

California Victim Compensation Board
Analysis of Geographic Distribution of Trauma Recovery Centers and Funding

July 16, 2026

Enacting General Fund Budget Act Language

Per state law, TRCs must provide mental health services, assertive outreach, and clinical case management to crime victims using a multidisciplinary team of clinicians that includes a psychiatrist, psychologist and social worker.

On June 29, 2026 the Governor approved the [2026 Budget Act](#) which provided a one-time \$12.5 million General Fund appropriation for existing TRCs. The relevant language is below.

- 2. Of the amount appropriated in Schedule (1), \$11,000,000 shall be allocated to the existing Trauma Recovery Centers awarded funding for the 2024–25 and 2025–26 fiscal years and that applied, but were not yet recommended, for funding awards for the 2026–27 and 2027–28 fiscal years. Each Trauma Recovery Center would receive up to \$1,100,000, or its requested application amount, whichever is less, for each year of the 2026–27 and 2027–28 fiscal years project period, to serve victims of violent crime.*
- 3. Of the amount appropriated in Schedule (1), \$875,000 shall be used for training and technical assistance, provided by the University of California Trauma Recovery Center Technical Assistance Program, for the California Victim Compensation Board, and California Trauma Recovery Centers. Administrative costs shall not exceed 5 percent of this amount.*
- 4. Of the amount appropriated in Schedule (1), \$625,000 shall be allocated to the California Victims Compensation Board to cover administrative costs.*
- 5. Any remaining funds should be disseminated in the following order of priority:*
 - (a) Trauma Recovery Centers that were previously recommended to be awarded funding by CalVCB for fiscal years 2026–27 and 2027–28 shall receive additional amounts up to their full agency-recommended amount, as previously determined by CalVCB.*
 - (b) All funded Trauma Recovery Centers may be awarded additional funds for the purpose of providing flexible emergency cash assistance to support victims of violent crime. Allowable uses include, but are not limited to: transportation, childcare, food, emergency shelter, and other urgent, reasonable expenses that support victims of violent crime. Each trauma recovery center shall have two years to encumber these funds.*
 - (c) Any remaining funds shall be distributed equally to increase Trauma Recovery Center grant awards over each of the next two years, prioritizing additional funding to Trauma Recovery Centers that were not fully funded per their requested amounts.*
- 6. Funds described in Provisions 2 through 5, inclusive, shall be available for encumbrance or expenditure until July 1, 2029.*

The National Alliance of Trauma Recovery Centers (NATRC) advocated for this funding to sustain five existing TRCs at risk for closure beginning July 1, 2026. They stated in advocacy materials that this request will stabilize services for the five existing TRCs for the next two years while they identify a long-term legislative funding solution that does not rely on General Fund support.

Given the recent approval and urgency to ensure continuity of services for victims, we seek that the Board approve the following.

Recipient	Budget Section	Award Amount	Notes
Alameda County District Attorney's Office	2	\$2,000,000	Proposed service area is Alameda County.
Citrus Counseling Services, Inc.	2	\$2,200,000	Proposed service area is San Bernardino County.
Miracles Counseling Center	2	\$2,200,000	Proposed service area is Los Angeles County including South Los Angeles, Compton, Watts, Inglewood, Hawthorne, Lawndale, San Pedro, Wilmington, and the broader Harbor and Port regions, as well as portions of Central and West Los Angeles.
Regents of the University of California, Davis	2	\$1,899,717	Proposed service area is the Sacramento region including surrounding counties Shasta, Modoc, Stanislaus, Sutter, Calaveras, Yuba, Placer, El Dorado, Yolo, San Joaquin, Tehama, and Alameda.
University of Southern California	5a	\$1,177,530	The Board had previously approved \$822,471 for the USC TRC. The additional funding will bring this organization to its full request of \$2,000,000.
Flexible Emergency Cash Assistance Program (FECAP) for 22 TRCs	5b	\$1,522,753	Staff are currently working to develop the scope of work for the FECAP grants and UC TAP contract in alignment with the Budget Act language. Board approval of the agreements is requested now to ensure that when the documents are approved and signed by both parties, they can go into immediate effect.
University of California TRC Technical Assistance Program (UC TAP)	3	\$875,000	

Staff Recommendation

We request that the Board approve staff's recommendation to award the TRC grants for July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2028 as authorized in the Budget Act of 2026, as well as the Executive Officer's execution of the FECAP grants for 22 TRCS and the Executive Office's execution of the UC TAP contract.

Geographic Analysis

The Board requested an analysis to consider ways to promote geographic equity in the distribution of Trauma Recovery Center (TRC) funds before the Fiscal Year 2027 TRC Notice of Funds Available (NOFA) is released. During the March 2026 meeting discussion, members expressed interest in learning more about whether places with higher crime rates are being appropriately considered, about regions without TRCs, and the impact on victims in changing the current methodology.

Statutory Language

The only language that references geography or crime rates related to TRCs is found in Government Code Section §13963.1 (f), which states: The trauma recovery center sites shall be selected by the Board through a well-defined selection process that takes into account the rate of crime and geographic distribution to serve the greatest number of victims.

Current Process

CalVCB employs a competitive grant process that is based on the statutory requirements. Applicants are evaluated on their ability to implement the TRC model. Applicants receive up to 10 percent of the available points for demonstrating their organization's experience and/or ability to serve the greatest number of victims based on geographic location. Responses to this question also include consideration of crime rate in their service area, segments of the population to be served, availability of similar services in the area, and the impact or deficit to the community if not funded. This process results in applicants who can serve the greatest number of victims in high need areas receiving higher scores on this qualification question.

Service Areas

TRCs generally maximize the number of victims served in cities or neighborhoods. In densely populated portions of the state, TRCs rarely have capacity to serve entire counties or even surrounding communities. Many victims in highly populated areas still go without access to services due to a higher number of violent crimes compared to the capacity of the organization.

For example, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Alameda counties contain multiple TRCs. These counties have the highest number of violent crimes and are among the most populous in the state with millions of residents. Given that they experience significant crime, there is more opportunity for TRCs to serve the maximum number of victims. The presence of multiple TRCs in a county has not been proven to be evidence that there are sufficient TRC services available because most TRCs report that they have waitlists even in counties with multiple TRCs.

Applicants from the Northern and Central regions have historically scored lower overall, especially on the NOFA criteria related to providing clinical care. A couple of Northern region organizations have been successful in receiving TRC grants because of their demonstrated clinical experience and ability to serve victims across multiple counties. For example, one TRC serves victims in Shasta and Siskiyou counties out of one main office and three satellite offices.

In 2022, the Legislature and Governor recognized regional service gaps and provided dedicated funding for existing TRCs to operate pilot programs in Northern and Central California. This one-time funding expired last fiscal year.

Key Statistics

The California TRC Strategic Plan developed by the NATRC in September 2025 estimated a \$100.8 million annual state allocation would be needed to expand and sustain TRCs statewide. This estimate assumed a total of 67 TRCs are needed for there to be either at least one TRC per county or for TRCs to be prioritized in areas with high violence and service gaps.

As this table shows, the total number of violent crimes is significantly higher in the Southern California region where CalVCB has historically granted the most TRCs. Detailed statistics by county are included in Appendix A. Historical information on the distribution of TRCs by region can be found in Appendix B.

A	B	C	D	E	F
Region	Total Population	Total Violent Crimes	Number of TRCs ¹	Grant Applications Received	Average Violent Crime Rate Per 10,000 Residents
Northern	4,549,099	21,963	1	4	47
Bay Area	7,910,420	38,040	8	12	41
Central	4,953,490	26,473	0	5	48
Southern	22,019,254	101,653	15	19	41

Source: The statistics provide aggregate information using the most recently available, comparable, and complete data. Column B is sourced from U.S. Census data for 2024. Columns C and F are sourced from the Department of Justice report *Crime in California 2024* and provide data for calendar year 2024. Column D is the total number of TRCs in Fiscal Year 2024-25. Column E is the number of applications received by region for the 2025 NOFA cycle.

Although the average crime rate per region is fairly similar among the four regions, the Northern and Central regions have the highest average crime rates. These numbers are due to the lower population in these two regions. Given the statute's direction for TRCs to serve the greatest number of victims, we recommend that crime rates continue to be considered, but more weight be given to the total number of victims served.

¹ The Northern and Central California pilot program TRCs are not included in this table because their grant notices and contracts were executed on different timeframes. The Central California pilot operated from May 1, 2023, through September 30, 2025 in San Joaquin and Kern counties. The Northern California pilot operated in Napa in Sonoma Counties from September 12, 2023, through June 30, 2025.

Requested Alternatives

As requested, below are potential alternatives regarding geographic distribution for the Board's consideration.

Alternative 1: Incentivize Applicants to Create Geographically Disbursed Satellite Services by Awarding Additional NOFA Points

CalVCB would adjust the scoring rubric for all applicable qualification questions to award additional points to organizations that commit to delivering services to regions where services don't exist at a point in time. Services could be delivered through satellite offices, mobile services, community-based partnerships, or telehealth models consistent with the UCSF TRC model and statutory requirements.

Potential Benefits	Potential Consequences
1) Preserves a single statewide competitive funding process. 2) Currently funded TRCs will be incentivized to expand services to underrepresented areas. 3) Encourages innovative approaches to expanding access to services. 4) Increased access to services more quickly through the expansion of existing provider networks.	1) No guarantee that satellites will be proposed in specific areas. 2) Recommended maximum award amounts of \$2.2 million for a 2-year grant may need to be reassessed. 3) Telehealth and satellite models may improve access but may not fully address barriers faced by populations requiring intensive outreach and case management. 4) TRCs would either need to find ways to continually expand, or this would be a one-time incentive. 5) If TRCs do not receive the amount of funding they request, service expansions are unlikely to be implemented.

Requirements for the Board to move forward:

- Approve the implementation of an adjusted scoring rubric to award additional points in applicable qualification questions to applicants that commit to delivering satellite services to regions where services don't exist at a point in time. Include direction on how many points should be awarded as part of this incentive and how to define underrepresented regions.
- Before the March 2027 Board meeting, require an evaluation of recommended maximum funding as the current amount would likely be insufficient for TRC's to operate satellite offices.

Alternative 2: Award Additional Points for Establishing a TRC in Counties or Regions Without One

CalVCB would maintain a statewide competitive grant process, but questions related to geography would be given additional weight. The Board could bifurcate the geography qualification question to award additional points to applicants that propose establishing a TRC in a county or region where one doesn't exist.

Potential Benefits	Potential Consequences
1) Provides a competitive advantage to organizations in counties or regions without TRCs while preserving a single statewide competitive funding process.	1) TRCs that receive additional geography points may not be competitive enough in the remaining criteria to successfully obtain a grant. 2) Inability to serve greatest number of victims in higher population, high crime areas of the state. 3) Currently funded TRCs receiving lower scores and not being recommended for a consecutive grant. 4) Movement of TRCs to accommodate identified gaps will create new gaps by shifting resources, leading to a cycle of opening and closing TRCs.

Requirements for the Board to move forward:

- Approve the implementation of a scoring process that gives more points to applicants from counties or regions where TRC services don't exist at a point in time, including direction on how many points should be given and how to determine which counties/regions are eligible for additional points.
- Direct whether a maximum number of applications should be awarded extra points to minimize disruption of existing services in other areas of the state. For example, if five applications are received from an underrepresented county/region, do all five receive higher scores, or only the highest-scoring one or two applications?
- Direct how to evaluate grant applications where services are proposed to be offered in more than one county/region.

Alternative 3: Implement Regional NOFAs

CalVCB would develop a separate NOFA for identified regions. This alternative is the most likely to guarantee physical TRC services in the Central region, if organizations apply. Although organizations from the Central region have applied in recent cycles, they have not scored high enough to be competitive for a grant award as detailed in Appendix C.

Potential Benefits	Potential Consequences
1) Maximizes opportunity for TRCs in Northern and the Central regions. 2) Applicants would be competing against other service providers within their regions, which may be more similarly situated.	1) Inability to serve greatest number of victims in higher population, high crime areas of the state. 2) Challenges determining equitable or appropriate regional distribution of funding. (See Appendix D) 3) Applicants who are more competitive in another region not being recommended for funding. 4) Currently funded TRCs not being recommended for a consecutive grant. 5) Lower funding levels for TRCs. 6) Future funding instability not supporting grants in all regions at a minimally viable level.²

Requirements for the Board to move forward:

- Approve the implementation of Regional NOFAs.
- Approve defined regions and provide direction on how to allocate funding among regions.
- Approve a process for how to distribute grant awards if no applicants apply in a region.
- Direct whether a minimum point threshold should be established to ensure organizations with very low scores do not receive a grant.
- Direct how to evaluate grant applications where services are proposed to be offered in more than one region.

Geographic Analysis Conclusion

CalVCB's current competitive grant scoring process aligns with statute and evaluates applicants' ability to serve the greatest number of victims while considering geographic location and crime rates. Staff recommend that the current competitive process, modeled after the statutory requirements, be maintained. It is also recommended that any changes to the distribution of funds should be pursued via the legislative process which would result in a final direction that establishes clear authority, was considered by policy makers and stakeholders, and evaluated the need for additional and stable funding.

² Minimum viability is defined as the cost to meet the minimum staffing requirements outlined in state law which include the salary and benefits for a psychiatrist, psychologist, and social worker, as well operational costs. This number is much lower than the maximum award of \$2.2 million that CalVCB has previously recommended. During the July 2025 TRC Informational Hearing there was consensus among CalVCB and TRC stakeholders that the minimum viability standard is too low for TRCs to successfully operate.

Appendix A

The data below demonstrates key statistics by county. We highlighted cells in blue to demonstrate which counties have the highest statistic within each region.

A	B	C	D	E	F
County	Total Population	Total Violent Crimes	Total Number of Unique TRCs Between Fiscal Years 2023-24 and 2025-26	Total TRC Grant Applications for calendar years 2024, 2025, and 2026	Crime Rate Per 10,000 Residents*
NORTHERN					
ALPINE	1,099	12			109
AMADOR	42,026	128			30
BUTTE	208,334	1,325			64
COLUSA	22,074	84			38
DEL NORTE	27,009	123			46
EL DORADO	192,823	508		1	26
GLENN	28,304	124			44
HUMBOLDT	132,380	621			47
LAKE	67,764	488			72
LASSEN	28,340	126			44
MENDOCINO	89,175	332			37
MODOC	8,491	59			69
NEVADA	102,195	364			36
PLACER	433,822	949			22
PLUMAS	18,834	6			3
SACRAMENTO	1,611,231	8,255	1	6	51
SAN JOAQUIN	816,108	5,430	1 **	2	67
SHASTA	181,121	965	1	1	53
SIERRA	3,113	15			48
SISKIYOU	42,498	201			47
SUTTER	98,545	399			40
TEHAMA	65,451	382			58
TRINITY	15,642	84			54
YOLO	225,251	525			23
YUBA	87,469	458			52
BAY AREA					
ALAMEDA	1,649,060	13,075	3	10	79
CONTRA COSTA	1,172,607	4,437	1	1	38
MARIN	256,400	625			24
NAPA	132,727	418	1 **		31

SAN FRANCISCO	827,526	4,978	1	2	60
SAN MATEO	742,893	1,927		1	26
SANTA CLARA	1,926,325	8,139	1	1	42
SANTA CRUZ	262,406	939			36
SOLANO	455,101	2,152	1	2	47
SONOMA	485,375	1,350	1 **	3	28
CENTRAL					
CALAVERAS	46,505	189			41
FRESNO	1,024,125	6,505		9	64
KERN	922,529	6,274	1 **	2	68
KINGS	154,913	734			47
MADERA	165,432	741			45
MARIPOSA	17,048	94			55
MERCED	296,774	1,572			53
MONTEREY	436,251	1,879			43
SAN BENITO	69,159	214		1	31
SAN LUIS OBISPO	281,843	1,129			40
SANTA BARBARA	444,500	1,924			43
STANISLAUS	556,972	2,599		1	47
TULARE	483,546	2,344			48
TUOLUMNE	53,893	275			51
SOUTHERN					
IMPERIAL	181,724	421			23
INYO	18,485	130			70
LOS ANGELES	9,757,179	58,141	9	33	60
MONO	12,991	52			40
ORANGE	3,170,435	9,757	1	7	31
RIVERSIDE	2,529,933	7,387	1	2	29
SAN BERNARDINO	2,214,281	11,094	1	4	50
SAN DIEGO	3,298,799	12,190	4	7	37
VENTURA	835,427	2,481		2	30

Source: The statistics provide aggregate information using the most recently available, comparable, and complete data. Column B is sourced from U.S. Census data for 2024. Columns C and F are sourced from the Department of Justice report *Crime in California 2024* and provide data for calendar year 2024. Column D and E are sourced from CalVCB's TRC records.

*Crime rates are calculated per 10,000 residents. In counties with smaller populations, even a minor change in the number of crimes can result in a significant shift in the reported rate. Data for these counties is included for transparency but may not be directly comparable to more populous counties.

**San Joaquin and Kern counties were served via the regional pilot program by a TRC operating out of Los Angeles County. Napa and Sonoma counties were served via the regional pilot program by the TRC operating out of Solano County, which continued after the Solano County TRC received a consecutive grant to provide expanded services.

Appendix B

The data below demonstrates that the number of TRCs and TRC funding has historically been allocated to higher population regions that have a higher number of violent crimes.

Number of TRCs Approved Each Fiscal Year by Region

Fiscal Year	Northern	Bay Area	Central	Southern
2016-2017	1	2	0	3
2017-2018	1	2	0	3
2018-2019	0	2	0	4
2019-2020	2	2	0	4
2020-2021	0	3	0	4
2021-2022	0	2	0	8
2022-2023	0	2	1*	5
2023-2024	1*	6	0	9
2024-2025	0	2	0	6
2025-2026	1	5	0	5

Amount of TRC Funding Allocated Each Fiscal Year by Region

Fiscal Year	Northern	Bay Area	Central	Southern
2016-2017	\$733,333	\$2,880,949	\$0	\$2,240,462
2017-2018	\$1,731,716	\$870,583	\$0	\$2,943,174
2018-2019	\$0	\$3,325,259	\$0	\$4,758,541
2019-2020	\$2,680,836	\$1,806,877	\$0	\$4,929,887
2020-2021	\$0	\$5,686,354	\$0	\$6,052,096
2021-2022	\$0	\$2,891,045	\$0	\$14,166,591
2022-2023	\$0	\$5,387,913	\$2,500,000*	\$12,727,909
2023-2024	\$2,500,000*	\$6,609,882	\$0	\$10,804,294
2024-2025	\$1,176,577	\$3,344,000	\$0	\$8,006,448
2025-2026	\$1,667,204	\$8,066,153	\$0	\$8,682,513
TOTAL	\$10,489,666	\$40,869,015	\$2,500,000	\$75,311,914

*The numbers reflect satellite TRCs that operated due to one-time funding from the Budget Act of 2022. The Central California pilot operated from May 1, 2023, through September 30, 2025. The Northern California pilot operated from September 12, 2023, through June 30, 2025.

Appendix C

The data below demonstrates that generally, Central region applicants had low scores compared to other applicants.

Grant Year	Applicant #*	Area Served	Applicant Score	Lowest Score Funded
2024	1	Fresno City & County	38	55
2024	2	City of Fresno	30	55
2024	3	City of Fresno	Disqualified	55
2024	4	San Joaquin Valley	Disqualified	55
2025	1	Fresno City & County	63	67
2025	2	City of Fresno	58	67
2025	5	Stanislaus County	Disqualified	67
2025	6	City of Fresno (focus on Punjabi-Sikh community)	66	67
2025	7	City of Bakersfield	64	67
2026	1	Fresno City & County	47	76
2026	6	City of Fresno (focus on Punjabi-Sikh community)	64	76
2026	7	City of Bakersfield	70	76
2026	8	San Benito County	Disqualified	76

*Applicants with the same number applied in multiple years.

Appendix D

A key decision the Board will need to make related to Alternative 3 is how to distribute funding.

Funding could be provided equally or proportionally based on the total violent crimes as shown in the example below. This example uses the total Fiscal Year 2026-27 funding of \$11,250,000 for demonstrative purposes.

Methodology	Amount	Estimated Number of TRCs	Amount Per TRC for a Two-Year Grant
Equal Distribution			
4 Regions	\$2,812,500	1-2 per region	\$1,406,250
Distribution Proportionally by Violent Crime Totals			
Northern (12%)	\$1,313,374	1	\$1,350,000
Bay Area (20%)	\$2,274,769	1	\$2,250,000
Central (14%)	\$1,583,069	1	\$1,575,000
Southern (54%)	\$6,078,788	3	\$2,025,000

There are equity concerns with either funding approach. Equal distribution of funding by regions will likely result in the Board not meeting the statutory requirement of serving the greatest number of victims because there will be fewer TRCs in the highly populated, high-crime areas of the state. The proportional distribution leads to funding inequities. Specifically, a proportional distribution is more likely to result in the Northern and Central California regions not having enough funding to support minimum viability.