Request for ADA accommodations
should be made at least three business days
before the meeting and directed to:
JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov

# JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

## NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1) and (e)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

| | |
|---|---|
| **Date:** | Tuesday, June 6, 2023 |
| **Time:** | 4:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. |
| **Public Videocast:** | https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/2819 |

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be e-mailed to JBBC@jud.ca.gov.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

## I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

**Approval of Minutes**
Approve minutes of the May 17, 2023 Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting.

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

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to JBBC@jud.ca.gov, attention: Angela Cowan. Only written comments received by 4:00 p.m., Monday, June 5, 2023 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

## III.    DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1–1)

**Item 1**

**2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding Allocation (Action Required)**

Consideration of a Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendation for the civil assessment backfill funding for 2023-24 and ongoing.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s):   Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Ms. Rose Lane, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

## IV.    ADJOURNMENT

**Adjourn**

# JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET COMMITTEE

## MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

May 17, 2023
1:00 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.
https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/2736

| | |
|---|---|
| **Advisory Body Members Present:** | Hon. David M. Rubin, Chair; Hon. Ann Moorman, Vice Chair; Hon. Carin Fujisaki; Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz; Hon. C. Todd Bottke; Hon. Harold W. Hopp; Mr. David H. Yamasaki; and Ms. Rachel W. Hill |
| **Advisory Body Members Absent:** | Hon. Brad R. Hill |
| **Others Present:** | Hon. Jonathan Conklin; Mr. John Wordlaw, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Angela Cowan, Ms. Marcela Eggleton, Mr. Don Will, Ms. Audrey Fancy, Ms. Anna Maves, Mr. Chris Belloli, Ms. Deidre Benedict, Mr. Michael Sun, Ms. Rose Lane, Mr. Nick Armstrong, Ms. Heather Pettit, Ms. Pella McCormick, Mr. John Larson, Mr. Matt Espenshade, Mr. Tamer Ahmed, and Ms. Francine Byrne |

## OPEN MEETING

### Call to Order and Roll Call
The chair called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and took roll call.

### Approval of Minutes
The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the March 14, 2023 Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting.

## DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 8)

**Item 1: 2023-24 Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocations Methodology (Action Required)**

**Consideration of a Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommendation on a methodology for 2023-24 CARE Act Allocations.**

*Action: The Budget Committee unanimously voted to adopt the TCBAC recommendation to approve the following recommendations for consideration by the Judicial Council:*

1. *Approve, for Cohort One courts implementing the CARE Act, an allocation methodology that employs the Workload Formula with a base of 25 CARE Act cases, calculated at $93,225, for 2023-24.*

2. *Approve, for Cohort One courts implementing the CARE Act, an allocation methodology that employs the Workload Formula with a base of $98,000, pro-rated to the amount of funding*

*Cohort One courts are estimated to receive in 2024-25 when all courts are implementing the CARE Act.*

3. *Approve, for Cohort Two courts, an allocation methodology that employs the Workload Formula with a base of $98,000, pro-rated to the amount that remains after the allocation described in Recommendation 2 and is reduced by 0.5 percent to hold as a reserve for Cohort One courts that require additional program funding. Any unspent funding from the court allocations and this reserve will be redistributed through the reallocation process and via the approved methodology.*

4. *Direct Judicial Council staff to survey Cohort One courts by February 2024 and bring a reallocation proposal to the TCBAC for March 2024 Judicial Council action.*

**Item 2: 2023-24 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Allocations (Action Required)**

**Consideration of a TCBAC recommendation on 2023-24 allocations for court-appointed dependency counsel.**

*Action:  The Budget Committee unanimously voted to adopt the TCBAC recommendation to approve the 2023-24 court-appointed dependency counsel funding allocations, as outlined in Attachment A, for consideration by the Judicial Council at its July 20-21, 2023 business meeting.*

**Item 3: 2023-24 AB 1058 Funding Methodologies and Allocations (Action Required)**

**Consideration of a TCBAC recommendation on 2023-24 methodologies and allocations for the child support commissioner and family law facilitator program.**

*Action:  The Budget Committee unanimously voted to adopt the TCBAC recommendation to approve the following recommendations for consideration by the council at its business meeting on July 20-21, 2023:*

1. *Approve the recommended base allocation for the Child Support Commissioner program for 2023-24 and 2024-25, as described below and stated in Attachment A, maintaining the current funding methodology approved by the council in 2019, with updated workload data;*

2. *Approve the recommended base allocation for the Family Law Facilitator program for 2023-24 and 2024-25, as described below and stated in Attachment B, maintaining the current funding methodology approved by the council in 2021, with updated population data; and*

3. *Approve the committee's recommendation for 2023-24 Assembly Bill 1058 Program court funding comprised of the base funding allocations derived from recommendations 1 and 2 and the federal drawdown funding based on the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council in January 2019, as stated in Attachments C1 and C2.*

**Item 4: 2023-24 Court Reporter Allocations (Action Required)**

**Consideration of a TCBAC recommendation on 2023-24 allocations for $30 million in court reporter funding.**

*Action:* *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to adopt the TCBAC recommendation to approve the allocation of $30 million, to increase the number of court reporters in family and civil law case types, to the trial courts on a proportional basis using the council-approved methodology with updated Assessed Judicial Need data based on the 2022 Judicial Needs Assessment as outlined in Attachment for consideration by the council.*

**Item 5:** **2023-24 Pretrial Allocations (Action Required*)***

**Consideration of a TCBAC recommendation on 2023-24 pretrial allocations and funding floor adjustment.**

*Action:* *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to adopt the TCBAC recommendation to approve the 2023-24 allocations for Pretrial Release funding, as outlined in Attachment 4A, for consideration by the Judicial Council at its July 21, 2023 business meeting.*

*.*

**Item 6:** **2023-24 Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) (Action Required*)***

**Consideration of TCBAC recommendations on 2023-24 allocations from the IMF.**

*Action:* *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to adopt the TCBAC recommendation to approve a total of $45.2 million in preliminary allocations for 2023-24 from the IMF for consideration by the council at its July 20-21, 2023 business meeting.*

**Item 7: 2023-24 Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and Trial Court Allocations (Action Required)**

**Consideration of TCBAC recommendations on 2023-24 allocations from the TCTF and 2023-24 trial court allocations, including proposed funding, interpreter funding, and the Workload Formula.**

*Action:* *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to adopt the TCBAC recommendation to approve the following for consideration by the council at its business meeting on July 20-21, 2023:*

1. *Base, discretionary, and non-discretionary programs from the TCTF of $3 billion, including:*

   a. *GF allocation of $50.0 million for support for operation of the trial courts; and*

   b. *GF allocation of $68.8 million for employee benefits.*

2. *As a subset of the $3 billion total allocation, approve a Workload Allocation of $2.5 billion based on methodologies approved by the Judicial Council.*

**Item 8: 2024-25 Budget Change Concepts (Action Required)**

**Review of 2024-25 judicial branch Budget Change Concepts.**

*Action:* *The Budget Committee unanimously voted to recommend to the Judicial Council, at its July 20-21, 2023 business meeting, the following budget change proposal concepts be developed into budget change proposals for submission to the State Department of Finance in September 2023:*

1.  24-01 – Statewide External Audit Program,

2.  24-02 – Courts of Appeal Court-Appointed Counsel Program,

3.  24-04 – Trial Court Facilities Maintenance and Utilities

4.  24-05 – Facility Modifications Prioritization and Costs

5.  24-12 – Capital Outlay Funding FY 2024-25 through 2028-29

6.  24-15 – Court-Based Self-Help Centers

7.  24-17 – Habeas Corpus Resource Center Case Team Staff and Establishment of Los Angeles Office

8.  24-18 – Inflationary Adjustment for Trial Courts

9.  24-19 – Funding for 50 New Judgeships

10. 24-20 – Maintaining a Sufficient Pool of Competency to Stand Trial Court Evaluators.

## INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS(NO ACTION REQUIRED)

**Info: 1 2023-24 Self-Help Annual Update**

**Annual informational update of the three-year average population data from the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, and population estimates for cities, counties, and the state.**

*Action: No action was taken.*

**Info 2: 2023-24 May Revision Budget Update (No Action Required)**

**Update on the 2023-24 May Revision to the Governor's Budget.**

*Action: No action was taken.*

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no further open meeting business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

## CLOSED SESSION

**Item 1 Innovations Grant Program (California Rule of Court, Rule 10.75 (D)(9))**
*Review and discussion of administrative matters regarding Innovations Grant.*

Adjourned closed session at 4:51 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

<div align="center">

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
**Report to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee**
**(Action Item)**

</div>

---

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title:** | **2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding Allocation** |
| **Date:** | 5/24/2023 |
| **Contact:** | Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services<br>916-643-8027 | oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov |

---

## Issue

Consider a recommendation from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to allocate an ongoing $12.5 million reduction to the 2023-24 civil assessment backfill funding for consideration by the Judicial Council at its July 20-21, 2023 business meeting.

## Background

**2022-23 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding**

On July 15, 2022, the council approved a $110 million civil assessment backfill allocation methodology for 2022-23 as follows[1]:

1. Maintain the current allocation of the $48.3 million maintenance of effort (MOE) in the Workload Formula;

2. Fund the remaining civil assessment obligations for those impacted courts from the amount of retained civil assessments after the MOE obligation is met;

3. Allocate the remaining amount of civil assessment revenue via the Workload Formula and without a security reduction;

4. Remove retained civil assessment dollars from the Workload Formula model's "Other Local Revenues" column and identify each courts' new position in the Workload Formula as it relates to percentage funded; and

5. Recalculate funding proposed in the 2022-23 Governor's Budget including inflationary, equity, and new judgeship funding, and then civil assessment redistribution funding.

**2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding**

Per the 2022 Budget Act, effective 2023-24, the civil assessment backfill amount decreases by $10 million to $100 million ongoing, due to the elimination of one-time funding for prior

---

[1] Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 15, 2022), 22-127 - 20220715-22-127.pdf (legistar.com).

uncollected debt. In addition, the backfill amount is reduced by an additional $2.5 million for debt service obligation payments as approved by the council at its May 12, 2023 business meeting as outlined in Table 1[2]. As a result, there is a total $12.5 million reduction to the amount of backfill funding available for allocation outlined in Table 2, which is the focus of the allocation methodology recommendation for the committee's consideration.

**Table 1 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding**

| Description | Amount |
|---|---|
| 2022-23 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding | $110,000,000 |
| Reduction of One-time Funding | (10,000,000) |
| Maintenance of Effort Funds Already Included in the Workload Formula | (48,300,000) |
| Debt Service Obligations including $2.5 million increase | (4,900,000) |
| **Remaining Funding** | **$46,800,000** |

**Table 2 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding Reduction**

| Description | Amount |
|---|---|
| Reduction of One-time Funding | ($10,000,000) |
| Debt Service Obligation Increase | (2,500,000) |
| **Total Reduction** | **($12,500,000)** |

**2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation Methodology Recommendation**

On May 4, 2023, the TCBAC met to consider 2023-24 allocation recommendations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) as well as trial court allocations that included the $100 million for civil assessment backfill. In this initial recommendation, the backfill was treated as new funding for the upcoming fiscal year[3]. Under this approach, the Workload Formula statewide funding percentage increased 2.6 percent from 92.2 percent in 2022-23 to 94.8 percent in 2023-24 even with a reduction in workload need. The individual court allocations for the civil

---

[2] Judicial Council meeting materials (May 21, 2023), 23-087 - 20230512-23-087 (legistar.com).
[3] TCBAC meeting materials (May 4, 2023), tcbac-202305018-fms-materials.pdf (ca.gov).

assessment backfill funding varied from decreases of up to 100 percent and increases up to 552.6 percent.

The committee approved the proposed TCTF and trial court allocations as presented, excluding the 2023-24 civil assessment backfill allocation because of concerns raised by the committee due to the volatility and lack of stability of this funding relative to the backfill allocations that were made in 2022-23. This allocation recommendation was directed back to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) for further consideration of different scenarios for an ongoing allocation methodology[4].

On May 18, 2023, the FMS voted to recommend scenario 4, which was motioned and seconded to move forward to the TCBAC for consideration and passed with five "yes" votes and four "no" votes[5].

On May 25, 2023, the TCBAC met to consider the recommendation from FMS as well as a fifth supplemental scenario added at the request of the TCBAC chair to utilize the approved recommendation and adjust it to address concerns raised about courts above 100 percent of funding as well as courts below the statewide average funding level[6]. The committee voted to recommend scenario 5, which was motioned and seconded to move forward to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) for consideration and passed with 15 "yes" votes and one "no" vote.

**2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation Methodology Scenarios Considered**

Two scenarios assumed that the amount to be allocated is $46.8 million, thus treating the 2023-24 civil assessment backfill funding as new money. The three other scenarios assumed that the amount to be allocated is a reduction of $12.5 million.

Each of the scenarios zero out amounts for the two base funding floor courts, Alpine and Sierra, due to the fixed funding amount for those courts, and does not yet account for funding floor adjustments for the base funding floor courts. A summary of the five scenarios described below is included as Attachment A. Detailed calculations and comparisons of the scenarios are included as Attachment B.

The TCBAC discussed issues of funding equity, volatility, and allocation methodologies that treat the civil assessment backfill as new money instead of existing funding. As the 2022-23 civil assessment backfill allocation methodology was not implemented as an ongoing

---

[4] The Judicial Branch Budget Committee approved these allocation recommendations at its May 17, 2023 meeting; jbbc-20230517-materials.pdf (ca.gov).
[5] FMS meeting materials (May 18, 2023), tcbac-202305018-fms-materials.pdf (ca.gov).
[6] TCBAC meeting materials (May 25, 2023), tcbac-20230525-materials.pdf (ca.gov).

recommendation, the deliberation of an ongoing methodology effective in 2023-24 focused on these themes as well as the fundamental principles of the Workload Formula.

**Scenario 1 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation via the Workload Formula**

This scenario was the one presented to the TCBAC at its May 4, 2023 meeting and was an allocation of the $46.8 million (as described in Table 1) via the Workload Formula methodology as follows:

1. Bring all Cluster 1 courts up to at least 100 percent of funding need.
2. Allocate up to 50 percent of remaining funding to courts under the statewide average funding ratio. Allocated funds will bring courts up to but not over the statewide average funding ratio.
3. Allocate remaining funding to all courts based on the Workload Formula.
4. Allow no court's allocation to exceed 100 percent of its need unless it is the result of a funding floor calculation[7].

Using this method, courts that received civil assessment funding in 2022-23 may not receive funding in 2023-24 and, conversely, courts that did not receive civil assessment funding in 2022-23 could receive funding. This is due to the equity approach in the Workload Formula and where courts are with the methodology based on being a Cluster 1 court or where courts fall in the methodology based on their percentage of funding received prior to adding in the civil assessment backfill funding. The lowest funded court would be at 92.3 percent of workload need.

*This scenario was not moved for a vote and therefore not approved to move forward to the Budget Committee for consideration due to concerns about volatility and lack of funding stability compared to the prior year's allocation for civil assessment backfill.*

**Scenario 2 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation of the $12.5 Million Reduction Only via the Workload Formula**

This scenario treats 2023-24 as a reduction in base funding from 2022-23 and allocates the $12.5 million reduction in civil assessment backfill (as described in Table 2) via the Workload Formula methodology. The lowest funded court would be at 86.8 percent of workload need.

As this scenario reduces 2022-23 civil assessment backfill allocations by $12.5 million, courts that did not receive civil assessment backfill in 2022-23 are excluded from the calculation.

---

[7] Due to the proposed $74.1 million inflationary funding included in the allocations, in which all 58 courts receive the same percentage increase, some courts are exceeding 100 percent of funding prior to applying any of the civil assessment backfill methodology scenarios.

In addition, the volatility in allocations to individual courts compared to the prior year is less than in scenario 1 with decreases ranging from 8.6 to 20.9 percent.

*This scenario was originally motioned and seconded to move forward by the FMS for TCBAC consideration; however, the motion failed with a five "no" and four "yes" vote. This scenario was not moved for a vote by TCBAC and therefore not approved to move forward to the Budget Committee for consideration.*

### Scenario 3 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Proportional Allocation Based on the Workload Formula Allocation

This scenario allocates the $46.8 million (as described in Table 1) on a proportional basis based on 2023-24 Workload Formula allocations as approved by the TCBAC. With this approach, all courts (except the base funding floor courts) would receive a portion of the civil assessment backfill, including Cluster 1 courts, with the lowest funded court at 86.5 percent of workload need.

Using this method, those courts with a civil assessment backfill allocation decrease from the prior year ranges from 35 to 137.3 percent. This approach would allow other courts that did not receive any of this funding in 2022-23 to receive an allocation in 2023-24.

*This scenario was not moved for a vote and therefore not approved to move forward to the Budget Committee for consideration based on similar concerns noted in scenario 1.*

### Scenario 4 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation of the $12.5 Million Reduction Only Based on a Proportional Adjustment of the Reduction Only

This scenario treats 2023-24 as a reduction in base funding from 2022-23 and allocates the $12.5 million reduction in civil assessment backfill funding (as described in Table 2) proportionally based on courts' percentage of 2022-23 civil assessment funding. This method would only apply to those courts that received civil assessment backfill funding in 2022-23. The lowest funded court would be at 86.8 percent of workload need. With this scenario, all courts that received civil assessment backfill funding would receive the same percentage decrease of 21.1 percent.

*This scenario was motioned and seconded by FMS to move forward to the TCBAC for consideration with a five "yes" and four "no" vote. It was not moved for a vote by the TCBAC and therefore not approved to move forward to the Budget Committee for consideration based on the adjustments to this scenario included in scenario 5.*

**Scenario 5 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation of the $12.5 Million Reduction Only Based on a Proportional Adjustment of the Reduction Only and Adjusted Further to Provide Funding from Courts Over 100 Percent due to Civil Assessment Funding and Provided to Courts Below the Statewide Average Funding Level**

This scenario, which is a variation of scenario 4, increases the amount of the $12.5 million reduction for three courts funded over 100 percent in the amount of $421,000[8], and decreases the reduction amount for five courts below the statewide average funding level[9]. As a result, the lowest funded court would be at 87.4 percent of workload need.

*This scenario was moved and seconded by the TCBAC to move forward to the Budget Committee for consideration with 15 "yes" votes and one "no" vote based on the added adjustment to scenario 4 to address courts funded below the statewide average utilizing civil assessment backfill funding that would put courts above (or further above) 100 percent of funding.*

**Recommendation**

Approve a recommendation from the TCBAC to implement scenario 5 effective July 1, 2023, which is an ongoing $12.5 million reduction in civil assessment backfill funding that is proportional based on courts' percentage of 2022-23 civil assessment funding—and makes additional adjustments to three courts funded over 100 percent and redirects $421,000 to five courts below the statewide average funding level—for consideration by the Judicial Council at is July 20-21, 2023 business meeting.

**Attachments**

1. **Attachment A**: 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Summary
2. **Attachment B**: 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Detail

---

[8] The three courts are Alameda, Mendocino, and Tuolumne Superior Courts.
[9] The five courts are Napa, Nevada, Orange, San Mateo, and Sutter Superior Courts.

# 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios - Summary[1]

| Court | 2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Nov 22) | 2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage | SCENARIO 1 Allocation via Workload Formula Methodology | Workload Formula Percentage | SCENARIO 2 Reduction Using Workload Formula Methodology | Total Civil Assessment Allocation | Workload Formula Percentage | SCENARIO 3 Proportional Allocation Based on Workload Formula Allocation | Workload Formula Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alameda | 1,023,593 | 99.6% | 479,311 | 100.0% | (219,956) | 803,637 | 100.0% | 1,688,569 | 100.4% |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | 100.0% | - | 104.4% | - | - | 104.4% | 85,284 | 104.4% |
| Butte | 223,924 | 90.6% | 172,505 | 93.0% | (84,817) | 139,107 | 93.0% | 260,980 | 92.8% |
| Calaveras | - | 100.0% | - | 101.3% | - | - | 101.3% | 65,803 | 101.3% |
| Colusa | - | 105.7% | 128,917 | 100.0% | - | - | 100.0% | 47,421 | 95.1% |
| Contra Costa | 1,511,254 | 90.9% | 2,288,839 | 92.5% | (325,345) | 1,185,908 | 92.5% | 985,491 | 90.6% |
| Del Norte | - | 100.0% | - | 101.2% | - | - | 101.2% | 73,174 | 101.2% |
| El Dorado | 129,338 | 90.8% | 303,163 | 92.3% | (58,618) | 70,720 | 92.3% | 178,298 | 90.1% |
| Fresno | 1,865,347 | 90.9% | 613,103 | 95.0% | (162,241) | 1,703,106 | 95.0% | 1,178,141 | 96.7% |
| Glenn | - | 100.0% | 225,179 | 100.0% | - | - | 100.0% | 56,698 | 93.0% |
| Humboldt | 104,892 | 92.4% | 83,308 | 99.2% | (22,045) | 82,847 | 99.2% | 167,203 | 99.2% |
| Imperial | - | 110.3% | - | 125.6% | - | - | 125.6% | 198,721 | 125.6% |
| Inyo | - | 109.2% | - | 102.0% | - | - | 102.0% | 48,225 | 102.0% |
| Kern | 1,888,221 | 90.9% | 612,560 | 95.5% | (162,097) | 1,726,124 | 95.5% | 1,183,756 | 97.2% |
| Kings | 312,333 | 90.9% | 191,706 | 92.5% | (67,029) | 245,303 | 92.5% | 205,354 | 93.0% |
| Lake | 144,785 | 90.9% | 117,321 | 92.4% | (30,871) | 113,914 | 92.4% | 94,260 | 92.3% |
| Lassen | - | 107.4% | - | 120.0% | - | - | 120.0% | 52,973 | 120.0% |
| Los Angeles | 21,126,821 | 90.9% | 10,259,424 | 92.8% | (4,410,476) | 16,716,346 | 92.8% | 13,546,233 | 93.6% |
| Madera | 350,567 | 90.9% | 200,196 | 92.6% | (74,827) | 275,740 | 92.6% | 229,425 | 93.2% |
| Marin | 174,063 | 93.5% | 145,988 | 93.6% | (86,923) | 87,140 | 93.6% | 268,458 | 93.2% |
| Mariposa | - | 100.0% | - | 102.7% | - | - | 102.7% | 35,071 | 102.7% |
| Mendocino | 58,932 | 100.0% | - | 105.7% | (17,726) | 41,206 | 105.7% | 144,651 | 106.3% |
| Merced | 483,440 | 90.9% | 202,237 | 93.0% | (102,212) | 381,228 | 93.0% | 314,631 | 94.0% |
| Modoc | - | 103.5% | - | 109.9% | - | - | 109.9% | 26,599 | 109.9% |
| Mono | - | 115.2% | - | 118.3% | - | - | 118.3% | 46,151 | 118.3% |
| Monterey | 737,493 | 90.9% | 319,197 | 93.0% | (158,286) | 579,207 | 93.0% | 487,100 | 93.9% |
| Napa | 115,140 | 93.3% | 453,612 | 92.6% | (57,354) | 57,786 | 92.6% | 173,433 | 88.8% |
| Nevada | 190,881 | 90.9% | 694,505 | 94.0% | (41,061) | 149,820 | 94.0% | 121,995 | 86.8% |
| Orange | 5,364,415 | 90.9% | 11,709,412 | 93.1% | (1,154,848) | 4,209,567 | 93.1% | 3,478,436 | 89.5% |
| Placer | 704,473 | 90.9% | 273,346 | 93.3% | (151,067) | 553,406 | 93.3% | 465,723 | 94.3% |
| Plumas | - | 111.3% | - | 123.7% | - | - | 123.7% | 36,233 | 123.7% |
| Riverside | 3,873,460 | 90.9% | 2,901,326 | 92.4% | (833,793) | 3,039,667 | 92.4% | 2,548,526 | 92.5% |
| Sacramento | 3,079,318 | 90.9% | 1,569,922 | 92.7% | (656,611) | 2,422,707 | 92.7% | 2,016,000 | 93.5% |
| San Benito | - | 100.0% | - | 121.6% | - | - | 121.6% | 90,965 | 121.6% |
| San Bernardino | 4,053,883 | 90.9% | 1,410,211 | 93.9% | (862,869) | 3,191,014 | 93.9% | 2,668,472 | 95.0% |
| San Diego | 2,130,881 | 92.0% | 1,741,675 | 93.7% | (1,051,705) | 1,079,176 | 93.7% | 3,249,884 | 93.3% |
| San Francisco | - | 112.0% | - | 119.9% | - | - | 119.9% | 1,196,050 | 119.9% |
| San Joaquin | 1,464,125 | 90.9% | 487,800 | 96.6% | (129,083) | 1,335,042 | 96.6% | 953,392 | 98.2% |
| San Luis Obispo | 529,032 | 90.9% | 177,741 | 96.7% | (47,034) | 481,998 | 96.7% | 347,751 | 98.3% |
| San Mateo | 551,661 | 91.9% | 3,600,398 | 93.8% | (270,093) | 281,567 | 93.8% | 809,593 | 87.1% |
| Santa Barbara | 325,198 | 93.9% | 263,262 | 96.7% | (69,665) | 255,533 | 96.7% | 514,893 | 96.7% |
| Santa Clara | 1,154,167 | 92.5% | 898,157 | 99.1% | (237,673) | 916,494 | 99.1% | 1,800,798 | 99.1% |
| Santa Cruz | 439,448 | 90.8% | 158,320 | 98.4% | (41,895) | 397,553 | 98.4% | 315,112 | 99.8% |
| Shasta | 388,554 | 90.7% | 158,042 | 95.0% | (41,822) | 346,732 | 95.0% | 303,701 | 96.1% |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | 123,205 | 90.9% | 185,101 | 92.5% | (26,480) | 96,725 | 92.5% | 80,218 | 90.6% |
| Solano | 573,749 | 90.6% | 421,134 | 92.7% | (176,392) | 397,357 | 92.7% | 541,587 | 92.7% |
| Sonoma | 872,797 | 90.9% | 283,614 | 98.5% | (75,051) | 797,747 | 98.5% | 565,013 | 100.1% |
| Stanislaus | 889,759 | 90.9% | 417,712 | 92.9% | (194,445) | 695,314 | 92.9% | 597,840 | 93.7% |
| Sutter | 230,173 | 90.9% | 637,404 | 93.7% | (50,034) | 180,138 | 93.7% | 150,103 | 88.7% |
| Tehama | 121,923 | 90.6% | 59,130 | 95.2% | (15,647) | 106,276 | 95.2% | 113,841 | 95.9% |
| Trinity | - | 107.1% | - | 100.0% | - | - | 100.0% | 40,528 | 100.0% |
| Tulare | 900,115 | 90.9% | 1,351,267 | 92.5% | (196,393) | 703,722 | 92.5% | 595,075 | 90.7% |
| Tuolumne | 58,439 | 94.4% | - | 102.1% | (11,975) | 46,465 | 102.1% | 94,393 | 103.1% |
| Ventura | 601,850 | 90.7% | 435,232 | 95.3% | (115,172) | 486,678 | 95.3% | 838,534 | 95.4% |
| Yolo | 440,621 | 90.9% | 149,737 | 94.5% | (39,624) | 400,997 | 94.5% | 286,223 | 96.1% |
| Yuba | - | 113.0% | - | 106.5% | - | - | 106.5% | 118,030 | 106.5% |
| **Total** | **59,312,271** | **92.1%** | **46,781,014** | **94.8%** | **(12,531,257)** | **46,781,014** | **94.8%** | **46,781,014** | **94.8%** |

*Cluster 1 courts*
*Base funding floor courts zeroed out*

[1] See Attachment B for additional information.

# 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios - Summary[1]

| Court | 2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Nov 22) | 2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage | SCENARIO 4 — Proportional Reduction on the Decrease | SCENARIO 4 — Total Civil Assessment Allocation | SCENARIO 4 — Workload Formula Percentage | SCENARIO 5 - RECOMMENDED — Scenario 4 Updated to Address +100% and Below Statewide Average | SCENARIO 5 — Total Civil Assessment Allocation | SCENARIO 5 — Workload Formula Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alameda | 1,023,593 | 99.6% | (216,261) | 807,332 | 101.3% | (544,282) | 479,311 | 100.4% |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | 100.0% | - | - | 106.4% | - | - | 104.4% |
| Butte | 223,924 | 90.6% | (47,310) | 176,614 | 93.6% | (47,310) | 176,614 | 93.0% |
| Calaveras | - | 100.0% | - | - | 103.2% | - | - | 101.3% |
| Colusa | - | 105.7% | - | - | 96.9% | - | - | 95.1% |
| Contra Costa | 1,511,254 | 90.9% | (319,292) | 1,191,962 | 90.3% | (319,292) | 1,191,962 | 90.6% |
| Del Norte | - | 100.0% | - | - | 103.1% | - | - | 101.2% |
| El Dorado | 129,338 | 90.8% | (27,326) | 102,012 | 91.1% | (27,326) | 102,012 | 90.4% |
| Fresno | 1,865,347 | 90.9% | (394,103) | 1,471,244 | 95.9% | (394,103) | 1,471,244 | 96.3% |
| Glenn | - | 100.0% | - | - | 94.8% | - | - | 93.0% |
| Humboldt | 104,892 | 92.4% | (22,161) | 82,731 | 100.1% | (22,161) | 82,731 | 99.2% |
| Imperial | - | 110.3% | - | - | 128.0% | - | - | 125.6% |
| Inyo | - | 109.2% | - | - | 103.9% | - | - | 102.0% |
| Kern | 1,888,221 | 90.9% | (398,936) | 1,489,285 | 96.4% | (398,936) | 1,489,285 | 96.9% |
| Kings | 312,333 | 90.9% | (65,988) | 246,344 | 92.7% | (65,988) | 246,344 | 93.0% |
| Lake | 144,785 | 90.9% | (30,590) | 114,195 | 91.9% | (30,590) | 114,195 | 92.3% |
| Lassen | - | 107.4% | - | - | 122.3% | - | - | 120.0% |
| Los Angeles | 21,126,821 | 90.9% | (4,463,590) | 16,663,232 | 93.2% | (4,463,590) | 16,663,232 | 93.6% |
| Madera | 350,567 | 90.9% | (74,066) | 276,501 | 92.8% | (74,066) | 276,501 | 93.2% |
| Marin | 174,063 | 93.5% | (36,775) | 137,288 | 94.4% | (36,775) | 137,288 | 93.5% |
| Mariposa | - | 100.0% | - | - | 104.6% | - | - | 102.7% |
| Mendocino | 58,932 | 100.0% | (12,451) | 46,481 | 107.7% | (58,932) | 0 | 106.4% |
| Merced | 483,440 | 90.9% | (102,139) | 381,301 | 93.7% | (102,139) | 381,301 | 94.0% |
| Modoc | - | 103.5% | - | - | 112.0% | - | - | 109.9% |
| Mono | - | 115.2% | - | - | 120.6% | - | - | 118.3% |
| Monterey | 737,493 | 90.9% | (155,815) | 581,679 | 93.6% | (155,815) | 581,679 | 93.9% |
| Napa | 115,140 | 93.3% | (24,326) | 90,814 | 89.9% | - | 115,140 | 89.1% |
| Nevada | 190,881 | 90.9% | (40,328) | 150,552 | 86.5% | - | 190,881 | 86.8% |
| Orange | 5,364,415 | 90.9% | (1,133,372) | 4,231,043 | 89.1% | (942,615) | 4,421,800 | 89.5% |
| Placer | 704,473 | 90.9% | (148,838) | 555,635 | 94.0% | (148,838) | 555,635 | 94.3% |
| Plumas | - | 111.3% | - | - | 126.0% | - | - | 123.7% |
| Riverside | 3,873,460 | 90.9% | (818,369) | 3,055,091 | 92.2% | (818,369) | 3,055,091 | 92.5% |
| Sacramento | 3,079,318 | 90.9% | (650,586) | 2,428,732 | 93.1% | (650,586) | 2,428,732 | 93.5% |
| San Benito | - | 100.0% | - | - | 123.9% | - | - | 121.6% |
| San Bernardino | 4,053,883 | 90.9% | (856,488) | 3,197,395 | 94.7% | (856,488) | 3,197,395 | 95.0% |
| San Diego | 2,130,881 | 92.0% | (450,204) | 1,680,677 | 94.5% | (450,204) | 1,680,677 | 93.7% |
| San Francisco | - | 112.0% | - | - | 122.2% | - | - | 119.9% |
| San Joaquin | 1,464,125 | 90.9% | (309,334) | 1,154,790 | 97.5% | (309,334) | 1,154,790 | 97.9% |
| San Luis Obispo | 529,032 | 90.9% | (111,772) | 417,260 | 97.6% | (111,772) | 417,260 | 98.0% |
| San Mateo | 551,661 | 91.9% | (116,553) | 435,108 | 88.2% | - | 551,661 | 87.4% |
| Santa Barbara | 325,198 | 93.9% | (68,706) | 256,491 | 97.6% | (68,706) | 256,491 | 96.7% |
| Santa Clara | 1,154,167 | 92.5% | (243,848) | 910,319 | 100.0% | (243,848) | 910,319 | 99.1% |
| Santa Cruz | 439,448 | 90.8% | (92,845) | 346,603 | 99.3% | (92,845) | 346,603 | 99.5% |
| Shasta | 388,554 | 90.7% | (82,092) | 306,461 | 95.9% | (82,092) | 306,461 | 95.9% |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | 123,205 | 90.9% | (26,030) | 97,175 | 90.3% | (26,030) | 97,175 | 90.7% |
| Solano | 573,749 | 90.6% | (121,219) | 452,530 | 93.1% | (121,219) | 452,530 | 92.8% |
| Sonoma | 872,797 | 90.9% | (184,401) | 688,396 | 99.4% | (184,401) | 688,396 | 99.8% |
| Stanislaus | 889,759 | 90.9% | (187,985) | 701,775 | 93.4% | (187,985) | 701,775 | 93.7% |
| Sutter | 230,173 | 90.9% | (48,630) | 181,543 | 88.3% | - | 230,173 | 88.7% |
| Tehama | 121,923 | 90.6% | (25,759) | 96,164 | 96.0% | (25,759) | 96,164 | 95.8% |
| Trinity | - | 107.1% | - | - | 101.9% | - | - | 100.0% |
| Tulare | 900,115 | 90.9% | (190,173) | 709,943 | 90.3% | (190,173) | 709,943 | 90.7% |
| Tuolumne | 58,439 | 94.4% | (12,347) | 46,092 | 104.1% | (58,439) | 0 | 103.1% |
| Ventura | 601,850 | 90.7% | (127,156) | 474,694 | 96.1% | (127,156) | 474,694 | 95.3% |
| Yolo | 440,621 | 90.9% | (93,093) | 347,528 | 95.4% | (93,093) | 347,528 | 95.7% |
| Yuba | - | 113.0% | - | - | 108.5% | - | - | 106.5% |
| **Total** | **59,312,271** | **92.1%** | **(12,531,257)** | **46,781,014** | **94.8%** | **(12,531,257)** | **46,781,014** | **94.8%** |

*Cluster 1 courts*
*Base funding floor courts zeroed out*

[1] *See Attachment B for additional information.*

# 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios - Detail[1]

<div align="right">Attachment B</div>

| Court | 2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Updated November 2022) | | | | Total 2022-23 Workload Formula Allocation (as of Nov 22) | 2022-23 Workload Formula | 2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage | 2023-24 Workload Formula | Year to Year Workload Formula Difference | % Difference |
| | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Cluster 1 Courts to 100%) | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below Statewide Average) | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below 100%) | Total | | | | | | |
| | A | B | C | D (A + B + C) | E | F | G (E / F) | H | I | J |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alameda | - | - | 1,023,593 | 1,023,593 | 88,386,879 | 88,721,292 | 99.6% | 89,736,951 | 1,015,659 | 1.1% |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | 3,977,297 | 3,977,456 | 100.0% | 4,318,194 | 340,738 | 8.6% |
| Butte | - | 53,273 | 170,652 | 223,924 | 13,403,821 | 14,791,477 | 90.6% | 15,020,326 | 228,849 | 1.5% |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | 3,287,713 | 3,287,845 | 100.0% | 3,434,244 | 146,399 | 4.5% |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | 2,369,916 | 2,241,285 | 105.7% | 2,635,567 | 394,282 | 17.6% |
| Contra Costa | - | 852,977 | 658,277 | 1,511,254 | 51,852,505 | 57,057,062 | 90.9% | 58,792,180 | 1,735,118 | 3.0% |
| Del Norte | - | - | - | - | 3,721,741 | 3,721,891 | 100.0% | 3,822,121 | 100,230 | 2.7% |
| El Dorado | - | 9,848 | 119,490 | 129,338 | 9,400,356 | 10,356,971 | 90.8% | 10,536,589 | 179,618 | 1.7% |
| Fresno | - | 1,052,833 | 812,514 | 1,865,347 | 64,001,776 | 70,425,780 | 90.9% | 66,190,564 | (4,235,216) | -6.0% |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | 2,913,222 | 2,913,338 | 100.0% | 3,222,234 | 308,895 | 10.6% |
| Humboldt | - | - | 104,892 | 104,892 | 8,400,951 | 9,091,694 | 92.4% | 8,993,983 | (97,711) | -1.1% |
| Imperial | - | - | - | - | 10,127,636 | 9,180,484 | 110.3% | 8,363,980 | (816,505) | -8.9% |
| Inyo | - | - | - | - | 2,464,602 | 2,257,443 | 109.2% | 2,499,943 | 242,500 | 10.7% |
| Kern | - | 1,065,743 | 822,478 | 1,888,221 | 64,786,602 | 71,289,380 | 90.9% | 66,131,988 | (5,157,393) | -7.2% |
| Kings | - | 176,286 | 136,047 | 312,333 | 10,716,430 | 11,792,062 | 90.9% | 11,937,681 | 145,618 | 1.2% |
| Lake | - | 81,719 | 63,066 | 144,785 | 4,967,700 | 5,466,319 | 90.9% | 5,522,043 | 55,723 | 1.0% |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | 2,505,447 | 2,332,455 | 107.4% | 2,332,823 | 368 | 0.0% |
| Los Angeles | - | 11,924,329 | 9,202,493 | 21,126,821 | 724,880,656 | 797,638,572 | 90.9% | 782,911,052 | (14,727,521) | -1.8% |
| Madera | - | 197,866 | 152,701 | 350,567 | 12,028,282 | 13,235,588 | 90.9% | 13,312,566 | 76,978 | 0.6% |
| Marin | - | - | 174,063 | 174,063 | 14,100,425 | 15,087,150 | 93.5% | 15,317,860 | 230,710 | 1.5% |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | 1,809,864 | 1,809,937 | 100.0% | 1,805,697 | (4,239) | -0.2% |
| Mendocino | - | - | 58,932 | 58,932 | 7,650,910 | 7,651,217 | 100.0% | 7,231,739 | (419,478) | -5.5% |
| Merced | - | 272,862 | 210,579 | 483,440 | 16,587,283 | 18,252,186 | 90.9% | 18,090,994 | (161,192) | -0.9% |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - | 1,328,965 | 1,284,287 | 103.5% | 1,279,449 | (4,837) | -0.4% |
| Mono | - | - | - | - | 2,346,825 | 2,037,226 | 115.2% | 2,061,575 | 24,349 | 1.2% |
| Monterey | - | 416,253 | 321,240 | 737,493 | 25,304,074 | 27,843,901 | 90.9% | 28,026,310 | 182,409 | 0.7% |
| Napa | - | - | 115,140 | 115,140 | 9,308,622 | 9,979,950 | 93.3% | 10,386,823 | 406,873 | 4.1% |
| Nevada | - | 107,736 | 83,144 | 190,881 | 6,549,288 | 7,206,655 | 90.9% | 7,599,777 | 393,121 | 5.5% |
| Orange | - | 3,027,765 | 2,336,650 | 5,364,415 | 184,058,006 | 202,532,326 | 90.9% | 210,173,824 | 7,641,499 | 3.8% |
| Placer | - | 397,616 | 306,857 | 704,473 | 24,171,119 | 26,597,230 | 90.9% | 26,685,022 | 87,792 | 0.3% |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | 1,851,510 | 1,663,727 | 111.3% | 1,548,909 | (114,818) | -6.9% |
| Riverside | - | 2,186,245 | 1,687,215 | 3,873,460 | 132,901,973 | 146,241,646 | 90.9% | 148,941,935 | 2,700,289 | 1.8% |
| Sacramento | - | 1,738,018 | 1,341,300 | 3,079,318 | 105,654,241 | 116,258,997 | 90.9% | 116,609,120 | 350,122 | 0.3% |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - | 4,662,251 | 4,662,438 | 100.0% | 3,952,945 | (709,492) | -15.2% |
| San Bernardino | - | 2,288,079 | 1,765,804 | 4,053,883 | 139,092,454 | 153,053,479 | 90.9% | 151,789,230 | (1,264,249) | -0.8% |
| San Diego | - | - | 2,130,881 | 2,130,881 | 169,886,475 | 184,697,021 | 92.0% | 185,202,539 | 505,518 | 0.3% |
| San Francisco | - | - | - | - | 63,648,429 | 56,836,452 | 112.0% | 52,730,196 | (4,106,256) | -7.2% |
| San Joaquin | - | 826,376 | 637,748 | 1,464,125 | 50,235,466 | 55,277,714 | 90.9% | 52,662,950 | (2,614,764) | -4.7% |
| San Luis Obispo | - | 298,594 | 230,437 | 529,032 | 18,151,569 | 19,973,484 | 90.9% | 19,188,902 | (784,581) | -3.9% |
| San Mateo | - | - | 551,661 | 551,661 | 43,950,939 | 47,815,932 | 91.9% | 49,452,194 | 1,636,262 | 3.4% |
| Santa Barbara | - | - | 325,198 | 325,198 | 26,458,643 | 28,186,948 | 93.9% | 28,421,722 | 234,774 | 0.8% |
| Santa Clara | - | - | 1,154,167 | 1,154,167 | 92,486,457 | 100,038,958 | 92.5% | 96,965,024 | (3,073,934) | -3.1% |
| Santa Cruz | - | 231,784 | 207,664 | 439,448 | 16,342,609 | 17,999,527 | 90.8% | 17,092,256 | (907,272) | -5.0% |
| Shasta | - | 190,401 | 198,153 | 388,554 | 15,583,110 | 17,175,140 | 90.7% | 17,062,242 | (112,898) | -0.7% |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | 69,539 | 53,666 | 123,205 | 4,227,273 | 4,651,574 | 90.9% | 4,784,619 | 133,044 | 2.9% |
| Solano | - | 214,450 | 359,299 | 573,749 | 28,222,823 | 31,142,713 | 90.6% | 31,325,060 | 182,347 | 0.6% |
| Sonoma | - | 492,621 | 380,176 | 872,797 | 29,946,481 | 32,952,277 | 90.9% | 30,618,988 | (2,333,289) | -7.1% |
| Stanislaus | - | 496,232 | 393,528 | 889,759 | 30,992,431 | 34,109,559 | 90.9% | 34,469,129 | 359,570 | 1.1% |
| Sutter | - | 129,913 | 100,259 | 230,173 | 7,897,431 | 8,690,114 | 90.9% | 9,151,367 | 461,253 | 5.3% |
| Tehama | - | 48,516 | 73,407 | 121,923 | 5,766,918 | 6,362,648 | 90.6% | 6,383,645 | 20,997 | 0.3% |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | 2,063,314 | 1,926,810 | 107.1% | 2,141,889 | 215,079 | 11.2% |
| Tulare | - | 508,040 | 392,075 | 900,115 | 30,883,782 | 33,983,658 | 90.9% | 35,475,356 | 1,491,698 | 4.4% |
| Tuolumne | - | - | 58,439 | 58,439 | 4,783,130 | 5,065,303 | 94.4% | 4,885,338 | (179,965) | -3.6% |
| Ventura | - | 51,527 | 550,323 | 601,850 | 43,286,773 | 47,700,002 | 90.7% | 46,987,643 | (712,359) | -1.5% |
| Yolo | - | 248,694 | 191,927 | 440,621 | 15,118,113 | 16,635,553 | 90.9% | 16,165,652 | (469,901) | -2.8% |
| Yuba | - | - | - | - | 5,992,602 | 5,301,565 | 113.0% | 5,858,507 | 556,942 | 10.5% |
| **Total** | - | 29,656,136 | 29,656,136 | 59,312,271 | 2,467,496,113 | 2,678,463,698 | 92.1% | 2,658,241,455 | (20,222,243) | -0.8% |

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor courts zeroed out

[1] Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.

| Court | SCENARIO 1 Proposed 2023-24 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Allocation via the Workload Formula Methodology as presented to TCBAC) | | | | Difference | Workload Formula % Difference | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage | Workload Formula % Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Cluster 1 Courts to 100%) | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below Statewide Average) | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below 100%) | Total | | | | | |
| | K | L | M | N (J + K + L) | O (M - D) | P (N / D) | Q | R (N / O) | S (P - G) |
| Alameda | - | - | 479,311 | 479,311 | (544,281) | -53.2% | 89,736,951 | 100.0% | 0.4% |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | | | 4,508,095 | 104.4% | 4.4% |
| Butte | - | 33,376 | 139,129 | 172,505 | (51,420) | -23.0% | 13,967,859 | 93.0% | 2.4% |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | | | 3,478,334 | 101.3% | 1.3% |
| Colusa | 128,917 | - | - | 128,917 | 128,917 | - | 2,635,567 | 100.0% | -5.7% |
| Contra Costa | - | 1,744,265 | 544,574 | 2,288,839 | 777,585 | 51.5% | 54,381,796 | 92.5% | 1.6% |
| Del Norte | - | - | - | - | | | 3,867,982 | 101.2% | 1.2% |
| El Dorado | - | 205,566 | 97,597 | 303,163 | 173,825 | 134.4% | 9,727,986 | 92.3% | 1.6% |
| Fresno | - | - | 613,103 | 613,103 | (1,252,245) | -67.1% | 62,889,533 | 95.0% | 4.1% |
| Glenn | 225,179 | - | - | 225,179 | 225,179 | - | 3,222,234 | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| Humboldt | - | - | 83,308 | 83,308 | (21,584) | -20.6% | 8,921,636 | 99.2% | 6.8% |
| Imperial | - | - | - | - | | | 10,504,378 | 125.6% | 15.3% |
| Inyo | - | - | - | - | | | 2,549,192 | 102.0% | -7.2% |
| Kern | - | - | 612,560 | 612,560 | (1,275,661) | -67.6% | 63,185,827 | 95.5% | 4.7% |
| Kings | - | 81,131 | 110,575 | 191,706 | (120,627) | -38.6% | 11,046,705 | 92.5% | 1.7% |
| Lake | - | 66,172 | 51,149 | 117,321 | (27,464) | -19.0% | 5,099,899 | 92.4% | 1.5% |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | | | 2,800,158 | 120.0% | 12.6% |
| Los Angeles | - | 3,007,563 | 7,251,860 | 10,259,424 | (10,867,398) | -51.4% | 726,312,192 | 92.8% | 1.9% |
| Madera | - | 76,886 | 123,310 | 200,196 | (150,371) | -42.9% | 12,327,594 | 92.6% | 1.7% |
| Marin | - | 4,104 | 141,885 | 145,988 | (28,075) | -16.1% | 14,336,656 | 93.6% | 0.1% |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | | | 1,853,852 | 102.7% | 2.7% |
| Mendocino | - | - | - | - | (58,932) | -100.0% | 7,646,223 | 105.7% | 5.7% |
| Merced | - | 34,666 | 167,571 | 202,237 | (281,203) | -58.2% | 16,833,593 | 93.0% | 2.2% |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - | | | 1,406,026 | 109.9% | 6.4% |
| Mono | - | - | - | - | | | 2,439,564 | 118.3% | 3.1% |
| Monterey | - | 59,598 | 259,599 | 319,197 | (418,296) | -56.7% | 26,067,278 | 93.0% | 2.1% |
| Napa | - | 357,402 | 96,210 | 453,612 | 338,472 | 294.0% | 9,621,242 | 92.6% | -0.6% |
| Nevada | - | 624,111 | 70,394 | 694,505 | 503,625 | 263.8% | 7,143,135 | 94.0% | 3.1% |
| Orange | - | 9,762,638 | 1,946,774 | 11,709,412 | 6,344,997 | 118.3% | 195,579,266 | 93.1% | 2.2% |
| Placer | - | 26,171 | 247,175 | 273,346 | (431,127) | -61.2% | 24,891,411 | 93.3% | 2.4% |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | | | 1,915,288 | 123.7% | 12.4% |
| Riverside | - | 1,521,723 | 1,379,603 | 2,901,326 | (972,134) | -25.1% | 137,616,222 | 92.4% | 1.5% |
| Sacramento | - | 489,808 | 1,080,114 | 1,569,922 | (1,509,397) | -49.0% | 108,135,499 | 92.7% | 1.9% |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - | | | 4,808,406 | 121.6% | 21.6% |
| San Bernardino | - | 4,235 | 1,405,976 | 1,410,211 | (2,643,672) | -65.2% | 142,465,444 | 93.9% | 3.0% |
| San Diego | - | 26,201 | 1,715,473 | 1,741,675 | (389,207) | -18.3% | 173,530,260 | 93.7% | 1.7% |
| San Francisco | - | - | - | - | | | 63,223,112 | 119.9% | 7.9% |
| San Joaquin | - | - | 487,800 | 487,800 | (976,324) | -66.7% | 50,884,034 | 96.6% | 5.7% |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - | 177,741 | 177,741 | (351,291) | -66.4% | 18,559,817 | 96.7% | 5.8% |
| San Mateo | - | 3,142,338 | 458,060 | 3,600,398 | 3,048,737 | 552.6% | 46,395,428 | 93.8% | 1.9% |
| Santa Barbara | - | - | 263,262 | 263,262 | (61,936) | -19.0% | 27,480,471 | 96.7% | 2.8% |
| Santa Clara | - | - | 898,157 | 898,157 | (256,010) | -22.2% | 96,088,178 | 99.1% | 6.6% |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | 158,320 | 158,320 | (281,128) | -64.0% | 16,815,108 | 98.4% | 7.6% |
| Shasta | - | - | 158,042 | 158,042 | (230,511) | -59.3% | 16,211,631 | 95.0% | 4.3% |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | | | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | 140,783 | 44,318 | 185,101 | 61,896 | 50.2% | 4,425,405 | 92.5% | 1.6% |
| Solano | - | 130,980 | 290,154 | 421,134 | (152,615) | -26.6% | 29,049,365 | 92.7% | 2.1% |
| Sonoma | - | - | 283,614 | 283,614 | (589,183) | -67.5% | 30,150,159 | 98.5% | 7.6% |
| Stanislaus | - | 98,435 | 319,277 | 417,712 | (472,048) | -53.1% | 32,019,505 | 92.9% | 2.0% |
| Sutter | - | 552,637 | 84,766 | 637,404 | 407,231 | 176.9% | 8,571,845 | 93.7% | 2.8% |
| Tehama | - | - | 59,130 | 59,130 | (62,793) | -51.5% | 6,076,743 | 95.2% | 4.6% |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | | | 2,142,285 | 100.0% | -7.1% |
| Tulare | - | 1,022,670 | 328,597 | 1,351,267 | 451,152 | 50.1% | 32,806,872 | 92.5% | 1.6% |
| Tuolumne | - | - | - | - | (58,439) | -100.0% | 4,989,613 | 102.1% | 7.7% |
| Ventura | - | - | 435,232 | 435,232 | (166,618) | -27.7% | 44,760,088 | 95.3% | 4.5% |
| Yolo | - | - | 149,737 | 149,737 | (290,884) | -66.0% | 15,279,476 | 94.5% | 3.6% |
| Yuba | - | - | - | - | | | 6,239,076 | 106.5% | -6.5% |
| **Total** | **354,096** | **23,213,459** | **23,213,459** | **46,781,014** | **(12,531,257)** | **-21.1%** | **2,519,621,494** | **94.8%** | **2.7%** |

*Cluster 1 courts*
*Base funding floor co...*

¹ *Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.*
*Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.*

| Court | SCENARIO 2 Proposed 2023-24 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Reduction using Workload Formula methodology) | | | | | Difference | Workload Formula % Difference | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage | Workload Formula % Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Cluster 1 Courts to 100%) | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below Statewide Average) | Civil Assessment Redistribution (Courts Below 100%) | Civil Assessment Workload Formula Reduction | Total | Difference | | | | |
| | T | U | V | W (R + S + T) | X (D + U) | Y (V - D) | Z (D - V / D) | AA | AB (Y / Z) | AC (AA - G) |
| Alameda | - | - | (219,956) | (219,956) | 803,637 | (219,956) | -21.5% | 90,061,277 | 100.4% | 0.7% |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4,508,095 | 104.4% | 4.4% |
| Butte | - | (48,001) | (36,817) | (84,817) | 139,107 | (84,817) | -37.9% | 13,934,462 | 92.8% | 2.2% |
| Calaveras | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3,478,334 | 101.3% | 1.3% |
| Colusa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,506,650 | 95.1% | -10.6% |
| Contra Costa | - | (181,239) | (144,107) | (325,345) | 1,185,908 | (325,345) | -21.5% | 53,278,865 | 90.6% | -0.3% |
| Del Norte | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3,867,982 | 101.2% | 1.2% |
| El Dorado | - | (32,791) | (25,826) | (58,618) | 70,720 | (58,618) | -45.3% | 9,495,543 | 90.1% | -0.6% |
| Fresno | - | - | (162,241) | (162,241) | 1,703,106 | (162,241) | -8.7% | 63,979,537 | 96.7% | 5.8% |
| Glenn | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,997,055 | 93.0% | -7.0% |
| Humboldt | - | - | (22,045) | (22,045) | 82,847 | (22,045) | -21.0% | 8,921,175 | 99.2% | 6.8% |
| Imperial | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10,504,378 | 125.6% | 15.3% |
| Inyo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,549,192 | 102.0% | -7.2% |
| Kern | - | - | (162,097) | (162,097) | 1,726,124 | (162,097) | -8.6% | 64,299,391 | 97.2% | 6.4% |
| Kings | - | (37,769) | (29,261) | (67,029) | 245,303 | (67,029) | -21.5% | 11,100,303 | 93.0% | 2.1% |
| Lake | - | (17,336) | (13,535) | (30,871) | 113,914 | (30,871) | -21.3% | 5,096,492 | 92.3% | 1.4% |
| Lassen | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,800,158 | 120.0% | 12.6% |
| Los Angeles | - | (2,491,468) | (1,919,007) | (4,410,476) | 16,716,346 | (4,410,476) | -20.9% | 732,769,114 | 93.6% | 2.7% |
| Madera | - | (42,196) | (32,631) | (74,827) | 275,740 | (74,827) | -21.3% | 12,403,139 | 93.2% | 2.3% |
| Marin | - | (49,377) | (37,546) | (86,923) | 87,140 | (86,923) | -49.9% | 14,277,808 | 93.2% | -0.2% |
| Mariposa | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,853,852 | 102.7% | 2.7% |
| Mendocino | - | - | (17,726) | (17,726) | 41,206 | (17,726) | -30.1% | 7,687,429 | 106.3% | 6.3% |
| Merced | - | (57,869) | (44,343) | (102,212) | 381,228 | (102,212) | -21.1% | 17,012,584 | 94.0% | 3.2% |
| Modoc | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,406,026 | 109.9% | 6.4% |
| Mono | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,439,564 | 118.3% | 3.1% |
| Monterey | - | (89,590) | (68,696) | (158,286) | 579,207 | (158,286) | -21.5% | 26,327,288 | 93.9% | 3.1% |
| Napa | - | (31,895) | (25,459) | (57,354) | 57,786 | (57,354) | -49.8% | 9,225,415 | 88.8% | -4.5% |
| Nevada | - | (22,433) | (18,628) | (41,061) | 149,820 | (41,061) | -21.5% | 6,598,450 | 86.8% | -4.1% |
| Orange | - | (639,687) | (515,161) | (1,154,848) | 4,209,567 | (1,154,848) | -21.5% | 188,079,421 | 89.5% | -1.4% |
| Placer | - | (85,659) | (65,408) | (151,067) | 553,406 | (151,067) | -21.4% | 25,171,470 | 94.3% | 3.4% |
| Plumas | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1,915,288 | 123.7% | 12.4% |
| Riverside | - | (468,719) | (365,074) | (833,793) | 3,039,667 | (833,793) | -21.5% | 137,754,563 | 92.5% | 1.6% |
| Sacramento | - | (370,789) | (285,823) | (656,611) | 2,422,707 | (656,611) | -21.3% | 108,988,284 | 93.5% | 2.6% |
| San Benito | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4,808,406 | 121.6% | 21.6% |
| San Bernardino | - | (490,815) | (372,053) | (862,869) | 3,191,014 | (862,869) | -21.3% | 144,246,247 | 95.0% | 4.2% |
| San Diego | - | (597,752) | (453,953) | (1,051,705) | 1,079,176 | (1,051,705) | -49.4% | 172,867,762 | 93.3% | 1.4% |
| San Francisco | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 63,223,112 | 119.9% | 7.9% |
| San Joaquin | - | - | (129,083) | (129,083) | 1,335,042 | (129,083) | -8.8% | 51,731,275 | 98.2% | 7.4% |
| San Luis Obispo | - | - | (47,034) | (47,034) | 481,998 | (47,034) | -8.9% | 18,864,074 | 98.3% | 7.4% |
| San Mateo | - | (148,880) | (121,213) | (270,093) | 281,567 | (270,093) | -49.0% | 43,076,597 | 87.1% | -4.8% |
| Santa Barbara | - | - | (69,665) | (69,665) | 255,533 | (69,665) | -21.4% | 27,472,742 | 96.7% | 2.8% |
| Santa Clara | - | - | (237,673) | (237,673) | 916,494 | (237,673) | -20.6% | 96,106,515 | 99.1% | 6.7% |
| Santa Cruz | - | - | (41,895) | (41,895) | 397,553 | (41,895) | -9.5% | 17,054,341 | 99.8% | 9.0% |
| Shasta | - | - | (41,822) | (41,822) | 346,732 | (41,822) | -10.8% | 16,400,321 | 96.1% | 5.4% |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | - | (14,753) | (11,728) | (26,480) | 96,725 | (26,480) | -21.5% | 4,337,028 | 90.6% | -0.2% |
| Solano | - | (99,610) | (76,781) | (176,392) | 397,357 | (176,392) | -30.7% | 29,025,588 | 92.7% | 2.0% |
| Sonoma | - | - | (75,051) | (75,051) | 797,747 | (75,051) | -8.6% | 30,664,291 | 100.1% | 9.3% |
| Stanislaus | - | (109,958) | (84,488) | (194,445) | 695,314 | (194,445) | -21.9% | 32,297,108 | 93.7% | 2.8% |
| Sutter | - | (27,603) | (22,431) | (50,034) | 180,138 | (50,034) | -21.7% | 8,114,579 | 88.7% | -2.2% |
| Tehama | - | - | (15,647) | (15,647) | 106,276 | (15,647) | -12.8% | 6,123,889 | 95.9% | 5.3% |
| Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2,142,285 | 100.0% | -7.1% |
| Tulare | - | (109,439) | (86,954) | (196,393) | 703,722 | (196,393) | -21.8% | 32,159,327 | 90.7% | -0.2% |
| Tuolumne | - | - | (11,975) | (11,975) | 46,465 | (11,975) | -20.5% | 5,036,078 | 103.1% | 8.7% |
| Ventura | - | - | (115,172) | (115,172) | 486,678 | (115,172) | -19.1% | 44,811,534 | 95.4% | 4.6% |
| Yolo | - | - | (39,624) | (39,624) | 400,997 | (39,624) | -9.0% | 15,530,736 | 96.1% | 5.2% |
| Yuba | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6,239,076 | 106.5% | -6.5% |
| **Total** | **-** | **(6,265,629)** | **(6,265,629)** | **(12,531,257)** | **46,781,014** | **(12,531,257)** | **-21.1%** | **2,519,621,494** | **94.8%** | **2.7%** |

*Cluster 1 courts*
*Base funding floor co*

[1] *Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.*
*Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.*

|  | SCENARIO 3 Proposed 2023-24 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Proportional based on Workload Formula allocation) | | | | | | | |
| Court | Proposed Workload Formula Allocation (Before Civil Assessment Funding) | Percent of 2023-24 Proposed Workload Formula Allocation | Total | Difference | Workload Formula % Difference | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage | Workload Formula % Difference |
|  | AD | AE (AC / TOTAL AC) | AF (AD * 46.8m) | AG (AE - D) | AH (D - AF / D) | AI | AJ (AH / AI) | AK (AJ - G) |
| Alameda | 89,257,640 | 3.6% | 1,688,569 | 664,977 | -35.0% | 90,946,209 | 101.3% | 1.7% |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | 4,508,095 | 0.2% | 85,284 | 85,284 | - | 4,593,379 | 106.4% | 6.4% |
| Butte | 13,795,355 | 0.6% | 260,980 | 37,055 | -83.5% | 14,056,334 | 93.6% | 3.0% |
| Calaveras | 3,478,334 | 0.1% | 65,803 | 65,803 | - | 3,544,137 | 103.2% | 3.2% |
| Colusa | 2,506,650 | 0.1% | 47,421 | 47,421 | - | 2,554,070 | 96.9% | -8.8% |
| Contra Costa | 52,092,957 | 2.1% | 985,491 | (525,763) | -134.8% | 53,078,448 | 90.3% | -0.6% |
| Del Norte | 3,867,982 | 0.2% | 73,174 | 73,174 | - | 3,941,156 | 103.1% | 3.1% |
| El Dorado | 9,424,822 | 0.4% | 178,298 | 48,960 | -62.1% | 9,603,120 | 91.1% | 0.4% |
| Fresno | 62,276,431 | 2.5% | 1,178,141 | (687,206) | -136.8% | 63,454,572 | 95.9% | 5.0% |
| Glenn | 2,997,055 | 0.1% | 56,698 | 56,698 | - | 3,053,753 | 94.8% | -5.2% |
| Humboldt | 8,838,328 | 0.4% | 167,203 | 62,310 | -40.6% | 9,005,531 | 100.1% | 7.7% |
| Imperial | 10,504,378 | 0.4% | 198,721 | 198,721 | - | 10,703,099 | 128.0% | 17.6% |
| Inyo | 2,549,192 | 0.1% | 48,225 | 48,225 | - | 2,597,418 | 103.9% | -5.3% |
| Kern | 62,573,268 | 2.5% | 1,183,756 | (704,465) | -137.3% | 63,757,024 | 96.4% | 5.5% |
| Kings | 10,854,999 | 0.4% | 205,354 | (106,979) | -134.3% | 11,060,353 | 92.7% | 1.8% |
| Lake | 4,982,578 | 0.2% | 94,260 | (50,525) | -134.9% | 5,076,838 | 91.9% | 1.1% |
| Lassen | 2,800,158 | 0.1% | 52,973 | 52,973 | - | 2,853,131 | 122.3% | 14.9% |
| Los Angeles | 716,052,768 | 29.0% | 13,546,233 | (7,580,588) | -135.9% | 729,599,002 | 93.2% | 2.3% |
| Madera | 12,127,398 | 0.5% | 229,425 | (121,142) | -134.6% | 12,356,824 | 92.8% | 1.9% |
| Marin | 14,190,668 | 0.6% | 268,458 | 94,395 | -45.8% | 14,459,126 | 94.4% | 0.9% |
| Mariposa | 1,853,852 | 0.1% | 35,071 | 35,071 | - | 1,888,923 | 104.6% | 4.6% |
| Mendocino | 7,646,223 | 0.3% | 144,651 | 85,719 | - | 7,790,873 | 107.7% | 7.7% |
| Merced | 16,631,356 | 0.7% | 314,631 | (168,810) | -134.9% | 16,945,986 | 93.7% | 2.8% |
| Modoc | 1,406,026 | 0.1% | 26,599 | 26,599 | - | 1,432,625 | 112.0% | 8.5% |
| Mono | 2,439,564 | 0.1% | 46,151 | 46,151 | - | 2,485,716 | 120.6% | 5.4% |
| Monterey | 25,748,081 | 1.0% | 487,100 | (250,393) | -134.0% | 26,235,181 | 93.6% | 2.7% |
| Napa | 9,167,629 | 0.4% | 173,433 | 58,292 | -49.4% | 9,341,062 | 89.9% | -3.3% |
| Nevada | 6,448,630 | 0.3% | 121,995 | (68,886) | -136.1% | 6,570,625 | 86.5% | -4.4% |
| Orange | 183,869,854 | 7.4% | 3,478,436 | (1,885,979) | -135.2% | 187,348,290 | 89.1% | -1.7% |
| Placer | 24,618,065 | 1.0% | 465,723 | (238,750) | -133.9% | 25,083,787 | 94.0% | 3.1% |
| Plumas | 1,915,288 | 0.1% | 36,233 | 36,233 | - | 1,951,522 | 126.0% | 14.7% |
| Riverside | 134,714,896 | 5.4% | 2,548,526 | (1,324,934) | -134.2% | 137,263,423 | 92.2% | 1.3% |
| Sacramento | 106,565,577 | 4.3% | 2,016,000 | (1,063,319) | -134.5% | 108,581,577 | 93.1% | 2.2% |
| San Benito | 4,808,406 | 0.2% | 90,965 | 90,965 | - | 4,899,371 | 123.9% | 23.9% |
| San Bernardino | 141,055,233 | 5.7% | 2,668,472 | (1,385,411) | -134.2% | 143,723,705 | 94.7% | 3.8% |
| San Diego | 171,788,586 | 6.9% | 3,249,884 | 1,119,003 | -47.5% | 175,038,470 | 94.5% | 2.5% |
| San Francisco | 63,223,112 | 2.6% | 1,196,050 | 1,196,050 | - | 64,419,162 | 122.2% | 10.2% |
| San Joaquin | 50,396,234 | 2.0% | 953,392 | (510,733) | -134.9% | 51,349,626 | 97.5% | 6.6% |
| San Luis Obispo | 18,382,076 | 0.7% | 347,751 | (181,281) | -134.3% | 18,729,827 | 97.6% | 6.7% |
| San Mateo | 42,795,030 | 1.7% | 809,593 | 257,933 | -53.2% | 43,604,623 | 88.2% | -3.7% |
| Santa Barbara | 27,217,209 | 1.1% | 514,893 | 189,696 | -41.7% | 27,732,102 | 97.6% | 3.7% |
| Santa Clara | 95,190,021 | 3.8% | 1,800,798 | 646,631 | -44.0% | 96,990,819 | 100.0% | 7.6% |
| Santa Cruz | 16,656,788 | 0.7% | 315,112 | (124,336) | -128.3% | 16,971,900 | 99.3% | 8.5% |
| Shasta | 16,053,589 | 0.6% | 303,701 | (84,853) | -121.8% | 16,357,289 | 95.9% | 5.1% |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | 4,240,304 | 0.2% | 80,218 | (42,987) | -134.9% | 4,320,521 | 90.3% | -0.6% |
| Solano | 28,628,231 | 1.2% | 541,587 | (32,162) | -105.6% | 29,169,818 | 93.1% | 2.5% |
| Sonoma | 29,866,544 | 1.2% | 565,013 | (307,784) | -135.3% | 30,431,558 | 99.4% | 8.5% |
| Stanislaus | 31,601,794 | 1.3% | 597,840 | (291,919) | -132.8% | 32,199,634 | 93.4% | 2.6% |
| Sutter | 7,934,441 | 0.3% | 150,103 | (80,069) | -134.8% | 8,084,544 | 88.3% | -2.5% |
| Tehama | 6,017,613 | 0.2% | 113,841 | (8,082) | -106.6% | 6,131,454 | 96.0% | 5.4% |
| Trinity | 2,142,285 | 0.1% | 40,528 | 40,528 | - | 2,182,812 | 101.9% | -5.2% |
| Tulare | 31,455,605 | 1.3% | 595,075 | (305,040) | -133.9% | 32,050,680 | 90.3% | -0.5% |
| Tuolumne | 4,989,613 | 0.2% | 94,393 | 35,954 | -38.5% | 5,084,006 | 104.1% | 9.6% |
| Ventura | 44,324,856 | 1.8% | 838,534 | 236,684 | -60.7% | 45,163,390 | 96.1% | 5.4% |
| Yolo | 15,129,739 | 0.6% | 286,223 | (154,398) | -135.0% | 15,415,962 | 95.4% | 4.5% |
| Yuba | 6,239,076 | 0.3% | 118,030 | 118,030 | - | 6,357,106 | 108.5% | -4.5% |
| Total | 2,472,840,480 | 100.0% | 46,781,014 | (12,531,257) | -21.1% | 2,519,621,494 | 94.8% | 2.7% |

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor co[...]

[1] Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
  Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.

# 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios - Detail[1]

| Court | SCENARIO 4 Proposed Civil Assessment Redistribution (Proportional reduction on the decrease) | | | Difference | % Difference | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage | Workload Formula % Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent of 2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution | 2023-24 Civil Assessment Proportional Reduction | Total | | | | | |
| | AL (D / TOTAL D) | AM (AL * -12.5m) | AN (D + AM) | AO (AN - D) | AP (AO / D) | AQ | AR (AQ / AR) | AS (AS - G) |
| Alameda | 1.7% | (216,261) | 807,332 | (216,261) | -21.1% | 90,064,972 | 100.4% | 0.7% |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 4,508,095 | 104.4% | 4.4% |
| Butte | 0.4% | (47,310) | 176,614 | (47,310) | -21.1% | 13,971,969 | 93.0% | 2.4% |
| Calaveras | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 3,478,334 | 101.3% | 1.3% |
| Colusa | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,506,650 | 95.1% | -10.6% |
| Contra Costa | 2.5% | (319,292) | 1,191,962 | (319,292) | -21.1% | 53,284,919 | 90.6% | -0.2% |
| Del Norte | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 3,867,982 | 101.2% | 1.2% |
| El Dorado | 0.2% | (27,326) | 102,012 | (27,326) | -21.1% | 9,526,834 | 90.4% | -0.3% |
| Fresno | 3.1% | (394,103) | 1,471,244 | (394,103) | -21.1% | 63,747,675 | 96.3% | 5.4% |
| Glenn | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,997,055 | 93.0% | -7.0% |
| Humboldt | 0.2% | (22,161) | 82,731 | (22,161) | -21.1% | 8,921,059 | 99.2% | 6.8% |
| Imperial | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 10,504,378 | 125.6% | 15.3% |
| Inyo | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,549,192 | 102.0% | -7.2% |
| Kern | 3.2% | (398,936) | 1,489,285 | (398,936) | -21.1% | 64,062,553 | 96.9% | 6.0% |
| Kings | 0.5% | (65,988) | 246,344 | (65,988) | -21.1% | 11,101,344 | 93.0% | 2.1% |
| Lake | 0.2% | (30,590) | 114,195 | (30,590) | -21.1% | 5,096,773 | 92.3% | 1.4% |
| Lassen | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,800,158 | 120.0% | 12.6% |
| Los Angeles | 35.6% | (4,463,590) | 16,663,232 | (4,463,590) | -21.1% | 732,716,000 | 93.6% | 2.7% |
| Madera | 0.6% | (74,066) | 276,501 | (74,066) | -21.1% | 12,403,899 | 93.2% | 2.3% |
| Marin | 0.3% | (36,775) | 137,288 | (36,775) | -21.1% | 14,327,956 | 93.5% | 0.1% |
| Mariposa | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 1,853,852 | 102.7% | 2.7% |
| Mendocino | 0.1% | (12,451) | 46,481 | (12,451) | -21.1% | 7,692,704 | 106.4% | 6.4% |
| Merced | 0.8% | (102,139) | 381,301 | (102,139) | -21.1% | 17,012,657 | 94.0% | 3.2% |
| Modoc | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 1,406,026 | 109.9% | 6.4% |
| Mono | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,439,564 | 118.3% | 3.1% |
| Monterey | 1.2% | (155,815) | 581,679 | (155,815) | -21.1% | 26,329,760 | 93.9% | 3.1% |
| Napa | 0.2% | (24,326) | 90,814 | (24,326) | -21.1% | 9,258,443 | 89.1% | -4.1% |
| Nevada | 0.3% | (40,328) | 150,552 | (40,328) | -21.1% | 6,599,182 | 86.8% | -4.0% |
| Orange | 9.0% | (1,133,372) | 4,231,043 | (1,133,372) | -21.1% | 188,100,897 | 89.5% | -1.4% |
| Placer | 1.2% | (148,838) | 555,635 | (148,838) | -21.1% | 25,173,699 | 94.3% | 3.5% |
| Plumas | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 1,915,288 | 123.7% | 12.4% |
| Riverside | 6.5% | (818,369) | 3,055,091 | (818,369) | -21.1% | 137,769,987 | 92.5% | 1.6% |
| Sacramento | 5.2% | (650,586) | 2,428,732 | (650,586) | -21.1% | 108,994,310 | 93.5% | 2.6% |
| San Benito | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 4,808,406 | 121.6% | 21.6% |
| San Bernardino | 6.8% | (856,488) | 3,197,395 | (856,488) | -21.1% | 144,252,628 | 95.0% | 4.2% |
| San Diego | 3.6% | (450,204) | 1,680,677 | (450,204) | -21.1% | 173,469,263 | 93.7% | 1.7% |
| San Francisco | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 63,223,112 | 119.9% | 7.9% |
| San Joaquin | 2.5% | (309,334) | 1,154,790 | (309,334) | -21.1% | 51,551,024 | 97.9% | 7.0% |
| San Luis Obispo | 0.9% | (111,772) | 417,260 | (111,772) | -21.1% | 18,799,336 | 98.0% | 7.1% |
| San Mateo | 0.9% | (116,553) | 435,108 | (116,553) | -21.1% | 43,230,138 | 87.4% | -4.5% |
| Santa Barbara | 0.5% | (68,706) | 256,491 | (68,706) | -21.1% | 27,473,701 | 96.7% | 2.8% |
| Santa Clara | 1.9% | (243,848) | 910,319 | (243,848) | -21.1% | 96,100,340 | 99.1% | 6.7% |
| Santa Cruz | 0.7% | (92,845) | 346,603 | (92,845) | -21.1% | 17,003,391 | 99.5% | 8.7% |
| Shasta | 0.7% | (82,092) | 306,461 | (82,092) | -21.1% | 16,360,050 | 95.9% | 5.2% |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | 0.2% | (26,030) | 97,175 | (26,030) | -21.1% | 4,337,478 | 90.7% | -0.2% |
| Solano | 1.0% | (121,219) | 452,530 | (121,219) | -21.1% | 29,080,761 | 92.8% | 2.2% |
| Sonoma | 1.5% | (184,401) | 688,396 | (184,401) | -21.1% | 30,554,941 | 99.8% | 8.9% |
| Stanislaus | 1.5% | (187,985) | 701,775 | (187,985) | -21.1% | 32,303,568 | 93.7% | 2.9% |
| Sutter | 0.4% | (48,630) | 181,543 | (48,630) | -21.1% | 8,115,984 | 88.7% | -2.2% |
| Tehama | 0.2% | (25,759) | 96,164 | (25,759) | -21.1% | 6,113,777 | 95.8% | 5.1% |
| Trinity | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,142,285 | 100.0% | -7.1% |
| Tulare | 1.5% | (190,173) | 709,943 | (190,173) | -21.1% | 32,165,547 | 90.7% | -0.2% |
| Tuolumne | 0.1% | (12,347) | 46,092 | (12,347) | -21.1% | 5,035,705 | 103.1% | 8.6% |
| Ventura | 1.0% | (127,156) | 474,694 | (127,156) | -21.1% | 44,799,549 | 95.3% | 4.6% |
| Yolo | 0.7% | (93,093) | 347,528 | (93,093) | -21.1% | 15,477,267 | 95.7% | 4.9% |
| Yuba | 0.0% | - | - | - | - | 6,239,076 | 106.5% | -6.5% |
| **Total** | **100.0%** | **(12,531,257)** | **46,781,014** | **(12,531,257)** | **-21.1%** | **2,519,621,494** | **94.8%** | **2.7%** |

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor co

[1] Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
  Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.

# 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios - Detail[1]

| Court | SCENARIO 5 Proposed Civil Assessment Redistribution (Proportional reduction on the decrease addressing courts above 100 percent and below the statewide average funding level) | | | | Difference | % Difference | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation | Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage | Workload Formula % Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation Without Civil Assessment Backfill | Workload Formula Percentage | Secondary Civil Assessment Reduction from Scenario 4 to Account for +/- Variances | Total | | | | | |
| | AT | AU | AX | AY | AZ | BA | BB | BC | BD |
| | | (D / C) | | (A + H) | (I - A) | (J / A) | (D + I) | (L / C) | (M - B) |
| Alameda | 89,257,640 | 99.5% | (544,282) | 479,311 | (544,282) | -53.2% | 89,736,951 | 100.0% | 0.4% |
| Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Amador | 4,508,095 | 104.4% | - | - | - | - | 4,508,095 | 104.4% | 4.4% |
| Butte | 13,795,355 | 91.8% | (47,310) | 176,614 | (47,310) | -21.1% | 13,971,969 | 93.0% | 2.4% |
| Calaveras | 3,478,334 | 101.3% | | - | - | - | 3,478,334 | 101.3% | 1.3% |
| Colusa | 2,506,650 | 95.1% | - | - | - | - | 2,506,650 | 95.1% | -10.6% |
| Contra Costa | 52,092,957 | 88.6% | (319,292) | 1,191,962 | (319,292) | -21.1% | 53,284,919 | 90.6% | -0.2% |
| Del Norte | 3,867,982 | 101.2% | - | - | - | - | 3,867,982 | 101.2% | 1.2% |
| El Dorado | 9,424,822 | 89.4% | (27,326) | 102,012 | (27,326) | -21.1% | 9,526,834 | 90.4% | -0.3% |
| Fresno | 62,276,431 | 94.1% | (394,103) | 1,471,244 | (394,103) | -21.1% | 63,747,675 | 96.3% | 5.4% |
| Glenn | 2,997,055 | 93.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,997,055 | 93.0% | -7.0% |
| Humboldt | 8,838,328 | 98.3% | (22,161) | 82,731 | (22,161) | -21.1% | 8,921,059 | 99.2% | 6.8% |
| Imperial | 10,504,378 | 125.6% | - | - | - | - | 10,504,378 | 125.6% | 15.3% |
| Inyo | 2,549,192 | 102.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,549,192 | 102.0% | -7.2% |
| Kern | 62,573,268 | 94.6% | (398,936) | 1,489,285 | (398,936) | -21.1% | 64,062,553 | 96.9% | 6.0% |
| Kings | 10,854,999 | 90.9% | (65,988) | 246,344 | (65,988) | -21.1% | 11,101,344 | 93.0% | 2.1% |
| Lake | 4,982,578 | 90.2% | (30,590) | 114,195 | (30,590) | -21.1% | 5,096,773 | 92.3% | 1.4% |
| Lassen | 2,800,158 | 120.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,800,158 | 120.0% | 12.6% |
| Los Angeles | 716,052,768 | 91.5% | (4,463,590) | 16,663,232 | (4,463,590) | -21.1% | 732,716,000 | 93.6% | 2.7% |
| Madera | 12,127,398 | 91.1% | (74,066) | 276,501 | (74,066) | -21.1% | 12,403,899 | 93.2% | 2.3% |
| Marin | 14,190,668 | 92.6% | (36,775) | 137,288 | (36,775) | -21.1% | 14,327,956 | 93.5% | 0.1% |
| Mariposa | 1,853,852 | 102.7% | - | - | - | - | 1,853,852 | 102.7% | 2.7% |
| Mendocino | 7,646,223 | 105.7% | (58,932) | 0 | (58,932) | -100.0% | 7,646,223 | 105.7% | 5.7% |
| Merced | 16,631,356 | 91.9% | (102,139) | 381,301 | (102,139) | -21.1% | 17,012,657 | 94.0% | 3.2% |
| Modoc | 1,406,026 | 109.9% | - | - | - | - | 1,406,026 | 109.9% | 6.4% |
| Mono | 2,439,564 | 118.3% | - | - | - | - | 2,439,564 | 118.3% | 3.1% |
| Monterey | 25,748,081 | 91.9% | (155,815) | 581,679 | (155,815) | -21.1% | 26,329,760 | 93.9% | 3.1% |
| Napa | 9,167,629 | 88.3% | - | 115,140 | - | 0.0% | 9,282,770 | 89.4% | -3.9% |
| Nevada | 6,448,630 | 84.9% | - | 190,881 | - | 0.0% | 6,639,511 | 87.4% | -3.5% |
| Orange | 183,869,854 | 87.5% | (942,615) | 4,421,800 | (942,615) | -17.6% | 188,291,654 | 89.6% | -1.3% |
| Placer | 24,618,065 | 92.3% | (148,838) | 555,635 | (148,838) | -21.1% | 25,173,699 | 94.3% | 3.5% |
| Plumas | 1,915,288 | 123.7% | - | - | - | - | 1,915,288 | 123.7% | 12.4% |
| Riverside | 134,714,896 | 90.4% | (818,369) | 3,055,091 | (818,369) | -21.1% | 137,769,987 | 92.5% | 1.6% |
| Sacramento | 106,565,577 | 91.4% | (650,586) | 2,428,732 | (650,586) | -21.1% | 108,994,310 | 93.5% | 2.6% |
| San Benito | 4,808,406 | 121.6% | - | - | - | - | 4,808,406 | 121.6% | 21.6% |
| San Bernardino | 141,055,233 | 92.9% | (856,488) | 3,197,395 | (856,488) | -21.1% | 144,252,628 | 95.0% | 4.2% |
| San Diego | 171,788,586 | 92.8% | (450,204) | 1,680,677 | (450,204) | -21.1% | 173,469,263 | 93.7% | 1.7% |
| San Francisco | 63,223,112 | 119.9% | - | - | - | - | 63,223,112 | 119.9% | 7.9% |
| San Joaquin | 50,396,234 | 95.7% | (309,334) | 1,154,790 | (309,334) | -21.1% | 51,551,024 | 97.9% | 7.0% |
| San Luis Obispo | 18,382,076 | 95.8% | (111,772) | 417,260 | (111,772) | -21.1% | 18,799,336 | 98.0% | 7.1% |
| San Mateo | 42,795,030 | 86.5% | - | 551,661 | - | 0.0% | 43,346,691 | 87.7% | -4.3% |
| Santa Barbara | 27,217,209 | 95.8% | (68,706) | 256,491 | (68,706) | -21.1% | 27,473,701 | 96.7% | 2.8% |
| Santa Clara | 95,190,021 | 98.2% | (243,848) | 910,319 | (243,848) | -21.1% | 96,100,340 | 99.1% | 6.7% |
| Santa Cruz | 16,656,788 | 97.5% | (92,845) | 346,603 | (92,845) | -21.1% | 17,003,391 | 99.5% | 8.7% |
| Shasta | 16,053,589 | 94.1% | (82,092) | 306,461 | (82,092) | -21.1% | 16,360,050 | 95.9% | 5.2% |
| Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Siskiyou | 4,240,304 | 88.6% | (26,030) | 97,175 | (26,030) | -21.1% | 4,337,478 | 90.7% | -0.2% |
| Solano | 28,628,231 | 91.4% | (121,219) | 452,530 | (121,219) | -21.1% | 29,080,761 | 92.8% | 2.2% |
| Sonoma | 29,866,544 | 97.5% | (184,401) | 688,396 | (184,401) | -21.1% | 30,554,941 | 99.8% | 8.9% |
| Stanislaus | 31,601,794 | 91.7% | (187,985) | 701,775 | (187,985) | -21.1% | 32,303,568 | 93.7% | 2.9% |
| Sutter | 7,934,441 | 86.7% | - | 230,173 | - | 0.0% | 8,164,614 | 89.2% | -1.7% |
| Tehama | 6,017,613 | 94.3% | (25,759) | 96,164 | (25,759) | -21.1% | 6,113,777 | 95.8% | 5.1% |
| Trinity | 2,142,285 | 100.0% | - | - | - | - | 2,142,285 | 100.0% | -7.1% |
| Tulare | 31,455,605 | 88.7% | (190,173) | 709,943 | (190,173) | -21.1% | 32,165,547 | 90.7% | -0.2% |
| Tuolumne | 4,989,613 | 102.1% | (58,439) | 0 | (58,439) | -100.0% | 4,989,613 | 102.1% | 7.7% |
| Ventura | 44,324,856 | 94.3% | (127,156) | 474,694 | (127,156) | -21.1% | 44,799,549 | 95.3% | 4.6% |
| Yolo | 15,129,739 | 93.6% | (93,093) | 347,528 | (93,093) | -21.1% | 15,477,267 | 95.7% | 4.9% |
| Yuba | 6,239,076 | 106.5% | - | - | - | - | 6,239,076 | 106.5% | -6.5% |
| **Total** | **2,472,840,480** | **93.0%** | **(12,531,257)** | **46,781,014** | **(12,531,257)** | **-21.1%** | **2,519,621,494** | **94.8%** | **2.7%** |

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor co

[1] Scenarios are before funding floor adjustments.
  Workload Formula percentage differences take into account changes that took place from 2022-23 and 2023-24, changes in workload need, and proposed inflationary funding.