

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report Summary

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Working Group on Court Security
Hon. Richard D. Aldrich, Chair
Christine M. Hansen, Director, Finance Division, 415-865-7951
Michael Roddy, Regional Administrative Director, Northern/Central Region

DATE: April 5, 2005

SUBJECT: Recommendations on Trial Court Security Funding Standards and Methodology (Action Required)

Issue Statement

Assembly Bill 1759 (Chapter 159, Statutes of 2003) amended Government Code section 69927 to require that the Judicial Council establish a working group on court security (working group), to make recommendations on court security practices to the Judicial Council. The working group was charged with the development and implementation of uniform standards and guidelines that may be used in the provision of trial court security services. In addition, the Budget Act of 2003 (Ch. 157, Stats. of 2003) included an ongoing reduction of \$22 million in court security funding beginning July 1, 2004. This report presents recommendations for court security funding standards and a methodology to be used for allocation of the security reduction and for determining future court security funding levels. This report also recommends changes that will improve the effectiveness and accountability of the annual court security budget process.

Recommendation

The Working Group on Court Security and Administrative Office of the Court staff recommend that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the standards for funding: entrance screening stations; courtroom and internal security; and holding cells, internal transportation and control rooms. The recommended methodology replaces the interim standards approved at the July 2004 Judicial Council meeting.

The standards are as follows:

Entrance Screening

PC 830.1 FTEs per entrance screening station (Mid-Step)	Average Weighted Filings/Location
1.4	0 – 249,999
1.6	250,000 – 899,000
1.85	900,000 – 2,000,000

Courtroom and Internal Security

Cluster	Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs)	PC 830.1 FTEs per JPE/AJN (Mid-Step)
1	1.1 to 4.0	1.140
2	4.1 to 20.0	1.260
3	20.1 to 59.9	1.300
4	60.0 to 600.0	1.340

Internal Transportation, Holding Cells, and Control Room Standards

Cluster	Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs)	PC 830.1 FTEs per Adjusted Assessed Judicial Need (Mid-Step)
1	1.1 to 4.0	0.1700
2	4.1 to 20.0	0.1900
3	20.1 to 59.9	0.2300
4	60.0 to 600.0	0.4100

2. Approve a permanent funding standard of 1 sergeant position per 12 nonsupervisory security positions.
3. Delegate authority to staff to make technical adjustments to the court security standards after updated court security cost data is received in May 2005.
4. Approve the implementation policy that beginning in FY 2004–2005, trial court security budgets that are above the level produced under the proposed methodology will be reduced to the standard. It is the intent to seek additional funding in the FY 2006–2007 budget that will result in all courts being funded at the proposed standard.

5. In FY 2004–2005, using the recommended methodology applying standards to functional security areas, as indicated in column N of Attachment 1, approve the allocation of \$8.8 million in one-time reductions. (This is in addition to the \$11 million in one-time prorated reductions already taken). Courts may apply for relief from the \$4 million set-aside fund from the carryover of emergency funding from prior years. Courts would have a single opportunity to apply for relief from the fund if the use of the recommended reduction allocation methodology had a severe adverse impact on its security plan in FY 2004–2005.
6. In FY 2005–2006, using the recommended methodology applying standards to functional security areas, as indicated in column L of Attachment 1, approve the allocation of \$13.3 million in ongoing reductions.
7. Approve the policy that beginning in FY 2005–2006, courts that are below the recommended standards and that reduced security services in response to temporary court security reductions in FY 2003–2004 and FY 2004–2005 will have security funding reduction restored to the base level.
8. Approve the following policies to improve the annual court security budget process:
 - Changes in court security salary ranges, benefits, and retirement costs known as of May 15 of each year for the following fiscal year, will be funded within the scope of available funding. When full funding of the recommended standards is achieved, the objective is that each court’s total security budget would be limited to the amount provided under the funding model. Any cost changes (increases or decreases) that occurred during the year would be recorded and the budget would be adjusted during the following year, subject to available funding.
 - Create a court security budget line item that requires that court security budget allocations may only be expended for that purpose and that unused funds would roll over on an annual basis to be reallocated to fund one-time costs.
 - Direct the Working Group on Court Security to perform regular reviews of the court security funding standards to ensure that the standards continue to reflect trial court security needs and practices.
 - Pursue a FY 2006–2007 security budget change proposal that, in combination with the current security baseline and State Appropriations Limit funding applied to security, will fund all courts at the proposed security standards.

Rationale for Recommendation

The rationale for each of the recommendations is explained in detail at pages 10-13.

Alternative Actions Considered

In addition to the recommended alternative, other options were considered. Among the alternatives, was the option to implement the interim methodology approved in July 2004 for the \$22 million reduction.

This alternative was not recommended because: (1) it does not include the development of permanent and complete standards and guidelines in all functional areas as required by the Budget Act of 2003, and (2) it does not consider the varying security needs resulting from court size and workload. The working group and AOC staff felt that both of these requirements were essential in the creation of the recommendation.

Comments from Interested Parties

While trial court budget reports are not subject to the invitation to public comment requirement, the recommended methodology was presented to trial court presiding judges and executive officers at the Statewide Issues Meeting on February 25, 2005 and to the Trial Court Budget Working Group on March 17, 2005. The California State Sheriffs Association also brought together representatives of local court security divisions to discuss these recommendations. In addition, the court security staffing and cost data collected in the court security surveys was submitted to the courts and sheriffs for verification before preparation of the final report. All courts were then provided an opportunity to verify and/or update their budget.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

No additional funds will be sought at this time to implement the recommendations. Beginning in FY 2004–2005, trial court security budgets that are above the level produced under the proposed methodology will be reduced to the standard. The Department of Finance has indicated that they would support a baseline adjustment in court security in the FY 2006–2007 budget process. They have further indicated that they would not support any augmentations to security above the percentage change in SAL after the baseline adjustment is received. Therefore, the Administrative Office of the Courts intends to submit a budget change proposal this fall that would propose funding all courts at the proposed standard, fully funding all costs required by Senate Bill 1396, and establishing and funding perimeter security where it can logistically be accommodated, in court locations where it currently does not exist.

Attachments

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3688

Report

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Working Group on Court Security
Hon. Richard D. Aldrich, Chair
Christine M. Hansen, Director, Finance Division, 415-865-7951
Michael Roddy, Regional Administrative Director, Northern/Central Region

DATE: April 5, 2005

SUBJECT: Recommendations on Trial Court Security Funding Standards and Methodology (Action Required)

Issue Statement

Assembly Bill 1759 (Chapter 159, Statutes of 2003) amended Government Code section 69927 to require that the Judicial Council establish a working group on court security (working group), to make recommendations on court security practices to the Judicial Council. The working group was charged with the development and implementation of uniform standards and guidelines that may be used in the provision of trial court security services. In addition, the Budget Act of 2003 (Ch. 157, Stats. of 2003) included an ongoing reduction of \$22 million in court security funding beginning July 1, 2004. This report presents recommendations for court security funding standards and a methodology to be used for allocation of the security reduction and for determining future court security funding levels. This report also recommends changes that will improve the effectiveness and accountability of the annual court security budget process.

Background

During the 2003 legislative session, the legislature expressed concern with the ongoing growth of court security expenditures and looked for a means for stakeholders to work cooperatively to establish standards for providing court security services. The result was a reduction in the FY 2003–2004 judicial branch budget of \$11 million (increasing to \$22 million per year in FY 2004–2005) to reflect anticipated savings from the development and implementation of uniform standards and guidelines that may be used in the provision of trial court security services. To facilitate the development and implementation of these uniform standards and guidelines Assembly Bill 1759 (Chapter 159, Statutes of 2003) amended Government Code section 69927 to require the Judicial Council to establish a working group on court security (working group), to make recommendations on court security practices to the Judicial Council. The Judicial

Council formally approved Rules 6.170 and 6.171 of the California Rules of Court on October 14, 2003. Pursuant to California Rules of Court 6.170 and 6.171, the working group is comprised of:

- Eight judicial branch representatives;
- Two county representatives;
- Three county sheriff representatives;
- Two law enforcement labor representatives; and
- A non-voting chair who is an appellate court justice.

The working group was directed to develop, for consideration and action by the Judicial Council, the following:

- Recommendations on uniform standards and guidelines that may be used by the Judicial Council and any sheriff or marshal for the implementation of trial court security services;
- Recommendations and policy directions to achieve efficiencies that will reduce court security operating costs and constrain growth
- Recommendations, as appropriate and in consultation with the Administrative Office of the Courts' (AOC) Office of Court Construction and Management regarding security considerations for court facilities; and
- Recommendations on the subject areas to be addressed in the comprehensive court security plans required under Government Code section 69925.

FY 2004–2005 Court Security Budget Reduction

At the July 7, 2004 Judicial Council meeting, the council, based on the recommendations of the Working Group on Court Security, approved an interim allocation methodology for this reduction until later in the fiscal year, pending the development of guidelines and standards by the Working Group which would assist the courts in achieving necessary cost savings. The interim court security funding standards were as follows:

- Entrance Screening: 1.9 mid-step (salary and benefits) deputy sheriff FTEs per existing entrance screening station
- Supervision: 1.0 mid-step sergeant FTE per 12 non-supervisory deputy sheriff positions
- Interim funding recommendations of 1.44 mid-step deputy sheriff FTEs per JPE for courtroom security, internal security and internal transportation.

The council approved the allocation of the \$22 million ongoing security reduction on a transitional basis, applying half of the reduction in a prorated manner and applying the approved interim standards to functional security areas for the second \$11 million. The council also approved the establishment of a \$4 million fund from the carryover of emergency funding from prior years. Courts would be able to apply for relief from the fund one time if the use of the recommended transitional reduction allocation methodology had a severe adverse impact on its security plan in fiscal year 2004–2005 and if its court security reduction was greater than it would have been had reductions been allocated on a prorated basis. The council also directed the working group to continue developing permanent standards for these remaining areas of court security services.

The first \$11 million of the court security reduction was implemented following the council’s action in July 2004. In order to develop more complete court security standards that would replace the approved interim standards and be used to allocate the second half of the \$22 million reduction security standards, the working group directed staff to collect additional court security workload data from the courts, including the number of inmates transported to court from the jail, the number of incidents involving court security personnel, and the number of individuals entering the courthouse each week. In addition, staff developed a needs assessment survey that was distributed to the courts and sheriffs to determine the level of additional staffing that would be needed to provide effective court security at each court.

Over the course of reviewing the data from the initial court security survey and subsequent follow-up surveys, the working group derived the following principles that were used to develop the court security standards recommended in this report:

- 1) Court security standards should be based on the empirical information collected from court security surveys and on current knowledge of trial court experience and service levels.
 - a. All trial courts require a minimum level of security at the entrance, in the courtroom and during the transport and supervision of prisoners.
 - b. Based on information submitted by the trial courts in the most recent security survey, most courts have indicated that they would not be able to absorb further reductions in court security funding without significantly impacting the quality of security services.
 - c. Efficiency and effectiveness, rather than available funding, should drive the development of court security standards.
- 2) A “one size fits all” level of court security standards is not the best approach. A single level of court security standards does not appropriately consider factors such as court size and workload that impact court security needs.

- a. Trial courts and sheriffs need flexibility in assigning staff to best use security staff resources to meet specific and varying local needs.
 - b. Recommended standards require an adjustment mechanism to account for changes and differences in court size, workload, the variety of case types, and facilities.
- 3) Additional funding required to implement the court security standards should be within the range of historical expectations for court security funding increases.
- a. The court security standards should reflect an improved statewide level of court security.
- 4) Standards should be easy to maintain and update based on changes in court factors that impact the need for court security staff (i.e. judicial positions, workload, etc.)
- a. The model should use existing workload measurements, such as filings, rather than using new data types that must be created or collected separately.

Recommendation

The Working Group on Court Security and AOC staff recommend that the Judicial Council:

- 1. Approve the standards for funding: entrance screening stations; courtroom and internal security; and holding cells, internal transportation and control rooms. The recommended methodology replaces the interim standards approved at the July 2004 Judicial Council meeting.

The standards are as follows:

Entrance Screening

PC 830.1 FTEs per entrance screening station (Mid-Step)	Average Weighted Filings/ Location
1.4	0 – 249,999
1.6	250,000 – 899,000
1.85	900,000 – 2,000,000

Courtroom and Internal Security

Cluster	Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs)	PC 830.1 FTEs per JPE/AJN (Mid-Step)
1	1.1 to 4.0	1.140

Cluster	Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs)	PC 830.1 FTEs per JPE/AJN (Mid-Step)
2	4.1 to 20.0	1.260
3	20.1 to 59.9	1.300
4	60.0 to 600.0	1.340

Internal Transportation, Holding Cells, and Control Room Standards

Cluster	Judicial Position Equivalents (JPEs)	PC 830.1 FTEs per Adjusted Assessed Judicial Need (Mid-Step)
1	1.1 to 4.0	0.1700
2	4.1 to 20.0	0.1900
3	20.1 to 59.9	0.2300
4	60.0 to 600.0	0.4100

2. Approve a permanent funding standard of 1 sergeant position per 12 nonsupervisory security positions.
3. Delegate authority to staff to make technical adjustments to the court security standards after updated court security cost data is received in May 2005.
4. Approve the implementation policy that beginning in FY 2004–2005, trial court security budgets that are above the level produced under the proposed methodology will be reduced to the standard. It is the intent to seek additional funding in the FY 2006–2007 budget that will result in all courts being funded at the proposed standard.
5. In FY 2004–2005, using the recommended methodology applying standards to functional security areas, as indicated in column N of Attachment 1, approve the allocation of \$8.8 million in one-time reductions. (This is in addition to the \$11 million in one-time prorated reductions already taken). Courts may apply for relief from the \$4 million set-aside fund from the carryover of emergency funding from prior years. Courts would have a single opportunity to apply for relief from the fund if the use of the recommended reduction allocation methodology had a severe adverse impact on its security plan in FY 2004–2005.
6. In FY 2005–2006, using the recommended methodology applying standards to functional security areas, as indicated in column L of Attachment 1, approve the allocation of \$13.3 million in ongoing reductions.

7. Approve the policy that beginning in FY 2005–2006, courts that are below the recommended standards and that reduced security services in response to temporary court security reductions in FY 2003–2004 and FY 2004–2005 will have security funding reduction restored to the base level.
8. Approve the following policies to improve the annual court security budget process:
 - Changes in court security salary ranges, benefits, and retirement costs known as of May 15 of each year for the following fiscal year, will be funded within scope of available funding. When full funding of the recommended standards is achieved, the objective is that each court’s total security budget would be limited to the amount provided under the funding model. Any cost changes (increases or decreases) that occurred during the year would be recorded and the budget would be adjusted during the following year, subject to available funding.
 - Create a court security budget line item that requires that court security budget allocations may only be expended for that purpose and that unused funds would roll over on an annual basis to be reallocated to fund one-time costs.
 - Direct the Working Group on Court Security to perform regular reviews of the court security funding standards to ensure that the standards continue to reflect trial court security needs and practices.
 - Pursue a FY 2006–2007 security budget change proposal that, in combination with the current security baseline and State Appropriations Limit funding applied to security, will fund all courts at the proposed security standards.

Rationale for Recommendation

Allocation of \$19.8 million in court security reductions

While the Budget Act of 2003 directed the working group to develop court security funding standards that would result in \$22 million in savings, the working group was not able to achieve this level of reductions with standards that also maintained an appropriate level of court security. Based on current cost information, the recommended court security standards will achieve \$13.3 million in ongoing reductions. In FY 2004–2005, due to the initial \$11 million reduction being applied in a prorated manner, \$19.8 million in one-time reductions will be achieved. Staff is developing a new court security survey to obtain updated court security cost information from the trial courts. After the data is updated, staff may make technical adjustments to the standards that could result in additional changes in the ongoing reductions. Technical adjustments would be brought to the Judicial Council for approval.

Entrance Screening

Under the proposed standards courts will continue to operate with the same number of entrance screening stations being used in FY 2003–2004. Courts would receive funding for entrance screening staff based on the workload (as measured by the average number of weighted filings per court location). The rationale for funding the number of staff per screening station based on average weighted filings is to recognize that courts with higher filing workloads at each facility are likely to have more individuals entering court facilities and will require funding for additional staff at each screening station to perform weapons screening effectively.¹

Courtroom and Internal Security

Development of the proposed court security funding standards for security functions within the courthouse (excluding supervision) comprised a two-tier approach. In the first level of analysis, internal court functions were divided into two areas:

- Courtroom and Internal Security; and
- Internal Transportation, Holding Cells and Control Rooms

Courts were divided into categories based on total weighted filings for courtroom and internal security and based on felony filings for internal transportation, holding cells, and control rooms. Based on filing workload, courts received funding for a certain level of PC 830.1 security staff per judicial position equivalent (JPE).

The first level of analysis produced results that could be used as court security standards. However, the first workload analysis required the use of weighted filing and felony data which is more difficult to collect and maintain on an ongoing and consistent basis each year. We were able to use a second level of analysis based on court clusters that yielded the same results as the first level of analysis, but was easier to update and maintain.

Assuming that courts of different sizes require different levels of security staffing per judicial officer, and that there is a general and separate relationship between court size and security needs, we created a funding model that applied the same staffing standard to courts of similar size. For example, based on a review of court size and filing data, we found that courts with 40-50 judges generally have a larger and more complex workload (e.g., high volumes calendars in criminal and family law) than courts with 2 to 4 judges. More filings and more volatile high volume calendars means that the larger courts often require more security staff in the courtroom and for prisoner transport and would require funding for more security staff per judicial position.²

¹ Average weighted filings per location is calculated by taking the total weighted filings divided by the number of court locations.

² The concept of applying standards based on court size was developed by the AOC Finance Division and Research and Planning Unit as part of the Resource Equity Model methodology, that has been used by the AOC to compare trial court funding levels and assign budget reductions based on comparisons to courts

Courts are separated into four clusters based upon the number of judicial position equivalents (JPE). Based on the cluster group, each court receives funding for a certain number of mid-step PC 830.1 positions per the lesser of a court's JPE or assessed judicial need (AJN) which is a measure of the number of judicial positions required to process the court's current filing workload. The methodology uses the lesser of a court's JPE or AJN, to ensure that courts with more judicial positions than are needed to manage existing workload do not receive more security funding than required.

Internal Transportation, Holding Cells & Control Rooms

The same cluster methodology used for courtroom and internal security is applied to the standards for internal transportation, holding cells, and control rooms, with an adjustment for courts that need more judges to process the existing workload. Instead of funding a certain number of mid-step PC 830.1 positions per the lesser of a court's JPE or AJN, the standards for funding security staff in internal transportation, holding cells, and control rooms are based on a court's JPE plus 50 percent of the difference between each court's JPE and AJN. For example, if a court has 50 JPEs and an AJN of 60, the court would receive funding based on an adjusted AJN of 55 judicial positions. The purpose of this adjustment is to recognize that many courts in the state need more judicial positions to process their current workload and that this additional workload has an impact on the number of security staff needed to transport and monitor prisoners in the court.

Supervision

Supervision staff is based on the number of non-supervision court security staff. The current approved standard for funding supervision positions is 1.0 mid-step sergeant FTE per 12 non-supervisory mid-step deputy sheriff positions and there have been few objections to maintaining this standard. The recommended standard for funded supervision would remain at 1.0 mid-step sergeant FTE per 12 non-supervisory deputy sheriff positions. In addition, pursuant to SB 1396, funding would be provided for 0.25 sheriff management FTEs (i.e., lieutenant or captain) to oversee the provision of court security services. Funding would be allocated based on actual costs subject to the approval of the Working Group on Court Security.

Implementation Process

The working group will monitor implementation of the funding standards and will perform regular reviews of the court security funding standards to ensure that the standards continue to reflect trial court security needs and practices.

Changes to the Annual Court Security Budget Process

The working group recommends adopting new policies related to the annual court security budget. These recommended changes will provide a framework for reviewing

of similar size. This methodology is also being advocated as a means of consistency in the allocation of future funds within the judicial branch.

and adjusting the standards; increase the predictability of court security expenditures; improve court and sheriff accountability for proper expenditure of court security funds; and provide direction in pursuing future court security funding.

Alternative Actions Considered

In addition to the recommended alternative, other options were considered. Among the alternatives, was the option to implement the interim methodology approved in July 2004 for the \$22 million reduction.

This alternative was not recommended because: (1) it does not include the development of permanent and complete standards and guidelines in all functional areas as required by the Budget Act of 2003, and (2) it does not consider the varying security needs resulting from court size and workload. The working group and AOC staff felt that both of these requirements were essential in the creation of the recommendation.

Comments from Interested Parties

While trial court budget reports are not subject to the invitation to public comment requirement, the recommended methodology was presented to trial court presiding judges and executive officers at the Statewide Issues Meeting on February 25, 2005 and to the Trial Court Budget Working Group on March 17, 2005. The California State Sheriffs Association also brought together representatives of local court security divisions to discuss these recommendations. In addition, the court security staffing and cost data collected in the court security surveys was submitted to the courts and sheriffs for verification before preparation of the final report. All courts were then provided an opportunity to verify and or update their budget.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

No additional funds will be sought at this time to implement the recommendations. Beginning in FY 2004–2005, trial court security budgets that are above the level produced under the proposed methodology will be reduced to the standard. The Department of Finance has indicated that they would support a baseline adjustment in court security in the FY 2006–2007 budget process. They have further indicated that they would not support any augmentations to security above the percentage change in SAL after the baseline adjustment is received. Therefore, the AOC intends to submit a budget change proposal this fall that would propose funding all courts at the proposed standard, fully funding all costs required by Senate Bill 1396, and establishing and funding perimeter security where it can logistically be accommodated, in court locations where it currently does not exist.

Attachments

Attachment 1

Option 2C - Proposed Court Security Funding Standards - Approved by the Working Group on Court Security on 2/2/2005

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P
Cluster	Court System	Total Security Funding as of FY 04-05*	FY 04-05 Court Security Budget*	Lesser of FY 04-05 Funding or Budget	Entrance Screening	Courtroom & Internal Security	Internal Transportation, Holding Cells & Control Rooms	Supervision	Total Court Security Budget Based on Standards	Difference from Funding/ Budget and Standard	Gross Reduction Before Applying 1st \$11 Million Reduction	Less FY 2004-05 One-Time \$11 Million Reduction	2nd \$11 Million Reduction	Total FY 2004-2005 Reduction	Amended FY 2004-05 Budget (Lesser of Standard or Budget)
4	Alameda	\$ 19,464,673	\$ 21,872,407	\$ 19,464,673	\$ 1,475,239	\$ 12,444,566	\$ 3,865,358	\$ 1,696,511	\$ 19,481,673	\$ 17,001	\$ -	\$ (559,375)	\$ -	\$ (559,375)	\$ 19,481,673
1	Alpine	33,029	11,362	11,362	-	14,188	2,116	-	16,304	4,942	-	-(310)	-	-(310)	11,052
1	Amador	526,682	446,942	446,942	237,041	241,274	35,979	-	514,295	67,353	-	-(12,039)	-	-(12,039)	434,903
2	Butte	1,221,221	1,741,760	1,221,221	109,394	1,281,769	219,124	150,332	1,760,619	539,398	-	-(29,860)	-	-(29,860)	1,711,900
1	Calaveras	240,511	266,761	240,511	112,021	255,408	38,087	-	405,517	165,006	-	-(7,573)	-	-(7,573)	259,188
1	Colusa	185,200	171,468	171,468	-	148,668	22,170	96,632	267,470	96,002	-	-(2,680)	-	-(2,680)	168,788
3	Contra Costa	10,678,503	10,694,147	10,678,503	1,536,117	7,250,135	1,354,872	967,580	11,108,705	430,202	-	-(296,331)	-	-(296,331)	10,397,816
1	Del Norte	265,432	203,525	203,525	-	175,464	26,343	-	201,808	(1,717)	(1,717)	-(5,848)	-	-(5,848)	197,677
2	El Dorado	1,825,090	1,759,858	1,759,858	567,470	1,149,128	173,281	192,369	2,082,248	322,390	-	-(42,236)	-	-(42,236)	1,717,622
3	Fresno	8,966,127	6,572,979	6,572,979	1,742,401	5,088,389	1,095,569	831,297	8,757,657	2,184,678	-	-(177,585)	-	-(177,585)	6,395,394
1	Glenn	155,574	173,012	155,574	59,853	105,500	16,588	61,858	243,798	88,223	-	-(2,952)	-	-(2,952)	170,606
2	Humboldt	1,225,325	1,033,985	1,033,985	-	707,109	115,387	75,529	898,025	(135,959)	(135,959)	-(23,262)	(112,697)	-(135,959)	898,025
2	Imperial	678,602	921,031	678,602	-	1,003,815	154,186	111,224	1,269,225	590,622	-	-(20,125)	-	-(20,125)	900,906
1	Inyo	178,146	190,135	178,146	-	186,356	27,790	-	214,146	36,000	-	-(4,802)	-	-(4,802)	185,333
3	Kern	7,218,288	6,814,186	6,814,186	1,539,825	4,143,029	882,060	892,769	7,457,683	643,497	-	-(178,664)	-	-(178,664)	6,635,522
2	Kings	601,451	656,615	601,451	226,904	797,096	146,322	94,930	1,265,251	663,800	-	-(16,592)	-	-(16,592)	640,023
2	Lake	219,066	300,772	219,066	-	451,278	70,856	88,079	610,214	391,147	-	-(6,408)	-	-(6,408)	294,364
1	Lassen	239,769	211,278	211,278	-	170,105	26,222	-	196,326	(14,952)	(14,952)	-(5,979)	-(8,973)	-(14,952)	196,326
4	Los Angeles	133,675,399	133,441,133	133,441,133	11,068,844	75,462,955	23,800,146	11,942,845	122,274,789	(11,166,344)	(11,166,344)	-(3,839,737)	-(7,326,607)	-(11,166,344)	122,274,789
2	Madera	577,399	351,965	351,965	-	530,960	110,002	69,887	710,849	358,884	-	-(9,774)	-	-(9,774)	342,191
2	Marin	2,652,331	2,427,921	2,427,921	-	1,526,291	230,155	177,308	1,933,754	(494,167)	(494,167)	-(72,430)	-(421,737)	-(72,430)	1,933,754
1	Mariposa	51,557	39,766	39,766	-	66,951	9,984	-	76,935	37,169	-	-(873)	-	-(873)	38,893
2	Mendocino	893,422	889,780	889,780	224,662	738,015	111,288	110,642	1,184,607	294,827	-	-(22,055)	-	-(22,055)	867,725
2	Merced	1,563,212	1,601,366	1,563,212	354,235	1,025,908	233,593	166,575	1,780,311	217,099	-	-(31,031)	-	-(31,031)	1,570,335
1	Modoc	15,646	23,472	15,646	-	31,319	4,670	-	35,989	20,344	-	-(340)	-	-(340)	23,132
1	Mono	70,628	90,231	70,628	-	110,620	16,496	-	127,116	56,488	-	-(1,732)	-	-(1,732)	88,499
3	Monterey	2,777,358	3,117,718	2,777,358	-	2,871,695	591,613	346,116	3,809,424	1,032,066	-	-(79,670)	-	-(79,670)	3,038,048
2	Napa	1,805,012	1,331,900	1,331,900	536,225	953,139	143,727	150,045	1,783,136	451,235	-	-(35,069)	-	-(35,069)	1,296,831
2	Nevada	905,337	753,724	753,724	224,900	586,988	88,514	87,762	988,164	234,440	-	-(11,400)	-	-(11,400)	742,324
4	Orange	31,966,847	32,046,312	31,966,847	2,989,778	22,697,570	7,197,695	3,797,140	36,682,184	4,715,336	-	-(934,259)	-	-(934,259)	31,112,053
2	Placer	1,843,722	1,887,673	1,843,722	1,299,158	1,915,411	311,915	324,279	3,850,762	2,007,041	-	-(51,594)	-	-(51,594)	1,836,079
1	Plumas	261,341	157,157	157,157	-	143,638	21,420	-	165,058	7,901	-	-(4,366)	-	-(4,366)	152,791
4	Riverside	12,261,547	11,499,771	11,499,771	2,909,225	8,509,571	3,375,045	1,656,644	16,450,484	4,950,713	-	-(317,619)	-	-(317,619)	11,182,152
4	Sacramento	16,769,221	15,179,856	15,179,856	1,264,875	9,415,551	3,522,642	1,543,695	15,746,762	566,906	-	-(446,601)	-	-(446,601)	14,733,255
1	San Benito	159,225	85,288	85,288	-	226,620	35,590	-	262,209	176,921	-	-(1,823)	-	-(1,823)	83,465
4	San Bernardino	18,008,096	18,961,945	18,008,096	2,834,190	11,767,404	4,800,912	2,426,812	21,829,317	3,821,222	-	-(534,618)	-	-(534,618)	18,427,327
4	San Diego	29,389,549	28,679,725	28,679,725	2,570,215	19,501,647	6,112,182	3,334,512	31,518,556	2,838,831	-	-(787,629)	-	-(787,629)	27,892,096
4	San Francisco	8,167,305	8,672,299	8,167,305	531,489	7,789,565	2,464,201	976,670	11,761,925	3,594,619	-	-(241,685)	-	-(241,685)	8,430,614
3	San Joaquin	4,884,798	5,800,335	4,884,798	1,153,253	3,647,027	804,420	631,410	6,236,110	1,351,312	-	-(135,446)	-	-(135,446)	5,664,889
2	San Luis Obispo	2,246,779	2,364,951	2,246,779	-	1,674,685	264,374	194,498	2,133,556	(113,223)	(113,223)	-(69,218)	-(44,005)	-(113,223)	2,133,556
3	San Mateo	6,911,308	7,238,837	6,911,308	833,888	5,606,597	991,936	757,499	8,189,921	1,278,613	-	-(191,046)	-	-(191,046)	7,047,791
3	Santa Barbara	4,787,273	4,702,168	4,702,168	-	3,156,275	558,418	361,609	4,076,302	(625,866)	(625,866)	-(121,540)	-(504,326)	-(625,866)	4,076,302
4	Santa Clara	29,030,721	26,495,441	26,495,441	3,731,695	15,444,553	4,797,172	2,311,665	26,285,085	(210,355)	(210,355)	-(754,706)	-	-(754,706)	25,740,735
2	Santa Cruz	2,568,720	2,442,248	2,442,248	671,730	1,791,794	292,637	276,425	3,032,586	590,338	-	-(61,198)	-	-(61,198)	2,381,050
2	Shasta	1,519,635	1,613,639	1,519,635	102,550	1,219,340	173,587	107,593	1,305,070	(214,565)	(214,565)	-(45,138)	-(169,427)	-(214,565)	1,305,070
1	Sierra	24,090	24,090	24,090	-	22,341	3,331	-	25,672	1,582	-	-(701)	-	-(701)	23,389
2	Siskiyou	1,029,226	493,197	493,197	265,960	335,110	50,532	68,766	720,368	227,171	-	-(15,332)	-	-(15,332)	477,865
3	Solano	4,068,512	4,550,888	4,068,512	740,036	3,407,697	693,727	401,744	5,243,205	1,174,693	-	-(115,856)	-	-(115,856)	4,435,032
3	Sonoma	4,673,229	4,751,400	4,673,229	1,190,619	3,490,550	728,101	529,834	5,939,103	1,265,874	-	-(130,843)	-	-(130,843)	4,620,557
3	Stanislaus	2,639,813	2,766,498	2,639,813	231,296	1,925,685	452,964	250,808	2,860,754	220,941	-	-(61,436)	-	-(61,436)	2,705,062
2	Sutter	602,953	695,250	602,953	300,054	476,739	87,525	81,339	945,658	342,705	-	-(17,878)	-	-(17,878)	677,372
2	Tehama	342,953	385,548	342,953	-	346,218	60,005	-	406,222	63,269	-	-(9,861)	-	-(9,861)	375,687
1	Trinity	117,247	186,931	117,247	-	60,767	9,062	77,741	147,570	30,323	-	-(3,483)	-	-(3,483)	147,570
3	Tulare	3,521,277	3,603,217	3,521,277	657,781	1,831,618	416,541	319,320	3,225,260	(296,017)	(296,017)	-(101,920)	-(194,097)	-(296,017)	3,225,260
2	Tuolumne	439,522	391,846	391,846	-	364,538	57,313	84,871	506,722	114,876	-	-(8,555)	-	-(8,555)	383,291
3	Ventura	9,343,580	9,022,517	9,022,517	924,147	6,292,829	1,122,526	891,688	9,231,190	208,674	-	-(270,385)	-	-(270,385)	8,752,132
2	Yolo	2,135,534	2,173,472	2,135,534	873,824	1,580,842	247,663	261,354	2,963,684	828,150	-	-(55,067)	-	-(55,067)	2,118,405
2	Yuba	501,179	555,378	501,179	179,311	392,550	69,750	66,500	708,111	206,932	-	-(13,469)	-	-(13,469)	541,909
	TOTAL	\$ 399,116,252	\$ 395,539,074	\$ 387,650,852	\$ 46,270,207	\$ 254,254,849	\$ 73,335,684	\$ 40,044,707	\$ 413,905,447	\$ 26,254,595	\$ (13,273,165)	\$ (11,000,004)	\$ (8,781,868)	\$ (19,781,872)	\$ 373,595,848

Notes

Column A: Cluster Category - Courts are separated into four clusters based upon the number of judicial position equivalents (JPE).

Column B: Court System

Column C: Total Security Funding as of FY 2004–2005 – Sum of the court’s base year (FY 1996–1997) level of court security funding and all court security budget increases to date.

Column D: FY 2004–2005 Court Security Budget – This is the funding level each court is expected to spend in FY 2004–2005 as reported to the AOC in November 2004.

Column E: Lesser of FY 2004–2005 Funding or Budget – Lesser of Column C and Column D.

Column F: Entrance Screening – FY 2004–2005 funding that would be provided for entrance screening functions under the proposed standards if the standards were fully funded.

Column G: Courtroom & Internal Security - FY 2004–2005 funding that would be provided for courtroom & internal security functions under the proposed standards if the standards were fully funded.

Column H: Internal Transportation, Holding Cells & Control Rooms - FY 2004–2005 funding that would be provided for internal transportation, holding cells & control rooms functions under the proposed standards if the standards were fully funded.

Column I: Supervision - FY 2004–2005 funding that would be provided for supervision functions under the proposed standards if the standards were fully funded.

Column J: Total Court Security Budget Based on Standards – Sum of Columns F, G, H, and I.

Column K: Difference from Funding/Budget and Standard – Difference between Column J and Column E.

Column L: Gross Reduction Before Applying 1st \$11 Million Reduction – Amount that each court’s security budget exceeds the funding level under the proposed standard.

Column M: Less FY 2004–2005 One-Time \$11 Million Reduction – Each court’s pro-rated share of the first \$11 million reduction (allocated based on share of the statewide court security budget).

Column N: 2nd \$11 Million Reduction – For courts with a security budget that exceeds the level provided under the proposed funding standards, this is the additional reduction that each court would need to make in FY 2004–2005.

Column O: Total FY 2004–2005 Reduction – this is the sum of the court’s share of the total \$22 million court security reduction to be allocated in FY 2004–2005.

Column P: Amended FY 2004–2005 Budget (Lesser of Standard or Budget) – Each court’s amended FY 2004–2005 court security budget that reflects new funding and share of the \$22 million reduction.