



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

Report Type

Action Required

Effective Date

July 18, 2025

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

June 24, 2025

Recommended by

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

Contact

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

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 ^c
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., <i>Trial Court Budget: Allocation Methodology of \$72.2 Million Trial Court Funding in Governor’s Proposed 2021–22 Budget</i> (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., <i>Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for 2022–23</i> (June 28, 2022), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11018996&GUID=EFC36BA3-294F-4DC3-8C7E-1AC030ED7B72 . ^c Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., <i>Trial Court Budget: Allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund and Trial Court Allocations for 2023–24</i> (June 23, 2023), https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12124713&GUID=2A166CFF-E318-4E77-AA91-C06AE38FD2FC2 .		

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:

1. 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.
2. 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 TCBCAC 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>.

5. 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
7. 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-A1EC-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.&lawCode=GOV

Trial Court Funding and Workload Formula Resource Guide

February 2025



Judicial Council of California

Table of Contents

Background	3
<i>Trial Court Allocations Before 2013.....</i>	<i>5</i>
Implementation of the Workload-Based Allocation Funding Methodology.....	6
Implementation of the Workload Formula	7
Implementation Adjustments and Refinements	9
<i>Base Funding Floor Courts</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Definition and Impact of “New Money”</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Allocations in Fiscal Years with “No New Money”.....</i>	<i>11</i>
Funding Reduction Methodology	12
<i>Reduction in Fiscal Year 2020–21.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Reduction in Fiscal Year 2022–23.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Reduction in Fiscal Year 2024–25.....</i>	<i>13</i>
Recent Funding to Support Equity	14
<i>Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2018–19.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Funding Provided in Fiscal Year 2022–23.....</i>	<i>14</i>
Resource Assessment Study Implementation	15
<i>RAS Policies and Methodology</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Converting FTE to Dollars.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>RAS Model Overview.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Cluster Model.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Cluster Model Background</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Cluster Model Use in RAS/Workload Formula.....</i>	<i>19</i>
Library of Definitions.....	20
<i>Terms</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Acronyms.....</i>	<i>23</i>

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 counties 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 XIII B 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.

WAFM Five-Year Implementation

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

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

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

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:

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

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-20240501-materialspdf.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

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

$$\text{Total Need (FTE)} = \text{Staff Need} + \text{Manager Need} + \text{Administrative Staff Need}$$

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:

$$\text{Staff Need (FTE)} = \frac{\text{Average Filings} * \text{Caseweight (mins.)}}{\text{Staff Year Value (mins.)}} + \text{Court Reporter Need}$$

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:

$$\text{Manager Need (FTE)} = \frac{\text{Staff Need (FTE)} + \text{Court Interpreters (FTE)}}{\text{Cluster Ratio}}$$

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.

$$\text{Administrative Staff Need (FTE)} = \frac{(\text{Staff Need (FTE)} + \text{Manager Need (FTE)}) + \text{Non-RAS FTE}}{\text{Cluster Ratio}}$$

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

Court	FY 2024-25 Ending Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation	FY 2024-25 ONGOING BASE ADJUSTMENTS		FY 2024-25 Adjusted Ending TCTF Ongoing Base Allocation	FY 2025-26 ONGOING BASE ALLOCATIONS					OTHER ONE-TIME TCTF ALLOCATIONS							FY 2025-26 BASE ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENTS						FY 2025-26 Total TCTF Base Allocation
		General Ledger (GL) 812110			GL 812110					GL 812110							GL 812110						
		FY 2024-25 Initial Reduction of \$96.982 million	FY 2024-25 Revised Reduction of \$55.642 million after \$41.34 million Restoration		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	
A	B	C	D (A-B+C)	E	F	G	H	I (E:H)	J	K	L	M	N	O	P (J:O)	Q	R	S	T	U	V (P:U)	W (D+I+O+V)	
Alameda	87,078,862	(4,324,870)	(2,884,769)	88,518,962			1,424,956	(27,296)	1,397,660	-	187,647				187,647	-	1,356		-	-	1,356	90,105,625	
Alpine	894,531	-	-	894,531			15,512	5,840	21,352	-	-				-	9,409	-		-	-	9,409	925,292	
Amador	4,206,279	(167,223)	(95,942)	4,277,561			69,594	181,313	250,907	5,790	7,098				12,888	-	70		-	-	70	4,541,426	
Butte	14,080,619	(583,710)	(360,287)	14,304,042	(157,896)		220,838	232,088	295,030	15,210	106,023				121,233	-	210		-	-	210	14,720,514	
Calaveras	3,331,021	(111,187)	(53,833)	3,388,376			53,213	47,902	101,114	791	6,654				7,445	-	52		-	-	52	3,496,987	
Colusa	2,380,354	(94,059)	(53,965)	2,420,448			39,553	51,781	91,334	-	9,759				9,759	-	39		-	-	39	2,521,581	
Contra Costa	49,324,107	(1,738,846)	(841,887)	50,221,066			832,188	581,122	1,413,311	-	86,060				86,060	-	801		-	-	801	51,721,238	
Del Norte	3,687,521	(138,333)	(79,366)	3,746,487			72,011	61,470	133,481	-	14,195				14,195	-	60		-	-	60	3,894,224	
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	9,909,689	
Fresno	59,232,238	(3,029,033)	(2,020,422)	60,240,849			1,016,828	58,311	1,075,139	75,930	238,662				314,592	-	966		-	-	966	61,631,545	
Glenn	2,952,674	(115,557)	(66,299)	3,001,932			48,184	130,265	178,449	1,230	8,207				9,437	-	49		-	-	49	3,189,867	
Humboldt	8,115,475	(425,808)	(284,022)	8,257,261		14,109	143,344	355,151	512,605	12,250	43,030				55,280	-	132		-	-	132	8,825,277	
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	10,330,053	
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	2,676,363	
Kern	60,340,513	(3,142,777)	(2,096,291)	61,386,998	(753,733)		1,067,196	(645,733)	(332,270)	38,700	254,410				293,110	-	985		-	-	985	61,348,824	
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	11,163,128	
Lake	5,194,262	(171,163)	(82,871)	5,282,554		68,018	81,916	47,172	197,106	-	9,759				9,759	-	80		-	-	80	5,489,499	
Lassen	2,689,655	(92,113)	(52,849)	2,728,920			41,553	21,235	62,787	4,241	12,199				16,441	-	41		-	-	41	2,808,188	
Los Angeles	698,845,807	(28,238,886)	(16,201,647)	710,883,046			11,498,318	5,276,310	16,774,628	-	2,875,473				2,875,473	-	11,022		-	-	11,022	730,544,169	
Madera	11,862,930	(495,278)	(284,158)	12,074,049			204,038	37,734	241,772	-	50,793				50,793	-	189		-	-	189	12,366,803	
Marin	12,943,444	(474,469)	(229,721)	13,188,192	(163,065)		227,075	94,157	158,167	42,540	21,959				64,499	-	214		-	-	214	13,411,071	
Mariposa	1,811,111	(65,897)	(37,808)	1,839,201			29,947	7,024	36,971	-	3,549				3,549	-	29		-	-	29	1,879,750	
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	7,913,172	
Merced	15,461,130	(651,946)	(374,045)	15,739,032			265,979	99,904	365,882	13,095	56,560				69,655	-	254		-	-	254	16,174,823	
Modoc	1,276,235	(52,864)	(30,330)	1,298,769			22,109	(11,528)	10,581	776	4,436				5,212	-	21		-	-	21	1,314,583	
Mono	2,238,360	(72,775)	(41,754)	2,269,382			38,823	16,107	54,930	-	444				444	-	37		-	-	37	2,324,792	
Monterey	26,100,772	(1,019,502)	(584,924)	26,535,349	(307,111)		419,107	355,193	467,189	-	45,914				45,914	-	400		-	-	400	27,048,851	
Napa	9,198,115	(319,738)	(154,806)	9,363,047			153,022	138,857	291,879	14,590	39,481				54,071	-	147		-	-	147	9,709,145	
Nevada	7,184,669	(221,442)	(107,214)	7,298,896			105,979	90,773	196,752	-	11,312				11,312	-	103		-	-	103	7,507,063	
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	187,076,799	
Placer	24,682,490	(976,477)	(560,239)	25,098,728			400,741	331,352	732,093	24,920	34,602				59,522	-	384		-	-	384	25,890,727	
Plumas	1,817,224	(58,157)	(33,367)	1,842,015			30,475	-	30,475	2,448	2,218				4,666	-	29		-	-	29	1,877,184	
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	144,339,941	
Sacramento	104,226,967	(3,701,694)	(1,792,227)	106,136,433		761,962	1,771,581	(671,038)	1,862,505	43,920	166,353			2,674,000	2,884,273	-	1,637		-	-	1,637	110,884,849	
San Benito	4,583,477	(149,818)	(85,956)	4,647,339			76,775	122,760	199,536	-	10,425				10,425	-	74		-	-	74	4,857,373	
San Bernardino	137,828,637	(4,579,894)	(2,217,420)	140,191,111		647,296	2,191,8																

Court	FY 2025-26 OTHER NON-TCTF BASE ALLOCATIONS		FY 2025-26 Total Base Allocation	FY 2025-26 NON-BASE ALLOCATIONS						FY 2025-26 Trial Court Allocation
	GL 816111	GL 816111		GL 812167	GL 832010	GL 834010	GL 834010	GL 832012		
	General Fund Employee Benefits	General Fund Pretrial Funding (Ongoing)		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)	AG (Z+AF)
Alameda	3,102,046		93,207,671	424,792	1,017,456	5,803,556	(710)		7,245,094	100,452,765
Alpine	20,340		945,632	2,034	34,711	545	-		37,290	982,922
Amador	51,756		4,593,182	11,006	57,922	65,956	-		134,884	4,728,066
Butte	124,077		14,844,591	59,332	155,943	292,326	-		507,601	15,352,193
Calaveras	50,506		3,547,493	18,652	60,856	44,059	-		123,568	3,671,061
Colusa	24,773		2,546,354	13,708	46,982	129,857	-		190,547	2,736,901
Contra Costa	1,396,191		53,117,429	218,186	722,449	3,179,424	2,674		4,122,734	57,240,162
Del Norte	94,130		3,988,354	11,208	50,173	29,107	-		90,487	4,078,842
El Dorado	213,120		10,122,809	54,374	147,338	254,469	-		456,182	10,578,990
Fresno	3,340,363		64,971,908	181,080	636,326	2,761,001	5,581		3,583,988	68,555,896
Glenn	54,665		3,244,532	19,264	51,119	164,755	-		235,138	3,479,669
Humboldt	73,084		8,898,361	48,160	114,410	104,638	(89)		267,118	9,165,480
Imperial	125,539		10,455,592	67,678	140,935	776,427	1,913		986,954	11,442,546
Inyo	75,586		2,751,949	30,402	45,295	62,766	-		138,463	2,890,412
Kern	3,544,268		64,893,092	277,328	575,261	3,978,884	(21,432)		4,810,042	69,703,134
Kings	45,118		11,208,246	57,026	124,210	718,467	1,502		901,205	12,109,450
Lake	9,123		5,498,622	20,328	74,100	181,273	-		275,701	5,745,323
Lassen	7,839		2,816,027	20,156	51,816	57,432	-		129,403	2,974,431
Los Angeles	18,887,968		749,432,137	3,144,530	5,905,041	38,440,901	132,673		47,623,144	797,055,282
Madera	384,825		12,751,628	52,502	127,752	892,962	(275)		1,072,940	13,824,568
Marin	644,511		14,055,582	114,766	186,887	826,273	5,851		1,133,778	15,189,360
Mariposa	22,301		1,902,051	3,904	44,141	58,533	-		106,577	2,008,628
Mendocino	311,771		8,224,943	30,068	87,604	572,474	251		690,397	8,915,340
Merced	774,827		16,949,650	55,652	203,166	1,231,933	2,601		1,493,352	18,443,001
Modoc	31,967		1,346,550	6,134	39,130	4,872	-		50,136	1,396,686
Mono	85,641		2,410,433	12,446	41,913	72,961	-		127,320	2,537,753
Monterey	277,496		27,326,347	183,464	292,214	1,763,444	18,946		2,258,068	29,584,416
Napa	309,795		10,018,940	30,550	115,118	864,961	4,631		1,015,260	11,034,200
Nevada	95,495		7,602,558	49,946	94,368	106,633	48		250,995	7,853,553
Orange	6,929,920		194,006,719	923,882	1,915,066	9,525,851	27,984		12,392,784	206,399,502
Placer	634,796		26,525,523	77,378	277,721	943,385	459		1,298,942	27,824,465
Plumas	14,929		1,892,113	9,206	45,425	2,758	-		57,389	1,949,502
Riverside	923,656		145,263,597	532,226	1,484,060	7,221,038	(276,310)		8,961,014	154,224,612
Sacramento	3,560,591		114,445,440	340,254	973,583	5,248,982	(18,650)		6,544,169	120,989,609
San Benito	34,642		4,892,015	14,700	72,920	161,127	-		248,746	5,140,761
San Bernardino	1,264,732		146,419,271	435,474	1,335,608	6,680,109	45,670		8,496,861	154,916,132
San Diego	2,853,598		183,097,236	718,442	1,989,883	6,942,231	(12,284)		9,638,272	192,735,508
San Francisco	5,487,134		65,587,665	272,528	535,395	4,683,132	28,629		5,519,684	71,107,348
San Joaquin	1,245,356		51,620,873	201,698	501,401	2,198,348	2,388		2,903,835	54,524,708
San Luis Obispo	298,957		19,202,371	130,020	200,629	855,166	2,643		1,188,458	20,390,830
San Mateo	2,411,112		46,006,582	329,518	477,779	3,567,242	22,313		4,396,851	50,403,434
Santa Barbara	1,597,661		29,029,553	162,858	298,093	3,117,814	12,062		3,590,827	32,620,380
Santa Clara	2,309,466		94,895,772	452,782	1,164,067	6,748,121	-		8,364,970	103,260,741
Santa Cruz	203,558		16,492,460	113,210	191,965	1,026,564	(749)		1,330,990	17,823,450
Shasta	262,221		21,436,044	44,394	141,669	575,601	-		761,665	22,197,708
Sierra	9,616		913,011	1,830	35,916	586	-		38,332	951,343
Siskiyou	91,038		4,683,119	37,000	60,085	69,509	-		166,594	4,849,712
Solano	353,778		30,408,007	119,364	300,389	888,676	6,950		1,315,379	31,723,387
Sonoma	1,172,049		32,498,569	119,004	321,108	1,911,664	3,971		2,355,748	34,854,317
Stanislaus	1,305,229		32,387,547	88,718	361,215	1,743,675	1,324		2,194,932	34,582,479
Sutter	159,761		8,558,437	37,382	93,002	313,817	-		444,201	9,002,638
Tehama	108,184		5,919,895	28,100	72,678	252,013	1,443		354,234	6,274,129
Trinity	53,679		2,627,653	7,648	43,538	66,692	-		117,878	2,745,531
Tulare	33,744		34,134,320	204,932	316,908	2,729,518	7,241		3,258,600	37,392,920
Tuolumne	50,352		5,361,098	16,642	66,713	75,628	-		158,983	5,520,080
Ventura	968,752		45,982,640	205,304	530,521	2,909,263	21,191		3,666,279	49,648,919
Yolo	210,076		16,884,323	48,556	164,970	718,369	3,748		935,643	17,819,967
Yuba	90,867		6,715,920	15,788	83,056	98,044	-		196,888	6,912,809
Unallocated	-	48,950,000	116,993,700	-	-	-	-	186,700,000	186,700,000	303,693,700
Total	68,818,575	48,950,000	2,718,554,137	10,907,514	25,300,000	134,715,810	34,190	186,700,000	357,657,514	3,076,211,651

¹ Benefits funding reflects actual cost changes as identified by the court and is fiscally neutral.

Court	FY 2024-25 Adjusted Ending Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation	General Fund Employee Benefits	Total Base Allocation	FY 2024-25 NON-BASE ADJUSTMENTS USED TO CALCULATE WORKLOAD ALLOCATION			FY 2024-25 BASE ADJUSTMENTS USED TO CALCULATE WORKLOAD ALLOCATION		
				Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics	2% Automation Replacement	Self-Help	Security Base Adjustment	Subordinate Judicial Officer (SJO) Adjustment	Total Workload Formula Related Adjustments
	A	B	C (A+B)	D	E	F	G	H	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	50,221,066	1,396,191	51,617,257	74,666	218,186	722,449	-	(898,176)	117,126
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)	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)	-	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	15,739,032	774,827	16,513,859	15,053	55,652	203,166	-	(379,594)	(105,724)
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	12,446	41,913	(25,502)	-	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	49,265,691	1,245,356	50,511,047	52,691	201,698	501,401	(303,783)	(1,188,653)	(736,645)
San Luis Obispo	18,431,963	298,957	18,730,920	14,609	130,020	200,629	(255,144)	(560,547)	(470,434)
San Mateo	41,749,337	2,411,112	44,160,449	12,738	329,518	477,779	(467,732)	(1,216,658)	(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	5,684,715	108,184	5,792,899	1,258	28,100	72,678	-	(9,409)	92,626
Trinity	2,473,755	53,679	2,527,434	693	7,648	43,538	(543,614)	-	(491,735)
Tulare	32,552,742	33,744	32,586,486	24,586	204,932	316,908	(16,444)	(599,927)	(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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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.

Court	WORKLOAD ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENTS											WORKLOAD ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENTS						WORKLOAD FORMULA		FOR DISPLAY ONLY
	FY 2025-26 Beginning Workload Allocation	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Fiscal Neutral Offset	Change in Revenue Collected	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Current Methodology	Revenue Collected	Proposed Reallocation (Fiscal Neutral)		Proposed Inflationary Adjustment	FY 2025-26 Workload Allocation (Prior to Implementing Funding Floor)	FY 2025-26 Workload Funding Floor Adjustment				FY 2025-26 Final Workload Allocation	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula	Workload Formula Percentage	FY 2025-26 Civil Assessment Backfill Debt Obligations	
		Reduction for SJO Conversion	SJO Adjustment (Change from Prior Year)	Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics (Change from Prior Year)	FY 2025-25 Non-Interpreter Benefit Cost Change Funding	Criminal Justice Realignment	All Other Applicable Revenue Sources ¹	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)		Applied Funding Floor	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Percentage Share of Adjustment	Adjustment Allocation					
J (C+I)	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T (J+S)	U	V	W	X	Y (T+V+X)	Z	AA (Y/Z)	AB		
Alameda	87,408,586	-	(73,975)	32,861	(27,296)	187,647	2,174,774	-	-	1,424,956	91,127,553			3.55%	1,356	91,128,909	104,992,974	86.80%	-	
Alpine	951,647	-	-	(0)	5,840	-	11,592	-	-	15,512	984,591	994,000	9,409	-	-	994,000	603,134	164.81%	-	
Amador	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%	-	
Butte	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%	-	
Calaveras	3,383,275	-	(10,745)	133	47,902	6,654	15,755	-	-	53,213	3,496,186			0.14%	52	3,496,238	3,606,402	96.95%	-	
Colusa	2,506,251	-	-	46	51,781	9,759	12,290	-	-	39,553	2,619,681			0.10%	39	2,619,720	2,856,438	91.71%	-	
Contra Costa	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%	-	
Del Norte	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%	-	
El Dorado	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%	-	
Fresno	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%	500,000	
Glenn	3,117,123	-	-	58	130,265	8,207	9,920	-	-	48,184	3,313,757			0.13%	49	3,313,806	3,597,431	92.12%	-	
Humboldt	8,169,539	-	(12,882)	295	355,151	43,030	136,056	-	14,109	143,344	8,848,642			0.34%	132	8,848,774	10,588,607	83.57%	-	
Imperial	10,074,120	-	(8,976)	2,204	35,817	37,485	95,474	(272,686)	-	163,060	10,126,499			0.39%	151	10,126,650	9,089,531	111.41%	-	
Inyo	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%	-	
Kern	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%	-	
Kings	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%	-	
Lake	5,112,562	-	(3,004)	152	47,172	9,759	41,455	-	68,018	81,916	5,358,030			0.21%	80	5,358,110	6,801,779	78.78%	-	
Lassen	2,449,981	-	23,974	51	21,235	12,199	180,150	-	-	41,553	2,729,144			0.11%	41	2,729,185	3,011,499	90.63%	-	
Los 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	855,155,403	86.64%	-	
Madera	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%	-	
Marin	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%	-	
Mariposa	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%	-	
Mendocino	7,795,912	-	-	946	78,744	107,353	83,438	(83,176)	-	123,508	8,106,725			0.32%	121	8,106,845	8,317,612	97.47%	-	
Merced	16,408,135	-	(16,421)	3,928	99,904	56,560	240,654	-	-	265,979	17,058,738			0.66%	254	17,058,992	19,764,231	86.31%	310,000	
Modoc	1,375,449	-	-	62	(11,528)	4,436	11,437	-	-	22,109	1,401,965			0.05%	21	1,401,986	1,631,239	85.95%	-	
Mono	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%	-	
Monterey	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%	-	
Napa	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%	-	
Nevada	6,673,453	-	(36,937)	224	90,773															

FY 2025-26 Funding Reallocation using Updated FY 2025-26 Need (2017 caseweights)

Attachment D

Court	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Allocation	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula (need)	FY 2025-26 Workload Formula Percentage
Alpine	969,079	603,134	160.67%
Sierra	1,026,110	723,743	141.78%
Mono	2,457,821	1,832,353	134.13%
Imperial	10,236,124	9,089,531	112.61%
San Francisco	66,053,982	66,337,381	99.57%
San Benito	4,868,154	5,017,536	97.02%
Mendocino	8,066,393	8,317,612	96.98%
Del Norte	3,989,542	4,143,558	96.28%
Plumas	1,921,905	2,004,526	95.88%
Mariposa	1,893,744	1,977,763	95.75%
Calaveras	3,442,973	3,606,402	95.47%
Amador	4,639,043	5,054,637	91.78%
Kings	10,981,895	11,991,986	91.58%
Sonoma	31,473,095	34,423,117	91.43%
Shasta	18,633,871	20,395,958	91.36%
Glenn	3,265,573	3,597,431	90.78%
Inyo	2,607,427	2,879,445	90.55%
Colusa	2,580,128	2,856,438	90.33%
Tuolumne	5,169,280	5,735,494	90.13%
Lassen	2,687,591	3,011,499	89.24%
Trinity	2,131,883	2,390,644	89.18%
Butte	14,054,331	15,789,599	89.01%
Santa Cruz	16,548,141	18,753,968	88.24%
Marin	14,306,837	16,306,453	87.74%
Kern	65,916,037	75,373,265	87.45%
Monterey	26,748,064	30,711,141	87.10%
San Luis Obispo	19,003,954	22,140,370	85.83%
Yolo	16,036,625	18,710,200	85.71%
Santa Clara	95,052,476	111,142,739	85.52%
Ventura	44,499,632	52,081,213	85.44%
Alameda	89,702,597	104,992,974	85.44%
San Diego	178,804,354	209,284,736	85.44%
Solano	29,537,461	34,597,881	85.37%
Los Angeles	729,433,093	855,155,403	85.30%
San Joaquin	50,541,968	59,364,538	85.14%
Merced	16,792,759	19,764,231	84.97%
Modoc	1,379,856	1,631,239	84.59%
Fresno	63,899,171	75,545,290	84.58%
Tehama	5,966,300	7,072,339	84.36%
Nevada	6,785,538	8,091,168	83.86%
Santa Barbara	27,489,694	32,795,371	83.82%
Madera	12,470,354	14,889,330	83.75%
Siskiyou	4,483,052	5,361,696	83.61%
Orange	190,017,107	227,825,418	83.40%
Napa	9,755,742	11,751,146	83.02%
Contra Costa	52,980,767	63,851,865	82.97%
Placer	25,412,235	30,658,907	82.89%
Humboldt	8,691,189	10,588,607	82.08%
El Dorado	10,072,551	12,459,721	80.84%
Riverside	140,295,367	173,663,361	80.79%
San Bernardino	138,065,468	171,870,209	80.33%
San Mateo	44,512,059	55,569,237	80.10%
Sacramento	107,542,661	135,509,115	79.36%
Sutter	8,268,366	10,543,011	78.43%
Tulare	33,302,707	43,083,921	77.30%
Lake	5,208,096	6,801,779	76.57%
Yuba	6,537,411	8,867,754	73.72%
Stanislaus	31,564,349	42,870,299	73.63%
Total:	2,530,773,982	2,991,459,680	84.60%

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)
969,079			160.67%	0.00%
1,026,110			141.78%	0.00%
2,457,821			134.13%	0.00%
9,963,439	(272,686)		109.61%	-3.00%
65,390,609	(663,374)		98.57%	-1.00%
4,868,154			97.02%	0.00%
7,983,217	(83,176)		95.98%	-1.00%
3,989,542			96.28%	0.00%
1,921,905			95.88%	0.00%
1,893,744			95.75%	0.00%
3,442,973			95.47%	0.00%
4,639,043			91.78%	0.00%
10,861,975	(119,920)		90.58%	-1.00%
31,128,864	(344,231)		90.43%	-1.00%
18,429,911	(203,960)		90.36%	-1.00%
3,265,573			90.78%	0.00%
2,607,427			90.55%	0.00%
2,580,128			90.33%	0.00%
5,111,925	(57,355)		89.13%	-1.00%
2,687,591			89.24%	0.00%
2,131,883			89.18%	0.00%
13,896,435	(157,896)		88.01%	-1.00%
16,360,601	(187,540)		87.24%	-1.00%
14,143,772	(163,065)		86.74%	-1.00%
65,162,304	(753,733)		86.45%	-1.00%
26,440,953	(307,111)		86.10%	-1.00%
19,003,954			85.83%	0.00%
16,036,625			85.71%	0.00%
95,052,476			85.52%	0.00%
44,499,632			85.44%	0.00%
89,702,597			85.44%	0.00%
178,804,354			85.44%	0.00%
29,537,461			85.37%	0.00%
729,433,093			85.30%	0.00%
50,541,968			85.14%	0.00%
16,792,759			84.97%	0.00%
1,379,856			84.59%	0.00%
63,899,171			84.58%	0.00%
5,966,300			84.36%	0.00%
6,785,538			83.86%	0.00%
27,489,694			83.82%	0.00%
12,470,354			83.75%	0.00%
4,483,052			83.61%	0.00%
190,017,107			83.40%	0.00%
9,755,742			83.02%	0.00%
52,980,767			82.97%	0.00%
25,412,235			82.89%	0.00%
8,705,298		14,109	82.21%	0.13%
10,109,104		36,553	81.13%	0.29%
140,819,632		524,264	81.09%	0.30%
138,712,765		647,296	80.71%	0.38%
44,743,960		231,901	80.52%	0.42%
108,304,623		761,962	79.92%	0.56%
8,350,089		81,723	79.20%	0.78%
33,733,546		430,839	78.30%	1.00%
5,276,114		68,018	77.57%	1.00%
6,626,088		88,678	74.72%	1.00%
31,993,052		428,703	74.63%	1.00%
2,530,773,982	(3,314,046)	3,314,046	84.60%	0.00%

This is **not** the final statewide average percentage.
After all calculations the final statewide percentage
is 85.9% as noted in Attachment D.

Floor courts (2)
Cluster 1 courts (13)
Courts in the band (21)
Contributing courts (12)
Recipient courts (11)

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

Attachment E

#	Program Name	Program Number	Office	FY 2024-25 Allocations			Recommended FY 2025-26 Allocations			\$\$ Change from FY 2024-25	% Change from FY 2024-25
				State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Approved Allocations	State Operations	Local Assistance	Total Proposed Allocations		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G (E + F)	H	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 Allocations			\$ 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				E	F	G (E + F)	H	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
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 Allocations				\$ 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 Program		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)	H	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 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS			ESTIMATES	
Description		2021-22 (Financial Statements)	2022-23 (Financial Statements)	2023-24 (Financial Statements)	2024-25	2025-26
#	A	B	C	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	Program 0150028 - Assigned Judges	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	Program 0150075 - Grants	9,426,000	29,840,000	29,840,016	30,329,000	10,329,000
13	Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	14,944,000	13,750,000	13,018,675	27,937,000	23,299,000
14	Total Local Assistance	3,005,152,000	3,294,437,242	3,470,358,714	3,498,267,451	3,528,900,451
15	<i>FISCAL Assessment</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>	<i>174,000</i>
16	<i>Pro Rata/State Ops</i>	<i>209,861</i>	<i>184,733</i>	<i>91,623</i>	<i>77,000</i>	<i>207,000</i>
17	<i>Supplemental Pension Payments</i>	<i>76,000</i>	<i>76,000</i>	<i>30,116</i>		
18	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	-	-	-		
19	Total Expenditures (includes State Ops and LA)	3,008,830,027	3,298,030,152	3,473,948,449	3,502,537,451	3,533,773,451
20	<i>Unallocated</i>					
21	<i>Less Funding Provided by General Fund:</i>	<i>1,843,395,000</i>	<i>2,178,493,000</i>	<i>2,326,506,000</i>	<i>2,056,834,000</i>	<i>2,242,369,000</i>
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	Total Restricted/Reserved Funds	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

Court	FY 2024-25 Ending Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation	FY 2024-25 ONGOING BASE ADJUSTMENTS		FY 2024-25 Adjusted Ending TCTF Ongoing Base Allocation	FY 2025-26 ONGOING BASE ALLOCATIONS					OTHER ONE-TIME TCTF ALLOCATIONS							FY 2025-26 BASE ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENTS						FY 2025-26 Total TCTF Base Allocation
		General Ledger (GL) 812110			GL 812110					GL 812110							GL 812110						
		FY 2024-25 Initial Reduction of \$96.982 million	FY 2024-25 Revised Reduction of \$55.642 million after \$41.34 million Restoration		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	
A	B	C	D (A-B+C)	E	F	G	H	I (E+H)	J	K	L	M	N	O	P (J+O)	Q	R	S	T	U	V (P+U)	W (D+I+O+V)	
Alameda	87,078,862	(4,324,870)	(2,884,769)	88,518,962		1,424,956	(27,296)	1,397,660	-	187,647					187,647	-	1,356		-	-	1,356	90,105,625	
Alpine	894,531	-	-	894,531		15,512	5,840	21,352	-	-					-	9,409	-		-	-	9,409	925,292	
Amador	4,206,279	(167,223)	(95,942)	4,277,561		69,594	181,313	250,907	5,790	7,098					12,888	-	70		-	-	70	4,541,426	
Butte	14,080,619	(583,710)	(360,287)	14,304,042	(146,900)	220,838	232,088	306,027	15,210	106,023					121,233	-	210		-	-	210	14,731,511	
Calaveras	3,331,021	(111,187)	(53,833)	3,388,376		53,213	47,902	101,114	791	6,654					7,445	-	52		-	-	52	3,496,987	
Colusa	2,380,354	(94,059)	(53,965)	2,420,448		39,553	51,781	91,334	-	9,759					9,759	-	39		-	-	39	2,521,581	
Contra Costa	49,324,107	(1,738,846)	(841,887)	50,221,066		832,188	581,122	1,903,703	-	86,060					86,060	-	808		-	-	808	52,211,637	
Del Norte	3,687,521	(138,333)	(79,366)	3,746,487		72,011	61,470	133,481	-	14,195					14,195	-	60		-	-	60	3,894,224	
El Dorado	9,282,009	(320,824)	(155,331)	9,447,501		153,542	191,183	344,725	24,418	56,338					80,756	-	152		-	-	152	9,873,135	
Fresno	59,232,238	(3,029,033)	(2,020,422)	60,240,849	(662,872)	1,016,828	58,311	412,267	75,930	238,662					314,592	-	956		-	-	956	60,968,664	
Glenn	2,952,674	(115,557)	(66,299)	3,001,932		48,184	130,265	178,449	1,230	8,207					9,437	-	49		-	-	49	3,189,867	
Humboldt	8,115,475	(425,808)	(284,022)	8,257,261		143,344	355,151	498,495	12,250	43,030					55,280	-	131		-	-	131	8,811,168	
Imperial	10,217,919	(368,916)	(246,074)	10,340,761	(242,200)	163,060	35,817	(43,322)	25,465	37,485					62,950	-	151		-	-	151	10,360,540	
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	2,676,363	
Kern	60,340,513	(3,142,777)	(2,096,291)	61,386,998	(687,763)	1,067,196	(645,733)	(266,300)	38,700	254,410					293,110	-	986		-	-	986	61,414,794	
Kings	10,714,033	(429,257)	(246,280)	10,897,010		173,709	147,451	321,160	5,935	58,778					64,713	-	166		-	-	166	11,283,049	
Lake	5,194,262	(171,163)	(82,871)	5,282,554		81,916	47,172	189,650	-	9,759					9,759	-	80		-	-	80	5,482,043	
Lassen	2,689,655	(92,113)	(52,849)	2,728,920		41,553	21,235	62,787	4,241	12,199					16,441	-	41		-	-	41	2,808,188	
Los Angeles	698,845,807	(28,238,886)	(16,201,647)	710,883,046		11,498,318	5,276,310	16,774,628	-	2,875,473					2,875,473	-	11,022		-	-	11,022	730,544,169	
Madera	11,862,930	(495,278)	(284,158)	12,074,049		204,038	37,734	297,865	-	50,793					50,793	-	189		-	-	189	12,422,897	
Marin	12,943,444	(474,469)	(229,721)	13,188,192		227,075	94,157	321,231	42,540	21,959					64,499	-	216		-	-	216	13,574,138	
Mariposa	1,811,111	(65,897)	(37,808)	1,839,201		29,947	7,024	36,971	-	3,549					3,549	-	29		-	-	29	1,879,750	
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	7,918,598	
Merced	15,461,130	(651,946)	(374,045)	15,739,032		265,979	99,904	365,882	13,095	56,560					69,655	-	254		-	-	254	16,174,823	
Modoc	1,276,235	(52,864)	(30,330)	1,298,769		22,109	(11,528)	10,581	776	4,436					5,212	-	21		-	-	21	1,314,583	
Mono	2,238,360	(72,775)	(41,754)	2,269,382		38,823	16,107	54,930	-	444					444	-	37		-	-	37	2,324,792	
Monterey	26,100,772	(1,019,502)	(584,924)	26,535,349		419,107	355,193	774,300	-	45,914					45,914	-	404		-	-	404	27,355,967	
Napa	9,198,115	(319,738)	(154,806)	9,363,047	21,951	153,022	138,857	313,830	14,590	39,481					54,071	-	148		-	-	148	9,731,096	
Nevada	7,184,669	(221,442)	(107,214)	7,298,896		105,979	90,773	196,752	-	11,312					11,312	-	103		-	-	103	7,507,063	
Orange	179,164,268	(6,276,002)	(3,038,614)	182,401,656	483,238	3,003,611	1,134,334	4,621,182	-	534,327					534,327	-	2,879		-	-	2,879	187,560,044	
Placer	24,682,490	(976,477)	(560,239)	25,098,728		400,741	331,352	732,093	24,920	34,602					59,522	-	384		-	-	384	25,890,727	
Plumas	1,817,224	(58,157)	(33,367)	1,842,015		30,475	-	30,475	2,448	2,218					4,666	-	29		-	-	29	1,877,184	
Riverside	134,734,147	(4,545,609)	(2,200,820)	137,078,936	543,993	2,175,468	3,732,481	6,451,941	-	826,665					826,665	-	2,127		-	-	2,127	144,359,670	
Sacramento	104,226,967	(3,701,694)	(1,792,227)	106,136,433	1,223,323	1,771,581	(671,038)	2,323,866	43,920	166,353				2,674,000	2,884,273	-	1,644		-	-	1,644	111,346,217	
San Benito	4,583,477	(149,818)	(85,956)	4,647,339		76,775	122,760	199,536	-	10,425					10,425	-	74		-	-	74	4,857,373	
San Bernardino	137,828,637	(4,579,894)	(2,217,420)	140,191,111	1,440,393	2,191,876	939,065	4,571,334	239,760	943,334					1,183,094	-	2,108		-	-	2,108	145,947,647	
San Diego	174,414,396	(6,764,332)	(3,880,936)	177,297,791		2,846,931	(427,911)	2,419,020	-	524,124					524,124	-	2,702		-	-	2,702	180,243,638	
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	59,104,736	
San Joaquin	48,451,486	(2,430,393)	(1,616,188)	49,265,691		804,787	169,587	974,374	51,955	82,733					134,688	-	764		-	-	764	50,375,517	
San Luis Obispo	18,135,370	(890,721)	(594,128)	18,431,963	(194,925)	298,347	58,372	161,794	18,700	95,746					114,446	-	284		-	-	284	18,708,487	
San Mateo	41,002,030	(1,448,731)	(701,423)	41,749,337		693,343	81																

Court	FY 2025-26 OTHER NON-TCTF BASE ALLOCATIONS		FY 2025-26 Total Base Allocation	FY 2025-26 NON-BASE ALLOCATIONS						FY 2025-26 Trial Court Allocation
	GL 816111	GL 816111		GL 812167	GL 832010	GL 834010	GL 834010	GL 832012	Total Non-Base Allocations	
	General Fund Employee Benefits	General Fund Pretrial Funding (Ongoing)		2% Automation Replacement	Self-Help	Court Interpreters Program (CIP) Allocation	CIP Ongoing Benefits	Dependency Counsel Allocation (\$186.7m with Reserve)		
Alameda	3,102,046		93,207,671	424,792	1,017,456	5,803,556	(710)		7,245,094	100,452,765
Alpine	20,340		945,632	2,034	34,711	545	-		37,290	982,922
Amador	51,756		4,593,182	11,006	57,922	65,956	-		134,884	4,728,066
Butte	124,077		14,855,588	59,332	155,943	292,326	-		507,601	15,363,189
Calaveras	50,506		3,547,493	18,652	60,856	44,059	-		123,568	3,671,061
Colusa	24,773		2,546,354	13,708	46,982	129,857	-		190,547	2,736,901
Contra Costa	1,396,191		53,607,828	218,186	722,449	3,179,424	2,674		4,122,734	57,730,562
Del Norte	94,130		3,988,354	11,208	50,173	29,107	-		90,487	4,078,842
El Dorado	213,120		10,086,255	54,374	147,338	254,469	-		456,182	10,542,436
Fresno	3,340,363		64,309,027	181,080	636,326	2,761,001	5,581		3,583,988	67,893,015
Glenn	54,665		3,244,532	19,264	51,119	164,755	-		235,138	3,479,669
Humboldt	73,084		8,884,252	48,160	114,410	104,638	(89)		267,118	9,151,371
Imperial	125,539		10,486,079	67,678	140,935	776,427	1,913		986,954	11,473,032
Inyo	75,586		2,751,949	30,402	45,295	62,766	-		138,463	2,890,412
Kern	3,544,268		64,959,062	277,328	575,261	3,978,884	(21,432)		4,810,042	69,769,104
Kings	45,118		11,328,167	57,026	124,210	718,467	1,502		901,205	12,229,372
Lake	9,123		5,491,166	20,328	74,100	181,273	-		275,701	5,766,867
Lassen	7,839		2,816,027	20,156	51,816	57,432	-		129,403	2,945,431
Los Angeles	18,887,968		749,432,137	3,144,530	5,905,041	38,440,901	132,673		47,623,144	797,055,282
Madera	384,825		12,807,722	52,502	127,752	892,962	(275)		1,072,940	13,880,662
Marin	644,511		14,218,649	114,766	186,887	826,273	5,851		1,133,778	15,352,426
Mariposa	22,301		1,902,051	3,904	44,141	58,533	-		106,577	2,008,628
Mendocino	311,771		8,230,369	30,068	87,604	572,474	251		690,397	8,920,766
Merced	774,827		16,949,650	55,652	203,166	1,231,933	2,601		1,493,352	18,443,001
Modoc	31,967		1,346,550	6,134	39,130	4,872	-		50,136	1,396,686
Mono	85,641		2,410,433	12,446	41,913	72,961	-		127,320	2,537,753
Monterey	277,496		27,633,463	183,464	292,214	1,763,444	18,946		2,258,068	29,891,532
Napa	309,795		10,040,891	30,550	115,118	864,961	4,631		1,015,260	11,056,151
Nevada	95,495		7,602,558	49,946	94,368	106,633	48		250,995	7,853,553
Orange	6,929,920		194,489,964	923,882	1,915,066	9,525,851	27,984		12,392,784	206,882,747
Placer	634,796		26,525,523	77,378	277,721	943,385	459		1,298,942	27,824,465
Plumas	14,929		1,892,113	9,206	45,425	2,758	-		57,389	1,949,502
Riverside	923,656		145,283,326	532,226	1,484,060	7,221,038	(276,310)		8,961,014	154,244,340
Sacramento	3,560,591		114,906,808	340,254	973,583	5,248,982	(18,650)		6,544,169	121,450,977
San Benito	34,642		4,892,015	14,700	72,920	161,127	-		248,746	5,140,761
San Bernardino	1,264,732		147,212,379	435,474	1,335,608	6,680,109	45,670		8,496,861	155,709,241
San Diego	2,853,598		183,097,236	718,442	1,989,883	6,942,231	(12,284)		9,638,272	192,735,508
San Francisco	5,487,134		64,591,870	272,528	535,395	4,683,132	28,629		5,519,684	70,111,554
San Joaquin	1,245,356		51,620,873	201,698	501,401	2,198,348	2,388		2,903,835	54,524,708
San Luis Obispo	298,957		19,007,444	130,020	200,629	855,166	2,643		1,188,458	20,195,902
San Mateo	2,411,112		45,879,689	329,518	477,779	3,567,242	22,313		4,396,851	50,276,541
Santa Barbara	1,597,661		29,029,553	162,858	298,093	3,117,814	12,062		3,590,827	32,620,380
Santa Clara	2,309,466		93,922,217	452,782	1,164,067	6,748,121	-		8,364,970	102,287,186
Santa Cruz	203,558		16,510,592	113,210	191,965	1,026,564	(749)		1,330,990	17,841,582
Shasta	262,221		21,458,019	44,394	141,669	575,601	-		761,665	22,219,684
Sierra	9,616		913,011	1,830	35,916	586	-		38,332	951,343
Siskiyou	91,038		4,683,119	37,000	60,085	69,509	-		166,594	4,849,712
Solano	353,778		30,408,007	119,364	300,389	888,676	6,950		1,315,379	31,723,387
Sonoma	1,172,049		32,535,472	119,004	321,108	1,911,664	3,971		2,355,748	34,891,220
Stanislaus	1,305,229		32,329,391	88,718	361,215	1,743,675	1,324		2,194,932	34,524,323
Sutter	159,761		8,571,567	37,382	93,002	313,817	-		444,201	9,015,769
Tehama	108,184		5,919,895	28,100	72,678	252,013	1,443		354,234	6,274,129
Trinity	53,679		2,627,653	7,648	43,538	66,692	-		117,878	2,745,531
Tulare	33,744		34,088,969	204,932	316,908	2,729,518	7,241		3,258,600	37,347,569
Tuolumne	50,352		5,367,597	16,642	66,713	75,628	-		158,983	5,526,580
Ventura	968,752		45,982,640	205,304	530,521	2,909,263	21,191		3,666,279	49,648,919
Yolo	210,076		16,884,323	48,556	164,970	718,369	3,748		935,643	17,819,967
Yuba	90,867		6,706,078	15,788	83,056	98,044	-		196,888	6,902,967
Unallocated	-	48,950,000	116,993,700	-	-	-	-	186,700,000	186,700,000	303,693,700
Total	68,818,575	48,950,000	2,718,554,137	10,907,514	25,300,000	134,715,810	34,190	186,700,000	357,657,514	3,076,211,651

¹ Benefits funding reflects actual cost changes as identified by the court and is fiscally neutral.

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

Court	FY 2024-25 Adjusted Ending Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Ongoing Base Allocation	General Fund Employee Benefits	Total Base Allocation	FY 2024-25 NON-BASE ADJUSTMENTS USED TO CALCULATE WORKLOAD ALLOCATION			FY 2024-25 BASE ADJUSTMENTS USED TO CALCULATE WORKLOAD ALLOCATION		
				Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics	2% Automation Replacement	Self-Help	Security Base Adjustment	Subordinate Judicial Officer (SJO) Adjustment	Total Workload Formula Related Adjustments
	A	B	C (A+B)	D	E	F	G	H	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	50,221,066	1,396,191	51,617,257	74,666	218,186	722,449	-	(898,176)	117,126
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)	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)	-	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	15,739,032	774,827	16,513,859	15,053	55,652	203,166	-	(379,594)	(105,724)
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	12,446	41,913	(25,502)	-	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	49,265,691	1,245,356	50,511,047	52,691	201,698	501,401	(303,783)	(1,188,653)	(736,645)
San Luis Obispo	18,431,963	298,957	18,730,920	14,609	130,020	200,629	(255,144)	(560,547)	(470,434)
San Mateo	41,749,337	2,411,112	44,160,449	12,738	329,518	477,779	(467,732)	(1,216,658)	(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	5,684,715	108,184	5,792,899	1,258	28,100	72,678	-	(9,409)	92,626
Trinity	2,473,755	53,679	2,527,434	693	7,648	43,538	(543,614)	-	(491,735)
Tulare	32,552,742	33,744	32,586,486	24,586	204,932	316,908	(16,444)	(599,927)	(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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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.

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

Attachment H

Court	WORKLOAD ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENTS											WORKLOAD ALLOCATION ADJUSTMENTS					WORKLOAD FORMULA		FOR DISPLAY ONLY
	FY 2025-26 Beginning Workload Allocation	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Fiscal Neutral Offset	Change in Revenue Collected	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Current Methodology	Revenue Collected	Proposed Reallocation (Fiscal Neutral)		Proposed Inflationary Adjustment	FY 2025-26 Workload Allocation (Prior to Implementing Funding Floor)	FY 2025-26 Workload Funding Floor Adjustment				FY 2025-26 Final Workload Allocation	FY 2024-25 Workload Formula	Workload Formula Percentage	FY 2025-26 Civil Assessment Backfill Debt Obligations
		Reduction for SJO Conversion	SJO Adjustment (Change from Prior Year)	Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics (Change from Prior Year)	FY 2025-25 Non-Interpreter Benefit Cost Change Funding	Criminal Justice Realignment	All Other Applicable Revenue Sources ¹	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)		Applied Funding Floor	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Percentage Share of Adjustment	Adjustment Allocation				
J (C+I)	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T (J:S)	U	V	W	X	Y (T+V+X)	Z	AA (Y/Z)	AB	
Alameda	87,408,586	-	(73,975)	32,861	(27,296)	187,647	2,174,774	-	-	1,424,956	91,127,553			3.55%	1,356	91,128,909	94,645,177	96.28%	-
Alpine	951,647	-	-	(0)	5,840	-	11,592	-	-	15,512	984,591	994,000	9,409	-	-	994,000	549,681	180.83%	-
Amador	4,239,428	-	(6,797)	136	181,313	7,098	217,866	-	-	69,594	4,708,638			0.18%	70	4,708,708	4,684,703	100.51%	-
Butte	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%	-
Calaveras	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%	-
Colusa	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%	-
Contra Costa	51,734,383	-	49,712	4,482	581,122	86,060	525,007	-	490,392	832,188	54,303,347			2.11%	808	54,304,155	59,907,816	90.65%	-
Del Norte	3,902,500	-	-	26	61,470	14,195	11,351	-	-	72,011	4,061,553			0.16%	60	4,061,613	3,875,339	104.81%	-
El Dorado	9,724,426	-	(1,909)	524	191,183	56,338	101,989	-	-	153,542	10,226,093			0.40%	152	10,226,245	10,819,495	94.52%	-
Fresno	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%	500,000
Glenn	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%	-
Humboldt	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%	-
Imperial	10,074,120	-	(8,976)	2,204	35,817	37,485	95,474	(242,200)	-	163,060	10,156,985			0.40%	151	10,157,136	8,073,327	125.81%	-
Inyo	2,533,954	-	-	12	50,129	4,880	18,452	-	-	40,474	2,647,901			0.10%	39	2,647,940	2,676,571	98.93%	-
Kern	63,718,681	-	131,550	10,749	(645,733)	254,410	2,446,380	(687,763)	-	1,067,196	66,295,470			2.58%	986	66,296,456	68,776,330	96.39%	-
Kings	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%	-
Lake	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%	-
Lassen	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%	-
Los 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%	-
Madera	12,206,752	-	2,944	361	37,734	50,793	171,768	-	56,093	204,038	12,730,485			0.50%	189	12,730,674	13,875,025	91.75%	-
Marin	14,075,316	-	(16,546)	2,040	94,157	21,959	129,912	-	-	227,075	14,533,912			0.57%	216	14,534,128	15,677,866	92.70%	-
Mariposa	1,861,723	-	-	85	7,024	3,549	21,363	-	-	29,947	1,923,691			0.07%	29	1,923,719	1,846,094	104.20%	-
Mendocino	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%	-
Merced	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%	310,000
Modoc	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%	-
Mono	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%	-
Monterey	25,981,382	-	(10,973)	1,768	355,193	45,914	374,780	-	-	419,107	27,167,171			1.06%	404	27,167,575	28,560,984	95.12%	-
Napa	9,268,089	-	(8,304)	359	138,857	39,481	317,261	-	21,951	153,022	9,930,715			0.39%	148	9,930,863	10,740,134	92.46%	-
Nevada	6,673,453	-	(36,937)	224	90,773	11,312	46,713	-	-	105,979	6,891,517			0.27%	103	6,891,620	7,425,652	92.81%	-
Orange	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%	-
Placer	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%	-
Plumas	1,911,919	-	-	43	-	2,218	7,725	-	-	30,475	1,952,380			0.08%	29	1,952,409	1,629,248	119.83%	-
Riverside	134,073,710	-	(74,506)	8,450	3,732,481	826,665	1,728,567	-	543,993	2,175,468	143,014,828			5.57%	2,127	143,016,955	155,691,163	91.86%	-
Sacramento	106,997,096	-	(581,050)	24,565															