R E P O R T   T O   T H E   J U D I C I A L   C O U N C I L

Item No.: 21-016
For business meeting on: January 22, 2021

Title
Trial Court Budget: $50 Million COVID-19 Backlog Funding

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected
None

Recommended by
Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Hon. David M. Rubin, Chair

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair

Agenda Item Type
Action Required

Effective Date
January 22, 2021

Date of Report
January 12, 2021

Contact
Zlatko Theodorovic, 916-263-1397
 zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov
Fran Mueller, 916-263-5771
 fran.mueller@jud.ca.gov
Leah Rose-Goodwin, 415-865-7708
 leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Judicial Branch Budget Committee recommends approval of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendations regarding a COVID-19 related backlog definition, reporting requirements, and methodology for allocating the remaining $25 million from the one-time $50 million COVID-19 backlog funding appropriation.

Recommendation

The Judicial Branch Budget Committee recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the COVID-19 backlog definition developed by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee as workload that was not disposed of during the pandemic period of March 1, 2020, through August 31, 2020, compared to the same period in 2019.

2. Approve the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's recommendation for at least quarterly reporting requirements regarding progress in reducing the COVID-19 backlog with continued evaluation of trial court spending. In March 2021, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee will perform a reconciliation using trial court COVID-19 spending reports and court projections to redistribute COVID-19 backlog funds to courts still in need of COVID-19 backlog funding as defined.

3. Approve the allocation methodology for the remaining $25 million COVID-19 backlog funding as displayed in Attachment A.

4. Continue work on the Judicial Council staff–created template that has been distributed to all 58 courts to report nondispositional information on how courts have addressed COVID-19 related challenges.

Relevant Previous Council Action

At its July 24, 2020 business meeting, the Judicial Council considered an allocation methodology recommended by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) for the $50 million in COVID-19 funding. In response, the Judicial Council approved the following four-part motion:

1. Of the $50 million appropriated to the judicial branch for trial court COVID-19 related backlogs, the Judicial Council allocates $25 million immediately using the pro rata method proposed by TCBAC.

2. TCBAC will develop more precise definitions and practices for documenting and reporting COVID-19 related backlogs, and report its recommendations to the council prior to distribution of any of the second $25 million.

3. TCBAC will gather data from trial courts regarding how trial courts spent the first $25 million, and report that data back to the council prior to allocation of the second $25 million.

4. Have TCBAC develop, in consultation with the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee), recommendations for allocating the remaining $25 million on a data-and-needs basis. TCBAC will report the recommendations to the council.

In September 2020, in addition to its consulting role outlined in the motion, the Budget Committee gained an oversight role over TCBAC when the Chief Justice realigned TCBAC from reporting to the Executive and Planning Committee to the Budget Committee.

Comments
While TCBAC did not solicit public comment for its recommended action through the invitation-to-comment process, it received a public comment for its October 5, 2020 meeting. Specifically, 26 courts provided an alternative approach to the distribution of COVID-19 backlog funding

using a workload-based funding share allocation, adjusted by factors that assess each court's COVID-19 backlog impact. This approach was later presented to the Budget Committee and is described in the "Alternatives considered" section.

During TCBAC meetings on October 5, 2020, and October 15, 2020, there was vigorous discussion, and several alternatives were proposed and considered (see "Alternatives considered" section) before approving a final recommendation to take to the Budget Committee.[1]

The Budget Committee received no written public comment for its meetings on November 12, 2020, or January 5, 2021.

Analysis/Rationale

Pursuant to Government Code section 68502.5, allocation of trial court funds is one of the principal responsibilities of the Judicial Council.

As described in the enacted budget summary for 2020–21, "[t]he Judicial Branch has had to radically change its operations to protect the public from the spread of COVID-19 while also maintaining access to justice. Actions taken by the Judicial Council include extending court deadlines, suspending jury trials, using technology to conduct proceedings remotely, and suspending evictions and foreclosures. Trial courts have also taken actions to protect the public by closing courthouses and courtrooms, limiting operations to only essential court functions, and suspending collection activities, among others.

These actions have resulted in delays in court operations and a backlog of cases that will take time for the courts to process as they continue to practice physical distancing. In an effort to help the trial courts address the backlog and resume normal operations, the Budget Act of 2020 includes $50 million one-time General Fund in 2020–21."[2]

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee review and recommendation process
In accordance with the council action described above, the first $25 million has been distributed to the trial courts. In response to the remaining items in the motion approved by the Judicial Council, considerable work has been completed:

- On June 2, 2020, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) considered options on methodologies to allocate the one-time $50 million General Fund included in the 2020-21 May Revision to the trial courts for COVID-19 related case filing backlog for consideration by TCBAC at its June 11, 2020 meeting.

---

[1] Trial Court Budget Advisory Com., Oct. 15, 2020 meeting minutes, TCBAC webpage, *https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20201015-minutes.pdf*.

[2] 2020–21 Enacted Budget Summary, Dept. of Finance website, *http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2020-21/pdf/Enacted/BudgetSummary/JudicialBranch.pdf*.

- On June 11, 2020, TCBAC considered an FMS recommendation to allocate the $50 million via a methodology like the Workload Formula that was modified by TCBAC to a pro rata allocation to be distributed immediately upon approval of the council.

- On August 12, 2020, TCBAC met to discuss the motion and next steps, and established the Ad Hoc COVID-19 Backlog Subcommittee (subcommittee), consisting of nine TCBAC members, to develop a recommendation for approval by the committee to move forward to the Budget Committee and then the council at its November 12–13, 2020 business meeting.

- The subcommittee met three times (September 14, 21, and 28, 2020), developing a five-part recommendation for TCBAC's consideration at its October 5, 2020 meeting. At that meeting, TCBAC approved the recommendation related to already-allocated $25 million, and recommended that the subcommittee revisit the various other recommendations.

- The subcommittee met for a fourth time on October 8, 2020, and refined some of the recommendations developed at the previous meeting, and included additional considerations to develop an updated 11-part recommendation presented to TCBAC at its October 15, 2020 meeting. This recommendation was approved by TCBAC to move forward to the Budget Committee for consideration.

TCBAC used several guiding principles to develop its recommendations:

- The allocation must be made based on backlog as defined.

- There is recognition that all courts have been affected by the unprecedented occurrence of COVID-19. It is also recognized that the methodology for this funding is addressing the need for those courts most impacted by existing backlog during March 2020 through August 2020. The methodology must be transparent and efficient for implementation and reporting purposes.

- The methodology must be data-based, and this initial allocation methodology is a precursor to further analysis of future funding need as it relates to backlog including filing delay–related issues.

- The recommendations made were the beginning of the ongoing evaluation and reporting of the impact of COVID-19 to the branch and the legal system supporting the courts. Those who have contributed to this effort believe that this impact will be felt and should be evaluated and measured for a significant time to come. The subcommittee will continue to review and refine its approach, and it will continue to make recommendations to the Budget Committee and the council as appropriate.

Additionally, it was recognized there may be other causes of COVID-19 related delay and backlog that should be considered in the future. As a result, TCBAC's Ad Hoc COVID-19

Backlog Funding Subcommittee will continue its work to evaluate a potential statewide case-processing "delay factor" to determine the need for potential additional funding to address the continued impact of the pandemic on court operations and service to the public.

Disposition data
As defined, COVID-19 backlog is case-weighted workload that was not disposed of during the period March 1, 2020, through August 31, 2020, using (as a baseline) case-weighted disposition data from the same period in 2019. To fulfill the data request, courts were asked to submit monthly data by the case-type categories that correspond to the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) caseweights.

The caseweights are based on a time study that assesses the average number of minutes of workload required to move a case from filing to disposition, including any postdisposition activity. While the weights are usually used in conjunction with filings data, TCBAC determined that they could be used effectively with disposition counts for the purposes of assessing workload backlog.

Courts submitted data electronically via the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) or the JBSIS Web Portal. Courts unable to submit disposition data electronically or to collect certain disposition data not available in JBSIS used an Excel template developed for this purpose. Data collection began on November 3, and data submissions were made and accepted through December 15. On December 16, the JBSIS data was downloaded and compiled for analysis.

The analysis required a total of 15,324 data elements, with each element representing a court, a case-type, and a month. Each court needed to submit approximately 264 elements. Of the required elements, courts submitted 14,963 data elements (98%).

The COVID-19 backlog working group noted during its discussions that a few courts had been unable to report disposition data in JBSIS, usually due to case management system (CMS) transitions requiring the new CMS to extract data from the legacy system. Therefore, TCBAC's recommendation included a consideration for courts that might be unable to submit JBSIS data, stating that "in the event there are courts unable to enter the disposition data by case type for the time periods noted, proxies based on statewide averages will be applied to those courts for each time period to establish those courts' COVID-19 backlog and proportional allocation of the remaining $25 million."

Budget Committee review and recommendation process
After TCBAC completed its work and in accordance with the transition in oversight responsibility of TCBAC from the Executive Committee to the Budget Committee, the Budget Committee held two public meetings during which the Budget Committee evaluated both the TCBAC recommendation and an alternative recommendation from 26 courts.

At the November 12, 2020 meeting, the Budget Committee reviewed and discussed the allocation models. At the January 5, 2021 meeting, the Budget Committee again reviewed the two models. The Budget Committee found that both models it evaluated provided data-driven allocation approaches. Both models relied on sound policy in allocating the second $25 million. After significant discussion, the Budget Committee concluded the model TCBAC recommended aligned more closely to the legislative spirit underpinning the $50 million appropriation, providing a better needs-based approach for the money based on data.

The chart in Attachment B provides allocation information by court of the $50 million in COVID-19 backlog funding in Column C. Column A shows the allocation of the first $25 million, and column B shows the proposed allocation of the second $25 million. Column B is the allocation recommendation made in this report.

Policy implications
The development of this recommendation is significant as it will provide data, reporting, and the allocation of funding relative to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, as courts attempt to address the backlog they are still required to conform to state and local health requirements; this means that adjudicating cases will become costlier. Since meetings on these allocations have occurred, the impact of the pandemic to California has become more dire and courts may need to implement further costly shutdowns or reduced services.

The reporting information gathered as a result of this recommendation will inform future pandemic funding needs, and the allocation methodology created may guide any future COVID-19 related funding appropriations to the trial courts.

Alternatives considered
Over the course of various meetings, the following options were considered to measure backlog:

1. Use filings data to create a pandemic-weighted caseload model that adds an additional "COVID-19 delay factor to new filings." Filings data is reported in JBSIS by nearly all courts, making this model easy to implement. Also, the branch's weighted RAS model is a recognized methodology for allocations.

   This option requires an additional time study to calculate the delay factor by RAS case category. Given the emergent situation facing Californians needing court access, and the trial courts' urgent COVID-19 related fiscal needs, this approach was deemed impractical.

2. Use filings-to-dispositions ratio or gap to express backlog. Filings to disposition, or caseload clearance, is a recognized metric for measuring backlog.

   This option requires collecting two data elements, increasing the data reporting burden on courts, and there were viewpoints that the same result could be achieved only by collecting disposition data.

3. Develop a two-part measurement that includes a point-in-time "snapshot" of backlog plus a forward-facing measure of backlog that has yet to impact the court system. This includes calculating a "delay factor" that accounts for expected slowing of court processes due to physical distancing requirements.

   While adopting this recommendation would address court concerns that a point-in-time measurement of backlog was insufficient to capture the full impact of the pandemic court workload, similar to the first option, this option was determined to be impractical to implement—requiring an additional time study or similar effort to develop the delay factors.

4. Use the average change in dispositions as a measure for pending backlog.

   This measure is simple but potentially oversimplifies COVID-19 impact and workload differences in the courts, as it does not take the differences in workload associated with the various case types into consideration.

5. Use the average change in case-weighted dispositions as the backlog measure.

   TCBAC adopted this approach for its being data-specific and simple to implement yet able to account for the workload differences associated with different case types, given that courts may have had to modify or adjust their case processing work in response to pandemic-related issues.

Over the course of various meetings, the following options were considered to allocate the second $25 million:

1. Distribute the remaining $25 million via a pro rata allocation, mirroring the allocation of the first $25 million.

   This option did not support the data and needs-based approach to measuring backlog as directed by the Judicial Council.

2. Use a workload-based funding share allocation, adjusted by factors that assess each court's COVID-19 backlog impact.[3]

   This option was reviewed and considered by the Budget Committee as an alternative to TCBAC-recommended model.

---

[3] Materials from Judicial Branch Budget Committee's Jan. 5, 2021 meeting, *https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/Budget Committee-20210105-materials.pdf*.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This funding provides essential relief, both to Californians seeking access to justice and to trial courts in their efforts to mitigate COVID-19 related case backlogs that have developed due to the pandemic. Judicial Council staff will be required to report on COVID-19 related backlog data and distribute the remaining $25 million as part of the normal monthly distribution process to the trial courts.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: TCBAC Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020–21 $25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
2. Attachment B: $50 Million One-Time COVID-19 Backlog Funding Allocation

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 $25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
December 2020

Court	# of Dispositions, Pre Pandemic, March 2019 through August 2019 (Period 1)							# of Dispositions, Pandemic Period, March 2020 through August 2020 (Period 2)							Change in Dispositions	% +/-
	March	April	May	June	July	August	Total	March	April	May	June	July	August	Total		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G (A THRU F)	H	I	J	K	L	M	N (H THRU M)	O (N - G)	P ((N - G) / G)
Alameda	19,060	18,625	18,740	18,145	21,398	19,703	115,671	13,457	7,293	6,691	6,533	10,480	12,641	57,095	(58,576)	-50.6%
Alpine	84	65	105	106	120	114	594	97	81	117	60	71	75	501	(93)	-15.7%
Amador	423	407	468	560	590	584	3,032	378	276	257	309	424	470	2,114	(918)	-30.3%
Butte	2,701	2,459	2,598	2,325	2,763	2,568	15,414	2,168	1,441	1,440	1,640	1,959	1,886	10,534	(4,880)	-31.7%
Calaveras	464	381	371	424	521	412	2,573	415	200	201	467	268	250	1,801	(772)	-30.0%
Colusa**	375	437	528	438	421	316	2,515	366	146	168	596	599	293	2,168	(347)	-13.8%
Contra Costa**	9,008	9,354	9,460	9,715	10,486	9,527	57,547	4,980	3,481	3,280	4,416	7,323	8,881	32,360	(25,187)	-43.8%
Del Norte	1,094	1,352	1,456	1,399	1,302	1,118	7,721	979	507	320	770	842	967	4,385	(3,336)	-43.2%
El Dorado	1,065	988	1,060	1,115	1,274	1,252	6,754	992	487	692	765	901	1,125	4,962	(1,792)	-26.5%
Fresno	14,271	14,495	14,247	12,690	15,401	14,072	85,176	11,394	4,494	6,590	6,875	9,766	10,358	49,477	(35,699)	-41.9%
Glenn*	430	430	430	430	430	430	2,578	243	243	243	243	243	243	1,459	(1,119)	-43.4%
Humboldt	1,705	1,781	2,098	1,932	2,069	2,027	11,612	1,545	800	661	859	798	930	5,593	(6,019)	-51.8%
Imperial	3,904	3,817	4,095	4,103	4,520	4,627	25,066	3,172	2,898	2,294	2,033	2,065	2,230	14,692	(10,374)	-41.4%
Inyo	909	715	862	644	886	789	4,805	961	446	366	553	402	668	3,396	(1,409)	-29.3%
Kern	13,994	13,517	14,468	13,042	13,682	13,412	82,115	10,317	4,463	6,401	9,287	10,068	9,219	49,755	(32,360)	-39.4%
Kings	2,036	1,941	2,077	1,879	2,113	2,074	12,120	1,967	1,252	905	1,209	1,352	1,559	8,244	(3,876)	-32.0%
Lake	1,189	1,087	899	1,049	1,095	1,087	6,406	630	226	227	717	561	792	3,153	(3,253)	-50.8%
Lassen**	536	484	542	518	595	681	3,356	521	435	545	565	379	382	2,827	(529)	-15.8%
Los Angeles	129,582	123,308	126,760	121,246	142,415	142,176	785,487	94,474	52,152	48,333	57,840	66,889	80,304	399,992	(385,495)	-49.1%
Madera	2,241	2,330	2,483	2,201	2,440	2,561	14,256	1,827	873	735	1,387	1,294	1,556	7,672	(6,584)	-46.2%
Marin	4,187	4,286	4,227	3,904	2,451	4,131	23,186	2,185	1,509	1,423	1,909	2,062	1,976	11,064	(12,122)	-52.3%
Mariposa	247	303	314	306	272	317	1,759	184	136	85	64	125	161	755	(1,004)	-57.1%
Mendocino	1,787	1,523	1,744	1,525	1,770	1,608	9,957	1,647	1,132	858	1,073	1,223	1,166	7,099	(2,858)	-28.7%
Merced**	3,877	3,665	3,966	3,497	4,210	3,955	23,170	3,249	1,401	1,720	2,526	2,514	2,217	13,625	(9,545)	-41.2%
Modoc	137	117	149	239	204	190	1,036	137	160	129	224	148	147	945	(91)	-8.8%
Mono	589	636	617	595	753	764	3,954	688	574	488	418	327	413	2,908	(1,046)	-26.5%
Monterey	5,123	4,835	5,404	4,409	5,020	4,942	29,733	4,372	2,522	2,658	3,184	3,689	3,465	19,890	(9,843)	-33.1%
Napa**	2,139	1,621	1,858	1,520	1,429	1,548	10,114	653	124	400	1,186	840	780	3,980	(6,133)	-60.6%
Nevada	1,188	971	928	1,242	1,410	1,362	7,101	1,008	655	535	1,019	1,015	991	5,223	(1,878)	-26.4%
Orange	36,606	35,780	37,427	35,273	37,185	39,519	221,790	25,199	7,951	12,139	18,494	18,365	19,475	101,623	(120,167)	-54.2%
Placer	2,400	2,611	2,503	2,364	2,939	2,770	15,587	1,879	606	973	1,390	1,402	882	7,132	(8,455)	-54.2%
Plumas	261	233	239	225	335	299	1,592	234	148	651	424	225	217	1,899	307	19.3%
Riverside	26,735	26,643	27,716	25,839	28,753	28,993	164,679	19,496	7,224	5,531	13,128	16,753	16,679	78,811	(85,868)	-52.1%
Sacramento	8,275	11,254	23,350	18,303	23,538	20,144	104,864	6,467	798	3,873	4,255	5,500	7,537	28,430	(76,434)	-72.9%
San Benito	471	540	580	513	553	571	3,228	378	181	144	176	280	297	1,456	(1,772)	-54.9%
San Bernardino	29,930	27,067	26,869	24,418	26,647	26,408	161,339	16,647	4,991	10,128	21,854	21,894	23,289	98,803	(62,536)	-38.8%
San Diego	29,282	28,381	28,291	27,278	31,106	31,620	175,958	15,287	10,163	11,449	12,258	12,231	12,681	74,069	(101,889)	-57.9%
San Francisco	9,078	10,397	8,094	8,955	11,383	9,440	57,347	2,996	1,502	1,447	2,470	2,284	2,881	13,580	(43,767)	-76.3%
San Joaquin	7,237	7,531	8,102	6,909	9,093	9,705	48,577	4,922	1,912	1,481	3,246	4,296	4,104	19,961	(28,616)	-58.9%
San Luis Obispo	3,877	3,886	4,073	3,752	4,094	4,173	23,855	2,651	1,718	1,279	1,919	2,054	2,303	11,924	(11,931)	-50.0%
San Mateo	11,363	10,892	11,907	11,047	12,507	12,766	70,482	8,846	4,929	3,317	4,477	5,029	5,091	31,689	(38,793)	-55.0%
Santa Barbara	6,217	5,778	6,107	5,926	6,114	5,907	36,049	4,606	2,676	2,150	2,299	2,240	2,142	16,113	(19,936)	-55.3%
Santa Clara	12,701	12,528	14,518	15,320	15,581	14,865	85,513	11,302	5,869	8,002	6,123	7,706	6,564	45,566	(39,947)	-46.7%

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 $25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
December 2020

Court	# of Dispositions, Pre Pandemic, March 2019 through August 2019 (Period 1)							# of Dispositions, Pandemic Period, March 2020 through August 2020 (Period 2)							Change in Dispositions	% +/-
	March	April	May	June	July	August	Total	March	April	May	June	July	August	Total		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G (A THRU F)	H	I	J	K	L	M	N (H THRU M)	O (N - G)	P ((N - G) / G)
Santa Cruz	2,892	2,825	3,090	2,888	3,560	3,677	18,932	2,241	1,266	1,796	1,887	2,546	2,147	11,883	(7,049)	-37.2%
Shasta	3,562	3,076	3,386	3,138	3,266	3,308	19,736	2,568	3,830	1,794	2,543	2,632	2,254	15,621	(4,115)	-20.9%
Sierra	28	48	36	48	64	64	288	35	14	43	52	29	24	197	(91)	-31.6%
Siskiyou	923	790	980	985	1,152	961	5,791	967	162	466	735	729	861	3,920	(1,871)	-32.3%
Solano	6,105	5,182	5,345	4,454	5,408	4,813	31,307	3,873	3,076	2,336	2,879	4,094	4,052	20,310	(10,997)	-35.1%
Sonoma	7,283	7,486	7,197	7,090	8,108	7,469	44,633	5,098	3,830	4,116	5,861	7,129	6,910	32,944	(11,689)	-26.2%
Stanislaus	5,547	5,434	5,482	5,209	5,535	5,358	32,565	4,642	1,954	2,046	2,722	3,054	3,877	18,295	(14,270)	-43.8%
Sutter	1,417	1,343	1,506	1,374	1,465	1,519	8,624	1,259	620	809	1,194	1,169	1,105	6,156	(2,468)	-28.6%
Tehama**	1,192	1,141	1,193	999	1,315	1,137	6,977	886	587	456	457	804	877	4,067	(2,910)	-41.7%
Trinity	203	233	211	281	229	358	1,515	178	120	181	102	145	170	896	(619)	-40.9%
Tulare	5,384	5,383	5,518	5,678	5,855	6,219	34,037	4,137	1,570	2,849	2,957	4,561	5,646	21,720	(12,317)	-36.2%
Tuolumne	708	649	861	819	934	760	4,731	691	628	368	397	451	443	2,978	(1,753)	-37.1%
Ventura	11,222	11,674	21,954	11,394	12,671	11,995	80,910	8,541	2,766	2,877	7,417	8,344	8,019	37,964	(42,946)	-53.1%
Yolo	2,189	2,326	3,033	2,592	3,060	2,511	15,711	1,304	720	922	999	1,018	1,178	6,141	(9,570)	-60.9%
Yuba	684	752	808	676	773	699	4,392	559	142	512	529	603	583	2,928	(1,464)	-33.3%
	458,116	447,792	483,329	444,944	505,262	496,374	2,835,816	322,894	162,359	172,896	231,970	266,193	288,433	1,444,746	(1,391,071)	-49.1%

Floor courts
Cluster 1 courts

*Proxy applied to all data.
**Proxy applied to some data.

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 $25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
December 2020

Court	Calculated Dispo Mins in Period 1	Calculated Dispo Mins in Period 2	Change in Backlog Minutes	% +/-	Percent of Change	Second $25m Allocation
	(Weights Reflected Here)					
	Q	R	S (R - Q)	T ((R - Q) / Q)	U (S / TOTAL S)	V (U * $25M)
Alameda	17,883,665	9,698,757	(8,184,908)	-45.8%	3.25%	813,228
Alpine	43,015	40,609	(2,406)	-5.6%	0.001%	239
Amador	616,966	428,719	(188,247)	-30.5%	0.07%	18,704
Butte	3,817,659	2,672,706	(1,144,953)	-30.0%	0.46%	113,759
Calaveras	687,161	571,018	(116,143)	-16.9%	0.05%	11,540
Colusa**	369,577	270,599	(98,978)	-26.8%	0.04%	9,834
Contra Costa**	9,436,357	5,701,968	(3,734,389)	-39.6%	1.48%	371,038
Del Norte	1,806,138	1,145,699	(660,439)	-36.6%	0.26%	65,619
El Dorado	1,762,976	1,444,055	(318,921)	-18.1%	0.13%	31,687
Fresno	16,166,752	8,762,424	(7,404,328)	-45.8%	2.94%	735,671
Glenn*	578,069	325,424	(252,645)	-43.7%	0.10%	25,102
Humboldt	2,528,781	1,462,476	(1,066,305)	-42.2%	0.42%	105,945
Imperial	3,407,249	1,729,210	(1,678,039)	-49.2%	0.67%	166,725
Inyo	475,368	340,810	(134,558)	-28.3%	0.05%	13,369
Kern	15,994,498	10,009,111	(5,985,387)	-37.4%	2.38%	594,690
Kings	2,805,070	1,757,319	(1,047,751)	-37.4%	0.42%	104,101
Lake	1,870,993	994,416	(876,577)	-46.9%	0.35%	87,094
Lassen**	733,770	430,115	(303,655)	-41.4%	0.12%	30,170
Los Angeles	167,557,586	89,739,693	(77,817,893)	-46.4%	30.93%	7,731,749
Madera	2,778,429	1,727,725	(1,050,704)	-37.8%	0.42%	104,395
Marin	3,288,561	1,875,006	(1,413,555)	-43.0%	0.56%	140,447
Mariposa	274,542	161,046	(113,496)	-41.3%	0.05%	11,277
Mendocino	2,078,227	1,600,494	(477,733)	-23.0%	0.19%	47,466
Merced**	3,659,587	2,290,314	(1,369,273)	-37.4%	0.54%	136,047
Modoc	284,159	171,779	(112,380)	-39.5%	0.04%	11,166
Mono	445,321	265,684	(179,637)	-40.3%	0.07%	17,848
Monterey	5,607,782	3,829,861	(1,777,921)	-31.7%	0.71%	176,649
Napa**	1,947,121	1,204,387	(742,734)	-38.1%	0.30%	73,796
Nevada	1,307,084	987,282	(319,802)	-24.5%	0.13%	31,775
Orange	44,665,088	21,758,720	(22,906,368)	-51.3%	9.10%	2,275,907
Placer	4,539,693	2,512,320	(2,027,373)	-44.7%	0.81%	201,434
Plumas	355,846	278,383	(77,463)	-21.8%	0.03%	7,696
Riverside	29,964,834	16,636,704	(13,328,130)	-44.5%	5.30%	1,324,242
Sacramento	21,638,646	9,467,120	(12,171,526)	-56.2%	4.84%	1,209,326
San Benito	614,116	395,116	(219,000)	-35.7%	0.09%	21,759
San Bernardino	41,492,501	24,427,912	(17,064,589)	-41.1%	6.78%	1,695,486
San Diego	34,136,170	17,112,902	(17,023,268)	-49.9%	6.77%	1,691,380
San Francisco	9,115,994	5,361,206	(3,754,789)	-41.2%	1.49%	373,064
San Joaquin	11,282,400	6,093,647	(5,188,753)	-46.0%	2.06%	515,539
San Luis Obispo	4,453,302	2,391,980	(2,061,322)	-46.3%	0.82%	204,807
San Mateo	8,331,325	4,689,619	(3,641,706)	-43.7%	1.45%	361,829
Santa Barbara	6,336,987	3,420,137	(2,916,851)	-46.0%	1.16%	289,809
Santa Clara	16,355,620	9,116,896	(7,238,724)	-44.3%	2.88%	719,218

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommended Methodology for Remaining 2020-21 $25 Million in COVID-19 Backlog Funding
December 2020

Court	Calculated Dispo Mins in Period 1	Calculated Dispo Mins in Period 2	Change in Backlog Minutes	% +/-	Percent of Change	Second $25m Allocation
	(Weights Reflected Here)					
	Q	R	S (R - Q)	T ((R - Q) / Q)	U (S / TOTAL S)	V (U * $25M)
Santa Cruz	4,133,651	2,698,109	(1,435,542)	-34.7%	0.57%	142,631
Shasta	4,511,643	4,109,959	(401,684)	-8.9%	0.16%	39,910
Sierra	56,136	56,136	-	0.00%	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	999,173	724,148	(275,025)	-27.5%	0.11%	27,326
Solano	5,781,170	3,704,924	(2,076,246)	-35.9%	0.83%	206,289
Sonoma	6,383,454	4,009,887	(2,373,567)	-37.2%	0.94%	235,830
Stanislaus	8,528,854	4,843,575	(3,685,279)	-43.2%	1.46%	366,158
Sutter	1,791,150	1,240,452	(550,699)	-30.7%	0.22%	54,716
Tehama**	1,537,783	860,910	(676,873)	-44.0%	0.27%	67,252
Trinity	316,694	176,101	(140,593)	-44.4%	0.06%	13,969
Tulare	7,973,857	4,729,658	(3,244,199)	-40.7%	1.29%	322,334
Tuolumne	1,143,850	719,491	(424,359)	-37.1%	0.17%	42,163
Ventura	12,051,994	5,805,414	(6,246,580)	-51.8%	2.48%	620,641
Yolo	3,221,283	1,696,134	(1,525,149)	-47.3%	0.61%	151,534
Yuba	1,305,707	937,098	(368,609)	-28.2%	0.15%	36,624
	563,231,384	311,613,360	(251,618,024)	-44.7%	100.00%	25,000,000
			-		0%	-

Floor courts
Cluster 1 courts

*Proxy applied to all d
**Proxy applied to som

$50 Million One-Time COVID-19 Backlog Funding Allocation

Court	First $25m Allocation (Pro Rata)	Second $25m Allocation (Recommendation)	Total $50m Allocation
Alameda	842,169	813,228	1,655,397
Alpine	4,099	239	4,338
Amador	34,576	18,704	53,280
Butte	142,826	113,759	256,585
Calaveras	27,720	11,540	39,259
Colusa	21,131	9,834	30,966
Contra Costa	539,671	371,038	910,709
Del Norte	30,804	65,619	96,423
El Dorado	91,925	31,687	123,612
Fresno	677,260	735,671	1,412,931
Glenn	25,321	25,102	50,423
Humboldt	85,802	105,945	191,746
Imperial	98,417	166,725	265,142
Inyo	20,493	13,369	33,863
Kern	687,911	594,690	1,282,601
Kings	102,879	104,101	206,981
Lake	52,118	87,094	139,212
Lassen	21,101	30,170	51,271
Los Angeles	7,326,544	7,731,749	15,058,292
Madera	116,120	104,395	220,515
Marin	139,187	140,447	279,633
Mariposa	15,494	11,277	26,771
Mendocino	71,110	47,466	118,577
Merced	166,730	136,047	302,777
Modoc	11,089	11,166	22,254
Mono	17,595	17,848	35,443
Monterey	254,246	176,649	430,895
Napa	96,689	73,796	170,485
Nevada	60,945	31,775	92,719
Orange	1,831,901	2,275,907	4,107,808
Placer	238,483	201,434	439,917
Plumas	15,906	7,696	23,603
Riverside	1,329,084	1,324,242	2,653,326
Sacramento	1,175,581	1,209,326	2,384,907
San Benito	38,657	21,759	60,416
San Bernardino	1,400,914	1,695,486	3,096,399
San Diego	1,697,402	1,691,380	3,388,782
San Francisco	585,040	373,064	958,104
San Joaquin	513,099	515,539	1,028,638
San Luis Obispo	192,206	204,807	397,013
San Mateo	436,824	361,829	798,653
Santa Barbara	292,697	289,809	582,506
Santa Clara	953,930	719,218	1,673,148
Santa Cruz	172,052	142,631	314,683
Shasta	156,752	39,910	196,662
Sierra	2,760	-	2,760
Siskiyou	39,716	27,326	67,041
Solano	303,021	206,289	509,310
Sonoma	298,558	235,830	534,388
Stanislaus	329,931	366,158	696,089
Sutter	81,203	54,716	135,919
Tehama	57,335	67,252	124,587
Trinity	17,235	13,969	31,204
Tulare	305,728	322,334	628,062
Tuolumne	45,126	42,163	87,289
Ventura	495,230	620,641	1,115,871
Yolo	162,774	151,534	314,308
Yuba	48,879	36,624	85,503
	25,000,000	25,000,000	50,000,000