



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 Affected

None

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 TCBCAC 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-A012-6A8D8502A126>.

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

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 TCBCAC 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.

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		(32,761,989)
7	2019-20 Adjusted TCTF Ongoing Base Allocation	1,911,907,178
8	General Fund (GF) Employee Benefits	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		11,851,354
15	New and Changed Allocations	
16	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	
29	2019-20 Appropriation	120,686,000
30	2020-21 Court Interpreter Employee Benefits Cost Change	1,114,000
31	2020-21 New Judgeships Funding	257,000
32	2020-21 BCP Funding	8,423,000
33		130,480,000
34	R&E Subcommittee Recommendations	
35	Judicial Council (Staff) - Program 0140010	
36	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	596,000
37	Equal Access Fund	246,000
38	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000
39	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	656,000
40	Phoenix Financial Services	79,250
41	Phoenix Human Resources Services	1,505,000
42	Statewide E-Filing Implementation	422,167
43		3,764,417
44	Allocation for Reimbursements - Program 0150010	
45	Jury	14,500,000
46	Screening Equipment Replacement	1,800,000
47	Self-Help Center	25,300,000
48	Elder Abuse	332,340
49	Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Rollover	pending
50	Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program	455,346
51	California State Auditor Audits	325,000
52		42,712,686
53	Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts - Program 0150095	
54	Children in Dependency Case Training	113,000
55	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	18,094,937
56	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	1,626,767
57	California Courts Technology Center	688,803
58	Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations	122,645
59	State Controller's Office Audits of Trial Courts	540,000
60		21,186,152
61	2020-21 Total TCTF Trial Court/Other Allocations	2,206,756,567
62	2020-21 Trial Court Allocation by Program	
63	0140010 - Judicial Council	3,764,417
64	0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,894,625,998
65	0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	156,700,000
66	0150037 - Court Interpreters	130,480,000
67	0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	21,186,152
68	Total 2020-21 TCTF Allocation by Program	2,206,756,567

Displayed numbers may differ from Attachment B due to rounding.

Court	Other Allocations and Information							2020-21 Total Allocation and Revenues	One-Time Adjustments				2020-21 Total Adjusted Allocation and Revenues
	Non-Sheriff Security	Support for New Judgeships Non-Sheriff Security (0.23%)	SIOs (includes AS 1058)	Funding for COVID-19 Related Case Filing Backlog (One-Time)	Cannabis Conviction Resentencing	Telephonic Appearances	Total Other Allocations and Information		2020-21 Supplemental Funding (\$50m Reserve) Replenishment	Preliminary One-Time Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 3% Cap	Total Adjustments		
	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF (ZAA)		AG (WAF)	AI	AJ (AA-AJ)	AK (AG-AJ)	
Alameda	3,310,250	7,624	2,233,064	1,684,339	114,101	-	7,349,369	81,426,679	-	-	-	81,426,679	
Alpine	-	-	-	8,158	-	-	8,158	-	-	-	-	808,798	
Amador	-	-	124,455	69,132	3,587	5,790	202,964	3,597,622	-	-	-	3,597,622	
Butte	486,597	1,119	394,198	285,652	18,769	15,210	1,201,546	12,215,494	-	-	-	12,215,494	
Calaveras	-	-	54,462	3,950	-	791	60,113	2,875,792	-	-	-	2,875,792	
Colusa	-	-	-	42,263	3,802	-	46,065	2,120,719	-	-	-	2,120,719	
Contra Costa	-	-	787,957	1,079,143	44,481	-	1,911,781	45,620,088	-	-	-	45,620,088	
Del Norte	-	-	-	61,607	4,474	-	66,081	3,113,493	-	-	-	3,113,493	
El Dorado	-	-	25,339	181,851	13,153	24,418	244,761	7,726,475	-	-	-	7,726,475	
Fresno	-	-	1,192,382	1,354,519	45,437	79,930	2,668,268	54,347,850	-	-	-	54,347,850	
Glenn	10,186	33	-	50,643	4,541	-	65,413	2,852,684	-	-	-	2,852,684	
Humboldt	174,787	402	215,807	171,603	17,452	12,250	582,297	7,435,578	-	-	-	7,435,578	
Imperial	437,987	1,007	170,987	196,855	22,651	25,465	854,932	10,024,076	-	-	-	10,024,076	
Inyo	194,400	467	46,062	40,987	2,687	1,295	386,086	2,267,523	-	-	-	2,267,523	
Kern	68,257	157	2,067,505	1,375,823	45,450	38,700	3,595,933	59,049,642	-	-	-	59,049,642	
Kings	439,486	1,011	198,908	205,759	9,230	5,935	860,329	9,240,568	-	-	-	9,240,568	
Lake	294,675	471	71,511	104,237	7,644	-	478,538	4,200,853	-	-	-	4,200,853	
Lassen	306,071	704	8,471	42,201	3,385	4,241	365,074	2,682,567	-	-	-	2,682,567	
Los Angeles	14,889,678	34,246	19,243,472	14,653,087	919,150	-	49,739,673	586,640,132	-	-	-	586,640,132	
Madera	397,287	914	-	225,240	12,924	-	643,465	9,048,878	-	-	-	9,048,878	
Marin	50,026	21	70,847	778,371	7,779	42,540	829,584	13,081,184	-	-	-	13,081,184	
Mariposa	-	-	89,047	30,983	3,695	-	73,730	1,594,903	-	-	-	1,594,903	
Mendocino	311,814	717	-	142,221	15,786	8,200	479,038	6,613,519	-	-	-	6,613,519	
Merced	-	-	319,300	333,461	12,174	13,095	678,030	13,822,261	-	-	-	13,822,261	
Modoc	822	2	-	22,178	1,706	776	25,483	1,121,749	-	-	-	1,121,749	
Monro	25,162	58	26,070	35,189	1,088	-	87,567	2,183,896	-	-	-	2,183,896	
Monterey	906,226	2,084	375,755	508,493	21,818	-	1,714,376	22,000,869	-	-	-	22,000,869	
Napa	307,859	708	187,888	193,179	10,224	14,590	714,147	8,457,393	-	-	-	8,457,393	
Nevada	451,479	1,038	374,175	121,389	8,961	-	957,042	5,764,740	-	-	-	5,764,740	
Orange	2,847,600	6,200	3,898,770	3,661,802	216,705	-	10,833,635	153,471,109	-	-	-	153,471,109	
Placer	-	-	1,042,679	476,966	17,049	24,920	1,564,614	19,527,030	-	-	-	19,527,030	
Plumas	-	-	-	31,813	2,338	2,448	36,598	1,598,273	-	-	-	1,598,273	
Reynolds	2,011,947	4,627	3,468,451	2,658,168	111,107	-	8,254,300	117,212,950	-	-	-	117,212,950	
Sacramento	1,945,257	4,467	2,132,653	2,351,162	86,265	43,920	6,560,526	86,711,404	-	-	-	86,711,404	
San Benito	2,405,583	7,893	3,703,354	2,891,817	146,393	239,760	10,304,690	3,876,690	-	-	-	3,876,690	
San Bernardino	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	113,472,854	-	-	-	113,472,854	
San Diego	684,557	1,574	4,251,312	3,394,805	382,170	-	8,714,418	154,342,159	-	-	-	154,342,159	
San Francisco	-	-	492,479	1,170,080	83,444	17,515	1,763,518	57,618,659	-	-	-	57,618,659	
San Joaquin	299,739	689	1,083,493	1,035,199	43,878	51,955	2,550,942	39,543,811	-	-	-	39,543,811	
San Luis Obispo	251,739	579	466,570	384,412	15,531	18,700	1,137,531	15,961,269	-	-	-	15,961,269	
San Mateo	461,490	1,061	1,195,718	873,648	32,499	39,743	2,604,159	39,831,029	-	-	-	39,831,029	
Santa Barbara	1,099,946	2,528	630,126	685,384	23,523	46,719	2,385,136	25,487,526	-	-	-	25,487,526	
Santa Clara	-	-	816,948	1,907,860	134,389	-	2,859,197	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	15,540,816	-	-	-	15,540,816	
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	463,530	1,063	652,793	669,062	29,835	42,765	1,792,008	25,668,108	-	-	-	25,668,108	
Sonoma	458,321	1,054	630,952	597,136	37,383	19,895	1,749,701	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	
Butter	257,359	592	-	102,406	3,486	2,795	426,618	6,501,349	-	-	-	6,501,349	
Tehama	-	-	7,491	134,670	12,654	1,340	155,955	4,727,578	-	-	-	4,727,578	
Trinity	536,359	1,234	-	34,470	8,115	400	580,578	2,272,690	-	-	-	2,272,690	
Tulare	16,225	37	573,154	611,456	36,691	12,890	1,250,452	24,369,690	-	-	-	24,369,690	
Tuolumne	229,698	583	32,727	50,251	6,919	6,290	366,004	4,161,480	-	-	-	4,161,480	
Ventura	1,624,079	3,735	825,803	990,460	22,732	-	3,466,809	40,065,200	-	-	-	40,065,200	
Yolo	407,160	1,396	273,511	325,547	9,364	-	1,216,979	12,683,610	-	-	-	12,683,610	
Yuba	138,080	313	-	37,769	4,900	9,456	200,513	5,901,412	-	-	-	5,901,412	
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	

¹ Benefits funding reflects actual cost changes as identified by the court and is fiscally neutral.

Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Condition Statement as of June 30, 2020					
	Description	YEAR END FINANCIAL STATEMENTS		ESTIMATED	
		2017-18 (Financial Statements)	2018-19 (Financial Statements)	2019-20	2020-21
#	A	B	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	<i>Total Revenues¹</i>	<i>1,283,589,015</i>	<i>1,295,031,921</i>	<i>1,159,284,252</i>	<i>1,098,323,277</i>
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	<i>From State Court Facilities Construction Fund</i>	<i>5,486,000</i>	<i>5,486,000</i>	<i>5,486,000</i>	<i>5,486,000</i>
9	<i>From Immediate and Critical Needs Account - Loan²</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>100,000,000</i>	<i>(100,000,000)</i>
10	<i>From Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund</i>	<i>594,000</i>	<i>594,000</i>	<i>594,000</i>	<i>594,000</i>
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	<i>Pro Rata/State Ops</i>	<i>128,098</i>	<i>176,000</i>	<i>240,000</i>	<i>383,643</i>
24	<i>Supplemental Pension Payments</i>		<i>98,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>
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	<i>Less Funding Provided by General Fund:</i>	<i>1,177,981,000</i>	<i>1,343,623,000</i>	<i>1,523,049,000</i>	<i>1,610,932,000</i>
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
31	Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance	33,814,602	41,929,290	90,242,115	26,370,185

¹ Revenues reflect May Revise estimates provide to DOF. Revenues include possible impacts of COVID-19.

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.