



# Judicial Council of California

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

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

## REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

*Item No.: 23-076*

For business meeting on: July 21, 2023

---

**Title**

Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2023–24  
Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile  
Dependency Counsel Funding

**Agenda Item Type**

Action Required

**Effective Date**

July 1, 2023

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**

None

**Date of Report**

June 28, 2023

**Recommended by**

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

**Contact**

Audrey Fancy, 415-865-7706  
[audrey.fancy@jud.ca.gov](mailto:audrey.fancy@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends allocation of \$186.7 million for fiscal year (FY) 2023–24 from the ongoing Trial Court Trust Fund to the trial courts for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel. The allocation may change based on final appropriations included in the signed Budget Act of 2023 (Sen. Bill 101; Stats. 2023, ch.12).

### Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2023, allocate \$186.7 million for fiscal year 2023–24 to the trial courts for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel costs.

This recommendation was presented to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on May 17, 2023 and approved for consideration by the Judicial Council.

### Relevant Previous Council Action

Court-appointed dependency counsel became a state fiscal responsibility in 1989 through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (Sen. Bill 612; Stats. 1988, ch. 945). The act added section 77003 to the Government Code, defined “court operations” in that section as including

court-appointed dependency counsel, and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. In 1997, the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850) provided the funding for, and delineated the parameters of, the transition to state trial court funding that had been outlined in the earlier legislation.

In 2015, the council approved recommendations of the TCBAC to reallocate funding for court-appointed dependency counsel among the trial courts based on a caseload funding model in an effort to provide a more equitable allocation of funding among the courts.<sup>1</sup> In addition, the council directed that a joint subcommittee of the TCBAC and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be formed to review that workload model for possible updates and revisions. After a year of research and analysis, the methodology recommended by this joint subcommittee was approved by the council.<sup>2</sup>

In July 2016, the council directed the Executive and Planning Committee to form a working group to consider changes to the court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding methodology as it relates to small courts.

In May 2017, the council adopted the modified funding methodology recommended by the Executive and Planning Committee working group for small courts to address the unique circumstances of each small court. The adjustments include (1) suspending reallocation-related budget reductions for the smallest courts with caseloads under 200, (2) adjusting the local economic index for the small courts with dependency caseloads under 400, and (3) slightly reducing the funding allocations of the larger courts receiving increases related to the reallocation to compensate for these increases to the small court budgets for 2017–18 and 2018–19, and ongoing effective July 1, 2019.<sup>3</sup>

In July 2022, the council adopted a recommendation by the TCBAC<sup>4</sup> to revise the current methodology to adjust *all* large court budgets to offset the costs for small court funding rather than only those large courts receiving increases.<sup>5</sup> Based on current workload and filing

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Reallocation* (Apr. 17, 2015), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150417-item1.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150417-item1.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (Apr. 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF>.

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Law: Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Methodology for Small Courts* (Jan. 15, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6913216&GUID=4DEB6A82-B007-46D8-9885-8D11D907DBF5>.

<sup>4</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2022–23 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding* (July 15, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11019079&GUID=CB0A2EE1-B3CF-43AC-B92B-F4724B5D209C>.

<sup>5</sup> The cost of these adjustments requires a transfer of approximately \$1 million from the larger courts to the small court allocations. The previous methodology specified that the offset be provided by reducing the budgets of larger courts receiving increases. In 2021–22, the council received a one-time funding augmentation of \$10 million for

information, 31 courts remain in the small court category with 25 of those courts meeting the “smallest” court criteria.

The council also adopted a TCBCAC recommendation to clarify the court-appointed dependency counsel funding allocation methodology as it relates to the survey of entry-level county counsel, specifically, that the county counsel median salary be updated on an annual basis as the update cycle was not specified in the methodology set forth in the April 2016 council report.

### **Analysis/Rationale**

The amount of \$186.7 million is allocated in the annual budget for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel. The FY 2023–24 allocations to trial courts in Attachment A were derived by using the methodology designated in the Judicial Council reports listed above. Attachment B details the total funding need for court-appointed dependency counsel using the methodology designated in the Judicial Council reports listed above.

The key factors used in this methodology are (for each court):

- A three-year rolling average of original dependency filings;
- A three-year rolling average of number of children in foster care<sup>6</sup>; and
- Current county counsel salaries at the median of the first two salary ranges reported by counties, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics current index.

### **Policy implications**

There are no policy implications to consider for the recommended allocation.

### **Comments**

Circulation for public comment was not required for this report.

---

COVID-related expenses in dependency counsel. As a result, in 2022–23, almost all large courts received allocation decreases, and those few courts receiving an increase would have been heavily impacted by the small court adjustments. Since the “reallocation” referenced in the January 2019 report was completed, and all courts were funded at the same percentage of need, it was recommended that the current methodology be revised so that funding for all large courts be adjusted to offset the costs for small court funding.

<sup>6</sup> On February 27, 2020, the California Child Welfare Indicators Project site was updated to improve navigation and offer new features. With these changes, some previously available views of the data were removed. Cases opened and not identified to a specific court are assigned to the service component “Missing.” Statewide, these cases total 199 and are not reported as service component data on the site.

To comply with CDSS data de-identification guidelines, “masking” is performed to protect the privacy of individuals served by CDSS. In reporting the number of children served, any service component with a value between 1 and 10 is masked. Three courts, Alpine, Mono, and Sierra, had total values between 1 and 10; therefore, the number of children served was masked and identified with (M). With the aim of maintaining confidentiality and allocating funds to each of these courts, each was allotted a value of 10 as of reporting period July 1, 2022.

**Alternatives considered**

No alternatives were considered because the recommended allocation outlined in Attachment A was determined using the methodology approved by the council.

**Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

This recommendation is for the allocation of funds that are included in the FY 2023–24 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

**Attachments**

1. Attachment A: 2023–24 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding
2. Attachment B: 2023–24 Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology

## 2023-24 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Court	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Prior Year 22-23	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Current Year 23-24	2016-17 Allocation	2017-18 Allocation	2018-19 Allocation	2019-20 Allocation	2020-21 Allocation	2021-22 Allocation	2022-23 Allocation	2023-24 Proposed Allocation
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Alameda	\$5,224,818	\$5,340,545	\$3,618,313	\$3,565,629	\$3,399,620	\$3,629,342	\$3,422,591	\$3,348,652	\$3,840,167	\$3,903,699
Alpine	\$21,826	\$25,622	\$399	\$1,799	\$2,628	\$7,226	\$11,439	\$19,616	\$19,850	\$25,764
Amador	\$195,640	\$212,023	\$115,233	\$143,696	\$144,678	\$145,653	\$126,205	\$128,301	\$144,314	\$158,374
Butte	\$1,260,325	\$1,293,234	\$627,554	\$794,546	\$799,814	\$926,951	\$891,346	\$872,569	\$926,321	\$945,296
Calaveras	\$216,733	\$216,619	\$142,758	\$220,822	\$191,355	\$203,567	\$202,088	\$189,010	\$161,288	\$190,388
Colusa	\$116,873	\$111,138	\$40,667	\$43,948	\$72,637	\$103,517	\$117,871	\$112,668	\$99,064	\$111,854
Contra Costa	\$3,739,116	\$3,629,916	\$2,600,337	\$2,363,610	\$2,294,410	\$2,617,772	\$2,571,073	\$2,651,024	\$2,748,197	\$2,653,306
Del Norte	\$251,570	\$268,195	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$203,096	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$256,964
El Dorado	\$750,054	\$644,987	\$655,569	\$548,764	\$505,148	\$582,746	\$560,863	\$579,296	\$553,278	\$474,903
Fresno	\$6,072,068	\$6,549,587	\$2,670,600	\$3,015,746	\$2,800,979	\$3,209,875	\$3,302,907	\$3,735,438	\$4,462,884	\$4,787,455
Glenn	\$167,242	\$143,780	\$90,417	\$111,158	\$122,690	\$140,011	\$154,825	\$164,905	\$146,444	\$143,016
Humboldt	\$1,059,437	\$998,462	\$462,558	\$522,682	\$657,658	\$615,068	\$665,891	\$715,427	\$778,671	\$729,831
Imperial	\$927,440	\$795,309	\$518,512	\$576,150	\$562,114	\$645,919	\$693,729	\$669,610	\$681,656	\$581,336
Inyo	\$45,308	\$72,350	\$72,277	\$45,459	\$51,626	\$48,006	\$39,570	\$41,562	\$58,143	\$76,990
Kern	\$4,418,848	\$4,985,989	\$2,277,753	\$2,664,810	\$2,627,276	\$2,864,207	\$2,720,713	\$2,748,308	\$3,247,790	\$3,644,535
Kings	\$1,076,639	\$1,060,814	\$443,478	\$700,757	\$713,352	\$696,307	\$659,612	\$690,969	\$791,315	\$775,408
Lake	\$217,530	\$203,493	\$296,119	\$272,201	\$276,158	\$285,153	\$288,934	\$280,183	\$296,119	\$277,755
Lassen	\$164,699	\$191,506	\$106,891	\$106,891	\$108,967	\$128,825	\$130,683	\$135,339	\$129,091	\$174,612
Los Angeles	\$126,460,174	\$124,470,473	\$45,149,389	\$60,560,884	\$62,434,046	\$73,864,405	\$75,809,513	\$82,722,770	\$92,946,429	\$90,982,340
Madera	\$992,466	\$1,060,009	\$293,833	\$535,074	\$589,946	\$674,047	\$631,797	\$643,573	\$732,094	\$844,825
Marin	\$363,420	\$357,998	\$388,488	\$311,538	\$304,984	\$270,557	\$287,842	\$288,497	\$357,163	\$358,761
Mariposa	\$91,991	\$87,640	\$38,070	\$38,070	\$41,897	\$54,019	\$48,793	\$60,059	\$67,857	\$73,918
Mendocino	\$653,698	\$658,478	\$566,908	\$440,581	\$458,911	\$527,624	\$510,212	\$529,357	\$511,024	\$608,018
Merced	\$1,403,353	\$1,440,319	\$751,397	\$844,260	\$775,718	\$825,284	\$840,466	\$894,211	\$1,031,445	\$1,052,809
Modoc	\$47,359	\$38,874	\$17,128	\$24,065	\$37,161	\$49,493	\$59,313	\$52,855	\$51,256	\$50,853
Mono	\$26,864	\$26,616	\$13,956	\$13,956	\$14,615	\$14,550	\$18,114	\$18,392	\$19,817	\$21,591
Monterey	\$909,023	\$798,660	\$494,823	\$682,574	\$715,702	\$829,349	\$797,204	\$738,059	\$670,542	\$595,734
Napa	\$609,803	\$510,600	\$232,362	\$315,051	\$311,403	\$384,039	\$417,108	\$435,215	\$449,822	\$375,955
Nevada	\$233,139	\$204,648	\$226,123	\$202,832	\$174,058	\$173,215	\$178,805	\$185,041	\$226,123	\$203,761
Orange	\$11,916,056	\$12,540,527	\$5,648,065	\$5,366,139	\$5,355,390	\$6,553,748	\$6,915,607	\$7,611,043	\$8,758,132	\$9,166,564
Placer	\$883,659	\$930,735	\$687,985	\$895,552	\$747,111	\$710,846	\$600,593	\$622,053	\$651,832	\$704,472
Plumas	\$133,438	\$112,340	\$154,059	\$151,555	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$159,634
Riverside	\$12,604,128	\$14,649,029	\$6,411,055	\$8,806,009	\$8,173,324	\$7,999,219	\$6,877,392	\$7,422,498	\$9,263,855	\$10,707,784
Sacramento	\$6,927,596	\$6,710,957	\$4,832,997	\$5,609,080	\$5,161,591	\$5,586,032	\$5,017,201	\$4,920,141	\$5,091,685	\$4,905,409
San Benito	\$140,103	\$129,390	\$89,163	\$112,410	\$104,920	\$107,040	\$109,317	\$99,288	\$103,347	\$95,270
San Bernardino	\$20,165,787	\$20,604,882	\$5,731,210	\$8,514,703	\$9,751,976	\$11,957,781	\$12,446,717	\$13,045,926	\$14,821,566	\$15,061,246
San Diego	\$8,338,202	\$8,578,420	\$7,711,177	\$6,132,621	\$5,339,513	\$5,525,422	\$5,141,307	\$5,323,538	\$6,128,460	\$6,270,441
San Francisco	\$3,955,189	\$3,887,680	\$3,296,146	\$3,060,973	\$2,754,101	\$2,926,579	\$2,698,254	\$2,671,880	\$2,907,007	\$2,841,720
San Joaquin	\$3,927,784	\$3,889,728	\$2,601,178	\$2,480,278	\$2,399,805	\$2,739,513	\$2,729,427	\$2,706,301	\$2,886,866	\$2,843,217
San Luis Obispo	\$1,095,741	\$957,999	\$647,980	\$703,001	\$672,046	\$795,812	\$803,509	\$797,919	\$805,354	\$700,254
San Mateo	\$1,124,519	\$1,039,566	\$668,643	\$960,903	\$934,702	\$984,479	\$837,813	\$829,202	\$829,503	\$765,432
Santa Barbara	\$1,791,151	\$1,908,246	\$1,267,448	\$979,287	\$826,760	\$865,438	\$889,172	\$1,012,943	\$1,316,470	\$1,394,843
Santa Clara	\$4,988,971	\$4,145,634	\$3,780,956	\$3,223,912	\$2,947,634	\$3,290,686	\$3,262,294	\$3,404,630	\$3,666,823	\$3,030,273
Santa Cruz	\$683,612	\$607,692	\$713,676	\$598,314	\$544,197	\$619,253	\$557,112	\$526,052	\$504,267	\$623,754
Shasta	\$1,024,871	\$1,124,351	\$621,700	\$680,076	\$614,678	\$690,857	\$662,855	\$670,839	\$753,266	\$821,850
Sierra	\$0	\$38,625	\$13,759	\$9,848	\$8,323	\$5,045	\$10,829	\$13,759	\$22,459	\$28,440
Siskiyou	\$217,904	\$196,638	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$256,552
Solano	\$1,557,531	\$1,590,035	\$801,057	\$883,349	\$805,489	\$880,251	\$868,262	\$957,238	\$1,144,763	\$1,162,244
Sonoma	\$2,151,188	\$2,223,386	\$990,021	\$918,101	\$945,770	\$1,262,354	\$1,405,793	\$1,477,889	\$1,581,093	\$1,625,196
Stanislaus	\$2,031,179	\$1,942,404	\$1,004,470	\$1,092,505	\$1,091,719	\$1,424,350	\$1,448,878	\$1,452,004	\$1,492,887	\$1,419,811
Sutter	\$467,969	\$434,175	\$146,804	\$220,511	\$260,937	\$353,444	\$374,781	\$363,107	\$345,198	\$336,571
Tehama	\$301,516	\$299,901	\$177,634	\$319,793	\$362,975	\$392,840	\$340,323	\$293,399	\$241,836	\$294,234
Trinity	\$93,113	\$78,441	\$93,829	\$96,021	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$83,204
Tulare	\$3,387,290	\$3,306,098	\$1,032,410	\$1,591,232	\$1,714,221	\$2,067,711	\$2,155,983	\$2,290,172	\$2,489,610	\$2,416,609
Tuolumne	\$409,884	\$341,239	\$110,593	\$159,147	\$168,548	\$187,463	\$257,399	\$338,350	\$313,321	\$307,665
Ventura	\$2,578,652	\$2,521,856	\$1,284,628	\$1,835,753	\$1,833,055	\$2,017,019	\$1,802,468	\$1,741,369	\$1,895,272	\$1,843,364
Yolo	\$1,841,836	\$1,689,887	\$430,429	\$596,503	\$712,428	\$1,021,991	\$1,167,029	\$1,272,273	\$1,353,723	\$1,235,231
Yuba	\$508,707	\$551,781	\$278,909	\$474,768	\$471,244	\$410,105	\$363,820	\$377,291	\$375,249	\$418,668
Reserve	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$252,965,035</b>	<b>\$253,429,531</b>	<b>\$114,700,000</b>	<b>\$136,700,000</b>	<b>\$136,700,000</b>	<b>\$156,700,000</b>	<b>\$156,700,000</b>	<b>\$166,700,000</b>	<b>\$186,700,000</b>	<b>\$186,700,000</b>

Note: Allocations are based on filings data obtained from the Office of Court Research and caseload data obtained from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) as of July 1, 2022.

\*Updated on May 3, 2023

## Total Funding Need for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Based on 2016 Workload Methodology

	Average Original Filings FY19 - FY21	Average CW Cases July 2020, 2021, 2022	Filings %	Cases %	Sum of Weighted %	Partially Redistributed Caseload	BLS Index 2019-2021	Annual Salary	Caseload Multiplied by Estimated Child-to-Parent Case Ratio	Attorneys Needed Per Caseload	Total Salaries	Total Funding Need
Court	A	B	C	D	E (.3C+.7D)	F (B*E)	G	H (G*Median Salary)	I (F*1.8)	J (I/141)	K (H*J)	L (K/.45)
Alameda	577	1,267	1.60%	1.80%	1.74%	1,226	1.50	\$ 153,567	2,207	15.65	\$ 2,403,245	\$ 5,340,545
*Alpine	9	10	0.02%	0.01%	0.02%	12	0.73	\$ 74,696	22	0.15	\$ 11,530	\$ 25,622
*Amador	40	72	0.11%	0.10%	0.11%	74	0.98	\$ 100,552	134	0.95	\$ 95,411	\$ 212,023
Butte	242	500	0.67%	0.71%	0.70%	492	0.90	\$ 92,580	886	6.29	\$ 581,955	\$ 1,293,234
*Calaveras	62	75	0.17%	0.11%	0.13%	89	0.83	\$ 85,457	161	1.14	\$ 97,479	\$ 216,619
*Colusa	27	52	0.08%	0.07%	0.07%	52	0.73	\$ 74,628	94	0.67	\$ 50,012	\$ 111,138
Contra Costa	616	816	1.71%	1.16%	1.32%	933	1.34	\$ 137,136	1,679	11.91	\$ 1,633,462	\$ 3,629,916
*Del Norte	67	116	0.19%	0.17%	0.17%	121	0.76	\$ 78,391	217	1.54	\$ 120,688	\$ 268,195
*El Dorado	107	201	0.30%	0.29%	0.29%	204	1.09	\$ 111,670	366	2.60	\$ 290,244	\$ 644,987
Fresno	1,131	2,523	3.14%	3.58%	3.45%	2,431	0.93	\$ 94,987	4,375	31.03	\$ 2,947,314	\$ 6,549,587
*Glenn	28	73	0.08%	0.10%	0.10%	67	0.74	\$ 75,510	121	0.86	\$ 64,701	\$ 143,780
Humboldt	222	480	0.62%	0.68%	0.66%	466	0.74	\$ 75,497	839	5.95	\$ 449,308	\$ 998,462
Imperial	165	422	0.46%	0.60%	0.56%	392	0.70	\$ 71,463	706	5.01	\$ 357,889	\$ 795,309
*Inyo	19	31	0.05%	0.04%	0.05%	32	0.77	\$ 78,634	58	0.41	\$ 32,557	\$ 72,350
Kern	887	1,929	2.47%	2.74%	2.66%	1,872	0.91	\$ 93,896	3,369	23.90	\$ 2,243,695	\$ 4,985,989
Kings	220	410	0.61%	0.58%	0.59%	417	0.87	\$ 89,743	750	5.32	\$ 477,366	\$ 1,060,814
*Lake	48	96	0.13%	0.14%	0.14%	95	0.73	\$ 75,191	172	1.22	\$ 91,572	\$ 203,493
*Lassen	49	76	0.14%	0.11%	0.12%	82	0.80	\$ 82,376	148	1.05	\$ 86,178	\$ 191,506
Los Angeles	15,763	30,692	43.83%	43.58%	43.66%	30,745	1.39	\$ 142,711	55,340	392.48	\$ 56,011,713	\$ 124,470,473
*Madera	277	334	0.77%	0.47%	0.56%	396	0.92	\$ 94,239	714	5.06	\$ 477,004	\$ 1,060,009
*Marin	49	92	0.14%	0.13%	0.13%	93	1.32	\$ 135,083	168	1.19	\$ 161,099	\$ 357,998
*Mariposa	19	33	0.05%	0.05%	0.05%	35	0.87	\$ 89,052	62	0.44	\$ 39,438	\$ 87,640
*Mendocino	147	284	0.41%	0.40%	0.41%	285	0.79	\$ 81,342	514	3.64	\$ 296,315	\$ 658,478
Merced	325	609	0.90%	0.86%	0.88%	617	0.80	\$ 82,262	1,111	7.88	\$ 648,144	\$ 1,440,319
*Modoc	16	21	0.04%	0.03%	0.03%	24	0.56	\$ 57,416	43	0.30	\$ 17,493	\$ 38,874
*Mono	5	10	0.01%	0.01%	0.01%	10	0.90	\$ 92,589	18	0.13	\$ 11,977	\$ 26,616
*Monterey	100	261	0.28%	0.37%	0.34%	241	1.14	\$ 116,582	435	3.08	\$ 359,397	\$ 798,660
*Napa	79	132	0.22%	0.19%	0.20%	139	1.26	\$ 129,264	251	1.78	\$ 229,770	\$ 510,600
*Nevada	41	59	0.11%	0.08%	0.09%	66	1.07	\$ 109,607	118	0.84	\$ 92,092	\$ 204,648
Orange	1,856	3,390	5.16%	4.81%	4.92%	3,464	1.24	\$ 127,630	6,234	44.22	\$ 5,643,237	\$ 12,540,527
*Placer	169	247	0.47%	0.35%	0.39%	272	1.17	\$ 120,538	490	3.47	\$ 418,831	\$ 930,735
*Plumas	27	56	0.08%	0.08%	0.08%	55	0.70	\$ 72,225	99	0.70	\$ 50,553	\$ 112,340
Riverside	2,687	4,290	7.47%	6.09%	6.51%	4,582	1.10	\$ 112,708	8,247	58.49	\$ 6,592,063	\$ 14,649,029
Sacramento	736	1,879	2.05%	2.67%	2.48%	1,748	1.32	\$ 135,357	3,146	22.31	\$ 3,019,931	\$ 6,710,957
*San Benito	25	41	0.07%	0.06%	0.06%	44	1.02	\$ 104,562	79	0.56	\$ 58,226	\$ 129,390
San Bernardino	3,032	6,521	8.43%	9.26%	9.01%	6,346	1.12	\$ 114,451	11,423	81.01	\$ 9,272,197	\$ 20,604,882
San Diego	1,171	2,622	3.26%	3.72%	3.58%	2,523	1.17	\$ 119,858	4,541	32.21	\$ 3,860,289	\$ 8,578,420
San Francisco	379	855	1.05%	1.21%	1.17%	821	1.63	\$ 166,848	1,478	10.49	\$ 1,749,456	\$ 3,887,680
San Joaquin	600	1,336	1.67%	1.90%	1.83%	1,287	1.04	\$ 106,499	2,317	16.44	\$ 1,750,378	\$ 3,889,728
San Luis Obispo	146	332	0.41%	0.47%	0.45%	318	1.04	\$ 106,279	572	4.06	\$ 431,099	\$ 957,999
*San Mateo	123	225	0.34%	0.32%	0.33%	230	1.55	\$ 159,518	413	2.93	\$ 467,805	\$ 1,039,566
Santa Barbara	310	510	0.86%	0.72%	0.77%	539	1.22	\$ 124,725	971	6.88	\$ 858,711	\$ 1,908,246
Santa Clara	405	1,017	1.13%	1.44%	1.35%	950	1.50	\$ 153,847	1,710	12.13	\$ 1,865,535	\$ 4,145,634
*Santa Cruz	94	183	0.26%	0.26%	0.26%	183	1.14	\$ 116,873	330	2.34	\$ 273,462	\$ 607,692
Shasta	235	428	0.65%	0.61%	0.62%	438	0.88	\$ 90,566	788	5.59	\$ 505,958	\$ 1,124,351
*Sierra	11	10	0.03%	0.01%	0.02%	13	1.00	\$ 102,631	24	0.17	\$ 17,381	\$ 38,625
*Siskiyou	60	90	0.17%	0.13%	0.14%	98	0.69	\$ 70,550	177	1.25	\$ 88,487	\$ 196,638
Solano	243	445	0.67%	0.63%	0.64%	454	1.20	\$ 123,502	817	5.79	\$ 715,516	\$ 1,590,035
Sonoma	303	646	0.84%	0.92%	0.89%	630	1.21	\$ 124,402	1,134	8.04	\$ 1,000,524	\$ 2,223,386
Stanislaus	298	673	0.83%	0.96%	0.92%	646	1.03	\$ 105,969	1,163	8.25	\$ 874,082	\$ 1,942,404
*Sutter	120	125	0.33%	0.18%	0.22%	158	0.94	\$ 96,890	284	2.02	\$ 195,379	\$ 434,175
*Tehama	83	127	0.23%	0.18%	0.20%	138	0.75	\$ 76,555	249	1.76	\$ 134,956	\$ 299,901
*Trinity	30	30	0.08%	0.04%	0.05%	39	0.70	\$ 71,658	69	0.49	\$ 35,299	\$ 78,441
Tulare	642	1,163	1.79%	1.65%	1.69%	1,191	0.95	\$ 97,832	2,144	15.21	\$ 1,487,744	\$ 3,306,098
*Tuolumne	112	112	0.31%	0.16%	0.21%	144	0.81	\$ 83,305	260	1.84	\$ 153,558	\$ 341,239
Ventura	340	699	0.94%	0.99%	0.98%	689	1.26	\$ 129,050	1,240	8.79	\$ 1,134,835	\$ 2,521,856
Yolo	287	502	0.80%	0.71%	0.74%	520	1.12	\$ 114,648	935	6.63	\$ 760,449	\$ 1,689,887
*Yuba	99	197	0.28%	0.28%	0.28%	196	0.96	\$ 98,989	354	2.51	\$ 248,301	\$ 551,781
<b>Total</b>	<b>35,964</b>	<b>70,426</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>70,426</b>	<b>1.00</b>		<b>126,767</b>	<b>899</b>	<b>\$ 114,043,289</b>	<b>\$ 253,429,531</b>

Median annual salary of county attorneys \$ 102,631

\*Courts with small court adjustments