

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

**Report Summary**

*(Annotated to include Judicial Council actions taken on August 25, 2006)*

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts  
Christine M. Hansen, Director, Finance Division, 415-865-7951,  
tina.hansen@jud.ca.gov

DATE: August 24, 2006

SUBJECT: FY 2006–2007 Trial Court Budget Allocations (Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Judicial Council has authority to approve the allocation of funding to the trial courts. This report presents recommendations for trial court allocations, including allocation of the State Appropriations Limit (SAL) adjustment funding, to occur in fiscal year (FY) 2006–2007. Attachment 1 (Calculation of SAL Allocation for FY 2006–2007) and Attachment 2 (Trial Court SAL Growth Factor Allocation Template) to this report display the SAL adjustment allocation calculations and recommended allocations for FY 2006–2007. Two portions of the SAL funding are not yet ready for allocation.

New funding was also received through the Budget Act of 2006. A partial allocation of this funding will be recommended in this report. Additional allocations for FY 2006–2007 will be made from ongoing funding available in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). In addition, recommendations are made relating to FY 2005–2006 funding. All these items are discussed in more detail in the report. Attachment 3 to this report displays the recommended allocations by court and provides the beginning and adjusted FY 2006–2007 base budget for each court at the present time. *Please note that Attachment 3 has been revised since the Judicial Council meeting. Column A includes the security base, the subordinate judicial officer base funding, and the funding that used to be provided from the Trial Court Improvement Fund which is now funded from the Trial Court Trust Fund.*

Summary of Recommendations

The following recommendations are made by Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff. The Trial Court Budget Working Group joins in on recommendations 1-3, 5-10, 13-15, 17, 22, 23, and 30. The Workers' Compensation Oversight Committee joins in on recommendation 30. It is recommended that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the allocation to the courts in FY 2006–2007 of up to \$3.878 million in ongoing costs for retirement rate and plan changes effective in FY 2005–2006 that have not previously been allocated and for annualization of increases that occurred part way through FY 2005–2006, \$6.077 million for ratified rate and plan changes effective in FY 2006–2007, and set aside up to \$13.245 million for nonratified retirement rate and plan changes projected for FY 2006–2007 from the SAL funding, as indicated in columns B, C, and D of Attachment 3.
2. Approve that *one-time* costs for nonsecurity operating costs related to new facilities to be opened during FY 2006–2007 through the first three months of FY 2007–2008 be funded from (1) the FY 2005–2006 undesignated SAL carryover and (2) Trial Court Trust Fund one-time savings.
3. Approve a maximum allocation of \$1.3 million in *ongoing* funds from the SAL adjustment, to be used to address nonsecurity operational costs for new facilities opened or planned to open in FY 2006–2007 through the first three months of FY 2007–2008, and defer consideration of recommendations on allocations until the October 20, 2006 council meeting.
4. Approve allocation of \$3.7 million in ongoing funding—\$34,000 per court and the remainder allocated based on 2006 population figures from the Department of Finance—to the trial courts for providing services to assist unrepresented litigants, as indicated in column E of Attachment 3. Any additional funds available for self-help in FY 2006–2007 would be allocated by population.
5. Approve \$44.107 million in Inflation and Workforce funding for allocation to the courts to be used to meet staff compensation, operating expenses, and other costs at their discretion, as indicated in column F of Attachment 3.
6. Approve evenly splitting the adjusted Workload Growth and Equity funding component into two subcomponents—Resource Allocation Study Funding and Pro-rata Growth Funding.
7. Approve allocation of the Pro-rata Growth Funding to all the trial courts based on their proportion of the trial court base budget, to be used consistent with local discretion, as indicated in column G of Attachment 3.
8. Approve deferral of allocation of the Resource Allocation Study Funding until the October 20, 2006, Judicial Council meeting, so that additional refinements to the methodology can be completed and all required information be compiled and incorporated into the analysis.
9. Approve a total allocation for mandatory cost changes in security of \$36.956 million, \$19.987 million in ongoing SAL funding, \$4.323 million in ongoing prior year security carryover, and \$12.646 million in one-time prior year carryover.
10. Direct staff to:
  - Incorporate these new and revised standards into the security allocation for FY 2006–2007;
  - Obtain more detailed information about prior year and current year salary and benefit costs;
  - Return to the Judicial Council at its October 20 meeting with recommendations for allocations; and

- In the interim, allocate to each court the same level of security funding as was provided in FY 2005–2006.
11. Approve referral of requests for one-time costs that are not part of the basic screening equipment previously paid for with these types of funds to the AOC’s Emergency Response and Security unit for possible funding from its grant program.
  12. Approve deferral, until the October 20, 2006, Judicial Council meeting, of recommendations on allocation of funding to address security costs for new facilities opening in FY 2006–2007 through the first three months of FY 2007–2008.
  13. Approve permanent redirection of the FY 2006–2007 Jury SAL allocation of \$969,527 to Court-Appointed Counsel and \$50,000 to Processing of Elder Abuse Protective Orders.
  14. Approve increased funding for reimbursement of Court-Appointed Counsel costs for FY 2006–2007 to the SAL allocation on the program’s base budget and the permanently redirected SAL allocation on the Jury program budget (minus \$50,000 for Elder Abuse), in the amount of \$969,527.
  15. Direct staff to come back to the council at a future date with a report containing options to address the Court-Appointed Counsel program.
  16. Approve a permanent redirection of \$50,000 from the SAL growth allocation to the Jury program to address anticipated shortfalls in the elder abuse protective order reimbursement program, beginning in FY 2006–2007.
  17. Approve dividing the interpreter program SAL allocation into two parts—Inflation and Workforce to address current program costs, and Workload Growth and Equity to address growth of the interpreter program.
  18. Approve the application of the adjusted SAL growth factor to the following scheduled reimbursement programs: CASA, Model Self-Help, Equal Access, Family Law Information Centers, and Civil Case Coordination.
  19. Approve the combination of funding for Service of Process for Protective Orders, Prisoner Hearing Costs, and Costs of Homicide Trials into one pool for purposes of reimbursement, based on actual costs up to that collective level and application of a 4.7 percent SAL increase to the combined program.
  20. Approve application of a 4.7 percent SAL factor to the Drug Court Projects program.
  21. Approve application of the total SAL growth rate to the Equal Access fund.
  22. Approve a permanent redirection of \$400,000 from the Trial Court Trust Fund to the Civil Case Coordination program.
  23. Approve a permanent redirection of \$800,000 from the Trial Court Trust Fund to the Assigned Judges Program.
  24. Approve the policy that no ongoing funding to staff the new entrance screening stations be provided to the designated courts until they have notified AOC staff that the security positions are in place and that they will not receive any of the one-time funding for equipment until they have provided documentation of the cost of the equipment, for which reimbursement must not exceed \$30,000 per station.
  25. Approve the allocation of funding for new screening stations, based on the policies in recommendation 24 above, as indicated in columns H and I of Attachment 3.
  26. Approve deferral of the establishment of a replacement schedule for entrance screening equipment until the October council meeting.

27. Defer allocation of the funding for new judgeships contained in the Budget Act of 2006 until Senate Bill 56 is enacted.
28. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to allocate ongoing and one-time savings in undesignated funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund, or the SAL funding, to the extent that funds are available, for any program areas identified in the SAL Allocation Template, and authority to make technical adjustments to these SAL allocations, without the need to return to the Judicial Council.
29. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to allocate funding from the TCTF related to one county's increased maintenance of effort payments to be distributed to the court, beginning in FY 2006–2007.
30. (a) Refund (through a reduction in the FY 2006–2007 program premium) the difference between the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program estimated costs for excess coverage premium vs. the actual premium costs for FY 2005–2006, for a total refund of \$1,012,751;  
(b) Use \$249,516 of the savings to fund state pro rata charges for the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund, based on payroll;  
(c) Relieve four courts that had actual losses greater than their FY 2005–2006 allocations, in the amount of \$161,061; and  
(d) Refund 50 percent of the remainder through a reduction in the FY 2006–2007 premium back to participating courts that had allocations greater than actual losses, with 50 percent to remain as a cash reserve in the JBWCP fund in the event of an adverse claims year. The total of these allocations for the courts is indicated in column J of Attachment 3.
31. Approve permanent allocation of \$0.968 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund to the base budgets of several courts (as indicated in column K of Attachment 3) for IT staffing and apply the SAL growth factor to the funds each year.

***Recommendations 1 through 31 were approved by the Judicial Council.***

#### Rationale for Recommendation

Please see the rationale included for each separate recommendation within the report.

#### Alternative Actions Considered

Please see the alternatives included for each separate recommendation within the report.

#### Comments From Interested Parties

As mentioned repeatedly throughout the report, the Trial Court Budget Working Group met to discuss many of the above recommendations. Based on input from various constituents, the Legislature adopted Supplemental Report Language that directs how SAL funds are to be allocated in FY 2006–2007.

#### Implementation Requirements and Costs

No additional funds are needed to implement these recommendations.

#### Attachments

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

**Report**

*(Annotated to include Judicial Council actions taken on August 25, 2006)*

TO: Members of the Judicial Council

FROM: Administrative Office of the Courts  
Christine M. Hansen, Director, Finance Division, 415-865-7951,  
tina.hansen@jud.ca.gov

DATE: August 24, 2006

SUBJECT: FY 2006–2007 Trial Court Budget Allocations (Action Required)

Issue Statement

The Judicial Council has authority to approve the allocation of funding to the trial courts. This report presents recommendations for trial court allocations, including allocation of the State Appropriations Limit (SAL) adjustment funding, to occur in fiscal year (FY) 2006–2007. Attachment 1 (Calculation of SAL Allocation for FY 2006–2007) and Attachment 2 (Trial Court SAL Growth Factor Allocation Template) to this report display the SAL adjustment allocation calculations and recommended allocations for FY 2006–2007. Two portions of the SAL funding are not yet ready for allocation.

New funding was also received through the Budget Act of 2006. A partial allocation of this funding will be recommended in this report. Additional allocations for FY 2006–2007 will be made from ongoing funding available in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). In addition, recommendations are made relating to FY 2005–2006 funding. All these items are discussed in more detail in the report. Attachment 3 to this report displays the recommended allocations by court and provides the beginning and adjusted FY 2006–2007 base budget for each court at the present time. *Please note that Attachment 3 has been revised since the Judicial Council meeting. Column A includes the security base, the subordinate judicial officer base funding, and the funding that used to be provided from the Trial Court Improvement Fund which is now funded from the Trial Court Trust Fund.*

Rationale for Recommendation

*State Appropriations Limit Growth Factor Allocation Template*

The Legislature is required to make an annual budget appropriation for the operations of the trial courts based on the request of the Judicial Council. Beginning in FY 2005–2006, Government Code section 77202(a)(1) requires the Judicial Council’s budget request for

the trial courts to include a base funding adjustment for operating costs that is computed based on the year-to-year percentage change in the annual State Appropriations Limit. On April 15, 2005, the Judicial Council adopted the State Appropriations Limit Allocation Process and Template. Subsequently, on June 10, 2005, the Executive and Planning Committee of the Judicial Council approved the Calculation Process for Allocation of the SAL Funding Adjustment for FY 2005–2006 and the Judicial Council ratified that approval on June 15, 2005, by means of a circulating order.

Based on input from various constituents, the Legislature adopted the Supplemental Report of the 2006 Budget Act (Supplemental Report Language) that directs how SAL funds are to be allocated in FY 2006–2007. These changes have been incorporated into the SAL allocation template and will be discussed in further detail in this report. After enactment of the Budget Act of 2006 (Stats 2006, ch. 47) on June 30, 2006, the Trial Court Budget Working Group met on July 20 to discuss recommendations regarding allocation of the SAL growth funding.

#### *State Appropriations Limit Methodology*

The final SAL funding growth factor for FY 2006–2007 was 4.96 percent (as compared to 6.44 percent in FY 2005–2006). (Please see Attachment 2, which provides detail regarding this section of the report.) Application of the SAL growth percentage results in \$113.058 million in increased funding. Of this amount, \$1.693 million is allocated to the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund. The remaining \$111.366 million is available for allocation as part of trial court funding. In addition to this amount, the following funding is also available for allocation: \$0.245 million in undesignated carryover from FY 2005–2006 SAL funding, \$3.449 million in unallocated security funding carried over from FY 2005–2006, and \$0.874 million in unallocated security funding carried over from FY 2005–2006 TCTF allocation. A large part of the security carryover funding was not allocated, because of estimated increases in mandatory security costs that did not occur during the fiscal year. This results in total ongoing funding available for allocation of \$115.980 million. There is also \$16.924 million in available one-time carryover funding, including \$4.279 million undesignated, \$2.908 million security from the prior year SAL allocation, and \$9.738 million security carryover from the prior year TCTF allocation.

#### *Allocation of FY 2006–2007 SAL adjustment funding based on actual costs*

##### **Court Employee Retirement Rate and Plan Cost Changes**

Administrative Office of the Courts staff surveyed the courts to determine the cost of court staff retirement rate and plan changes for FY 2006–2007. Based on this information, projected increased court costs for rate and plan changes will be \$23.199 million in FY 2006–2007. This amount includes both ratified and nonratified changes. The exact amounts may change as pending rates are finalized. The council, at its July 2005 meeting, approved the policy that retirement funding be provided to courts based only on confirmed rate changes. For courts that do not have confirmed rate changes, but have provided expected retirement rate change information, funding is to be set aside and

provided once rate changes have been finalized and confirmed. The \$23.199 million includes the annualized costs of retirement rate and plan changes for a few courts that occurred in FY 2005–2006, but that were not known to staff until late during that fiscal year. These costs were not included in the SAL allocation last year. There were also a few courts that had retirement rate and plan changes in FY 2005–2006, for which funding had not yet been allocated.

This recommendation is consistent with the policies established by the council for allocation of employee retirement rate and plan changes, and with the retirement allocation methodology used as part of the FY 2005–2006 trial court funding allocation. To ensure that sufficient funds are available to fund these changes, AOC staff and the Trial Court Budget Working Group believe that the actual costs should be funded, and that this should be done separately from the funding made available to the courts for discretionary purposes (the Inflation and Workforce allocation discussed later in this report).

### *Judicial Council Priorities*

#### Trial Court Staffing and Operating Expenses for New Facilities

The Judicial Council approved two budget priorities for FY 2006–2007: (1) Trial Court Staffing and Operating Expenses for New Facilities and (2) Self-Help Centers.

Supplemental Report Language, which states legislative intent but does not impose legal requirements, directs that the total amount that can be provided from the SAL adjustment for both of these priorities in FY 2006–2007 cannot exceed \$5.0 million. Based on commitments made during the legislative budget process, AOC staff recommends that a maximum of \$1.3 million in ongoing funding be provided for nonsecurity operating expenses for new trial court facilities and that a minimum of \$3.7 million in one-time and ongoing funding be provided for self-help. Self-help allocations will be discussed in the next section of this report.

Only courts that were anticipating the opening of a new or transferring facility in FY 2006–2007, and through September 2007 of FY 2007–2008, were to complete the forms and provide information on these costs. The survey form was divided into non-security and security costs. One-time and ongoing costs were allowed to be requested.

A total of 22 courts requested funding for nonsecurity operating costs for 30 facilities. Of the 30 facilities, 17 facilities requests for funding are for transferring facilities. The survey instructions advised the courts that only rule 810 of the California Rules of Court allowable costs were permitted and should be for unfunded costs associated with opening and operating a new court facility. If funding for positions was requested, courts were instructed to complete a workload analysis form to show justification for the positions. Courts were also instructed to identify the value of offsetting resources such as staff and existing furniture or equipment that could be transferred from an existing facility to the new one.

Ongoing funding for FY 2006–2007 was requested in the amount of \$2.602. \$4.344 million in ongoing funding was requested for FY 2007–2008. These funds were requested by courts for items including new staff positions, janitorial costs, various information services, and communications-related costs. One-time funding for FY 2006–2007 was requested in the amount of \$11.890. \$0.597 million in one-time funding was requested for FY 2007–2008. These requests were to fund items such as furniture, file storage, moving services, and IT and communications equipment. AOC staff contacted the courts when additional information was needed to determine whether sufficient justification to include the costs was provided.

Staff applied the following specific criteria in reviewing the operational funding requests associated with new court facilities:

- Rule 810 unallowable charges were not to be considered, with the exception of cases where historically the county has never paid for these costs.
- All costs that either were unrelated to the new court facility or were already paid by the court are not being recommended.
- All costs submitted should be above and beyond the courts' ability to pay within their existing resources.
- Undesignated reserves for Trial Court Trust Fund and Non-Trial Court Trust Fund as of the third quarter Quarterly Financial Statement (QFS) were evaluated to determine if one-time costs could be absorbed.

As a result of the review of the requests, staff will recommend additional funding for some courts. Because of the number of requests, the amount of one-time funding requested, and the availability of one-time funds for allocation, AOC staff and the Trial Court Budget Working Group agreed that any approved one-time costs should be allocated from prior year one-time carryover funding and the TCTF one-time savings. As directed by the Judicial Council last year, staff established a process to allocate these costs on notification by the courts that the costs have been incurred.

The procedures used to recommend amounts for allocation are consistent with the approved methodology used last year for the same purpose. Because of the limitation on the amount of SAL funding available to address Judicial Council budget priorities in FY 2006–2007, staff and the Trial Court Budget Working Group believe that the current year SAL funding should be used only for ongoing costs. Since there is some undesignated one-time funding remaining from prior fiscal years and one-time savings in the TCTF, it seems appropriate to use these funds to address those one-time costs that courts cannot otherwise absorb.

While it is recommended that the established criteria be used, AOC staff believes that recommendations for allocation of this funding should be deferred until the October 20, 2006, Judicial Council meeting for the following reasons:

- The total amount of funding requested, particularly for transferring facilities, is more than what is available for funding of both ongoing and one-time costs. This

will require detailed analysis to determine where the limited funding should be recommended for allocation.

- Some courts have costs that will be changing from those originally submitted because of changes in lease negotiations or transfer dates.
- Decisions are still being made regarding ongoing supplemental funding for administrative infrastructure. This could have an impact as to what are the recommended costs for courts to absorb.
- Finally, methodology refinements to the Resource Allocation Study model are under consideration and development. Implementation of these refinements will help in the prioritization in this program area because of the limited availability of one-time and ongoing funding.

### Self-Help

Funding to support self-help programs was the second Judicial Council budget priority for FY 2006–2007. Data collected by the AOC indicates that most of the 6 million annual traffic filings involve self-represented litigants; at least half of the estimated 94,500 child custody mediation cases handled by the California courts each year have at least one or more self-represented parent; and in more than 63 percent of child support cases, neither parent has representation. In addition, all the nearly 400,000 small claims cases filed each year involve self-represented litigants. The establishment by courts of self-help programs and centers assists in broadening and facilitating both access to, and understanding of, the court process for all persons served by the courts. One of the recommendations resulting from the 2005 *Trust and Confidence in the California Courts* survey of over 2,400 California adults was to expand the development of self-help centers and other information services and to carefully tailor them to the specific needs of individual jurisdictions.

Staff surveyed the courts regarding their funding needs in this area. The survey asked their needs in a variety of program areas, above what they currently receive for the AB 1058 child support family law facilitator program and small claims advisor funds. A total of 54 courts responded to the survey. Courts requested funding in the areas of child support, family law, guardianship, domestic violence, conservatorship, simple probate, civil, small claims, and other. The requested funds would be used to pay for attorney time, nonattorney staff time, informational materials, mediation, assistance in courtrooms, self-help centers, and workshops in the community. The initial amount requested by the courts, with no prioritization of need, was approximately \$47.2 million, which included \$3.9 million in one-time funding. As mentioned previously, in combination with Trial Court Operating Costs for New Facilities Opening in FY 2006–2007, Supplemental Report Language directs that no more than \$5.0 million be available from the SAL adjustment for both these priorities. Based on commitments made during the legislative budget process, AOC staff recommends that no less than \$3.7 million in one-time and ongoing funding be allocated in the area of assisting unrepresented litigants and that up to \$1.3 million in ongoing funding be provided for nonsecurity operating costs for new trial court facilities.

AOC staff is recommending that all courts receive a base amount of \$34,000, which will allow them to have an attorney-supervised self-help center available at least 12 hours per week, according to the minimum guidelines being recommended by the Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants. The remainder of the funding would be allocated to the courts based on 2006 population figures from the Department of Finance (DOF). Any additional funds for self-help that are available in FY 2006–2007 would be allocated by population. The Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants considered and approved this methodology for recommendation to the Judicial Council.

Providing a base level of funding for self-help programs will allow each court to establish an attorney-supervised self-help center to assist self-represented litigants for a minimum of 12 hours a week.

Given extensive needs of the public for access to self-help services, self-help was identified as a Judicial Council statewide funding priority. Following the legislative intent that no more than \$5 million be spent on this program, this recommendation will enable the funding of enhanced services within the \$5 million cap for both self-help and nonsecurity operating costs of new trial court facilities.

#### *Court allocations (excluding security)*

##### **Inflation and Workforce**

Beginning in FY 2005–2006, funding to address staff compensation, operating expenses, and other budget priorities of the courts was provided to courts through the Inflation and Workforce component of the SAL growth factor. This approach, which applies the adjusted Inflation and Workforce percentage to each court's base budget (excluding security), provides a funding stream to each court based on the relative size of each court's budget, to address the costs of court operations.

The methodology for allocation of this funding is the same as used last year. It provides funding for the courts to address local needs and local priorities.

##### **Workload Growth and Equity**

In FY 2005–2006, the entire adjusted Workload Growth and Equity percentage was applied to the total trial court base budget (excluding security) which resulted in an amount of funding that was used to address funding needs for courts that appeared relatively under-resourced based on an analysis of court workload growth and funding. The methodology used to identify these courts uses the Resource Allocation Study model (RAS), which was developed by the AOC's Office of Court Research, in consultation with the National Center for State Courts and a working group composed of court executives from 15 superior courts. This process provided additional SAL funding to nearly 30 courts.

Consistent with the Supplemental Report Language adopted by the Legislature, this process is proposed to be modified for FY 2006–2007, by determining estimated resource

needs based on the model's analysis of filings workload, and then comparing that information to current funding and costs. A total of 28 relatively under-resourced courts were provided funding as part of the FY 2005–2006 SAL funding allocation. Instead of using the entire amount of funding derived by applying the adjusted Workload Growth and Equity percentage to the trial court base budget (excluding security) for allocation to underresourced courts through the RAS model, the Workload Growth and Equity percentage has been split into two even subcomponents. One subcomponent—Resource Allocation Study Funding—is recommended to be used in the same way as in FY 2005–2006. The other subcomponent—Pro-rata Growth—is recommended to be allocated to all courts based on their portion of the total base budget. The Legislature's intent related to this adjustment is included in the Supplemental Report Language, which states:

It is the intent of the Legislature that the funds appropriated in Item 0250-101-0932 for the operation of the trial courts, except funds relating to security, that represent an increase in support for the trial courts over 2005–06 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council so that a portion of the funds are allocated on a pro rata basis for the general operation of the trial courts and a portion of the funds are allocated in order to address the differential growth needs of the trial courts.

The Supplemental Report Language later states that half the funding will be allocated through the RAS model and half through the pro-rata process.

While it is recommended that the RAS model be used to allocate that subcomponent of the Workload Growth and Equity funding, recommendations for allocation of this funding should be deferred until the October 20, 2006, Judicial Council meeting for the following reasons:

- Senate Bill 56, the new judgeship legislation, has not yet been passed. Courts that receive new judge positions will also receive funding for additional staff positions. Once this information is included in the RAS model, the baseline resource levels of these courts available to address workload will be increased. Some of the courts that received funding based on the RAS model analysis last year may no longer need as much, or any, of the allocation after judgeship funding is taken into account.
- Not all courts have submitted the Schedule 7A for FY 2006–2007, and the reports that have been submitted are being reviewed and compiled. Information from this document is used in the RAS model analysis.
- Decisions are still being made regarding ongoing supplemental funding for administrative infrastructure. This could have an impact on the results of the RAS model.
- Finally, methodology refinements to the RAS model are under consideration and development.

Dividing the Workload Growth and Equity percentage as recommended is a compromise designed to address the concerns both of those interested parties that want all of this funding to be provided in a directed manner to *all* trial courts based solely on the relative

size of their budgets, and of those that believe that it should continue to be a priority of the Judicial Council to address workload growth underfunding for courts that have been identified by specific objective criteria. Deferring allocation of the Resource Allocation Study Funding until the October meeting will provide time for staff to complete refinements and compile and review the required data. Also, by that time, it is hoped that SB 56 will have been enacted.

### *Security*

Two security funding areas are discussed in this report—FY 2006–2007 mandatory security cost changes in salaries, retirement, and other benefits and the security costs associated with new facilities to be opened in FY 2006–2007. Application of the full SAL growth factor—4.96 percent—to the total trial court security budget results in new SAL security funding of \$19.987 million in FY 2006–2007. As indicated earlier in this report, there is also \$4.323 million in additional ongoing security funding that carries over from FY 2005–2006, and \$12.646 million in one-time security funding that carries over from previous years. The bulk of this one-time funding was the result of a late deficiency request for FY 2004–2005 that was not received until the following year. In FY 2005–2006, all security allocations were made from security funding, i.e., no undesignated SAL funding or other undesignated funds were used to address security costs.

#### Mandatory security cost changes in salaries, retirement, and other benefits

AOC staff surveyed the trial courts and sheriffs in May 2006 to identify increased mandatory costs for security services. These costs included negotiated salary increases, retirement costs, and costs for other benefits. Courts were instructed to include only existing levels of security—no new positions over the previous fiscal year. The survey form allowed for the inclusion of costs for all areas of security for which the court was paying as of the time Senate Bill 1396 (Stats. 2002, ch. 1010) was enacted. The initial amount requested by courts for FY 2006–2007, above the amount provided to the courts in the previous year, was in excess of \$46 million.

Staff have various concerns regarding the information contained in the survey responses. Staff identified several courts that included additional positions in their surveys. Courts were instructed to remove these positions and include costs only for the level of staffing that was funded in FY 2005–2006. In comparing the FY 2006–2007 mid-step salary and benefit costs for deputies and supervisor/managers to those same costs for FY 2005–2006 (the amounts on which the funding standards are based), staff determined that in many cases the information appears to be incorrect. Because of the limited funding available to address mandatory cost changes for existing levels of security, it is essential to determine exactly what is included as part of the mid-step salary and benefit costs, including the types of benefits and the level of benefits. This will require that staff return to the courts and sheriffs to obtain greater detail in this area.

Staff specifically asked as part of the FY 2006–2007 survey, whether the cost increases were based on ratified agreements. Consistent with last year, many agreements will not

be in place until well into the fiscal year that the agreements cover. This results in the need for courts and sheriff staff to estimate potential changes based on ongoing negotiations or changes from the previous year. In FY 2005–2006, several courts made such projections, but final agreements were not ratified during the year. This is the reason for part of the ongoing carryover of SAL funds into FY 2006–2007.

Another part of the security cost survey includes items such as professional support staff; services, supplies, and equipment; and vehicle use. In an agenda item discussed during today's meeting (Item 6), the council considered recommendations for funding standards for these areas. Assuming that these funding standards are approved by the council, staff would use them to determine costs for these items for those courts that currently pay for them. The standards are recommended to be used in the following manner:

- Professional support staff—Funding for these staff for courts currently paying for these costs would be capped at 1.5 percent of their security base budget.
- Security service, supplies, and equipment—For those courts currently paying for these items, the lesser of actual costs or the new standard for these items would be funded. Individual items would be funded at the lesser of actual costs or standard for each item.
- Vehicle use—Courts currently paying for this cost would be funded at the lesser of \$0.445 per mile or their requested amount.

The security standards were considered by the Judicial Council earlier at this meeting. To treat courts consistently, they should be used in the allocation for the current year. Until additional information can be obtained from courts regarding what is included in their mid-step salary and benefit costs, the new SAL security funding should not be allocated to courts but, rather, they should be maintained at their existing security funding level.

#### Security costs for new facilities opening in FY 2006–2007

A total of 16 court systems requested ongoing funding for security costs for 21 new facilities opening in FY 2006–2007 through September 2007. Although only instructed to submit costs related to new entrance screening stations, a few courts submitted requests for additional security staff to support holding cells and control rooms, internal security, and security after normal business hours. Courts were told that the security funding standards for their courts would be applied to the positions requested. They also requested funding for one-time equipment costs for basic entrance screening equipment, such as X-ray machines, magnetometers, hand-held wands, as well as other items including cameras, access card systems, remote control door locks, and radio communications infrastructure. Many of these items are not types of equipment that have previously been funded through this funding. For this reason, staff recommends that these items be referred to the AOC's Emergency Response and Security unit to determine the appropriateness of the request and for possible funding through its grant program.

In FY 2005–2006, the Judicial Council directed that all security costs for new facilities for that year be funded from security funding. Because staff will be contacting courts to obtain greater detail regarding costs for mandatory security increases for FY 2006–2007,

it has been recommended that allocations for these security costs be deferred until the October 20 Judicial Council meeting. Once total costs for mandatory security increases have been determined, the level of funding remaining to address security costs for new facilities can be established. Due to the fact that the funding needs to meet mandatory security costs will not be known in time for the August meeting, it is recommended that allocations to address security costs for new facilities be deferred until the October meeting.

The staff of the Emergency Response and Security unit has been provided a certain level of funding each year to assist courts in one-time security needs. On request, they visit courts and examine their needs for specific types of equipment to determine if they are appropriate and reasonable for funding. These nonbasic security equipment requests are more appropriately addressed through this process. Before recommendations can be made on allocation of funding for security costs for new facilities, the funding needed to address mandatory cost changes must be determined. Deferring the recommendations until the October Judicial Council meeting will provide necessary time to survey the courts in greater detail to determine the mandatory security costs and then determine the level of security funding remaining to address new facility costs.

#### *Trial court reimbursement and local assistance funding*

##### **Jury**

The amount of funding available to address reimbursable juror costs (per diem, mileage, and food and lodging for sequestered jurors for criminal jury trials and for civil jury trials where a waiver of payment of jury fees has been granted) is \$33.8 million. The implementation of the one-day/one-trial program and changes in the jury reimbursement process, including limiting reimbursement strictly to the costs mentioned above, no longer reimbursing the courts where the county retains civil jury fees, and no longer reimbursing state employees for jury service, have resulted in a reduction in the total amount reimbursed to courts for the costs of jurors. Because jury funding is currently available, there appears to be no need to grow the jury program by the SAL factor. Because of the needs of other programs, as explained shortly in this report, it is recommended that the SAL growth for jury be redirected to Court-Appointed Counsel and Processing of Elder Abuse Protective Orders. In FY 2005–2006, the Judicial Council approved the redirection of \$675,000 in jury program funding on a one-time basis to address FY 2005–2006 subordinate judicial officer retirement increases and a permanent redirection of \$52,537.

While a goal of the Judicial Council is raising per diem rates for jurors, the Court Executives Advisory Committee subgroup, which is working on possible changes to jury per diem, reports that it is not ready at this time to present recommendations. Changes to the amount of per diem would require revision of statutes before they could go into effect. This would mean that the earliest such changes could go into effect would be during FY 2007–2008. Sufficient funds will remain in the jury program to provide for an

increase in the per diem rate at a future point when comprehensive recommendations can be made to address the jury reimbursement program.

As previously mentioned, sufficient funds remain in the jury program to allow for permanent redirection of the SAL allocation and to provide for an increase in per diem at a later date when a comprehensive plan for changes in the jury reimbursement process can be recommended. In the meantime, while jury reimbursement has not grown over the past few years, costs for other program areas, including court-appointed counsel, have increased.

#### Court-Appointed Counsel

The FY 2005–2006 baseline for court-appointed counsel was \$90.891 million. The FY 2005–2006 costs were just over \$96 million. Based on the prior year cost, the current year cost for the program is anticipated to be between \$103 and \$105 million, well over the FY 2006–2007 SAL base funding available for this program.

Based on the recommendation of AOC staff and the Trial Court Budget Working Group, the Judicial Council has approved full court-appointed counsel program funding for three of the last four years. This has been accomplished primarily on a retroactive basis through one-time allocations of one-time savings in the TCTF. The result of using after-the-fact allocations to fully fund the program has resulted in the following structural problems with the program:

- Courts cannot accurately plan for court-appointed counsel costs each fiscal year;
- Courts have a disincentive to implement cost control measures;
- Courts have an incentive to increase expenditures before receipt of additional funding, as new funding is provided only in arrears of actual cost increases; and
- Court-appointed counsel consumes an unpredictable and increasing share of surplus funding in other program areas.

Additional staff work needs to be completed to more thoroughly present options to the council. Staff recommends that increased funding for reimbursement of Court-Appointed Counsel costs be limited to the SAL increase for Court-Appointed Counsel and the permanently redirected SAL increase to the Jury program (minus the \$50,000 for Elder Abuse Protective Orders).

The recommended action will provide some additional funding for the program, while staff works on more permanent alternatives to manage program funding needs and approaches over the long term.

#### Processing of Elder Abuse Protective Orders

Assembly Bill 59 (Stats. 1999, ch. 561) authorized elders and dependent adults to seek emergency protective orders to protect them from nonrelative cohabitants under the Domestic Violence Protection Act (DVPA) for nonfinancially-related abuses. It also created a new protective order for elder and dependent adult abuse, which includes

financial abuse. The Budget Act of 2000 (Stats. 2000, ch. 52) provided \$1.175 million to address court workload associated with the processing of these orders.

Beginning with FY 2005–2006, the Judicial Council approved the permanent reduction of \$875,000 from this program to be used to address shortfalls in other program areas. This left a balance of \$300,000. However, based on the costs for the program in FY 2005–2006, and the increasing trend in program costs since its inception (see the table below), it is recommended that \$50,000 in additional funds be permanently redirected from SAL for Jury to this program beginning in FY 2006–2007.

Reimbursement of Elder Abuse Protective Orders  
FY 2001–2002 through FY 2005–2006

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>No. of Filings</b>	<b>Amount Allocated</b>
2001–2002	1,073	\$198,505
2002–2003	1,110	205,350
2003–2004	1,198	221,630
2004–2005	1,515	280,275
2005–2006	1,703	315,055

To fully reimburse this program, which has experienced increasing costs every year of its existence, a relatively modest permanent redirection of funds is necessary. Sufficient funds will still remain in the Jury program to address future jury reimbursement changes.

*Scheduled reimbursement programs*

**Court Interpreters**

In FY 2005–2006, the Judicial Council approved an increase of \$14.996 million for the court interpreter program budget. This included \$4.362 million from the application of the adjusted SAL factor to the beginning program budget, and \$10.633 million above the SAL amount. This funding was needed to address the anticipated increase in costs in the program due to the anticipated need to fund nonsalary-driven benefits, such as health care, that had not previously been mandatory for contract or per diem interpreters who subsequently became staff interpreters. These benefits costs would go into effect midway through FY 2005–2006. The FY 2006–2007 beginning base budget for court interpreters is \$88.231 million.

Discussions with the Trial Court Budget Working Group resulted in a proposal to divide the SAL growth allocation for the interpreter program into an Inflation and Workforce component and a Workload Growth and Equity component, similar to the way other nonreimbursed staff funding is divided. The Workload Growth and Equity funding would be used to fund growth of the interpreter program overall, while the Inflation and Workforce funding would be used for current program costs, such as employee compensation increases.

AOC staff and the Trial Court Budget Working Group believed that the funding for this program should be funded similarly to the way other court allocations (excluding security) are funded.

CASA/Model Self-Help/Equal Access/Family Law Information Centers/  
Civil Case Coordination

The Budget Act of 2006 includes SAL funding increases for these scheduled reimbursement programs, based on the total adjusted SAL growth factor. This funding should be adequate for the current purposes of the programs.

*Scheduled local assistance programs*

Service of Process for Protective Orders/Prisoner Hearing Costs/  
Cost of Homicide Trials

The Budget Act of 2006 has combined the Service of Process for Protective Orders, Prisoner Hearing Costs, and Costs of Homicide Trials into a single program line item and provided 4.7 percent increased SAL funding for it. This means that even though the Cost of Homicide Trials funding was originally \$271,000, if the cost for this program goes up and the combined cost of all three programs does not exceed the total amount, funding will be available to reimburse courts for the increased costs.

Each of these program areas is a program in which courts have been reimbursed based on actual costs. For that reason, the amount of funding needed in each program can vary from year to year. Combining the programs will provide for more flexibility in reimbursement, without having to seek additional funds from other sources. The Budget Act includes increasing the funding at the 4.7 percent SAL amount, and there is no apparent reason to change this.

Drug Court Projects

As with the other scheduled local assistance programs cited above, the Budget Act of 2006 includes increased funding based on the application of a 4.7 percent SAL factor.

The 2006 Budget Act includes increasing the funding at the 4.7 percent SAL amount, and there is no apparent reason to change this.

Equal Access

The Budget Act of 2006 includes funding equal to application of the full 4.96 percent SAL growth rate on the Equal Access program. This program contains funds that are distributed by the Judicial Council through the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission to qualified legal services projects and support centers, to be used for legal services in civil matters for indigent persons. If the Judicial Council determines that awards made by the commission comply with statutory and other relevant guidelines, it approves these awards.

Equal access is one of the principal goals of the Judicial Council. Growing this fund at the maximum SAL rate will allow the various programs funded with this money to continue to expand and assist more individuals.

#### *Other FY 2006–2007 allocations*

##### **Civil Case Coordination**

Coordinating civil cases allows two or more civil cases that share common questions of fact or law and that are pending in different counties to be joined in one court. The actions that are coordinated can be complex or noncomplex. Noncomplex actions are coordinated by means of a motion made directly to the destination court, where one of the actions is already pending. To coordinate complex actions, a petition to coordinate is submitted to the chair of the Judicial Council (the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court), who assigns a judge to decide the merits of the petition. If coordination is granted by the assigned motion judge, the Chief Justice assigns a trial judge.

The AOC handles administrative activities related to petitions for coordination. This includes processing an assigned court's claim for reimbursement of costs associated with managing coordinated cases. The state reimburses for the expenses of the assigned judges and other necessary judicial officers and employees, as well as the cost of facilities. The state pays these costs from funds appropriated to the Judicial Council. The base budget for civil case coordination is \$400,000. However, from fiscal years 2000–2001 to 2004–2005, AOC program staff have either requested deficiency funding from the Department of Finance, or used one-time year-end savings to meet the cost of the claims. The cost for the program during these years varied from a low of \$583,122 to a high of \$800,203, with four of the six years being in excess of \$700,000.

In FY 2005–2006, the Judicial Council approved the allocation of an additional \$385,000, on a one-time basis, from reserves in the Trial Court Trust Fund. It is recommended that a \$400,000 permanent base adjustment from the Trial Court Trust Fund be made to the Civil Case Coordination program.

If no additional funds are provided to the program, courts would be required to absorb these costs within their existing operating budgets. One reason for coordinating cases is to use funds and resources efficiently by combining cases that share common factors, rather than hearing multiple cases in multiple jurisdictions that are trying the same facts. If funding to reimburse the courts is not provided, it might tend to discourage the coordination of these cases, which could result in even higher expenditures than are experienced through coordination. Staff will continue to examine the types of costs that courts are submitting for reimbursement and remove inappropriate ones, such as overhead, from the amount approved. The Budget Act of 2006 has included increased funding for this program, based on the adjusted SAL growth factor.

##### *Assigned judges program*

For several years, the Assigned Judges Program, which provides temporary assignment of judges to courts to cover vacancies, illnesses, disqualifications, and calendar

congestion, has experienced a shortfall in funding of approximately \$800,000. AOC staff and the Trial Court Budget Working Group believe that to address this consistent deficit in funding, a permanent redirection of \$800,000 in available undesignated funding from the TCTF should be made to this program beginning in FY 2006–2007.

The shortfall has been an ongoing issue for the program for several years. Each year, it has had to be addressed on a one-time basis. Because there is some ongoing savings available in the TCTF, it appears reasonable to redirect some of this funding to the Assigned Judges Program.

#### *Allocation of new funding from FY 2006–2007 BCPs*

##### 97 New Screening Stations

The Budget Act of 2006 includes ongoing funding in the amount of \$13.465 to staff 97 additional screening stations and \$2.91 million in one-time funding to provide equipment for those screening stations. These costs were based on a survey sent to the courts in the spring of FY 2005–2006. The original request was much higher, though, the DOF agreed to recommend funding for only one station per facility, except for those few facilities that had Americans With Disability Act issues and required a second station to provide appropriate access. The ongoing funding is based on the Judicial Council approved entrance screening funding standard for each court scheduled to receive new stations. Funding for equipment was based on a maximum of \$30,000 per station for screening equipment, including X-ray machine, magnetometer, and hand-held wands. AOC staff have been developing contracts with vendors to enable courts to purchase equipment at a lower cost than if they had purchased it on their own.

Staff recommends that no ongoing funding for staffing be provided to the courts until they have notified AOC staff that the security staff are in place and have provided documentation of the cost of the screening station equipment, for which reimbursement must not exceed \$30,000 per station.

The recommendations will provide that no funding will be given to courts until the screening stations are in place. This will prevent any possibility of the funding's being used for other security purposes, beyond that for which it was intended.

##### Five-Year Replacement Cycle Funding for Entrance Screening Equipment

The Budget Act of 2006 also includes \$2.286 million in ongoing funding for replacement of all new and existing entrance screening station equipment (X-ray machines, magnetometers, and hand-held wands) on a five-year cycle. To determine which equipment needs to be replaced first, a survey was sent to the courts to obtain a statewide inventory of all entrance screening equipment. Staff will then establish criteria to determine prioritization of needs, such as condition of equipment, age, and so on. This process may require additional follow-up with the courts. For this reason, it is

recommended that approval of a replacement schedule by the Judicial Council be deferred until the October 20 meeting.

#### 50 New Judgeships

The Budget Act of 2006 provides \$5.45 million to address one month of costs for 50 new judgeships and support staff, effective April 1, 2007. The funding includes \$2.47 million in one-time costs for furniture, supplies, and equipment for these positions. Creation of the judgeships is pending approval of Senate Bill 56, which is now proceeding through the Legislature. While the funding is included in the 2006 Budget Act, if the legislation is not enacted, the monies will not be received. Staff recommends taking no action at this time with regard to this funding until SB 56 has become law.

Although the funding is included in the 2006 Budget Act, the possibility remains that the authorizing legislation—Senate Bill 56—will not be enacted. Waiting until final resolution of the legislation before determining allocation of the funds appears prudent.

#### *General recommendation regarding allocation authority*

With some of the allocations included in this report, the actual amounts may change as more updated information is received from the courts, such as changes in agreements for retirement or security salary and benefit costs. Rather than coming back to the council to seek permission to change these costs, having the authority to do so in advance will facilitate allocating funding when final amounts are known. It is also possible that unanticipated issues may make it necessary that the Administrative Director have the ability to allocate from the TCTF or unallocated SAL funding, to any program areas identified in the SAL Allocation Template, to the extent that savings are available.

Allocation for some of the program areas included in these allocation recommendations are based on actual costs. Because some courts have not been able to submit final numbers, for a variety of reasons, the numbers currently included for these courts may change. Providing authority to the Administrative Director, to make technical adjustments to these allocations without having to come back to the council will enable the courts to receive the funds more quickly. In addition, the Administrative Director of the Courts needs to be able to address unexpected problems that may arise in various program areas by having the authority to allocate available undesignated savings from the TCTF or unallocated SAL funding in any of the areas included in the SAL Allocation Template as such issues become known. There may not be sufficient time to go to the council to address this type of situation.

#### *Delegation of allocation authority for increased MOE payments*

The FY 2007–2008 Trial Court Budget Request report, to be presented at this meeting, describes the need for and recommends approval of submission of a Budget Change Proposal for a technical baseline adjustment to reflect increased ongoing county maintenance of effort (MOE) payments, in accordance with Government Code section 77201.1(g). In accordance with this section, funding that a county previously used to offset its retirement costs will now be deposited into the Trial Court Trust Fund. To

ensure that the court does not incur a shortfall, this funding will henceforth be allocated to the court as part of its ongoing baseline allocation. Once the funds have been deposited in the TCTF, the Administrative Director of the Courts will need to have the delegated authority to allocate this funding from the TCTF to the court.

If this technical adjustment BCP is approved for submission, and ultimately approved by the Governor and the Legislature, the funds, in the amount of \$23,527,949, will be provided from the county and deposited in the TCTF. These funds will then need to be allocated to the court so that they can be applied toward the employer's share of retirement costs. If the allocation authority is not approved by the Judicial Council, the court will not receive this money and will have a funding shortfall.

### *FY 2005–2006 funding issue*

#### Workers' Compensation Program

Currently 54 courts are participating in the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program (JBWCP). In FY 2005–2006, as a result of the following there was an \$8.5 million one-time savings in the program:

- Workers' compensation tail claims from the counties to the JBWCP did not transfer at the expected rate;
- The workers' compensation excess insurance premium was \$1 million less than expected; and
- Proactive claims management by the courts and the third-party administrator resulted in lower costs.

The Workers' Compensation Oversight Committee met on July 13, 2006, to review the JBWCP allocations for FY 2006–2007 and to discuss what should be done with the one-time savings in the program in FY 2005–2006 that would provide a benefit to all participating courts and yet still be fiscally prudent. The committee presented recommendations to the Trial Court Budget Working Group at its July 20 meeting. Many possible options were discussed and a combination of actions was recommended. The working group concurred in the recommendations.

The proposed recommendations reduce the current year cost of the program to all participating courts and reserves some funding for a future time when the program may not have such savings. It also provides relief to a few courts that experienced higher losses than their allocations during the previous fiscal year.

#### *Permanent allocation of funding for IT staffing from the TCTF*

Beginning in FY 2000–2001, the AOC began providing approximately \$1 million in one-time funding from the Judicial Administration Efficiency and Modernization Fund (Modernization Fund) to courts that had little or no information technology staff or support. This funding has continued to be provided on an annual basis to a number of small courts without IT staff. The funds were provided to the courts with the understanding that they were to be used for limited term or contract IT assistance.

However, each year there were concerns regarding whether the funds would be provided. Rather than continuing to provide this funding on a one-time basis each year and because there are sufficient funds available in the Trial Court Trust Fund, AOC staff recommends that beginning in FY 2006–2007, \$0.968 million be permanently allocated to these courts' base budgets from the Trial Court Trust Fund. These funds will then be grown annually by the SAL growth factor. This will provide certainty to the courts that funding for IT staffing will be available, allow them to hire permanent staffing, if they want, and increase the funding for these courts over time.

#### *Notification of pending allocation for October Judicial Council meeting*

In FY 2005–2006, an undesignated fees compromise was reached that incrementally reduced the obligation of the counties over a four-year period to pay \$31 million to the Trial Court Trust Fund annually pursuant to former Government Code section 68085.5. The compromise provided that beginning in FY 2005–2006, the trial courts' base budgets would be reduced by \$11 million, and this amount would increase by \$5 million each year until the entire \$31 million ongoing reduction is met in FY 2009–2010.

At its meeting in August 2005, the Judicial Council allocated the \$11 million reduction to the courts on a pro-rated basis to address the FY 2005–2006 requirement. The amount of the reduction for FY 2006–2007 has increased to \$16 million. The Enhanced Civil Assessments Working Group met recently and developed recommendations to address this reduction. These recommendations will soon be presented to the Trial Court Budget Working Group. Recommendations will then be presented to the Judicial Council for its consideration at its October 20, 2006 meeting.

#### Alternative Actions Considered

##### *Court employee retirement rate and plan cost changes*

Based on the policies already established for this funding category, no alternatives were considered.

##### *Trial court staffing and operating expenses for new facilities*

One alternative considered was to present recommendations to the council at the August meeting. However, in order to thoroughly review the requests and work with the AOC's Office of Court Construction and Management in this review process, additional time is needed.

In terms of funding, an alternative was to limit the total allocation (to address one-time and ongoing costs) for this program area to the FY 2006–2007 amount of \$5.0 million that is to be divided between the two priority areas. This option is not recommended because it would unnecessarily reduce the amount of funding available to address ongoing costs in both priority areas, especially as one-time undesignated funding from prior years is available to address some of the costs that would otherwise exceed the available funding.

### *Self-help*

One alternative that staff looked at was to allocate the funding according to the 2000 Census data. This was not recommended because it was believed that this would hurt growing communities and would not adequately represent the needs throughout the state. Staff also considered using the same formula used last year to allocate \$1.5 million in Trial Court Improvement Funds. These were allocated according to a formula where the amount given to the facilitator was averaged by the county population. Concerns were raised about courts that were traditionally underfunded and, while the facilitator amount is higher in rural areas, it still does not provide enough to provide a basic level of service in every court throughout the state. A final alternative would be to allocate more funding from the SAL adjustment to this area, given the substantial need for more self-help services statewide. This action would, however, be inconsistent with legislative intent expressed in Supplement Report Language regarding the allocation of SAL adjustment funding and would reduce funding available for allocation to courts for local operational needs.

### *Inflation and workforce*

No alternative actions were considered for this recommendation.

### *Workload growth and equity*

AOC staff will be refining the RAS model and inputting updated information. Alternatives for allocation of the Workload Growth and Equity funding based on the RAS model will be provided to the council at its October 20 business meeting.

### *Mandatory security cost changes in salaries, retirement, and other benefits*

Alternative allocations will be presented to the council at its October meeting when staff has had the opportunity to obtain more detailed information from the courts regarding salary and benefit costs for fiscal years 2005–2006 and 2006–2007.

### *Security costs for new facilities opening in FY 2006–2007*

One alternative would be for staff to make recommendations on funding of security costs for new facilities in August and then hold over allocation of the funds until the October meeting when recommendations are presented for allocations to address mandatory cost changes. While this option could be performed, doing so might create a false impression that courts will be funded for security costs related to new facilities, when in fact there may be no security funding remaining for this purpose. Waiting until the level of available security funding has been determined appears to be a more prudent alternative.

### *Jury*

No specific alternatives were considered.

### *Court-appointed counsel*

Additional alternatives will be provided to the council at a future meeting, based on additional staff work.

*Processing of elder abuse protective orders*

No specific alternatives were considered.

*Court interpreters*

No specific alternatives were considered, other than not splitting the funding among the two components.

*CASA/model self-help/equal access/family law information centers/  
civil case coordination*

No specific alternatives were considered.

*Service of process for protective orders/prisoner hearing costs/  
cost of homicide trials*

One alternative would be to separate the funding for these programs into three separate line items. This was not recommended because it would lessen the flexibility to meet changes in funding needed from year to year.

*Drug court projects*

No specific alternative was considered.

*Equal access*

No specific alternatives were considered.

*Civil case coordination*

Because the use of deficiency requests is no longer available, no alternative sources of funds are available to use for this purpose.

*Assigned judges program*

One alternative considered was to continue to address this shortfall on a one-time basis each year. Because ongoing funding is available in the TCTF and the issue is one of long standing, it makes sense to permanently handle the continuing shortfall.

*97 new screening stations*

No specific alternatives were considered. This recommendation represents the manner in which the budget change proposal was developed.

*Five-year replacement cycle funding for entrance screening equipment*

No alternatives were considered. The recommendation is consistent with the policies established by the council for allocation of funding for new entrance screening equipment for new facilities opening in FY 2004–2005 and FY 2005–2006.

*50 new judgeships*

One alternative would be to make recommendations of allocation of the funds in the event that the legislation is enacted. However, if the legislation is enacted, the funding will not be available until near the end of the current fiscal year. Also, it is very likely

that not all the judges will be appointed during the current fiscal year. This will provide sufficient time to present allocations to the Judicial Council at a later meeting.

*General recommendation regarding allocation authority*

No specific alternatives were considered, other than returning to the council for every change in allocation.

*Delegation of allocation authority for increased MOE payments*

No alternatives were considered.

*Workers' Compensation Program*

One option considered was to use the entire savings to partially offset the workers' compensation cost allocation for FY 2006–2007. Another was to retain the entire savings in the JBWCP fund to be used during an adverse year. Both staff and the working group felt that the first option would leave minimal reserves that would be needed in a year with higher than anticipated costs. The second option was not recommended because it did not specifically provide courts with operational benefits that accrued from the program's favorable performance in FY 2005–2006.

*Permanent allocation of funding for IS staffing from the Mod Fund*

No specific alternatives were considered other than continuing to provide this funding from the Modernization Fund.

Comments From Interested Parties

As mentioned repeatedly throughout the report, the Trial Court Budget Working Group met to discuss many of the above recommendations. Based on input from various constituents, the Legislature adopted Supplemental Report Language that directs how SAL funds are to be allocated in FY 2006–2007.

Implementation Requirements and Costs

No additional funds are needed to implement these recommendations.

Recommendation

The following recommendations are made by Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) staff. The Trial Court Budget Working Group joins in on recommendations 1-3, 5-10, 13-15, 17, 22, 23, and 30. The Workers' Compensation Oversight Committee joins in on recommendation 30. It is recommended that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the allocation to the courts in FY 2006–2007 of up to \$3.878 million in ongoing costs for retirement rate and plan changes effective in FY 2005–2006 that have not previously been allocated and for annualization of increases that occurred part way through FY 2005–2006, \$6.077 million for ratified rate and plan changes effective in FY 2006–2007, and set aside up to \$13.245 million for nonratified retirement rate and plan changes projected for FY 2006–2007 from the SAL funding, as indicated in columns B, C, and D of Attachment 3.

2. Approve that *one-time* costs for nonsecurity operating costs related to new facilities to be opened during FY 2006–2007 through the first three months of FY 2007–2008 be funded from (1) the FY 2005–2006 undesignated SAL carryover and (2) Trial Court Trust Fund one-time savings.
3. Approve a maximum allocation of \$1.3 million in *ongoing* funds from the SAL adjustment, to be used to address nonsecurity operational costs for new facilities opened or planned to open in FY 2006–2007 through the first three months of FY 2007–2008, and defer consideration of recommendations on allocations until the October 20, 2006 council meeting.
4. Approve allocation of \$3.7 million in ongoing funding—\$34,000 per court and the remainder allocated based on 2006 population figures from the Department of Finance to the trial courts for providing services to assist unrepresented litigants, as indicated in column E of Attachment 3. Any additional funds available for self-help in FY 2006–2007 would be allocated by population.
5. Approve \$44.107 million in Inflation and Workforce funding for allocation to the courts to be used to meet staff compensation, operating expenses, and other costs at their discretion, as indicated in column F of Attachment 3.
6. Approve evenly dividing the adjusted Workload Growth and Equity funding component into two subcomponents—Resource Allocation Study Funding and Pro-rata Growth Funding.
7. Approve allocation of the Pro-rata Growth Funding to all the trial courts based on their proportion of the trial court base budget, to be used consistent with local discretion, as indicated in column G of Attachment 3.
8. Approve deferral of allocation of the Resource Allocation Study Funding until the October 20, 2006, Judicial Council meeting, so that additional refinements to the methodology can be completed and all required information be compiled and incorporated into the analysis.
9. Approve a total allocation for mandatory cost changes in security of \$36.956 million, \$19.987 million in ongoing SAL funding, \$4.323 million in ongoing prior year security carryover, and \$12.646 million in one-time prior year carryover of security funding.
10. Direct staff to:
  - Incorporate the new and revised security standards into the security allocation for FY 2006–2007;
  - Obtain more detailed information about prior year and current year salary and benefit costs;
  - Return to the Judicial Council at its October 20 meeting with recommendations for allocations; and
  - In the interim, allocate to each court the same level of security funding as was provided in FY 2005–2006.
11. Approve referral of requests for one-time costs that are not part of the basic screening equipment previously paid for with these types of funds to the AOC’s Emergency Response and Security unit for possible funding from its grant program.

12. Approve deferral, until the October 20, 2006, Judicial Council meeting, of recommendations on allocation of funding to address security costs for new facilities opening in FY 2006–2007 through the first three months of FY 2007–2008.
13. Approve permanent redirection of the FY 2006–2007 Jury SAL allocation of \$969,527 to Court-Appointed Counsel and \$50,000 to Processing of Elder Abuse Protective Orders.
14. Approve increased funding for reimbursement of Court-Appointed Counsel costs for FY 2006–2007 to the SAL allocation on the program’s base budget and the permanently redirected SAL allocation on the Jury program budget (minus \$50,000 for Elder Abuse), in the amount of \$969,527.
15. Direct staff to come back to the council at a future date with a report containing options to address the Court-Appointed Counsel program.
16. Approve a permanent redirection of \$50,000 from the SAL growth allocation to the Jury program to address anticipated shortfalls in the elder abuse protective order reimbursement program, beginning in FY 2006–2007.
17. Approve dividing the interpreter program SAL allocation into two parts—Inflation and Workforce to address current program costs, and Workload Growth and Equity to address growth of the interpreter program.
18. Approve the application of the adjusted SAL growth factor to the following scheduled reimbursement programs: CASA, Model Self-Help, Equal Access, Family Law Information Centers, and Civil Case Coordination.
19. Approve the combination of funding for Service of Process for Protective Orders, Prisoner Hearing Costs, and Costs of Homicide Trials into one pool for purposes of reimbursement, based on actual costs up to that collective level and application of a 4.7 percent SAL increase to the combined program.
20. Approve application of a 4.7 percent SAL factor to the Drug Court Projects program.
21. Approve application of the total SAL growth rate to the Equal Access fund.
22. Approve a permanent redirection of \$400,000 from the Trial Court Trust Fund to the Civil Case Coordination program.
23. Approve a permanent redirection of \$800,000 from the Trial Court Trust Fund to the Assigned Judges Program.
24. Approve the policy that no ongoing funding to staff the new entrance screening stations be provided to the designated courts until they have notified AOC staff that the security positions are in place and that they will not receive any of the one-time funding for equipment until they have provided documentation of the cost of the equipment, for which reimbursement must not exceed \$30,000 per station.
25. Approve the allocation of funding for new screening stations, based on the policies in recommendation 24 above, as indicated in columns H and I of Attachment 3.
26. Approve deferral of the establishment of a replacement schedule for entrance screening equipment until the October council meeting.
27. Defer allocation of the funding for new judgeships contained in the Budget Act of 2006 until SB 56 is enacted.
28. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to allocate ongoing and one-time savings in undesignated funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund, or the SAL funding, to the extent that funds are available, for any program areas identified

in the SAL Allocation Template, and authority to make technical adjustments to these SAL allocations, without the need to return to the Judicial Council.

29. Delegate authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts to allocate funding from the TCTF related to one county's increased MOE payments to be distributed to the court, beginning in FY 2006–2007.
30. (a) Refund (through a reduction in the FY 2006–2007 program premium) the difference between the JBWCP program estimated costs for excess coverage premium versus the actual premium costs for FY 2005–2006, for a total refund of \$1,012,751;  
(b) Use \$249,516 of the savings to fund state pro rata charges for the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund, based on payroll;  
(c) Relieve four courts that had actual losses greater than their FY 2005–2006 allocations, in the amount of \$161,061; and  
(d) Refund 50 percent of the remainder through a reduction in the FY 2006–2007 premium back to participating courts that had allocations greater than actual losses, with 50 percent to remain as a cash reserve in the JBWCP fund in the event of an adverse claims year. The total of these allocations for the courts is indicated in column J of Attachment 3.
31. Approve permanent allocation of \$0.968 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund to the base budgets of several courts (as indicated in column K of Attachment 3) for IT staffing and apply the SAL growth factor to the funds each year.

***Recommendations 1 through 4 were approved by the Judicial Council.***

Attachments

**Calculation of SAL Allocation for  
FY 2006-2007**

	A	B	C	D	E
	<b>Base Budget &amp; SAL Factors</b>				
		<b>Base Budget</b>			
1	Court Allocations (Excluding Security)	\$ 1,603,551,564			
2	Security	402,967,403			
3	Reimbursement & Local Assistance Funding	238,744,501			
4	<b>Totals</b>	\$ 2,245,263,468			
5	SAL Factor:				
6	Inflation & Workforce	3.96%			
7	Workload Growth & Equity	1.00%			
8	<b>Total SAL Factor</b>	4.96%			

	SAL Funding Allocation Calculations				
9	Total SAL Adjustment Funding	\$ 111,366,000			
10	Plus Ongoing Carryover SAL Funding	244,757			
11	Plus SAL Adjustment—Modernization Fund Ongoing Operations	46,021			
12	Less Security Funding	(19,987,183)			
13	<b>Total Funds Available for Allocation</b>	\$ 91,669,595			
14	Less:				
15	Court Employee Retirement Rate & Plan Cost Changes	(23,199,272)			
16	Judicial Council Approved Priorities:	(5,000,000)			
17	1. Trial Court Staffing & Operating Expenses for New Facilities	tbd			
17	2. Self-Help Programs	tbd			
18	<b>Net SAL Adjustment Funding</b>	\$ 63,470,323			
19	<b>Net SAL Funding Adjustment</b>	\$ 63,470,323 =	3.4452%		% of Funding Increase on Base Budget (Excluding Security)
20	<b>Total Base Budget (excluding Security)</b>	\$ 1,842,296,065			
21	<b>Workforce and Inflation Factors</b>	3.96% =	79.8387%		Workforce & Inflation as % of Total SAL
22	<b>Total SAL Factor</b>	4.96%			
23	<b>Workload Growth &amp; Equity Factor</b>	1.00% =	20.1613%		Workload as % of Total SAL
24	<b>Total SAL Factor</b>	4.96%			
25	<b>Adjusted Inflation &amp; Workforce Factor</b>	3.4452% X	79.8387% =	2.7506%	
26	<b>Adjusted Workload Growth &amp; Equity Factor</b>	3.4452% X	20.1613% =	0.6946%	

	SAL Funding Allocations	Base Budget	Inflation & Workforce (2.7506%)	Workload Growth & Equity (0.6946%)	Total SAL Adjustment Funding
27	Court Allocations (Excluding Security)	\$ 1,603,551,564	\$ 44,107,021	\$ 11,138,137	\$ 55,245,157
28	Reimbursement & Local Assistance Funding	238,744,501	6,566,866	1,658,296	8,225,163
29	<b>Totals</b>	\$ 1,842,296,065	\$ 50,673,887	\$ 12,796,433	\$ 63,470,320

**TRIAL COURT  
SAL GROWTH FACTOR  
ALLOCATION TEMPLATE  
FY 2006-2007  
(Based on Projections) <sup>1</sup>**

**ADJUSTED SAL GROWTH FACTOR**

Inflation & Workforce	2.7506%
Workload Growth & Equity	0.6946%
Total Adjusted SAL Growth Factor	3.4452%

**SAL GROWTH FACTOR <sup>2</sup>**

Inflation & Workforce	3.96%
Workload Growth & Equity	1.00%
Total SAL Growth Rate	4.96%

	A	B	C	D
	Base Budget Amount	SAL/Other Factor	Ongoing SAL Adjustment (A x B or Actual)	One-Time SAL Adjustment
<b>2006-2007 SAL FUNDING ADJUSTMENT</b>	<b>\$2,245,263,468</b>	4.9600%	\$ 111,366,000	
Plus Undesignated Carryover From PY SAL Allocation			244,757	\$4,278,521
Plus SAL Adjustment—Modernization Fund Ongoing Operations			46,021	
Plus Security Carryover From PY SAL Allocation			3,448,877	2,907,872
Plus Security Carryover From PY Trial Court Trust Fund Allocation			874,072	9,738,000
Transfer To/From Trial Court Employee Retirement Account			-	-
<b>TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION</b>			<b>\$ 115,979,727</b>	<b>\$ 16,924,393</b>
<b>I. FUNDING BASED ON ACTUAL COSTS:</b>				
<b>A. Court Employee Retirement Rate &amp; Plan Cost Changes</b>			23,199,272	
<b>B. Judicial Council Approved Priorities <sup>3</sup></b>				
1. Trial Court Staffing & Operating Expenses for New Facilities			1,300,000	4,278,521
2. Self-Help Programs			3,700,000	
<b>TOTAL FUNDING BASED ON ACTUAL COSTS</b>			28,199,272	4,278,521
<b>FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR ALLOCATION TO COURTS:</b>				
<b>II. Court Allocations (Excluding Security)</b>				
<b>A. Inflation &amp; Workforce</b>	1,603,551,564	2.7506%	44,107,021	
<b>B. Workload Growth &amp; Equity</b>	1,603,551,564			
1. Resource Allocation Study Funding		0.3473%	5,569,068	
2. Pro-rata Growth		0.3473%	5,569,068	
<b>TOTAL COURT ALLOCATIONS (EXCLUDING SECURITY)</b>			55,245,157	-
<b>III. Security:</b>				
<b>A. CY SAL Allocation</b>	402,967,403	4.9600%	19,987,183	
<b>B. PY Carryovers</b>			4,322,949	12,645,872
<b>IV. Trial Court Reimbursement &amp; Local Assistance Funding</b>				
<b>A. Unscheduled Reimbursement Programs</b>				
1. Court-Appointed Counsel	90,890,951	4.4247%	4,021,608	
2. Jury	33,828,181		-	
3. Processing of Elder Abuse Protective Orders	300,000		50,000	
<b>B. Scheduled Reimbursement Programs</b>				
1. Interpreters	88,230,562			
a. Inflation & Workforce		2.7506%	2,426,855	
b. Workload Growth & Equity		0.6946%	612,842	
2. CASA	2,047,906	3.4452%	70,554	
3. Model Self-Help	885,581	3.4452%	30,510	
4. Equal Access	5,080,000	3.4452%	175,015	
5. Family Law Information Centers	319,320	3.4452%	11,001	
6. Civil Case Coordination	400,000	3.4452%	13,781	
<b>C. Scheduled Local Assistance Programs<sup>4</sup></b>				
1. Service of Process for Protective Orders	3,199,000	4.7000%	150,000	
2. Prisoner Hearings Costs	2,726,000	4.7000%	128,000	
3. Cost of Homicide Trials	271,000	4.7000%	13,000	
4. Drug Court Projects	1,066,000	4.7000%	50,000	
5. Equal Access	9,500,000	4.9600%	472,000	
<b>TOTAL TRIAL COURT REIMBURSEMENT &amp; LOCAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS</b>	<b>\$ 238,744,501</b>		<b>\$ 8,225,166</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>TOTAL FUNDING ALLOCATED TO COURTS</b>			<b>\$ 115,979,727</b>	<b>\$ 16,924,393</b>

**Footnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> This template and estimated allocations will not be final until approved by the Judicial Council at its August meeting.

<sup>2</sup> Final 2006-07 SAL Growth Factor.

<sup>3</sup> The amount approved for FY 2006-07 one-time costs is recommended to be paid from the TCTF reserve.

<sup>4</sup> The Department of Finance included a 4.7% SAL increase for Items 1 through 4 of this section and a 4.96% SAL increase for Item 5 of this section in the Final Budget Act of 2006.

Proposed Allocation of SAL, BCP and Other Funding to Trial Courts

Court System	FY 2006-07 Base Budget (excluding security)	FY 2006-07 Security Base Budget	FY 2006-07 Total Base Budget	Retirement Rate and Plan Changes			Self-Help Centers	Inflation and Workforce	Workload Growth and Equity-Pro Rata Funding	97 Screening Stations (to be allocated after notification from courts)		Total Recommend Offset to FY 2006-07 JBWCP Premium	IT Staffing	Adjusted FY 2006-07 Base Budget
				FY 2005-06 Adjustments and Annualization	Ratified FY 2006-07	Non-Ratified FY 2006-07				Maximum FY 2006-07 One-Time	FY 2006-07 Ongoing			
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Alameda	\$80,925,555	\$19,403,008	\$ 100,328,563	\$1,102,992	\$ -	\$ 1,503,448	\$ 104,209	\$ 2,266,048	\$ 286,117	\$60,000	\$386,931	\$158,510		\$ 106,196,818
Alpine	563,771	16,304	580,075		-	-	34,058	15,912	2,009			3,754		635,808
Amador	2,106,044	382,010	2,488,054			14,450	35,773	61,330	7,744			6,479	\$ 66,893	2,680,723
Butte	8,284,695	1,811,916	10,096,611		-	-	44,097	228,327	28,829	30,000	116,049	41,638		10,585,552
Calaveras	1,770,621	254,157	2,024,777		5,102	-	36,125	51,940	6,558			13,778	69,596	2,207,876
Colusa	1,307,723	170,838	1,478,561		-	-	35,000	36,910	4,660			5,827		1,560,959
Contra Costa	38,330,380	10,647,030	48,977,410		729,201	-	81,852	1,033,323	130,470	30,000	234,174	31,949		51,248,380
Del Norte	2,257,593	156,799	2,414,392		742	-	35,357	65,639	8,288			1,563	68,000	2,593,981
El Dorado	7,154,621	1,806,426	8,961,048		(15,307)	-	42,191	187,892	23,724			50,648		9,250,196
Fresno	34,244,709	8,688,485	42,933,194		-	708,324	75,815	936,482	118,243	210,000	952,930	114,103		46,049,090
Glenn	1,692,501	183,584	1,876,086		(8,702)	-	35,332	48,745	6,155	60,000	127,862	8,788	34,526	2,188,791
Humboldt	5,643,000	974,643	6,617,643		136,821	-	40,161	156,227	19,726	30,000	104,723	32,911		7,138,211
Imperial	7,056,837	991,424	8,048,261		-	167,866	41,744	192,257	24,275	180,000	756,588	28,613	53,266	9,492,870
Inyo	1,850,872	182,746	2,033,618		-	-	34,861	54,375	6,865	60,000	241,987	N/A	75,615	2,507,321
Kern	31,469,314	7,072,615	38,541,929		-	299,096	70,253	855,536	108,022	30,000	167,106	147,890		40,219,833
Kings	5,670,069	863,061	6,533,130	(21,503)	(3,476)	-	40,867	156,680	19,783	150,000	486,101	30,281	65,520	7,457,384
Lake	2,970,805	338,722	3,309,527		(5,249)	-	36,980	83,803	10,581	60,000	197,823	19,978	61,133	3,774,576
Lassen	1,632,327	222,257	1,854,584		(2,060)	-	35,648	47,653	6,017	60,000	189,571	11,749	56,000	2,259,162
Los Angeles	454,065,776	129,926,419	583,992,196	2,420,602	(1,410,908)	6,975,774	510,282	12,170,134	1,536,633			N/A		606,194,712
Madera	5,134,061	420,551	5,554,612		(49,148)	-	40,712	146,915	18,550	90,000	270,463	17,332	71,133	6,160,569
Marin	15,387,468	2,197,566	17,585,034		188,721	-	45,777	417,413	52,704	30,000	188,165	50,823		18,558,637
Mariposa	863,301	45,702	909,003		(3,145)	-	34,847	25,952	3,277	30,000	99,295	5,442	56,186	1,160,857
Mendocino	4,833,772	1,121,792	5,955,564		6,683	-	38,204	134,074	16,929	60,000	259,568	48,553		6,519,576
Mendocino	7,987,550	1,650,002	9,637,552		279,782	-	45,471	214,042	27,026	60,000	283,200	6,761		10,553,834
Modoc	708,816	38,531	747,347		-	-	34,457	21,178	2,674			3,800	41,514	850,970
Mono	1,289,787	115,621	1,405,409		-	-	34,632	36,896	4,659	60,000	254,677	N/A	17,424	1,813,696
Monterey	14,664,059	3,243,917	17,907,976		-	(63,793)	53,749	408,861	51,624	150,000	1,014,920	66,263		19,589,601
Napa	7,345,332	1,706,481	9,051,813		(28,158)	-	40,250	200,733	25,345			25,599		9,315,583
Nevada	4,285,756	1,041,824	5,327,580		-	913,779	38,652	119,266	15,059			32,593		6,446,929
Orange	134,939,433	35,710,740	170,650,173		4,305,810	-	176,822	3,664,631	462,706			714,782		179,974,924
Placer	10,961,640	2,049,988	13,011,628		(21,439)	-	48,713	290,648	36,698			73,503		13,439,752
Plumas	1,502,008	163,318	1,665,326		6,204	-	34,997	44,215	5,583	30,000	108,639	9,425	64,520	1,968,908
Riverside	65,838,846	11,727,044	77,565,890		-	(4,371)	124,804	1,783,253	225,158	60,000	282,416	485,213		80,522,362
Sacramento	66,473,832	17,683,088	84,156,920		-	2,020,032	98,412	1,818,484	229,607	30,000	198,039	436,489		88,987,983
San Benito	2,176,739	149,230	2,325,969		-	-	36,679	63,236	7,984	30,000	149,071	14,415	63,694	2,691,047
San Bernardino	67,536,588	20,051,496	87,588,084		1,000,368	-	126,593	1,854,759	234,187	180,000	919,286	203,536		92,106,814
San Diego	145,692,226	30,409,294	176,101,521		-	-	176,566	4,005,822	505,786			273,950		181,063,644
San Francisco	60,683,063	8,518,419	69,201,482		(135,081)	-	71,128	1,652,719	208,677	30,000	169,919	215,682		71,414,526
San Joaquin	21,550,168	5,536,112	27,086,281		-	281,776	65,065	595,212	75,153	90,000	543,336	133,647		28,870,470
San Luis Obispo	12,250,926	2,448,213	14,699,140		4,284	-	46,237	328,616	41,492	90,000	455,189	28,276		15,693,234
San Mateo	34,000,750	7,711,533	41,712,283		636,537	-	67,661	930,918	117,540	60,000	391,456	207,154		44,123,549
Santa Barbara	19,725,473	4,668,885	24,394,358		160,151	-	53,600	539,603	68,132	330,000	1,834,131	165,873		27,545,847
Santa Clara	82,105,605	25,544,471	107,650,076		-	130,168	116,433	2,284,227	288,412			107,457		110,576,773
Santa Cruz	11,792,344	2,321,629	14,113,973		(70,979)	-	46,196	321,339	40,573			10,372		14,461,474
Shasta	7,733,409	1,305,070	9,038,479		-	(32,295)	42,437	212,731	26,860	60,000	200,477	10,322		9,559,011
Sierra	531,091	25,650	556,741		-	(9,458)	34,163	14,990	1,893			3,618		601,947
Siskiyou	3,785,122	612,691	4,397,813		(15,717)	-	36,145	104,784	13,230			21,889		4,558,144
Solano	18,586,946	4,153,697	22,740,643	280,357	62,012	-	53,657	508,220	64,169	30,000	148,470	34,147		23,921,675
Sonoma	20,018,639	5,695,299	25,713,937		-	325,040	56,310	546,805	69,041			77,483		26,788,616
Stanislaus	14,929,395	3,061,406	17,990,801		-	35,141	57,911	408,713	51,605	30,000	157,315	131,250		18,862,737
Sutter	3,724,241	663,695	4,387,936		(31,390)	-	38,251	105,116	13,272			16,884		4,530,069
Tehama	3,174,812	374,012	3,548,824		-	(20,156)	36,860	89,608	11,314	150,000	465,794	13,689		4,295,934
Trinity	947,427	177,086	1,124,513	7,713	(5,099)	-	34,652	28,684	3,622	30,000	83,255	2,708	61,133	1,371,180
Tulare	13,920,986	3,570,763	17,491,750		189,890	-	53,553	376,593	47,550	60,000	237,114	53,998		18,510,447
Tuolumne	2,945,283	434,083	3,379,366		1,311	-	36,707	82,747	10,448	90,000	320,630	19,351	41,694	3,982,255
Ventura	28,119,783	9,736,537	37,856,320	87,544	188,178	-	71,996	779,698	98,447			54,218		39,136,401
Yolo	7,327,625	2,250,994	9,578,619		(15,498)	-	42,848	198,542	25,068			36,686		9,866,266
Yuba	3,456,708	538,528	3,995,236		(3,694)	-	37,246	97,565	12,319			N/A		4,138,672
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$1,617,928,226</b>	<b>\$402,967,403</b>	<b>\$2,020,895,629</b>	<b>\$3,877,705</b>	<b>\$ 6,076,747</b>	<b>\$13,244,821</b>	<b>\$ 3,700,000</b>	<b>\$44,107,021</b>	<b>\$ 5,569,068</b>	<b>\$2,820,000</b>	<b>\$12,996,671</b>	<b>\$4,521,647</b>	<b>\$967,847</b>	<b>\$2,118,777,154</b>

N/A Court does not participate in the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program.

Please note that this spreadsheet has been updated since the council meeting. Column A now includes the SJO base and funding that used to be provided from the Trial Court Improvement Fund.