



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

STEVEN JAHR
Administrative Director of the Courts

December 31, 2012

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Legislative Counsel
State of California
State Capitol, Room 3021
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Gregory P. Schmidt
Secretary of the Senate
California State Senate
State Capitol, Room 400
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3196
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: *Report to the Legislature on Statewide Amnesty Program*, as required by Vehicle Code section 42008.7

Dear Ms. Boyer-Vine, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Wilson:

Attached is the report to the Legislature on the *Statewide Amnesty Program: Fiscal Year 2011–2012*, as required by Vehicle Code section 42008.7 (Sen. Bill 758; Stats. 2010, ch. 720), authorizing a one-time Amnesty Program for the collection of delinquent bail and fines meeting certain eligibility requirements for the period of January 1, 2012–June 30, 2012. This is a one-time report submitted to the Legislature and provides information about the number of cases

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Mr. Gregory P. Schmidt
Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
December 31, 2012
Page 2

resolved, the amount of money collected, and the operating cost of the Amnesty Program as reported by all 58 court and county collections programs.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Administrative Office of the Courts, Chief Financial Officer and Director, Fiscal Services Office, at 916-263-1397, or collections@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steven Jahr', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts

SJ/MBM/lcc
Attachment

cc: Members of the Judicial Council
Margie Estrada, Policy Consultant, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg
Fredericka McGee, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker John Pérez
Joe Stephenshaw, Consultant, Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review
Matt Osterli, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Marvin Deon II, Consultant, Assembly Committee on Budget
Allan Cooper, Consultant, Republican Fiscal Office
Curt Soderlund, AOC Chief Administrative Officer
Curtis L. Child, AOC Chief Operating Officer
Donna Hershkowitz, Assistant Director, AOC Office of Governmental Affairs
Zlatko Theodorovic, AOC Chief Financial Officer and Director, Fiscal Services Office
Margie Borjon-Miller, Assistant Director, AOC Fiscal Services Office, Enhanced Collections Unit
Peter Allen, Senior Manager, AOC Office of Communications



Judicial Council of California
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

STEVEN JAHR
Administrative Director of the Courts

Report Title: Report to the Legislature on *Statewide Amnesty Program: Fiscal Year 2011–2012*

Statutory Citation: Vehicle Code section 42008.7

Date of Report: December 31, 2012

The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature describing the results of the statewide amnesty program for selected court-ordered debt conducted from January 1–June 30, 2012, as required by Vehicle Code section 42008.7.

The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

The Amnesty Program allowed individuals with past due court-ordered debt relating to traffic infractions and certain misdemeanors to pay outstanding delinquent debt at a 50 percent reduction if the individual met certain eligibility criteria. Court and county collections programs were required to submit information about the number of cases resolved, the amount of money collected, and the operating costs of the Amnesty Program. The results of the Amnesty Program included the following: 42,245 cases were resolved; \$14,920,872 in gross revenue was collected; and total operating costs for the Amnesty Program were \$2,868,379. The total net revenue collected and distributed under the Amnesty Program, after recovering a total \$2,649,922 in operating costs, was \$12,270,950.

The full report on the Amnesty Program's collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is available at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm>.

A printed copy of the amnesty report can be requested by calling 818-558-3221. For more information on this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic, Administrative Office of the Courts, Chief Financial Officer and Director, Fiscal Services Office, at 916-263-1397, or collections@jud.ca.gov.

Judicial Council Members

As of December 05, 2012

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye
Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. Noreen Evans
Member of the California State Senate

Hon. Judith Ashmann-Gerst
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Second Appellate District, Division Two

Mr. James P. Fox
Attorney at Law (Retired)
California State Bar Association

Hon. Stephen H. Baker
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Shasta

Hon. James E. Herman
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Barbara

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

Hon. Harry E. Hull, Jr.
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Third Appellate District

Hon. James R. Brandlin
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Teri L. Jackson
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Francisco

Ms. Angela J. Davis
Assistant United States Attorney
for the Central District of California

Hon. Ira R. Kaufman
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Plumas

Hon. David De Alba
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

Ms. Edith R. Matthai
Attorney at Law
Robie & Matthai

Hon. Emilie H. Elias
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Douglas P. Miller
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Fourth Appellate District, Division Two

Hon. Sherrill A. Ellsworth
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Riverside

Hon. Mary Ann O'Malley
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Judicial Council Members

As of December 05, 2012

Mr. Mark P. Robinson, Jr.
Attorney at Law
Robinson Calcagnie Robinson
Shapiro Davis, Inc.

Hon. Brian L. McCabe
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Merced

Hon. David Rosenberg
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Yolo

Hon. Robert James Moss
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Sue Alexander
Commissioner of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

Hon. Kenneth K. So
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

Mr. Alan Carlson
Chief Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Orange

Ms. Mary Beth Todd
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Sutter

Hon. Laurie M. Earl
Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Sacramento

Hon. Charles D. Wachob
Assistant Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court of California,
County of Placer

Hon. Allan D. Hardcastle
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Sonoma

Mr. David H. Yamasaki
Court Executive Officer
Superior Court of California,
County of Santa Clara

Hon. Morris D. Jacobson
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Alameda

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Hon. Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts
and Secretary of the Judicial Council

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS**

Hon. Tani Cantil-Sakauye
*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Hon. Steven Jahr
Administrative Director of the Courts


Curt Soderlund
Chief Administrative Officer

**JUDICIAL AND COURT
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION**

FISCAL SERVICES OFFICE

Zlatko Theodorovic
Director and Chief Financial Officer

Primary Author
Margie Borjon-Miller
*Assistant Director, Fiscal Services Office,
Enhanced Collections Unit*



Statewide Amnesty Program: Fiscal Year 2011–2012

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE,
AS REQUIRED BY VEHICLE CODE
SECTION 42008.7
DECEMBER 2012



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS

Background

In October 2010, Vehicle Code section 42008.7 was enacted (Sen. Bill 758; Stats. 2010, ch. 720) authorizing a one-time mandatory Amnesty Program for the collection of delinquent bail and fines meeting certain eligibility requirements for the period of January 1, 2012–June 30, 2012. Effective January 1, 2012, the Vehicle Code section was amended to allow statewide collection programs the option to extend the Amnesty Program to specified misdemeanors, if the court and county agreed (Assem. Bill 1358, Stats. 2011, ch. 662). The six-month program was implemented locally by each court or county responsible for the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt under Penal Code section 1463.010(b). The Amnesty Program allowed individuals with eligible delinquent infraction or specified misdemeanor cases to fully satisfy their payment obligations by making a lump-sum payment of 50 percent of the outstanding debt balance.

The Amnesty Program offered relief to individuals who had not paid bail or fines in eligible cases that were more than three years past due. The one-time program was also a means of generating revenue by encouraging payment of old fines that had become hard to collect. The program gave courts and counties the opportunity to resolve old delinquent cases, thereby freeing up resources to focus on collecting more recent court-ordered debt. Additionally, the Amnesty Program gave collection programs one last opportunity to collect outstanding debt that otherwise would likely remain uncollected.

Eligibility for the Amnesty Program required that a case meet the following criteria:

- The citation or case was filed with the court;
- The individual either failed to appear or failed to pay on or before January 1, 2009, and no payments were made after that date; and
- The individual did not owe restitution to a victim and had no outstanding misdemeanor or felony warrants within the county where the violation had occurred.


Findings

Pursuant to Vehicle Code section 42008.7, each court or county was required to submit a report about the number of cases resolved, the amount of money collected, and the operating costs of the Amnesty Program (see Attachment 1). All 58 court and county collection programs submitted a report, as statutorily required.

Programs reported a total of 42,245 cases resolved through the Amnesty Program, which resulted in courts and counties collecting \$14,920,872 in gross amnesty revenue. The total operating costs for the Amnesty Program were \$2,868,379. The total net revenue collected and distributed under the Amnesty Program, after recovering a total of \$2,649,922 for operating costs, was \$12,270,950. Total net revenue was calculated by deducting operating costs from each revenue fund prior to distribution.

Programs were allowed to recover costs of operating the Amnesty Program pursuant to Penal Code section 1463.007. The programs recovered a total of \$2,649,922 of the total operating costs. Some programs reported that the Amnesty Program costs exceeded the revenue collected. Other programs reported minimal operating expenses and were able to absorb those costs without claiming cost recovery. Amnesty Program expenses varied across the state depending on individual program start-up costs that included modifications to case management and accounting systems and allocation of staff.

The chart below shows the revenue and operating costs of the statewide Amnesty Program:



Additional Information

In addition to the information required by Vehicle Code section 42008.7, the Administrative Office of the Courts' Enhanced Collections Unit asked courts and counties to provide the number and value of eligible cases, as well as information about challenges or issues encountered, and to indicate whether courts and counties would support a future amnesty program. Information about the number and value of the total eligible accounts was requested for two reasons: (1) to analyze revenues collected as compared to the total amount eligible; and (2) to determine whether there was a significant reduction of the outstanding delinquent debt reported by court and county collection programs as a result of amnesty.

Forty-nine of 58 programs reported a total of 1,881,665 amnesty eligible cases with a value of \$1.86 billion. Upon completion of the program, the courts and counties reduced their outstanding balances by \$29 million, collecting \$14.9 million in revenue and "adjusting" \$14.9 million based

on the Amnesty Program's provision that individuals pay 50 percent of the outstanding balance. It should be noted that only 30 of the 58 programs provided the number of accounts eligible for amnesty, 49 were able to provide the value of accounts, and 9 programs were unable to report either number because of limitations with their case management and accounting systems. A summary of data provided by the 58 programs is available in Attachment 2.

Twenty-two of the 58 programs stated they would support a future amnesty program. However, 23 of 58 programs did not find the program beneficial to their collection efforts and stated they would not support a future amnesty program. Thirteen programs did not respond to the question about supporting a future amnesty program.

The Amnesty Program issues reported by courts and counties included restrictive eligibility requirements, the costs of reprogramming case management and accounting systems, and extensive preparation and labor-intensive processes to implement and operate the program. Some programs reported that the Amnesty Program was unfairly biased against responsible individuals who were paying on time. Specifically, if a payment was made after January 1, 2009, the case was ineligible for amnesty. Also, a payment received via tax intercept by the Franchise Tax Board's Interagency Intercept Collections (FTB-IIC) program after January 1, 2009, rendered a case ineligible.

Program Support

The Administrative Office of the Courts' Enhanced Collections Unit and Office of Communications developed outreach materials and tools (e.g., YouTube video, Twitter, multi-lingual press releases, and flyers) for use in the statewide Amnesty Program to communicate a standard message. Local collection programs were able to modify the message to meet their demographic and community needs. Media tools were utilized by local newspapers, radio stations, and television networks to explain the purpose and eligibility criteria. The Office of Communications also coordinated with local public information officers to assist with community outreach. The media tools were available on the Enhanced Collections' internal and external websites to ensure wide access for courts, county personnel, and justice partners.

The Enhanced Collections Unit assisted the courts and the counties with implementing the Amnesty Program by developing guidelines and frequently asked questions and offering Webinar training on the implementation process. The unit assisted the courts and counties with questions about the Amnesty Program, with most queries being related to cost recovery, distribution, guidelines clarification, and community outreach.

In addition to assisting the courts and counties, the Enhanced Collections Unit responded to numerous telephone and e-mail inquiries from the public about eligibility, payment options, and clarification of the jurisdiction of their traffic citations. These inquiries came from individuals within the state as well as out of state.

Department of Finance Amnesty Funding

The California Department of Finance provided \$500,000 to assist court and county collection programs with amnesty to offset costs associated with private vendor commission fees. Fourteen programs elected to participate and received a portion of the \$500,000 offered by the Department of Finance. The Enhanced Collections Unit provided administrative assistance to participating programs to help with invoice processing and the reporting requirements established by the Department of Finance.

Discharge From Accountability

In addition to providing individuals with the opportunity to pay half of the amount owed, the Amnesty Program provided an opportunity to determine realistic figures pertaining to what portion of outstanding debt is actually collectible. Debt can be discharged from accountability when collection costs exceed the value of the delinquent debt, or the likelihood of collection does not warrant the expense, as set forth in Government Code sections 25257 and 25259.7.

In FY 2011–2012, court and county collection programs reported \$7.9 billion in outstanding court-ordered delinquent debt; \$1.8 billion of that amount was eligible for amnesty. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that up to \$1.8 billion is eligible to be discharged from accountability if the criteria in Government Code sections 25257 and 25259.7 are met and all reasonable collection efforts have been exhausted.

The collectability of delinquent debt is primarily determined by the age of the account calculated from the date it becomes delinquent. The likelihood of collecting older delinquent court-ordered debt drops as the account ages. The cases that were eligible for amnesty represent \$1.8 billion of the total outstanding debt and are nearly 4 years old or significantly older.

Conclusion

The Amnesty Program was offered to provide individuals with an opportunity to resolve their delinquent court-ordered debt at a reduction of 50 percent and allow those adversely impacted by economic uncertainty and unemployment the chance to pay their court-ordered debt. An associated benefit of the Amnesty Program is that individuals were able to reinstate their driving privileges by releasing sanctions imposed by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Although the Amnesty Program did not generate hundreds of millions of dollars, it was successful in reducing outstanding statewide debt by \$29 million. The program provided an opportunity for collection programs to collect old debt that in all likelihood would otherwise have remained uncollected. And it gave court and county collection programs the opportunity to focus efforts on newer debt.

In FY 2012–2013, the Enhanced Collections Unit will continue to work with the Informal Collections Working Group and court and county collection programs to ensure statewide consistency in the discharge of debt from accountability.

For more information about this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic, Administrative Office of the Courts, Chief Financial Officer and Director, Fiscal Services Office, 916-263-1397, or send questions to the AOC's Enhanced Collections Unit at collections@jud.ca.gov.

Attachments

1. Amnesty Program Collections Reporting Template
2. Statewide Amnesty Program Summary Report

Amnesty Program Collections Report
January 1, 2012, through June 30, 2012
Court/County: _____

Mandatory Amnesty Program - TRAFFIC				
	No. Accounts Resolved	Revenue Collected	Program Operating Cost	Recovered Cost
January				
February				
March				
April				
May				
June				
TOTAL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Optional Amnesty Program - MISDEMEANOR				
	No. Accounts Resolved	Revenue Collected	Program Operating Cost	Recovered Cost
January				
February				
March				
April				
May				
June				
TOTAL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Completed by: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Phone No.: _____

Email _____

Statewide Amnesty Program Summary Report

Program	Mandatory (Infractions) Program				Optional (Misdemeanors) Program				Combined Court/County Amnesty Program Total					Additional Court/County Amnesty Program Information			
	No. Accounts Resolved	Revenue Collected	Program Operating Cost	Recovered Cost (1)	No. Accounts Resolved	Revenue Collected	Program Operating Cost	Recovered Cost	No. Accounts Resolved	Gross Revenue Collected	Program Operating Cost	Recovered Cost	Net Revenue Collected	No. Eligible Cases	Total Case Value	Total Collections: Revenue and Equal 50% Reduction	Cost by Revenue Collected
Alameda	541	\$141,412	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	541	\$141,411.78	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$141,411.78	0	\$55,724	\$282,823.56	0.0%
Alpine	1	\$431	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1	\$430.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$430.50	0	\$0	\$861.00	0.0%
Amador	5	\$1,532	\$62	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	5	\$1,532.00	\$62.00	\$0.00	\$1,532.00	1,427	\$605,596	\$3,064.00	4.0%
Butte	182	\$96,761	\$14,838	\$14,838	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	182	\$96,761.00	\$14,838.48	\$14,838.48	\$81,922.52	12,206	\$12,281,641	\$193,522.00	15.3%
Calaveras	28	\$8,417	\$1,100	\$867	8	\$6,104	\$695	\$629	36	\$14,520.85	\$1,795.20	\$1,495.68	\$13,025.17	1,227	\$593,936	\$29,041.70	12.4%
Colusa	187	\$84,599	\$23,110	\$23,110	1	\$333	\$44	\$44	188	\$84,931.86	\$23,153.89	\$23,153.89	\$61,777.97	5,618	\$5,599,093	\$169,863.72	27.3%
Contra Costa	2,591	\$962,879	\$283,013	\$283,013	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	2,591	\$962,878.72	\$283,012.82	\$283,012.82	\$679,865.90	0	\$81,544,599	\$1,925,757.44	29.4%
Del Norte	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	\$0	\$0.00	0.0%
El Dorado	96	\$37,258	\$10,185	\$10,185	11	\$7,207	\$0	\$0	107	\$44,465.29	\$10,184.58	\$10,184.58	\$34,280.71	0	\$0	\$88,930.58	22.9%
Fresno	449	\$157,606	\$66,027	\$66,027	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	449	\$157,606.00	\$66,027.00	\$66,027.00	\$91,579.00	0	\$0	\$315,212.00	41.9%
Glenn	222	\$66,384	\$18,827	\$18,827	32	\$15,085	\$4,237	\$4,237	254	\$81,468.25	\$23,063.88	\$23,063.88	\$58,404.37	9,075	\$7,635,512	\$162,936.50	28.3%
Humboldt	182	\$47,622	\$39,123	\$39,123	7	\$2,742	\$0	\$0	189	\$50,364.15	\$39,122.58	\$39,122.58	\$11,241.57	728	\$295,638	\$100,728.30	77.7%
Imperial	544	\$184,239	\$32,736	\$32,736	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	544	\$184,238.64	\$32,736.16	\$32,736.16	\$151,502.48	0	\$11,210,997	\$368,477.28	17.8%
Inyo	30	\$10,142	\$8,859	\$8,859	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	30	\$10,141.50	\$8,859.23	\$8,859.33	\$1,282.17	30	\$24,228	\$20,283.00	87.4%
Kern	894	\$284,886	\$170,383	\$170,383	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	894	\$284,886.00	\$170,383.23	\$170,383.23	\$114,502.77	100,000	\$0	\$569,772.00	59.8%
Kings	499	\$141,504	\$14,984	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	499	\$141,504.36	\$14,984.06	\$0.00	\$141,504.36	0	\$14,604,198	\$283,008.72	10.6%
Lake	175	\$84,475	\$25,708	\$19,552	32	\$15,318	\$4,662	\$3,545	207	\$99,792.86	\$30,369.70	\$23,097.33	\$76,695.53	0	\$12,014,541	\$199,585.72	30.4%
Lassen	255	\$85,356	\$25,696	\$25,696	1	\$691	\$90	\$90	256	\$86,046.72	\$25,785.73	\$25,785.73	\$60,260.99	6,884	\$5,103,091	\$172,093.44	30.0%
Los Angeles	14,328	\$5,821,722	\$546,425	\$546,425	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	14,328	\$5,821,722.00	\$546,425.00	\$546,425.00	\$5,275,297.00	992,959	\$820,000,000	\$11,643,444.00	9.4%
Madera	91	\$28,105	\$2,895	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	91	\$28,104.93	\$2,894.92	\$0.00	\$28,104.93	0	\$8,821,239	\$56,209.86	10.3%
Marin	80	\$22,755	\$5,002	\$4,736	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	80	\$22,755.00	\$5,002.26	\$4,736.00	\$18,019.00	0	\$2,480,296	\$45,510.00	22.0%
Mariposa	14	\$5,260	\$999	\$1,320	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	14	\$5,260.00	\$998.88	\$1,320.18	\$3,939.82	358	\$374,616	\$10,520.00	19.0%
Mendocino	82	\$23,537	\$1,851	\$1,851	32	\$20,592	\$675	\$675	114	\$44,129.00	\$2,526.64	\$2,526.64	\$41,602.36	3,465	\$2,375,755	\$88,258.00	5.7%
Merced	390	\$130,004	\$19,148	\$19,148	14	\$4,917	\$3,399	\$3,387	404	\$134,921.44	\$22,547.13	\$22,535.10	\$112,386.34	0	\$0	\$269,842.88	16.7%
Modoc	9	\$1,721	\$84	\$84	5	\$1,658	\$77	\$77	14	\$3,379.00	\$160.51	\$160.51	\$3,218.49	0	\$328,218	\$6,758.00	4.8%
Mono	30	\$7,261	\$1,767	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	30	\$7,260.50	\$1,766.70	\$0.00	\$7,260.50	0	\$0	\$14,521.00	24.3%
Monterey	1,661	\$480,588	\$49,439	\$7,421	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1,661	\$480,588.00	\$49,439.00	\$7,421.00	\$473,167.00	64,331	\$38,514,701	\$961,176.00	10.3%
Napa	429	\$111,558	\$23,553	\$23,553	106	\$48,463	\$8,344	\$8,344	535	\$160,020.28	\$31,896.98	\$31,896.97	\$128,123.31	21,031	\$13,992,530	\$320,040.56	19.9%
Nevada	120	\$10,686	\$4,462	\$4,462	1	\$675	\$32	\$32	121	\$11,360.64	\$4,494.12	\$4,494.12	\$6,866.52	0	\$0	\$32,721.28	39.6%
Orange	2,662	\$900,772	\$166,372	\$166,372	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	2,662	\$900,772.06	\$166,372.12	\$166,372.12	\$734,399.94	108,000	\$86,815,371	\$1,801,544.12	18.5%
Placer	202	\$73,314	\$17,817	\$19,991	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	202	\$73,313.80	\$17,817.06	\$19,990.89	\$53,322.91	23,808	\$18,995,442	\$146,627.60	24.3%
Plumas	16	\$5,029	\$754	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	16	\$5,028.50	\$754.30	\$0.00	\$5,028.50	630	\$461,256	\$10,057.00	15.0%
Riverside	1,907	\$483,112	\$80,633	\$80,633	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1,907	\$483,111.55	\$80,633.32	\$80,633.32	\$402,478.23	0	\$22,139,244	\$966,223.10	16.7%
Sacramento	876	\$320,461	\$31,182	\$41,963	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	876	\$320,460.61	\$31,182.31	\$41,962.56	\$278,498.05	90,568	\$75,168,668	\$640,921.22	9.7%
San Benito	59	\$19,696	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	59	\$19,695.88	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,695.88	0	\$0	\$39,391.76	0.0%
San Bernardino	827	\$288,575	\$134,460	\$134,460	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	827	\$288,575.03	\$134,460.48	\$134,460.48	\$154,114.55	0	\$72,139,900	\$577,150.06	46.6%
San Diego	2,009	\$551,441	\$130,199	\$31,607	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	2,009	\$551,440.76	\$130,198.87	\$31,606.68	\$519,834.08	0	\$130,775,555	\$1,102,881.52	23.6%
San Francisco	989	\$305,293	\$71,251	\$71,251	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	989	\$305,293.47	\$71,250.99	\$71,250.99	\$234,042.48	0	\$41,833,612	\$610,586.94	23.3%
San Joaquin	385	\$98,539	\$36,389	\$36,389	135	\$56,765	\$9,194	\$9,194	520	\$155,303.94	\$45,583.22	\$45,583.22	\$109,720.72	50,274	\$24,024,273	\$310,607.88	29.4%
San Luis Obispo	106	\$37,834	\$11,353	\$11,353	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	106	\$37,834.05	\$11,353.37	\$11,353.37	\$26,480.68	1,846	\$1,446,995	\$75,668.10	30.0%
San Mateo	77	\$31,351	\$49,150	(\$17,799)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	77	\$31,350.83	\$49,149.62	-\$17,798.79	\$49,149.62	0	\$0	\$62,701.66	156.8%
Santa Barbara	174	\$55,445	\$64,863	\$55,445	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	174	\$55,445.00	\$64,863.00	\$55,445.00	\$0.00	0	\$10,779,600	\$110,890.00	117.0%
Santa Clara	629	\$220,574	\$91,233	\$91,233	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	629	\$220,573.74	\$91,232.59	\$91,232.59	\$129,341.15	1,154	\$500,000	\$441,147.48	41.4%
Santa Cruz	105	\$32,412	\$12,514	\$12,514	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	105	\$32,412.07	\$12,514.15	\$12,514.15	\$19,897.92	50,274	\$23,287,947	\$64,824.14	38.6%
Shasta	766	\$149,138	\$42,833	\$42,833	146	\$56,276	\$13,225	\$13,225	912	\$205,414.47	\$56,057.25	\$56,057.25	\$149,357.22	38,800	\$29,588,854	\$410,828.94	27.3%
Sierra	42	\$14,896	\$6,913	\$6,913	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	42	\$14,895.50	\$6,912.54	\$6,912.54	\$7,982.96	428	\$330,258	\$29,791.00	46.4%
Siskiyou	80	\$35,423	\$9,275	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	80	\$35,422.71	\$9,275.33	\$0.00	\$35,422.71	0	\$70,845	\$70,845.42	26.2%
Solano	1,305	\$465,965	\$61,757	\$47,680	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1,305	\$465,965.00	\$61,757.00	\$47,680.00	\$418,285.00	143,000	\$85,901,103	\$931,930.00	13.3%
Sonoma	535	\$152,745	\$161,734	\$161,734	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	535	\$152,745.26	\$161,734.44	\$161,734.44	-\$8,989.18	12,618	\$7,285,809	\$305,490.52	105.9%
Stanislaus	1,140	\$400,372	\$102,289	\$102,289	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	1,140	\$400,371.50	\$102,288.51	\$102,288.51	\$298,082.99	58,497	\$49,374,690	\$800,743.00	25.5%
Sutter	93	\$31,570	\$3,554	\$3,554	15	\$8,201	\$1,016	\$1,016	108	\$39,771.45	\$4,569.53	\$4,569.53	\$35,201.92	7,767	\$6,023,572	\$79,542.90	11.5%
Tehama	160	\$64,514	\$8,215	\$6,645	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	160	\$64,513.53	\$8,215.14	\$6,644.66	\$57,868.87	0	\$129,028	\$129,027.06	12.7%
Trinity	3	\$908	\$275	\$633	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	3	\$907.75	\$274.80	\$632.95	\$274.80	0	\$0	\$1,815.50	30.3%
Tulare	889	\$331,504	\$30,094	\$58,000	146	\$117,347	\$10,659	\$20,875	1,035	\$448,851.31	\$40,753.23	\$78,874.79	\$369,976.52	61,931	\$46,403,718	\$897,702.62	9.1%
Tuolumne	57	\$23,110	\$3,628	\$3,628	12	\$7,855	\$0	\$0	69	\$30,964.30	\$3,627.55	\$3,627.55	\$27,336.75	0	\$7,200,000	\$61,928.60	11.7%
Ventura	834	\$246,171	\$49,234	\$49,234	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	834	\$246,171.00	\$49,234.00	\$49,234.00	\$196,937.00	0	\$63,943,685	\$492,342.00	20.0%
Yolo	61	\$28,456	\$4,245	\$4,245	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	61	\$28,455.89	\$4,245.49	\$4,245.49	\$24,210.40	0	\$2,830,000	\$56,911.78	14.9%
Yuba	377	\$129,564	\$35,981	\$35,981	61	\$13,766	\$3,557	\$3,557	438	\$143,330.20	\$39,538.26	\$39,538.26	\$103,791.94	12,731	\$10,727,696	\$286,660.40	27.6%
Revenue	41,480	\$14,536,878	\$2,808,473	\$2,580,996	765	\$383,994	\$59,906	\$68,927	42,245	\$14,920,872.43	\$2,868,379.15	\$2,649,922.76	\$12,270,949.67	1,881,665	\$1,857,179,067.38	\$29,841,744.86	19.2%

(1) The operating cost is the amount expended and the recovered cost is the total amount deducted from each revenue fund prior to distribution.