

## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 21-134
For business meeting on October 1, 2021

#### **Title**

Trial Court Budget: \$60 Million One-Time COVID-Driven Caseload Backlog Funding

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**None

#### **Presented by**

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

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

#### **Agenda Item Type**

Action Required

#### **Effective Date**

October 1, 2021

#### **Date of Report**

September 3, 2021

#### Contact

Zlatko Theodorovic, 916-263-1397

<u>zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov</u>

Fran Mueller, 916-263-5771

<u>fran.mueller@jud.ca.gov</u>

Leah Rose-Goodwin, 415-865-7708

leah.rose-goodwin@jud.ca.gov

## **Executive Summary**

The Judicial Branch Budget Committee recommends approval of two separate allocations from the \$60 million one-time COVID-driven caseload backlog funding included in the 2021 Budget Act based on the most recent filings and disposition data available for identifying backlog. This funding is for trial courts to specifically address backlogs and workload delays resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, with the funding available for expenditure or encumbrance through the 2022–23 fiscal year.

#### Recommendations

The Judicial Branch Budget Committee recommends that the Judicial Council:

1. Approve the updated data-driven methodology that utilizes both filings and dispositions by case type to calculate a clearance rate. This clearance rate is used to identify court backlogs for allocating the \$60 million one-time COVID-driven caseload backlog funding.

- 2. Allocate half of the funding, \$30 million, in October 2021 based on the most updated filings and clearance data available through March 2021.
- 3. Allocate the second half of the funding, \$30 million, in January 2022 based on the most recent filings and clearance data available at that time.
- 4. In the event there is future funding for COVID-driven caseload backlog, adopt the Trial Court Budget Committee recommendation to include complex case types (e.g., asbestos and complex) in the data used for the allocation methodology.

#### **Relevant Previous Council Action**

#### Prior year \$50 million one-time COVID-19 backlog funding

The 2020 Budget Act included \$50 million in one-time funding to assist courts in addressing the backlog of filings that had accumulated due to court closures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. These funds were eligible for expenditure or encumbrance for the 2020–21 fiscal year.

The first \$25 million was approved for allocation to all trial courts at the July 24, 2020 Judicial Council meeting, via pro rata based on courts' Workload Formula (Link A). At its January 22, 2021 business meeting, the Judicial Council approved an allocation methodology for distribution of the second \$25 million that was data driven, allocating funds proportionally based on each court's share of total statewide backlog. The backlog was measured using a weighted count of dispositions in the pre-pandemic period compared to a pandemic period (Link B). The net change in average dispositions from these two points of time was used to identify those courts eligible for funding. Proxies based on statewide averages were used in limited instances where courts were unable to report disposition data due to technical issues related to their case management systems.

One court, Sierra, did not receive funding as part of the data-driven methodology because they did not have a qualifying backlog as measured by the methodology. In addition, six courts returned funds that were not needed, and those funds were redistributed at the end of the 2020–21 fiscal year.<sup>1</sup>

#### Quarterly reporting

At its January 22, 2021 business meeting, the Judicial Council approved quarterly reporting by the trial courts on the progress in reducing the COVID-19 related backlog (Link B). The first quarterly report was provided to the council as an informational item at its July 9, 2021 business meeting (Link C). The report includes progress in reducing COVID-19 backlog from March 2020 to March 2021. Quarterly informational reporting on COVID-19 backlog progress will continue.

2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Includes Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, Napa, Plumas, and Trinity superior courts.

### Analysis/Rationale

Backlog caseload data was provided to the administration and Legislature to demonstrate the continued backlog funding need. This information formed the basis for the current funding augmentation.

Both the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) and the Judicial Branch Budget Committee (Budget Committee) propose using an updated funding methodology to allocate the one-time \$60 million backlog appropriation. The updated formula includes filings data by case type to determine the caseload clearance rate, which is measured by dividing dispositions by filings.<sup>2</sup> The data compares clearance rates from March to August 2019 (pre-pandemic) to those of March 2020 to March 2021, the total pandemic period through the most recent data reported by courts, and applies pre-pandemic clearance rates to pandemic filings less dispositions to identify the case types in which a backlog exists.

These identified areas of backlog for each court are then weighted by the caseweights used in the Resource Assessment Study model, and then each court's share of the backlog is used to determine the proportional allocation of funding. For those courts unable to report complete disposition and filings data for the time period noted, proxies were applied using statewide data trends to establish those courts' backlog for the purpose of allocating funds. However, proxydata use occurred rarely.

Case data collection by the branch will continue, and updated data will be evaluated to determine progress made by the trial courts in addressing the workload backlogs related to the pandemic. While complex case types including asbestos, complex civil, and Employment Development Department (Sacramento only) were excluded from the analysis due to insufficient 2019 data for those case types, these cases make up approximately 1 percent of case types. Future information about these matters will be included in the data should future funding for COVID-related backlog be received.

The outcome in applying available data through March 2021 to the allocation methodology is outlined in Attachment A. First, aggregate, non-weighted clearance rates are displayed as informational, followed by weighted clearance rates for backlog case types only. Next, total caseload is converted into minutes, weighted by case type, and displayed separately to show non-backlog caseloads, backlog caseloads, and the total. Only the backlog-weighted minutes are used to determine each courts' percentage of backlog. That multiplier is then applied to the first \$30 million and then allocated proportionally.

Branch wide data shows fluidity in the backlog situation. Given that courts are continuing to make progress in addressing COVID-related backlog, a two-phased allocation approach allows

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Case types include mental health certification, child support, civil-limited, civil-unlimited, conservatorship/guardianship, dissolution, domestic violence, estates/trusts, felony, infractions, juvenile delinquency, juvenile dependency, mental health, misdemeanor-nontraffic, misdemeanor-traffic, other family petition, parentage, small claims, and unlawful detainers.

for the most current backlog data available at the time of funds distribution. It also provides more time for data entry, reducing the amount of proxy data used.

### **Policy implications**

None.

#### Comments

No public comment received.

#### Alternatives considered

During the TCBAC meeting on August 5, 2021 (Link D), and the Budget Committee meeting on August 13, 2021 (Link E), two options were considered and discussed using court-specific backlog data and the underlying methodology to determine the timing of allocating the \$60 million this fiscal year:

- A. Split the \$60 million and allocate \$30 million in October 2021 based on data available through March 2021, and allocate the second \$30 million in January 2022 based on the most recent data available then. Given that courts are continuing to make progress in addressing the backlog, this option would allocate funding in two phases utilizing the most current backlog data available at the time of distribution.
- B. Adopt the TCBAC's approach by allocating the full \$60 million in October 2021 based on data available through March 2021, providing courts with the full allocation amount and allowing time to plan and spend accordingly.

The TCBAC recommended allocating the full \$60 million in one October 2021 distribution. The TCBAC members considered a one-time allocation that would allow for better fiscal planning and efficiency (e.g., begin staff hiring or reassignments). Providing a trial court its entire allocation at once takes away any guesswork in planning for the second half of 2021–22.

The Budget Committee weighed the TCBAC approach against an allocation methodology that accounted for the changing backlog landscape. By distributing the money in two installments, the branch more accurately applies funds to where the backlogs actually are based on the most current data. Moreover, to alleviate planning concerns, as soon as the data on which the January 2022 distribution becomes validated, that information can be released to the trial courts so they can begin further planning.

### Fiscal and Operational Impacts

If the recommendations to allocate the one-time \$60 million COVID-driven backlog funding are not approved, the fiscal and operational impacts to the trial courts will be consequential as it relates to courts' ability to continue progress in reducing COVID-19 related backlog.

#### **Attachments and Links**

- 1. Attachment A: \$30 Million COVID-Driven Caseload Backlog Funding
- 2. Link A: Judicial Council meeting report (July 24, 2020),

  https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8651228&GUID=27A3B6D8-9783-48658C5A-F6697EB58734; Judicial Council meeting minutes (July 24, 2020),
  https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=711582&GUID=90001AF2-7CEE-4F0F-906B-29A03ED9CB43
- 3. Link B: Judicial Council meeting report (Jan. 22, 2021),

   https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9054988&GUID=54812C82-983E-4812-848C-2F4FD9F6F97A; Judicial Council meeting minutes (Jan. 22, 2021),
   https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=M&ID=803674&GUID=B66B9C94-CE8A-41B1-8F5F-1BC9A3B278E1
- 4. Link C: Judicial Council meeting report (July 9, 2021),

   https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9499529&GUID=91D6ED5D-CF6F-42AA9788-E2D6D8C7AF3F
- 5. Link D: Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting report (Aug. 5, 2021), https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/tcbac-20210805-materials.pdf
- 6. Link E: Judicial Branch Budget Committee meeting report (Aug. 13, 2021), <a href="https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbbc-20210813-materials.pdf">https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jbbc-20210813-materials.pdf</a>

	AGGREGATE, NON - WEIGHTED INFORMATION									WEIGHTEDINFO				
	March to August 2019 (Pre Pandemic)					March 2020 to March 2021 (All Pandemic)						2019	2020	
Court	Filings	Dispositions	Average Monthly Filings	Average Monthly Dispositions	Overall Clearance Rate	Filings	Dispositions	Average Monthly Filings	Average Monthly Dispositions	Overall Clearance Rate	Clearance Rate Difference	Clearance for Casetypes w/ Backlog	Clearance for Casetypes w/ Backlog	Clearance Rate Difference
	А	В	С	D	E (D / C)	F	G	Н	1	J (I / H)	K (J - E)	L	М	N
Alameda*	131,197	115,480	21,866	19,247	88.0%	171,868	144,596	13,221	11,123	84.1%	-3.89%	87.6%	82.32%	-5.28%
Alpine	613	594	102	99	96.9%	1,022	1,010	79	78	98.8%	1.93%	100.9%	100.41%	-0.48%
Amador	4,057	3,032	676	505	74.7%	6,178	5,134	475	395	83.1%	8.37%	85.3%	66.25%	-19.10%
Butte	17,607	15,413	2,935	2,569	87.5%	26,337	24,048	2,026	1,850	91.3%	3.77%	97.2%	81.95%	-15.28%
Calaveras	2,981	2,573	497	429	86.3%	4,550	4,315	350	332	94.8%	8.52%	132.1%	114.45%	-17.64%
Colusa*	3,946	2,514	658	419	63.7%	3,529	4,077	271	314	115.5%	51.84%	77.8%	49.78%	-28.03%
Contra Costa	65,993	57,514	10,999	9,586	87.2%	81,492	82,571	6,269	6,352	101.3%	14.17%	84.4%	74.73%	-9.65%
Del Norte	4,006	7,721	668	1,287	192.7%	5,487	10,046	422	773	183.1%	-9.65%	198.6%	171.56%	-27.03%
El Dorado	10,584	6,754	1,764	1,126	63.8%	20,545	13,696	1,580	1,054	66.7%	2.85%	79.7%	70.49%	-9.16%
Fresno	90,354	85,144	15,059	14,191	94.2%	110,652	115,630	8,512	8,895	104.5%	10.26%	89.8%	69.07%	-20.77%
Glenn*	3,272	2,578	545	430	78.8%	3,273	1,459	252	112	44.6%	-34.20%	90.9%	73.69%	-17.20%
Humboldt*	14,159	11,612	2,360	1,935	82.0%	18,931	16,088	1,456	1,238	85.0%	2.97%	91.7%	74.08%	-17.67%
Imperial	27,017	25,065	4,503	4,178	92.8%	31,205	32,547	2,400	2,504	104.3%	11.53%	132.4%	98.74%	-33.67%
Inyo	5,301	4,805	884	801	90.6%	9,647	7,895	742	607	81.8%	-8.80%	92.3%	81.68%	-10.61%
Kern	93,207	82,100	15,535	13,683	88.1%	138,038	117,546	10,618	9,042	85.2%	-2.93%	87.0%	69.30%	-17.73%
Kings	14,978	12,113	2,496	2,019	80.9%	26,324	18,934	2,025	1,456	71.9%	-8.95%	86.3%	58.96%	-27.31%
Lake	6,381	6,406	1,064	1,068	100.4%	9,047	6,702	696	516	74.1%	-26.31%	177.7%	65.70%	-111.97%
Lassen*	3,910	3,356	652	559	85.8%	7,800 1,252,994	6,593	600	507	84.5%	-1.30%	163.2%	90.38%	-72.86%
Los Angeles	881,592 19,626	784,324 14,253	146,932	130,721 2,376	89.0% 72.6%	22,438	929,775	96,384 1,726	71,521 1,593	74.2% 92.3%	-14.76% 19.67%	89.4% 98.7%	71.18% 53.35%	-18.24% -45.35%
Madera Marin	22,539	23,185	3,271 3,757	3,864	102.9%	31,178	20,708 25,542	2,398	1,965	92.3% 81.9%	-20.94%	103.7%	82.37%	-45.35% -21.32%
-	2,246	1,759	3,737	293	78.3%	3,075	23,342	2,398	1,965	77.9%	-20.94%	84.2%	58.28%	-21.32%
Mariposa* Mendocino	11,379	9,957	1,897	1,660	87.5%	13,098	18,991	1,008	1,461	145.0%	57.49%	108.4%	88.56%	-19.83%
Merced*	29,207	23,169	4,868	3,861	79.3%	40,743	36,775	3,134	2,829	90.3%	10.93%	89.7%	65.25%	-19.85%
Modoc	1,080	1,036	180	173	95.9%	2,354	2,060	181	158	87.5%	-8.42%	134.2%	71.26%	-62.95%
Mono	4,283	3,954	714	659	92.3%	8,081	7,439	622	572	92.1%	-0.26%	94.4%	89.00%	-5.42%
Monterey	32,537	29,722	5,423	4,954	91.3%	56,393	49,888	4,338	3,838	88.5%	-2.88%	96.1%	89.32%	-6.76%
Napa*	9,898	10,113	1,650	1,685	102.2%	10,945	9,722	842	748	88.8%	-13.34%	106.7%	94.35%	-12.37%
Nevada	8,484	7,099	1,414	1,183	83.7%	13,187	12,724	1,014	979	96.5%	12.81%	93.1%	56.28%	-36.80%
Orange*	241,671	221,600	40,279	36,933	91.7%	213,387	291,423	16,414	22,417	136.6%	44.88%	92.5%	81.84%	-10.62%
Placer*	25,361	15,580	4,227	2,597	61.4%	34,430	21,149	2,648	1,627	61.4%	-0.01%	100.6%	77.74%	-22.88%
Plumas*	2,226	1,592	371	265	71.5%	3,153	3,386	243	260	107.4%	35.88%	87.4%	68.34%	-19.09%
Riverside*	179,440	164,595	29,907	27,433	91.7%	279,972	201,846	21,536	15,527	72.1%	-19.63%	93.9%	72.23%	-21.69%
Sacramento	150,492	67,824	25,082	11,304	45.1%	186,286	75,996	14,330	5,846	40.8%	-4.27%	77.9%	62.12%	-15.73%
San Benito	4,738	3,228	790	538	68.1%	5,099	4,041	392	311	79.3%	11.12%	101.8%	86.15%	-15.60%
San Bernardino*	162,852	161,242	27,142	26,874	99.0%	276,856	243,991	21,297	18,769	88.1%	-10.88%	100.5%	87.29%	-13.19%
San Diego	245,204	175,838	40,867	29,306	71.7%	292,943	205,270	22,534	15,790	70.1%	-1.64%	70.2%	66.8%	-3.38%
San Francisco*	54,575	57,156	9,096	9,526	104.7%	56,952	30,727	4,381	2,364	54.0%	-50.78%	115.8%	49.9%	-65.91%
San Joaquin*	71,219	48,567	11,870	8,095	68.2%	110,631	64,904	8,510	4,993	58.7%	-9.53%	69.5%	57.4%	-12.16%
San Luis Obispo	25,175	23,852	4,196	3,975	94.7%	36,102	30,249	2,777	2,327	83.8%	-10.96%	95.3%	84.2%	-11.06%
San Mateo	76,796	70,463	12,799	11,744	91.8%	92,043	83,012	7,080	6,386	90.2%	-1.57%	89.2%	65.9%	-23.29%

# \$30 Million COVID-Driven Caseload Backlog Funding<sup>1</sup> August 2021

	AGGREGATE, NON-						- WEIGHTED INFORMATION						WEIGHTEDINFO		
		March to Aug	e Pandemic)	P	March 2020 to I	March 2021	(All Pandemic)		2019	2020					
Court	Filings	Dispositions	Average Monthly Filings	Average Monthly Dispositions	Overall Clearance Rate	Filings	Dispositions	Average Monthly Filings	Average Monthly Dispositions	Overall Clearance Rate	Clearance Rate Difference	Clearance for Casetypes w/ Backlog	Clearance for Casetypes w/ Backlog	Clearance Rate Difference	
	А	В	С	D	E (D / C)	F	G	н	_	J (I / H)	K (J - E)	L	М	N	
Santa Barbara	38,337	36,045	6,390	6,008	94.0%	50,230	40,416	3,864	3,109	80.5%	-13.56%	96.2%	79.6%	-16.51%	
Santa Clara*	115,309	85,508	19,218	14,251	74.2%	84,343	96,938	6,488	7,457	114.9%	40.78%	85.0%	67.3%	-17.76%	
Santa Cruz	22,943	18,932	3,824	3,155	82.5%	30,663	27,336	2,359	2,103	89.1%	6.63%	114.9%	80.9%	-34.08%	
Shasta	21,503	19,735	3,584	3,289	91.8%	36,362	32,930	2,797	2,533	90.6%	-1.22%	94.0%	81.5%	-12.54%	
Sierra*	311	288	52	48	92.6%	491	460	38	35	93.7%	1.05%	104.1%	87.7%	-16.33%	
Siskiyou	7,475	5,791	1,246	965	77.5%	9,182	6,218	706	478	67.7%	-9.75%	83.8%	65.7%	-18.08%	
Solano	36,253	31,296	6,042	5,216	86.3%	62,603	49,036	4,816	3,772	78.3%	-8.00%	90.5%	74.7%	-15.87%	
Sonoma	32,635	44,631	5,439	7,439	136.8%	51,840	73,810	3,988	5,678	142.4%	5.62%	94.3%	55.2%	-39.12%	
Stanislaus	39,340	32,565	6,557	5,428	82.8%	59,409	45,519	4,570	3,501	76.6%	-6.16%	111.7%	70.4%	-41.25%	
Sutter*	10,178	8,624	1,696	1,437	84.7%	14,701	13,307	1,131	1,024	90.5%	5.78%	84.4%	67.7%	-16.68%	
Tehama	8,241	6,977	1,374	1,163	84.7%	11,615	10,013	893	770	86.2%	1.54%	88.7%	67.9%	-20.79%	
Trinity	1,678	1,515	280	253	90.3%	2,533	2,517	195	194	99.4%	9.08%	89.8%	52.5%	-37.25%	
Tulare	37,359	34,037	6,227	5,673	91.1%	59,709	52,266	4,593	4,020	87.5%	-3.57%	92.4%	66.8%	-25.56%	
Tuolumne*	5,021	4,731	837	789	94.2%	6,279	6,002	483	462	95.6%	1.37%	87.1%	64.0%	-23.12%	
Ventura	80,195	80,900	13,366	13,483	100.9%	103,760	91,211	7,982	7,016	87.9%	-12.97%	101.8%	84.9%	-16.93%	
Yolo	17,328	15,711	2,888	2,619	90.7%	21,255	17,750	1,635	1,365	83.5%	-7.16%	93.4%	82.3%	-11.10%	
Yuba	5,520	4,390	920	732	79.5%	9,591	6,663	738	513	69.5%	-10.06%	79.5%	65.6%	-14.00%	
	3,241,809	2,796,557	540,302	466,093	86.3%	4,332,830	3,557,292	333,295	273,638	82.1%	-4.16%	5739.7%	4387.3%	-1352.39%	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Includes Certification, Child Support, Civil - Limited, Civil - Unlimited, Conservatorship/Guardianship, Dissolution, Domestic Violence, Estates/Trusts, Felony, Infractions, Juvenile Delinquency, Juvenile Dependency, Mental Health, Misdemeanor - Non Traffic, Misdemeanor - Traffic, Other Family Petition, Parentage, Small Claims, and Unlawful Detainer.

Excludes Asbestos, Complex, and Employment Development Department (Sacramento Only) as data is not available for all periods; less than a 1 percent impact.

Floor courts
Cluster 1 courts

<sup>\*</sup>Proxy applied to some data.

#### \$30 Million COVID-Driven Caseload Backlog Funding August 2021

Court	Non-Backlog Weighted Minutes	All Pandemic Backlog Weighted Minutes	Total Caseload Weighted Minutes	All Pandemic Backlog Weighted Minutes	% of Backlog	First Half / \$30m Allocation
	О	Р	Q (O + P)	R (= P)	S (R / TOTAL R)	T (S * \$30m)
Alameda*	(1,184,571)	2,272,032	1,087,461	2,272,032	1.763%	\$528,921
Alpine	(9,722)	2,290	(7,432)	2,290	0.002%	533
Amador	(92,524)	74,735	(17,789)	74,735	0.058%	17,398
Butte	(755,179)	529,612	(225,567)	529,612	0.411%	123,292
Calaveras	(170,977)	70,171	(100,806)	70,171	0.054%	16,336
Colusa*	(171,999)	70,470	(101,529)	70,470	0.055%	16,405
Contra Costa	(1,883,986)	1,304,290	(579,696)	1,304,290	1.012%	303,634
Del Norte	(410,922)	275,086	(135,836)	275,086	0.213%	64,039
El Dorado	(361,150)	189,982	(171,169)	189,982	0.147%	44,227
Fresno	(1,609,470)	4,249,514	2,640,044	4,249,514	3.298%	989,272
Glenn*	(66,095)	158,135	92,040	158,135	0.123%	36,813
Humboldt*	(228,352)	587,683	359,331	587,683	0.456%	136,811
Imperial	(358,254)	972,580	614,326	972,580	0.755%	226,413
Inyo	(87,000)	142,181	55,182	142,181	0.110%	33,099
Kern	(1,011,452)	4,061,563	3,050,111	4,061,563	3.152%	945,517
Kings	(178,916)	1,536,600	1,357,684	1,536,600	1.192%	357,715
Lake	(31,130)	1,227,273	1,196,143	1,227,273	0.952%	285,705
Lassen*	(42,751)	455,049	412,298	455,049	0.353%	105,934
Los Angeles	(5,178,726)	32,241,900	27,063,174	32,241,900	25.019%	7,505,801
Madera	(443,526)	1,698,754	1,255,228	1,698,754	1.318%	395,464
Marin	(97,345)	1,093,269	995,924	1,093,269	0.848%	254,509
Mariposa*	(74,505)	78,445	3,940	78,445	0.061%	18,262
Mendocino	(1,538,436)	210,006	(1,328,430)	210,006	0.163%	48,889
Merced*	(788,832)	1,029,325	240,493	1,029,325	0.799%	239,623
Modoc	(8,443)	217,343	208,900	217,343	0.169%	50,597
Mono	(168,203)	92,048	(76,155)	92,048	0.071%	21,429
Monterey	(747,802)	535,045	(212,757)	535,045	0.415%	124,557
Napa*	(114,460)	431,047	316,587	431,047	0.334%	100,346
Nevada	(223,147)	416,297	193,150	416,297	0.323%	96,912
Orange*	(4,930,899)	8,098,597	3,167,699	8,098,597	6.284%	1,885,325
Placer*	(250,959)	651,442	400,483	651,442	0.506%	151,653
Plumas*	(78,760)	51,682	(27,079)	51,682	0.040%	12,031
Riverside*	(2,347,550)	7,000,753	4,653,203	7,000,753	5.433%	1,629,751
Sacramento	(1,093,089)	5,931,305	4,838,217	5,931,305	4.603%	1,380,787
San Benito	(248,356)	124,092	(124,264)	124,092	0.096%	28,888
San Bernardino*	(1,317,357)	12,630,254	11,312,898	12,630,254	9.801%	2,940,279
San Diego	(1,324,872)	6,832,170	5,507,298	6,832,170	5.302%	1,590,505
San Francisco*	(1,271,928)	1,828,604	556,675	1,828,604	1.419%	425,692
San Joaquin*	(1,674,653)	1,146,534	(528,119)	1,146,534	0.890%	266,909
San Luis Obispo	(192,356)	1,522,064	1,329,708	1,522,064	1.181%	354,331
San Mateo	(620,461)	2,935,370	2,314,909	2,935,370	2.278%	683,344

#### \$30 Million COVID-Driven Caseload Backlog Funding August 2021

Court	Non-Backlog Weighted Minutes	All Pandemic Backlog Weighted Minutes	Total Caseload Weighted Minutes	All Pandemic Backlog Weighted Minutes	% of Backlog	First Half / \$30m Allocation
	О	Р	Q (O + P)	R (= P)	S (R / TOTAL R)	T (S * \$30m)
Santa Barbara	(370,921)	1,485,667	1,114,747	1,485,667	1.153%	345,858
Santa Clara*	(3,086,704)	2,997,247	(89,457)	2,997,247	2.326%	697,749
Santa Cruz	(1,003,645)	935,843	(67,802)	935,843	0.726%	217,861
Shasta	(203,363)	961,048	757,685	961,048	0.746%	223,729
Sierra*	(42,903)	20,064	(22,839)	20,064	0.016%	4,671
Siskiyou	(190,895)	284,600	93,704	284,600	0.221%	66,254
Solano	(1,244,832)	1,778,422	533,590	1,778,422	1.380%	414,010
Sonoma	(878,811)	2,715,869	1,837,058	2,715,869	2.107%	632,245
Stanislaus	(357,422)	3,734,267	3,376,845	3,734,267	2.898%	869,324
Sutter*	(177,513)	412,581	235,069	412,581	0.320%	96,048
Tehama	(141,968)	587,481	445,513	587,481	0.456%	136,763
Trinity	(27,883)	297,252	269,368	297,252	0.231%	69,199
Tulare	(627,876)	2,507,612	1,879,736	2,507,612	1.946%	583,763
Tuolumne*	(146,061)	576,310	430,249	576,310	0.447%	134,163
Ventura	(1,486,907)	3,523,832	2,036,926	3,523,832	2.734%	820,336
Yolo	(215,107)	551,154	336,048	551,154	0.428%	128,307
Yuba	(173,177)	523,082	349,906	523,082	0.406%	121,772
	(43,765,100)	128,867,922	85,102,822	128,867,922	100.000%	\$30,000,000