Judicial Council *of* California

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

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 25-032
For business meeting on July 18, 2025

Title
Trial Court Budget: Allocation Methodologies for Potential Future Funding Reductions and Restorations

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected
None

Recommended by
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair
Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Vice-Chair

Report Type
Action Required

Effective Date
July 18, 2025

Date of Report
June 13, 2025

Contact
Oksana Tuk, 916-643-8027
oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Workload Formula is the Judicial Council–approved policy by which certain funding is allocated to the trial courts to support funding equity, stability, and predictability. The policy does not include methodologies for addressing trial court funding reductions and restorations. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends updating the policy to incorporate allocation methodologies to address future budget situations including (1) budget reductions, (2) a funding restoration in the same fiscal year as the reduction occurred, and (3) a funding restoration that occurs in a future fiscal year following a reduction in a prior fiscal year. Establishing these policies will increase transparency regarding how funding is allocated to the trial courts so they can plan for changes in funding levels and allow the Judicial Council to address budget changes more efficiently going forward.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 18, 2025:

1. Approve the reverse Workload Formula equity reduction allocation methodology without reduction limitation calculated on each court's Workload Formula allocation for any

potential future funding reduction. This methodology will apply the reduction based on a court's size and position from the statewide average funding level. Courts surrounding the statewide average within a specified band will take a proportional reduction, courts above the band will take a larger reduction, and courts below the band take a lesser reduction;

2. Approve an allocation methodology for a restoration of funding that occurs in the same fiscal year the reduction took place based on a recalculation of the reduction using the initial methodology with the restored funding; and

3. Approve an allocation methodology for a restoration of funding in a *future fiscal year* that follows a reduction in a prior fiscal year based on the existing Judicial Council–approved Workload Formula methodology calculated on the Workload Formula need amount. In general, the Workload Formula allocates the first 50 percent of funding to courts under the statewide average and then the remaining 50 percent is allocated to all courts.

These recommendations were presented to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on April 24, 2025, and approved for consideration by the Judicial Council.

Relevant Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council allocates funding to the trial courts through various methodologies, including its approved Workload Formula policy. Allocation of trial court funding is one of the principal responsibilities of the Judicial Council. Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the council to make a preliminary allocation for the trial courts in July and finalize allocations in January of each fiscal year.

At its business meeting on January 12, 2018,[1] the Judicial Council approved new policy parameters for the Workload Formula that specifically addressed how new discretionary funding included in the budget is to be allocated in the Workload Formula for the trial courts. The new policy also stated that allocations in fiscal years for which a budget reduction must be implemented will be addressed as needed.

Currently, there are no standard methodologies for addressing funding reductions and restorations. The Workload Formula policy states that a methodology for applying a funding reduction will be determined for each year in which a reduction occurs. No policy exists for the restoration of funding after a reduction occurs.

The Budget Act of 2020 included a $167.8 million reduction to trial court baseline funding due to the budget deficit projected as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. At its business meeting on

[1] Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology* (Dec. 8, 2017), *jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-6A8D8502A126*.

July 24, 2020,[2] the council approved a methodology to allocate the reduction using a 4 percent band around the statewide funding level and applying the specific steps in the recommended methodology.

When the $167.8 million reduction was restored in the Budget Act of 2021, the funding was allocated back to the trial courts in the exact amounts of their initial reductions. This approach supported the Workload Formula's core principles of funding equity, stability, and predictability for the trial courts.

The Budget Act of 2024 included an ongoing reduction of $97 million General Fund to trial court operations due to the state's projected multiyear deficit. At its business meeting on July 12, 2024,[3] the Judicial Council approved a recommendation to use the same methodology for the $97 million reduction that was adopted by the council in July 2020 to allocate the $167.8 million reduction in fiscal year (FY) 2020–21.

The FY 2025–26 Governor's Budget included a proposed partial restoration of $42 million of the $97 million reduction beginning in FY 2024–25 to mitigate the impact of the reduction on access to justice. On a one-time basis, the Legislature approved the use of available reserves in the Trial Court Trust Fund to fund the $42 million restoration in FY 2024–25. At its business meeting on February 21, 2025,[4] the Judicial Council approved a recommendation to allocate the $42 million restoration using the same methodology approved by the council in July 2024 for the initial $97 million reduction.

Analysis/Rationale

With a focus on establishing allocation methodologies for various budget situations that are not stated in the Workload Formula policy, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee directed the Funding Methodology Subcommittee to evaluate allocation methodology options for potential future budget reductions and restorations. Having methodologies in place allows the courts to plan for changes in the budget and increases transparency to the courts and the public. The Funding Methodology Subcommittee began this work in fall 2024 and presented various options for each policy for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee. The proposed policy updates and options considered are described below.

---

[2] Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for Fiscal Year 2020–21* (July 2, 2020), *jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8651228&GUID=27A3B6D8-9783-4865-8C5A-F6697EB58734*.

[3] Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for Fiscal Year 2024–25* (June 17, 2024), *jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13077708&GUID=08C509A8-B264-4D66-AFDC-B3EC97A5D296*.

[4] Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocation for Partial Restoration of Trial Court Operations Funding for Fiscal Year 2024–25* (Feb. 7, 2025), *jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13753142&GUID=14594704-3AD4-4E4C-B048-F8BA3A96B894*.

Recommendation #1: Allocation methodology for budget reductions
The options considered for this recommendation included the following:

1. Pro rata reduction allocation based on each court's Workload Formula need or allocation amount, whereas the reduction is applied proportionally to all courts. This methodology does not advance the Workload Formula's principle of improving funding equity among the trial courts.

2. Reverse Workload Formula equity reduction allocation with reduction limitation calculated on each court's Workload Formula need or allocation. This methodology will apply the reduction based on a court's size and position from the statewide funding average with limitations on the amount of the reduction. Courts surrounding the statewide average within a specified band will take a proportional reduction, courts above the band will take a larger reduction, and courts below the band take a lesser reduction. While this methodology supports the principle of equity, it does not advance funding stability and predictability for the trial courts.

3. Reverse Workload Formula equity reduction allocation without reduction limitation calculated on each court's Workload Formula need or allocation. This methodology will apply the reduction based on a court's size and position from the statewide funding average without limitations on the amount of the reduction. Courts surrounding the statewide average within a specified band will take a proportional reduction, courts above the band will take a larger reduction, and courts below the band take a lesser reduction.

Option 3 is the recommended methodology for reductions because it supports funding stability and predictability consistent with the existing Workload Formula policy principles. This is the same Judicial Council–approved methodology that was used in FY 2020–21 to allocate the $167.8 million reduction and more recently in FY 2024–25 to allocate the initial $97 million reduction.

The steps for the recommended methodology are outlined below and utilize a 4 percent band around the statewide average funding level.

1. Courts within the established band around the statewide average funding level take a proportional reduction but do not fall outside the band.

2. Courts above the band take up to an additional 1 percent reduction from those within the band without falling into the band.

3. Courts below the band take less of a reduction than those within the band, scaled by their size and distance from the statewide average, not taking more of a reduction than those inside the band.

4. Cluster 1 courts take the same percentage reduction as courts within the band but are not required to take the additional percentage reduction as the other courts above the band.

Attachment A displays a hypothetical example of the implementation of this reduction policy.

Recommendation #2: Allocation methodology for funding restoration in the same fiscal year

At its business meeting on February 21, 2025, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation to allocate the $42 million restoration in FY 2024–25 using the same methodology approved by the council in July 2024 for the initial $97 million reduction. This allocation was approved on a one-time basis for FY 2024–25.

An alternative methodology was considered that restores funding proportionally based on each trial court's initial reduction amount. This approach was not recommended because it does not support the Workload Formula's core principles of funding equity, stability, and predictability.

The recommendation for an ongoing allocation methodology for a future funding restoration in the *same fiscal year as the reduction occurred* is the same as the methodology adopted by the council in FY 2024–25.

The steps to implement this policy basically recalculates the reduction using the initial methodology, which would be recalculated with the restored funding. The initial reduction amount is backed out of the formula and recalculated with the revised reduction amount after the restoration.

Attachment B displays this restoration policy, which was used in FY 2024–25 for the $42 million restoration.

Recommendation #3: Allocation methodology for funding restoration in a future fiscal year

This methodology will be applied when a budget reduction in a fiscal year is followed by a restoration in a subsequent fiscal year, and the budget act language specifically refers to the funding as a restoration associated with a prior reduction. The options considered for this recommendation included the following:

1. Restoration of funding exactly how it was reduced. Funding is allocated to the courts in the same amounts, or portion thereof, as the initial reduction.

2. Restoration using the Workload Formula methodology based on each court's Workload Formula need or allocation amount. This methodology treats the funding as "new money" and allocates it to the courts in the same way new money is allocated using the existing Workload Formula methodology (see Attachment C).

3. Restoration using a pro rata allocation based on each court's Workload Formula need or allocation amount. This approach will allocate funding proportionally to all trial courts based on each court's Workload Formula need or allocation amount.

4. Restoration using the Workload Formula methodology with an equity adjustment. This approach will fund the courts under and up to the statewide average funding level or portion thereof. To the extent additional funding is available after the first step, the remaining funds will be allocated using the existing Workload Formula methodology.

Option 2 is the recommended methodology for a restoration in a future fiscal year following a reduction in a prior fiscal year. The methodology is based on the existing council-approved Workload Formula policy. This option provides a more tailored approach, supports funding equity, and aligns with the Workload Formula's principles of funding stability and predictability. In all future restoration situations, the restoration will be guided by specific budget act language specifying the intent of the funding and associating the restoration with a prior reduction.

The steps to implement this methodology currently exist in the Workload Formula policy. The steps are the same as the allocation of funding in years with "new money" and are described below.

1. Bring all cluster 1 courts up to 100 percent of funding need.

2. Allocate up to 50 percent of remaining funding to courts under the statewide average funding ratio. Allocated funds will bring courts up to but not over the statewide average funding ratio.

3. The first 50 percent allocation of new funding to courts below the statewide average will be scaled by courts' distance from the statewide average and size based on the courts' Workload Formula need.

4. Allocate remaining funding to all courts based on the Workload Formula.

5. Allow no court's allocation to exceed 100 percent of its need unless it is the result of a funding floor calculation.

Attachment C displays a hypothetical example of this restoration policy.

Policy implications

The current Workload Formula policy does not include methodologies for addressing trial court funding reductions and restorations. Given the state's budget volatility, it is important to have established policies and a long-term strategy. These policy updates will increase transparency regarding the impact on trial court allocations so the courts can plan for changes in funding levels and the Judicial Council can address budget changes more efficiently going forward.

Comments

This proposal was not circulated for public comment. However, these recommendations were considered at meetings that were open to the public, and no public comments were received.

Alternatives considered

Several allocation methodology options were considered for each budget situation and vetted during a series of committee meetings. The alternatives considered for each of the proposed policies are described in the Analysis/Rationale section.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

The proposed methodologies and updates to the Workload Formula policy will increase efficiencies in determining how to allocate future funding reductions and restorations because specific policies will be in place. The fiscal and operational impacts of these policies will be determined based on future budget circumstances.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Reverse Workload Formula Equity Reduction Allocation Without Reduction Limitation
2. Attachment B: Recalculate Reduction Using Initial Methodology With Restored Funding
3. Attachment C: Workload Formula Restoration
4. Link A: *Trial Court Funding and Workload Formula Resource Guide*, *courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20241217-fms-materials-additional.pdf*

[For Model Purposes Only]

Reverse Workload Formula Equity Reduction Allocation without Reduction Limitation

Attachment A

This scenario represents a methodology using a reduction of $100 million as an example.

Court	2024-25 Final Workload Formula Allocation as of July, 1 2024	2024-25 Workload Formula Need as of July 1, 2024	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (BEFORE $100m Reduction)	Reverse Workload Formula without Limitation Reduction of $100m on WF Allocation	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation (AFTER $100m Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (AFTER $100m Reduction)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage CHANGE (AFTER $100m Reduction)
	A	B	C(A/B)	D	E	F	G
Alameda	88,446,403	94,645,177	93.45%	(3,615,728)	84,830,676	89.63%	-3.82%
Alpine	978,500	549,681	178.01%	-	978,500	178.01%	0.00%
Amador	4,318,750	4,684,703	92.19%	(174,149)	4,144,600	88.47%	-3.72%
Butte	13,707,099	14,689,951	93.31%	(540,465)	13,166,634	89.63%	-3.68%
Calaveras	3,299,313	3,767,570	87.57%	(113,748)	3,185,565	84.55%	-3.02%
Colusa	2,454,902	2,635,032	93.16%	(98,992)	2,355,910	89.41%	-3.76%
Contra Costa	51,597,645	59,907,816	86.13%	(1,778,897)	49,818,749	83.16%	-2.97%
Del Norte	4,483,485	3,875,339	115.69%	(180,792)	4,302,693	111.03%	-4.67%
El Dorado	9,519,963	10,819,495	87.99%	(328,213)	9,191,750	84.96%	-3.03%
Fresno	63,133,105	66,287,167	95.24%	(3,177,113)	59,955,992	90.45%	-4.79%
Glenn	2,990,182	3,237,289	92.37%	(120,576)	2,869,606	88.64%	-3.72%
Humboldt	8,900,393	9,318,361	95.51%	(447,904)	8,452,490	90.71%	-4.81%
Imperial	10,163,038	8,073,327	125.88%	(511,445)	9,651,593	119.55%	-6.33%
Inyo	2,512,390	2,676,571	93.87%	(101,310)	2,411,081	90.08%	-3.79%
Kern	66,272,438	68,776,330	96.36%	(3,335,097)	62,937,341	91.51%	-4.85%
Kings	10,774,613	12,025,488	89.60%	(434,476)	10,340,137	85.99%	-3.61%
Lake	5,078,997	6,056,222	83.86%	(175,105)	4,903,892	80.97%	-2.89%
Lassen	2,581,880	2,580,519	100.05%	(104,112)	2,477,768	96.02%	-4.03%
Los Angeles	713,278,790	791,102,381	90.16%	(28,762,280)	684,516,509	86.53%	-3.64%
Madera	12,659,634	13,875,025	91.24%	(510,488)	12,149,146	87.56%	-3.68%
Marin	14,079,161	15,677,866	89.80%	(567,729)	13,511,432	86.18%	-3.62%
Mariposa	1,860,977	1,846,094	100.81%	(75,042)	1,785,935	96.74%	-4.06%
Mendocino	7,672,588	7,775,002	98.68%	(386,116)	7,286,473	93.72%	-4.97%
Merced	16,500,078	18,264,043	90.34%	(665,350)	15,834,728	86.70%	-3.64%
Modoc	1,372,099	1,480,959	92.65%	(55,329)	1,316,771	88.91%	-3.74%
Mono	2,417,935	2,038,771	118.60%	(97,501)	2,320,434	113.82%	-4.78%
Monterey	26,002,768	28,560,984	91.04%	(1,048,537)	24,954,231	87.37%	-3.67%
Napa	9,487,748	10,740,134	88.34%	(327,103)	9,160,645	85.29%	-3.05%
Nevada	6,570,957	7,425,652	88.49%	(226,542)	6,344,414	85.44%	-3.05%
Orange	186,230,932	209,526,287	88.88%	(6,420,557)	179,810,376	85.82%	-3.06%
Placer	24,862,554	27,355,659	90.89%	(1,002,559)	23,859,995	87.22%	-3.66%
Plumas	1,897,592	1,629,248	116.47%	(76,519)	1,821,073	111.77%	-4.70%
Riverside	134,884,127	155,691,163	86.64%	(4,650,308)	130,233,819	83.65%	-2.99%
Sacramento	109,842,203	122,332,264	89.79%	(4,429,281)	105,412,922	86.17%	-3.62%
San Benito	4,779,146	4,197,092	113.87%	(192,714)	4,586,431	109.28%	-4.59%
San Bernardino	135,901,495	156,640,095	86.76%	(4,685,383)	131,216,112	83.77%	-2.99%
San Diego	176,701,558	189,500,353	93.25%	(7,125,320)	169,576,238	89.49%	-3.76%
San Francisco	64,458,077	55,305,114	116.55%	(3,243,791)	61,214,286	110.68%	-5.87%
San Joaquin	49,951,911	53,533,653	93.31%	(1,969,582)	47,982,329	89.63%	-3.68%
San Luis Obispo	18,523,163	19,492,482	95.03%	(932,160)	17,591,003	90.25%	-4.78%
San Mateo	42,988,911	49,033,290	87.67%	(1,482,099)	41,506,811	84.65%	-3.02%
Santa Barbara	26,681,819	29,058,002	91.82%	(1,075,919)	25,605,901	88.12%	-3.70%
Santa Clara	93,382,508	97,354,039	95.92%	(4,699,385)	88,683,123	91.09%	-4.83%
Santa Cruz	16,363,507	16,940,790	96.59%	(823,478)	15,540,029	91.73%	-4.86%
Shasta	16,201,831	18,198,452	89.03%	(558,579)	15,643,252	85.96%	-3.07%
Sierra	978,500	623,149	157.02%	-	978,500	157.02%	0.00%
Siskiyou	4,314,253	4,841,098	89.12%	(148,740)	4,165,513	86.04%	-3.07%
Solano	28,669,037	31,445,139	91.17%	(1,156,051)	27,512,986	87.50%	-3.68%
Sonoma	30,480,267	30,732,916	99.18%	(1,533,890)	28,946,377	94.19%	-4.99%
Stanislaus	31,437,389	37,054,820	84.84%	(1,083,845)	30,353,544	81.92%	-2.92%
Sutter	8,192,412	9,485,325	86.37%	(282,444)	7,909,967	83.39%	-2.98%
Tehama	5,876,354	6,426,611	91.44%	(236,958)	5,639,395	87.75%	-3.69%
Trinity	1,987,739	2,276,992	87.30%	(68,530)	1,919,209	84.29%	-3.01%
Tulare	32,682,780	38,548,955	84.78%	(1,126,782)	31,555,998	81.86%	-2.92%
Tuolumne	4,818,467	5,085,552	94.75%	(242,485)	4,575,982	89.98%	-4.77%
Ventura	44,177,371	46,999,346	94.00%	(2,051,757)	42,125,615	89.63%	-4.37%
Yolo	15,341,081	17,504,806	87.64%	(528,904)	14,812,177	84.62%	-3.02%
Yuba	6,144,600	7,883,564	77.94%	(211,843)	5,932,757	75.25%	-2.69%
Total:	2,481,867,415	2,718,089,203	91.31%	(100,000,000)	2,381,867,415	87.63%	-3.68%

Floor courts (2)

Cluster 1 courts (13)

[For Model Purposes Only]

Recalculate Reduction Using Initial Methodology with Restored Funding

Attachment B

Court	2024-25 Final Workload Formula Allocation	2024-25 Workload Formula	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (BEFORE Restoration)	Reallocation of Reduction Restoration					
				2024-25 Initial Reduction ($96.982 million)	2024-25 Revised Reduction ($55.642 million)	2024-25 Partial Restoration ($41.34 million)	2024-25 Workload Formula Allocation (AFTER Restoration)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (AFTER Restoration)	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage CHANGE
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Alameda	88,446,403	94,645,177	93.45%	(4,324,870)	(2,884,769)	1,440,100	89,886,503	94.97%	1.52%
Alpine	978,500	549,681	178.01%	-	-	-	978,500	178.01%	0.00%
Amador	4,318,750	4,684,703	92.19%	(167,223)	(95,942)	71,281	4,390,031	93.71%	1.52%
Butte	13,707,099	14,689,951	93.31%	(583,710)	(360,287)	223,423	13,930,522	94.83%	1.52%
Calaveras	3,299,313	3,767,570	87.57%	(111,187)	(53,833)	57,354	3,356,668	89.09%	1.52%
Colusa	2,454,902	2,635,032	93.16%	(94,059)	(53,965)	40,094	2,494,996	94.69%	1.52%
Contra Costa	51,597,645	59,907,816	86.13%	(1,738,846)	(841,887)	896,959	52,494,605	87.63%	1.50%
Del Norte	4,483,485	3,875,339	115.69%	(138,333)	(79,366)	58,966	4,542,452	117.21%	1.52%
El Dorado	9,519,963	10,819,495	87.99%	(320,824)	(155,331)	165,492	9,685,455	89.52%	1.53%
Fresno	63,133,105	66,287,167	95.24%	(3,029,033)	(2,020,422)	1,008,611	64,141,716	96.76%	1.52%
Glenn	2,990,182	3,237,289	92.37%	(115,557)	(66,299)	49,258	3,039,440	93.89%	1.52%
Humboldt	8,900,393	9,318,361	95.51%	(425,808)	(284,022)	141,786	9,042,179	97.04%	1.52%
Imperial	10,163,038	8,073,327	125.88%	(368,916)	(246,074)	122,842	10,285,880	127.41%	1.52%
Inyo	2,512,390	2,676,571	93.87%	(95,542)	(54,816)	40,726	2,553,116	95.39%	1.52%
Kern	66,272,438	68,776,330	96.36%	(3,142,777)	(2,096,291)	1,046,485	67,318,923	97.88%	1.52%
Kings	10,774,613	12,025,488	89.60%	(429,257)	(246,280)	182,977	10,957,590	91.12%	1.52%
Lake	5,078,997	6,056,222	83.86%	(171,163)	(82,871)	88,292	5,167,289	85.32%	1.46%
Lassen	2,581,880	2,580,519	100.05%	(92,113)	(52,849)	39,265	2,621,145	101.57%	1.52%
Los Angeles	713,278,790	791,102,381	90.16%	(28,238,886)	(16,201,647)	12,037,239	725,316,029	91.68%	1.52%
Madera	12,659,634	13,875,025	91.24%	(495,278)	(284,158)	211,119	12,870,753	92.76%	1.52%
Marin	14,079,161	15,677,866	89.80%	(474,469)	(229,721)	244,748	14,323,909	91.36%	1.56%
Mariposa	1,860,977	1,846,094	100.81%	(65,897)	(37,808)	28,090	1,889,067	102.33%	1.52%
Mendocino	7,672,588	7,775,002	98.68%	(355,283)	(236,981)	118,303	7,790,891	100.20%	1.52%
Merced	16,500,078	18,264,043	90.34%	(651,946)	(374,045)	277,902	16,777,980	91.86%	1.52%
Modoc	1,372,099	1,480,959	92.65%	(52,864)	(30,330)	22,534	1,394,633	94.17%	1.52%
Mono	2,417,935	2,038,771	118.60%	(72,775)	(41,754)	31,021	2,448,957	120.12%	1.52%
Monterey	26,002,768	28,560,984	91.04%	(1,019,502)	(584,924)	434,578	26,437,346	92.56%	1.52%
Napa	9,487,748	10,740,134	88.34%	(319,738)	(154,806)	164,932	9,652,680	89.87%	1.54%
Nevada	6,570,957	7,425,652	88.49%	(221,442)	(107,214)	114,228	6,685,185	90.03%	1.54%
Orange	186,230,932	209,526,287	88.88%	(6,276,002)	(3,038,614)	3,237,387	189,468,320	90.43%	1.55%
Placer	24,862,554	27,355,659	90.89%	(976,477)	(560,239)	416,238	25,278,792	92.41%	1.52%
Plumas	1,897,592	1,629,248	116.47%	(58,157)	(33,367)	24,790	1,922,382	117.99%	1.52%
Riverside	134,884,127	155,691,163	86.64%	(4,545,609)	(2,200,820)	2,344,789	137,228,916	88.14%	1.51%
Sacramento	109,842,203	122,332,264	89.79%	(3,701,694)	(1,792,227)	1,909,467	111,751,670	91.35%	1.56%
San Benito	4,779,146	4,197,092	113.87%	(149,818)	(85,956)	63,862	4,843,008	115.39%	1.52%
San Bernardino	135,901,495	156,640,095	86.76%	(4,579,894)	(2,217,420)	2,362,474	138,263,969	88.27%	1.51%
San Diego	176,701,558	189,500,353	93.25%	(6,764,332)	(3,880,936)	2,883,396	179,584,953	94.77%	1.52%
San Francisco	64,458,077	55,305,114	116.55%	(2,527,201)	(1,685,691)	841,510	65,299,587	118.07%	1.52%
San Joaquin	49,951,911	53,533,653	93.31%	(2,430,393)	(1,616,188)	814,205	50,766,116	94.83%	1.52%
San Luis Obispo	18,523,163	19,492,482	95.03%	(890,721)	(594,128)	296,593	18,819,756	96.55%	1.52%
San Mateo	42,988,911	49,033,290	87.67%	(1,448,731)	(701,423)	747,307	43,736,218	89.20%	1.52%
Santa Barbara	26,681,819	29,058,002	91.82%	(1,037,243)	(595,103)	442,140	27,123,960	93.34%	1.52%
Santa Clara	93,382,508	97,354,039	95.92%	(4,448,653)	(2,967,335)	1,481,318	94,863,826	97.44%	1.52%
Santa Cruz	16,363,507	16,940,790	96.59%	(774,120)	(516,352)	257,767	16,621,274	98.11%	1.52%
Shasta	16,201,831	18,198,452	89.03%	(546,003)	(264,355)	281,648	16,483,479	90.58%	1.55%
Sierra	978,500	623,149	157.02%	-	-	-	978,500	157.02%	0.00%
Siskiyou	4,314,253	4,841,098	89.12%	(145,391)	(70,393)	74,998	4,389,251	90.67%	1.55%
Solano	28,669,037	31,445,139	91.17%	(1,122,454)	(643,991)	478,462	29,147,499	92.69%	1.52%
Sonoma	30,480,267	30,732,916	99.18%	(1,404,359)	(936,734)	467,625	30,947,892	100.70%	1.52%
Stanislaus	31,437,389	37,054,820	84.84%	(1,059,443)	(512,944)	546,499	31,983,888	86.32%	1.47%
Sutter	8,192,412	9,485,325	86.37%	(276,085)	(133,670)	142,415	8,334,826	87.87%	1.50%
Tehama	5,876,354	6,426,611	91.44%	(229,402)	(131,616)	97,786	5,974,139	92.96%	1.52%
Trinity	1,987,739	2,276,992	87.30%	(66,987)	(32,433)	34,554	2,022,293	88.81%	1.52%
Tulare	32,682,780	38,548,955	84.78%	(1,101,413)	(533,265)	568,148	33,250,929	86.26%	1.47%
Tuolumne	4,818,467	5,085,552	94.75%	(232,387)	(155,007)	77,381	4,895,848	96.27%	1.52%
Ventura	44,177,371	46,999,346	94.00%	(2,147,664)	(1,432,532)	715,132	44,892,503	95.52%	1.52%
Yolo	15,341,081	17,504,806	87.64%	(516,996)	(250,311)	266,685	15,607,767	89.16%	1.52%
Yuba	6,144,600	7,883,564	77.94%	(207,074)	(100,258)	106,816	6,251,416	79.30%	1.35%
Total:	2,481,867,415	2,718,089,203	91.31%	(96,982,000)	(55,642,000)	41,340,000	2,523,207,415	92.83%	1.52%

Floor courts (2)
Cluster 1 courts (13)

[For Model Purposes Only]

Attachment C

Workload Formula Restoration

This scenario represents a methodology using a hypothetical restoration amount of $50 million as an example.

Court	2024-25 Revised Workload Formula Allocation (after $42m restoration)	2024-25 Workload Formula Need as of July 1, 2024	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (BEFORE $50m Restoration)		Workload Formula Restoration of $50m on WF Need	2024-25 Workload Formula Percentage (AFTER $50m Restoration)
	A	B	C (A/B)		D	E
Alameda	89,886,503	94,645,177	94.97%		890,100	95.91%
Alpine	978,500	549,681	178.01%		-	178.01%
Amador	4,390,031	4,684,703	93.71%		294,672	100.00%
Butte	13,930,522	14,689,951	94.83%		138,153	95.77%
Calaveras	3,356,668	3,767,570	89.09%		410,902	100.00%
Colusa	2,494,996	2,635,032	94.69%		140,036	100.00%
Contra Costa	52,494,605	59,907,816	87.63%		2,860,658	92.40%
Del Norte	4,542,452	3,875,339	117.21%		-	117.21%
El Dorado	9,685,455	10,819,495	89.52%		278,215	92.09%
Fresno	64,141,716	66,287,167	96.76%		623,404	97.70%
Glenn	3,039,440	3,237,289	93.89%		197,849	100.00%
Humboldt	9,042,179	9,318,361	97.04%		87,635	97.98%
Imperial	10,285,880	8,073,327	127.41%		-	127.41%
Inyo	2,553,116	2,676,571	95.39%		123,455	100.00%
Kern	67,318,923	68,776,330	97.88%		646,814	98.82%
Kings	10,957,590	12,025,488	91.12%		168,813	92.52%
Lake	5,167,289	6,056,222	85.32%		511,670	93.77%
Lassen	2,621,145	2,580,519	101.57%		-	101.57%
Los Angeles	725,316,029	791,102,381	91.68%		9,128,814	92.84%
Madera	12,870,753	13,875,025	92.76%		130,600	93.70%
Marin	14,323,909	15,677,866	91.36%		201,419	92.65%
Mariposa	1,889,067	1,846,094	102.33%		-	102.33%
Mendocino	7,790,891	7,775,002	100.20%		-	100.20%
Merced	16,777,980	18,264,043	91.86%		199,755	92.96%
Modoc	1,394,633	1,480,959	94.17%		86,326	100.00%
Mono	2,448,957	2,038,771	120.12%		-	120.12%
Monterey	26,437,346	28,560,984	92.56%		272,029	93.52%
Napa	9,652,680	10,740,134	89.87%		242,256	92.13%
Nevada	6,685,185	7,425,652	90.03%		158,116	92.16%
Orange	189,468,320	209,526,287	90.43%		3,831,465	92.26%
Placer	25,278,792	27,355,659	92.41%		265,490	93.38%
Plumas	1,922,382	1,629,248	117.99%		-	117.99%
Riverside	137,228,916	155,691,163	88.14%		6,360,117	92.23%
Sacramento	111,751,670	122,332,264	91.35%		1,578,871	92.64%
San Benito	4,843,008	4,197,092	115.39%		-	115.39%
San Bernardino	138,263,969	156,640,095	88.27%		6,149,674	92.19%
San Diego	179,584,953	189,500,353	94.77%		1,782,175	95.71%
San Francisco	65,299,587	55,305,114	118.07%		-	118.07%
San Joaquin	50,766,116	53,533,653	94.83%		503,462	95.77%
San Luis Obispo	18,819,756	19,492,482	96.55%		183,319	97.49%
San Mateo	43,736,218	49,033,290	89.20%		1,413,735	92.08%
Santa Barbara	27,123,960	29,058,002	93.34%		273,279	94.28%
Santa Clara	94,863,826	97,354,039	97.44%		915,576	98.38%
Santa Cruz	16,621,274	16,940,790	98.11%		159,321	99.05%
Shasta	16,483,479	18,198,452	90.58%		314,190	92.30%
Sierra	978,500	623,149	157.02%		-	157.02%
Siskiyou	4,389,251	4,841,098	90.67%		80,728	92.33%
Solano	29,147,499	31,445,139	92.69%		296,739	93.64%
Sonoma	30,947,892	30,732,916	100.70%		-	100.70%
Stanislaus	31,983,888	37,054,820	86.32%		2,539,743	93.17%
Sutter	8,334,826	9,485,325	87.87%		421,034	92.31%
Tehama	5,974,139	6,426,611	92.96%		60,440	93.90%
Trinity	2,022,293	2,276,992	88.81%		254,699	100.00%
Tulare	33,250,929	38,548,955	86.26%		2,682,589	93.22%
Tuolumne	4,895,848	5,085,552	96.27%		47,828	97.21%
Ventura	44,892,503	46,999,346	95.52%		442,010	96.46%
Yolo	15,607,767	17,504,806	89.16%		510,773	92.08%
Yuba	6,251,416	7,883,564	79.30%		1,141,053	93.77%
Total:	**2,523,207,415**	**2,718,089,203**	**92.83%**		**50,000,000**	**94.67%**

Floor courts (2)
Cluster 1 courts (13)