



Judicial Council of California
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**MATERIALS FOR MAY 25, 2023
VIRTUAL MEETING**

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the May 4, 2023 Meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items (Item 1)	
Item 1 – 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding Allocation (Action Required).....	7
Attachment A: 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Summary	12
Attachment B: 2023 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Detail	14
Attachment C: 2023-24 Supplemental Civil Assessment Scenario – Summary	19
Attachment D: 2023 Supplemental Civil Assessment Scenario – Detail	20



Judicial Council of California
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@jud.ca.gov

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY 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: Thursday, May 25, 2023
Time: 3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Public Video Livestream: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/2809>

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 emailed to tcbac@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 4, 2023 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) 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 tcbac@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by 3:30 p.m. on May 24, 2023 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)

Item 1

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

Consideration of a Funding Methodology Subcommittee recommendation for the civil assessment backfill funding for 2023-24 and ongoing.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Rose Lane, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

None

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



Judicial Council of California
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm

tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

May 4, 2023

12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/2735>

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Michael A. Sachs, Hon. Kimberly A. Gaab, Hon. Patricia L. Kelly, Hon. Erick L. Larsh, Hon. Michael J. Reinhart, Hon. Kevin M. Seibert, and Hon. Kimberly Merrifield.

Executive Officers: Ms. Rebecca Fleming (Vice Chair), Ms. Krista LeVier, Mr. Brandon E. Riley, Mr. Chris Ruhl, Mr. Neal Taniguchi, Ms. Stephanie Cameron, Mr. Chad Finke, and Mr. Shawn Landry, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Wendy G. Getty, Hon. Jill C. Fannin, Ms. Kim Bartleson, and Mr. James Kim.

Others Present: Hon. David Kalemkarian, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Brandy Olivera, Mr. Jessie Romine, and Ms. Rose Lane.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair welcomed the members, called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved minutes from the April 21, 2023 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-7)

Item 1 – 2023-24 Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocation Methodology (Action Required)

Consideration of a Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommendation on a methodology for 2023-24 CARE Act allocations.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Don Will, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) at its May 17, 2023 meeting:

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 the 2023-24 allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for court-appointed dependency counsel.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Audrey Fancy, Principal Managing Attorney, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the recommended court-appointed dependency counsel allocations as outlined in Attachment 2A for consideration by the Budget Committee at its May 17, 2023 meeting.

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

Consideration of the 2023-24 methodologies and allocations for the child support commissioner and family law facilitator programs.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Anna Maves, Supervising Attorney, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted on the following for consideration by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee at its May 17, 2023 meeting:

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 Pretrial Allocations and Funding Floor (Action Required)

Consideration of the 2023-24 pretrial allocations and funding floor adjustment.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Deirdre Benedict, Supervising Analyst, Judicial Council Criminal Justice Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the 2023-24 allocations for Pretrial Release funding, as outlined in Attachment 4A, for consideration by the Budget Committee at its May 17, 2023 meeting.

Item 5 – 2023-24 Court Reporter Allocations (Action Required)

Consideration of the 2023-24 allocations for the \$30 million court reporter funding.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Chris Belloli, Manager, Judicial Council Business Management Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve the allocation of the \$30 million 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 5A for consideration by the Budget Committee at its May 17, 2023 meeting.

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

Consideration of Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee recommendations on 2023-24 allocations from the IMF.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Mike Sun, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to adopt a recommendation to approve a total of \$45.2 million in preliminary allocations for 2023-24 from the IMF as outlined in Attachment 6A for consideration by the Budget Committee at its May 17, 2023 meeting.

Item 7 – 2023-24 Allocations from the TCTF and Trial Court Allocations (Action Required)

Consideration of R&E Subcommittee recommendations on 2023-24 allocations from the TCTF, and consideration of 2023-24 trial court allocations, including proposed funding, interpreter funding, and the Workload Formula from the TCTF, State Court Facilities Construction Fund, and General Fund.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: TCBAC unanimously voted to approve base, discretionary, and non-discretionary programs from the TCTF of \$3 billion (Attachment 7B, column AG), excluding the proposed 2023-24 civil assessment backfill allocation in Attachment 7B, columns F, G, and H; and a Workload Allocation of \$2.5 billion based on methodologies approved by the Judicial Council (Attachment 7C, column AA), excluding the proposed 2023-24 civil assessment backfill allocation in Attachment C, columns S, T, and U. The civil assessment

backfill allocation will be sent back to the FMS and the TCBAC to consider alternatives allocation methodologies, all for consideration by the Budget Committee.

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.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Nick Armstrong, Senior Research Analyst, Judicial Council Business Management Services

Action: *No action taken.*

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:11 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on .

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
(Action Item)

Title: 2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding Allocation
Date: 5/19/2023
Contact: Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services
916-643-8027 | oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov

Issue

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

Background

2022-23 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding

On June 15, 2022, the FMS¹ approved a \$110 million civil assessment backfill allocation methodology for 2022-23 that was considered by the TCBAC, the Budget Committee, and approved by the council as follows:

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.

¹ FMS meeting materials (June 15, 2022), [tcbac-20220615-fms-materials.pdf \(ca.gov\)](#); FMS meeting minutes (June 15, 2022), [Minutes Open \(ca.gov\)](#).

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
(Action Item)

2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Funding

Per the 2022 Budget Act, effective in 2023-24, the civil assessment backfill amount decreases by \$10 million to \$100 million ongoing. In addition, the backfill amount is reduced by an additional \$2.5 million for debt service obligation payments as approved by the Judicial Council at its May 12, 2023 business meeting². As a result, there is a total \$12.5 million reduction to the amount of backfill funding available for allocation, which is the focus of the allocation methodology recommendation for the committee's consideration.

Initial 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 year³. 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 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 which raised concerns for the committee due to the volatility and lack of stability of this funding in relation to the backfill allocations that were made in 2022-23. This allocation was directed back to the FMS to further consider options for an ongoing allocation methodology.

2023-24 Civil Assessment Backfill Allocation Methodology Scenarios

On May 18, 2023, the FMS met to consider four allocation scenarios for the civil assessment backfill funding. Two of them assumed that the amount to be allocated is \$46.8 million (*\$110 million in 2022-23 – \$10 million ongoing reduction effective 2023-24 – \$48.3 million MOE already included in the Workload Formula – \$4.9 million for debt service obligations = \$46.8 million remaining*). The other two scenarios assumed that the amount to be allocated is a reduction of \$12.5 million (*\$10 million ongoing reduction effective 2023-24 + \$2.5 million increase for a debt service obligation = a \$12.5 million reduction*).

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

² Judicial Council meeting materials (May 21, 2023), [23-087 - 20230512-23-087 \(legistar.com\)](https://legistar.com/23-087-20230512-23-087).

³ TCBAC meeting materials (May 18, 2023), [tcbac-202305018-fms-materials.pdf \(ca.gov\)](https://tcbac-202305018-fms-materials.pdf).

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
(Action Item)

adjustments for these two base funding floor courts. A summary of the four scenarios described below is included as Attachment A. Detailed calculations and comparisons of the scenarios are included as Attachment B.

The FMS 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 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.

Methodology Scenarios Considered

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 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 calculation⁴.

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 TCBAC for consideration due to concerns about volatility and lack of funding stability compared to the prior year's allocation for civil assessment backfill.

⁴ 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.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
(Action Item)

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 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. 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 to the TCBAC for consideration. The motion failed with a five “no” and four “yes” vote.

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

This scenario allocates the \$46.8 million (as described above) 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 TCBAC 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 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.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
(Action Item)

This scenario was motioned and seconded to move forward to the TCBAC for consideration and passed with a five “yes” and four “no” vote.

Supplemental Scenario for Discussion

At the FMS meeting on May 18, 2023, members noted concerns about courts going over 100 percent of the statewide funding percentage due to civil assessment backfill funding as well as courts below the statewide average funding level. Following the meeting, the cochairs of the subcommittee directed Judicial Council Budget Services staff to develop a supplemental scenario, which is a variation of Scenario 4, that addresses this issue.

This supplemental scenario, outlined in Attachment C (and detailed in Attachment D) increases the amount of the \$12.5 million reduction for three courts in the amount of \$421,000⁵, and decreases the reduction amount for five courts below the statewide average funding level⁶. As a result, the lowest funded court would be at 87.4 percent of workload need.

Recommendation

Approve a recommendation from the FMS to implement Scenario 4, an ongoing \$12.5 million reduction in civil assessment backfill funding that is proportional based on courts’ percent of 2022-23 civil assessment backfill funding, effective July 1, 2023, for consideration by the Budget Committee and then the Judicial Council.

Attachments

1. **Attachment A:** 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Summary
2. **Attachment B:** 2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios – Detail
3. **Attachment C:** 2023-24 Supplemental Civil Assessment Scenario – Summary
4. **Attachment D:** 2023-24 Supplemental Civil Assessment Scenario – Detail

⁵ The three courts are Alameda, Mendocino, and Tuolumne Superior Courts.

⁶ The five courts are Napa, Nevada, Orange, San Mateo, and Sutter Superior Courts.

2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios - Summary¹

Court	2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Nov 22)	2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 1		SCENARIO 2		SCENARIO 3		SCENARIO 4	
			Allocation via Workload Formula Methodology	Workload Formula Percentage	Reduction Using Workload Formula Methodology	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 3 (Proportional based on Workload Formula allocation)	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 4 (Proportional reduction on the decrease)	Workload Formula Percentage
Alameda	1,023,593	99.6%	479,311	100.0%	803,637	100.4%	1,688,569	101.3%	807,332	100.4%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	100.0%	-	104.4%	-	104.4%	85,284	106.4%	-	104.4%
Butte	223,924	90.6%	172,505	93.0%	139,107	92.8%	260,980	93.6%	176,614	93.0%
Calaveras	-	100.0%	-	101.3%	-	101.3%	65,803	103.2%	-	101.3%
Colusa	-	105.7%	128,917	100.0%	-	95.1%	47,421	96.9%	-	95.1%
Contra Costa	1,511,254	90.9%	2,288,839	92.5%	1,185,908	90.6%	985,491	90.3%	1,191,962	90.6%
Del Norte	-	100.0%	-	101.2%	-	101.2%	73,174	103.1%	-	101.2%
El Dorado	129,338	90.8%	303,163	92.3%	70,720	90.1%	178,298	91.1%	102,012	90.4%
Fresno	1,865,347	90.9%	613,103	95.0%	1,703,106	96.7%	1,178,141	95.9%	1,471,244	96.3%
Glenn	-	100.0%	225,179	100.0%	-	93.0%	56,698	94.8%	-	93.0%
Humboldt	104,892	92.4%	83,308	99.2%	82,847	99.2%	167,203	100.1%	82,731	99.2%
Imperial	-	110.3%	-	125.6%	-	125.6%	198,721	128.0%	-	125.6%
Inyo	-	109.2%	-	102.0%	-	102.0%	48,225	103.9%	-	102.0%
Kern	1,888,221	90.9%	612,560	95.5%	1,726,124	97.2%	1,183,756	96.4%	1,489,285	96.9%
Kings	312,333	90.9%	191,706	92.5%	245,303	93.0%	205,354	92.7%	246,344	93.0%
Lake	144,785	90.9%	117,321	92.4%	113,914	92.3%	94,260	91.9%	114,195	92.3%
Lassen	-	107.4%	-	120.0%	-	120.0%	52,973	122.3%	-	120.0%
Los Angeles	21,126,821	90.9%	10,259,424	92.8%	16,716,346	93.6%	13,546,233	93.2%	16,663,232	93.6%
Madera	350,567	90.9%	200,196	92.6%	275,740	93.2%	229,425	92.8%	276,501	93.2%
Marin	174,063	93.5%	145,988	93.6%	87,140	93.2%	268,458	94.4%	137,288	93.5%
Mariposa	-	100.0%	-	102.7%	-	102.7%	35,071	104.6%	-	102.7%
Mendocino	58,932	100.0%	-	105.7%	41,206	106.3%	144,651	107.7%	46,481	106.4%
Merced	483,440	90.9%	202,237	93.0%	381,228	94.0%	314,631	93.7%	381,301	94.0%
Modoc	-	103.5%	-	109.9%	-	109.9%	26,599	112.0%	-	109.9%
Mono	-	115.2%	-	118.3%	-	118.3%	46,151	120.6%	-	118.3%
Monterey	737,493	90.9%	319,197	93.0%	579,207	93.9%	487,100	93.6%	581,679	93.9%
Napa	115,140	93.3%	453,612	92.6%	57,786	88.8%	173,433	89.9%	90,814	89.1%
Nevada	190,881	90.9%	694,505	94.0%	149,820	86.8%	121,995	86.5%	150,552	86.8%
Orange	5,364,415	90.9%	11,709,412	93.1%	4,209,567	89.5%	3,478,436	89.1%	4,231,043	89.5%
Placer	704,473	90.9%	273,346	93.3%	553,406	94.3%	465,723	94.0%	555,635	94.3%
Plumas	-	111.3%	-	123.7%	-	123.7%	36,233	126.0%	-	123.7%
Riverside	3,873,460	90.9%	2,901,326	92.4%	3,039,667	92.5%	2,548,526	92.2%	3,055,091	92.5%
Sacramento	3,079,318	90.9%	1,569,922	92.7%	2,422,707	93.5%	2,016,000	93.1%	2,428,732	93.5%
San Benito	-	100.0%	-	121.6%	-	121.6%	90,965	123.9%	-	121.6%
San Bernardino	4,053,883	90.9%	1,410,211	93.9%	3,191,014	95.0%	2,668,472	94.7%	3,197,395	95.0%
San Diego	2,130,881	92.0%	1,741,675	93.7%	1,079,176	93.3%	3,249,884	94.5%	1,680,677	93.7%
San Francisco	-	112.0%	-	119.9%	-	119.9%	1,196,050	122.2%	-	119.9%
San Joaquin	1,464,125	90.9%	487,800	96.6%	1,335,042	98.2%	953,392	97.5%	1,154,790	97.9%
San Luis Obispo	529,032	90.9%	177,741	96.7%	481,998	98.3%	347,751	97.6%	417,260	98.0%
San Mateo	551,661	91.9%	3,600,398	93.8%	281,567	87.1%	809,593	88.2%	435,108	87.4%

¹ See Attachment B for additional information.

2023-24 Civil Assessment Scenarios - Summary¹

Court	2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Nov 22)	2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 1		SCENARIO 2		SCENARIO 3		SCENARIO 4	
			Allocation via Workload Formula Methodology	Workload Formula Percentage	Reduction Using Workload Formula Methodology	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 3 (Proportional based on Workload Formula allocation)	Workload Formula Percentage	SCENARIO 4 (Proportional reduction on the decrease)	Workload Formula Percentage
Santa Barbara	325,198	93.9%	263,262	96.7%	255,533	96.7%	514,893	97.6%	256,491	96.7%
Santa Clara	1,154,167	92.5%	898,157	99.1%	916,494	99.1%	1,800,798	100.0%	910,319	99.1%
Santa Cruz	439,448	90.8%	158,320	98.4%	397,553	99.8%	315,112	99.3%	346,603	99.5%
Shasta	388,554	90.7%	158,042	95.0%	346,732	96.1%	303,701	95.9%	306,461	95.9%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	123,205	90.9%	185,101	92.5%	96,725	90.6%	80,218	90.3%	97,175	90.7%
Solano	573,749	90.6%	421,134	92.7%	397,357	92.7%	541,587	93.1%	452,530	92.8%
Sonoma	872,797	90.9%	283,614	98.5%	797,747	100.1%	565,013	99.4%	688,396	99.8%
Stanislaus	889,759	90.9%	417,712	92.9%	695,314	93.7%	597,840	93.4%	701,775	93.7%
Sutter	230,173	90.9%	637,404	93.7%	180,138	88.7%	150,103	88.3%	181,543	88.7%
Tehama	121,923	90.6%	59,130	95.2%	106,276	95.9%	113,841	96.0%	96,164	95.8%
Trinity	-	107.1%	-	100.0%	-	100.0%	40,528	101.9%	-	100.0%
Tulare	900,115	90.9%	1,351,267	92.5%	703,722	90.7%	595,075	90.3%	709,943	90.7%
Tuolumne	58,439	94.4%	-	102.1%	46,465	103.1%	94,393	104.1%	46,092	103.1%
Ventura	601,850	90.7%	435,232	95.3%	486,678	95.4%	838,534	96.1%	474,694	95.3%
Yolo	440,621	90.9%	149,737	94.5%	400,997	96.1%	286,223	95.4%	347,528	95.7%
Yuba	-	113.0%	-	106.5%	-	106.5%	118,030	108.5%	-	106.5%
Total	59,312,271	92.1%	46,781,014	94.8%	46,781,014	94.8%	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.

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
	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)				
Alameda	-	-	1,023,593	1,023,593	88,386,879	88,721,292	99.6%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	3,977,297	3,977,456	100.0%
Butte	-	53,273	170,652	223,924	13,403,821	14,791,477	90.6%
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	3,287,713	3,287,845	100.0%
Colusa	-	-	-	-	2,369,916	2,241,285	105.7%
Contra Costa	-	852,977	658,277	1,511,254	51,852,508	57,057,062	90.9%
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	3,721,741	3,721,891	100.0%
El Dorado	-	9,848	119,490	129,338	9,400,356	10,356,971	90.8%
Fresno	-	1,052,833	812,514	1,865,347	64,001,776	70,425,780	90.9%
Glenn	-	-	-	-	2,913,222	2,913,338	100.0%
Humboldt	-	-	104,892	104,892	8,400,951	9,091,694	92.4%
Imperial	-	-	-	-	10,127,636	9,180,484	110.3%
Inyo	-	-	-	-	2,464,602	2,257,443	109.2%
Kern	-	1,065,743	822,478	1,888,221	64,786,602	71,289,380	90.9%
Kings	-	176,286	136,047	312,333	10,716,430	11,792,062	90.9%
Lake	-	81,719	63,066	144,785	4,967,700	5,466,319	90.9%
Lassen	-	-	-	-	2,505,447	2,332,455	107.4%
Los Angeles	-	11,924,329	9,202,493	21,126,821	724,880,656	797,638,572	90.9%
Madera	-	197,866	152,701	350,567	12,028,282	13,235,588	90.9%
Marin	-	-	174,063	174,063	14,100,425	15,087,150	93.5%
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	1,809,864	1,809,937	100.0%
Mendocino	-	-	58,932	58,932	7,650,910	7,651,217	100.0%
Merced	-	272,862	210,579	483,440	16,587,283	18,252,186	90.9%
Modoc	-	-	-	-	1,328,965	1,284,287	103.5%
Mono	-	-	-	-	2,346,825	2,037,226	115.2%
Monterey	-	416,253	321,240	737,493	25,304,074	27,843,901	90.9%
Napa	-	-	115,140	115,140	9,308,622	9,979,950	93.3%
Nevada	-	107,736	83,144	190,881	6,549,288	7,206,655	90.9%
Orange	-	3,027,765	2,336,650	5,364,415	184,058,006	202,532,326	90.9%
Placer	-	397,616	306,857	704,473	24,171,119	26,597,230	90.9%
Plumas	-	-	-	-	1,851,510	1,663,727	111.3%
Riverside	-	2,186,245	1,687,215	3,873,460	132,901,973	146,241,646	90.9%
Sacramento	-	1,738,018	1,341,300	3,079,318	105,654,241	116,258,997	90.9%
San Benito	-	-	-	-	4,662,251	4,662,438	100.0%
San Bernardino	-	2,288,079	1,765,804	4,053,883	139,092,454	153,053,479	90.9%
San Diego	-	-	2,130,881	2,130,881	169,886,475	184,697,021	92.0%
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	63,648,429	56,836,452	112.0%
San Joaquin	-	826,376	637,748	1,464,125	50,235,466	55,277,714	90.9%
San Luis Obispo	-	298,594	230,437	529,032	18,151,569	19,973,484	90.9%
San Mateo	-	-	551,661	551,661	43,950,939	47,815,932	91.9%
Santa Barbara	-	-	325,198	325,198	26,458,643	28,186,948	93.9%
Santa Clara	-	-	1,154,167	1,154,167	92,486,457	100,038,958	92.5%
Santa Cruz	-	231,784	207,664	439,448	16,342,609	17,999,527	90.8%
Shasta	-	190,401	198,153	388,554	15,583,110	17,175,140	90.7%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	69,539	53,666	123,205	4,227,273	4,651,574	90.9%
Solano	-	214,450	359,299	573,749	28,222,823	31,142,713	90.6%
Sonoma	-	492,621	380,176	872,797	29,946,481	32,952,277	90.9%
Stanislaus	-	496,232	393,528	889,759	30,992,431	34,109,559	90.9%
Sutter	-	129,913	100,259	230,173	7,897,431	8,690,114	90.9%
Tehama	-	48,516	73,407	121,923	5,766,918	6,362,648	90.6%
Trinity	-	-	-	-	2,063,314	1,926,810	107.1%
Tulare	-	508,040	392,075	900,115	30,883,782	33,983,658	90.9%
Tuolumne	-	-	58,439	58,439	4,783,130	5,065,303	94.4%
Ventura	-	51,527	550,323	601,850	43,286,773	47,700,002	90.7%
Yolo	-	248,694	191,927	440,621	15,118,113	16,635,553	90.9%
Yuba	-	-	-	-	5,992,602	5,301,565	113.0%
Total	-	29,656,136	29,656,136	59,312,271	2,467,496,113	2,678,463,698	92.1%

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 TCBC)				Difference	Workload Formula % Difference	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation	2023-24 Workload Formula	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						
	H	I	J	K (H + I + J)	L (K - D)	M (L / D)	N	O	P (N / O)	Q (P - G)
	Alameda	-	-	479,311	479,311	(544,281)	-53.2%	89,736,951	89,736,951	100.0%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,508,095	4,318,194	104.4%	4.4%
Butte	-	33,376	139,129	172,505	(51,420)	-23.0%	13,967,859	15,020,326	93.0%	2.4%
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,478,334	3,434,244	101.3%	1.3%
Colusa	128,917	-	-	128,917	128,917	-	2,635,567	2,635,567	100.0%	-5.7%
Contra Costa	-	1,744,265	544,574	2,288,839	777,585	51.5%	54,381,796	58,792,180	92.5%	1.6%
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,867,982	3,822,121	101.2%	1.2%
El Dorado	-	205,566	97,597	303,163	173,825	134.4%	9,727,986	10,536,589	92.3%	1.6%
Fresno	-	-	613,103	613,103	(1,252,245)	-67.1%	62,889,533	66,190,564	95.0%	4.1%
Glenn	225,179	-	-	225,179	225,179	-	3,222,234	3,222,234	100.0%	0.0%
Humboldt	-	-	83,308	83,308	(21,584)	-20.6%	8,921,636	8,993,983	99.2%	6.8%
Imperial	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,504,378	8,363,980	125.6%	15.3%
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,549,192	2,499,943	102.0%	-7.2%
Kern	-	-	612,560	612,560	(1,275,661)	-67.6%	63,185,827	66,131,988	95.5%	4.7%
Kings	-	81,131	110,575	191,706	(120,627)	-38.6%	11,046,705	11,937,681	92.5%	1.7%
Lake	-	66,172	51,149	117,321	(27,464)	-19.0%	5,099,899	5,522,043	92.4%	1.5%
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,800,158	2,332,823	120.0%	12.6%
Los Angeles	-	3,007,563	7,251,860	10,259,424	(10,867,398)	-51.4%	726,312,192	782,911,052	92.8%	1.9%
Madera	-	76,886	123,310	200,196	(150,371)	-42.9%	12,327,594	13,312,566	92.6%	1.7%
Marin	-	4,104	141,885	145,988	(28,075)	-16.1%	14,336,656	15,317,860	93.6%	0.1%
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,853,852	1,805,697	102.7%	2.7%
Mendocino	-	-	-	-	(58,932)	-100.0%	7,646,223	7,231,739	105.7%	5.7%
Merced	-	34,666	167,571	202,237	(281,203)	-58.2%	16,833,593	18,090,994	93.0%	2.2%
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,406,026	1,279,449	109.9%	6.4%
Mono	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,439,564	2,061,575	118.3%	3.1%
Monterey	-	59,598	259,599	319,197	(418,296)	-56.7%	26,067,278	28,026,310	93.0%	2.1%
Napa	-	357,402	96,210	453,612	338,472	294.0%	9,621,242	10,386,823	92.6%	-0.6%
Nevada	-	624,111	70,394	694,505	503,625	263.8%	7,143,135	7,599,777	94.0%	3.1%
Orange	-	9,762,638	1,946,774	11,709,412	6,344,997	118.3%	195,579,266	210,173,824	93.1%	2.2%
Placer	-	26,171	247,175	273,346	(431,127)	-61.2%	24,891,411	26,685,022	93.3%	2.4%
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,915,288	1,548,909	123.7%	12.4%
Riverside	-	1,521,723	1,379,603	2,901,326	(972,134)	-25.1%	137,616,222	148,941,935	92.4%	1.5%
Sacramento	-	489,808	1,080,114	1,569,922	(1,509,397)	-49.0%	108,135,499	116,609,120	92.7%	1.9%
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,808,406	3,952,945	121.6%	21.6%
San Bernardino	-	4,235	1,405,976	1,410,211	(2,643,672)	-65.2%	142,465,444	151,789,230	93.9%	3.0%
San Diego	-	26,201	1,715,473	1,741,675	(389,207)	-18.3%	173,530,260	185,202,539	93.7%	1.7%
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	-	-	63,223,112	52,730,196	119.9%	7.9%
San Joaquin	-	-	487,800	487,800	(976,324)	-66.7%	50,884,034	52,662,950	96.6%	5.7%
San Luis Obispo	-	-	177,741	177,741	(351,291)	-66.4%	18,559,817	19,188,902	96.7%	5.8%
San Mateo	-	3,142,338	458,060	3,600,398	3,048,737	552.6%	46,395,428	49,452,194	93.8%	1.9%
Santa Barbara	-	-	263,262	263,262	(61,936)	-19.0%	27,480,471	28,421,722	96.7%	2.8%
Santa Clara	-	-	898,157	898,157	(256,010)	-22.2%	96,088,178	96,965,024	99.1%	6.6%
Santa Cruz	-	-	158,320	158,320	(281,128)	-64.0%	16,815,108	17,092,256	98.4%	7.6%
Shasta	-	-	158,042	158,042	(230,511)	-59.3%	16,211,631	17,062,242	95.0%	4.3%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	140,783	44,318	185,101	61,896	50.2%	4,425,405	4,784,619	92.5%	1.6%
Solano	-	130,980	290,154	421,134	(152,615)	-26.6%	29,049,365	31,325,060	92.7%	2.1%
Sonoma	-	-	283,614	283,614	(589,183)	-67.5%	30,150,159	30,618,988	98.5%	7.6%
Stanislaus	-	98,435	319,277	417,712	(472,048)	-53.1%	32,019,505	34,469,129	92.9%	2.0%
Sutter	-	552,637	84,766	637,404	407,231	176.9%	8,571,845	9,151,367	93.7%	2.8%
Tehama	-	-	59,130	59,130	(62,793)	-51.5%	6,076,743	6,383,645	95.2%	4.6%
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,142,285	2,141,889	100.0%	-7.1%
Tulare	-	1,022,670	328,597	1,351,267	451,152	50.1%	32,806,872	35,475,356	92.5%	1.6%
Tuolumne	-	-	-	-	(58,439)	-100.0%	4,989,613	4,885,338	102.1%	7.7%
Ventura	-	-	435,232	435,232	(166,618)	-27.7%	44,760,088	46,987,643	95.3%	4.5%
Yolo	-	-	149,737	149,737	(290,884)	-66.0%	15,279,476	16,165,652	94.5%	3.6%
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,239,076	5,858,507	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	2,658,241,455	94.8%	2.7%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor co

¹Scenarios 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 W (V - D)	Workload Formula % Difference X (D - V / D)	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation Y	2023-24 Workload Formula Z	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage AA (Y / Z)	Workload Formula % Difference AB (AA - G)
	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						
	R	S	T	U (R + S + T)	V (D + U)						
Alameda	-	-	(219,956)	(219,956)	803,637	(219,956)	-21.5%	90,061,277	89,736,951	100.4%	0.7%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,508,095	4,318,194	104.4%	4.4%
Butte	-	(48,001)	(36,817)	(84,817)	139,107	(84,817)	-37.9%	13,934,462	15,020,326	92.8%	2.2%
Calaveras	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,478,334	3,434,244	101.3%	1.3%
Colusa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,506,650	2,635,567	95.1%	-10.6%
Contra Costa	-	(181,239)	(144,107)	(325,345)	1,185,908	(325,345)	-21.5%	53,278,865	58,792,180	90.6%	-0.3%
Del Norte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,867,982	3,822,121	101.2%	1.2%
El Dorado	-	(32,791)	(25,826)	(58,618)	70,720	(58,618)	-45.3%	9,495,543	10,536,589	90.1%	-0.6%
Fresno	-	-	(162,241)	(162,241)	1,703,106	(162,241)	-8.7%	63,979,537	66,190,564	96.7%	5.8%
Glenn	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,997,055	3,222,234	93.0%	-7.0%
Humboldt	-	-	(22,045)	(22,045)	82,847	(22,045)	-21.0%	8,921,175	8,993,983	99.2%	6.8%
Imperial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10,504,378	8,363,980	125.6%	15.3%
Inyo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,549,192	2,499,943	102.0%	-7.2%
Kern	-	-	(162,097)	(162,097)	1,726,124	(162,097)	-8.6%	64,299,391	66,131,988	97.2%	6.4%
Kings	-	(37,769)	(29,261)	(67,029)	245,303	(67,029)	-21.5%	11,100,303	11,937,681	93.0%	2.1%
Lake	-	(17,336)	(13,535)	(30,871)	113,914	(30,871)	-21.3%	5,096,492	5,522,043	92.3%	1.4%
Lassen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,800,158	2,332,823	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	782,911,052	93.6%	2.7%
Madera	-	(42,196)	(32,631)	(74,827)	275,740	(74,827)	-21.3%	12,403,139	13,312,566	93.2%	2.3%
Marin	-	(49,377)	(37,546)	(86,923)	87,140	(86,923)	-49.9%	14,277,808	15,317,860	93.2%	-0.2%
Mariposa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,853,852	1,805,697	102.7%	2.7%
Mendocino	-	-	(17,726)	(17,726)	41,206	(17,726)	-30.1%	7,687,429	7,231,739	106.3%	6.3%
Merced	-	(57,869)	(44,343)	(102,212)	381,228	(102,212)	-21.1%	17,012,584	18,090,994	94.0%	3.2%
Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,406,026	1,279,449	109.9%	6.4%
Mono	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,439,564	2,061,575	118.3%	3.1%
Monterey	-	(89,590)	(68,696)	(158,286)	579,207	(158,286)	-21.5%	26,327,288	28,026,310	93.9%	3.1%
Napa	-	(31,895)	(25,459)	(57,354)	57,786	(57,354)	-49.8%	9,225,415	10,386,823	88.8%	-4.5%
Nevada	-	(22,433)	(18,628)	(41,061)	149,820	(41,061)	-21.5%	6,598,450	7,599,777	86.8%	-4.1%
Orange	-	(639,687)	(515,161)	(1,154,848)	4,209,567	(1,154,848)	-21.5%	188,079,421	210,173,824	89.5%	-1.4%
Placer	-	(85,659)	(65,408)	(151,067)	553,406	(151,067)	-21.4%	25,171,470	26,685,022	94.3%	3.4%
Plumas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,915,288	1,548,909	123.7%	12.4%
Riverside	-	(468,719)	(365,074)	(833,793)	3,039,667	(833,793)	-21.5%	137,754,563	148,941,935	92.5%	1.6%
Sacramento	-	(370,789)	(285,823)	(656,611)	2,422,707	(656,611)	-21.3%	108,988,284	116,609,120	93.5%	2.6%
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,808,406	3,952,945	121.6%	21.6%
San Bernardino	-	(490,815)	(372,053)	(862,869)	3,191,014	(862,869)	-21.3%	144,246,247	151,789,230	95.0%	4.2%
San Diego	-	(597,752)	(453,953)	(1,051,705)	1,079,176	(1,051,705)	-49.4%	172,867,762	185,202,539	93.3%	1.4%
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63,223,112	52,730,196	119.9%	7.9%
San Joaquin	-	-	(129,083)	(129,083)	1,335,042	(129,083)	-8.8%	51,731,275	52,662,950	98.2%	7.4%
San Luis Obispo	-	-	(47,034)	(47,034)	481,998	(47,034)	-8.9%	18,864,074	19,188,902	98.3%	7.4%
San Mateo	-	(148,880)	(121,213)	(270,093)	281,567	(270,093)	-49.0%	43,076,597	49,452,194	87.1%	-4.8%
Santa Barbara	-	-	(69,665)	(69,665)	255,533	(69,665)	-21.4%	27,472,742	28,421,722	96.7%	2.8%
Santa Clara	-	-	(237,673)	(237,673)	916,494	(237,673)	-20.6%	96,106,515	96,965,024	99.1%	6.7%
Santa Cruz	-	-	(41,895)	(41,895)	397,553	(41,895)	-9.5%	17,054,341	17,092,256	99.8%	9.0%
Shasta	-	-	(41,822)	(41,822)	346,732	(41,822)	-10.8%	16,400,321	17,062,242	96.1%	5.4%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	(14,753)	(11,728)	(26,480)	96,725	(26,480)	-21.5%	4,337,028	4,784,619	90.6%	-0.2%
Solano	-	(99,610)	(76,781)	(176,392)	397,357	(176,392)	-30.7%	29,025,588	31,325,060	92.7%	2.0%
Sonoma	-	-	(75,051)	(75,051)	797,747	(75,051)	-8.6%	30,664,291	30,618,988	100.1%	9.3%
Stanislaus	-	(109,958)	(84,488)	(194,445)	695,314	(194,445)	-21.9%	32,297,108	34,469,129	93.7%	2.8%
Sutter	-	(27,603)	(22,431)	(50,034)	180,138	(50,034)	-21.7%	8,114,579	9,151,367	88.7%	-2.2%
Tehama	-	-	(15,647)	(15,647)	106,276	(15,647)	-12.8%	6,123,889	6,383,645	95.9%	5.3%
Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,142,285	2,141,889	100.0%	-7.1%
Tulare	-	(109,439)	(86,954)	(196,393)	703,722	(196,393)	-21.8%	32,159,327	35,475,356	90.7%	-0.2%
Tuolumne	-	-	(11,975)	(11,975)	46,465	(11,975)	-20.5%	5,036,078	4,885,338	103.1%	8.7%
Ventura	-	-	(115,172)	(115,172)	486,678	(115,172)	-19.1%	44,811,534	46,987,643	95.4%	4.6%
Yolo	-	-	(39,624)	(39,624)	400,997	(39,624)	-9.0%	15,530,736	16,165,652	96.1%	5.2%
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,239,076	5,858,507	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	2,658,241,455	94.8%	2.7%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor co

¹Scenarios 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 3 Proposed 2023-24 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Proportional based on Workload Formula allocation)			Difference	Workload Formula % Difference	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation	2023-24 Workload Formula	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Percentage	Workload Formula % Difference
	Proposed Workload Formula Allocation (Before Civil Assessment Funding)	Percent of 2023-24 Proposed Workload Formula Allocation	Total						
	AC	AD (AC / TOTAL AC)	AE (AD * 46.8m)						
	AF (AE - D)	AG (D - AF / D)	AH						
Alameda	89,257,640	3.6%	1,688,569	664,977	-35.0%	90,946,209	89,736,951	101.3%	1.7%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	4,508,095	0.2%	85,284	85,284	-	4,593,379	4,318,194	106.4%	6.4%
Butte	13,795,355	0.6%	260,980	37,055	-83.5%	14,056,334	15,020,326	93.6%	3.0%
Calaveras	3,478,334	0.1%	65,803	65,803	-	3,544,137	3,434,244	103.2%	3.2%
Colusa	2,506,650	0.1%	47,421	47,421	-	2,554,070	2,635,567	96.9%	-8.8%
Contra Costa	52,092,957	2.1%	985,491	(525,763)	-134.8%	53,078,448	58,792,180	90.3%	-0.6%
Del Norte	3,867,982	0.2%	73,174	73,174	-	3,941,156	3,822,121	103.1%	3.1%
El Dorado	9,424,822	0.4%	178,298	48,960	-62.1%	9,603,120	10,536,589	91.1%	0.4%
Fresno	62,276,431	2.5%	1,178,141	(687,206)	-136.8%	63,454,572	66,190,564	95.9%	5.0%
Glenn	2,997,055	0.1%	56,698	56,698	-	3,053,753	3,222,234	94.8%	-5.2%
Humboldt	8,838,328	0.4%	167,203	62,310	-40.6%	9,005,531	8,993,983	100.1%	7.7%
Imperial	10,504,378	0.4%	198,721	198,721	-	10,703,099	8,363,980	128.0%	17.6%
Inyo	2,549,192	0.1%	48,225	48,225	-	2,597,418	2,499,943	103.9%	-5.3%
Kern	62,573,268	2.5%	1,183,756	(704,465)	-137.3%	63,757,024	66,131,988	96.4%	5.5%
Kings	10,854,999	0.4%	205,354	(106,979)	-134.3%	11,060,353	11,937,681	92.7%	1.8%
Lake	4,982,578	0.2%	94,260	(50,525)	-134.9%	5,076,838	5,522,043	91.9%	1.1%
Lassen	2,800,158	0.1%	52,973	52,973	-	2,853,131	2,332,823	122.3%	14.9%
Los Angeles	716,052,768	29.0%	13,546,233	(7,580,588)	-135.9%	729,599,002	782,911,052	93.2%	2.3%
Madera	12,127,398	0.5%	229,425	(121,142)	-134.6%	12,356,824	13,312,566	92.8%	1.9%
Marin	14,190,668	0.6%	268,458	94,395	-45.8%	14,459,126	15,317,860	94.4%	0.9%
Mariposa	1,853,852	0.1%	35,071	35,071	-	1,888,923	1,805,697	104.6%	4.6%
Mendocino	7,646,223	0.3%	144,651	85,719	-	7,790,873	7,231,739	107.7%	7.7%
Merced	16,631,356	0.7%	314,631	(168,810)	-134.9%	16,945,986	18,090,994	93.7%	2.8%
Modoc	1,406,026	0.1%	26,599	26,599	-	1,432,625	1,279,449	112.0%	8.5%
Mono	2,439,564	0.1%	46,151	46,151	-	2,485,716	2,061,575	120.6%	5.4%
Monterey	25,748,081	1.0%	487,100	(250,393)	-134.0%	26,235,181	28,026,310	93.6%	2.7%
Napa	9,167,629	0.4%	173,433	58,292	-49.4%	9,341,062	10,386,823	89.9%	-3.3%
Nevada	6,448,630	0.3%	121,995	(68,886)	-136.1%	6,570,625	7,599,777	86.5%	-4.4%
Orange	183,869,854	7.4%	3,478,436	(1,885,979)	-135.2%	187,348,290	210,173,824	89.1%	-1.7%
Placer	24,618,065	1.0%	465,723	(238,750)	-133.9%	25,083,787	26,685,022	94.0%	3.1%
Plumas	1,915,288	0.1%	36,233	36,233	-	1,951,522	1,548,909	126.0%	14.7%
Riverside	134,714,896	5.4%	2,548,526	(1,324,934)	-134.2%	137,263,423	148,941,935	92.2%	1.3%
Sacramento	106,565,577	4.3%	2,016,000	(1,063,319)	-134.5%	108,581,577	116,609,120	93.1%	2.2%
San Benito	4,808,406	0.2%	90,965	90,965	-	4,899,371	3,952,945	123.9%	23.9%
San Bernardino	141,055,233	5.7%	2,668,472	(1,385,411)	-134.2%	143,723,705	151,789,230	94.7%	3.8%
San Diego	171,788,586	6.9%	3,249,884	1,119,003	-47.5%	175,038,470	185,202,539	94.5%	2.5%
San Francisco	63,223,112	2.6%	1,196,050	1,196,050	-	64,419,162	52,730,196	122.2%	10.2%
San Joaquin	50,396,234	2.0%	953,392	(510,733)	-134.9%	51,349,626	52,662,950	97.5%	6.6%
San Luis Obispo	18,382,076	0.7%	347,751	(181,281)	-134.3%	18,729,827	19,188,902	97.6%	6.7%
San Mateo	42,795,030	1.7%	809,593	257,933	-53.2%	43,604,623	49,452,194	88.2%	-3.7%
Santa Barbara	27,217,209	1.1%	514,893	189,696	-41.7%	27,732,102	28,421,722	97.6%	3.7%
Santa Clara	95,190,021	3.8%	1,800,798	646,631	-44.0%	96,990,819	96,965,024	100.0%	7.6%
Santa Cruz	16,656,788	0.7%	315,112	(124,336)	-128.3%	16,971,900	17,092,256	99.3%	8.5%
Shasta	16,053,589	0.6%	303,701	(84,853)	-121.8%	16,357,289	17,062,242	95.9%	5.1%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	4,240,304	0.2%	80,218	(42,987)	-134.9%	4,320,521	4,784,619	90.3%	-0.6%
Solano	28,628,231	1.2%	541,587	(32,162)	-105.6%	29,169,818	31,325,060	93.1%	2.5%
Sonoma	29,866,544	1.2%	565,013	(307,784)	-135.3%	30,431,558	30,618,988	99.4%	8.5%
Stanislaus	31,601,794	1.3%	597,840	(291,919)	-132.8%	32,199,634	34,469,129	93.4%	2.6%
Sutter	7,934,441	0.3%	150,103	(80,069)	-134.8%	8,084,544	9,151,367	88.3%	-2.5%
Tehama	6,017,613	0.2%	113,841	(8,082)	-106.6%	6,131,454	6,383,645	96.0%	5.4%
Trinity	2,142,285	0.1%	40,528	40,528	-	2,182,812	2,141,889	101.9%	-5.2%
Tulare	31,455,605	1.3%	595,075	(305,040)	-133.9%	32,050,680	35,475,356	90.3%	-0.5%
Tuolumne	4,989,613	0.2%	94,393	35,954	-38.5%	5,084,006	4,885,338	104.1%	9.6%
Ventura	44,324,856	1.8%	838,534	236,684	-60.7%	45,163,390	46,987,643	96.1%	5.4%
Yolo	15,129,739	0.6%	286,223	(154,398)	-135.0%	15,415,962	16,165,652	95.4%	4.5%
Yuba	6,239,076	0.3%	118,030	118,030	-	6,357,106	5,858,507	108.5%	-4.5%
Total	2,472,840,480	100.0%	46,781,014	(12,531,257)	-21.1%	2,519,621,494	2,658,241,455	94.8%	2.7%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor co

¹Scenarios 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 4 Proposed Civil Assessment Redistribution (Proportional reduction on the decrease)			Difference	% Difference	Proposed 2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation	2023-24 Workload Formula	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	AS (AQ / AR)	AT (AS - G)	
Alameda	1.7%	(216,261)	807,332	(216,261)	-21.1%	90,064,972	89,736,951	100.4%	0.7%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	0.0%	-	-	-	-	4,508,095	4,318,194	104.4%	4.4%
Butte	0.4%	(47,310)	176,614	(47,310)	-21.1%	13,971,969	15,020,326	93.0%	2.4%
Calaveras	0.0%	-	-	-	-	3,478,334	3,434,244	101.3%	1.3%
Colusa	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,506,650	2,635,567	95.1%	-10.6%
Contra Costa	2.5%	(319,292)	1,191,962	(319,292)	-21.1%	53,284,919	58,792,180	90.6%	-0.2%
Del Norte	0.0%	-	-	-	-	3,867,982	3,822,121	101.2%	1.2%
El Dorado	0.2%	(27,326)	102,012	(27,326)	-21.1%	9,526,834	10,536,589	90.4%	-0.3%
Fresno	3.1%	(394,103)	1,471,244	(394,103)	-21.1%	63,747,675	66,190,564	96.3%	5.4%
Glenn	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,997,055	3,222,234	93.0%	-7.0%
Humboldt	0.2%	(22,161)	82,731	(22,161)	-21.1%	8,921,059	8,993,983	99.2%	6.8%
Imperial	0.0%	-	-	-	-	10,504,378	8,363,980	125.6%	15.3%
Inyo	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,549,192	2,499,943	102.0%	-7.2%
Kern	3.2%	(398,936)	1,489,285	(398,936)	-21.1%	64,062,553	66,131,988	96.9%	6.0%
Kings	0.5%	(65,988)	246,344	(65,988)	-21.1%	11,101,344	11,937,681	93.0%	2.1%
Lake	0.2%	(30,590)	114,195	(30,590)	-21.1%	5,096,773	5,522,043	92.3%	1.4%
Lassen	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,800,158	2,332,823	120.0%	12.6%
Los Angeles	35.6%	(4,463,590)	16,663,232	(4,463,590)	-21.1%	732,716,000	782,911,052	93.6%	2.7%
Madera	0.6%	(74,066)	276,501	(74,066)	-21.1%	12,403,899	13,312,566	93.2%	2.3%
Marin	0.3%	(36,775)	137,288	(36,775)	-21.1%	14,327,956	15,317,860	93.5%	0.1%
Mariposa	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1,853,852	1,805,697	102.7%	2.7%
Mendocino	0.1%	(12,451)	46,481	(12,451)	-21.1%	7,692,704	7,231,739	106.4%	6.4%
Merced	0.8%	(102,139)	381,301	(102,139)	-21.1%	17,012,657	18,090,994	94.0%	3.2%
Modoc	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1,406,026	1,279,449	109.9%	6.4%
Mono	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,439,564	2,061,575	118.3%	3.1%
Monterey	1.2%	(155,815)	581,679	(155,815)	-21.1%	26,329,760	28,026,310	93.9%	3.1%
Napa	0.2%	(24,326)	90,814	(24,326)	-21.1%	9,258,443	10,386,823	89.1%	-4.1%
Nevada	0.3%	(40,328)	150,552	(40,328)	-21.1%	6,599,182	7,599,777	86.8%	-4.0%
Orange	9.0%	(1,133,372)	4,231,043	(1,133,372)	-21.1%	188,100,897	210,173,824	89.5%	-1.4%
Placer	1.2%	(148,838)	555,635	(148,838)	-21.1%	25,173,699	26,685,022	94.3%	3.5%
Plumas	0.0%	-	-	-	-	1,915,288	1,548,909	123.7%	12.4%
Riverside	6.5%	(818,369)	3,055,091	(818,369)	-21.1%	137,769,987	148,941,935	92.5%	1.6%
Sacramento	5.2%	(650,586)	2,428,732	(650,586)	-21.1%	108,994,310	116,609,120	93.5%	2.6%
San Benito	0.0%	-	-	-	-	4,808,406	3,952,945	121.6%	21.6%
San Bernardino	6.8%	(856,488)	3,197,395	(856,488)	-21.1%	144,252,628	151,789,230	95.0%	4.2%
San Diego	3.6%	(450,204)	1,680,677	(450,204)	-21.1%	173,469,263	185,202,539	93.7%	1.7%
San Francisco	0.0%	-	-	-	-	63,223,112	52,730,196	119.9%	7.9%
San Joaquin	2.5%	(309,334)	1,154,790	(309,334)	-21.1%	51,551,024	52,662,950	97.9%	7.0%
San Luis Obispo	0.9%	(111,772)	417,260	(111,772)	-21.1%	18,799,336	19,188,902	98.0%	7.1%
San Mateo	0.9%	(116,553)	435,108	(116,553)	-21.1%	43,230,138	49,452,194	87.4%	-4.5%
Santa Barbara	0.5%	(68,706)	256,491	(68,706)	-21.1%	27,473,701	28,421,722	96.7%	2.8%
Santa Clara	1.9%	(243,848)	910,319	(243,848)	-21.1%	96,100,340	96,965,024	99.1%	6.7%
Santa Cruz	0.7%	(92,845)	346,603	(92,845)	-21.1%	17,003,391	17,092,256	99.5%	8.7%
Shasta	0.7%	(82,092)	306,461	(82,092)	-21.1%	16,360,050	17,062,242	95.9%	5.2%
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	0.2%	(26,030)	97,175	(26,030)	-21.1%	4,337,478	4,784,619	90.7%	-0.2%
Solano	1.0%	(121,219)	452,530	(121,219)	-21.1%	29,080,761	31,325,060	92.8%	2.2%
Sonoma	1.5%	(184,401)	688,396	(184,401)	-21.1%	30,554,941	30,618,988	99.8%	8.9%
Stanislaus	1.5%	(187,985)	701,775	(187,985)	-21.1%	32,303,568	34,469,129	93.7%	2.9%
Sutter	0.4%	(48,630)	181,543	(48,630)	-21.1%	8,115,984	9,151,367	88.7%	-2.2%
Tehama	0.2%	(25,759)	96,164	(25,759)	-21.1%	6,113,777	6,383,645	95.8%	5.1%
Trinity	0.0%	-	-	-	-	2,142,285	2,141,889	100.0%	-7.1%
Tulare	1.5%	(190,173)	709,943	(190,173)	-21.1%	32,165,547	35,475,356	90.7%	-0.2%
Tuolumne	0.1%	(12,347)	46,092	(12,347)	-21.1%	5,035,705	4,885,338	103.1%	8.6%
Ventura	1.0%	(127,156)	474,694	(127,156)	-21.1%	44,799,549	46,987,643	95.3%	4.6%
Yolo	0.7%	(93,093)	347,528	(93,093)	-21.1%	15,477,267	16,165,652	95.7%	4.9%
Yuba	0.0%	-	-	-	-	6,239,076	5,858,507	106.5%	-6.5%
Total	100.0%	(12,531,257)	46,781,014	(12,531,257)	-21.1%	2,519,621,494	2,658,241,455	94.8%	2.7%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor co

¹Scenarios 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	2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Nov 22)	2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage	SUPPLEMENTAL SCENARIO	
			Scenario 4 updated to address +/-	Workload Formula Percentage
Alameda	1,023,593	99.6%	479,311	100.0%
Alpine	-	-	-	0.0%
Amador	-	100.0%	-	104.4%
Butte	223,924	90.6%	176,614	93.0%
Calaveras	-	100.0%	-	101.3%
Colusa	-	105.7%	-	95.1%
Contra Costa	1,511,254	90.9%	1,191,962	90.6%
Del Norte	-	100.0%	-	101.2%
El Dorado	129,338	90.8%	102,012	90.4%
Fresno	1,865,347	90.9%	1,471,244	96.3%
Glenn	-	100.0%	-	93.0%
Humboldt	104,892	92.4%	82,731	99.2%
Imperial	-	110.3%	-	125.6%
Inyo	-	109.2%	-	102.0%
Kern	1,888,221	90.9%	1,489,285	96.9%
Kings	312,333	90.9%	246,344	93.0%
Lake	144,785	90.9%	114,195	92.3%
Lassen	-	107.4%	-	120.0%
Los Angeles	21,126,821	90.9%	16,663,232	93.6%
Madera	350,567	90.9%	276,501	93.2%
Marin	174,063	93.5%	137,288	93.5%
Mariposa	-	100.0%	-	102.7%
Mendocino	58,932	100.0%	0	105.7%
Merced	483,440	90.9%	381,301	94.0%
Modoc	-	103.5%	-	109.9%
Mono	-	115.2%	-	118.3%
Monterey	737,493	90.9%	581,679	93.9%
Napa	115,140	93.3%	115,140	89.4%
Nevada	190,881	90.9%	190,881	87.4%
Orange	5,364,415	90.9%	4,421,800	89.6%
Placer	704,473	90.9%	555,635	94.3%
Plumas	-	111.3%	-	123.7%
Riverside	3,873,460	90.9%	3,055,091	92.5%
Sacramento	3,079,318	90.9%	2,428,732	93.5%
San Benito	-	100.0%	-	121.6%
San Bernardino	4,053,883	90.9%	3,197,395	95.0%
San Diego	2,130,881	92.0%	1,680,677	93.7%
San Francisco	-	112.0%	-	119.9%
San Joaquin	1,464,125	90.9%	1,154,790	97.9%
San Luis Obispo	529,032	90.9%	417,260	98.0%
San Mateo	551,661	91.9%	551,661	87.7%
Santa Barbara	325,198	93.9%	256,491	96.7%
Santa Clara	1,154,167	92.5%	910,319	99.1%
Santa Cruz	439,448	90.8%	346,603	99.5%
Shasta	388,554	90.7%	306,461	95.9%
Sierra	-	-	-	0.0%
Siskiyou	123,205	90.9%	97,175	90.7%
Solano	573,749	90.6%	452,530	92.8%
Sonoma	872,797	90.9%	688,396	99.8%
Stanislaus	889,759	90.9%	701,775	93.7%
Sutter	230,173	90.9%	230,173	89.2%
Tehama	121,923	90.6%	96,164	95.8%
Trinity	-	107.1%	-	100.0%
Tulare	900,115	90.9%	709,943	90.7%
Tuolumne	58,439	94.4%	0	102.1%
Ventura	601,850	90.7%	474,694	95.3%
Yolo	440,621	90.9%	347,528	95.7%
Yuba	-	113.0%	-	106.5%
Total	59,312,271	92.1%	46,781,014	94.8%

Cluster 1 courts
Base funding floor courts zeroed out

¹ See Attachment D for additional information.

Court	2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Updated November 2022)	2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage	2023-24 Workload Formula	SUPPLEMENTAL SCENARIO 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
	Total			2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation Without Civil Assessment Backfill	Workload Formula Percentage	2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation with Scenario 4 Redistribution	Workload Formula Percentage	Secondary Civil Assessment Reduction to Account for +/- Variances	Total					
	A			D	E (D / C)	F	G (F / C)	H	I (A + H)					
Alameda	1,023,593	99.6%	89,736,951	89,257,640	99.5%	90,064,972	100.4%	(544,282)	479,311	(544,282)	-53.2%	89,736,951	100.0%	0.4%
Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	100.0%	4,318,194	4,508,095	104.4%	4,508,095	104.4%	-	-	-	-	4,508,095	104.4%	4.4%
Butte	223,924	90.6%	15,020,326	13,795,355	91.8%	13,971,969	93.0%	(47,310)	176,614	(47,310)	-21.1%	13,971,969	93.0%	2.4%
Calaveras	-	100.0%	3,434,244	3,478,334	101.3%	3,478,334	101.3%	-	-	-	-	3,478,334	101.3%	1.3%
Colusa	-	105.7%	2,635,567	2,506,650	95.1%	2,506,650	95.1%	-	-	-	-	2,506,650	95.1%	-10.6%
Contra Costa	1,511,254	90.9%	58,792,180	52,092,957	88.6%	53,284,919	90.6%	(319,292)	1,191,962	(319,292)	-21.1%	53,284,919	90.6%	-0.2%
Del Norte	-	100.0%	3,822,121	3,867,982	101.2%	3,867,982	101.2%	-	-	-	-	3,867,982	101.2%	1.2%
El Dorado	129,338	90.8%	10,536,589	9,424,822	89.4%	9,526,834	90.4%	(27,326)	102,012	(27,326)	-21.1%	9,526,834	90.4%	-0.3%
Fresno	1,865,347	90.9%	66,190,564	62,276,431	94.1%	63,747,675	96.3%	(394,103)	1,471,244	(394,103)	-21.1%	63,747,675	96.3%	5.4%
Glenn	-	100.0%	3,222,234	2,997,055	93.0%	2,997,055	93.0%	-	-	-	-	2,997,055	93.0%	-7.0%
Humboldt	104,892	92.4%	8,993,983	8,838,328	98.3%	8,921,059	99.2%	(22,161)	82,731	(22,161)	-21.1%	8,921,059	99.2%	6.8%
Imperial	-	110.3%	8,363,980	10,504,378	125.6%	10,504,378	125.6%	-	-	-	-	10,504,378	125.6%	15.3%
Inyo	-	109.2%	2,499,943	2,549,192	102.0%	2,549,192	102.0%	-	-	-	-	2,549,192	102.0%	-7.2%
Kern	1,888,221	90.9%	66,131,988	62,573,268	94.6%	64,062,553	96.9%	(398,936)	1,489,285	(398,936)	-21.1%	64,062,553	96.9%	6.0%
Kings	312,333	90.9%	11,937,681	10,854,999	90.9%	11,101,344	93.0%	(65,988)	246,344	(65,988)	-21.1%	11,101,344	93.0%	2.1%
Lake	144,785	90.9%	5,522,043	4,982,578	90.2%	5,096,773	92.3%	(30,590)	114,195	(30,590)	-21.1%	5,096,773	92.3%	1.4%
Lassen	-	107.4%	2,332,823	2,800,158	120.0%	2,800,158	120.0%	-	-	-	-	2,800,158	120.0%	12.6%
Los Angeles	21,126,821	90.9%	782,911,052	716,052,768	91.5%	732,716,000	93.6%	(4,463,590)	16,663,232	(4,463,590)	-21.1%	732,716,000	93.6%	2.7%
Madera	350,567	90.9%	13,312,566	12,127,398	91.1%	12,403,899	93.2%	(74,066)	276,501	(74,066)	-21.1%	12,403,899	93.2%	2.3%
Marin	174,063	93.5%	15,317,860	14,190,668	92.6%	14,327,956	93.5%	(36,775)	137,288	(36,775)	-21.1%	14,327,956	93.5%	0.1%
Mariposa	-	100.0%	1,805,697	1,853,852	102.7%	1,853,852	102.7%	-	-	-	-	1,853,852	102.7%	2.7%
Mendocino	58,932	100.0%	7,231,739	7,646,223	105.7%	7,692,704	106.4%	(58,932)	0	(58,932)	-100.0%	7,646,223	105.7%	5.7%
Merced	483,440	90.9%	18,090,994	16,631,356	91.9%	17,012,657	94.0%	(102,139)	381,301	(102,139)	-21.1%	17,012,657	94.0%	3.2%
Modoc	-	103.5%	1,279,449	1,406,026	109.9%	1,406,026	109.9%	-	-	-	-	1,406,026	109.9%	6.4%
Mono	-	115.2%	2,061,575	2,439,564	118.3%	2,439,564	118.3%	-	-	-	-	2,439,564	118.3%	3.1%
Monterey	737,493	90.9%	28,026,310	25,748,081	91.9%	26,329,760	93.9%	(155,815)	581,679	(155,815)	-21.1%	26,329,760	93.9%	3.1%
Napa	115,140	93.3%	10,386,823	9,167,629	88.3%	9,258,443	89.1%	-	115,140	-	0.0%	9,282,770	89.4%	-3.9%
Nevada	190,881	90.9%	7,599,777	6,448,630	84.9%	6,599,182	86.8%	-	190,881	-	0.0%	6,639,511	87.4%	-3.5%
Orange	5,364,415	90.9%	210,173,824	183,869,854	87.5%	188,100,897	89.5%	(942,615)	4,421,800	(942,615)	-17.6%	188,291,654	89.6%	-1.3%
Placer	704,473	90.9%	26,685,022	24,618,065	92.3%	25,173,699	94.3%	(148,838)	555,635	(148,838)	-21.1%	25,173,699	94.3%	3.5%
Plumas	-	111.3%	1,548,909	1,915,288	123.7%	1,915,288	123.7%	-	-	-	-	1,915,288	123.7%	12.4%
Riverside	3,873,460	90.9%	148,941,935	134,714,896	90.4%	137,769,987	92.5%	(818,369)	3,055,091	(818,369)	-21.1%	137,769,987	92.5%	1.6%
Sacramento	3,079,318	90.9%	116,609,120	106,565,577	91.4%	108,994,310	93.5%	(650,586)	2,428,732	(650,586)	-21.1%	108,994,310	93.5%	2.6%
San Benito	-	100.0%	3,952,945	4,808,406	121.6%	4,808,406	121.6%	-	-	-	-	4,808,406	121.6%	21.6%
San Bernardino	4,053,883	90.9%	151,789,230	141,055,233	92.9%	144,252,628	95.0%	(856,488)	3,197,395	(856,488)	-21.1%	144,252,628	95.0%	4.2%
San Diego	2,130,881	92.0%	185,202,539	171,788,586	92.8%	173,469,263	93.7%	(450,204)	1,680,677	(450,204)	-21.1%	173,469,263	93.7%	1.7%
San Francisco	-	112.0%	52,730,196	63,223,112	119.9%	63,223,112	119.9%	-	-	-	-	63,223,112	119.9%	7.9%
San Joaquin	1,464,125	90.9%	52,662,950	50,396,234	95.7%	51,551,024	97.9%	(309,334)	1,154,790	(309,334)	-21.1%	51,551,024	97.9%	7.0%
San Luis Obispo	529,032	90.9%	19,188,902	18,382,076	95.8%	18,799,336	98.0%	(111,772)	417,260	(111,772)	-21.1%	18,799,336	98.0%	7.1%
San Mateo	551,661	91.9%	49,452,194	42,795,030	86.5%	43,230,138	87.4%	-	551,661	-	0.0%	43,346,691	87.7%	-4.3%
Santa Barbara	325,198	93.9%	28,421,722	27,217,209	95.8%	27,473,701	96.7%	(68,706)	256,491	(68,706)	-21.1%	27,473,701	96.7%	2.8%
Santa Clara	1,154,167	92.5%	96,965,024	95,190,021	98.2%	96,100,340	99.1%	(243,848)	910,319	(243,848)	-21.1%	96,100,340	99.1%	6.7%
Santa Cruz	439,448	90.8%	17,092,256	16,656,788	97.5%	17,003,391	99.5%	(92,845)	346,603	(92,845)	-21.1%	17,003,391	99.5%	8.7%
Shasta	388,554	90.7%	17,062,242	16,053,589	94.1%	16,360,050	95.9%	(82,092)	306,461	(82,092)	-21.1%	16,360,050	95.9%	5.2%

¹ Scenario is before funding floor adjustment.

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	2022-23 Civil Assessment Redistribution (Updated November 2022)	2022-23 Workload Formula Percentage	2023-24 Workload Formula	SUPPLEMENTAL SCENARIO 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
	Total			2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation Without Civil Assessment Backfill	Workload Formula Percentage	2023-24 Workload Formula Allocation with Scenario 4 Redistribution	Workload Formula Percentage	Secondary Civil Assessment Reduction to Account for +/- Variances	Total					
	A			D	E (D / C)	F	G (F / C)	H	I (A + H)					
Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Siskiyou	123,205	90.9%	4,784,619	4,240,304	88.6%	4,337,478	90.7%	(26,030)	97,175	(26,030)	-21.1%	4,337,478	90.7%	-0.2%
Solano	573,749	90.6%	31,325,060	28,628,231	91.4%	29,080,761	92.8%	(121,219)	452,530	(121,219)	-21.1%	29,080,761	92.8%	2.2%
Sonoma	872,797	90.9%	30,618,988	29,866,544	97.5%	30,554,941	99.8%	(184,401)	688,396	(184,401)	-21.1%	30,554,941	99.8%	8.9%
Stanislaus	889,759	90.9%	34,469,129	31,601,794	91.7%	32,303,568	93.7%	(187,985)	701,775	(187,985)	-21.1%	32,303,568	93.7%	2.9%
Sutter	230,173	90.9%	9,151,367	7,934,441	86.7%	8,115,984	88.7%	-	230,173	-	0.0%	8,164,614	89.2%	-1.7%
Tehama	121,923	90.6%	6,383,645	6,017,613	94.3%	6,113,777	95.8%	(25,759)	96,164	(25,759)	-21.1%	6,113,777	95.8%	5.1%
Trinity	-	107.1%	2,141,889	2,142,285	100.0%	2,142,285	100.0%	-	-	-	-	2,142,285	100.0%	-7.1%
Tulare	900,115	90.9%	35,475,356	31,455,605	88.7%	32,165,547	90.7%	(190,173)	709,943	(190,173)	-21.1%	32,165,547	90.7%	-0.2%
Tuolumne	58,439	94.4%	4,885,338	4,989,613	102.1%	5,035,705	103.1%	(58,439)	0	(58,439)	-100.0%	4,989,613	102.1%	7.7%
Ventura	601,850	90.7%	46,987,643	44,324,856	94.3%	44,799,549	95.3%	(127,156)	474,694	(127,156)	-21.1%	44,799,549	95.3%	4.6%
Yolo	440,621	90.9%	16,165,652	15,129,739	93.6%	15,477,267	95.7%	(93,093)	347,528	(93,093)	-21.1%	15,477,267	95.7%	4.9%
Yuba	-	113.0%	5,858,507	6,239,076	106.5%	6,239,076	106.5%	-	-	-	-	6,239,076	106.5%	-6.5%
Total	59,312,271	92.1%	2,658,241,455	2,472,840,480	93.0%	2,519,621,494	94.8%	(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 courts zeroed out

¹ Scenario is before funding floor adjustment.
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.