



Judicial Council of California • Administrative Office of the Courts

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on July 29, 2014

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Allocations: Funding for General Court Operations and Specific Costs in Fiscal Year 2014–2015	Action Required
	Effective Date
	July 29, 2014
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Date of Report
None	July 22, 2014
Recommended by	Contact
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	Steven Chang, 415-865-7195
Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Cochair	steven.chang@jud.ca.gov
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Cochair	Colin Simpson, 415-865-4566
	colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

For fiscal year 2014–2015, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends the allocation of \$1.557 billion in 2014–2015 beginning base funding for general court operations, a statewide net allocation of \$86.3 million for general court operations using the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), a net zero allocation for the WAFM funding floor adjustments, each court’s share of \$41.0 million in new funding for noninterpreter employee benefits, a preliminary one-time allocation reduction related to the 1 percent cap on trial court fund balances, each court’s contribution toward a 2 percent reserve of \$37.9 million, and \$325,000 in funding for court audits. All the allocations are from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and the Program 45.10 (Support for Operation of the Trial Court) expenditure authority. If the council adopts all the recommendations, an estimated \$8.1 million in TCTF Program 45.10 expenditure authority will remain.

Recommendation

Based on actions taken at its July 7, 2014, public meeting—which were passed unanimously with the exception of recommendation 2, which was passed 14 to 9—the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 29, 2014:

1. Related to an estimated shortfall of \$22.7 million in 2014–2015 TCTF revenue that supports courts’ base allocation for operations, adopt the following recommendations:
 - a. Under Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) the council should preliminarily allocate courts’ 2014–2015 base allocation of \$1.557 billion from the TCTF and General Fund Program 45.10 appropriation under the assumption that any revenue shortfall that supports base allocations will be fully backfilled or funded. The council should then finalize allocations to trial courts in January of the fiscal year.
 - b. The council should direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to send a letter to the Department of Finance (DOF) indicating that a deficiency request for any shortfall of revenue that supports courts’ base allocations will be submitted by the Judicial Council after September 30, 2014, and subsequently direct the Administrative Director to submit such deficiency request after September 30, 2014.
 - c. If the deficiency request is not adopted by the Governor, the council should direct the TCBAC to provide the council with a recommendation on how the shortfall should be allocated among the courts.
 - d. The council should review two preliminary options for allocating a reduction to the extent a shortfall in revenue that supports courts’ base allocation is not backfilled or funded.
2. Allocate the new benefits funding by prorating \$41.0 million to the trial courts based on each court’s percentage of the total 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost change of \$63.9 million. (The remaining \$1.8 million in new benefits funding is for court interpreter benefits, and staff will coordinate with the Department of Finance to augment the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters) appropriation.)
3. Allocate each court’s share of a net allocation increase of \$86.3 million by using the 2014–2015 WAFM to reallocate 15 percent (\$216 million) and an additional \$146.3 million of courts’ historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, reallocate \$60 million in new funding provided in 2013–2014 for general court operations, and allocate \$86.3 million in new funding provided in 2014–2015 for general court operations.

4. Allocate each court's share of the 2014–2015 WAFM funding-floor allocation adjustment, which includes funding-floor allocations for nine courts totaling \$1.2 million and a corresponding funding-floor related reduction for all other courts totaling \$1.2 million, for a net zero total allocation.
5. Allocate \$325,000 for reimbursement of court audit costs incurred by the California State Auditor.
6. Allocate each court's one-time contribution toward the statutorily required 2 percent reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund (\$37.9 million in 2014–2015) calculated using the method used in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014.
7. Approve a preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$2.0 million to courts that are projecting the portion of their 2013–2014 ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent fund balance cap to exceed the cap by \$2.0 million, as required by statute.
8. Approve a one-time process for courts to submit their final computation of the portion of their 2013–2014 fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap for review by a five-person committee before submission to the council, as outlined in the report.
9. Approve an annual process for courts to submit their preliminary and final computation of the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap starting in 2015–2016, as outlined in the report.

A summary of the allocations by court related to recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 is displayed in Appendix A.

Recommendation 1: 2014–2015 Beginning Base Allocation for Court Operations

1. Related to an estimated shortfall of \$22.7 million in 2014–2015 TCTF revenue that supports courts' base allocation for operations, adopt the following recommendations:
 - a. Pursuant to Government Code section 68502.5 (c)(2)(A) the council should preliminarily allocate courts' 2014–2015 base allocation of \$1.557 billion from the TCTF and General Fund Program 45.10 appropriation under the assumption that any revenue shortfall that supports base allocations will be fully backfilled or funded. The council should then finalize allocations to trial courts in January of the fiscal year.
 - b. The council should direct the Administrative Director of the Courts to send a letter to the Department of Finance indicating that a deficiency request for any shortfall of revenue that supports courts' base allocations will be submitted by the Judicial Council after September 30, 2014, and subsequently direct the Administrative Director to submit such deficiency request after September 30, 2014.

- c. If the deficiency request is not adopted by the Governor, the council should direct the TCBAAC to provide the council with a recommendation on how the shortfall should be allocated among the courts.
- d. The council should review two preliminary options for allocating a reduction to the extent a shortfall in revenue that supports courts' base allocation is not backfilled or funded.

Previous council action

At its April 25, 2014, business meeting, the Judicial Council directed its staff to prepare and submit to the DOF a fiscal year 2014–2015 Spring Finance Letter requesting a \$70 million General Fund ongoing augmentation to the TCTF to address a projected shortfall in TCTF revenue that supports trial courts' allocations for operations. The decline in projected revenues was primarily a result of a decline in paid, first-paper civil filings and court operations assessments on criminal convictions. The Spring Finance Letter was submitted. In his May revision, the Governor proposed to provide \$30.9 million of General Fund revenues to backfill the potential fee revenue loss but concluded that a portion of the projected fee revenue loss constituted revenues from locally based charges, which are not part of a court's allocation from the TCTF. None of the projected shortfall was based on local revenues, and the DOF has been so advised and has acknowledged such. Despite this acknowledgement, the 2014–2015 enacted budget provided for the \$30.9 million only, leaving a projected deficit of \$22.7 million (see Appendix B, column E, line 38).

Rationale for recommendation 1

Over the past several years, the state has significantly reduced General Fund support for trial court operations and instead relied on new and existing court user fees to supplant reduced funding. Fee revenues are a less stable source of revenues for the trial courts, as evidenced by the decline in revenue that trial courts have experienced in the past year. The stability of state trial court funding should be protected despite fluctuations in user fee revenues. To the extent that revenues decline, the state should be committed to backfilling fully any shortfall in revenue that supports courts' base allocation for operations from the state General Fund. If not backfilled or funded, this reduction in revenue would be passed along to the trial courts as a reduction in General Fund support for trial court operations. Allocating a reduction in January should provide courts sufficient time to make adjustments to their 2014–2015 budgets. Appendix C displays courts' beginning base allocation for operations, totaling \$1.557 billion, which consists of their ending 2013–2014 TCTF and General Fund base allocations, an ongoing reduction resulting from conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships, and the removal of the allocation for 2012–2013 benefit cost changes. Given the current TCTF revenue projections, as reflected in the Governor's proposed May Revision, and TCTF appropriation levels set by the Budget Act of 2014—and assuming the allocation of the \$1.557 billion, the allocation of \$127.3 million in new funding provided in the Budget Act of 2014 (\$41 million for noninterpreter staff benefits and \$86.3 million for general court operations) per recommendations 2 and 3, and \$325,000 for audit costs and \$134.1 million in other allocations already approved by

the council from the Program 45.10 appropriation authority as discussed in recommendation 5—the TCTF is projected to end fiscal year 2014–2015 with a negative fund balance of \$13.2 million (see Appendix B, column E, line 32). Because \$9.4 million is restricted by statute or council policy, the unrestricted fund balance is a negative \$22.7 million (see Appendix B, column E, lines 35 and 38).

The TCBAC considered two allocation options regarding each court’s share of the \$22.7 million revenue shortfall, but these options are not being recommended at this time (see Appendix D). Instead, the TCBAC recommends that the council not take action on the revenue shortfall unless the deficiency request is not adopted by the Governor. In that scenario, the council should then direct the TCBAC to provide the council with a recommendation on how the shortfall should be allocated among the courts. Scenario 1 assigns each court a share of the \$22.7 million shortfall based on their pro-rata share of the 2014–2015 base allocation, and Scenario 2 assigns a share based on their pro-rata share of the 2014–2015 base allocation less each court’s 2011–2012 non-sheriff security allocation. Appendix E provides the detail behind the computation of the allocations by court.

The TCBAC makes this recommendation aware of the following:

1. The revenue loss has not yet actualized; it is a *potential* revenue loss, as the Governor himself recognized in his June budget.
2. More current projections based on current fiscal year data won’t be available until after the end of the first quarter.
3. Whether the DOF is going to backfill this \$22.7 million in future years, making this a one-time problem versus an ongoing problem, is a cause of confusion. Notable is the DOF Chief Deputy Director’s testimony at the June 5, 2014, Budget Conference Committee hearing wherein she indicated that “to the extent that there is uncertainty in any revenue forecast we would commit to backfilling fees going forward.”

Recommendation 2: Allocation of New Benefits Funding for 2014–2015

2. Allocate the new benefits funding by prorating \$41.0 million to the trial courts based on each court’s percentage of the total 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost change of \$63.9 million. (The remaining \$1.8 million in new benefits funding is for court interpreter benefits, and staff will coordinate with the Department of Finance to augment the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters) appropriation.)

Previous council action

The Judicial Council approved on August 23, 2013, that staff submit a trial court benefits budget change proposal (BCP) to the DOF for ongoing funding for full-year costs related to 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 cost changes.

Rationale for recommendation 2

Background. In fall of 2013, a BCP in the amount of \$64.8 million was submitted to the Department of Finance to address the ongoing cost to the trial courts in 2014–2015 of the retirement, employee health, and retiree health cost changes that occurred in 2012–2013 and were anticipated to occur in 2013–2014. The request separately identified the funding need for court employees other than interpreters, which is funded from the Program 45.10 appropriation, and for interpreters, which is funded from the Program 45.45 appropriation. The Governor’s January proposed budget did not include a separate benefits funding augmentation but instead provided that the benefit cost change increases were included in the proposed \$100 million augmentation to trial court funding.

After the release of the Governor’s January Budget proposal, the DOF performed an analysis of court retirement costs and determined that \$22.1 million was the amount trial courts could save by not covering the current employee share of costs for retirement. Staff performed its own analysis of these costs and estimated the amount to be \$17.9 million at that time. This estimate was communicated to the DOF prior to the release of the May Revision of the Governor’s proposed budget. The May Revision included an augmentation of \$42.8 million specifically for the benefit cost changes in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014, which took into account a reduction in the amount of \$22 million, based on the DOF estimate of what the trial courts were currently spending to cover the employee share of cost for retirement. The Senate and Assembly supported the May Revision benefits funding level. The 2014 Budget Act includes an augmentation of \$42.8 million to address these trial court benefit cost changes.

Because the level of funding provided is insufficient to fully fund the courts’ total benefit cost changes, a working group of the TCBAC, led by the Court Executives Advisory Committee vice-chair Mary Beth Todd, was formed to review the issue and present options for allocation of the funding to the full TCBAC. During the period in which the working group was meeting, the 2013–2014 benefit premiums and employer share amounts for all courts were finalized. This resulted in an overall funding need of \$63.9 million (\$61.3 million for noninterpreter staff and \$2.6 million for interpreter staff). The working group recommended option 3 (see below) because it took into account the application of the employee retirement subsidy against the benefit need as contemplated in the May Revision.

Allocation options considered at the July 7, 2014, TCBAC meeting. At the outset, Judge Earl, co-chair of the TCBAC, advised committee members that the Funding Methodology Subcommittee of the TCBAC will consider the issue of determining benefits funding needs based on the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) this fall. The TCBAC reviewed the options presented by the working group and voted 14 to 9 to recommend the approval of option 1 to the Judicial Council (see Appendix F). The following four options for allocating the new benefits augmentation among the courts were considered by the TCBAC. A description of how the allocation would work and its impact on the courts is provided.

1. Prorate the \$41.0 million in new funding to the courts based on each court's percentage of the total funding need of \$63.9 million. This option would result in all courts receiving approximately 67 percent of their total funding need.
2. Subtract the entire staff estimated employee retirement subsidy amount (\$17.9 million) for courts providing it from their total benefits funding need, and pro-rate the remaining reduction among those courts that don't subsidize their employees. This option would result in those courts that don't subsidize the employee share of retirement receiving approximately 94 percent of their total benefits funding need, and 20 courts would have a negative allocation, meaning their base funding would be reduced.
3. Subtract the staff estimated employee retirement subsidy amount for courts providing it from their total benefits funding need to the point that all courts that would otherwise have a negative allocation are brought to \$0, and pro-rate the remaining reduction among all other courts. This option would result in those courts that don't subsidize the employee share of retirement receiving approximately 83 percent of their total benefit cost need. No courts would have negative allocations under this option, but 20 would receive no allocation of the funding.
4. Subtract one-third of the DOF estimated employee subsidy amount (\$7.4 million) for courts providing it from their total benefits funding need up to the point that all courts that would otherwise have a negative allocation are brought to \$0, and pro-rate the remaining reduction among all other courts. This final option would result in those courts that do not subsidize the employee share of retirement receiving approximately 75 percent of their total benefit cost need. No courts would receive negative allocations with this option, but six would receive no allocation of the funding.

Those members who supported option 1 indicated the allocation of the reduction should be made on a pro-rata basis as was the case for most allocations when the funding provided was insufficient for the total need identified, and that it would be unfair to penalize courts so late in the fiscal year by reducing their allocation for paying a portion of the employee share of retirement when compliance with the California Public Employee Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) is not required until 2018 for employees hired prior to January 1, 2013. Supporters also felt that it would be unfair to reduce a court's allocation because it was paying a portion of its employee share of retirement as this practice was not and is not illegal, including pursuant to PEPRA, or against any current council policy. Committee members recognized that some of the contracts that include payment of a portion of the employee share of retirement are long-standing and that it will take some time to work with the unions to reduce the subsidy to the employees and that courts should not be penalized by having their allocations reduced because of this.

At the same time, however, other advisory committee members stated that those courts that do not subsidize any portion of the employee retirement share should not be penalized by receiving a lower allocation of the funding in order to provide a higher amount of funding to those courts that do subsidize.

Court Interpreter Funding. The allocation of the entire \$42.8 million in new benefits funding was appropriated to TCTF Program 45.10 in the 2014 Budget Act, even though \$1.8 million of that funding is for interpreters and needs to be scheduled to the correct program, TCTF (Court Interpreter) Program 45.45, by the DOF. Staff will coordinate with the DOF to make this technical change and will request that going forward this be done in the future when benefits funding for interpreters is appropriated. The interpreter benefits funding will augment the \$92.7 million Program 45.45 appropriation, which will increase to \$94.5 million. However, per Judicial Council policy, as approved at the council’s February 26, 2013, meeting, this additional benefits funding would be allocated to courts only if the \$92.7 million annual appropriation, which reimburses courts for eligible interpreter costs including staff interpreter retirement and health costs, is insufficient to reimburse courts for all their eligible court interpreter costs. For the past five years (from 2009–2010 to 2012–2013), after all eligible court interpreter costs were reimbursed, there have been savings from the Program 45.45 \$92.7 million appropriation. As of the date of this council report, the final eligible reimbursable costs for 2013–2014 are not yet available.

Recommendation 3: 2014–15 WAFM Allocation Adjustments

3. Allocate each court’s share of a net allocation increase of \$86.3 million by using the 2014–2015 WAFM to reallocate 15 percent (\$216 million) and an additional \$146.3 million of courts’ historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, reallocate \$60 million in new funding provided in 2013–2014 for general court operations, and allocate \$86.3 million in new funding provided in 2014–2015 for general court operations.

Previous council action

On April 26, 2013, the council adopted a policy to phase in the use of WAFM for reallocating courts’ historical WAFM base funding, as of the end of 2012–2013, over a five-year period starting in 2013–2014, in which 50 percent of historical funding would be reallocated according to WAFM by 2017–2018. For 2014–2015, 15 percent of courts’ historical base funding would be subject to reallocation based on WAFM. The council adopted an exception to the phase-in of reallocation of historical funding in years when new funding for general court operations was provided. In such years, additional historical funding, above and beyond the phase-in level and up to the level of the new funding amount, would be reallocated. The council adopted a number of revisions to the WAFM on February 20, 2014. To determine funding need for courts whose WAFM workload need is less than 50 full-time equivalents (FTEs), the council adopted using the most current three-year average salary data to determine each court’s Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) salary adjustment and adopted a per-FTE dollar allotment floor that is the median BLS-adjusted average FTE dollar allotment. For allocating trial court base funding for court operations, the council established an absolute funding floor (\$750,000 in fiscal year 2014–2015) and a graduated funding floor that is based on a court’s WAFM funding need (\$875,000, \$1,250,000, and \$1,875,000 in fiscal year 2014–2015); funded the funding-floor allocation by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor; and eliminated the cluster 1 courts’ exemption from having their historical base allocations reallocated using the WAFM.

Rationale for recommendation 3

The recommended allocation adjustments reflect the current WAFM, which incorporates the revisions adopted by the council on February 20, 2014, and is updated to include 2013–2014 Schedule 7A salary and benefit budgets (as of July 1, 2013) and average filings from 2010–2011 to 2012–2013 (see Appendix H). Appendix G displays the various WAFM allocation adjustments by court, which net to a total of \$86.3 million, as displayed in column Q. Column F displays the net reallocation of 15 percent (\$216 million) of courts’ historical base funding using the current WAFM. Column O displays the reversal of the reallocation of 10 percent of courts’ historical base funding that was allocated on an ongoing basis in 2013–2014. The sum of columns F and O provides the net change that is being reallocated in 2014–2015 due to the phase-in of WAFM. Columns I and M display the updated net reallocation of \$60 million in historical base funding using the current WAFM and the updated allocation of \$60 million in new 2013–2014 funding, respectively. Column P displays the reversal of the ongoing allocations made in 2013–2014 related to the \$60 million. The sum of columns I, M, and P provides the net change that is being allocated in 2014–2015. Column L displays the net reallocation of \$86.3 million in historical base funding. Column N displays the allocation of \$86.3 million in new funding for general court operations provided in 2014–2015.

Other appendixes provide detail underlying the information displayed in Appendixes G and H. Appendix G1 provides the detail of courts’ historical WAFM-related base allocation of the \$1.44 billion that is used in Appendix G. Appendixes H1, H2, and H3 provide detail related to the RAS workload/FTE need, BLS factor, and FTE allotment factor, respectively, displayed in Appendix H.

Recommendation 4: 2014–15 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment

4. Allocate each court’s share of the 2014–2015 WAFM funding floor allocation adjustment, which includes funding floor allocations for nine courts totaling \$1.2 million and a corresponding funding-floor related reduction for all other courts totaling \$1.2 million, for a net zero total allocation.

Previous council action

See the previous council action under recommendation 3.

Rationale for recommendation 4

The allocation adjustments are based on the policy adopted by the council on February 20, 2014. The allocation adjustment for each court is displayed in Appendix A (summary table) and Appendix I (columns C and E). The funding-floor allocations that nine courts received are displayed in column C of Appendix I. As displayed in Appendix I1, two courts were eligible for the absolute funding-floor level of \$750,000, one court for the graduated level of \$875,000, two courts for the graduated level of \$1,250,000, and four courts for the graduated level of \$1,874,999. The funding-floor adjustment for courts that did not receive a funding-floor allocation is displayed in column E of Appendix I.

Appendix I1 displays whether or not a court is eligible for a funding-floor adjustment and, if a court is eligible, what the maximum funding-floor amount is for the court. Appendix I2 displays each court's 2013–2014 WAFM-related base allocation. Appendix I3 displays each court's 2014–2015 WAFM-related base allocation before any funding-floor adjustment.

Recommendation 5: Allocation for Reimbursement of California State Auditor

5. Allocate \$325,000 for reimbursement of courts' audit costs incurred by the California State Auditor.

Previous Council Action

At its April 25 and June 27, 2014, meetings, the Judicial Council adopted the TCBAC recommendations regarding allocating \$21.19 million from the TCTF Programs 30.05 and 30.15 expenditure authority in FY 2014–2015 for 10 projects and programs (see Appendix J, column D) as well as allocating \$134.1 million from the TCTF Program 45.10 expenditure authority for costs related to court-appointed dependency counsel, jurors, self-help centers, replacement screening stations, criminal justice realignment, and elder abuse (see Appendix K, column B). As part of the TCBAC recommendation, the council also agreed to consider any recommended allocation changes from the TCBAC following enactment of the 2014–2015 State Budget, but the TCBAC decided at its July 7, 2014, meeting that to adjust any of those allocations based on the result of the Budget Act was unnecessary.

Two items that will be allocated from the Program 45.10 appropriation are pending (see Appendix K, rows 11 and 24). The allocation of any of the 2 percent reserve will be made by the council through the supplemental funding process, and the allocation of monies, using the council-approved formula, collected through the dependency counsel collections program will be brought to the TCBAC and council once final 2013–2014 collections are known.

A number of items will not be brought before the council because they either are required by the Budget Act (a \$10 million rather than \$50 million distribution from the Immediate & Critical Needs Account for court operations [see Appendix K, row 13]); have already been acted on by the council (removal of the 2012–2013 benefits allocation [see row 15]; various revenue distributions [see rows 27, 30, 31, and 32]); are required by statute (various revenue distributions [see rows 28, 29, and 30]); or are authorized charges for the cost of programs (see rows 35 and 36).

Rationale for recommendation 5

Provision 12 of the Budget Act of 2014 requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the council to reimburse the California State Auditor to the extent costs of trial court audits are incurred by the California State Auditor under section 19210 of the Public Contract Code during 2014–2015.

Recommendation 6: Allocation of Courts' Contribution to 2 Percent Reserve

6. Allocate each court's one-time contribution toward the statutorily required 2 percent reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund (\$37.9 million in 2014–2015) calculated using the method used in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014.

Previous council action

The council has taken no previous action concerning this recommendation.

Rationale for recommendation 6

The pro-rata method used in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 was a reasonable and fair approach. The 2 percent reserve amount is calculated based on each court's share of the beginning 2014–2015 allocation for base operations excluding 2011–2012 allocations related to non-sheriff security. The main rationale for excluding security allocations from the holdback computation is that the method treats the 39 courts with non-sheriff security costs the same as the 19 courts where sheriffs provide 100 percent of court security and that thus have zero security allocation in their base allocation. The recommended share for each court is displayed in column E of Appendix L.

Based on the Budget Act of 2014, the 2 percent reserve amount in 2014–2015 is \$37,882,840, which is 2 percent of the 2014–2015 TCTF Program 45.10 Budget Act appropriation of \$1,894,142,000. In 2013–2014, the amount was \$35.2 million. Although Government Code section 68502.5 prescribes unambiguously how the total 2 percent reserve or holdback amount is to be computed, it does not prescribe how each court's share should be computed. As such, the council has discretion in how to allocate each court's share of the holdback.

Recommendation 7: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1 Percent Cap

7. Approve a preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$2.0 million to courts that are projecting the portion of their 2013–2014 ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent fund balance cap to exceed the cap by \$2.0 million, as required by statute.

Previous council action

The council has taken no previous action concerning this recommendation.

Rationale for recommendation 7

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) (full text provided below) requires the council to make a preliminary allocation reduction in July of each fiscal year (see Appendix M) and a final allocation reduction before February of each fiscal year to offset the amount of reserves (or fund balance) in excess of the amount authorized by Government Code section 77203 to be carried over from one year to the next beginning June 30, 2014.

When setting the allocations for trial courts, the Judicial Council shall set a preliminary allocation in July of each fiscal year. The preliminary allocation shall

include an estimate of available trial court reserves as of June 30 of the prior fiscal year and each court's preliminary allocation shall be offset by the amount of reserves in excess of the amount authorized to be carried over pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 77203. In January of each fiscal year, after review of available trial court reserves as of June 30 of the prior fiscal year, the Judicial Council shall finalize allocations to trial courts and each court's finalized allocation shall be offset by the amount of reserves in excess of the amount authorized to be carried over pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 77203.

(Gov. Code, § 68502.5(c)(2)(A).)

Recommendation 8: One-Time Process for Reviewing Courts' 1 Percent Fund Cap Computations

8. Approve a one-time process for courts to submit their final computation of the portion of their 2013–2014 fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap for review by a five-person committee before submission to the council, as outlined in the report.

Previous council action

The council has taken no previous action concerning this recommendation.

Rationale for recommendation 8

To ensure consistency and compliance with the agreement and allowance from the Department of Finance to exclude statutorily restricted funds and encumbrances from the 1 percent calculation, the TCBAC is recommending that a one-time-only review committee be established to review the submissions. This is the critical year to ensure that the process is done correctly to assure the DOF that the council and courts are treating the review seriously in terms of compliance. In addition, the process will assist the council in complying with Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A).

The recommended process is as follows:

1. Courts will be required to submit the 1 percent computation form (see Appendix N) with final year-end information by October 15, 2014, for review by a committee consisting of the following members: Court Executives Advisory Committee chair and vice-chair, Judicial Council Chief Financial Officer, and two TCBAC members appointed by the TCBAC cochairs.
2. The review committee will review each court's submission and either concur with the submission and provide the concurrence to the court or provide questions and comments to the court for clarification by November 15, 2014.
3. Courts will have until December 1, 2014, to submit revised 1 percent computation forms.
4. The Judicial Council Chief Financial Officer will report the information provided by courts for the final allocation reduction, if any, to the council before February 1, 2015.

Recommendation 9: Annual Process for Courts to Submit 1 Percent Fund Cap Computations

9. Approve an annual process for courts to submit their preliminary and final computation of the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap starting in 2015–2016, as outlined in the report.

Previous council action

The council has taken no previous action concerning this recommendation.

Rationale for recommendation 9

To assist the council in complying with Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A), the TCBAC recommends the following annual process, starting in 2015–2016, for courts to provide preliminary and final computations of the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap:

1. Each year courts will be required to submit the 1 percent computation form with preliminary year-end information by July 15. The information provided by courts will be used by the council to make the preliminary allocation of reductions as required by statute. Courts would not be required to provide the details related to encumbrances, prepayments, and restricted revenue when submitting the form for the preliminary allocation.
2. Each year courts will be required to submit the 1 percent computation form with final year-end information by October 15.
3. Before February the Judicial Council Chief Financial Officer will report to the council the information provided by courts for the final allocation reduction, if any.

Comments From Interested Parties

No comments concerning the TCBAC’s recommendations were received.

Alternatives Considered and Policy Implications

Alternatives considered by the TCBAC were included in the rationales for the individual recommendations where applicable.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

WAFM will result in the permanent shift of some courts’ historical base allocation to other courts.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology is consistent with strategic Goal II, Independence and Accountability, in that the methodology model aims to “[a]llocate resources in a transparent and fair manner that promotes efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of

justice, supports the strategic goals of the judicial branch, promotes innovation, and provides for effective and consistent court operations” (Goal II.B.3).

It also meets objective III of the related operational plan, Modernization of Management and Administration, in that a workload-based approach creates “[s]tandards for determining adequate resources for all case types—particularly for complex litigation, civil and small claims, and court venues such as family and juvenile, probate guardianship, probate conservatorship, and traffic; accountability mechanisms for ensuring that resources are properly allocated according to those standards” (Objective III.A.2.c).

Attachments

1. Appendix A: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations
2. Appendix B: Trial Court Trust Fund—Fund Condition Statement
3. Appendix C: 2014–2015 Beginning Base Allocation: 2013–2014 Ending Base, Annualization, and Remove 2012–2013 Benefits Cost Changes Funding
4. Appendix D: Courts’ Share of Estimated Revenue Shortfall of \$22.7 Million (Two Scenarios)
5. Appendix E: Computation of Reduction Related to Revenue Shortfall for Scenarios 1 and 2
6. Appendix F: Option 1—Pro Rata Allocation of \$42.8 Million for Benefit Cost Increases
7. Appendix G: 2014–2015 WAFM Allocation Adjustments
8. Appendix G1: Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM
9. Appendix H: Computation of Funding Need Using the 2014–2015 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology
10. Appendix H1: 2014–2015 RAS FTE Need
11. Appendix H2: BLS Factor
12. Appendix H3: FTE Allotment Factor
13. Appendix I: FY 2014–2015 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor
14. Appendix I1: Determination of Funding Floor
15. Appendix I2: 2013–2014 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
16. Appendix I3: 2014–2015 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
17. Appendix J: 2014–2015 TCTF Program 30.05 and 30.15 Allocations Approved by the Judicial Council
18. Appendix K: FY 2014–15 TCTF Program 45.10: Appropriation vs. Allocations
19. Appendix L: Estimated FY 2014–2015 Allocation of 2% Holdback
20. Appendix M: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap
21. Appendix N: 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form

Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2	Recommendation 3	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 6	Recommendation 7	
	Preliminary 2014-2015 Base Allocation (TCTF and GF)	Allocation of New Benefits Funding for 2014-2015	2014-15 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2014-15 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment	2% Reserve	Preliminary Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	Total
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Alameda	73,478,643	1,609,137	506,404	(53,299)	(1,667,682)	-	73,873,203
Alpine	549,246	6,245	(73,967)	266,308	(17,235)	(627,134)	103,465
Amador	2,125,892	23,828	(10,168)	(1,615)	(49,271)	pending	2,088,666
Butte	8,199,700	158,491	609,976	(6,221)	(195,772)	-	8,766,175
Calaveras	1,931,593	45,771	18,308	(1,513)	(45,958)	-	1,948,201
Colusa	1,382,752	16,004	13,188	123,127	(35,377)	(255,628)	1,244,066
Contra Costa	34,913,318	1,020,012	1,841,330	(27,312)	(869,928)	-	36,877,421
Del Norte	2,331,772	45,700	114,280	(1,783)	(57,384)	(522,675)	1,909,911
El Dorado	6,064,065	18,950	263,889	(4,768)	(146,161)	-	6,195,975
Fresno	36,170,365	923,246	2,789,941	(29,356)	(918,483)	-	38,935,713
Glenn	1,818,056	24,061	(11,939)	32,836	(42,710)	(58,702)	1,761,603
Humboldt	5,231,249	137,243	276,212	(4,042)	(126,128)	-	5,514,534
Imperial	6,924,276	204,591	518,519	(5,349)	(166,429)	-	7,475,608
Inyo	1,915,156	32,741	(62,695)	186,861	(43,451)	-	2,028,611
Kern	32,510,246	551,636	4,252,465	(26,903)	(857,818)	-	36,429,626
Kings	5,557,823	22,140	425,836	(4,106)	(128,592)	-	5,873,101
Lake	3,112,502	3,199	95,557	(2,237)	(69,427)	-	3,139,594
Lassen	2,223,269	5,580	40,363	(1,498)	(45,490)	(47,596)	2,174,627
Los Angeles	440,738,829	12,101,803	35,639,382	(339,019)	(10,920,300)	-	477,220,696
Madera	6,336,734	45,479	355,661	(4,814)	(146,381)	-	6,586,680
Marin	12,667,867	358,566	(59,305)	(9,532)	(298,400)	-	12,659,197
Mariposa	970,008	3,560	1,730	96,473	(24,700)	-	1,047,072
Mendocino	4,507,833	235,205	129,330	(3,459)	(105,310)	(167,662)	4,595,937
Merced	9,713,960	310,199	673,039	(7,896)	(246,346)	(109,723)	10,333,231
Modoc	963,532	3,544	(69,362)	34,375	(21,463)	(1,096)	909,531
Mono	1,263,841	11,323	59,610	89,167	(32,260)	-	1,391,682
Monterey	14,547,769	264,491	747,923	(10,940)	(338,299)	-	15,210,944
Napa	6,574,920	181,753	140,912	(4,766)	(152,041)	-	6,740,778
Nevada	4,474,537	120,300	191,189	(3,091)	(100,239)	-	4,682,695
Orange	125,037,485	5,785,430	3,496,207	(97,195)	(3,030,285)	-	131,191,642
Placer	12,463,094	284,469	821,972	(9,566)	(312,504)	(4,178)	13,243,287
Plumas	1,462,973	6,015	(95,320)	(1,038)	(31,634)	-	1,340,996
Riverside	65,347,300	1,643,210	6,057,489	(51,696)	(1,637,764)	-	71,358,540
Sacramento	65,760,697	2,297,449	2,846,831	(50,844)	(1,589,942)	-	69,264,191

Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2	Recommendation 3	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 6	Recommendation 7	
	Preliminary 2014-2015 Base Allocation (TCTF and GF)	Allocation of New Benefits Funding for 2014-2015	2014-15 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2014-15 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment	2% Reserve	Preliminary Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	Total
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
San Benito	2,552,708	16,844	(74,843)	(1,885)	(57,450)	-	2,435,374
San Bernardino	72,400,120	1,333,588	6,917,080	(56,332)	(1,782,038)	-	78,812,418
San Diego	124,825,581	4,121,481	3,042,330	(95,765)	(3,024,484)	-	128,869,143
San Francisco	54,682,503	1,495,964	600,353	(40,937)	(1,307,585)	-	55,430,297
San Joaquin	25,403,961	535,858	1,587,646	(20,058)	(627,306)	-	26,880,101
San Luis Obispo	11,711,488	122,246	819,314	(8,923)	(285,828)	-	12,358,297
San Mateo	31,751,706	603,175	1,034,520	(23,884)	(758,734)	-	32,606,782
Santa Barbara	19,862,556	121,986	590,633	(14,454)	(449,528)	-	20,111,194
Santa Clara	74,446,824	825,453	719,654	(56,104)	(1,750,022)	-	74,185,805
Santa Cruz	10,026,427	154,317	549,799	(7,835)	(247,116)	-	10,475,591
Shasta	10,470,812	184,003	457,766	(6,340)	(200,883)	-	10,905,357
Sierra	538,452	8,941	(72,867)	273,332	(17,235)	-	730,623
Siskiyou	3,103,035	59,428	(29,475)	(2,302)	(72,150)	(13,296)	3,045,240
Solano	17,177,239	497,180	917,245	(13,346)	(418,123)	-	18,160,194
Sonoma	20,029,017	616,911	1,060,419	(15,724)	(489,743)	(198,442)	21,002,438
Stanislaus	16,259,606	818,944	1,492,323	(13,714)	(427,455)	-	18,129,705
Sutter	3,825,456	72,212	277,618	(2,979)	(90,461)	-	4,081,846
Tehama	2,966,054	24,866	197,864	(2,412)	(73,433)	-	3,112,939
Trinity	1,458,598	19,978	13,969	85,985	(25,994)	-	1,552,537
Tulare	13,310,745	103,341	960,816	(10,451)	(330,685)	-	14,033,766
Tuolumne	2,854,074	19,249	58,705	(2,026)	(62,443)	(2,118)	2,865,441
Ventura	27,575,898	542,126	2,053,031	(21,141)	(658,905)	-	29,491,009
Yolo	7,645,869	168,486	384,237	(5,417)	(175,387)	-	8,017,788
Yuba	3,286,336	66,221	197,074	(2,578)	(78,690)	-	3,468,362
Total	1,557,436,370	41,034,166	86,300,000	(0)	(37,882,840)	(2,008,249)	1,644,879,447

Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	FY 2014-15				
		FY 2012-13 (Year-End Financial Statement) Col. A	FY 2013-14 (Estimated) Col. B	Utilize All Expenditure Authority Col. C	Estimated Unused Expenditure Authority Col. D	Estimated Use of Expenditure Authority Col. E (C + D)
1	Beginning Balance	105,535,205	82,346,997	9,421,089		9,421,089
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	19,260,408	(5,905,715)	-		-
3	Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	124,795,613	76,441,282	9,421,089		9,421,089
4	Revenue	1,400,425,164	1,376,276,630	1,345,488,436		1,345,488,436
5	<i>Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue</i>	<i>658,893,532</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>		<i>659,050,502</i>
6	<i>Civil Fee Revenue</i>	<i>408,289,141</i>	<i>384,128,338</i>	<i>362,200,300</i>		<i>362,200,300</i>
7	<i>Court Operations Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>156,455,686</i>	<i>150,642,649</i>	<i>141,947,110</i>		<i>141,947,110</i>
8	<i>Civil Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>149,100,873</i>	<i>156,212,932</i>	<i>156,212,932</i>		<i>156,212,932</i>
9	<i>Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>25,194,026</i>	<i>25,056,964</i>	<i>25,005,836</i>		<i>25,005,836</i>
10	<i>Interest from SMIF</i>	<i>218,660</i>	<i>58,130</i>	<i>58,130</i>		<i>58,130</i>
11	<i>Sanctions and Contempt Fines</i>	<i>1,484,984</i>	<i>1,070,263</i>	<i>956,774</i>		<i>956,774</i>
12	<i>Miscellaneous Revenue</i>	<i>788,263</i>	<i>56,852</i>	<i>56,852</i>		<i>56,852</i>
13	General Fund Transfer	263,691,000	742,319,000	911,419,000		911,419,000
14	General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	-	-	30,900,000		30,900,000
15	Reduction Offset Transfers	86,709,000	26,080,000	26,080,000		26,080,000
16	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	(1,639,392)	(3,377,063)	(4,358,518)		(4,358,518)
17	Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	1,749,185,772	2,141,298,567	2,309,528,918		2,309,528,918
18	Total Resources	1,873,981,385	2,217,739,849	2,318,950,007		2,318,950,007
19	Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations					
21	Program 30.05 - Judicial Council (Staff)	3,692,227	4,312,172	5,359,100	(990,100)	4,369,000
22	Program 30.15 - Trial Court Operations	19,918,086	19,014,014	19,634,000	(2,818,000)	16,816,000
25	Program 45.10 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,344,726,911	1,740,041,427	1,874,457,148	(6,138,525)	1,868,318,623
26	Program 45.25 - Comp. of Superior Court Judges	304,004,469	312,682,000	313,229,000		313,229,000
27	Program 45.35 - Assigned Judges	24,624,238	26,047,000	26,047,000		26,047,000
28	Program 45.45 - Court Interpreters	84,483,339	95,234,076	94,559,834		94,559,834
29	Program 45.55 - Grants	9,963,931	9,209,256	9,554,900	(713,916)	8,840,984
30	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	221,186	1,778,814	-		-
31	Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations	1,791,634,387	2,208,318,759	2,342,840,982	(10,660,541)	2,332,180,441
32	Ending Fund Balance	82,346,997	9,421,089	(23,890,975)		(13,230,433)
34	Fund Balance Detail					
35	Restricted Fund Balance	14,440,310	9,160,459	9,420,279		9,420,279
36	Unrestricted Fund Balance	67,906,687	260,630	(33,311,254)		(22,650,713)
37						
38	Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit)	(42,448,616)	(67,020,193)	(33,312,064)		(22,651,522)

Intentionally Blank

**2014-2015 Beginning Base Allocation: 2013-2014 Ending Base, Annualization,
and Remove 2012-2013 Benefits Cost Changes Funding**

	Ending 2013-2014 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Benefits Base Allocation (2010-11 and 2011-12)	Benefits Allocation Reduction (2012-13) ¹	Annualization of Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Preliminary Beginning Base in 2014-2015
Court	1	2	3	4	5 = Sum of 1 to 4
Alameda	71,494,038	3,102,046	(1,117,440)	-	73,478,643
Alpine	536,863	20,340	(7,957)	-	549,246
Amador	2,075,747	51,756	(1,611)	-	2,125,892
Butte	8,170,991	124,076	(95,367)	-	8,199,700
Calaveras	1,940,406	50,506	(59,318)	-	1,931,593
Colusa	1,369,335	24,773	(11,356)	-	1,382,752
Contra Costa	34,404,261	1,396,191	(887,134)	-	34,913,318
Del Norte	2,300,564	94,129	(62,921)	-	2,331,772
El Dorado	5,872,358	213,119	(21,412)	-	6,064,065
Fresno	33,706,146	3,340,364	(876,146)	-	36,170,365
Glenn	1,794,458	54,665	(31,067)	-	1,818,056
Humboldt	5,241,609	73,084	(83,444)	-	5,231,249
Imperial	7,028,750	125,538	(230,012)	-	6,924,276
Inyo	1,894,107	75,586	(54,537)	-	1,915,156
Kern	29,595,035	3,544,269	(629,057)	-	32,510,246
Kings	5,519,658	45,117	(6,952)	-	5,557,823
Lake	3,102,931	9,123	449	-	3,112,502
Lassen	2,222,061	7,839	(6,630)	-	2,223,269
Los Angeles	429,960,172	18,887,969	(7,790,986)	(318,326)	440,738,829
Madera	6,089,746	384,825	(137,838)	-	6,336,734
Marin	12,354,099	644,512	(324,291)	(6,453)	12,667,867
Mariposa	954,124	22,300	(6,416)	-	970,008
Mendocino	4,435,925	311,770	(239,862)	-	4,507,833
Merced	9,208,327	774,827	(269,194)	-	9,713,960
Modoc	932,838	31,967	(1,273)	-	963,532
Mono	1,210,549	85,641	(32,349)	-	1,263,841
Monterey	14,497,845	277,496	(227,572)	-	14,547,769
Napa	6,372,800	309,796	(107,676)	-	6,574,920
Nevada	4,479,222	95,494	(100,179)	-	4,474,537
Orange	121,988,177	6,929,920	(3,671,441)	(209,171)	125,037,485
Placer	12,066,757	634,796	(238,459)	-	12,463,094
Plumas	1,448,318	14,929	(273)	-	1,462,973
Riverside	65,277,653	923,657	(685,149)	(168,861)	65,347,300
Sacramento	63,873,883	3,560,591	(1,673,778)	-	65,760,697
San Benito	2,526,744	34,642	(8,678)	-	2,552,708

**2014-2015 Beginning Base Allocation: 2013-2014 Ending Base, Annualization,
and Remove 2012-2013 Benefits Cost Changes Funding**

	Ending 2013-2014 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Benefits Base Allocation (2010-11 and 2011-12)	Benefits Allocation Reduction (2012-13) ¹	Annualization of Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Preliminary Beginning Base in 2014-2015
Court	1	2	3	4	5 = Sum of 1 to 4
San Bernardino	72,147,163	1,264,732	(1,011,776)	-	72,400,120
San Diego	125,478,197	2,853,598	(3,506,215)	-	124,825,581
San Francisco	49,195,369	5,487,134	-	-	54,682,503
San Joaquin	24,914,639	1,245,356	(756,034)	-	25,403,961
San Luis Obispo	11,449,303	298,958	(36,773)	-	11,711,488
San Mateo	29,551,664	2,411,112	(211,070)	-	31,751,706
Santa Barbara	18,243,443	1,597,662	21,451	-	19,862,556
Santa Clara	73,257,781	2,309,467	(1,120,423)	-	74,446,824
Santa Cruz	9,997,292	203,557	(174,422)	-	10,026,427
Shasta	10,169,734	262,222	38,857	-	10,470,812
Sierra	538,105	9,615	(9,268)	-	538,452
Siskiyou	3,072,125	91,037	(60,127)	-	3,103,035
Solano	17,240,736	353,779	(417,276)	-	17,177,239
Sonoma	19,441,709	1,172,049	(584,741)	-	20,029,017
Stanislaus	15,957,751	1,305,230	(1,003,375)	-	16,259,606
Sutter	3,690,455	159,760	(24,759)	-	3,825,456
Tehama	2,875,164	108,184	(17,294)	-	2,966,054
Trinity	1,421,481	53,679	(16,561)	-	1,458,598
Tulare	13,404,033	33,744	(127,031)	-	13,310,745
Tuolumne	2,806,339	50,351	(2,616)	-	2,854,074
Ventura	27,023,638	968,752	(416,492)	-	27,575,898
Yolo	7,642,166	210,076	(206,373)	-	7,645,869
Yuba	3,261,573	90,867	(66,104)	-	3,286,336
Total	1,518,726,356	68,818,575	(29,405,750)	(702,811)	1,557,436,370

1. At its April 24, 2014 business meeting, the Judicial Council directed that \$29.4 million from the TCTF no longer be allocated for benefit cost increases related to FY 2012–2013.

Courts' Share of Estimated Revenue Shortfall of \$22.7 Million

	Scenario 1 - Pro-Rata of 2014-15 Base Allocation			Scenario 2 - Pro-Rata of 2014-15 Base Allocation less 2011-12 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation			Scenario 2 as % of Scenario 1
	Allocation of Shortfall	Additional Adjustment Related to Funding Floor	Net Allocation	Allocation of Shortfall	Additional Adjustment Related to Funding Floor	Net Allocation	
Court	A	B	C (A+B)	E	F	G (E+F)	H
Alameda	(1,018,529)	(6,510)	(1,025,039)	(1,000,038)	(6,272)	(1,006,310)	98%
Alpine	(6,488)	6,488	(0)	(6,650)	6,650	0	0%
Amador	(28,828)	(199)	(29,026)	(29,546)	(191)	(29,737)	102%
Butte	(120,834)	(758)	(121,592)	(117,395)	(732)	(118,127)	97%
Calaveras	(26,889)	(187)	(27,076)	(27,559)	(179)	(27,738)	102%
Colusa	(19,024)	19,024	0	(19,498)	19,498	0	0%
Contra Costa	(508,962)	(3,347)	(512,309)	(521,652)	(3,206)	(524,858)	102%
Del Norte	(33,573)	(218)	(33,791)	(34,410)	(209)	(34,619)	102%
El Dorado	(85,516)	(587)	(86,103)	(87,648)	(563)	(88,211)	102%
Fresno	(537,377)	(3,606)	(540,983)	(550,775)	(3,455)	(554,229)	102%
Glenn	(24,659)	24,659	-	(25,139)	25,139	-	0%
Humboldt	(76,055)	(495)	(76,549)	(75,634)	(476)	(76,110)	99%
Imperial	(103,038)	(653)	(103,691)	(99,800)	(630)	(100,431)	97%
Inyo	(25,401)	25,401	0	(23,456)	23,456	(0)	0%
Kern	(502,760)	(3,296)	(506,056)	(514,390)	(3,158)	(517,548)	102%
Kings	(80,920)	(499)	(81,419)	(77,111)	(483)	(77,594)	95%
Lake	(43,267)	(273)	(43,540)	(41,633)	(264)	(41,896)	96%
Lassen	(30,575)	(181)	(30,756)	(27,279)	(177)	(27,456)	89%
Los Angeles	(6,581,606)	(41,321)	(6,622,927)	(6,548,299)	(39,737)	(6,588,036)	99%
Madera	(90,784)	(589)	(91,373)	(87,780)	(569)	(88,349)	97%
Marin	(174,714)	(1,171)	(175,885)	(178,938)	(1,122)	(180,059)	102%
Mariposa	(13,141)	13,141	(0)	(13,468)	13,468	-	0%
Mendocino	(65,649)	(423)	(66,071)	(63,151)	(409)	(63,560)	96%
Merced	(144,130)	(970)	(145,100)	(147,724)	(930)	(148,653)	102%
Modoc	(12,095)	12,095	0	(12,386)	12,386	0	0%
Mono	(17,984)	17,984	0	(18,099)	18,099	-	0%
Monterey	(209,652)	(1,336)	(210,988)	(202,865)	(1,289)	(204,155)	97%
Napa	(92,936)	(581)	(93,516)	(91,171)	(559)	(91,731)	98%
Nevada	(64,485)	(373)	(64,858)	(60,107)	(362)	(60,469)	93%
Orange	(1,809,768)	(11,912)	(1,821,680)	(1,817,137)	(11,444)	(1,828,581)	100%
Placer	(182,831)	(1,168)	(184,000)	(187,389)	(1,119)	(188,509)	102%
Plumas	(18,508)	(128)	(18,636)	(18,970)	(123)	(19,092)	102%
Riverside	(984,223)	(6,317)	(990,540)	(982,088)	(6,073)	(988,161)	100%
Sacramento	(955,348)	(6,224)	(961,573)	(953,420)	(5,984)	(959,404)	100%
San Benito	(33,613)	(232)	(33,845)	(34,451)	(223)	(34,673)	102%

Courts' Share of Estimated Revenue Shortfall of \$22.7 Million

	Scenario 1 - Pro-Rata of 2014-15 Base Allocation			Scenario 2 - Pro-Rata of 2014-15 Base Allocation less 2011-12 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation			Scenario 2 as % of Scenario 1
	Allocation of Shortfall	Additional Adjustment Related to Funding Floor	Net Allocation	Allocation of Shortfall	Additional Adjustment Related to Funding Floor	Net Allocation	
Court	A	B	C (A+B)	E	F	G (E+F)	H
San Bernardino	(1,086,660)	(6,872)	(1,093,532)	(1,068,603)	(6,619)	(1,075,223)	98%
San Diego	(1,778,378)	(11,741)	(1,790,119)	(1,813,641)	(11,255)	(1,824,897)	102%
San Francisco	(765,018)	(5,015)	(770,033)	(784,091)	(4,804)	(788,895)	102%
San Joaquin	(370,895)	(2,461)	(373,356)	(376,169)	(2,361)	(378,529)	101%
San Luis Obispo	(170,483)	(1,090)	(171,573)	(171,396)	(1,047)	(172,442)	101%
San Mateo	(449,877)	(2,923)	(452,800)	(454,975)	(2,805)	(457,780)	101%
Santa Barbara	(277,223)	(1,765)	(278,987)	(269,564)	(1,702)	(271,266)	97%
Santa Clara	(1,023,888)	(6,894)	(1,030,782)	(1,049,416)	(6,605)	(1,056,021)	102%
Santa Cruz	(144,580)	(961)	(145,541)	(148,184)	(921)	(149,105)	102%
Shasta	(149,727)	(750)	(150,477)	(120,460)	(745)	(121,205)	81%
Sierra	(6,394)	6,394	0	(6,553)	6,553	0	0%
Siskiyou	(42,213)	(283)	(42,495)	(43,265)	(271)	(43,536)	102%
Solano	(250,497)	(1,634)	(252,132)	(250,730)	(1,570)	(252,301)	100%
Sonoma	(292,464)	(1,927)	(294,391)	(293,679)	(1,852)	(295,531)	100%
Stanislaus	(250,217)	(1,685)	(251,902)	(256,327)	(1,615)	(257,942)	102%
Sutter	(56,256)	(364)	(56,621)	(54,247)	(352)	(54,599)	96%
Tehama	(42,965)	(297)	(43,262)	(44,036)	(285)	(44,321)	102%
Trinity	(20,110)	20,110	0	(14,389)	14,389	0	0%
Tulare	(193,682)	(1,282)	(194,964)	(198,296)	(1,228)	(199,524)	102%
Tuolumne	(39,505)	(247)	(39,752)	(37,445)	(239)	(37,684)	95%
Ventura	(406,514)	(2,580)	(409,094)	(395,118)	(2,489)	(397,607)	97%
Yolo	(110,465)	(656)	(111,121)	(105,170)	(635)	(105,804)	95%
Yuba	(47,826)	(316)	(48,143)	(47,188)	(304)	(47,493)	99%
Total	(22,700,000)	0	(22,700,000)	(22,700,000)	(0)	(22,700,000)	100%

Computation of Reduction Related to Revenue Shortfall for Scenarios 1 and 2

	Ending 2013-2014 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	Reduction for FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding From TCTF	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	Estimated Net WAFM Adjustments ¹	Estimated Non-Interpreter Benefits Base Allocation (12-13 and 13-14) ¹ (Item 3 Option 1)	Total	% of Total Base (for Scenario 1)	2011-2012 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation ²	Adjusted Base	% of Total Adjusted Base (for Scenario 2)
Court	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	B	C (A8-B)	D
Alameda	71,494,038	-	(1,117,440)	3,102,046	506,404	1,609,137	75,594,184	4.49%	3,177,924	72,416,260	4.4%
Alpine	536,863	-	(7,957)	20,340	(73,967)	6,245	481,525	0.03%	-	481,525	0.0%
Amador	2,075,747	-	(1,611)	51,756	(10,168)	23,828	2,139,551	0.13%	-	2,139,551	0.1%
Butte	8,170,991	-	(95,367)	124,076	609,976	158,491	8,968,168	0.53%	467,145	8,501,023	0.5%
Calaveras	1,940,406	-	(59,318)	50,506	18,308	45,771	1,995,672	0.12%	-	1,995,672	0.1%
Colusa	1,369,335	-	(11,356)	24,773	13,188	16,004	1,411,944	0.08%	-	1,411,944	0.1%
Contra Costa	34,404,261	-	(887,134)	1,396,191	1,841,330	1,020,012	37,774,660	2.24%	-	37,774,660	2.3%
Del Norte	2,300,564	-	(62,921)	94,129	114,280	45,700	2,491,752	0.15%	-	2,491,752	0.2%
El Dorado	5,872,358	-	(21,412)	213,119	263,889	18,950	6,346,904	0.38%	-	6,346,904	0.4%
Fresno	33,706,146	-	(876,146)	3,340,364	2,789,941	923,246	39,883,552	2.37%	-	39,883,552	2.4%
Glenn	1,794,458	-	(31,067)	54,665	(11,939)	24,061	1,830,179	0.11%	9,779	1,820,400	0.1%
Humboldt	5,241,609	-	(83,444)	73,084	276,212	137,243	5,644,704	0.34%	167,800	5,476,904	0.3%
Imperial	7,028,750	-	(230,012)	125,538	518,519	204,591	7,647,386	0.45%	420,479	7,226,907	0.4%
Inyo	1,894,107	-	(54,537)	75,586	(62,695)	32,741	1,885,201	0.11%	186,658	1,698,543	0.1%
Kern	29,595,035	-	(629,057)	3,544,269	4,252,465	551,636	37,314,348	2.21%	65,567	37,248,781	2.3%
Kings	5,519,658	-	(6,952)	45,117	425,836	22,140	6,005,799	0.36%	421,918	5,583,881	0.3%
Lake	3,102,931	-	449	9,123	95,557	3,199	3,211,258	0.19%	196,493	3,014,765	0.2%
Lassen	2,222,061	-	(6,630)	7,839	40,363	5,580	2,269,212	0.13%	293,836	1,975,376	0.1%
Los Angeles	429,960,172	(318,326)	(7,790,986)	18,887,969	35,639,382	12,101,803	488,480,015	28.99%	14,294,467	474,185,548	28.8%
Madera	6,089,746	-	(137,838)	384,825	355,661	45,479	6,737,874	0.40%	381,406	6,356,468	0.4%
Marin	12,354,099	(6,453)	(324,291)	644,512	(59,305)	358,566	12,967,129	0.77%	9,625	12,957,504	0.8%
Mariposa	954,124	-	(6,416)	22,300	1,730	3,560	975,299	0.06%	-	975,299	0.1%
Mendocino	4,435,925	-	(239,862)	311,770	129,330	235,205	4,872,369	0.29%	299,349	4,573,020	0.3%
Merced	9,208,327	-	(269,194)	774,827	673,039	310,199	10,697,197	0.63%	-	10,697,197	0.7%
Modoc	932,838	-	(1,273)	31,967	(69,362)	3,544	897,714	0.05%	789	896,925	0.1%
Mono	1,210,549	-	(32,349)	85,641	59,610	11,323	1,334,774	0.08%	24,156	1,310,618	0.1%
Monterey	14,497,845	-	(227,572)	277,496	747,923	264,491	15,560,183	0.92%	870,000	14,690,183	0.9%
Napa	6,372,800	-	(107,676)	309,796	140,912	181,753	6,897,585	0.41%	295,552	6,602,033	0.4%
Nevada	4,479,222	-	(100,179)	95,494	191,189	120,300	4,786,026	0.28%	433,431	4,352,595	0.3%
Orange	121,988,177	(209,171)	(3,671,441)	6,929,920	3,496,207	5,785,430	134,319,122	7.97%	2,733,776	131,585,346	8.0%
Placer	12,066,757	-	(238,459)	634,796	821,972	284,469	13,569,535	0.81%	-	13,569,535	0.8%
Plumas	1,448,318	-	(273)	14,929	(95,320)	6,015	1,373,668	0.08%	-	1,373,668	0.1%
Riverside	65,277,653	(168,861)	(685,149)	923,657	6,057,489	1,643,210	73,047,999	4.34%	1,931,520	71,116,479	4.3%
Sacramento	63,873,883	-	(1,673,778)	3,560,591	2,846,831	2,297,449	70,904,977	4.21%	1,864,424	69,040,553	4.2%
San Benito	2,526,744	-	(8,678)	34,642	(74,843)	16,844	2,494,709	0.15%	-	2,494,709	0.2%
San Bernardino	72,147,163	-	(1,011,776)	1,264,732	6,917,080	1,333,588	80,650,788	4.79%	3,269,446	77,381,342	4.7%
San Diego	125,478,197	-	(3,506,215)	2,853,598	3,042,330	4,121,481	131,989,392	7.83%	657,192	131,332,200	8.0%

Computation of Reduction Related to Revenue Shortfall for Scenarios 1 and 2

	Ending 2013-2014 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	Reduction for FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding From TCTF	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	Estimated Net WAFM Adjustments ¹	Estimated Non-Interpreter Benefits Base Allocation (12-13 and 13-14) ¹ (Item 3 Option 1)	Total	% of Total Base (for Scenario 1)	2011-2012 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation ²	Adjusted Base	% of Total Adjusted Base (for Scenario 2)
Court	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	B	C (A8-B)	D
San Francisco	49,195,369	-	-	5,487,134	600,353	1,495,964	56,778,819	3.37%	-	56,778,819	3.5%
San Joaquin	24,914,639	-	(756,034)	1,245,356	1,587,646	535,858	27,527,465	1.63%	287,747	27,239,718	1.7%
San Luis Obispo	11,449,303	-	(36,773)	298,958	819,314	122,246	12,653,048	0.75%	241,676	12,411,372	0.8%
San Mateo	29,551,664	-	(211,070)	2,411,112	1,034,520	603,175	33,389,400	1.98%	443,042	32,946,358	2.0%
Santa Barbara	18,243,443	-	21,451	1,597,662	590,633	121,986	20,575,175	1.22%	1,055,112	19,520,063	1.2%
Santa Clara	73,257,781	-	(1,120,423)	2,309,467	719,654	825,453	75,991,932	4.51%	-	75,991,932	4.6%
Santa Cruz	9,997,292	-	(174,422)	203,557	549,799	154,317	10,730,542	0.64%	-	10,730,542	0.7%
Shasta	10,169,734	-	38,857	262,222	457,766	184,003	11,112,580	0.66%	2,389,668	8,722,912	0.5%
Sierra	538,105	-	(9,268)	9,615	(72,867)	8,941	474,526	0.03%	-	474,526	0.0%
Siskiyou	3,072,125	-	(60,127)	91,037	(29,475)	59,428	3,132,988	0.19%	-	3,132,988	0.2%
Solano	17,240,736	-	(417,276)	353,779	917,245	497,180	18,591,664	1.10%	435,400	18,156,264	1.1%
Sonoma	19,441,709	-	(584,741)	1,172,049	1,060,419	616,911	21,706,347	1.29%	440,000	21,266,347	1.3%
Stanislaus	15,957,751	-	(1,003,375)	1,305,230	1,492,323	818,944	18,570,873	1.10%	9,326	18,561,547	1.1%
Sutter	3,690,455	-	(24,759)	159,760	277,618	72,212	4,175,286	0.25%	247,071	3,928,215	0.2%
Tehama	2,875,164	-	(17,294)	108,184	197,864	24,866	3,188,783	0.19%	-	3,188,783	0.2%
Trinity	1,421,481	-	(16,561)	53,679	13,969	19,978	1,492,546	0.09%	450,608	1,041,938	0.1%
Tulare	13,404,033	-	(127,031)	33,744	960,816	103,341	14,374,902	0.85%	15,576	14,359,326	0.9%
Tuolumne	2,806,339	-	(2,616)	50,351	58,705	19,249	2,932,028	0.17%	220,516	2,711,512	0.2%
Ventura	27,023,638	-	(416,492)	968,752	2,053,031	542,126	30,171,054	1.79%	1,559,157	28,611,897	1.7%
Yolo	7,642,166	-	(206,373)	210,076	384,237	168,486	8,198,593	0.49%	582,889	7,615,704	0.5%
Yuba	3,261,573	-	(66,104)	90,867	197,074	66,221	3,549,630	0.21%	132,569	3,417,061	0.2%
Total	1,518,726,356	(702,811)	(29,405,750)	68,818,575	86,300,000	41,034,166	1,684,770,536	100.0%	40,983,089	1,643,787,447	100.0%

1. Assumes the Judicial Council will adopt the TCBAC's recommendation regarding the allocation of the new trial court benefits funding. Assumes no reduction related to the \$22.7 million revenue shortfall.

2. Butte's sheriff allocation was not transferred to the court's sheriff, so it remains in the court's TCTF base allocation.

Option 1 - Pro Rata Allocation of \$42.8 Million for Benefit Cost Increases

	2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Cost Increases (Includes Interpreters)	Pro-Rata Allocation of \$42.8 Million (Includes Interpreters)	Pro-Rata Allocation (Excludes Interpreters)	Pro-Rata Allocation (Interpreters Only)
Court	A	B	C	D
Alameda	2,478,076	1,658,112	1,609,137	48,975
Alpine	9,334	6,245	6,245	-
Amador	35,611	23,828	23,828	-
Butte	236,868	158,491	158,491	-
Calaveras	68,405	45,771	45,771	-
Colusa	23,919	16,004	16,004	-
Contra Costa	1,566,375	1,048,081	1,020,012	28,069
Del Norte	68,299	45,700	45,700	-
El Dorado	29,284	19,594	18,950	645
Fresno	1,443,065	965,573	923,246	42,328
Glenn	35,960	24,061	24,061	-
Humboldt	205,112	137,243	137,243	-
Imperial	322,904	216,059	204,591	11,468
Inyo	48,932	32,741	32,741	-
Kern	859,234	574,924	551,636	23,288
Kings	33,089	22,140	22,140	-
Lake	4,780	3,199	3,199	-
Lassen	8,339	5,580	5,580	-
Los Angeles	19,182,588	12,835,310	12,101,803	733,507
Madera	73,021	48,859	45,479	3,380
Marin	554,559	371,062	358,566	12,496
Mariposa	5,321	3,560	3,560	-
Mendocino	359,661	240,654	235,205	5,448
Merced	489,945	327,828	310,199	17,630
Modoc	5,296	3,544	3,544	-
Mono	16,922	11,323	11,323	-
Monterey	403,681	270,108	264,491	5,618
Napa	283,403	189,629	181,753	7,876
Nevada	179,790	120,300	120,300	-
Orange	8,978,896	6,007,892	5,785,430	222,462
Placer	428,653	286,817	284,469	2,348
Plumas	8,989	6,015	6,015	-
Riverside	2,545,489	1,703,218	1,643,210	60,008
Sacramento	3,571,333	2,389,624	2,297,449	92,175
San Benito	25,173	16,844	16,844	-
San Bernardino	2,106,997	1,409,818	1,333,588	76,230
San Diego	6,423,404	4,297,980	4,121,481	176,499
San Francisco	2,280,504	1,525,914	1,495,964	29,950
San Joaquin	823,453	550,983	535,858	15,125
San Luis Obispo	187,030	125,144	122,246	2,898
San Mateo	944,893	632,240	603,175	29,065

Option 1 - Pro Rata Allocation of \$42.8 Million for Benefit Cost Increases

	2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Cost Increases (Includes Interpreters)	Pro-Rata Allocation of \$42.8 Million (Includes Interpreters)	Pro-Rata Allocation (Excludes Interpreters)	Pro-Rata Allocation (Interpreters Only)
Court	A	B	C	D
Santa Barbara	192,823	129,021	121,986	7,034
Santa Clara	1,271,482	850,765	825,453	25,311
Santa Cruz	242,430	162,213	154,317	7,897
Shasta	274,996	184,003	184,003	-
Sierra	13,363	8,941	8,941	-
Siskiyou	88,816	59,428	59,428	-
Solano	752,795	503,704	497,180	6,525
Sonoma	979,591	655,457	616,911	38,546
Stanislaus	1,240,681	830,156	818,944	11,212
Sutter	112,251	75,108	72,212	2,896
Tehama	37,162	24,866	24,866	-
Trinity	29,858	19,978	19,978	-
Tulare	161,964	108,372	103,341	5,031
Tuolumne	28,768	19,249	19,249	-
Ventura	826,078	552,739	542,126	10,614
Yolo	256,710	171,768	168,486	3,281
Yuba	98,968	66,221	66,221	-
Total	63,965,322	42,800,000	41,034,166	1,765,834

2014-2015 WAFM Allocation Adjustments

Cluster	Court	(Historical) Funding Subject to Reallocation	Court's Share of Current Historical Funding vs. FY 14-15 WAFM Funding Need		Reallocation of 15%			New Reallocation of \$60M			Reallocation of \$86.3M			Allocation of New Money		Reversal of 2013-14 WAFM Allocation		Total Adjustments to Allocation
			Share of Total Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM (Historical funding proportion)	Share of Total WAFM Funding Need (FY 14-15)	15 Percent of Funding Subject to Reallocation	Reallocation Using WAFM Proportion	Net	Allocation of \$60 Million Using 14-15 WAFM	Original Share of \$60 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$86.3 Million Using 14-15 WAFM	Original Share of \$86.3 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$60 Million Using 14-15 WAFM	Allocation of \$86.3 Million Using 14-15 WAFM	10% Reallocation	\$60M Reallocation	
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.83%	3.64%	(10,438,030)	7,874,633	(2,563,397)	2,186,657	(2,898,471)	(711,814)	3,145,142	(4,168,967)	(1,023,825)	2,186,657	3,145,142	1,294,630	(1,820,989)	506,404
1	Alpine	552,142	0.04%	0.01%	(82,821)	30,651	(52,170)	8,511	(22,998)	(14,487)	12,242	(33,079)	(20,837)	8,511	12,242	-	(7,226)	(73,967)
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.14%	0.11%	(312,074)	244,065	(68,008)	67,773	(86,658)	(18,885)	97,480	(124,643)	(27,163)	67,773	97,480	-	(61,365)	(10,168)
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.51%	0.55%	(1,093,172)	1,181,852	88,680	328,181	(303,556)	24,625	472,034	(436,615)	35,419	328,181	472,034	(18,573)	(320,390)	609,976
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.14%	0.11%	(292,634)	242,976	(49,658)	67,470	(81,260)	(13,789)	97,045	(116,878)	(19,834)	67,470	97,045	-	(62,926)	18,308
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.09%	0.08%	(205,245)	169,370	(35,875)	47,031	(56,993)	(9,962)	67,647	(81,975)	(14,329)	47,031	67,647	-	(41,323)	13,188
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.28%	2.30%	(4,935,969)	4,962,292	26,323	1,377,947	(1,370,638)	7,309	1,981,948	(1,971,434)	10,513	1,377,947	1,981,948	(101,350)	(1,461,361)	1,841,330
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.15%	0.15%	(330,348)	317,483	(12,865)	88,160	(91,732)	(3,573)	126,803	(131,942)	(5,138)	88,160	126,803	-	(79,107)	114,280
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.41%	0.39%	(882,135)	833,209	(48,927)	231,368	(244,955)	(13,586)	332,785	(352,326)	(19,541)	231,368	332,785	15,056	(233,266)	263,889
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.39%	2.62%	(5,168,434)	5,661,046	492,612	1,571,980	(1,435,190)	136,790	2,261,031	(2,064,281)	196,750	1,571,980	2,261,031	(232,624)	(1,636,598)	2,789,941
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.13%	0.10%	(271,756)	209,478	(62,278)	58,169	(75,462)	(17,294)	83,666	(108,540)	(24,874)	58,169	83,666	-	(49,328)	(11,939)
2	Humboldt	5,000,941	0.35%	0.39%	(750,891)	676,179	(74,712)	187,764	(208,510)	(20,746)	270,676	(299,907)	(29,840)	187,764	270,676	83,109	(139,430)	276,212
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.44%	0.48%	(944,143)	1,041,050	96,907	289,083	(262,173)	26,909	415,797	(377,092)	38,705	289,083	415,797	(46,526)	(302,356)	518,519
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.12%	0.08%	(258,369)	178,572	(79,717)	49,637	(71,745)	(22,108)	71,394	(103,193)	(31,799)	49,637	71,394	-	(50,201)	(62,695)
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.00%	2.84%	(4,317,268)	6,129,036	1,811,768	1,701,933	(1,198,835)	503,098	2,447,947	(1,724,324)	723,623	1,701,933	2,447,947	(940,847)	(1,995,057)	4,252,465
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.33%	0.37%	(714,826)	805,785	90,958	223,753	(198,496)	25,258	321,832	(285,503)	36,329	223,753	321,832	(39,652)	(232,642)	425,836
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.20%	0.16%	(435,558)	342,942	(92,616)	95,229	(120,947)	(25,718)	136,972	(173,963)	(36,991)	95,229	136,972	76,098	(57,416)	95,557
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.13%	0.11%	(283,599)	248,267	(35,333)	68,940	(78,751)	(9,811)	99,158	(113,270)	(14,112)	68,940	99,158	-	(68,479)	40,363
4	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.25%	30.56%	(58,872,324)	66,024,217	7,151,892	18,333,848	(16,347,884)	1,985,964	26,370,184	(23,513,706)	2,856,478	18,333,848	26,370,184	(2,523,297)	(18,535,686)	35,639,382
2	Madera	5,953,244	0.41%	0.40%	(892,987)	874,414	(18,573)	242,810	(247,968)	(5,157)	349,242	(356,660)	(7,418)	242,810	349,242	23,742	(228,985)	355,661
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.93%	0.57%	(2,000,820)	1,230,218	(770,602)	341,611	(555,595)	(213,984)	491,351	(799,131)	(307,780)	341,611	491,351	520,264	(120,165)	(59,305)
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.06%	0.05%	(138,089)	113,081	(25,008)	31,401	(38,345)	(6,944)	45,165	(55,153)	(9,988)	31,401	45,165	-	(32,895)	1,730
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.30%	0.26%	(656,861)	570,045	(86,816)	158,292	(182,400)	(24,107)	227,677	(262,352)	(34,675)	158,292	227,677	39,152	(150,192)	129,330
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.63%	0.73%	(1,355,005)	1,585,700	230,694	440,323	(376,263)	64,060	633,331	(541,191)	92,140	440,323	633,331	(222,543)	(564,967)	673,039
1	Modoc	890,668	0.06%	0.03%	(133,600)	72,923	(60,677)	20,250	(37,099)	(16,849)	29,126	(53,360)	(24,234)	20,250	29,126	-	(16,977)	(69,362)
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.09%	0.08%	(184,852)	176,195	(8,657)	48,926	(51,330)	(2,404)	70,372	(73,830)	(3,458)	48,926	70,372	-	(45,169)	59,610
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.90%	0.95%	(1,951,369)	2,048,514	97,146	568,839	(541,863)	26,976	818,180	(779,380)	38,800	568,839	818,180	(140,122)	(661,895)	747,923
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.42%	0.34%	(913,347)	733,340	(179,916)	203,662	(253,621)	(49,960)	292,933	(364,792)	(71,859)	203,662	292,933	108,997	(162,945)	140,912
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.26%	0.25%	(572,584)	530,145	(42,439)	147,213	(158,997)	(11,785)	211,741	(228,691)	(16,950)	147,213	211,741	34,238	(130,830)	191,189
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.54%	7.10%	(18,447,524)	15,337,998	(3,109,525)	4,259,112	(5,122,576)	(863,464)	6,126,022	(7,367,972)	(1,241,950)	4,259,112	6,126,022	1,884,108	(3,558,096)	3,496,207
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.77%	0.86%	(1,667,121)	1,868,638	201,516	518,890	(462,932)	55,958	746,337	(665,851)	80,486	518,890	746,337	(171,865)	(609,351)	821,972
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.10%	0.06%	(216,156)	127,623	(88,532)	35,439	(60,023)	(24,584)	50,973	(86,333)	(35,360)	35,439	50,973	-	(33,256)	(95,320)
4	Riverside	57,140,417	3.97%	5.04%	(8,571,063)	10,889,151	2,318,089	3,023,740	(2,380,044)	643,695	4,349,145	(3,423,297)	925,849	3,023,740	4,349,145	(1,528,075)	(3,674,954)	6,057,489
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.27%	4.15%	(9,235,197)	8,976,328	(258,869)	2,492,580	(2,564,463)	(71,884)	3,585,161	(3,688,553)	(103,393)	2,492,580	3,585,161	(120,612)	(2,676,151)	2,846,831
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.17%	0.13%	(374,404)	271,148	(103,256)	75,293	(103,966)	(28,672)	108,297	(149,537)	(41,241)	75,293	108,297	-	(85,264)	(74,843)
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.26%	5.69%	(9,200,272)	12,286,979	3,086,707	3,411,893	(2,554,765)	857,128	4,907,440	(3,674,604)	1,232,836	3,411,893	4,907,440	(2,180,083)	(4,398,841)	6,917,080
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.52%	6.98%	(18,410,497)	15,072,150	(3,338,346)	4,185,290	(5,112,294)	(927,004)	6,019,842	(7,353,184)	(1,333,341)	4,185,290	6,019,842	1,938,179	(3,502,289)	3,042,330
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.68%	2.65%	(7,948,224)	5,717,356	(2,230,867)	1,587,617	(2,207,092)	(619,475)	2,283,522	(3,174,534)	(891,012)	1,587,617	2,283,522	1,459,083	(988,514)	600,353
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.64%	1.83%	(3,545,898)	3,945,470	399,572	1,095,593	(984,638)	110,955	1,575,827	(1,416,238)	159,590	1,095,593	1,575,827	(415,666)	(1,338,224)	1,587,646
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.74%	0.76%	(1,590,741)	1,648,870	58,129	457,864	(441,723)	16,141	658,561	(635,345)	23,217	457,864	658,561	26,551	(421,150)	819,314
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.07%	1.81%	(4,465,509)	3,903,160	(562,349)	1,083,844	(1,239,999)	(156,155)	1,558,929	(1,783,532)	(224,603)	1,083,844	1,558,929	314,903	(980,049)	1,034,520
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.27%	1.06%	(2,754,799)	2,291,375	(463,424)	636,277	(764,963)	(128,685)	915,179	(1,100,271)	(185,092)	636,277	915,179	317,397	(501,019)	590,633
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.16%	3.85%	(11,140,119)	8,309,585	(2,830,533)	2,307,436	(3,093,429)	(785,993)	3,318,862	(4,449,382)	(1,130,520)	2,307,436	3,318,862	1,600,135	(1,759,734)	719,654
2	Santa Cruz	9,910,386	0.69%	0.65%	(1,486,558)	1,380,105	(106,453)	383,233	(412,793)	(29,560)	551,216	(593,734)	(42,517)	383,233	551,216	113,143	(319,264)	549,799
2	Shasta	7,409,092	0.51%	0.53%	(1,111,364)	1,142,567	31,203	317,272	(308,608)	8,665	456,343	(443,881)	12,463	317,272	456,343	(31,687)	(336,493)	457,766
1	Sierra	542,215	0.04%	0.01%	(81,332)	30,222	(51,110)	8,392	(22,585)	(14,192)	12,071	(32,484)	(20,413)	8,392	12,071	-	(7,615)	(72,867)
2	Siskiyou	3,254,627	0.23%	0.12%	(488,194)	269,703	(218,491)	74,892	(135,564)	(60,672)	107,720	(194,986)	(87,266)	74,892	107,720	157,748	(3,406)	(29,475)
3	Solano	15,704,185	1.09%	1.17%	(2,355,628)	2,537,152	181,524	704,5										

Cluster	Court	(Historical) Funding Subject to Reallocation	Court's Share of Current Historical Funding vs. FY 14-15 WAFM Funding Need		Reallocation of 15%			New Reallocation of \$60M			Reallocation of \$86.3M			Allocation of New Money		Reversal of 2013-14 WAFM Allocation		Total Adjustments to Allocation
			Share of Total Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM (Historical funding proportion)	Share of Total WAFM Funding Need (FY 14-15)	15 Percent of Funding Subject to Reallocation	Reallocation Using WAFM Proportion	Net	Allocation of \$60 Million Using 14-15 WAFM	Original Share of \$60 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$86.3 Million Using 14-15 WAFM	Original Share of \$86.3 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$60 Million Using 14-15 WAFM	Allocation of \$86.3 Million Using 14-15 WAFM	10% Reallocation	\$60M Reallocation	
		A	B	C	D = 15% * Col. A	E = \$216.1M * Col. C	F=D+E	G = \$60M*C	H = -\$60M*B	I=G+H	J = \$86.3M*C	K = -\$86.3M*B	L= J+K	M = \$60M * C	N = \$86.3M * C	O	P	Q
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.85%	0.94%	(1,843,952)	2,024,029	180,077	562,040	(512,035)	50,004	808,400	(736,477)	71,923	562,040	808,400	(107,295)	(604,334)	960,816
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.18%	0.15%	(388,470)	317,437	(71,034)	88,147	(107,872)	(19,725)	126,785	(155,156)	(28,371)	88,147	126,785	38,673	(75,770)	58,705
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.69%	1.94%	(3,655,024)	4,181,104	526,080	1,161,024	(1,014,941)	146,084	1,669,940	(1,459,823)	210,117	1,161,024	1,669,940	(348,266)	(1,311,950)	2,053,031
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.45%	0.47%	(975,622)	1,018,741	43,119	282,888	(270,914)	11,973	406,887	(389,665)	17,222	282,888	406,887	(57,493)	(320,358)	384,237
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.22%	0.20%	(483,761)	435,615	(48,147)	120,963	(134,333)	(13,370)	173,985	(193,215)	(19,230)	120,963	173,985	63,948	(81,076)	197,074
	Statewide	1,440,487,965	100%	100%	(216,073,195)	216,073,195	0	60,000,000	(60,000,000)	0	86,300,000	(86,300,000)	0	60,000,000	86,300,000	(0)	(60,000,000)	86,300,000

Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

	2013-14 Beginning Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (11-12)	Total	% of Total
	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)		
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Alameda	74,069,725	(3,177,924)	(1,958,825)	101,575	424,792	127,523	69,586,867	4.83%
Alpine	549,977	-	-	83	2,034	47	552,142	0.04%
Amador	2,066,138	-	-	2,565	11,006	783	2,080,491	0.14%
Butte	7,956,105	(467,145)	(291,613)	14,608	59,332	16,523	7,287,810	0.51%
Calaveras	1,927,985	-	-	3,074	18,652	1,180	1,950,892	0.14%
Colusa	1,352,785	-	-	1,447	13,708	363	1,368,302	0.09%
Contra Costa	34,237,741	-	(1,705,774)	69,231	218,186	87,076	32,906,460	2.28%
Del Norte	2,315,586	-	(126,942)	1,964	11,208	505	2,202,321	0.15%
El Dorado	5,867,266	-	(57,081)	11,851	54,374	4,491	5,880,901	0.41%
Fresno	35,177,288	-	(1,032,025)	60,497	181,080	69,384	34,456,224	2.39%
Glenn	1,799,795	(9,779)	-	1,927	19,264	500	1,811,707	0.13%
Humboldt	5,258,372	(167,800)	(150,006)	8,913	48,160	8,302	5,005,941	0.35%
Imperial	6,805,406	(420,479)	(180,405)	11,204	67,678	10,882	6,294,286	0.44%
Inyo	1,919,492	(186,658)	(42,314)	1,245	30,402	294	1,722,461	0.12%
Kern	30,203,399	(65,567)	(1,750,452)	52,450	277,328	64,629	28,781,786	2.00%
Kings	5,292,481	(421,918)	(181,060)	9,935	57,026	9,045	4,765,510	0.33%
Lake	3,130,735	(196,493)	(56,758)	4,311	20,328	1,596	2,903,720	0.20%
Lassen	2,161,420	(293,836)	-	2,384	20,156	538	1,890,662	0.13%
Los Angeles	428,645,200	(14,294,467)	(26,758,268)	689,065	3,144,530	1,056,102	392,482,162	27.25%
Madera	6,269,329	(381,406)	-	9,711	52,502	3,108	5,953,244	0.41%
Marin	13,587,985	(9,625)	(391,957)	17,038	114,766	20,590	13,338,797	0.93%
Mariposa	943,529	-	(28,406)	1,225	3,904	341	920,593	0.06%
Mendocino	4,636,654	(299,349)	-	6,083	30,068	5,619	4,379,075	0.30%
Merced	9,195,644	-	(250,840)	16,595	55,652	16,318	9,033,368	0.63%
Modoc	947,828	(789)	(63,471)	662	6,134	304	890,668	0.06%
Mono	1,251,020	(24,156)	(8,201)	914	12,446	324	1,232,348	0.09%
Monterey	13,973,323	(870,000)	(333,656)	28,573	183,464	27,420	13,009,124	0.90%
Napa	6,628,648	(295,552)	(287,148)	9,042	30,550	3,438	6,088,978	0.42%
Nevada	4,478,125	(433,431)	(292,045)	6,730	49,946	7,900	3,817,225	0.26%
Orange	127,622,123	(2,733,776)	(3,329,845)	206,630	923,882	294,477	122,983,490	8.54%
Placer	11,920,337	-	(933,901)	21,287	77,378	29,042	11,114,142	0.77%
Plumas	1,429,991	-	-	1,442	9,206	398	1,441,037	0.10%

	2013-14 Beginning Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (11-12)	Total	% of Total
	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)		
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Riverside	61,221,794	(1,931,520)	(2,882,751)	131,371	532,226	69,297	57,140,417	3.97%
Sacramento	64,637,712	(1,864,424)	(1,824,452)	93,189	340,254	185,701	61,567,979	4.27%
San Benito	2,476,122	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,327	2,496,024	0.17%
San Bernardino	66,832,972	(3,269,446)	(2,986,710)	133,960	435,474	188,896	61,335,147	4.26%
San Diego	126,960,874	(657,192)	(4,757,300)	206,259	718,422	265,582	122,736,644	8.52%
San Francisco	55,153,072	-	(2,582,976)	53,715	272,528	91,818	52,988,157	3.68%
San Joaquin	24,406,106	(287,747)	(779,859)	44,944	201,698	54,178	23,639,320	1.64%
San Luis Obispo	11,353,662	(241,676)	(673,831)	17,704	130,020	19,062	10,604,942	0.74%
San Mateo	31,297,630	(443,042)	(1,479,478)	48,700	329,518	16,733	29,770,060	2.07%
Santa Barbara	19,657,482	(1,055,112)	(457,408)	28,356	162,858	29,149	18,365,326	1.27%
Santa Clara	75,407,649	-	(1,833,360)	119,260	452,782	121,126	74,267,457	5.16%
Santa Cruz	10,187,917	-	(424,668)	17,644	113,210	16,283	9,910,386	0.69%
Shasta	10,063,775	(2,389,668)	(326,131)	12,206	44,394	4,517	7,409,092	0.51%
Sierra	540,106	-	-	235	1,830	44	542,215	0.04%
Siskiyou	3,317,504	-	(103,923)	3,104	37,000	943	3,254,627	0.23%
Solano	16,489,461	(435,400)	(535,433)	28,439	119,364	37,755	15,704,185	1.09%
Sonoma	19,577,796	(440,000)	(479,410)	32,278	119,004	36,215	18,845,883	1.31%
Stanislaus	15,772,316	(9,326)	(427,578)	34,594	88,718	39,080	15,497,803	1.08%
Sutter	3,604,262	(247,071)	-	6,150	37,382	2,322	3,403,045	0.24%
Tehama	2,879,149	-	(5,472)	4,138	28,100	1,382	2,907,298	0.20%
Trinity	1,431,739	(450,608)	-	943	7,648	636	990,359	0.07%
Tulare	12,726,148	(15,576)	(679,043)	28,289	204,932	28,262	12,293,011	0.85%
Tuolumne	2,819,593	(220,516)	(30,986)	3,916	16,642	1,152	2,589,803	0.18%
Ventura	26,332,175	(1,559,157)	(731,699)	54,971	205,304	65,233	24,366,827	1.69%
Yolo	7,474,390	(582,889)	(461,445)	12,802	48,556	12,735	6,504,149	0.45%
Yuba	3,335,312	(132,569)	-	4,696	15,788	1,849	3,225,076	0.22%
Total	1,529,578,150	(40,983,089)	(64,674,907)	2,500,000	10,907,494	3,160,318	1,440,487,965	100.00%

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

Computation of Funding Need Using the 2014-2015 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need ⁽¹⁾			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor ⁽²⁾	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2013)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor ⁽³⁾	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
Cluster	Court	A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1)* Dollar Factor	E	F = D+E	G	H = (C-1)*BLS-Adjusted Dollar Factor + (E*G)
4	Alameda	538	88	626	\$35,247,778	213,057	35,460,836	1.42	50,399,100
1	Alpine	2	1	3	\$112,793	113,803	226,596	0.82	186,744
1	Amador	21	4	25	\$1,353,515	113,803	1,467,317	0.99	1,457,029
2	Butte	117	22	139	\$7,782,709	155,781	7,938,491	0.92	7,303,102
1	Calaveras	22	5	27	\$1,466,308	113,803	1,580,110	0.86	1,354,183
1	Colusa	15	3	18	\$958,740	113,803	1,072,542	0.70	823,718
3	Contra Costa	342	53	395	\$22,220,199	181,151	22,401,350	1.25	28,003,138
1	Del Norte	27	6	33	\$1,804,686	113,803	1,918,489	0.79	1,518,324
2	El Dorado	76	13	89	\$4,962,887	155,781	5,118,669	0.99	5,081,422
3	Fresno	462	73	535	\$30,115,702	181,151	30,296,852	1.00	30,222,495
1	Glenn	20	5	25	\$1,353,515	113,803	1,467,317	0.68	1,127,085
2	Humboldt	78	13	91	\$5,075,680	155,781	5,231,461	0.76	3,973,734
2	Imperial	120	22	142	\$7,951,899	155,781	8,107,680	0.77	6,246,277
1	Inyo	16	4	20	\$1,071,532	113,803	1,185,335	0.83	986,295
3	Kern	467	76	543	\$30,566,873	181,151	30,748,024	1.05	32,353,095
2	Kings	87	15	102	\$5,696,041	155,781	5,851,822	0.89	5,188,809
2	Lake	39	7	46	\$2,537,840	155,781	2,693,621	0.76	2,086,506
1	Lassen	25	6	31	\$1,691,893	113,803	1,805,696	0.80	1,445,787
4	Los Angeles	4,759	731	5,490	\$309,560,087	213,057	309,773,145	1.34	413,807,661
2	Madera	84	15	99	\$5,526,852	155,781	5,682,633	0.94	5,313,861
2	Marin	93	16	109	\$6,090,816	155,781	6,246,597	1.30	8,103,882
1	Mariposa	10	3	13	\$676,757	113,803	790,560	0.74	609,079
2	Mendocino	56	10	66	\$3,665,769	155,781	3,821,550	0.86	3,283,184
2	Merced	136	23	159	\$8,910,638	155,781	9,066,420	0.91	8,227,972
1	Modoc	7	2	9	\$451,172	113,803	564,974	0.61	419,033
1	Mono	11	3	14	\$733,154	113,803	846,956	1.20	1,015,713
3	Monterey	174	28	202	\$11,335,685	181,151	11,516,836	1.19	13,705,955
2	Napa	62	11	73	\$4,060,544	155,781	4,216,325	1.21	5,105,195
2	Nevada	46	9	55	\$3,045,408	155,781	3,201,189	0.97	3,093,312

Computation of Funding Need Using the 2014-2015 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need ⁽¹⁾			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor ⁽²⁾	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2013)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor ⁽³⁾	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
Cluster	Court	A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1)* Dollar Factor	E	F = D+E	G	H = (C-1)*BLS-Adjusted Dollar Factor + (E*G)
4	Orange	1,163	187	1,350	\$76,078,804	213,057	76,291,862	1.30	99,104,980
2	Placer	145	24	169	\$9,474,603	155,781	9,630,384	1.14	11,013,753
1	Plumas	12	3	15	\$789,550	113,803	903,353	0.70	692,529
4	Riverside	974	151	1,125	\$63,389,604	213,057	63,602,662	1.07	68,119,766
4	Sacramento	642	97	739	\$41,620,576	213,057	41,833,634	1.28	53,501,544
1	San Benito	24	5	29	\$1,579,100	113,803	1,692,903	0.97	1,648,404
4	San Bernardino	1,103	164	1,267	\$71,397,899	213,057	71,610,957	1.05	75,200,564
4	San Diego	1,127	171	1,298	\$73,146,189	213,057	73,359,247	1.17	85,975,124
4	San Francisco	343	52	395	\$22,220,199	213,057	22,433,257	1.61	36,206,900
3	San Joaquin	325	50	375	\$21,092,270	181,151	21,273,421	1.11	23,644,785
2	San Luis Obispo	137	23	160	\$8,967,035	155,781	9,122,816	1.07	9,780,014
3	San Mateo	253	41	294	\$16,524,158	181,151	16,705,309	1.45	24,182,374
3	Santa Barbara	189	33	222	\$12,463,614	181,151	12,644,765	1.16	14,608,189
4	Santa Clara	524	79	603	\$33,950,660	213,057	34,163,717	1.47	50,202,374
2	Santa Cruz	113	21	134	\$7,500,727	155,781	7,656,509	1.17	8,965,365
2	Shasta	120	29	149	\$8,346,674	155,781	8,502,455	0.85	7,218,875
1	Sierra	3	1	4	\$169,189	113,803	282,992	0.71	212,549
2	Siskiyou	30	6	36	\$1,973,876	155,781	2,129,657	0.71	1,641,492
3	Solano	202	31	233	\$13,083,975	181,151	13,265,126	1.22	16,240,073
3	Sonoma	210	35	245	\$13,760,733	181,151	13,941,883	1.17	16,277,681
3	Stanislaus	254	39	293	\$16,467,762	181,151	16,648,913	1.02	17,038,081
2	Sutter	53	10	63	\$3,496,580	155,781	3,652,361	0.95	3,466,865
2	Tehama	46	8	54	\$2,989,012	155,781	3,144,793	0.80	2,518,788
1	Trinity	12	3	15	\$789,550	113,803	903,353	0.65	686,758
3	Tulare	205	34	239	\$13,422,354	181,151	13,603,505	0.82	11,186,419
2	Tuolumne	32	6	38	\$2,086,668	155,781	2,242,450	0.91	2,038,292
3	Ventura	321	59	380	\$21,374,253	181,151	21,555,403	1.23	26,455,786
2	Yolo	89	16	105	\$5,865,230	155,781	6,021,012	1.01	6,087,181
2	Yuba	45	8	53	\$2,932,615	155,781	3,088,397	0.94	2,904,989
Statewide		16,608	2,653	19,261			1,092,206,491		1,319,262,183

NOTES: (1) Estimated need based on 3-year average filings data from FY 10-110 through FY 12-13.

\$56,396 (2) Unadjusted base funding per RAS FTE, based on FY 13-14 Schedule 7A ; does not include collections staff, SJOs, CEO, security, nor vc

(3) Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Labor adjustment based on Quarterly Census of Wages & Employment, three year average from 1 comparison based on Public Administration (North American Industrial Classification System, 92) unless proportion of state government year average of local and state salaries for Public Administration is used for comparison.

Computation of Funding Need Using the 2014-2015 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 13-14 Schedule 7A)				Projected Benefits Expenses (Salary-driven benefits based on Adjusted Base)			OE&E (Based on Cluster Average OE&E / FTE) (Cluster 1: \$27,928; Clusters 2-4 \$20,287)	Remove AB 1058 staff/FLF costs (Using FY 10-11 data from CFCC)	Total WAFM Funding Need	Proportion of Total WAFM Estimated Funding Need
Cluster	Court	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Average Actual Non-Salary- Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 90)	Average Actual Non-Salary- Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 90)	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 10 FTE Need	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 90 FTE Need	Total Benefit Need Based on RAS FTE Need	Estimated OE&E Needed (Excludes funding for operations contracts)			
		I1	I2	J1	J2	$L = (((B-1) * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G) * J1 + (B * J2)$			N = C * OE&E	O	P = (H + M + N) - O	Q = P / Statewide
4	Alameda	36.7%	\$13,257	35.3%	\$13,294	22,943,412	3,740,277	26,683,689	12,699,829	1,423,006	88,359,612	3.64%
1	Alpine	17.8%	\$26,324	17.8%	\$26,324	69,150	42,974	112,124	83,784	38,723	343,929	0.01%
1	Amador	30.9%	\$10,215	30.9%	\$11,727	577,379	133,613	710,992	698,201	127,617	2,738,605	0.11%
2	Butte	25.2%	\$12,023	25.2%	\$11,216	2,934,555	557,055	3,491,611	2,819,930	353,331	13,261,312	0.55%
1	Calaveras	24.6%	\$14,595	24.6%	\$15,409	582,601	148,578	731,179	754,057	113,042	2,726,378	0.11%
1	Colusa	43.0%	\$16,159	44.0%	\$16,859	524,294	124,331	648,626	502,705	74,587	1,900,461	0.08%
3	Contra Costa	51.4%	\$16,229	51.4%	\$18,455	17,951,667	2,979,563	20,931,230	8,013,470	1,266,996	55,680,843	2.30%
1	Del Norte	26.3%	\$24,364	27.2%	\$25,716	975,020	239,338	1,214,358	921,626	91,900	3,562,408	0.15%
2	El Dorado	21.2%	\$16,577	21.2%	\$16,513	2,162,595	390,028	2,552,623	1,805,567	90,353	9,349,259	0.39%
3	Fresno	66.3%	\$8,199	66.5%	\$7,592	21,031,455	3,367,208	24,398,663	10,853,688	1,953,433	63,521,412	2.62%
1	Glenn	34.1%	\$15,775	36.6%	\$15,877	613,447	171,856	785,302	698,201	260,080	2,350,509	0.10%
2	Humboldt	29.2%	\$8,883	29.2%	\$9,915	1,669,272	313,687	1,982,959	1,846,141	215,566	7,587,268	0.31%
2	Imperial	32.4%	\$5,442	33.4%	\$5,895	2,341,172	474,572	2,815,744	2,880,792	261,411	11,681,402	0.48%
1	Inyo	30.8%	\$14,929	28.6%	\$13,937	470,260	123,198	593,458	558,561	132,572	2,005,742	0.08%
3	Kern	55.9%	\$15,785	55.8%	\$15,785	22,851,709	3,791,449	26,643,158	11,015,986	1,239,606	68,772,633	2.84%
2	Kings	20.6%	\$9,543	24.1%	\$10,480	1,724,573	358,858	2,083,432	2,069,301	300,000	9,041,542	0.37%
2	Lake	26.8%	\$8,833	27.0%	\$8,393	802,345	161,601	963,946	933,214	135,588	3,848,078	0.16%
1	Lassen	23.5%	\$10,694	22.7%	\$10,114	532,909	132,696	665,605	865,769	191,413	2,785,749	0.11%
4	Los Angeles	24.5%	\$21,352	35.1%	\$18,731	189,463,751	33,070,637	222,534,389	111,377,095	6,875,174	740,843,971	30.56%
2	Madera	28.4%	\$12,584	28.4%	\$12,582	2,316,231	439,997	2,756,228	2,008,439	266,913	9,811,615	0.40%
2	Marin	28.7%	\$12,396	29.7%	\$12,396	3,106,875	584,739	3,691,614	2,211,312	202,794	13,804,014	0.57%
1	Mariposa	36.4%	\$10,490	36.4%	\$15,588	264,199	109,306	373,504	363,065	76,788	1,268,860	0.05%
2	Mendocino	45.6%	\$7,300	48.3%	\$7,180	1,647,152	346,860	1,994,012	1,338,960	219,800	6,396,356	0.26%
2	Merced	58.2%	\$13,916	58.2%	\$13,446	5,943,173	1,046,953	6,990,125	3,225,675	650,966	17,792,806	0.73%
1	Modoc	27.8%	\$11,417	27.8%	\$11,417	164,905	54,166	219,071	251,352	71,198	818,258	0.03%
1	Mono	33.7%	\$19,302	35.0%	\$21,376	463,366	159,124	622,490	390,993	52,152	1,977,044	0.08%
3	Monterey	19.6%	\$14,303	19.4%	\$15,331	4,774,814	822,456	5,597,270	4,098,028	415,302	22,985,951	0.95%
2	Napa	17.8%	\$18,981	18.1%	\$20,464	1,932,545	382,892	2,315,436	1,480,970	671,935	8,229,667	0.34%
2	Nevada	39.2%	\$11,634	40.7%	\$11,981	1,518,640	346,574	1,865,213	1,115,800	125,677	5,948,648	0.25%

Computation of Funding Need Using the 2014-2015 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 13-14 Schedule 7A)				Projected Benefits Expenses (Salary-driven benefits based on Adjusted Base)			OE&E (Based on Cluster Average OE&E / FTE) (Cluster 1: \$27,928; Clusters 2-4 \$20,287)	Remove AB 1058 staff/FLF costs (Using FY 10-11 data from CFCC)	Total WAFM Funding Need	Proportion of Total WAFM Estimated Funding Need
Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 90)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 90)	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 10 FTE Need	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 90 FTE Need	Total Benefit Need Based on RAS FTE Need	Estimated OE&E Needed (Excludes funding for operations contracts)					
Cluster	Court	I1	I2	J1	J2	$L = \frac{K}{M} = \frac{((B-1)*FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E*(G)*J1}{(A*FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E*(G)*J1 + (B*J2)}$		N = C * OE&E	O	P = (H+ M + N) - O	Q = P / Statewide	
4	Orange	33.1%	\$10,943	33.5%	\$12,491	40,959,473	6,987,717	47,947,190	27,387,810	2,335,502	172,104,479	7.10%
2	Placer	28.4%	\$22,233	28.4%	\$22,233	5,882,885	1,005,761	6,888,646	3,428,548	363,353	20,967,595	0.86%
1	Plumas	25.0%	\$15,361	26.8%	\$20,379	315,298	106,143	421,441	418,921	100,856	1,432,034	0.06%
4	Riverside	33.7%	\$8,412	34.0%	\$9,583	28,038,863	4,604,327	32,643,190	22,823,175	1,401,236	122,184,895	5.04%
4	Sacramento	37.6%	\$18,311	38.0%	\$18,641	29,157,353	4,541,050	33,698,402	14,992,290	1,470,734	100,721,502	4.15%
1	San Benito	26.8%	\$12,096	21.7%	\$16,521	643,518	154,345	797,863	809,913	213,688	3,042,492	0.13%
4	San Bernardino	35.6%	\$9,298	38.2%	\$10,884	33,494,290	5,559,112	39,053,402	25,703,967	2,088,309	137,869,624	5.69%
4	San Diego	57.4%	\$7,523	56.8%	\$8,078	51,206,850	7,909,384	59,116,234	26,332,872	2,302,775	169,121,455	6.98%
4	San Francisco	30.6%	\$25,889	30.0%	\$25,889	18,447,337	2,841,540	21,288,877	8,013,470	1,355,984	64,153,264	2.65%
3	San Joaquin	38.1%	\$12,974	40.5%	\$6,617	11,982,102	1,655,108	13,637,210	7,607,725	618,427	44,271,294	1.83%
2	San Luis Obispo	42.0%	\$10,441	48.3%	\$10,532	4,909,550	965,098	5,874,647	3,245,963	399,000	18,501,624	0.76%
3	San Mateo	40.2%	\$15,815	41.0%	\$13,974	12,301,155	2,019,859	14,321,014	5,964,456	671,296	43,796,548	1.81%
3	Santa Barbara	38.3%	\$6,515	39.9%	\$7,300	5,948,007	1,157,192	7,105,198	4,503,773	506,118	25,711,043	1.06%
4	Santa Clara	37.7%	\$22,409	37.6%	\$23,124	28,112,447	4,371,730	32,484,177	12,233,222	1,679,649	93,240,124	3.85%
2	Santa Cruz	22.7%	\$14,515	22.7%	\$15,158	3,336,529	660,270	3,996,799	2,718,494	194,782	15,485,876	0.64%
2	Shasta	21.1%	\$7,605	22.3%	\$10,821	2,122,884	641,626	2,764,511	3,022,803	185,683	12,820,506	0.53%
1	Sierra	36.5%	\$15,739	36.5%	\$15,739	95,109	45,427	140,535	111,712	125,677	339,119	0.01%
2	Siskiyou	26.2%	\$15,668	26.2%	\$16,294	813,253	183,925	997,177	730,342	342,735	3,026,276	0.12%
3	Solano	31.6%	\$12,659	33.6%	\$12,643	6,959,271	1,161,637	8,120,908	4,726,933	619,065	28,468,850	1.17%
3	Sonoma	45.5%	\$17,914	47.0%	\$22,397	10,052,938	1,934,326	11,987,264	4,970,380	646,368	32,588,957	1.34%
3	Stanislaus	32.6%	\$17,256	33.0%	\$17,244	9,166,229	1,456,500	10,622,729	5,944,169	804,613	32,800,366	1.35%
2	Sutter	34.1%	\$13,741	35.3%	\$17,199	1,695,566	394,487	2,090,052	1,278,098	259,121	6,575,894	0.27%
2	Tehama	21.5%	\$15,763	21.5%	\$16,013	1,172,493	223,045	1,395,538	1,095,512	84,151	4,925,688	0.20%
1	Trinity	31.3%	\$13,505	34.1%	\$13,281	326,393	95,018	421,411	418,921	66,076	1,461,014	0.06%
3	Tulare	21.5%	\$19,651	21.6%	\$20,759	6,072,666	1,068,462	7,141,128	4,848,657	465,001	22,711,203	0.94%
2	Tuolumne	23.9%	\$13,728	24.8%	\$13,751	831,007	181,363	1,012,370	770,916	259,688	3,561,890	0.15%
3	Ventura	37.0%	\$9,160	39.3%	\$11,432	11,161,737	2,339,926	13,501,663	7,709,161	751,311	46,915,300	1.94%
2	Yolo	31.4%	\$12,772	38.3%	\$19,381	2,730,006	697,667	3,427,673	2,130,163	213,933	11,431,084	0.47%
2	Yuba	16.9%	\$11,542	16.9%	\$13,413	922,247	194,702	1,116,949	1,075,225	209,223	4,887,940	0.20%

Statewide 641,210,922 109,771,331 750,982,253 392,900,108 38,632,274 2,424,512,269 100%

NOTES:

\$56,396 vacant positions; in January 2014 the TCBCAC approved a dollar factor adjustment for courts with fewer than 2010 through 2012. Salaries of Local Government used for workers in total employment exceeds 50% in which case three-

Weighted Mean	OE&E \$ / FTE	Cluster 1
	\$27,928	Clusters 2-4

FY 2014-15 RAS FTE Need

Court	Program 10 (Operations) Staff Need										Program 90 (Administration) Staff			Total RAS Need (J+M)
	Infractions	Criminal	Civil	Family Law	Pr/MH	Juvenile	Total Program 10 Need (A thru F)	Manager/Supervisor Ratio (by cluster)	Manager/Supervisor Need (G/H)	Total Program 10 Need, Rounded up (G+I)	Non-RAS FTE (for Program 90 Need Calculation)*	Program 90 ratio (by cluster)	Program 90 Need, Rounded up (K/L)	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Alameda	79.7	126.1	130.2	104.7	32.2	19.8	492.8	11.1	44.3	538	91.5	7.2	88	626
Alpine	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.4	6.9	0.2	2	0.4	5.7	1	3
Amador	2.2	6.8	2.8	3.9	1.3	0.9	17.8	6.9	2.6	21	1.0	5.7	4	25
Butte	10.8	33.4	13.5	27.6	11.2	8.1	104.6	8.6	12.1	117	18.2	6.4	22	139
Calaveras	1.6	4.9	3.8	5.1	1.9	1.8	19.0	6.9	2.7	22	2.7	5.7	5	27
Colusa	4.3	4.6	0.9	1.4	0.6	1.1	13.0	6.9	1.9	15	1.5	5.7	3	18
Contra Costa	33.0	66.4	77.6	82.6	24.9	21.3	305.9	8.6	35.5	342	14.0	6.8	53	395
Del Norte	2.2	6.8	4.1	5.5	2.2	2.3	22.9	6.9	3.3	27	3.0	5.7	6	33
El Dorado	7.9	17.1	13.7	16.4	5.0	7.7	67.9	8.6	7.9	76	4.9	6.4	13	89
Fresno	32.6	156.7	73.1	98.7	23.1	29.8	413.9	8.6	48.0	462	28.4	6.8	73	535
Glenn	4.3	4.4	1.2	4.2	1.5	1.1	16.8	6.9	2.4	20	5.0	5.7	5	25
Humboldt	8.0	27.6	9.8	13.5	7.0	3.7	69.6	8.6	8.1	78	2.0	6.4	13	91
Imperial	23.1	32.8	10.8	29.9	4.4	5.9	106.9	8.6	12.4	120	15.5	6.4	22	142
Inyo	4.7	3.9	1.1	2.4	0.8	1.0	13.9	6.9	2.0	16	3.2	5.7	4	20
Kern	46.8	163.4	47.3	107.1	26.4	27.1	418.1	8.6	48.5	467	44.0	6.8	76	543
Kings	10.9	33.5	6.7	17.8	4.0	4.4	77.3	8.6	9.0	87	4.6	6.4	15	102
Lake	2.3	12.8	6.2	7.8	3.2	2.0	34.2	8.6	4.0	39	1.6	6.4	7	46
Lassen	3.2	6.9	4.2	4.7	1.5	1.2	21.8	6.9	3.1	25	4.5	5.7	6	31
Los Angeles	482.5	1,324.7	1,067.3	860.9	239.0	391.8	4,366.2	11.1	392.6	4,759	519.0	7.2	731	5,490
Madera	6.0	26.3	13.0	19.2	4.6	5.4	74.5	8.6	8.6	84	6.1	6.4	15	99
Marin	18.6	18.4	21.2	15.8	6.0	3.3	83.3	8.6	9.7	93	7.7	6.4	16	109
Mariposa	1.0	3.8	0.9	1.5	0.8	0.8	8.6	6.9	1.2	10	3.4	5.7	3	13
Mendocino	5.5	17.6	7.9	11.0	3.3	4.4	49.7	8.6	5.8	56	3.7	6.4	10	66
Merced	18.1	39.9	16.3	28.9	7.3	11.0	121.5	8.6	14.1	136	10.8	6.4	23	159
Modoc	0.6	2.0	0.7	1.9	0.6	0.3	6.0	6.9	0.9	7	2.0	5.7	2	9
Mono	3.2	3.2	1.1	0.9	0.3	0.3	9.0	6.9	1.3	11	2.8	5.7	3	14
Monterey	23.2	59.9	23.9	31.1	7.8	9.9	155.8	8.6	18.1	174	13.1	6.8	28	202
Napa	6.2	17.5	10.4	13.0	4.4	3.6	55.0	8.6	6.4	62	7.3	6.4	11	73
Nevada	6.2	13.0	7.3	8.3	3.5	2.3	40.6	8.6	4.7	46	6.9	6.4	9	55
Orange	120.4	322.0	281.9	232.2	55.0	54.6	1,066.1	11.1	95.9	1,163	182.7	7.2	187	1,350
Placer	14.7	33.5	30.1	32.1	8.1	10.9	129.4	8.6	15.0	145	7.0	6.4	24	169
Plumas	1.1	3.0	1.6	2.5	0.9	0.7	9.8	6.9	1.4	12	1.1	5.7	3	15
Riverside	89.1	239.5	212.0	237.9	46.3	68.9	893.6	11.1	80.4	974	116.1	7.2	151	1,125
Sacramento	59.9	165.8	140.2	154.9	40.0	27.3	588.3	11.1	52.9	642	58.6	7.2	97	739
San Benito	2.1	7.2	3.3	5.2	0.9	1.5	20.3	6.9	2.9	24	1.3	5.7	5	29
San Bernardino	76.3	359.6	195.4	254.0	57.3	68.5	1,011.1	11.1	90.9	1,103	79.7	7.2	164	1,267
San Diego	135.0	283.1	246.0	269.3	52.5	47.9	1,033.9	11.1	93.0	1,127	104.3	7.2	171	1,298
San Francisco	48.6	61.1	102.3	51.3	31.8	19.0	314.1	11.1	28.2	343	25.8	7.2	52	395
San Joaquin	28.9	108.1	53.0	63.5	21.4	16.0	291.0	8.6	33.8	325	12.3	6.8	50	375
San Luis Obispo	16.2	49.7	17.2	19.9	12.4	6.7	122.0	8.6	14.2	137	6.5	6.4	23	160
San Mateo	41.0	55.8	39.3	49.6	16.6	23.9	226.3	8.6	26.2	253	23.3	6.8	41	294
Santa Barbara	30.1	60.5	27.6	29.3	9.9	11.9	169.3	8.6	19.6	189	29.0	6.8	33	222
Santa Clara	62.2	145.0	113.2	104.8	35.9	19.1	480.1	11.1	43.2	524	40.1	7.2	79	603
Santa Cruz	16.0	34.8	16.8	20.9	4.8	7.7	100.9	8.6	11.7	113	20.7	6.4	21	134
Shasta	10.9	43.6	14.4	23.0	7.5	8.0	107.4	8.6	12.5	120	60.5	6.4	29	149
Sierra	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	1.8	6.9	0.3	3	1.3	5.7	1	4
Siskiyou	6.6	8.1	2.8	5.2	1.9	1.8	26.3	8.6	3.1	30	4.0	6.4	6	36
Solano	20.1	55.6	34.3	48.6	14.1	7.9	180.6	8.6	20.9	202	6.0	6.8	31	233
Sonoma	30.6	60.9	33.2	38.8	15.3	9.0	187.8	8.6	21.8	210	25.3	6.8	35	245
Stanislaus	21.5	82.3	34.0	61.2	17.1	10.9	226.9	8.6	26.3	254	7.6	6.8	39	293
Sutter	5.1	16.4	7.1	11.0	4.6	2.6	46.8	8.6	5.4	53	9.0	6.4	10	63
Tehama	5.2	15.9	5.1	8.9	2.5	3.2	40.7	8.6	4.7	46	2.6	6.4	8	54
Trinity	0.9	4.2	1.1	2.3	0.7	1.0	10.2	6.9	1.5	12	5.0	5.7	3	15
Tulare	25.5	65.5	27.3	41.4	10.5	13.3	183.5	8.6	21.3	205	23.9	6.8	34	239
Tuolumne	2.5	10.5	3.9	6.0	2.2	3.1	28.3	8.6	3.3	32	2.0	6.4	6	38
Ventura	37.1	73.0	63.2	65.3	23.1	25.3	286.9	8.6	33.3	321	75.2	6.8	59	380
Yolo	10.8	30.5	11.4	16.9	5.4	4.7	79.6	8.6	9.2	89	12.0	6.4	16	105
Yuba	5.0	13.7	5.4	10.3	3.1	2.6	40.2	8.6	4.7	45	3.3	6.4	8	53
Statewide	1,772.7	4,643.8	3,300.7	3,392.3	931.0	1,050.8	15,091.3		1,489.0	16,608	1,774.2		2,653.0	19,261

*Reported on FY 13-14 Schedule 7A; non-RAS staff include categories such as SJOs, Enhanced Collections Staff, and Interpreters

Intentionally Blank

BLS Factor

Cluster	County	% Local	% State	State Employment More than 50% of Govt Workforce?	3-Year Avg BLS Local (92)	3-Year Avg BLS (State & Local 92)	3-Year Avg (2010-2012) BLS Factor (50% Workforce Threshold)
4	Alameda	84%	16%	No	1.42	1.27	1.42
1	Alpine	100%	0%	No	0.82	0.82	0.82
1	Amador	33%	67%	Yes	0.94	0.99	0.99
2	Butte	89%	11%	No	0.92	0.89	0.92
1	Calaveras	90%	10%	No	0.86	0.93	0.86
1	Colusa	94%	6%	No	0.70	0.91	0.70
3	Contra Costa	96%	4%	No	1.25	1.12	1.25
1	Del Norte	31%	69%	Yes	0.64	0.79	0.79
2	El Dorado	96%	4%	No	0.99	1.09	0.99
3	Fresno	70%	30%	No	1.00	1.08	1.00
1	Glenn	96%	4%	No	0.68	0.82	0.68
2	Humboldt	82%	18%	No	0.76	0.93	0.76
2	Imperial	53%	47%	No	0.77	0.85	0.77
1	Inyo	72%	28%	No	0.83	0.89	0.83
3	Kern	60%	40%	No	1.05	1.01	1.05
2	Kings	32%	68%	Yes	0.85	0.89	0.89
2	Lake	96%	4%	No	0.76	0.78	0.76
1	Lassen	20%	80%	Yes	0.67	0.80	0.80
4	Los Angeles	91%	9%	No	1.34	1.26	1.34
2	Madera	38%	62%	Yes	0.84	0.94	0.94
2	Marin	66%	34%	No	1.30	1.12	1.30
1	Mariposa	93%	7%	No	0.74	0.87	0.74
2	Mendocino	84%	16%	No	0.86	0.85	0.86
2	Merced	100%	0%	No	0.91	0.91	0.91
1	Modoc	83%	17%	No	0.61	0.80	0.61
1	Mono	91%	9%	No	1.20	0.93	1.20
3	Monterey	61%	39%	No	1.19	1.06	1.19
2	Napa	80%	20%	No	1.21	1.03	1.21
2	Nevada	90%	10%	No	0.97	0.88	0.97
4	Orange	91%	9%	No	1.30	1.20	1.30
2	Placer	95%	5%	No	1.14	1.01	1.14
1	Plumas	93%	7%	No	0.70	0.72	0.70
4	Riverside	100%	0%	No	1.07	1.07	1.07
4	Sacramento	15%	85%	Yes	1.20	1.28	1.28
1	San Benito	100%	0%	No	0.97	0.97	0.97
4	San Bernardino	82%	18%	No	1.05	1.08	1.05
4	San Diego	85%	15%	No	1.17	1.16	1.17
4	San Francisco	53%	47%	No	1.61	1.57	1.61
3	San Joaquin	70%	30%	No	1.11	1.10	1.11
2	San Luis Obispo	55%	45%	No	1.07	1.08	1.07
3	San Mateo	95%	5%	No	1.45	1.15	1.45
3	Santa Barbara	93%	7%	No	1.16	1.07	1.16
4	Santa Clara	94%	6%	No	1.47	1.23	1.47
2	Santa Cruz	87%	13%	No	1.17	1.00	1.17
2	Shasta	64%	36%	No	0.85	0.95	0.85
1	Sierra	100%	0%	No	0.71	0.71	0.71
2	Siskiyou	84%	16%	No	0.71	0.75	0.71
3	Solano	61%	39%	No	1.22	1.11	1.22
3	Sonoma	88%	12%	No	1.17	1.11	1.17
3	Stanislaus	96%	4%	No	1.02	0.97	1.02
2	Sutter	95%	5%	No	0.95	0.93	0.95
2	Tehama	95%	5%	No	0.80	0.89	0.80
1	Trinity	93%	7%	No	0.65	0.79	0.65
3	Tulare	91%	9%	No	0.82	0.85	0.82
2	Tuolumne	48%	52%	Yes	0.84	0.91	0.91
3	Ventura	90%	10%	No	1.23	1.13	1.23
2	Yolo	85%	15%	No	1.01	1.27	1.01
2	Yuba	100%	0%	No	0.94	0.94	0.94

Intentionally Blank

FTE Allotment Factor

Cluster	Court	BLS Factor	FTE Dollar Factor Applied (Current -- \$56,396*BLS)	FTE Need	Eligible for FTE Floor ?	Has FTE Need <50 AND FTE Dollar Factor is Less Than Median of \$43,737?	Final FTE Dollar Factor
		A	B	C	D	E	F
4	Alameda	1.42	\$ 80,154	626			\$ 80,154
1	Alpine	0.82	\$ 46,478	3	Yes		\$ 46,478
1	Amador	0.99	\$ 56,001	25	Yes		\$ 56,001
2	Butte	0.92	\$ 51,883	139			\$ 51,883
1	Calaveras	0.86	\$ 48,333	27	Yes		\$ 48,333
1	Colusa	0.70	\$ 39,738	18	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
3	Contra Costa	1.25	\$ 70,499	395			\$ 70,499
1	Del Norte	0.79	\$ 44,633	33	Yes		\$ 44,633
2	El Dorado	0.99	\$ 55,986	89			\$ 55,986
3	Fresno	1.00	\$ 56,258	535			\$ 56,258
1	Glenn	0.68	\$ 38,354	25	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
2	Humboldt	0.76	\$ 42,838	91			\$ 42,838
2	Imperial	0.77	\$ 43,449	142			\$ 43,449
1	Inyo	0.83	\$ 46,926	20	Yes		\$ 46,926
3	Kern	1.05	\$ 59,340	543			\$ 59,340
2	Kings	0.89	\$ 50,007	102			\$ 50,007
2	Lake	0.76	\$ 42,841	46	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
1	Lassen	0.80	\$ 45,156	31	Yes		\$ 45,156
4	Los Angeles	1.34	\$ 75,337	5,490			\$ 75,337
2	Madera	0.94	\$ 52,737	99			\$ 52,737
2	Marin	1.30	\$ 73,165	109			\$ 73,165
1	Mariposa	0.74	\$ 41,743	13	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
2	Mendocino	0.86	\$ 48,452	66			\$ 48,452
2	Merced	0.91	\$ 51,181	159			\$ 51,181
1	Modoc	0.61	\$ 34,261	9	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
1	Mono	1.20	\$ 67,633	14	Yes		\$ 67,633
3	Monterey	1.19	\$ 67,116	202			\$ 67,116
2	Napa	1.21	\$ 68,286	73			\$ 68,286
2	Nevada	0.97	\$ 54,496	55			\$ 54,496
4	Orange	1.30	\$ 73,260	1,350			\$ 73,260
2	Placer	1.14	\$ 64,498	169			\$ 64,498
1	Plumas	0.70	\$ 39,749	15	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
4	Riverside	1.07	\$ 60,402	1,125			\$ 60,402
4	Sacramento	1.28	\$ 72,126	739			\$ 72,126
1	San Benito	0.97	\$ 54,914	29	Yes		\$ 54,914
4	San Bernardino	1.05	\$ 59,223	1,267			\$ 59,223
4	San Diego	1.17	\$ 66,095	1,298			\$ 66,095
4	San Francisco	1.61	\$ 91,023	395			\$ 91,023
3	San Joaquin	1.11	\$ 62,683	375			\$ 62,683
2	San Luis Obispo	1.07	\$ 60,459	160			\$ 60,459
3	San Mateo	1.45	\$ 81,639	294			\$ 81,639
3	Santa Barbara	1.16	\$ 65,153	222			\$ 65,153
4	Santa Clara	1.47	\$ 82,873	603			\$ 82,873
2	Santa Cruz	1.17	\$ 66,037	134			\$ 66,037
2	Shasta	0.85	\$ 47,883	149			\$ 47,883
1	Sierra	0.71	\$ 40,308	4	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
2	Siskiyou	0.71	\$ 40,074	36	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
3	Solano	1.22	\$ 69,044	233			\$ 69,044
3	Sonoma	1.17	\$ 65,845	245			\$ 65,845
3	Stanislaus	1.02	\$ 57,715	293			\$ 57,715
2	Sutter	0.95	\$ 53,532	63			\$ 53,532
2	Tehama	0.80	\$ 45,170	54			\$ 45,170
1	Trinity	0.65	\$ 36,889	15	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
3	Tulare	0.82	\$ 46,376	239			\$ 46,376
2	Tuolumne	0.91	\$ 51,262	38	Yes		\$ 51,262
3	Ventura	1.23	\$ 69,218	380			\$ 69,218
2	Yolo	1.01	\$ 57,016	105			\$ 57,016
2	Yuba	0.94	\$ 53,047	53			\$ 53,047

<p>WAFM Post BLS FTE Allotment: Median</p> <p>\$ 43,737</p>
--

Intentionally Blank

FY 2014-2015 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor

	Total WAFM- Related Allocation for 2014-15 (Prior to implementing funding floor)	Floor Funding	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Share of reduction	Reduction Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E
Alameda	71,098,998	N/A	-	4.48%	(53,299)
Alpine	483,692	750,000	266,308	0.00%	-
Amador	2,153,855	N/A	-	0.14%	(1,615)
Butte	8,298,544	N/A	-	0.52%	(6,221)
Calaveras	2,018,366	N/A	-	0.13%	(1,513)
Colusa	1,427,477	1,550,604	123,127	0.00%	-
Contra Costa	36,432,551	N/A	-	2.30%	(27,312)
Del Norte	2,378,517	N/A	-	0.15%	(1,783)
El Dorado	6,360,106	N/A	-	0.40%	(4,768)
Fresno	39,159,392	N/A	-	2.47%	(29,356)
Glenn	1,842,164	1,874,999	32,836	0.00%	-
Humboldt	5,392,011	N/A	-	0.34%	(4,042)
Imperial	7,135,906	N/A	-	0.45%	(5,349)
Inyo	1,688,139	1,874,999	186,861	0.00%	-
Kern	35,887,980	N/A	-	2.26%	(26,903)
Kings	5,477,690	N/A	-	0.35%	(4,106)
Lake	2,984,169	N/A	-	0.19%	(2,237)
Lassen	1,998,437	N/A	-	0.13%	(1,498)
Los Angeles	452,238,347	N/A	-	28.53%	(339,019)
Madera	6,421,575	N/A	-	0.41%	(4,814)
Marin	12,715,506	N/A	-	0.80%	(9,532)
Mariposa	952,351	1,048,824	96,473	0.00%	-
Mendocino	4,614,380	N/A	-	0.29%	(3,459)
Merced	10,533,131	N/A	-	0.66%	(7,896)
Modoc	840,624	875,000	34,375	0.00%	-
Mono	1,316,100	1,405,267	89,167	0.00%	-
Monterey	14,593,467	N/A	-	0.92%	(10,940)
Napa	6,357,621	N/A	-	0.40%	(4,766)
Nevada	4,123,789	N/A	-	0.26%	(3,091)
Orange	129,654,669	N/A	-	8.18%	(97,195)
Placer	12,761,151	N/A	-	0.80%	(9,566)
Plumas	1,384,672	N/A	-	0.09%	(1,038)
Riverside	68,960,028	N/A	-	4.35%	(51,696)
Sacramento	67,824,623	N/A	-	4.28%	(50,844)
San Benito	2,514,517	N/A	-	0.16%	(1,885)
San Bernardino	75,145,212	N/A	-	4.74%	(56,332)
San Diego	127,746,440	N/A	-	8.06%	(95,765)
San Francisco	54,608,301	N/A	-	3.44%	(40,937)
San Joaquin	26,756,658	N/A	-	1.69%	(20,058)
San Luis Obispo	11,903,167	N/A	-	0.75%	(8,923)
San Mateo	31,860,336	N/A	-	2.01%	(23,884)
Santa Barbara	19,281,399	N/A	-	1.22%	(14,454)
Santa Clara	74,840,528	N/A	-	4.72%	(56,104)
Santa Cruz	10,451,384	N/A	-	0.66%	(7,835)
Shasta	8,457,816	N/A	-	0.53%	(6,340)
Sierra	476,668	750,000	273,332	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	3,070,134	N/A	-	0.19%	(2,302)
Solano	17,803,464	N/A	-	1.12%	(13,346)
Sonoma	20,974,923	N/A	-	1.32%	(15,724)
Stanislaus	18,293,517	N/A	-	1.15%	(13,714)
Sutter	3,973,824	N/A	-	0.25%	(2,979)
Tehama	3,216,912	N/A	-	0.20%	(2,412)
Trinity	1,051,102	1,137,087	85,985	0.00%	-
Tulare	13,940,687	N/A	-	0.88%	(10,451)
Tuolumne	2,702,127	N/A	-	0.17%	(2,026)
Ventura	28,200,728	N/A	-	1.78%	(21,141)
Yolo	7,226,715	N/A	-	0.46%	(5,417)
Yuba	3,439,216	N/A	-	0.22%	(2,578)
Total	1,595,445,804	11,266,780	1,188,465	100.00%	(1,188,465)

Intentionally Blank

Determination of Funding Floor

Cluster	Court			Current adjusted allocation if no floor applied	Determine Adjusted Allocation if Floor Applies				Funding Floor (for the graduated floor, the lower of the floor or prior-year allocation plus 10%)
		WAFM Calculated Need	% of Statewide Need		Graduated Funding Floor That Would Apply	Apply Floor? Yes, if F>E	Prior Year Plus 10%	Adjusted allocation if no floor applied	
A	B	C	D	E	F	F1	F2	F3	G
4	Alameda	88,359,612	3.64%	71,098,998	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Alpine	343,929	0.01%	483,692	750,000	Y	615,307	483,692	750,000
1	Amador	2,738,605	0.11%	2,153,855	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Butte	13,261,312	0.55%	8,298,544	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Calaveras	2,726,378	0.11%	2,018,366	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Colusa	1,900,461	0.08%	1,427,477	1,874,999	Y	1,550,604	1,427,477	1,550,604
3	Contra Costa	55,680,843	2.30%	36,432,551	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Del Norte	3,562,408	0.15%	2,378,517	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	El Dorado	9,349,259	0.39%	6,360,106	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Fresno	63,521,412	2.62%	39,159,392	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Glenn	2,350,509	0.10%	1,842,164	1,874,999	Y	2,047,219	1,842,164	1,874,999
2	Humboldt	7,587,268	0.31%	5,392,011	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Imperial	11,681,402	0.48%	7,135,906	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Inyo	2,005,742	0.08%	1,688,139	1,874,999	Y	1,949,893	1,688,139	1,874,999
3	Kern	68,772,633	2.84%	35,887,980	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Kings	9,041,542	0.37%	5,477,690	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Lake	3,848,078	0.16%	2,984,169	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Lassen	2,785,749	0.11%	1,998,437	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Los Angeles	740,843,971	30.56%	452,238,347	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Madera	9,811,615	0.40%	6,421,575	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Marin	13,804,014	0.57%	12,715,506	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Mariposa	1,268,860	0.05%	952,351	1,250,000	Y	1,048,824	952,351	1,048,824
2	Mendocino	6,396,356	0.26%	4,614,380	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Merced	17,792,806	0.73%	10,533,131	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Modoc	818,258	0.03%	840,624	875,000	Y	998,487	840,624	875,000
1	Mono	1,977,044	0.08%	1,316,100	1,874,999	Y	1,405,267	1,316,100	1,405,267
3	Monterey	22,985,951	0.95%	14,593,467	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Napa	8,229,667	0.34%	6,357,621	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Nevada	5,948,648	0.25%	4,123,789	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Orange	172,104,479	7.10%	129,654,669	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Placer	20,967,595	0.86%	12,761,151	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Plumas	1,432,034	0.06%	1,384,672	1,250,000	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Riverside	122,184,895	5.04%	68,960,028	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Sacramento	100,721,502	4.15%	67,824,623	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	San Benito	3,042,492	0.13%	2,514,517	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Bernardino	137,869,624	5.69%	75,145,212	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Diego	169,121,455	6.98%	127,746,440	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Francisco	64,153,264	2.65%	54,608,301	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	San Joaquin	44,271,294	1.83%	26,756,658	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	San Luis Obispo	18,501,624	0.76%	11,903,167	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	San Mateo	43,796,548	1.81%	31,860,336	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Santa Barbara	25,711,043	1.06%	19,281,399	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Santa Clara	93,240,124	3.85%	74,840,528	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Santa Cruz	15,485,876	0.64%	10,451,384	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Shasta	12,820,506	0.53%	8,457,816	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Sierra	339,119	0.01%	476,668	750,000	Y	604,848	476,668	750,000
2	Siskiyou	3,026,276	0.12%	3,070,134	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Solano	28,468,850	1.17%	17,803,464	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Sonoma	32,588,957	1.34%	20,974,923	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Stanislaus	32,800,366	1.35%	18,293,517	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Sutter	6,575,894	0.27%	3,973,824	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Tehama	4,925,688	0.20%	3,216,912	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Trinity	1,461,014	0.06%	1,051,102	1,250,000	Y	1,137,087	1,051,102	1,137,087
3	Tulare	22,711,203	0.94%	13,940,687	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Tuolumne	3,561,890	0.15%	2,702,127	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Ventura	46,915,300	1.94%	28,200,728	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yolo	11,431,084	0.47%	7,226,715	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yuba	4,887,940	0.20%	3,439,216	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Statewide	2,424,512,269	100.00%	1,595,445,804					11,266,780

Intentionally Blank

2013-2014 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2013-14 Ending Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (12-13)	2013-14 WAFM- Related Base Allocation
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Sum 1:6)
Alameda	74,596,084	(3,177,924)	(1,958,825)	101,575	424,792	115,195	70,100,897
Alpine	557,203	-	-	83	2,034	49	559,370
Amador	2,127,503	-	-	2,565	11,006	733	2,141,806
Butte	8,295,068	(467,145)	(291,613)	14,608	59,332	15,194	7,625,444
Calaveras	1,990,912	-	-	3,074	18,652	967	2,013,605
Colusa	1,394,107	-	-	1,447	13,708	378	1,409,640
Contra Costa	35,800,452	-	(1,705,774)	69,231	218,186	76,248	34,458,343
Del Norte	2,394,693	-	(126,942)	1,964	11,208	535	2,281,457
El Dorado	6,085,477	-	(57,081)	11,851	54,374	4,059	6,098,679
Fresno	37,046,510	-	(1,032,025)	60,497	181,080	66,289	36,322,351
Glenn	1,849,123	(9,779)	-	1,927	19,264	573	1,861,108
Humboldt	5,314,693	(167,800)	(150,006)	8,913	48,160	8,040	5,062,000
Imperial	7,154,288	(420,479)	(180,405)	11,204	67,678	10,523	6,642,808
Inyo	1,969,693	(186,658)	(42,314)	1,245	30,402	262	1,772,630
Kern	33,139,304	(65,567)	(1,750,452)	52,450	277,328	59,874	31,712,936
Kings	5,564,775	(421,918)	(181,060)	9,935	57,026	7,908	5,036,666
Lake	3,112,054	(196,493)	(56,758)	4,311	20,328	1,522	2,884,964
Lassen	2,229,899	(293,836)	-	2,384	20,156	522	1,959,125
Los Angeles	448,848,141	(14,294,467)	(26,758,268)	689,065	3,144,530	977,472	412,606,474
Madera	6,474,572	(381,406)	-	9,711	52,502	2,893	6,158,273
Marin	12,998,611	(9,625)	(391,957)	17,038	114,766	18,155	12,746,989
Mariposa	976,424	-	(28,406)	1,225	3,904	329	953,476
Mendocino	4,747,695	(299,349)	-	6,083	30,068	5,209	4,489,706
Merced	9,983,153	-	(250,840)	16,595	55,652	14,527	9,819,087
Modoc	964,805	(789)	(63,471)	662	6,134	375	907,715
Mono	1,296,190	(24,156)	(8,201)	914	12,446	323	1,277,516
Monterey	14,775,341	(870,000)	(333,656)	28,573	183,464	24,904	13,808,625
Napa	6,682,595	(295,552)	(287,148)	9,042	30,550	3,144	6,142,631
Nevada	4,574,716	(433,431)	(292,045)	6,730	49,946	6,564	3,912,480
Orange	128,918,098	(2,733,776)	(3,329,845)	206,630	923,882	268,656	124,253,645
Placer	12,701,553	-	(933,901)	21,287	77,378	26,853	11,893,169
Plumas	1,463,246	-	-	1,442	9,206	356	1,474,251

	2013-14 Ending Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (12-13)	2013-14 WAFM- Related Base Allocation
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Sum 1:6)
Riverside	66,201,310	(1,931,520)	(2,882,751)	131,371	532,226	62,703	62,113,339
Sacramento	67,434,475	(1,864,424)	(1,824,452)	93,189	340,254	175,080	64,354,121
San Benito	2,561,386	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,233	2,581,194
San Bernardino	73,411,896	(3,269,446)	(2,986,710)	133,960	435,474	181,146	67,906,320
San Diego	128,331,796	(657,192)	(4,757,300)	206,259	718,422	246,860	124,088,844
San Francisco	54,682,503	-	(2,582,976)	53,715	272,528	86,214	52,511,985
San Joaquin	26,159,995	(287,747)	(779,859)	44,944	201,698	50,156	25,389,188
San Luis Obispo	11,748,261	(241,676)	(673,831)	17,704	130,020	17,902	10,998,380
San Mateo	31,962,776	(443,042)	(1,479,478)	48,700	329,518	15,239	30,433,712
Santa Barbara	19,841,104	(1,055,112)	(457,408)	28,356	162,858	27,529	18,547,328
Santa Clara	75,567,248	-	(1,833,360)	119,260	452,782	109,914	74,415,844
Santa Cruz	10,200,849	-	(424,668)	17,644	113,210	14,656	9,921,691
Shasta	10,431,955	(2,389,668)	(326,131)	12,206	44,394	4,435	7,777,191
Sierra	547,720	-	-	235	1,830	76	549,862
Siskiyou	3,163,162	-	(103,923)	3,104	37,000	966	3,100,308
Solano	17,594,515	(435,400)	(535,433)	28,439	119,364	34,831	16,806,315
Sonoma	20,613,759	(440,000)	(479,410)	32,278	119,004	36,705	19,882,335
Stanislaus	17,262,981	(9,326)	(427,578)	34,594	88,718	36,236	16,985,625
Sutter	3,850,216	(247,071)	-	6,150	37,382	2,077	3,648,754
Tehama	2,983,348	-	(5,472)	4,138	28,100	1,362	3,011,477
Trinity	1,475,160	(450,608)	-	943	7,648	573	1,033,716
Tulare	13,437,777	(15,576)	(679,043)	28,289	204,932	27,184	13,003,562
Tuolumne	2,856,690	(220,516)	(30,986)	3,916	16,642	1,043	2,626,790
Ventura	27,992,390	(1,559,157)	(731,699)	54,971	205,304	60,255	26,022,064
Yolo	7,852,242	(582,889)	(461,445)	12,802	48,556	11,098	6,880,364
Yuba	3,352,440	(132,569)	-	4,696	15,788	1,670	3,242,025
Total	1,587,544,931	(40,983,089)	(64,674,907)	2,500,000	10,907,494	2,925,771	1,498,220,199

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

FY 2014-2015 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2013-14 Ending TCTF Base*	TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	TCTF Reduction of 2012-13 Benefits Allocation	Recommended Allocation for TCTF Benefit Cost Increases for Non-Interpreter Staff	GF Base for Benefits	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (12-13)	Current-Year Adjusted Allocation	WAFM 14-15 Adjustment	Total 2014-15 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K (Sum A:J)	8	9
Alameda	71,494,038	-	(1,117,440)	1,609,137	3,102,046	(3,177,924)	(1,958,825)	101,575	424,792	115,195	70,592,594	506,404	71,098,998
Alpine	536,863	-	(7,957)	6,245	20,340	-	-	83	2,034	49	557,658	(73,967)	483,692
Amador	2,075,747	-	(1,611)	23,828	51,756	-	-	2,565	11,006	733	2,164,023	(10,168)	2,153,855
Butte	8,170,991	-	(95,367)	158,491	124,076	(467,145)	(291,613)	14,608	59,332	15,194	7,688,568	609,976	8,298,544
Calaveras	1,940,406	-	(59,318)	45,771	50,506	-	-	3,074	18,652	967	2,000,058	18,308	2,018,366
Colusa	1,369,335	-	(11,356)	16,004	24,773	-	-	1,447	13,708	378	1,414,288	13,188	1,427,477
Contra Costa	34,404,261	-	(887,134)	1,020,012	1,396,191	-	(1,705,774)	69,231	218,186	76,248	34,591,221	1,841,330	36,432,551
Del Norte	2,300,564	-	(62,921)	45,700	94,129	-	(126,942)	1,964	11,208	535	2,264,237	114,280	2,378,517
El Dorado	5,872,358	-	(21,412)	18,950	213,119	-	(57,081)	11,851	54,374	4,059	6,096,217	263,889	6,360,106
Fresno	33,706,146	-	(876,146)	923,246	3,340,364	-	(1,032,025)	60,497	181,080	66,289	36,369,451	2,789,941	39,159,392
Glenn	1,794,458	-	(31,067)	24,061	54,665	(9,779)	-	1,927	19,264	573	1,854,102	(11,939)	1,842,164
Humboldt	5,241,609	-	(83,444)	137,243	73,084	(167,800)	(150,006)	8,913	48,160	8,040	5,115,799	276,212	5,392,011
Imperial	7,028,750	-	(230,012)	204,591	125,538	(420,479)	(180,405)	11,204	67,678	10,523	6,617,387	518,519	7,135,906
Inyo	1,894,107	-	(54,537)	32,741	75,586	(186,658)	(42,314)	1,245	30,402	262	1,750,834	(62,695)	1,688,139
Kern	29,595,035	-	(629,057)	551,636	3,544,269	(65,567)	(1,750,452)	52,450	277,328	59,874	31,635,515	4,252,465	35,887,980
Kings	5,519,658	-	(6,952)	22,140	45,117	(421,918)	(181,060)	9,935	57,026	7,908	5,051,854	425,836	5,477,690
Lake	3,102,931	-	449	3,199	9,123	(196,493)	(56,758)	4,311	20,328	1,522	2,888,611	95,557	2,984,169
Lassen	2,222,061	-	(6,630)	5,580	7,839	(293,836)	-	2,384	20,156	522	1,958,075	40,363	1,998,437
Los Angeles	429,960,172	(318,326)	(7,790,986)	12,101,803	18,887,969	(14,294,467)	(26,758,268)	689,065	3,144,530	977,472	416,598,965	35,639,382	452,238,347
Madera	6,089,746	-	(137,838)	45,479	384,825	(381,406)	-	9,711	52,502	2,893	6,065,914	355,661	6,421,575
Marin	12,354,099	(6,453)	(324,291)	358,566	644,512	(9,625)	(391,957)	17,038	114,766	18,155	12,774,811	(59,305)	12,715,506
Mariposa	954,124	-	(6,416)	3,560	22,300	-	(28,406)	1,225	3,904	329	950,620	1,730	952,351
Mendocino	4,435,925	-	(239,862)	235,205	311,770	(299,349)	-	6,083	30,068	5,209	4,485,049	129,330	4,614,380
Merced	9,208,327	-	(269,194)	310,199	774,827	-	(250,840)	16,595	55,652	14,527	9,860,092	673,039	10,533,131
Modoc	932,838	-	(1,273)	3,544	31,967	(789)	(63,471)	662	6,134	375	909,986	(69,362)	840,624
Mono	1,210,549	-	(32,349)	11,323	85,641	(24,156)	(8,201)	914	12,446	323	1,256,490	59,610	1,316,100
Monterey	14,497,845	-	(227,572)	264,491	277,496	(870,000)	(333,656)	28,573	183,464	24,904	13,845,544	747,923	14,593,467
Napa	6,372,800	-	(107,676)	181,753	309,796	(295,552)	(287,148)	9,042	30,550	3,144	6,216,708	140,912	6,357,621
Nevada	4,479,222	-	(100,179)	120,300	95,494	(433,431)	(292,045)	6,730	49,946	6,564	3,932,601	191,189	4,123,789
Orange	121,988,177	(209,171)	(3,671,441)	5,785,430	6,929,920	(2,733,776)	(3,329,845)	206,630	923,882	268,656	126,158,463	3,496,207	129,654,669
Placer	12,066,757	-	(238,459)	284,469	634,796	-	(933,901)	21,287	77,378	26,853	11,939,179	821,972	12,761,151
Plumas	1,448,318	-	(273)	6,015	14,929	-	-	1,442	9,206	356	1,479,992	(95,320)	1,384,672
Riverside	65,277,653	(168,861)	(685,149)	1,643,210	923,657	(1,931,520)	(2,882,751)	131,371	532,226	62,703	62,902,539	6,057,489	68,960,028
Sacramento	63,873,883	-	(1,673,778)	2,297,449	3,560,591	(1,864,424)	(1,824,452)	93,189	340,254	175,080	64,977,792	2,846,831	67,824,623
San Benito	2,526,744	-	(8,678)	16,844	34,642	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,233	2,589,361	(74,843)	2,514,517
San Bernardino	72,147,163	-	(1,011,776)	1,333,588	1,264,732	(3,269,446)	(2,986,710)	133,960	435,474	181,146	68,228,132	6,917,080	75,145,212
San Diego	125,478,197	-	(3,506,215)	4,121,481	2,853,598	(657,192)	(4,757,300)	206,259	718,422	246,860	124,704,110	3,042,330	127,746,440
San Francisco	49,195,369	-	-	1,495,964	5,487,134	-	(2,582,976)	53,715	272,528	86,214	54,007,948	600,353	54,608,301
San Joaquin	24,914,639	-	(756,034)	535,858	1,245,356	(287,747)	(779,859)	44,944	201,698	50,156	25,169,011	1,587,646	26,756,658
San Luis Obispo	11,449,303	-	(36,773)	122,246	298,958	(241,676)	(673,831)	17,704	130,020	17,902	11,083,853	819,314	11,903,167
San Mateo	29,551,664	-	(211,070)	603,175	2,411,112	(443,042)	(1,479,478)	48,700	329,518	15,239	30,825,816	1,034,520	31,860,336
Santa Barbara	18,243,443	-	21,451	121,986	1,597,662	(1,055,112)	(457,408)	28,356	162,858	27,529	18,690,766	590,633	19,281,399
Santa Clara	73,257,781	-	(1,120,423)	825,453	2,309,467	-	(1,833,360)	119,260	452,782	109,914	74,120,874	719,654	74,840,528
Santa Cruz	9,997,292	-	(174,422)	154,317	203,557	-	(424,668)	17,644	113,210	14,656	9,901,586	549,799	10,451,384

	2013-14 Ending TCTF Base*	TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	TCTF Reduction of 2012-13 Benefits Allocation	Recommended Allocation for TCTF Benefit Cost Increases for Non-Interpreter Staff	GF Base for Benefits	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (12-13)	Current-Year Adjusted Allocation	WAFM 14-15 Adjustment	Total 2014-15 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K (Sum A:J)	8	9
Shasta	10,169,734	-	38,857	184,003	262,222	(2,389,668)	(326,131)	12,206	44,394	4,435	8,000,051	457,766	8,457,816
Sierra	538,105	-	(9,268)	8,941	9,615	-	-	235	1,830	76	549,535	(72,867)	476,668
Siskiyou	3,072,125	-	(60,127)	59,428	91,037	-	(103,923)	3,104	37,000	966	3,099,610	(29,475)	3,070,134
Solano	17,240,736	-	(417,276)	497,180	353,779	(435,400)	(535,433)	28,439	119,364	34,831	16,886,218	917,245	17,803,464
Sonoma	19,441,709	-	(584,741)	616,911	1,172,049	(440,000)	(479,410)	32,278	119,004	36,705	19,914,504	1,060,419	20,974,923
Stanislaus	15,957,751	-	(1,003,375)	818,944	1,305,230	(9,326)	(427,578)	34,594	88,718	36,236	16,801,194	1,492,323	18,293,517
Sutter	3,690,455	-	(24,759)	72,212	159,760	(247,071)	-	6,150	37,382	2,077	3,696,206	277,618	3,973,824
Tehama	2,875,164	-	(17,294)	24,866	108,184	-	(5,472)	4,138	28,100	1,362	3,019,048	197,864	3,216,912
Trinity	1,421,481	-	(16,561)	19,978	53,679	(450,608)	-	943	7,648	573	1,037,133	13,969	1,051,102
Tulare	13,404,033	-	(127,031)	103,341	33,744	(15,576)	(679,043)	28,289	204,932	27,184	12,979,871	960,816	13,940,687
Tuolumne	2,806,339	-	(2,616)	19,249	50,351	(220,516)	(30,986)	3,916	16,642	1,043	2,643,422	58,705	2,702,127
Ventura	27,023,638	-	(416,492)	542,126	968,752	(1,559,157)	(731,699)	54,971	205,304	60,255	26,147,697	2,053,031	28,200,728
Yolo	7,642,166	-	(206,373)	168,486	210,076	(582,889)	(461,445)	12,802	48,556	11,098	6,842,477	384,237	7,226,715
Yuba	3,261,573	-	(66,104)	66,221	90,867	(132,569)	-	4,696	15,788	1,670	3,242,142	197,074	3,439,216
Total	1,518,726,356	(702,811)	(29,405,750)	41,034,166	68,818,575	(40,983,089)	(64,674,907)	2,500,000	10,907,494	2,925,771	1,509,145,804	86,300,000	1,595,445,804

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

2014-2015 TCTF Program 30.05 and 30.15 Allocations Approved by the Judicial Council Appendix J

		FY 2014-15 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Recommendations			2014-15 Judicial Council-Approved Allocations
#	Project and Program Title	Program 30.05 AOC Support ¹	Program 30.15 Local Assistance	Total	
		Col. A	Col. B	Col C (Col. A + B)	
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	-	113,000	113,000	113,000
2	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	500,000	7,738,000	8,238,000	8,238,000
3	Equal Access Fund	262,000	-	262,000	262,000
4	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000	-	260,000	260,000
5	Enhanced Collections	625,000	-	625,000	625,000
6	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	1,276,000	5,187,000	6,463,000	6,463,000
7	Criminal and Traffic (V2) CMS	97,000	1,061,000	1,158,000	1,158,000
8	California Courts Technology Center	-	1,689,000	1,689,000	1,689,000
9	Interim Case Management System	-	1,028,000	1,028,000	1,028,000
10	Phoenix HR Services	1,349,000	-	1,349,000	1,349,000
11	Total	4,369,000	16,816,000	21,185,000	21,185,000
12	Budget Act Appropriation and Estimated Changes Using Budget Act Provisional Language Authority¹	5,359,100	19,634,000	24,993,100	24,993,100
13	Appropriation Balance	990,100	2,818,000	3,808,100	3,808,100

1. Provisional language in the Budget Act allows the Program 30.05 appropriation authority to be increased for increased revenues that support the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot, Equal Access Fund, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections.

Intentionally Blank

FY 2014-15 TCTF Program 45.10: Appropriation vs. Allocations

#	Description	Type	Estimated and Approved 2014-15 Allocations Col. A	2014-15 Judicial Council-Approved Allocations Col. B	For Judicial Council Consideration on July 29, 2014 Col. C
1	I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation	Base	1,518,726,356		
3	II. Adjustments				
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-702,811		
6	III. FY 2014-2015 Allocations				
7	\$86.3 Million in New Funding	Base	86,300,000		Rec. 3 and 4
8	\$41.0 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	41,034,166		Rec. 2
9	\$22.7 Million Revenue Shortfall	Base	Pending		Rec. 1
10	2.0% Holdback	Non-Base	-37,882,840		Rec. 6
11	1.5% & 0.5% Emergency Funding & Unspent Funding Allocated Back to Courts	Non-Base	37,882,840		Pending
12	Preliminary 1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-2,008,249		Rec. 7
13	\$10 Million Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-10,000,000		N/A
14	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000	
15	FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	-29,405,750		N/A
17	IV. Allocation for Reimbursements				
18	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	103,725,445	103,725,445	
19	Jury	Non-Base	16,000,000	16,000,000	
20	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000	2,286,000	
21	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000	2,500,000	
22	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000	332,000	
23	CSA Audits ¹	Non-Base	325,000		Rec. 5
24	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement	Non-Base	1,005,361		Pending
26	V. Estimated Revenue Distributions				
27	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	107,910,203		N/A
28	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	22,992,171		N/A
29	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494		N/A
30	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	3,450,448		N/A
31	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,707,282		N/A
32	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840		N/A
34	VI. Miscellaneous Charges				
35	Judicial Branch Worker's Compensation Fund Premiums	Non-Base	-16,536,018		N/A
36	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-5,405,564		N/A
37	Total		1,866,310,374	134,066,445	
39	Program 45.10 Appropriation Budget Act		1,894,142,000		
40	Transfer to Program 45.25 (Compensation of Superior Court Judges) due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships		-1,383,000		
41	Transfer to Program 45.45 (Court Interpreters) due to court interpreter portion of \$42.8 million for new benefits funding		-1,765,834		
42	Transfer to JBWCF		-16,536,018		
43	Adjusted Program 45.10 Appropriation		1,874,457,148		
45	Estimated Remaining Program 45.10 Appropriation		8,146,774		

¹ Provision 12 of the 2014 Budget Act requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits.

Intentionally Blank

Estimated FY 2014-2015 Allocation of 2% Holdback

	Ending 2013-2014 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	Reduction for FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding From TCTF	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	Estimated Net WAFM Adjustments ¹	Estimated Non-Interpreter Benefits Base Allocation (12-13 and 13-14) ¹	Total	2011-2012 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation ²	Adjusted Base	% of Total Adjusted Base	Estimated Pro-Rata Share of 2% Holdback
Court	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	B	C (A7-B)	D	E
Alameda	71,494,038	-	(1,117,440)	3,102,046	453,105	1,609,137	75,540,885	3,177,924	72,362,961	4.4%	(1,667,682)
Alpine	536,863	-	(7,957)	20,340	192,342	6,245	747,833	-	747,833	0.0%	(17,235)
Amador	2,075,747	-	(1,611)	51,756	(11,783)	23,828	2,137,937	-	2,137,937	0.1%	(49,271)
Butte	8,170,991	-	(95,367)	124,076	603,755	158,491	8,961,947	467,145	8,494,802	0.5%	(195,772)
Calaveras	1,940,406	-	(59,318)	50,506	16,795	45,771	1,994,159	-	1,994,159	0.1%	(45,958)
Colusa	1,369,335	-	(11,356)	24,773	136,315	16,004	1,535,071	-	1,535,071	0.1%	(35,377)
Contra Costa	34,404,261	-	(887,134)	1,396,191	1,814,019	1,020,012	37,747,349	-	37,747,349	2.3%	(869,928)
Del Norte	2,300,564	-	(62,921)	94,129	112,497	45,700	2,489,969	-	2,489,969	0.2%	(57,384)
El Dorado	5,872,358	-	(21,412)	213,119	259,121	18,950	6,342,136	-	6,342,136	0.4%	(146,161)
Fresno	33,706,146	-	(876,146)	3,340,364	2,760,586	923,246	39,854,196	-	39,854,196	2.4%	(918,483)
Glenn	1,794,458	-	(31,067)	54,665	20,897	24,061	1,863,014	9,779	1,853,235	0.1%	(42,710)
Humboldt	5,241,609	-	(83,444)	73,084	272,170	137,243	5,640,662	167,800	5,472,862	0.3%	(126,128)
Imperial	7,028,750	-	(230,012)	125,538	513,170	204,591	7,642,037	420,479	7,221,558	0.4%	(166,429)
Inyo	1,894,107	-	(54,537)	75,586	124,166	32,741	2,072,062	186,658	1,885,404	0.1%	(43,451)
Kern	29,595,035	-	(629,057)	3,544,269	4,225,562	551,636	37,287,444	65,567	37,221,877	2.3%	(857,818)
Kings	5,519,658	-	(6,952)	45,117	421,730	22,140	6,001,692	421,918	5,579,774	0.3%	(128,592)
Lake	3,102,931	-	449	9,123	93,320	3,199	3,209,021	196,493	3,012,528	0.2%	(69,427)
Lassen	2,222,061	-	(6,630)	7,839	38,864	5,580	2,267,714	293,836	1,973,878	0.1%	(45,490)
Los Angeles	429,960,172	(318,326)	(7,790,986)	18,887,969	35,300,364	12,101,803	488,140,996	14,294,467	473,846,529	28.8%	(10,920,300)
Madera	6,089,746	-	(137,838)	384,825	350,848	45,479	6,733,060	381,406	6,351,654	0.4%	(146,381)
Marin	12,354,099	(6,453)	(324,291)	644,512	(68,837)	358,566	12,957,597	9,625	12,947,972	0.8%	(298,400)
Mariposa	954,124	-	(6,416)	22,300	98,203	3,560	1,071,772	-	1,071,772	0.1%	(24,700)
Mendocino	4,435,925	-	(239,862)	311,770	125,871	235,205	4,868,909	299,349	4,569,560	0.3%	(105,310)
Merced	9,208,327	-	(269,194)	774,827	665,143	310,199	10,689,301	-	10,689,301	0.7%	(246,346)
Modoc	932,838	-	(1,273)	31,967	(34,986)	3,544	932,090	789	931,301	0.1%	(21,463)
Mono	1,210,549	-	(32,349)	85,641	148,778	11,323	1,423,941	24,156	1,399,785	0.1%	(32,260)
Monterey	14,497,845	-	(227,572)	277,496	736,983	264,491	15,549,243	870,000	14,679,243	0.9%	(338,299)
Napa	6,372,800	-	(107,676)	309,796	136,146	181,753	6,892,819	295,552	6,597,267	0.4%	(152,041)
Nevada	4,479,222	-	(100,179)	95,494	188,097	120,300	4,782,934	433,431	4,349,503	0.3%	(100,239)
Orange	121,988,177	(209,171)	(3,671,441)	6,929,920	3,399,012	5,785,430	134,221,927	2,733,776	131,488,151	8.0%	(3,030,285)
Placer	12,066,757	-	(238,459)	634,796	812,405	284,469	13,559,968	-	13,559,968	0.8%	(312,504)
Plumas	1,448,318	-	(273)	14,929	(96,358)	6,015	1,372,630	-	1,372,630	0.1%	(31,634)
Riverside	65,277,653	(168,861)	(685,149)	923,657	6,005,794	1,643,210	72,996,304	1,931,520	71,064,784	4.3%	(1,637,764)
Sacramento	63,873,883	-	(1,673,778)	3,560,591	2,795,987	2,297,449	70,854,133	1,864,424	68,989,709	4.2%	(1,589,942)
San Benito	2,526,744	-	(8,678)	34,642	(76,728)	16,844	2,492,824	-	2,492,824	0.2%	(57,450)
San Bernardino	72,147,163	-	(1,011,776)	1,264,732	6,860,748	1,333,588	80,594,456	3,269,446	77,325,010	4.7%	(1,782,038)
San Diego	125,478,197	-	(3,506,215)	2,853,598	2,946,565	4,121,481	131,893,627	657,192	131,236,435	8.0%	(3,024,484)

Estimated FY 2014-2015 Allocation of 2% Holdback

	Ending 2013-2014 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	Reduction for FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding From TCTF	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	Estimated Net WAFM Adjustments ¹	Estimated Non-Interpreter Benefits Base Allocation (12-13 and 13-14) ¹	Total	2011-2012 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation ²	Adjusted Base	% of Total Adjusted Base	Estimated Pro-Rata Share of 2% Holdback
Court	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	B	C (A7-B)	D	E
San Francisco	49,195,369	-	-	5,487,134	559,416	1,495,964	56,737,883	-	56,737,883	3.5%	(1,307,585)
San Joaquin	24,914,639	-	(756,034)	1,245,356	1,567,588	535,858	27,507,407	287,747	27,219,660	1.7%	(627,306)
San Luis Obispo	11,449,303	-	(36,773)	298,958	810,391	122,246	12,644,124	241,676	12,402,448	0.8%	(285,828)
San Mateo	29,551,664	-	(211,070)	2,411,112	1,010,636	603,175	33,365,516	443,042	32,922,474	2.0%	(758,734)
Santa Barbara	18,243,443	-	21,451	1,597,662	576,179	121,986	20,560,721	1,055,112	19,505,609	1.2%	(449,528)
Santa Clara	73,257,781	-	(1,120,423)	2,309,467	663,550	825,453	75,935,828	-	75,935,828	4.6%	(1,750,022)
Santa Cruz	9,997,292	-	(174,422)	203,557	541,964	154,317	10,722,708	-	10,722,708	0.7%	(247,116)
Shasta	10,169,734	-	38,857	262,222	451,425	184,003	11,106,240	2,389,668	8,716,572	0.5%	(200,883)
Sierra	538,105	-	(9,268)	9,615	200,465	8,941	747,859	-	747,859	0.0%	(17,235)
Siskiyou	3,072,125	-	(60,127)	91,037	(31,777)	59,428	3,130,686	-	3,130,686	0.2%	(72,150)
Solano	17,240,736	-	(417,276)	353,779	903,899	497,180	18,578,317	435,400	18,142,917	1.1%	(418,123)
Sonoma	19,441,709	-	(584,741)	1,172,049	1,044,695	616,911	21,690,624	440,000	21,250,624	1.3%	(489,743)
Stanislaus	15,957,751	-	(1,003,375)	1,305,230	1,478,609	818,944	18,557,159	9,326	18,547,833	1.1%	(427,455)
Sutter	3,690,455	-	(24,759)	159,760	274,639	72,212	4,172,307	247,071	3,925,236	0.2%	(90,461)
Tehama	2,875,164	-	(17,294)	108,184	195,452	24,866	3,186,372	-	3,186,372	0.2%	(73,433)
Trinity	1,421,481	-	(16,561)	53,679	99,955	19,978	1,578,531	450,608	1,127,923	0.1%	(25,994)
Tulare	13,404,033	-	(127,031)	33,744	950,365	103,341	14,364,451	15,576	14,348,875	0.9%	(330,685)
Tuolumne	2,806,339	-	(2,616)	50,351	56,679	19,249	2,930,002	220,516	2,709,486	0.2%	(62,443)
Ventura	27,023,638	-	(416,492)	968,752	2,031,890	542,126	30,149,914	1,559,157	28,590,757	1.7%	(658,905)
Yolo	7,642,166	-	(206,373)	210,076	378,820	168,486	8,193,175	582,889	7,610,286	0.5%	(175,387)
Yuba	3,261,573	-	(66,104)	90,867	194,496	66,221	3,547,052	132,569	3,414,483	0.2%	(78,690)
Total	1,518,726,356	(702,811)	(29,405,750)	68,818,575	86,300,000	41,034,166	1,684,770,536	40,983,089	1,643,787,447	100.0%	(37,882,840)

1. Assumes the Judicial Council will adopt the TCBCAC's recommendation regarding the allocation of the new trial court benefits funding. Assumes no reduction related to the \$22.7 million revenue shortfall.

2. Butte's sheriff allocation was not transferred to the court's sheriff, so it remains in the court's TCTF base allocation.

**Preliminary One-Time Allocation
Reduction for Fund Balance
Above the 1% Cap**

Court	Preliminary Reduction
Alameda	-
Alpine	(627,134)
Amador	pending
Butte	-
Calaveras	
Colusa	(255,628)
Contra Costa	-
Del Norte	(522,675)
El Dorado	-
Fresno	-
Glenn	(58,702)
Humboldt	-
Imperial	-
Inyo	-
Kern	-
Kings	-
Lake	-
Lassen	(47,596)
Los Angeles	-
Madera	-
Marin	-
Mariposa	-
Mendocino	(167,662)
Merced	(109,723)
Modoc	(1,096)
Mono	-
Monterey	-
Napa	-
Nevada	-
Orange	-
Placer	(4,178)
Plumas	-
Riverside	-
Sacramento	-
San Benito	-
San Bernardino	-
San Diego	-
San Francisco	-
San Joaquin	-
San Luis Obispo	-
San Mateo	-
Santa Barbara	-
Santa Clara	-
Santa Cruz	-
Shasta	-
Sierra	-
Siskiyou	(13,296)
Solano	-
Sonoma	(198,442)
Stanislaus	-
Sutter	-
Tehama	-
Trinity	-
Tulare	-
Tuolumne	(2,118)
Ventura	-
Yolo	-
Yuba	-
Total	(2,008,249)

Intentionally Blank

A - 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form

Enter Court Name Here

FY 2013-14

1	Part A - Computation of Cap		Instructions
2	Expenditures		Court enters FY13/14 year end expenditures
3	Accruals		Court enters FY13/14 year end expense accruals
4	Encumbrances as of June 30		Court enters FY13/14 fund balance reserved for encumbrances
5	Less: Expense related to prior-year encumbrances		This row does not apply to FY13/14. For future use.
6	Prior-Year Operating Budget	0	This cell calculates Prior Year Operating Budget
7	Fund Balance Cap (1% of Operating Budget)	0	This cell calculates fund balance cap

8	Part B - Computation of Fund Balance Subject to Cap		
9	Ending fund balance		Court enters FY13/14 actual year end fund balance
10	Less: Encumbrances as of June 30	0	This cell uses encumbrance amount entered above
11	Less: Statutorily Restricted Funds Per GC 77203	0	This cell is populated from Restricted sheet B1
12	Less: Prepayments		Court enters Pre Payments
13	Fund Balance Subject to Cap	0	This calculated cell is what will be compared to the cap above
14	Part C - Potential Additional Allocation Reduction		
15	Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that if not expensed in the next two years will revert to the TCTF through allocation reduction	0	Self explanatory
16	Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in reversion to TCTF	N/A	Self explanatory
17	Part D - Computation of Disencumbrance Above Cap		
18	Disencumbrance in second year		This row does not apply to FY13/14. For future use.
19	Disencumbrance in third year		This row does not apply to FY13/14. For future use.
20	Allocation Reduction in Second Year	0	This row does not apply to FY13/14. For future use.
21	Allocation Reduction in Third Year	0	This row does not apply to FY13/14. For future use.
22	Part E - Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction		
23	FY 2014/15 Allocation Reduction over the cap	0	This calculated cell is the amount of fund balance over the cap
24	Due to Disencumbrance of Prior-Year Encumbrance	0	This row does not apply to FY13/14. For future use.
25	Total Allocation Reduction	0	This is total amount FY14/15 allocation will be reduced.

