



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 26-051

For business meeting on July 17, 2026

Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2026–27 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding

Judicial Council Report Details

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Effective Date

July 17, 2026

Recommended by

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair

Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Vice-Chair

Date of Report

June 17, 2026

Contact

Audrey Fancy, 415-865-7706

audrey.fancy@jud.ca.gov

Report Type

Action Required

Executive Summary

The Judicial Council approves the allocation of court-appointed dependency counsel funding on an annual basis. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends allocation of the \$186.7 million appropriation for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel for fiscal year 2026–27. Allocations are subject to necessary technical adjustments and contingent upon funding included in the final enacted budget for fiscal year 2026–27.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 17, 2026, allocate \$186.7 million for fiscal year 2026–27 to the trial courts for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel costs. The following recommendations were considered by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on June 10, 2026, and approved for consideration by the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the fiscal year 2026–27 allocations for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel that reflect the results of the spending plan survey conducted in May 2026, as detailed in Attachment A, column H, including any needed technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the final enacted budget. The savings identified in the survey are available for allocation to:
 - a. Small courts impacted by funding reductions due to the existing methodology to provide a glide path to adjust to fiscal year 2026–27 reductions, up to 50 percent of the difference, if any, between their proposed allocation and the allocation calculated after applying small court adjustments, but before being capped at 100 percent of their total need as detailed in Attachment C, column D; and
 - b. Large courts, based on available remaining funding, to offset funding for small court adjustments.
2. Authorize Judicial Council staff to (1) conduct a midyear survey of trial courts in fiscal year 2026–27 to assess projected court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel expenditures and determine whether any courts will not fully spend their allocations and how much funding is available to reallocate to courts that need additional resources, and (2) implement a reallocation of this funding based on the existing methodology to maximize the appropriation to serve children and families in dependency proceedings.
3. Direct Judicial Council staff to report the results of the fiscal year 2026–27 reallocation at the time the council considers the next year’s proposed allocations, ensuring transparency in how the funds were redistributed to meet program needs.

Relevant Previous Council Action

Court-appointed dependency counsel became a state fiscal responsibility in 1989 through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (Sen. Bill 612; Stats. 1988, ch. 945). The act added Government Code section 77003, defining “court operations” to include court-appointed dependency counsel and provide an appropriation for trial court operations. The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850) funded and detailed the transition to full state trial court funding.

The court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel (CAC) funding is distributed to the courts using a workload model adopted by the council in 2016¹ and amended in 2022.² The key factors (for each court) used in this methodology are:

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., [*Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology*](#) (Apr. 1, 2016).

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., [*Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2022–23 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding*](#) (June 24, 2022).

- A three-year rolling average of original dependency filings;
- A three-year rolling average of children in foster care;³ and
- Median county counsel of the first two salary ranges reported by counties and the current U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics index.

The methodology also includes adjustments for small courts to ensure adequate funding.⁴ These adjustments include (1) suspending reallocation-related budget reductions for the smallest courts, with caseloads under 200; (2) adjusting the local economic index for the small courts, with dependency caseloads under 400; and (3) reducing the funding allocations of all large-court budgets to offset the costs for small courts. If these adjustments result in a small court receiving more than 100 percent of the total calculated need, calculated through the workload and funding methodology, the allocation is capped at 100 percent of total need. Currently, 38 courts fall within the small-court category, with 28 of those courts meeting the “smallest court” criteria.⁵

The initial allocation of \$186.7 million for fiscal year (FY) 2025–26, considered by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) on May 7, 2025,⁶ contained a calculation error involving the 100 percent cap for small courts. Although corrected allocations were approved by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on May 16, 2025,⁷ the recalculation caused significant and unexpected funding reductions for several courts. As a result, the proposed FY 2025–26 allocations were withdrawn from the Judicial Council’s July 18, 2025, business meeting agenda. The allocations were deferred back to the committee process to consider options to advance the goal of funding equity, stability, and predictability for the trial courts.

On August 11, 2025,⁸ the TCBAC directed Judicial Council staff to conduct a spending plan survey of all trial courts to identify any courts that did not intend to spend their full FY 2025–26 allocation. Any resulting savings would be made available to impacted small courts, up to their

³ On February 27, 2020, the California Child Welfare Indicators Project site was updated to improve navigation and offer new features. With these changes, some previously available views of the data were removed. Cases opened and not identified to a specific court are assigned to the service component “Missing.” To comply with California Department of Social Services (CDSS) data de-identification guidelines, “masking” is performed to protect the privacy of individuals served by CDSS. In reporting the number of children served, any service component with a value between 1 and 10 is masked. Three courts, Alpine, Mono, and Sierra, had total values between 1 and 10; therefore, the number of children served was masked and identified with “M.” With the aim of maintaining confidentiality and allocating funds to each of these courts, each was allotted a value of 10 as of reporting period July 1, 2025.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., [*Juvenile Law: Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Methodology for Small Courts*](#) (Dec. 20, 2018).

⁵ Due to downward trends in dependency filings, the small-court adjustments have applied to more courts in recent years, which has resulted in some small courts receiving increased funding despite drops in caseloads.

⁶ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, [Meeting Materials](#) (May 7, 2025).

⁷ Judicial Branch Budget Committee, [Meeting Materials](#) (May 16, 2025).

⁸ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, [Meeting Materials](#) (Aug. 11, 2025).

proposed allocation, with remaining funds to be distributed through the midyear reallocation process.

Staff consulted courts on their funding needs and the impact of the technical corrections to determine—based on courts’ spending plans—whether funds could be made available to assist courts needing a glide path to accommodate the impact of the technical correction for FY 2025–26. On August 18, 2025,⁹ the Judicial Branch Budget Committee approved recommendations from the TCBAC to allocate FY 2025–26 funding based on the existing methodology and the survey results.

On September 2, 2025,¹⁰ the Judicial Council approved the allocations and directed the TCBAC to add an additional item to its FY 2025–26 work plan to consider a revised methodology to address concerns raised by stakeholders and the courts that the existing methodology may no longer meet the needs of the program to support juvenile dependency proceedings.

On December 18, 2025,¹¹ the Funding Methodology Subcommittee reviewed the factors used in the current allocation methodology and recommended that a working group be established to consider revisions to the methodology. The TCBAC chair authorized a working group, which was convened in early 2026.

Analysis/Rationale

The judicial branch budget for FY 2026–27 includes \$186.7 million for court-appointed dependency counsel.¹² This appropriation has remained unchanged since FY 2022–23 and supports all aspects of legal representation for children and parents in juvenile dependency cases.

Due to the impact of the existing methodology, several small courts will have funding reductions for FY 2026–27 and may require a glide path to further adjust to these reductions. On May 7, 2026,¹³ the TCBAC approved a recommendation to allocate the FY 2026–27 funding according to the existing court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding methodology, as included in column H of Attachment A.

To redistribute funds, the TCBAC also directed Judicial Council staff to conduct a spending plan survey of all trial courts in May 2026 to determine whether any courts did not anticipate fully spending their proposed FY 2026–27 allocation. Any identified funds will first be made available to small courts impacted by reductions resulting from the application of the current methodology,

⁹ Judicial Branch Budget Committee, [Meeting Materials](#) (Aug. 18, 2025).

¹⁰ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., [Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2025–26 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding](#) (Aug. 25, 2025).

¹¹ Funding Methodology Subcommittee, [Meeting Materials](#) (Dec. 18, 2025).

¹² The judicial branch budget also includes up to \$66 million in federal reimbursement for those court-appointed dependency counsel providers participating in the Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program.

¹³ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, [Meeting Materials](#) (May 7, 2026).

with any remaining funds made available to large courts anticipating to fully exhaust their allocation. The TCBAC directed staff to bring updated proposed allocations back to the committee for consideration once the survey results were available.

In May 2026, council staff conducted the CAC spending plan survey. Fifty-four courts responded to the survey. Of those courts, 52 indicated that they would fully expend their proposed allocation, and 37 of those courts requested additional funding, if available. Two courts reported that they would not fully expend their proposed allocations, making a total of \$520,000 available for allocation to other courts.

On June 3, 2026,¹⁴ the TCBAC considered and approved council staff recommendations to allocate funds identified through the spending plan survey: first to small courts impacted by funding reductions to help them adjust to FY 2026–27 reductions, then to large courts, based on available remaining funding, to offset reductions to their funding for the small court adjustments.

The proposed trial court allocations are detailed in Attachment A, and total calculated funding need based on the approved methodology is shown in Attachment B. Based on this methodology, of the reallocated \$520,000, \$185,561 went to small courts and \$334,439 went to large courts.

Policy implications

There are no policy implications to consider for the recommended allocation. However, as noted above, the \$520,000 identified for reallocation through the court spending plan survey resulted in increased allocations for both large and small courts.

Comments

Public comments were not solicited for this proposal because the recommendations are within the Judicial Council’s purview to approve without circulation. However, the TCBAC received both written and verbal public comments, which were considered during its meeting on May 7, 2026.

Alternatives considered

The TCBAC considered the option of allocating funds according to the existing court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding methodology, without modification. However, the committee determined that aligning allocations based on court spending plans will better maximize the use of CAC funding and provide assistance to small courts in need.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This recommendation is for the allocation of funds that are included in the FY 2026–27 budget. Hence, no additional costs or operational impacts are anticipated.

¹⁴ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, [Action by Email Between Meetings Materials](#) (June 3, 2026).

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Fiscal Year 2026–27 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding
2. Attachment B: Fiscal Year 2026–27 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology
3. Attachment C: Fiscal Year 2026–27 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding: Small Court Eligibility for Additional Funding Requests

Fiscal Year 2026-27 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Court	2025-26 Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need (Prior Year) A	2026-27 Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need (Current Year) B	2023-24 Allocation C	2024-25 Allocation D	2025-26 Allocation E	2026-27 Proposed Allocation ¹ F (as approved by TCBCAC)	2026-27 CAC Adjustments to Allocation Based On Court Spending Plans G	2026-27 CAC Allocation Considering Court Spending Plans H
Alameda	\$ 5,200,616	\$ 5,267,582	\$ 3,903,699	\$ 4,150,739	\$ 4,137,757	\$ 4,238,495	\$ 10,447	\$ 4,248,942
Alpine	18,488	18,842	25,764	18,999	18,488	18,842	\$ -	18,842
Amador	195,107	197,298	158,374	155,513	162,137	171,210	\$ -	171,210
Butte	1,173,237	1,113,327	945,296	962,319	933,460	1,031,012	\$ -	1,031,012
Calaveras	261,689	283,738	190,388	231,546	245,673	264,817	\$ -	264,817
Colusa	92,682	82,811	111,854	101,811	72,682	82,811	\$ (20,000)	62,811
Contra Costa	3,028,870	2,891,154	2,653,306	2,519,783	2,409,855	2,326,331	\$ 5,734	2,332,065
Del Norte	259,687	238,188	256,964	269,768	275,298	238,188	\$ 8,401	246,589
El Dorado	668,438	789,307	474,903	601,356	668,438	789,307	\$ -	789,307
Fresno	6,453,499	5,962,358	4,787,455	5,108,860	4,936,000	4,797,538	\$ 11,825	4,809,363
Glenn	140,795	150,136	143,016	141,039	146,455	150,135	\$ 4,811	154,946
Humboldt	946,581	946,913	729,831	744,798	946,581	946,913	\$ 10,000	956,913
Imperial	702,205	705,469	581,336	809,029	797,587	705,469	\$ 57,677	763,146
Inyo	81,884	58,458	76,990	85,907	81,884	58,459	\$ 6,246	64,705
Kern	5,757,583	6,055,032	3,644,535	4,131,045	4,580,896	4,872,106	\$ 12,009	4,884,115
Kings	1,070,376	1,067,882	775,408	824,322	1,023,513	1,048,984	\$ -	1,048,984
Lake	188,449	252,714	277,755	247,103	246,219	252,714	\$ 27,181	279,895
Lassen	170,559	155,516	174,612	173,075	170,559	155,516	\$ 2,577	158,093
Los Angeles	104,063,283	97,222,771	90,982,340	86,836,815	82,795,685	78,229,100	\$ 192,813	78,421,913
Madera	906,405	963,539	844,825	824,032	797,713	881,306	\$ -	881,306
Marin	398,873	446,963	358,761	386,687	398,873	408,419	\$ -	408,419
Mariposa	109,316	123,325	73,918	75,764	104,702	119,874	\$ -	119,874
Mendocino	666,874	635,040	608,018	662,845	666,874	635,041	\$ 11,625	646,666
Merced	1,619,967	1,688,336	1,052,809	1,166,819	1,288,891	1,358,498	\$ -	1,358,498
Modoc	55,531	78,163	50,853	65,582	79,436	78,163	\$ 16,335	94,498
Mono	32,202	37,383	21,591	26,958	28,683	32,924	\$ -	32,924
Monterey	715,812	734,859	595,734	528,532	574,546	596,999	\$ -	596,999
Napa	398,461	401,278	375,955	356,764	319,824	325,998	\$ -	325,998
Nevada	169,292	179,215	203,761	193,301	169,292	179,216	\$ -	179,216
Orange	13,311,808	13,868,839	9,166,564	9,755,582	10,591,250	11,159,390	\$ -	11,159,390
Placer	920,382	1,010,654	704,472	645,769	738,744	821,055	\$ -	821,055
Plumas	98,933	116,896	159,634	128,921	137,275	116,896	\$ 22,049	138,945
Riverside	17,353,158	19,777,368	10,707,784	11,902,759	13,806,662	15,913,614	\$ -	15,913,614
Sacramento	5,655,172	5,751,369	4,905,409	4,725,098	4,499,414	4,627,788	\$ 11,406	4,639,174
San Benito	124,179	118,842	95,270	94,875	99,672	96,547	\$ -	96,547
San Bernardino	20,782,763	20,802,200	15,061,246	16,073,940	16,535,353	16,738,233	\$ 41,255	16,779,488
San Diego	7,440,278	7,024,273	6,270,441	6,084,732	5,919,695	5,651,994	\$ 13,931	5,665,925
San Francisco	4,328,355	4,761,070	2,841,720	3,113,689	3,443,762	3,830,936	\$ 9,442	3,840,378
San Joaquin	4,245,431	4,371,331	2,843,217	3,183,540	3,377,785	3,517,338	\$ 8,669	3,526,007
San Luis Obispo	954,201	964,094	700,254	732,191	765,888	783,230	\$ -	783,230
San Mateo	827,243	775,782	765,432	724,811	663,986	630,245	\$ -	630,245
Santa Barbara	1,875,853	2,117,904	1,394,843	1,440,382	1,492,481	1,704,145	\$ -	1,704,145
Santa Clara	2,687,186	3,315,200	3,030,273	2,464,672	2,138,001	2,667,534	\$ 6,575	2,674,109
Santa Cruz	563,955	538,795	623,754	584,471	563,955	538,795	\$ -	538,795
Shasta	1,313,197	1,327,756	821,850	932,070	1,044,817	1,068,362	\$ -	1,068,362
Sierra	31,447	30,828	28,440	36,894	31,447	30,828	\$ -	30,828
Siskiyou	172,097	190,087	256,552	255,222	250,588	190,087	\$ 10,000	200,087
Solano	1,386,404	1,274,691	1,162,244	1,145,839	1,112,796	1,035,559	\$ -	1,035,559
Sonoma	2,060,600	1,929,529	1,625,196	1,635,689	1,639,472	1,552,571	\$ 3,827	1,556,398
Stanislaus	1,614,945	1,451,691	1,419,811	1,357,149	1,284,896	1,168,085	\$ 2,879	1,170,964
Sutter	430,755	440,977	336,571	337,171	363,813	374,503	\$ -	374,503
Tehama	339,029	364,213	294,234	313,954	339,029	364,213	\$ -	364,213
Trinity	65,884	65,886	83,204	83,204	83,204	65,886	\$ 8,659	74,545
Tulare	3,753,824	3,964,201	2,416,609	2,618,925	1,984,956	3,189,745	\$ (500,000)	2,689,745
Tuolumne	317,223	356,598	307,665	300,491	304,674	344,880	\$ -	344,880
Ventura	1,998,532	1,828,854	1,843,364	1,695,670	1,590,089	1,471,565	\$ 3,627	1,475,192
Yolo	1,473,280	1,540,857	1,235,231	1,267,692	1,182,527	1,251,792	\$ -	1,251,792
Yuba	807,295	861,422	418,668	563,486	600,000	699,819	\$ -	699,819
Reserve	-	-	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	\$ -	100,000
Total	\$ 232,480,168	\$ 229,689,803	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 185,764,227	\$ 186,700,000	\$ -	\$ 186,700,000

¹ Allocation under existing methodology, as approved by TCBCAC at its May 7, 2026 meeting.

Note: Allocations are based on filings data obtained from the Judicial Council Research, Analytics, and Data and caseload data obtained from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) as of July 1, 2025.

Fiscal Year 2026-27 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology*

Court	3 YR Average Original Filings (FY 2022, 2023, 2024) A	3 YR Average CWS Cases (July 2023, July 2024, July 2025) B	Filings % C	Cases % D	Sum of Weighted % (.3C+.7D) E	Partially Redistributed Caseload (B'E) F	BLS Index 2022, 2023, 2024 G	Annual Salary (G * Median Salary) H	Caseload Multiplied by Estimated Child-to- Parent Case Ratio (F*1.8) I	Attorneys Needed Per Caseload (I/141) J	Total Attorney Salaries (H*J) K	Total Funding Need (K/45) L	Allocation Pre-BLS Adjustment M	Small Court Increase with BLS Adjustment N	Large Court Funding Adjustment (Pro-Rata Decrease) O	2026-27 Proposed Allocation P	2026-27 CAC Allocation Based On Court Spending Plan Q
Alameda	468	1,079	1.63%	1.96%	1.87%	1021	1.48	\$ 181,812	1,838	13.04	\$ 2,370,412	\$ 5,267,582	\$ 4,279,384	\$ -	\$ (40,889)	\$ 4,238,495	\$ 4,248,942
*Alpine	0	10	0.00%	0.02%	0.01%	7	0.75	92,382	13	0.09	8,479	18,842	15,307	3,535	-	18,842	18,842
*Amador	38	56	0.13%	0.10%	0.11%	61	0.93	113,955	110	0.78	88,784	197,298	160,285	10,925	-	171,210	171,210
*Butte	165	391	0.57%	0.72%	0.67%	368	0.87	106,782	662	4.69	500,997	1,113,327	904,467	126,545	-	1,031,012	1,031,012
*Calaveras	72	77	0.25%	0.14%	0.17%	94	0.86	105,352	170	1.21	127,682	283,738	230,509	34,308	-	264,817	264,817
*Colusa	18	31	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	32	0.75	92,647	57	0.40	37,265	82,811	67,276	15,535	-	62,811	62,811
Contra Costa	315	647	1.10%	1.19%	1.16%	632	1.31	161,284	1,137	8.07	1,301,019	2,891,154	2,348,773	-	(22,442)	2,326,331	2,332,065
*Del Norte	43	95	0.15%	0.17%	0.17%	91	0.75	92,371	164	1.16	107,185	238,188	193,504	44,684	-	238,188	246,589
*El Dorado	143	170	0.50%	0.31%	0.37%	200	1.13	138,925	360	2.56	355,188	789,307	641,233	148,074	-	789,307	789,307
Fresno	798	1,915	2.77%	3.51%	3.29%	1794	0.95	117,135	3,230	22.91	2,683,061	5,962,358	4,843,820	-	(46,282)	4,797,538	4,809,363
*Glenn	35	53	0.12%	0.10%	0.10%	57	0.76	92,931	103	0.73	67,561	150,136	121,970	28,165	-	150,135	154,946
*Humboldt	219	344	0.76%	0.63%	0.67%	365	0.74	91,334	658	4.67	426,111	946,913	789,272	177,641	-	946,913	954,913
*Imperial	156	291	0.54%	0.53%	0.54%	293	0.69	84,960	527	3.74	317,461	705,469	573,123	132,346	-	705,469	763,146
*Inyo	7	24	0.02%	0.04%	0.04%	20	0.82	101,232	37	0.26	26,306	58,458	47,492	10,967	-	58,459	64,705
Kern	816	1,985	2.84%	3.64%	3.40%	1854	0.94	115,154	3,336	23.66	2,724,765	6,055,032	4,919,108	-	(47,002)	4,872,106	4,884,115
*Kings	228	349	0.79%	0.64%	0.69%	374	0.82	100,669	673	4.77	480,547	1,067,882	867,548	181,436	-	1,048,984	1,048,984
*Lake	53	91	0.19%	0.17%	0.17%	94	0.77	94,991	169	1.20	113,721	252,714	205,305	47,409	-	252,714	279,895
*Lassen	24	62	0.06%	0.11%	0.11%	57	0.78	95,715	103	0.73	69,982	155,516	126,341	29,175	-	155,516	158,093
Los Angeles	11,081	20,159	38.51%	37.06%	37.06%	20437	1.36	167,693	36,786	260.96	43,750,247	97,222,771	78,983,779	-	(754,679)	78,229,100	78,984,013
*Madera	251	245	0.87%	0.45%	0.58%	314	0.88	108,114	565	4.01	433,539	963,539	782,779	881,306	-	963,539	981,306
*Marin	68	99	0.24%	0.18%	0.20%	108	1.19	146,270	194	1.38	201,134	446,963	363,113	45,306	-	408,419	408,419
*Mariposa	32	35	0.11%	0.06%	0.08%	43	0.83	101,734	77	0.55	55,496	123,325	100,189	19,685	-	119,874	119,874
*Mendocino	114	243	0.40%	0.45%	0.43%	235	0.78	95,394	422	3.00	285,768	635,040	515,907	119,134	-	635,041	646,666
Merced	325	618	1.13%	1.13%	1.13%	617	0.78	96,401	1,111	7.88	759,751	1,688,336	1,371,604	-	(13,106)	1,358,498	1,358,498
*Modoc	31	31	0.11%	0.06%	0.07%	40	0.57	69,738	71	0.50	35,173	78,163	63,500	14,663	-	78,163	94,498
*Mono	8	10	0.03%	0.02%	0.02%	12	0.15	112,280	12	0.08	16,822	37,383	30,370	2,554	-	32,924	32,924
*Monterey	92	191	0.32%	0.35%	0.34%	186	1.13	139,102	335	2.38	330,686	734,859	596,999	596,999	-	596,999	596,999
*Napa	53	85	0.18%	0.16%	0.16%	89	1.29	158,163	161	1.14	180,575	401,278	325,998	-	-	325,998	325,998
*Nevada	32	43	0.11%	0.08%	0.09%	49	1.06	130,199	87	0.62	80,647	179,215	145,595	33,621	-	179,216	179,216
Orange	1,900	3,097	6.60%	5.68%	5.96%	3248	1.23	150,529	5,846	41.46	6,240,978	13,868,839	11,267,045	-	(107,655)	11,159,390	11,159,390
*Placer	177	213	0.62%	0.39%	0.46%	250	1.16	142,699	449	3.19	454,794	1,010,654	821,055	-	-	821,055	821,055
*Plumas	27	44	0.09%	0.08%	0.08%	46	0.73	89,210	83	0.59	52,603	116,896	94,966	21,930	-	116,896	138,945
Riverside	3,153	5,063	10.96%	9.34%	9.83%	5357	1.06	130,130	9,643	68.39	8,899,815	19,777,368	16,067,134	-	(153,520)	15,913,614	15,913,614
Sacramento	580	1,329	1.91%	2.44%	2.28%	1243	1.33	163,146	2,237	15.86	2,988,116	6,672,412	5,751,369	-	(44,644)	4,627,768	4,639,174
*San Benito	17	34	0.06%	0.06%	0.06%	33	1.03	126,794	59	0.42	53,479	118,842	96,547	-	-	96,547	96,547
San Bernardino	2,461	5,419	8.55%	9.94%	9.53%	5192	1.15	141,220	9,346	66.29	9,360,990	20,802,200	16,899,708	-	(161,475)	16,738,233	16,779,488
San Diego	663	1,881	2.30%	3.45%	3.11%	1693	1.19	146,228	3,048	21.62	3,160,923	7,024,273	5,706,519	-	(54,525)	5,651,994	5,665,925
San Francisco	396	809	1.38%	1.48%	1.45%	791	1.73	212,085	1,424	10.10	2,142,481	4,761,070	3,867,893	-	(36,957)	3,830,936	3,840,378
San Joaquin	575	1,208	2.00%	2.22%	2.15%	1173	1.07	131,363	2,111	14.97	1,967,099	4,371,331	3,551,270	-	(33,932)	3,517,338	3,526,007
*San Luis Obispo	138	277	0.48%	0.51%	0.50%	272	1.02	124,769	490	3.48	433,842	964,094	783,230	-	-	783,230	783,230
*San Mateo	82	133	0.29%	0.24%	0.26%	140	1.59	195,478	252	1.79	349,102	775,782	630,245	-	-	630,245	630,245
Santa Barbara	276	488	0.96%	0.90%	0.91%	498	1.22	149,829	897	6.36	953,057	2,117,904	1,720,585	-	(16,440)	1,704,145	1,704,145
Santa Clara	318	666	1.11%	1.22%	1.19%	647	1.47	180,702	1,164	8.26	1,491,840	3,315,200	2,693,268	-	(25,734)	2,667,534	2,674,109
*Santa Cruz	73	137	0.25%	0.26%	0.25%	138	1.12	137,814	248	1.76	242,458	538,795	437,717	101,078	-	538,795	538,795
Shasta	205	412	0.71%	0.76%	0.74%	405	0.94	115,535	729	5.17	597,490	1,327,756	1,078,669	-	(10,307)	1,068,362	1,068,362
*Sierra	5	14	0.02%	0.03%	0.02%	13	0.70	85,664	23	0.16	13,873	30,828	25,045	5,783	-	30,828	30,828
*Siskiyou	49	72	0.17%	0.13%	0.14%	78	0.70	85,583	141	1.00	85,539	190,087	154,427	35,660	-	190,087	200,087
*Solano	135	332	0.47%	0.61%	0.57%	309	1.18	145,443	556	3.94	573,611	1,274,891	1,035,559	-	-	1,035,559	1,035,559
Sonoma	191	502	0.66%	0.92%	0.84%	460	1.20	147,936	828	5.87	868,288	1,929,529	1,567,549	-	(14,978)	1,552,571	1,556,398
Stanislaus	151	453	0.52%	0.83%	0.74%	403	1.03	126,929	726	5.15	653,261	1,451,691	1,179,354	-	(11,269)	1,168,085	1,170,964
*Sutter	104	106	0.36%	0.19%	0.24%	133	0.95	116,439	240	1.70	198,440	440,977	358,250	16,253	-	374,503	374,503
*Tehama	81	124	0.28%	0.23%	0.24%	133	0.79	96,649	239	1.70	163,896	364,213	295,887	68,326	-	364,213	364,213
*Trinity	19	20	0.07%	0.04%	0.05%	25	0.76	93,653	45	0.32	29,649	65,886	53,526	12,360	-	65,886	74,545
Tulare	703	1,137	2.44%	2.09%	2.19%	1195	0.95	116,933	2,151	15.26	1,783,891	3,964,201	3,220,517	-	(30,772)	3,189,745	2,689,745
*Tulume	108	88	0.38%	0.18%	0.23%	123	1.57	102,247	221	1.57	160,469	350,598	289,701	55,179	-	344,880	344,880
Ventura	208	432	0.72%	0.79%	0.77%	421	1.25	153,284	757	5.37	822,984	1,828,854	1,485,761	-	(14,196)	1,471,565	1,475,192
*Yolo	197	330	0.68%	0.61%	0.63%	343	1.29	158,261	618	4.38	693,386	1,540,857	1,251,792	-	-	1,251,792	1,251,792
*Yuba	125	190	0.43%	0.35%	0.37%	204	1.21	149,125	367	2.60	387,640	861,422	699,819	-	-	699,819	699,819
											100,000	-	-	-	-	100,000	100,000
Total	28,772	54,509	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	54,509			98,116	695.86	\$ 103,360,411	\$ 229,689,803	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 1,640,804	\$ (1,640,804)	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 186,700,000

*Small Courts
BLS = Bureau of Labor Statistics; CW = Child Welfare

Median annual salary of county attorneys \$ 122,864

Fiscal Year 2026-27 Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding: Small Court Eligibility for Additional Funding Requests

Court*	2026-27 Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need (Current Year) A	2026-27 Proposed Allocation B	Allocation Based on Small Court Adjustments (Before cap at 100% of funding need) C	Difference between Proposed Allocation and Allocation Based on Small Court Adjustments (Before cap at 100% of funding need) D	Maximum Additional Funding For Small Court Requests (50% of col D) E	2026-27 CAC Allocation Based On Court Spending Plan F
*Alpine	\$ 18,842	\$ 18,842	\$ 20,169	\$ 1,327	\$ 664	\$ 18,842
*Amador	197,298	171,210	171,210	0	0	171,210
Butte	1,113,327	1,031,012	1,031,012	0	0	1,031,012
*Calaveras	283,738	264,817	264,817	0	0	264,817
*Colusa	82,811	82,811	88,388	5,577	2,789	62,811
*Del Norte	238,188	238,188	254,989	16,801	8,401	246,589
*El Dorado	789,307	789,307	789,307	0	0	789,307
*Glenn	150,136	150,135	159,757	9,622	4,811	154,946
Humboldt	946,913	946,913	1,025,223	78,310	39,155	956,913
Imperial	705,469	705,469	820,822	115,353	57,677	763,146
*Inyo	58,458	58,459	70,951	12,492	6,246	64,705
Kings	1,067,882	1,048,984	1,048,984	0	0	1,048,984
*Lake	252,714	252,714	307,076	54,362	27,181	279,895
*Lassen	155,516	155,516	160,670	5,154	2,577	158,093
Madera	963,539	881,306	881,306	0	0	881,306
*Marin	446,963	408,419	408,419	0	0	408,419
*Mariposa	123,325	119,874	119,874	0	0	119,874
Mendocino	635,040	635,041	658,291	23,250	11,625	646,666
*Modoc	78,163	78,163	110,833	32,670	16,335	94,498
*Mono	37,383	32,924	32,924	0	0	32,924
*Monterey	734,859	596,999	596,999	0	0	596,999
*Napa	401,278	325,998	325,998	0	0	325,998
*Nevada	179,215	179,216	179,216	0	0	179,216
Placer	1,010,654	821,055	821,055	0	0	821,055
*Plumas	116,896	116,896	160,994	44,098	22,049	138,945
*San Benito	118,842	96,547	96,547	0	0	96,547
San Luis Obispo	964,094	783,230	783,230	0	0	783,230
*San Mateo	775,782	630,245	630,245	0	0	630,245
*Santa Cruz	538,795	538,795	538,795	0	0	538,795
*Sierra	30,828	30,828	35,587	4,759	2,380	30,828
*Siskiyou	190,087	190,087	256,552	66,465	33,233	200,087
Solano	1,274,691	1,035,559	1,035,559	0	0	1,035,559
*Sutter	440,977	374,503	374,503	0	0	374,503
*Tehama	364,213	364,213	372,647	8,434	4,217	364,213
*Trinity	65,886	65,886	83,204	17,318	8,659	74,545
*Tuolumne	356,598	344,880	344,880	0	0	344,880
Yolo	1,540,857	1,251,792	1,251,792	0	0	1,251,792
*Yuba	861,422	699,819	699,819	0	0	699,819
Reserve	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-
Total	\$ 18,310,986	\$ 16,616,652	\$ 17,112,644	\$ 495,992	\$ 247,999	\$ 16,682,213

* = smallest courts