



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: July 28, 2015

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Allocations: Funding for General Court Operations and Specific Costs in Fiscal Year 2015–2016	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	July 28, 2015
Recommended by	Date of Report
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Chair	July 21, 2015
	Contact
	Colin Simpson, 415-865-4566 colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

For fiscal year 2015–2016, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends the Judicial Council allocate \$1.784 billion to the trial courts from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and state General Fund for general court operations and specific costs. The recommended allocations include an allocation of \$1.683 billion in 2015–2016 beginning base funding for general court operations, each court’s share of \$24.2 million in new funding for non-interpreter employee benefits, a statewide net allocation of \$67.9 million for general court operations using the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), a net zero allocation for the WAFM funding floor adjustment, each court’s contribution toward a 2 percent reserve of \$37.7 million, a preliminary one-time allocation reduction related to the 1 percent cap on trial court fund balances, and one-time allocations of \$11 million in new funding for reimbursement of court-appointed dependency counsel costs, \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs, and \$26.9 million in new funding for Proposition 47–related workload costs. Assuming approval of the allocations and given current revenue projections and estimated savings from appropriations, the TCTF will end 2015–2016 with a fund balance of \$18.1 million, of which approximately \$2.9 million will be unrestricted.

Recommendation

Based on actions taken at its July 6, 2015 meeting—which were passed unanimously with the exception of recommendation 8, which was passed 20 to 6—the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 28, 2015:

1. Approve the 2015–2016 beginning base allocation for court operations of \$1.683 billion (see Attachment E, column 9), which carries forward the ending 2014–2015 Trial Court Trust Fund base allocation (column 6), and adds the General Fund benefits base allocation (column 7) and adjustments to annualize partial-year allocations made in 2014–2015 (column 8) (see Attachment A, column 1).
2. Allocate each court’s share of \$24.2 million for 2014–2015 non-interpreter employee benefits cost changes from the Trial Court Trust Fund. (The remaining \$1.2 million provided for 2014–2015 court interpreter benefits cost changes in the Budget Act of 2015 was added to the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.45, now identified as 0150037 (Court Interpreters) appropriation.) (See Attachment A, column 2.)
3. Allocate each court’s share of a net allocation increase of \$67.9 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund using the 2015–2016 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) consisting of a reallocation of \$432.1 million (30 percent) and an additional \$214.2 million of courts’ historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, reallocation of \$146.3 million in new funding provided in 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 for general court operations, and allocation of \$67.9 million in new funding provided in 2015–2016 for general court operations (see Attachment A, column 3).
4. Allocate each court’s share of the 2015–2016 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology funding-floor allocation adjustment, which includes funding-floor allocations for eight courts totaling \$560,269 and a corresponding funding-floor related reduction for all other courts totaling \$560,269, for a net zero total allocation (see Attachment A, column 4).
5. Allocate each court’s one-time contribution toward the statutorily required 2 percent reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund (\$37.7 million in 2015–2016) calculated using the method used from 2012–2013 through 2014–2015 (see Attachment A, column 5).
6. Approve a preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$392,881 to nine courts that are projecting the portion of their 2014–2015 ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent fund balance cap to exceed the cap by \$392,881, as required by statute (see Attachment A, column 6).
7. Approve a one-time allocation of \$11 million in new funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for reimbursement of court-appointed dependency counsel costs based on the Judicial Council–approved allocation methodology as follows:

- a. Allocate \$10.9 million to trial courts with a ratio of 2015–2016 base funding to their workload-based funding need that is below the statewide ratio of 2015–2016 base funding to funding needed to meet the workload standard for juvenile dependency; and
 - b. Set aside a reserve of \$100,000 to reimburse trial courts for unexpected and significant court-appointed dependency counsel costs based on an application and reimbursement process to be approved by the Judicial Council by April 2016 (see Attachment A, column 7).
8. Approve a one-time allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs from the Trial Court Trust Fund based on the most current available postrelease community supervision (PRCS) and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council’s Criminal Justice Services office pursuant to Penal Code section 13155 (each court’s percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole) (see Attachment A, column 8).
9. Approve a one-time allocation of \$26.9 million in new funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for Proposition 47–related workload costs in the following manner:
- a. Allocate \$6.73 million based on each court’s share of the 10-year average of statewide felony filings;
 - b. Allocate \$6.73 million based on each court’s share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from November 5, 2014 to May 31, 2015; and
 - c. Allocate \$13.45 million based on each court’s share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from June 1, 2015 to November 31, 2015 with funding to be distributed in January 2016 (see Attachment A, column 9).

A summary of the allocations by court related to recommendations 1 through 9 is displayed in Attachment A.

Recommendation 1: 2015–2016 Beginning Base Allocation for Court Operations

- 1. Approve the 2015–2016 beginning base allocation for court operations of \$1.683 billion (see Attachment E, column 9), which carries forward the ending 2014–2015 Trial Court Trust Fund base allocation (column 6), and adds the General Fund benefits base allocation (column 7) and adjustments to annualize partial-year allocations made in 2014–2015 (column 8) (see Attachment A, column 1).

Previous council action

None.

Rationale for recommendation 1

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) (full text provided below) requires the council to make a preliminary allocation in July of each fiscal year and a final allocation before February of each fiscal year.

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))

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 2015—and assuming the allocation of the \$1.683 billion, the allocation of \$130.0 million in new funding provided in the Budget Act of 2015 (\$24.2 million for noninterpreter staff benefits, \$11 million for court-appointed dependency counsel, \$26.9 million for Proposition 47 workload costs, and \$67.9 million for general court operations) per recommendations 2, 3, 7 and 9, \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment funding, and \$136.9 million in other allocations already approved by the council from the Program 45.10 (0150010) appropriation authority as discussed in recommendation 7—the TCTF is projected to end fiscal year 2015–2016 with a fund balance of \$18.1 million (see Attachment B, column E, line 34). Because \$15.2 million is restricted by statute or council policy, the unrestricted fund balance is \$2.9 million (see Attachment B, column E, lines 37 and 43).

Recommendation 2: Allocation of New Benefits Funding for 2015–2016

2. Allocate each court's share of \$24.2 million for 2014–2015 non-interpreter employee benefits cost changes from the Trial Court Trust Fund. (The remaining \$1.2 million provided for 2014–2015 court interpreter benefits cost changes in the Budget Act of 2015 was added to the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.45, now identified as 0150037 (Court Interpreters) appropriation.) (See Attachment A, column 2.)

Previous council action

At its June 26, 2015 business meeting, the council approved the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommendation for the allocation of \$13.4 million included in the 2015 Budget Act for trial courts that made progress toward meeting the Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 standard (PEPRA).

Rationale for recommendation 2

In the fall of 2014, a budget change proposal (BCP) in the amount of \$42.7 million was submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) to address the full-year impact to the trial courts in 2015–2016 of changes in costs for retirement, retiree health, and employee health that were

anticipated to occur in 2014–2015. Many of the health-related costs were unconfirmed at that time. The understanding was that a revised request would be submitted in February 2015 that would have updated, confirmed amounts. The Governor’s Proposed Budget included the entire \$42.7 million. Of this amount, \$10.8 million was to restore a portion of the \$22 million reduction included in the Budget Act of 2014 (Stats. 2014, ch. 25), which had been based on the DOF estimate of what the trial courts were currently spending to cover the employee share of costs for retirement. A number of courts negotiated with employee unions to either eliminate or reduce the amount they were contributing to the employee share of retirement. The \$10.8 million was an acknowledgement that these courts were making progress toward meeting the PEPRA standard.

The \$38.8 million in the 2015 Budget Act reflects a decrease in the augmentation of \$3.9 million from the Governor’s initial proposal, which is attributed to employee and retiree health premiums and/or employer share amounts coming in lower than estimated by courts at the time of original submission. The amount provided for retirement reduction restoration increased from \$10.8 million to \$13.4 million. The TCBAC presented recommendations for allocating the \$13.4 million to the Judicial Council at its meeting on June 26.

Allocations considered at the July 6, 2015, TCBAC meeting. The TCBAC unanimously approved the allocation of the remaining \$25.4 million in funding of the \$38.8 million in the 2015 Budget Act for trial courts’ 2014–2015 full-year benefit cost changes based on confirmed rates of \$25.4 million presented by Judicial Council staff. Of this amount, \$24.2 million is to augment Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Program 45.10 Court Operations and \$1.2 million is to augment the TCTF Court Interpreter Program 45.45 appropriation, which is allocated by region and not by individual trial court (see Attachment F).

Recommendation 3: 2015–2016 WAFM Allocation Adjustments

3. Allocate each court’s share of a net allocation increase of \$67.9 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund using the 2015–2016 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) consisting of a reallocation of \$432.1 million (30 percent) and an additional \$214.2 million of courts’ historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, reallocation of \$146.3 million in new funding provided in 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 for general court operations, and allocation of \$67.9 million in new funding provided in 2015–2016 for general court operations (see Attachment A, column 3).

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 2015–2016, 30 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; and eliminated the cluster 1 courts' exemption from having their historical base allocations reallocated using the WAFM. At its June 25 and 26, 2015 business meeting, the council approved both the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) recommendation to use an interim complex civil caseweight for use in the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model for purposes of FY 2015–2016 budget allocations and the TCBCAC recommendation to reduce the \$90.6 million of new funding provided in the 2015 Budget Act by the existing \$22.7 million revenue shortfall before allocating the monies using the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology. WAAC will reassess the interim caseweight using preliminary data from the fall 2015 update of the staff workload study and make any needed adjustments for purposes of FY 2016–2017 budget allocations.

Rationale for recommendation 3

The allocation adjustments reflect the current WAFM, which incorporates the revisions adopted by the council on February 20, 2014 and June 25 and 26, 2015, and allocates funding as directed by Judicial Council action on June 26, 2015. WAFM is updated to include 2014–2015 Schedule 7A salary and benefit budgets (as of July 1, 2014), average filings from 2011–2012 to 2013–2014, three-year average salary data from 2011 to 2013 from the BLS, and 2013–2014 AB 1058 child support grant reimbursement data (see Attachment G).

Attachment H displays the various WAFM allocation adjustments by court, which net to a total of \$67.9 million, as displayed in column R. Column G displays the net reallocation of 30 percent (\$432.1 million) of courts' historical base funding using the current WAFM. Column P displays the reversal of the reallocation of 15 percent of courts' historical base funding that was allocated on an ongoing basis in 2014–2015. The sum of columns G and P provides the net change that is being reallocated in 2015–2016 due to the phase-in of WAFM. Columns J and N display the updated net reallocation of \$146.3 million in historical base funding using the current WAFM and the updated allocation of \$146.3 million in new 2013–2014 and 2014–2015 funding, respectively. Column Q displays the reversal of the ongoing allocations made in 2014–2015 related to the \$146.3 million. The sum of columns J, N, and Q provides the net change in the \$146.3 million that is being allocated in 2015–2016. Column M displays the net reallocation of \$67.9 million in historical base funding. Column O displays the allocation of \$67.9 million in new funding for general court operations provided in 2015–2016.

Other attachments provide detail underlying the information displayed in Attachments G and H. Attachments G1, G2, and G3 provide detail related to the RAS workload/FTE need, BLS factor, and FTE allotment factor, respectively, displayed in Attachment G. Attachment H1 provides the detail of courts' historical WAFM-related base allocation of the \$1.44 billion that is used in

Attachment H. Attachments I and J provide a summary and detailed comparison of changes in WAFM need and its components by court and cluster from FY 2014–2015 to FY 2015–2016.

Recommendation 4: 2015–2016 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment

4. Allocate each court’s share of the 2015–2016 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology funding-floor allocation adjustment, which includes funding-floor allocations for eight courts totaling \$560,269 and a corresponding funding-floor related reduction for all other courts totaling \$560,269, for a net zero total allocation (see Attachment A, column 4).

Previous council action

At its February 20, 2014 meeting, for allocating trial court base funding for court operations, the council established an absolute funding floor (\$750,000 in fiscal year 2015–2016) 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 2015–2016); funded the funding-floor allocation by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor.

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 Attachment A (summary table) and Attachment K (columns C and E). The funding-floor allocations that eight courts received are displayed in column C of Attachment K. As displayed in Attachment K1, two courts were eligible for the absolute funding-floor level of \$750,000, 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 Attachment K.

Attachment K1 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. Attachment K2 displays each court’s 2014–2015 WAFM-related base allocation. Attachment K3 displays each court’s 2015–2016 WAFM-related base allocation before and after any funding-floor adjustment.

Recommendation 5: Allocation of Courts’ Contribution to 2 Percent Reserve

5. Allocate each court’s one-time contribution toward the statutorily required 2 percent reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund (\$37.7 million in 2015–2016) calculated using the method used from 2012–2013 through 2014–2015 (see Attachment A, column 5).

Previous council action

At its July 27, 2012, July 25, 2013, and July 29, 2014 business meetings, the council approved pro rata allocations of the one-time 2% reserve reduction for FY 2012–2013, 2013–2014, and 2014–2015 based on each court’s share of the beginning fiscal year allocation for base operations excluding 2011–2012 allocations related to non-sheriff security.

Rationale for recommendation 5

Based on the Budget Act of 2015, the 2% reserve amount in 2014–2015 is \$37,677,580 which is 2% of the 2015–2016 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Budget Act appropriation of \$1,883,879,000. Although Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B) 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.

The pro rata method used from 2012–2013 through 2014–2015 was a reasonable and fair approach. The 2 percent reserve amount is calculated based on each court’s share of the beginning 2015–2016 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 a zero security allocation in their base allocation. The recommended share for each court is displayed in column E of Attachment L.

Recommendation 6: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1 Percent Cap

6. Approve a preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$392,881 to nine courts that are projecting the portion of their 2014–2015 ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent fund balance cap to exceed the cap by \$392,881, as required by statute (see Attachment A, column 6).

Previous council action

At its July 29, 2014 business meeting, to assist the council in complying with Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A), the Judicial Council approved an 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.

Rationale for recommendation 6

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the council to make a preliminary allocation reduction in July of each fiscal year (see Attachment 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. The reductions reflect the calculated preliminary allocation reduction amounts provided by the courts on the 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form (see Attachment N).

Recommendation 7: Allocation for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Costs

7. Approve a one-time allocation of \$11 million in new funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for reimbursement of court-appointed dependency counsel costs based on the Judicial Council–approved allocation methodology as follows:
 - a. Allocate \$10.9 million to trial courts with a ratio of 2015–2016 base funding to their workload-based funding need that is below the statewide ratio of 2015–2016 base funding to funding needed to meet the workload standard for juvenile dependency; and
 - b. Set aside a reserve of \$100,000 to reimburse trial courts for unexpected and significant court-appointed dependency counsel costs based on an application and reimbursement process to be approved by the Judicial Council by April 2016 (see Attachment A, column 7).

Previous council action

The Judicial Council at its April 17, 2015 meeting approved several recommendations from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee that direct the allocation of court-appointed counsel funding to the courts. The council approved a methodology for allocating the existing base funding of \$103,725,444 in FY 2014–2015 based on each court’s workload as calculated by the workload model for juvenile dependency, and adjusted to available funding statewide (“workload-based funding”). The council decided to phase in the new allocation methodology with annual increases or decreases in fiscal years 2015–2016, 2016–2017, and 2017–2018, and in fiscal year 2018–2019 all courts will receive an equivalent percentage of statewide funding as calculated by the workload model. The allocations are to be phased in by basing each court’s annual allocation on a percentage of its historical base in FY 2014–2015 and a percentage of its workload-based funding in the current fiscal year, with the percentages changing annually as follows:

- 2015–2016: court receives 10% of workload-based funding and 90% of historical base;
- 2016–2017: 40% of workload-based funding and 60% of historical base;
- 2017–2018: 80% of workload-based funding and 20% of historical base; and
- 2018–2019: 100% of workload-based funding.

The council also directed that any new state funds designated for court-appointed dependency counsel in addition to the current \$103.7 million be allocated to courts with a ratio of allocated base funding to their calculated workload-based funding need that is below the statewide ratio of base funding to workload-based funding required to meet the workload standard. Additional Judicial Council actions related to the report that impact funding allocations in FY 2015–2016 directed that a \$100,000 reserve be established for unexpected costs and that the Superior Court of Colusa County be assigned a base allocation of 76% of its workload-based funding need.

At its April 17 and June 26, 2015, meetings, the Judicial Council adopted the TCBAC recommendations regarding allocating \$15.0 million from the TCTF Programs 30.05 (0140010) and 30.15 (0140019) expenditure authority in FY 2015–2016 for 13 projects and programs (see Attachment C, column C) as well as allocating \$136.9 million from the TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) expenditure authority for costs related to court-appointed dependency counsel, jurors, self-help centers, replacement screening stations, elder abuse, and FY 2013–2014 restored benefits funding (see Attachment D, column C).

Two items that will be allocated from the Program 45.10 (0150010) appropriation are pending (see Attachment D, rows 22 and 36). 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 council once final 2014–2015 collections are known.

A number of allocations are required by the Budget Act (a \$50 million distribution from the Immediate & Critical Needs Account for court operations [see Attachment D, row 24]); have already been acted on by the council (court-appointed dependency counsel collection reimbursement allocation rollover [see row 35]; various revenue distributions [see rows 39, 42, and 43]); are required by statute (various revenue distributions [see rows 40, 41, and 44]); or are authorized charges for the cost of programs or cash advances (see rows 47, 48, and 49).

Rationale for recommendation 7

These allocations reflect the actions taken by the council at its April 17, 2015 meeting. The allocation amounts by court of the \$10.9 million in new funding reflect the allocation methodology for new funding approved by the Judicial Council. Only courts with allocated base funding of less than 75.7% (statewide ratio) of their calculated workload-based need are allocated a proportionate share of the \$10.9 million based on their share of the remaining funding need of all courts that qualify. At the April 17 meeting, the Judicial Council also directed that a \$100,000 reserve be established. Attachment O summarizes the allocation of court-appointed dependency counsel funding to the local courts as calculated by this method for FY 2015–2016. Attachment P updates the four-year reallocation plan in the January 2015 Judicial Council report.

Recommendation 8: Allocation for Criminal Justice Realignment Costs

8. Approve a one-time allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs from the Trial Court Trust Fund based on the most current available postrelease community supervision (PRCS) and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council's Criminal Justice Services office pursuant to Penal Code section 13155 (each court's percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole) (see Attachment A, column 8).

Previous council action

In fiscal years 2011–2012 and 2012–2013, the funding provided in the Budget Act to address costs related to the Criminal Justice Realignment Act of 2011 was allocated to the trial courts based on each court's percentage of the total estimated petitions for revocation, as estimated by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Based on the recommendation of the TCBAC, the funding was split in FY 2013–2014 into two equal amounts with the first half being allocated in July 2013 based on the same methodology as previous allocations and the second half in February 2014 using a methodology that incorporated equally both population (each court's percentage of the statewide population of individuals on postrelease community supervision (PRCS) and parole) and workload (each court's percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole).

At the Judicial Council's June 27, 2014 business meeting, the council approved the TCBAC recommendation that the FY 2014–2015 criminal realignment allocation should be split into two equal amounts with the first half being allocated in July 2014 using the same population and workload methodology, but that the second half, in January 2015, be allocated solely based on PRCS and parole.

Rationale for recommendation 8

Allocation options considered at the July 6, 2015 TCBAC meeting. The TCBAC reviewed the options presented by the Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee and voted to recommend the approval of Option 1 but amended it to be one full-year allocation of \$9.223 million instead of two half-year allocations of \$4.6 million based on the Judicial Council–approved methodology (see Attachment Q). The following options for allocating the \$9.223 million 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 below.

Option 1—Allocate funding based on the workload methodology approved by the Judicial Council in the following manner:

- Allocate half of the \$9.223 million (\$4.6 million) in July 2105 based on the most current available PRCS and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial

Council’s Criminal Justice Services (CJS) pursuant to Penal Code section 13155 (each court’s percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole).

- Allocate the remaining \$4.6 million in January 2016 based on the most current available PRCS and parole workload data using the same methodology.

Option 2—Allocate the first half of the funding based on the workload methodology approved by the Judicial Council, and review and reassess the methodology for the second half of funding.

- Allocate half of the \$9.223 million (\$4.6 million) based on the most current available PRCS and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council’s Criminal Justice Services (CJS) pursuant to Penal Code section 13155 (each court’s percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole).
- Allow the Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee to reassess the methodology using updated data to ensure that the allocation methodology most accurately reflects the workload impact of realignment and present a recommendation at the next TCBAC meeting on August 5, 2015. The remaining \$4.6 million would be allocated in January 2016 using the methodology identified as the most appropriate measure of court workload.

Discussion. The TCBAC decided to amend Option 1 to only one allocation from two half-year allocations because of the difficulty in being able to fully utilize the funding by the trial courts in the second part of the year with the 1 percent cap on fund balance limitations imposed by Government Code section 77203. Some committee members did not agree with this approach and believed Option 2 would still allocate 50 percent of funding in July 2015 for courts at the beginning of the fiscal year and provide time for the Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee to reevaluate the data to see if all the workload was being captured in the current council-approved methodology. However, some TCBAC members believed that changing the allocation methodology during the fiscal year would be difficult for courts but that the subcommittee should proceed with reviewing the data to determine if the methodology needs to be changed for next fiscal year.

Recommendation 9: Allocation for Proposition 47 Workload Costs

9. Approve a one-time allocation of \$26.9 million in new funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for Proposition 47–related workload costs in the following manner:
 - a. Allocate \$6.73 million based on each court’s share of the 10-year average of statewide felony filings;
 - b. Allocate \$6.73 million based on each court’s share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from November 5, 2014 to May 31, 2015; and

- c. Allocate \$13.45 million based on each court's share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from June 1, 2015 to November 31, 2015 with funding to be distributed in January 2016 (see Attachment A, column 9).

Previous council action

None.

Rationale for recommendation 9

The 2015 Budget Act includes a General Fund augmentation of \$26.9 million in 2015–2016 to address increased workload associated with Proposition 47, the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act. The 2015 Governor's Budget proposed an additional \$7.6 million in 2016–2017 for Proposition 47 workload; however, the Legislature did not take action on this portion of the proposal. The initiative, which was approved by California voters November 2014, reduces most possessory drug offenses and thefts of property valued under \$950 to straight misdemeanors; creates a process for individuals currently serving sentences for these offenses to petition the courts for resentencing; and creates a process for individuals who have completed sentences for these offenses to apply to the courts to have these crimes reclassified as misdemeanors.

The California Department of Finance (DOF) requested information from the Judicial Council regarding the impact of Proposition 47 on the courts. In response to this request in December 2014, Judicial Council staff began conducting a monthly survey of the courts to determine the number of petitions for resentencing and applications for reclassification received by each jurisdiction since the passage of Proposition 47, as well additional information on related workload impacts on the courts. Judicial Council staff have also been interviewing court stakeholders and gathering qualitative information from the courts to more fully understand the effect of the initiative on the judicial branch. These data will be provided to both the Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee as well as the DOF and may be used to inform future decisions related to resource needs and allocation methodologies that will support the courts in implementing the legislation.

In February 2014, Judge Earl appointed Judge Thomas Borris and Mr. David Yamasaki as co-chairs to the Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee to work on the development of allocation methodologies for the \$26.9 million included in the 2015 Governor's Budget for new workload for trial courts due to Proposition 47. The subcommittee met once to consider options for the allocation of the \$26.9 million.

Allocation options considered at the July 6, 2015 TCBAC meeting. The TCBAC reviewed the options presented by the Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee and voted unanimously to recommend allocating the funds using the methodology set forth in Option 3 below (see Attachment R). The following options for allocating the \$26.9 million 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.

Option 1—One full-year allocation of \$26.9 million using the percentage of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from November 5, 2014 to May 31, 2015 (\$13.45 million), and the 10-year average percentage of statewide felony filings (\$13.45 million). Total of \$26.9 million would be allocated in July of 2015.

Option 2—Two half-year allocations using the percentage of Proposition 47 petitions and felony filings in the following manner:

- (a) Allocate 50 percent of \$26.9 million in first half of fiscal year funding using the percentage of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from November 5, 2014 to May 31, 2015 (\$6.73 million), and the 10-year average percentage of statewide felony filings (\$6.73 million). Total of \$13.45 million would be allocated in July of 2015.
- (b) Allocate additional 50 percent of \$26.9 million in second half of fiscal year funding using the same methodology, but incorporating updated Proposition 47 data—percentage of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from June 1, 2015 to November 31, 2015 (\$6.73 million)—and the 10-year average percentage of statewide felony filings (\$6.73 million). Total of \$13.45 million would be allocated in January of 2016.

Option 3—Two half-year allocations using a hybrid methodology (50 percent based on Proposition 47 petitions and felony filings; second 50 percent based only on Proposition 47 filings) in the following manner:

- (a) Allocate 50 percent of \$26.9 million in first half of fiscal year funding using on percentage of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from November 5, 2014 to May 31, 2015 (\$6.73 million), and the 10-year average percentage of statewide felony filings (\$6.73 million). Total of \$13.45 million would be allocated in July of 2015.
- (b) Allocate additional 50 percent of \$26.9 million in second half of fiscal year funding based only on percentage of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from June 1, 2015 to November 31, 2015. Total of \$13.45 million would be allocated in January of 2016.

Option 4—Set aside a reserve of \$100,000 from the \$26.9 million in 2015–2016 to cover unforeseen expenses because courts are still implementing and modifying Proposition 47 procedures. Options 1, 2, and 3 would be adjusted to reflect this methodology and the funding allocated would total \$26.8 million.

Discussion. The TCBAC recommends including felony filings along with petitions for resentencing and reclassification for the first 50 percent of \$26.9 million because not all courts were able to adequately capture information on Proposition 47–related workload in the initial months after the initiative passed. However, the committee recommends that the second allocation in FY 2015–2016 for the remaining 50 percent of \$26.9 million should only be based on petitions for resentencing and reclassification received from June 1 through November 31, 2015 due to the passage of Proposition 47. The committee did not support maintaining a small reserve of \$100,000 (per Option 4) for unforeseen expenses because there would be two half-year allocations, and the data used for petitions for resentencing and reclassification not captured

in a court's data for the first allocation could be accounted for in the data used for the allocation in the second half of the fiscal year.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

No public comments were received when the recommendations were considered by the TCBCAC at its July 6, 2015 meeting.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations
2. Attachment B: Trial Court Trust Fund—Fund Condition Statement
3. Attachment C: TCTF FY 2015–16 Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Appropriations Allocations Approved by the Judicial Council
4. Attachment D: FY 2014–15 and FY 2015–16 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations
5. Attachment E: 2015–2016 Beginning Base Allocation: 2014–2015 Beginning Base, 2014–2015 Base Allocations, and Annualization
6. Attachment F: Allocation of New Funding for 2014-2015 Benefit Cost Changes
7. Attachment G: Computation of Funding Need Using the 2015–2016 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology
8. Attachment G1: 2015–2016 RAS FTE Need
9. Attachment G2: BLS Factor
10. Attachment G3: FTE Allotment Factor
11. Attachment H: 2015–2016 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding
12. Attachment H1: Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM
13. Attachment I: Summary of Changes from 2014–2015 Total WAFM Funding Need
14. Attachment J: Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster
15. Attachment K: FY 2015–2016 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor
16. Attachment K1: Determination of Funding Floor
17. Attachment K2: 2014–2015 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
18. Attachment K3: Estimated 2015–2016 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
19. Attachment L: Estimated FY 2015–2016 Allocation of 2% Holdback
20. Attachment M: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap
21. Attachment N: FY 2014–15 - 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form
22. Attachment O: 2015–2016 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding
23. Attachment P: Four-year Dependency Counsel Funding Reallocation Plan
24. Attachment Q: Allocation of \$9.2 Million of Criminal Justice Realignment Funding Using Percentage of Petitions to Revoke/Modify PRCS and Parole
25. Attachment R: Allocation of \$13.45 Million of \$26.9 Million in New Funding for Proposition 47 Workload

Intentionally Blank

Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2	Recommendation 3	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 5	Recommendation 6	Recommendation 7	Recommendation 8	Recommendation 9	Recommendation 9	
	Preliminary 2015-16 Base Allocation (TCTF and GF)	2014-15 Benefits Funding	2015-16 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2015-16 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment	2% Reserve (One-time)	Preliminary Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap (One-time)	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (One-time)	Criminal Justice Realignment (One-time)	Proposition 47 Funding (1st Half) (One-time)	Proposition 47 Funding (2nd Half) (One-time)	Total
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Alameda	75,540,886	562,020	(1,264,416)	(23,470)	(1,557,034)	(8,935)	-	276,057	239,512	pending	73,764,620
Alpine	747,833	5,289	(44,027)	36,601	(16,129)	(102,954)	-	389	424	pending	627,425
Amador	2,137,937	15,693	18,171	(726)	(47,002)	-	-	4,857	17,279	pending	2,146,209
Butte	8,961,947	68,952	418,401	(2,905)	(194,208)	-	-	65,469	113,872	pending	9,431,527
Calaveras	1,994,159	30,138	25,667	(691)	(44,539)	-	37,560	4,468	17,465	pending	2,064,228
Colusa	1,535,072	10,604	11,496	127,447	(36,452)	(21,343)	-	2,137	8,578	pending	1,637,538
Contra Costa	37,747,350	590,873	1,659,325	(12,908)	(869,979)	-	-	89,752	132,375	pending	39,336,788
Del Norte	2,489,970	73,071	(92,520)	(791)	(53,607)	(133,139)	-	6,994	14,324	pending	2,304,301
El Dorado	6,342,136	90,455	140,211	(2,148)	(141,851)	-	-	28,363	59,718	pending	6,516,885
Fresno	39,657,551	1,581,245	3,407,730	(14,653)	(969,482)	-	-	264,401	555,965	pending	44,482,757
Glenn	1,863,014	31,311	(109,604)	69,935	(39,968)	-	27,831	3,497	13,679	pending	1,859,695
Humboldt	5,640,662	46,895	264,310	(1,900)	(125,731)	-	-	43,516	64,441	pending	5,932,193
Imperial	7,642,037	95,925	485,034	(2,573)	(169,752)	-	-	36,717	77,168	pending	8,164,556
Inyo	2,072,063	(7,122)	(50,400)	3,850	(39,750)	-	-	2,331	7,296	pending	1,988,268
Kern	37,287,445	(217,620)	4,739,894	(13,527)	(904,131)	-	279,950	373,386	406,173	pending	41,951,570
Kings	6,001,693	29,342	331,857	(1,910)	(128,253)	-	122,056	49,539	98,493	pending	6,502,816
Lake	3,209,022	33,201	(50,322)	(987)	(64,605)	-	-	13,210	35,779	pending	3,175,299
Lassen	2,267,714	6,803	(18,996)	(657)	(42,335)	(16,217)	-	7,771	16,338	pending	2,220,420
Los Angeles	486,747,776	7,896,395	26,818,347	(163,090)	(11,025,104)	-	6,225,630	3,445,560	2,583,386	pending	522,528,901
Madera	6,733,061	223,020	267,872	(2,290)	(147,864)	(3,222)	133,016	41,574	85,877	pending	7,331,045
Marin	12,957,597	(78,894)	(715,208)	(4,090)	(264,717)	-	-	24,089	33,524	pending	11,952,302
Mariposa	1,071,772	4,769	15,835	54,687	(24,765)	-	4,975	1,360	5,825	pending	1,134,459
Mendocino	4,868,910	56,174	126,710	(1,607)	(104,221)	-	-	29,011	38,056	pending	5,013,033
Merced	10,689,301	161,921	590,591	(3,718)	(249,006)	-	120,042	92,472	101,120	pending	11,502,724
Modoc	932,090	9,491	(15,665)	(309)	(19,972)	-	-	1,166	3,765	pending	910,565
Mono	1,423,941	10,568	(8,570)	126,524	(33,046)	-	1,442	389	8,454	pending	1,529,702
Monterey	15,549,243	205,587	630,401	(5,124)	(336,485)	-	85,664	50,704	116,895	pending	16,296,885
Napa	6,892,819	(3,237)	224,679	(2,173)	(148,372)	-	30,266	12,433	34,030	pending	7,040,445
Nevada	4,782,935	79,983	(7,657)	(1,394)	(96,235)	-	-	10,685	22,227	pending	4,790,544
Orange	133,822,160	3,449,769	2,324,353	(45,022)	(2,994,022)	(90,637)	-	459,641	1,349,712	pending	138,275,954
Placer	13,559,969	84,431	974,682	(4,604)	(317,318)	-	82,994	25,061	113,877	pending	14,519,091
Plumas	1,372,630	2,474	(114,763)	(421)	(27,194)	-	-	777	6,704	pending	1,240,208
Riverside	72,996,304	(650,572)	6,856,320	(25,208)	(1,678,242)	(15)	1,528,770	749,297	803,801	pending	80,580,454
Sacramento	70,854,133	332,406	3,657,752	(23,950)	(1,590,627)	-	-	198,738	605,935	pending	74,034,387
San Benito	2,492,824	21,556	(91,160)	(810)	(52,370)	-	44,415	9,519	23,758	pending	2,447,732
San Bernardino	80,594,456	1,521,168	6,757,237	(27,713)	(1,855,587)	-	1,111,278	748,520	720,903	pending	89,570,262
San Diego	131,693,616	2,061,274	1,471,869	(43,501)	(2,915,700)	-	-	467,218	2,100,319	pending	134,835,094
San Francisco	56,737,884	631,291	341,981	(19,228)	(1,255,432)	-	-	98,883	181,335	pending	56,716,713
San Joaquin	27,507,408	818,234	2,224,751	(9,901)	(656,469)	-	-	178,145	279,549	pending	30,341,717
San Luis Obispo	12,644,125	972	497,227	(4,103)	(278,566)	-	-	51,481	91,302	pending	13,002,438
San Mateo	33,365,517	363,484	477,303	(10,796)	(730,043)	-	182,611	40,019	133,764	pending	33,821,859
Santa Barbara	20,560,722	227,423	209,451	(6,510)	(430,871)	-	-	64,303	152,896	pending	20,777,413

Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2	Recommendation 3	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 5	Recommendation 6	Recommendation 7	Recommendation 8	Recommendation 9	Recommendation 9	
	Preliminary 2015-16 Base Allocation (TCTF and GF)	2014-15 Benefits Funding	2015-16 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2015-16 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment	2% Reserve (One-time)	Preliminary Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap (One-time)	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (One-time)	Criminal Justice Realignment (One-time)	Proposition 47 Funding (1st Half) (One-time)	Proposition 47 Funding (2nd Half) (One-time)	Total
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Santa Clara	75,935,828	1,851,301	(2,883,909)	(24,455)	(1,621,085)	-	-	129,383	322,568	pending	73,709,631
Santa Cruz	10,722,708	86,623	371,304	(3,603)	(242,209)	-	-	32,054	96,820	pending	11,063,698
Shasta	11,106,240	135,012	532,744	(3,053)	(203,702)	-	95,136	80,427	145,202	pending	11,888,006
Sierra	747,859	3,781	(44,895)	38,053	(16,130)	(16,419)	-	971	896	pending	714,117
Siskiyou	3,130,687	40,262	(154,682)	(968)	(65,476)	-	-	15,736	19,765	pending	2,985,324
Solano	18,578,318	95,975	750,033	(6,207)	(413,120)	-	-	111,511	130,798	pending	19,247,309
Sonoma	21,690,624	825,673	609,606	(7,452)	(493,721)	-	-	150,947	146,528	pending	22,922,206
Stanislaus	18,557,159	(289,912)	1,464,546	(6,521)	(431,340)	-	-	101,409	305,023	pending	19,700,363
Sutter	4,172,308	28,465	302,731	(1,431)	(92,308)	-	47,186	12,433	52,934	pending	4,522,318
Tehama	3,186,372	72,996	210,687	(1,160)	(75,000)	-	55,106	15,347	47,204	pending	3,511,553
Trinity	1,578,531	37,893	(35,061)	103,171	(26,762)	-	9,455	3,497	8,317	pending	1,679,042
Tulare	14,364,451	353,922	1,113,228	(5,107)	(341,767)	-	237,041	82,564	232,696	pending	16,037,029
Tuolumne	2,930,003	65,010	(13,277)	(894)	(59,676)	-	36,743	5,440	32,677	pending	2,996,025
Ventura	30,149,914	288,505	1,719,233	(10,082)	(663,756)	-	315,958	323,264	273,981	pending	32,397,018
Yolo	8,193,176	147,776	438,940	(2,736)	(177,313)	-	59,433	40,602	122,546	pending	8,822,424
Yuba	3,547,053	9,769	132,620	(1,191)	(77,181)	-	-	43,516	36,150	pending	3,690,736
Reserve	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	100,000
Total	1,682,580,918	24,229,808	67,900,000	0	(37,677,580)	(392,881)	10,974,556	9,223,000	13,450,000	13,450,000	1,783,737,821

Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	FY 2013-14 (Year-End Financial Statement) Col. A	FY 2014-15 (Estimated) Col. B	FY 2015-16		
				Utilize All Expenditure Authority ¹ Col. C	Estimated Unused Expenditure Authority Col. D	Estimated Use of Expenditure Authority Col. E
1	Beginning Balance	82,346,997	21,218,232	6,743,787	-	6,743,787
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	(2,688,884)	5,754,568	-	-	-
3	Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance	79,658,114	26,972,800	6,743,787	-	6,743,787
4	Revenue	1,374,450,890	1,341,324,951	1,319,206,676	-	1,319,206,676
5	<i>Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue</i>	<i>658,755,572</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	-	<i>659,050,502</i>
6	<i>Civil Fee Revenue</i>	<i>384,474,327</i>	<i>355,952,541</i>	<i>338,643,093</i>	-	<i>338,643,093</i>
7	<i>Court Operations Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>149,578,279</i>	<i>139,931,778</i>	<i>131,033,479</i>	-	<i>131,033,479</i>
8	<i>Civil Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>154,784,402</i>	<i>159,372,012</i>	<i>164,263,670</i>	-	<i>164,263,670</i>
9	<i>Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>25,360,674</i>	<i>24,994,594</i>	<i>24,237,643</i>	-	<i>24,237,643</i>
10	<i>Interest from SMIF</i>	<i>94,882</i>	<i>151,376</i>	<i>108,806</i>	-	<i>108,806</i>
11	<i>Sanctions and Contempt Fines</i>	<i>1,237,263</i>	<i>1,586,715</i>	<i>1,111,362</i>	-	<i>1,111,362</i>
12	<i>Miscellaneous Revenue</i>	<i>165,492</i>	<i>285,431</i>	<i>758,121</i>	-	<i>758,121</i>
13	General Fund Transfer	742,319,017	922,648,255	943,382,019	-	943,382,019
14	General Fund Transfer - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	-	-	114,700,000	-	114,700,000
15	General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	-	30,900,000	66,200,000	-	66,200,000
16	Reduction Offset Transfers	26,080,000	26,080,000	6,080,000	-	6,080,000
17	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	12,804,047	12,678,778	13,220,122	-	13,220,122
18	Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	2,155,653,954	2,333,631,984	2,462,788,817	-	2,462,788,817
19	Total Resources	2,235,312,067	2,360,604,784	2,469,532,604	-	2,469,532,604
20	Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations					
21	Program 30 (0140) - Expenditures/Allocations	22,672,123	19,718,918	18,151,100	(1,169,899)	16,981,201
22	Program 30.05 (0140010) - Judicial Council (Staff)	3,764,788	4,095,938	5,126,100	(244,552)	4,881,548
23	Program 30.15 (0140019) - Trial Court Operations	18,907,335	15,622,980	13,025,000	(925,347)	12,099,653
24						
25	Program 45 (0150) - Expenditures/Allocations	2,191,275,014	2,333,437,799	2,460,017,630	(25,588,856)	2,434,428,774
26	Program 45.10 (0150010) - Support for Trial Court Operations	1,753,105,306	1,883,174,214	1,878,540,000	(20,926,023)	1,857,613,977
27	Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	-	-	114,700,000	-	114,700,000
28	Program 45.25 (0150019) - Comp. of Superior Court Judges	312,138,986	319,803,869	335,320,730	(3,190,711)	332,130,019
29	Program 45.35 (0150028) - Assigned Judges	25,496,371	24,792,538	26,047,000	-	26,047,000
30	Program 45.45 (0150037) - Court Interpreters	90,983,918	96,802,928	95,855,000	-	95,855,000
31	Program 45.55 (0150046) - Grants	9,550,433	8,864,250	9,554,900	(1,472,122)	8,082,778
32	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	146,697	704,280	-	-	-
33	Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations	2,214,093,835	2,353,860,997	2,478,168,730	(26,758,755)	2,451,409,975
34	Ending Fund Balance	21,218,232	6,743,787	(8,636,126)	26,758,755	18,122,629
35						
36	Fund Balance Detail					
37	Restricted Fund Balance	18,557,776	15,527,424	15,180,335	-	15,180,335
38	<i>Court Interpreter Program</i>	<i>14,734,148</i>	<i>10,917,600</i>	<i>10,917,600</i>	-	<i>10,917,600</i>
39	<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	<i>996,574</i>	<i>807,407</i>	<i>1,102,164</i>	-	<i>1,102,164</i>
40	<i>Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements</i>	<i>1,632,117</i>	<i>927,837</i>	<i>927,837</i>	-	<i>927,837</i>
41	<i>Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services</i>	<i>1,168,453</i>	<i>380,151</i>	-	-	-
42	<i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel</i>	<i>26,484</i>	<i>2,494,429</i>	<i>2,232,735</i>	-	<i>2,232,735</i>
43	Unrestricted Fund Balance	2,660,456	(8,783,637)	(23,816,461)	26,758,755	2,942,294
44						
45	Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit)	(58,439,881)	(20,229,013)	(15,379,913)	26,758,755	11,378,842

1. Expenditure authority reflects the 2015 Budget Act appropriation authority adjusted for planned transfers between Program 45.10 (0150010) and Program 45.25 (0150019) appropriation due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships, between Program 45.10 (0150010) and Program 45.45 (0150037) appropriation due to the court interpreter portion of \$42.8 million for new benefits funding, and an increase to Program 45.25 to reflect a 2.48% judges' salary increase.

**TCTF FY 2015-16 Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations Appropriations Attachment C
Allocations Approved by the Judicial Council**

		FY 2015-16 Judicial Council-Approved Allocations		
#	Project and Program Title	Judicial Council (Staff) ¹	Trial Court Operations ¹	Total
		Col. A	Col. B	Col C (Col. A + B)
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	-	113,000	113,000
2	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000	-	260,000
3	Equal Access Fund	197,000	-	197,000
4	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	500,000	7,793,153	8,293,153
5	Statewide Support for Collections Programs	625,000	-	625,000
6	Costs Reimbursed by the Trial Courts			
7	California Courts Technology Center	-	1,581,000	1,581,000
8	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	-	625,000	625,000
9	CLETS Services/Integration	114,000	400,000	514,000
10	Human Resources - Court Investigation	-	94,500	94,500
11	Interim Case Management System	-	843,000	843,000
12	Other Post-Employment Benefits Valuations		650,000	650,000
13	Phoenix Financial Services	107,000	-	107,000
14	Phoenix HR Services	1,360,000	-	1,360,000
15	Total, Program/Project Allocations	3,163,000	12,099,653	15,262,653
16	Estimated State Controller's Office services charges	1,718,548	-	1,718,548
17	Total, Estimated Expenditures	4,881,548	12,099,653	16,981,201
19	Budget Act Appropriation and Changes Using Provisional Language Authority¹	5,126,100	13,025,000	18,151,100
20	Appropriation Balance	244,552	925,347	1,169,899

1. Provisional language in the Budget Act of 2015 allows the Judicial Council 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. Provisional language also allows up to \$11.274 million to be transferred to the Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriation authority for the recovery of costs for administrative services provided to the trial courts.

FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations

#	Description	Type	Estimated 2014-15	Estimated 2015-16	For Judicial Council Approval on July 28
			Col. A	Col. B	Col. C
1	I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation	Base	1,518,726,356	1,614,580,055	Rec. 1
3	II. Adjustments				
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-702,811	-817,737	Rec. 1
6	III. FY 2014-2015 Allocations				
7	\$86.3 Million in New Funding	Base	86,300,000		N/A
8	\$42.8 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	41,034,166		N/A
9	FY 2012-13 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	-29,405,750		N/A
10	\$22.7 Million Revenue Shortfall	Non-Base	-22,700,000		N/A
11	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding (FY 2012-13 costs)	Non-Base	130,450		N/A
13	IV. FY 2015-2016 Allocations				
14	\$25.4 Million in FY 2014-15 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base		24,229,808	Rec. 2
15	\$13.4 Million in FY 2013-14 Restored Benefits Funding	Base		13,274,798	JC Approved
16	\$90.6 Million in New Funding Offset by \$22.7 Million Revenue Shortfall	Base		67,900,000	Rec. 3 & 4
17	\$26.9 Million Proposition 47 Workload Funding	Non-Base		26,900,000	Rec. 9
18	Cash Advance From FY 2015-16 Allocation	Non-Base	20,946,674		
20	V. Statutory Allocation Adjustments				
21	2.0% Holdback	Non-Base	-37,882,840	-37,677,580	Rec. 5
22	1.5% & 0.5% Emergency Funding & Unspent Funding Allocated Back to Courts	Non-Base	37,882,840	37,677,580	Pending
23	1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-1,711,712	-392,881	Rec. 6
24	Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-10,000,000	-50,000,000	N/A
25	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-1,371,906		N/A
27	VI. Allocation for Reimbursements				
28	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	103,725,445	114,700,000	Rec. 7
29	Jury	Non-Base	14,000,000	14,500,000	JC Approved
30	Criminal Justice Realignment	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000	Rec. 8
31	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000	2,286,000	JC Approved
32	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000	2,500,000	JC Approved
33	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000	332,000	JC Approved
34	CSA Audits ¹	Non-Base	254,600	325,000	JC Approved
35	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement Rollover	Non-Base	775,519		N/A
36	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement	Non-Base	525,139	857,924	Pending
38	VII. Estimated Revenue Distributions				
39	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	112,285,492	115,960,941	N/A
40	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	23,440,758	25,308,207	N/A
41	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494	10,907,494	N/A
42	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	3,111,367	2,880,243	N/A
43	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,436,513	2,256,310	N/A
44	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	943,840	N/A
46	VIII. Miscellaneous Charges				
47	Repayment of Prior Year Cash Advance	Non-Base	-1,734,355	-20,946,674	N/A
48	Infrastructure Charges Prior Year Adjustment- Phoenix Services	Non-Base	1,200,542	380,151	N/A
49	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-5,124,326	-5,774,500	N/A
50	Total		1,882,334,495	1,972,313,977	
52	Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriation Budget Act ²		1,894,142,000	1,998,579,000	
53	Transfer to Compensation of Superior Court Judges appropriation due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships		-2,755,000	-3,573,000	
54	Transfer to Court Interpreters appropriation due to court interpreter portion of \$42.8 million for new benefits funding		-1,766,000	-1,766,000	
55	Adjusted Appropriation		1,889,621,000	1,993,240,000	
57	Estimated Remaining Appropriation		7,286,505	20,926,023	

¹ Provision 12 of the 2015 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.

² FY 2015-16 includes the Budget Act Appropriation of \$114,700,000 for Item 0250-102-0932 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel.

Intentionally Blank

2015-2016 Beginning Base Allocation: 2014-2015 Beginning Base, 2014-2015 Base Allocations, and Annualization

	Beginning 2014-2015 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	2014-15 WAFM Allocation	2014-15 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	TCTF Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Ending 2014-2015 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (2010- 11 and 2011-12)	Annualization of Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Preliminary Beginning Base in 2015-2016
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6 = Sum of 1 to 5	7	8	9 = Sum of 6 to 8
Alameda	70,376,597	506,404	(53,299)	1,609,137	-	72,438,839	3,102,047	-	75,540,886
Alpine	528,906	(73,967)	266,308	6,245	-	727,493	20,340	-	747,833
Amador	2,074,136	(10,168)	(1,615)	23,828	-	2,086,181	51,756	-	2,137,937
Butte	8,075,624	609,976	(6,221)	158,491	-	8,837,870	124,077	-	8,961,947
Calaveras	1,881,088	18,308	(1,513)	45,771	-	1,943,653	50,506	-	1,994,159
Colusa	1,357,979	13,188	123,127	16,004	-	1,510,299	24,773	-	1,535,072
Contra Costa	33,517,127	1,841,330	(27,312)	1,020,012	-	36,351,158	1,396,192	-	37,747,350
Del Norte	2,237,643	114,280	(1,783)	45,700	-	2,395,840	94,130	-	2,489,970
El Dorado	5,850,946	263,889	(4,768)	18,950	-	6,129,016	213,120	-	6,342,136
Fresno	32,830,001	2,789,941	(29,356)	923,246	(196,645)	36,317,187	3,340,364	-	39,657,551
Glenn	1,763,391	(11,939)	32,836	24,061	-	1,808,349	54,665	-	1,863,014
Humboldt	5,158,165	276,212	(4,042)	137,243	-	5,567,578	73,084	-	5,640,662
Imperial	6,798,738	518,519	(5,349)	204,591	-	7,516,498	125,539	-	7,642,037
Inyo	1,839,570	(62,695)	186,861	32,741	-	1,996,477	75,586	-	2,072,063
Kern	28,965,977	4,252,465	(26,903)	551,636	-	33,743,176	3,544,269	-	37,287,445
Kings	5,512,705	425,836	(4,106)	22,140	-	5,956,575	45,118	-	6,001,693
Lake	3,103,380	95,557	(2,237)	3,199	-	3,199,899	9,123	-	3,209,022
Lassen	2,215,431	40,363	(1,498)	5,580	-	2,259,875	7,839	-	2,267,714
Los Angeles	421,850,861	35,639,382	(339,019)	12,101,803	(891,180)	468,361,847	18,887,969	(502,040)	486,747,776
Madera	5,951,909	355,661	(4,814)	45,479	-	6,348,235	384,826	-	6,733,061
Marin	12,023,355	(59,305)	(9,532)	358,566	-	12,313,085	644,512	-	12,957,597
Mariposa	947,708	1,730	96,473	3,560	-	1,049,471	22,301	-	1,071,772
Mendocino	4,196,062	129,330	(3,459)	235,205	-	4,557,139	311,771	-	4,868,910
Merced	8,939,133	673,039	(7,896)	310,199	-	9,914,474	774,827	-	10,689,301
Modoc	931,565	(69,362)	34,375	3,544	-	900,123	31,967	-	932,090
Mono	1,178,200	59,610	89,167	11,323	-	1,338,300	85,641	-	1,423,941
Monterey	14,270,273	747,923	(10,940)	264,491	-	15,271,747	277,496	-	15,549,243
Napa	6,265,124	140,912	(4,766)	181,753	-	6,583,023	309,796	-	6,892,819
Nevada	4,379,043	191,189	(3,091)	120,300	-	4,687,440	95,495	-	4,782,935
Orange	118,107,565	3,496,207	(97,195)	5,785,430	(183,526)	127,108,481	6,929,921	(216,241)	133,822,160
Placer	11,828,298	821,972	(9,566)	284,469	-	12,925,172	634,797	-	13,559,969
Plumas	1,448,044	(95,320)	(1,038)	6,015	-	1,357,701	14,929	-	1,372,630
Riverside	64,423,643	6,057,489	(51,696)	1,643,210	-	72,072,647	923,657	-	72,996,304
Sacramento	62,200,105	2,846,831	(50,844)	2,297,449	-	67,293,541	3,560,592	-	70,854,133

2015-2016 Beginning Base Allocation: 2014-2015 Beginning Base, 2014-2015 Base Allocations, and Annualization

	Beginning 2014-2015 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	2014-15 WAFM Allocation	2014-15 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	TCTF Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Ending 2014-2015 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (2010- 11 and 2011-12)	Annualization of Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Preliminary Beginning Base in 2015-2016
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6 = Sum of 1 to 5	7	8	9 = Sum of 6 to 8
San Benito	2,518,067	(74,843)	(1,885)	16,844	-	2,458,182	34,642	-	2,492,824
San Bernardino	71,135,387	6,917,080	(56,332)	1,333,588	-	79,329,723	1,264,733	-	80,594,456
San Diego	121,971,982	3,042,330	(95,765)	4,121,481	(100,555)	128,939,474	2,853,599	(99,456)	131,693,616
San Francisco	49,195,369	600,353	(40,937)	1,495,964	-	51,250,749	5,487,135	-	56,737,884
San Joaquin	24,158,605	1,587,646	(20,058)	535,858	-	26,262,051	1,245,357	-	27,507,408
San Luis Obispo	11,412,530	819,314	(8,923)	122,246	-	12,345,167	298,958	-	12,644,125
San Mateo	29,340,593	1,034,520	(23,884)	603,175	-	30,954,404	2,411,113	-	33,365,517
Santa Barbara	18,264,894	590,633	(14,454)	121,986	-	18,963,060	1,597,662	-	20,560,722
Santa Clara	72,137,357	719,654	(56,104)	825,453	-	73,626,361	2,309,467	-	75,935,828
Santa Cruz	9,822,870	549,799	(7,835)	154,317	-	10,519,150	203,558	-	10,722,708
Shasta	10,208,590	457,766	(6,340)	184,003	-	10,844,018	262,222	-	11,106,240
Sierra	528,837	(72,867)	273,332	8,941	-	738,243	9,616	-	747,859
Siskiyou	3,011,998	(29,475)	(2,302)	59,428	-	3,039,649	91,038	-	3,130,687
Solano	16,823,460	917,245	(13,346)	497,180	-	18,224,539	353,779	-	18,578,318
Sonoma	18,856,968	1,060,419	(15,724)	616,911	-	20,518,574	1,172,050	-	21,690,624
Stanislaus	14,954,377	1,492,323	(13,714)	818,944	-	17,251,929	1,305,230	-	18,557,159
Sutter	3,665,696	277,618	(2,979)	72,212	-	4,012,547	159,761	-	4,172,308
Tehama	2,857,870	197,864	(2,412)	24,866	-	3,078,188	108,184	-	3,186,372
Trinity	1,404,919	13,969	85,985	19,978	-	1,524,852	53,679	-	1,578,531
Tulare	13,277,001	960,816	(10,451)	103,341	-	14,330,707	33,744	-	14,364,451
Tuolumne	2,803,723	58,705	(2,026)	19,249	-	2,879,651	50,352	-	2,930,003
Ventura	26,607,146	2,053,031	(21,141)	542,126	-	29,181,161	968,753	-	30,149,914
Yolo	7,435,793	384,237	(5,417)	168,486	-	7,983,099	210,077	-	8,193,176
Yuba	3,195,469	197,074	(2,578)	66,221	-	3,456,186	90,867	-	3,547,053
Total	1,488,617,795	86,300,000	(0)	41,034,166	(1,371,906)	1,614,580,054	68,818,601	(817,737)	1,682,580,918

Allocation of New Funding for 2014-2015 Benefit Cost Changes

Court	2014-2015 Total Confirmed Benefit Cost Changes*		
	Total Confirmed Non-Interpreter Cost Changes	Total Confirmed Interpreter Cost Changes	Recommended Allocation of Total Confirmed Cost Changes (A + C)
	A	B	C
Alameda	562,020	13,775	575,795
Alpine	5,289	-	5,289
Amador	15,693	-	15,693
Butte	68,952	-	68,952
Calaveras	30,138	-	30,138
Colusa	10,604	-	10,604
Contra Costa	590,873	61,027	651,900
Del Norte	73,071	-	73,071
El Dorado	90,455	1,751	92,206
Fresno	1,581,245	60,920	1,642,164
Glenn	31,311	-	31,311
Humboldt	46,895	-	46,895
Imperial	95,925	4,218	100,143
Inyo	(7,122)	-	(7,122)
Kern	(217,620)	(5,220)	(222,841)
Kings	29,342	1,145	30,487
Lake	33,201	-	33,201
Lassen	6,803	-	6,803
Los Angeles	7,896,395	523,816	8,420,211
Madera	223,020	10,103	233,123
Marin	(78,894)	(6,389)	(85,283)
Mariposa	4,769	-	4,769
Mendocino	56,174	(3,546)	52,627
Merced	161,921	10,909	172,830
Modoc	9,491	-	9,491
Mono	10,568	-	10,568
Monterey	205,587	12,619	218,205
Napa	(3,237)	(290)	(3,527)
Nevada	79,983	-	79,983
Orange	3,449,769	189,632	3,639,401
Placer	84,431	352	84,783
Plumas	2,474	-	2,474
Riverside	(650,572)	(26,526)	(677,099)
Sacramento	332,406	6,332	338,738
San Benito	21,556	-	21,556
San Bernardino	1,521,168	38,222	1,559,390
San Diego	2,061,274	83,274	2,144,547
San Francisco	631,291	19,529	650,819
San Joaquin	818,234	21,765	839,998
San Luis Obispo	972	-	972
San Mateo	363,484	19,471	382,956
Santa Barbara	227,423	11,276	238,699
Santa Clara	1,851,301	67,555	1,918,856
Santa Cruz	86,623	5,637	92,259
Shasta	135,012	-	135,012
Sierra	3,781	-	3,781
Siskiyou	40,262	-	40,262
Solano	95,975	571	96,546
Sonoma	825,673	41,123	866,796
Stanislaus	(289,912)	(12,899)	(302,811)
Sutter	28,465	704	29,169
Tehama	72,996	1,858	74,854
Trinity	37,893	-	37,893
Tulare	353,922	13,046	366,968
Tuolumne	65,010	-	65,010
Ventura	288,505	(702)	287,803
Yolo	147,776	1,821	149,597
Yuba	9,769	-	9,769
Total:	24,229,808	1,166,875	25,396,684

*Total confirmed benefit cost changes are as of June 23, 2015 and include 2013-2014 true-up adjustments for several courts.

Intentionally Blank

Computation of Funding Need Using the 2015-2016 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 7/1/2014)	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	517	84	601	\$34,122,403	222,872	34,345,275	1.42	48,824,340
1	Alpine	2	1	3	\$113,741	114,213	227,954	0.83	188,922
1	Amador	21	5	26	\$1,421,767	114,213	1,535,980	1.00	1,534,684
2	Butte	113	21	134	\$7,563,799	159,760	7,723,560	0.91	7,018,308
1	Calaveras	22	5	27	\$1,478,637	114,213	1,592,851	0.89	1,412,142
1	Colusa	15	3	18	\$966,801	114,213	1,081,014	0.71	830,674
3	Contra Costa	329	52	381	\$21,610,855	185,787	21,796,642	1.25	27,307,057
1	Del Norte	24	5	29	\$1,592,379	114,213	1,706,592	0.77	1,323,022
2	El Dorado	74	13	87	\$4,890,878	159,760	5,050,638	1.00	5,029,894
3	Fresno	461	72	533	\$30,255,197	185,787	30,440,984	0.99	30,097,800
1	Glenn	18	4	22	\$1,194,284	114,213	1,308,497	0.69	1,004,478
2	Humboldt	78	13	91	\$5,118,360	159,760	5,278,121	0.77	4,072,841
2	Imperial	117	21	138	\$7,791,282	159,760	7,951,042	0.78	6,223,496
1	Inyo	16	4	20	\$1,080,543	114,213	1,194,756	0.83	994,552
3	Kern	459	76	535	\$30,368,938	185,787	30,554,725	1.05	32,229,103
2	Kings	85	14	99	\$5,573,326	159,760	5,733,086	0.88	5,047,027
2	Lake	39	7	46	\$2,559,180	159,760	2,718,941	0.75	2,104,700
1	Lassen	23	5	28	\$1,535,508	114,213	1,649,721	0.80	1,325,655
4	Los Angeles	4,512	690	5,202	\$295,784,361	222,872	296,007,234	1.34	396,807,827
2	Madera	82	14	96	\$5,402,714	159,760	5,562,474	0.93	5,196,728
2	Marin	90	16	106	\$5,971,420	159,760	6,131,181	1.28	7,839,688
1	Mariposa	10	3	13	\$682,448	114,213	796,661	0.78	620,314
2	Mendocino	56	10	66	\$3,696,594	159,760	3,856,354	0.83	3,215,623
2	Merced	128	22	150	\$8,473,730	159,760	8,633,490	0.90	7,746,157
1	Modoc	8	2	10	\$511,836	114,213	626,049	0.60	465,486
1	Mono	10	3	13	\$682,448	114,213	796,661	1.15	915,428
3	Monterey	166	27	193	\$10,919,169	185,787	11,104,956	1.19	13,262,845
2	Napa	61	11	72	\$4,037,818	159,760	4,197,578	1.22	5,124,059
2	Nevada	45	9	54	\$3,014,146	159,760	3,173,906	0.97	3,075,266

Computation of Funding Need Using the 2015-2016 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 7/1/2014)	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	1,130	181	1,311	\$74,500,579	222,872	74,723,452	1.30	97,204,875
2	Placer	144	24	168	\$9,497,402	159,760	9,657,162	1.17	11,315,447
1	Plumas	11	3	14	\$739,319	114,213	853,532	0.70	653,271
4	Riverside	952	148	1,100	\$62,500,868	222,872	62,723,740	1.08	67,708,747
4	Sacramento	633	96	729	\$41,401,849	222,872	41,624,721	1.28	53,355,341
1	San Benito	22	5	27	\$1,478,637	114,213	1,592,851	0.98	1,566,846
4	San Bernardino	1,046	155	1,201	\$68,244,805	222,872	68,467,678	1.06	72,389,061
4	San Diego	1,108	169	1,277	\$72,566,976	222,872	72,789,849	1.17	85,488,910
4	San Francisco	339	51	390	\$22,122,691	222,872	22,345,564	1.68	37,551,796
3	San Joaquin	320	49	369	\$20,928,407	185,787	21,114,194	1.10	23,284,438
2	San Luis Obispo	132	22	154	\$8,701,213	159,760	8,860,973	1.07	9,498,700
3	San Mateo	241	39	280	\$15,866,917	185,787	16,052,704	1.44	23,191,014
3	Santa Barbara	183	32	215	\$12,170,324	185,787	12,356,111	1.17	14,406,369
4	Santa Clara	505	77	582	\$33,041,860	222,872	33,264,732	1.44	47,916,662
2	Santa Cruz	111	21	132	\$7,450,058	159,760	7,609,818	1.15	8,775,813
2	Shasta	120	28	148	\$8,359,989	159,760	8,519,749	0.85	7,278,801
1	Sierra	2	1	3	\$113,741	114,213	227,954	0.73	171,720
2	Siskiyou	29	6	35	\$1,933,603	159,760	2,093,363	0.69	1,610,377
3	Solano	192	30	222	\$12,568,418	185,787	12,754,205	1.20	15,342,291
3	Sonoma	198	33	231	\$13,080,254	185,787	13,266,041	1.17	15,469,541
3	Stanislaus	249	38	287	\$16,265,012	185,787	16,450,799	1.02	16,720,694
2	Sutter	52	10	62	\$3,469,111	159,760	3,628,871	0.95	3,462,702
2	Tehama	46	8	54	\$3,014,146	159,760	3,173,906	0.80	2,533,155
1	Trinity	10	3	13	\$682,448	114,213	796,661	0.65	603,900
3	Tulare	209	35	244	\$13,819,573	185,787	14,005,360	0.83	11,554,627
2	Tuolumne	32	6	38	\$2,104,215	159,760	2,263,975	0.83	1,870,908
3	Ventura	310	57	367	\$20,814,666	185,787	21,000,453	1.21	25,514,417
2	Yolo	87	16	103	\$5,800,808	159,760	5,960,569	1.03	6,113,301
2	Yuba	46	8	54	\$3,014,146	159,760	3,173,906	0.93	2,947,405

Statewide 16,040 2,563 18,603 1,064,129,817 1,286,339,245

NOTES:

(1) Estimated need based on 3-year average filings data from **FY 2011-2012 through FY 2013-2014**.

\$56,871

(2) Unadjusted base funding per RAS FTE, based on **FY 2014-2015 Schedule 7A** ; does not include collections staff, SJOs, CEO, security, n

(3) Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Labor adjustment based on Quarterly Census of Wages & Employment, three year average from . 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 2015-2016 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 2014-15 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 2013-14 data)	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	$K = (A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor} * I1) + (B * J2)$		M = (K + L)	N = C * OE&E	O	P = (H + M + N) - O	Q = P / Statewide
4	Alameda	36.7%	\$14,096	35.6%	\$14,147	22,618,895	3,687,315	26,306,210	12,192,647	1,598,988	85,724,209	3.60%
1	Alpine	18.5%	\$23,750	18.5%	\$23,750	64,927	41,250	106,177	83,784	-	378,883	0.02%
1	Amador	25.7%	\$8,841	25.0%	\$10,239	492,527	136,657	629,184	726,129	116,005	2,773,992	0.12%
2	Butte	26.1%	\$12,252	26.1%	\$11,728	2,907,304	553,716	3,461,020	2,718,494	370,762	12,827,059	0.54%
1	Calaveras	21.6%	\$14,270	21.6%	\$17,439	553,445	152,606	706,051	754,057	155,288	2,716,963	0.11%
1	Colusa	39.8%	\$15,596	40.7%	\$16,353	497,302	117,839	615,141	502,705	67,730	1,880,790	0.08%
3	Contra Costa	54.2%	\$15,741	54.2%	\$18,402	17,879,053	3,050,808	20,929,861	7,729,449	1,120,477	54,845,890	2.30%
1	Del Norte	20.2%	\$24,226	20.2%	\$25,578	794,686	181,208	975,894	809,913	96,508	3,012,322	0.13%
2	El Dorado	21.5%	\$17,051	21.5%	\$16,480	2,164,106	394,821	2,558,926	1,764,992	333,647	9,020,166	0.38%
3	Fresno	68.6%	\$9,720	69.0%	\$9,193	22,275,773	3,544,650	25,820,424	10,813,113	1,654,214	65,077,123	2.73%
1	Glenn	30.6%	\$13,960	34.5%	\$16,761	494,443	139,802	634,245	614,417	204,360	2,048,781	0.09%
2	Humboldt	30.4%	\$9,188	30.4%	\$10,056	1,757,103	328,276	2,085,379	1,846,141	140,560	7,863,801	0.33%
2	Imperial	32.8%	\$4,926	34.2%	\$5,799	2,284,919	469,469	2,754,387	2,799,643	224,769	11,552,757	0.49%
1	Inyo	27.2%	\$13,930	22.8%	\$12,607	428,717	104,514	533,231	558,561	122,545	1,963,799	0.08%
3	Kern	55.9%	\$16,476	55.9%	\$16,476	22,967,999	3,879,002	26,847,001	10,853,688	1,214,661	68,715,131	2.89%
2	Kings	21.0%	\$8,921	24.6%	\$9,831	1,653,960	332,154	1,986,114	2,008,439	278,099	8,763,482	0.37%
2	Lake	20.7%	\$7,723	20.7%	\$7,804	657,959	134,437	792,396	933,214	153,026	3,677,284	0.15%
1	Lassen	20.0%	\$10,523	20.3%	\$11,354	452,452	112,587	565,039	781,985	77,644	2,595,035	0.11%
4	Los Angeles	25.7%	\$22,765	34.7%	\$19,875	190,947,036	32,033,477	222,980,513	105,534,363	7,200,581	718,122,121	30.17%
2	Madera	31.2%	\$12,584	31.2%	\$12,582	2,389,506	437,892	2,827,397	1,947,578	290,662	9,681,041	0.41%
2	Marin	28.2%	\$12,709	26.7%	\$12,709	2,987,654	549,712	3,537,366	2,150,450	221,581	13,305,924	0.56%
1	Mariposa	36.3%	\$10,026	37.1%	\$15,237	261,139	111,612	372,751	363,065	73,997	1,282,132	0.05%
2	Mendocino	44.9%	\$9,420	47.2%	\$9,480	1,719,317	359,388	2,078,705	1,338,960	183,022	6,450,265	0.27%
2	Merced	59.0%	\$14,835	60.0%	\$14,848	5,754,582	1,055,569	6,810,151	3,043,090	714,509	16,884,889	0.71%
1	Modoc	25.5%	\$12,586	25.5%	\$12,586	190,650	53,904	244,554	279,280	72,130	917,190	0.04%
1	Mono	34.5%	\$19,657	36.4%	\$21,622	421,743	160,231	581,974	363,065	64,871	1,795,596	0.08%
3	Monterey	19.3%	\$14,545	19.4%	\$16,507	4,593,398	830,642	5,424,040	3,915,443	425,711	22,176,616	0.93%
2	Napa	17.8%	\$19,706	18.4%	\$21,372	1,957,502	398,887	2,356,390	1,460,683	223,590	8,717,542	0.37%
2	Nevada	36.2%	\$12,328	37.5%	\$12,649	1,452,465	337,417	1,789,882	1,095,512	448,240	5,512,421	0.23%

Computation of Funding Need Using the 2015-2016 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 2014-15 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 2013-14 data)	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	$L = (((B-1) * FTE \text{ Dollar} = (A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G) * J1) + (B * J2)$			N = C * OE&E	O = (H + M + N) - O	Q = P / Statewide	
4	Orange	38.1%	\$11,036	38.4%	\$12,150	44,334,919	7,424,752	51,759,671	26,596,607	2,195,060	173,366,093	7.28%
2	Placer	29.1%	\$19,829	29.1%	\$19,829	5,648,763	976,641	6,625,403	3,408,261	424,810	20,924,301	0.88%
1	Plumas	28.6%	\$13,693	28.2%	\$17,914	289,415	101,154	390,568	390,993	135,453	1,299,380	0.05%
4	Riverside	32.5%	\$9,553	32.3%	\$10,577	28,115,310	4,561,278	32,676,587	22,315,994	1,672,322	121,029,006	5.08%
4	Sacramento	40.3%	\$19,032	41.2%	\$18,924	30,634,318	4,787,382	35,421,700	14,789,418	1,426,146	102,140,312	4.29%
1	San Benito	23.3%	\$12,269	23.3%	\$16,695	556,700	161,792	718,492	754,057	164,879	2,874,516	0.12%
4	San Bernardino	37.9%	\$8,332	40.7%	\$9,879	32,572,369	5,392,046	37,964,414	24,365,008	2,574,029	132,144,453	5.55%
4	San Diego	56.8%	\$9,016	56.9%	\$9,929	52,017,923	8,206,947	60,224,870	25,906,840	2,478,229	169,142,391	7.11%
4	San Francisco	32.3%	\$27,582	31.9%	\$27,568	19,829,556	3,047,603	22,877,159	7,912,034	1,271,943	67,069,047	2.82%
3	San Joaquin	42.6%	\$13,107	44.4%	\$8,836	12,739,857	1,860,996	14,600,853	7,486,001	635,857	44,735,436	1.88%
2	San Luis Obispo	41.5%	\$10,221	50.9%	\$10,374	4,691,723	967,572	5,659,295	3,124,239	387,296	17,894,938	0.75%
3	San Mateo	42.7%	\$17,464	42.8%	\$14,572	12,670,394	2,018,300	14,688,694	5,680,435	590,688	42,969,454	1.81%
3	Santa Barbara	39.5%	\$6,744	42.2%	\$7,575	6,024,689	1,201,465	7,226,154	4,361,762	479,947	25,514,338	1.07%
4	Santa Clara	30.9%	\$23,911	30.8%	\$25,168	24,870,865	3,953,181	28,824,046	11,807,189	1,918,716	86,629,182	3.64%
2	Santa Cruz	22.7%	\$16,282	22.7%	\$17,588	3,460,083	709,096	4,169,179	2,677,919	205,113	15,417,797	0.65%
2	Shasta	22.2%	\$9,970	23.9%	\$12,482	2,490,804	695,083	3,185,887	3,002,516	513,547	12,953,657	0.54%
1	Sierra	37.5%	\$17,520	37.5%	\$17,520	68,120	48,844	116,964	83,784	4,188	368,280	0.02%
2	Siskiyou	28.2%	\$19,216	28.2%	\$17,008	917,988	195,536	1,113,524	710,054	330,897	3,103,058	0.13%
3	Solano	32.3%	\$12,824	34.4%	\$14,711	6,703,206	1,200,956	7,904,161	4,503,773	591,286	27,158,939	1.14%
3	Sonoma	43.9%	\$19,989	43.8%	\$19,951	9,722,513	1,683,193	11,405,706	4,686,359	686,985	30,874,621	1.30%
3	Stanislaus	28.9%	\$17,882	29.4%	\$18,898	8,607,333	1,401,877	10,009,211	5,822,446	1,015,921	31,536,429	1.32%
2	Sutter	31.4%	\$14,487	32.0%	\$18,269	1,639,745	387,918	2,027,663	1,257,811	239,056	6,509,119	0.27%
2	Tehama	22.9%	\$17,076	22.9%	\$16,571	1,263,943	234,593	1,498,536	1,095,512	100,653	5,026,551	0.21%
1	Trinity	31.8%	\$13,849	36.1%	\$13,908	278,738	100,459	379,198	363,065	55,255	1,290,907	0.05%
3	Tulare	22.0%	\$18,427	22.7%	\$19,889	6,003,887	1,092,161	7,096,048	4,950,093	638,573	22,962,196	0.96%
2	Tuolumne	27.2%	\$13,781	28.2%	\$13,806	850,098	186,273	1,036,371	770,916	235,699	3,442,496	0.14%
3	Ventura	37.5%	\$9,200	40.4%	\$11,251	10,884,113	2,293,990	13,178,103	7,445,427	869,709	45,268,238	1.90%
2	Yolo	32.4%	\$12,077	39.9%	\$19,656	2,692,841	729,366	3,422,208	2,089,588	230,666	11,394,431	0.48%
2	Yuba	17.4%	\$11,152	17.4%	\$12,656	935,853	191,416	1,127,270	1,095,512	208,198	4,961,988	0.21%

Statewide 645,136,627 109,501,708 754,638,335 379,436,474 40,129,299 2,380,284,755 100%

NOTES:

\$56,871 for vacant positions; in January 2014 the TCBAC approved a dollar factor adjustment for courts with fewer 2011 through 2013. 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 2015-16 RAS FTE Need

Court	Program 10 (Operations) Staff Need										Program 90 (Administration) Staff Need			Total RAS Need
	Infractions	Criminal	Civil	Family Law	Pr/MH	Juvenile	Total Program 10 Need	Manager/Supervisor Ratio (by cluster)	Manager/Supervisor Need	Total Program 10 Need (rounded up)	Non-RAS FTE (for Program 90 Need Calculation)*	Program 90 ratio (by cluster)	Program 90 Need (rounded up)	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G (A thru F)	H	I (G/H)	J (G+I)	K	L	M ((J+K)/L)	
Alameda	76.3	121.2	122.7	103.4	31.9	18.0	473.5	11.1	42.6	517	85.6	7.2	84	601
Alpine	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.4	6.9	0.2	2	0.4	5.7	1	3
Amador	2.1	7.0	2.6	3.9	1.2	0.8	17.6	6.9	2.5	21	2.3	5.7	5	26
Butte	10.1	34.4	12.1	24.8	12.4	7.3	101.0	8.6	11.7	113	16.5	6.4	21	134
Calaveras	1.5	5.3	3.4	4.8	1.9	1.9	18.7	6.9	2.7	22	2.5	5.7	5	27
Colusa	3.7	4.8	0.9	1.5	0.5	1.0	12.4	6.9	1.8	15	1.5	5.7	3	18
Contra Costa	30.3	64.4	71.4	81.9	25.6	20.5	294.1	8.6	34.1	329	18.9	6.8	52	381
Del Norte	2.1	6.0	3.2	4.8	2.6	1.9	20.7	6.9	3.0	24	3.0	5.7	5	29
El Dorado	7.9	17.5	12.7	15.7	4.7	7.0	65.5	8.6	7.6	74	4.9	6.4	13	87
Fresno	29.3	169.0	67.4	93.4	23.5	30.3	412.9	8.6	47.9	461	27.4	6.8	72	533
Glenn	4.0	4.0	1.1	3.6	1.4	1.2	15.3	6.9	2.2	18	4.5	5.7	4	22
Humboldt	7.5	28.6	9.3	13.4	7.2	3.1	69.2	8.6	8.0	78	2.0	6.4	13	91
Imperial	22.6	33.1	10.5	27.6	5.0	5.5	104.4	8.6	12.1	117	15.3	6.4	21	138
Inyo	4.3	3.9	1.1	2.4	0.8	0.8	13.3	6.9	1.9	16	3.2	5.7	4	20
Kern	42.6	170.8	45.0	99.1	28.6	25.1	411.1	8.6	47.7	459	51.0	6.8	76	535
Kings	10.1	34.1	6.6	16.3	4.0	4.3	75.4	8.6	8.7	85	4.6	6.4	14	99
Lake	2.2	13.9	5.9	7.7	3.2	1.7	34.5	8.6	4.0	39	1.6	6.4	7	46
Lassen	2.8	6.1	3.6	4.5	1.4	1.2	19.5	6.9	2.8	23	2.3	5.7	5	28
Los Angeles	436.6	1,210.6	1,029.2	826.2	248.8	388.1	4,139.5	11.1	372.3	4,512	471.0	7.2	690	5,202
Madera	5.7	26.6	11.7	18.9	4.2	5.7	72.9	8.6	8.5	82	6.1	6.4	14	96
Marin	17.2	17.8	18.7	16.3	7.0	2.8	79.8	8.6	9.3	90	6.7	6.4	16	106
Mariposa	0.8	3.6	0.8	1.5	0.7	0.6	8.1	6.9	1.2	10	3.4	5.7	3	13
Mendocino	5.5	18.1	7.7	10.1	3.7	4.9	49.9	8.6	5.8	56	3.7	6.4	10	66
Merced	17.3	37.1	14.9	27.6	7.8	9.5	114.3	8.6	13.3	128	11.7	6.4	22	150
Modoc	0.6	2.3	0.6	1.7	0.6	0.4	6.2	6.9	0.9	8	2.0	5.7	2	10
Mono	2.6	3.5	1.2	0.9	0.2	0.3	8.7	6.9	1.3	10	1.8	5.7	3	13
Monterey	20.2	58.3	22.2	31.0	8.0	8.9	148.6	8.6	17.2	166	13.4	6.8	27	193
Napa	6.2	17.9	9.5	12.6	4.9	3.4	54.5	8.6	6.3	61	7.3	6.4	11	72
Nevada	6.6	13.3	6.8	8.1	3.3	1.9	40.0	8.6	4.6	45	6.9	6.4	9	54
Orange	106.9	328.3	267.0	228.5	59.1	46.9	1,036.7	11.1	93.2	1,130	178.0	7.2	181	1,311
Placer	13.5	36.1	27.6	30.9	8.5	11.5	128.2	8.6	14.9	144	7.0	6.4	24	168
Plumas	1.0	2.9	1.5	2.3	0.9	0.6	9.4	6.9	1.4	11	1.1	5.7	3	14
Riverside	84.0	254.0	189.3	232.2	45.4	67.8	872.6	11.1	78.5	952	117.7	7.2	148	1,100
Sacramento	54.0	166.0	136.8	151.6	44.2	27.9	580.6	11.1	52.2	633	59.1	7.2	96	729
San Benito	1.9	6.9	3.3	4.8	1.1	1.3	19.2	6.9	2.8	22	1.3	5.7	5	27
San Bernardino	70.2	351.4	182.9	238.6	55.9	59.9	958.9	11.1	86.2	1,046	73.3	7.2	155	1,201
San Diego	123.6	278.3	257.7	257.5	55.3	43.5	1,015.9	11.1	91.4	1,108	110.1	7.2	169	1,277
San Francisco	51.5	52.7	107.6	49.0	31.8	17.8	310.4	11.1	27.9	339	25.8	7.2	51	390
San Joaquin	25.7	112.5	48.9	61.2	22.4	15.4	286.0	8.6	33.2	320	12.2	6.8	49	369
San Luis Obispo	14.7	51.0	16.0	18.7	10.9	6.5	117.9	8.6	13.7	132	7.5	6.4	22	154
San Mateo	37.3	59.3	35.7	47.1	13.3	22.4	215.2	8.6	25.0	241	17.8	6.8	39	280
Santa Barbara	28.8	59.7	26.5	28.7	10.3	10.0	164.0	8.6	19.0	183	28.3	6.8	32	215
Santa Clara	55.6	144.6	107.9	101.7	36.0	17.0	462.8	11.1	41.6	505	45.7	7.2	77	582
Santa Cruz	17.5	34.6	15.3	20.0	4.7	7.1	99.3	8.6	11.5	111	19.7	6.4	21	132
Shasta	10.7	46.3	13.4	21.4	7.6	7.6	107.0	8.6	12.4	120	55.4	6.4	28	148
Sierra	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	1.5	6.9	0.2	2	1.1	5.7	1	3
Siskiyou	5.9	8.1	2.8	5.3	1.9	1.6	25.6	8.6	3.0	29	4.6	6.4	6	35
Solano	18.5	52.6	32.3	46.4	14.6	7.2	171.6	8.6	19.9	192	6.0	6.8	30	222
Sonoma	26.5	58.3	30.2	37.1	16.5	7.9	176.5	8.6	20.5	198	21.5	6.8	33	231
Stanislaus	18.7	86.6	32.4	57.2	18.6	9.2	222.7	8.6	25.8	249	7.6	6.8	38	287
Sutter	5.1	16.7	6.8	10.9	4.6	2.2	46.3	8.6	5.4	52	9.7	6.4	10	62
Tehama	5.3	16.4	4.7	8.8	2.6	2.7	40.5	8.6	4.7	46	3.3	6.4	8	54
Trinity	0.7	3.6	1.0	1.9	0.7	0.9	8.7	6.9	1.3	10	4.0	5.7	3	13
Tulare	24.1	70.6	26.3	40.3	11.2	14.2	186.6	8.6	21.7	209	21.9	6.8	35	244
Tuolumne	2.5	10.7	3.5	5.9	2.3	2.9	27.9	8.6	3.2	32	2.0	6.4	6	38
Ventura	35.3	72.4	57.7	64.5	24.4	23.5	277.8	8.6	32.2	310	74.5	6.8	57	367
Yolo	10.4	29.9	10.5	16.5	5.1	5.2	77.6	8.6	9.0	87	13.0	6.4	16	103
Yuba	5.0	14.3	5.2	9.9	3.1	3.2	40.7	8.6	4.7	46	2.0	6.4	8	54
Statewide	1,634.4	4,558.7	3,154.5	3,262.8	958.4	1,002.1	14,570.9		1,438.6	16,040	1,711.9		2,563.0	18,603

*Reported on FY 14-15 Schedule 7A; non-RAS staff include categories such as SJOs, Enhanced Collections Staff, and Interpreters

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 (2011-2013) BLS Factor (50% Workforce Threshold)
4	Alameda	84%	16%	No	1.42	1.27	1.42
1	Alpine	100%	0%	No	0.83	0.83	0.83
1	Amador	34%	66%	Yes	0.95	1.00	1.00
2	Butte	89%	11%	No	0.91	0.89	0.91
1	Calaveras	90%	10%	No	0.89	0.93	0.89
1	Colusa	95%	5%	No	0.71	0.90	0.71
3	Contra Costa	96%	4%	No	1.25	1.12	1.25
1	Del Norte	32%	68%	Yes	0.62	0.77	0.77
2	El Dorado	96%	4%	No	1.00	1.07	1.00
3	Fresno	70%	30%	No	0.99	1.07	0.99
1	Glenn	96%	4%	No	0.69	0.81	0.69
2	Humboldt	83%	17%	No	0.77	0.93	0.77
2	Imperial	51%	49%	No	0.78	0.85	0.78
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	0.86	0.88	0.88
2	Lake	96%	4%	No	0.75	0.79	0.75
1	Lassen	20%	80%	Yes	0.68	0.80	0.80
4	Los Angeles	92%	8%	No	1.34	1.25	1.34
2	Madera	39%	61%	Yes	0.84	0.93	0.93
2	Marin	66%	34%	No	1.28	1.12	1.28
1	Mariposa	93%	7%	No	0.78	0.92	0.78
2	Mendocino	84%	16%	No	0.83	0.84	0.83
2	Merced	100%	0%	No	0.90	0.90	0.90
1	Modoc	85%	15%	No	0.60	0.82	0.60
1	Mono	92%	8%	No	1.15	0.98	1.15
3	Monterey	61%	39%	No	1.19	1.06	1.19
2	Napa	80%	20%	No	1.22	1.02	1.22
2	Nevada	91%	9%	No	0.97	0.90	0.97
4	Orange	91%	9%	No	1.30	1.20	1.30
2	Placer	95%	5%	No	1.17	1.01	1.17
1	Plumas	94%	6%	No	0.70	0.74	0.70
4	Riverside	100%	0%	No	1.08	1.08	1.08
4	Sacramento	15%	85%	Yes	1.21	1.28	1.28
1	San Benito	100%	0%	No	0.98	0.98	0.98
4	San Bernardino	83%	17%	No	1.06	1.09	1.06
4	San Diego	85%	15%	No	1.17	1.15	1.17
4	San Francisco	53%	47%	No	1.68	1.60	1.68
3	San Joaquin	69%	31%	No	1.10	1.09	1.10
2	San Luis Obispo	56%	44%	No	1.07	1.09	1.07
3	San Mateo	95%	5%	No	1.44	1.16	1.44
3	Santa Barbara	93%	7%	No	1.17	1.06	1.17
4	Santa Clara	94%	6%	No	1.44	1.19	1.44
2	Santa Cruz	88%	12%	No	1.15	0.96	1.15
2	Shasta	100%	0%	No	0.85	0.85	0.85
1	Sierra	100%	0%	No	0.73	0.73	0.73
2	Siskiyou	83%	17%	No	0.69	0.75	0.69
3	Solano	61%	39%	No	1.20	1.10	1.20
3	Sonoma	88%	12%	No	1.17	1.10	1.17
3	Stanislaus	96%	4%	No	1.02	0.97	1.02
2	Sutter	95%	5%	No	0.95	0.96	0.95
2	Tehama	95%	5%	No	0.80	0.89	0.80
1	Trinity	93%	7%	No	0.65	0.80	0.65
3	Tulare	91%	9%	No	0.83	0.87	0.83
2	Tuolumne	51%	49%	No	0.83	0.89	0.83
3	Ventura	90%	10%	No	1.21	1.11	1.21
2	Yolo	83%	17%	No	1.03	1.30	1.03
2	Yuba	100%	0%	No	0.93	0.93	0.93

FTE Allotment Factor

		BLS Factor	FTE Dollar Factor Applied (Current -- \$56,871*BLS)	FTE Need	Eligible for FTE Floor ?	Has FTE Need <50 AND FTE Dollar Factor is Less Than Median of \$44,101?	Final FTE Dollar Factor
Cluster	Court	A	B	C	D	E	F
4	Alameda	1.42	\$ 80,846	601			\$ 80,846
1	Alpine	0.83	\$ 47,133	3	Yes		\$ 47,133
1	Amador	1.00	\$ 56,823	26	Yes		\$ 56,823
2	Butte	0.91	\$ 51,678	134			\$ 51,678
1	Calaveras	0.89	\$ 50,419	27	Yes		\$ 50,419
1	Colusa	0.71	\$ 40,314	18	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
3	Contra Costa	1.25	\$ 71,248	381			\$ 71,248
1	Del Norte	0.77	\$ 43,919	29	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
2	El Dorado	1.00	\$ 56,637	87			\$ 56,637
3	Fresno	0.99	\$ 56,230	533			\$ 56,230
1	Glenn	0.69	\$ 39,020	22	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
2	Humboldt	0.77	\$ 43,884	91			\$ 43,884
2	Imperial	0.78	\$ 44,514	138			\$ 44,514
1	Inyo	0.83	\$ 47,341	20	Yes		\$ 47,341
3	Kern	1.05	\$ 59,987	535			\$ 59,987
2	Kings	0.88	\$ 50,065	99			\$ 50,065
2	Lake	0.75	\$ 42,777	46	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
1	Lassen	0.80	\$ 45,699	28	Yes		\$ 45,699
4	Los Angeles	1.34	\$ 76,237	5,202			\$ 76,237
2	Madera	0.93	\$ 53,131	96			\$ 53,131
2	Marin	1.28	\$ 72,718	106			\$ 72,718
1	Mariposa	0.78	\$ 44,282	13	Yes		\$ 44,282
2	Mendocino	0.83	\$ 47,422	66			\$ 47,422
2	Merced	0.90	\$ 51,026	150			\$ 51,026
1	Modoc	0.60	\$ 34,148	10	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
1	Mono	1.15	\$ 65,349	13	Yes		\$ 65,349
3	Monterey	1.19	\$ 67,922	193			\$ 67,922
2	Napa	1.22	\$ 69,423	72			\$ 69,423
2	Nevada	0.97	\$ 55,103	54			\$ 55,103
4	Orange	1.30	\$ 73,981	1,311			\$ 73,981
2	Placer	1.17	\$ 66,636	168			\$ 66,636
1	Plumas	0.70	\$ 39,816	14	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
4	Riverside	1.08	\$ 61,391	1,100			\$ 61,391
4	Sacramento	1.28	\$ 72,898	729			\$ 72,898
1	San Benito	0.98	\$ 55,942	27	Yes		\$ 55,942
4	San Bernardino	1.06	\$ 60,128	1,201			\$ 60,128
4	San Diego	1.17	\$ 66,792	1,277			\$ 66,792
4	San Francisco	1.68	\$ 95,571	390			\$ 95,571
3	San Joaquin	1.10	\$ 62,716	369			\$ 62,716
2	San Luis Obispo	1.07	\$ 60,964	154			\$ 60,964
3	San Mateo	1.44	\$ 82,160	280			\$ 82,160
3	Santa Barbara	1.17	\$ 66,307	215			\$ 66,307
4	Santa Clara	1.44	\$ 81,920	582			\$ 81,920
2	Santa Cruz	1.15	\$ 65,585	132			\$ 65,585
2	Shasta	0.85	\$ 48,587	148			\$ 48,587
1	Sierra	0.73	\$ 41,587	3	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
2	Siskiyou	0.69	\$ 39,497	35	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
3	Solano	1.20	\$ 68,411	222			\$ 68,411
3	Sonoma	1.17	\$ 66,317	231			\$ 66,317
3	Stanislaus	1.02	\$ 57,804	287			\$ 57,804
2	Sutter	0.95	\$ 54,267	62			\$ 54,267
2	Tehama	0.80	\$ 45,390	54			\$ 45,390
1	Trinity	0.65	\$ 37,191	13	Yes	Yes	\$ 44,101
3	Tulare	0.83	\$ 46,919	244			\$ 46,919
2	Tuolumne	0.83	\$ 46,997	38	Yes		\$ 46,997
3	Ventura	1.21	\$ 69,095	367			\$ 69,095
2	Yolo	1.03	\$ 58,328	103			\$ 58,328
2	Yuba	0.93	\$ 52,812	54			\$ 52,812

WAFM Post BLS FTE Allotment: Median
\$ 44,101

Intentionally Blank

2015-2016 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding

(assumes \$90.6 million in new funding then reduced by \$22.7 million revenue shortfall)

Cluster	Court	(Historical) Funding Subject to Reallocation	Court's Share of Current Historical Funding vs. FY 15-16 WAFM Funding Need		Reallocation Ratio	Reallocation of 30%			New Reallocation of \$146.3M		
			Share of Total Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM (Historical funding proportion)	Share of Total WAFM Funding Need (FY 15-16)		30 Percent of Funding Subject to Reallocation	Reallocation Using WAFM Proportion	Net	Allocation of \$146.3 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	Original Share of \$146.3 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net
		A	B	C	D = C / B	E = 30% * Col. A	F = \$432.1M * Col. C	G = E + F	H = \$146.3M*C	I = -\$146.3M*B	J = H + I
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.83%	3.60%	74.6%	(20,876,060)	15,563,435	(5,312,625)	5,268,887	(7,067,437)	(1,798,550)
1	Alpine	552,142	0.04%	0.02%	41.5%	(165,643)	68,787	(96,855)	23,287	(56,077)	(32,790)
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.14%	0.12%	80.7%	(624,147)	503,625	(120,523)	170,499	(211,301)	(40,802)
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.51%	0.54%	106.5%	(2,186,343)	2,328,783	142,440	788,393	(740,170)	48,222
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.14%	0.11%	84.3%	(585,267)	493,271	(91,996)	166,993	(198,138)	(31,145)
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.09%	0.08%	83.2%	(410,491)	341,462	(69,029)	115,599	(138,969)	(23,369)
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.28%	2.30%	100.9%	(9,871,938)	9,957,402	85,464	3,371,006	(3,342,072)	28,933
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.15%	0.13%	82.8%	(660,696)	546,894	(113,802)	185,147	(223,674)	(38,527)
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.41%	0.38%	92.8%	(1,764,270)	1,637,633	(126,637)	554,409	(597,281)	(42,872)
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.39%	2.73%	114.3%	(10,336,867)	11,814,907	1,478,040	3,999,850	(3,499,471)	500,380
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.13%	0.09%	68.4%	(543,512)	371,961	(171,551)	125,925	(184,002)	(58,077)
2	Humboldt	5,005,941	0.35%	0.33%	95.1%	(1,501,782)	1,427,692	(74,090)	483,335	(508,417)	(25,083)
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.44%	0.49%	111.1%	(1,888,286)	2,097,431	209,145	710,070	(639,265)	70,804
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.12%	0.08%	69.0%	(516,738)	356,532	(160,206)	120,701	(174,938)	(54,237)
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.00%	2.89%	144.5%	(8,634,536)	12,475,396	3,840,861	4,223,454	(2,923,159)	1,300,295
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.33%	0.37%	111.3%	(1,429,653)	1,591,031	161,378	538,632	(483,999)	54,633
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.20%	0.15%	76.6%	(871,116)	667,620	(203,496)	226,018	(294,910)	(68,892)
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.13%	0.11%	83.1%	(567,199)	471,135	(96,064)	159,499	(192,021)	(32,522)
4	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.25%	30.17%	110.7%	(117,744,649)	130,376,788	12,632,140	44,138,108	(39,861,590)	4,276,519
2	Madera	5,953,244	0.41%	0.41%	98.4%	(1,785,973)	1,757,616	(28,357)	595,028	(604,628)	(9,600)
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.93%	0.56%	60.4%	(4,001,639)	2,415,722	(1,585,917)	817,825	(1,354,726)	(536,901)
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.06%	0.05%	84.3%	(276,178)	232,774	(43,404)	78,804	(93,498)	(14,694)
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.30%	0.27%	89.1%	(1,313,723)	1,171,061	(142,662)	396,454	(444,751)	(48,297)
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.63%	0.71%	113.1%	(2,710,011)	3,065,492	355,481	1,037,800	(917,454)	120,346
1	Modoc	890,668	0.06%	0.04%	62.3%	(267,200)	166,518	(100,682)	56,373	(90,459)	(34,085)
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.09%	0.08%	88.2%	(369,704)	325,995	(43,710)	110,363	(125,161)	(14,798)
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.90%	0.93%	103.2%	(3,902,737)	4,026,218	123,480	1,363,047	(1,321,243)	41,803
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.42%	0.37%	86.6%	(1,826,693)	1,582,691	(244,003)	535,808	(618,414)	(82,605)
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.26%	0.23%	87.4%	(1,145,167)	1,000,793	(144,374)	338,811	(387,688)	(48,877)
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.54%	7.28%	85.3%	(36,895,047)	31,475,029	(5,420,018)	10,655,641	(12,490,548)	(1,834,908)

2015-2016 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding

(assumes \$90.6 million in new funding then reduced by \$22.7 million revenue shortfall)

Cluster	Court	(Historical) Funding Subject to Reallocation	Court's Share of Current Historical Funding vs. FY 15-16 WAFM Funding Need		Reallocation Ratio	Reallocation of 30%			New Reallocation of \$146.3M		
			Share of Total Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM (Historical funding proportion)	Share of Total WAFM Funding Need (FY 15-16)		30 Percent of Funding Subject to Reallocation	Reallocation Using WAFM Proportion	Net	Allocation of \$146.3 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	Original Share of \$146.3 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net
		A	B	C	D = C / B	E = 30% * Col. A	F = \$432.1M * Col. C	G = E + F	H = \$146.3M*C	I = -\$146.3M*B	J = H + I
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.77%	0.88%	113.9%	(3,334,243)	3,798,857	464,614	1,286,075	(1,128,783)	157,292
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.10%	0.05%	54.6%	(432,311)	235,905	(196,406)	79,864	(146,356)	(66,492)
4	Riverside	57,140,417	3.97%	5.08%	128.2%	(17,142,125)	21,973,106	4,830,980	7,438,834	(5,803,341)	1,635,493
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.27%	4.29%	100.4%	(18,470,394)	18,543,818	73,424	6,277,874	(6,253,017)	24,857
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.17%	0.12%	69.7%	(748,807)	521,875	(226,932)	176,677	(253,503)	(76,826)
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.26%	5.55%	130.4%	(18,400,544)	23,991,141	5,590,597	8,122,025	(6,229,370)	1,892,656
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.52%	7.11%	83.4%	(36,820,993)	30,708,206	(6,112,788)	10,396,038	(12,465,478)	(2,069,440)
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.68%	2.82%	76.6%	(15,896,447)	12,176,546	(3,719,901)	4,122,281	(5,381,626)	(1,259,345)
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.64%	1.88%	114.5%	(7,091,796)	8,121,825	1,030,029	2,749,585	(2,400,876)	348,709
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.74%	0.75%	102.1%	(3,181,483)	3,248,869	67,386	1,099,881	(1,077,068)	22,813
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.07%	1.81%	87.3%	(8,931,018)	7,801,207	(1,129,811)	2,641,042	(3,023,531)	(382,489)
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.27%	1.07%	84.1%	(5,509,598)	4,632,189	(877,409)	1,568,194	(1,865,234)	(297,040)
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.16%	3.64%	70.6%	(22,280,237)	15,727,735	(6,552,502)	5,324,510	(7,542,811)	(2,218,302)
2	Santa Cruz	9,910,386	0.69%	0.65%	94.1%	(2,973,116)	2,799,138	(173,978)	947,628	(1,006,527)	(58,899)
2	Shasta	7,409,092	0.51%	0.54%	105.8%	(2,222,728)	2,351,767	129,040	796,174	(752,488)	43,685
1	Sierra	542,215	0.04%	0.02%	41.1%	(162,665)	66,862	(95,802)	22,636	(55,069)	(32,433)
2	Siskiyou	3,254,627	0.23%	0.13%	57.7%	(976,388)	563,368	(413,021)	190,724	(330,549)	(139,825)
3	Solano	15,704,185	1.09%	1.14%	104.7%	(4,711,256)	4,930,770	219,515	1,669,276	(1,594,961)	74,315
3	Sonoma	18,845,883	1.31%	1.30%	99.1%	(5,653,765)	5,605,361	(48,404)	1,897,654	(1,914,041)	(16,387)
3	Stanislaus	15,497,803	1.08%	1.32%	123.1%	(4,649,341)	5,725,514	1,076,173	1,938,331	(1,574,000)	364,331
2	Sutter	3,403,045	0.24%	0.27%	115.8%	(1,020,914)	1,181,746	160,832	400,071	(345,623)	54,449
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.20%	0.21%	104.6%	(872,189)	912,582	40,393	308,948	(295,273)	13,675
1	Trinity	990,359	0.07%	0.05%	78.9%	(297,108)	234,367	(62,740)	79,343	(100,584)	(21,240)
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.85%	0.96%	113.0%	(3,687,903)	4,168,842	480,938	1,411,331	(1,248,513)	162,818
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.18%	0.14%	80.4%	(776,941)	624,993	(151,947)	211,587	(263,028)	(51,441)
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.69%	1.90%	112.4%	(7,310,048)	8,218,557	908,509	2,782,332	(2,474,763)	307,569
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.45%	0.48%	106.0%	(1,951,245)	2,068,686	117,442	700,339	(660,580)	39,759
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.22%	0.21%	93.1%	(967,523)	900,861	(66,662)	304,980	(327,548)	(22,568)
	Statewide	1,440,487,965	100%	100%	100%	(432,146,390)	432,146,390	0	146,300,000	(146,300,000)	0

2015-2016 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding
(assumes \$90.6 million in new funding then reduced by \$22.7 million revenue shortfall)

Cluster	Court	Reallocation of \$67.9M			Allocation of New Money		Reversal of 2014-15 WAFM Allocation		Estimated 2015-16 Net Total Adjustments to Allocation	Estimated 2015-16 Funding Floor Adjustment
		Allocation of \$67.9 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	Original Share of \$67.9 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$146.3 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	Allocation of \$67.9 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	15% Reallocation	\$146.3M Reallocation		
		K = \$67.9M*C	L = -\$67.9M*B	M = K + L	N = \$146.3M * C	O = \$67.9M * C	P	Q	R	S
4	Alameda	2,445,369	(3,280,103)	(834,734)	5,268,887	2,445,369	2,563,397	(3,596,160)	(1,264,416)	(23,470)
1	Alpine	10,808	(26,026)	(15,218)	23,287	10,808	52,170	14,570	(44,027)	36,601
1	Amador	79,131	(98,068)	(18,937)	170,499	79,131	68,008	(119,205)	18,171	(726)
2	Butte	365,905	(343,524)	22,381	788,393	365,905	(88,680)	(860,259)	418,401	(2,905)
1	Calaveras	77,504	(91,959)	(14,455)	166,993	77,504	49,658	(130,892)	25,667	(691)
1	Colusa	53,651	(64,497)	(10,846)	115,599	53,651	35,876	(90,387)	11,496	127,447
3	Contra Costa	1,564,534	(1,551,105)	13,428	3,371,006	1,564,534	(26,323)	(3,377,718)	1,659,325	(12,908)
1	Del Norte	85,929	(103,810)	(17,881)	185,147	85,929	12,865	(206,252)	(92,520)	(791)
2	El Dorado	257,309	(277,207)	(19,898)	554,409	257,309	48,927	(531,026)	140,211	(2,148)
3	Fresno	1,856,390	(1,624,156)	232,234	3,999,850	1,856,390	(492,612)	(4,166,552)	3,407,730	(14,653)
1	Glenn	58,444	(85,398)	(26,955)	125,925	58,444	62,278	(99,667)	(109,604)	69,935
2	Humboldt	224,323	(235,964)	(11,641)	483,335	224,323	74,712	(407,245)	264,310	(1,900)
2	Imperial	329,554	(296,693)	32,861	710,070	329,554	(96,907)	(770,494)	485,034	(2,573)
1	Inyo	56,019	(81,191)	(25,172)	120,701	56,019	79,617	(67,123)	(50,400)	3,850
3	Kern	1,960,168	(1,356,681)	603,486	4,223,454	1,960,168	(1,811,768)	(5,376,602)	4,739,894	(13,527)
2	Kings	249,987	(224,631)	25,356	538,632	249,987	(90,958)	(607,171)	331,857	(1,910)
2	Lake	104,898	(136,872)	(31,974)	226,018	104,898	92,616	(169,492)	(50,322)	(987)
1	Lassen	74,026	(89,120)	(15,094)	159,499	74,026	35,333	(144,174)	(18,996)	(657)
4	Los Angeles	20,485,151	(18,500,355)	1,984,796	44,138,108	20,485,151	(7,151,892)	(49,546,473)	26,818,347	(163,090)
2	Madera	276,161	(280,617)	(4,456)	595,028	276,161	18,573	(579,477)	267,872	(2,290)
2	Marin	379,565	(628,748)	(249,184)	817,825	379,565	770,602	(311,199)	(715,208)	(4,090)
1	Mariposa	36,574	(43,394)	(6,820)	78,804	36,574	25,008	(59,633)	15,835	54,687
2	Mendocino	184,000	(206,416)	(22,415)	396,454	184,000	86,816	(327,187)	126,710	(1,607)
2	Merced	481,658	(425,804)	55,854	1,037,800	481,658	(230,694)	(1,229,854)	590,591	(3,718)
1	Modoc	26,164	(41,983)	(15,819)	56,373	26,164	60,677	(8,292)	(15,665)	(309)
1	Mono	51,221	(58,089)	(6,868)	110,363	51,221	8,657	(113,437)	(8,570)	126,524
3	Monterey	632,610	(613,209)	19,402	1,363,047	632,610	(97,146)	(1,452,795)	630,401	(5,124)
2	Napa	248,677	(287,015)	(38,338)	535,808	248,677	179,916	(374,776)	224,679	(2,173)
2	Nevada	157,247	(179,932)	(22,684)	338,811	157,247	42,439	(330,219)	(7,657)	(1,394)
4	Orange	4,945,441	(5,797,049)	(851,608)	10,655,641	4,945,441	3,109,525	(8,279,720)	2,324,353	(45,022)

2015-2016 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding
(assumes \$90.6 million in new funding then reduced by \$22.7 million revenue shortfall)

Cluster	Court	Reallocation of \$67.9M			Allocation of New Money		Reversal of 2014-15 WAFM Allocation		Estimated 2015-16 Net Total Adjustments to Allocation	Estimated 2015-16 Funding Floor Adjustment
		Allocation of \$67.9 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	Original Share of \$67.9 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$146.3 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	Allocation of \$67.9 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	15% Reallocation	\$146.3M Reallocation		
		K = \$67.9M*C	L = -\$67.9M*B	M = K + L	N = \$146.3M * C	O = \$67.9M * C	P	Q	R	S
2	Placer	596,887	(523,885)	73,001	1,286,075	596,887	(201,516)	(1,401,671)	974,682	(4,604)
1	Plumas	37,066	(67,926)	(30,860)	79,864	37,066	88,532	(26,468)	(114,763)	(421)
4	Riverside	3,452,473	(2,693,417)	759,057	7,438,834	3,452,473	(2,318,089)	(8,942,429)	6,856,320	(25,208)
4	Sacramento	2,913,654	(2,902,118)	11,537	6,277,874	2,913,654	258,869	(5,902,464)	3,657,752	(23,950)
1	San Benito	81,998	(117,655)	(35,656)	176,677	81,998	103,256	(113,677)	(91,160)	(810)
4	San Bernardino	3,769,553	(2,891,143)	878,410	8,122,025	3,769,553	(3,086,707)	(10,409,297)	6,757,237	(27,713)
4	San Diego	4,824,956	(5,785,413)	(960,458)	10,396,038	4,824,956	3,338,346	(7,944,787)	1,471,869	(43,501)
4	San Francisco	1,913,212	(2,497,692)	(584,481)	4,122,281	1,913,212	2,230,867	(2,360,651)	341,981	(19,228)
3	San Joaquin	1,276,123	(1,114,282)	161,841	2,749,585	1,276,123	(399,572)	(2,941,964)	2,224,751	(9,901)
2	San Luis Obispo	510,471	(499,883)	10,588	1,099,881	510,471	(58,129)	(1,155,784)	497,227	(4,103)
3	San Mateo	1,225,747	(1,403,266)	(177,519)	2,641,042	1,225,747	562,349	(2,262,015)	477,303	(10,796)
3	Santa Barbara	727,822	(865,683)	(137,861)	1,568,194	727,822	463,424	(1,237,679)	209,451	(6,510)
4	Santa Clara	2,471,184	(3,500,731)	(1,029,547)	5,324,510	2,471,184	2,830,533	(3,709,786)	(2,883,909)	(24,455)
2	Santa Cruz	439,808	(467,144)	(27,336)	947,628	439,808	106,452	(862,372)	371,304	(3,603)
2	Shasta	369,516	(349,241)	20,275	796,174	369,516	(31,203)	(794,743)	532,744	(3,053)
1	Sierra	10,506	(25,558)	(15,053)	22,636	10,506	51,110	14,143	(44,895)	38,053
2	Siskiyou	88,518	(153,413)	(64,895)	190,724	88,518	218,492	(34,674)	(154,682)	(968)
3	Solano	774,736	(740,245)	34,491	1,669,276	774,736	(181,524)	(1,840,775)	750,033	(6,207)
3	Sonoma	880,729	(888,335)	(7,605)	1,897,654	880,729	(77,454)	(2,018,927)	609,606	(7,452)
3	Stanislaus	899,608	(730,517)	169,091	1,938,331	899,608	(598,507)	(2,384,481)	1,464,546	(6,521)
2	Sutter	185,679	(160,409)	25,270	400,071	185,679	(75,589)	(447,983)	302,731	(1,431)
2	Tehama	143,387	(137,041)	6,347	308,948	143,387	(2,884)	(299,179)	210,687	(1,160)
1	Trinity	36,824	(46,682)	(9,858)	79,343	36,824	18,348	(75,738)	(35,061)	103,171
3	Tulare	655,020	(579,453)	75,566	1,411,331	655,020	(180,077)	(1,492,368)	1,113,228	(5,107)
2	Tuolumne	98,201	(122,075)	(23,874)	211,587	98,201	71,034	(166,836)	(13,277)	(894)
3	Ventura	1,291,322	(1,148,574)	142,747	2,782,332	1,291,322	(526,080)	(3,187,166)	1,719,233	(10,082)
2	Yolo	325,038	(306,585)	18,453	700,339	325,038	(43,119)	(718,970)	438,940	(2,736)
2	Yuba	141,546	(152,020)	(10,474)	304,980	141,546	48,147	(262,349)	132,620	(1,191)
	Statewide	67,900,000	(67,900,000)	0	146,300,000	67,900,000	(0)	(146,300,000)	67,900,000	0

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 and GF (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%
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%

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 and GF (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
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.

Summary of Changes from 2014–2015 Total WAFM Funding Need

Description	Change in Variable				Change in WAFM Estimated Need				
	2014-15 Amount	2015-16 Amount	Change in Amount	% Change	Change in Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base	Change in Estimated Benefit Need	Change in Estimated OE&E Needed	Total Change in Estimated Need	% Change in Total Estimated Need
	A	B	C (B - A)	D (C / A)	E	F	G	H Sum (E : G)	I (H / \$2.425B)
RAS FTE Need Decrease	19,261	18,603	(658)	-3.4%	(46,250,061)	(25,725,062)	(13,463,633)	(85,438,755)	-3.5%
Average Benefits Increase	\$ 729,644,124	\$ 754,638,335	\$ 24,994,211	3.4%		24,994,211		24,994,211	1.0%
Average RAS-Related Salary Increase	\$ 56,396	\$ 56,871	\$ 474	0.8%	10,889,991	3,795,139		14,685,130	0.6%
BLS Salary Adjustment			-	0.2%	2,437,132	591,793		3,028,925	0.1%
AB 1058 Funding Adjustment	(38,632,274)	(40,129,299)	(1,497,025)	0.2%				(1,497,025)	-0.1%
Total					(32,922,938)	3,656,082	(13,463,633)	(44,227,515)	-1.8%

Intentionally Blank

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Cluster	County	(Historical) WAFM Funding Subject to Reallocation	% of Statewide Historical WAFM Funding	WAFM Funding Need								
				14-15 Total WAFM Funding Need	% of 14-15 Statewide WAFM Funding Need	14-15 Re- allocation Ratio	WAFM Funding Need	% of Statewide WAFM Funding Need	Re- allocation Ratio	Change in WAFM Funding Need	% Change in WAFM Funding Need	Change in % of Statewide WAFM Funding Need
				C	D	E = (D / B)	F	G	H = (G / B)	I = (F - C)	J = (I / C)	K = (G / D) -100%
A	B	C	D	E = (D / B)	F	G	H = (G / B)	I = (F - C)	J = (I / C)	K = (G / D) -100%		
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.8%	88,359,612	3.6%	75.4%	85,724,209	3.6%	74.6%	(2,635,404)	-3.0%	-1.2%
1	Alpine	552,142	0.0%	343,929	0.0%	37.0%	378,883	0.0%	41.5%	34,954	10.2%	12.2%
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.1%	2,738,605	0.1%	78.2%	2,773,992	0.1%	80.7%	35,387	1.3%	3.2%
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.5%	13,261,312	0.5%	108.1%	12,827,059	0.5%	106.5%	(434,253)	-3.3%	-1.5%
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.1%	2,726,378	0.1%	83.0%	2,716,963	0.1%	84.3%	(9,415)	-0.3%	1.5%
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.1%	1,900,461	0.1%	82.5%	1,880,790	0.1%	83.2%	(19,671)	-1.0%	0.8%
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.3%	55,680,843	2.3%	100.5%	54,845,890	2.3%	100.9%	(834,953)	-1.5%	0.3%
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.2%	3,562,408	0.1%	96.1%	3,012,322	0.1%	82.8%	(550,086)	-15.4%	-13.9%
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.4%	9,349,259	0.4%	94.5%	9,020,166	0.4%	92.8%	(329,093)	-3.5%	-1.7%
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.4%	63,521,412	2.6%	109.5%	65,077,123	2.7%	114.3%	1,555,711	2.4%	4.4%
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.1%	2,350,509	0.1%	77.1%	2,048,781	0.1%	68.4%	(301,728)	-12.8%	-11.2%
2	Humboldt	5,005,941	0.3%	7,587,268	0.3%	90.1%	7,863,801	0.3%	95.1%	276,533	3.6%	5.6%
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.4%	11,681,402	0.5%	110.3%	11,552,757	0.5%	111.1%	(128,646)	-1.1%	0.7%
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.1%	2,005,742	0.1%	69.2%	1,963,799	0.1%	69.0%	(41,943)	-2.1%	-0.3%
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.0%	68,772,633	2.8%	142.0%	68,715,131	2.9%	144.5%	(57,502)	-0.1%	1.8%
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.3%	9,041,542	0.4%	112.7%	8,763,482	0.4%	111.3%	(278,059)	-3.1%	-1.3%
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.2%	3,848,078	0.2%	78.7%	3,677,284	0.2%	76.6%	(170,794)	-4.4%	-2.7%
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.1%	2,785,749	0.1%	87.5%	2,595,035	0.1%	83.1%	(190,713)	-6.8%	-5.1%
4	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.2%	740,843,971	30.6%	112.1%	718,122,121	30.2%	110.7%	(22,721,850)	-3.1%	-1.3%
2	Madera	5,953,244	0.4%	9,811,615	0.4%	97.9%	9,681,041	0.4%	98.4%	(130,574)	-1.3%	0.5%
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.9%	13,804,014	0.6%	61.5%	13,305,924	0.6%	60.4%	(498,091)	-3.6%	-1.8%
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.1%	1,268,860	0.1%	81.9%	1,282,132	0.1%	84.3%	13,273	1.0%	2.9%
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.3%	6,396,356	0.3%	86.8%	6,450,265	0.3%	89.1%	53,909	0.8%	2.7%
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.6%	17,792,806	0.7%	117.0%	16,884,889	0.7%	113.1%	(907,917)	-5.1%	-3.3%
1	Modoc	890,668	0.1%	818,258	0.0%	54.6%	917,190	0.0%	62.3%	98,931	12.1%	14.2%
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.1%	1,977,044	0.1%	95.3%	1,795,596	0.1%	88.2%	(181,449)	-9.2%	-7.5%
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.9%	22,985,951	0.9%	105.0%	22,176,616	0.9%	103.2%	(809,335)	-3.5%	-1.7%
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.4%	8,229,667	0.3%	80.3%	8,717,542	0.4%	86.6%	487,875	5.9%	7.9%
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.3%	5,948,648	0.2%	92.6%	5,512,421	0.2%	87.4%	(436,227)	-7.3%	-5.6%
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.5%	172,104,479	7.1%	83.1%	173,366,093	7.3%	85.3%	1,261,614	0.7%	2.6%
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.8%	20,967,595	0.9%	112.1%	20,924,301	0.9%	113.9%	(43,294)	-0.2%	1.6%
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.1%	1,432,034	0.1%	59.0%	1,299,380	0.1%	54.6%	(132,655)	-9.3%	-7.6%
4	Riverside	57,140,417	4.0%	122,184,895	5.0%	127.0%	121,029,006	5.1%	128.2%	(1,155,889)	-0.9%	0.9%
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.3%	100,721,502	4.2%	97.2%	102,140,312	4.3%	100.4%	1,418,810	1.4%	3.3%
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.2%	3,042,492	0.1%	72.4%	2,874,516	0.1%	69.7%	(167,977)	-5.5%	-3.8%
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.3%	137,869,624	5.7%	133.6%	132,144,453	5.6%	130.4%	(5,725,171)	-4.2%	-2.4%
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.5%	169,121,455	7.0%	81.9%	169,142,391	7.1%	83.4%	20,936	0.0%	1.9%
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.7%	64,153,264	2.6%	71.9%	67,069,047	2.8%	76.6%	2,915,783	4.5%	6.5%
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.6%	44,271,294	1.8%	111.3%	44,735,436	1.9%	114.5%	464,142	1.0%	2.9%
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.7%	18,501,624	0.8%	103.7%	17,894,938	0.8%	102.1%	(606,686)	-3.3%	-1.5%
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.1%	43,796,548	1.8%	87.4%	42,969,454	1.8%	87.3%	(827,094)	-1.9%	-0.1%
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.3%	25,711,043	1.1%	83.2%	25,514,338	1.1%	84.1%	(196,705)	-0.8%	1.1%
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.2%	93,240,124	3.8%	74.6%	86,629,182	3.6%	70.6%	(6,610,942)	-7.1%	-5.4%
2	Santa Cruz	9,910,386	0.7%	15,485,876	0.6%	92.8%	15,417,797	0.6%	94.1%	(68,079)	-0.4%	1.4%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Cluster	County	(Historical) WAFM Funding Subject to Reallocation	% of Statewide Historical WAFM Funding	WAFM Funding Need								
				14-15 Total WAFM Funding Need	% of 14-15 Statewide WAFM Funding Need	14-15 Re- allocation Ratio	WAFM Funding Need	% of Statewide WAFM Funding Need	Re- allocation Ratio	Change in WAFM Funding Need	% Change in WAFM Funding Need	Change in % of Statewide WAFM Funding Need
				C	D	E = (D / B)	F	G	H = (G / B)	I = (F - C)	J = (I / C)	K = (G / D) -100%
2	Shasta	7,409,092	0.5%	12,820,506	0.5%	102.8%	12,953,657	0.5%	105.8%	133,151	1.0%	2.9%
1	Sierra	542,215	0.0%	339,119	0.0%	37.2%	368,280	0.0%	41.1%	29,161	8.6%	10.6%
2	Siskiyou	3,254,627	0.2%	3,026,276	0.1%	55.2%	3,103,058	0.1%	57.7%	76,782	2.5%	4.4%
3	Solano	15,704,185	1.1%	28,468,850	1.2%	107.7%	27,158,939	1.1%	104.7%	(1,309,911)	-4.6%	-2.8%
3	Sonoma	18,845,883	1.3%	32,588,957	1.3%	102.7%	30,874,621	1.3%	99.1%	(1,714,337)	-5.3%	-3.5%
3	Stanislaus	15,497,803	1.1%	32,800,366	1.4%	125.7%	31,536,429	1.3%	123.1%	(1,263,936)	-3.9%	-2.1%
2	Sutter	3,403,045	0.2%	6,575,894	0.3%	114.8%	6,509,119	0.3%	115.8%	(66,776)	-1.0%	0.8%
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.2%	4,925,688	0.2%	100.7%	5,026,551	0.2%	104.6%	100,863	2.0%	3.9%
1	Trinity	990,359	0.1%	1,461,014	0.1%	87.6%	1,290,907	0.1%	78.9%	(170,107)	-11.6%	-10.0%
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.9%	22,711,203	0.9%	109.8%	22,962,196	1.0%	113.0%	250,993	1.1%	3.0%
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.2%	3,561,890	0.1%	81.7%	3,442,496	0.1%	80.4%	(119,393)	-3.4%	-1.6%
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.7%	46,915,300	1.9%	114.4%	45,268,238	1.9%	112.4%	(1,647,062)	-3.5%	-1.7%
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.5%	11,431,084	0.5%	104.4%	11,394,431	0.5%	106.0%	(36,653)	-0.3%	1.5%
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.2%	4,887,940	0.2%	90.0%	4,961,988	0.2%	93.1%	74,049	1.5%	3.4%
	Statewide	1,440,487,965	100.0%	2,424,512,269	100.0%		2,380,284,755	100.0%		(44,227,515)	-1.8%	

Court % Changes in Relative WAFM Funding Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Relative decrease of <-5%	40% (6)	5% (1)	0% (0)	11% (1)	14% (8)
Relative change within +/- 5%	40% (6)	86% (19)	100% (12)	78% (7)	76% (44)
Relative increase of >5%	20% (3)	9% (2)	0% (0)	11% (1)	10% (6)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

Range of % Changes in Relative WAFM Funding Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	14.2%	7.9%	4.4%	6.5%	14.2%
Median	-0.3%	0.8%	0.1%	0.9%	0.6%
Low	-13.9%	-5.6%	-3.5%	-5.4%	-13.9%

Court % Changes in WAFM Funding Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in Need of <-5%	47% (7)	9% (2)	8% (1)	11% (1)	19% (11)
Need change within +/- 5%	33% (5)	86% (19)	92% (11)	89% (8)	74% (43)
Increase in Need of >5%	20% (3)	5% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (4)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

Range of % Changes in WAFM Funding Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	12.1%	5.9%	2.4%	4.5%	12.1%
Median	-2.1%	-1.1%	-1.7%	-0.9%	-1.2%
Low	-15.4%	-7.3%	-5.3%	-7.1%	-15.4%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Cluster	County	RAS FTE Need						
		14-15 RAS FTE Need	% of 14-15 Statewide RAS FTE Need	RAS FTE Need	% of Statewide RAS FTE Need	Change in RAS FTE Need	% Change in RAS FTE Need	% Change in % of Statewide RAS FTE Need
		L	M	N	O	P = (N - L)	Q = (P / L)	R =(O/M) -100%
4	Alameda	626	3.3%	601	3.2%	(25)	-4.0%	-0.6%
1	Alpine	3	0.0%	3	0.0%	-	0.0%	3.5%
1	Amador	25	0.1%	26	0.1%	1	4.0%	7.7%
2	Butte	139	0.7%	134	0.7%	(5)	-3.6%	-0.2%
1	Calaveras	27	0.1%	27	0.1%	-	0.0%	3.5%
1	Colusa	18	0.1%	18	0.1%	-	0.0%	3.5%
3	Contra Costa	395	2.1%	381	2.0%	(14)	-3.5%	-0.1%
1	Del Norte	33	0.2%	29	0.2%	(4)	-12.1%	-9.0%
2	El Dorado	89	0.5%	87	0.5%	(2)	-2.2%	1.2%
3	Fresno	535	2.8%	533	2.9%	(2)	-0.4%	3.2%
1	Glenn	25	0.1%	22	0.1%	(3)	-12.0%	-8.9%
2	Humboldt	91	0.5%	91	0.5%	-	0.0%	3.5%
2	Imperial	142	0.7%	138	0.7%	(4)	-2.8%	0.6%
1	Inyo	20	0.1%	20	0.1%	-	0.0%	3.5%
3	Kern	543	2.8%	535	2.9%	(8)	-1.5%	2.0%
2	Kings	102	0.5%	99	0.5%	(3)	-2.9%	0.5%
2	Lake	46	0.2%	46	0.2%	-	0.0%	3.5%
1	Lassen	31	0.2%	28	0.2%	(3)	-9.7%	-6.5%
4	Los Angeles	5,490	28.5%	5,202	28.0%	(288)	-5.2%	-1.9%
2	Madera	99	0.5%	96	0.5%	(3)	-3.0%	0.4%
2	Marin	109	0.6%	106	0.6%	(3)	-2.8%	0.7%
1	Mariposa	13	0.1%	13	0.1%	-	0.0%	3.5%
2	Mendocino	66	0.3%	66	0.4%	-	0.0%	3.5%
2	Merced	159	0.8%	150	0.8%	(9)	-5.7%	-2.3%
1	Modoc	9	0.0%	10	0.1%	1	11.1%	15.0%
1	Mono	14	0.1%	13	0.1%	(1)	-7.1%	-3.9%
3	Monterey	202	1.0%	193	1.0%	(9)	-4.5%	-1.1%
2	Napa	73	0.4%	72	0.4%	(1)	-1.4%	2.1%
2	Nevada	55	0.3%	54	0.3%	(1)	-1.8%	1.7%
4	Orange	1,350	7.0%	1,311	7.0%	(39)	-2.9%	0.5%
2	Placer	169	0.9%	168	0.9%	(1)	-0.6%	2.9%
1	Plumas	15	0.1%	14	0.1%	(1)	-6.7%	-3.4%
4	Riverside	1,125	5.8%	1,100	5.9%	(25)	-2.2%	1.2%
4	Sacramento	739	3.8%	729	3.9%	(10)	-1.4%	2.1%
1	San Benito	29	0.2%	27	0.1%	(2)	-6.9%	-3.6%
4	San Bernardino	1,267	6.6%	1,201	6.5%	(66)	-5.2%	-1.9%
4	San Diego	1,298	6.7%	1,277	6.9%	(21)	-1.6%	1.9%
4	San Francisco	395	2.1%	390	2.1%	(5)	-1.3%	2.2%
3	San Joaquin	375	1.9%	369	2.0%	(6)	-1.6%	1.9%
2	San Luis Obispo	160	0.8%	154	0.8%	(6)	-3.8%	-0.3%
3	San Mateo	294	1.5%	280	1.5%	(14)	-4.8%	-1.4%
3	Santa Barbara	222	1.2%	215	1.2%	(7)	-3.2%	0.3%
4	Santa Clara	603	3.1%	582	3.1%	(21)	-3.5%	-0.1%
2	Santa Cruz	134	0.7%	132	0.7%	(2)	-1.5%	2.0%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Cluster	County	RAS FTE Need						
		14-15 RAS FTE Need	% of 14-15 Statewide RAS FTE Need	RAS FTE Need	% of Statewide RAS FTE Need	Change in RAS FTE Need	% Change in RAS FTE Need	% Change in % of Statewide RAS FTE Need
		L	M	N	O	P = (N - L)	Q = (P / L)	R =(O/M) -100%
2	Shasta	149	0.8%	148	0.8%	(1)	-0.7%	2.8%
1	Sierra	4	0.0%	3	0.0%	(1)	-25.0%	-22.3%
2	Siskiyou	36	0.2%	35	0.2%	(1)	-2.8%	0.7%
3	Solano	233	1.2%	222	1.2%	(11)	-4.7%	-1.4%
3	Sonoma	245	1.3%	231	1.2%	(14)	-5.7%	-2.4%
3	Stanislaus	293	1.5%	287	1.5%	(6)	-2.0%	1.4%
2	Sutter	63	0.3%	62	0.3%	(1)	-1.6%	1.9%
2	Tehama	54	0.3%	54	0.3%	-	0.0%	3.5%
1	Trinity	15	0.1%	13	0.1%	(2)	-13.3%	-10.3%
3	Tulare	239	1.2%	244	1.3%	5	2.1%	5.7%
2	Tuolumne	38	0.2%	38	0.2%	-	0.0%	3.5%
3	Ventura	380	2.0%	367	2.0%	(13)	-3.4%	0.0%
2	Yolo	105	0.5%	103	0.6%	(2)	-1.9%	1.6%
2	Yuba	53	0.3%	54	0.3%	1	1.9%	5.5%
	Statewide	19,261	100.0%	18,603	100.0%	(658)	-3.4%	

Court % Changes in Relative RAS FTE Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Relative decrease of <-5%	33% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	9% (5)
Relative change within +/- 5%	53% (8)	95% (21)	92% (11)	100% (9)	84% (49)
Relative increase of >5%	13% (2)	5% (1)	8% (1)	0% (0)	7% (4)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

Range of % Changes in Relative RAS FTE Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	15.0%	5.5%	5.7%	2.2%	15.0%
Median	-3.4%	1.8%	0.1%	0.5%	1.2%
Low	-22.3%	-2.3%	-2.4%	-1.9%	-22.3%

Court % Changes in RAS FTE Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in Need of <-5%	53% (8)	5% (1)	8% (1)	22% (2)	21% (12)
Need change within +/- 5%	40% (6)	95% (21)	92% (11)	78% (7)	78% (45)
Increase in Need of >5%	7% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

Range of % Changes in RAS FTE Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	11.1%	1.9%	2.1%	-1.3%	11.1%
Median	-6.7%	-1.7%	-3.3%	-2.9%	-2.2%
Low	-25.0%	-5.7%	-5.7%	-5.2%	-25.0%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Cluster	County	FTE Allotment Factor										
		14-15 FTE Allotment Factor (Floor at bottom)	Eligible for FTE Floor?	Qualifies for FTE Floor Adjustment?	% of 14-15 Statewide FTE Allotment Factor	FTE Allotment Factor (Floor at bottom)	Eligible for FTE Floor?	Qualifies for FTE Floor Adjustment?	% of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor	Change in FTE Allotment Factor	% Change in FTE Allotment Factor	% Change in % of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor
		S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA = (W - S)	AB = (AA / S)	AC = (Z/V) - 100%
4	Alameda	80,154			142.1%	80,846			142.2%	692	0.9%	0.0%
1	Alpine	46,478	Yes		82.4%	47,133	Yes		82.9%	655	1.4%	0.6%
1	Amador	56,001	Yes		99.3%	56,823	Yes		99.9%	822	1.5%	0.6%
2	Butte	51,883			92.0%	51,678			90.9%	(205)	-0.4%	-1.2%
1	Calaveras	48,333	Yes		85.7%	50,419	Yes		88.7%	2,086	4.3%	3.4%
1	Colusa	39,738	Yes	Yes	70.5%	40,314	Yes	Yes	70.9%	576	1.4%	0.6%
3	Contra Costa	70,499			125.0%	71,248			125.3%	749	1.1%	0.2%
1	Del Norte	44,633	Yes		79.1%	43,919	Yes	Yes	77.2%	(714)	-1.6%	-2.4%
2	El Dorado	55,986			99.3%	56,637			99.6%	651	1.2%	0.3%
3	Fresno	56,258			99.8%	56,230			98.9%	(29)	-0.1%	-0.9%
1	Glenn	38,354	Yes	Yes	68.0%	39,020	Yes	Yes	68.6%	665	1.7%	0.9%
2	Humboldt	42,838			76.0%	43,884			77.2%	1,046	2.4%	1.6%
2	Imperial	43,449			77.0%	44,514			78.3%	1,066	2.5%	1.6%
1	Inyo	46,926	Yes		83.2%	47,341	Yes		83.2%	415	0.9%	0.0%
3	Kern	59,340			105.2%	59,987			105.5%	647	1.1%	0.2%
2	Kings	50,007			88.7%	50,065			88.0%	58	0.1%	-0.7%
2	Lake	42,841	Yes	Yes	76.0%	42,777	Yes	Yes	75.2%	(64)	-0.1%	-1.0%
1	Lassen	45,156	Yes		80.1%	45,699	Yes		80.4%	544	1.2%	0.4%
4	Los Angeles	75,337			133.6%	76,237			134.1%	900	1.2%	0.4%
2	Madera	52,737			93.5%	53,131			93.4%	395	0.7%	-0.1%
2	Marin	73,165			129.7%	72,718			127.9%	(446)	-0.6%	-1.4%
1	Mariposa	41,743	Yes	Yes	74.0%	44,282	Yes		77.9%	2,539	6.1%	5.2%
2	Mendocino	48,452			85.9%	47,422			83.4%	(1,030)	-2.1%	-2.9%
2	Merced	51,181			90.8%	51,026			89.7%	(155)	-0.3%	-1.1%
1	Modoc	34,261	Yes	Yes	60.8%	34,148	Yes	Yes	60.0%	(113)	-0.3%	-1.2%
1	Mono	67,633	Yes		119.9%	65,349	Yes		114.9%	(2,284)	-3.4%	-4.2%
3	Monterey	67,116			119.0%	67,922			119.4%	805	1.2%	0.4%
2	Napa	68,286			121.1%	69,423			122.1%	1,137	1.7%	0.8%
2	Nevada	54,496			96.6%	55,103			96.9%	607	1.1%	0.3%
4	Orange	73,260			129.9%	73,981			130.1%	721	1.0%	0.1%
2	Placer	64,498			114.4%	66,636			117.2%	2,139	3.3%	2.5%
1	Plumas	39,749	Yes	Yes	70.5%	39,816	Yes	Yes	70.0%	67	0.2%	-0.7%
4	Riverside	60,402			107.1%	61,391			107.9%	989	1.6%	0.8%
4	Sacramento	72,126			127.9%	72,898			128.2%	772	1.1%	0.2%
1	San Benito	54,914	Yes		97.4%	55,942	Yes		98.4%	1,028	1.9%	1.0%
4	San Bernardino	59,223			105.0%	60,128			105.7%	904	1.5%	0.7%
4	San Diego	66,095			117.2%	66,792			117.4%	697	1.1%	0.2%
4	San Francisco	91,023			161.4%	95,571			168.1%	4,548	5.0%	4.1%
3	San Joaquin	62,683			111.1%	62,716			110.3%	33	0.1%	-0.8%
2	San Luis Obispo	60,459			107.2%	60,964			107.2%	504	0.8%	0.0%
3	San Mateo	81,639			144.8%	82,160			144.5%	521	0.6%	-0.2%
3	Santa Barbara	65,153			115.5%	66,307			116.6%	1,154	1.8%	0.9%
4	Santa Clara	82,873			146.9%	81,920			144.0%	(952)	-1.1%	-2.0%
2	Santa Cruz	66,037			117.1%	65,585			115.3%	(453)	-0.7%	-1.5%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Cluster	County	FTE Allotment Factor										
		14-15 FTE Allotment Factor (Floor at bottom)	Eligible for FTE Floor?	Qualifies for FTE Floor Adjustment?	% of 14-15 Statewide FTE Allotment Factor	FTE Allotment Factor (Floor at bottom)	Eligible for FTE Floor?	Qualifies for FTE Floor Adjustment?	% of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor	Change in FTE Allotment Factor	% Change in FTE Allotment Factor	% Change in % of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor
		S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA = (W - S)	AB = (AA / S)	AC = (Z/V) - 100%
2	Shasta	47,883			84.9%	48,587			85.4%	705	1.5%	0.6%
1	Sierra	40,308	Yes	Yes	71.5%	41,587	Yes	Yes	73.1%	1,279	3.2%	2.3%
2	Siskiyou	40,074	Yes	Yes	71.1%	39,497	Yes	Yes	69.4%	(577)	-1.4%	-2.3%
3	Solano	69,044			122.4%	68,411			120.3%	(634)	-0.9%	-1.7%
3	Sonoma	65,845			116.8%	66,317			116.6%	472	0.7%	-0.1%
3	Stanislaus	57,715			102.3%	57,804			101.6%	89	0.2%	-0.7%
2	Sutter	53,532			94.9%	54,267			95.4%	734	1.4%	0.5%
2	Tehama	45,170			80.1%	45,390			79.8%	219	0.5%	-0.4%
1	Trinity	36,889	Yes	Yes	65.4%	37,191	Yes	Yes	65.4%	302	0.8%	0.0%
3	Tulare	46,376			82.2%	46,919			82.5%	543	1.2%	0.3%
2	Tuolumne	51,262	Yes		90.9%	46,997	Yes		82.6%	(4,265)	-8.3%	-9.1%
3	Ventura	69,218			122.7%	69,095			121.5%	(123)	-0.2%	-1.0%
2	Yolo	57,016			101.1%	58,328			102.6%	1,312	2.3%	1.4%
2	Yuba	53,047			94.1%	52,812			92.9%	(235)	-0.4%	-1.3%
	Statewide	56,396	18	9	100.0%	56,871	18	9	100.0%	474	0.8%	
		43,737	15	7	77.6%	44,101	15	7	77.5%	364	0.8%	

Court % Changes in % of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in % of statewide of <-5%	0% (0)	5% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)
% of statewide change within +/-5%	93% (14)	95% (21)	100% (12)	100% (9)	97% (56)
Increase in % of statewide of >5%	7% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

Range of % Changes in % of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	5.2%	2.5%	0.9%	4.1%	5.2%
Median	0.6%	-0.2%	-0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Low	-4.2%	-9.1%	-1.7%	-2.0%	-9.1%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

		Average % and \$ per FTE for Salary-Driven and Non-Salary-Driven Benefits											
Cluster	County	14-15 Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 10)	14-15 Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	14-15 Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	14-15 Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 10)	Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)	Change in Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Change in Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	Change in Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	Change in Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)
		AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK	AL =(AH/AD) -100%	AM =(AI/AE) -100%	AN =(AJ/AF) -100%	AO =(AK/AG) -100%
4	Alameda	36.67%	13,257	35.33%	13,294	36.68%	14,096	35.56%	14,147	0.04%	6.33%	0.67%	6.42%
1	Alpine	17.75%	26,324	17.75%	26,324	18.49%	23,750	18.49%	23,750	4.15%	-9.78%	4.15%	-9.78%
1	Amador	30.85%	10,215	30.85%	11,727	25.72%	8,841	25.03%	10,239	-16.65%	-13.45%	-18.87%	-12.69%
2	Butte	25.17%	12,023	25.17%	11,216	26.08%	12,252	26.08%	11,728	3.61%	1.90%	3.62%	4.57%
1	Calaveras	24.59%	14,595	24.59%	15,409	21.59%	14,270	21.59%	17,439	-12.20%	-2.23%	-12.20%	13.17%
1	Colusa	42.97%	16,159	43.99%	16,859	39.81%	15,596	40.66%	16,353	-7.35%	-3.49%	-7.57%	-3.00%
3	Contra Costa	51.44%	16,229	51.42%	18,455	54.18%	15,741	54.16%	18,402	5.34%	-3.00%	5.32%	-0.29%
1	Del Norte	26.32%	24,364	27.15%	25,716	20.15%	24,226	20.15%	25,578	-23.45%	-0.57%	-25.78%	-0.54%
2	El Dorado	21.22%	16,577	21.22%	16,513	21.53%	17,051	21.53%	16,480	1.47%	2.86%	1.47%	-0.20%
3	Fresno	66.34%	8,199	66.48%	7,592	68.65%	9,720	69.03%	9,193	3.47%	18.55%	3.84%	21.09%
1	Glenn	34.06%	15,775	36.65%	15,877	30.63%	13,960	34.54%	16,761	-10.07%	-11.51%	-5.75%	5.57%
2	Humboldt	29.22%	8,883	29.22%	9,915	30.40%	9,188	30.40%	10,056	4.02%	3.43%	4.02%	1.43%
2	Imperial	32.38%	5,442	33.40%	5,895	32.80%	4,926	34.24%	5,799	1.32%	-9.48%	2.52%	-1.64%
1	Inyo	30.82%	14,929	28.64%	13,937	27.18%	13,930	22.81%	12,607	-11.82%	-6.69%	-20.36%	-9.55%
3	Kern	55.86%	15,785	55.84%	15,785	55.95%	16,476	55.95%	16,476	0.16%	4.38%	0.19%	4.38%
2	Kings	20.56%	9,543	24.06%	10,480	21.05%	8,921	24.58%	9,831	2.38%	-6.51%	2.16%	-6.19%
2	Lake	26.84%	8,833	27.01%	8,393	20.74%	7,723	20.74%	7,804	-22.73%	-12.56%	-23.21%	-7.02%
1	Lassen	23.52%	10,694	22.72%	10,114	20.02%	10,523	20.33%	11,354	-14.90%	-1.60%	-10.54%	12.26%
4	Los Angeles	24.50%	21,352	35.05%	18,731	25.65%	22,765	34.68%	19,875	4.68%	6.62%	-1.07%	6.11%
2	Madera	28.42%	12,584	28.42%	12,582	31.16%	12,584	31.16%	12,582	9.63%	0.00%	9.63%	0.00%
2	Marin	28.72%	12,396	29.73%	12,396	28.17%	12,709	26.75%	12,709	-1.90%	2.53%	-10.05%	2.53%
1	Mariposa	36.42%	10,490	36.42%	15,588	36.33%	10,026	37.13%	15,237	-0.25%	-4.42%	1.94%	-2.25%
2	Mendocino	45.64%	7,300	48.26%	7,180	44.88%	9,420	47.25%	9,480	-1.67%	29.05%	-2.11%	32.04%
2	Merced	58.19%	13,916	58.21%	13,446	59.03%	14,835	60.00%	14,848	1.44%	6.61%	3.08%	10.42%
1	Modoc	27.76%	11,417	27.76%	11,417	25.50%	12,586	25.50%	12,586	-8.15%	10.24%	-8.15%	10.24%
1	Mono	33.74%	19,302	34.96%	21,376	34.46%	19,657	36.41%	21,622	2.11%	1.84%	4.14%	1.15%
3	Monterey	19.58%	14,303	19.39%	15,331	19.33%	14,545	19.37%	16,507	-1.28%	1.69%	-0.13%	7.67%
2	Napa	17.85%	18,981	18.11%	20,464	17.84%	19,706	18.42%	21,372	-0.06%	3.82%	1.73%	4.44%
2	Nevada	39.23%	11,634	40.71%	11,981	36.20%	12,328	37.54%	12,649	-7.72%	5.97%	-7.79%	5.57%
4	Orange	33.14%	10,943	33.46%	12,491	38.12%	11,036	38.41%	12,150	15.03%	0.85%	14.78%	-2.73%
2	Placer	28.43%	22,233	28.42%	22,233	29.11%	19,829	29.12%	19,829	2.38%	-10.81%	2.46%	-10.81%
1	Plumas	24.95%	15,361	26.84%	20,379	28.61%	13,693	28.19%	17,914	14.65%	-10.86%	5.05%	-12.10%
4	Riverside	33.73%	8,412	33.99%	9,583	32.54%	9,553	32.34%	10,577	-3.52%	13.58%	-4.87%	10.37%
4	Sacramento	37.58%	18,311	37.98%	18,641	40.28%	19,032	41.20%	18,924	7.18%	3.94%	8.48%	1.52%
1	San Benito	26.80%	12,096	21.71%	16,521	23.30%	12,269	23.30%	16,695	-13.06%	1.43%	7.34%	1.05%
4	San Bernardino	35.57%	9,298	38.21%	10,884	37.93%	8,332	40.66%	9,879	6.63%	-10.39%	6.41%	-9.23%
4	San Diego	57.36%	7,523	56.84%	8,078	56.79%	9,016	56.86%	9,929	-1.00%	19.85%	0.04%	22.93%
4	San Francisco	30.64%	25,889	29.99%	25,889	32.34%	27,582	31.86%	27,568	5.55%	6.54%	6.23%	6.49%
3	San Joaquin	38.12%	12,974	40.46%	6,617	42.58%	13,107	44.41%	8,836	11.71%	1.02%	9.77%	33.53%
2	San Luis Obispo	42.00%	10,441	48.28%	10,532	41.54%	10,221	50.94%	10,374	-1.11%	-2.10%	5.49%	-1.50%
3	San Mateo	40.18%	15,815	41.02%	13,974	42.73%	17,464	42.77%	14,572	6.34%	10.43%	4.27%	4.28%
3	Santa Barbara	38.30%	6,515	39.94%	7,300	39.48%	6,744	42.21%	7,575	3.07%	3.52%	5.68%	3.76%
4	Santa Clara	37.70%	22,409	37.55%	23,124	30.93%	23,911	30.78%	25,168	-17.95%	6.70%	-18.03%	8.84%
2	Santa Cruz	22.73%	14,515	22.75%	15,158	22.70%	16,282	22.71%	17,588	-0.13%	12.17%	-0.16%	16.03%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Average % and \$ per FTE for Salary-Driven and Non-Salary-Driven Benefits													
Cluster	County	14-15 Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 10)	14-15 Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	14-15 Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	14-15 Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 10)	Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)	Change in Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Change in Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	Change in Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	Change in Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)
		AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK	AL =(AH/AD) -100%	AM =(AI/AE) -100%	AN =(AJ/AF) -100%	AO =(AK/AG) -100%
2	Shasta	21.06%	7,605	22.26%	10,821	22.20%	9,970	23.86%	12,482	5.40%	31.10%	7.21%	15.35%
1	Sierra	36.50%	15,739	36.50%	15,739	37.51%	17,520	37.50%	17,520	2.76%	11.31%	2.76%	11.31%
2	Siskiyou	26.16%	15,668	26.16%	16,294	28.21%	19,216	28.21%	17,008	7.83%	22.65%	7.83%	4.38%
3	Solano	31.56%	12,659	33.57%	12,643	32.29%	12,824	34.41%	14,711	2.30%	1.30%	2.52%	16.35%
3	Sonoma	45.50%	17,914	46.95%	22,397	43.90%	19,989	43.82%	19,951	-3.51%	11.59%	-6.68%	-10.92%
3	Stanislaus	32.63%	17,256	32.96%	17,244	28.87%	17,882	29.38%	18,898	-11.53%	3.62%	-10.88%	9.59%
2	Sutter	34.09%	13,741	35.34%	17,199	31.41%	14,487	32.02%	18,269	-7.86%	5.43%	-9.37%	6.22%
2	Tehama	21.53%	15,763	21.53%	16,013	22.92%	17,076	22.92%	16,571	6.43%	8.33%	6.43%	3.49%
1	Trinity	31.31%	13,505	34.08%	13,281	31.80%	13,849	36.06%	13,908	1.57%	2.54%	5.82%	4.72%
3	Tulare	21.50%	19,651	21.59%	20,759	21.95%	18,427	22.65%	19,889	2.09%	-6.23%	4.89%	-4.19%
2	Tuolumne	23.88%	13,728	24.84%	13,751	27.20%	13,781	28.18%	13,806	13.92%	0.38%	13.44%	0.40%
3	Ventura	37.00%	9,160	39.31%	11,432	37.50%	9,200	40.36%	11,251	1.35%	0.43%	2.67%	-1.58%
2	Yolo	31.40%	12,772	38.27%	19,381	32.36%	12,077	39.94%	19,656	3.07%	-5.45%	4.36%	1.42%
2	Yuba	16.88%	11,542	16.88%	13,413	17.41%	11,152	17.41%	12,656	3.13%	-3.37%	3.13%	-5.64%
	Statewide												

Court % Changes in Program 10 Salary-Driven Benefits by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in Benefits of <-10%	47% (7)	5% (1)	8% (1)	11% (1)	17% (10)
Benefits change within +/-10%	47% (7)	91% (20)	83% (10)	78% (7)	76% (44)
Increase in Benefits of >10%	7% (1)	5% (1)	8% (1)	11% (1)	7% (4)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

Range of % Changes in Program 10 Salary-Driven Benefits by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	14.7%	13.9%	11.7%	15.0%	15.0%
Median	-8.1%	1.9%	2.2%	4.7%	1.5%
Low	-23.4%	-22.7%	-11.5%	-17.9%	-23.4%

Court % Changes in Program 10 Non-Salary-Driven Benefits by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in Benefits of <-10%	20% (3)	9% (2)	0% (0)	11% (1)	10% (6)
Benefits change within +/-10%	67% (10)	73% (16)	75% (9)	67% (6)	71% (41)
Increase in Benefits of >10%	13% (2)	18% (4)	25% (3)	22% (2)	19% (11)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

Range of % Changes in Program 10 Non-Salary-Driven Benefits by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	11.3%	31.1%	18.6%	19.8%	31.1%
Median	-2.2%	2.7%	2.6%	6.5%	1.9%
Low	-13.5%	-12.6%	-6.2%	-10.4%	-13.5%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Cluster	County	Funding Floor Adjustment					
		14-15 Floor Eligible?	14-15 Floor Allocation Adjustment	% of 14-15 Statewide Floor Allocation Adjustment	Floor Eligible?	Floor Allocation Adjustment	% of Statewide RAS FTE Need
		AP	AQ	AR	AS	AT	AU
4	Alameda		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Alpine	Yes	266,308	22.4%	Yes	36,601	6.5%
1	Amador		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Butte		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Calaveras		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Colusa	Yes	123,127	10.4%	Yes	127,447	22.7%
3	Contra Costa		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Del Norte		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	El Dorado		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Fresno		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Glenn	Yes	32,836	2.8%	Yes	69,935	12.5%
2	Humboldt		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Imperial		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Inyo	Yes	186,861	15.7%	Yes	3,850	0.7%
3	Kern		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Kings		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Lake		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Lassen		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Los Angeles		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Madera		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Marin		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Mariposa	Yes	96,473	8.1%	Yes	54,687	9.8%
2	Mendocino		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Merced		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Modoc	Yes	34,375	2.9%		-	0.0%
1	Mono	Yes	89,167	7.5%	Yes	126,524	22.6%
3	Monterey		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Napa		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Nevada		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Orange		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Placer		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Plumas		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Riverside		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Sacramento		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	San Benito		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	San Bernardino		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	San Diego		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	San Francisco		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	San Joaquin		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	San Luis Obispo		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	San Mateo		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Santa Barbara		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Santa Clara		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Santa Cruz		-	0.0%		-	0.0%

Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster

Cluster	County	Funding Floor Adjustment					
		14-15 Floor Eligible?	14-15 Floor Allocation Adjustment	% of 14-15 Statewide Floor Allocation Adjustment	Floor Eligible?	Floor Allocation Adjustment	% of Statewide RAS FTE Need
		AP	AQ	AR	AS	AT	AU
2	Shasta		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Sierra	Yes	273,332	23.0%	Yes	38,053	6.8%
2	Siskiyou		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Solano		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Sonoma		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Stanislaus		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Sutter		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Tehama		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Trinity	Yes	85,985	7.2%	Yes	103,171	18.4%
3	Tulare		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Tuolumne		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Ventura		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Yolo		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Yuba		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
	Statewide	9	1,188,465	100.0%	8	560,269	100.0%

FY 2015-2016 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor

Court	Total WAFM- Related Allocation for 2015-16 (Prior to implementing funding floor)	Floor Funding	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Share of reduction	Reduction Allocation
	A				
Alameda	70,962,153	N/A	-	4.19%	(23,470)
Alpine	713,399	750,000	36,601	0.00%	-
Amador	2,194,305	N/A	-	0.13%	(726)
Butte	8,784,749	N/A	-	0.52%	(2,905)
Calaveras	2,088,427	N/A	-	0.12%	(691)
Colusa	1,578,218	1,705,664	127,447	0.00%	-
Contra Costa	39,026,500	N/A	-	2.30%	(12,908)
Del Norte	2,392,069	N/A	-	0.14%	(791)
El Dorado	6,495,767	N/A	-	0.38%	(2,148)
Fresno	44,303,003	N/A	-	2.62%	(14,653)
Glenn	1,805,064	1,874,999	69,935	0.00%	-
Humboldt	5,746,184	N/A	-	0.34%	(1,900)
Imperial	7,780,197	N/A	-	0.46%	(2,573)
Inyo	1,871,149	1,874,999	3,850	0.00%	-
Kern	40,899,938	N/A	-	2.41%	(13,527)
Kings	5,775,061	N/A	-	0.34%	(1,910)
Lake	2,982,871	N/A	-	0.18%	(987)
Lassen	1,986,663	N/A	-	0.12%	(657)
Los Angeles	493,111,905	N/A	-	29.11%	(163,090)
Madera	6,923,150	N/A	-	0.41%	(2,290)
Marin	12,365,601	N/A	-	0.73%	(4,090)
Mariposa	1,099,019	1,153,706	54,687	0.00%	-
Mendocino	4,858,116	N/A	-	0.29%	(1,607)
Merced	11,241,111	N/A	-	0.66%	(3,718)
Modoc	933,451	N/A	-	0.06%	(309)
Mono	1,419,270	1,545,794	126,524	0.00%	-
Monterey	15,493,436	N/A	-	0.91%	(5,124)
Napa	6,569,121	N/A	-	0.39%	(2,173)
Nevada	4,214,470	N/A	-	0.25%	(1,394)
Orange	136,127,653	N/A	-	8.04%	(45,022)
Placer	13,921,525	N/A	-	0.82%	(4,604)
Plumas	1,272,318	N/A	-	0.08%	(421)
Riverside	76,217,870	N/A	-	4.50%	(25,208)
Sacramento	72,412,749	N/A	-	4.27%	(23,950)
San Benito	2,448,763	N/A	-	0.14%	(810)
San Bernardino	83,792,311	N/A	-	4.95%	(27,713)
San Diego	131,528,478	N/A	-	7.76%	(43,501)
San Francisco	58,137,096	N/A	-	3.43%	(19,228)
San Joaquin	29,935,089	N/A	-	1.77%	(9,901)
San Luis Obispo	12,407,088	N/A	-	0.73%	(4,103)
San Mateo	32,643,570	N/A	-	1.93%	(10,796)
Santa Barbara	19,682,535	N/A	-	1.16%	(6,510)
Santa Clara	73,942,303	N/A	-	4.36%	(24,455)
Santa Cruz	10,892,453	N/A	-	0.64%	(3,603)
Shasta	9,231,147	N/A	-	0.54%	(3,053)
Sierra	711,947	750,000	38,053	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	2,926,725	N/A	-	0.17%	(968)
Solano	18,767,019	N/A	-	1.11%	(6,207)
Sonoma	22,531,485	N/A	-	1.33%	(7,452)
Stanislaus	19,717,933	N/A	-	1.16%	(6,521)
Sutter	4,327,102	N/A	-	0.26%	(1,431)
Tehama	3,506,558	N/A	-	0.21%	(1,160)
Trinity	1,146,829	1,250,000	103,171	0.00%	-
Tulare	15,441,852	N/A	-	0.91%	(5,107)
Tuolumne	2,702,700	N/A	-	0.16%	(894)
Ventura	30,483,882	N/A	-	1.80%	(10,082)
Yolo	8,271,468	N/A	-	0.49%	(2,736)
Yuba	3,601,913	N/A	-	0.21%	(1,191)
Total	1,704,344,724	10,905,162	560,269	100.00%	(560,269)

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	85,724,209	3.60%	70,962,153	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Alpine	378,883	0.02%	713,399	750,000	Y	825,000	713,399	750,000
1	Amador	2,773,992	0.12%	2,194,305	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Butte	12,827,059	0.54%	8,784,749	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Calaveras	2,716,963	0.11%	2,088,427	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Colusa	1,880,790	0.08%	1,578,218	1,874,999	Y	1,705,664	1,578,218	1,705,664
3	Contra Costa	54,845,890	2.30%	39,026,500	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Del Norte	3,012,322	0.13%	2,392,069	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	El Dorado	9,020,166	0.38%	6,495,767	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Fresno	65,077,123	2.73%	44,303,003	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Glenn	2,048,781	0.09%	1,805,064	1,874,999	Y	2,062,499	1,805,064	1,874,999
2	Humboldt	7,863,801	0.33%	5,746,184	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Imperial	11,552,757	0.49%	7,780,197	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Inyo	1,963,799	0.08%	1,871,149	1,874,999	Y	2,062,499	1,871,149	1,874,999
3	Kern	68,715,131	2.89%	40,899,938	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Kings	8,763,482	0.37%	5,775,061	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Lake	3,677,284	0.15%	2,982,871	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Lassen	2,595,035	0.11%	1,986,663	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Los Angeles	718,122,121	30.17%	493,111,905	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Madera	9,681,041	0.41%	6,923,150	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Marin	13,305,924	0.56%	12,365,601	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Mariposa	1,282,132	0.05%	1,099,019	1,250,000	Y	1,153,706	1,099,019	1,153,706
2	Mendocino	6,450,265	0.27%	4,858,116	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Merced	16,884,889	0.71%	11,241,111	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Modoc	917,190	0.04%	933,451	875,000	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Mono	1,795,596	0.08%	1,419,270	1,874,999	Y	1,545,794	1,419,270	1,545,794
3	Monterey	22,176,616	0.93%	15,493,436	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Napa	8,717,542	0.37%	6,569,121	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Nevada	5,512,421	0.23%	4,214,470	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Orange	173,366,093	7.28%	136,127,653	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Placer	20,924,301	0.88%	13,921,525	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Plumas	1,299,380	0.05%	1,272,318	1,250,000	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Riverside	121,029,006	5.08%	76,217,870	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Sacramento	102,140,312	4.29%	72,412,749	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	San Benito	2,874,516	0.12%	2,448,763	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Bernardino	132,144,453	5.55%	83,792,311	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Diego	169,142,391	7.11%	131,528,478	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Francisco	67,069,047	2.82%	58,137,096	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	San Joaquin	44,735,436	1.88%	29,935,089	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	San Luis Obispo	17,894,938	0.75%	12,407,088	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	San Mateo	42,969,454	1.81%	32,643,570	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Santa Barbara	25,514,338	1.07%	19,682,535	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Santa Clara	86,629,182	3.64%	73,942,303	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Santa Cruz	15,417,797	0.65%	10,892,453	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Shasta	12,953,657	0.54%	9,231,147	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Sierra	368,280	0.02%	711,947	750,000	Y	825,000	711,947	750,000
2	Siskiyou	3,103,058	0.13%	2,926,725	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Solano	27,158,939	1.14%	18,767,019	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Sonoma	30,874,621	1.30%	22,531,485	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Stanislaus	31,536,429	1.32%	19,717,933	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Sutter	6,509,119	0.27%	4,327,102	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Tehama	5,026,551	0.21%	3,506,558	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Trinity	1,290,907	0.05%	1,146,829	1,250,000	Y	1,250,796	1,146,829	1,250,000
3	Tulare	22,962,196	0.96%	15,441,852	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Tuolumne	3,442,496	0.14%	2,702,700	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Ventura	45,268,238	1.90%	30,483,882	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yolo	11,394,431	0.48%	8,271,468	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yuba	4,961,988	0.21%	3,601,913	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Statewide	2,380,284,755	100.00%	1,704,344,724					10,905,162

2014-2015 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2013-14 Ending TCTF Base	GF Base for Benefits	2014-15 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2014-15 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	TCTF Reduction of 2012-13 Benefits Allocation	Revenue Shortfall Reduction	FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (12-13)	2014-15 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N (Sum A:M)
Alameda	71,494,038	3,102,046	506,404	(53,299)	(1,117,440)	(1,006,310)	1,609,137	-	(3,177,924)	(1,958,825)	101,575	424,792	115,195	70,039,389
Alpine	536,863	20,340	(73,967)	266,308	(7,957)	-	6,245	-	-	-	83	2,034	49	750,000
Amador	2,075,747	51,756	(10,168)	(1,615)	(1,611)	(29,737)	23,828	-	-	-	2,565	11,006	733	2,122,503
Butte	8,170,991	124,076	609,976	(6,221)	(95,367)	(118,127)	158,491	-	(467,145)	(291,613)	14,608	59,332	15,194	8,174,196
Calaveras	1,940,406	50,506	18,308	(1,513)	(59,318)	(27,738)	45,771	-	-	-	3,074	18,652	967	1,989,114
Colusa	1,369,335	24,773	13,188	123,127	(11,356)	-	16,004	-	-	-	1,447	13,708	378	1,550,604
Contra Costa	34,404,261	1,396,191	1,841,330	(27,312)	(887,134)	(524,858)	1,020,012	-	-	(1,705,774)	69,231	218,186	76,248	35,880,382
Del Norte	2,300,564	94,129	114,280	(1,783)	(62,921)	(34,619)	45,700	-	-	(126,942)	1,964	11,208	535	2,342,115
El Dorado	5,872,358	213,119	263,889	(4,768)	(21,412)	(88,211)	18,950	-	-	(57,081)	11,851	54,374	4,059	6,267,128
Fresno	33,706,146	3,340,364	2,789,941	(29,356)	(876,146)	(554,229)	923,246	(196,645)	-	(1,032,025)	60,497	181,080	66,289	38,379,162
Glenn	1,794,458	54,665	(11,939)	32,836	(31,067)	-	24,061	-	(9,779)	-	1,927	19,264	573	1,874,999
Humboldt	5,241,609	73,084	276,212	(4,042)	(83,444)	(76,110)	137,243	-	(167,800)	(150,006)	8,913	48,160	8,040	5,311,860
Imperial	7,028,750	125,538	518,519	(5,349)	(230,012)	(100,431)	204,591	-	(420,479)	(180,405)	11,204	67,678	10,523	7,301,126
Inyo	1,894,107	75,586	(62,695)	186,861	(54,537)	-	32,741	-	(186,658)	(42,314)	1,245	30,402	262	1,874,999
Kern	29,595,035	3,544,269	4,252,465	(26,903)	(629,057)	(517,548)	551,636	-	(65,567)	(1,750,452)	52,450	277,328	59,874	35,343,529
Kings	5,519,658	45,117	425,836	(4,106)	(6,952)	(77,594)	22,140	-	(421,918)	(181,060)	9,935	57,026	7,908	5,395,989
Lake	3,102,931	9,123	95,557	(2,237)	449	(41,896)	3,199	-	(196,493)	(56,758)	4,311	20,328	1,522	2,940,035
Lassen	2,222,061	7,839	40,363	(1,498)	(6,630)	(27,456)	5,580	-	(293,836)	-	2,384	20,156	522	1,969,483
Los Angeles	429,960,172	18,887,969	35,639,382	(339,019)	(7,790,986)	(6,588,036)	12,101,803	(1,209,506)	(14,294,467)	(26,758,268)	689,065	3,144,530	977,472	444,420,112
Madera	6,089,746	384,825	355,661	(4,814)	(137,838)	(88,349)	45,479	-	(381,406)	-	9,711	52,502	2,893	6,328,412
Marin	12,354,099	644,512	(59,305)	(9,532)	(324,291)	(180,059)	358,566	(6,453)	(9,625)	(391,957)	17,038	114,766	18,155	12,525,915
Mariposa	954,124	22,300	1,730	96,473	(6,416)	-	3,560	-	-	(28,406)	1,225	3,904	329	1,048,824
Mendocino	4,435,925	311,770	129,330	(3,459)	(239,862)	(63,560)	235,205	-	(299,349)	-	6,083	30,068	5,209	4,547,361
Merced	9,208,327	774,827	673,039	(7,896)	(269,194)	(148,653)	310,199	-	-	(250,840)	16,595	55,652	14,527	10,376,582
Modoc	932,838	31,967	(69,362)	34,375	(1,273)	-	3,544	-	(789)	(63,471)	662	6,134	375	875,000
Mono	1,210,549	85,641	59,610	89,167	(32,349)	-	11,323	-	(24,156)	(8,201)	914	12,446	323	1,405,267
Monterey	14,497,845	277,496	747,923	(10,940)	(227,572)	(204,155)	264,491	-	(870,000)	(333,656)	28,573	183,464	24,904	14,378,373
Napa	6,372,800	309,796	140,912	(4,766)	(107,676)	(91,731)	181,753	-	(295,552)	(287,148)	9,042	30,550	3,144	6,261,124
Nevada	4,479,222	95,494	191,189	(3,091)	(100,179)	(60,469)	120,300	-	(433,431)	(292,045)	6,730	49,946	6,564	4,060,228
Orange	121,988,177	6,929,920	3,496,207	(97,195)	(3,671,441)	(1,828,581)	5,785,430	(392,697)	(2,733,776)	(3,329,845)	206,630	923,882	268,656	127,545,367
Placer	12,066,757	634,796	821,972	(9,566)	(238,459)	(188,509)	284,469	-	-	(933,901)	21,287	77,378	26,853	12,563,076
Plumas	1,448,318	14,929	(95,320)	(1,038)	(273)	(19,092)	6,015	-	-	-	1,442	9,206	356	1,364,542
Riverside	65,277,653	923,657	6,057,489	(51,696)	(685,149)	(988,161)	1,643,210	(168,861)	(1,931,520)	(2,882,751)	131,371	532,226	62,703	67,920,171
Sacramento	63,873,883	3,560,591	2,846,831	(50,844)	(1,673,778)	(959,404)	2,297,449	-	(1,864,424)	(1,824,452)	93,189	340,254	175,080	66,814,374
San Benito	2,526,744	34,642	(74,843)	(1,885)	(8,678)	(34,673)	16,844	-	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,233	2,477,959
San Bernardino	72,147,163	1,264,732	6,917,080	(56,332)	(1,011,776)	(1,075,223)	1,333,588	-	(3,269,446)	(2,986,710)	133,960	435,474	181,146	74,013,657
San Diego	125,478,197	2,853,598	3,042,330	(95,765)	(3,506,215)	(1,824,897)	4,121,481	(100,555)	(657,192)	(4,757,300)	206,259	718,422	246,860	125,725,224
San Francisco	49,195,369	5,487,134	600,353	(40,937)	-	(788,895)	1,495,964	-	-	(2,582,976)	53,715	272,528	86,214	53,778,469
San Joaquin	24,914,639	1,245,356	1,587,646	(20,058)	(756,034)	(378,529)	535,858	-	(287,747)	(779,859)	44,944	201,698	50,156	26,358,070
San Luis Obispo	11,449,303	298,958	819,314	(8,923)	(36,773)	(172,442)	122,246	-	(241,676)	(673,831)	17,704	130,020	17,902	11,721,801
San Mateo	29,551,664	2,411,112	1,034,520	(23,884)	(211,070)	(457,780)	603,175	-	(443,042)	(1,479,478)	48,700	329,518	15,239	31,378,672
Santa Barbara	18,243,443	1,597,662	590,633	(14,454)	21,451	(271,266)	121,986	-	(1,055,112)	(457,408)	28,356	162,858	27,529	18,995,679
Santa Clara	73,257,781	2,309,467	719,654	(56,104)	(1,120,423)	(1,056,021)	825,453	-	-	(1,833,360)	119,260	452,782	109,914	73,728,403
Santa Cruz	9,997,292	203,557	549,799	(7,835)	(174,422)	(149,105)	154,317	-	-	(424,668)	17,644	113,210	14,656	10,294,444
Shasta	10,169,734	262,222	457,766	(6,340)	38,857	(121,205)	184,003	-	(2,389,668)	(326,131)	12,206	44,394	4,435	8,330,271
Sierra	538,105	9,615	(72,867)	273,332	(9,268)	-	8,941	-	-	-	235	1,830	76	750,000
Siskiyou	3,072,125	91,037	(29,475)	(2,302)	(60,127)	(43,536)	59,428	-	-	(103,923)	3,104	37,000	966	3,024,297
Solano	17,240,736	353,779	917,245	(13,346)	(417,276)	(252,301)	497,180	-	(435,400)	(535,433)	28,439	119,364	34,831	17,537,817
Sonoma	19,441,709	1,172,049	1,060,419	(15,724)	(584,741)	(295,531)	616,911	-	(440,000)	(479,410)	32,278	119,004	36,705	20,663,669

2014-2015 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2013-14 Ending TCTF Base	GF Base for Benefits	2014-15 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2014-15 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	TCTF Reduction of 2012-13 Benefits Allocation	Revenue Shortfall Reduction	FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (12-13)	2014-15 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N (Sum A:M)
Stanislaus	15,957,751	1,305,230	1,492,323	(13,714)	(1,003,375)	(257,942)	818,944	-	(9,326)	(427,578)	34,594	88,718	36,236	18,021,862
Sutter	3,690,455	159,760	277,618	(2,979)	(24,759)	(54,599)	72,212	-	(247,071)	-	6,150	37,382	2,077	3,916,247
Tehama	2,875,164	108,184	197,864	(2,412)	(17,294)	(44,321)	24,866	-	-	(5,472)	4,138	28,100	1,362	3,170,180
Trinity	1,421,481	53,679	13,969	85,985	(16,561)	-	19,978	-	(450,608)	-	943	7,648	573	1,137,087
Tulare	13,404,033	33,744	960,816	(10,451)	(127,031)	(199,524)	103,341	-	(15,576)	(679,043)	28,289	204,932	27,184	13,730,713
Tuolumne	2,806,339	50,351	58,705	(2,026)	(2,616)	(37,684)	19,249	-	(220,516)	(30,986)	3,916	16,642	1,043	2,662,418
Ventura	27,023,638	968,752	2,053,031	(21,141)	(416,492)	(397,607)	542,126	-	(1,559,157)	(731,699)	54,971	205,304	60,255	27,781,980
Yolo	7,642,166	210,076	384,237	(5,417)	(206,373)	(105,804)	168,486	-	(582,889)	(461,445)	12,802	48,556	11,098	7,115,493
Yuba	3,261,573	90,867	197,074	(2,578)	(66,104)	(47,493)	66,221	-	(132,569)	-	4,696	15,788	1,670	3,389,145
Total	1,518,726,356	68,818,575	86,300,000	(0)	(29,405,750)	(22,700,000)	41,034,166	(2,074,718)	(40,983,089)	(64,674,907)	2,500,000	10,907,494	2,925,771	1,571,373,898

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

Estimated FY 2015-2016 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2014-15 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 (13-14)	Annualization TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	Estimated 2014-15 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2013-14 Benefits Subsidy Reduction Return Allocation	Current-Year Adjusted Allocation	2015-16 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	Total 2015-16 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)	2015-16 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	Total 2015-16 WAFM-Related Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J (Sum A:I)	K	L (Sum J:K)	M	N (Sum L:M)
Alameda	75,540,885	(3,177,924)	(1,887,560)	101,575	424,792	104,612	-	562,020	558,169	72,226,569	(1,264,416)	70,962,153	(23,470)	70,938,683
Alpine	747,833	-	-	83	2,034	20	-	5,289	2,166	757,426	(44,027)	713,399	36,601	750,000
Amador	2,137,937	-	-	2,565	11,006	669	-	15,693	8,265	2,176,134	18,171	2,194,305	(726)	2,193,580
Butte	8,961,947	(467,145)	(311,297)	14,608	59,332	14,315	-	68,952	25,636	8,366,348	418,401	8,784,749	(2,905)	8,781,843
Calaveras	1,994,159	-	-	3,074	18,652	860	-	30,138	15,877	2,062,759	25,667	2,088,427	(691)	2,087,736
Colusa	1,535,071	-	-	1,447	13,708	340	-	10,604	5,551	1,566,722	11,496	1,578,218	127,447	1,705,664
Contra Costa	37,747,349	-	(1,685,860)	69,231	218,186	73,580	-	590,873	353,816	37,367,175	1,659,325	39,026,500	(12,908)	39,013,593
Del Norte	2,489,969	-	(107,954)	1,964	11,208	479	-	73,071	15,852	2,484,589	(92,520)	2,392,069	(791)	2,391,278
El Dorado	6,342,136	-	(153,647)	11,851	54,374	3,814	-	90,455	6,573	6,355,555	140,211	6,495,767	(2,148)	6,493,618
Fresno	39,657,551	-	(968,568)	60,497	181,080	63,218	-	1,581,245	320,250	40,895,273	3,407,730	44,303,003	(14,653)	44,288,350
Glenn	1,863,014	(9,779)	-	1,927	19,264	585	-	31,311	8,346	1,914,668	(109,604)	1,805,064	69,935	1,874,999
Humboldt	5,640,662	(167,800)	(149,979)	8,913	48,160	7,416	-	46,895	47,606	5,481,874	264,310	5,746,184	(1,900)	5,744,283
Imperial	7,642,037	(420,479)	(181,551)	11,204	67,678	9,382	-	95,925	70,967	7,295,164	485,034	7,780,197	(2,573)	7,777,624
Inyo	2,072,062	(186,658)	-	1,245	30,402	262	-	(7,122)	11,357	1,921,549	(50,400)	1,871,149	3,850	1,874,999
Kern	37,287,444	(65,567)	(1,422,291)	52,450	277,328	56,950	-	(217,620)	191,349	36,160,043	4,739,894	40,899,938	(13,527)	40,886,410
Kings	6,001,692	(421,918)	(249,197)	9,935	57,026	8,643	-	29,342	7,680	5,443,203	331,857	5,775,061	(1,910)	5,773,151
Lake	3,209,021	(196,493)	(39,664)	4,311	20,328	1,378	-	33,201	1,110	3,033,193	(50,322)	2,982,871	(987)	2,981,884
Lassen	2,267,714	(293,836)	-	2,384	20,156	503	-	6,803	1,935	2,005,659	(18,996)	1,986,663	(657)	1,986,006
Los Angeles	487,249,816	(14,294,467)	(23,016,456)	689,065	3,144,530	928,908	(502,040)	7,896,395	4,197,807	466,293,558	26,818,347	493,111,905	(163,090)	492,948,814
Madera	6,733,060	(381,406)	-	9,711	52,502	2,614	-	223,020	15,775	6,655,277	267,872	6,923,150	(2,290)	6,920,860
Marin	12,957,597	(9,625)	(60,946)	17,038	114,766	16,496	-	(78,894)	124,378	13,080,809	(715,208)	12,365,601	(4,090)	12,361,512
Mariposa	1,071,772	-	-	1,225	3,904	278	-	4,769	1,235	1,083,184	15,835	1,099,019	54,687	1,153,706
Mendocino	4,868,909	(299,349)	(17,140)	6,083	30,068	5,075	-	56,174	81,587	4,731,407	126,710	4,858,116	(1,607)	4,856,510
Merced	10,689,301	-	(394,105)	16,595	55,652	13,556	-	161,921	107,600	10,650,520	590,591	11,241,111	(3,718)	11,237,393
Modoc	932,090	(789)	-	662	6,134	299	-	9,491	1,229	949,116	(15,665)	933,451	(309)	933,142
Mono	1,423,941	(24,156)	-	914	12,446	199	-	10,568	3,928	1,427,840	(8,570)	1,419,270	126,524	1,545,794
Monterey	15,549,243	(870,000)	(348,606)	28,573	183,464	23,029	-	205,587	91,745	14,863,034	630,401	15,493,436	(5,124)	15,488,311
Napa	6,892,819	(295,552)	(355,081)	9,042	30,550	2,855	-	(3,237)	63,045	6,344,442	224,679	6,569,121	(2,173)	6,566,948
Nevada	4,782,934	(433,431)	(311,388)	6,730	49,946	5,623	-	79,983	41,729	4,222,127	(7,657)	4,214,470	(1,394)	4,213,076
Orange	134,038,401	(2,733,776)	(4,120,954)	206,630	923,882	248,771	(216,241)	3,449,769	2,006,818	133,803,300	2,324,353	136,127,653	(45,022)	136,082,631
Placer	13,559,968	-	(919,283)	21,287	77,378	24,387	-	84,431	98,675	12,946,843	974,682	13,921,525	(4,604)	13,916,921
Plumas	1,372,630	-	-	1,442	9,206	356	-	2,474	973	1,387,081	(114,763)	1,272,318	(421)	1,271,898
Riverside	72,996,304	(1,931,520)	(2,343,035)	131,371	532,226	56,789	-	(650,572)	569,988	69,361,550	6,856,320	76,217,870	(25,208)	76,192,662
Sacramento	70,854,133	(1,864,424)	(1,962,507)	93,189	340,254	165,020	-	332,406	796,927	68,754,997	3,657,752	72,412,749	(23,950)	72,388,799
San Benito	2,492,824	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,124	-	21,556	5,843	2,539,923	(91,160)	2,448,763	(810)	2,447,953
San Bernardino	80,594,456	(3,269,446)	(2,998,333)	133,960	435,474	155,207	-	1,521,168	462,588	77,035,074	6,757,237	83,792,311	(27,713)	83,764,598
San Diego	131,793,072	(657,192)	(4,860,861)	206,259	718,422	228,431	(99,456)	2,061,274	666,662	130,056,609	1,471,869	131,528,478	(43,501)	131,484,977
San Francisco	56,737,883	-	(500,247)	53,715	272,528	81,035	-	631,291	518,912	57,795,116	341,981	58,137,096	(19,228)	58,117,868
San Joaquin	27,507,407	(287,747)	(806,249)	44,944	201,698	46,176	-	818,234	185,876	27,710,338	2,224,751	29,935,089	(9,901)	29,925,189
San Luis Obispo	12,644,124	(241,676)	(676,999)	17,704	130,020	15,941	-	972	19,774	11,909,861	497,227	12,407,088	(4,103)	12,402,984
San Mateo	33,365,516	(443,042)	(1,610,124)	48,700	329,518	14,649	-	363,484	97,565	32,166,267	477,303	32,643,570	(10,796)	32,632,773
Santa Barbara	20,560,721	(1,055,112)	(518,796)	28,356	162,858	25,320	-	227,423	42,314	19,473,084	209,451	19,682,535	(6,510)	19,676,025
Santa Clara	75,935,828	-	(1,922,146)	119,260	452,782	102,859	-	1,851,301	286,329	76,826,212	(2,883,909)	73,942,303	(24,455)	73,917,847
Santa Cruz	10,722,708	-	(485,144)	17,644	113,210	12,580	-	86,623	53,529	10,521,149	371,304	10,892,453	(3,603)	10,888,850
Shasta	11,106,240	(2,389,668)	(277,596)	12,206	44,394	3,990	-	135,012	63,826	8,698,403	532,744	9,231,147	(3,053)	9,228,094
Sierra	747,859	-	-	235	1,830	35	-	3,781	3,101	756,842	(44,895)	711,947	38,053	750,000
Siskiyou	3,130,686	-	(151,135)	3,104	37,000	876	-	40,262	20,614	3,081,407	(154,682)	2,926,725	(968)	2,925,757
Solano	18,578,317	(435,400)	(575,761)	28,439	119,364	33,592	-	95,975	172,459	18,016,985	750,033	18,767,019	(6,207)	18,760,812
Sonoma	21,690,624	(440,000)	(551,376)	32,278	119,004	31,686	-	825,673	213,991	21,921,878	609,606	22,531,485	(7,452)	22,524,033
Stanislaus	18,557,159	(9,326)	(447,115)	34,594	88,718	35,199	-	(289,912)	284,071	18,253,387	1,464,546	19,717,933	(6,521)	19,711,412

Estimated FY 2015-2016 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2014-15 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 (13-14)	Annualization TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	Estimated 2014-15 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2013-14 Benefits Subsidy Reduction Return Allocation	Current-Year Adjusted Allocation	2015-16 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	Total 2015-16 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)	2015-16 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	Total 2015-16 WAFM-Related Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J (Sum A:I)	K	L (Sum J:K)	M	N (Sum L:M)
Sutter	4,172,307	(247,071)	-	6,150	37,382	2,089	-	28,465	25,049	4,024,371	302,731	4,327,102	(1,431)	4,325,670
Tehama	3,186,372	-	(5,739)	4,138	28,100	1,378	-	72,996	8,625	3,295,871	210,687	3,506,558	(1,160)	3,505,398
Trinity	1,578,531	(450,608)	-	943	7,648	552	-	37,893	6,930	1,181,889	(35,061)	1,146,829	103,171	1,250,000
Tulare	14,364,451	(15,576)	(670,426)	28,289	204,932	27,186	-	353,922	35,846	14,328,624	1,113,228	15,441,852	(5,107)	15,436,745
Tuolumne	2,930,002	(220,516)	(86,731)	3,916	16,642	977	-	65,010	6,677	2,715,976	(13,277)	2,702,700	(894)	2,701,806
Ventura	30,149,914	(1,559,157)	(617,049)	54,971	205,304	54,112	-	288,505	188,050	28,764,649	1,719,233	30,483,882	(10,082)	30,473,800
Yolo	8,193,175	(582,889)	(24,224)	12,802	48,556	10,078	-	147,776	27,253	7,832,527	438,940	8,271,468	(2,736)	8,268,732
Yuba	3,547,052	(132,569)	-	4,696	15,788	1,586	-	9,769	22,970	3,469,293	132,620	3,601,913	(1,191)	3,600,722
Total	1,683,398,629	(40,983,089)	(58,793,118)	2,500,000	10,907,494	2,727,939	(817,737)	24,229,808	13,274,798	1,636,444,724	67,900,000	1,704,344,724	0	1,704,344,724

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

Estimated FY 2015-2016 Allocation of 2% Holdback

	Ending 2014-2015 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	Estimated Net WAFM Adjustments	Estimated Funding Floor Adjustment	Estimated 2014-15 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2013-2014 Benefits Subsidy Reduction Return	Total	2011-2012 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation ¹	Adjusted Base	% of Total Adjusted Base	Estimated Pro Rata Share of 2% Holdback
Court	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	B	C (A8-B)	D	E
Alameda	72,438,839	-	3,102,047	(1,264,416)	(23,470)	562,020	558,169	75,373,189	3,177,924	72,195,265	4.1%	(1,557,034)
Alpine	727,493	-	20,340	(44,027)	36,601	5,289	2,166	747,862	-	747,862	0.0%	(16,129)
Amador	2,086,181	-	51,756	18,171	(726)	15,693	8,265	2,179,341	-	2,179,341	0.1%	(47,002)
Butte	8,837,870	-	124,077	418,401	(2,905)	68,952	25,636	9,472,031	467,145	9,004,886	0.5%	(194,208)
Calaveras	1,943,653	-	50,506	25,667	(691)	30,138	15,877	2,065,151	-	2,065,151	0.1%	(44,539)
Colusa	1,510,299	-	24,773	11,496	127,447	10,604	5,551	1,690,170	-	1,690,170	0.1%	(36,452)
Contra Costa	36,351,158	-	1,396,192	1,659,325	(12,908)	590,873	353,816	40,338,456	-	40,338,456	2.3%	(869,979)
Del Norte	2,395,840	-	94,130	(92,520)	(791)	73,071	15,852	2,485,582	-	2,485,582	0.1%	(53,607)
El Dorado	6,129,016	-	213,120	140,211	(2,148)	90,455	6,573	6,577,228	-	6,577,228	0.4%	(141,851)
Fresno	36,317,187	-	3,340,364	3,407,730	(14,653)	1,581,245	320,250	44,952,123	-	44,952,123	2.6%	(969,482)
Glenn	1,808,349	-	54,665	(109,604)	69,935	31,311	8,346	1,863,003	9,779	1,853,224	0.1%	(39,968)
Humboldt	5,567,578	-	73,084	264,310	(1,900)	46,895	47,606	5,997,573	167,800	5,829,773	0.3%	(125,731)
Imperial	7,516,498	-	125,539	485,034	(2,573)	95,925	70,967	8,291,390	420,479	7,870,911	0.5%	(169,752)
Inyo	1,996,477	-	75,586	(50,400)	3,850	(7,122)	11,357	2,029,748	186,658	1,843,090	0.1%	(39,750)
Kern	33,743,176	-	3,544,269	4,739,894	(13,527)	(217,620)	191,349	41,987,540	65,567	41,921,973	2.4%	(904,131)
Kings	5,956,575	-	45,118	331,857	(1,910)	29,342	7,680	6,368,662	421,918	5,946,744	0.3%	(128,253)
Lake	3,199,899	-	9,123	(50,322)	(987)	33,201	1,110	3,192,024	196,493	2,995,531	0.2%	(64,605)
Lassen	2,259,875	-	7,839	(18,996)	(657)	6,803	1,935	2,256,799	293,836	1,962,963	0.1%	(42,335)
Los Angeles	468,361,847	(502,040)	18,887,969	26,818,347	(163,090)	7,896,395	4,197,807	525,497,236	14,294,467	511,202,769	29.3%	(11,025,104)
Madera	6,348,235	-	384,826	267,872	(2,290)	223,020	15,775	7,237,439	381,406	6,856,033	0.4%	(147,864)
Marin	12,313,085	-	644,512	(715,208)	(4,090)	(78,894)	124,378	12,283,783	9,625	12,274,158	0.7%	(264,717)
Mariposa	1,049,471	-	22,301	15,835	54,687	4,769	1,235	1,148,299	-	1,148,299	0.1%	(24,765)
Mendocino	4,557,139	-	311,771	126,710	(1,607)	56,174	81,587	5,131,773	299,349	4,832,424	0.3%	(104,221)
Merced	9,914,474	-	774,827	590,591	(3,718)	161,921	107,600	11,545,695	-	11,545,695	0.7%	(249,006)
Modoc	900,123	-	31,967	(15,665)	(309)	9,491	1,229	926,836	789	926,047	0.1%	(19,972)
Mono	1,338,300	-	85,641	(8,570)	126,524	10,568	3,928	1,556,391	24,156	1,532,235	0.1%	(33,046)
Monterey	15,271,747	-	277,496	630,401	(5,124)	205,587	91,745	16,471,852	870,000	15,601,852	0.9%	(336,485)
Napa	6,583,023	-	309,796	224,679	(2,173)	(3,237)	63,045	7,175,134	295,552	6,879,582	0.4%	(148,372)
Nevada	4,687,440	-	95,495	(7,657)	(1,394)	79,983	41,729	4,895,596	433,431	4,462,165	0.3%	(96,235)
Orange	127,108,481	(216,241)	6,929,921	2,324,353	(45,022)	3,449,769	2,006,818	141,558,079	2,733,776	138,824,303	7.9%	(2,994,022)
Placer	12,925,172	-	634,797	974,682	(4,604)	84,431	98,675	14,713,153	-	14,713,153	0.8%	(317,318)
Plumas	1,357,701	-	14,929	(114,763)	(421)	2,474	973	1,260,893	-	1,260,893	0.1%	(27,194)
Riverside	72,072,647	-	923,657	6,856,320	(25,208)	(650,572)	569,988	79,746,831	1,931,520	77,815,311	4.5%	(1,678,242)
Sacramento	67,293,541	-	3,560,592	3,657,752	(23,950)	332,406	796,927	75,617,268	1,864,424	73,752,844	4.2%	(1,590,627)
San Benito	2,458,182	-	34,642	(91,160)	(810)	21,556	5,843	2,428,253	-	2,428,253	0.1%	(52,370)
San Bernardino	79,329,723	-	1,264,733	6,757,237	(27,713)	1,521,168	462,588	89,307,736	3,269,446	86,038,290	4.9%	(1,855,587)
San Diego	128,939,474	(99,456)	2,853,599	1,471,869	(43,501)	2,061,274	666,662	135,849,919	657,192	135,192,727	7.7%	(2,915,700)
San Francisco	51,250,749	-	5,487,135	341,981	(19,228)	631,291	518,912	58,210,839	-	58,210,839	3.3%	(1,255,432)
San Joaquin	26,262,051	-	1,245,357	2,224,751	(9,901)	818,234	185,876	30,726,368	287,747	30,438,621	1.7%	(656,469)
San Luis Obispo	12,345,167	-	298,958	497,227	(4,103)	972	19,774	13,157,994	241,676	12,916,318	0.7%	(278,566)
San Mateo	30,954,404	-	2,411,113	477,303	(10,796)	363,484	97,565	34,293,073	443,042	33,850,031	1.9%	(730,043)

Estimated FY 2015-2016 Allocation of 2% Holdback

	Ending 2014-2015 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	Estimated Net WAFM Adjustments	Estimated Funding Floor Adjustment	Estimated 2014-15 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2013-2014 Benefits Subsidy Reduction Return	Total	2011-2012 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation ¹	Adjusted Base	% of Total Adjusted Base	Estimated Pro Rata Share of 2% Holdback
Court	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	B	C (A8-B)	D	E
Santa Barbara	18,963,060	-	1,597,662	209,451	(6,510)	227,423	42,314	21,033,399	1,055,112	19,978,287	1.1%	(430,871)
Santa Clara	73,626,361	-	2,309,467	(2,883,909)	(24,455)	1,851,301	286,329	75,165,092	-	75,165,092	4.3%	(1,621,085)
Santa Cruz	10,519,150	-	203,558	371,304	(3,603)	86,623	53,529	11,230,561	-	11,230,561	0.6%	(242,209)
Shasta	10,844,018	-	262,222	532,744	(3,053)	135,012	63,826	11,834,769	2,389,668	9,445,101	0.5%	(203,702)
Sierra	738,243	-	9,616	(44,895)	38,053	3,781	3,101	747,900	-	747,900	0.0%	(16,130)
Siskiyou	3,039,649	-	91,038	(154,682)	(968)	40,262	20,614	3,035,913	-	3,035,913	0.2%	(65,476)
Solano	18,224,539	-	353,779	750,033	(6,207)	95,975	172,459	19,590,578	435,400	19,155,178	1.1%	(413,120)
Sonoma	20,518,574	-	1,172,050	609,606	(7,452)	825,673	213,991	23,332,442	440,000	22,892,442	1.3%	(493,721)
Stanislaus	17,251,929	-	1,305,230	1,464,546	(6,521)	(289,912)	284,071	20,009,343	9,326	20,000,017	1.1%	(431,340)
Sutter	4,012,547	-	159,761	302,731	(1,431)	28,465	25,049	4,527,121	247,071	4,280,050	0.2%	(92,308)
Tehama	3,078,188	-	108,184	210,687	(1,160)	72,996	8,625	3,477,521	-	3,477,521	0.2%	(75,000)
Trinity	1,524,852	-	53,679	(35,061)	103,171	37,893	6,930	1,691,464	450,608	1,240,856	0.1%	(26,762)
Tulare	14,330,707	-	33,744	1,113,228	(5,107)	353,922	35,846	15,862,340	15,576	15,846,764	0.9%	(341,767)
Tuolumne	2,879,651	-	50,352	(13,277)	(894)	65,010	6,677	2,987,519	220,516	2,767,003	0.2%	(59,676)
Ventura	29,181,161	-	968,753	1,719,233	(10,082)	288,505	188,050	32,335,620	1,559,157	30,776,463	1.8%	(663,756)
Yolo	7,983,099	-	210,077	438,940	(2,736)	147,776	27,253	8,804,410	582,889	8,221,521	0.5%	(177,313)
Yuba	3,456,186	-	90,867	132,620	(1,191)	9,769	22,970	3,711,221	132,569	3,578,652	0.2%	(77,181)
Total	1,614,580,054	(817,737)	68,818,601	67,900,000	0	24,229,808	13,274,798	1,787,985,524	40,983,089	1,747,002,435	100.0%	(37,677,580)

1. 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
(as of 4:30 pm on July 21, 2015)**

Court	Preliminary Reduction	Comments
Alameda	(8,935)	
Alpine	(102,954)	
Amador	-	
Butte	-	
Calaveras	-	
Colusa	(21,343)	
Contra Costa	-	
Del Norte	(133,139)	
El Dorado	-	
Fresno	-	
Glenn	-	
Humboldt	-	
Imperial	-	
Inyo	-	
Kern	-	
Kings	-	
Lake	-	
Lassen	(16,217)	
Los Angeles	-	
Madera	(3,222)	
Marin	-	
Mariposa	-	
Mendocino	-	
Merced	-	
Modoc	-	
Mono	-	
Monterey	-	
Napa	-	
Nevada	-	
Orange	(90,637)	
Placer	-	
Plumas	-	
Riverside	(15)	
Sacramento	-	
San Benito	-	
San Bernardino	-	
San Diego	-	
San Francisco	-	
San Joaquin	-	
San Luis Obispo	-	
San Mateo	-	
Santa Barbara	-	
Santa Clara	-	
Santa Cruz	-	
Shasta	-	
Sierra	(16,419)	
Siskiyou	-	
Solano	-	
Sonoma	-	
Stanislaus	-	Not received
Sutter	-	
Tehama	-	Not received
Trinity	-	
Tulare	-	
Tuolumne	-	
Ventura	-	
Yolo	-	
Yuba	-	
Total	(392,881)	-

Intentionally Blank

FY 2014-15 - 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form

Enter Court Name Here

	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	Instructions
1 Part A - Computation of Cap			
2 Expenditures	0	0	Court enters expenditures for ending fiscal year
3 Less: Expense related to FY13/14 encumbrances		0	Court enters current year expenditures as a related to prior year encumbrances. Enter a negative number.
Less: Expense related to FY14/15 encumbrances			Court enters current year expenditures as a related to prior year encumbrances. Enter a negative number.
Less: Expense related to FY15/16 encumbrances			Court enters current year expenditures as a related to prior year encumbrances. Enter a negative number.
4 Accruals	0	0	Court enters expense accruals for ending fiscal year
5 Encumbrances as of June 30	0	0	Court enters total ending year fund balance reserved for encumbrances
6 Less: remaining Encumbrances from FY13/14		0	Court enters the amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrance (row 5) that is related to prior fiscal years. Enter a negative number.
Less: remaining Encumbrances from FY14/15			Court enters the amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrance (row 5) that is related to prior fiscal years. Enter a negative number.
Less: remaining Encumbrances from FY15/16			Court enters the amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrance (row 5) that is related to prior fiscal years. Enter a negative number.
7 Operating Budget	0	0	This cell calculates Operating Budget
8 Fund Balance Cap (1% of Operating Budget)	0	0	This cell calculates fund balance cap
9 Part B - Computation of Fund Balance Subject to Cap			
10 Ending fund balance	0	0	Court enters actual year end fund balance
11 Less: Encumbrances as of June 30	0	0	This cell uses encumbrance amount entered above
12 Less: Excluded Funds Per GC 77203	0	0	This comes from the TOTAL cell on the Excluded Detail sheet.
13 Less: Prepayments	0	0	Court enters Pre Payments. Please make sure this is not included in the Excluded Funds per GC77203 on the line above.
14 Fund Balance Subject to Cap	0	0	This calculated cell is what will be compared to the cap above
15 Part C - Potential Additional Allocation Reduction			
16 Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that if not expensed in the next two is subject to the cap	0	0	These amounts will be liquidated 3 years from the original date of the encumbrance if not spent (year of encumbrance, plus 2 additional).
17 Less: Encumbrances from Excluded Funds	0	0	This is the amount of encumbrances from cell 11 that represents excluded funds encumbered and therefore not subject to reversion
18 Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction	0	0	Self Explanatory
19 Part D - Computation of Liquidation Above Cap			
20 FY13/14 Liquidation in second year	0	0	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in year following original encumbrance. The amount entered in this cell relates to the fiscal year at the top of the column.

FY 2014-15 - 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form

Enter Court Name Here

	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	Instructions	
21	FY13/14 Liquidation in third year	0	0	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance. The amount entered in this cell relates to the fiscal year at the top of the column.
22	FY14/15 Liquidation in second year	0	0	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in year following original encumbrance. The amount entered in this cell relates to the fiscal year at the top of the column.
23	FY14/15 Liquidation in third year	0	0	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance. The amount entered in this cell relates to the fiscal year at the top of the column.
24	Allocation Reduction Due to Liquidation	0	0	This is the amount of the prior year unused encumbrance that will revert to TCTF.
25	Part E - Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction			
26	Current Year Only	0	0	This calculated cell is the amount of fund balance over the cap
27	Due to Liquidation of Prior-Year Encumbrance	0	0	This is the unused amount of the encumbrance that will revert to the TCTF.
28	Total Allocation Reduction	0	0	This is total amount that will be reduced in the allocation. It includes rows 24 and 25 from current year, as well as, row 21 from last year, and row 22 from 2 years ago.

2015-2016 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding				
Court	FY 2014-2015 Historical Funding Level	FY 2015-2016 10% Workload and 90% Historical Basis	Allocate \$10,974,556	FY 2015-2016 Total
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D
Alameda	\$4,171,032	\$4,037,391	\$0	\$4,037,391
Alpine	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Amador	\$120,147	\$115,233	\$0	\$115,233
Butte	\$664,759	\$664,923	\$0	\$664,923
Calaveras	\$76,519	\$86,380	\$37,560	\$123,940
Colusa	\$38,266	\$38,471	\$0	\$38,471
Contra Costa	\$3,120,151	\$3,030,406	\$0	\$3,030,406
Del Norte	\$223,090	\$214,730	\$0	\$214,730
El Dorado	\$819,765	\$788,644	\$0	\$788,644
Fresno	\$2,958,296	\$2,900,594	\$0	\$2,900,594
Glenn	\$55,250	\$62,586	\$27,831	\$90,417
Humboldt	\$562,460	\$543,896	\$0	\$543,896
Imperial	\$607,371	\$591,128	\$0	\$591,128
Inyo	\$76,990	\$72,277	\$0	\$72,277
Kern	\$2,023,943	\$2,067,598	\$279,950	\$2,347,548
Kings	\$199,672	\$232,723	\$122,056	\$354,779
Lake	\$307,076	\$296,119	\$0	\$296,119
Lassen	\$108,374	\$106,891	\$0	\$106,891
Los Angeles	\$32,782,704	\$34,004,527	\$6,225,630	\$40,230,157
Madera	\$53,031	\$92,427	\$133,016	\$225,443
Marin	\$408,419	\$388,488	\$0	\$388,488
Mariposa	\$32,243	\$33,095	\$4,975	\$38,070
Mendocino	\$742,022	\$711,060	\$0	\$711,060
Merced	\$593,861	\$618,206	\$120,042	\$738,248
Modoc	\$16,064	\$16,090	\$0	\$16,090
Mono	\$12,329	\$12,515	\$1,442	\$13,956
Monterey	\$329,570	\$348,877	\$85,664	\$434,541
Napa	\$176,430	\$182,020	\$30,266	\$212,285
Nevada	\$232,799	\$226,123	\$0	\$226,123
Orange	\$6,583,082	\$6,418,278	\$0	\$6,418,278
Placer	\$418,422	\$435,092	\$82,994	\$518,087
Plumas	\$163,291	\$154,059	\$0	\$154,059
Riverside	\$4,171,898	\$4,551,552	\$1,528,770	\$6,080,322
Sacramento	\$5,378,190	\$5,205,426	\$0	\$5,205,426
San Benito	\$31,885	\$44,748	\$44,415	\$89,163
San Bernardino	\$3,587,297	\$3,851,884	\$1,111,278	\$4,963,161
San Diego	\$9,749,950	\$9,408,199	\$0	\$9,408,199
San Francisco	\$3,907,633	\$3,761,098	\$0	\$3,761,098
San Joaquin	\$3,081,901	\$2,982,578	\$0	\$2,982,578
San Luis Obispo	\$707,000	\$699,248	\$0	\$699,248
San Mateo	\$323,022	\$371,971	\$182,611	\$554,582
Santa Barbara	\$1,610,017	\$1,557,379	\$0	\$1,557,379
Santa Clara	\$4,700,131	\$4,508,063	\$0	\$4,508,063
Santa Cruz	\$894,765	\$863,289	\$0	\$863,289
Shasta	\$569,416	\$586,682	\$95,136	\$681,818
Sierra	\$14,898	\$13,759	\$0	\$13,759
Siskiyou	\$256,552	\$245,373	\$0	\$245,373
Solano	\$896,319	\$875,639	\$0	\$875,639
Sonoma	\$1,150,195	\$1,137,764	\$0	\$1,137,764
Stanislaus	\$1,130,986	\$1,107,189	\$0	\$1,107,189
Sutter	\$84,083	\$96,718	\$47,186	\$143,904
Tehama	\$93,909	\$108,753	\$55,106	\$163,859
Trinity	\$83,204	\$84,374	\$9,455	\$93,829
Tulare	\$658,892	\$717,512	\$237,041	\$954,553
Tuolumne	\$63,981	\$73,850	\$36,743	\$110,593
Ventura	\$755,357	\$836,016	\$315,958	\$1,151,975
Yolo	\$333,430	\$344,674	\$59,433	\$404,107
Yuba	\$199,732	\$200,855	\$0	\$200,855
Reserve	\$613,375		\$100,000	\$100,000
Total	\$103,725,444	\$103,725,444	\$10,974,556	\$114,700,000

Four-year Dependency Counsel Funding Reallocation Plan						
Court	Workload Model	FY 2014-2015 Historical Funding Level	FY 2015-2016 10% Workload and 90% Historical Basis	FY 2016-2017 40% Workload and 60% Historical Basis	FY 2017-2018 80% Workload and 20% Historical Basis	FY 2018-2019 100% Workload Basis
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F
Alameda	\$3,450,971	\$4,171,032	\$4,037,391	\$3,562,033	\$2,928,221	\$2,885,085
Alpine	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Amador	\$85,337	\$120,147	\$115,233	\$98,346	\$75,831	\$71,343
Butte	\$833,637	\$664,759	\$664,923	\$653,550	\$638,386	\$696,938
Calaveras	\$226,027	\$76,519	\$123,940	\$149,950	\$183,009	\$188,963
Colusa	\$50,570	\$38,266	\$38,471	\$38,402	\$38,311	\$42,278
Contra Costa	\$2,716,648	\$3,120,151	\$3,030,406	\$2,705,491	\$2,272,270	\$2,271,175
Del Norte	\$168,567	\$223,090	\$214,730	\$185,671	\$146,926	\$140,925
El Dorado	\$614,079	\$819,765	\$788,644	\$680,652	\$536,662	\$513,383
Fresno	\$2,937,651	\$2,958,296	\$2,900,594	\$2,674,693	\$2,373,492	\$2,455,938
Glenn	\$166,061	\$55,250	\$90,417	\$109,769	\$134,342	\$138,830
Humboldt	\$458,194	\$562,460	\$543,896	\$478,168	\$390,530	\$383,060
Imperial	\$545,032	\$607,371	\$591,128	\$531,559	\$452,133	\$455,659
Inyo	\$34,019	\$76,990	\$72,277	\$56,766	\$36,083	\$28,441
Kern	\$3,108,448	\$2,023,943	\$2,347,548	\$2,462,576	\$2,630,775	\$2,598,728
Kings	\$686,525	\$199,672	\$354,779	\$441,959	\$552,024	\$573,949
Lake	\$239,289	\$307,076	\$296,119	\$257,769	\$206,635	\$200,051
Lassen	\$115,953	\$108,374	\$106,891	\$100,507	\$91,996	\$96,939
Los Angeles	\$57,151,312	\$32,782,704	\$40,230,157	\$43,451,304	\$47,849,537	\$47,779,709
Madera	\$586,978	\$53,031	\$225,443	\$329,378	\$458,180	\$490,726
Marin	\$247,454	\$408,419	\$388,488	\$321,407	\$231,966	\$206,877
Mariposa	\$51,592	\$32,243	\$38,070	\$40,316	\$43,505	\$43,132
Mendocino	\$518,940	\$742,022	\$711,060	\$604,932	\$463,428	\$433,845
Merced	\$1,064,522	\$593,861	\$738,248	\$802,433	\$889,298	\$889,963
Modoc	\$20,432	\$16,064	\$16,090	\$15,880	\$15,601	\$17,082
Mono	\$17,875	\$12,329	\$13,956	\$14,445	\$15,209	\$14,944
Monterey	\$667,373	\$329,570	\$434,541	\$485,454	\$552,510	\$557,938
Napa	\$294,547	\$176,430	\$212,285	\$227,019	\$247,483	\$246,247
Nevada	\$202,963	\$232,799	\$226,123	\$201,942	\$169,701	\$169,681
Orange	\$6,056,115	\$6,583,082	\$6,418,278	\$5,806,386	\$4,990,530	\$5,063,041
Placer	\$743,664	\$418,422	\$518,087	\$562,037	\$621,671	\$621,719
Plumas	\$82,240	\$163,291	\$154,059	\$123,449	\$82,637	\$68,754
Riverside	\$10,235,491	\$4,171,898	\$6,080,322	\$7,081,647	\$8,370,327	\$8,557,088
Sacramento	\$4,443,854	\$5,378,190	\$5,205,426	\$4,591,158	\$3,772,133	\$3,715,157
San Benito	\$209,882	\$31,885	\$89,163	\$123,099	\$165,344	\$175,466
San Bernardino	\$7,983,596	\$3,587,297	\$4,963,161	\$5,660,950	\$6,567,862	\$6,674,455
San Diego	\$7,678,775	\$9,749,950	\$9,408,199	\$8,208,950	\$6,609,951	\$6,419,618
San Francisco	\$2,951,118	\$3,907,633	\$3,761,098	\$3,251,759	\$2,572,641	\$2,467,197
San Joaquin	\$2,542,228	\$3,081,901	\$2,982,578	\$2,629,612	\$2,158,990	\$2,125,357
San Luis Obispo	\$781,869	\$707,000	\$699,248	\$663,376	\$615,547	\$653,659
San Mateo	\$1,050,916	\$323,022	\$554,582	\$683,698	\$847,062	\$878,588
Santa Barbara	\$1,318,162	\$1,610,017	\$1,557,379	\$1,370,733	\$1,121,871	\$1,102,011
Santa Clara	\$3,340,629	\$4,700,131	\$4,508,063	\$3,847,982	\$2,967,875	\$2,792,837
Santa Cruz	\$703,197	\$894,765	\$863,289	\$752,893	\$605,699	\$587,887
Shasta	\$940,396	\$569,416	\$681,818	\$727,329	\$790,857	\$786,191
Sierra	\$3,576	\$14,898	\$13,759	\$10,074	\$5,162	\$2,989
Siskiyou	\$173,164	\$256,552	\$245,373	\$207,259	\$156,441	\$144,768
Solano	\$847,816	\$896,319	\$875,639	\$797,604	\$693,557	\$708,792
Sonoma	\$1,274,378	\$1,150,195	\$1,137,764	\$1,079,946	\$1,002,855	\$1,065,407
Stanislaus	\$1,100,152	\$1,130,986	\$1,107,189	\$1,015,618	\$893,522	\$919,751
Sutter	\$272,155	\$84,083	\$143,904	\$177,234	\$219,413	\$227,527
Tehama	\$313,635	\$93,909	\$163,859	\$203,015	\$252,505	\$262,206
Trinity	\$119,529	\$83,204	\$93,829	\$96,909	\$101,792	\$99,929
Tulare	\$1,598,826	\$658,892	\$954,553	\$1,109,159	\$1,308,327	\$1,336,652
Tuolumne	\$210,459	\$63,981	\$110,593	\$136,627	\$169,551	\$175,948
Ventura	\$2,010,744	\$755,357	\$1,151,975	\$1,364,720	\$1,636,807	\$1,681,025
Yolo	\$565,644	\$333,430	\$404,107	\$433,747	\$474,633	\$472,890
Yuba	\$264,659	\$199,732	\$200,855	\$200,658	\$200,396	\$221,261
Reserve		\$613,375	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Total	\$137,077,862	\$103,725,444	\$114,700,000	\$114,700,000	\$114,700,000	\$114,700,000

**Allocation of \$9.2 Million of Criminal Justice Realignment Funding
Using Percentage of Petitions to Revoke/Modify PRCS and Parole**

Court	Workload (Petitions to revoke/modify PRCS and Parole)	Percentage of Statewide Workload (Petitions to revoke/modify PRCS and Parole)	Recommended Allocation
	Column A	Column B	Column C
Alameda	1,421	2.99%	\$276,057
Alpine ^{1,2}	2	0.00%	\$389
Amador	25	0.05%	\$4,857
Butte	337	0.71%	\$65,469
Calaveras	23	0.05%	\$4,468
Colusa	11	0.02%	\$2,137
Contra Costa	462	0.97%	\$89,752
Del Norte	36	0.08%	\$6,994
El Dorado	146	0.31%	\$28,363
Fresno	1,361	2.87%	\$264,401
Glenn	18	0.04%	\$3,497
Humboldt	224	0.47%	\$43,516
Imperial	189	0.40%	\$36,717
Inyo	12	0.03%	\$2,331
Kern	1,922	4.05%	\$373,386
Kings	255	0.54%	\$49,539
Lake	68	0.14%	\$13,210
Lassen	40	0.08%	\$7,771
Los Angeles	17,736	37.36%	\$3,445,560
Madera	214	0.45%	\$41,574
Marin	124	0.26%	\$24,089
Mariposa	7	0.01%	\$1,360
Mendocino ^{1,2}	149	0.31%	\$29,011
Merced ^{1,2}	476	1.00%	\$92,472
Modoc	6	0.01%	\$1,166
Mono	2	0.00%	\$389
Monterey	261	0.55%	\$50,704
Napa	64	0.13%	\$12,433
Nevada	55	0.12%	\$10,685
Orange	2,366	4.98%	\$459,641
Placer	129	0.27%	\$25,061
Plumas	4	0.01%	\$777
Riverside	3,857	8.12%	\$749,297
Sacramento	1,023	2.15%	\$198,738
San Benito	49	0.10%	\$9,519
San Bernardino	3,853	8.12%	\$748,520
San Diego	2,405	5.07%	\$467,218
San Francisco	509	1.07%	\$98,883
San Joaquin	917	1.93%	\$178,145
San Luis Obispo	265	0.56%	\$51,481
San Mateo	206	0.43%	\$40,019
Santa Barbara	331	0.70%	\$64,303
Santa Clara	666	1.40%	\$129,383
Santa Cruz	165	0.35%	\$32,054
Shasta	414	0.87%	\$80,427
Sierra	5	0.01%	\$971
Siskiyou	81	0.17%	\$15,736
Solano	574	1.21%	\$111,511
Sonoma	777	1.64%	\$150,947
Stanislaus	522	1.10%	\$101,409
Sutter ^{1,2}	64	0.13%	\$12,433
Tehama	79	0.17%	\$15,347
Trinity	18	0.04%	\$3,497
Tulare	425	0.90%	\$82,564
Tuolumne	28	0.06%	\$5,440
Ventura	1,664	3.50%	\$323,264
Yolo	209	0.44%	\$40,602
Yuba	224	0.47%	\$43,516
Total (statewide)	47,475	100%	\$9,223,000

¹proxy used for missing PRCS petitions (average of populated quarters)

²proxy used for missing Parole petitions (average of populated quarters)

Allocation of \$13.45 Million of \$26.9 Million in New Funding for Proposition 47 Workload*

Court	Felony petitions percent of statewide totals 10 year average (JBSIS Data)	Allocation of 50% of \$13.45 million based on JBSIS Data	Proposition 47 petitions percent of statewide total (CJS Prop 47 Survey Data) ¹	Allocation of 50% of \$13.45 Million based on Proposition 47 Survey (Column D)	June 1 - November 30, 2015 Allocation
	A	B	C	D	E
Alameda	3.00%	\$201,633	0.56%	\$37,879	\$239,512
Alpine	0.01%	\$424	0.00%	\$0	\$424
Amador	0.16%	\$10,743	0.10%	\$6,535	\$17,279
Butte	0.73%	\$49,140	0.96%	\$64,732	\$113,872
Calaveras	0.11%	\$7,062	0.15%	\$10,403	\$17,465
Colusa	0.10%	\$6,666	0.03%	\$1,912	\$8,578
Contra Costa	1.51%	\$101,699	0.46%	\$30,677	\$132,375
Del Norte	0.17%	\$11,167	0.05%	\$3,157	\$14,324
El Dorado	0.43%	\$28,597	0.46%	\$31,121	\$59,718
Fresno	4.10%	\$275,742	4.17%	\$280,223	\$555,965
Glenn	0.11%	\$7,544	0.09%	\$6,135	\$13,679
Humboldt	0.53%	\$35,409	0.43%	\$29,032	\$64,441
Imperial	0.72%	\$48,403	0.43%	\$28,765	\$77,168
Inyo	0.09%	\$5,740	0.02%	\$1,556	\$7,296
Kern	3.04%	\$204,686	3.00%	\$201,487	\$406,173
Kings	0.75%	\$50,255	0.72%	\$48,238	\$98,493
Lake	0.29%	\$19,329	0.24%	\$16,450	\$35,779
Lassen	0.16%	\$11,092	0.08%	\$5,246	\$16,338
Los Angeles	23.15%	\$1,556,969	15.26%	\$1,026,418	\$2,583,386
Madera	0.73%	\$49,243	0.54%	\$36,634	\$85,877
Marin	0.38%	\$25,433	0.12%	\$8,091	\$33,524
Mariposa	0.07%	\$4,892	0.01%	\$934	\$5,825
Mendocino	0.44%	\$29,742	0.12%	\$8,314	\$38,056
Merced	1.20%	\$80,580	0.31%	\$20,540	\$101,120
Modoc	0.04%	\$2,831	0.01%	\$934	\$3,765
Mono	0.06%	\$3,964	0.07%	\$4,490	\$8,454
Monterey	1.23%	\$82,440	0.51%	\$34,455	\$116,895
Napa	0.42%	\$28,428	0.08%	\$5,602	\$34,030
Nevada	0.25%	\$16,670	0.08%	\$5,557	\$22,227
Orange	6.05%	\$407,188	14.02%	\$942,524	\$1,349,712
Placer	1.03%	\$69,552	0.66%	\$44,325	\$113,877
Plumas	0.07%	\$4,615	0.03%	\$2,090	\$6,704
Riverside	6.27%	\$421,723	5.68%	\$382,078	\$803,801
Sacramento	3.99%	\$268,538	5.02%	\$337,397	\$605,935
San Benito	0.18%	\$11,932	0.18%	\$11,826	\$23,758
San Bernardino	7.25%	\$487,450	3.47%	\$233,453	\$720,903
San Diego	6.59%	\$443,432	24.64%	\$1,656,887	\$2,100,319
San Francisco	2.30%	\$154,393	0.40%	\$26,942	\$181,335
San Joaquin	2.63%	\$176,983	1.53%	\$102,566	\$279,549
San Luis Obispo	0.71%	\$47,422	0.65%	\$43,881	\$91,302
San Mateo	1.18%	\$79,346	0.81%	\$54,417	\$133,764
Santa Barbara	1.08%	\$72,693	1.19%	\$80,203	\$152,896
Santa Clara	3.70%	\$248,634	1.10%	\$73,935	\$322,568
Santa Cruz	0.71%	\$47,649	0.73%	\$49,171	\$96,820
Shasta	1.01%	\$68,199	1.15%	\$77,002	\$145,202
Sierra	0.01%	\$763	0.00%	\$133	\$896
Siskiyou	0.22%	\$14,785	0.07%	\$4,979	\$19,765
Solano	1.64%	\$110,436	0.30%	\$20,362	\$130,798
Sonoma	1.22%	\$81,796	0.96%	\$64,732	\$146,528
Stanislaus	2.58%	\$173,425	1.96%	\$131,598	\$305,023
Sutter	0.45%	\$29,949	0.34%	\$22,985	\$52,934
Tehama	0.33%	\$21,996	0.37%	\$25,208	\$47,204
Trinity	0.09%	\$6,005	0.03%	\$2,312	\$8,317
Tulare	1.78%	\$119,416	1.68%	\$113,281	\$232,696
Tuolumne	0.22%	\$14,760	0.27%	\$17,917	\$32,677
Ventura	1.53%	\$102,637	2.55%	\$171,344	\$273,981
Yolo	0.91%	\$60,971	0.92%	\$61,575	\$122,546
Yuba	0.32%	\$21,789	0.21%	\$14,360	\$36,150
Total	100%	\$6,725,000	100%	\$6,725,000	\$13,450,000

*Allocation for the additional 50% of \$26.9 million in second half of fiscal year funding will be based only on the percentage of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from July 1, 2015 to November 30, 2015 only. Felony Filings data would not be used.