



Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688
www.courts.ca.gov

CIRCULATING ORDER MEMORANDUM TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Circulating Order Number: CO-25-05

Title

Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2025–26
Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile
Dependency Counsel Funding

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Recommended by

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

Action Requested

VOTING MEMBERS ONLY: Submit votes
by responding to the transmittal email.

Please Respond By

September 2, 2025

Date of Report

August 25, 2025

Contact

Audrey Fancy, 415-865-7706

audrey.fancy@jud.ca.gov

Kelly Meehleib, 916-263-1693

kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov

Public Comment

Written comments for this Judicial Council
action are accepted by 3:00 p.m., on
August 26, 2025.

California Rules of Court, rules 10.5(h) and 10.13(d) allow the Judicial Council to act on business between meetings, including urgent matters, by circulating order. This memorandum is not a Judicial Council meeting; circulating orders are conducted via electronic communications. Public notice for circulating orders may be provided and public comments may be accepted in writing according to an established time frame at judicialcouncil@jud.ca.gov. Only written comments received by the deadline will be delivered to Judicial Council members.

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 the fiscal year 2025–26 appropriation of \$186.7 million for court-appointed dependency counsel.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective September 2, 2025, allocate \$186.7 million for fiscal year (FY) 2025–26 to the trial courts for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel costs. The following recommendations were presented to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on August 18, 2025, and approved for consideration by the Judicial Council:

1. Allocate funding according to the existing court-appointed counsel (CAC) funding methodology approved by the Judicial Council. Proposed allocations are detailed in Attachment A, column L.
2. Allocate FY 2025–26 funds identified by courts through a spending plan survey of all courts conducted to determine whether any courts do not intend to spend their full allocation (as detailed in Attachment A, column L) and to make those funds available to assist small courts in adjusting to the reductions they face in this fiscal year. Concurrent to base allocations, allocate available funds to impacted small courts that require assistance, up to their proposed allocation approved by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on May 7, 2025, with any remaining funds to be allocated to all eligible courts through the regular midyear reallocation process. Proposed allocations based on the spending plan survey results are detailed in Attachment A, column M.
3. Direct TCBAC to add an additional item to its FY 2025–26 work plan to consider a revised methodology for an appropriate and effective way to address unique challenges faced by trial courts.

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 section 77003 to the Government Code, defined “court operations” in that section as including court-appointed dependency counsel, and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. In 1997, the Lockyer–Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850) provided the funding for and delineated the parameters of the transition to state trial court funding that had been outlined in the earlier legislation.

Court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding is distributed to the courts based on a workload model adopted by the Judicial Council in 2016¹ and amended in 2022.² Models of

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (Apr. 1, 2016), jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF.

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), jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11019079&GUID=CB0A2EE1-B3CF-43AC-B92B-F4724B5D209C.

dependency counsel provision among attorneys and organizations are numerous around the state. They range from solo practitioners who charge hourly fees to complex nonprofit, for-profit, and governmental organizations. No single method of calculating financial need for court-appointed counsel accounts for all the variance in organizational models and local costs. The model provides a means for calculating a total financial need that courts and attorney firms can then implement through a variety of service models.

The key factors used in this methodology are (for each court):

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

The funding methodology also includes several adjustments for small courts to ensure that these courts have adequate funding to meet their needs.⁴ Small-court 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. The methodology also provides that if the impact of these adjustments results in a small court being allocated more than 100 percent of the total need calculated through the workload and funding methodology, the court will receive an allocation equal to 100 percent of total need.

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. Based on current workload and filing information, 37 courts are in the small-court category, with 27 of those courts meeting the “smallest court” criteria.

Analysis/Rationale

The current annual budget for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel is \$186.7 million. The current court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel allocation methodology for small

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 with 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. Two courts, Alpine and Mono, 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, 2024.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Law: Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Methodology for Small Courts* (Dec. 20, 2018), jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6913216&GUID=4DEB6A82-B007-46D8-9885-8D11D907DBF5.

courts,⁵ approved by the Judicial Council in FY 2019–20, specifies adjustments for small courts based on caseload and the local economic index and provides that no small court receives more than 100 percent of its total need.

The initial CAC allocation of \$186.7 million for FY 2025–26, considered by TCBAC at its meeting on May 7, 2025,⁶ included a calculation error in the application of the 100 percent limit for small courts. A revised allocation reflecting the correct methodology resulted in the reallocation of \$438,000 among the trial courts, approved by the Judicial Branch Budget Committee at its meeting on May 16, 2025.⁷ This recalculation resulted in a significant and unexpected percentage funding decrease for a number of small courts.

The FY 2025–26 allocations to trial courts in Attachment A, column L, were derived using the methodology designated in the Judicial Council reports listed above. Proposed allocations are based on a survey conducted by Judicial Council staff of all courts and their spending plan in relation to their proposed allocation as detailed in Attachment A, column L. Staff consulted with courts on their funding needs and the impact of technical corrections made to allocation levels in FY 2025–26 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 this fiscal year. The results of this spending plan assessment are detailed in Attachment A, column M. Attachment B details the total funding need for court-appointed dependency counsel using the methodology designated in those same reports.

Policy implications

Applying this correction prospectively, beginning in FY 2025–26, results in a slight increase to the allocations for larger courts but downward-adjusted allocations for 16 small courts. The committee determined that it was necessary to maintain fidelity to the approved methodology while providing a glide path for impacted small courts needing one-time assistance.

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 Funding Methodology Subcommittee and this committee received written and verbal comments for

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Law: Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Methodology for Small Courts* (Dec. 20, 2018), jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6913216&GUID=4DEB6A82-B007-46D8-9885-8D11D907DBF5.

⁶ Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Notice and Agenda (May 7, 2025), courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250507-noticeandagenda.pdf; Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Meeting Materials (May 7, 2025), courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250507-materials.pdf.

⁷ Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting Notice and Agenda (May 16, 2025), courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/jbbc-20250516-noticeandagenda.pdf; Judicial Branch Budget Committee Meeting Materials (May 16, 2025), courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/jbbc-20250516-materials.pdf.

consideration at their meetings and informal comments from courts and court-appointed dependency providers.

Alternatives considered

TCBAC considered alternative options for the allocation of funding that were raised by the trial courts or stakeholders. The committee considered delaying the correction of the identified calculation error until FY 2026–27 to give the impacted courts time to prepare and minimize destabilization of their CAC programs. However, the committee determined that it would be an inaccurate allocation and inappropriate to not follow the methodology that was approved by the Judicial Council. In addition, the error impacts funding for the large courts that would fund the small-court adjustments.

The committee also considered using all or a portion of the \$100,000 in small-court reserve funding, included in the annual budget to assist small courts that experience sudden caseload increases, to fund impacted small courts. However, the committee determined that this was not a viable option because the reserve funding is already insufficient to meet the current intended need and may preclude access to these funds should a court experience a sudden caseload increase or unusually complex cases. The committee also considered using other funding sources, including the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program and Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program, and unspent funding from prior years to address funding needs, but determined that these options are not viable because of restrictions on the funds.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This recommendation is for the allocation of funds that are included in the FY 2025–26 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated. However, as noted above, committee recommendation 2 provides small courts with a glide path without impacting allocation levels for courts intending to fully spend allocated funds.⁸

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: *Fiscal Year 2025–26 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding*
2. Attachment B: *Fiscal Year 2025–26 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology*
3. Voting instructions, at page 9
4. Vote and signature pages, at pages 10–11

⁸ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed–Counsel Funding Reallocation* (Apr. 8, 2015), courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20150417-itemi.pdf.

Author

Audrey Fancy

Principal Managing Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Kelly Meehleib

Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Fiscal Year 2025-26 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Court	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Prior Year 24-25	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Current Year 25-26	2016-17 Allocation	2017-18 Allocation	2018-19 Allocation	2019-20 Allocation	2020-21 Allocation	2021-22 Allocation	2022-23 Allocation	2023-24 Allocation	2024-25 Allocation	Proposed Allocation 2025-26	Proposed Allocation 2025-26 Based on Court Spending Plan
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Alameda	\$ 5,507,175	\$ 5,200,616	\$ 3,618,313	\$ 3,565,629	\$ 3,399,620	\$ 3,629,342	\$ 3,422,591	\$ 3,346,652	\$ 3,840,167	\$ 3,903,699	\$ 4,150,739	\$ 4,137,757	\$ 4,137,757
Alpine	19,301	18,488	399	1,799	2,628	7,226	11,439	19,616	19,850	25,764	18,999	18,999	18,488
Amador	200,569	195,107	115,233	143,696	144,678	145,653	126,205	128,301	144,314	158,374	155,513	162,137	162,137
Butte	1,276,798	1,173,237	627,554	794,546	799,814	926,951	891,346	872,569	926,321	945,296	962,319	933,460	933,460
Calaveras	258,697	261,689	142,758	220,822	191,355	203,567	202,088	189,010	161,288	190,388	231,546	245,673	245,673
Colusa	99,107	92,682	40,667	43,948	72,637	103,517	117,871	112,668	99,064	111,854	101,811	92,682	72,682
Contra Costa	3,343,233	3,028,870	2,600,337	2,363,610	2,294,410	2,617,772	2,571,073	2,651,024	2,748,197	2,653,306	2,519,783	2,409,855	2,409,855
Del Norte	269,344	259,687	214,730	214,730	214,730	214,730	203,096	214,730	214,730	256,964	269,768	259,687	275,298
El Dorado	601,436	668,438	655,569	548,764	505,148	582,746	560,863	579,296	553,278	474,903	601,356	668,438	668,438
Fresno	6,778,404	6,453,499	2,670,600	3,015,746	2,800,979	3,209,875	3,302,907	3,735,438	4,462,884	4,787,455	5,108,860	5,134,586	4,936,000
Glenn	142,637	140,795	90,417	111,158	122,690	140,011	154,825	164,905	146,444	143,016	141,039	140,795	146,455
Humboldt	988,193	946,581	462,558	522,682	657,658	615,068	665,891	715,427	778,671	729,831	744,798	946,581	946,581
Imperial	747,666	702,205	518,512	576,150	562,114	645,919	693,729	669,610	681,656	581,336	809,029	702,205	797,587
Inyo	88,156	81,884	72,277	45,459	51,626	48,006	39,570	41,562	58,143	76,990	85,907	81,884	81,884
Kern	5,481,045	5,757,583	2,277,753	2,664,810	2,627,276	2,864,207	2,720,713	2,748,308	3,247,790	3,644,535	4,131,045	4,580,896	4,580,896
Kings	1,093,705	1,070,376	443,478	700,757	713,352	696,307	659,612	690,969	791,315	775,408	824,322	1,023,513	1,023,513
Lake	184,195	188,449	296,119	272,201	276,158	285,153	288,934	280,183	296,119	277,755	247,103	188,449	246,219
Lassen	184,025	170,559	106,891	106,891	108,967	128,825	130,683	135,339	129,091	174,612	173,075	170,559	170,559
Los Angeles	115,214,556	104,063,283	45,149,389	60,560,884	62,434,046	73,864,405	75,809,513	82,722,770	92,946,429	90,982,340	86,836,815	82,795,685	82,795,685
Madera	998,990	906,405	293,833	535,074	589,946	674,047	631,797	643,573	732,094	844,825	824,032	797,713	797,713
Marin	385,919	398,873	386,488	311,538	304,984	270,557	287,842	288,497	357,163	358,761	386,687	386,873	398,873
Mariposa	86,998	109,316	38,070	41,897	54,019	48,793	60,059	67,857	73,918	75,764	104,702	104,702	104,702
Mendocino	704,430	666,874	566,908	440,581	458,911	527,624	510,212	529,357	511,024	608,018	662,845	666,874	666,874
Merced	1,548,128	1,619,967	751,397	844,260	775,718	825,284	840,466	894,211	1,031,445	1,052,809	1,166,819	1,288,891	1,288,891
Modoc	48,248	55,531	17,128	24,065	37,161	49,493	59,313	52,855	51,256	50,853	55,531	79,436	79,436
Mono	32,047	32,202	13,956	13,956	14,615	14,550	18,114	18,392	19,817	21,591	26,958	26,683	26,683
Monterey	694,915	715,812	494,823	682,574	715,702	829,349	797,204	738,059	670,542	595,734	528,532	574,546	574,546
Napa	469,074	398,461	232,362	315,051	311,403	384,309	417,108	435,215	449,822	375,955	356,764	319,824	319,824
Nevada	193,343	169,292	226,123	202,832	174,058	173,215	178,805	185,041	226,123	203,761	169,292	169,292	169,292
Orange	12,943,647	13,311,806	5,648,065	5,366,139	5,355,390	6,553,748	6,915,607	7,611,043	8,758,132	9,166,564	9,755,582	10,591,250	10,591,250
Placer	849,058	920,382	687,985	895,552	747,111	710,846	600,593	622,053	651,832	704,472	645,769	738,744	738,744
Plumas	91,447	98,933	154,059	151,555	154,059	154,059	154,059	154,059	154,059	159,634	128,921	98,933	137,275
Riverside	15,792,508	17,353,158	6,411,055	8,806,009	8,173,324	7,999,219	6,877,392	7,422,498	9,263,855	10,707,784	11,902,759	13,806,662	13,806,662
Sacramento	6,269,231	5,655,172	4,832,997	5,609,080	5,161,591	5,586,032	5,017,201	4,920,141	5,091,685	4,905,409	4,725,098	4,499,414	4,499,414
San Benito	124,742	124,179	89,163	112,410	104,920	107,040	109,317	99,288	103,347	95,270	94,875	99,672	99,672
San Bernardino	21,326,805	20,782,763	5,731,210	8,514,703	9,751,976	11,957,781	12,446,717	13,045,926	14,821,566	15,061,246	16,073,940	16,535,353	16,535,353
San Diego	6,073,185	7,440,278	7,711,177	6,132,621	5,359,513	5,525,422	5,141,307	5,323,538	6,126,460	6,270,441	6,084,732	5,919,695	5,919,695
San Francisco	4,131,224	4,328,355	3,296,146	3,060,973	2,754,101	2,926,579	2,698,254	2,671,980	2,907,007	2,841,720	3,113,689	3,443,762	3,443,762
San Joaquin	4,223,902	4,245,431	2,601,178	2,480,278	2,399,805	2,739,513	2,729,427	2,705,301	2,886,866	2,843,217	3,183,540	3,377,785	3,377,785
San Luis Obispo	940,973	954,201	647,980	703,001	672,046	795,812	803,509	797,919	805,354	700,254	732,191	765,888	765,888
San Mateo	952,983	827,243	668,643	960,903	934,702	984,479	837,813	829,202	829,503	765,432	724,811	663,986	663,986
Santa Barbara	1,911,090	1,875,853	1,267,448	979,287	826,760	865,438	889,172	1,012,943	1,316,470	1,394,843	1,440,382	1,492,481	1,492,481
Santa Clara	3,270,112	2,687,186	3,780,956	3,223,912	2,947,634	3,290,686	3,262,294	3,404,630	3,666,823	3,030,273	2,464,672	2,138,001	2,138,001
Santa Cruz	586,717	563,955	713,676	598,314	544,197	619,253	557,112	526,052	504,267	623,754	584,471	563,955	563,955
Shasta	1,236,665	1,313,197	621,700	680,076	614,678	690,857	662,855	670,839	753,266	821,850	932,070	1,044,817	1,044,817
Sierra	34,732	31,447	13,759	9,848	8,323	5,045	10,829	13,759	22,459	28,440	36,894	31,447	31,447
Siskiyou	175,297	172,097	245,373	245,373	245,373	245,373	245,373	245,373	245,373	256,552	255,222	172,097	250,588
Solano	1,520,292	1,386,404	801,057	883,349	805,489	880,251	868,262	957,238	1,144,763	1,162,244	1,145,839	1,112,796	1,112,796
Sonoma	2,170,223	2,060,600	990,021	918,101	945,770	1,262,354	1,405,793	1,477,889	1,581,093	1,625,196	1,635,689	1,639,472	1,639,472
Stanislaus	1,800,657	1,614,945	1,004,470	1,092,505	1,091,719	1,424,350	1,448,878	1,452,004	1,492,887	1,419,811	1,357,149	1,284,896	1,284,896
Sutter	418,535	430,755	146,804	220,511	260,937	353,444	374,781	363,107	345,198	336,571	337,171	363,813	363,813
Tehama	308,871	339,029	177,634	319,793	362,975	392,840	340,323	293,399	241,836	294,234	313,954	339,029	339,029
Trinity	75,925	65,884	93,829	96,021	93,829	93,829	93,829	93,829	93,829	83,204	83,204	83,204	83,204
Tulare	3,474,774	3,753,824	1,032,410	1,591,232	1,714,221	2,067,711	2,155,963	2,290,172	2,489,610	2,416,609	2,618,925	2,985,648	1,984,956
Tuolumne	325,449	317,223	110,593	159,147	168,548	187,463	257,399	338,350	313,321	307,665	300,491	304,674	304,674
Ventura	2,249,805	1,998,532	1,284,628	1,835,753	1,833,055	2,017,019	1,802,468	1,741,369	1,895,272	1,843,364	1,695,670	1,590,089	1,590,089
Yolo	1,681,966	1,473,280	430,429	596,503	712,428	1,021,991	1,167,029	1,272,273	1,353,723	1,235,231	1,267,692	1,182,527	1,182,527
Yuba	740,872	807,295	278,909	474,768	471,244	410,105	363,820	377,291	375,249	418,668	563,486	647,975	600,000
Reserve	-	-	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Total	\$ 245,342,019	\$ 232,480,168	\$ 114,700,000	\$ 136,700,000	\$ 136,700,000	\$ 156,700,000	\$ 156,700,000	\$ 166,700,000	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 186,700,000	\$ 185,764,227

Notes: 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, 2024.

Item 0250-102-0932 of section 2.00 of the Budget Act of 2025 provides that the \$186,700,000 appropriated for Court Appointed Dependency Counsel shall be allocated by the Judicial Council using the methodology customarily used to distribute statewide court-appointed dependency counsel funding, which shall reflect annual updates to relevant variables based on the most recently available data.

leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=20250260SB101

Fiscal Year 2025-26 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology*

Court	Average Original Filings FY21 - FY23	Average CW Cases July 2022, 2023, 2024	Filings %	Cases %	Sum of Weighted %	Partially Redistributed Caseload	BLS Index 2021-2023	Annual Salary	Caseload Multiplied by Estimated Child-to-Parent Case Ratio	Attorneys Needed per Caseload	Total Salaries	Total Funding Need	Allocation Pre-BLS Adjustment	Small Court Increase with BLS Adjustment	Large Court Funding Adjustment (Pro Rata Decrease)	Proposed Allocation 2025-26	Proposed Allocation 2025-26 Based on Court Spending Plan
	A	B	C	D	E (.3C+.7D)	F (B*E)	G	H (G*Median Salary)	I (F*1.8)	J (I/141)	K (H*J)	L (K/.45)	M	N	O	P	Q
Alameda	491	1,126	1.65%	1.90%	1.82%	1,081	1.49	\$ 169,533	1,946	13.80	\$ 2,340,277	\$ 5,200,616	\$ 4,174,270	\$ -	\$ (36,513)	\$ 4,137,757	\$ 4,137,757
*Alpine	1	10	0.00%	0.02%	0.01%	7	0.78	88,097	13	0.09	8,319	18,488	14,839	3,649	-	-	18,488
*Amador	37	59	0.12%	0.10%	0.11%	63	0.96	108,893	114	0.81	87,798	195,107	156,602	5,535	-	162,137	162,137
Butte	189	435	0.63%	0.73%	0.70%	417	0.87	99,191	750	5.32	527,957	1,173,237	941,698	-	(8,237)	933,460	933,460
*Calaveras	69	78	0.23%	0.13%	0.16%	96	0.85	96,391	172	1.22	117,760	261,689	210,044	35,629	-	245,673	245,673
*Colusa	21	38	0.07%	0.06%	0.07%	39	0.74	83,590	70	0.50	41,707	92,682	74,391	18,291	-	92,682	92,682
Contra Costa	386	679	1.29%	1.14%	1.19%	705	1.33	151,363	1,270	9.00	1,362,992	3,028,870	2,431,120	-	(21,265)	2,409,855	2,409,855
*Del Norte	50	110	0.17%	0.19%	0.18%	107	0.75	85,360	137	1.37	116,859	259,687	208,437	51,249	-	259,687	275,298
*El Dorado	123	161	0.41%	0.27%	0.31%	186	1.11	126,504	335	2.38	300,797	668,438	536,521	131,917	-	668,438	668,438
Fresno	913	2,262	3.06%	3.81%	3.58%	2,127	0.94	106,928	3,829	27.16	2,904,075	6,453,499	5,179,896	-	(45,309)	5,134,586	4,936,000
*Glenn	30	56	0.10%	0.09%	0.10%	57	0.77	86,995	103	0.73	63,358	140,795	113,009	27,786	-	140,795	146,455
*Humboldt	209	385	0.70%	0.65%	0.68%	394	0.75	84,675	709	5.03	425,961	946,581	759,772	186,809	-	946,581	946,581
*Imperial	149	317	0.50%	0.53%	0.52%	311	0.70	79,670	559	3.97	315,992	702,205	563,624	138,581	-	702,205	797,587
*Inyo	16	32	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	32	0.79	89,719	58	0.41	36,848	81,884	65,724	16,160	-	81,884	81,884
Kern	871	2,007	2.92%	3.38%	3.24%	1,925	0.93	105,455	3,464	24.57	2,590,912	5,757,583	4,621,319	-	(40,423)	4,580,896	4,580,896
*Kings	225	378	0.75%	0.64%	0.67%	399	0.83	94,635	718	5.09	481,669	1,070,376	859,136	164,376	-	1,023,513	1,023,513
*Lake	35	79	0.12%	0.13%	0.13%	76	0.77	86,989	137	0.97	84,802	188,449	151,258	37,190	-	188,449	246,219
*Lassen	32	68	0.11%	0.12%	0.11%	67	0.79	90,123	120	0.85	76,752	170,559	136,899	33,660	-	170,559	170,559
Los Angeles	12,011	23,432	40.21%	39.48%	39.70%	23,562	1.37	155,683	42,412	300.79	46,828,478	104,063,283	83,526,302	-	(730,617)	82,795,685	82,795,685
*Madera	223	254	0.75%	0.43%	0.52%	311	0.90	102,822	559	3.97	407,882	906,405	727,525	70,187	-	797,713	797,713
*Marin	62	93	0.21%	0.16%	0.17%	102	1.22	138,550	183	1.30	179,493	398,873	320,155	78,718	-	398,873	398,873
*Mariposa	30	33	0.10%	0.06%	0.07%	41	0.83	94,479	73	0.52	49,192	109,316	87,742	16,960	-	104,702	104,702
*Mendocino	132	265	0.44%	0.45%	0.45%	264	0.78	88,967	476	3.37	300,093	666,874	535,266	131,608	-	666,874	666,874
Merced	327	632	1.10%	1.06%	1.07%	638	0.79	89,570	1,148	8.14	728,985	1,619,967	1,300,265	-	(11,374)	1,288,891	1,288,891
*Modoc	23	24	0.08%	0.04%	0.05%	31	0.56	63,260	56	0.40	24,989	55,531	44,572	10,959	-	55,531	79,436
*Mono	7	10	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	11	0.89	101,595	20	0.14	14,491	32,202	25,847	2,836	-	28,683	28,683
Monterey	92	201	0.31%	0.34%	0.33%	195	1.14	129,322	351	2.49	322,115	715,812	574,546	-	-	574,546	574,546
Napa	50	97	0.17%	0.16%	0.16%	97	1.27	144,392	175	1.24	179,307	398,461	319,824	33,410	-	319,824	319,824
*Nevada	33	43	0.11%	0.07%	0.08%	50	1.06	120,461	89	0.63	76,181	169,292	135,882	-	-	169,292	169,292
Orange	1,886	3,207	6.31%	5.40%	5.68%	3,369	1.23	139,272	6,065	43.01	5,990,313	13,311,808	10,684,711	-	(93,461)	10,591,250	10,591,250
Placer	165	212	0.55%	0.36%	0.42%	247	1.16	131,458	444	3.15	414,172	920,382	738,744	-	-	738,744	738,744
*Plumas	24	41	0.08%	0.07%	0.07%	43	0.72	81,911	77	0.54	44,520	98,933	79,409	19,525	-	98,933	137,275
Riverside	2,877	4,787	9.63%	8.07%	8.54%	5,066	1.06	120,741	9,119	64.68	7,808,921	17,353,158	13,928,497	-	(121,835)	13,806,662	13,806,662
Sacramento	539	1,432	1.80%	2.41%	2.23%	1,323	1.33	150,644	2,382	16.89	2,544,827	5,655,172	4,539,119	-	(39,704)	4,499,414	4,499,414
San Benito	20	37	0.07%	0.06%	0.06%	38	1.01	114,425	69	0.49	55,881	124,179	99,672	-	-	99,672	99,672
San Bernardino	2,611	5,822	8.74%	9.81%	9.49%	5,632	1.14	130,078	10,138	71.90	9,352,243	20,782,763	16,681,266	-	(145,914)	16,535,353	16,535,353
San Diego	781	2,133	2.62%	3.59%	3.30%	1,959	1.18	133,903	3,526	25.00	3,348,125	7,440,278	5,971,932	-	(52,237)	5,919,695	5,919,695
San Francisco	377	816	1.26%	1.37%	1.34%	796	1.69	191,746	1,432	10.16	1,947,760	4,328,355	3,474,151	-	(30,389)	3,443,762	3,443,762
San Joaquin	606	1,272	2.03%	2.14%	2.11%	1,252	1.05	119,543	2,253	15.98	1,910,444	4,245,431	3,407,591	-	(29,807)	3,377,785	3,377,785
San Luis Obispo	148	289	0.49%	0.49%	0.49%	291	1.02	115,760	523	3.71	429,390	954,201	765,888	-	-	765,888	765,888
San Mateo	87	154	0.29%	0.26%	0.27%	159	1.61	183,131	287	2.03	372,259	827,243	663,986	-	-	663,986	663,986
Santa Barbara	245	476	0.82%	0.80%	0.81%	479	1.21	137,982	863	6.12	844,134	1,875,853	1,505,651	-	(13,170)	1,492,481	1,492,481
Santa Clara	186	644	0.62%	1.09%	0.95%	561	1.48	168,702	1,011	7.17	1,209,234	2,687,186	2,156,867	-	(18,866)	2,138,001	2,138,001
*Santa Cruz	84	155	0.28%	0.26%	0.27%	159	1.10	125,362	285	2.02	253,780	563,955	452,658	111,297	-	563,955	563,955
Shasta	226	436	0.76%	0.74%	0.74%	440	0.93	105,214	792	5.62	590,939	1,313,197	1,054,036	-	(9,220)	1,044,817	1,044,817
*Sierra	6	14	0.02%	0.02%	0.02%	14	0.71	80,275	25	0.18	14,151	31,447	25,241	6,206	-	31,447	31,447
*Siskiyou	47	71	0.16%	0.12%	0.13%	78	0.69	78,056	140	0.99	77,444	172,097	138,134	33,964	-	172,097	250,588
Solano	163	378	0.54%	0.64%	0.61%	362	1.19	135,162	651	4.62	623,882	1,386,404	1,112,796	-	-	1,112,796	1,112,796
Sonoma	218	578	0.73%	0.97%	0.90%	535	1.20	135,889	962	6.82	927,270	2,060,600	1,653,939	-	(14,467)	1,639,472	1,639,472
Stanislaus	180	541	0.60%	0.91%	0.82%	486	1.03	117,028	876	6.21	726,725	1,614,945	1,296,234	-	(11,338)	1,284,896	1,284,896
*Sutter	116	104	0.39%	0.17%	0.24%	142	0.94	107,143	255	1.81	193,840	430,755	345,745	18,068	-	363,813	363,813
*Tehama	87	123	0.29%	0.21%	0.23%	138	0.76	86,622	248	1.76	152,563	339,029	272,121	66,908	-	339,029	339,029
*Trinity	20	22	0.07%	0.04%	0.05%	27	0.75	84,999	49	0.35	29,648	65,884	52,882	13,002	-	65,884	83,204
Tulare	687	1,121	2.30%	1.89%	2.01%	1,194	0.97	110,796	2,150	15.25	1,689,221	3,753,824	3,013,003	-	(26,355)	2,986,648	1,984,956
*Tululume	100	85	0.33%	0.14%	0.20%	119	0.83	94,219	214	1.52	142,750	317,223	254,619	50,055	-	304,674	304,674
Ventura	230	511	0.77%	0.86%	0.83%	495	1.25	142,374	891	6.32	899,340	1,998,532	1,604,120	-	(14,031)	1,590,089	1,590,089
Yolo	189	339	0.63%	0.57%	0.59%	350	1.30	148,210	631	4.47	662,976	1,473,280	1,182,527	-	-	1,182,527	1,182,527
Yuba	125	187	0.42%	0.31%	0.35%	205	1.22	138,557	370	2.62	363,283	807,295	647,975	-	-	647,975	600,000
Total	29,867	59,350	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	59,350	1.00		106,829	758	\$ 104,616,076	\$ 232,480,168	\$ 186,600,000	\$ 1,514,534	\$ (1,514,534)	\$ 186,600,000	\$ 185,664,227

Median annual salary of county attorneys \$ 113,656

* Courts with small court adjustments

BLS = Bureau of Labor Statistics; CW = child welfare

Instructions for Review and Action by Circulating Order

Voting members

- Please reply to the email message with “I approve,” “I disapprove,” or “I abstain,” by 3:00 p.m. on **September 2, 2025**.
- If you are unable to reply by 3:00 p.m. on **September 2, 2025**, please do so as soon as possible thereafter.

Advisory members

The circulating order is being emailed to you for your information only. There is no need to sign or return any documents.

CIRCULATING ORDER
Judicial Council of California
Voting and Signature Pages

Effective immediately, the Judicial Council approves the Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Allocations for fiscal year 2025–26.

My vote is as follows:

☒ Approve ☐ Disapprove ☐ Abstain

_____/s/
 Patricia Guerrero, Chair

_____/s/
 Maria Lucy Armendariz

 Bunmi O. Awoniyi

_____/s/
 C. Todd Bottke

_____/s/
 Stacy Boulware Eurie

_____/s/
 Carol A. Corrigan

_____/s/
 Charles S. Crompton

_____/s/
 Judith K. Dulcich

_____/s/
 Carin T. Fujisaki

_____/s/
 Maureen F. Hallahan

_____/s/
 Maria D. Hernandez

_____/s/
 Brad R. Hill

_____/s/
 Rachel W. Hill

 Ash Kalra

My vote is as follows:

☒ Approve

☐ Disapprove

☐ Abstain

 /s/
Ann C. Moorman

 /s/
Gretchen Nelson

 /s/
Ricardo R. Ocampo

 /s/
Craig M. Peters

Maxwell V. Pritt

 /s/
Thomas J. Umberg

 /s/
Tamara L. Wood

Date: 9/3/25

Attest:

 Michelle J. Curran
Administrative Director and
Secretary of the Judicial Council