, 2020

Title

Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for Fiscal Year 2020–21

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes AffectedNone

Recommended by

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

July 24, 2020

Date of Report

July 2, 2020

Contact

Oksana Tuk, 916-643-8027 oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

For the 2020–21 fiscal year, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends the Judicial Council allocate \$2.207 billion to the trial courts from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), \$68.8 million from the state General Fund for employee benefits, and \$50.0 million in Immediate and Critical Needs Account (ICNA) for support for operation of the trial courts. This allocation incorporates \$50 million in one-time funding for COVID-19 backlog and an ongoing reduction of \$167.831 million. The TCBAC also recommends the Judicial Council approve the Workload Formula allocation of \$1.951 billion based on methodologies approved by the Judicial Council. Assuming approval of the allocations, current revenue projections, and estimated savings from 2019–20 appropriations, the TCTF will end 2020–21 with a fund balance of \$54.8 million, of which approximately \$26.4 million will be unrestricted. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent recession, these allocations may change based on available state revenues and additional budget decisions.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 24, 2020:

- 1. Approve allocation of the one-time \$50 million for COVID-19 backlog;
- 2. Approve allocation of the ongoing reduction amount of \$167.831 million;
- 3. Approve the base, discretionary, and nondiscretionary program allocations from the TCTF in the amount of \$2.207 billion (Attachment A, line 68);
- 4. Approve a General Fund allocation in the amount of \$68.8 million for employee benefits (Attachment A, line 8);
- 5. Approve an ICNA allocation in the amount of \$50.0 million for support for operation of the trial courts (Attachment A, line 9); and
- 6. Approve the total Workload Allocation of \$1.951 billion based on methodologies approved by the Judicial Council (Attachment B, column W).

Policy implications

These recommendations are consistent with the statutory requirement for the council to make a preliminary allocation for the trial courts in July of each fiscal year.

All items were approved by a unanimous vote by the TCBAC, except for the \$50 million allocation of one-time funding for COVID-19 backlog which had two no votes.

The two "no" votes, where both committee members represented a small, rural county and felt the need to adhere to the core Judicial Council principals of equity. While understanding and respecting other arguments and a need for unity during difficult times, they believed that unless the Legislature explicitly directs otherwise, all Judicial branch processes should be based on equity with special consideration to the underfunded courts.

Relevant Previous Council Action

Base, discretionary, and nondiscretionary program allocations from the TCTF and General Fund

Allocation of trial court funds is one of the principal responsibilities of the Judicial Council. Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A)¹ requires the council to make a preliminary allocation for the trial courts in July of each fiscal year and finalize allocations in January of each fiscal year.

Workload Formula allocation

On January 12, 2018, the council approved changes to the Workload Formula that eliminated the historical base to improve transparency, accountability, and predictability—and to simplify

¹ See http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=68502.5.&lawCode=GOV.

reporting. In addition, as identified in the January 2018 report to the council, the TCBAC established the "[p]rinciples of WAFM for 2018–19 and [b]eyond," which included "[s]implification of reporting while maintaining transparency.²"

The council also approved the following policy and process to allocate funding in years where new, discretionary funding is available to the trial courts:

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

At its meeting on March 15, 2019, the council approved increasing the base funding floor from \$750,000 to \$800,000.³ The base funding floor is currently allocated to the two smallest superior courts, the Alpine and Sierra courts, with the funding allocated through a pro rata reduction to the allocations of all other courts that do not qualify for the base funding floor.

At its meeting on January 17, 2020, the council approved technical refinements to the Workload Formula parameters to provide clear allocation methodologies to further the goals of funding equity, minimizing adverse funding impacts to trial courts, and providing clear direction on applying policy parameters as follow⁴:

- 1. Specify that the methodology for the first 50 percent allocation of new funding to courts below the statewide average be scaled by courts' distance from the statewide average and size based on the courts' Workload Formula need;
- 2. Include an exception for consistency purposes to allow the 2020–21 funding provided in the 2019 Budget Act for support of the 25 judgeships to apply the same allocation methodology used for 2019–20; and

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology* (Dec. 8, 2017), p. 7, https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-

<u>https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-6A8D8502A126</u>.

³ See https://jcc.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3856591&GUID=4FC1924A-A956-4924-B7F9-E4D63AECE94B&Options=&Search="https://jcc.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3856591&GUID=4FC1924A-A956-4924-B7F9-E4D63AECE94B&Options=&Search="https://jcc.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=3856591&GUID=4FC1924A-A956-4924-B7F9-E4D63AECE94B&Options=&Search="https://jcc.legislationDetail.aspx">https://jcc.legislationDetail.aspx?ID=3856591&GUID=4FC1924A-A956-4924-B7F9-E4D63AECE94B&Options=&Search="https://jcc.legislationDetail.aspx">https://jcc.legislationDetail.aspx?

⁴ Judicial Council meeting report (January 17, 2020), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7976128&GUID=DC14BAC5-0079-4C0C-A0E6-52C7EC068BB0.

- 3. Specify that the reallocation of funding for every second year in which no new money is provided be based on beginning Workload Formula allocations, distributed to courts via distance from statewide average and size based on Workload Formula need, and in the following sequence:
 - a. Up to 1 percent reduction for courts above the 2 percent band to courts below the 2 percent band.
 - b. Up to 2 percent reduction for courts above 105 percent of funding need to courts below the 2 percent band.
 - c. Courts above 105 percent of funding need will not fall below 104 percent of funding need.
 - d. Courts that penetrate the band following the up to 1 percent reallocation will not be eligible for additional funding from the 2 percent reallocation from courts above 105 percent of funding need.

Analysis/Rationale

Recommendation 1: Approve allocation of the one-time \$50 million in COVID-19 backlog During the TCBAC meeting on June 11, 2020, the committee approved the recommendation for one-time \$50 million in funding for COVID-19—related case filing backlog, and that it be allocated to all courts, including the base funding floor courts, pro rata based on courts' Workload Formula.

Alternatives considered

Several allocation methodology options for the \$50 million COVID-19—related backlog funding in 2020–21 were discussed. Below is the list of options that were considered with main highlights for each:

- 1. Pro rata allocation based on courts' Workload Allocation
 - a. Pros
 - Keeps base funding floors at current Judicial Council-approved level.
 - Funding is allocated to all courts with the presumption that each court has been adversely impacted as a result of the statewide closure due to COVID-19.
 - b. Cons
 - Not consistent with current Judicial Council adopted methodologies for allocating new money.
 - Funding will not be distributed equitably.
- 2. Pro rata allocation based on courts' Workload Formula
 - a. Pros
 - Partially consistent with Judicial Council–approved methodology for allocating new money in that funding is based on Workload Formula.
 - Allocates funding per intent that it is pandemic-related and is not tied to equity.

b. Cons

- Not fully consistent with current Judicial Council adopted methodologies for allocating new money.
- Does not address unique funding needs of smaller courts.
- 3. Allocation based on the council-approved Workload Formula
 - a. Pros
 - Consistent with Judicial Council-approved methodology for allocating new money.
 - Addresses funding equity among courts.

b. Cons

- Allocates one-time funding for specific purpose in a manner established for ongoing, discretionary funds.
- Does not allocate on a pro rata basis; therefore, does not recognize that each trial court may have unique COVID-19-related backlog costs not addressed by principles related to equity.
- 4. Staggered distribution based on courts' Workload Formula–initial allocation of a portion of the funding (such as 60%), with remainder of funding disbursed at a later date in the fiscal year
 - a. Pros
 - Allows time to gather data regarding backlog in order to accurately assess impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

b. Cons

- Partial funding does not address the ongoing need of all trial courts to have sufficient funds necessary to effectively reduce and control COVID-19 backlog that will continue to occur given the unpredictable nature of the spread of the coronavirus.
- Partially withholding such funds hinders the ability of trial courts to take immediate steps to reduce and control COVID-19—related backlog as it continues to occur.

Public Comments

No public comment received.

Recommendation 2: Approve allocation of the ongoing \$168.731 million reduction

The TCBAC unanimously approved the recommendation for the allocation methodology for the \$167,831,000 reduction for trial court operations. The methodology applies the reduction, excluding base funding floor courts, based on courts' Workload Formula by establishing a 4 percent band around the statewide average funding level (2 percent above the average funding level and 2 percent below), and includes the following criteria:

1. Courts within the band take a pro rata reduction, but do not fall outside the band;

- 2. Courts above the band take up to an additional 1 percent cut from those within the band without falling into the band;
- 3. Courts below the band take less of a cut than those within the band, scaled by their size and distance from the statewide average, not taking more of a cut than those inside of the band; and
- 4. Cluster 1 courts—all of which are above the band—take the same percentage reduction as courts within the band, but are not required to take the additional percentage reduction as those other courts above the band.

Alternatives considered

Various allocation methodologies for the reduction to trial court operations were discussed for consideration. Below is the list of options that were considered with the main highlights for each:

- 1. Pro rata reduction based on courts' Workload Formula holding funding floor courts at Judicial Council—approved funding level and Cluster 1 courts at current funding allocation level.
 - a. Pros
 - Maintains the status quo holding the positions of all the courts that made progress in improving funding levels.
 - Keeps base funding floors and Cluster 1 courts at current level.
 - b. Cons
 - Inconsistent with Judicial Council policy addressing funding equity.
 - Excludes special consideration to courts below statewide average funding.
- 2. Pro rata reduction based on courts' Workload Allocation holding funding floor courts at Judicial Council—approved funding level and Cluster 1 courts at current funding allocation level.
 - a. Pros
 - Equalizes reduction through proportional reduction.
 - Keeps base funding floor courts and Cluster 1 courts funding at current level.
 - b. Cons
 - Inconsistent with Judicial Council policy addressing funding equity.
 - Will perpetuate the underfunded courts to be even more underfunded based on their historic positions.
- 3. Split funding allocation (50/50, 40/60, and 30/70), where a percentage reduction is applied to courts above the statewide average and the remaining percentage is applied to courts below the average based on either the courts' Workload Formula or Workload Allocation.
 - a. Pros
 - Provides more tailored approach for reduction.
 - Ensures control of funding allocation.

b. Cons

- Risk that gains toward equity may be lost.
- Courts currently above statewide average may fall below statewide average.
- 4. Reduction based on courts' Workload Formula and establishment of 4, 6, and 8 percent bands around the statewide funding level where:
 - Courts within the band take a pro rata reduction, but do not fall outside the band;
 - Courts above the band take up to an additional 1 percent cut from those within the band without falling into the band;
 - Courts below the band take an approximate 1 percent cut below those within the band, scaled by their size and distance from the statewide average, not taking more of a cut than those inside of the band; and
 - Cluster 1 courts take the same reduction as courts within the band.
 - a. Pros
 - Moves even more towards equity and more closely aligned with principals.
 - Solution does not disadvantage one court more than another.
 - To an extent, can provide a little more relief for courts below the band (which are at the bottom of the equity distribution).

b. Cons

- Negative adjustments are more impactful for larger number of courts.
- No special consideration for Cluster 1 courts.

Public Comments

The TCBAC received and considered a total of five public comments prior to its June 11, 2020 and June 18, 2020 meetings regarding allocation of the \$167,831,000 reduction.

Below is a brief summary for each of the five comments:

- 1. In a joint effort, 29 superior courts submitted detailed comments outlining prior committee discussions, funding reduction principals and purposes, and ideas for committee consideration on reduction approaches and methodology that underscores the court's position that while pro rata distribution seems to be a relatively simple and straightforward way to handle the reduction, it does not adequately address the competing principals and priorities on which the branch had previously reached consensus. The committee was asked to consider whether its alternative proposals are more feasible, realistic, and better aligned with overarching branch priorities and goals of equity, fairness, and parity.
- 2. The Sacramento Superior Court expressed support for the message presented as a joint effort by the 29 superior courts mentioned above and views a reduction on a pro rata basis as inconsistent with prior direction of the Judicial Council. The court submitted additional comments highlighting language from a recent TCBAC report to the Judicial Council that stated "...allocating dollars based on allocation perpetuates the disparity in allocations, which

the Workload Formula is meant to remedy. Allocating dollars based on need supports the path to equity."

- 3. The San Bernardino Superior Court stated the importance in remaining consistent with underlying goals and values that the Workload Formula was founded upon, advocating that reductions not be made on a pro rata basis, but rather in an approach that balances the principals, measures, and methodologies—while keeping with past commitments—and giving due consideration towards courts below the statewide average funding.
- 4. The Riverside Superior Court submitted comments recognizing that all courts have to share in the reductions, while still trying to comply with the spirit of the approved Workload Formula, which takes into consideration a court's workload need. The Riverside court asked the committee to consider that among the proposed band scenarios, the 8% band applies a straight pro rata reduction to the highest number of courts and, at the same time, provides courts below the band a slightly lesser reduction based on their size and distance from the statewide average.
- 5. The Del Norte Superior Court expressed concerns regarding Cluster 1 courts being underrepresented at the committee level, and that there was little advocacy for the state's small courts. The committee was asked to consider that small courts are at a unique disadvantage when applying broad funding methodologies without consideration to size or scale, and that a blanket approach doesn't reasonably account for outliers such as Cluster 1 courts. While being very cognizant of the burden that reduction brings on all courts, the court requested the committee consider alternative reductions to Cluster 1 courts.

Recommendation 3: Approve Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) base, discretionary, and non-discretionary allocations

Approve \$2.207 billion in 2020–21 TCTF base allocations and allocations from the TCTF for the Judicial Council, for support for operation of the trial courts, and for expenses on behalf of the trial courts.

A number of allocations are required by the Budget Act (e.g., a \$50 million distribution from the ICNA for court operations), or are various revenue distributions required by statute, or are authorized charges for the cost of programs or cash advances.

Base, discretionary, and non-discretionary programs

Program 0140010 – Judicial Council

Allocation for Judicial Council staff in the amount of \$3,764,417 (Attachment A, line 43).

Program 0150010 – Support for Operation of the Trial Courts

TCTF allocation in the amount of \$1,851,913,312 (Attachment A, line 24), which includes:

1. A net reduction of \$32,761,989 for 2019-20 allocation adjustments (Attachment A, line 6), consisting of:

- i. \$20,938,011 for 2019-20 non-interpreter benefits cost change augmentation.
- ii. \$3.7 million reduction to remove the remaining Self-Help reimbursement program funding.
- iii. \$50 million reduction to remove funding provided by ICNA.
- 2. \$10,907,514 for 2 percent automation replacement previously provided from 2 percent automation revenues pursuant to Government Code section 77207.5 (Attachment A, line 12).
- 3. \$943,840 for telephonic appearances based on 2009-10 revenue-sharing arrangements as required by Government Code section 72011 (Attachment A, line 13).
- 4. New and changed allocations totaling a net reduction of \$71,845,220 (Attachment A, line 23), which includes:
 - i. \$28,936,780 for 2020-21 full-year cost changes for retirement, employee health, and retiree health for non-court interpreter employees (Attachment A, line 16).
 - ii. \$9,223,000 for criminal justice realignment funding based on the most current available post release community supervision and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council's Criminal Justice Services office under Penal Code section 13155 (Attachment A, line 17).
 - iii. \$2,929,000 for one-time cannabis conviction resentencing (Attachment A, line 18).
 - iv. \$4,798,075 for support related to the funding for 25 new judgeships (Attachment A, line 19).
 - v. \$98,925 for non-sheriff security for new judgeships (Attachment A, line 20).
 - vi. \$167,831,000 reduction included (Attachment A, line 22).
 - vii. \$50,000,000 for one-time COVID-19 related case filing backlog (Attachment A, line 21).
- 5. Allocation for costs incurred by, and reimbursed to trial courts in the amount of \$42,712,686 (Attachment A, line 52), which includes:
 - i. \$14,500,000 for Jury (Attachment A, line 45).
 - ii. \$1,800,000 for Screening Equipment Replacement (Attachment A, line 46).
 - iii. \$25,300,000 for Self-Help Center (Attachment A, line 47).
 - iv. \$332,340 for Elder Abuse (Attachment A, line 48).

- v. \$455,346 for Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (Attachment A, line 50).
- vi. 325,000 for California State Auditor Audits (Attachment A, line 51).

Program 0150011 – Court Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocation in the amount of \$156,700,000 for Court Appointed Dependency Counsel (Attachment A, line 27).

• Assumes council approval of Court Appointed Counsel item.

Program 0150037 – Court Interpreters

Allocation in the amount of \$130,480,000 (Attachment A, line 33), which includes:

- 1. \$120,686,000 in 2019-20 appropriation (Attachment A, line 29).
- 2. \$1,114,000 for 2020-21 court interpreter employee benefits cost change (Attachment A, line 30).
- 3. \$257,000 in 2020-21 new judgeships funding (Attachment A, line 31).
- 4. \$8,423,000 for 2020-21 Budget Change Proposal funding (Attachment A, line 32).

Program 0150095 – Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts
Allocation in the amount of \$21,186,152 for expenditures incurred by the Judicial Council on behalf of the trial courts (Attachment A, line 60).

The projected 2020–21 ending TCTF fund balance is \$54.8 million (Attachment C, column E, row 28). Approximately \$28.4 million are monies that are either statutorily restricted or restricted by the council (Attachment C; column E, row 30). The estimated unrestricted fund balance is \$26.4 million (Attachment C; column E, row 31). The 2020-21 preliminary allocation requests totaling \$2.207 billion can be supported by the TCTF based on current revenue projections and 2019-20 projected savings.

Public Comments

No public comment received.

Recommendation 4: Approve General Fund Employee Benefit Allocations

Approve \$68,818,575 in General Fund allocations for employee benefits (Attachment A, line 8). This allocation is ongoing and funds cost increases associated with retirement, employee health, and retiree health benefits for the period 2010–11 through 2011–12.

Public Comments

No public comment received.

Recommendation 5: Approve Immediate and Critical Needs Account (ICNA) Allocations Approve \$50,000,000 from the ICNA for support for operation of the trial courts (Attachment A, line 9).

Public Comments

No public comment received.

Recommendation 6: Approve 2020-21 Workload Allocations

Approve the 2020-21 Workload Allocation including allocations, revenues, and adjustments in the amount of \$1.951 billion (Attachment B, columns W).

Changes to the prior year Workload Allocation include:

- a. Adjustment to subordinate judicial officer (SJO) allocation totaling \$784,584 (Attachment B, column L).
- b. A change of \$157,163 in Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics collections from fiscal year 2017-18 to 2018-19 (Attachment B, column M).
- c. 2020-21 non-interpreter benefits cost change totaling \$28,936,780 (Attachment B, column N).
- d. An allocation of \$10,000,000 in discretionary funding that was formerly designated for court reporters in family law in 2018-19 (Attachment B, column O).
- e. Criminal Justice Realignment funding of \$9,223,000 (Attachment B, column P).
- f. 2018-19 revenues collected totaling \$104,343,805 (Attachment B, column Q)⁵.
- g. Remaining support for new judgeships totaling \$4,798,075, which includes a \$98,925 reduction for non-sheriff security (Attachment B, columns R-T).
- h. 2020-21 Workload Funding Floor Adjustment, which includes funding floor allocations for two courts (Alpine and Sierra Superior Courts) totaling \$77,520, with all other courts sharing pro rata in the reduction to cover the funding floor allocations (Attachment B, column V). The funding floor adjustment may change based on final appropriations included in the 2020 Budget Act.

11

⁵ Includes all other applicable revenue sources as recommended by the FMS.

Public Comments

No public comment received.

Pending allocations

There are items pending allocation from the Program 0150010 appropriation due to timing and when information will become available. These items include:

- a. Under Government Code section 77203(b), 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, effective June 30, 2020. Because the courts have until July 15, 2020 to provide preliminary 2019-20 ending fund balances, the preliminary reduction amounts related to trial court reserves above the 3 percent cap referenced in Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) will not be available in time for the Judicial Council's July 23-24, 2020 business meeting. The TCBAC will consider the final allocation reductions for fund balances above the 3 percent cap prior to recommendation to the Judicial Council before January 2021.
- b. The allocation of monies, using the council-approved formula, collected through the dependency counsel collections program will be brought to the TCBAC and council once final 2019–20 collections are known.
- c. The \$10 million in urgent needs funding assumes no allocations in 2020–21. If monies are allocated in 2020-21, courts would need to replenish the monies up to what was allocated by the council from their 2021-22 base allocation⁶.
- d. Various revenue distributions as required by statute or as authorized charges for the cost of programs or cash advances.
- e. Any changes to appropriations provided for in the final 2020 Budget Act.
- f. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, final TCTF allocation amounts for 2020-21 will be based on available state revenues and final budget decisions. Some modification might be necessary based on potential state revenue reductions and priority changes.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

If the recommendations to allocate funds are not approved, the fiscal and operational impacts to the trial courts will be significant.

Attachments and Links

- 1. Attachment A: 2020–21 TCTF Recommended Preliminary Allocations
- 2. Attachment B: 2020-21 Workload Allocation

⁶ Judicial Branch Budget Committee report (March 18, 2019), https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbbc-20190318-materials.pdf.

3. Attachment C: TCTF Fund Condition Statement

2020-21 TCTF Allocation

| 1 | 2019-20 Ending Ongoing TCTF Base Allocation | 1,944,669,167 |
|--|---|---|
| 2 | 2019-20 Allocation Adjustments | |
| 3 | Remove Remaining Self-Help - Reimbursement Program | (3,700,000) |
| 4 | Remove Allocation Funded from the Immediate and Critical Needs Account (ICNA) | (50,000,000) |
| 5 | 2019-20 Non-Interpreter Benefits Funding Augmentation | 20,938,011 |
| 6 7 | 2010 20 Adjusted TCTE Ongoing Boss Allosotion | (32,761,989) |
| 8 | 2019-20 Adjusted TCTF Ongoing Base Allocation General Fund (GF) Employee Benefits | 1,911,907,178 68,818,575 |
| 9 | Trial Court Operations Funded from ICNA | 50,000,000 |
| 10 | 2019-20 Total Base Allocation including GF and ICNA | 2,030,725,753 |
| | | _,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, |
| 11 | Other Allocations | |
| 12 | 2% Automation Replacement | 10,907,514 |
| 13 | Telephonic Appearances | 943,840 |
| 14 | No. and Character Allers Com- | 11,851,354 |
| 15 16 | New and Changed Allocations 2020-21 Non-Court Interpreter Benefits Cost Change | 28,936,780 |
| 17 | Criminal Justice Realignment | 9,223,000 |
| 18 | Cannabis Conviction Resentencing | 2,929,000 |
| 19 | Support for New Judgeships | 4,798,075 |
| 20 | Non-Sheriff Security for New Judgeships | 98,925 |
| 21 | Funding for COVID-19 Related Case Filing Backlog | 50,000,000 |
| 22 | Baseline Reduction | (167,831,000) |
| 23 | | (71,845,220) |
| 24 | 2020-21 TCTF Ongoing Base, Other and New and Changed Allocations - Program 0150010 | 1,851,913,312 |
| 25 | Other Program Allocations | |
| 26 | Court-Appointment Dependency Counsel - Program 0150011 | |
| 27 | Dependency Counsel Allocation | 156,700,000 |
| 28 | Court Interpreters - Program 0150037 | 120 (0(000 |
| 29 30 | 2019-20 Appropriation 2020-21 Court Interpreter Employee Benefits Cost Change | 120,686,000 |
| 31 | 2020-21 Court interpreter Employee Benefits Cost Change 2020-21 New Judgeships Funding | 1,114,000 257,000 |
| 32 | 2020-21 New studgeships Funding | 8,423,000 |
| 33 | | 130,480,000 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 34 | R&E Subcommittee Recommendations | |
| 35 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 | **** |
| 35 36 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program | 596,000 |
| 35 36 37 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund | 246,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections | 246,000 260,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs | 246,000 260,000 656,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services | 246,000 260,000 656,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 122,645 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 122,645 540,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations State Controller's Office Audits of Trial Courts 2020-21 Total TCTF Trial Court/Other Allocations | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 122,645 540,000 21,186,152 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 78 85 960 61 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations State Controller's Office Audits of Trial Courts | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 122,645 540,000 21,186,152 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 60 61 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations State Controller's Office Audits of Trial Courts 2020-21 Total TCTF Trial Court/Other Allocations | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 122,645 540,000 21,186,152 2,206,756,567 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 64 65 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations State Controller's Office Audits of Trial Courts 2020-21 Total TCTF Trial Court/Other Allocations 2020-21 Trial Court Allocation by Program 0140010 - Judicial Council 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 122,645 540,000 21,186,152 2,206,756,567 3,764,417 1,894,625,998 156,700,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations State Controller's Office Audits of Trial Courts 2020-21 Total TCTF Trial Court/Other Allocations 2020-21 Trial Court Allocation by Program 0140010 - Judicial Council 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel 0150037 - Court Interpreters | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 122,645 540,000 21,186,152 2,206,756,567 3,764,417 1,894,625,998 156,700,000 130,480,000 |
| 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 64 65 | Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Equal Access Fund Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections Statewide Support for Collections Programs Phoenix Financial Services Phoenix Human Resources Services Statewide E-Filing Implementation Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010 Jury Screening Equipment Replacement Self-Help Center Elder Abuse Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program California State Auditor Audits Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095 Children in Dependency Case Training Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System California Courts Technology Center Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations State Controller's Office Audits of Trial Courts 2020-21 Total TCTF Trial Court/Other Allocations 2020-21 Trial Court Allocation by Program 0140010 - Judicial Council 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel | 246,000 260,000 656,000 79,250 1,505,000 422,167 3,764,417 14,500,000 1,800,000 25,300,000 332,340 pending 455,346 325,000 42,712,686 113,000 18,094,937 1,626,767 688,803 122,645 540,000 21,186,152 2,206,756,567 |

2020-21 Trial Court Workload Allocation

| Alameda Alpine Alpine Butte Calaveras Colvas Colvas Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Glenn Humboldt Impertal | 2019-20 Total Base (TCTF, GF, ICNA) Allocation A 80,178,307 749,248 3.309,651 1,296,311 2,211,396,311 2,211,396,311 2,211,396,311 2,211,396,311 2,211,396,311 2,211,396,311 2,213,310 2,213,310 2,213,310 | CALCULATE | 2% Automation Replacement C 424,792 2,034 11,006 59,332 18,652 13,708 | | 2019-1 Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment E (3,310,250) | Remove Funding for Court Reporters in Family Law (Discretionary) | Remove Funding for Court Reporters in Family Law | SJO Adjustment | Total Workload Formula Related Adjustments | 2020-21 Beginning Workload Allocation | Fiscal Neutral Cost Change Reduction for SJO Conversion | Fiscal Neutral Offset SJO Adjustment (Change from | Change in Revenue Collected Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics | Fiscal Neutral Cost Change 2020-21 | Proportional Share | Current Methodology | Revenue Collected | | on Methodology App | lied in 2019-20 | 4% Band | RAS Methodology | 2020-21 Final | 2020-21 | 2020-21 Workload |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Alameda Alpine Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Glenn Humboldt | Total Base (TCTF, GF, ICNA) Allocation A 80,178,307 749,248 3,309,653 11,996,311 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,069,207 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,840 | Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics 101,727 20 687 13,452 890 377 67,729 465 | 2% Automation Replacement C | Self-Help D 1,005,139 34,679 56,654 | (FY 10-11) Adjustment | Court Reporters in Family Law (Discretionary) | Court Reporters in | , | Formula Related | Workload | Reduction for | SJO Adjustment | Automated Recordkeeping & | | Share | Methodology | Kevenue Collected | | оп месновоюку жрр | iled iii 2019-20 | 4% Band | Methodology | | | |
| Alameda Alpine Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Glenn Humboldt | Total Base (TCTF, GF, ICNA) Allocation A 80,178,307 749,248 3,309,653 11,996,311 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,069,207 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,840 | Recordkeeping & Micrographics 101,727 20 687 13,452 890 377 67,729 465 | C 424,792 2,034 11,006 59,332 18,652 | 1,005,139 34,679 56,654 | (FY 10-11) Adjustment | Court Reporters in Family Law (Discretionary) | Court Reporters in | , | Formula Related | Workload | | Adjustment | Recordkeeping & | | | | | | | | | | | | Workload |
| Alameda Alpine Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Glenn Humboldt | Allocation A. 80,178,307 749,248 3,309,653 11,996,311 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | Recordkeeping & Micrographics 101,727 20 687 13,452 890 377 67,729 465 | C 424,792 2,034 11,006 59,332 18,652 | 1,005,139 34,679 56,654 | (FY 10-11) Adjustment | Family Law (Discretionary) | Court Reporters in | , | Formula Related | Allocation | | | | | | | | Remaining Support | Remaining Support | | | 2020-21 | | | Formula |
| Alpine Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Contra Costa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Gilenn Humboldt | 749,248 3,309,653 11,996,311 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | 8 Micrographics 8 101,727 20 687 13,452 890 377 67,729 465 | C 424,792 2,034 11,006 59,332 18,652 | 1,005,139 34,679 56,654 | Adjustment | (Discretionary) | | , | | | SJO Conversion | (Change from | | Benefit Cost | Court Reporters in Family Law | Criminal Justice | | | for New Judgeships | Remaining Support for New Judgeships | 2020-21 May Revision Allocation | Workload | Workload Allocation | Workload Formula | Percentage |
| Alpine Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Contra Costa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Gilenn Humboldt | 749,248 3,309,653 11,996,311 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | 20 687 13,452 890 377 67,729 465 | 2,034 11,006 59,332 18,652 | 34,679 56,654 | E (3,310,250) | F | G | | | | | (ev) | (Change from | Change Funding ¹ | (Discretionary) | Realignment | Revenue Sources | (Cluster 1 Courts to | (Courts Below Statewide Average) | (Courts Below 100%) | Reduction | Funding Floor Adjustment | | | |
| Alpine Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Contra Costa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Gilenn Humboldt | 749,248 3,309,653 11,996,311 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | 20 687 13,452 890 377 67,729 465 | 2,034 11,006 59,332 18,652 | 34,679 56,654 | (3,310,250) | (397,540) | G | | | | | , | PY) | Funding | | | | 100%) | Statewide Average) | | | Aujustment | | | |
| Alpine Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Contra Costa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Gilenn Humboldt | 749,248 3,309,653 11,996,311 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | 20 687 13,452 890 377 67,729 465 | 2,034 11,006 59,332 18,652 | 34,679 56,654 | (3,310,250) | (397,540) | | | I (B:H) | 1 | К | L | М | N | 0 | P | q | R | s | Т | U | V | W (J:V) | x | Y (W/X) |
| Amador Butte Calaveras Colusa Contra Costa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Glenn Humboldt | 3,309,653 11,996,311 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | 13,452 890 377 67,729 465 | 11,006 59,332 18,652 | 56,654 | | | | (2,038,482) | (4,214,615) 36,733 | 75,963,692 785,981 | - | (194,581) | 2,926 | 382,965 25,363 | 397,540 | 234,162 | 3,912,553 31.812 | | | 64,809 | (6,685,811) | (2,946) (43,319) | 74,075,309 800,000 | 88,487,371 430.663 | 83.7% 185.8% |
| Calaveras Colusa Contra Costa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Glenn Humboldt | 2,821,885 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | 890 377 67,729 465 | 18,652 | 167 630 | - | | | | 68,347 | 3,378,000 | | (124,455) | 63 | 2,688 | | 3,753 | 241,681 | 131,205 | - | - | (238,163) | (135) | 3,394,638 | 3,632,936 | 93.4% |
| Colusa Contra Costa Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Gienn Humboldt | 2,010,225 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | 377 67,729 465 | | 60,659 | (486,597) | | (60,749) | (351,075) | (658,007) 80,201 | 11,338,304 2.902,086 | | (43,123) | 855 | 162,858 30.845 | 60,749 | 103,782 8.159 | 363,511 65.497 | | 258 | 10,991 | (983,800) (190,936) | (438) | 11,013,948 2.815.601 | 15,006,861 2,912,538 | 73.4% 96.7% |
| Del Norte El Dorado Fresno Glenn Humboldt | 42,313,195 3,089,307 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | 465 | | 47.010 | - : | - : | | - : | 61,096 | 2,902,086 | - : | - : | 62 | 30,845 18 921 | | 8,159 3,916 | 121 696 | 4 439 | | | (190,936) | (112) | 2,815,601 | 2,912,538 | 93.4% |
| El Dorado Fresno Glenn Humboldt | 7,623,140 52,102,101 2,253,830 | | 218,186 | 706,574 | | | (213,434) | (986,003) | (206,947) | 42,106,248 | | 198,046 | 6,370 | 661,377 | 213,434 | 116,020 | 4,651,361 | 9,000 | | 41,530 | (4,284,342) | (1,738) | 43,708,305 | 56,703,690 | 77.1% |
| Fresno Glenn Humboldt | 52,102,101 2,253,830 | | 11,208 | 50,009 | · | | | | 61,683 | 3,150,990 | | | 21 | 42,067 | | 14,523 | 92,021 | | | | (212,178) | (123) | 3,087,322 | 3,236,555 | 95.4% |
| Glenn Humboldt | 2,253,830 | 65,655 | 54,374 181.080 | 143,229 621.854 | - | (37,609) | | (118,284) | 45,159 (524,410) | 7,668,299 51,577,691 | | 92,945 | 327 4.174 | 159,495 1 107 907 | 37,609 265.110 | 35,084 319 179 | 208,956 | | 6.503 | 7,074 52.118 | (729,777) (4 665 024) | (297) | 7,479,715 51.679.582 | 9,658,668 71,160,168 | 77.4% |
| | | 494 | 19,264 | 50,958 | (10,186) | (103,110) | | (1,117,000) | 60,530 | 2,314,359 | | (04,433) | 2 | 68,717 | 103,110 | 7,506 | 148,281 | 121,659 | 0,303 | 32,220 | (174,415) | (99) | 2,486,011 | 2,660,525 | 93.4% |
| Imperial | 6,945,902 | 7,608 | 48,160 | 114,834 | (174,787) | | (34,954) | (122,238) | (161,377) | 6,784,525 | | (93,565) | 171 | (1,975) | 34,954 | 36,987 | 666,863 | | | 6,603 | (591,009) | (272) | 6,843,282 | 9,015,231 | 75.9% |
| Invo | 9,470,100 2,262,864 | 8,574 247 | 67,678 30.402 | 145,160 44,989 | (437,987) (194,430) | | (47,852) | (66.958) | (264,427) (185,750) | 9,205,673 2,077,114 | - | (170,987) 20.895 | 1,075 | 27,038 10.710 | 47,852 | 20,724 | 811,876 108.009 | | | 7,574 | (781,315) (141,161) | (365) | 9,169,144 2,081,514 | 10,340,787 2,153,266 | 88.7% 96.7% |
| Kern | 55,306,341 | 61,684 | 277,328 | 562,321 | (68,297) | | (281,681) | (1,988,380) | (1,437,024) | 53,869,316 | - : | (79,127) | 5,390 | 27,915 | 281,681 | 355,404 | 6,403,585 | | | 52,938 | (5,461,188) | (2,206) | 55,453,708 | 72,279,366 | 76.7% |
| Kings | 8,219,626 | 8,712 | 57,026 | 122,261 | (439,486) | (41,393) | | (206,922) | (499,802) | 7,719,823 | | 8,014 | (203) | 72,565 | 41,393 | 67,556 | 1,280,246 | | | 7,917 | (816,738) | (333) | 8,380,240 | 10,809,613 | 77.5% |
| Lake Lassen | 4,173,132 2,408,885 | 1,295 437 | 20,328 20,156 | 72,332 52,249 | (204,675) | (20,545) | | (67,039) | (198,303) (233,230) | 3,974,829 2,175,655 | | (4,472) (8,471) | 179 | 60,331 2,957 | 20,545 | 19,745 4.406 | 37,898 288,345 | | 7,504 | 4,011 | (308,102) (145,343) | (152) (92) | 3,812,315 2,317,492 | 5,476,122 2,217,057 | 69.6% 104.5% |
| Los Angeles | 574.868.320 | 924.417 | 3.144.530 | 6.078.704 | (14.889.678) | (2.886.810) | | (22,477,693) | (30.106.530) | 544.761.790 | | 3.234.221 | 78.689 | 8.716.568 | 2.886.810 | 3.008.209 | 16.061.460 | - : | 1.001.197 | 563.809 | (43.390.940) | | 536,900,459 | 769.805.490 | 69.7% |
| Madera | 8,514,767 | 2,713 | 52,502 | 126,366 | (397,287) | (43,218) | | | (258,924) | 8,255,843 | | | 277 | 150,937 | 43,218 | 50,749 | 537,565 | | 22,503 | 8,936 | (678,181) | (334) | 8,391,513 | 12,200,823 | |
| Marin Marinosa | 12,048,832 | 15,895 | 114,766 3,904 | 189,587 | (10,026) | (62,936) | | (34 500) | 247,286 14.441 | 12,296,118 1.393,844 | | (70,847) | (304) | 294,533 | 62,936 | 19,908 6.527 | 1,164,020 89,275 | 142 786 | | 10,711 | (1,104,974) | (504) | 12,671,596 1.521.173 | 14,624,434 1.627.957 | 86.6% 93.4% |
| Mendocino | 6,467,503 | 4.818 | 3,904 | 44,711 86.610 | (311,814) | (31,965) | | (34,500) | (222,284) | 6,245,220 | | (4,547) | 344 | 140.527 | 31,965 | 39,000 | 236.709 | 142,786 | | 5.472 | (564,531) | (244) | 6,134,461 | 7,471,627 | 93.4% |
| Merced | 13,473,390 | 14,324 | 55,652 | 196,115 | | | (68,995) | (331,916) | (134,819) | 13,338,571 | | 12,616 | 1,171 | 83,198 | 68,995 | 97,092 | 679,218 | | | 12,831 | (1,148,453) | (523) | 13,144,715 | 17,518,479 | 75.0% |
| Modoc | 1,071,107 | 294 | 6,134 | 39,654 42,094 | (822) | | | | 45,261 12,181 | 1,116,368 | | (8 669) | 9 | 18,176 13,343 | - | 1,958 | 36,178 | | | - | (76,380) | (44) | 1,096,265 | 1,165,104 | 94.1% |
| Mono Monterey | 2,012,882 20,941,046 | 204 | 12,446 183,464 | 42,094 295.097 | (25,162) | (103.764) | | (17,401) | 12,181 (855,834) | 2,025,063 20,085,213 | | (8,669) | 1.088 | 13,343 488.865 | 103,764 | 326 32,799 | 187,552 1.240.004 | | | 19.565 | (121,193) | (83) | 2,096,329 20,188,513 | 1,848,675 26,713,867 | 113.4% 75.6% |
| Napa | 7,866,465 | 2,562 | 30,550 | 118,053 | (307,859) | (203,704) | (40,006) | (422,851) | (619,550) | 7,246,915 | | 235,463 | 376 | 115,757 | 40,006 | 25,238 | 750,882 | | - | 7,441 | (678,525) | (308) | 7,743,246 | 10,159,229 | 76.2% |
| Nevada | 5,529,589 | 5,078 | 49,946 | 92,331 | (451,479) | | (28,461) | (308,250) | (640,834) | 4,888,755 | | (65,925) | 324 | 43,889 | 28,461 | 3,264 | 263,711 | | | 4,690 | (419,792) | (189) | 4,747,188 | 6,403,491 | 74.1% |
| Orange | 144,231,157 18,354,193 | 250,121 23,870 | 923,882 | 1,919,207 259,962 | (2,847,608) | (734,637) | (90,332) | (4,485,435) (862,171) | (4,974,470) (591,293) | 139,256,687 17,762,900 | - | 586,665 (180,508) | 15,904 1,455 | 2,745,091 223,749 | 734,637 90,332 | 476,810 47,648 | 11,504,887 1,442,645 | | 11,476 | 140,973 18,352 | (12,618,298) (1,451,920) | (5,681) (715) | 142,837,674 17,965,416 | 192,479,244 25,057,579 | 74.2% 71.7% |
| Plumas | 1,370,628 | 420 | 9,206 | 45,698 | | | (30,332) | (002,272) | 55,324 | 1,425,952 | | (100,300) | (50) | 32,266 | - | 3,916 | 23,207 | 186,010 | 11,470 | 10,331 | (109,565) | (62) | 1,561,674 | 1,671,301 | |
| Riverside | 106,421,603 | 56,063 | 532,226 | 1,441,569 | (2,011,947) | (514,099) | | (3,224,055) | (3,720,243) | 102,701,360 | | (244,395) | 8,231 | 2,455,622 | 514,099 | 720,110 | 13,256,648 | | | 102,279 | (10,551,328) | (4,334) | 108,958,292 | 139,647,866 | 78.0% |
| Sacramento San Benito | 87,562,992 3,511,682 | 206,758 | 340,254 14.700 | 928,062 67,557 | (1,942,057) | (415,809) | | (406,404) | (1,289,197) 83.404 | 86,273,796 3,595,086 | | (1,726,249) | (20,623) | 1,506,489 46.372 | 415,809 | 163,832 9.138 | 1,647,041 72,590 | 338.504 | 443,893 | 90,466 | (6,639,307) (266,273) | (3,267) | 82,151,879 3,795,305 | 123,519,200 4.061.729 | 66.5% 93.4% |
| San Bernardino | 111.256.348 | 167.675 | 435.474 | 1.309.047 | (3.405.583) | (554.088) | | (3.436.483) | (5.483.958) | 105.772.390 | | (266.871) | 5.042 | 828,496 | 554.088 | 1.146.008 | 3.198.033 | 330,304 | 165.066 | 107.806 | (8.337.791) | (4.103) | 103.168.164 | 147.195.060 | 70.1% |
| San Diego | 146,288,635 | 227,243 | 718,442 | 1,991,314 | (684,557) | (742,318) | | (4,407,483) | (2,897,358) | 143,391,277 | | 156,171 | 16,143 | 3,891,099 | 742,318 | 424,919 | 10,356,357 | | | 130,622 | (13,475,333) | (5,792) | 145,627,780 | 178,347,357 | 81.7% |
| San Francisco San Joaquin | 56,263,001 39,447,630 | 71,963 53,784 | 272,528 201,698 | 549,995 474.823 | (299.729) | (280,480) (194,123) | | (491,065) (961,545) | 122,941 (725,091) | 56,385,942 38,722,539 | | (1,414) (121,948) | 3,612 1,994 | 851,398 499,859 | 280,480 194,123 | 68,862 62,334 | 2,867,977 529,521 | | 103.660 | 45,021 39,485 | (4,644,515) (2,993,226) | (2,222) | 55,855,141 37,036,868 | 61,470,612 53,911,727 | 90.9% |
| San Luis Obispo | 15,021,320 | 15,361 | 130,020 | 199.324 | (251,739) | (74,917) | | (445,458) | (427,410) | 14,593,910 | | (21,112) | 1,568 | 235,451 | 74,917 | 79,142 | 1,169,255 | - : | 103,660 | 14,791 | (1,323,933) | (590) | 14,823,737 | 20,195,240 | 73.4% |
| San Mateo | 38,992,294 | 13,552 | 329,518 | 488,596 | (461,490) | (198,431) | | (1,653,021) | (1,481,276) | 37,511,018 | | 457,303 | 930 | 4,381 | 198,431 | 56,786 | 2,433,744 | | | 33,616 | (3,467,858) | (1,481) | 37,226,870 | 45,897,449 | 81.1% |
| Santa Barbara | 24,279,618 | 25,073 | 162,858 | 299,995 | (1,099,046) | (121,916) | | (552,146) | (1,285,183) | 22,994,435 | | (77,980) | 963 | 297,414 | 121,916 | 65,272 | 1,644,886 | | | 22,524 | (2,016,123) | (917) | 23,052,390 | 30,753,903 | 75.0% |
| Santa Clara Santa Cruz | 80,445,085 13,443,980 | 96,684 13,167 | 452,782 113,210 | 1,177,971 197,259 | - | (400,368) | (67.302) | (766,176) (266,678) | 560,893 (10,344) | 81,005,978 13.433,636 | | (50,772) | 5,847 | 1,364,681 225,492 | 400,368 67.302 | 169,706 26,435 | 219,137 703.863 | | 202 | 73,409 13,240 | (6,790,995) (1,185,108) | (3,038) | 76,394,321 13,288,289 | 100,230,170 18,077,614 | 76.2% 73.5% |
| Shasta | 15,487,199 | 3,732 | 44,394 | 139,418 | (2,743,529) | | (77,290) | (301,456) | (2,934,731) | 12,552,468 | | (11,609) | 441 | 196,604 | 77,290 | 81,263 | 281,517 | | 169 | | (1,079,724) | | 12,110,000 | 16,470,092 | 73.5% |
| Sierra | 712,676 | 55 | 1,830 | 35,893 | | | | | 37,778 | 750,454 | | | 1 | (79,480) | - | | 8,186 | | | | | 120,839 | 800,000 | 290,048 | 275.8% |
| Siskiyou Solano | 3,209,596 23,713,222 | 863 32,548 | 37,000 119,364 | 60,376 291.354 | (453 530) | (16,379) (116,378) | | (179,015) (448,631) | (97,155) (575,273) | 3,112,441 23,137,949 | | (15,365) (204.163) | 165 2.688 | 11,592 516.906 | 16,379 116.378 | 9,301 126,301 | 114,403 2.214.906 | | 1,371 | 3,056 23,319 | (243,258) | (120) | 3,009,966 23,846,100 | 4,172,970 31,838.641 | 72.1% 74.9% |
| Sonoma | 25,180,662 | 28,982 | 119,004 | 332,137 | (458,321) | (125,413) | - | (584,160) | (687,772) | 24,492,891 | - | (26,792) | 2,529 | 196,181 | 125,413 | 74,899 | 1,732,950 | | | 22,975 | (2,370,189) | (965) | 24,249,892 | 31,369,689 | 77.3% |
| Stanislaus | 26,398,689 | 33,615 | 88,718 | 357,479 | (9,714) | (133,542) | | (572,037) | (235,481) | 26,163,208 | | (5,297) | 1,410 | (61,654) | 133,542 | 123,037 | 713,028 | | 9,546 | 25,390 | (2,026,477) | (997) | 25,074,737 | 34,666,113 | 72.3% |
| Sutter Tehama | 6,034,069 4,640,864 | 1,908 | 37,382 28,100 | 91,226 | (257,359) | (29,222) | - | | (156,064) 78.094 | 5,878,005 4,718,958 | - | (7,491) | 222 136 | 145,430 100,800 | 29,222 | 22,519 | 478,871 175,678 | | 5,399 | 6,249 4.412 | (490,944) (447,518) | (242) | 6,074,731 4,591,623 | 8,532,084 6,024,257 | 71.2% 76.2% |
| Tehama Trinity | 4,640,864 2.166.252 | 1,228 | 28,100 7.648 | 71,772 42.044 | (536,359) | (23,006) | | - | 78,094 (486.014) | 4,718,958 1.680.238 | | (7,491) | 136 | 100,800 38,544 | 23,006 | 23,824 | 175,678 | | | 4,412 | (447,518) | (183) | 4,591,623 1.692.112 | 6,024,257 1,810,896 | 76.2% 93.4% |
| Tulare | 23,145,805 | 26,812 | 204,932 | 312,495 | (16,225) | (114,677) | - | (543,948) | (130,611) | 23,015,194 | | (29,206) | 666 | 18,668 | 114,677 | 96,113 | 1,736,957 | | 12,001 | 23,527 | (1,868,438) | (920) | 23,119,237 | 32,123,068 | 72.0% |
| Tuolumne | 4,004,125 | 1,024 | 16,642 | 66,290 540.054 | (229,698) | (19,861) | (004,000) | (61,207) (804,479) | (226,810) | 3,777,315 | | 28,480 | 100 | 141,078 (504,894) | 19,861 | 7,397 408.927 | 176,767 | | | 3,473 | (358,244) | (151) | 3,796,076 | 4,741,401 | 80.1% |
| Ventura Volo | 40,019,287 12,465,928 | 53,750 10,207 | 205,304 | 540,054 163,199 | (1,624,079) | (61 382) | (201,238) | (804,479) | (1,830,688) (446,580) | 38,188,599 12,019,349 | - | (21,323) (273,511) | 3,613 509 | (504,894) 60,979 | 201,238 61,382 | 408,927 | 1,195,772 | | 51,919 53,700 | 38,110 12,526 | (2,958,113) (926,704) | (1,456) | 36,602,392 11,466,631 | 52,034,179 17,102,756 | 70.3% 67.0% |
| Yuba | 5,249,859 | 1,602 | 15,788 | 78,018 | (138,089) | (25,770) | | | (68,452) | 5,181,407 | | (273,322) | 112 | 19,578 | 25,770 | 44,711 | 256,531 | | 33,700 | - | (388,043) | (204) | 5,139,860 | 5,135,790 | 100.1% |
| Total | 2,030,725,754 | 2,754,613 | 10,907,514 | 25,300,000 | (43,010,938) | (8,787,706) | (1,212,294) | (56,463,957) | (70,512,768) | 1,960,212,986 | | 784,584 | 157,163 | 28,936,780 | 10,000,000 | 9,223,000 | 104,343,805 | 1,004,667 | 1,896,704 | 1,896,704 | (167,831,000) | (0) | 1,950,625,393 | 2,626,768,921 | 74.3% |

2020-21 Trial Court Workload Allocation

| $\overline{}$ | | | Other | Allocations and Inform | | 0 | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|----------------------|---|
| Court | Non-Sheriff Security | Support for New Judgeships Non-Sheriff Security (0.23%) | SIOs (excludes AB 1058) | Funding for COVID- 19 Related Case Filing Backlog (One-Time) | Cannabis Conviction Resentencing | Telephonic Appearances | Total Other Allocations and Information | 2020-21 Total Allocation and Revenues | 2020-21 Supplemental Funding (\$10m Reserve) Replenishment | Preliminary One-Time Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 3% Cap | Total Adjustments | 2020-21 Total Adjusted Allocation and Revenues |
| | Z | AA | AB | AC | AD | AE | AF (Z:AE) | AG (W+AF) | AH | Al | AJ (AH:AI) | AK (AG+AJ) |
| Alameda | 3,310,250 | 7,614 | 2,233,064 | 1,684,339 | 114,103 | | 7,349,369 | 81,424,679 | | | | 81,424,679 |
| Alpine | | | | 8,198 | 511 | | 8,709 | 808,708 | | | | 808,708 |
| Amador Butte | 486.597 | 1.119 | 124,455 394 198 | 69,152 285.652 | 3,587 18.769 | 5,790 15.210 | 202,984 1,201,546 | 3,597,622 12.215.494 | | | | 3,597,622 12.215.494 |
| Calaveras | 486,597 | 1,119 | 394,198 | 285,652 55,440 | 3,950 | 15,210 | 1,201,546 | 2,875,782 | - | - | - : | 2,215,494 |
| Colusa | | | | 42,263 | 3,802 | /91 | 46,065 | 2,120,719 | - | | - : | 2,120,719 |
| Contra Costa | | | 787,957 | 1,079,343 | 44.483 | | 1,911,783 | 45,620,088 | | | | 45,620,088 |
| Del Norte | | | | 61,607 | 4,474 | | 66,081 | 3,153,403 | | | | 3,153,403 |
| El Dorado | | | 25,339 | 183,851 | 13,153 | 24,418 | 246,760 | 7,726,475 | | | | 7,726,475 |
| Fresno | | | 1,192,382 | 1,354,519 | 45,437 | 75,930 | 2,668,268 | 54,347,850 | | | - | 54,347,850 |
| Glenn | 10,186 | 23 | | 50,643 | 4,541 | 1,230 | 66,623 | 2,552,634 | | | | 2,552,634 |
| Humboldt | 174,787 | 402 | 215,802 | 171,603 | 17,452 | 12,250 | 592,297 | 7,435,578 | | | | 7,435,578 |
| Imperial | 437,987 194.430 | 1,007 | 170,987 46.063 | 196,835 40.987 | 22,651 | 25,465 1.395 | 854,932 | 10,024,076 | - | | | 10,024,076 |
| Inyo | 194,430 | 447 157 | 46,063 2.067.506 | 40,987 1.375.823 | 2,687 45.450 | 1,395 | 286,009 3,595,933 | 2,367,523 59.049.642 | | | | 2,367,523 59,049,642 |
| Kern Kings | 439.486 | 1.011 | 2,067,506 | 1,3/5,823 | 9,230 | 38,700 5.935 | 3,595,933 860.329 | 9,240,568 | | | | 9,240,568 |
| Lake | 204.675 | 471 | 71.511 | 104.237 | 7,644 | 3,533 | 388,537 | 4,200,852 | | | - : | 4,200,852 |
| Lassen | 306.071 | 704 | 8.471 | 42.201 | 3,386 | 4.241 | 365,074 | 2.682.567 | | | - : | 2,682,567 |
| Los Angeles | 14.889.678 | 34.246 | 19.243.472 | 14.653.087 | 919.190 | 7,272 | 49,739,673 | 586,640,132 | | | | 586,640,132 |
| Madera | 397.287 | 914 | | 232,240 | 12,924 | | 643,365 | 9,034,878 | | | | 9,034,878 |
| Marin | 10,026 | 23 | 70,847 | 278,373 | 7,779 | 42,540 | 409,588 | 13,081,184 | | | | 13,081,184 |
| Mariposa | | | 39,047 | 30,988 | 3,695 | | 73,730 | 1,594,903 | | | | 1,594,903 |
| Mendocino | 311,814 | 717 | | 142,221 | 15,786 | 8,520 | 479,058 | 6,613,519 | | | | 6,613,519 |
| Merced | | | 319,300 | 333,461 | 12,374 | 13,095 | 678,230 | 13,822,945 | | | | 13,822,945 |
| Modoc | 822 | 2 | | 22,178 | 1,706 | 776 | 25,483 | 1,121,749 | | | | 1,121,749 |
| Mono | 25,162 | 58 | 26,070 | 35,189 | 1,088 | | 87,567 | 2,183,896 | | | | 2,183,896 |
| Monterey | 906,226 | 2,084 | 375,735 | 508,493 | 21,818 | | 1,814,356 | 22,002,869 | | | | 22,002,869 |
| Napa Nevada | 307,859 451,479 | 708 1.038 | 187,388 374,175 | 193,379 121.889 | 10,224 8,961 | 14,590 | 714,147 957,542 | 8,457,393 5,704,730 | | | | 8,457,393 5,704,730 |
| Orange | 2,847,608 | 6,550 | 3,898,770 | 3,663,802 | 216,705 | - | 10,633,435 | 153,471,109 | - | - | - : | 153,471,109 |
| Placer | 2,047,000 | 0,330 | 1,042,679 | 476,966 | 17,049 | 24,920 | 1,561,614 | 19,527,030 | | | - | 19,527,030 |
| Plumas | | | | 31.813 | 2.338 | 2,448 | 36,598 | 1,598,273 | | | | 1,598,273 |
| Riverside | 2,011,947 | 4,627 | 3,468,451 | 2,658,168 | 111,107 | | 8,254,300 | 117,212,592 | | | | 117,212,592 |
| Sacramento | 1,942,057 | 4,467 | 2,132,653 | 2,351,162 | 86,266 | 43,920 | 6,560,526 | 88,712,404 | | | | 88,712,404 |
| San Benito | | | | 77,314 | 4,071 | | 81,385 | 3,876,690 | | | | 3,876,690 |
| San Bernardino | 3,405,583 | 7,833 | 3,703,354 | 2,801,827 | 146,333 | 239,760 | 10,304,690 | 113,472,854 | | | | 113,472,854 |
| San Diego | 684,557 | 1,574 | 4,251,312 | 3,394,805 | 382,170 | | 8,714,418 | 154,342,199 | | | | 154,342,199 |
| San Francisco | | 689 | 492,479 1.083.493 | 1,170,080 | 83,444 43,878 | 17,515 | 1,763,518 2,505,942 | 57,618,659 39.542.811 | | | | 57,618,659 |
| San Joaquin | 299,729 251.739 | 689 579 | 1,083,493 466.570 | 1,026,199 | 43,878 15.531 | 51,955 18.700 | | | <u> </u> | | - | 39,542,811 |
| San Luis Obispo San Mateo | 251,739 461.490 | 1.061 | 466,570 1.195.718 | 384,412 873,648 | 15,531 | 18,700 39,743 | 1,137,531 2,604,159 | 15,961,269 39,831,029 | <u> </u> | - | | 15,961,269 39.831.029 |
| San Mateo Santa Barbara | 1.099.046 | 2,528 | 1,195,718 630 126 | 8/3,648 585.394 | 23,323 | 39,743 44,719 | 2,604,159 | 25,437,526 | | | - | 39,831,029 25.437.526 |
| Santa Clara | 1,059,046 | 2,328 | 816.948 | 1.907.860 | 134.389 | 44,715 | 2,385,138 | 79,253,519 | — | | - : | 79,253,519 |
| Santa Cruz | | | 262,934 | 344.104 | 18.191 | 21.904 | 647,132 | 13,935,422 | | - | | 13,935,422 |
| Shasta | 2,743,529 | 6,310 | 313,065 | 313,505 | 25,217 | 9,190 | 3,410,816 | 15,520,816 | | | | 15,520,816 |
| Sierra | | | | 5,521 | 1,034 | 630 | 7,185 | 807,185 | | | | 807,185 |
| Siskiyou | | | 194,381 | 79,432 | 7,470 | | 281,282 | 3,291,249 | | | | 3,291,249 |
| Solano | 453,530 | 1,043 | 652,793 | 606,042 | 25,835 | 42,765 | 1,782,008 | 25,628,108 | _ | | - | 25,628,108 |
| Sonoma | 458,321 | 1,054 | 610,952 | 597,116 | 37,363 | 14,895 | 1,719,701 | 25,969,593 | | | | 25,969,593 |
| Stanislaus | 9,714 | 22 | 577,334 | 659,862 | 29,261 | 46,740 | 1,322,934 | 26,397,670 | | | | 26,397,670 |
| Sutter | 257,359 | 592 | | 162,406 | 3,466 | 2,795 | 426,618 | 6,501,349 | - | | | 6,501,349 |
| Tehama Trinity | 536.359 | 1.234 | 7,491 | 114,670 34,470 | 12,454 8.115 | 1,340 | 135,955 580,578 | 4,727,578 2.272.690 | | | | 4,727,578 2,272,690 |
| Trinity Tulare | 536,359 16.225 | 1,234 | 573,154 | 34,470 611.456 | 8,115 36.691 | 400 12.890 | 580,578 1,250,452 | 24,369,690 | <u> </u> | - | | 2,272,690 |
| Tuolumne | 229.698 | 528 | 32,727 | 90.252 | 6,919 | 6,280 | 1,250,452 366.404 | 4,162,480 | | - : | - : | 4,162,480 |
| Ventura | 1,624,079 | 3,735 | 825,803 | 990,460 | 22,732 | -,200 | 3,466,809 | 40,069,200 | - | | - | 40,069,200 |
| Yolo | 607,160 | 1,396 | 273,511 | 325,547 | 9,364 | | 1,216,979 | 12,683,610 | | | | 12,683,610 |
| Yuba | 138,089 | 318 | | 97,759 | 4,930 | 9,456 | 250,551 | 5,390,412 | | | | 5,390,412 |
| Total | 43.010.938 | 98.925 | 55,679,373 | 50,000,000 | 2,929,000 | 943,840 | 152.662.076 | 2,103,287,469 | | | | 2,103,287,469 |

Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Condition Statement as of June 30, 2020

| | | YEAR END FINANC | IAL STATEMENTS | ESTIMATED | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| | Description | 2017-18 (Financial Statements) | 2018-19 (Financial Statements) | 2019-20 | 2020-21 | | |
| # | A | В | C | D | E | | |
| 1 | Beginning Fund Balance | 66,659,468 | 60,478,281 | 71,630,938 | 118,842,009 | | |
| 2 | Prior-Year Adjustments | (12,185,090) | 7,380,390 | - | - | | |
| 3 | TOTAL REVENUES AND TRANSFERS | 1,303,563,015 | 1,314,999,921 | 1,278,761,252 | 1,016,638,277 | | |
| 4 | Total Revenues ¹ | 1,283,589,015 | 1,295,031,921 | 1,159,284,252 | 1,098,323,277 | | |
| 5 | Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements | | | | | | |
| 6 | General Fund Loan - Statewide E-Filing | 671,000 | 491,000 | | (1,162,000) | | |
| 7 | Reduction Offset Transfers | 6,080,000 | 6,080,000 | 106,080,000 | (93,920,000) | | |
| 8 | From State Court Facilities Construction Fund | 5,486,000 | 5,486,000 | 5,486,000 | 5,486,000 | | |
| 9 | From Immediate and Critical Needs Account - Loan ² | - | - | 100,000,000 | (100,000,000) | | |
| 10 | From Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund | 594,000 | 594,000 | 594,000 | 594,000 | | |
| 11 | Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements | 13,397,000 | 13,397,000 | 13,397,000 | 13,397,000 | | |
| 12 | Total Resources | 1,358,037,393 | 1,382,858,593 | 1,350,392,190 | 1,135,480,286 | | |
| 13 | EXPENDITURES/ENCUMBRANCES/ALLOCATIONS | | | | | | |
| 14 | Program 0140010 - Judicial Council (Staff) | 2,657,200 | 3,446,535 | 3,452,975 | 3,764,417 | | |
| 15 | Program 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts | 1,831,305,998 | 1,990,037,604 | 2,030,148,207 | 1,954,915,838 | | |
| 16 | Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel | 136,631,250 | 134,062,223 | 156,700,000 | 156,700,000 | | |
| 17 | Program 0150019 - Compensation of Superior Court Judges | 348,583,021 | 373,931,033 | 388,452,000 | 387,647,000 | | |
| 18 | Program 0150028 - Assigned Judges | 28,063,247 | 22,372,129 | 21,000,000 | 25,212,000 | | |
| 19 | Program 0150037 - Court Interpreters | 108,537,000 | 112,773,052 | 134,186,000 | 131,380,000 | | |
| 20 | Program 0150075 - Grants | 9,554,900 | 9,003,519 | 10,329,000 | 10,329,000 | | |
| 21 | Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts | 10,078,398 | 8,950,559 | 10,014,999 | 21,186,152 | | |
| 22 | Total Local Assistance | 2,462,675,415 | 2,651,130,120 | 2,750,830,206 | 2,687,369,990 | | |
| 23 | Pro Rata/State Ops | 128,098 | 176,000 | 240,000 | 383,643 | | |
| 24 | Supplemental Pension Payments | | 98,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | | |
| 25 | Total Expenditures (includes State Ops and LA) | 2,465,332,615.79 | 2,654,576,654.54 | 2,754,283,181.00 | 2,691,134,407.00 | | |
| 26 | Less Funding Provided by General Fund: | 1,177,981,000 | 1,343,623,000 | 1,523,049,000 | 1,610,932,000 | | |
| 27 | Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments | 1,297,558,112 | 1,311,227,655 | 1,231,550,181 | 1,080,662,050 | | |
| 28 | Ending Fund Balance | 60,478,281 | 71,630,938 | 118,842,009 | 54,818,236 | | |
| 29 | Restricted Funds | | | | | | |
| 30 | Total Restricted/Reserved Funds | 26,663,679 | 29,701,648 | 28,599,894 | 28,448,051 | | |
| | Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance | 33,814,602 | 41,929,290 | 90,242,115 | 26,370,185 | | |

² 2019-20 Fund Balance includes \$100M loan from the ICNA to be repaid in 2020-21

³ The revenue affects of a temporary reduction to the fee collected by CourtCall will be known by August 2020.