

March 6, 2026



Annual Proposition 36 Court Implementation Report

January 2025 through December 2025



Judicial Council of California

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Patricia Guerrero
*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Michelle Curran
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

Salena Chow
Chief Operating Officer

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES

Francine Byrne
Director

Randie Chance
Principal Manager

Kevin Walker
Supervising Analyst

Audrey Webostad
Associate Analyst

Janet Raygoza
Analyst

Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
Background	4
Drug Charges	4
Theft Charges	5
STATEWIDE FILING DATA	5
Survey Results	6
Treatment-Mandated Felony Cases	8
Theft Cases	10
Summary of Survey Findings	10
Data Considerations	11
Challenges in Data Collection and Case Tracking	11
Case Processing Under Health and Safety Code Section 11395	12
IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSITION 36 (2024)	12
Court Activities	13
Court Expenditures	14
Judicial Council Activities	14
Allocation	15
Data Collection and Reporting	15
Training, Technical Assistance, and Outreach	15
Legal Guidance, Webinar, and Proposition 36 Resource Page Development	16
Outreach	16
Allocation to County Behavioral Health Department from the Department of Health Care Services	16
County Treatment Provider Allocation Overview	17
CONCLUSION	17
APPENDIX A: SURVEY FORM	18
APPENDIX B: SURVEY RESPONSES	24
APPENDIX C: COURT PROPOSITION 36 FUNDING ALLOCATIONS	56
APPENDIX D: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTHCARE SERVICES PROPOSITION 36 FUNDING ALLOCATIONS	58

Introduction

Proposition 36, the “Homelessness, Drug Addiction, and Theft Reduction Act,” was approved by California voters in November 2024 and started on December 18, 2024. This law raises penalties for some drug and theft crimes, allowing prosecutors to charge these crimes as felonies if the defendants had previously committed specified drug and theft offenses. It also gives individuals with two or more prior drug possession convictions the option to join a treatment program instead of serving time in custody, with the possibility of having their cases dismissed if they complete the treatment successfully.

The Budget Act of 2025 (Stats. 2025, ch. 5) provided \$20 million to the judicial branch to address the increased workload from Prop. 36 and expand or create collaborative courts for its implementation. The Budget Act also requires that the Judicial Council issue an annual report until all funds are expended.¹ This report meets that requirement and provides background information on Prop. 36, presents statewide data on cases filed, and describes the implementation and spending activities for the courts and Judicial Council. It also includes details on county behavioral health department allocations and activities conducted by the California Department of Health Care Services.

Background

Prop. 36 increases punishment for some drug and theft crimes. It makes changes to the Health and Safety Code and Penal Code sections that govern when a certain drug or theft crime can be charged as a felony instead of a misdemeanor.^{2 3} It authorizes prosecutors, under certain three-strike conditions, to charge those drug and theft cases as felonies when they otherwise would have previously been charged as misdemeanors, and it has additional provisions related to drug and theft charges identified below.

Drug Charges

Prop. 36 introduced the following new provisions related to drug charges:

- Allows prosecutors to charge drug possession as a felony if someone has two or more past drug convictions. Defendants can choose treatment instead of custody. These cases are known as “treatment-mandated felonies.” This is a deferred entry of judgment program that permits defendants who successfully complete their treatment to have their charges dismissed (Health & Saf. Code, § 11395).⁴
- Requires courts to advise convicted hard drug dealers and manufacturers that they can be charged with murder if they traffic in hard drugs and someone dies as a result (Health & Saf. Code, § 11369).

¹ See https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260AB102.

² See https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=HSC&division=10.

³ See https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PEN§ionNum=666.1.

⁴ The terms “treatment-mandated felony” and “Health and Safety Code section 11395 felony case” are used interchangeably within this report.

- Adds fentanyl to an existing law that prohibits the possession of a hard drug while armed with a loaded firearm (Health & Saf. Code, § 11370.1).
- Creates new enhancement penalties for fentanyl trafficking in specified quantities (one ounce to 80 kilograms) with punishment with a range of 3 to 25 years (Health & Saf. Code, § 11370.4(c)).
- Allows judges to sentence drug dealers to state prison instead of county jail (Pen. Code, § 1170(h)) when they are convicted of trafficking hard drugs in large quantities (Health & Saf. Code, § 11370.4) or are armed with a firearm while engaged in drug trafficking (Pen. Code, § 12022(c)).
- Expands the definition of “great bodily injury” for enhancement purposes to include instances where someone suffers serious injury or death from using drugs that were sold, furnished, administered, or given by the offender (Pen. Code, § 12022.7).

Theft Charges

Proposition 36 introduced the following new provisions related to theft and property damage:

- Allows the aggregation of stolen items’ value to meet the \$950 threshold for felony theft (Pen. Code, § 490.3).
- Permits a felony charge for petty theft or shoplifting with two prior theft-related convictions (Pen. Code, § 666.1).
- Creates an enhancement for any property damage that occurred during the commission, or attempted commission, of a felony when the property damage is over \$50,000 (Pen. Code, § 12022.6).
- Creates an enhancement for acting in concert with two or more persons to take, damage, or destroy property (Pen. Code, § 12022.65).
- Allows prosecutors to refer defendants to a theft diversion or deferred entry of judgement program (Pen. Code, § 666.1(b)).

Statewide Filing Data

The Judicial Council surveyed the courts to collect the required Prop. 36 data elements set forth in the Budget Act of 2025. Fifty-six courts answered the survey, based on a combination of information from their case management systems and supplemental information from other sources as needed.⁵ These courts represent 99.5 percent of California’s 2024 residential population.⁶

The Judicial Council does not have access to case-level data. All data submitted through the survey were aggregated totals for each county. Because the Judicial Council cannot track

⁵ While all courts were able to provide the number of cases received, many could not respond to all the remaining questions in the survey. It is important to understand the response rates per question before making inferences about the data and comparing it to total cases received. Please see Appendix B to identify the response rates for each question. The survey and responses may be viewed in Appendices A and B, respectively.

⁶ See <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2020s-counties-total.html>.

individual cases across reporting periods to determine case outcomes, the data presented in this report should not be used to infer program participation, success, or failure rates.

Survey Results

During 2025, the first full year of implementation, the courts received 19,104 (55%) felony drug cases (Health & Saf. Code, § 11395) and 15,508 (45%) felony theft cases (Pen. Code, § 666.1), totaling 34,612 felony Prop. 36 cases (see Figure 1).⁷

Figure 1:




Figure 2 shows the total number of felony cases reported monthly by the courts for each code section filed. The total number of monthly cases increased over time, especially in the first four months of implementation in 2025. The trend then decreases slightly between April and July, then increases again, with sharp decreases for both code sections in November. Overall, the number of monthly cases generally increased over the course of 2025.

⁷ For the purpose of the Statewide Filings Data section of this report, the term “Proposition 36 cases” refers only to two main types of cases that were created by the initiative: Health and Safety Code section 11395 cases and Penal Code section 666.1 cases.

Figure 2:





Figure 3 illustrates the percentage breakdown of Health and Safety Code section 11395 felony drug and Penal Code section 666.1 felony theft cases filed in 2025 by court size. The smallest courts showed the greatest difference, with 76 percent of Prop. 36 cases for drug possession and 24 percent for theft. Small and large courts also generally saw more cases for drug possession than theft, while medium courts tended to report a roughly even split of the two types of Prop. 36 cases examined. Notably, variations exist among courts of the same size, likely due to differing local practices.

Figure 3:



Treatment-Mandated Felony Cases

Of the responding courts, 48 percent reported having a dedicated calendar for treatment-mandated felony cases. Additionally, 63 percent used probation services, and 55 percent had dedicated treatment professionals processing these cases. Twenty-three percent of courts reported using additional program components to manage treatment-mandated felony cases. These components included partnerships with county Health and Human Services agencies and other organizations as well as leveraging established collaborative courts. Some courts noted that probation officers attend traditional post-sentencing collaborative court sessions but are not involved in treatment-mandated felony programs because treatment-mandated felonies are processed as deferred entry of judgement cases in which defendants have not been sentenced to probation.

There were 53 courts that were able to report on the number of cases that involved individuals that elected treatment. These 53 courts received 18,666 felony drug cases under Health and Safety Code section 11395, of which 3,207 (17%) involved individuals who opted for treatment. The survey asked courts to identify the reasons why defendants did not participate in the treatment-mandated felony option. Forty-five courts provided a response to this question. Out of these 45 courts, two (4%) noted that all eligible defendants had elected to receive treatment. Twenty-eight (62% of the 45) courts reported that some defendants had declined treatment in lieu of custody. Twenty-three (51% of the 45) courts noted that some defendants had declined

evaluation for treatment and that some defendants failed to appear. Twenty-two (49% of the 45) courts noted that some cases had been referred to other programs.⁸

Courts reported that 57 cases were dismissed following the participant's successful completion of the assigned treatment program during the reporting period. However, it would be premature to assume this figure as a rate of program success. Treatment programs can last several months to over a year, meaning many cases—especially those filed towards the end of the reporting period—have not had time to progress through all portions of the treatment program required for successful completion. Only 30 of the 56 responding trial courts were able to report the number of defendants undergoing treatment at the time of the survey and reported 879 participants currently in treatment.

Courts (49 out of 56) also reported on the number of cases in which charges were imposed after the defendant had an unsatisfactory treatment outcome (poor performance, refusal, etc.) or received a new criminal charge. These 49 courts reported 2,735 cases in which the defendant elected to participate in treatment and 197 cases (7%) in which judgment was imposed and the defendant was sentenced.

Out of the reporting courts, 29 courts were able to report on all the key outcomes of the cases in which the defendant elected to participate in treatment in lieu of custody, including whether the defendant was currently in treatment. Table 1 presents outcomes for only these 29 courts to provide an illustration of case flow. These 29 courts reported 10,937 Health and Safety Code section 11395 felony drug cases filed, 1,305 of which involved a defendant who elected to receive treatment.

Of these 1,305 cases, 36 resulted in case dismissal upon the defendant's successful completion of a treatment program. Conversely, 92 cases involved defendants who had their sentence imposed due to an unsatisfactory outcome while participating in treatment.⁹ In most (879) of the remaining cases, the defendant was still undergoing treatment at this time of the survey.¹⁰ The remaining defendants were likely somewhere in the process of engaging in treatment or their whereabouts were unknown.

⁸ In many cases, Health & Saf. Code, § 11395 charges were filed along more serious charges making the treatment option unfeasible for some defendants.

⁹ Unsatisfactory outcomes included the defendant performing unsatisfactorily in the program, not benefiting from treatment, not being amenable to treatment, refusing treatment (after first electing to participate in treatment), or having been convicted of a new crime. (See e.g., Health & Saf. Code, § 11395(d)(4).)

¹⁰ Some cases in which defendants elected to participate in treatment may not have fallen into the outcome categories captured within Table 1. There are a variety of reasons why this could happen. Some examples include cases where defendants elected to participate in treatment and (1) had not yet begun treatment prior to when courts responded to the survey, (2) absconded after their referral to treatment, and (3) began treatment but had yet to have a follow-up hearing with the court by the time of the survey.

Table 1: Case Counts and Treatment Outcomes Within the Reporting Period

Outcome	Case Count
Health and Safety Code section 11395 felony drug cases	10,937
Cases in which defendant elected treatment	1,305
Treatment cases resulting in dismissal of charge(s)	36
Treatment cases in which judgement was imposed	92
Treatment cases in progress at time of reporting	879

Note: this table includes data only from the 29 courts that were able to report on all the listed outcomes. Courts that were unable to report one or more of the counts listed in the table are excluded from all rows of the table.

Only 44 trial courts were able to report how many of the Health and Safety Code section 11395 defendants had been previously charged with a violation of a treatment-mandated felony pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11395 during the reporting period. Those 44 trial courts reported 15,796 total Health and Safety Code section 11395 cases, 1,957 (12%) of which involved defendants who had been previously charged with another treatment-mandated felony in 2025.

Theft Cases

Courts (51 out of 56) received 13,099 felonies under Penal Code section 666.1 and reported that 4,999 (38%) resulted in a conviction during the reporting period. Since the Judicial Council does not have access to case-level data, the actual conviction rate cannot be calculated from the data collected. It can take many months for a case to reach disposition. It is likely that many, if not most, of the cases filed during the reporting period have not yet reached case resolution. The survey did not request information on the nature of the convictions, and it is unknown whether the convictions resulted in a prison sentence, jail sentence, or probation, which may include participation in a theft diversion or deferred entry of judgement program. Of the 56 reporting courts, 7 percent reported that theft diversion programs were available in their jurisdictions, 4 percent had deferred entry of judgment programs, 42 percent had neither, and 41 percent could not report this information.

Summary of Findings

There is significant variation in the ways that Prop. 36 is being implemented throughout the state. Some county justice system partners have focused more heavily on prosecuting Penal Code section 666.1 theft felonies, while others have focused on prosecuting Health and Safety Code section 11395 drug felonies. Some prosecutors began filing many complaints as soon as the legislation was enacted; others took a more incremental approach. Some prosecutors chose to file some of the eligible cases as misdemeanors.¹¹ Small courts tended to have more drug possession cases, while the smallest, medium, and large courts tended to have a more even distribution

¹¹ This is shown in the table of survey responses viewable in Appendix B.

between drug possession and theft cases. The courts are finding that some individuals charged with Health and Safety Code section 11395 felony drug cases may be more appropriate for alternative approaches, such as mental health diversion. In many instances, people charged with Health and Safety Code section 11395 also have higher level charges that require more serious sentences that may involve incarceration, so the treatment-mandated felony option is not pursued. Not all cases result in dispositions that were contemplated by the legislation. For example, some Penal Code section 666.1 felony theft cases are referred to mental health diversion programs, post-adjudication drug or mental health courts, or regular probation.

Some courts have pointed out the downstream workload impacts that are not measured by this survey. For example, some courts indicated that misdemeanor cases that were previously resolved quickly through plea bargains or time-served dispositions are taking longer because they are now considered priorable offenses. This results in longer lifespans for misdemeanor cases.

There are no statutory time limitations on prior convictions that qualify a defendant for charges under Health and Safety Code section 11395 felony drug or Penal Code section 666.1 felony theft. Some prosecutors have chosen to implement “wash out” periods and do not consider older cases or will otherwise file the Prop. 36 cases as misdemeanors under certain circumstances.

Data Considerations

Readers should consider the following contextual information when interpreting the survey data presented within this report.

Challenges in Data Collection and Case Tracking

Courts across the state employ disparate systems with varying levels of data extraction capabilities, resulting in inconsistencies in the information captured. Most courts lack the capability to track demographic data through their case management platforms. Consequently, other justice system stakeholders—such as treatment providers, district attorneys, and public defenders—may be able to report on more details related to Proposition 36 case progression than the courts. Similarly, the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) may have access to more complete treatment information. However, DHCS was unable to provide treatment data for the calendar year of 2025 in time for this first report. Future reports will benefit from the inclusion of this additional treatment information.

Data from the courts alone cannot provide a complete picture of Proposition 36’s implementation. To address gaps in what the courts can capture and report, it is also necessary to examine additional sources of information that may capture information that is not readily available to the courts. For example, the Committee for the Revision of the Penal Code, in coordination with the California Policy Lab, is using data from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to examine prison admissions data for Prop. 36 offenses.¹² The

¹² See <https://clrc.ca.gov/CRPC/Data/data.html>.

data examined include the racial/ethnic composition for individuals admitted to state prison for a Prop. 36 controlling offense.¹³ Examining available information from these sorts of alternative sources can supplement court-reported data and provide a more complete picture of program implementation and impact.

Case Processing Under Health and Safety Code Section 11395

Several factors contribute to the gap between the number of cases filed and those resulting in treatment referrals and program admissions. Cases initially charged under Health and Safety Code section 11395 felony drug frequently resolve through pleas to lesser or alternative charges. Defendants may also defer electing treatment until later stages of plea negotiations, sometimes months after the initial filing; in such cases, a considerable amount of time can lapse between when the qualifying charge is filed and when the person ultimately opts to receive treatment. In some instances, treatment-eligible charges are filed alongside more serious offenses, rendering defendants effectively ineligible for treatment in lieu of custody. Additionally, some trial courts utilize preexisting diversion and treatment pathways rather than the new Prop. 36 framework, often to ensure probation agency involvement.

Some courts noted a general lack of access to the necessary treatment services within their county. State funding for county behavioral health departments to invest in Prop. 36 treatment services were not available until late in the reporting period, meaning that any relief that the funding will provide will largely not be seen within the period covered by this report. Courts also expressed that access to treatment provided through county behavioral health departments is only available for those who meet certain financial qualifications. It can be especially difficult for defendants who do not meet these requirements to use private insurance to receive treatment from outside providers that are not accustomed to coordinating with parties within the criminal justice system.

There is a tension between the desire for swift adjudication of these cases and the need to support treatment effectiveness. Treatment programs can require many months to complete to support positive outcomes, including sobriety or changes in criminogenic thinking.¹⁴ Given that the reporting period for the survey spans only a single year, many cases remain pending simply due to insufficient time for program completion. This partially explains the low number of successful completions during the reporting period. While successful outcomes in these programs take some time to achieve, individuals who are unsuccessful are typically identified and terminated early in the process.

Implementation of Proposition 36 (2024)

Since the passage of Prop. 36, the judicial branch and justice partners have worked to understand and respond to the requirements and resource needs for implementation. The section below

¹³ A controlling offense means it was the most serious offense for which the person was convicted.

¹⁴ See https://nida.nih.gov/sites/default/files/principles-drug-abuse-treatment-criminal-justice-populations-research-based-guide_508.pdf for more information

describes some of the implementation and expenditure activities of the trial courts and the Judicial Council.

Court Activities

Many courts have opted to use dedicated calendars to process treatment-mandated felonies using a collaborative court type process. However, some of them have noted that these calendars may not be as effective as traditional collaborative courts because treatment providers and probation officers do not always fully participate as members of the team.¹⁵ Courts also reported that treatment-mandated felonies may linger in the system for some time since defendants can opt into these programs at any time prior to the final case disposition. Courts have addressed some of these challenges through collaboration with justice system partners. Some courts worked with district attorneys to develop procedures to ensure that they can effectively process cases. Some courts worked with their county behavioral health department to determine appropriate length of time in treatment.

Courts reported several challenges related to the sparsity of treatment services for a treatment-mandated felony.¹⁶ Under Prop. 36, courts make referrals to programs and services that are at no cost to the defendant, and that defendant may, but is not required to, pay for the program (Health & Saf. Code, § 11395(d)(4)). Most defendants qualify for Medi-Cal and are eligible to receive services through the county behavioral health department. However, courts report that county systems are often under-resourced and that treatment availability is sometimes limited. Prop. 36 allows individuals with private insurance and those who do not qualify for Medi-Cal to use other resources to pay for treatment. However, many private insurers are unfamiliar with the criminal justice system and Prop. 36 processes. This often results in delays and lengthens the amount of time to case disposition, which can result in defendants opting to resolve cases through nontreatment options. It is likely that some of these challenges may be addressed through the additional funding that will be available to county behavioral health departments in the spring of 2026.

Courts reported that treatment-mandated felonies may linger in the system for some time since defendants can opt into these programs at any time prior to the final case disposition. This suggests that processing time for these cases may take longer than processing time for other drug-related felonies. Some courts are making efforts to track this time and identify potential procedures to streamline this process.

¹⁵ Health and Safety Code section 11395 does not specify that individuals undergoing treatment must be supervised by probation. Without a statutory requirement or dedicated funding, probation supervision for treatment-mandated felonies is not provided in each county. County behavioral health departments did not have access to funding for Prop. 36 during the reporting period. It is anticipated that treatment availability will expand once that funding is received.

¹⁶ County behavioral health departments did not have access to dedicated Prop. 36 funding during this reporting period.

Court Expenditures

Under the Budget Act of 2025, the Legislature allocated funding to address the increased workload and to implement or expand collaborative courts. The courts received their allocations in September 2025, less than four months before the survey was conducted. Many were still determining the most appropriate use of the funding and reported challenges related to the one-time nature of the allocation. Courts noted that it takes a minimum of 6–8 months to develop collaborative court model programs and they are dependent on ongoing staffing. Without consistent ongoing funding, some courts are reluctant to set up comprehensive programs. A more robust examination of the use of the allocation will be provided in subsequent reports.

Courts are adopting diverse strategies to address their specific needs and challenges. Most courts have used or plan to use funds for staffing, contracting, administrative costs, and collaborative court-related expenses. Some courts hired or intend to hire subordinate judicial officers (such as court commissioners) to hear cases, collaborative court coordinators, and business operations analysts to streamline operations and enhance program efficiency. Others have focused their efforts on collecting data to better understand the barriers to participation. One court is documenting the reasons defendants opt out of treatment, while another is investing funds into the potential development of a countywide dashboard. A few courts have not yet utilized their funds but are actively determining the most effective way to proceed.

Numerous courts have assessed the time staff spend on treatment-mandated cases, which encompasses tasks such as reporting, attending meetings, training, processing cases, performing clerical duties within and outside the courtroom, and monitoring progress. Similarly, felony theft cases that were previously adjudicated as misdemeanors also impact court workload. Many reported that the increased workload has highly impacted staff and operations, requiring some courts to allocate their Prop. 36 funds primarily towards salaries and benefits.¹⁷

Judicial Council Activities

The Judicial Council received \$1 million over three years to support court implementation of Prop. 36. In fiscal year (FY) 2025–26, the Judicial Council developed an allocation methodology and distributed funding to all 58 superior courts; gathered and analyzed data from the courts; engaged in a number training, technical assistance, and outreach activities; and collaborated with the Department of Health Care Services as described in more detail below.

¹⁷ Significantly more staff time is needed to process felony cases than misdemeanors. Because they have more serious consequences, felony cases are more likely to result in trial, tend to have more continuances, and often result in additional post-adjudication activities. Based on the Resource Allocation Study conducted by Judicial Council in 2024, case weights—the total staff time spent on specific case types from filing through disposition including post-disposition work—show that felony cases require nearly three times as much time as misdemeanor nontraffic cases. See <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14019448&GUID=99F54D42-7B70-40DA-9E23-ECF5C049A1B9>.

Allocation

The funding methodology for Prop. 36 uses two components to distribute \$19 million dollars in General Fund to the trial courts. Half of the funding is allocated based on each court's share of statewide, nontraffic misdemeanor and felony filings from FY 2023–24, providing a stable baseline that is tied to established criminal workload, as required by the Budget Act of 2025. The other half is allocated using data collected through a Judicial Council survey, which captures felony filings received by the court under the new Prop. 36 provisions between December 18, 2024, and April 30, 2025. This allocation formula ensures that the funding aligns with the actual and emerging workloads associated with implementation.

The Judicial Council's Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee considered additional funding allocation methodologies but ultimately recommended this two-part method because it most accurately represents both historical workload and the significant new demands introduced by Prop. 36. Courts received their full funding allocation near the beginning of FY 2025–26. The allocations can be found in Appendix C.

Data Collection and Reporting

The Judicial Council formally surveyed the courts three times to assess the impact of Prop. 36 on the courts. The survey documented Prop. 36–related filings (Pen. Code, § 666.1; Health & Saf. Code, § 11395) that the courts received between December 18, 2024, and April 30, 2025. Findings from this survey were used to inform the allocation methodology for the distribution of funds to the courts. The second survey was conducted in adherence to the Budget Act of 2024,¹⁸ focused solely on Health and Safety Code section 11395 cases filed between December 18, 2024, and June 30, 2025, and was used to inform a report that was submitted to the Legislature on October 1, 2025.¹⁹ Finally, the 2025 annual survey was conducted in order to inform the development of this report.

Training, Technical Assistance, and Outreach

The Judicial Council has conducted training, technical assistance, and outreach activities in support of court implementation of Prop. 36. Training and technical assistance activities include the development of a legal guidance memorandum and webinar for judicial officers, and the creation of a Prop. 36 judicial branch intranet resource page for judicial officers and court staff. Outreach activities include participation in several workgroups and meetings of justice system partners related to Prop. 36, and participation in a court site visit to the Superior Court of San Diego County's Prop. 36 court with legislative staff members, as described in more detail below.

¹⁸ See https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202520260AB102.

¹⁹ See <https://courts.ca.gov/system/files/legislative-reports/lr-2025-preliminary-proposition-36-court-data.pdf>, accessed Feb. 9, 2026.

Legal Guidance, Webinar, and Proposition 36 Resource Page Development

The Judicial Council issued a memorandum in November 2024 (and revised January 2025) that was distributed to all 58 presiding judges and court executive officers in the state that provided a summary and legal guidance related to Prop. 36. It outlines implementation guidance for courts and justice system stakeholders, and covers eligibility criteria, procedural requirements, and practical considerations for treatment-mandated felonies. Additionally, it includes references to relevant Penal Code and Health and Safety Code sections, information on advisements, and cross-references to companion legislative measures for comprehensive application.

On June 30, 2025, the Judicial Council hosted a webinar on Prop. 36 that provided an overview of the main legal impacts of Prop. 36 and implementation examples from Orange County. Eighty-two representatives from well over half of California's counties attended the live webinar. Attendees included judges and court staff. These resources and several others, including model court forms and procedures, are posted on an online resource page for judicial officers and court staff members.

Outreach

In recognition of the fact that Prop. 36 affects a variety of justice system partners, Judicial Council staff have engaged in several outreach activities with the courts and other key program stakeholders, including panel presentations at conferences and meetings, and participation in Prop. 36 workgroup meetings, listed below:

- California Association of Collaborative Courts Conference, March 2025;
- Public Policy Institute of California Proposition 36 workgroup meeting, September 2025;
- California Association of Counties Annual Conference, December 2025; and
- California Behavioral Health Planning Council Meeting, January 2026.

Additionally, Judicial Council staff assisted in planning and attended a site visit for legislative staff to observe the Superior Court of San Diego County's Proposition 36 court in December 2025.

Allocation to County Behavioral Health Departments from the Department of Health Care Services

As authorized by Assembly Bill 102, the Department of Health Care Services was allocated \$50 million from the General Fund to support Prop. 36 through the distribution of funds to county behavioral health departments for planning, capacity-building, and direct treatment services. DHCS contracted with the Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management (The Center) to serve as the administrative and fiscal intermediary. Beginning in January 2026, The Center will begin the process to distribute \$47.5 million to county behavioral health departments, with the remaining funds identified for state administrative costs.

Under AB 102, counties must allocate at least 50 percent of their funding to planning and capacity-building activities, such as hiring and training staff for forensic assessments and court coordination, upgrading information technology systems, and developing policies and data-sharing agreements. Counties may use up to 50 percent for direct treatment services that are not Medi-Cal reimbursable, including residential and outpatient treatment gaps, withdrawal management, medication-assisted treatment, transportation, and court coordination costs. Any portion spent on treatment services must be matched by a 25 percent local contribution.

DHCS will coordinate with counties to collect and report data required under AB 102, including expenditures and the number of individuals served. Initial reporting will be limited, as county capacity varies. DHCS is procuring a vendor to compile information on counties' current capacity and needs to inform contract development and build scopes of work that support data collection and reporting requirements under AB 102. Data completeness will improve over time as counties implement infrastructure upgrades.

County Treatment Provider Allocation Overview

Funding allocations for each county behavioral health department are based on a formula that considers population size, identified needs, and urban/rural factors. Each county is identified to receive a minimum allocation of \$250,000, with larger counties receiving proportionally higher amounts based on anticipated use of the treatment-mandated felony process. These allocations support planning, capacity-building, and treatment activities under Prop. 36. Appendix C provides the specific allocation for each county. If any county opts out of funding, their funding will be redistributed, based on the same formula, to those counties that participate.

Conclusion

With nearly 35,000 related felony cases reported in the first calendar year of implementation, Prop. 36 has significantly impacted the court system and the broader criminal justice system. Over half (55%) of Prop. 36 felony cases were for drug offenses, for which defendants have the option to choose treatment instead of custody time, meaning collaboration with justice system partners remains vital to effective program implementation. The current data available do not fully assess program outcomes, including the proposition's impact on various populations. Therefore, additional research by academic institutions or agencies with access to more comprehensive case-level data is recommended.

This report focuses on the initial year of implementation and more detailed information is expected to be available next year. Both the courts and county behavioral health departments will gain additional resources, improving the branch's ability to measure the program's effectiveness. The Judicial Council will continue to collaborate with the courts and justice system partners to support the goals of rehabilitation and reduced reoffending. The Judicial Council will submit the subsequent report to the Legislature by March 1, 2027, and annually for a total of three years or until the funds are exhausted.

Appendix A: Survey Form

In accordance with the **Budget Act of 2025 (AB 102)**, the Judicial Council is collecting information from each trial court regarding the implementation of Proposition 36 during the period of **January 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025**.

- **Submission:** Please submit your completed survey by **close of business on January 15, 2026**, using the submission button located on page 6.
- **Required Questions:** The survey cannot be submitted unless all questions **outlined in red** are completed. Hovering over a response box displays instructions for data entry.
- **Section 5 Note:** The Judicial Council recognizes that courts do not typically track the information requested in **Section 5 (pages 5-6)**. However, courts that can provide some or all the requested counts are asked to do so.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

1. Please provide an email for the point of contact for any follow-up questions regarding the information provided in this survey. (please use a semicolon (;) as a separator for multiple email addresses)

2. Please select the appropriate county name from the drop-down list:

Alameda

Section 1: Health & Safety Code section 11395

3. Please fill in the table with the total number of misdemeanor and felony cases filed each month pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11395, including all cases where that section was filed regardless of other charges.

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
HS Misd.												
HS Felony												

4. Please select from the program components below that are applicable to the processing of treatment-mandated felonies in your court (select all that apply).

- Dedicated Calendar
- Probation Supervision
- Dedicated Treatment Professionals

Other:

5. Did the court order a drug addiction expert to conduct a substance abuse and mental health evaluation of the defendant pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11395(d)(1)(A) in all or nearly all cases?

Yes

No (Please explain):

6. Did the court order that a case worker or other qualified individual determine whether the defendant was eligible to receive Medi-Cal, Medicare, or any other relevant benefits for any programs or evaluations, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11395(d)(1)(C) in all or nearly all cases?

Yes

No (Please explain):

7. In how many of the felony cases described in Question 3 did the defendant elect treatment by pleading guilty or no contest to a violation, agreeing to participate in, and complete, a detailed treatment program pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11395(d)(1)(A)?

8. Please select the reason(s) why defendants in your jurisdiction with charges that are eligible as treatment mandated felonies did not participate in treatment (select all that apply).

Case referred to another program (such as diversion)

Defendant declined evaluation of treatment needs

Defendant declined receiving treatment in lieu of custody

Defendant did not have significant treatment needs

Defendant failed to appear or absconded before/at treatment decision point

Qualifying charge(s) reduced to a misdemeanor by the court

Treatment not available

Other (please provide detail):

Does not apply (meaning all eligible defendants elected to receive treatment)

9. In how many of the cases described in Question 7 did the defendant successfully complete the treatment program, receive the positive recommendation of treatment, and subsequently have their charges dismissed by the court?

--

10. In how many of the cases described in Question 7 did the defendant have their judgment imposed, and was sentenced due to the defendant performing unsatisfactorily in the program, not benefiting from treatment, not being amenable to treatment, refusing treatment (after first electing to participate in treatment), or having been convicted of a new crime?

--

11. In how many of the felony cases counted in Question 3 was the defendant previously charged, or charged more than once in this reporting period, with a violation of a treatment-mandated felony pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11395? *Please do not include cases in which a defendant was previously charged with a misdemeanor violation of Health and Safety Code section 11395.*

--

Section 2: Penal Code section 666.1

12. Please fill in the table with the total number of misdemeanor and felony cases filed in each month pursuant to Penal Code section 666.1, including all cases where that section was filed regardless of other charges.

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
PC Misd.												
PC Felony												

13. In how many of the felony cases described in Question 12 was the defendant convicted of an offense listed within Penal Code section 666.1?

--

14. Has the prosecutor's office in your county implemented a theft diversion or deferred entry of judgment program pursuant to Penal Code section 1001.81 for which cases filed pursuant to Penal Code section 666.1 are eligible? Please check all that apply.

- Yes – Diversion Program
- Yes – Deferred Entry of Judgment Program
- No
- Unknown

Section 3: Estimated Expenditures

15. Your court should have received funding for Proposition 36 implementation on September 15, 2025. Of that amount, approximately how much has been spent on each given category?

Salary/Benefits: \$	
Training/Travel: \$	
Equipment/Supplies: \$	
Contractors/Service Providers: \$	
Other (please provide detail): \$	

Section 4: Data Collection Capacity Assessment and Additional Information

16. Please note which of the questions above (from sections 1, 2, and 3) could not be tracked by your court.

--

17. Please select any of the following defendant characteristics by which your court can disaggregate any of the counts provided in Sections 1 and 2.

- Race
- Gender
- Age
- Housing Status
- None of the above

18. What else should the Judicial Council and California Legislature know about Proposition 36 implementation in your jurisdiction?

Section 5: Treatment Survey

19. In how many of the felony cases described in Question 3 did an expert submit a report of the evaluation to the court and the parties?

Court cannot access this information

20. In how many of the felony cases described in Question 3 was the defendant entered into:

20a. drug treatment but not mental health treatment?

20b. mental health treatment but not drug treatment?

20c. both drug treatment and mental health treatment?

Court cannot access this information

21. In how many of the felony cases described in Question 3 was the defendant ordered to receive job training?

Court cannot access this information

22. In how many of the felony cases described in Question 3 is the defendant currently undergoing treatment at the time of this survey?

Court cannot access this information

23. Please select any of the following defendant characteristics by which your court can disaggregate any of the counts provided in Sections 5.

- Race
- Gender
- Age
- Housing Status
- None of the above

Appendix B: Survey Responses

Table 1 shows the Health and Saf. Code, § 11395 and Pen. Code, § 666.1 misdemeanor and felony case filings and outcomes by trial courts. All counts are derived from reported cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 1

Trial Court	HS § 11395 Misdemeanor Cases Filed	HS § 11395 Felony Cases Filed	HS § 11395 Felony Cases Elected Treatment	HS § 11395 Felony Cases Resulting in Dismissal of Charges	HS § 11395 Felony Cases in which Judgment Was Imposed	PC § 666.1 Misdemeanor Cases Filed	PC § 666.1 Felony Cases Filed	PC § 666.1 Felony Cases Resulting in Conviction
Statewide:	3,144	19,104	2,853	52	197	2,144	15,508	4,999
Alameda	16	11	0	0	0	213	537	119
Alpine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amador	0	43	2	1	0	0	32	6
Butte	17	14	14	0	0	1	1	0
Calaveras	0	29	0	0	0	0	5	1
Colusa	0	9	3	0	0	0	2	0
Contra Costa	72	90	0	0	0	81	427	
Del Norte	0	4	1	0	0	10	11	1
El Dorado	2	80	12	1	0	2	79	17
Fresno	15	101	8	0	0	15	553	183
Glenn	0	10	1	0	1	0	0	0
Humboldt	4	78	15	0		0	113	57
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kern	23	1,226	6	6	0	14	762	294
Kings	3	103	1	0	0	4	55	23
Lake	1	122	34	0	0	0	29	3
Lassen	1	20	0	0	0	1	15	3
Los Angeles	405	1,660	3	1		448	2,672	1,187
Madera	1	119	32	0	0		34	34
Marin	0	31	1	0	0	24	50	24
Mariposa		5	0	0	0		1	0
Mendocino		105	39	0	0		71	34
Merced	1	32	8	0	6	8	110	46
Modoc	0	7	0			0	2	1
Mono	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	2
Monterey		171					129	53
Napa		43	28	0	5		71	71
Nevada	0	48	12	0	3	0	21	5
Orange	877	5,260	309	8	50	276	1,003	
Placer	207	237	37	0	5	12	290	89
Plumas		2	1	0	0		0	0
Riverside	211	1,769	240	0	12	137	1,537	556

Trial Court	HS § 11395 Misdemeanor Cases Filed	HS § 11395 Felony Cases Filed	HS § 11395 Felony Cases Elected Treatment	HS § 11395 Felony Cases Resulting in Dismissal of Charges	HS § 11395 Felony Cases in which Judgment Was Imposed	PC § 666.1 Misdemeanor Cases Filed	PC § 666.1 Felony Cases Filed	PC § 666.1 Felony Cases Resulting in Conviction
Sacramento	456	224	2	0	0	139	786	
San Benito		38	9	0	3		10	0
San Bernardino	0	289	41	0	0	17	907	442
San Diego	17	2,175	628	5	6	14	1,052	415
San Francisco	0	4	0	0	0	129	125	19
San Joaquin	5	136	44	4	5	10	214	214
San Luis Obispo		404	79	0	1		108	67
San Mateo	32	349	24	0	1	81	717	59
Santa Barbara	127	225	79	0	3	27	159	40
Santa Clara	335	690	100			241	799	228
Santa Cruz	26	197				41	155	44
Shasta	14	291	44	2	4	10	166	41
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou		70					25	
Solano		163	32	0	0		174	43
Sonoma	72	153	13	0	0	53	163	43
Stanislaus	14	910	387	5	44	16	412	159
Sutter	31	217	54	0	0	0	121	121
Tehama	0	69	9	0	2	1	13	0
Trinity	7	24	0	0	0	0	2	0
Tulare	78	309	203	0	20	10	294	103
Tuolumne		74	27	0	6		22	6
Ventura	44	411	232	7	6	40	268	135
Yolo	1	117	13	0	0	36	168	
Yuba	2	131	26	12	14	10	32	11

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 2

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS January Misd. (n 46)	3. HS February Misd. (n 47)	3. HS March Misd. (n 47)	3. HS April Misd. (n 47)	3. HS May Misd. (n 47)	3. HS June Misd. (n 50)	3. HS July Misd. (n 48)	3. HS August Misd. (n 46)	3. HS September Misd. (n 48)	3. HS October Misd. (n 48)
Statewide:	240	180	221	255	275	277	306	304	348	320
Alameda	1	2	0	3	1	1	2	1	1	1
Alpine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amador	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Butte	5	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calaveras	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colusa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contra Costa	2	7	11	8	8	7	7	7	2	3
Del Norte	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
El Dorado	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Fresno	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	4	0	2
Glenn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Humboldt	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kern	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	5	3	2
Kings	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lassen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	6	17	27	18	35	38	33	54	42	60
Madera	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Marin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mariposa										
Mendocino										
Merced	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Modoc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mono	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monterey		1				1				1

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS January Misd. (n 46)	3. HS February Misd. (n 47)	3. HS March Misd. (n 47)	3. HS April Misd. (n 47)	3. HS May Misd. (n 47)	3. HS June Misd. (n 50)	3. HS July Misd. (n 48)	3. HS August Misd. (n 46)	3. HS September Misd. (n 48)	3. HS October Misd. (n 48)
Napa										
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	110	41	32	36	72	70	95	87	110	82
Placer	17	13	17	24	26	14	20	13	14	16
Plumas										
Riverside	17	23	22	33	13	16	10	16	22	10
Sacramento	20	21	45	57	59	47	41	51	66	45
San Benito			1			2	1			
San Bernardino	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Diego	2	0	3	2	2	3	0	1	1	0
San Francisco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Joaquin	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
San Luis Obispo				2	2	2	2		3	4
San Mateo	1	3	3	3	4	3	2	0	6	6
Santa Barbara	0	0	0	7	8	22	23	19	14	15
Santa Clara	12	17	23	33	23	20	36	31	43	44
Santa Cruz	2	4	1	2	0	1	0	3	6	4
Shasta	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	2
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou										
Solano						1			1	
Sonoma	29	12	5	1	4	4	5	0	3	3
Stanislaus	1	3	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
Sutter	1	2	3	0	2	7	2	2	1	7
Tehama	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinity	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0
Tulare	12	6	10	7	7	2	6	4	4	6
Tuolumne										

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS January Misd. (n 46)	3. HS February Misd. (n 47)	3. HS March Misd. (n 47)	3. HS April Misd. (n 47)	3. HS May Misd. (n 47)	3. HS June Misd. (n 50)	3. HS July Misd. (n 48)	3. HS August Misd. (n 46)	3. HS September Misd. (n 48)	3. HS October Misd. (n 48)
Ventura	1	2	5	4	2	6	9	3	3	6
Yolo	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Yuba	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 3

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS November Misd. (n 48)	3. HS December Misd. (n 47)	3. HS January Felony (n 56)	3. HS February Felony (n 56)	3. HS March Felony (n 56)	3. HS April Felony (n 56)	3. HS May Felony (n 56)	3. HS June Felony (n 56)	3. HS July Felony (n 56)	3. HS August Felony (n 56)
Statewide:	200	218	1,181	1,283	1,428	1,627	1,532	1,476	1,776	1,826
Alameda	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	2	3
Alpine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amador	0	0	5	3	7	2	8	5	5	2
Butte	0	0	2	0	2	2	1	2	0	3
Calaveras	0	0	0	2	1	1	3	3	2	4
Colusa	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0
Contra Costa	3	7	12	15	14	7	8	9	4	9
Del Norte	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
El Dorado	0	0	7	9	12	6	8	4	6	8
Fresno	0	2	5	3	5	9	5	11	11	9
Glenn	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
Humboldt	1	0	5	7	6	3	7	1	3	9
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kern	0	0	90	78	102	95	102	104	117	127
Kings	0	0	3	6	7	8	7	11	8	4
Lake	0	0	4	13	14	15	6	12	13	7
Lassen	0	1	2	1	0	3	1	1	3	1
Los Angeles	40	35	72	83	87	111	132	123	205	189
Madera	0	0	15	12	9	7	7	10	10	11
Marin	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	2	2	6
Mariposa			0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0
Mendocino			12	11	6	7	10	10	8	9
Merced	0	0	1	0	4	1	3	2	6	1
Modoc	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
Mono	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monterey			16	13	6	12	13	15	13	19

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS November Misd. (n 48)	3. HS December Misd. (n 47)	3. HS January Felony (n 56)	3. HS February Felony (n 56)	3. HS March Felony (n 56)	3. HS April Felony (n 56)	3. HS May Felony (n 56)	3. HS June Felony (n 56)	3. HS July Felony (n 56)	3. HS August Felony (n 56)
Napa			5	5	3	3	4	0	5	3
Nevada	0	0	6	1	4	1	4	5	8	9
Orange	65	77	305	403	405	480	457	418	427	497
Placer	15	18	27	13	40	15	14	10	17	18
Plumas			0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Riverside	15	14	134	127	138	160	141	121	179	155
Sacramento	3	1	0	6	10	7	9	3	17	21
San Benito	1		3	6	2	3	0	5	5	4
San Bernardino	0	0	1	12	9	16	21	27	23	14
San Diego	2	1	144	147	161	155	166	169	199	236
San Francisco	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
San Joaquin	1	0	1	1	17	21	13	4	8	10
San Luis Obispo	1	1	7	19	20	56	42	27	58	37
San Mateo	1	0	18	21	20	27	27	28	32	37
Santa Barbara	10	9	0	0	0	30	22	19	48	29
Santa Clara	23	30	34	39	56	71	55	74	60	73
Santa Cruz	2	1	10	14	18	13	17	13	21	7
Shasta	3	1	19	15	24	33	16	16	15	30
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou			3	3	3	6	7	4	7	6
Solano			9	6	6	18	12	8	6	20
Sonoma	1	5	25	12	18	10	14	9	11	16
Stanislaus	0	2	47	77	86	87	68	75	92	70
Sutter	3	1	16	16	11	12	17	17	22	18
Tehama	0	0	0	3	3	6	2	8	7	11
Trinity	1	1	3	0	3	1	0	1	5	3
Tulare	6	8	25	18	21	20	16	21	34	28
Tuolumne			12	5	4	8	6	5	11	3

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS November Misd. (n 48)	3. HS December Misd. (n 47)	3. HS January Felony (n 56)	3. HS February Felony (n 56)	3. HS March Felony (n 56)	3. HS April Felony (n 56)	3. HS May Felony (n 56)	3. HS June Felony (n 56)	3. HS July Felony (n 56)	3. HS August Felony (n 56)
Ventura	1	2	33	23	33	44	31	39	25	38
Yolo	0	0	21	15	12	8	10	8	6	6
Yuba	0	0	15	11	13	16	12	14	8	5

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 4

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS September Felony (n 56)	3. HS October Felony (n 56)	3. HS November Felony (n 56)	3. HS December Felony (n 56)	4. HS Dedicated Calendar (n 56)	4. HS Probation Supervision (n 56)	4. HS Dedicate Treatment Profession (n 56)	4. HS Program Other (n 56)	5. HS Court Order Expert Eval (n 52)	6. HS Court Order Med Benefit Eval (n 50)
Statewide:	1,726	1,907	1,544	1,798	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alameda	0	0	0	1	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	NO
Alpine	0	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	NO
Amador	2	0	0	4	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	YES	YES
Butte	1	1	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Calaveras	3	3	2	5	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	NO
Colusa	1	2	0	1	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	YES
Contra Costa	2	5	2	3	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Del Norte	0	0	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	NO	NO
El Dorado	5	10	4	1	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Fresno	8	19	7	9	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	NO	NO
Glenn	1	1	1	4	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	NO
Humboldt	10	10	4	13	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	NO	NO
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	1	0	0	1	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	NO
Kern	116	113	85	97	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Kings	9	18	13	9	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	NO
Lake	9	10	11	8	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	YES
Lassen	2	0	5	1	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	NO
Los Angeles	174	206	135	143	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE		
Madera	15	11	3	9	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	YES	NO
Marin	2	3	2	3	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	YES
Mariposa	0	0	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	NO	NO
Mendocino	9	8	6	9	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	NO
Merced	2	4	4	4	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Modoc	0	0	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	NO
Mono	0	0	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	NO

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS September Felony (n 56)	3. HS October Felony (n 56)	3. HS November Felony (n 56)	3. HS December Felony (n 56)	4. HS Dedicated Calendar (n 56)	4. HS Probation Supervision (n 56)	4. HS Dedicate Treatment Profession (n 56)	4. HS Program Other (n 56)	5. HS Court Order Expert Eval (n 52)	6. HS Court Order Med Benefit Eval (n 50)
Monterey	26	11	10	17	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE		
Napa	4	1	5	5	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	YES	YES
Nevada	2	3	2	3	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	YES
Orange	456	478	446	488	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	YES	YES
Placer	25	14	21	23	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Plumas	0	0	0	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	NO
Riverside	148	188	113	165	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Sacramento	31	27	48	45	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	NO
San Benito	1	2	2	5	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	
San Bernardino	28	40	38	60	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	NO	NO
San Diego	197	206	168	227	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	NO	
San Francisco	1	1	0	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	NO	NO
San Joaquin	12	14	12	23	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	YES	YES
San Luis Obispo	36	47	30	25	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
San Mateo	40	46	28	25	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Santa Barbara	23	20	14	20	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Santa Clara	52	55	59	62	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	NO	NO
Santa Cruz	17	29	22	16	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE		
Shasta	26	53	30	14	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	YES	YES
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou	8	10	7	6	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE		
Solano	19	14	24	21	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	YES	YES
Sonoma	10	9	7	12	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	YES	YES
Stanislaus	74	79	70	85	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	NO
Sutter	16	32	24	16	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	YES	NO
Tehama	9	3	0	17	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	NO	NO
Trinity	2	2	0	4	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	NO	NO

2. Trial Court (n 56)	3. HS September Felony (n 56)	3. HS October Felony (n 56)	3. HS November Felony (n 56)	3. HS December Felony (n 56)	4. HS Dedicated Calendar (n 56)	4. HS Probation Supervision (n 56)	4. HS Dedicate Treatment Profession (n 56)	4. HS Program Other (n 56)	5. HS Court Order Expert Eval (n 52)	6. HS Court Order Med Benefit Eval (n 50)
Tulare	24	41	31	30	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES
Tuolumne	4	5	3	8	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	NO
Ventura	44	35	33	33	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	NO	NO
Yolo	7	5	7	12	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	YES	YES
Yuba	12	13	6	6	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	YES	YES

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 5

2. Trial Court (n 56)	7. HS Elected Treatment (n 53)	8. HS Case Referred Out (n 45)	8. HS Defendant Decline Treat Eval (n 45)	8. HS Defendant Decline Treatment (n 45)	8. HS Defendant No Signf. Needs (n 45)	8. HS Failure to Appear (n 45)	8. HS Charge Reduce to Misd. (n 45)	8. HS Treatment Not Available (n 45)	8. HS Other (n 45)	8. Does Not Apply (n 45)
Statewide:	2,853	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alameda	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Alpine	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Amador	2	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Butte	14	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Calaveras	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Colusa	3	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Contra Costa	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Del Norte	1	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
El Dorado	12									
Fresno	8									
Glenn	1	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Humboldt	15									
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	0	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Kern	6	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Kings	1	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Lake	34									
Lassen	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
Los Angeles	3									
Madera	32	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Marin	1									
Mariposa	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Mendocino	39	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Merced	8	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Modoc	0	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Mono	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	7. HS Elected Treatment (n 53)	8. HS Case Referred Out (n 45)	8. HS Defendant Decline Treat Eval (n 45)	8. HS Defendant Decline Treatment (n 45)	8. HS Defendant No Signf. Needs (n 45)	8. HS Failure to Appear (n 45)	8. HS Charge Reduce to Misd. (n 45)	8. HS Treatment Not Available (n 45)	8. HS Other (n 45)	8. Does Not Apply (n 45)
Monterey		FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Napa	28	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Nevada	12									
Orange	309	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Placer	37									
Plumas	1	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Riverside	240	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Sacramento	2	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
San Benito	9	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
San Bernardino	41	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
San Diego	628	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
San Francisco	0	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
San Joaquin	44	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
San Luis Obispo	79	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
San Mateo	24	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Santa Barbara	79									
Santa Clara	100	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Santa Cruz		FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
Shasta	44									
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou										
Solano	32	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Sonoma	13	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Stanislaus	387	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Sutter	54	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Tehama	9	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Trinity	0	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	7. HS Elected Treatment (n 53)	8. HS Case Referred Out (n 45)	8. HS Defendant Decline Treat Eval (n 45)	8. HS Defendant Decline Treatment (n 45)	8. HS Defendant No Signf. Needs (n 45)	8. HS Failure to Appear (n 45)	8. HS Charge Reduce to Misd. (n 45)	8. HS Treatment Not Available (n 45)	8. HS Other (n 45)	8. Does Not Apply (n 45)
Tulare	203	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Tuolumne	27	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Ventura	232	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Yolo	13	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Yuba	26	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 6

2. Trial Court (n 56)	9. HS Case Dismissed (n 51)	10. HS Charges Imposed (n 49)	11. Previous HS Charge (n 44)	12. PC January Misd. (n 45)	12. PC February Misd. (n 45)	12. PC March Misd. (n 46)	12. PC April Misd. (n 49)	12. PC May Misd. (n 45)	12. PC June Misd. (n 46)	12. PC July Misd. (n 48)
Statewide:	52	197	1957	153	135	168	220	181	178	193
Alameda	0	0	0	8	12	18	13	18	17	19
Alpine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amador	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Butte	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Calaveras	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colusa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contra Costa	0	0		11	6	8	7	7	9	7
Del Norte	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	2	1
El Dorado	1	0		0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Fresno	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	6
Glenn	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Humboldt	0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kern	6	0	352	0	2	0	0	2	5	2
Kings	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lake	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lassen	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Los Angeles	1		146	24	34	28	50	39	24	51
Madera	0	0	119							1
Marin	0	0		0	0	0	3	2	7	0
Mariposa	0	0	0							
Mendocino	0	0	28				1			1
Merced	0	6	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
Modoc				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mono	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monterey									3	

2. Trial Court (n 56)	9. HS Case Dismissed (n 51)	10. HS Charges Imposed (n 49)	11. Previous HS Charge (n 44)	12. PC January Misd. (n 45)	12. PC February Misd. (n 45)	12. PC March Misd. (n 46)	12. PC April Misd. (n 49)	12. PC May Misd. (n 45)	12. PC June Misd. (n 46)	12. PC July Misd. (n 48)
Napa	0	5	4							
Nevada	0	3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	8	50	0	29	14	22	22	27	27	29
Placer	0	5	28	1	1	0	1	1	2	0
Plumas	0	0	0							
Riverside	0	12	482	5	9	7	21	12	12	11
Sacramento	0	0	0	14	10	14	16	20	11	8
San Benito	0	3	2							
San Bernardino	0	0	20	1	1	3	3	1	2	2
San Diego	5	6		3	1	3	2	1	0	0
San Francisco	0	0	1	12	5	5	14	14	16	11
San Joaquin	4	5		2	2	2	1	0	2	0
San Luis Obispo	0	1	68			1	4			1
San Mateo	0	1	3	10	9	5	8	10	9	4
Santa Barbara	0	3		0	1	2	0	1	0	2
Santa Clara			0	12	9	26	19	10	9	17
Santa Cruz				4	2	3	2	3	5	2
Shasta	2	4	43	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou							1			
Solano	0	0	68				1			
Sonoma	0	0	60	5	7	3	10	3	3	3
Stanislaus	5	44	140	3	3	1	2	1	0	2
Sutter	0	0	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tehama	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulare	0	20	99	1	0	3	0	0	2	1
Tuolumne	0	6	5							

2. Trial Court (n 56)	9. HS Case Dismissed (n 51)	10. HS Charges Imposed (n 49)	11. Previous HS Charge (n 44)	12. PC January Misd. (n 45)	12. PC February Misd. (n 45)	12. PC March Misd. (n 46)	12. PC April Misd. (n 49)	12. PC May Misd. (n 45)	12. PC June Misd. (n 46)	12. PC July Misd. (n 48)
Ventura	7	6	115	1	3	2	0	1	2	8
Yolo	0	0	0	1	2	9	15	6	1	0
Yuba	12	14	33	0	0	1	0	1	3	2

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 7

2. Trial Court (n 56)	12. PC August Misd. (n 48)	12. PC September Misd. (n 47)	12. PC October Misd. (n 47)	12. PC November Misd. (n 45)	12. PC December Misd. (n 46)	12. PC January Felony (n 56)	12. PC February Felony (n 56)	12. PC March Felony (n 56)	12. PC April Felony (n 56)	12. May Felony (n 56)
Statewide:	185	209	220	142	160	896	887	1,125	1,343	1,304
Alameda	31	21	14	18	24	19	15	35	39	35
Alpine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amador	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	2
Butte	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Calaveras	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Colusa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contra Costa	8	4	6	6	2	57	45	44	46	41
Del Norte	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
El Dorado	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4	9	10
Fresno	1	2	1	1	1	10	13	50	63	62
Glenn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Humboldt	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	6	5	10
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kern	1	0	1	0	1	29	40	32	52	85
Kings	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	2	2	3
Lake	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3
Lassen	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1
Los Angeles	33	51	46	31	37	190	171	219	245	253
Madera	2	1	1			1	2	2	2	1
Marin	1	3	2	2	4	4	4	3	5	3
Mariposa						0	0	0	0	0
Mendocino	1					11	5	4	5	6
Merced	0	1	2	0	1	4	7	10	7	8
Modoc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mono	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Monterey			1		1	5	3	12	10	9

2. Trial Court (n 56)	12. PC August Misd. (n 48)	12. PC September Misd. (n 47)	12. PC October Misd. (n 47)	12. PC November Misd. (n 45)	12. PC December Misd. (n 46)	12. PC January Felony (n 56)	12. PC February Felony (n 56)	12. PC March Felony (n 56)	12. PC April Felony (n 56)	12. May Felony (n 56)
Napa						5	7	2	9	6
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2
Orange	30	23	27	12	14	73	61	85	90	79
Placer	2	0	1	2	1	23	17	25	28	16
Plumas						0	0	0	0	0
Riverside	15	15	14	12	4	83	69	94	134	133
Sacramento	14	8	10	7	7	40	36	56	67	55
San Benito						0	0	1	0	1
San Bernardino	0	0	3	1	0	12	19	27	55	69
San Diego	0	1	1	2	0	57	75	80	101	77
San Francisco	10	9	13	7	13	7	7	12	16	4
San Joaquin	0	0	0	1	0	22	9	16	15	16
San Luis Obispo		1				9	3	7	12	11
San Mateo	7	4	7	3	5	41	42	64	62	60
Santa Barbara	2	9	4	2	4	10	13	9	10	9
Santa Clara	13	35	44	22	25	33	60	59	76	73
Santa Cruz	3	4	6	4	3	16	18	15	18	14
Shasta	1	3	1	1	0	15	18	9	5	15
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou						1	1	0	3	2
Solano	1					8	8	23	14	11
Sonoma	4	5	4	1	5	8	8	12	20	19
Stanislaus	0	2	1	0	1	22	28	29	36	27
Sutter	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	12	9	10
Tehama	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulare	1	1	0	1	0	19	23	19	17	18
Tuolumne						0	0	0	2	3

2. Trial Court (n 56)	12. PC August Misd. (n 48)	12. PC September Misd. (n 47)	12. PC October Misd. (n 47)	12. PC November Misd. (n 45)	12. PC December Misd. (n 46)	12. PC January Felony (n 56)	12. PC February Felony (n 56)	12. PC March Felony (n 56)	12. PC April Felony (n 56)	12. May Felony (n 56)
Ventura	4	5	5	3	6	19	10	25	20	30
Yolo	0	1	1	0	0	13	13	12	19	11
Yuba	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	3	3	0

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 8

2. Trial Court (n 56)	12. PC June Felony (n 56)	12. PC July Felony (n 56)	12. PC August Felony (n 56)	12. PC September Felony (n 56)	12. PC October Felony (n 56)	12. PC November Felony (n 56)	12. PC December Felony (n 56)	13. PC Convicted (n 51)	14. PC Diversion Program (n 56)	14. PC Deferred Entry of Judgment (n 56)
Statewide:	1,240	1,357	1,400	1,509	1,647	1,197	1,603	4,999	NA	NA
Alameda	39	49	75	46	73	49	63	119	FALSE	FALSE
Alpine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE
Amador	1	2	4	2	5	0	6	6	FALSE	FALSE
Butte	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE
Calaveras	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	FALSE	FALSE
Colusa	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	FALSE	FALSE
Contra Costa	33	37	32	23	19	21	29		FALSE	FALSE
Del Norte	2	2	1	0	3	1	1	1	TRUE	FALSE
El Dorado	10	5	9	3	4	6	7	17	FALSE	FALSE
Fresno	56	65	57	57	55	26	39	183	FALSE	FALSE
Glenn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE
Humboldt	11	8	9	18	9	11	11	57	FALSE	FALSE
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE
Kern	62	37	72	66	96	70	121	294	FALSE	FALSE
Kings	6	4	8	12	8	4	1	23	FALSE	FALSE
Lake	4	3	2	0	4	1	2	3	FALSE	FALSE
Lassen	2	6	0	1	1	1	0	3	FALSE	FALSE
Los Angeles	208	249	207	250	267	176	237	1187	FALSE	FALSE
Madera	0	5	4	3	7	2	5	34	FALSE	FALSE
Marin	6	4	6	7	1	3	4	24	FALSE	FALSE
Mariposa	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE
Mendocino	9	5	8	3	6	3	6	34	FALSE	FALSE
Merced	11	6	19	9	13	8	8	46	FALSE	FALSE
Modoc	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	FALSE	FALSE
Mono	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	FALSE	FALSE

2. Trial Court	12. PC June Felony	12. PC July Felony	12. PC August Felony	12. PC September Felony	12. PC October Felony	12. PC November Felony	12. PC December Felony	13. PC Convicted	14. PC Diversion Program	14. PC Deferred Entry of Judgment
(n 56)	(n 56)	(n 56)	(n 56)	(n 56)	(n 56)	(n 56)	(n 56)	(n 51)	(n 56)	(n 56)
Monterey	21	9	11	19	13	7	10	53	FALSE	FALSE
Napa	9	5	4	7	7	7	3	71	FALSE	FALSE
Nevada	1	4	3	2	3	2	1	5	FALSE	FALSE
Orange	95	92	88	73	94	60	113		FALSE	FALSE
Placer	15	29	21	22	27	16	51	89	TRUE	FALSE
Plumas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE
Riverside	124	147	138	177	158	124	156	556	FALSE	TRUE
Sacramento	65	81	58	81	99	71	77		FALSE	FALSE
San Benito	1	0	0	4	2	0	1	0	FALSE	FALSE
San Bernardino	84	79	117	119	159	91	76	442	TRUE	FALSE
San Diego	72	84	99	94	120	82	111	415	FALSE	FALSE
San Francisco	8	11	13	15	8	10	14	19	FALSE	TRUE
San Joaquin	8	15	17	19	18	23	36	214	FALSE	FALSE
San Luis Obispo	7	10	9	12	11	4	13	67	FALSE	FALSE
San Mateo	37	65	79	58	79	70	60	59	FALSE	FALSE
Santa Barbara	13	19	19	15	14	10	18	40	FALSE	FALSE
Santa Clara	82	49	66	95	72	49	85	228	FALSE	FALSE
Santa Cruz	5	12	13	15	12	11	6	44	FALSE	FALSE
Shasta	13	6	7	13	19	28	18	41	FALSE	FALSE
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou	1	5	1	5	1	2	3		FALSE	FALSE
Solano	12	14	13	18	12	19	22	43	FALSE	FALSE
Sonoma	13	12	9	15	10	16	21	43	FALSE	FALSE
Stanislaus	25	32	30	29	46	33	75	159	TRUE	FALSE
Sutter	5	7	10	13	8	12	15	121	FALSE	FALSE
Tehama	1	1	1	0	2	1	3	0	FALSE	FALSE
Trinity	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	FALSE	FALSE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	12. PC June Felony (n 56)	12. PC July Felony (n 56)	12. PC August Felony (n 56)	12. PC September Felony (n 56)	12. PC October Felony (n 56)	12. PC November Felony (n 56)	12. PC December Felony (n 56)	13. PC Convicted (n 51)	14. PC Diversion Program (n 56)	14. PC Deferred Entry of Judgment (n 56)
Tulare	27	27	24	37	26	23	34	103	FALSE	FALSE
Tuolumne	1	4	5	1	4	0	2	6	FALSE	FALSE
Ventura	22	32	21	22	25	27	15	135	FALSE	FALSE
Yolo	11	15	4	19	19	11	21		FALSE	FALSE
Yuba	0	1	4	6	8	4	2	11	FALSE	FALSE

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 9

2. Trial Court (n 56)	14. PC No (n 56)	14. PC Unknown (n 56)	15. Fund Salary & Benefits (n 40)	15. Fund Training & Travel (n 26)	15. Fund Equip. & Supplies (n 28)	15. Fund Contractors & Services (n 26)	15. Fund Other (n 24)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Race (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Gender (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Age (n 56)
Statewide:	NA	NA	\$1,546,844	\$ 2,500	\$ 11,873	\$ 109,272	\$ 254,232	NA	NA	NA
Alameda	FALSE	TRUE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
Alpine	FALSE	TRUE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Amador	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 22,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Butte	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 410					FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Calaveras	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 13,043	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Colusa	FALSE	TRUE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Contra Costa	TRUE	FALSE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Del Norte	FALSE	FALSE						TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
El Dorado	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 31,952					TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Fresno	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 36,453	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Glenn	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 481					TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Humboldt	FALSE	TRUE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	TRUE	FALSE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Kern	TRUE	FALSE						TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
Kings	FALSE	TRUE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Lake	FALSE	TRUE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Lassen	FALSE	TRUE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Los Angeles	FALSE	TRUE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Madera	FALSE	TRUE						TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Marin	FALSE	TRUE					\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Mariposa	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 10,911		\$ 10,149			FALSE	TRUE	TRUE
Mendocino	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 2,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Merced	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 113,074	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Modoc	TRUE	FALSE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Mono	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 1,213					TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Monterey	FALSE	FALSE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	14. PC No (n 56)	14. PC Unknown (n 56)	15. Fund Salary & Benefits (n 40)	15. Fund Training & Travel (n 26)	15. Fund Equip. & Supplies (n 28)	15. Fund Contractors & Services (n 26)	15. Fund Other (n 24)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Race (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Gender (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Age (n 56)
Napa	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 8,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,000	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Nevada	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 2,681	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Orange	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 24,841	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Placer	FALSE	FALSE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Plumas	FALSE	FALSE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Riverside	FALSE	FALSE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Sacramento	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 194,925	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
San Benito	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 38,580	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
San Bernardino	FALSE	FALSE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
San Diego	FALSE	FALSE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
San Francisco	FALSE	FALSE					\$ 173,091	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
San Joaquin	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 1,644	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 108,272	\$ 6,500	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
San Luis Obispo	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 42,119					FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
San Mateo	TRUE	FALSE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Santa Barbara	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 12,134	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Santa Clara	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 465,051					TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Santa Cruz	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 133,641		\$ 224		\$ 37,633	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Shasta	FALSE	TRUE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 944					FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Solano	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 46,274	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Sonoma	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 11,199					TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Stanislaus	FALSE	FALSE	\$ 5,223					FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Sutter	FALSE	TRUE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Tehama	TRUE	FALSE						FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Trinity	TRUE	FALSE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Tulare	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 12,000					FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Tuolumne	TRUE	FALSE	\$ 54,541					TRUE	TRUE	TRUE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	14. PC No (n 56)	14. PC Unknown (n 56)	15. Fund Salary & Benefits (n 40)	15. Fund Training & Travel (n 26)	15. Fund Equip. & Supplies (n 28)	15. Fund Contractors & Services (n 26)	15. Fund Other (n 24)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Race (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Gender (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Age (n 56)
Ventura	FALSE	TRUE						TRUE	TRUE	TRUE
Yolo	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 148,032				\$ 37,008	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Yuba	FALSE	TRUE	\$ 112,978	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 10

2. Trial Court (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Housing (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by None (n 56)	19. HS Expert Report (n 34)	19. HS Expert Rep. No Info (n 56)	20a. HS Drug Treatment Only (n 18)	20b. HS Mental Health Treat Only (n 15)	20c. HS Drug & Mental Treatment (n 17)	20. HS Treat No Info (n 56)	21. HS Job Training Order (n 17)	21. HS Job Training No Info (n 56)
Statewide:	NA	NA	2,624	NA	148	4	95	NA	13	NA
Alameda	FALSE	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE	0	FALSE
Alpine	FALSE	TRUE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE	0	FALSE
Amador	FALSE	TRUE	2	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Butte	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Calaveras	FALSE	TRUE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE		TRUE
Colusa	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Contra Costa	FALSE	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE	0	FALSE
Del Norte	FALSE	FALSE	1	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
El Dorado	FALSE	FALSE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Fresno	FALSE	TRUE	8	FALSE	5	0	3	FALSE	0	FALSE
Glenn	FALSE	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE		TRUE
Humboldt	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	FALSE	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE	0	FALSE
Kern	FALSE	FALSE	725	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Kings	FALSE	TRUE	0	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Lake	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Lassen	FALSE	TRUE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE		TRUE
Los Angeles	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Madera	FALSE	FALSE	15	FALSE	10	0	21	FALSE	11	FALSE
Marin	FALSE	FALSE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Mariposa	FALSE	FALSE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE	0	FALSE
Mendocino	FALSE	FALSE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Merced	TRUE	FALSE	11	FALSE	2	0	8	FALSE	0	TRUE
Modoc	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE	1			FALSE	0	FALSE
Mono	FALSE	FALSE	0	FALSE				FALSE	0	FALSE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Housing (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by None (n 56)	19. HS Expert Report (n 34)	19. HS Expert Rep. No Info (n 56)	20a. HS Drug Treatment Only (n 18)	20b. HS Mental Health Treat Only (n 15)	20c. HS Drug & Mental Treatment (n 17)	20. HS Treat No Info (n 56)	21. HS Job Training Order (n 17)	21. HS Job Training No Info (n 56)
Monterey	FALSE	FALSE		FALSE				FALSE		FALSE
Napa	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Nevada	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Orange	FALSE	FALSE	532	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Placer	FALSE	TRUE	40	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Plumas	FALSE	TRUE		FALSE	2			FALSE	0	FALSE
Riverside	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Sacramento	FALSE	FALSE		FALSE				FALSE	2	FALSE
San Benito	FALSE	FALSE	21	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
San Bernardino	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
San Diego	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
San Francisco	FALSE	FALSE	1	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE	0	FALSE
San Joaquin	TRUE	FALSE	44	FALSE			44	FALSE		TRUE
San Luis Obispo	FALSE	TRUE	141	FALSE	79			FALSE	0	FALSE
San Mateo	FALSE	FALSE	18	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Santa Barbara	FALSE	TRUE	79	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Santa Clara	FALSE	FALSE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Santa Cruz	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Shasta	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Solano	FALSE	FALSE	32	FALSE	22	4	6	FALSE	0	FALSE
Sonoma	FALSE	FALSE	13	FALSE			13	FALSE		TRUE
Stanislaus	FALSE	TRUE	437	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Sutter	FALSE	TRUE	217	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Tehama	FALSE	TRUE	9	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Trinity	FALSE	TRUE	0	FALSE	0	0	0	FALSE	0	FALSE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by Housing (n 56)	17. Section 1-2 Count by None (n 56)	19. HS Expert Report (n 34)	19. HS Expert Rep. No Info (n 56)	20a. HS Drug Treatment Only (n 18)	20b. HS Mental Health Treat Only (n 15)	20c. HS Drug & Mental Treatment (n 17)	20. HS Treat No Info (n 56)	21. HS Job Training Order (n 17)	21. HS Job Training No Info (n 56)
Tulare	FALSE	TRUE	164	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Tuolumne	TRUE	FALSE	32	FALSE	27	0	0	FALSE	0	FALSE
Ventura	FALSE	FALSE	58	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE
Yolo	FALSE	TRUE		TRUE				TRUE		TRUE
Yuba	FALSE	TRUE	24	FALSE				TRUE		TRUE

Proposition 36 Survey Responses: January 2025 to December 2025

The column order and numbers in this data table correspond to the question order and numbers on the survey viewable in Appendix A. All counts are derived from cases filed in the calendar year of 2025. The outcomes reflect case status as of when courts submitted responses to the survey in January 2026.

Table 11

2. Trial Court (n 56)	22. HS Currently Undergoing Treat (n 30)	22. HS Current Under Treat No Info (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Race (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Gender (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Age (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Housing (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by None (n 56)
Statewide:	879	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alameda	0	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Alpine	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Amador	2	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Butte		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Calaveras		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Colusa		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Contra Costa	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Del Norte	1	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
El Dorado		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Fresno	5	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Glenn	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Humboldt		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Imperial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Inyo	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Kern	177	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Kings	1	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Lake		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Lassen	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Los Angeles		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Madera	16	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Marin		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Mariposa	0	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Mendocino		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Merced	10	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE	FALSE
Modoc	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Mono	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	22. HS Currently Undergoing Treat (n 30)	22. HS Current Under Treat No Info (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Race (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Gender (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Age (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Housing (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by None (n 56)
Monterey		FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE
Napa		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Nevada		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Orange	229	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Placer		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Plumas	1	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Riverside		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Sacramento		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
San Benito		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
San Bernardino		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
San Diego	55	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
San Francisco	0	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
San Joaquin	24	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
San Luis Obispo	79	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
San Mateo	23	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Santa Barbara		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Santa Clara		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Santa Cruz		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Shasta		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Sierra	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Siskiyou		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Solano	8	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
Sonoma	13	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Stanislaus		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Sutter	211	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Tehama	9	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Trinity	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE

2. Trial Court (n 56)	22. HS Currently Undergoing Treat (n 30)	22. HS Current Under Treat No Info (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Race (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Gender (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Age (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by Housing (n 56)	23. Section 5 Count by None (n 56)
Tulare		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Tuolumne	15	FALSE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE
Ventura		TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	TRUE	FALSE	FALSE
Yolo		TRUE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE
Yuba	0	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	FALSE	TRUE

Appendix C: Court Proposition 36 Funding Allocations

"Non Traff + Felony" stands for the nontraffic misdemeanor and felony filings from fiscal year 2023 and 2024. "PC 666.1 + HS 11395" stands for the sum of filings under Pen. Code, § 666.1 and Health & Saf. Code, § 11395 between December 18, 2024, and April 30, 2025, reported by courts to the Judicial Council.

County	Non Traff + Felony	Non Traff + Felony %	\$9.5mil × (Non Traff + Felony %)	PC 666.1 + HS 11395	PC 666.1 + HS 11395 %	\$9.5mil × (PC 666.1 + HS 11395 %)	Method 1
Alameda	9,516	2.04%	\$ 193,536.37	116	1.11%	\$ 105,636.50	\$ 299,172.87
Alpine	12	0.00%	\$ 244.06	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 244.06
Amador	960	0.21%	\$ 19,524.48	30	0.29%	\$ 27,319.79	\$ 46,844.26
Butte	2,846	0.61%	\$ 57,881.94	32	0.31%	\$ 29,141.10	\$ 87,023.04
Calaveras	507	0.11%	\$ 10,311.36	3	0.03%	\$ 2,731.98	\$ 13,043.34
Colusa	546	0.12%	\$ 11,104.55	5	0.05%	\$ 4,553.30	\$ 15,657.84
Contra Costa	5,148	1.10%	\$ 104,700.00	119	1.14%	\$ 108,368.48	\$ 213,068.49
Del Norte	707	0.15%	\$ 14,378.96	-	-	\$ -	\$ 14,378.96
El Dorado	1,632	0.35%	\$ 33,191.61	74	0.71%	\$ 67,388.80	\$ 100,580.41
Fresno	17,413	3.73%	\$ 354,145.53	163	1.56%	\$ 148,437.50	\$ 502,583.03
Glenn	530	0.11%	\$ 10,779.14	4	0.04%	\$ 3,642.64	\$ 14,421.78
Humboldt	2,661	0.57%	\$ 54,119.41	45	0.43%	\$ 40,979.68	\$ 95,099.09
Imperial	2,154	0.46%	\$ 43,808.04	25	0.24%	\$ 22,766.49	\$ 66,574.53
Inyo	605	0.13%	\$ 12,304.49	0	0.00%	\$ -	\$ 12,304.49
Kern	18,617	3.99%	\$ 378,632.47	496	4.75%	\$ 451,687.12	\$ 830,319.59
Kings	2,489	0.53%	\$ 50,621.27	37	0.35%	\$ 33,694.40	\$ 84,315.67
Lake	2,295	0.49%	\$ 46,675.70	77	0.74%	\$ 70,120.78	\$ 116,796.48
Lassen	635	0.14%	\$ 12,914.63	8	0.08%	\$ 7,285.28	\$ 20,199.90
Los Angeles	77,260	16.54%	\$ 1,571,313.58	1,799	17.25%	\$ 1,638,276.46	\$ 3,209,590.03
Madera	3,307	0.71%	\$ 67,257.75	51	0.49%	\$ 46,443.63	\$ 113,701.39
Marin	1,699	0.36%	\$ 34,554.26	-	-	\$ -	\$ 34,554.26
Mariposa	418	0.09%	\$ 8,501.28	3	0.03%	\$ 2,731.98	\$ 11,233.26
Mendocino	1,963	0.42%	\$ 39,923.49	61	0.58%	\$ 55,550.23	\$ 95,473.72
Merced	4,306	0.92%	\$ 87,575.41	28	0.27%	\$ 25,498.47	\$ 113,073.88
Modoc	306	0.07%	\$ 6,223.43	6	0.06%	\$ 5,463.96	\$ 11,687.38
Mono	208	0.04%	\$ 4,230.30	5	0.05%	\$ 4,553.30	\$ 8,783.60
Monterey	6,717	1.44%	\$ 136,610.32	81	0.78%	\$ 73,763.42	\$ 210,373.74
Napa	1,696	0.36%	\$ 34,493.24	37	0.35%	\$ 33,694.40	\$ 68,187.64
Nevada	1,153	0.25%	\$ 23,449.71	17	0.16%	\$ 15,481.21	\$ 38,930.92
Orange	50,487	10.81%	\$ 1,026,804.41	2,032	19.48%	\$ 1,850,460.12	\$ 2,877,264.53
Placer	6,053	1.30%	\$ 123,105.89	103	0.99%	\$ 93,797.93	\$ 216,903.82
Plumas	245	0.05%	\$ 4,982.81	-	-	\$ -	\$ 4,982.81
Riverside	34,147	7.31%	\$ 694,481.55	1,025	9.83%	\$ 933,426.00	\$ 1,627,907.55
Sacramento	20,273	4.34%	\$ 412,312.19	235	2.25%	\$ 214,004.98	\$ 626,317.18
San Benito	1,091	0.23%	\$ 22,188.75	18	0.17%	\$ 16,391.87	\$ 38,580.62
San Bernardino	31,991	6.85%	\$ 650,632.83	247	2.37%	\$ 224,932.90	\$ 875,565.73
San Diego	28,474	6.10%	\$ 579,104.10	975	9.35%	\$ 887,893.02	\$ 1,466,997.12
San Francisco	6,451	1.38%	\$ 131,200.41	46	0.44%	\$ 41,890.34	\$ 173,090.75
San Joaquin	11,951	2.56%	\$ 243,059.39	128	1.23%	\$ 116,564.42	\$ 359,623.81
San Luis Obispo	5,740	1.23%	\$ 116,740.10	137	1.31%	\$ 124,760.35	\$ 241,500.45
San Mateo	9,878	2.11%	\$ 200,898.73	210	2.01%	\$ 191,238.50	\$ 392,137.22
Santa Barbara	7,020	1.50%	\$ 142,772.73	80	0.77%	\$ 72,852.76	\$ 215,625.49
Santa Clara	17,090	3.66%	\$ 347,576.35	129	1.24%	\$ 117,475.08	\$ 465,051.43
Santa Cruz	3,921	0.84%	\$ 79,745.28	124	1.19%	\$ 112,921.78	\$ 192,667.06
Shasta	6,535	1.40%	\$ 132,908.80	142	1.36%	\$ 129,313.65	\$ 262,222.45

County	Non Traff + Felony	Non Traff + Felony %	\$9.5mil × (Non Traff + Felony %)	PC 666.1 + HS 11395	PC 666.1 + HS 11395 %	\$9.5mil × (PC 666.1 + HS 11395 %)	Method 1
Sierra	58	0.01%	\$ 1,179.60	2	0.02%	\$ 1,821.32	\$ 3,000.92
Siskiyou	1,124	0.24%	\$ 22,859.91	30	0.29%	\$ 27,319.79	\$ 50,179.69
Solano	4,030	0.86%	\$ 81,962.12	93	0.89%	\$ 84,691.33	\$ 166,653.46
Sonoma	7,298	1.56%	\$ 148,426.70	128	1.23%	\$ 116,564.42	\$ 264,991.11
Stanislaus	11,786	2.52%	\$ 239,703.62	455	4.36%	\$ 414,350.08	\$ 654,053.70
Sutter	2,455	0.53%	\$ 49,929.78	121	1.16%	\$ 110,189.80	\$ 160,119.58
Tehama	1,842	0.39%	\$ 37,462.59	23	0.22%	\$ 20,945.17	\$ 58,407.76
Trinity	409	0.09%	\$ 8,318.24	6	0.06%	\$ 5,463.96	\$ 13,782.20
Tulare	9,143	1.96%	\$ 185,950.30	178	1.71%	\$ 162,097.39	\$ 348,047.69
Tuolumne	1,428	0.31%	\$ 29,042.66	28	0.27%	\$ 25,498.47	\$ 54,541.12
Ventura	11,629	2.49%	\$ 236,510.56	220	2.11%	\$ 200,345.09	\$ 436,855.65
Yolo	3,546	0.76%	\$ 72,118.53	124	1.19%	\$ 112,921.78	\$ 185,040.31
Yuba	2,705	0.58%	\$ 55,014.28	71	0.68%	\$ 64,656.83	\$ 119,671.10
Total:	467,106	100%	\$ 9,500,000.00	10,432	100%	\$ 9,500,000.00	\$ 19,000,000.00

Appendix D: Department of Health Care Services Proposition 36 Funding Allocations

County	Allocation	County	Allocation
Alameda	\$1,452,997.18	Orange	\$4,703,692.20
Alpine	\$ 252,731.25	Placer	\$ 470,799.22
Amador	\$ 316,729.12	Plumas	\$ 267,883.75
Butte	\$ 497,519.27	Riverside	\$2,245,760.00
Calaveras	\$ 278,994.25	Sacramento	\$1,600,274.71
Colusa	\$ 282,284.59	San Benito	\$ 296,747.69
Contra Costa	\$ 955,284.46	San Bernardino	\$1,222,689.70
Del Norte	\$ 285,568.51	San Diego	\$3,025,599.99
El Dorado	\$ 380,028.64	San Francisco	\$ 929,120.34
Fresno	\$ 939,410.47	San Joaquin	\$ 804,778.10
Glenn	\$ 284,992.09	San Luis Obispo	\$ 435,665.97
Humboldt	\$ 427,056.21	San Mateo	\$ 480,774.33
Imperial	\$ 465,977.35	Santa Barbara	\$ 386,646.70
Inyo	\$ 263,561.25	Santa Clara	\$1,829,667.00
Kern	\$1,456,223.02	Santa Cruz	\$ 576,328.77
Kings	\$ 319,380.17	Shasta	\$ 331,497.24
Lake	\$ 402,065.41	Sierra	\$ 256,187.84
Lassen	\$ 282,185.09	Siskiyou	\$ 338,110.54
Los Angeles	\$8,464,225.59	Solano	\$ 659,329.91
Madera	\$ 424,390.41	Sonoma	\$ 453,549.72
Marin	\$ 365,294.68	Stanislaus	\$1,039,889.43
Mariposa	\$ 273,497.09	Sutter-Yuba	\$ 451,715.17
Mendocino	\$ 458,944.09	Tehama	\$ 327,876.87
Merced	\$ 476,567.93	Trinity	\$ 286,688.60
Modoc	\$ 268,716.92	Tulare	\$ 688,267.13
Mono	\$ 262,589.42	Tuolumne	\$ 337,157.97
Monterey	\$ 671,681.18	Ventura	\$ 728,650.43
Napa	\$ 317,337.67	Yolo	\$ 464,908.53
Nevada	\$ 333,508.84		