

Judicial Council of California

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

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 25-035 For business meeting on July 18, 2025

Title

Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for Fiscal Year 2025–26

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 24, 2025

Contact Oksana Tuk, 916-643-8027 <u>oksana.tuk@jud.ca.gov</u>

Executive Summary

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the Judicial Council to make a preliminary allocation for the trial courts in July and finalize allocations in January of each fiscal year. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends the Judicial Council allocate \$3.076 billion to the trial courts, which includes \$2.958 billion from the Trial Court Trust Fund and \$117.8 million from the General Fund, for fiscal year (FY) 2025–26. The allocation reflects the \$55 million ongoing reduction to trial court operations included in the Budget Act of 2024.

The proposed allocations, current revenue projections, and estimated savings from FY 2024–25 appropriations will result in a fund balance of \$151.8 million (\$41.7 million is unrestricted) in the Trial Court Trust Fund for FY 2025–26.

Recommendation

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

1. Approve the standard annual updates to the Workload Formula model, including updated filings, salary, benefits, operating expenditures and equipment, Bureau of Labor Statistics

data, and court executive officer salary data, and continue to use the existing 2017 caseweights in the Workload Formula calculations for FY 2025–26. This results in a statewide funding percentage of 85.9 percent;

- 2. Approve the deferral of the updated 2024 caseweights in the Workload Formula calculations to FY 2026–27 to allow time for evaluation of the changes in the weights and their impact on funding allocations to the trial courts;
- 3. Approve base, discretionary, and nondiscretionary program allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and General Fund in the amount of \$3.076 billion, including any needed technical adjustments and contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26:
 - a. General Fund allocation of \$68.8 million for employee benefits; and
 - b. As a subset of the \$3.076 billion total allocation, a Workload Formula allocation of \$2.571 billion based on methodologies approved by the Judicial Council; and
- 4. Approve the delegation of authority to the Administrative Director of the Judicial Council to authorize baseline technical adjustments for Trial Court Trust Fund allocations, up to a maximum of 10 percent of specific allocations, to allow for the efficient implementation of required budgetary adjustments.

On May 30, 2025, the Judicial Branch Budget Committee approved these recommendations for consideration by the Judicial Council.

Relevant Previous Council Action

The allocation of funding appropriated in the state budget to the trial courts is one of the principal responsibilities of the Judicial Council. The council allocates this funding through various methodologies, including its approved Workload Formula policy.

In its December 2017 report to the Judicial Council, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) established the principles of the Workload Formula for FY 2018–19 and beyond (Link A). On January 12, 2018, the Judicial Council approved changes to the Workload Formula policy that eliminated the historical base to improve transparency, accountability, and predictability, and simplify reporting (Link B).

The Workload Formula established a base funding floor for the two smallest trial courts, Alpine and Sierra, to ensure these courts had sufficient funding to support core operations. At its business meeting on March 15, 2019, the Judicial Council approved an increase to the base funding floor from \$750,000 to \$800,000 (Link C). On March 11, 2022, the council further increased the base funding floor to \$950,000 effective July 1, 2022 (Link D). Most recently, at its March 2023 meeting, the council updated the policy so that the base funding floor courts could receive inflationary funding consistent with the other trial courts (Link E). The base funding

floor is currently proposed at \$994,000, and the funding is allocated through a pro rata adjustment to the allocations of the other 56 courts.

At its meeting on January 17, 2020, the Judicial Council approved technical adjustments to the Workload Formula policy to clarify allocation methodologies that would further the goals of funding equity, minimize adverse funding impacts, and provide clear direction on applying policy parameters when calculating allocations to the trial courts (Link F).

Analysis/Rationale

The May Revision to the Governor's proposed FY 2025–26 budget maintains essential program funding to support California's court system. This includes the (1) ongoing restoration of trial court funding (\$42 million), which results in a baseline reduction of \$55 million; (2) additional funding for trial court operational cost increases (\$40 million); and (3) funding for trial court employee health benefit and retirement cost increases (\$19.7 million), which has been reduced from the January budget to reflect updated costs reported by the trial courts. The current proposed budget for FY 2025–26 does not include new money as defined by the Workload Formula policy.

The May Revision also includes funding for the Superior Court of Sacramento County to implement the Tribal Nations Access to Justice Act (Sen. Bill 549; Stats. 2024, ch. 860), (\$2.7 million) and an ongoing reduction of \$20 million for the Pretrial Release Program, which reduces the total annual appropriation to the trial courts from \$68.95 million to \$48.95 million.

Resource Assessment Study and Workload Formula policy

The calculated funding level of each court is measured by the Judicial Council–approved weighted caseload study, the Resource Assessment Study (RAS). The methodology for weighted caseload was developed by the National Center for State Courts and is based on the principle that funding should be linked to workload. In addition to California, at least 30 other states utilize the RAS model to measure court workload.

California's RAS model calculates 22 different caseweights and uses an average number of processing minutes per case type, taking into account differences in workload complexity and time to process, and multiplies those weighting factors by the number of filings in each case type in each court. The processing minutes, totaled for all case types and based on each court's unique case mix, constitute the "workload" for each court. This workload is then used to calculate how many trial court staff are needed to process these cases.

The number of staff is then converted to a dollar need using an average salary cost, adjustments for cost-of-labor differentials based on U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data, retirement and health costs, operating expenditures and equipment costs, and other adjustments to account for court size to be used in the Judicial Council's Workload Formula methodology. The Workload Formula need is updated each year to reflect the most recent three-year average of filings data.

The Workload Formula policy has been in place since FY 2018–19 to improve funding equity, stability, and predictability for the trial courts, and to allow time for adjustment and adaptation when there are funding changes in the state budget.

A resource guide with additional information about trial court funding and the Workload Formula policy is included as Attachment A.

2024 RAS time study

A time study was conducted in 2024, and updated caseweights for the 22 casetypes were derived using the RAS model. The study found that case complexity increased for many casetypes compared to the existing 2017 caseweights (based on a 2016 time study). Some of the changes are due to legislation enacted over the last eight years, as well as variations in case volume and case mix by court. The Judicial Council approved the new caseweights from the 2024 time study at its business meeting on April 25, 2025.¹

Proposed Workload Formula for FY 2025-26

At its meeting on May 22, 2025,² the TCBAC approved updating the standard annual components of the Workload Formula, including updated filings, salary, benefits, operating expenditures and equipment, Bureau of Labor Statistics data, and court executive officer salary data, and continuing to use the existing 2017 caseweights for FY 2025–26. This results in a final statewide funding percentage of 85.9 percent after all calculations. This is a decrease from the FY 2024–25 funding percentage of 92.8 percent due to an increased workload need for the trial courts based on standard Workload Formula updates and a minor increase in proposed funding (\$40 million for operational cost increases and \$19.7 million for trial court benefits).

This approach is consistent with the historical practice to make these annual adjustments when calculating the Workload Formula need to incorporate updated information regarding actual filings and current costs for court staff. Continuing to use the existing 2017 caseweights will support funding stability, minimize the volatility of introducing the new caseweights into the model until further evaluation is done to determine the reasons for the changes in the weights, and allow time for adjustment and adaptation to the impact of the 2024 caseweights. The impact to the trial court allocations and the Workload Formula changes by individual court are displayed in Attachments B and C.

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Courts: Update of Resource Assessment Study Model* (Apr. 9, 2025), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14019448&GUID=99F54D42-7B70-40DA-9E23-ECF5C049A1B9*.

² Judicial Council of Cal., Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting materials (May 22, 2025), https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250522-materials.pdf.

Funding reallocation in fiscal years with "no new money"

At its business meeting on January 17, 2020,³ the Judicial Council approved technical refinements to the Workload Formula policy. Specifically, the equity-based reallocation of existing funding for every second year in which no new money is included in the budget will be based on the beginning Workload Formula allocations. The reallocation will be distributed to courts via their distance from the statewide average funding level and court size based on Workload Formula need, in the following sequence:

- 1. Up to a 1 percent reduction for courts above the 2 percent band to courts below the 2 percent band.
- 2. Up to a 2 percent reduction for courts above 105 percent of funding need to courts below the 2 percent band.
- 3. Courts above 105 percent of funding need will not fall below 104 percent of funding need.
- 4. Courts that penetrate the band following the up-to-1-percent reallocation will not be eligible for additional funding from the 2 percent reallocation from courts above 105 percent of funding need.

The proposed budget for FY 2025–26 does not include new money for the trial courts per the definition in the Workload Formula policy. Because the Budget Act of 2024 also did not include new money, FY 2025–26 is considered the second year of no new money and the equity-based reallocation will be implemented in the proposed Workload Formula allocation. This is the first time since the implementation of the Workload Formula policy in FY 2018–19 that the equity-based reallocation policy will be incorporated in the calculation of the allocations.

The proposed amount of the funding reallocation is \$3.3 million for FY 2025–26. There are 21 courts in the band around the statewide funding average, 26 courts above the band of which 12 will contribute funding to courts below the band, with 11 courts to receive funding. The proposed reallocation and impact by individual court are displayed in Attachment D.

Funding for operational cost increases (Consumer Price Index)

Each year, the cost of maintaining existing service levels in the California court system increases due to the general inflationary pressures facing all government operations. In FYs 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24, the final budget included Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustments to address trial court operational cost increases due to inflation. As this funding was intended to benefit all courts, it was allocated proportionally based on applying the CPI percentage increase to the prior year's Workload Formula allocation for each court in each respective fiscal year.

At its July 2024 business meeting, the Judicial Council revisited the Workload Formula definition of "new money" for the trial courts as it relates to CPI funding. The council approved

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Technical Refinement of Approved Workload Formula Methodology* (Dec. 20, 2019),

https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7976128&GUID=DC14BAC5-0079-4C0C-A0E6-52C7EC068BB0.

the recommendation to clarify that CPI funding included in the budget to address inflationary costs for the trial courts is *not* considered "new money" for the purpose of allocating funding via the Workload Formula. The definition of "new money" in the Workload Formula policy was revised accordingly to exclude CPI funding.⁴

The proposed FY 2025–26 budget includes \$40 million to address trial court operational cost increases. The table below summarizes CPI proposals and funding received by the trial courts in recent fiscal years.

Fiscal year	Dollars (in millions)	Description
2020–21	\$0	January budget included \$61.7 million for 3.0% inflationary increase and commitment for the administration to work with the Judicial Council to address future costs. Funding withdrawn in May Revision due to projected deficit from the COVID-19 pandemic.
2021–22	72.2	Represents 3.7% CPI increase ^a
2022–23	84.2	Represents 3.8% CPI increase ^b
2023–24	74.1	Represents 3.0% CPI increase °
2024–25	0	Request submitted to Department of Finance for a 2.9% CPI adjustment (\$67 million). Due to state's fiscal deficit, Budget Act of 2024 included a \$97 million reduction for the trial courts and no CPI increase.
2025–26 (proposed)	40.0	Included in FY 2025–26 proposed budget. Initial request was \$67 million for a 2.7% CPI increase.
Total	\$270.5	

^a Judicial Council of Cal., Judicial Branch Budget Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocation Methodology of* \$72.2 *Million Trial Court Funding in Governor's Proposed 2021–22 Budget* (June 17, 2021), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9499530&GUID=797D4736-AE15-43D3-84D7-4676D4D7C4B0*.

^b Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for 2022–23* (June 28, 2022),

 $https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx? \textit{M=F&ID=11018996} \\ \& GUID=EFC36BA3-294F-4DC3-8C7E-1AC030ED7B72. \\ \label{eq:generalized}$

^c Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for 2023–24* (June 23, 2023), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12124713&GUID=2A166CFF-E318-4E77-AA91-C06AE38FDFC2.

At its meeting on April 16, 2025,⁵ the TCBAC approved the allocation of the proposed \$40 million for operational cost increases as a proportional increase of 1.6 percent over each trial court's FY 2024–25 Workload Formula allocation, which is consistent with the council's existing policy. The TCBAC also approved the sequence of funding adjustments for FY 2025–26

⁴ 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), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13077708&GUID=08C509A8-B264-4D66-AFDC-B3EC97A5D296.*

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting materials (Apr. 16, 2025), https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250416-materials.pdf.

so that the equity-based reallocation of existing funding will occur first before adding the \$40 million for increased operational costs for the trial courts.

Base, discretionary, and nondiscretionary program allocations include the following:

- 1. Program 0140010—Judicial Council
 - a. Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee allocation recommendations⁶ for Judicial Council staff of \$4.5 million (Attachment E, column J, line 29).
- 2. Program 0150010—Support for Operation of the Trial Courts
 - a. Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) allocation of \$2.6 billion (Attachment B, column W).
 - b. New allocations of:
 - (i) Funding reallocation (Attachment B, columns E and F);
 - (ii) \$40 million for trial court operational cost increases included in the proposed FY 2025–26 budget (Attachment B, column G);
 - (iii) \$19.7 million for non-court interpreter benefit cost changes for FY 2025–26 (Attachment B, column H); and
 - (iv) \$2.7 million for implementation of SB 549, Tribal Nations Access to Justice Act, for the Superior Court of Sacramento County included in the proposed FY 2025–26 May Revision (Attachment B, column O).
 - c. R&E Subcommittee allocation recommendations for support for operation of the trial courts of \$44.1 million (Attachment E, column J, line 30).
- 3. Program 0150011—Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel
 - a. Allocation of \$186.7 million for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (Attachment E, column J, line 31).
 - (i) This item is included as a single amount and was approved by the TCBAC at its meeting on May 7, 2025.
- 4. Program 0150010-Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act
 - a. Allocation of \$31.0 million for CARE Act (Attachment B, column N).
 - (i) This item is included as a single amount and was approved by the TCBAC at its meeting on April 16, 2025.
- 5. Program 0150037—Court Interpreters
 - a. R&E Subcommittee allocation recommendation of \$87,000 for the Court Interpreter Data Collection System (Attachment E, column J, line 32).

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., TCBAC R&E Subcommittee meeting materials (Apr. 3, 2025), https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250403-rande-materials.pdf.

- 6. Program 0150095—Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts
 - a. R&E Subcommittee allocation recommendations of \$25.7 million for expenditures incurred by the Judicial Council on behalf of the trial courts (Attachment E, column J, line 33).

General Fund

A total of \$68.8 million General Fund for trial court employee benefits (Attachment B, column X).

FY 2025–26 Workload Formula allocation

The FY 2025–26 Workload Formula allocation includes allocations, revenues, and adjustments of \$2.571 billion (Attachment C, column Y).

Changes to the prior year Workload Formula allocation include:

- 1. Decrease of \$2.1 million to the subordinate judicial officer allocation (Attachment C, column L);
- 2. Increase of \$413,000 in automated recordkeeping and micrographics collections from FY 2022–23 to FY 2023–24 (Attachment C, column M);
- 3. Increase of \$19.7 million for FY 2025–26 non–interpreter benefit cost changes (Attachment C, column N);
- 4. Criminal justice realignment funding of \$9.2 million (Attachment C, column O);
- 5. FY 2023–24 revenues collected totaling \$43.2 million (Attachment C, column P);⁷
- 6. Funding reallocation as outlined in the funding reallocation in fiscal years with "no new money" subsection (Attachment C, columns Q and R);
- 7. Increase of \$40 million as outlined in the "Funding for operational cost increases (Consumer Price Index)" subsection (Attachment C, column S);
- 8. Increase in the base funding floor amount for two courts, Alpine and Sierra, to \$994,000 to allow these courts to retain inflationary adjustments above the base funding floor amount (Attachment C, column U); and
- 9. FY 2025–26 funding floor adjustment, with the 56 other courts sharing a pro rata adjustment in the funding floor allocation (Attachment C, columns V and X). The funding floor adjustment may change based on final appropriations included in the Budget Act of 2025.

⁷ Includes all other applicable revenue sources as recommended by the Funding Methodology Subcommittee, excluding civil assessment revenue as of FY 2022–23. Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trial courts but is used in the calculation of the Workload Formula allocation.

Pending allocations

Items pending allocation from the Program 0150010 appropriation include the following:

- Under Government Code section 77203(b), "a trial court may carry over unexpended funds in an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the court's operating budget from the prior fiscal year," effective June 30, 2020. Because the courts have until July 15, 2025, to provide their preliminary FY 2024–25 ending fund balances, the preliminary reduction amounts related to trial court reserves above the cap referenced in Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) (Link G) will not be available in time to be considered by the Judicial Council at its business meeting on July 18, 2025. Therefore, the TCBAC will consider the final allocation reductions for fund balances above the statutory cap prior to its recommendation to the Judicial Council before January 2026.
- The TCBAC approved an initial allocation of \$68.95 million for pretrial services at its meeting on May 7, 2025. The proposed FY 2025–26 May Revision reduced the funding to \$48.95 million. This funding is reflected in the trial court allocations, and a methodology to implement the \$20 million reduction will be considered at a future TCBAC meeting.
- 3. Using the Judicial Council–approved formula, the allocation of funding collected via the dependency counsel collections program will be considered by the TCBAC and the council once final FY 2024–25 collections are known.
- 4. The allocation of various revenue distributions as required by statute or as authorized charges for the cost of programs or cash advances.

Potential impacts to allocations

- 1. Allocation changes may be necessary to the extent there are changes to appropriations and associated language in the Budget Act of 2025.
- 2. The proposed budget for FY 2025–26 maintains \$5 million in the Trial Court Emergency Fund to support emergency situations, revenue shortages, or budgetary imbalances. The proposed allocations in this report assume no use of the \$5 million in FY 2025–26. If funding is allocated in FY 2025–26, courts will need to replenish the funding up to what was allocated by the Judicial Council from their FY 2026–27 base allocation.⁸

The projected FY 2025–26 ending TCTF fund balance is \$151.8 million (Attachment F, column F, row 23):

- The restricted fund balance (restricted by statute or Judicial Council policy) is \$110.2 million (Attachment F, column F, row 25).
- The unrestricted fund balance is \$41.7 million (Attachment F, column F, row 26).

⁸ Judicial Council of Cal., Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting materials (Mar. 18, 2019), https://courts.ca.gov/system/files?file=file/jbbc-20190318-materials.pdf.

The FY 2025–26 preliminary allocations totaling \$2.958 billion can be supported by the TCTF based on revenue projections and projected savings in the current year.

The final allocations will be updated based on any needed technical adjustments and are contingent on funding included in the enacted budget for FY 2025–26.

Delegation of authority for technical adjustments

The annual allocations from the TCTF approved by the Judicial Council are estimated based on available information at the time allocation requests are developed. Authority for technical baseline budget adjustments is necessary to address midyear revisions to budgets for funded personal services and rent increases approved by the Department of Finance and included in the annual budget act. Delegating authority to the Administrative Director of the Judicial Council to address these adjustments midyear to a maximum of 10 percent of specific allocations will allow for greater efficiency in the implementation of required budgetary adjustments.

The Administrative Director currently has delegated authority to transfer allocations approved by the Judicial Council between projects and programs not to exceed 20 percent of the allocations to be reduced or augmented.

Policy implications

The allocation recommendations are consistent with the statutory requirement that the Judicial Council approve preliminary allocations for the trial courts in July of each fiscal year. The recommendation to delegate authority to the Administrative Director will streamline the process to make necessary allocation adjustments during the fiscal year and will require an update to the Judicial Council delegation policy.

Comments

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

Alternatives considered

Recommendation 1: The TCBAC considered using the current FY 2024–25 Workload Formula need, which is based on the 2017 caseweights, to calculate the allocations for FY 2025–26 and not including the standard RAS updates for filings and other cost adjustments. This option results in a final statewide funding percentage of 94.6 percent after all calculations. This is an increase from the FY 2024–25 funding percentage of 92.8 percent because the need is held flat with the current year and there is a minor increase in proposed funding for FY 2025–26.

While this approach will support funding stability and predictability (the total amount of funding in FY 2025–26 for allocation to the trial courts is the same for each option, although the amount to individual courts will vary), it is not consistent with past practice to include standard annual RAS updates. This approach also underestimates the workload need for the trial courts by not using current available data for filings and other formula inputs, which results in a falsely

overstated statewide funding percentage. The impact to the trial courts allocation and the Workload Formula changes per trial court are displayed in Attachments G and H.

Recommendation 2: The TCBAC considered using the standard annual updates to the Workload Formula model along with the updated 2024 caseweights in the Workload Formula calculations for FY 2025–26 at its meeting on May 7, 2025.⁹ However, due to the number of years between the studies (2016 to 2024), the significant changes in the findings of the 2024 time study, and the short period of time between the approval of the 2024 caseweights by the Judicial Council at its April 2025 meeting and the calculation of the FY 2025–26 allocations for the trial courts using the Workload Formula, it was determined that this option did not allow sufficient time to understand the reasons for the changes in the weights and their impact on allocations to the courts.

This approach was not considered to be a viable option for FY 2025–26 as it does not align with the core principles of the Workload Formula to minimize funding volatility and maximize stability and predictability to the extent possible.

Recommendation 3: The recommended allocations are consistent with approved methodologies and past practice or were thoroughly vetted through the committee process and deemed necessary.

Recommendation 4: If the recommendation to delegate authority to the Administrative Director to authorize technical baseline adjustments to TCTF allocations is not approved, it will require the Judicial Council to separately consider and approve any necessary technical adjustments throughout the year for previously approved allocations resulting in ongoing operational inefficiencies and increased workload for committees and council staff.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

If the recommendations to allocate funding are not approved, the fiscal and operational impacts to the trial courts will be significant and access to justice across the state will be hindered.

Attachments and Links

- 1. Attachment A: Trial Court Funding and Workload Formula Resource Guide
- 2. Attachment B: FY 2025–26 Trial Court Recommended Preliminary Allocations with Updated FY 2025–26 Workload Formula Need
- 3. Attachment C: FY 2025–26 Workload Formula Allocations with Updated FY 2025–26 Workload Formula Need
- 4. Attachment D: FY 2025–26 Funding Reallocation using Updated FY 2025–26 Need (2017 caseweights)

⁹Judicial Council of Cal., Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting materials (May 7, 2025), https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20250507-noticeandagenda.pdf.

- Attachment E: Judicial Council of California, Approved FY 2024–25 and Proposed FY 2025–26 Allocations, State Operations and Local Assistance, Trial Court Trust Fund
- 6. Attachment F: Trial Court Trust Fund, Fund Condition Statement, May Revise FY 2025–26
- Attachment G: FY 2025–26 Trial Court Recommended Preliminary Allocations with FY 2024–25 Workload Formula Need
- 8. Attachment H: FY 2025–26 Workload Formula Allocations with FY 2024–25 Workload Formula Need
- 9. Link A: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Trial Court Budget: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (Dec. 8, 2017), p. 7, https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-6A8D8502A126
- 10. Link B: Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (Jan. 12, 2018), item 18-003, pp. 9–10, https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=559778&GUID=3553B33A-BE03-4DF3-84E1-8196225C58DB
- 11. Link C: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Base Funding Floor Allocation* (Mar. 15, 2019), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7058011&GUID=805D0070-0C38-40C7-A8CE-F08E82D8DDD5
- 12. Link D: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Base Funding Floor Allocation* (Feb. 18, 2022), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10541345&GUID=95859AA1-D4C0-4EAA-B339-EE6F27359A29
- 13. Link E: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., Trial Court Budget: Base Funding Floor Inflationary Increases (Mar. 24, 2023), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11695190&GUID=BB0B0101-F2C4-4E59-AIEC-59301CF1CE4B
- 14. Link F: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Technical Refinement of Approved Workload Formula Methodology* (Dec. 20, 2019), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7976128&GUID=DC14BAC5-0079-4C0C-A0E6-52C7EC068BB0*; Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (Jan. 17, 2020), item 20-024, pp. 10–11, *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=711572&GUID=AC46528C-6E37-406A-A1CE-B41CC33E29EB*
- 15. Link G: Gov. Code, § 68502.5, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=68502.5.&l awCode=GOV

Attachment A



Trial Court Funding and Workload Formula Resource Guide

February 2025



Judicial Council of California

Table of Contents

Background	3
Trial Court Allocations Before 2013	5
Implementation of the Workload-Based Allocation Funding Methodology	6
Implementation of the Workload Formula	7
Implementation Adjustments and Refinements	9
Base Funding Floor Courts	9
Definition and Impact of "New Money"	10
Allocations in Fiscal Years with "No New Money"	11
Funding Reduction Methodology	12
Reduction in Fiscal Year 2020–21	12
Reduction in Fiscal Year 2022–23	13
Reduction in Fiscal Year 2024–25	13
Recent Funding to Support Equity	14
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2018–19	14
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2018–19 Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23	
•	14
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23	14
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23 Resource Assessment Study Implementation	14 15 15
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23 Resource Assessment Study Implementation RAS Policies and Methodology	14 15 15 17
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23 Resource Assessment Study Implementation RAS Policies and Methodology Converting FTE to Dollars	14 15 15 17 17
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23 Resource Assessment Study Implementation RAS Policies and Methodology Converting FTE to Dollars RAS Model Overview	
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23 Resource Assessment Study Implementation RAS Policies and Methodology Converting FTE to Dollars RAS Model Overview Cluster Model	
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23 Resource Assessment Study Implementation RAS Policies and Methodology Converting FTE to Dollars RAS Model Overview Cluster Model Cluster Model Background	
Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23 Resource Assessment Study Implementation RAS Policies and Methodology Converting FTE to Dollars RAS Model Overview Cluster Model Overview Cluster Model Background Cluster Model Use in RAS/Workload Formula	

Background

The allocation of funding appropriated in the state budget to the trial courts is one of the principal responsibilities of the Judicial Council. To carry out this responsibility, the Judicial Council has taken a considerable amount of time and effort over the past several decades to review and refine the allocation process.

Trial Court Funding Act—During the 1990s, the state was confronted with a system of funding the trial courts that resulted in a wide disparity in the services offered from court to court and the relative level of funding provided to each court. Many courts did not have sufficient resources to meet their basic constitutional and statutory mandates. County-based funding for the trial courts maximized resources for the courts in counties that set judicial services as a high priority and minimized resources in counties with other priorities.

In an effort to address both the disparities in funding and access to the courts, the Governor and Legislature passed Assembly Bill 233, the Lockyer-Eisenberg Trial Court Funding Act (Stats. 1997, ch. 850), which created a new structure in which the 58 county-funded courts became primarily state-funded.¹ The intent of this change in funding structure was to address the disparity in funding levels across the county court systems and ensure that all Californians have access to justice and similar experiences in resolving their legal disputes in trial courts throughout the state. The act also required the state to assume full responsibility for any growth in the cost of trial court operations.

Immediately upon its passage by the Legislature, the Judicial Council highlighted the primary benefits of AB 233:

- Promote a stable, consistent funding source for the trial courts;
- Promote fiscal responsibility and accountability by the trial courts in managing scarce resources in the most efficient and effective manner;
- Recognize the state as having primary responsibility for trial court funding, thereby enabling the courts, the state, and the counties to engage in long-term planning;
- Enhance equal access to justice by removing disparities resulting from the varying ability of individual counties to address the operating needs of the courts and provide basic and constitutionally mandated services; and
- Provide significant financial relief in all 58 counties, which allowed the counties to redirect local resources to critical programs that serve local constituents.

¹ Assem. Bill 233 (Stats. 1997, ch. 850), *http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/97-98/bill/asm/ab_0201-0250/ab_233_bill_19971010_chaptered.pdf*.

The goal of providing equal access to justice is supported by ensuring that there is funding equity among the trial courts. The act came after more than a decade of failed or deficient funding attempts by the Legislature to bring more funding equity to the courts. Previous initiatives in the 1980s and 1990s included (1) block grants for counties for certain judicial positions, (2) increased state participation in the funding of judges' salaries and benefits, and (3) realignment funds, which shifted revenues from the courties to the state General Fund to provide local relief from the fiscal pressures of funding the courts in their respective counties. Unfortunately, these solutions only made modest gains in addressing the funding disparities.

State Appropriations Limit Adjustment—In fiscal year (FY) 2005–06, the Governor and the Legislature agreed on a funding approach for the trial courts (Gov. Code, § 77202) to ensure that (1) state appropriations for the trial courts are not eroded, (2) sufficient funding is provided to sustain service levels, and (3) operational cost changes are accommodated without degrading the quality of court services to the public. This new methodology was also intended to grant budgetary independence, as is appropriate for a separate branch of government, and allow for multiyear budget planning, including multiyear bargaining agreements with court labor unions.

In addition to the state General Fund appropriations for the judicial branch to support the trial courts, Government Code section 77202 authorized the use of a cost-of-living and growth adjustment computed by multiplying the year-to-year percentage change in the state appropriations limit as described in section 3 of article XIIIB of the California Constitution.

Factors used to calculate the state appropriations limit include changes in population and inflation. The population factor was intended to account for changes in trial court workload, and the inflation factor was intended to address changes in staffing and operating costs. The state appropriations limit adjustment was applied to the state Budget Act appropriations that supported trial court allocations. However, it did not specify how allocations between trial courts were to be made. This funding adjustment process was in place for several fiscal years before it was suspended during the Great Recession, beginning in 2009–10, and never reinstated.

Trial Court Funding Workgroup—On September 19, 2012, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr., and Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye announced in a joint letter the creation of a new working group to evaluate the state's progress in achieving the goals of the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997. The Trial Court Funding Workgroup examined both the express requirements and intent of AB 233 to determine the success of the judicial branch in implementing this major reform.

In a report submitted to the Judicial Council in April 2013, the workgroup concluded that the judicial branch had substantially complied with the Trial Court Funding Act. However, it was also determined that the judicial branch must continue to work to ensure that litigants across the state have equal access to justice and that funding for the branch is allocated in a manner that promotes greater access to the courts.

The workgroup also recommended that the branch identify and consider implementing efficiencies and best practices more uniformly, and adopt appropriate measures to assess improvements in providing access to justice for all Californians.

Trial Court Budget Working Group—Concurrent with the work of the Trial Court Funding Workgroup, the Judicial Council's Trial Court Budget Working Group began an examination of the trial court funding allocation methodologies used by the Judicial Council with the intent to create a budget development methodology and a more equitable allocation methodology for consideration by the Judicial Council.

As a result of the work of these two workgroups, the Judicial Council adopted foundational changes to the way funds were allocated to the trial courts. The most significant actions are identified below, ending with the landmark policy decision to approve the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (known as WAFM) on April 26, 2013.

Trial Court Allocations Before 2013

- Prior to 1997, courts were funded by county board of supervisors, which led to wide disparities in levels of funding and access to justice across the 58 counties.
- In FY 1998–99, the Judicial Council directed the Trial Court Budget Commission to allocate \$3 million in ongoing funding to address courts with insufficient resources. Twelve courts qualified for this funding that was approved by the Judicial Council at its January 26, 2000, business meeting.²
- Between fiscal years 1998–99 and 2004–05, augmentations to trial court funding were provided through requests for funding submitted to the Department of Finance and the Legislature, and included in the final enacted budgets. The courts applied for funds based on Judicial Council priorities, and working groups made decisions regarding which of the applications to approve.
- In 2005, the Judicial Council approved the use of a weighted caseload study, the Resource Assessment Study (RAS), to assess the need for trial court staff based on workload measures.³ The RAS model was used for three successive fiscal years, 2005–06 through 2007–08, to allocate a portion of new state appropriations limit funding to courts that the model identified as being historically underfunded. Over three years, approximately \$32 million in new funding was redirected to the baseline budgets of those underfunded courts using the RAS model.

² Judicial Council of Cal., Staff Rep., mins. (Jan. 26, 2000), https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/min0100.pdf.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., *Report Summary: Fiscal Year 2005–2006 Trial Court Budget Allocations* (July 20, 2005), https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-12/0705item1.pdf.

• Until FY 2013–14, most changes in trial court funding were allocated based on courts' then-proportionate share of historical statewide allocations.

Implementation of the Workload-Based Allocation Funding Methodology

At its April 2013 business meeting, the Judicial Council affirmed a shift from a funding model based on historical levels to one based on workload need when it adopted a recommendation from the Trial Court Budget Working Group, now the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC), for a new trial court budget development and allocation process.

The Trial Court Budget Working Group adopted the RAS model as the basis for the trial court budget development and allocation process. The RAS model demonstrated that the trial courts were funded below necessary levels. At the time, there was no new funding available for equalization and any additional funding for some courts had to be offset by funding reductions to others. Given the extreme financial hardship under which all courts were operating, the Trial Court Budget Working Group recommended against immediate full equalization of Trial Court Trust Fund allocations—the primary special fund that supports trial court operations—based on the RAS model.

Instead, a five-year transition plan to move from historical allocations to workload-based allocations was implemented starting in FY 2013–14. The plan called for 10 percent of allocations to be based on WAFM in that year, increasing to 50 percent in FY 2017–18. In addition, any new money appropriated for general trial court operations was to be allocated using WAFM, and an amount of historical base funding equal to the new money amount would also be reallocated using WAFM. This was intended to accelerate the movement of courts towards greater equity in funding.

Following the action taken at its April 2013 meeting, the Judicial Council approved several subsequent modifications to the WAFM model as described below:

- July 25, 2013–(1) exempted the cluster 1 courts (the cluster system is discussed in more detail in the Cluster Model section beginning on page 18) from any funding reallocation using WAFM, (2) simplified the cost of labor adjustment calculations, (3) employed a cluster-average salary for the court executive officer, (4) determined that the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Category 92: Local Government should be used as the comparator, and (5) approved the use of a blended local-state government BLS factor if the proportion of state employees in a jurisdiction is greater than 50 percent;
- August 22, 2013–approved an adjustment request process (ARP) by which trial courts could request adjustments to funding based on workload factors not accounted for in the WAFM model but deemed essential to the operation of a trial court;
- February 20, 2014–(1) approved use of a three-year average BLS adjustment factor,
 (2) adopted a full-time equivalent (FTE) dollar allotment floor for courts with fewer than 50 employees, (3) established an absolute and graduated funding floor and cap on the size

of the allocation adjustment for courts eligible for the graduated funding floor, and (4) eliminated the cluster 1 exemption put in place in July 2013; and

• July 28, 2017–changed the deadlines and submission requirements for the ARP.

In addition to these policy changes, annual allocations via WAFM were approved by the Judicial Council at its July business meetings. The table below summarizes the reallocation schedule; amount of new funding, if applicable, allocated to the trial courts each year; and the total WAFM-related allocations.

Fiscal Year	Percentage Reallocation	New Funding Allocated (in millions)	Total WAFM- Related Allocation (in millions)
2013–14	10	\$60.0	\$1,498.2
2014–15	15	\$22.7 (shortfall); \$86.3 new	\$1,571.4
2015–16	30	\$67.9	\$1,704.3
2016–17	40	\$19.6	\$1,737.3
2017–18	50	\$0	\$1,745.5

WAFM Five-Year Implementation

Implementation of the Workload Formula

In the spring of 2017 and with the end of the five-year transition plan approaching, the TCBAC's Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) revisited one of the items on its work plan, which was to review WAFM for FY 2018–19 and beyond. To better formulate its approach, the FMS undertook an evaluation of the first five years of WAFM. The goal of this process was threefold: (1) to better understand the model's impact on the trial courts, (2) to assess whether WAFM achieved the goals that had been set when the model was first put into place in FY 2013–14, and (3) to inform any revisions to the funding methodology going forward.

From those discussions, the FMS articulated a set of objectives, principles, and measures that were later formally adopted as the basis for the modifications to WAFM moving forward. The key objective of WAFM for FY 2018–19 and beyond was to reach equity of available funding based on a model that uses workload and related factors to identify funding need. This was consistent with the underlying objectives of WAFM when it was first established.

At the Judicial Council's January 12, 2018, business meeting, the work of the FMS and TCBAC culminated with the council approving new policy parameters for the allocation process now known as the Workload Formula. Effective in FY 2018–19, the intent of the Workload Formula was to further the objectives of the judicial branch in reaching workload-based equitable funding

for the trial courts.⁴ Additionally, the guiding principles for the Workload Formula were modified from a primary focus on equity to also reflect concerns about the need for greater stability and predictability in funding for the courts. The principles of the Workload Formula include the following:

- Minimize volatility, and maximize stability and predictability to the extent possible;
- Commit to evaluating all submissions as submitted via the Adjustment Request Process;
- Allow time for adjustment and adaptation;
- Be responsive to local circumstances;
- Maintain transparency and accountability;
- Preserve the independent authority of the trial courts; and
- Simplify reporting while maintaining transparency.

At its July 19, 2019, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved recommendations related to how the Workload Formula–based allocations are calculated. These recommendations increased the accuracy and transparency of the Workload Formula by including all relevant sources of funding.⁵

At its September 24, 2019, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation to change the Workload Formula policy regarding reallocations in years when no "new money" was included in the budget.⁶

At its January 17, 2020, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved additional changes to the Workload Formula methodology. Changes included technical refinements to the Workload Formula parameters to provide clear allocation methodologies to further the goals of funding equity, minimize adverse funding impacts to the trial courts, and provide clear direction on applying policy parameters.⁷

https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7684283&GUID=BAC36D10-9191-44F8-A59D-4BA133D2560A.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology* (Dec. 8, 2017), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-6A8D8502A126*.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Workload Formula-Allocations* (June 25, 2019), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7338800&GUID=9284F0B3-BCAE-4C0C-A110-49AA99D8A139*.

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Policy for Courts that Exceed 100 Percent of Workload Formula Funding* (Sept. 5, 2019),

⁷ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Technical Refinement of Approved Workload Formula Methodology* (Dec. 20, 2019),

https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7976128&GUID=DC14BAC5-0079-4C0C-A0E6-52C7EC068BB0.

Implementation Adjustments and Refinements

Base Funding Floor Courts

In order to provide the two smallest trial courts with funding to support the minimum level of staffing and operational costs, a base funding floor policy was established.

When WAFM was implemented in FY 2013–14, it was determined that the smallest courts' funding needs could not be established using workload metrics alone. For that reason, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation from the TCBAC to establish a base funding floor amount of \$750,000 effective in FY 2014–15.⁸

On March 15, 2019, the Judicial Council approved increasing the base funding floor amount from \$750,000 to \$800,000⁹ and took further action at its business meeting on March 11, 2022, to increase the base funding floor to \$950,000, effective July 1, 2022.¹⁰ The base funding floor is currently allocated to the two smallest trial courts, Alpine and Sierra. The funding is allocated through a pro rata adjustment to the allocations of all other courts that do not qualify for the base funding floor.

The latest update to the base funding floor amount occurred on March 24, 2023, when the Judicial Council approved the policy change that allowed the two funding floor courts to receive inflationary funding consistent with the other 56 courts when Consumer Price Index (CPI) funding is included in the final budget.¹¹ The CPI measures inflation as experienced by consumers in their day-to-day living expenses, and the Department of Finance publishes an annual CPI factor that is used to determine the rate of cost increases for various state entities.

In FY 2023–24, the inflationary CPI adjustment was calculated at 3 percent which brought the base funding floor amount to \$978,500. This amount is the same for FY 2024–25 because the Budget Act of 2024 did not include a CPI adjustment due to the state's projected multiyear deficit.

⁸ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Allocations: Revisions to the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology* (Feb. 10, 2014), *https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20140220-itemk.pdf*.

⁹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Base Funding Floor Allocation* (Feb. 13, 2019), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7058011&GUID=805D0070-0C38-40C7-A8CE-F08E82D8DDD5*.

¹⁰ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Base Funding Floor Allocation* (Feb. 18, 2022), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10541345&GUID=95859AA1-D4C0-4EAA-B339-EE6F27359A29*.

¹¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Base Funding Floor Inflationary Increases* (Mar. 3, 2023), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11695190&GUID=BB0B0101-F2C4-4E59-A1EC-59301CF1CE4B*.

Definition and Impact of "New Money"

At its January 12, 2018, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved new policy parameters for the Workload Formula that specifically addressed how new money included in the budget is to be allocated in the Workload Formula, including the definition of "new money":¹²

"New money" is defined as any new ongoing allocation of general discretionary dollars to support costs of trial court workload, excluding funding for benefits and retirement increases.

Examples of funding that were subsequently identified as new money and allocated to the trial courts using the Workload Formula methodology include:

- FY 2019–20: new judgeship funding; and
- FY 2022–23: equity funding, civil assessment backfill funding, and new judgeship funding.

The Workload Formula allocates funding in years with "new money" in the following manner:

- 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.

In fiscal years 2021–22, 2022–23, and 2023–24, the budget included a CPI adjustment to address trial court operational cost increases due to inflation. This funding was intended to benefit all courts. Therefore, it was not allocated according to the Workload Formula methodology described above. Rather, it was allocated proportionally based on applying the CPI percentage increase to the prior year's Workload Formula allocation for each court in each respective fiscal year. In making the determination to allocate the CPI increases in this manner at the time, the Judicial Council did not specifically address whether the CPI increases, on their own, meet the definition of "new money."

¹² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology* (Dec. 8, 2017), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-6A8D8502A126*.

The Budget Act of 2021 included \$72.2 million ongoing General Fund for the trial courts to address inflationary cost increases. The Judicial Council approved the allocation of the \$72.2 million to all courts using the 3.7 percent CPI–based increase over each court's FY 2020–21 Workload Formula allocation.¹³ This approach ensured all courts received funding to address inflationary cost increases.

The following year, the Budget Act of 2022 included \$84.2 million ongoing General Fund for inflationary cost increases. The Judicial Council approved the allocation of the \$84.2 million to all courts as a 3.8 percent increase over each court's FY 2021–22 Workload Formula allocation.¹⁴

For the third consecutive year, the Budget Act of 2023 included \$74.1 million ongoing General Fund for the trial courts in recognition of increasing operational cost pressures due to rising inflation. The Judicial Council approved the allocation of the \$74.1 million to all courts as a 3 percent increase over each court's FY 2022–23 Workload Formula allocation.¹⁵

At its July 12, 2024, business meeting, the Judicial Council revisited the "new money" concept as it relates to CPI funding. The council approved the recommendation that CPI funding included in the budget to address inflationary costs for the trial courts is *not* considered "new money" for the purpose of allocating funding via the Workload Formula. The definition of "new money" in the Workload Formula policy was revised accordingly to exclude CPI funding.¹⁶

Allocations in Fiscal Years with "No New Money"

At its January 17, 2020, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved recommendations to make technical refinements to the Workload Formula policy parameters. Specifically, the reallocation of existing funding for every second year in which no new money is included in the budget will be based on the beginning Workload Formula allocations, distributed to courts via distance from the statewide average and size based on Workload Formula need, in the following sequence:

https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12124713&GUID=2A166CFF-E318-4E77-AA91-C06AE38FDFC2.

¹³ Judicial Council of Cal., Judicial Branch Budget Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocation Methodology of* \$72.2 Million Trial Court Funding in Governor's Proposed 2021–22 Budget (June 17, 2021), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9499530&GUID=797D4736-AE15-43D3-84D7-4676D4D7C4B0.

¹⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for 2022–23* (June 28, 2022),

https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M = F&ID = 11018996&GUID = EFC36BA3 - 294F - 4DC3 - 8C7E - 1AC030ED7B72.

¹⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund* and *Trial Court Allocations for 2023–24* (June 23, 2023),

¹⁶ 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), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13077708&GUID=08C509A8-B264-4D66-AFDC-B3EC97A5D296.

- 1. Up to 1 percent reduction for courts above the 2 percent band to courts below the 2 percent band.
- 2. Up to 2 percent reduction for courts above 105 percent of funding need to courts below the 2 percent band.
- 3. Courts above 105 percent of funding need will not fall below 104 percent of funding need.
- 4. Courts that penetrate into the band following the up to 1 percent reallocation will not be eligible for additional funding from the 2 percent reallocation from courts above 105 percent of funding need.

In anticipation of no new money included in the FY 2024–25 budget given the state's projected multiyear deficit, the TCBAC considered the implementation of the current policy to reallocate existing funding among the courts for the 2024–25 allocations.¹⁷ Based on this policy, there would have been a funding reallocation of \$7.2 million for FY 2024–25. However, because the Budget Act of 2024 included a reduction of \$97 million for the trial courts, it was determined that the reallocation of the \$7.2 million would not be implemented, as this would have resulted in double reductions for some courts.

Since the Workload Formula was implemented in FY 2018–19, there have been no instances of the reallocation of funding due to a second year of no new money included in the budget.

Funding Reduction Methodology

Currently, there is no "standard" methodology for addressing funding reductions. The Workload Formula policy states that a methodology for applying a funding reduction will be determined for each fiscal year in which a reduction occurs. Three recent examples of funding reductions that occurred in fiscal years 2020–21, 2023–24, and 2024–25 are described below.

Reduction in Fiscal Year 2020–21

The Budget Act of 2020 included a \$167.8 million reduction to trial court baseline funding due to the sizeable budget deficit projected as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Judicial Council–approved methodology¹⁸ to allocate this reduction, using a 4 percent band around the statewide funding level, is described below:

¹⁷ Trial Court Budget Advisory Com. Rep. (May 1, 2024), https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/tcbac-20240501materialspdf.pdf.

¹⁸ 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), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8651228&GUID=27A3B6D8-9783-4865-8C5A-F6697EB58734*.

- Courts within the established band around the statewide average funding level take a proportional reduction, but do not fall outside of the band;
- Courts above the band take an additional 1 percent cut from those within the band without falling into the band;
- Courts below the band take less of a cut than those within the band, scaled by their size and distance from the statewide average, not taking more of a cut than those inside of the band; and
- Cluster 1 courts—all of which are above the band—take the same percentage reduction as courts within the band but are not required to take the additional percentage reduction as those other courts above the band.

The full amount of the reduction was restored in the Budget Act of 2021, and the funding was allocated to the courts in the same amounts as the initial reduction.

Reduction in Fiscal Year 2022–23

Per the Budget Act of 2022, effective FY 2023–24, the civil assessment backfill amount decreased by \$10 million to \$100 million ongoing, due to the elimination of one-time funding for prior uncollected debt. The backfill amount was also reduced by an additional \$2.5 million for debt service obligation payments as approved by the Judicial Council at its May 12, 2023, business meeting.¹⁹ As a result, there was a total reduction of \$12.5 million ongoing to the amount of civil assessment backfill funding allocated to the trial courts beginning in FY 2023–24.

The \$12.5 million was reduced proportionally based on the courts' percentage of FY 2022–23 civil assessment backfill funding, with additional adjustments to three courts funded over 100 percent and a redirection of \$421,000 to five courts below the statewide average funding level.²⁰ As approved by the Judicial Council at its July 21, 2023, business meeting, the \$12.5 million ongoing reduction was reflected in the trial court allocations beginning in FY 2023–24.²¹

Reduction in Fiscal Year 2024–25

Due to the state's projected multiyear deficit, the Budget Act of 2024 included an ongoing reduction of \$97 million to trial court operational funding. At its July 12, 2024, business

¹⁹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Policy for Courts With Specified Debt Service Obligations Included in the Workload Formula* (Apr. 21, 2023),

https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11916929&GUID=4F4B033A-9A14-4C88-8654-8CF355F8E8D5.

²⁰ Judicial Branch Budget Com. Rep. (June 6, 2023), https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/jbbc-20230606-materials.pdf.

²¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for 2023–24* (June 23, 2023), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12124713&GUID=2A166CFF-E318-4E77-AA91-C06AE38FDFC2*.

meeting,²² the Judicial Council approved the allocation methodology for this reduction, which was similar to the methodology used for the FY 2020–21 reduction. The \$97 million reduction was calculated based on the steps described on page 13 utilizing a 4 percent band around the statewide average funding level.

The FY 2025–26 Governor's Budget proposed to restore \$42 million of the \$97 million reduction beginning in FY 2024–25. On a one-time basis, in FY 2024–25, the partial restoration will be funded by available reserves in the Trial Court Trust Fund. The administration will reassess the condition of the Trial Court Trust Fund in the spring of 2025 to evaluate the need for a General Fund backfill.

Recent Funding to Support Equity

Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2018–19

The Budget Act of 2018 included \$75 million in discretionary funding intended to benefit all trial courts and allocated according to a methodology determined by the Judicial Council.²³ The budget also included \$47.8 million that was allocated by the Judicial Council according to WAFM to 35 courts to equalize funding and bring all courts up to the statewide average funding level based on caseweights at that time.²⁴

Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23

The Budget Act of 2022 included \$100 million ongoing General Fund to promote fiscal equity among the trial courts. This funding was allocated by the Judicial Council according to the Workload Formula and distributed to 22 of the 58 courts below the statewide average funding level to bring them as close to the statewide average as calculated for FY 2022–23.²⁵ The budget also included funding for new judgeships and civil assessment backfill that was allocated via the Workload Formula methodology.

²² 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),

https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13077708&GUID=08C509A8-B264-4D66-AFDC-B3EC97A5D296.

²³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocation of \$75 Million in Discretionary Funds* (Aug. 30, 2018), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6613660&GUID=262131C4-DD88-4D30-9B94-CE8E2550BEC3v.*

²⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: 2018–19 Trial Court Base Allocations* (June 8, 2018), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6353563&GUID=B6C7B821-0722-4663-B27A-A23B367148E2*.

²⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for 2022–23* (June 28, 2022), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11018996&GUID=EFC36BA3-294F-4DC3-8C7E-1AC030ED7B72*.

Resource Assessment Study Implementation

RAS Policies and Methodology

In 2000, the Judicial Council's Office of Court Research (now known as the Research, Analytics, and Data Office) was directed to develop workload measures for nonjudicial trial court staff with the goal of developing a method for allocating resources to the trial courts that takes workload into account. The Judicial Council approved the Resource Allocation Study model, known as RAS, at its July 20, 2005, meeting.²⁶ Later, RAS was revised to Resource Assessment Study to better reflect the model's use in assessing, not allocating, workload.

The RAS model is based on weighted caseload, a nationally known and accepted methodology for trial court workload measurement. The methodology for weighted caseload was developed by the National Center for State Courts and is based on the principle that funding should be linked to workload. In addition to California, at least 30 other states use weighted caseload models to measure the work activities of court staff, judicial officers, and other entities connected with the court system.

Weighted caseload relies on three basic components: (1) annual, three-year average court filings; (2) caseweights and other model parameters that estimate how much time or resources court case processing activities take; and (3) a staff-year value, which quantifies the amount of time staff have for their work activities. The resulting calculation is an estimate of the staff needed for each court's case processing work, expressed as full-time equivalents (FTE).

As part of the process for determining annual trial court allocations, the RAS FTE need is computed and then converted to a dollar estimate. The RAS FTE need is calculated using the average of the three most recent years of filings data and the most current set of workload measures available.

California's RAS model calculates over 20 different caseweights. It uses an average number of processing minutes per case type, taking into account differences in workload complexity and time to process, and multiplies those weighting factors by the number of filings in each case type in each court. The total number of minutes for all case types in a court, based on each court's unique case mix, constitutes the "workload" for each court. This workload is then used to calculate how many trial court staff are needed to process these cases. The RAS is updated periodically to address changes in the caseweights, which are often driven by changes in the law that impact case processing.

The model was first used in three fiscal years (2005–06 through 2007–08) to identify historically underfunded courts and redirect a portion of new state appropriations limit funding to those courts identified, based on workload, as the most severely underfunded.

²⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., Staff Rep., *Report Summary: Fiscal Year 2005–2006 Trial Court Budget Allocations* (July 20, 2005), *https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-12/0705item1.pdf*.

In February 2013, the Judicial Council approved an updated version of the RAS model with caseweights and other parameters derived from a 2010 time study.²⁷ In the same year, the Judicial Council approved a recommendation to adopt a new funding model, known as WAFM (described in detail beginning on page 6) that would use the RAS model as the basis for its workload-based funding model.²⁸ The council's approval of the RAS models were made with the understanding that ongoing technical adjustments would be made to the model as needed and as more data became available.

Two technical adjustments were proposed to the model following its approval in 2013: (1) a recommendation from the TCBAC that the committee study special circumstance workload;²⁹ and (2) a request to develop an interim caseweight (pending the RAS model update) to measure the workload in complex civil cases, following the dissolution of the complex civil pilot program and corresponding State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund funding. An interim caseweight to measure complex civil workload was approved by the Judicial Council at its June 26, 2015, meeting and implemented starting with the FY 2015–16 budget allocations.³⁰

The sequential update of the RAS model was approved by the Judicial Council at its July 27, 2017, business meeting.³¹

On July 24, 2020, the Judicial Council approved the adoption of a new, interim caseweight to measure the workload of mental health certification hearings under Welfare and Institutions Code section 5250 that are performed by court staff.³² Starting on July 1, 2018, these petitions started being collected in the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System. Since they have a very different workload profile than that of other mental health filings, it was more accurate to establish a separate weight for certification workload rather than use the existing mental health caseweight. Establishing an interim, separate weight helped ensure that the workload for this

https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20130426-itemp.pdf.

²⁷ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Courts: Update of the Resource Assessment Study Model* (Feb. 8, 2013), *https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20130226-itemm.pdf*.

²⁸ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget Working Group: Recommendation of New Budget Development and Allocation Methodology* (Apr. 24, 2013), https://www.apr.com/wites/default/files/courte/default/2012/10/16 apr. 20120426 itemp. pdf.

²⁹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Allocations: Revisions to the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology* (Feb. 10, 2014), *https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20140220-itemk.pdf*.

³⁰ Judicial Council of Cal., mins., (June 25, 2015), https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20150626-minutes.pdf.

³¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Courts: Update of Resource Assessment Study Model* (June 13, 2017), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5338582&GUID=FA2962D0-141A-40D4-B9CA-CB5C2467A49Cv*.

³² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Courts: Interim Caseweight for Mental Health Certification Hearings for Use in Resource Assessment Study Model* (June 30, 2020), *https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8643451&GUID=CDF1174A-E96B-4478-9BF5-AE2ACEA883FC.*

case type was captured as part of the annual RAS updates until the workload could be more fully studied during the RAS model update and a more permanent weight was developed.

Mental Health Certification was included as a caseweight category, and workload was captured during a time study as part of the 2024 RAS model update. (The 2024 update is not yet completed or approved.)

Converting FTE to Dollars

Once the number of staff has been calculated, this information is converted into dollars using an average salary cost, adjustments for cost-of-labor differentials based on U.S. BLS data, retirement and health costs, operating expenditure and equipment costs, and other adjustments to account for court size. The workload need is updated each year to reflect the most recent three-year average of filings data.

RAS Model Overview

Each fiscal year, the RAS model is used to estimate the total FTE need in each court using the following formula:

Total Need (FTE) = Staff Need + Manager Need + Administrative Staff Need

Step 1: Staff Need

Staff need is calculated using a weighted caseload methodology. The total need is calculated for each case type and then summed across all case types using the following formula:

Staff Need (FTE) = <u>Average Filings * Caseweight (mins.) + Court Reporter Need</u> Staff Year Value (mins.)

The components of this formula include:

- Average filings: three-year average filings for a given case type;
- Caseweight: estimated staff time to process a filing of a given case type;
- Staff year value: estimated minutes available for case processing per FTE per year; and
- Court reporter need: judicial need multiplied by a factor of 1.25 in relevant case types.

The methodology for determining judicial need, which is the number of judgeships needed in the trial courts, is a workload-based methodology similar to the RAS which is used to assess staff need in the trial courts. The judicial need methodology was first approved by the Judicial Council in August 2001 and later modified and approved by the council in August 2004. The model was updated in 2010 and most recently in 2018, and the resulting updated caseweights were approved by the Judicial Council in December 2011 and September 2019, respectively.

Step 2: Manager Need

Manager need is calculated by dividing the staff need (Step 1), plus each court's court interpreter FTE, by a ratio of staff to managers and supervisors. This allocates managerial resources in proportion to staffing need using the following formula:

Manager Need (FTE) = <u>Staff Need (FTE) + Court Interpreters (FTE)</u> Cluster Ratio

The cluster manager ratio is calculated using actual data as reported by the courts in the last three years' Schedule 7A data. The Schedule 7A process establishes all authorized trial court positions by classification and associated costs, and is used to develop the annual budget. To reflect economies of scale, separate ratios are calculated for courts in clusters 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Step 3: Administrative Staff Need

Staff support need is based on the same principles as manager need (Step 2). In this case, the combined staff and manager need is added to existing Non-RAS FTE before applying the ratio.

Administrative Staff Need (FTE) = (<u>Staff Need (FTE) + Manager Need (FTE)) + Non-RAS FTE</u> Cluster Ratio

The cluster administrative staff ratio is calculated using actual data as reported by the courts in the last three years' Schedule 7A data. To reflect economies of scale, separate ratios are calculated for courts in clusters 1 and 2, and a pooled ratio is used for clusters 3 and 4.

Cluster Model

The cluster model is used in both the RAS model and the Workload Formula. It is used in two areas in the RAS model and two areas in the Workload Formula. (It is also used when making decisions in the Workload Formula, specifically to identify the smallest courts (cluster 1) to bring them to the 100 percent funding level.) Decisions on clustering may involve discussions and recommendations by the Data Analytics Advisory Committee and the FMS as their use impacts the RAS and the Workload Formula.

Cluster Model Background

The current four-cluster model was developed in the early 2000s. It was primarily informed based on the number of Authorized Judicial Positions (AJP). Courts were ranked by their number of AJPs first and then grouped into four clusters. The model was used as a stable proxy for court size.

Cluster boundaries were created based on a clear break in the number of AJPs. The smallest of the 58 trial courts, those with two AJPs, comprised cluster 1 courts. The remaining three clusters were identified based on natural breaks—or jumps—in the total number of AJPs.

Based on the most recent review (done in FY 2020–21), the number of AJPs had not changed significantly since their initial use in the RAS model in FY 2004–05. Notable exceptions included the Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Francisco superior courts:

- Riverside and San Bernardino had significant increases in their AJPs due to allocations of new judgeships approved by the Legislature over the last few years. However, these increases did not change their cluster status (they were/are cluster 4).
- San Francisco's AJP count dropped from 65 to 55.9 when the court eliminated 10 subordinate judicial officer positions in 2014. Due to this change, San Francisco was moved from cluster 4 to cluster 3. The request to change clusters was submitted via an ARP to the TCBAC, and the change was approved by the Judicial Council in FY 2020–21.³³

Cluster Model Use in RAS/Workload Formula

The cluster model is applied in two areas when developing the RAS model and in two areas in the Workload Formula. The ratios are updated every three years:

RAS:

- 1. Supervisor/Manager ratio (RAS): The number of staff to supervisor
- 2. Administrative Staff (Program 90)/Case Processing Staff (Program 10) ratio (RAS): The number of Program 90 staff (Human Resources, Information Technology, etc.) to Program 10 staff (case processing))

Workload Formula:

- 1. Court Executive Officer Salary (Workload Formula)
- 2. Operating Expenses and Equipment (Workload Formula)–Essential one number for C1 and one for all others

The cluster concept is also used in the Workload Formula when identifying the smallest courts (C1) to bring them to 100 percent of the funding need level (when new money is provided in the Budget Act).

³³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Workload Formula Adjustment Request Process (ARP), Cluster Assignment Evaluation for the Superior Court of San Francisco County (June 30, 2020), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8643165&GUID=506C4AE4-3DD1-4559-B281-C6D055EC103C.*

Library of Definitions

Terms

Adjustment request process (ARP) – Judicial Council process by which the trial courts can request adjustments to funding based on workload factors not accounted for in the Workload Formula model but deemed essential to the operation of a trial court.

Allocation – Method of dividing and distributing appropriated funding to entities within the judicial branch, such as the 58 trial courts.

Appropriation – A budget appropriation is a law that designates funding for specific purposes. Appropriations are a part of the budget-making process for governments and associated agencies, and are usually limited in the amount and period of time during which the expenditures are authorized.

Authorized Judicial Position (AJP) – Authorized positions that ensure a court has the necessary judicial resources, such as judgeships, commissioners, and referees within a trial court that are officially approved and funded through the state budget process.

Band – A statistical concept where a range of values is plotted around the calculated average. (In terms of funding allocation, a 4 percent band would be a range between 2 percent above the statewide average funding level and 2 percent below.)

Base allocation funding – Calculated each fiscal year by adjusting the prior year's ongoing base funding allocation with new ongoing funding and adjustments. (Any one-time expired allocations are removed.)

Base funding floor – A set funding amount established and allocated for the two smallest superior courts (Alpine and Sierra). It is based on the minimum level of staffing and operational costs necessary to support general court operations and is not related to their Workload Formula need.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) – The Bureau of Labor Statistics identifies labor cost differences between courts in various regions of the state. It is a component of the Workload Formula need calculation for trial court funding.

Caseweights – A component of the Workload Formula (workload analysis) that assigns weights to cases based on the duration and resources required to process the specific case types.

Cluster model – The current four-cluster model, developed in the early 2000s, ranks courts by their number of Authorized Judicial Positions. The cluster model is applied in the RAS model, Workload Formula, and other decision points where each cluster carries a particular value.

Consumer Price Index (CPI) – A measure of the average change over time in the prices paid by urban consumers for consumer goods and services. The CPI is calculated and provided by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

CPI funding – Funding included in the budget and allocated to all courts as a specific CPI percent increase over each court's prior fiscal year Workload Formula allocation.

Current-year base adjustments – Various allocation adjustments for base funding for the trial courts including funding floor allocation adjustments, supplemental funding adjustments when a court receives emergency funding in the prior year, and midyear adjustments for court allocations, such as the final reduction for fund balance above the 3 percent statutory cap.

Data Analytics Advisory Committee (DAAC) – Advisory body to the Judicial Council that develops and recommends policies on the collection, use, analysis, and sharing of judicial branch data and information resources.

Discretionary funding – Funding for the trial courts that has no restriction on what it can be used for and what can be expended at the courts' discretion.

Filing – Submission of documents into the court record with associated filing fee to initiate or continue a legal case. The various filing types include complaints, answers, motions, petitions, briefs, declarations, etc.

Fiscal year (FY) – The 12-month period for accounting, financial reporting, and budgeting purposes, not necessarily aligning with a calendar year. California's fiscal year begins July 1 and ends June 30 of the following year.

Full-time equivalent (FTE) – Excluding overtime but including holidays and paid vacations, the value that results from dividing the maximum amount of regular time a position is authorized to work in a fiscal year (July 1–June 30) by the standard maximum annual time established by the court (typically 2,080 hours). For example, a position authorized to work no more than 1,040 regular hours in a fiscal year is assigned an FTE value of 0.5. Except for temporary help blankets, the FTE value for each position can equal but not exceed 1.0.

Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) – A subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee tasked to review and refine the Workload Formula, develop allocation methodologies for nondiscretionary funding, evaluate existing allocation methodologies, and consider alternative methodologies to advance the goal of funding equity and stability to support trial court operations.

Inflation – The gradual price increase of goods and services in an economy over time that are indexed and typically referred to as the Consumer Price Index.

Judicial Need – The workload-based methodology used to determine the number of judgeships needed in the trial courts. This methodology is separate from, but similar to, the Resource Assessment Study, which is used to assess staff need in the trial courts.

New money – Any new ongoing discretionary funding to support the cost of trial court workload, excluding funding for benefits and retirement increases

Nonbase allocations – Various funding included in the budget as a separate item with dollar amounts that change annually (i.e., self-help, dependency counsel, and court interpreters funding).

Non-TCTF base allocations – Funding provided from the General Fund for employee benefits and pretrial funding. Typically, a static amount per court provided in December distributions.

One-time allocations – Funding identified as one-time is either provided for a single year, such as funding for COVID-19 related case filing backlog, and allocated in a single year, or provided annually and reallocated each year, such as criminal justice realignment funding.

Ongoing allocations – Allocations that remain in the base funding and are carried forward into the base allocation for future fiscal years (i.e., trial court benefit cost changes).

Prior year adjustment – An adjustment to the prior year base allocation to account for changes that were not captured previously.

Resource Assessment Study (RAS) – The model used to assess the workload need and allocation of staff resources to the trial courts. This methodology is separate from, but similar to, the Judicial Need, which is used to assess the number of judgeships needed in the trial courts.

Restricted funding – Typically identified in a budget act through provisional language, allowing expenditures for the specific purpose of the appropriated funding (i.e., CARE Act and court interpreters funding).

Schedule 7A – A worksheet used to start the budget process that includes trial courts' budgeted salaries and benefits for each court staff position by classification, excluding judges. Schedule 7A data is included in the Workload Formula and RAS models to derive statewide FTEs and salary costs for various positions.

State appropriations limit (SAL) – The constitutional limit on the growth of certain appropriations from tax proceeds, generally set to the level of the prior year's appropriation limit as adjusted for changes in cost of living and population.

Statewide average funding level – The ratio of available funding in a given fiscal year to the total estimated Workload Formula funding need for all trial courts.

Superior court – In California, the trial court in any of the 58 counties that tries and determines legal cases. A single superior court may have branches in multiple cities within the county.

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) – Advisory body to the Judicial Council that provides input on trial court funding issues and the budget process for the benefit of all courts statewide and proposes recommendations to the Judicial Council on trial court funding consistent with council goals.

Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) – The special fund within the judicial branch's budget that includes appropriations to fund trial court operations, salaries and benefits of superior court judges, court interpreter services, assigned judge services, and local assistance grants.

Workload Formula – The Judicial Council–approved methodology currently used to allocate a portion of funding to the trial courts with a focus on funding equity, stability, and predictability.

Workload Formula allocation – The amount of available funding allocated through the Workload Formula methodology.

Workload Formula need – The amount of funding needed to fully support annual court workload based on the calculated funding need.

Workload-Based Allocation Funding Methodology (WAFM) – Methodology used to allocate funding to the trial courts in fiscal years 2013–14 through 2017–18. Funding was allocated based on workload as derived from filings, which required shifts in the baseline funding from some courts to others and was phased in over a five-year period.

Acronyms

APJ – Authorized Judicial Positions

- ARP Adjustment Request Process
- BLS Bureau of Labor Statistics
- C1, C2, C3, and C4 Court clusters 1, 2, 3, and 4 (relative to the four-cluster model)
- CPI Consumer Price Index
- CY Current Year (in terms of current fiscal year)
- FY Fiscal Year (in terms of state fiscal year, it is a 12-month period from July 1 to June 30)
- DAAC Data Analytics Advisory Committee
- FMS Funding Methodology Subcommittee

FTE – Full-time Equivalent

- JBSIS Judicial Branch Statistical Information System
- PY Prior Year (in terms of previous fiscal year)
- RAS Resource Assessment Study
- TCBAC Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
- TCTF Trial Court Trust Fund
- WAFM Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology
- WF Workload Formula

FY 2025-26 Trial Court Recommended Preliminary Allocations with Updated FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Need

		FY 2024-25 ON ADJUST	NGOING BASE TMENTS			FY 2025-26 ON	NGOING BASE AI	LOCATIONS				OTHER ONE-	-TIME TCTF AI	LLOCATIONS				FY 20	025-26 BASE ALLC	OCATION ADJUSTN	ИENTS		
	FY 2024-25	General Ledge	er (GL) 812110				GL 812110						GL 812110						61.8	12110			
	Ending			FY 2024-25		5													010				F
	Trial Court Trust Fund		FY 2024-25 Revised	Adjusted Ending TCTF	Funding	Funding Reallocated																	
Court	(TCTF)	FY 2024-25 Initial	Reduction of	Ongoing Base	Reallocated from Courts	to Courts	FY 2025-26 Inflationary	FY 2025-26				Court	Increased			Total		Floor	Reduction	Supplemental	One-Time Reduction		
	Ongoing Base	Reduction of	\$55.642 million after	Allocation	Contributing	Receiving an Equity	Adjustment	Non-Interpreter Benefit Cost	Total Ongoing	Telephonic	Criminal Justice	Reporters	Transcript Rates	CARE Act	SB 549	One-Time	Floor Allocation	Reduction	for SJO	Funding	for Fund	Total Base Allocation	
	Allocation	\$96.982 million	\$41.34 million		to Equity	Adjustment	Funding	Change	Allocations	Appearances	Realignment	SB 170	SB 170	Funding	30 343	Base	Adjustment	Allocation	Conversion	(\$5m Reserve)	Balance	Adjustments	
			Restoration		(second year of no	(second year	of \$40m (1.6 Percent)	Funding ¹				Funding	Funding			Allocations		(TBD)	(Annualization)	Replenishment	Above the 3% Cap		
					"new money")	of no "new money")	. ,														·		
						-			. (=)														
Alameda	A 87,078,862	в (4,324,870)	C (2,884,769	D (A-B+C) 88,518,962	E	F	G 1,424,956	н (27,296)	I (E:H) 1,397,660	J 	к 187,647	L	M	N	0	P (J:O) 187,647	Q	R 1,356	5		U	V (P:U) 1,356	N
Alpine	894,531	-	- (2,004,709	894,531			15,512	5,840	21,352	-	-					-	9,409	-		-	-	9,409	
Amador	4,206,279	(167,223)	(95,942)		(457.000)		69,594	181,313	250,907	5,790	7,098					12,888	-	70		-	-	70	
Butte Calaveras	14,080,619 3,331,021	(583,710) (111,187)	(360,287)	14,304,042 3,388,376	(157,896)		220,838 53,213	232,088 47,902	295,030 101,114	15,210 791	106,023 6,654					121,233 7,445	-	210 52		-	-	210 52	
Colusa	2,380,354	(94,059)	(53,965)	2,420,448			39,553	51,781	91,334	-	9,759					9,759	-	39		-	-	39	
Contra Costa Del Norte	49,324,107 3,687,521	(1,738,846) (138,333)	(841,887)	50,221,066 3,746,487			832,188 72,011	581,122 61,470	1,413,311 133,481	-	86,060 14,195					86,060 14,195	-	801 60		-	-	801 60	
El Dorado	9,282,009	(320,824)	(155,331)	9,447,501		36,553	153,542	191,183	381,279	24,418	56,338					80,756	-	153		-	-	153	
Fresno	59,232,238	(3,029,033)	(2,020,422)				1,016,828	58,311	1,075,139	75,930	238,662					314,592	-	966		-	-	966	
Glenn Humboldt	2,952,674 8,115,475	(115,557) (425,808)	(66,299)	3,001,932 8,257,261		14,109	48,184 143,344	130,265 355,151	178,449 512,605	1,230 12,250	8,207 43,030					9,437 55,280	-	49 132		-	-	49 132	
Imperial	10,217,919	(368,916)	(246,074	10,340,761	(272,686)		163,060	35,817	(73,808)	25,465	37,485					62,950	-	151		-	-	151	
lnyo Kern	2,538,720 60,340,513	(95,542) (3,142,777)	(54,816)	2,579,446 61,386,998	(753,733)		40,474 1,067,196	50,129 (645,733)	90,603 (332,270)	1,395 38,700	4,880 254,410					6,275 293,110	-	39 985		-	-	39 985	
Kings	10,714,033	(429,257)	(246,280)	10,897,010	(119,920)		173,709	147,451	201,240	5,935	58,778					64,713	-	164		-	-	164	
Lake	5,194,262 2,689,655	(171,163) (92,113)	(82,871)	5,282,554		68,018	81,916 41,553	47,172 21,235	197,106 62,787	- 4,241	9,759 12,199					9,759 16,441	-	80 41		-	-	80	
Lassen Los Angeles	698,845,807	(28,238,886)	(16,201,647)	710,883,046			11,498,318	5,276,310	16,774,628	- 4,241	2,875,473					2,875,473	-	11,022		-	-	11,022	
Madera	11,862,930	(495,278)	(284,158)	12,074,049			204,038	37,734	241,772	-	50,793					50,793	-	189		-	-	189	
Marin Mariposa	12,943,444 1,811,111	(474,469) (65,897)	(229,721)	13,188,192 1,839,201	(163,065)		227,075 29,947	94,157 7,024	158,167 36,971	42,540	21,959 3,549					64,499 3,549	-	214 29		-	-	214 29	
Mendocino	7,559,799	(355,283)	(236,981)	7,678,102	(83,176)		123,508	78,744	119,076	8,520	107,353					115,873	-	121		-	-	121	
Merced Modoc	15,461,130 1,276,235	(651,946) (52,864)	(374,045)	15,739,032 1,298,769			265,979 22,109	99,904 (11,528)	365,882 10,581	13,095 776	56,560 4,436					69,655 5,212	-	254 21		-	-	254 21	
Mono	2,238,360	(72,775)	(41,754)	2,269,382			38,823	16,107	54,930	-	444					444	-	37		-	-	37	
Monterey	26,100,772 9,198,115	(1,019,502) (319,738)	(584,924)	26,535,349 9,363,047	(307,111)		419,107 153,022	355,193 138,857	467,189 291,879	- 14,590	45,914 39,481					45,914 54,071	-	400 147		-	-	400 147	
Napa Nevada	7,184,669	(221,442)	(107,214)	7,298,896			105,979	90,773	196,752	- 14,590	11,312					11,312	-	147		-	-	147	
Orange	179,164,268	(6,276,002)	(3,038,614)	182,401,656			3,003,611	1,134,334	4,137,945	-	534,327					534,327	-	2,871		-	-	2,871	
Placer Plumas	24,682,490 1,817,224	(976,477) (58,157)	(560,239)	25,098,728			400,741 30,475	331,352	732,093 30,475	24,920 2,448	34,602 2,218					59,522 4,666	-	384 29		-	-	384 29	\vdash
Riverside	134,734,147	(4,545,609)	(2,200,820)	137,078,936		524,264	2,175,468	3,732,481	6,432,213	-	826,665					826,665	-	2,127		-	-	2,127	
Sacramento San Benito	104,226,967 4,583,477	(3,701,694) (149,818)	(1,792,227) (85,956)	106,136,433 4,647,339		761,962	1,771,581 76,775	(671,038) 122,760	1,862,505 199,536	43,920	166,353 10,425				2,674,000	2,884,273 10,425	-	1,637 74		-	-	1,637 74	
San Bernardino	137,828,637	(4,579,894)	(2,217,420)	140,191,111		647,296	2,191,876	939,065	3,778,237	239,760	943,334					1,183,094	-	2,096		-	-	2,096	
San Diego San Francisco	174,414,396 57,440,281	(6,764,332) (2,527,201)	(3,880,936)	177,297,791 58,281,791	(663,374)		2,846,931 1,035,184	(427,911) 1,337,486	2,419,020 1,709,296	- 17,515	524,124 90,940					524,124 108,455	-	2,702 988		-	-	2,702 988	
San Joaquin	48,451,486	(2,430,393)	(1,616,188)	49,265,691	(003,374)		804,787	1,337,480	974,374	51,955	82,733					134,688	-	764		-	-	764	
San Luis Obispo	18,135,370	(890,721)	(594,128	18,431,963		004.004	298,347	58,372	356,718	18,700	95,746					114,446	-	287		-		287	
San Mateo Santa Barbara	41,002,030 26,107,408	(1,448,731) (1,037,243)	(701,423)	41,749,337 26,549,548		231,901	693,343 429,992	812,377 361,082	1,737,621 791,074	39,743 44,719	68,094 46,135					107,836 90,854	-	676 415		-	-	676 415	\vdash
Santa Clara	89,326,797	(4,448,653)	(2,967,335	90,808,115			1,503,861	40,664	1,544,525	-	232,229					232,229	-	1,436		-	-	1,436	
Santa Cruz Shasta	15,944,612 20,032,211	(774,120) (546,003)	(516,352)	16,202,379 20,313,859	(187,540) (203,960)		263,494 261,310	(44,188) 712,852	31,767 770,203	21,904 9,190	32,605 80,293					54,509 89,483	-	247 278		-	-	247 278	-
Sierra	924,629	-	-	924,629			15,512	10,023	25,535	630	222					852	(47,622)	-		-	-	(47,622)	
Siskiyou	4,353,927 28,460,464	(145,391) (1,122,454)		4,428,924			69,582 462,071	87,961 483,371	157,543 945,442	- 42,765	5,545 126,650					5,545 169,415	-	68 446		-	-	68 446	
Solano Sonoma	30,014,244	(1,404,359)	(936,734)		(344,231)		490,612	578,657	725,037	14,895	126,650					119,143	-	440		-	-	448	
Stanislaus	29,232,977	(1,059,443)	(512,944	29,779,476		428,703	-	208,029	1,143,768	-	158,590					158,590	-	483		-	-	483	
Sutter Tehama	8,086,130 5,586,929	(276,085) (229,402)	(133,670) (131,616)	8,228,544 5,684,715		81,723	132,131 94,707	(74,812) 20,656	139,041 115,363	2,795 1,340	28,169 10,203					30,964 11,543	-	126 90		-		126 90	\vdash
Trinity	2,439,200	(66,987)	(32,433)	2,473,755			32,059	62,405	94,464	400	5,323					5,723	-	32		-	-	32	
Tulare Tuolumne	31,984,594 5,017,940	(1,101,413) (232,387)	(533,265)	32,552,742 5,095,320	(57,355)	430,839	527,122 77,613	482,206 174,171	1,440,167 194,429	12,890 6,280	94,267 14,639					107,157 20,919	-	510 77		-	-	510 77	\vdash
Ventura	42,298,212	(2,147,664)	(1,432,532)	43,013,343			711,674	842,372	1,554,045	-	445,827					445,827	-	673		-	-	673	
Yolo Yuba	15,769,892 6,086,703	(516,996) (207,074)	(250,311) (100,258)	16,036,577 6,193,519		88,678	247,427 99,103	337,432 186,732	584,860 374,512	- 9,456	52,568 47,466					52,568 56,922	-	242 100		-	-	242 100	
Unallocated		(207,074)						100,732				30,000,000	7,000,000	31,043,700		68,043,700	-			-		-	
Total	2,418,890,806	(96,982,000)	(55,642,000)	2,460,230,806	(3,314,046)	3,314,046	40,000,000	19,716,955	59,716,955	897,100	9,223,000	30,000,000	7,000,000	31,043,700	2,674,000	80,837,800	(38,212)	38,212	-	-	-	(0)	2,

tta	ch	m	e	nt	В
	••••		-		_

FY 2025-26 Total TCTF
Base
Allocation
W (D+I+O+V)
90,105,625 925,292
4,541,426
14,720,514 3,496,987
2,521,581
51,721,238 3,894,224
9,909,689
61,631,545 3,189,867
8,825,277 10,330,053
2,676,363
61,348,824 11,163,128
5,489,499
2,808,188 730,544,169
12,366,803
13,411,071 1,879,750
7,913,172
16,174,823 1,314,583
2,324,792 27,048,851
9,709,145
7,507,063 187,076,799
25,890,727
1,877,184 144,339,941
110,884,849
4,857,373 145,154,539
180,243,638
60,100,531 50,375,517
18,903,414 43,595,470
27,431,892
92,586,306 16,288,902
21,173,823
903,395 4,592,081
30,054,229
31,326,520 31,082,318
8,398,676
5,811,711 2,573,974
34,100,576 5,310,746
45,013,888
16,674,247 6,625,053
68,043,700
2,600,785,562

FY 2025-26 Trial Court Recommended Preliminary Allocations with Updated FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Need

		THER NON-TCTF LOCATIONS			FY	2025-26 NON-B	ASE ALLOCATIO	DNS	
	GL 816111	GL 816111	FY 2025-26	GL 812167	GL 832010	GL 834010	GL 834010	GL 832012	
Court	General Fund Employee Benefits	General Fund Pretrial Funding (Ongoing)	Total Base Allocation	2% Automation Replacement	Self-Help	Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Allocation	CIP Ongoing Benefits	Dependency Counsel Allocation (\$186.7m with Reserve)	Total Non-Base Allocations
	x	Y	Z (W+X+Y)	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF (AA:AE)
lameda	3,102,046		93,207,671	424,792	1,017,456	5,803,556	(710)		7,245,094
lpine	20,340		945,632	2,034	34,711	545	-		37,290
mador utte	51,756 124,077		4,593,182 14,844,591	11,006 59,332	57,922 155,943	65,956 292,326	-		134,884 507,601
Calaveras	50,506		3,547,493	18,652	60,856	44,059	-		123,568
Colusa	24,773		2,546,354	13,708	46,982	129,857			190,547
Contra Costa	1,396,191		53,117,429	218,186	722,449	3,179,424	2,674		4,122,734
Del Norte	94,130		3,988,354	11,208	50,173	29,107	-		90,487
l Dorado resno	213,120 3,340,363		10,122,809 64,971,908	54,374 181,080	147,338 636,326	254,469 2,761,001	- 5,581		456,182 3,583,988
Glenn	54,665		3,244,532	19,264	51,119	164,755	-	+	235,138
lumboldt	73,084		8,898,361	48,160	114,410	104,638	(89)		267,118
nperial	125,539		10,455,592	67,678	140,935	776,427	1,913		986,954
пуо	75,586		2,751,949	30,402	45,295	62,766	-		138,463
iern ings	3,544,268		64,893,092	277,328	575,261	3,978,884	(21,432)	├	4,810,042
ings ake	45,118 9,123		11,208,246 5,498,622	57,026 20,328	124,210 74,100	718,467 181,273	1,502	+	<u> </u>
assen	7,839		2,816,027	20,328	51,816	57,432	-	<u> </u>	129,403
os Angeles	18,887,968		749,432,137	3,144,530	5,905,041	38,440,901	132,673	<u> </u>	47,623,144
1adera	384,825		12,751,628	52,502	127,752	892,962	(275)		1,072,940
1arin	644,511		14,055,582	114,766	186,887	826,273	5,851		1,133,778
1ariposa Jondosino	22,301		1,902,051	3,904	44,141	58,533	-		106,577
1endocino 1erced	311,771 774,827		8,224,943 16,949,650	30,068 55,652	87,604 203,166	572,474 1,231,933	251 2,601	├	690,397 1,493,352
lodoc	31,967		1,346,550	6,134	39,130	4,872	- 2,001	+	<u> </u>
lono	85,641		2,410,433	12,446	41,913	72,961	-	<u> </u>	127,320
lonterey	277,496		27,326,347	183,464	292,214	1,763,444	18,946		2,258,068
ара	309,795		10,018,940	30,550	115,118	864,961	4,631		1,015,260
evada	95,495		7,602,558	49,946	94,368	106,633	48	├	250,995
range lacer	6,929,920 634,796		194,006,719 26,525,523	923,882 77,378	1,915,066 277,721	9,525,851 943,385	27,984 459	+	12,392,784 1,298,942
lumas	14,929		1,892,113	9,206	45,425	2,758		+	57,389
iverside	923,656		145,263,597	532,226	1,484,060	7,221,038	(276,310)	<u> </u>	8,961,014
acramento	3,560,591		114,445,440	340,254	973,583	5,248,982	(18,650)		6,544,169
an Benito	34,642		4,892,015	14,700	72,920	161,127	-		248,746
an Bernardino	1,264,732		146,419,271	435,474	1,335,608	6,680,109	45,670		8,496,861
an Diego an Francisco	2,853,598 5,487,134		183,097,236 65,587,665	718,442 272,528	1,989,883 535,395	6,942,231 4,683,132	(12,284) 28,629	+	9,638,272 5,519,684
an Joaquin	1,245,356		51,620,873	201,698	501,401	2,198,348	28,029	+	2,903,835
an Luis Obispo	298,957		19,202,371	130,020	200,629	855,166	2,643		1,188,458
an Mateo	2,411,112		46,006,582	329,518	477,779	3,567,242	22,313		4,396,851
anta Barbara	1,597,661		29,029,553	162,858	298,093	3,117,814	12,062		3,590,827
anta Clara	2,309,466		94,895,772	452,782	1,164,067 191,965	6,748,121	-	├	8,364,970
anta Cruz hasta	203,558 262,221		16,492,460 21,436,044	113,210 44,394	191,965	1,026,564 575,601	(749)		1,330,990 761,665
erra	9,616		913,011	1,830	35,916	586	-		38,332
skiyou	91,038		4,683,119	37,000	60,085	69,509	-		166,594
olano	353,778		30,408,007	119,364	300,389	888,676	6,950		1,315,379
onoma	1,172,049		32,498,569	119,004	321,108	1,911,664	3,971		2,355,748
anislaus utter	1,305,229 159,761		32,387,547 8,558,437	88,718 37,382	361,215 93,002	1,743,675 313,817	1,324	<u> </u>	2,194,932 444,201
ehama	108,184		5,919,895	28,100	72,678	252,013	1,443	<u> </u>	354,234
rinity	53,679		2,627,653	7,648	43,538	66,692	-,		117,878
ulare	33,744		34,134,320	204,932	316,908	2,729,518	7,241		3,258,600
uolumne	50,352		5,361,098	16,642	66,713	75,628	-		158,983
entura	968,752		45,982,640	205,304	530,521	2,909,263	21,191		3,666,279
olo uba	210,076		16,884,323	48,556	164,970 83.056	718,369	3,748	├	935,643
nallocated	90,867	48,950,000	6,715,920 116,993,700	- 15,788	83,056	98,044	-	186,700,000	196,888 186,700,000
manocated		-0,550,000	110,333,700	-	-		-	100,700,000	100,700,000

FY 2025-26 **Trial Court** Allocation AG (Z+AF) 100,452,765 982,922 4,728,066 15,352,193 3,671,061 2,736,901 57,240,162 4,078,842 10,578,990 68,555,896 3,479,669 9,165,480 11,442,546 2,890,412 69,703,134 12,109,450 5,774,323 2,945,431 797,055,282 13,824,568 15,189,360 2,008,628 8,915,340 18,443,001 1,396,686 2,537,753 29,584,416 11,034,200 7,853,553 206,399,502 27,824,465 1,949,502 154,224,612 120,989,609 5,140,761 154,916,132 192,735,508 71,107,348 54,524,708 20,390,830 50,403,434 32,620,380 103,260,741 17,823,450 22,197,708 951,343 4,849,712 31,723,387 34,854,317 34,582,479 9,002,638 6,274,129 2,745,531 37,392,920 5,520,080 49,648,919 17,819,967 6,912,809 303,693,700 3,076,211,651

Attachment B

FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Allocations with Updated FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Need

	FY 2024-25 Adjusted			FY 2024-25 NON-B CALCULATE W	ASE ADJUSTME /ORKLOAD ALLO			BASE ADJUSTMEN FE WORKLOAD ALI	
Court	rt Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation		Total Base Allocation	Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics	2% Automation Replacement	Self-Help	Security Base Adjustment	Subordinate Judicial Officer (SJO) Adjustment	Total Workload Formula Related Adjustments
	Α	В	C (A+B)	D	E	F	G	Н	I (D:H)
Alameda	88,518,962	3,102,046	91,621,008	101,718	424,792	1,017,456	(3,355,024)	(2,401,364)	(4,212,423)
Alpine	894,531	20,340	914,871	31	2,034	34,711	-	-	36,776
Amador	4,277,561	51,756	4,329,317	649	11,006	57,922	-	(159,466)	(89,889)
Butte	14,304,042	124,077	14,428,119	12,082	59,332	155,943	(493,178)	(528,573)	(794,394)
Calaveras	3,388,376	50,506	3,438,882	832	18,652	60,856	-	(135,947)	(55,607)
Colusa	2,420,448	24,773	2,445,221	339	13,708	46,982	-	-	61,029
Contra Costa Del Norte	50,221,066 3,746,487	1,396,191 94,130	51,617,257 3,840,617	74,666 502	218,186 11,208	722,449 50,173	-	(898,176)	117,126 61,882
El Dorado	9,447,501	213,120	9,660,621	3,339	54,374	147,338		- (141,247)	63,805
Fresno	60,240,849	3,340,363	63,581,212	65,195	181,080	636,326	-	(1,243,009)	(360,408)
Glenn	3,001,932	54,665	3,056,597	468	19,264	51,119	(10,324)	- (1)2 10)000	60,527
Humboldt	8,257,261	73,084	8,330,345	7,717	48,160	114,410	(177,151)	(153,942)	(160,806)
Imperial	10,340,761	125,539	10,466,300	8,575	67,678	140,935	(443,912)	(165,457)	(392,180)
Inyo	2,579,446	75,586	2,655,032	285	30,402	45,295	(197,060)		(121,079)
Kern	61,386,998	3,544,268	64,931,266	57,162	277,328	575,261	(69,221)	(2,053,115)	(1,212,585)
Kings	10,897,010	45,118	10,942,128	7,959	57,026	124,210	(445,431)	(343,333)	(599,569)
Lake	5,282,554	9,123	5,291,677	1,419	20,328	74,100	(207,443)	(67,519)	(179,115)
Lassen	2,728,920	7,839	2,736,759	418	20,156	51,816	(310,211)	(48,956)	(286,778)
Los Angeles	710,883,046	18,887,968	729,771,014	946,953	3,144,530	5,905,041	(15,091,072)	(22,539,836)	(27,634,384)
Madera	12,074,049	384,825	12,458,874	3,205	52,502	127,752	(402,661)	(32,920)	(252,122)
Marin	13,188,192	644,511	13,832,703	14,218	114,766	186,887	(10,161)	(63,097)	242,613
Mariposa	1,839,201	22,301	1,861,502	274	3,904	44,141	-	(48,097)	221
Mendocino	7,678,102	311,771	7,989,873	4,398	30,068	87,604	(316,031)	-	(193,961)
Merced Medec	15,739,032	774,827	16,513,859	15,053	55,652	203,166	- (833)	(379,594)	(105,724)
Modoc Mono	1,298,769 2,269,382	31,967 85,641	1,330,736 2,355,023	282 190	6,134 12,446	39,130 41,913	(25,502)	-	44,713 29,047
Monterey	26,535,349	277,496	26,812,845	19,507	183,464	292,214	(918,484)	(408,166)	(831,464)
Napa	9,363,047	309,795	9,672,842	2,567	30,550	115,118	(312,023)	(240,967)	(404,754)
Nevada	7,298,896	95,495	7,394,391	5,998	49,946	94,368	(457,585)	(413,665)	(720,939)
Orange	182,401,656	6,929,920	189,331,576	245,672	923,882	1,915,066	(2,886,124)	(4,430,585)	(4,232,090)
Placer	25,098,728	634,796	25,733,524	23,418	77,378	277,721	-	(1,242,269)	(863,752)
Plumas	1,842,015	14,929	1,856,944	344	9,206	45,425	-	-	54,976
Riverside	137,078,936	923,656	138,002,592	60,872	532,226	1,484,060	(2,039,160)	(3,966,880)	(3,928,882)
Sacramento	106,136,433	3,560,591	109,697,024	202,585	340,254	973,583	(1,968,325)	(2,248,026)	(2,699,928)
San Benito	4,647,339	34,642	4,681,981	850	14,700	72,920	-	-	88,469
San Bernardino	140,191,111	1,264,732	141,455,843	171,535	435,474	1,335,608	(3,451,646)	(4,436,437)	(5,945,466)
San Diego	177,297,791	2,853,598	180,151,389	228,762	718,442	1,989,883	(693,816)	(5,194,655)	(2,951,385)
San Francisco	58,281,791	5,487,134	63,768,925	59,708	272,528	535,395	-	(509,998)	357,632
San Joaquin San Luis Obispo	49,265,691 18,431,963	1,245,356 298,957	50,511,047 18,730,920	52,691 14,609	201,698 130,020	501,401 200,629	(303,783) (255,144)	(1,188,653) (560,547)	(736,645) (470,434)
San Luis Obispo San Mateo	41,749,337	298,957	44,160,449	14,609	329,518	477,779	(467,732)	(560,547) (1,216,658)	(470,434) (864,356)
Santa Barbara	26,549,548	1,597,661	28,147,209	23,039	162,858	298,093	(1,113,911)	(659,625)	(1,289,546)
Santa Clara	90,808,115	2,309,466	93,117,581	96,598	452,782	1,164,067		(1,056,459)	656,988
Santa Cruz	16,202,379	203,558	16,405,937	12,763	113,210	191,965	-	(289,299)	28,640
Shasta	20,313,859	262,221	20,576,080	3,670	44,394	141,669	(2,780,637)	(340,979)	(2,931,883)
Sierra	924,629	9,616	934,245	46	1,830	35,916	-	-	37,792
Siskiyou	4,428,924	91,038	4,519,962	861	37,000	60,085	-	(247,132)	(149,186)
Solano	28,938,926	353,778	29,292,704	31,689	119,364	300,389	(459,664)	(733,995)	(742,217)
Sonoma	30,481,869	1,172,049	31,653,918	29,334	119,004	321,108	(464,520)	(1,117,219)	(1,112,293)
Stanislaus	29,779,476	1,305,229	31,084,705	33,765	88,718	361,215	(9,846)	(644,829)	(170,977)
Sutter	8,228,544	159,761	8,388,305	1,818	37,382	93,002	(260,840)	-	(128,638)
Tehama Trinity	5,684,715 2,473,755	108,184 53,679	5,792,899 2,527,434	1,258 693	28,100 7,648	72,678 43,538	- (543,614)	(9,409)	92,626 (491,735)
Tulare	32,552,742	33,744	32,586,486	24,586	204,932	43,538	(543,614)	- (599,927)	(491,735) (69,945)
Tuolumne	5,095,320	50,352	5,145,672	990	16,642	66,713	(232,805)	(68,382)	(216,842)
Ventura	43,013,343	968,752	43,982,095	51,184	205,304	530,521	(1,646,046)	(939,744)	(1,798,781)
Yolo	16,036,577	210,076	16,246,653	10,688	48,556	164,970	(615,372)	-	(391,158)
Yuba	6,193,519	90,867	6,284,386	1,624	15,788	83,056	(139,957)	-	(39,489)
Unallocated				-	-	-	-	-	-
		68,818,575	2,529,049,381	2,754,387	10,907,514	25,300,000	(43,592,694)	(64,168,151)	(68,798,944)

¹ Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trial courts, but is used in the calculation of the Workload Formula allocation.

Attachment C

FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Allocations with Updated FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Need

		Fiscal Neutral	Fiscal Neutral	Change in Revenue	Fiscal Neutral	Current	Revenue	Proposed Re		Proposed Inflationary		FY 2025-2	6 Workload Fu	Inding Floor A	Adjustment				
Court neda ne	FY 2025-26 Beginning Workload Allocation	Cost Change Reduction for SJO Conversion	SJO Adjustment (Change from Prior Year)	Collected Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics (Change from Prior Year)	Cost Change FY 2025-25 Non- Interpreter Benefit Cost Change Funding	Methodology Criminal Justice Realignment	Collected All Other Applicable Revenue Sources ¹	(Fiscal N Funding Reallocated from Courts Contributing to Equity (second year of no "new money")	leutral) Funding Reallocated to Courts Receiving an Equity Adjustment (second year of no "new money")	Adjustment FY 2025-26 Inflationary Adjustment Funding of \$40m (1.6 Percent)	FY 2025-26 Workload Allocation (Prior to Implementing Funding Floor)	Applied Funding Floor	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Percentage Share of Adjustment		FY 2025-26 Final Workload Allocation	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula	Workload Formula Percentage	FY 20 Ass E Ob
	. ,	К _	L (73,975)	M 32,861	N (27,296)	O 187,647	P 2,174,774	Q _	R _	S 1,424,956	T (J:S) 91,127,553	U	V	W 3.55%	X 1,356	Y (T+V+X) 91,128,909	Z 104,992,974	AA (Y/Z) 86.80%	
	951,647	-	-	(0)	5,840	-	11,592	-	-	15,512	984,591	994,000	9,409	-	-	994,000	603,134	164.81%	
	4,239,428	-	(6,797)	136	181,313	7,098	217,866	-	-	69,594	4,708,638			0.18%	70	4,708,708	5,054,637	93.16%	
	13,633,725	-	(26,372)	1,669	232,088	106,023	107,198	(157,896)	-	220,838	14,117,273			0.55%	210	14,117,483	15,789,599	89.41%	
	3,383,275 2,506,251	-	(10,745)	133 46	47,902 51,781	6,654 9,759	15,755 12,290	-	-	53,213 39,553	3,496,186 2,619,681			0.14%	52 39	3,496,238 2,619,720	3,606,402 2,856,438	96.95% 91.71%	
а	51,734,383	-	49,712	4,482	581,122	86,060	525,007	-	-	832,188	53,812,955			2.09%	801	53,813,756	63,851,865	84.28%	
	3,902,500	-	-	26	61,470	14,195	11,351		-	72,011	4,061,553			0.16%	60	4,061,613	4,143,558	98.02%	
	9,724,426	-	(1,909)	524	191,183	56,338	101,989	-	36,553	153,542	10,262,646			0.40%	153	10,262,799	12,459,721	82.37%	
	63,220,804	-	(68,838)	11,048	58,311	238,662	439,185	-	-	1,016,828	64,916,000			2.53%	966	64,916,965	75,545,290	85.93%	, ┣───
	3,117,123 8,169,539	-	- (12,882)	58 295	130,265 355,151	8,207 43,030	9,920 136,056		- 14,109	48,184 143,344	3,313,757 8,848,642			0.13% 0.34%	49 132	3,313,806 8,848,774	3,597,431 10,588,607	92.12% 83.57%	, ┣───
	10,074,120	-	(12,882)	2,204	35,817	37,485	95,474	(272,686)	-	163,060	10,126,499			0.34%	151	10,126,650	9,089,531	111.41%	,
	2,533,954	-	-	12	50,129	4,880	18,452	-	-	40,474	2,647,901			0.10%	39	2,647,940	2,879,445	91.96%	
	63,718,681	-	131,550	10,749	(645,733)	254,410	2,446,380	(753,733)	-	1,067,196	66,229,500			2.58%	985	66,230,485	75,373,265	87.87%	
	10,342,559	-	(14,595)	953	147,451	58,778	446,749	(119,920)	-	173,709	11,035,684			0.43%	164	11,035,848	11,991,986	92.03%	
	5,112,562 2,449,981	-	(3,004) 23,974	152 51	47,172 21,235	9,759 12,199	41,455 180,150	-	68,018	81,916 41,553	5,358,030 2,729,144			0.21% 0.11%	80 41	5,358,110 2,729,185	6,801,779 3,011,499	78.78% 90.63%	
	702,136,631	-	407,920	139,449	5,276,310	2,875,473	18,597,310	-	_	11,498,318	740,931,411			28.84%	11,022	740,942,433	855,155,403	86.64%	,
	12,206,752	-	2,944	361	37,734	50,793	171,768	-	-	204,038	12,674,392			0.49%	189	12,674,580	14,889,330	85.13%	
	14,075,316	-	(16,546)	2,040	94,157	21,959	129,912	(163,065)	-	227,075	14,370,847			0.56%	214	14,371,061	16,306,453	88.13%	
	1,861,723	-	-	85	7,024	3,549	21,363	-	-	29,947	1,923,691			0.07%	29	1,923,719	1,977,763	97.27%	
	7,795,912 16,408,135	-	- (16,421)	946 3,928	78,744 99,904	107,353 56,560	83,438 240,654	(83,176)	-	123,508 265,979	8,106,725 17,058,738			0.32% 0.66%	121 254	8,106,845 17,058,992	8,317,612 19,764,231	97.47% 86.31%	
	1,375,449	-	(10,421)	62	(11,528)	4,436	11,437	-		203,575	1,401,965			0.05%	234	1,401,986	1,631,239	85.95%	
	2,384,070	-	-	57	16,107	444	57,143	-	-	38,823	2,496,644			0.10%	37	2,496,681	1,832,353	136.26%	
	25,981,382	-	(10,973)	1,768	355,193	45,914	374,780	(307,111)	-	419,107	26,860,060			1.05%	400	26,860,459	30,711,141	87.46%	
	9,268,089	-	(8,304)	359	138,857	39,481	317,261	-	-	153,022	9,908,764			0.39%	147	9,908,912	11,751,146	84.32%	
	6,673,453 185,099,486	-	(36,937) (417,864)	224 34,678	90,773 1,134,334	11,312 534,327	46,713 3,632,145	-	-	105,979 3,003,611	6,891,517 193,020,718			0.27% 7.51%	103 2,871	6,891,620 193,023,589	8,091,168 227,825,418	85.17% 84.72%	
	24,869,772	-	(18,947)	3,592	331,352	34,602	191,865	-		400,741	25,812,975			1.00%	384	25,813,359	30,658,907	84.20%	
	1,911,919	-	-	43	-	2,218	7,725	-	-	30,475	1,952,380			0.08%	29	1,952,409	2,004,526	97.40%	
	134,073,710	-	(74,506)	8,450	3,732,481	826,665	1,728,567	-	524,264	2,175,468	142,995,100			5.57%	2,127	142,997,227	173,663,361	82.34%	
	106,997,096	-	(581,050)	24,565	(671,038)	166,353	1,606,735	-	761,962	1,771,581	110,076,204			4.29%	1,637	110,077,841	135,509,115	81.23%	
no	4,770,450 135,510,377	-	(76,762) (347,771)	337 27,383	122,760 939,065	10,425 943,334	40,943 993,080	-	- 647,296	76,775 2,191,876	4,944,929 140,904,641			0.19% 5.49%	74 2,096	4,945,003 140,906,737	5,017,536 171,870,209	98.55% 81.98%	
	177,200,005	-	(32,542)	25,620	(427,911)	524,124	1,515,058	-		2,846,931	181,651,286			7.07%	2,702	181,653,988	209,284,736	86.80%	
0	64,126,558	-	(50,557)	8,099	1,337,486	90,940	541,457	(663,374)	-	1,035,184	66,425,792			2.59%	988	66,426,781	66,337,381	100.13%	
	49,774,402	-	(83,898)	6,464	169,587	82,733	592,680	-	-	804,787	51,346,756			2.00%	764	51,347,519	59,364,538	86.50%	
бро	18,260,486 43,296,094	-	(33,980) (127,685)	2,087 1,987	58,372 812,377	95,746 68,094	621,244 461,193	-	- 231,901	298,347 693,343	19,302,300 45,437,303			0.75% 1.77%	287 676	19,302,588 45,437,979	22,140,370 55,569,237	87.18% 81.77%	, ┣───
а	43,296,094 26,857,663	-	(127,685) (27,191)	3,014	361,082	68,094 46,135	248,991		- 231,901	429,992	45,437,303 27,919,686			1.77%	415	45,437,979 27,920,101	32,795,371	81.77%	, ┠───
	93,774,569	-	(38,212)	21,720	40,664	232,229	1,021,505	I	-	1,503,861	96,556,337			3.76%	1,436	96,557,774	111,142,739	86.88%	
	16,434,577	-	(20,525)	704	(44,188)	32,605	144,968	(187,540)	-	263,494	16,624,096			0.65%	247	16,624,343	18,753,968	88.64%	
	17,644,197	-	(15,015)	550	712,852	80,293	210,993	(203,960)	-	261,310	18,691,221	004.077	10-0	0.73%	278	18,691,499	20,395,958	91.64%	╷ ┣───
	972,037 4,370,776	-	- (9,039)	14 213	10,023 87,961	222 5,545	43,813 27,595	-	-	15,512 69,582	1,041,622 4,552,634	994,000	(47,622)	- 0.18%	- 68	994,000 4,552,702	723,743 5,361,696	137.34% 84.91%	, ┠───
	28,550,487	-	(44,864)	5,712	483,371	126,650	416,104	-	-	462,071	29,999,532			1.17%	446	29,999,978	34,597,881	86.71%	
	30,541,625	-	(24,005)	3,620	578,657	104,248	268,950	(344,231)	-	490,612	31,619,476			1.23%	470	31,619,946	34,423,117	91.86%	
	30,913,729	-	(22,949)	7,692	208,029	158,590	299,258	-	428,703	507,035	32,500,088			1.27%	483	32,500,571	42,870,299	75.81%	
	8,259,667	-	-	431	(74,812)	28,169	54,911	-	81,723	132,131	8,482,220			0.33%	126	8,482,346	10,543,011	80.45%	, ┣──
	5,885,525 2,035,698	-	9,409	129 (80)	20,656 62,405	10,203 5,323	40,378 28,537	-	-	94,707 32,059	6,061,007 2,163,942			0.24%	90 32	6,061,097 2,163,974	7,072,339 2,390,644	85.70% 90.52%	, ┠───
	32,516,542	-	(2,301)	4,176	482,206	94,267	207,817		430,839	527,122	34,260,667			1.33%	510	34,261,177	43,083,921	90.52% 79.52%	,
	4,928,831	-	(2,296)	42	174,171	14,639	53,893	(57,355)	-	77,613	5,189,538			0.20%	77	5,189,615	5,735,494	90.48%	
	42,183,315	-	(16,431)	4,971	842,372	445,827	1,039,579	-	-	711,674	45,211,305			1.76%	673	45,211,978	52,081,213	86.81%	
	15,855,495	-	(299,824)	1,789	337,432	52,568	89,164	-	-	247,427	16,284,052			0.63%	242	16,284,295	18,710,200	87.03%	,
	6,244,898	-	-	317	186,732	47,466	57,998	-	88,678	99,103	6,725,191			0.26%	100	6,725,291	8,867,754	75.84%	,

¹ Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trial courts, but is used in the calculation of the Workload Formula allocation.

Attachment C

Court	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Allocation	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula (need)	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Percentage	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Allocation (AFTER Reallocation)	Funding Reallocated from Courts Contributing to Equity (second year of no "new money")	Funding Reallocated to Courts Receiving an Equity Adjustment (second year of no "new money")	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Percentage (AFTER Reallocation)	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Percentage CHANGE (AFTER Reallocation)
Alpine	969,079	603,134	160.67%	969,079			160.67%	0.00%
Sierra	1,026,110	723,743	141.78%	1,026,110			141.78%	0.00%
Mono	2,457,821	1,832,353	134.13%	2,457,821			134.13%	0.00%
Imperial	10,236,124	9,089,531	112.61%	9,963,439	(272,686)		109.61%	-3.00%
San Francisco	66,053,982	66,337,381	99.57%	65,390,609	(663,374)		98.57%	-1.00%
San Benito	4,868,154	5,017,536	97.02%	4,868,154			97.02%	0.00%
Mendocino	8,066,393	8,317,612	96.98%	7,983,217	(83,176)		95.98%	-1.00%
Del Norte	3,989,542	4,143,558	96.28%	3,989,542			96.28%	0.00%
Plumas	1,921,905	2,004,526	95.88%	1,921,905			95.88%	0.00%
Mariposa	1,893,744	1,977,763	95.75%	1,893,744			95.75%	0.00%
Calaveras	3,442,973	3,606,402	95.47%	3,442,973			95.47%	0.00%
Amador	4,639,043	5,054,637	91.78%	4,639,043	(91.78%	0.00%
Kings	10,981,895	11,991,986	91.58%	10,861,975	(119,920)		90.58%	-1.00%
Sonoma	31,473,095	34,423,117	91.43%	31,128,864	(344,231)		90.43%	-1.00%
Shasta	18,633,871	20,395,958	91.36%	18,429,911	(203,960)		90.36%	-1.00%
Glenn	3,265,573	3,597,431	90.78%	3,265,573			90.78%	0.00%
Inyo Colusa	2,607,427 2,580,128	2,879,445 2,856,438	90.55% 90.33%	2,607,427			90.55% 90.33%	0.00%
Colusa Tuolumne	5,169,280	5,735,494	90.33%	2,580,128 5,111,925	(57,355)		90.33% 89.13%	-1.00%
Lassen	2,687,591	3,011,499	89.24%	2,687,591	(37,333)		89.24%	0.00%
Trinity	2,087,591	2,390,644	89.18%	2,087,391			89.24%	0.00%
Butte	14,054,331	15,789,599	89.01%	13,896,435	(157,896)		88.01%	-1.00%
Santa Cruz	16,548,141	18,753,968	88.24%	16,360,601	(187,540)		87.24%	-1.00%
Marin	14,306,837	16,306,453	87.74%	14,143,772	(163,065)		86.74%	-1.00%
Kern	65,916,037	75,373,265	87.45%	65,162,304	(753,733)		86.45%	-1.00%
Monterey	26,748,064	30,711,141	87.10%	26,440,953	(307,111)		86.10%	-1.00%
San Luis Obispo	19,003,954	22,140,370	85.83%	19,003,954			85.83%	0.00%
Yolo	16,036,625	18,710,200	85.71%	16,036,625			85.71%	0.00%
Santa Clara	95,052,476	111,142,739	85.52%	95,052,476			85.52%	0.00%
Ventura	44,499,632	52,081,213	85.44%	44,499,632			85.44%	0.00%
Alameda	89,702,597	104,992,974	85.44%	89,702,597			85.44%	0.00%
San Diego	178,804,354	209,284,736	85.44%	178,804,354			85.44%	0.00%
Solano	29,537,461	34,597,881	85.37%	29,537,461			85.37%	0.00%
Los Angeles	729,433,093	855,155,403	85.30%	729,433,093			85.30%	0.00%
San Joaquin	50,541,968	59,364,538	85.14%	50,541,968			85.14%	0.00%
Merced	16,792,759	19,764,231	84.97%	16,792,759			84.97%	0.00%
Modoc	1,379,856	1,631,239	84.59%	1,379,856			84.59%	0.00%
Fresno	63,899,171	75,545,290	84.58%	63,899,171			84.58%	0.00%
Tehama	5,966,300	7,072,339	84.36%	5,966,300			84.36%	0.00%
Nevada	6,785,538	8,091,168	83.86%	6,785,538			83.86%	0.00%
Santa Barbara	27,489,694	32,795,371	83.82%	27,489,694			83.82%	0.00%
Madera	12,470,354	14,889,330	83.75%	12,470,354			83.75%	0.00%
Siskiyou	4,483,052	5,361,696	83.61%	4,483,052			83.61%	0.00%
Orange	190,017,107	227,825,418	83.40%	190,017,107			83.40%	0.00%
Napa Contra Costa	9,755,742	11,751,146	83.02%	9,755,742			83.02%	0.00%
Contra Costa	52,980,767	63,851,865 30,658,907	82.97%	52,980,767			82.97%	0.00%
Placer Humboldt	25,412,235 8,691,189	10,588,607	82.89% 82.08%	<u>25,412,235</u> 8,705,298		14,109	82.89% 82.21%	0.00%
El Dorado	10,072,551	12,459,721	80.84%	10,109,104		36,553	82.21%	0.13%
Riverside	140,295,367	173,663,361	80.79%	140,819,632		524,264	81.13%	0.30%
San Bernardino	138,065,468	171,870,209	80.33%	138,712,765		647,296	80.71%	0.38%
San Mateo	44,512,059	55,569,237	80.10%	44,743,960		231,901	80.52%	0.42%
Sacramento	107,542,661	135,509,115	79.36%	108,304,623		761,962	79.92%	0.56%
Sutter	8,268,366	10,543,011	78.43%	8,350,089		81,723	79.20%	0.78%
Tulare	33,302,707	43,083,921	77.30%	33,733,546		430,839	78.30%	1.00%
Lake	5,208,096	6,801,779	76.57%	5,276,114		68,018	77.57%	1.00%
Yuba	6,537,411	8,867,754	73.72%	6,626,088		88,678	74.72%	1.00%
Stanislaus	31,564,349	42,870,299	73.63%	31,993,052		428,703	74.63%	1.00%

Floor courts (2) Cluster 1 courts (13) Courts in the band (21) Contributing courts (12) Recipient courts (11) This is <u>not</u> the final statewide average percentage. After all calculations the final statewide percentage is 85.9% as noted in Attachment D.

Judicial Council of California Approved FY 2024-25 and Proposed FY 2025-26 Allocations State Operations and Local Assistance Trial Court Trust Fund

				F	Y 2024-25 Allocations		Recomme	ended FY 2025-26	Allocations		
#	Program Name	Program Number	Office	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Proposed Allocations	\$\$ Change from FY 2024-25	% Change from FY 2024-25
Α	В	С	D	E	F	G (E + F)	Н	I	J (H + I)	K (J - G)	L (K / G)
1	SCO Audit - Pilot program per GC 77206 (h)(4) ¹	0150095	AS		\$ 1,850,000	\$ 1,850,000		\$ 1,887,000	\$ 1,887,000	37,000	2%
2	California State Auditor Audits	0150010	AS		325,000	325,000		325,000	325,000	-	0%
3	Phoenix Financial Services	0140010	BAP	103,000		103,000	107,000		107,000	4,000	4%
4	Phoenix HR Services	0140010	BAP	1,723,000		1,723,000	1,776,000		1,776,000	53,000	3%
5	Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations	0150095	BAP		131,000	131,000		643,000	643,000	512,000	391%
6	Statewide Support for Collections Programs 1	0140010	BS	747,000		747,000	827,000		827,000	80,000	11%
7	Jury	0150010	BS		18,700,000	18,700,000		14,500,000	14,500,000	(4,200,000)	-22%
8	Elder Abuse	0150010	BS		1,400,000	1,400,000		1,500,000	1,500,000	100,000	7%
9	SCO Administrative Costs per GC 68085(g)	0150010	BS		88,000	88,000		88,000	88,000	-	0%
10	Children in Dependency Case Training	0150095	CFCC		113,000	113,000		113,000	113,000	-	0%
11	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	0140010	CFCC	780,000		780,000	960,000		960,000	180,000	23%
12	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	0150095	CFCC		21,032,000	21,032,000		18,200,000	18,200,000	(2,832,000)	-13%
13	Equal Access Fund	0140010	CFCC	274,000		274,000	274,000		274,000	-	0%
14	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	0140010	CFCC	556,000		556,000	556,000		556,000	-	0%
15	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	0150011	CFCC		186,700,000	186,700,000		186,700,000	186,700,000	-	0%
16	Juvenile Dependency Collections Reimbursement	0150010	CFCC		350,000	350,000		363,458	363,458	13,458	4%
17	Self-Help Center	0150010	CFCC		25,300,000	25,300,000		25,300,000	25,300,000	-	0%
18	Screening Equipment Replacement	0150010	FS		2,511,000	2,511,000		2,000,000	2,000,000	(511,000)	-20%
19	Court Interpreters Data Collections System (CIDCS)	0150037	IT	87,000		87,000	87,000		87,000	-	0%
20	Data Center and Cloud Services	0150095	IT		4,611,000	4,611,000		4,611,000	4,611,000	-	0%
21	Electronic Courts of Appeal Record and Transcripts (eCART) Program	0150095	IT		200,000	200,000		200,000	200,000	-	0%
22		Total A	llocations	\$ 4,270,000	\$ 263,311,000	\$ 267,581,000	\$ 4,587,000	\$ 256,430,458	\$ 261,017,458	\$ (6,563,542)	-2.45%

	Totals by Office	Office	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Proposed Allocations	\$\$ Change from FY 2024-25	% Change from FY 2024-25
	Legend		Е	F	G (E + F)	Н	I	J (H + I)	K (J - G)	L (K / G)
23	Audit Services	AS	\$ -	\$ 2,175,000	\$ 2,175,000	\$ -	\$ 2,212,000	\$ 2,212,000	\$ 37,000	1.70%
24	Branch Accounting and Procurement	BAP	1,826,000	131,000	1,957,000	1,883,000	643,000	2,526,000	569,000	29.08%
25	Budget Services	BS	747,000	20,188,000	20,935,000	827,000	16,088,000	16,915,000	(4,020,000)	-19.20%
26	Center for Families, Children and the Courts	CFCC	1,610,000	233,495,000	235,105,000	1,790,000	230,676,458	232,466,458	(2,638,542)	-1.12%
27	Facility Services	FS	-	2,511,000	2,511,000	-	2,000,000	2,000,000	(511,000)	-20.35%
28	Information Technology	IT	87,000	4,811,000	4,898,000	87,000	4,811,000	4,898,000	-	0.00%
	Total A	llocations	\$ 4,270,000	\$ 263,311,000	\$ 267,581,000	\$ 4,587,000	\$ 256,430,458	\$ 261,017,458	\$ (6,563,542)	-2.45%

	licial Council (Staff) pport for the Operation of the Trial Courts urt Appointed Dependency Counsel urt Interpreters	Program Number	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Proposed Allocations	\$\$ Change from FY 2024-25	% Change from FY 2024-25
	Legend		E	F	G (E + F)	Н	I	J (H + I)	K (J - G)	L (K / G)
29	Judicial Council (Staff)	0140010	\$ 4,183,000	\$ -	\$ 4,183,000	\$ 4,500,000	\$ -	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 317,000	7.58%
30	Support for the Operation of the Trial Courts	0150010	-	48,674,000	48,674,000	-	44,076,458	44,076,458	(4,597,542)	-9.45%
31	Court Appointed Dependency Counsel	0150011	-	186,700,000	186,700,000	-	186,700,000	186,700,000	-	0.00%
32	Court Interpreters	0150037	87,000	-	87,000	87,000	-	87,000	-	0.00%
33	Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	0150095	-	27,937,000	27,937,000	-	25,654,000	25,654,000	(2,283,000)	-8.17%
		Total Allocations	\$ 4,270,000	\$ 263,311,000	\$ 267,581,000	\$ 4,587,000	\$ 256,430,458	\$ 261,017,458	\$ (6,563,542)	-2.45%

¹ The allocation increase of \$1.5 million for FY 2024-25 was approved by Judicial Council at its February 21, 2025 business meeting.

Trial Court Trust Fund Fund Condition Statement May Revise FY 2025-26

		YEAR END F	INANCIAL STAT	EMENTS	ESTIM	ATES
	Description	2021-22 (Financial Statements)	2022-23 (Financial Statements)	2023-24 (Financial Statements)	2024-25	2025-26
#	Α	В	С	D	E	F
1	Beginning Fund Balance	162,032,593	180,993,913	234,161,463	365,958,407	185,539,956
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	(2,639,686)	39,095,081	52,234,508	-	-
3	TOTAL REVENUES AND TRANSFERS	1,187,495,894	1,134,044,353	1,227,300,625	1,265,536,000	1,258,075,000
4	Total Resources	1,346,888,801	1,354,133,348	1,513,696,595	1,631,494,407	1,443,614,956
5	EXPENDITURES/ENCUMBRANCES/ALLOCATIONS					
6	Program 0140010/0150037 - Judicial Council (Staff)	3,678,027	3,592,910	3,589,736	4,270,000	4,873,000
7	Program 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	2,217,294,000	2,466,660,242	2,632,244,156	2,607,255,451	2,675,216,451
8	Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	196,700,000	211,967,000	211,616,172	210,700,000	186,700,000
9	Program 0150019 - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	398,004,000	423,563,000	428,118,549	443,544,000	466,001,000
10	6 6	47,371,000	24,111,000	23,569,452	27,500,000	32,519,000
11	Program 0150037 - Court Interpreters	121,413,000	124,546,000	131,951,695	151,002,000	134,836,000
12	e	9,426,000	29,840,000	29,840,016	30,329,000	10,329,000
13		14,944,000	13,750,000	13,018,675	27,937,000	23,299,000
14		3,005,152,000	3,294,437,242	3,470,358,714	3,498,267,451	3,528,900,451
15		174,000	174,000	174,000	174,000	174,000
16 17	1	209,861 76,000	184,733	91,623	77,000	207,000
18		70,000	76,000	30,116		
19		3,008,830,027	3,298,030,152	3,473,948,449	3,502,537,451	3,533,773,451
20		0,000,000,000	0,220,0000,102	c,,	0,002,007,101	0,000,110,101
21		1,843,395,000	2,178,493,000	2,326,506,000	2,056,834,000	2,242,369,000
22	Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	1,165,894,888	1,119,971,885	1,147,738,188	1,445,954,451	1,291,785,451
23	Ending Fund Balance	180,993,913	234,161,463	365,958,407	185,539,956	151,829,505
24	Restricted Funds					
25		100,967,840	138,446,525	165,516,655	110,153,308	110,153,308
26	Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance	80,026,073	95,714,938	200,441,751	75,386,648	41,676,197

¹ Revenue estimates are as of FY 2025-26 May Revise

FY 2025-26 Trial Court Recommended Preliminary Allocations with FY 2024-25 Workload Formula Need

			NGOING BASE TMENTS			FY 2025-26 OI	NGOING BASE AL	LOCATIONS				OTHER ONE-	-TIME TCTF AL	LIOCATIONS				FY 2	025-26 BASE ALLC		/IENTS		
	FY 2024-25 Ending	General Ledg	er (GL) 812110	FY 2024-25			GL 812110						GL 812110					1	GL 8	12110			
Court	Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation	FY 2024-25 Initial Reduction of \$96.982 million	FY 2024-25 Revised Reduction of \$55.642 million after \$41.34 million Restoration	Adjusted Ending TCTF Ongoing Base Allocation	Funding Reallocated from Courts Contributing to Equity (second year of no "new money")	Funding Reallocated to Courts Receiving an Equity Adjustment (second year of no "new money")	FY 2025-26 Inflationary Adjustment Funding of \$40m (1.6 Percent)	FY 2025-26 Non-Interpreter Benefit Cost Change Funding ¹	Total Ongoing Allocations	Telephonic Appearances	Criminal Justice Realignment	Court Reporters SB 170 Funding	Increased Transcript Rates SB 170 Funding	CARE Act Funding	SB 549	Total One-Time Base Allocations	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Floor Reduction Allocation (TBD)	Reduction for SJO Conversion (Annualization)	Supplemental Funding (\$5m Reserve) Replenishment	One-Time Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 3% Cap	Total Base Allocation Adjustments	
	А	В	C	D (A-B+C)	E	F	G	Н	I (E:H)	J	К	L	М	Ν	0	P (J:O)	Q	R	S	т	U	V (P:U)	W
Alameda Alpine	87,078,862 894,531	(4,324,870) -	(2,884,769)	88,518,962 894,531			1,424,956 15,512	(27,296) 5,840	1,397,660 21,352	-	187,647 -					187,647 -	- 9,409	1,356		-	-	1,356 9,409	,
Amador	4,206,279	(167,223)		4,277,561	(1.15.000)		69,594	181,313	250,907	5,790	· · ·					12,888	-	70		-	-	70	
Butte Calaveras	14,080,619 3,331,021	(583,710) (111,187)	(360,287) (53,833)	14,304,042 3,388,376	(146,900)		220,838 53,213	232,088 47,902	306,027 101,114	15,210 791	106,023 6,654					121,233 7,445	-	210 52		-	-	210 52	,
Colusa Contra Costa	2,380,354 49,324,107	(94,059) (1,738,846)	(53,965) (841,887)	2,420,448 50,221,066		490,392	39,553 832,188	51,781 581,122	91,334 1,903,703	-	9,759 86,060					9,759 86,060	-	39 808		-	-	39 808	
Del Norte	3,687,521	(1,738,846) (138,333)				490,392	72,011	61,470	133,481	-	14,195					14,195	-	60		-	-	60	
El Dorado Fresno	9,282,009 59,232,238	(320,824) (3,029,033)	(155,331) (2,020,422)	9,447,501 60,240,849	(662,872)		153,542 1,016,828	191,183 58,311	344,725 412,267	24,418 75,930	· ·					80,756 314,592	-	152 956		-	-	152 956	,
Glenn	2,952,674	(115,557)	(66,299)	3,001,932	(002,872)		48,184	130,265	178,449	1,230	8,207					9,437	-	49		-	-	49	
Humboldt Imperial	8,115,475 10,217,919	(425,808) (368,916)	(284,022) (246,074)	8,257,261 10,340,761	(242,200)		143,344 163,060	355,151 35,817	498,495 (43,322)	12,250 25,465	43,030 37,485					55,280 62,950	-	131 151		-	-	131 151	,
Inyo	2,538,720	(95,542)	(54,816)	2,579,446			40,474	50,129	90,603	1,395	4,880					6,275	-	39		-	-	39	
Kern Kings	60,340,513 10,714,033	(3,142,777) (429,257)	(2,096,291) (246,280)	61,386,998 10,897,010	(687,763)		1,067,196 173,709	(645,733) 147,451	(266,300) 321,160	38,700 5,935						293,110 64,713	-	986 166		-	-	986 166	,
Lake	5,194,262	(171,163)	(82,871)	5,282,554		60,562	81,916	47,172	189,650	-	9,759					9,759	-	80		-	-	80	
Lassen Los Angeles	2,689,655 698,845,807	(92,113) (28,238,886)	(52,849) (16,201,647)	2,728,920 710,883,046			41,553 11,498,318	21,235 5,276,310	62,787 16,774,628	4,241	12,199 2,875,473					16,441 2,875,473	-	41 11,022		-	-	41 11,022	,
Madera	11,862,930	(495,278)	(284,158)	12,074,049		56,093	204,038	37,734	297,865	-	50,793					50,793	-	189		-	-	189	
Marin Mariposa	12,943,444 1,811,111	(474,469) (65,897)		13,188,192 1,839,201			227,075 29,947	94,157 7,024	321,231 36,971	42,540	21,959 3,549					64,499 3,549	-	216 29		-	-	216 29	,
Mendocino	7,559,799	(355,283)	(236,981)	7,678,102	(77,750)		123,508	78,744	124,502	8,520	107,353					115,873	-	121		-	-	121	
Merced Modoc	15,461,130 1,276,235	(651,946) (52,864)	, , ,	15,739,032 1,298,769			265,979 22,109	99,904 (11,528)	365,882 10,581	13,095 776	56,560 4,436					69,655 5,212	-	254 21		-	-	254 21	
Mono	2,238,360	(72,775)	(41,754)	2,269,382			38,823	16,107	54,930	-	444					444	-	37		-	-	37	
Monterey Napa	26,100,772 9,198,115	(1,019,502) (319,738)	(584,924) (154,806)	26,535,349 9,363,047		21,951	419,107 153,022	355,193 138,857	774,300 313,830	- 14,590	45,914 39,481					45,914 54,071	-	404		-	-	404 148	,
Nevada	7,184,669	(221,442)	(107,214)	7,298,896			105,979	90,773	196,752	-	11,312					11,312	-	103		-	-	103	ı 🗀
Orange Placer	179,164,268 24,682,490	(6,276,002) (976,477)	(3,038,614) (560,239)	182,401,656 25,098,728		483,238	3,003,611 400,741	1,134,334 331,352	4,621,182 732,093	- 24,920	534,327 34,602					534,327 59,522	-	2,879 384		-	-	2,879 384	
Plumas	1,817,224	(58,157)	(33,367)	1,842,015			30,475	-	30,475	2,448	2,218					4,666	-	29		-	-	29	
Riverside Sacramento	134,734,147 104,226,967	(4,545,609) (3,701,694)	(2,200,820) (1,792,227)	137,078,936 106,136,433		543,993 1,223,323	2,175,468 1,771,581	3,732,481 (671,038)	6,451,941 2,323,866	- 43,920	826,665 166,353				2,674,000	826,665 2,884,273	-	2,127 1,644		-	-	2,127 1,644	,
San Benito	4,583,477	(149,818)	(85,956)	4,647,339			76,775	122,760	199,536	-	10,425					10,425	-	74		-	-	74	
San Bernardino San Diego	137,828,637 174,414,396	(4,579,894) (6,764,332)	(2,217,420) (3,880,936)	140,191,111 177,297,791		1,440,393	2,191,876 2,846,931	939,065 (427,911)	4,571,334 2,419,020	239,760	943,334 524,124					1,183,094 524,124	-	2,108 2,702		-	-	2,108 2,702	.
San Francisco	57,440,281	(2,527,201)	(1,685,691)	58,281,791	(1,659,153)		1,035,184	1,337,486	713,517	17,515	90,940					108,455	-	973		-	-	973	
San Joaquin San Luis Obispo	48,451,486 18,135,370	(2,430,393) (890,721)	(1,616,188) (594,128)	49,265,691 18,431,963	(194,925)		804,787 298,347	169,587 58,372	974,374 161,794	51,955 18,700	82,733 95,746					134,688 114,446	-	764 284		-	-	764 284	
San Mateo	41,002,030	(1,448,731)	(701,423)	41,749,337		105,009	693,343	812,377	1,610,730	39,743	68,094					107,836	-	674		-	-	674	
Santa Barbara Santa Clara	26,107,408 89,326,797	(1,037,243) (4,448,653)	(595,103) (2,967,335)	26,549,548 90,808,115	(973,540)		429,992 1,503,861	361,082 40,664	791,074 570,985	44,719	46,135 232,229					90,854 232,229	-	415 1,422		-	-	415 1,422	,
Santa Cruz	15,944,612	(774,120)	(516,352)	16,202,379	(169,408)		263,494	(44,188)	49,899	21,904	32,605					54,509	-	248		-	-	248	
Shasta Sierra	20,032,211 924,629	(546,003)	(264,355)	20,313,859 924,629	(181,985)		261,310 15,512	712,852 10,023	792,178 25,535	9,190 630						89,483 852	- (47,622)	278		-	-	278 (47,622)	
Siskiyou	4,353,927	(145,391)		4,428,924			69,582	87,961	157,543	-	5,545					5,545	-	68		-	-	68	
Solano Sonoma	28,460,464 30,014,244	(1,122,454) (1,404,359)		28,938,926 30,481,869	(307,329)		462,071 490,612	483,371 578,657	945,442 761,939	42,765 14,895						169,415 119,143	-	446 471		-	-	446 471	,
Stanislaus	29,232,977	(1,059,443)	(512,944)	29,779,476		370,548	507,035	208,029	1,085,613	-	158,590					158,590	-	483		-	-	483	
Sutter Tehama	8,086,130 5,586,929	(276,085) (229,402)		8,228,544 5,684,715		94,853	132,131 94,707	(74,812) 20,656	152,171 115,363	2,795 1,340						30,964 11,543	-	126 90		-	-	126 90	,
Trinity	2,439,200	(66,987)	(32,433)	2,473,755		-	32,059	62,405	94,464	400	5,323					5,723	-	32		-	-	32	
Tulare Tuolumne	31,984,594 5,017,940	(1,101,413) (232,387)	(533,265) (155,007)	32,552,742 5,095,320	(50,856)	385,490	527,122 77,613	482,206 174,171	1,394,817 200,928	12,890 6,280						107,157 20,919	-	509 77		-	-	509 77	,
Ventura	42,298,212	(2,147,664)	(1,432,532)	43,013,343			711,674	842,372	1,554,045	-	445,827					445,827	-	673		-	-	673	
Yolo Yuba	15,769,892 6,086,703	(516,996) (207,074)		16,036,577 6,193,519		78,836	247,427 99,103	337,432 186,732	584,860 364,670	- 9,456	52,568 47,466					52,568 56,922	-	242 100		-	-	242 100	,
Unallocated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30,000,000	7,000,000	31,043,700		68,043,700	-	-		-	-	-	
Total	2,418,890,806	(96,982,000)	(55,642,000)	2,460,230,806	(5,354,680)	5,354,680	40,000,000	19,716,955	59,716,955	897,100	9,223,000	30,000,000	7,000,000	31,043,700	2,674,000	80,837,800	(38,212)	38,212	-	-	-	0	2,

	tta	ch	me	ent	t G
--	-----	----	----	-----	-----

FY 2025-26
Total TCTF Base
Allocation
W (D+I+O+V)
90,105,625 925,292
4,541,426
14,731,511
3,496,987 2,521,581
52,211,637
3,894,224 9,873,135
60,968,664
3,189,867
8,811,168 10,360,540
2,676,363
61,414,794
11,283,049 5,482,043
2,808,188
730,544,169 12,422,897
13,574,138
1,879,750
7,918,598 16,174,823
1,314,583
2,324,792 27,355,967
9,731,096
7,507,063
187,560,044 25,890,727
1,877,184
144,359,670 111,346,217
4,857,373
145,947,647
180,243,638 59,104,736
50,375,517
18,708,487 43,468,577
27,431,892
91,612,751
16,307,034 21,195,798
903,395
4,592,081 30,054,229
31,363,423
31,024,162 8,411,806
5,811,711
2,573,974
34,055,225 5,317,245
45,013,888
16,674,247 6,615,211
68,043,700
2,600,785,562

FY 2025-26 Trial Court Recommended Preliminary Allocations with FY 2024-25 Workload Formula Need

Employee Funding Denefits Funding Denefits Automation Self-Help Program (CP) Program (CP) Denefits Allocate Self-Self Allocate Self-Self X Y Z(WYXY) AA AB AC AD AE AL AL Atimetica 3,107,045 93,207,01 243,079 1,07,455 5,903,555 1710 - 7,244 Arsador 51,726 94,933,221 1,006 57,922 65,956 - 1,323 Calversa 50,306 3,547,493 186,62 06,958 1,40,00 - 1,202 Cortia Cotat 1,399,101 3,5467,328 121,818 722,446 3,179,424 2,2474 - 9,130 Cortia Cotat 1,399,101 3,264,354 11,208 10,243,255 64,374 147,338 25,441,40 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 1,44,403 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>THER NON-TCTF</th><th></th><th></th><th>FY</th><th>′ 2025-26 NON-B/</th><th>ASE ALLOCATIO</th><th>DNS</th><th></th><th></th></t<>			THER NON-TCTF			FY	′ 2025-26 NON-B/	ASE ALLOCATIO	DNS		
Cont General Fand Pretrial Benefits Cont Pretrial randing (orgoing) Tabi Issue Allocation Fast Pretrial Pretri		GL 816111	GL 816111		GL 812167	GL 832010	GL 834010	GL 834010	GL 832012		
Nameda 310,246 9327/51 742,792 1,97,55 5,93,555 (7,0) 728 Amador 51,756 4,993,182 1,0,06 37,922 65,935,556 - 138 Amador 55,056 3,847,493 155,693 222,236 - 129 Calwarers 55,056 3,847,493 136,652 60,556 44,090 - 128 Contra Corsia 12,956,191 52,467,248 12,72,449 3,179,447 2,744 4,272 1,97,449 1,27,449 3,179,447 4,272 1,91,733 1,92,64 4,21,11 1,92,11	Court	Employee	Pretrial Funding	Total Base	Automation	Self-Help	Interpreters Program (CIP)	Ongoing	Counsel Allocation (\$186.7m with	Total Non-Base Allocations	FY 2 Tria Allo
Jameda 3.00/2.46 99.207/F1 74.2722 1.07.455 5.03.555 (7.10) 7.28 Amador 5.1756 4.993.182 1.006 37.922 65.935.56 (7.10) 7.28 Butte 124.077 1.4855.588 53.32 215.538 229.236 (- 1.99 Calveros 50.506 3.847.493 126.652 60.556 4.490 (- 1.22 Contra Costa 1.295.191 52.667.288 17.248 3.17.942 3.77.44 4.17.924 7.67.4 4.22 Del Norte 9.13.0 10.086.255 54.374 13.7.38 254.634 1.228<			X	7 (14(+)(+)()		4.0		4.0	45		
Ippenel 20.340 945.632 2.034 34.713 545.5 7.8 Butte 124.077 14.855.588 50.332 10.06 57.922 55.95.5 - 133 Gutzeras 24.773 2.546.354 13.768 44.095 - 10.06 Colusa 24.773 2.546.354 13.768 45.922 - 0.90 Colusa 1.395.191 53.697.284 13.768 45.922 - 0.90 Colusa 2.47.73 2.546.354 13.268 97.244 2.724 4.122 Del Norte 94.130 3.988.354 11.208 50.173 129.44 10.438 689 2.752 1282 11.208 75.017 128.39 1.388 199.275 - 2.383 13.000 63.518 2.761.01 5.581 3.388 12.421 4.383 199 2.753.61 1.385 199 2.753.91 10.035 7.76.27 1.913 989 10.922 1.773.91 8.92.72 1.921 <td>lamada</td> <td></td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>AG</td>	lamada		Y								AG
Amador 51,756 4.593,182 11,006 57,922 65,956 . 133 Galveros 50,506 3.547,493 135,584 292,326 . 5050 Colusa 24,773 24,63,54 13,708 45,852 44,9059 . 129 Contra Cotta 13,96,911 33,80,836 122,81,86 72,2449 3,174,42 2,674 44,22 De Norte 94,130 33,80,836 112,000 64,310,027 . 93 Ibmobidi 73,804 88,84,222 13,100 64,330,027 . . 93 Inwobidi 73,084 88,84,222 43,100 114,431 114,553 . . 32,89 . . 34,93 . <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>- (110)</td><td></td><td>7,245,094 37,290</td><td>10</td></t<>								- (110)		7,245,094 37,290	10
Catavers 50,506 3,447,493 18,652 60,256 64,009 . 122 Cortra Cortat 1,396,191 53,607,828 128,186 722,440 3,177,424 2,674 4,122 Dervarde 29,130 13,086,191 53,807,828 112,028 50,177 22,107 . 99 El Dorado 23,130 10,086,255 54,334 147,338 25,469 . 93,53 Gienn 53,665 3,244,532 45,100 164,400 10,440 10,4468 3888,252 45,100 114,410 10,458 888 22,759,49 36,412 52,752 52,762 . 133 898 12,253 . 132,873 47,823 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 2,324,324 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323 . 12,323								-		134,884	
Colusa 24,773 2,546,354 13,788 14,082 12,2837 . 191 Cortra Corta 3,390,130 3,368,354 11,208 50,172 20,177 . 93 De Norte 93,130 33,883,354 11,208 50,173 22,1107 . 93 De Norte 33,40,363 . 64,890,027 181,080 636,326 2,71,011 5,551 3,384 Fremo 3,340,363 . 64,890,027 181,080 636,326 2,71,011 5,551 3,384 Jumperial 72,556 . 3,244,281 0,46,550,002 2,73,390 3,04,02 45,225 62,766 1,913 998 Inyo 75,566 . 2,73,290 3,04,02 45,225 62,766 1,313 1,200 900 1,200 130 Lase 9,123 . 5,961,166 5,1416 5,746,273 4,762 1,762,77 1,783 1,200 130,04 4,762 1,764,77 1,763,77		,				-		-		507,601	1
Contra cotad 1.386,191 53,407,883 218,186 722,449 32,724,44 2.674 4.122 Derk Morte 33,803,30 33,803,803 11,208 50,173 22,107 9 El Dorado 23,13,20 10,066,255 54,334 1147,338 25,4469 . 453 Fresno 33,40,353 64,390,027 181,000 616,352 . 32,845 Iumboldi 73,546 3,244,552 19,264 114,410 146,458 (B9) 266 Inyo 75,546 2,751,490 67,678 10,043,576 1,513 368 Inyo 75,546 2,751,490 30,402 45,785 67,766 - 1,318 Kern 3,344,288 64,950,002 277,328 575,616 1,502 481 1,222,17 481 1,322,167 1,318 560,176 16,337,447 1,502 431 Lake 9,138 5,641,17 1,242,137 31,44,515 5,511 1,122,773 472,273 472,22		-					-	-		123,568	
Del Norte 94.130 9.88.354 11.208 50.73 29.107 . 9.907 ID Orado 213.120 10.068.255 55.374 10.738 224.460 . 45.45 Irrema 3.340.363 64.309.027 181.080 636.266 2.761.001 5.581 .386 Importal 72.565 10.468.079 67.678 10.40.35 776.427 1.913 . 989 Importal 75.565 775.86 776.427 1.913 . 989 .								- 2 674		190,547 4,122,734	5
El Dorado 213.120 10.086.255 54.374 147.388 22.94.669 - 64.99 Grenn 54.665 3.304.363 64.999.027 18.1080 65.326 2.761.001 5.981 3.368 Iumbolit 73.084 8.842.522 44.106 104.975 - 23.83 Iumpoint 75.986 2.751.949 67.678 140.935 776.427 1.913 989 Inyo 75.986 2.751.949 67.678 140.935 776.427 1.913 989 Kern 3.544.768 64.959.662 277.328 575.761 3.978.844 (21.422) 4.411 Kara 45.113 1.1226.160 7.0238 74.100 181.273 - 127 Lasker 9.123 2.416.027 2.0156 51.816 57.432 - 127 Lasker 18.887.668 74.942.317 3.144.549 141.766 18.687 86.273 5.51 1.133 Marin 64.911 1.28.073.239 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>- 2,074</td><td></td><td>90,487</td><td></td></t<>								- 2,074		90,487	
Glenn 54.665 3.244.532 19.264 51.119 164.755 - 232 Imperial 173.539 10.486.079 67.678 140.035 (69) 266 Inyo 75.586 27.751.499 67.678 140.035 776.427 1.913 98 Inyo 3.544.268 64.959.062 277.228 575.261 3.978.884 (21.432) 4.816 Iake 9.123 5.491.166 20.328 77.100 18.1273 - 227 Iasen 7.839 2.816.027 20.156 5.1816 77.323 - 277 Iasen 18.87.968 749.482.137 3.144.530 5.500.041 3.84.40.001 131.673 47.622 Marin 64.451 14.286.491 11.766 18.88.77 825.531 1.075 Marinos 24.30.49 3.904 44.141 58.533 - 10.90 Merced 77.4827 15.934.539 15.942 3.910 4.731.33 2.601 1.498 <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>456,182</td> <td>1</td>		-						-		456,182	1
numbolit 73.084 5.884.252 44.3160 11.44.10 10.46.38 (199) 267 imporial 125.539 10.466.079 67.78 14.04.0335 776.427 1.913 988 imporial 3.544.268 64.959.062 277.328 575.261 3.978.864 (21.42.22) 4.811 Karn 3.544.268 64.959.062 277.328 575.261 3.978.864 (21.42.22) 4.811 Lake 9.123 5.491.166 20.328 74.000 181.273 - 277 Lassen 7.839 2.816.077 20.156 55.1816 57.432 - 122.673 447.225 Madera 384.825 13.807.722 55.502 20.275 1.907 447.225 1.907 Marino 644.511 14.218.649 11.4466 18.837 826.273 5.851 1.313 Marino 33.076 44.341 55.652 20.3166 1.321.393 2.601 1.498 Mono 85.641 2.400.4								5,581		3,583,988	6
Imporial 125,538 10486,079 67,678 140,935 776,427 1,913 989 karn 3,544,268 2,751,949 2,0402 45,285 52,766 . 1318 karn 3,544,268 45,118 11,328,167 570,261 3,978,884 (21,422) 4,811 Lase 9,123 5,491,666 20,328 77,400 181,273 . 2277 Lassen 7,839 2,816,027 20,156 51,816 57,422 . 12,273 Lassen 384,825 12,807,722 52,502 127,752 892,902 (275) 1,077 Marin 644,511 14,218,649 11,4766 188,887 826,273 5,851 1,313 Marinos 22,301 1902,051 3,0048 87,604 57,474 251 689 Morco 31,367 1,346,560 5,652 203,166 1,21,233 2,001 1,493 Morco 31,967 1,346,564 292,1214 1,75,444					· · · · ·	•		-		235,138	
Inyo 75,586 2,751,989 30,022 45,275 62,766 . 133 Kings 45,118 11,228,167 5,7026 12,72,109 718,467 1,502 900 Lake 9,123 5,491,166 20,328 74,000 181,273 . 227 Lassen 7,839 2,816,027 20,155 51,816 57,422 . 127 Madera 38,825 12,807,722 55,502 127,752 89,262 (275) 1,077 Marino 644,511 14,218,649 114,766 186,887 826,273 5,851 1,133 Mendocino 311,771 8,220,369 30,068 87,604 572,474 251 690 Modoc 31,967 1,346,550 5,552 202,366 1,343 1,448 4,193 72,861 . 122,78 Mono 85,641 2,40,433 12,444 4,1934 72,761 . 122,78 Napa 300,795 70,62558							-	. ,		267,118 986,954	1
kern 3,544,268 64,959,062 773,28 575,261 3,978,884 (21,432) 4,431 Lake 9,123 5,401,165 570,265 124,210 718,867 1,502 900 Lake 9,123 2,816,027 20,156 51,4161 57,432 - 127 Lase 7,839 2,816,027 20,156 51,4161 57,432 - 127 Madra 384,825 12,807,722 52,502 127,752 882,627 5,531 1,303 Marin 644,511 14,218,649 114,766 114,766 158,887 82,673 5,531 1,303 Mendocino 31,1771 82,20,369 30,068 87,604 57,2474 251 699 Modoc 31,967 1,346,550 51,313 9,303 4,421 1,763,444 1,21,333 2,601 1,446 Napa 300,795 10,00,491 30,555 1,21,333 2,601 1,242 Napa 309,795 10,00,491										138,463	
Jake 9,123 5,491,166 20,328 74,100 181,273 . 727 Lassen 7,833 2,816,027 20,156 51,816 57,432 . 127 Los Angeles 18,887,668 78,422,137 20,156 51,816 57,432 . 127 Marin 644,511 14,218,649 114,766 186,827,732 82,6273 5,551 1,137 Marinosa 22,301 1,902,051 3,004 44,414 58,533 . 100 Mendocino 31,1771 8,230,369 30,068 87,604 572,474 251 669 Mono 85,641 2,410,433 12,446 41,913 72,261 . 122 Mono 85,641 2,410,433 12,446 42,913 12,445 49,310 4,872 . 52 Mono 85,4951 7,602,558 49,946 92,482 1,753,444 18,946 42,252 Nevada 95,495 7,602,558 49,946		-					-	(21,432)		4,810,042	6
Issen 7,839 2,816,027 20,156 51,816 57,432 . 122 Los Angeles 18,887,968 749,432,137 3,144,530 5,905,041 38,440,901 132,673 47,602 Madra 384,825 12,207,722 8,20,662 (275) 1,077 Marinos 644,511 14,218,649 114,766 186,887 82,62,73 5,851 1,133 Marinosa 22,301 1,3902,051 3,004 44,414 58,533 - 100 Mencod 311,771 8,230,369 30,068 37,604 572,474 251 699 Mococ 31,967 1,344,550 5,613 39,130 4,872 - 122 Nono 85,641 2,410,433 12,446 41,913 72,961 - 122 Napa 309,795 10,040,891 30,550 115,118 864,961 4,631 1,019 Nevada 95,495 7,602,558 1,915,066 552,5851 27,984 2,239<								1,502		901,205	1
Ibs Angeles 18.887.968 749.432.137 3.144.530 5.905.041 38.40.901 132.673 47.023 Madera 384.825 12.807.722 52.502 12.752 892.962 (275) 1.077 Marin 644.511 14.218.649 114.766 186.887 826.273 5.851 1.133 Mariposa 22.301 1.902.051 3.904 44.141 58.533 - 100 Mendocino 311.977 8.820.369 55.652 203.166 1.231.933 2.601 1.498 Modoc 31.967 1.946,550 6.134 39.130 4.872 - 122 Mono 85.641 2.410,433 12.446 41.913 72.661 - 122 Mone 95.695 10.040.891 30.550 155.148 864.961 4.631 1.911 Nevada 95.495 7.062.558 49.946 94.388 106.633 48 250 Orange 6.929.900 14.827.85 532.226 <td< td=""><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td>275,701</td><td></td></td<>		-						-		275,701	
Madera 384,825 12,807,722 52,502 127,752 892,962 (275) 1,077 Marino 644,511 14,216,649 114,766 826,273 5,831 1,133 Marinosa 22,301 1,902,061 3,904 44,141 58,533 - 100 Merced 774,827 16,6945,650 55,652 203,166 1,234,933 2,601 1,486 Modoc 31,967 1,346,550 6,134 39,130 4,872 - 55 Monterey 277,496 27,633,463 118,466 229,214 1,763,444 18,946 2,235 Napa 300,795 10,040,891 30,550 115,118 864,961 4,631 1,011 Nevada 09,592,920 194,889,964 923,882 1,915,066 9,525,851 27,984 12,393 Plucas 14,792 1,582,113 3,006 45,425 2,758 - 55 Sarternito 3,560,591 194,883,326 532,226 14,440,000 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>129,403</td> <td>79</td>								-		129,403	79
Marin Mariposa 644,511 14,218,649 114,266 186,887 826,273 5,851 1,133 Mariposa 22,301 3,904 44,141 58,533 . 100 Mercocino 311,771 8,230,389 30,068 87,604 572,474 251 698 Modoc 31,967 1,346,550 6,133 39,130 4,872 . 55 Mono 85,641 2,410,433 12,446 41,913 72,961 . 122 Monterey 277,495 27,633,463 1183,464 292,214 1,763,444 18,946 4,631 1,010 Nevada 95,495 7,602,558 49,946 94,368 106,633 48 256 Orange 6,329,920 194,489,964 923,882 1,915,106 9,525,851 2,7984 1,239 Placer 634,796 26,525,523 77,378 277,721 943,335 459 1,239 San Bento 33,60,91 114,906,608 340,254 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1,072,940</td><td>/9</td></td<>										1,072,940	/9
Mendocino 311,771 8,230,369 30,068 87,604 572,474 251 693 Merced 774,827 16,949,550 55,652 203,166 1,231,933 2,601 1,493 Mono 85,641 2,410,433 13,464 41,913 77,961 123 Monterey 277,496 27,633,463 183,464 292,214 1,763,444 18,946 2,225 Napa 309,795 10,040,891 30,550 115,118 864,961 4,631 1,011 Nevada 95,495 7,602,558 19,948 94,368 1006,633 48 225 Placer 634,796 26,525,523 77,378 277,721 943,385 459 1,239 Plumas 14,929 1,892,113 9,206 4,523,326 5,242,62 2,758 - 535 Sar Benito 3,560,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Brancidio 1,245,356 51,620,873										1,133,778	1
Merced 774,827 16,949,690 55,652 203,166 1,231,933 2,601 1,493 Modoc 31,967 1,346,550 6,134 39,130 4,872 - 55 Monterey 277,496 2410,431 72,961 - 122 Monterey 277,496 27,633,463 183,464 292,214 1,763,444 18,946 2,258 Napa 309,795 10,040,891 30,550 115,118 864,961 4,631 1,011 Nevada 95,495 7,602,588 49,946 94,386 100,633 48 225 Orange 6,929,920 1,8489,964 27,832 1,77,378 277,721 943,385 459 1,2393 Placer 634,796 252,525 145,283,326 532,226 1,449,060 7,221,038 (276,310) 8,966 San Bernardino 3,260,591 14,906,808 340,224 7,383 5,248,982 (18,560) 6,543 San Isogouin 1,264,732 48,892,664	lariposa	22,301		1,902,051	3,904	44,141	58,533	-		106,577	
Modoc 31,967 1,346,550 6,134 39,130 4,872 - 55 Monterey 277,746 27,633,446 12,446 41,913 72,961 - 122 Napa 309,795 309,795 10,040,891 30,550 115,118 864,961 4,631 1,011 Nevada 95,495 7,602,558 49,946 94,368 106,633 48 223,892 1,915,066 9,525,851 27,984 12,393 Placer 634,796 26,525,523 77,378 277,721 943,385 459 1,299 Remardine 3,662 145,283,226 532,226 1,444,060 7,221,038 (276,310) 8,666 Sar Paracino 3,560,591 144,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Brancisco 5,847,134 433,097,236 114,700 72,2920 16,127 - 244 San Joaquin 1,245,356 1147,208,728 5353,598 6,680,109 45,670 8,4										690,397	
Mono 85,641 2,410,433 12,446 41,913 72,961 - 122 Monterey 277,496 27,633,463 183,464 282,214 1,763,444 18,946 2,233 Nepa 309,795 10,040,891 30,550 115,118 864,961 4,631 1,011 Nevada 95,495 7,602,558 49,946 94,368 106,633 48 22,52 Placer 634,796 26,525,523 77,737 277,721 943,385 459 1,299 Plumas 14,929 1,892,113 9,206 45,425 2,758 - 55 Sacarameto 3,560,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Bernardino 1,264,732 147,212,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,109 45,670 8,499 San Lis Obispo 28,957 113,906,608 130,020 200,629 85,516 2,484 2,388 2,200 5,515 5,515 5,515 <								2,601		1,493,352	1
Monterey 277,496 27,633,463 183,464 292,214 1,763,444 18,946 2,253 Napa 309,795 10,040,891 30,550 115,118 864,961 4,631 1,011 Nevada 95,495 7,602,558 49,946 94,368 106,633 48 255 Orange 6,929,920 194,489,964 923,882 1,915,066 9,525,851 27,984 12,392 Placer 634,796 26,525,523 77,378 277,721 943,385 459 1,293 Plumas 14,929 1,892,113 9,206 45,425 2,758 55 Sar Bernardino 3,560,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Bernardino 1,264,732 147,212,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,109 45,670 8,999 San Los optim 1,245,356 51,560,873 272,528 53,353 5,468,131 2,0629 5,514 San Los optim 1,245,356 51,								-		50,136 127,320	
Napa 309,795 10,040,891 30,550 115,118 864,961 4,631 1,019 Nevada 95,495 7,602,558 49,946 94,368 106,633 48 223,99 Placer 634,796 26,525,523 77,378 277,721 943,385 459 11,299 Plumas 14,929 1,892,113 9,206 45,425 2,758 - 556 Sacramento 3,560,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,6544 San Benito 34,642 4,882,015 147,721,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,109 45,670 8,499 San Brandino 1,264,732 147,212,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,109 45,670 8,499 San Ligo 2,835,598 183,097,236 718,442 1,988,883 6,42,231 (12,284) 9,633 San Ligo Dispo 288,557 19,007,444 130,020 200,622 855,166 2,643 1,188 San Lis Obis								18.946		2,258,068	2
Orange 6,929,920 194,489,964 923,882 1,915,066 9,525,851 27,984 12,392 Placer 634,796 265,225,523 77,378 277,721 943,385 459 1,293 Plumas 14,929 1,892,113 9,206 45,425 2,758 - 557 Saramento 3,560,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Bernot 3,664,2 4,892,015 14,700 72,920 161,127 - 244 San Bernardino 2,247,336 64591,370 272,528 533,595 4,683,132 28,629 5,519 San Francisco 5,487,134 64,591,870 272,528 535,395 4,683,132 28,629 5,519 San Luis Obipo 298,957 19,007,444 130,020 200,629 855,166 2,643 1,188 Santa Barbara 1,597,661 29,029,553 162,878 29,09,03 3,117,814 12,062 3,599 Santa Cura <										1,015,260	1
Placer 634,796 26,525,523 77,378 277,721 943,385 459 1,296 Plumas 14,929 1,892,113 9,206 45,425 2,758 - 55 Saramento 3,560,591 1145,283,326 532,226 1,484,060 7,221,038 (276,310) 8,961 San Benito 3,660,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Benito 3,642 4,892,015 14,700 72,920 161,127 - 244 San Bernardino 1,264,732 147,212,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,009 45,670 8,499 San Isogouin 1,245,356 15,620,873 201,698 501,401 2,198,348 2,388 2,900 San Luis Obipo 298,957 19,007,444 130,020 200,629 855,166 2,643 1,188 Santa Clara 2,309,466 93,922,217 452,782 1,164,067 6,748,121 - 8,366 Siskiyou	evada									250,995	
Plumas 14,929 1,892,113 9,206 45,425 2,758 - 55 Saramento 3,560,591 145,283,326 532,226 1,484,060 7,221,038 (276,310) 8,966 Saramento 3,560,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Bernardino 1,264,732 147,212,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,109 45,670 8,496 San Francisco 5,487,134 64,591,870 572,528 535,395 4,683,132 28,629 5,519 San Luis Obispo 288,957 19,007,444 130,020 200,629 855,166 2,643 1,188 Santa Lis Obispo 288,957 19,007,444 130,020 200,629 855,166 2,643 1,188 Santa Clara 1,597,661 29,029,553 162,858 298,093 3,117,814 12,062 3,599 Santa Clara 2,629 13,201 191,965 1,026,564 (749) 1,333 Siskiyou										12,392,784	20
Riverside 923,656 145,283,326 532,226 1,484,060 7,221,038 (276,310) 8,961 Saramento 3,560,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Benito 1,264,732 147,212,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,109 45,670 8,499 San Diego 2,853,598 183,097,266 718,442 1,989,883 6,942,231 (12,284) 9,633 San Francisco 5,487,134 64,591,870 272,528 553,395 4,683,132 28,629 5,519 San Joaquin 1,245,356 114,007,444 130,020 200,629 855,166 2,643 1,188 San Mateo 2,411,112 45,879,689 329,518 477,779 3,567,242 22,313 4,399 Santa Clara 2,309,466 93,922,217 452,782 1,164,067 6,748,121 - 8,364 Santa Cruz 203,558 16,510,592 113,210 191,965 1,026,564 (749) 1,333								459		1,298,942	2
Sacramento 3,560,591 114,906,808 340,254 973,583 5,248,982 (18,650) 6,544 San Benito 34,642 4,892,015 147,212,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,109 45,670 8,499 San Diego 2,853,598 183,097,236 718,442 1,989,883 6,942,231 (12,284) 9,638 San Francisco 5,487,134 64,951,870 72,528 535,395 4,683,132 28,629 5,5151 San Joaquin 1,245,356 51,620,873 201,698 501,401 2,198,348 2,388 2,903 San Luis Obispo 29,8957 19,007,444 130,020 200,629 855,166 2,643 1,188 Santa Clara 2,309,466 39,922,513 162,858 298,093 3,117,814 12,062 3,596 Siarta Clara 2,309,466 39,922,513 162,858 298,093 3,117,814 12,062 3,596 Sintara 262,221 21,458,019 44,394 14,669 575,601 766 766								- (276 310)		57,389 8,961,014	15
San Benito 34,642 4,892,015 14,700 72,920 161,127 - 244 San Bernardino 1,264,732 147,212,379 435,474 1,335,608 6,680,109 45,670 8,499 San Diego 2,853,598 183,097,236 718,442 1,989,883 6,942,231 (12,284) 9,633 San Francisco 5,487,134 64,591,870 272,528 535,395 4,683,132 28,629 5,519 San Luis Obispo 298,957 19,007,444 130,020 200,629 855,166 2,643 1,18 San Mateo 2,411,112 45,879,689 329,518 477,779 3,567,242 22,313 4,394 Santa Clara 2,309,466 93,922,217 452,782 1,164,067 6,748,121 - 8,366 Shasta 262,221 21,458,019 113,210 191,965 1,026,564 (749) 1,330 Sikiyou 91,038 4,683,119 37,000 60,085 69,509 - 166 Sikiyou										6,544,169	12
San Diego2,853,598183,097,236718,4421,989,8836,942,231(12,284)9,638San Francisco5,487,13464,591,870272,528535,3954,683,13228,6295,519San Joaquin1,245,35651,620,873201,698501,4012,198,3482,3882,900San Luis Obispo298,95719,007,444130,020200,629855,1662,6431,188Sant Luis Obispo298,95719,007,444130,020200,629855,1662,6431,188Sant Barbara1,597,66129,029,553162,858298,0933,117,81412,0623,596Santa Clara2,309,46693,922,217452,7821,164,0676,748,1218,866Santa Cruz203,55816,510,592113,210191,9651,026,564(749)1,330Shasta262,22121,458,01944,394141,669575,601-761Sierra9,616913,0111,83035,916586-38Sonoma1,172,04932,535,472119,004321,1081,911,6643,9712,355Stanislaus1,305,22932,239,39188,718361,2151,743,6751,3242,194Sutter159,7618,571,56737,38293,002313,817-444Tehama108,1845,919,89528,10072,678252,0131,443354Trinity53,6792,627,6537,64843,53866,692- <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td>248,746</td><td></td></td<>								-		248,746	
San Francisco5,487,13464,591,870272,528535,3954,683,13228,6295,514San Joaquin1,245,35651,620,873201,698501,4012,198,3482,3882,903San Luis Obispo298,95719,007,444130,020200,629855,1662,6431,188San Mateo2,411,11245,879,689329,518477,7793,567,24222,3134,396Santa Barbara1,597,66129,029,553162,858298,0933,117,81412,0623,599Santa Clara2,309,46693,922,217452,7821,164,0676,748,121-8,866Santa Cruz203,55816,510,592113,210191,9651,026,564(749)1,330Shasta262,22121,458,01944,394141,669575,601-761Sierra9,616913,0111,83035,916586-388Siskiyou91,0384,683,11937,00060,08569,509-166Solano353,77830,408,007119,364300,389888,6766,9501,314Sonoma1,172,04932,535,472119,004321,1081,911,6643,9712,355Stanislaus1,305,22932,329,39188,718361,2151,743,6751,3242,194Sutter159,7618,571,56737,38293,002313,817-444Tehama108,1845,919,89528,10072,678252,0131,443										8,496,861	15
San Joaquin1,245,35651,620,873201,698501,4012,198,3482,3882,903San Luis Obispo298,95719,007,444130,020200,629855,1662,6431,188San Mateo2,411,11245,879,689329,518477,7793,567,24222,3134,394Santa Barbara1,597,66129,029,553162,858298,0933,117,81412,0623,594Santa Clara2,309,46693,922,217452,7821,164,0676,748,121-8,364Santa Cruz203,55816,510,592113,210191,9651,026,564(749)1,330Shasta262,22121,458,01944,394141,669575,601-765Sierra9,616913,0111,83035,916586-366Solano353,77830,408,007119,364300,389888,6766,9501,312Sonoma1,172,04932,535,472119,004321,1081,911,6643,9712,355Starislaus1,305,22932,329,39188,718361,2151,743,6751,3242,194Sutter159,7618,571,56737,38293,002313,817-444Tehama108,1845,919,89528,10072,678252,0131,443354Trinity53,6792,627,6537,64843,53866,692-117	-									9,638,272	19
San Luis Obispo298,95719,007,444130,020200,629855,1662,6431,188San Mateo2,411,11245,879,689329,518477,7793,567,24222,3134,396Santa Barbara1,597,66129,029,553162,858298,0933,117,81412,0623,596Santa Clara2,309,46693,922,217452,7821,164,0676,748,121-8,364Santa Cruz203,55816,510,592113,210191,9651,026,564(749)1,330Shasta262,22121,458,01944,394141,669575,601-766Sierra9,616913,0111,83035,916586-388Siskiyou91,0384,683,11937,00060,08569,509-1166Solano353,77830,408,007119,364300,389888,6766,9501,315Sonama1,172,04932,535,472119,004321,1081,911,6643,9712,355Starislaus1,305,22932,329,39188,718361,2151,743,6751,3242,194Sutter159,7618,571,56737,38293,002313,817-444Tehama108,1845,919,89528,10072,678252,0131,443354Trinity53,6792,627,6537,64843,53866,692-111										5,519,684 2,903,835	5
San Mateo2,411,11245,879,689329,518477,7793,567,24222,3134,396Santa Barbara1,597,66129,029,55316,2858298,0933,117,81412,0623,590Santa Clara2,309,46693,922,217452,7821,164,0676,748,121-8,364Santa Cruz203,55816,510,592113,210191,9651,026,564(749)1,330Shasta262,22121,458,01944,394141,669575,601-760Sierra9,616913,0111,83035,916586-38Siskiyou91,0384,683,11937,00060,08569,509-1166Solano353,77830,408,007119,364300,389888,6766,9501,314Sonoma1,172,04932,535,472119,004321,1081,911,6643,9712,355Statislaus1,305,22932,329,39188,718361,2151,743,6751,3242,194Sutter159,7618,571,56737,38293,002313,817-444Tehama108,1845,919,89528,10072,678252,0131,443354Trinity53,6792,627,6537,64843,53866,692-111										2,903,835	2
Santa Barbara1,597,66129,029,553162,858298,0933,117,81412,0623,590Santa Clara2,309,46693,922,217452,7821,164,0676,748,121-8,364Santa Cruz203,55816,510,592113,210191,9651,026,564(749)1,330Shasta262,22121,458,01944,394141,669575,601-761Sierra9,616913,0111,83035,916586-38Siskiyou91,0384,683,11937,00060,08569,509-1166Solano353,77830,408,007119,364300,389888,6766,9501,315Sonoma1,172,04932,535,472119,004321,1081,911,6643,9712,355Stanislaus1,305,22932,329,39188,718361,2151,743,6751,3242,194Sutter159,7618,571,56737,38293,002313,817-444Tehama108,1845,919,89528,10072,678252,0131,443354Trinity53,6792,627,6537,64843,53866,692-111										4,396,851	5
Santa Cruz203,55816,510,592113,210191,9651,026,564(749)1,330Shasta262,22121,458,01944,394141,669575,601-761Sierra9,616913,0111,83035,916586-38Siskiyou91,0384,683,11937,00060,08569,509-166Solano353,77830,408,007119,364300,389888,6766,9501,319Sonoma1,172,04932,535,472119,004321,1081,911,6643,9712,355Stanislaus1,305,22932,329,39188,718361,2151,743,6751,3242,194Sutter159,7618,571,56737,38293,002313,817-444Tehama108,1845,919,89528,10072,678252,0131,443354Trinity53,6792,627,6537,64843,53866,692-117		1,597,661		29,029,553	162,858	298,093	3,117,814			3,590,827	3
Shasta 262,221 21,458,019 44,394 141,669 575,601 - 765 Sierra 9,616 913,011 1,830 35,916 586 - 38 Siskiyou 91,038 4,683,119 37,000 60,085 69,509 - 166 Solano 353,778 30,408,007 119,364 300,389 888,676 6,950 1,319 Sonoma 1,172,049 32,535,472 119,004 321,108 1,911,664 3,971 2,355 Stanislaus 1,305,229 32,329,391 88,718 361,215 1,743,675 1,324 2,194 Sutter 159,761 5,919,895 28,100 72,678 252,013 1,443 354 Trinity 53,679 2,627,653 7,648 43,538 66,692 - 117								-		8,364,970	10
Sierra 9,616 913,011 1,830 35,916 586 - 38 Siskiyou 91,038 4,683,119 37,000 60,085 69,509 - 166 Solano 353,778 30,408,007 119,364 300,389 888,676 6,950 1,319 Sonoma 1,172,049 32,535,472 119,004 321,108 1,911,664 3,971 2,355 Stanislaus 1,305,229 32,329,391 88,718 361,215 1,743,675 1,324 2,194 Sutter 159,761 8,571,567 37,382 93,002 313,817 - 444 Tehama 108,184 5,919,895 28,100 72,678 252,013 1,443 354 Trinity 53,679 2,627,653 7,648 43,538 66,692 - 1117										1,330,990	1
Siskiyou 91,038 4,683,119 37,000 60,085 69,509 - 166 Solano 353,778 30,408,007 119,364 300,389 888,676 6,950 1,315 Sonoma 1,172,049 32,535,472 119,004 321,108 1,911,664 3,971 2,535 Stanislaus 1,305,229 32,329,391 88,718 361,215 1,743,675 1,324 2,194 Sutter 159,761 8,571,567 37,382 93,002 313,817 - 444 Tehama 108,184 5,919,895 28,100 72,678 252,013 1,443 354 Trinity 53,679 2,627,653 7,648 43,538 66,692 - 117								-		761,665 38,332	
Sonoma 1,172,049 32,535,472 119,004 321,108 1,911,664 3,971 2,355 Stanislaus 1,305,229 32,329,391 88,718 361,215 1,743,675 1,324 2,194 Sutter 159,761 8,571,567 37,382 93,002 313,817 - 444 Tehama 108,184 5,919,895 28,100 72,678 252,013 1,443 354 Trinity 53,679 2,627,653 7,648 43,538 66,692 - 111						-		-		166,594	
Stanislaus 1,305,229 32,329,391 88,718 361,215 1,743,675 1,324 2,194 Sutter 159,761 8,571,567 37,382 93,002 313,817 - 444 Tehama 108,184 5,919,895 28,100 72,678 252,013 1,443 354 Trinity 53,679 2,627,653 7,648 43,538 66,692 - 112	olano	353,778		30,408,007	119,364	300,389	888,676	6,950		1,315,379	3
Sutter 159,761 8,571,567 37,382 93,002 313,817 - 444 Tehama 108,184 5,919,895 28,100 72,678 252,013 1,443 354 Trinity 53,679 2,627,653 7,648 43,538 66,692 - 112								-		2,355,748	3
Tehama 108,184 5,919,895 28,100 72,678 252,013 1,443 354 Trinity 53,679 2,627,653 7,648 43,538 66,692 - 112						-		1,324		2,194,932	3
Trinity 53,679 2,627,653 7,648 43,538 66,692 - 112								- 1 44२		444,201 354,234	
								1,440 -		<u> </u>	
	,							7,241		3,258,600	3
Tuolumne 50,352 5,367,597 16,642 66,713 75,628 - 158	uolumne					66,713	75,628	-		158,983	
								-		3,666,279	4
								3,748		935,643	1
		90,867	ፈጽ ዓടብ በባባ			83,056	98,044	-	186 700 000	196,888 186,700,000	30
		68,818,575			- 10 907 514	25 300 000	134 715 810	3/1 190		357,657,514	3,07

FY 2025-26 Trial Court Allocation	
AG (Z+AF)	
100,452,765 982,922	ļ
4,728,066	ļ
15,363,189	ĺ
3,671,061 2,736,901	ĺ
57,730,562	I
4,078,842	ļ
10,542,436	
67,893,015	ĺ
3,479,669 9,151,371	
11,473,032	ļ
2,890,412	ļ
69,769,104	
12,229,372 5,766,867	
2,945,431	ĺ
797,055,282	ļ
13,880,662	
15,352,426	
2,008,628 8,920,766	I
18,443,001	I
1,396,686	ļ
2,537,753	
29,891,532 11,056,151	I
7,853,553	I
206,882,747	l
27,824,465	
1,949,502	1
<u>154,244,340</u> 121,450,977	
5,140,761	ļ
155,709,241	ĺ
192,735,508	ļ
70,111,554 54,524,708	ĺ
20,195,902	ĺ
50,276,541	ļ
32,620,380	ĺ
<u>102,287,186</u> 17,841,582	ĺ
22,219,684	ļ
951,343	ļ
4,849,712	ĺ
31,723,387	ĺ
34,891,220 34,524,323	ĺ
9,015,769	ļ
6,274,129	ĺ
2,745,531	ĺ
37,347,569 5,526,580	ļ
49,648,919	
17,819,967	ļ
6,902,967	ļ
303,693,700 3,076,211,651	l
3,070,211,031	

Attachment G

FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Allocations with FY 2024-25 Workload Formula Need

	FY 2024-25 Adjusted			FY 2024-25 NON-B CALCULATE W	SASE ADJUSTME VORKLOAD ALLO			BASE ADJUSTMEN TE WORKLOAD AL	
Court	Ending Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation	General Fund Employee Benefits	Total Base Allocation	Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics	2% Automation Replacement	Self-Help	Security Base Adjustment	Subordinate Judicial Officer (SJO) Adjustment	Total Workload Formula Related Adjustments
	Α	В	C (A+B)	D	E	F	G	Н	I (D:H)
Alameda	88,518,962	3,102,046	91,621,008	101,718	424,792	1,017,456	(3,355,024)	(2,401,364)	
Alpine	894,531	20,340	914,871	31	2,034	34,711	-	-	36,776
Amador	4,277,561	51,756	4,329,317	649	11,006	57,922	-	(159,466)	
Butte Calaveras	14,304,042 3,388,376	124,077 50,506	14,428,119 3,438,882	12,082 832	59,332 18,652	155,943 60,856	(493,178)	(528,573) (135,947)	
Colusa	2,420,448	24,773	2,445,221	339	13,708	46,982	-	(133,947)	61,029
Contra Costa	50,221,066	1,396,191	51,617,257	74,666	218,186	722,449	-	(898,176)	
Del Norte	3,746,487	94,130	3,840,617	502	11,208	50,173			61,882
El Dorado	9,447,501	213,120	9,660,621	3,339	54,374	147,338	-	(141,247)	
Fresno	60,240,849	3,340,363	63,581,212	65,195	181,080	636,326	-	(1,243,009)	
Glenn	3,001,932	54,665	3,056,597	468	19,264	51,119	(10,324)	-	60,527
Humboldt Imperial	8,257,261 10,340,761	73,084 125,539	8,330,345 10,466,300	7,717 8,575	48,160 67,678	114,410 140,935	(177,151) (443,912)	(153,942) (165,457)	
Inyo	2,579,446	75,586	2,655,032	285	30,402	45,295	(443,912) (197,060)	(165,457)	(392,180) (121,079)
Kern	61,386,998	3,544,268	64,931,266	57,162	277,328	575,261	(69,221)	(2,053,115)	
Kings	10,897,010	45,118	10,942,128	7,959	57,026	124,210	(445,431)	(343,333)	
Lake	5,282,554	9,123	5,291,677	1,419	20,328	74,100	(207,443)	(67,519)	
Lassen	2,728,920	7,839	2,736,759	418	20,156	51,816	(310,211)	(48,956)	
Los Angeles	710,883,046	18,887,968	729,771,014	946,953	3,144,530	5,905,041	(15,091,072)	(22,539,836)	(27,634,384)
Madera	12,074,049	384,825	12,458,874	3,205	52,502	127,752	(402,661)	(32,920)	(252,122)
Marin	13,188,192	644,511	13,832,703	14,218	114,766	186,887	(10,161)	(63,097)	242,613
Mariposa	1,839,201	22,301	1,861,502	274	3,904	44,141	-	(48,097)	
Mendocino	7,678,102	311,771	7,989,873	4,398	30,068	87,604	(316,031)	-	(193,961)
Merced	15,739,032	774,827	16,513,859	15,053	55,652	203,166	-	(379,594)	
Modoc	1,298,769	31,967	1,330,736	282	6,134	39,130	(833)	-	44,713
Mono	2,269,382	85,641	2,355,023	190 19,507	12,446 183,464	41,913 292,214	(25,502) (918,484)	- (409.166)	29,047 (831,464)
Monterey Napa	26,535,349 9,363,047	277,496 309,795	26,812,845 9,672,842	2,567	30,550	115,118	(312,023)	(408,166) (240,967)	
Nevada	7,298,896	95,495	7,394,391	5,998	49,946	94,368	(457,585)	(413,665)	
Orange	182,401,656	6,929,920	189,331,576	245,672	923,882	1,915,066	(2,886,124)	(4,430,585)	
Placer	25,098,728	634,796	25,733,524	23,418	77,378	277,721	-	(1,242,269)	
Plumas	1,842,015	14,929	1,856,944	344	9,206	45,425	-	-	54,976
Riverside	137,078,936	923,656	138,002,592	60,872	532,226	1,484,060	(2,039,160)	(3,966,880)	(3,928,882)
Sacramento	106,136,433	3,560,591	109,697,024	202,585	340,254	973,583	(1,968,325)	(2,248,026)	(2,699,928)
San Benito	4,647,339	34,642	4,681,981	850	14,700	72,920	-	-	88,469
San Bernardino	140,191,111	1,264,732	141,455,843	171,535	435,474	1,335,608	(3,451,646)	(4,436,437)	
San Diego	177,297,791	2,853,598	180,151,389	228,762	718,442	1,989,883	(693,816)	(5,194,655)	
San Francisco	58,281,791	5,487,134	63,768,925	59,708	272,528	535,395	-	(509,998)	
San Joaquin San Luis Obispo	49,265,691	1,245,356 298,957	50,511,047	52,691 14,609	201,698 130,020	501,401 200,629	(303,783) (255,144)	(1,188,653) (560,547)	
San Luis Obispo San Mateo	18,431,963 41,749,337	298,957	18,730,920 44,160,449	14,609	329,518	477,779	(467,732)	(560,547) (1,216,658)	
Santa Barbara	26,549,548	1,597,661	28,147,209	23,039	162,858	298,093	(1,113,911)	(659,625)	
Santa Clara	90,808,115	2,309,466	93,117,581	96,598	452,782	1,164,067	-	(1,056,459)	
Santa Cruz	16,202,379	203,558	16,405,937	12,763	113,210	191,965	-	(289,299)	
Shasta	20,313,859	262,221	20,576,080	3,670	44,394	141,669	(2,780,637)	(340,979)	(2,931,883)
Sierra	924,629	9,616	934,245	46	1,830	35,916	-	-	37,792
Siskiyou	4,428,924	91,038	4,519,962	861	37,000	60,085	-	(247,132)	(149,186)
Solano	28,938,926	353,778	29,292,704	31,689	119,364	300,389	(459,664)	(733,995)	
Sonoma	30,481,869	1,172,049	31,653,918	29,334	119,004	321,108	(464,520)	(1,117,219)	
Stanislaus	29,779,476	1,305,229	31,084,705	33,765	88,718	361,215	(9,846)	(644,829)	
Sutter Tehama	8,228,544 5,684,715	159,761 108,184	8,388,305 5,792,899	1,818 1,258	37,382 28,100	93,002 72,678	(260,840)	- (9,409)	(128,638) 92,626
Trinity	2,473,755	53,679	2,527,434	693	7,648	43,538	- (543,614)	(5,409)	(491,735)
Tulare	32,552,742	33,744	32,586,486	24,586	204,932	316,908	(16,444)	(599,927)	
Tuolumne	5,095,320	50,352	5,145,672	990	16,642	66,713	(232,805)	(68,382)	
Ventura	43,013,343	968,752	43,982,095	51,184	205,304	530,521	(1,646,046)	(939,744)	
Yolo	16,036,577	210,076	16,246,653	10,688	48,556	164,970	(615,372)		(391,158)
Yuba	6,193,519	90,867	6,284,386	1,624	15,788	83,056	(139,957)	-	(39,489)
Unallocated	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	2,460,230,806	68,818,575	2,529,049,381	2,754,387	10,907,514	25,300,000	(43,592,694)	(64,168,151)	(68,798,944)

¹ Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trial courts, but is used in the calculation of the Workload Formula allocation.

Attachment H

FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Allocations with FY 2024-25 Workload Formula Need

Court		Fiscal Neutral	Fiscal Neutral Offset	Change in Revenue	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Current	Revenue	Proposed Re (Fiscal N		Proposed Inflationary		FY 2025-2	6 Workload Fu	Inding Floor	Adjustment				
Court	FY 2025-26 Beginning Workload Allocation	Cost Change Reduction for SJO Conversion	SJO Adjustment (Change from Prior Year)	Collected Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics (Change from Prior Year)	FY 2025-25 Non- Interpreter Benefit Cost Change Funding	Methodology Criminal Justice Realignment	Collected All Other Applicable Revenue Sources ¹	Funding Reallocated from Courts Contributing to Equity (second year of no	Funding Reallocated to Courts Receiving an Equity Adjustment (second year of no "new money")	Adjustment FY 2025-26 Inflationary Adjustment Funding of \$40m (1.6 Percent)	FY 2025-26 Workload Allocation (Prior to Implementing Funding Floor)	Applied Funding Floor	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Percentage Share of Adjustment	Adjustment Allocation	FY 2025-26 Final Workload Allocation	FY 2024-25 Workload Formula	Workload Formula Percentage	FY 2025-26 Civ Assessment Backfill Debt Obligations
	J (C+I)	К	L	М	N	0	Р	Q	R	S	T (J:S)	U	V	W	X	Y (T+V+X)	Z	AA (Y/Z)	AB
ieda ie	87,408,586 951,647	-	(73,975)	32,861 (0)	(27,296) 5,840	187,647	2,174,774 11,592	-	-	1,424,956 15,512	91,127,553 984,591	994,000	9,409	3.55%	1,356	91,128,909 994,000	94,645,177 549,681	96.28% 180.83%	
dor	4,239,428	-	- (6,797)	136	181,313	- 7,098	217,866	-	-	69,594	4,708,638	994,000	9,409	- 0.18%	70	4,708,708	4,684,703	180.83%	
2	13,633,725	-	(26,372)	1,669	232,088	106,023	107,198	(146,900)	-	220,838	14,128,270			0.55%	210	14,128,480	14,689,951	96.18%	
/eras	3,383,275	-	(10,745)	133	47,902	6,654	15,755	-	-	53,213	3,496,186			0.14%	52	3,496,238	3,767,570	92.80%	
sa	2,506,251	-	-	46	51,781	9,759	12,290	-	-	39,553	2,619,681			0.10%	39	2,619,720	2,635,032	99.42%	
ra Costa Iorte	51,734,383 3,902,500	-	49,712	4,482 26	581,122 61,470	86,060 14,195	525,007 11,351	-	490,392	832,188 72,011	54,303,347 4,061,553			2.11% 0.16%	808 60	54,304,155 4,061,613	59,907,816 3,875,339	90.65% 104.81%	
orado	9,724,426	-	(1,909)	524	191,183	56,338	101,989	-	-	153,542	10,226,093			0.10%	152	10,226,245	10,819,495	94.52%	
10	63,220,804	-	(68,838)	11,048	58,311	238,662	439,185	(662,872)	-	1,016,828	64,253,128			2.50%	956	64,254,084	66,287,167	96.93%	500,00
n	3,117,123	-	-	58	130,265	8,207	9,920	-	-	48,184	3,313,757			0.13%	49	3,313,806	3,237,289	102.36%	
boldt	8,169,539	-	(12,882)	295	355,151	43,030	136,056	-	-	143,344	8,834,533			0.34%	131	8,834,665	9,318,361	94.81%	
erial	10,074,120 2,533,954	-	(8,976)	2,204	35,817 50,129	37,485 4,880	95,474 18,452	(242,200)	-	163,060 40,474	10,156,985 2,647,901			0.40%	151 39	10,157,136 2,647,940	8,073,327 2,676,571	125.81% 98.93%	
	2,533,954 63,718,681	-	- 131,550		(645,733)	4,880 254,410	2,446,380	- (687,763)	-	40,474 1,067,196	2,647,901 66,295,470			2.58%	986	2,647,940 66,296,456	68,776,330	98.93%	
5	10,342,559	-	(14,595)	953	147,451	58,778	446,749	-	-	173,709	11,155,604			0.43%	166	11,155,770	12,025,488	92.77%	
	5,112,562	-	(3,004)	152	47,172	9,759	41,455	-	60,562	81,916	5,350,574			0.21%	80	5,350,654	6,056,222	88.35%	
en	2,449,981	-	23,974	51	21,235	12,199	180,150	-	-	41,553	2,729,144			0.11%	41	2,729,185	2,580,519	105.76%	
Angeles	702,136,631	-	407,920	139,449	5,276,310	2,875,473	18,597,310	-	-	11,498,318	740,931,411			28.84%	11,022	740,942,433	791,102,381	93.66%	
era	12,206,752 14,075,316	-	2,944 (16,546)	361 2,040	37,734 94,157	50,793 21,959	171,768 129,912	-	56,093	204,038 227,075	12,730,485 14,533,912			0.50% 0.57%	189 216	12,730,674 14,534,128	13,875,025 15,677,866	91.75% 92.70%	
n posa	1,861,723	-	(10,540)	85	7,024	3,549	21,363	-	-	29,947	1,923,691			0.07%	210	1,923,719	1,846,094	104.20%	
docino	7,795,912	-	-	946	78,744	107,353	83,438	(77,750)	-	123,508	8,112,151			0.32%	121	8,112,271	7,775,002	104.34%	
ced	16,408,135	-	(16,421)	3,928	99,904	56,560	240,654	-	-	265,979	17,058,738			0.66%	254	17,058,992	18,264,043	93.40%	310,00
ос	1,375,449	-	-	62	(11,528)	4,436	11,437	-	-	22,109	1,401,965			0.05%	21	1,401,986	1,480,959	94.67%	
0	2,384,070	-	-	57	16,107	444	57,143	-	-	38,823	2,496,644			0.10%	37	2,496,681	2,038,771	122.46%	
terey a	25,981,382 9,268,089	-	(10,973) (8,304)	1,768 359	355,193 138,857	45,914 39,481	374,780 317,261	-	- 21,951	419,107 153,022	27,167,171 9,930,715			1.06% 0.39%	404	27,167,575 9,930,863	28,560,984 10,740,134	95.12% 92.46%	
ida	6,673,453	-	(36,937)	224	90,773	11,312	46,713	-		105,979	6,891,517			0.27%	140	6,891,620	7,425,652	92.81%	
ge	185,099,486	-	(417,864)	34,678	1,134,334	534,327	3,632,145	-	483,238	3,003,611	193,503,955			7.53%	2,879	193,506,834	209,526,287	92.35%	
er	24,869,772	-	(18,947)	3,592	331,352	34,602	191,865	-	-	400,741	25,812,975			1.00%	384	25,813,359	27,355,659	94.36%	
ias	1,911,919	-	-	43	-	2,218	7,725	-	-	30,475	1,952,380			0.08%	29	1,952,409	1,629,248	119.83%	
rside amento	134,073,710 106,997,096	-	(74,506) (581,050)	8,450 24,565	3,732,481 (671,038)	826,665 166,353	1,728,567 1,606,735	-	543,993 1,223,323	2,175,468 1,771,581	143,014,828 110,537,565			5.57% 4.30%	2,127 1,644	143,016,955 110,539,209	155,691,163 122,332,264	91.86% 90.36%	
Benito	4,770,450	-	(76,762)	337	122,760	10,425	40,943	-		76,775	4,944,929			0.19%	74	4,945,003	4,197,092	117.82%	
Bernardino	135,510,377	-	(347,771)	27,383	939,065	943,334	993,080	-	1,440,393	2,191,876	141,697,738			5.52%	2,108	141,699,846	156,640,095	90.46%	
Diego	177,200,005	-	(32,542)	25,620	(427,911)	524,124	1,515,058	-	-	2,846,931	181,651,286			7.07%	2,702	181,653,988	189,500,353	95.86%	
rancisco	64,126,558	-	(50,557)	8,099	1,337,486	90,940	541,457	(1,659,153)	-	1,035,184	65,430,013			2.55%	973	65,430,986	55,305,114	118.31%	
oaquin uis Obispo	49,774,402 18,260,486	-	(83,898) (33,980)	6,464 2,087	169,587 58,372	82,733 95,746	592,680 621,244	- (194,925)	-	804,787 298,347	51,346,756 19,107,376			2.00% 0.74%	764 284	51,347,519 19,107,660	53,533,653 19,492,482	95.92% 98.03%	
uis Obispo Vateo	43,296,094	-	(127,685)	1,987	812,377	68,094	461,193	(194,925)	105,009	693,343	45,310,412			1.76%	674	45,311,086	49,033,290	98.03%	
a Barbara	26,857,663	-	(127,191)	3,014	361,082	46,135	248,991	-		429,992	27,919,686			1.09%	415	27,920,101	29,058,002	96.08%	
a Clara	93,774,569	-	(38,212)	21,720	40,664	232,229	1,021,505	(973,540)	-	1,503,861	95,582,797			3.72%	1,422	95,584,219	97,354,039	98.18%	4,031,2
a Cruz	16,434,577	-	(20,525)	704	(44,188)	32,605	144,968	(169,408)	-	263,494	16,642,228			0.65%	248	16,642,475	16,940,790	98.24%	75,0
ta	17,644,197	-	(15,015)	550	712,852	80,293	210,993	(181,985)	-	261,310	18,713,196	004.000	/ 47 622	0.73%	278	18,713,475	18,198,452	102.83%	
a you	972,037 4,370,776	-	- (9,039)	14 213	10,023 87,961	222 5,545	43,813 27,595		-	15,512 69,582	1,041,622 4,552,634	994,000	(47,622)	- 0.18%	- 68	994,000 4,552,702	623,149 4,841,098	159.51% 94.04%	
ou o	28,550,487	-	(44,864)	5,712	483,371	126,650	416,104	-	-	462,071	29,999,532			1.17%	446	29,999,978	31,445,139	94.04 <i>%</i> 95.40%	
ma	30,541,625	-	(24,005)	3,620	578,657	104,248	268,950	(307,329)	-	490,612	31,656,378			1.23%	471	31,656,849	30,732,916	103.01%	
islaus	30,913,729	-	(22,949)	7,692	208,029	158,590	299,258	-	370,548	507,035	32,441,933			1.26%	483	32,442,416	37,054,820	87.55%	
er	8,259,667	-	-	431	(74,812)	28,169	54,911	-	94,853	132,131	8,495,350			0.33%	126	8,495,476	9,485,325	89.56%	
ma tv	5,885,525 2,035,698	-	9,409	129 (80)	20,656 62,405	10,203 5,323	40,378 28,537	-	-	94,707 32,059	6,061,007 2,163,942			0.24%	90 32	6,061,097 2,163,974	6,426,611 2,276,992	94.31% 95.04%	
ty re	32,516,542	-	- (2,301)	(80) 4,176	482,206	5,323 94,267	28,537		- 385,490	527,122	2,163,942 34,215,318			1.33%	509	34,215,827	38,548,955	95.04% 88.76%	
umne	4,928,831	-	(2,296)	42	174,171	14,639	53,893	(50,856)		77,613	5,196,037			0.20%	77	5,196,115	5,085,552	102.17%	
ura	42,183,315	-	(16,431)	4,971	842,372	445,827	1,039,579	-	-	711,674	45,211,305			1.76%	673	45,211,978	46,999,346	96.20%	
	15,855,495	-	(299,824)	1,789	337,432	52,568	89,164	-	-	247,427	16,284,052			0.63%	242	16,284,295	17,504,806	93.03%	
	6,244,898	-	-	317	186,732	47,466	57,998	-	78,836	99,103	6,715,349			0.26%	100	6,715,449	7,883,564	85.18%	
located	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			- 1	-	-	-	-	

¹ Revenue does not reflect an allocation of funding to the trial courts, but is used in the calculation of the Workload Formula allocation.

Attachment H