



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: June 26, 2015

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Courts: 2015–2016 Allocation Using the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
N/A	June 26, 2015
Recommended by	Date of Report
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Chair	June 2, 2015
	Contact
	Steven Chang, 415-865-7195 steven.chang@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that any new funding for general court operations provided by the Budget Act of 2015 for 2015–2016 that will be allocated in accordance with the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology be reduced by the \$22.7 million shortfall in Trial Court Trust Fund fine and fee revenue that has not been backfilled from the state General Fund.

Recommendation

On May 18, 2015, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) unanimously adopted the following recommendation:

1. The amount of any new funding for general court operations provided in the Budget Act of 2015 that will be allocated in 2015–2016 using the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology should be reduced by the \$22.7 million shortfall in Trial Court Trust Fund fine and fee revenue that supports trial courts' base allocations and that has not been backfilled from the state General Fund.

Previous Council Action

On July 29, 2014, due to a projected shortfall of \$22.7 million in revenue fine and fee revenue that supports trial courts' base allocation the council allocated a \$22.7 million reduction on a one-time basis and directed Judicial Council staff to submit a deficiency request to backfill the shortfall with an augmentation of General Fund monies to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). The deficiency request was not approved by the Department of Finance. The council allocated the \$22.7 million reduction using the same method for computing courts' contributions towards the statutorily required 2 percent reserve that is held in the TCTF.

Rationale for Recommendation

Of the projected \$88.9 million shortfall in fine and fee revenue that supports trial courts' base allocations from 2012–2013 to the end of 2015–2016, the Governor's May Revise budget proposal includes a General Fund backfill of only \$66.2 million or \$22.7 million less than the total shortfall. To bring into balance the projected revenues that support courts' base allocations, the council will need to allocate a \$22.7 million reduction in 2015–2016. The council's policy is to use the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) to allocate any new funding for general court operations. The TCBAC's recommendation to allocate the net of any new funding and a \$22.7 million reduction using WAFM recognizes that, in reality, the real amount of new funding in 2015–2016 is reduced by \$22.7 million. The Governor's May Revise budget proposal is to provide \$90.6 million in new funding for general court operations. If the Budget Act of 2015 provides \$90.6 million in new funding, under this proposal \$67.9 million (\$90.6 million less \$22.7 million) would be allocated using the WAFM on an ongoing basis. Scenario A of Attachment 1 displays the computed allocations based on the recommendation using the preliminary 2015–2016 WAFM.¹

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

No public comments for this issue were received when considered by the TCBAC at its May 18, 2015 public meeting.

As displayed in scenario B of Attachment 1, the TCBAC considered a scenario whereby each court's 2014–2015 share of the \$22.7 million reduction would be made permanent and the WAFM would be used to allocate the entire amount of any new funding (e.g., \$90.6 million).

Attachments

1. Attachment 1: Preliminary 2015–16 WAFM at \$67.9M vs. Preliminary 2015–16 WAFM at \$90.6M with \$22.7M Reduction

¹ The preliminary 2015–2016 WAFM does not reflect the interim civil complex caseweight being recommended by the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee nor updated AB 1058 distributions.

Attachment 1 -- Preliminary 2015-16 WAFM at \$67.9M vs. Preliminary 2015-16 WAFM at \$90.6M with \$22.7M Reduction¹

Scenario A -- Preliminary 2015-16 WAFM at \$67.9M					
	WAFM (@30%) Adjustment in 2015-16	Allocation and Reallocation of \$143.6M	Allocation and Reallocation of \$67.9M	Funding Floor Adjustment	Total
Court	A	B	C	D	E
Alameda	(2,781,134)	(147,426)	1,600,608	(28,639)	(1,356,590)
Alpine	(51,416)	511	(6,525)	52,171	(5,260)
Amador	(52,364)	10,593	60,241	(891)	17,580
Butte	67,352	(14,441)	392,556	(3,580)	441,887
Calaveras	(32,375)	11,702	66,180	(853)	44,655
Colusa	(32,834)	2,060	42,906	132,362	144,494
Contra Costa	49,380	15,611	1,574,895	(15,749)	1,624,136
Del Norte	(97,541)	(57,332)	69,116	(970)	(86,727)
El Dorado	(45,316)	2,445	247,591	(2,671)	202,049
Fresno	982,342	331,589	2,087,654	(17,936)	3,383,649
Glenn	(117,745)	(37,556)	28,827	95,153	(31,322)
Humboldt	(6,652)	46,082	210,396	(2,316)	247,509
Imperial	114,866	12,160	363,241	(3,160)	487,107
Inyo	(80,787)	(793)	30,785	15,603	(35,192)
Kern	2,079,606	181,349	2,579,528	(16,643)	4,823,840
Kings	57,149	(22,892)	271,173	(2,339)	303,091
Lake	(104,695)	(8,179)	74,868	(1,219)	(39,226)
Lassen	(79,334)	(29,792)	53,086	(793)	(56,833)
Los Angeles	5,585,024	(1,060,904)	22,502,872	(199,312)	26,827,680
Madera	2,391	14,194	275,532	(2,827)	289,291
Marin	(847,080)	(51,782)	120,399	(4,956)	(783,418)
Mariposa	(17,836)	4,856	29,930	54,808	71,757
Mendocino	(57,346)	19,954	161,113	(1,945)	121,777
Merced	149,949	(54,672)	545,420	(4,558)	636,139
Modoc	(39,067)	14,632	10,639	(386)	(14,182)
Mono	(31,243)	(15,292)	45,551	122,866	121,882
Monterey	46,118	(34,550)	658,228	(6,294)	663,502
Napa	(138,818)	27,827	186,854	(2,588)	73,275
Nevada	(8,834)	22,753	163,819	(1,775)	175,963
Orange	(2,466,785)	435,190	4,044,719	(54,515)	1,958,609
Placer	268,245	45,181	671,505	(5,636)	979,295
Plumas	(100,477)	(8,087)	8,531	(523)	(100,557)
Riverside	2,598,231	189,680	4,238,347	(30,909)	6,995,349
Sacramento	354,321	415,182	2,932,113	(29,203)	3,672,413
San Benito	(130,221)	(18,258)	44,286	(989)	(105,183)
San Bernardino	2,677,348	(277,171)	4,702,470	(34,118)	7,068,530

Scenario B -- Preliminary 2015-16 WAFM at \$90.6M and \$22.7M Reduction						Total A Minus Total B
WAFM (@30%) Adjustment in 2015-16	Allocation and Reallocation of \$143.6M	Allocation and Reallocation of \$90.6M	Funding Floor Adjustment	\$22.7 Million Reduction	Total	
F	G	H	I	J	K	F
(2,781,134)	(147,426)	2,135,716	(25,876)	(1,006,310)	(1,825,029)	468,439
(51,416)	511	(8,707)	54,352	-	(5,260)	(0)
(52,364)	10,593	80,381	(806)	(29,737)	8,067	9,513
67,352	(14,441)	523,794	(3,259)	(118,127)	455,319	(13,432)
(32,375)	11,702	88,305	(773)	(27,738)	39,122	5,533
(32,834)	2,060	57,250	118,018	-	144,494	-
49,380	15,611	2,101,406	(14,316)	(524,858)	1,627,223	(3,086)
(97,541)	(57,332)	92,222	(878)	(34,619)	(98,148)	11,421
(45,316)	2,445	330,365	(2,425)	(88,211)	196,858	5,192
982,342	331,589	2,785,588	(16,340)	(554,229)	3,528,950	(145,301)
(117,745)	(37,556)	38,464	85,515	-	(31,322)	(0)
(6,652)	46,082	280,734	(2,103)	(76,110)	241,952	5,558
114,866	12,160	484,678	(2,879)	(100,431)	508,395	(21,288)
(80,787)	(793)	41,077	5,311	-	(35,192)	-
2,079,606	181,349	3,441,903	(15,241)	(517,548)	5,170,069	(346,229)
57,149	(22,892)	361,830	(2,131)	(77,594)	316,363	(13,271)
(104,695)	(8,179)	99,897	(1,103)	(41,896)	(55,976)	16,750
(79,334)	(29,792)	70,834	(718)	(27,456)	(66,466)	9,633
5,585,024	(1,060,904)	30,025,923	(181,490)	(6,588,036)	27,780,517	(952,837)
2,391	14,194	367,646	(2,568)	(88,349)	293,315	(4,024)
(847,080)	(51,782)	160,651	(4,458)	(180,059)	(922,729)	139,310
(17,836)	4,856	39,936	44,802	-	71,757	0
(57,346)	19,954	214,976	(1,764)	(63,560)	112,260	9,516
149,949	(54,672)	727,762	(4,154)	(148,653)	670,232	(34,092)
(39,067)	14,632	14,196	(347)	-	(10,586)	(3,595)
(31,243)	(15,292)	60,779	107,637	-	121,882	-
46,118	(34,550)	878,284	(5,724)	(204,155)	679,973	(16,470)
(138,818)	27,827	249,322	(2,344)	(91,731)	44,257	29,018
(8,834)	22,753	218,587	(1,612)	(60,469)	170,424	5,539
(2,466,785)	435,190	5,396,930	(49,379)	(1,828,581)	1,487,375	471,234
268,245	45,181	896,000	(5,136)	(188,509)	1,015,780	(36,485)
(100,477)	(8,087)	11,383	(470)	(19,092)	(116,744)	16,187
2,598,231	189,680	5,655,291	(28,238)	(988,161)	7,426,803	(431,453)
354,321	415,182	3,912,363	(26,547)	(959,404)	3,695,915	(23,502)
(130,221)	(18,258)	59,091	(893)	(34,673)	(124,954)	19,771
2,677,348	(277,171)	6,274,577	(31,173)	(1,075,223)	7,568,360	(499,830)

Scenario A -- Preliminary 2015-16 WAFM at \$67.9M					
	WAFM (@30%) Adjustment in 2015-16	Allocation and Reallocation of \$143.6M	Allocation and Reallocation of \$67.9M	Funding Floor Adjustment	Total
Court	A	B	C	D	E
San Diego	(2,780,253)	377,877	3,862,672	(53,294)	1,407,001
San Francisco	(2,022,825)	140,862	1,160,989	(23,034)	(744,008)
San Joaquin	647,004	167,533	1,443,164	(12,145)	2,245,555
San Luis Obispo	21,400	(24,869)	524,874	(5,055)	516,350
San Mateo	(604,047)	(28,233)	1,036,731	(13,224)	391,227
Santa Barbara	(398,574)	43,909	594,804	(8,013)	232,126
Santa Clara	(3,774,707)	(639,286)	1,425,064	(29,944)	(3,018,873)
Santa Cruz	(53,152)	36,089	416,989	(4,427)	395,499
Shasta	168,185	92,748	411,898	(3,794)	669,037
Sierra	(66,540)	(10,447)	(11,413)	84,660	(3,740)
Siskiyou	(194,136)	16,491	23,746	(1,183)	(155,082)
Solano	54,626	(85,921)	814,454	(7,590)	775,569
Sonoma	(118,352)	(132,577)	875,483	(9,102)	615,451
Stanislaus	541,823	(38,380)	1,088,860	(7,973)	1,584,330
Sutter	86,874	7,641	211,462	(1,756)	304,221
Tehama	44,688	28,305	151,990	(1,432)	223,550
Trinity	(45,286)	(18,239)	26,686	127,290	90,451
Tulare	351,493	116,063	746,497	(6,323)	1,207,731
Tuolumne	(82,475)	(7,747)	73,835	(1,097)	(17,483)
Ventura	439,919	(58,339)	1,452,135	(12,397)	1,821,318
Yolo	86,576	29,424	347,341	(3,372)	459,969
Yuba	(14,662)	22,672	132,282	(1,462)	138,831
Total	0	0	67,900,000	(0)	67,900,000

Scenario B -- Preliminary 2015-16 WAFM at \$90.6M and \$22.7M Reduction						Total A Minus Total B
WAFM (@30%) Adjustment in 2015-16	Allocation and Reallocation of \$143.6M	Allocation and Reallocation of \$90.6M	Funding Floor Adjustment	\$22.7 Million Reduction	Total	
F	G	H	I	J	K	F
(2,780,253)	377,877	5,154,021	(48,262)	(1,824,897)	878,486	528,515
(2,022,825)	140,862	1,549,126	(20,797)	(788,895)	(1,142,529)	398,521
647,004	167,533	1,925,635	(11,068)	(378,529)	2,350,575	(105,019)
21,400	(24,869)	700,348	(4,598)	(172,442)	519,839	(3,489)
(604,047)	(28,233)	1,383,326	(11,985)	(457,780)	281,280	109,946
(398,574)	43,909	793,656	(7,258)	(271,266)	160,466	71,659
(3,774,707)	(639,286)	1,901,485	(27,025)	(1,056,021)	(3,595,554)	576,681
(53,152)	36,089	556,395	(4,021)	(149,105)	386,206	9,293
168,185	92,748	549,601	(3,453)	(121,205)	685,877	(16,840)
(66,540)	(10,447)	(15,228)	88,475	-	(3,740)	0
(194,136)	16,491	31,685	(1,063)	(43,536)	(190,560)	35,478
54,626	(85,921)	1,086,738	(6,906)	(252,301)	796,237	(20,668)
(118,352)	(132,577)	1,168,170	(8,270)	(295,531)	613,441	2,011
541,823	(38,380)	1,452,883	(7,284)	(257,942)	1,691,101	(106,770)
86,874	7,641	282,157	(1,600)	(54,599)	320,472	(16,251)
44,688	28,305	202,803	(1,303)	(44,321)	230,171	(6,621)
(45,286)	(18,239)	35,607	118,369	-	90,451	-
351,493	116,063	996,062	(5,761)	(199,524)	1,258,333	(50,602)
(82,475)	(7,747)	98,520	(992)	(37,684)	(30,379)	12,895
439,919	(58,339)	1,937,606	(11,295)	(397,607)	1,910,284	(88,966)
86,576	29,424	463,462	(3,066)	(105,804)	470,591	(10,623)
(14,662)	22,672	176,507	(1,327)	(47,493)	135,697	3,134
0	0	90,600,000	0	(22,700,000)	67,900,000	-

¹¹⁾ The preliminary 2015–2016 WAFM does not reflect the interim civil complex caseweight being recommended by the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee nor updated AB 1058 distributions.