



Judicial Council of California
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR APRIL 16, 2024
VIRTUAL MEETING

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the March 7, 2024 meeting	3
Discussion and Possible Action Items (Items 1-2)	
Item 1 – Model Self-Help Pilot Program Technology Model Project Allocation Methodology (Action Required).....	5
Item 2 – 2024–25 Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocation Methodology (Action Required).....	7
Attachment 1 : Allocation Table 1	10
Attachment 2 : Allocation Table 2	12



Judicial Council of California

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

www.courts.ca.gov/tbac.htm
tbac@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 FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

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, April 16, 2024
Time: 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Public Call-in Number: <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/3269>

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 tbac@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 March 7, 2024 Funding Methodology Subcommittee 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 tbac@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by 12:00 p.m. on April 15, 2024 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

Item 1

Model Self-Help Pilot Program Technology Model Project Allocation Methodology (Action Required)

Consideration of revisions to the allocation methodology for Model Self-Help Pilot Program funding.

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

Item 2

2024–25 Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocation Methodology (Action Required)

Consideration of a methodology to allocate 2024–25 CARE Act funding.

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

IV. 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
FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

March 7, 2024
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.

<https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/3360>

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Cochair), Hon. Judith C. Clark, Hon. Wendy G. Getty, Hon. David C. Kalemkarian, and Hon. Patricia L. Kelly.

Executive Officers: Mr. Chad Finke (Cochair), Ms. Krista LeVier, Mr. Brandon E. Riley, Mr. David W. Slayton, Mr. Neal Taniguchi, and Mr. David H. Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Kevin M. Seibert and Mr. James Kim.

Others Present: Hon. Ann C. Moorman, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Fran Mueller, Ms. Donna Newman, Ms. Oksana Tuk, and Ms. Rose Lane.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair welcomed the members, called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The subcommittee approved minutes from the October 25, 2023 Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 - 2)

Item 1 – Workload Formula Definitions for Various Funding Allocations (Action Required)

Consideration of the existing Workload Formula definitions for funding allocations for new money, no new money, and potential reductions included in the budget.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Cochair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee
Mr. Chad Finke, Cochair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee
Ms. Oksana Tuk, Senior Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Action: The FMS unanimously voted to recommend (1) that Consumer Price Increase (CPI) funding included in the budget to address inflationary costs for the trial courts is not considered “new money” for

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

Title: Model Self-Help Pilot Program Technology Model Project Allocation Methodology
Date: 04/16/2024
Contact: Don Will, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts
415-865-7557 | don.will@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider revisions to the methodology for the allocation of funds for the Model Self-Help (MSH) Pilot Program Technology Model Project to address the urgent need to expand self-help services in all courts.

Background

The current allocation methodology calls for soliciting proposals from the courts each year for the annual budget act allocation of \$191,400 for technology projects related to self-help¹. In 2023–24 nine courts were awarded small grants based on this process. Revising the allocation to one multi-year award for self-help technology, following a solicitation process to the courts, would enable a proposing court to provide the technology and coordination for a collaboration that will make additional self-help resources available to all participating courts.

The MSH Program is supported by an annual funding allocation through the budget act. The Judicial Council originally allocated the funding in 2002 to five trial courts. One of these courts, the Superior Court of Contra Costa County, received an ongoing annual allocation for a program focused on self-help technology. In the 2019–20 program year, the Superior Court of Contra Costa County decided not to continue its participation. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) then recommended, and the Judicial Council² approved, that all courts be given the opportunity to apply for self-help technology programs to be funded by the \$191,400. In 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24 an average of nine courts received grants annually.

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., *Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts: FY 2023-24 Model Self-Help Pilot Program—Technology* (Nov. 17, 2023),

<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12400803&GUID=46EDF4A7-C740-41A5-AD85-C12EAB34FE60>

² Judicial Council of Cal., *Allocations and Reimbursements to Trial Courts: Model Self-Help Pilot Program Reallocation* (Feb. 18, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9196655&GUID=E2F158DD-0583-43AF-A839-4C99C4105AF8>

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

The collaboration recommended in this proposal is based on the Judicial Council’s Innovations Grant Self-Help Assistance and Referral Program (SHARP) Tech Connect, a project in the Superior Court of Butte County, which provided a voice and video-conferencing platform for 22 small courts. This model gave self-represented litigants in the small courts access to remote self-help services and allowed courts to pool their resources and make qualified attorneys available remotely. The SHARP Tech Connect project is discussed in the Judicial Council’s *Final Report on the Court Innovations Grant Program*³.

A phone, video-conferencing, and live-chat platform managed by a lead court but staffed by attorneys from all participating courts would allow:

- Public access to self-help legal assistance for the residents of these counties during all business hours;
- Legal experts in complex areas such as conservatorship, consumer debt and eviction available to self-represented litigants in all participating counties; and
- Access to experienced self-help attorney staff available to self-represented litigants in all participating counties to provide high quality services.

The projects that courts have conducted using the self-help technology grant over the past three years have been very valuable. However, this proposed model will allow a much larger number of courts to benefit from the program and addresses one of the key barriers to accessing self-help services in California.

Recommendation

Consider the following recommendations for consideration by the TCBAC.

1. Revise the allocation methodology for the Model Self-Help Pilot Technology Model Project to require that proposed projects be limited to enabling courts to collaborate in providing self-help services remotely;
2. Revise the methodology to award three-year grants through a competitive solicitation process open to all courts and conducted every three years; and
3. Revise the methodology to make one grant award for the project.

³ Judicial Council of Cal. *Final Report on the Court Innovations Grant Program* (Sept. 23, 2021).
<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9839364&GUID=E8AECBDE-B259-47F2-8995-700FEF76FA13>

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

Title: 2024–25 Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Allocation Methodology

Date: 4/15/2024

Contact: Don Will, Deputy Director, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts
415-865-7557 | don.will@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consider a methodology for allocating funding included in the 2024–25 Governor’s Budget for court operations related to the CARE Act based on the allocation methodology approved by the Judicial Council for the 2023–24 funding.

Background

On June 7, 2023, the Judicial Council approved the allocation methodology recommended by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to distribute \$20.0 million for 2023–24 in implementation and planning funds to all courts¹. On September 19, 2023, the Judicial Council approved the allocation of an additional \$9.4 million included in the 2023 Budget Act for the Superior Court of Los Angeles County to participate as a Cohort One court implementing the CARE Act in 2023–24².

The approved methodology for 2023–24 included these elements:

1. For Cohort One courts³ implementing the CARE Act, an allocation for court operations that employs the Workload Formula with a base of 25 CARE Act cases calculated at \$93,225;
2. For Cohort One courts implementing the CARE Act, an allocation for staff and other operational costs that employs the Workload Formula with a base of \$98,000; prorated to

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2023–24 Allocation of Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Funding* (June 7, 2023),

<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12125820&GUID=BB56211B-2F20-4BB8-8E94-B0909B17F695>

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2023–24 Allocation of Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act Funding* (September 19, 2023),

<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12246630&GUID=64A38B92-D51B-4459-BF69-F16D534D0541>

³ The Superior Courts of Glenn, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne Counties implemented the CARE Act in October 2023, and the Superior Court of Los Angeles County implemented in December 2023.

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

the amount that Cohort One courts are estimated to receive in 2024–25 when all courts are implementing the CARE Act;

3. For Cohort Two courts, an allocation that employs the Workload Formula with a base of \$98,000, prorated to the amount that remains after the allocation described in Recommendation 2 and after reduction by 0.5 percent to hold as a reserve for Cohort One courts that require additional program funding, with any unspent funding from the court allocations and this reserve redistributed through the reallocation process via the approved methodology; and
4. A method to reallocate unspent funds during the fiscal year.

In 2024–25, all courts are required to implement the CARE Act. Cohort One, including Los Angeles, will be in full implementation for all 12 months of the year. Cohort Two courts are required to implement the CARE Act by December 1, 2024, but may implement sooner.

The 2024–25 Governor’s Budget includes \$52.7 million for court operations in 2024–25 and \$66.0 million in 2025–26 and ongoing (Link A). The \$66.0 million is intended to fund court operations when all courts have fully implemented the CARE Act.

The allocation methodology proposed for consideration for 2024–2025 retains the base funding and Workload Formula elements of the 2023–2024 methodology and is updated to reflect a full year of implementation funding for Cohort One and a partial year for Cohort Two. This is calculated as follows:

- Table 1 uses the Workload Formula and base amounts calculate the allocations to all courts at the \$66.0 million in full funding (Table 1, Cols. F., H., and I).
- Table 2 sets the allocation of Cohort One and Los Angeles to the full year of implementation calculated in Table 1 (Table 2, Cols. F, H. and I).
- Table 2 prorates the remaining funding to Cohort Two courts.
- Note that in 2025–26, the allocations of all courts will be those in Table 1.

Reallocation. Judicial Council staff were directed to survey courts and conduct a reallocation of unspent CARE Act funding in the second half of 2023–24. This process was incorporated into the recent survey conducted by Budget Services to determine the amount of unspent funding in 2023–24.

Recommendations

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

The Funding Methodology Subcommittee is asked to consider the following recommendations for consideration by the TCBAC, the Judicial Branch Budget Committee, and then the Judicial Council:

1. Continue all elements of the allocation methodology approved in 2023–24 including employing the Workload Formula and the funding base already defined;
2. Approve, for Cohort One courts and Los Angeles, an allocation based on the amount required for a full year of CARE Act implementation; and
3. Approve, for Cohort Two courts, an allocation prorated to the amount required for a full year of CARE Act implementation.

Attachments

1. **Link A:** Budget Request 0250-197-BCP-2023-MR Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act.
https://esd.dof.ca.gov/Documents/bcp/2324/FY2324_ORG0250_BCP7012.pdf.
2. **Attachment 1:** Allocation Table 1.
3. **Attachment 2:** Allocation Table 2.

Table 1. Allocation of Court Operations Budget When Fully Funded in FY 2025—2026

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Court	Final Workload Allocation			Staff/Other		Court/Ops		Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Final Staff/Other Costs	Base	Final Hearing Costs	Total Allocation
Alameda	89,736,650	3.56%	755,454	98,000	\$ 683,150	93,225	\$ 1,567,339	\$ 2,250,489
Alpine	978,500	0.04%	8,238	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Amador	4,508,080	0.18%	37,952	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Butte	13,971,923	0.55%	117,624	98,000	\$ 189,107	93,225	\$ 322,743	\$ 511,851
Calaveras	3,478,322	0.14%	29,282	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Colusa	2,506,641	0.10%	21,102	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Contra Costa	53,284,741	2.11%	448,581	98,000	\$ 445,456	93,225	\$ 968,540	\$ 1,413,996
Del Norte	3,867,969	0.15%	32,563	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
El Dorado	9,526,802	0.38%	80,202	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Fresno	63,747,461	2.53%	536,662	98,000	\$ 513,681	93,225	\$ 1,140,412	\$ 1,654,093
Glenn	2,997,045	0.12%	25,231	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Humboldt	8,921,029	0.35%	75,102	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Imperial	10,504,343	0.42%	88,431	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Inyo	2,549,184	0.10%	21,460	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Kern	64,062,338	2.54%	539,313	98,000	\$ 515,734	93,225	\$ 1,145,585	\$ 1,661,319
Kings	11,101,306	0.44%	93,457	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 275,587	\$ 373,587
Lake	5,096,756	0.20%	42,907	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Lassen	2,800,148	0.11%	23,573	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Los Angeles	732,713,543	29.06%	6,168,396	98,000	\$ 4,875,837	93,225	\$ 12,129,596	\$ 17,005,434
Madera	12,403,858	0.49%	104,423	98,000	\$ 178,882	93,225	\$ 296,985	\$ 475,867
Marin	14,327,907	0.57%	120,620	98,000	\$ 191,429	93,225	\$ 328,591	\$ 520,020
Mariposa	1,853,846	0.07%	15,607	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mendocino	7,646,197	0.30%	64,370	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Merced	17,012,600	0.67%	143,222	98,000	\$ 208,935	93,225	\$ 372,693	\$ 581,628
Modoc	1,406,022	0.06%	11,837	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mono	2,439,556	0.10%	20,538	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Monterey	26,329,671	1.04%	221,658	98,000	\$ 269,689	93,225	\$ 525,746	\$ 795,435
Napa	9,282,739	0.37%	78,147	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Nevada	6,639,488	0.26%	55,895	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Orange	188,291,022	7.47%	1,585,140	98,000	\$ 1,325,798	93,225	\$ 3,186,304	\$ 4,512,101
Placer	25,173,615	1.00%	211,926	98,000	\$ 262,151	93,225	\$ 506,755	\$ 768,906
Plumas	1,915,282	0.08%	16,124	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Riverside	137,769,526	5.46%	1,159,822	98,000	\$ 996,360	93,225	\$ 2,356,381	\$ 3,352,741
Sacramento	108,993,944	4.32%	917,573	98,000	\$ 808,722	93,225	\$ 1,883,681	\$ 2,692,403
San Benito	4,808,390	0.19%	40,480	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
San Bernardino	144,252,144	5.72%	1,214,396	98,000	\$ 1,038,631	93,225	\$ 2,462,872	\$ 3,501,503
San Diego	173,468,681	6.88%	1,460,357	98,000	\$ 1,229,145	93,225	\$ 2,942,815	\$ 4,171,960
San Francisco	63,222,900	2.51%	532,246	98,000	\$ 510,260	93,225	\$ 1,131,795	\$ 1,642,055
San Joaquin	51,550,851	2.04%	433,984	98,000	\$ 434,150	93,225	\$ 940,057	\$ 1,374,207
San Luis Obispo	18,799,273	0.75%	158,263	98,000	\$ 220,585	93,225	\$ 402,043	\$ 622,628
San Mateo	43,346,545	1.72%	364,916	98,000	\$ 380,652	93,225	\$ 805,284	\$ 1,185,936
Santa Barbara	27,473,608	1.09%	231,288	98,000	\$ 277,148	93,225	\$ 544,537	\$ 821,686
Santa Clara	96,100,018	3.81%	809,024	98,000	\$ 724,644	93,225	\$ 1,671,871	\$ 2,396,515
Santa Cruz	17,003,334	0.67%	143,144	98,000	\$ 208,874	93,225	\$ 372,541	\$ 581,415
Shasta	16,359,995	0.65%	137,728	98,000	\$ 204,679	93,225	\$ 361,973	\$ 566,652
Sierra	978,500	0.04%	8,238	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Siskiyou	4,337,464	0.17%	36,515	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Solano	29,080,663	1.15%	244,817	98,000	\$ 287,628	93,225	\$ 570,936	\$ 858,564
Sonoma	30,554,838	1.21%	257,228	98,000	\$ 297,240	93,225	\$ 595,153	\$ 892,393
Stanislaus	32,303,460	1.28%	271,949	98,000	\$ 308,643	93,225	\$ 623,878	\$ 932,520
Sutter	8,164,586	0.32%	68,734	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225

Table 1. Allocation of Court Operations Budget When Fully Funded in FY 2025—2026

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Court	Final Workload Allocation			Staff/Other		Court/Ops		Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Final Staff/Other Costs	Base	Final Hearing Costs	Total Allocation
Tehama	6,113,757	0.24%	51,469	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Trinity	2,142,278	0.08%	18,035	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tulare	32,165,439	1.28%	270,787	98,000	\$ 307,743	93,225	\$ 621,610	\$ 929,353
Tuolumne	4,989,596	0.20%	42,005	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Ventura	44,799,399	1.78%	377,147	98,000	\$ 390,125	93,225	\$ 829,150	\$ 1,219,275
Yolo	15,477,215	0.61%	130,296	98,000	\$ 198,923	93,225	\$ 347,471	\$ 546,394
Yuba	6,239,055	0.25%	52,524	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Total	2,521,570,045	100.00%	21,228,000	5,684,000	\$ 21,228,000	5,407,050	\$ 44,748,000	\$ 65,976,000

Table 2. Allocation of Court Operations Budget FY 2024—2025

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Court	Final Workload Allocation			Staff/Other		Court Ops		Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Final Staff/Other Costs	Base	Final Hearing Costs	Total Allocation
Alameda	89,736,650	3.56%	273,779	98,000	\$ 414,453	93,225	\$ 1,028,556	\$ 1,443,010
Alpine	978,500	0.04%	2,985	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Amador	4,508,080	0.18%	13,754	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Butte	13,971,923	0.55%	42,627	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Calaveras	3,478,322	0.14%	10,612	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Colusa	2,506,641	0.10%	7,648	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Contra Costa	53,284,741	2.11%	162,567	98,000	\$ 285,907	93,225	\$ 648,616	\$ 934,522
Del Norte	3,867,969	0.15%	11,801	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
El Dorado	9,526,802	0.38%	29,065	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Fresno	63,747,461	2.53%	194,488	98,000	\$ 322,803	93,225	\$ 757,669	\$ 1,080,472
Glenn	2,997,045	0.12%	25,231	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Humboldt	8,921,029	0.35%	27,217	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Imperial	10,504,343	0.42%	32,048	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Inyo	2,549,184	0.10%	7,777	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Kern	64,062,338	2.54%	195,449	98,000	\$ 323,914	93,225	\$ 760,951	\$ 1,084,865
Kings	11,101,306	0.44%	33,869	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Lake	5,096,756	0.20%	15,550	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Lassen	2,800,148	0.11%	8,543	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Los Angeles	732,713,543	29.06%	6,168,396	98,000	\$ 4,875,837	93,225	\$ 12,129,596	\$ 17,005,434
Madera	12,403,858	0.49%	37,843	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Marin	14,327,907	0.57%	43,713	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mariposa	1,853,846	0.07%	5,656	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mendocino	7,646,197	0.30%	23,328	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Merced	17,012,600	0.67%	51,904	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Modoc	1,406,022	0.06%	4,290	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Mono	2,439,556	0.10%	7,443	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Monterey	26,329,671	1.04%	80,330	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Napa	9,282,739	0.37%	28,321	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Nevada	6,639,488	0.26%	20,257	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Orange	188,291,022	7.47%	1,585,140	98,000	\$ 1,325,798	93,225	\$ 3,186,304	\$ 4,512,101
Placer	25,173,615	1.00%	76,803	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Plumas	1,915,282	0.08%	5,843	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Riverside	137,769,526	5.46%	1,159,822	98,000	\$ 996,360	93,225	\$ 2,356,381	\$ 3,352,741
Sacramento	108,993,944	4.32%	332,531	98,000	\$ 482,363	93,225	\$ 1,229,277	\$ 1,711,640
San Benito	4,808,390	0.19%	14,670	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
San Bernardino	144,252,144	5.72%	440,101	98,000	\$ 606,700	93,225	\$ 1,596,775	\$ 2,203,475
San Diego	173,468,681	6.88%	1,460,357	98,000	\$ 1,229,145	93,225	\$ 2,942,815	\$ 4,171,960
San Francisco	63,222,900	2.51%	532,246	98,000	\$ 510,260	93,225	\$ 1,131,795	\$ 1,642,055
San Joaquin	51,550,851	2.04%	157,277	98,000	\$ 279,792	93,225	\$ 630,543	\$ 910,335
San Luis Obispo	18,799,273	0.75%	57,355	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
San Mateo	43,346,545	1.72%	132,247	98,000	\$ 250,860	93,225	\$ 545,029	\$ 795,889
Santa Barbara	27,473,608	1.09%	83,820	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Santa Clara	96,100,018	3.81%	293,193	98,000	\$ 436,893	93,225	\$ 1,094,882	\$ 1,531,776
Santa Cruz	17,003,334	0.67%	51,876	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Shasta	16,359,995	0.65%	49,913	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Sierra	978,500	0.04%	2,985	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Siskiyou	4,337,464	0.17%	13,233	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Solano	29,080,663	1.15%	88,723	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Sonoma	30,554,838	1.21%	93,220	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Stanislaus	32,303,460	1.28%	271,949	98,000	\$ 308,643	93,225	\$ 623,878	\$ 932,520
Sutter	8,164,586	0.32%	24,909	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tehama	6,113,757	0.24%	18,653	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225

Table 2. Allocation of Court Operations Budget FY 2024—2025

Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Court	Final Workload Allocation			Staff/Other		Court Ops		Total
	Final Workload Allocation	Percentage	Distribution	Base	Final Staff/Other Costs	Base	Final Hearing Costs	Total Allocation
Trinity	2,142,278	0.08%	6,536	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Tulare	32,165,439	1.28%	98,134	98,000	\$ 211,430	93,225	\$ 428,488	\$ 639,918
Tuolumne	4,989,596	0.20%	42,005	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Ventura	44,799,399	1.78%	136,679	98,000	\$ 255,983	93,225	\$ 560,172	\$ 816,156
Yolo	15,477,215	0.61%	47,220	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Yuba	6,239,055	0.25%	19,035	98,000	\$ 98,000	93,225	\$ 93,225	\$ 191,225
Reserve					\$ 38,659		\$ 64,908	\$ 103,567
Total	2,521,570,045	100.00%	14,862,966	4,900,000	\$ 17,173,800	4,661,250	\$ 35,538,862	\$ 52,712,662