JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA BUDGET SERVICES

Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (Action Item)

Title: 2023-24 Increased Transcript Rate Allocations

Date: 9/27/2023

Contact: Chris Belloli, Manager, Business Management Services

415-865-7658 | chris.belloli@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of 2023-24 allocations for the ongoing \$7 million General Fund included in the 2023 Budget Act to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates. The approved recommendation will be considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) and then the Judicial Council at its November 17, 2023 business meeting.

Background

Budget Language

Senate Bill 170 (Ch. 240, Stats. 2021), which amended the 2021 Budget Act, included \$7 million ongoing General Fund to establish a methodology to allocate funding to all trial courts to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates.

Allocation Methodology

In the first year of funding in 2021-22, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) established the Ad Hoc Court Reporter Funding Subcommittee consisting of members from the TCBAC to develop an allocation methodology recommendation for 2021-22. Through deliberations, the ad hoc subcommittee developed a recommendation for an allocation methodology for the \$7 million and presented it to the TCBAC at its November 30, 2021 meeting and to the Budget Committee on December 7, 2021. The Judicial Council approved the allocation methodology at its January 21, 2022 business meeting and directed staff to update the three-year average for the allocation methodology each year based on the most recent data available.

Annual True Up Process

Because this funding is intended solely to cover the costs associated with increased transcript rates, any unspent funds are required to revert to the General Fund each fiscal year. The actual expenditures for each court from 2020-21 will be used to establish a baseline from which cost increases eligible to be covered by these funds will be determined for each court. Based on the

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA BUDGET SERVICES

Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (Action Item)

historical baseline amount and the actual expenditures for the current fiscal year, a true up process will occur at the end of each fiscal year to pull back any remaining funds. This process and adjustments for 2023-24 are outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1 – Annual Reversion Calculation for 2023-24

Court	Actual Expenditures			3-Year	2023-24	2023-24	GF
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	Average	Allocation from \$7M	Expenditures	Reversion
	(Baseline)						
Α	\$85,000	\$100,000	\$110,000	\$98,333	\$43,260	\$120,000	\$8,260

Based on the example in Table 1, Court A would receive an allocation of \$43,260 from the 2023-24 \$7 million court reporter transcript appropriation. In this example, the court's actual expenditures for 2023-24 would be \$120,000, which is a \$35,000 increase from the 2020-21 baseline amount for 2023-24 (\$120,000 - \$85,000 = \$35,000). Comparing the \$35,000 increase to the \$43,260 allocation from the 2023-24 appropriation, the court would be required to revert the remaining \$8,260 (\$43,260 - \$35,000 = \$8,260) to the General Fund.

Recommendation

Approve the allocation of the \$7 million appropriation to each trial court proportionally using the council-approved methodology, based on an average of the prior three-year transcript expenditures, as outlined in Attachment 1A.

Attachments

Attachment 1A: Transcript Funding – Recommended 2023-24 Allocations

Attachment 1A - Transcript Funding: Recommended FY 2023-24 Allocations

Actual Expenditures on

		Court Reporter Transcripts				Proportion of	Proportional
Cluster	Court	FY 2020-21 *	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	Average	Average Expenditures	Allocation of \$7M
	Statewide	\$12,739,717	\$17,974,624	\$22,616,137		100.00%	\$7,000,000
4	Alameda	\$316,575	\$527,628	\$551,195	\$465,133	2.62%	\$183,156
1	Alpine	\$139	\$650	\$165	\$318	0.00%	\$125
1	Amador	\$18,321	\$32,359	\$31,430	\$27,370	0.15%	\$10,777
2	Butte	\$97,894	\$101,943	\$93,852	\$97,896	0.55%	\$38,549
1	Calaveras	\$26,846	\$40,629	\$32,234	\$33,236	0.19%	\$13,087
1	Colusa	\$8,008	\$10,812	\$8,963	\$9,261	0.05%	\$3,647
3	Contra Costa	\$405,961	\$522,978	\$627,384	\$518,774	2.92%	\$204,278
1	Del Norte	\$53,391	\$42,074	\$33,494	\$42,986	0.24%	\$16,927
2	El Dorado	\$49,904	\$74,572	\$109,159	\$77,879	0.44%	\$30,666
3	Fresno	\$431,683	\$686,268	\$675,195	\$597,715	3.36%	\$235,363
1	Glenn	\$7,650	\$14,521	\$4,637	\$8,936	0.05%	\$3,519
2	Humboldt	\$7,435	\$4,145	\$4,693	\$5,425	0.03%	\$2,136
2	Imperial	\$23,298	\$33,028	\$35,251	\$30,526	0.17%	\$12,020
1	Inyo	\$10,357	\$15,168	\$29,841	\$18,455	0.10%	\$7,267
3	Kern	\$709,145	\$907,055	\$1,038,791	\$884,997	4.98%	\$348,486
2	Kings	\$275,882	\$401,049	\$384,797	\$353,909	1.99%	\$139,359
2	Lake	\$32,336	\$44,614	\$62,402	\$46,450	0.26%	\$18,291
1	Lassen	\$30,822	\$32,613	\$52,085	\$38,507	0.22%	\$15,163
4	Los Angeles	\$3,433,513	\$5,169,252	\$7,314,385	\$5,305,716	29.85%	\$2,089,238
2	Madera	\$83,123	\$116,359	\$164,174	\$121,218	0.68%	\$47,732
2	Marin	\$45,711	\$108,027	\$101,811	\$85,183	0.48%	\$33,543
1	Mariposa	\$4,709	\$2,485	\$23,790	\$10,328	0.06%	\$4,067
2	Mendocino	\$134,226	\$156,358	\$136,446	\$142,343	0.80%	\$56,051
2	Merced	\$156,237	\$178,975	\$212,591	\$182,601	1.03%	\$71,903
1	Modoc	\$7,155	\$6,034	\$4,142	\$5 <i>,</i> 777	0.03%	\$2,275
1	Mono	\$2,806	\$10,568	\$6,890	\$6,754	0.04%	\$2,660
3	Monterey	\$127,556	\$143,806	\$180,729	\$150,697	0.85%	\$59,340
2	Napa	\$90,806	\$167,582	\$143,356	\$133,914	0.75%	\$52,732
2	Nevada	\$23,786	\$32,868	\$51,187	\$35,947	0.20%	\$14,155
4	Orange	\$982,451	\$1,041,335	\$1,664,727	\$1,229,504	6.92%	\$484,143
2	Placer	\$148,518	\$196,763	\$289,885	\$211,722	1.19%	\$83,370
1	Plumas	\$2,104	\$5,553	\$3,646	\$3,768	0.02%	\$1,484
4	Riverside	\$11,186	\$28,642	\$17,281	\$19,036	0.11%	\$7,496
4	Sacramento	\$623,902	\$918,902	\$1,147,043	\$896,616	5.04%	\$353,061
1	San Benito	\$3,766	\$14,632	\$14,587	\$10,995	0.06%	\$4,330
4	San Bernardino	\$636,886	\$840,984	\$1,126,530	\$868,134	4.88%	\$341,846
4	San Diego	\$501,181	\$1,146,404	\$1,339,811	\$995,798	5.60%	\$392,117
3	San Francisco	\$300,914	\$409,721	\$463,844	\$391,493	2.20%	\$154,159

Attachment 1A - Transcript Funding: Recommended FY 2023-24 Allocations

Actual Expenditures on

			Court Reporte	Proportion of	Proportional		
Cluster	Court	FY 2020-21 *	FY 2021-22	FY 2022-23	Average	Average Expenditures	Allocation of \$7M
	Statewide	\$12,739,717	\$17,974,624	\$22,616,137	\$17,776,826	100.00%	\$7,000,000
3	San Joaquin	\$349,811	\$434,522	\$429,188	\$404,507	2.28%	\$159,283
2	San Luis Obispo	\$135,606	\$222,544	\$237,866	\$198,672	1.12%	\$78,231
3	San Mateo	\$280,961	\$295,795	\$453,091	\$343,282	1.93%	\$135,175
3	Santa Barbara	\$134,408	\$181,113	\$418,523	\$244,681	1.38%	\$96,348
4	Santa Clara	\$497,743	\$644,517	\$657,972	\$600,077	3.38%	\$236,293
2	Santa Cruz	\$100,255	\$128,923	\$142,959	\$124,046	0.70%	\$48,846
2	Shasta	\$88,543	\$117,894	\$184,845	\$130,427	0.73%	\$51,359
1	Sierra	\$698	\$975	\$856	\$843	0.00%	\$332
2	Siskiyou	\$31,755	\$37,262	\$48,526	\$39,181	0.22%	\$15,428
3	Solano	\$159,262	\$288,247	\$268,888	\$238,799	1.34%	\$94,032
3	Sonoma	\$118,224	\$154,601	\$201,893	\$158,239	0.89%	\$62,310
3	Stanislaus	\$239,016	\$197,748	\$253,288	\$230,018	1.29%	\$90,574
2	Sutter	\$36,528	\$35,849	\$22,578	\$31,652	0.18%	\$12,464
2	Tehama	\$13,000	\$35,585	\$35,541	\$28,042	0.16%	\$11,042
1	Trinity	\$7,875	\$9,543	\$5,500	\$7,639	0.04%	\$3,008
3	Tulare	\$298,604	\$386,039	\$383,720	\$356,121	2.00%	\$140,230
2	Tuolumne	\$90,624	\$72,486	\$61,692	\$74,934	0.42%	\$29,507
3	Ventura	\$168,224	\$248,114	\$306,031	\$240,790	1.35%	\$94,816
2	Yolo	\$138,545	\$230,010	\$266,251	\$211,602	1.19%	\$83,323
2	Yuba	\$23,853	\$65,501	\$54,509	\$47,954	0.27%	\$18,883

^{*} Total expenditures in FY 2020-21 will serve as the baseline for the true-up process at the end of FY 2023-24

GL Accounts

938701 Court Transcripts
938702 Non-Felony Appeals
938703 Felony Appeals
938705 Civil Transcripts
938711 Electronic Reporting