



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: February 26, 2016

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Child Support: Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation	Action Required
	Effective Date
	February 26, 2016
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Date of Report
None	February 1, 2016
Recommended by	Contact
AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee	Anna L. Maves, Supervising Attorney
Hon. Irma Poole Asberry, Cochair	916-263-8624
Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Cochair	<a href="mailto:anna.maves@jud.ca.gov">anna.maves@jud.ca.gov</a>
Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, Cochair	

---

### **Executive Summary**

At its meeting on April 17, 2015, the Judicial Council approved the recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee that the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee be established to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program. The subcommittee, which included representatives from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the California Department of Child Support Services was charged to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 and report back at the February 2016 Judicial Council meeting. The joint subcommittee completed its work in November 2015 after extensive discussions and review of the relevant information.

The joint subcommittee was asked to report back to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and the Workload Assessment

Advisory Committee by December 31, 2015, and report back to the council at its February 2016 meeting. This report is being provided in response to that directive and includes the recommendations of the subcommittee as well as the report back from the three respective advisory committees.

## **Recommendation**

The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective February 26, 2016:

1. Continue to allocate funding using the historical funding methodology, coordinate with California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies, and review the funding methodology for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators at the conclusion of the DCSS program review.
2. When developing a funding methodology in the future, determine whether there is sufficient data to determine the specific workload of the family law facilitator, which may be different than how workload for the child support commissioner is determined<sup>1</sup>; and
3. Adopt the recommendation of the joint subcommittee for revising the process of how funds are moved from one court to another during a fiscal year to maximize program resources. This process would include providing questionnaires for the courts to identify funds available for redistribution and courts requesting additional funds. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee would make recommendations to the Judicial Council for reallocation of these available funds. The Judicial Council would direct the Administrative Director to continue to monitor spending patterns of the courts and provide a survey with a financial analysis to the courts towards the end of the fiscal year to determine if additional funds are available to be reallocated to courts that have exhausted their AB 1058 allocation. The Administrative Director would reallocate the available funds and report back to the Judicial Council on any action taken once the fiscal year has closed.

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that Recommendation 1, *supra*, instead provide as follows:

1. Allocate funding using the historical model in fiscal year (FY) 2016–2017. Develop a workload-based funding methodology to begin implementation in FY 2017–2018. Coordinate with California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommend a minor edit to this recommendation as discussed below.

## **Previous Council Action**

The Judicial Council is required annually to allocate non-Trial Court Trust Funds to the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program, and has done so since 1997.<sup>2</sup> The council receives recommendations on these allocations annually from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. Funds for this program are provided through a cooperative agreement between the DCSS and the Judicial Council. The agreement requires the council to annually approve the funding allocation for each court for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators. Two-thirds of the funds are provided from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement, through the 1996 Federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Recovery Act (PRWORA) and one-third of the funds come from the state General Fund (non-Trial Court Trust Fund court funding). This funding is commonly referred to as “base funding.” Any funds left unspent during the fiscal year revert to the state General Fund and cannot be used in subsequent years. In addition to the base funding, DCSS and the Judicial Council of California provide a mechanism for the courts to voluntarily participate in the federal drawdown option whereby courts could receive two-thirds of additional program funding by paying one-third of program costs from local trial court funds and receiving two-thirds federal matching funds.

In addition to allocating funds for each fiscal year, in order to maximize use of program resources—under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court—the Judicial Council at midyear redistributes both base funding and federal drawdown funds to courts that indicate a need for additional funds from any unallocated funds and any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants.

## **Rationale for Recommendation**

### **Subcommittee process**

The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee met initially on June 18, 2015, again on August 25, 2015, and finally on November 19, 2015. Each aspect of the AB 1058 funding methodology (initial, midyear, and federal drawdown) was reviewed by members with assistance from staff and input from DCSS.

At the June 2015 meeting, Judicial Council staff from Finance and the Office of Court Research provided a presentation on the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), including the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) which is the basis for computing trial court workload for the WAFM. This background provided information about current data available through the courts and the methodology for allocating trial court funds. As part of the discussion, materials included a document (for discussion only) showing three-year average annual filing numbers for DCSS cases, as reported by courts to the Judicial Council via the Judicial Branch

---

<sup>2</sup> AB 1058 added article 4 to chapter 2, of part 2, of division 9 of the Family Code, which at section 4252(b)(6) requires the Judicial Council to “[e]stablish procedures for the distribution of funding to the courts for child support commissioners, family law facilitators pursuant to [Family Code] Division 14 (commencing with Section 10000) and related allowable costs.”

Statistical Information System (JBSIS), for use in the annual *Court Statistics Report* and for the use in the RAS/WAFM model. These numbers were used to illustrate what would happen if the limited funds available were allocated using the RAS three-year average filing numbers, demonstrating that additional work was necessary to develop other possible approaches to allocation of AB 1058 funds.

Also at the June meeting, staff from the Center for Families, Children & the Courts provided an overview of the AB 1058 Program including historical background and information about the funding of the program. This included information about how funding decisions originally made by the council were based on a workload assessment based on data provided by the Department of Social Services<sup>3</sup>. The data used was the number of cases opened in the local child support agency that had a child support order. In addition, minimum funding was provided to all of the courts regardless of caseload size. The allocation for family law facilitators was based on the allocation each court received for the child support commissioners.

Starting in 1997, each fiscal year the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee reviews the funds available for allocation for the courts for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators and makes recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding funding allocations. Questionnaires are sent annually to each court requesting the information needed to evaluate appropriate funding levels. Courts that have indicated an exceptional need, such as increased workload or increased costs, have received an adjustment to the allocation with increased funding. This increased funding was made available via the contract with DCSS or with funds available from courts that requested reduced funds.

Since 2008, due to the state budget crisis, the title IV-D program has been flat funded. Because there are no additional funds available for the program, the Judicial Council has allocated funds to the courts at the same level the court received in the prior fiscal year, less any amount a court indicated they did not need, for both the Child Support Commissioner Program and Family Law Facilitator Program.

Funds available because a court has indicated that it won't spend them have been allocated among all the courts requesting additional funds proportionate to their share of the total base funding. This has provided courts with funds consistent with the funding they received in the prior fiscal year and provided all courts that have requested additional funds with some additional funds. Although there has been an adjustment to the funding based on the questionnaires completed annually by the courts, there has not been an adjustment to the funding methodology based on workload.

At this meeting, the group decided that the first step in considering possible approaches to developing a funding methodology was to analyze the available data to determine

---

<sup>3</sup> California's title IV-D program was managed by the Department of Social Services before the creation of the Department of Child Support Services in 2000.

workload/caseload for each court. The discussion of the subcommittee focused on which data to use to accurately determine the workload/caseload for each court. A subcommittee of the workgroup was formed to review options associated with reallocation of funds during a fiscal year.

At the August meeting the group reviewing the midyear reallocation reported back to the larger group as follows:

**Midyear Reallocation:** In December/January, each court responds to questionnaires for the Child Support Commissioner Program and Family Law Facilitator Program indicating whether they wish to maintain their base funding and federal drawdown allocations for each program, return funds they do not anticipate expending, or request additional funds. As with the original allocations, requests for additional funds far exceed funds returned. The proposed reallocations are reviewed, revised, and recommended by the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and approved by the Judicial Council. Courts that voluntarily return funds and courts that are allocated additional funds must enter into an amended contract with the revised funding. The following issues were identified and discussed by the reallocation workgroup:

- There are insufficient funds to entirely fund the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program statewide. Despite some courts not expending all allocated funds resulting in approximately 2.5% of funds available for title IV-D services being unexpended annually, many courts spend their entire allocation and supplement the program with trial court funds to provide basic services.
- In order to participate in the federal drawdown program, courts must contribute the state match of 34% from trial court trust funds. At the end of the fiscal year, some courts lack sufficient funds to contribute the court's required match. Although the court's inability to participate in the federal drawdown program does not result in funds reverting to the General Fund, inability to move these funds to courts able to provide the match results in not all available title IV-D funds being maximized for the benefit of the program.
- Processing of midyear reallocation takes too much time. The current process which requires approval by the Judicial Council and contract amendments with the courts does not allow for last-minute movement of funds from courts that will not expend all allocated title IV-D funds to courts that have already expended all allocated funds and are using trial court funds to continue to provide services. In addition, this process takes place in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year, when finance staff in the courts and Judicial Council already have their heaviest workload.
- Although during the current reallocation process, some funds are identified which can be reallocated to other courts, some courts do not voluntarily return funds despite spending patterns that might suggest they are not projected to fully spend their allocation. These funds are then not spent and not made available to another court.

As a result of this analysis, the group recommended the following process for the midyear reallocation:

- In December, Judicial Council staff will provide each court with a questionnaire inquiring about each court's current budget. This will identify any funds available for reallocation to other courts in that fiscal year and courts that need additional funds in that fiscal year.
- The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee will review the funds available and the requests for additional funds provided by each court, and develop recommendations for reallocating funds that the Judicial Council would consider during their February meeting. The Judicial Council decides during their February meeting on the reallocation of amounts voluntarily forfeited by courts to those courts requesting additional AB 1058 funds.
- The Judicial Council requires the Administrative Director to continue to monitor spending patterns of each of the courts throughout the remainder of the fiscal year. In April, Judicial Council staff would send each court a survey for courts to identify any expected savings or expenditures for any remaining funding. Included in this survey, each court would be provided with a financial analysis that shows spending projections for the remainder of the fiscal year based on invoices received to date. Courts would be required to certify their budgets to show that they will spend all of the remaining funds allocated to them and have sufficient trial court budget funds to provide the match necessary to receive federal drawdown funds. The Administrative Director would then be authorized to adjust the midyear reallocations based on the information provided by the courts in order to redistribute funds to those courts that have already provided valid unreimbursed claims and then to courts that are projected to have unreimbursed expenditures during the remainder of the current fiscal year (May and June). Courts would be noticed of the change in the Judicial Council's reallocation of funds based on the additional funds available due to the courts' spending projections for the remainder of the fiscal year.
- Once the Administrative Director has calculated the redistribution based on the information provided by the courts, revised contracts shall be provided to the impacted courts and a report shall be provided to the Judicial Council regarding the revision to the allocation. After each fiscal year has closed, staff will also provide the Judicial Council and all trial courts with an annual report which displays the final adjusted allocations, each court's actual expenditures, and any unspent funds, both base funds and federal drawdown funds by court.
- Judicial Council staff will provide information and education to the courts regarding this change to the reallocation processes, specifically at the Court Executive Advisory Committee meeting, the Chief Financial Officer Roundtable, the courts' annual budget meeting, the AB 1058 Annual Conference, and Beyond the Bench.

The group also recommended that ongoing work be conducted to consider improvements to other aspects of the AB 1058 program, including but not limited to policies and procedures, increased use of technology, communications, and training.

Additionally, at the August meeting members discussed data reliability and the use of filing data versus DCSS caseload data. Members also discussed what other factors should be considered in any funding methodology and decided that the primary components in a revised funding methodology should include:

1. Comparative workload data based on DCSS caseload statistics;
2. Factoring in differences in local costs of labor;
3. A minimum funding floor for small courts; and
4. Gradual phase-in to minimize the impact of any shifts in funding.

A smaller subcommittee was established to explore and present specific options for the full subcommittee's consideration at its next meeting.

At the November 19, 2015 meeting, the full subcommittee had an extensive discussion about the information available and the best way to proceed. The subcommittee received extensive statewide input including 26 separate e-mail messages and letters from judicial officers, child support commissioners, family law facilitators and court administrators, and in-person comments from judicial officers and a court executive.

The smaller subcommittee tasked with proposing a funding methodology incorporating the factors specified above, reported back to the joint subcommittee. A report was provided that showed possible funding allocation options. It also showed different options for phasing in any change in allocation over three or four years. The subcommittee recognized some public comments received from trial courts and acknowledged that the reports prepared erroneously combined funding for courts that have reached agreements to share resources and that any funding allocation methodology should take that into account the concerns raised.

Alisha Griffin, director of the DCSS, the state agency designated to administer the title IV-D state plan, reported to the subcommittee that DCSS has instituted a review of its allocation methodology for allocating funding to the local child support agencies. This comprehensive two-year review will include evaluating the cost for providing services, determining increased efficiencies that could be adopted statewide, and encouraging uniformity among the local child support agencies. This information could then be used to justify increased investment by the Legislature to increase funding for the program. Director Griffin advised that revising the current funding methodology might negatively impact the work that the funder is currently undertaking to potentially increase funding for the title IV-D program, which would include additional funds for the courts.

After a comprehensive discussion and in consideration of the input provided from the public comment, the joint subcommittee reconsidered the funding allocation methodology for distributing base funds and federal drawdown funds for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators and made the following recommendation based on a 10–5 vote:

1. Continue to allocate funding using the historical funding methodology, coordinate with DCSS on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies, and review the funding methodology for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators at the conclusion of the DCSS program review.
2. When developing a funding methodology, determine whether there is sufficient data to determine the specific workload of the family law facilitator, which may be different than how workload for the child support commissioner is determined.
3. Adopt the recommendation of the midyear reallocation subcommittee for revising the process of how funds are moved from one court to another during a fiscal year to maximize program resources.

#### **Subsequent advisory committee input**

***Workload Assessment Advisory Committee:*** The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) met on December 2, 2015, to review and discuss the recommendations that were approved by the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee at its November 19, 2015 meeting. WAAC voted unanimously to support all three recommendations in concept, with the suggestion of a nonsubstantive amendment to Recommendation 2, in order to clarify its intent and avoid confusion with the workload measurement that is under WAAC’s charge through the Resource Assessment Study (RAS). The proposed amendment to Recommendation 2 is as follows:

“When developing a funding methodology, determine whether the family law facilitator methodology should use different underlying data than the child support commissioner methodology, and identify what data should be used, given that different factors drive commissioner and facilitator workloads.”

In addition to voting in support of the joint subcommittee’s recommendations, WAAC is committing to improving the data related to AB 1058 case processing through its own work, both by exploring with the Court Executives Advisory Committee the concerns expressed regarding the consistency and reliability of DCSS filings data (and associated JBSIS reporting guidelines), and by ensuring that the full range of AB 1058 workload is captured in the 2016 update of the staff workload study. Although WAAC recognizes that whatever funding methodology is eventually adopted may not function in the same way as the RAS model, the data from the staff workload study may nonetheless prove useful in the development of the methodology.



***Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee:*** The committee met on December 8, 2015, by phone to discuss the recommendations of the joint subcommittee. Members appreciated the work that was done and agreed that going forward the advisory committee should continue to pursue its role of providing recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding the AB 1058 program and to coordinate with DCSS on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies, and provide information to the Judicial Council at the conclusion of the DCSS program review and throughout the process. The committee will seek to provide this input as part of the Annual Agenda process and through its work crafting recommendations on AB 1058, as approved by RUPRO and the Judicial Council. The committee also indicated support for the friendly amendment that WAAC was considering as discussed above.

Because the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee held its call in December 2015 to discuss the joint subcommittee recommendation, members only discussed the recommendation made by the joint subcommittee and not the subsequent recommendation from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee discussed below. Additionally, members did not consider any materials or funding allocation options considered and rejected by the joint subcommittee.

***Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee:*** The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) met in person in a public session on January 14, 2016, to review and discuss the recommendations of the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee. The TCBAC reviewed three written public comments addressing the joint subcommittee recommendations and heard one public comment in person.

At its January 14, 2016 meeting, the TCBAC heard a description of the work of the joint subcommittee, as summarized in the preceding paragraphs of this document. Three judicial members of TCBAC and three court executive officer members of TCBAC who had served on the joint subcommittee were present at the January 14, 2016 TCBAC meeting and participated in the description and discussion of the work and conclusions of the joint subcommittee.

In addition, Mr. Stephen Nash, a former member of TCBAC (currently a member of WAAC) and a member of the joint subcommittee, participated in the January 14, 2016 TCBAC meeting at the invitation of the chair. Mr. Nash explained charts which, as described at pages 6–7 above, were prepared by a smaller subcommittee of the joint subcommittee, based on principles approved by the joint subcommittee at its August meeting. These charts demonstrated possible funding allocation options based on caseload data supplied by DCSS. The charts presented to the TCBAC (which are attached) differed slightly from the charts presented to the joint subcommittee, because they corrected a mistake that was recognized in the course of the November meeting of the joint subcommittee.

TCBAC discussed the fact that the current monetary distribution of AB 1058 funds differs substantially from a distribution based on current workload. Committee members were particularly concerned with this divergence in light of the fact that the original funding distribution model approved by the council in 1997 contemplated that the funding model would be updated based on evolving caseloads, which has not been done. TCBAC members expressed

concern for the impact of the current funding distribution on courts whose caseloads have grown substantially in the last 10–15 years.

While recognizing the value of cooperation with DCSS in the workload assessment it has just begun, many members expressed concern that, under the joint subcommittee recommendation, reallocation of funding could not begin to be assessed until July 2018, when DCSS anticipates concluding its assessment. TCBAC members agreed with the comments of WAAC that the judicial branch should work toward reliable internal data. Some members also were concerned that the joint subcommittee’s first recommendation appeared to imply that the branch would distribute funding according to the preferences of DCSS. Several members stated that it would be inappropriate for the court to distribute funding according to performance measures that took into account the extent to which DCSS as a litigant prevailed in court.

The TCBAC presentation and discussion concerning AB 1058 extended over two hours. At the conclusion, 21 members of the TCBAC voted in favor of recommending to the Judicial Council that it adopt an *alternative* to the joint subcommittee’s *first* recommendation as follows:

1. Allocate funding using the historical model in FY 2016–2017. Develop a workload-based funding methodology to begin implementation in FY 2017–2018. Coordinate with California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies.

Six TCBAC members opposed the revised recommendation.

The TCBAC did not endorse any particular workload-based formula, but rather urges that work continue to develop an appropriate and acceptable workload-based model that could be implemented in FY 2017–2018.

The TCBAC voted unanimously to approve Recommendation 2 of the joint subcommittee with the modification suggested by WAAC. The TCBAC also voted unanimously in favor of Recommendation 3 of the joint subcommittee.

***Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee:*** Following the TCBAC’s January 14, 2016, meeting and recommendations stated above, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee met in an open, recorded meeting, on February 2, 2016. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the TCBAC recommendation and the most effective way to work with the other advisory committees that formed the tripartite joint subcommittee in developing a funding methodology based on workload for both child support commissioners and family law facilitators. Based on the TCBAC response to the joint recommendation, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends the following:

1. That the Judicial Council reappoint the joint subcommittee for at least fiscal year 2016–2017 to continue consideration of the allocation of the AB 1058 funds
2. That the joint subcommittee work with DCSS as DCSS reviews its funding allocation methodology for the local child support agencies
3. That the joint subcommittee continue its work to determine accurate and complete workload numbers to include in a funding methodology for both child support commissioners and family law facilitators
4. As part of the joint subcommittee’s funding methodology determination, that a subject-matter–expert group be established comprising both child support commissioners and family law facilitators to provide input and expertise to the joint subcommittee
5. That the joint subcommittee report back to the council at its December 2016 meeting after providing a report to TCBAC, WAAC, and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to ensure statewide input

By providing additional time for further consideration of the most appropriate approach for the council to take, and by obtaining more input from subject-matter experts, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee seeks to more fully address the work that led to the joint subcommittee recommendation; TCBAC’s concerns; and the issues DCSS has raised addressing the performance-standards nature of this funding, which makes it significantly different from other funding sources.

### **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

The joint subcommittee’s recommendation was included in materials provided to the joint subcommittee for its public meeting on November 19, 2015, and posted for the public in accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75 requirements for open meetings. All three joint subcommittee meetings were open to the public. Twenty-six written comments from superior court judges, child support commissioners, family law facilitators, and administrators were received and distributed to members for the November 19 meeting, and in-person public comments were provided by three public commentators representing two superior courts.

### **Alternatives considered for allocating funding**

The joint subcommittee discussed a number of factors that should be included in any funding allocation methodology. These included identifying workload for each court, either using court data or data provided by DCSS—including a funding floor for small courts—and phasing in any change so that courts can make appropriate adjustments. Ultimately, the joint subcommittee determined that it had insufficient information to make a recommendation for a change to the current funding methodology and that there was not an urgent need to change to the current methodology.

## **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

There are no implementation requirements and costs other than the completion of an additional budget survey by each court to determine available funds that could be provided to courts that have already exhausted their AB 1058 budget and are using trial court funds to maintain service levels.

### **Attachment**

1. Funding Allocation Options Considered by TCBAC

Overview of Process for Developing Recommendations for AB 1058 Funding Allocation Methodology

## Background

At the August 25, 2015, meeting of the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee, members voted to include four primary components in any funding allocation methodologies to be considered:

1. the model should be based on some measure of workload;
2. the model should factor in differences in local costs of labor between different jurisdictions;
3. the model should incorporate a minimum funding floor for small courts; and
4. the model should be phased in gradually to minimize the impact of any shifts in funding.

A smaller subcommittee was established to explore and present specific options for the full subcommittee's consideration. Following is an overview of the group's work and resulting recommendations. Where feasible, the group used approaches consistent with the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), which allocates the annual state trial court operations funds and was developed in an effort to more equitably distribute funding across courts, relative to historical funding levels.

## Workload Measures

At its August 25, 2015, meeting, the joint subcommittee explored using both court filings (JBSIS) data and DCSS caseload data (cases with support orders established during the federal fiscal year) and determined that the latter would be more reflective of court workload and likely more reliable and consistently collected and reported, given that the data are audited. However, some members expressed a greater degree of comfort in using data generated and maintained by the courts. Other possibilities for workload measures included hearings and filings of requests for order (RFOs), but neither is consistently collected on a statewide basis, so using them would require placing additional reporting requirements on the courts.

The subcommittee opted to take an approach consistent with WAFM and use a three-year average of DCSS caseload, rather than a single year of data, in order to smooth over any spikes in volume. The first step in the allocation model involves summing the individual courts' three-year averages to arrive at a statewide total, then calculating each court's percentage of the total and multiplying it by total available funding to establish the initial, unadjusted pro rata share of funding.

## DRAFT – For deliberative purposes only

## Cost of Labor Adjustment

The subcommittee voted to incorporate a cost of labor adjustment into the methodology because there are significant labor cost differences across courts. WAFM uses a local cost of labor adjustment factor based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data on local government employee salaries. Given that this seems to be an appropriate index for such adjustments, and because there are benefits to using consistent metrics where possible, the draft methodology incorporates the same BLS factors as WAFM.

AB 1058 funding supports both salaries and operating expenses. Only the portion of funding that covers salaries should be subject to the cost of labor adjustment. To determine that portion of funding, actual expenditure data from FY 2013-14 were used to calculate average salary expenditures (including paid benefits, which function like salaries, and costs of contract staff) as a percentage of total base funding. Although a court may pay salaries out of both base and drawdown funding, it seemed safer to operate under the assumption to include all of the salary in the base, given that some courts do not participate in the drawdown. Additionally, because there is little variation in commissioner salaries from county to county, only support staff salaries are subject to the cost of labor adjustment in the Child Support Commissioner allocations.

The next steps in the allocation model involve applying the average salary percentages to the initial, unadjusted pro rata share of funding to determine the amount subject to the cost of labor adjustment, multiplying that amount by the BLS factor, and adding back in the non-salary portion of the allocation to come up with a total adjusted allocation. Applying the cost of labor adjustments results in a statewide total that exceeds available funding, so at a later point in the model, further adjustments need to be made to rescale the allocations to available funding.

## Funding Floor

The subcommittee opted to retain the assumption in the original allocation model that each court, regardless of workload, should be provided with a minimum of 0.3 FTE child support commissioner and 0.3 FTE family law facilitator. Unlike the original model, however, there is no allowance for minimum support staff since that would already be provided through the WAFM funding floor. To establish what that floor translates to in dollars, actual FY 2013-14 expenditure data were used to calculate the average salary, benefits, and travel and training costs for the Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 courts (the smallest courts that would be subject to the funding floor). Using these data, the funding floor would be roughly \$45,600 for the family law facilitator program and roughly \$62,600 for the child support commissioner program.

The final steps in the allocation model involve comparing the adjusted allocation to the funding floor and assigning the floor to those courts with a lower adjusted allocation. The remaining funding is then distributed proportionately to the BLS-adjusted share of the total among the courts not subject to the funding floor.

DRAFT – For deliberative purposes only

### Implementation and Phase-In

The workload-based methodology would, if implemented, result in changed allocations for courts throughout the state. Again consistent with WAFM, phasing in the new allocation methodology over time would ease the transition for courts. Three different phase-in options are proposed:

- A. a 3-year phase-in that is 33% workload-based (67% historical) in year 1, 67% workload-based in year 2, and 100% workload-based in year 3;
- B. a 4-year phase-in that is 25% workload-based (75% historical) in year 1, 50% workload-based in year 2, 75% workload-based in year 3, and 100% workload-based in year 4; and
- C. a 4-year phase-in that is 15% workload-based (85% historical) in year 1, 45% workload-based in year 2, 70% workload-based in year 3, and 100% workload-based in year 4 (an approach that would reduce the immediate impact relative to option B).

The full subcommittee may also wish to consider whether to implement the new allocation methodology immediately (i.e., FY 2016-17) or delay until FY 2017-18 in order to give the courts additional time to prepare for the transition.

CSC Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Support Staff Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	3-Year Avg. DCSS Caseload (Line 17)	% of Total DCSS Caseload	Pro Rata CSC Base Allocation	Support Salary Only (Assuming 43% of Base)	BLS Factor	Salary w/ BLS Adjustment	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (no floor)
Alameda	2,308	2.66%	\$855,578	\$366,448	1.42	\$520,356	\$1,009,486
Alpine	1	0.00%	\$494	\$212	0.83	\$176	\$458
Alpine-El Dorado	432						
Amador	84	0.10%	\$31,134	\$13,335	1.00	\$13,335	\$31,134
Butte	735	0.85%	\$272,549	\$116,734	0.91	\$106,228	\$262,043
Calaveras	126	0.15%	\$46,702	\$20,003	0.89	\$17,802	\$44,501
Colusa	51	0.06%	\$19,027	\$8,149	0.71	\$5,786	\$16,663
Contra Costa	2,394	2.76%	\$887,330	\$380,048	1.25	\$475,060	\$982,342
Del Norte	193	0.22%	\$71,411	\$30,586	0.77	\$23,551	\$64,377
El Dorado	431	0.50%	\$159,749	\$68,421	1.00	\$68,421	\$159,749
Fresno	4,202	4.85%	\$1,557,584	\$667,121	0.99	\$660,450	\$1,550,912
Glenn	153	0.18%	\$56,585	\$24,236	0.69	\$16,723	\$49,072
Humboldt	388	0.45%	\$143,935	\$61,648	0.77	\$47,469	\$129,756
Imperial	1,002	1.16%	\$371,389	\$159,068	0.78	\$124,073	\$336,394
Inyo	61	0.07%	\$22,733	\$9,737	0.83	\$8,081	\$21,078
Kern	3,545	4.09%	\$1,313,945	\$562,769	1.05	\$590,907	\$1,342,083
Kings	714	0.82%	\$264,766	\$113,400	0.88	\$99,792	\$251,158
Lake	190	0.22%	\$70,299	\$30,110	0.75	\$22,582	\$62,772
Lassen	154	0.18%	\$57,080	\$24,448	0.80	\$19,558	\$52,190
Los Angeles	16,118	18.60%	\$5,974,217	\$2,558,787	1.34	\$3,428,774	\$6,844,204
Madera	676	0.78%	\$250,434	\$107,262	0.93	\$99,754	\$242,926
Marin	195	0.22%	\$72,153	\$30,903	1.28	\$39,556	\$80,806
Mariposa	41	0.05%	\$15,197	\$6,509	0.78	\$5,077	\$13,765
Mendocino	328	0.38%	\$121,449	\$52,017	0.83	\$43,174	\$112,606
Merced	1,400	1.62%	\$518,906	\$222,250	0.90	\$200,025	\$496,681
Modoc	26	0.03%	\$9,637	\$4,128	0.60	\$2,477	\$7,986
Mono	16	0.02%	\$5,807	\$2,487	1.15	\$2,860	\$6,180
Monterey	1,391	1.60%	\$515,570	\$220,821	1.19	\$262,777	\$557,526
Napa	309	0.36%	\$114,654	\$49,107	1.22	\$59,910	\$125,457
Nevada	185	0.21%	\$68,693	\$29,422	0.97	\$28,539	\$67,811
Nevada-Sierra	193						
Orange	4,398	5.07%	\$1,630,107	\$698,183	1.30	\$907,638	\$1,839,562
Placer	558	0.64%	\$206,698	\$88,530	1.17	\$103,580	\$221,748
Plumas	67	0.08%	\$24,710	\$10,583	0.70	\$7,408	\$21,535



CSC Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Support Staff Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	3-Year Avg. DCSS Caseload (Line 17)	% of Total DCSS Caseload	Pro Rata CSC Base Allocation	Support Salary Only (Assuming 43% of Base)	BLS Factor	Salary w/ BLS Adjustment	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (no floor)
Riverside	6,608	7.62%	\$2,449,361	\$1,049,073	1.08	\$1,132,999	\$2,533,287
Sacramento	5,777	6.66%	\$2,141,106	\$917,046	1.28	\$1,173,819	\$2,397,879
San Benito	180	0.21%	\$66,717	\$28,575	0.98	\$28,004	\$66,145
San Bernardino	9,486	10.94%	\$3,515,960	\$1,505,903	1.06	\$1,596,257	\$3,606,315
San Diego	4,230	4.88%	\$1,567,838	\$671,513	1.17	\$785,670	\$1,681,995
San Francisco	762	0.88%	\$282,557	\$121,020	1.68	\$203,314	\$364,851
San Joaquin	3,299	3.81%	\$1,222,889	\$523,769	1.10	\$576,146	\$1,275,266
San Luis Obispo	436	0.50%	\$161,479	\$69,162	1.07	\$74,003	\$166,320
San Mateo	642	0.74%	\$237,956	\$101,918	1.44	\$146,761	\$282,799
Santa Barbara	1,013	1.17%	\$375,466	\$160,814	1.17	\$188,152	\$402,804
Santa Clara	2,305	2.66%	\$854,466	\$365,972	1.44	\$526,999	\$1,015,493
Santa Cruz	408	0.47%	\$151,224	\$64,770	1.15	\$74,486	\$160,940
Shasta	772	0.89%	\$286,016	\$122,502	0.85	\$104,127	\$267,641
Shasta-Trinity	811						
Sierra	7	0.01%	\$2,718	\$1,164	0.73	\$850	\$2,404
Siskiyou	167	0.19%	\$61,775	\$26,458	0.69	\$18,256	\$53,572
Solano	1,202	1.39%	\$445,395	\$190,765	1.20	\$228,918	\$483,547
Sonoma	830	0.96%	\$307,761	\$131,815	1.17	\$154,224	\$330,169
Stanislaus	1,813	2.09%	\$672,107	\$287,867	1.02	\$293,624	\$677,864
Sutter	350	0.40%	\$129,603	\$55,510	0.95	\$52,734	\$126,828
Tehama	345	0.40%	\$127,750	\$54,716	0.80	\$43,773	\$116,807
Trinity	39	0.05%	\$14,579	\$6,244	0.65	\$4,059	\$12,393
Tulare	1,260	1.45%	\$467,016	\$200,025	0.83	\$166,021	\$433,011
Tuolumne	189	0.22%	\$70,176	\$30,057	0.83	\$24,947	\$65,066
Ventura	1,371	1.58%	\$508,157	\$217,646	1.21	\$263,352	\$553,863
Yolo	463	0.53%	\$171,733	\$73,554	1.03	\$75,761	\$173,940
Yuba	280	0.32%	\$103,658	\$44,397	0.93	\$41,289	\$100,550
<b>Total</b>	<b>86,675</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$32,125,980</b>	<b>\$13,759,715</b>		<b>\$15,990,446</b>	<b>\$34,356,711</b>

CSC Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Support Staff Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	Adjusted Base Greater Than Floor Allocation?	If "No," Floor Allocation Amount	Adjusted Base Allocation Excluding Floor Courts	% of Total Adjusted Base Allocation	Adjusted Salary Rescaled to Available Allocation	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (with floor)	Pro Rata CSC Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)
Alameda	Yes		\$1,009,486	3.00%	\$926,797	\$926,797	\$215,014
Alpine	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$124
Alpine-El Dorado						\$209,222	\$40,271
Amador	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$7,824
Butte	Yes		\$262,043	0.78%	\$240,579	\$240,579	\$68,494
Calaveras	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$11,737
Colusa	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$4,782
Contra Costa	Yes		\$982,342	2.92%	\$901,876	\$901,876	\$222,994
Del Norte	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$17,946
El Dorado	Yes		\$159,749	0.47%	\$146,664	\$146,664	\$40,146
Fresno	Yes		\$1,550,912	4.60%	\$1,423,874	\$1,423,874	\$391,434
Glenn	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$14,220
Humboldt	Yes		\$129,756	0.39%	\$119,127	\$119,127	\$36,172
Imperial	Yes		\$336,394	1.00%	\$308,839	\$308,839	\$93,333
Inyo	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$5,713
Kern	Yes		\$1,342,083	3.98%	\$1,232,151	\$1,232,151	\$330,206
Kings	Yes		\$251,158	0.75%	\$230,585	\$230,585	\$66,538
Lake	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$17,667
Lassen	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$14,345
Los Angeles	Yes		\$6,844,204	20.31%	\$6,283,583	\$6,283,583	\$1,501,373
Madera	Yes		\$242,926	0.72%	\$223,027	\$223,027	\$62,936
Marin	Yes		\$80,806	0.24%	\$74,187	\$74,187	\$18,133
Mariposa	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$3,819
Mendocino	Yes		\$112,606	0.33%	\$103,382	\$103,382	\$30,521
Merced	Yes		\$496,681	1.47%	\$455,997	\$455,997	\$130,406
Modoc	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$2,422
Mono	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$1,459
Monterey	Yes		\$557,526	1.65%	\$511,858	\$511,858	\$129,567
Napa	Yes		\$125,457	0.37%	\$115,181	\$115,181	\$28,813
Nevada	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$17,263
Nevada-Sierra						\$125,116	\$17,946
Orange	Yes		\$1,839,562	5.46%	\$1,688,880	\$1,688,880	\$409,660
Placer	Yes		\$221,748	0.66%	\$203,584	\$203,584	\$51,945
Plumas	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$6,210

CSC Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Support Staff Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	Adjusted Base Greater Than Floor Allocation?	If "No," Floor Allocation Amount	Adjusted Base Allocation Excluding Floor Courts	% of Total Adjusted Base Allocation	Adjusted Salary Rescaled to Available Allocation	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (with floor)	Pro Rata CSC Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)
Riverside	Yes		\$2,533,287	7.52%	\$2,325,781	\$2,325,781	\$615,546
Sacramento	Yes		\$2,397,879	7.12%	\$2,201,464	\$2,201,464	\$538,079
San Benito	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$16,766
San Bernardino	Yes		\$3,606,315	10.70%	\$3,310,915	\$3,310,915	\$883,592
San Diego	Yes		\$1,681,995	4.99%	\$1,544,220	\$1,544,220	\$394,011
San Francisco	Yes		\$364,851	1.08%	\$334,965	\$334,965	\$71,009
San Joaquin	Yes		\$1,275,266	3.78%	\$1,170,807	\$1,170,807	\$307,323
San Luis Obispo	Yes		\$166,320	0.49%	\$152,696	\$152,696	\$40,581
San Mateo	Yes		\$282,799	0.84%	\$259,635	\$259,635	\$59,800
Santa Barbara	Yes		\$402,804	1.20%	\$369,810	\$369,810	\$94,358
Santa Clara	Yes		\$1,015,493	3.01%	\$932,312	\$932,312	\$214,735
Santa Cruz	Yes		\$160,940	0.48%	\$147,757	\$147,757	\$38,004
Shasta	Yes		\$267,641	0.79%	\$245,718	\$245,718	\$71,878
Shasta-Trinity						\$308,276	\$75,542
Sierra	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$683
Siskiyou	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$15,524
Solano	Yes		\$483,547	1.43%	\$443,939	\$443,939	\$111,932
Sonoma	Yes		\$330,169	0.98%	\$303,125	\$303,125	\$77,343
Stanislaus	Yes		\$677,864	2.01%	\$622,339	\$622,339	\$168,906
Sutter	Yes		\$126,828	0.38%	\$116,439	\$116,439	\$32,570
Tehama	Yes		\$116,807	0.35%	\$107,239	\$107,239	\$32,105
Trinity	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$3,664
Tulare	Yes		\$433,011	1.28%	\$397,543	\$397,543	\$117,365
Tuolumne	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$17,636
Ventura	Yes		\$553,863	1.64%	\$508,495	\$508,495	\$127,704
Yolo	Yes		\$173,940	0.52%	\$159,692	\$159,692	\$43,158
Yuba	Yes		\$100,550	0.30%	\$92,314	\$92,314	\$26,050
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$1,188,603</b>	<b>\$33,697,608</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$30,937,377</b>	<b>\$32,125,980</b>	<b>\$8,073,539</b>

**FLF Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B**

County	DCSS	DCSS	DCSS	3-Year Avg.	% of Total DCSS Caseload	Pro Rata FLF Base Allocation	Salary Only (Assuming 91% of Base)	BLS Factor	Salary w/ BLS Adjustment	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (no floor)
	Caseload FFY 2013	Caseload FFY 2014	Caseload FFY 2015	DCSS Caseload (Line 17)						
Alameda	2,027	2,421	2,477	2,308	2.66%	\$292,695	\$265,968	1.42	\$377,675	\$404,401
Alpine	1	1	2	1	0.00%	\$169	\$154	0.83	\$128	\$143
Alpine-El Dorado	481	402	414	432						
Amador	107	80	65	84	0.10%	\$10,651	\$9,679	1.00	\$9,679	\$10,651
Amador-Calaveras	254	204	172	210						
Butte	770	700	736	735	0.85%	\$93,240	\$84,726	0.91	\$77,100	\$85,614
Calaveras	147	124	107	126	0.15%	\$15,977	\$14,518	0.89	\$12,921	\$14,380
Colusa	53	60	41	51	0.06%	\$6,509	\$5,915	0.71	\$4,199	\$4,794
Contra Costa	2,070	2,726	2,386	2,394	2.76%	\$303,557	\$275,839	1.25	\$344,799	\$372,517
Del Norte	167	179	232	193	0.22%	\$24,430	\$22,199	0.77	\$17,093	\$19,324
El Dorado	480	401	412	431	0.50%	\$54,650	\$49,660	1.00	\$49,660	\$54,650
Fresno	3,944	3,960	4,703	4,202	4.85%	\$532,852	\$484,197	0.99	\$479,355	\$528,010
Glenn	163	163	132	153	0.18%	\$19,358	\$17,590	0.69	\$12,137	\$13,905
Humboldt	383	426	356	388	0.45%	\$49,240	\$44,744	0.77	\$34,453	\$38,949
Imperial	1,060	976	970	1,002	1.16%	\$127,053	\$115,451	0.78	\$90,052	\$101,653
Inyo	61	66	57	61	0.07%	\$7,777	\$7,067	0.83	\$5,866	\$6,576
Kern	4,809	3,302	2,524	3,545	4.09%	\$449,503	\$408,458	1.05	\$428,881	\$469,926
Kings	756	681	706	714	0.82%	\$90,577	\$82,306	0.88	\$72,429	\$80,700
Lake	124	196	249	190	0.22%	\$24,050	\$21,854	0.75	\$16,390	\$18,586
Lassen	140	161	161	154	0.18%	\$19,527	\$17,744	0.80	\$14,195	\$15,978
Los Angeles	19,801	10,622	17,932	16,118	18.60%	\$2,043,791	\$1,857,170	1.34	\$2,488,608	\$2,675,228
Madera	648	698	681	676	0.78%	\$85,674	\$77,851	0.93	\$72,401	\$80,224
Marin	226	187	171	195	0.22%	\$24,684	\$22,430	1.28	\$28,710	\$30,964
Mariposa	32	53	38	41	0.05%	\$5,199	\$4,724	0.78	\$3,685	\$4,159
Mendocino	422	298	263	328	0.38%	\$41,548	\$37,754	0.83	\$31,336	\$35,130
Merced	1,536	1,255	1,409	1,400	1.62%	\$177,519	\$161,309	0.90	\$145,178	\$161,388
Modoc	25	20	33	26	0.03%	\$3,297	\$2,996	0.60	\$1,797	\$2,098
Mono	13	23	11	16	0.02%	\$1,987	\$1,805	1.15	\$2,076	\$2,257
Monterey	1,512	1,375	1,286	1,391	1.60%	\$176,378	\$160,272	1.19	\$190,724	\$206,829
Napa	339	312	277	309	0.36%	\$39,223	\$35,642	1.22	\$43,483	\$47,064
Nevada	181	202	173	185	0.21%	\$23,500	\$21,354	0.97	\$20,714	\$22,859
Nevada-Sierra	189	211	178	193						
Orange	4,254	3,910	5,030	4,398	5.07%	\$557,663	\$506,742	1.30	\$658,764	\$709,685
Placer	572	598	503	558	0.64%	\$70,712	\$64,255	1.17	\$75,178	\$81,635

FLF Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	DCSS	DCSS	DCSS	3-Year Avg.	% of Total	Pro Rata FLF	Salary Only	Salary w/ BLS	Salary w/ BLS	Total
	Caseload	Caseload	Caseload	DCSS	DCSS	Base	(Assuming			
	FFY 2013	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	(Line 17)	Caseload	Allocation	91% of Base)	BLS Factor	Adjustment	(no floor)
Plumas	61	69	70	67	0.08%	\$8,453	\$7,681	0.70	\$5,377	\$6,149
Riverside	6,320	6,831	6,674	6,608	7.62%	\$837,931	\$761,419	1.08	\$822,332	\$898,844
Sacramento	5,972	5,738	5,620	5,777	6.66%	\$732,476	\$665,593	1.28	\$851,959	\$918,842
San Benito	170	194	176	180	0.21%	\$22,824	\$20,740	0.98	\$20,325	\$22,409
San Bernardino	9,662	9,763	9,033	9,486	10.94%	\$1,202,817	\$1,092,986	1.06	\$1,158,565	\$1,268,396
San Diego	4,085	4,423	4,182	4,230	4.88%	\$536,360	\$487,385	1.17	\$570,240	\$619,216
San Francisco	742	837	708	762	0.88%	\$96,663	\$87,837	1.68	\$147,566	\$156,392
San Joaquin	3,491	3,511	2,896	3,299	3.81%	\$418,353	\$380,152	1.10	\$418,168	\$456,368
San Luis Obispo	449	420	438	436	0.50%	\$55,242	\$50,198	1.07	\$53,712	\$58,756
San Mateo	708	645	573	642	0.74%	\$81,405	\$73,972	1.44	\$106,519	\$113,953
Santa Barbara	1,262	944	833	1,013	1.17%	\$128,448	\$116,719	1.17	\$136,561	\$148,290
Santa Clara	2,281	2,351	2,284	2,305	2.66%	\$292,314	\$265,623	1.44	\$382,497	\$409,188
Santa Cruz	599	346	279	408	0.47%	\$51,734	\$47,010	1.15	\$54,062	\$58,786
Shasta	689	918	708	772	0.89%	\$97,847	\$88,912	0.85	\$75,575	\$84,510
Shasta-Trinity	730	965	738	811						
Sierra	8	9	5	7	0.01%	\$930	\$845	0.73	\$617	\$702
Siskiyou	168	160	172	167	0.19%	\$21,133	\$19,203	0.69	\$13,250	\$15,180
Solano	1,431	1,195	979	1,202	1.39%	\$152,370	\$138,457	1.20	\$166,149	\$180,062
Sonoma	916	790	785	830	0.96%	\$105,286	\$95,672	1.17	\$111,936	\$121,550
Stanislaus	1,787	1,892	1,761	1,813	2.09%	\$229,929	\$208,934	1.02	\$213,113	\$234,108
Sutter	360	371	318	350	0.40%	\$44,337	\$40,289	0.95	\$38,274	\$42,323
Tehama	360	376	298	345	0.40%	\$43,703	\$39,713	0.80	\$31,770	\$35,761
Trinity	41	47	30	39	0.05%	\$4,987	\$4,532	0.65	\$2,946	\$3,401
Tulare	1,118	1,248	1,414	1,260	1.45%	\$159,767	\$145,178	0.83	\$120,498	\$135,087
Tuolumne	245	165	158	189	0.22%	\$24,007	\$21,815	0.83	\$18,107	\$20,299
Ventura	1,116	1,264	1,733	1,371	1.58%	\$173,842	\$157,968	1.21	\$191,141	\$207,015
Yolo	472	481	437	463	0.53%	\$58,750	\$53,386	1.03	\$54,987	\$60,352
Yuba	320	270	249	280	0.32%	\$35,461	\$32,223	0.93	\$29,968	\$33,206
<b>Total</b>	<b>91,656</b>	<b>81,434</b>	<b>86,936</b>	<b>86,675</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$9,986,816</b>		<b>\$11,605,883</b>	<b>\$12,609,424</b>

FLF Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	Adjusted Base Greater Than Floor Allocation?	If "No," Floor Allocation Amount	Adjusted Base Allocation Excluding Floor Courts	% of Total Adjusted Base Allocation	Adjusted Salary Rescaled to Available Allocation	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (with floor)	Pro Rata FLF Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)
Alameda	Yes		\$404,401	3.35%	\$326,506	\$326,506	\$73,483
Alpine	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$42
Alpine-El Dorado	No					\$91,195	\$13,763
Amador	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$2,674
Amador-Calaveras	No					\$91,195	\$6,685
Butte	Yes		\$85,614	0.71%	\$69,123	\$69,123	\$23,408
Calaveras	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$4,011
Colusa	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$1,634
Contra Costa	Yes		\$372,517	3.08%	\$300,763	\$300,763	\$76,210
Del Norte	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$6,133
El Dorado	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$13,720
Fresno	Yes		\$528,010	4.37%	\$426,305	\$426,305	\$133,775
Glenn	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$4,860
Humboldt	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$12,362
Imperial	Yes		\$101,653	0.84%	\$82,073	\$82,073	\$31,897
Inyo	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$1,952
Kern	Yes		\$469,926	3.89%	\$379,409	\$379,409	\$112,850
Kings	Yes		\$80,700	0.67%	\$65,156	\$65,156	\$22,740
Lake	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$6,038
Lassen	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$4,902
Los Angeles	Yes		\$2,675,228	22.13%	\$2,159,926	\$2,159,926	\$513,104
Madera	Yes		\$80,224	0.66%	\$64,772	\$64,772	\$21,509
Marin	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$6,197
Mariposa	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$1,305
Mendocino	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$10,431
Merced	Yes		\$161,388	1.34%	\$130,301	\$130,301	\$44,567
Modoc	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$828
Mono	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$499
Monterey	Yes		\$206,829	1.71%	\$166,990	\$166,990	\$44,281
Napa	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$9,847
Nevada	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$5,900
Nevada-Sierra	No					\$91,195	\$6,133
Orange	Yes		\$709,685	5.87%	\$572,986	\$572,986	\$140,004
Placer	Yes		\$81,635	0.68%	\$65,910	\$65,910	\$17,753

FLF Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	Adjusted Base Greater Than Floor Allocation?	If "No," Floor Allocation Amount	Adjusted Base Allocation Excluding Floor Courts	% of Total Adjusted Base Allocation	Adjusted Salary Rescaled to Available Allocation	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (with floor)	Pro Rata FLF Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)
Plumas	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$2,122
Riverside	Yes		\$898,844	7.44%	\$725,709	\$725,709	\$210,367
Sacramento	Yes		\$918,842	7.60%	\$741,855	\$741,855	\$183,892
San Benito	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$5,730
San Bernardino	Yes		\$1,268,396	10.49%	\$1,024,077	\$1,024,077	\$301,973
San Diego	Yes		\$619,216	5.12%	\$499,942	\$499,942	\$134,656
San Francisco	Yes		\$156,392	1.29%	\$126,268	\$126,268	\$24,268
San Joaquin	Yes		\$456,368	3.78%	\$368,462	\$368,462	\$105,030
San Luis Obispo	Yes		\$58,756	0.49%	\$47,438	\$47,438	\$13,869
San Mateo	Yes		\$113,953	0.94%	\$92,003	\$92,003	\$20,437
Santa Barbara	Yes		\$148,290	1.23%	\$119,726	\$119,726	\$32,247
Santa Clara	Yes		\$409,188	3.39%	\$330,370	\$330,370	\$73,387
Santa Cruz	Yes		\$58,786	0.49%	\$47,462	\$47,462	\$12,988
Shasta	Yes		\$84,510	0.70%	\$68,232	\$68,232	\$24,565
Shasta-Trinity	No					\$113,829	\$25,817
Sierra	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$233
Siskiyou	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$5,306
Solano	Yes		\$180,062	1.49%	\$145,378	\$145,378	\$38,253
Sonoma	Yes		\$121,550	1.01%	\$98,137	\$98,137	\$26,432
Stanislaus	Yes		\$234,108	1.94%	\$189,014	\$189,014	\$57,725
Sutter	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$11,131
Tehama	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$10,972
Trinity	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$1,252
Tulare	Yes		\$135,087	1.12%	\$109,066	\$109,066	\$40,110
Tuolumne	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$6,027
Ventura	Yes		\$207,015	1.71%	\$167,140	\$167,140	\$43,644
Yolo	Yes		\$60,352	0.50%	\$48,727	\$48,727	\$14,750
Yuba	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$8,903
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$1,231,130</b>	<b>\$12,087,525</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$9,759,227</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>

CSC Allocation, Based on DCSS Caseload, Using BLS Adjustment & Funding Floor

County	Base Allocation			Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)			Total Allocation		
	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference
Alameda	\$926,797	\$1,055,625	-12.2%	\$215,014	\$344,419	-37.6%	\$1,141,811	\$1,400,044	-18.4%
Alpine-El Dorado	\$209,222	\$206,440	1.3%	\$40,271	\$61,641	-34.7%	\$249,492	\$268,081	-6.9%
Amador	\$62,558	\$142,508	-56.1%	\$7,824	\$28,085	-72.1%	\$70,382	\$170,593	-58.7%
Butte	\$240,579	\$363,685	-33.8%	\$68,494	\$23,968	185.8%	\$309,073	\$387,653	-20.3%
Calaveras	\$62,558	\$133,526	-53.1%	\$11,737	\$24,558	-52.2%	\$74,295	\$158,084	-53.0%
Colusa	\$62,558	\$45,987	36.0%	\$4,782	\$12,628	-62.1%	\$67,340	\$58,615	14.9%
Contra Costa	\$901,876	\$1,014,068	-11.1%	\$222,994	\$28,066	694.5%	\$1,124,870	\$1,042,134	7.9%
Del Norte	\$62,558	\$48,315	29.5%	\$17,946	\$14,427	24.4%	\$80,504	\$62,742	28.3%
Fresno	\$1,423,874	\$1,601,818	-11.1%	\$391,434	\$508,183	-23.0%	\$1,815,309	\$2,110,001	-14.0%
Glenn	\$62,558	\$121,963	-48.7%	\$14,220	\$38,693	-63.2%	\$76,779	\$160,656	-52.2%
Humboldt	\$119,127	\$122,985	-3.1%	\$36,172	\$36,722	-1.5%	\$155,299	\$159,707	-2.8%
Imperial	\$308,839	\$163,746	88.6%	\$93,333	\$48,894	90.9%	\$402,172	\$212,640	89.1%
Inyo	\$62,558	\$80,540	-22.3%	\$5,713	\$14,264	-59.9%	\$68,271	\$94,804	-28.0%
Kern	\$1,232,151	\$663,938	85.6%	\$330,206	\$210,636	56.8%	\$1,562,357	\$874,574	78.6%
Kings	\$230,585	\$302,515	-23.8%	\$66,538	\$95,974	-30.7%	\$297,123	\$398,489	-25.4%
Lake	\$62,558	\$157,624	-60.3%	\$17,667	\$18,894	-6.5%	\$80,225	\$176,518	-54.6%
Lassen	\$62,558	\$94,874	-34.1%	\$14,345	\$28,329	-49.4%	\$76,903	\$123,203	-37.6%
Los Angeles	\$6,283,583	\$5,238,223	20.0%	\$1,501,373	\$1,431,302	4.9%	\$7,784,956	\$6,669,525	16.7%
Madera	\$223,027	\$215,224	3.6%	\$62,936	\$42,414	48.4%	\$285,963	\$257,638	11.0%
Marin	\$74,187	\$128,240	-42.2%	\$18,133	\$3,451	425.4%	\$92,319	\$131,691	-29.9%
Mariposa	\$62,558	\$76,427	-18.1%	\$3,819	\$22,820	-83.3%	\$66,377	\$99,247	-33.1%
Mendocino	\$103,382	\$173,010	-40.2%	\$30,521	\$23,100	32.1%	\$133,903	\$196,110	-31.7%
Merced	\$455,997	\$548,422	-16.9%	\$130,406	\$163,755	-20.4%	\$586,403	\$712,177	-17.7%
Modoc	\$62,558	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$2,422	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$64,980	\$0	#DIV/0!
Mono	\$62,558	\$45,960	36.1%	\$1,459	\$1,237	18.0%	\$64,017	\$47,197	35.6%
Monterey	\$511,858	\$381,807	34.1%	\$129,567	\$110,854	16.9%	\$641,426	\$492,661	30.2%
Napa	\$115,181	\$185,081	-37.8%	\$28,813	\$58,718	-50.9%	\$143,994	\$243,799	-40.9%
Nevada-Sierra	\$125,116	\$332,867	-62.4%	\$17,946	\$99,393	-81.9%	\$143,062	\$432,260	-66.9%
Orange	\$1,688,880	\$2,336,135	-27.7%	\$409,660	\$298,377	37.3%	\$2,098,540	\$2,634,512	-20.3%
Placer	\$203,584	\$377,583	-46.1%	\$51,945	\$43,443	19.6%	\$255,529	\$421,026	-39.3%



## CSC Allocation, Based on DCSS Caseload, Using BLS Adjustment &amp; Funding Floor

County	Base Allocation			Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)			Total Allocation		
	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference
Plumas	\$62,558	\$96,396	-35.1%	\$6,210	\$11,153	-44.3%	\$68,768	\$107,549	-36.1%
Riverside	\$2,325,781	\$995,520	133.6%	\$615,546	\$315,832	94.9%	\$2,941,327	\$1,311,352	124.3%
Sacramento	\$2,201,464	\$1,061,319	107.4%	\$538,079	\$336,707	59.8%	\$2,739,543	\$1,398,026	96.0%
San Benito	\$62,558	\$136,260	-54.1%	\$16,766	\$13,539	23.8%	\$79,325	\$149,799	-47.0%
San Bernardino	\$3,310,915	\$2,544,692	30.1%	\$883,592	\$759,828	16.3%	\$4,194,507	\$3,304,520	26.9%
San Diego	\$1,544,220	\$1,820,467	-15.2%	\$394,011	\$577,550	-31.8%	\$1,938,232	\$2,398,017	-19.2%
San Francisco	\$334,965	\$916,982	-63.5%	\$71,009	\$341,446	-79.2%	\$405,974	\$1,258,428	-67.7%
San Joaquin	\$1,170,807	\$689,435	69.8%	\$307,323	\$65,511	369.1%	\$1,478,129	\$754,946	95.8%
San Luis Obispo	\$152,696	\$232,181	-34.2%	\$40,581	\$73,661	-44.9%	\$193,277	\$305,842	-36.8%
San Mateo	\$259,635	\$395,940	-34.4%	\$59,800	\$129,184	-53.7%	\$319,435	\$525,124	-39.2%
Santa Barbara	\$369,810	\$474,006	-22.0%	\$94,358	\$137,624	-31.4%	\$464,167	\$611,630	-24.1%
Santa Clara	\$932,312	\$1,756,347	-46.9%	\$214,735	\$380,836	-43.6%	\$1,147,047	\$2,137,183	-46.3%
Santa Cruz	\$147,757	\$193,147	-23.5%	\$38,004	\$55,840	-31.9%	\$185,761	\$248,987	-25.4%
Shasta-Trinity	\$308,276	\$423,384	-27.2%	\$75,542	\$126,420	-40.2%	\$383,818	\$549,804	-30.2%
Siskiyou	\$62,558	\$239,894	-73.9%	\$15,524	\$76,108	-79.6%	\$78,083	\$316,002	-75.3%
Solano	\$443,939	\$524,122	-15.3%	\$111,932	\$67,092	66.8%	\$555,871	\$591,214	-6.0%
Sonoma	\$303,125	\$502,025	-39.6%	\$77,343	\$159,269	-51.4%	\$380,468	\$661,294	-42.5%
Stanislaus	\$622,339	\$783,525	-20.6%	\$168,906	\$128,748	31.2%	\$791,246	\$912,273	-13.3%
Sutter	\$116,439	\$195,330	-40.4%	\$32,570	\$36,591	-11.0%	\$149,009	\$231,921	-35.8%
Tehama	\$107,239	\$94,859	13.1%	\$32,105	\$30,095	6.7%	\$139,343	\$124,954	11.5%
Tulare	\$397,543	\$552,849	-28.1%	\$117,365	\$77,452	51.5%	\$514,908	\$630,301	-18.3%
Tuolumne	\$62,558	\$161,119	-61.2%	\$17,636	\$48,109	-63.3%	\$80,194	\$209,228	-61.7%
Ventura	\$508,495	\$579,328	-12.2%	\$127,704	\$183,795	-30.5%	\$636,200	\$763,123	-16.6%
Yolo	\$159,692	\$193,254	-17.4%	\$43,158	\$57,705	-25.2%	\$202,850	\$250,959	-19.2%
Yuba	\$92,314	\$204,463	-54.9%	\$26,050	\$46,201	-43.6%	\$118,364	\$250,664	-52.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$32,125,980</b>	<b>\$32,125,980</b>		<b>\$8,073,539</b>	<b>\$8,073,541</b>		<b>\$40,199,519</b>	<b>\$40,199,521</b>	
Average change			-12.8%			17.4%			-12.9%
# of courts w/ funding increase			14			22			14
# of courts w/ funding decrease			41			33			41

## FLF Allocation, Based on DCSS Caseload, Using BLS Adjustment &amp; Funding Floor

County	Base Allocation			Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)			Total Allocation		
	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference
Alameda	\$326,506	\$369,025	-11.5%	\$73,483	\$107,336	-31.5%	\$399,988	\$476,361	-16.0%
Alpine-El Dorado	\$91,195	\$108,332	-15.8%	\$13,763	\$30,671	-55.1%	\$104,958	\$139,003	-24.5%
Amador-Calaveras	\$91,195	\$119,392	-23.6%	\$6,685	\$7,211	-7.3%	\$97,880	\$126,603	-22.7%
Butte	\$69,123	\$103,647	-33.3%	\$23,408	\$29,103	-19.6%	\$92,532	\$132,750	-30.3%
Colusa	\$45,597	\$53,758	-15.2%	\$1,634	\$14,692	-88.9%	\$47,232	\$68,450	-31.0%
Contra Costa	\$300,763	\$352,361	-14.6%	\$76,210	\$3,456	2105.1%	\$376,972	\$355,817	5.9%
Del Norte	\$45,597	\$51,084	-10.7%	\$6,133	\$3,892	57.6%	\$51,731	\$54,976	-5.9%
Fresno	\$426,305	\$401,222	6.3%	\$133,775	\$113,593	17.8%	\$560,080	\$514,815	8.8%
Glenn	\$45,597	\$77,449	-41.1%	\$4,860	\$21,926	-77.8%	\$50,457	\$99,375	-49.2%
Humboldt	\$45,597	\$91,116	-50.0%	\$12,362	\$24,902	-50.4%	\$57,959	\$116,018	-50.0%
Imperial	\$82,073	\$53,758	52.7%	\$31,897	\$15,219	109.6%	\$113,970	\$68,977	65.2%
Inyo	\$45,597	\$58,423	-22.0%	\$1,952	\$16,541	-88.2%	\$47,550	\$74,964	-36.6%
Kern	\$379,409	\$361,140	5.1%	\$112,850	\$102,244	10.4%	\$492,259	\$463,384	6.2%
Kings	\$65,156	\$59,589	9.3%	\$22,740	\$16,871	34.8%	\$87,895	\$76,460	15.0%
Lake	\$45,597	\$58,640	-22.2%	\$6,038	\$16,466	-63.3%	\$51,635	\$75,106	-31.3%
Lassen	\$45,597	\$79,131	-42.4%	\$4,902	\$31,252	-84.3%	\$50,500	\$110,383	-54.3%
Los Angeles	\$2,159,926	\$1,921,963	12.4%	\$513,104	\$492,952	4.1%	\$2,673,030	\$2,414,915	10.7%
Madera	\$64,772	\$82,062	-21.1%	\$21,509	\$15,208	41.4%	\$86,280	\$97,270	-11.3%
Marin	\$45,597	\$139,122	-67.2%	\$6,197	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$51,794	\$139,122	-62.8%
Mariposa	\$45,597	\$46,234	-1.4%	\$1,305	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$46,903	\$46,234	1.4%
Mendocino	\$45,597	\$61,300	-25.6%	\$10,431	\$17,830	-41.5%	\$56,028	\$79,130	-29.2%
Merced	\$130,301	\$100,217	30.0%	\$44,567	\$28,140	58.4%	\$174,868	\$128,357	36.2%
Modoc	\$45,597	\$72,130	-36.8%	\$828	\$823	0.6%	\$46,425	\$72,953	-36.4%
Mono	\$45,597	\$49,203	-7.3%	\$499	\$828	-39.8%	\$46,096	\$50,031	-7.9%
Monterey	\$166,990	\$122,948	35.8%	\$44,281	\$34,808	27.2%	\$211,270	\$157,756	33.9%
Napa	\$45,597	\$62,978	-27.6%	\$9,847	\$17,830	-44.8%	\$55,445	\$80,808	-31.4%
Nevada-Sierra	\$91,195	\$118,168	-22.8%	\$6,133	\$33,180	-81.5%	\$97,328	\$151,348	-35.7%
Orange	\$572,986	\$548,837	4.4%	\$140,004	\$155,384	-9.9%	\$712,990	\$704,221	1.2%
Placer	\$65,910	\$91,566	-28.0%	\$17,753	\$25,923	-31.5%	\$83,663	\$117,489	-28.8%
Plumas	\$45,597	\$56,866	-19.8%	\$2,122	\$4,788	-55.7%	\$47,720	\$61,654	-22.6%

FLF Allocation, Based on DCSS Caseload, Using BLS Adjustment & Funding Floor

County	Base Allocation			Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)			Total Allocation		
	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference
Riverside	\$725,709	\$676,683	7.2%	\$210,367	\$184,943	13.7%	\$936,076	\$861,626	8.6%
Sacramento	\$741,855	\$314,827	135.6%	\$183,892	\$89,133	106.3%	\$925,747	\$403,960	129.2%
San Benito	\$45,597	\$61,300	-25.6%	\$5,730	\$17,213	-66.7%	\$51,327	\$78,513	-34.6%
San Bernardino	\$1,024,077	\$467,102	119.2%	\$301,973	\$132,244	128.3%	\$1,326,051	\$599,346	121.2%
San Diego	\$499,942	\$619,053	-19.2%	\$134,656	\$154,721	-13.0%	\$634,598	\$773,774	-18.0%
San Francisco	\$126,268	\$250,566	-49.6%	\$24,268	\$70,940	-65.8%	\$150,536	\$321,506	-53.2%
San Joaquin	\$368,462	\$217,745	69.2%	\$105,030	\$45,300	131.9%	\$473,492	\$263,045	80.0%
San Luis Obispo	\$47,438	\$68,337	-30.6%	\$13,869	\$19,347	-28.3%	\$61,307	\$87,684	-30.1%
San Mateo	\$92,003	\$129,159	-28.8%	\$20,437	\$37,567	-45.6%	\$112,440	\$166,726	-32.6%
Santa Barbara	\$119,726	\$173,589	-31.0%	\$32,247	\$47,442	-32.0%	\$151,974	\$221,031	-31.2%
Santa Clara	\$330,370	\$453,072	-27.1%	\$73,387	\$128,273	-42.8%	\$403,757	\$581,345	-30.5%
Santa Cruz	\$47,462	\$75,590	-37.2%	\$12,988	\$21,401	-39.3%	\$60,450	\$96,991	-37.7%
Shasta-Trinity	\$113,829	\$164,554	-30.8%	\$25,817	\$44,974	-42.6%	\$139,646	\$209,528	-33.4%
Siskiyou	\$45,597	\$75,822	-39.9%	\$5,306	\$21,290	-75.1%	\$50,903	\$97,112	-47.6%
Solano	\$145,378	\$131,471	10.6%	\$38,253	\$24,365	57.0%	\$183,632	\$155,836	17.8%
Sonoma	\$98,137	\$140,877	-30.3%	\$26,432	\$39,885	-33.7%	\$124,569	\$180,762	-31.1%
Stanislaus	\$189,014	\$223,137	-15.3%	\$57,725	\$62,654	-7.9%	\$246,739	\$285,791	-13.7%
Sutter	\$45,597	\$67,534	-32.5%	\$11,131	\$19,121	-41.8%	\$56,729	\$86,655	-34.5%
Tehama	\$45,597	\$27,802	64.0%	\$10,972	\$2,169	405.9%	\$56,569	\$29,971	88.7%
Tulare	\$109,066	\$312,151	-65.1%	\$40,110	\$80,697	-50.3%	\$149,177	\$392,848	-62.0%
Tuolumne	\$45,597	\$65,735	-30.6%	\$6,027	\$18,458	-67.3%	\$51,625	\$84,193	-38.7%
Ventura	\$167,140	\$257,724	-35.1%	\$43,644	\$72,965	-40.2%	\$210,784	\$330,689	-36.3%
Yolo	\$48,727	\$77,898	-37.4%	\$14,750	\$22,054	-33.1%	\$63,476	\$99,952	-36.5%
Yuba	\$45,597	\$66,968	-31.9%	\$8,903	\$18,961	-53.0%	\$54,500	\$85,929	-36.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>		<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>		<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	
Average change			-11.0%			31.9%			-11.6%
# of courts w/ funding increase			14			17			16
# of courts w/ funding decrease			40			35			38

County	3-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation											
	Base Allocation				Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)				Total Allocation			
	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)
Alameda	\$1,055,625	\$1,012,682	\$969,740	\$926,797	\$344,419	\$301,284	\$258,149	\$215,014	\$1,400,044	\$1,313,966	\$1,227,889	\$1,141,811
Alpine-El Dorado	\$206,440	\$207,367	\$208,294	\$209,222	\$61,641	\$54,518	\$47,394	\$40,271	\$268,081	\$261,885	\$255,689	\$249,492
Amador	\$142,508	\$115,858	\$89,208	\$62,558	\$28,085	\$21,331	\$14,578	\$7,824	\$170,593	\$137,189	\$103,786	\$70,382
Butte	\$363,685	\$322,650	\$281,614	\$240,579	\$23,968	\$38,810	\$53,652	\$68,494	\$387,653	\$361,460	\$335,266	\$309,073
Calaveras	\$133,526	\$109,870	\$86,214	\$62,558	\$24,558	\$20,284	\$16,010	\$11,737	\$158,084	\$130,154	\$102,224	\$74,295
Colusa	\$45,987	\$51,511	\$57,034	\$62,558	\$12,628	\$10,013	\$7,397	\$4,782	\$58,615	\$61,523	\$64,431	\$67,340
Contra Costa	\$1,014,068	\$976,671	\$939,273	\$901,876	\$28,066	\$93,042	\$158,018	\$222,994	\$1,042,134	\$1,069,713	\$1,097,291	\$1,124,870
Del Norte	\$48,315	\$53,063	\$57,810	\$62,558	\$14,427	\$15,600	\$16,773	\$17,946	\$62,742	\$68,663	\$74,584	\$80,504
Fresno	\$1,601,818	\$1,542,503	\$1,483,189	\$1,423,874	\$508,183	\$469,267	\$430,351	\$391,434	\$2,110,001	\$2,011,770	\$1,913,539	\$1,815,309
Glenn	\$121,963	\$102,161	\$82,360	\$62,558	\$38,693	\$30,535	\$22,378	\$14,220	\$160,656	\$132,697	\$104,738	\$76,779
Humboldt	\$122,985	\$121,699	\$120,413	\$119,127	\$36,722	\$36,539	\$36,355	\$36,172	\$159,707	\$158,238	\$156,768	\$155,299
Imperial	\$163,746	\$212,110	\$260,475	\$308,839	\$48,894	\$63,707	\$78,520	\$93,333	\$212,640	\$275,817	\$338,995	\$402,172
Inyo	\$80,540	\$74,546	\$68,552	\$62,558	\$14,264	\$11,414	\$8,563	\$5,713	\$94,804	\$85,960	\$77,115	\$68,271
Kern	\$663,938	\$853,342	\$1,042,747	\$1,232,151	\$210,636	\$250,493	\$290,349	\$330,206	\$874,574	\$1,103,835	\$1,333,096	\$1,562,357
Kings	\$302,515	\$278,538	\$254,562	\$230,585	\$95,974	\$86,162	\$76,350	\$66,538	\$398,489	\$364,700	\$330,912	\$297,123
Lake	\$157,624	\$125,935	\$94,247	\$62,558	\$18,894	\$18,485	\$18,076	\$17,667	\$176,518	\$144,420	\$112,323	\$80,225
Lassen	\$94,874	\$84,102	\$73,330	\$62,558	\$28,329	\$23,668	\$19,006	\$14,345	\$123,203	\$107,770	\$92,336	\$76,903
Los Angeles	\$5,238,223	\$5,586,676	\$5,935,130	\$6,283,583	\$1,431,302	\$1,454,659	\$1,478,016	\$1,501,373	\$6,669,525	\$7,041,335	\$7,413,146	\$7,784,956
Madera	\$215,224	\$217,825	\$220,426	\$223,027	\$42,414	\$49,255	\$56,096	\$62,936	\$257,638	\$267,080	\$276,522	\$285,963
Marin	\$128,240	\$110,222	\$92,204	\$74,187	\$3,451	\$8,345	\$13,239	\$18,133	\$131,691	\$118,567	\$105,443	\$92,319
Mariposa	\$76,427	\$71,804	\$67,181	\$62,558	\$22,820	\$16,486	\$10,153	\$3,819	\$99,247	\$88,290	\$77,334	\$66,377
Mendocino	\$173,010	\$149,801	\$126,591	\$103,382	\$23,100	\$25,574	\$28,047	\$30,521	\$196,110	\$175,374	\$154,639	\$133,903
Merced	\$548,422	\$517,614	\$486,805	\$455,997	\$163,755	\$152,639	\$141,522	\$130,406	\$712,177	\$670,252	\$628,328	\$586,403
Modoc	\$0	\$20,853	\$41,705	\$62,558	\$0	\$807	\$1,615	\$2,422	\$0	\$21,660	\$43,320	\$64,980
Mono	\$45,960	\$51,493	\$57,025	\$62,558	\$1,237	\$1,311	\$1,385	\$1,459	\$47,197	\$52,804	\$58,411	\$64,017
Monterey	\$381,807	\$425,157	\$468,508	\$511,858	\$110,854	\$117,092	\$123,330	\$129,567	\$492,661	\$542,249	\$591,838	\$641,426
Napa	\$185,081	\$161,781	\$138,481	\$115,181	\$58,718	\$48,750	\$38,782	\$28,813	\$243,799	\$210,531	\$177,262	\$143,994
Nevada-Sierra	\$332,867	\$263,617	\$194,366	\$125,116	\$99,393	\$72,244	\$45,095	\$17,946	\$432,260	\$335,861	\$239,462	\$143,062
Orange	\$2,336,135	\$2,120,383	\$1,904,632	\$1,688,880	\$298,377	\$335,471	\$372,566	\$409,660	\$2,634,512	\$2,455,855	\$2,277,197	\$2,098,540
Placer	\$377,583	\$319,583	\$261,584	\$203,584	\$43,443	\$46,277	\$49,111	\$51,945	\$421,026	\$365,860	\$310,695	\$255,529
Plumas	\$96,396	\$85,117	\$73,837	\$62,558	\$11,153	\$9,505	\$7,858	\$6,210	\$107,549	\$94,622	\$81,695	\$68,768
Riverside	\$995,520	\$1,438,940	\$1,882,361	\$2,325,781	\$315,832	\$415,737	\$515,641	\$615,546	\$1,311,352	\$1,854,677	\$2,398,002	\$2,941,327
Sacramento	\$1,061,319	\$1,441,367	\$1,821,416	\$2,201,464	\$336,707	\$403,831	\$470,955	\$538,079	\$1,398,026	\$1,845,198	\$2,292,371	\$2,739,543
San Benito	\$136,260	\$111,693	\$87,125	\$62,558	\$13,539	\$14,615	\$15,691	\$16,766	\$149,799	\$126,308	\$102,816	\$79,325
San Bernardino	\$2,544,692	\$2,800,100	\$3,055,507	\$3,310,915	\$759,828	\$801,083	\$842,337	\$883,592	\$3,304,520	\$3,601,182	\$3,897,844	\$4,194,507
San Diego	\$1,820,467	\$1,728,385	\$1,636,302	\$1,544,220	\$577,550	\$516,370	\$455,191	\$394,011	\$2,398,017	\$2,244,755	\$2,091,493	\$1,938,232
San Francisco	\$916,982	\$722,976	\$528,971	\$334,965	\$341,446	\$251,300	\$161,155	\$71,009	\$1,258,428	\$974,277	\$690,125	\$405,974
San Joaquin	\$689,435	\$849,892	\$1,010,349	\$1,170,807	\$65,511	\$146,115	\$226,719	\$307,323	\$754,946	\$996,007	\$1,237,068	\$1,478,129
San Luis Obispo	\$232,181	\$205,686	\$179,191	\$152,696	\$73,661	\$62,634	\$51,608	\$40,581	\$305,842	\$268,320	\$230,799	\$193,277
San Mateo	\$395,940	\$350,505	\$305,070	\$259,635	\$129,184	\$106,056	\$82,928	\$59,800	\$525,124	\$456,561	\$387,998	\$319,435
Santa Barbara	\$474,006	\$439,274	\$404,542	\$369,810	\$137,624	\$123,202	\$108,780	\$94,358	\$611,630	\$562,476	\$513,322	\$464,167
Santa Clara	\$1,756,347	\$1,481,669	\$1,206,991	\$932,312	\$380,836	\$325,469	\$270,102	\$214,735	\$2,137,183	\$1,807,138	\$1,477,092	\$1,147,047
Santa Cruz	\$193,147	\$178,017	\$162,887	\$147,757	\$55,840	\$49,895	\$43,949	\$38,004	\$248,987	\$227,912	\$206,836	\$185,761
Shasta-Trinity	\$423,384	\$385,015	\$346,645	\$308,276	\$126,420	\$109,461	\$92,501	\$75,542	\$549,804	\$494,475	\$439,147	\$383,818
Siskiyou	\$239,894	\$180,782	\$121,670	\$62,558	\$76,108	\$55,913	\$35,719	\$15,524	\$316,002	\$236,696	\$157,389	\$78,083
Solano	\$524,122	\$497,394	\$470,667	\$443,939	\$67,092	\$82,039	\$96,985	\$111,932	\$591,214	\$579,433	\$567,652	\$555,871

County	3-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation											
	Base Allocation				Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)				Total Allocation			
	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)
Sonoma	\$502,025	\$435,725	\$369,425	\$303,125	\$159,269	\$131,960	\$104,652	\$77,343	\$661,294	\$567,685	\$474,076	\$380,468
Stanislaus	\$783,525	\$729,796	\$676,068	\$622,339	\$128,748	\$142,134	\$155,520	\$168,906	\$912,273	\$871,931	\$831,588	\$791,246
Sutter	\$195,330	\$169,033	\$142,736	\$116,439	\$36,591	\$35,251	\$33,911	\$32,570	\$231,921	\$204,284	\$176,646	\$149,009
Tehama	\$94,859	\$98,986	\$103,112	\$107,239	\$30,095	\$30,765	\$31,435	\$32,105	\$124,954	\$129,750	\$134,547	\$139,343
Tulare	\$552,849	\$501,080	\$449,311	\$397,543	\$77,452	\$90,756	\$104,061	\$117,365	\$630,301	\$591,837	\$553,372	\$514,908
Tuolumne	\$161,119	\$128,265	\$95,412	\$62,558	\$48,109	\$37,951	\$27,794	\$17,636	\$209,228	\$166,217	\$123,205	\$80,194
Ventura	\$579,328	\$555,717	\$532,106	\$508,495	\$183,795	\$165,098	\$146,401	\$127,704	\$763,123	\$720,815	\$678,507	\$636,200
Yolo	\$193,254	\$182,067	\$170,879	\$159,692	\$57,705	\$52,856	\$48,007	\$43,158	\$250,959	\$234,923	\$218,886	\$202,850
Yuba	\$204,463	\$167,080	\$129,697	\$92,314	\$46,201	\$39,484	\$32,767	\$26,050	\$250,664	\$206,564	\$162,464	\$118,364
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$32,125,980</b>	<b>\$32,125,980</b>	<b>\$32,125,980</b>	<b>\$32,125,980</b>	<b>\$8,073,541</b>	<b>\$8,073,540</b>	<b>\$8,073,540</b>	<b>\$8,073,539</b>	<b>\$40,199,521</b>	<b>\$40,199,520</b>	<b>\$40,199,520</b>	<b>\$40,199,519</b>

4-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation: 25% Workload First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
		Year 1 (25%)	Year 2 (50%)	Year 3 (75%)	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1 (25%)	Year 2 (50%)	Year 3 (75%)	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1 (25%)	Year 2 (50%)	Year 3 (75%)	Year 4 (100%)
	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)
Alameda	\$1,055,625	\$1,023,418	\$991,211	\$959,004	\$926,797	\$344,419	\$312,068	\$279,717	\$247,365	\$215,014	\$1,400,044	\$1,335,486	\$1,270,928	\$1,206,369	\$1,141,811
Alpine-El Dorado	\$206,440	\$207,135	\$207,831	\$208,526	\$209,222	\$61,641	\$56,298	\$50,956	\$45,613	\$40,271	\$268,081	\$263,434	\$258,787	\$254,139	\$249,492
Amador	\$142,508	\$122,521	\$102,533	\$82,546	\$62,558	\$28,085	\$23,020	\$17,955	\$12,890	\$7,824	\$170,593	\$145,540	\$120,488	\$95,435	\$70,382
Butte	\$363,685	\$332,908	\$302,132	\$271,355	\$240,579	\$23,968	\$35,100	\$46,231	\$57,363	\$68,494	\$387,653	\$368,008	\$348,363	\$328,718	\$309,073
Calaveras	\$133,526	\$115,784	\$98,042	\$80,300	\$62,558	\$24,558	\$21,353	\$18,147	\$14,942	\$11,737	\$158,084	\$137,137	\$116,189	\$95,242	\$74,295
Colusa	\$45,987	\$50,130	\$54,273	\$58,415	\$62,558	\$12,628	\$10,666	\$8,705	\$6,743	\$4,782	\$58,615	\$60,796	\$62,977	\$65,158	\$67,340
Contra Costa	\$1,014,068	\$986,020	\$957,972	\$929,924	\$901,876	\$28,066	\$76,798	\$125,530	\$174,262	\$222,994	\$1,042,134	\$1,062,818	\$1,083,502	\$1,104,186	\$1,124,870
Del Norte	\$48,315	\$51,876	\$55,437	\$58,997	\$62,558	\$14,427	\$15,307	\$16,187	\$17,066	\$17,946	\$62,742	\$67,183	\$71,623	\$76,064	\$80,504
Fresno	\$1,601,818	\$1,557,332	\$1,512,846	\$1,468,360	\$1,423,874	\$508,183	\$478,996	\$449,809	\$420,622	\$391,434	\$2,110,001	\$2,036,328	\$1,962,655	\$1,888,982	\$1,815,309
Glenn	\$121,963	\$107,112	\$92,261	\$77,409	\$62,558	\$38,693	\$32,575	\$26,457	\$20,339	\$14,220	\$160,656	\$139,687	\$118,717	\$97,748	\$76,779
Humboldt	\$122,985	\$122,021	\$121,056	\$120,092	\$119,127	\$36,722	\$36,585	\$36,447	\$36,310	\$36,172	\$159,707	\$158,605	\$157,503	\$156,401	\$155,299
Imperial	\$163,746	\$200,019	\$236,293	\$272,566	\$308,839	\$48,894	\$60,004	\$71,114	\$82,223	\$93,333	\$212,640	\$260,023	\$307,406	\$354,789	\$402,172
Inyo	\$80,540	\$76,045	\$71,549	\$67,054	\$62,558	\$14,264	\$12,126	\$9,989	\$7,851	\$5,713	\$94,804	\$88,171	\$81,538	\$74,904	\$68,271
Kern	\$663,938	\$805,991	\$948,044	\$1,090,098	\$1,232,151	\$210,636	\$240,528	\$270,421	\$300,313	\$330,206	\$874,574	\$1,046,520	\$1,218,465	\$1,390,411	\$1,562,357
Kings	\$302,515	\$284,532	\$266,550	\$248,567	\$230,585	\$95,974	\$88,615	\$81,256	\$73,897	\$66,538	\$398,489	\$373,147	\$347,806	\$322,464	\$297,123
Lake	\$157,624	\$133,858	\$110,091	\$86,325	\$62,558	\$18,894	\$18,587	\$18,280	\$17,974	\$17,667	\$176,518	\$152,445	\$128,371	\$104,298	\$80,225
Lassen	\$94,874	\$86,795	\$78,716	\$70,637	\$62,558	\$28,329	\$24,833	\$21,337	\$17,841	\$14,345	\$123,203	\$111,628	\$100,053	\$88,478	\$76,903
Los Angeles	\$5,238,223	\$5,499,563	\$5,760,903	\$6,022,243	\$6,283,583	\$1,431,302	\$1,448,820	\$1,466,337	\$1,483,855	\$1,501,373	\$6,669,525	\$6,948,383	\$7,227,241	\$7,506,099	\$7,784,956
Madera	\$215,224	\$217,175	\$219,126	\$221,076	\$223,027	\$42,414	\$47,545	\$52,675	\$57,806	\$62,936	\$257,638	\$264,719	\$271,801	\$278,882	\$285,963
Marin	\$128,240	\$114,727	\$101,213	\$87,700	\$74,187	\$3,451	\$7,121	\$10,792	\$14,462	\$18,133	\$131,691	\$121,848	\$112,005	\$102,162	\$92,319
Mariposa	\$76,427	\$72,960	\$69,493	\$66,025	\$62,558	\$22,820	\$18,070	\$13,320	\$8,569	\$3,819	\$99,247	\$91,030	\$82,812	\$74,595	\$66,377
Mendocino	\$173,010	\$155,603	\$138,196	\$120,789	\$103,382	\$23,100	\$24,955	\$26,811	\$28,666	\$30,521	\$196,110	\$180,558	\$165,007	\$149,455	\$133,903
Merced	\$548,422	\$525,316	\$502,210	\$479,103	\$455,997	\$163,755	\$155,418	\$147,080	\$138,743	\$130,406	\$712,177	\$680,733	\$649,290	\$617,846	\$586,403
Modoc	\$0	\$15,640	\$31,279	\$46,919	\$62,558	\$0	\$605	\$1,211	\$1,816	\$2,422	\$0	\$16,245	\$32,490	\$48,735	\$64,980
Mono	\$45,960	\$50,110	\$54,259	\$58,409	\$62,558	\$1,237	\$1,293	\$1,348	\$1,404	\$1,459	\$47,197	\$51,402	\$55,607	\$59,812	\$64,017
Monterey	\$381,807	\$414,320	\$446,833	\$479,346	\$511,858	\$110,854	\$115,532	\$120,211	\$124,889	\$129,567	\$492,661	\$529,852	\$567,043	\$604,235	\$641,426
Napa	\$185,081	\$167,606	\$150,131	\$132,656	\$115,181	\$58,718	\$51,242	\$43,766	\$36,290	\$28,813	\$243,799	\$218,848	\$193,897	\$168,945	\$143,994
Nevada-Sierra	\$332,867	\$280,929	\$228,992	\$177,054	\$125,116	\$99,393	\$79,031	\$58,670	\$38,308	\$17,946	\$432,260	\$359,961	\$287,661	\$215,362	\$143,062
Orange	\$2,336,135	\$2,174,321	\$2,012,507	\$1,850,694	\$1,688,880	\$298,377	\$326,198	\$354,019	\$381,839	\$409,660	\$2,634,512	\$2,500,519	\$2,366,526	\$2,232,533	\$2,098,540
Placer	\$377,583	\$334,083	\$290,583	\$247,084	\$203,584	\$43,443	\$45,568	\$47,694	\$49,819	\$51,945	\$421,026	\$379,652	\$338,277	\$296,903	\$255,529
Plumas	\$96,396	\$87,937	\$79,477	\$71,018	\$62,558	\$11,153	\$9,917	\$8,681	\$7,446	\$6,210	\$107,549	\$97,854	\$88,158	\$78,463	\$68,768
Riverside	\$995,520	\$1,328,085	\$1,660,650	\$1,993,216	\$2,325,781	\$315,832	\$390,760	\$465,689	\$540,617	\$615,546	\$1,311,352	\$1,718,846	\$2,126,339	\$2,533,833	\$2,941,327
Sacramento	\$1,061,319	\$1,346,355	\$1,631,392	\$1,916,428	\$2,201,464	\$336,707	\$387,050	\$437,393	\$487,736	\$538,079	\$1,398,026	\$1,733,405	\$2,068,785	\$2,404,164	\$2,739,543
San Benito	\$136,260	\$117,835	\$99,409	\$80,984	\$62,558	\$13,539	\$14,346	\$15,153	\$15,960	\$16,766	\$149,799	\$132,180	\$114,562	\$96,943	\$79,325
San Bernardino	\$2,544,692	\$2,736,248	\$2,927,804	\$3,119,359	\$3,310,915	\$759,828	\$790,769	\$821,710	\$852,651	\$883,592	\$3,304,520	\$3,527,017	\$3,749,513	\$3,972,010	\$4,194,507
San Diego	\$1,820,467	\$1,751,405	\$1,682,344	\$1,613,282	\$1,544,220	\$577,550	\$531,665	\$485,781	\$439,896	\$394,011	\$2,398,017	\$2,283,071	\$2,168,124	\$2,053,178	\$1,938,232
San Francisco	\$916,982	\$771,478	\$625,974	\$480,469	\$334,965	\$341,446	\$273,837	\$206,227	\$138,618	\$71,009	\$1,258,428	\$1,045,315	\$832,201	\$619,088	\$405,974
San Joaquin	\$689,435	\$809,778	\$930,121	\$1,050,464	\$1,170,807	\$65,511	\$125,964	\$186,417	\$246,870	\$307,323	\$754,946	\$935,742	\$1,116,538	\$1,297,334	\$1,478,129
San Luis Obispo	\$232,181	\$212,310	\$192,439	\$172,568	\$152,696	\$73,661	\$65,391	\$57,121	\$48,851	\$40,581	\$305,842	\$277,701	\$249,560	\$221,419	\$193,277
San Mateo	\$395,940	\$361,864	\$327,787	\$293,711	\$259,635	\$129,184	\$111,838	\$94,492	\$77,146	\$59,800	\$525,124	\$473,702	\$422,280	\$370,857	\$319,435
Santa Barbara	\$474,006	\$447,957	\$421,908	\$395,859	\$369,810	\$137,624	\$126,807	\$115,991	\$105,174	\$94,358	\$611,630	\$574,764	\$537,899	\$501,033	\$464,167
Santa Clara	\$1,756,347	\$1,550,338	\$1,344,330	\$1,138,321	\$932,312	\$380,836	\$339,311	\$297,785	\$256,260	\$214,735	\$2,137,183	\$1,889,649	\$1,642,115	\$1,394,581	\$1,147,047
Santa Cruz	\$193,147	\$181,799	\$170,452	\$159,104	\$147,757	\$55,840	\$51,381	\$46,922	\$42,463	\$38,004	\$248,987	\$233,180	\$217,374	\$201,567	\$185,761
Shasta-Trinity	\$423,384	\$394,607	\$365,830	\$337,053	\$308,276	\$126,420	\$113,701	\$100,981	\$88,262	\$75,542	\$549,804	\$508,308	\$466,811	\$425,315	\$383,818
Siskiyou	\$239,894	\$195,560	\$151,226	\$106,892	\$62,558	\$76,108	\$60,962	\$45,816	\$30,670	\$15,524	\$316,002	\$256,522	\$197,042	\$137,562	\$78,083
Solano	\$524,122	\$504,076	\$484,031	\$463,985	\$443,939	\$67,092	\$78,302	\$89,512	\$100,722	\$111,932	\$591,214	\$582,378	\$573,542	\$564,707	\$555,871

4-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation: 25% Workload First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
Sonoma	\$502,025	\$452,300	\$402,575	\$352,850	\$303,125	\$159,269	\$138,787	\$118,306	\$97,824	\$77,343	\$661,294	\$591,087	\$520,881	\$450,674	\$380,468
Stanislaus	\$783,525	\$743,229	\$702,932	\$662,636	\$622,339	\$128,748	\$138,788	\$148,827	\$158,867	\$168,906	\$912,273	\$882,016	\$851,759	\$821,503	\$791,246
Sutter	\$195,330	\$175,607	\$155,884	\$136,162	\$116,439	\$36,591	\$35,586	\$34,581	\$33,576	\$32,570	\$231,921	\$211,193	\$190,465	\$169,737	\$149,009
Tehama	\$94,859	\$97,954	\$101,049	\$104,144	\$107,239	\$30,095	\$30,597	\$31,100	\$31,602	\$32,105	\$124,954	\$128,551	\$132,149	\$135,746	\$139,343
Tulare	\$552,849	\$514,022	\$475,196	\$436,369	\$397,543	\$77,452	\$87,430	\$97,409	\$107,387	\$117,365	\$630,301	\$601,453	\$572,604	\$543,756	\$514,908
Tuolumne	\$161,119	\$136,479	\$111,839	\$87,198	\$62,558	\$48,109	\$40,491	\$32,872	\$25,254	\$17,636	\$209,228	\$176,969	\$144,711	\$112,452	\$80,194
Ventura	\$579,328	\$561,620	\$543,912	\$526,203	\$508,495	\$183,795	\$169,772	\$155,750	\$141,727	\$127,704	\$763,123	\$731,392	\$699,661	\$667,931	\$636,200
Yolo	\$193,254	\$184,864	\$176,473	\$168,083	\$159,692	\$57,705	\$54,068	\$50,432	\$46,795	\$43,158	\$250,959	\$238,932	\$226,905	\$214,877	\$202,850
Yuba	\$204,463	\$176,426	\$148,388	\$120,351	\$92,314	\$46,201	\$41,163	\$36,126	\$31,088	\$26,050	\$250,664	\$217,589	\$184,514	\$151,439	\$118,364
Total	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,539	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,519

4-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation: 15% Workload First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
		Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
	Historical														
Alameda	\$1,055,625	\$1,036,301	\$997,652	\$965,445	\$926,797	\$344,419	\$325,008	\$286,187	\$253,836	\$215,014	\$1,400,044	\$1,361,309	\$1,283,839	\$1,219,281	\$1,141,811
Alpine-El Dorado	\$206,440	\$206,857	\$207,692	\$208,387	\$209,222	\$61,641	\$58,435	\$52,024	\$46,682	\$40,271	\$268,081	\$265,293	\$259,716	\$255,069	\$249,492
Amador	\$142,508	\$130,516	\$106,531	\$86,543	\$62,558	\$28,085	\$25,046	\$18,968	\$13,903	\$7,824	\$170,593	\$155,561	\$125,498	\$100,446	\$70,382
Butte	\$363,685	\$345,219	\$308,287	\$277,511	\$240,579	\$23,968	\$30,647	\$44,005	\$55,136	\$68,494	\$387,653	\$375,866	\$352,292	\$332,647	\$309,073
Calaveras	\$133,526	\$122,881	\$101,590	\$83,848	\$62,558	\$24,558	\$22,635	\$18,788	\$15,583	\$11,737	\$158,084	\$145,516	\$120,379	\$99,431	\$74,295
Colusa	\$45,987	\$48,473	\$53,444	\$57,587	\$62,558	\$12,628	\$11,451	\$9,097	\$7,135	\$4,782	\$58,615	\$59,924	\$62,541	\$64,722	\$67,340
Contra Costa	\$1,014,068	\$997,239	\$963,582	\$935,534	\$901,876	\$28,066	\$57,305	\$115,783	\$164,515	\$222,994	\$1,042,134	\$1,054,544	\$1,079,365	\$1,100,049	\$1,124,870
Del Norte	\$48,315	\$50,451	\$54,724	\$58,285	\$62,558	\$14,427	\$14,955	\$16,011	\$16,891	\$17,946	\$62,742	\$65,406	\$70,735	\$75,176	\$80,504
Fresno	\$1,601,818	\$1,575,126	\$1,521,743	\$1,477,257	\$1,423,874	\$508,183	\$490,671	\$455,646	\$426,459	\$391,434	\$2,110,001	\$2,065,797	\$1,977,389	\$1,903,716	\$1,815,309
Glenn	\$121,963	\$113,052	\$95,231	\$80,380	\$62,558	\$38,693	\$35,022	\$27,680	\$21,562	\$14,220	\$160,656	\$148,074	\$122,911	\$101,942	\$76,779
Humboldt	\$122,985	\$122,406	\$121,249	\$120,285	\$119,127	\$36,722	\$36,640	\$36,475	\$36,337	\$36,172	\$159,707	\$159,046	\$157,723	\$156,622	\$155,299
Imperial	\$163,746	\$185,510	\$229,038	\$265,311	\$308,839	\$48,894	\$55,560	\$68,892	\$80,001	\$93,333	\$212,640	\$241,070	\$297,930	\$345,313	\$402,172
Inyo	\$80,540	\$77,843	\$72,448	\$67,953	\$62,558	\$14,264	\$12,981	\$10,416	\$8,278	\$5,713	\$94,804	\$90,824	\$82,864	\$76,231	\$68,271
Kern	\$663,938	\$749,170	\$919,634	\$1,061,687	\$1,232,151	\$210,636	\$228,571	\$264,442	\$294,335	\$330,206	\$874,574	\$977,741	\$1,184,076	\$1,356,022	\$1,562,357
Kings	\$302,515	\$291,725	\$270,146	\$252,164	\$230,585	\$95,974	\$91,559	\$82,728	\$75,369	\$66,538	\$398,489	\$383,284	\$352,874	\$327,533	\$297,123
Lake	\$157,624	\$143,364	\$114,844	\$91,078	\$62,558	\$18,894	\$18,710	\$18,342	\$18,035	\$17,667	\$176,518	\$162,074	\$133,186	\$109,113	\$80,225
Lassen	\$94,874	\$90,027	\$80,332	\$72,253	\$62,558	\$28,329	\$26,231	\$22,036	\$18,540	\$14,345	\$123,203	\$116,258	\$102,368	\$90,793	\$76,903
Los Angeles	\$5,238,223	\$5,395,027	\$5,708,635	\$5,969,975	\$6,283,583	\$1,431,302	\$1,441,813	\$1,462,834	\$1,480,352	\$1,501,373	\$6,669,525	\$6,836,840	\$7,171,469	\$7,450,327	\$7,784,956
Madera	\$215,224	\$216,394	\$218,735	\$220,686	\$223,027	\$42,414	\$45,492	\$51,649	\$56,780	\$62,936	\$257,638	\$261,887	\$270,384	\$277,466	\$285,963
Marin	\$128,240	\$120,132	\$103,916	\$90,403	\$74,187	\$3,451	\$5,653	\$10,058	\$13,728	\$18,133	\$131,691	\$125,785	\$113,974	\$104,131	\$92,319
Mariposa	\$76,427	\$74,347	\$70,186	\$66,719	\$62,558	\$22,820	\$19,970	\$14,270	\$9,519	\$3,819	\$99,247	\$94,317	\$84,456	\$76,238	\$66,377
Mendocino	\$173,010	\$162,566	\$141,677	\$124,270	\$103,382	\$23,100	\$24,213	\$26,440	\$28,295	\$30,521	\$196,110	\$186,779	\$168,117	\$152,565	\$133,903
Merced	\$548,422	\$534,558	\$506,831	\$483,725	\$455,997	\$163,755	\$158,753	\$148,748	\$140,410	\$130,406	\$712,177	\$693,311	\$655,579	\$624,135	\$586,403
Modoc	\$0	\$9,384	\$28,151	\$43,791	\$62,558	\$0	\$363	\$1,090	\$1,695	\$2,422	\$0	\$9,747	\$29,241	\$45,486	\$64,980
Mono	\$45,960	\$48,450	\$53,429	\$57,579	\$62,558	\$1,237	\$1,270	\$1,337	\$1,393	\$1,459	\$47,197	\$49,720	\$54,766	\$58,971	\$64,017
Monterey	\$381,807	\$401,315	\$440,330	\$472,843	\$511,858	\$110,854	\$113,661	\$119,275	\$123,953	\$129,567	\$492,661	\$514,976	\$559,605	\$596,796	\$641,426
Napa	\$185,081	\$174,596	\$153,626	\$136,151	\$115,181	\$58,718	\$54,232	\$45,261	\$37,785	\$28,813	\$243,799	\$228,828	\$198,887	\$173,936	\$143,994
Nevada-Sierra	\$332,867	\$301,704	\$239,379	\$187,441	\$125,116	\$99,393	\$87,176	\$62,742	\$42,380	\$17,946	\$432,260	\$388,880	\$302,121	\$229,822	\$143,062
Orange	\$2,336,135	\$2,239,047	\$2,044,870	\$1,883,056	\$1,688,880	\$298,377	\$315,069	\$348,454	\$376,275	\$409,660	\$2,634,512	\$2,554,116	\$2,393,325	\$2,259,332	\$2,098,540
Placer	\$377,583	\$351,483	\$299,283	\$255,784	\$203,584	\$43,443	\$44,718	\$47,269	\$49,394	\$51,945	\$421,026	\$396,201	\$346,552	\$305,178	\$255,529
Plumas	\$96,396	\$91,320	\$81,169	\$72,709	\$62,558	\$11,153	\$10,412	\$8,929	\$7,693	\$6,210	\$107,549	\$101,732	\$90,097	\$80,402	\$68,768
Riverside	\$995,520	\$1,195,059	\$1,594,137	\$1,926,703	\$2,325,781	\$315,832	\$360,789	\$450,703	\$525,632	\$615,546	\$1,311,352	\$1,555,858	\$2,044,841	\$2,452,334	\$2,941,327
Sacramento	\$1,061,319	\$1,232,341	\$1,574,384	\$1,859,421	\$2,201,464	\$336,707	\$366,913	\$427,324	\$477,667	\$538,079	\$1,398,026	\$1,599,254	\$2,001,709	\$2,337,088	\$2,739,543
San Benito	\$136,260	\$125,205	\$103,094	\$84,669	\$62,558	\$13,539	\$14,023	\$14,991	\$15,798	\$16,766	\$149,799	\$139,228	\$118,085	\$100,467	\$79,325
San Bernardino	\$2,544,692	\$2,659,625	\$2,889,492	\$3,081,048	\$3,310,915	\$759,828	\$778,393	\$815,522	\$846,462	\$883,592	\$3,304,520	\$3,438,018	\$3,705,014	\$3,927,511	\$4,194,507
San Diego	\$1,820,467	\$1,779,030	\$1,696,156	\$1,627,094	\$1,544,220	\$577,550	\$550,019	\$494,958	\$449,073	\$394,011	\$2,398,017	\$2,329,049	\$2,191,114	\$2,076,167	\$1,938,232
San Francisco	\$916,982	\$829,679	\$655,074	\$509,570	\$334,965	\$341,446	\$300,880	\$219,749	\$152,140	\$71,009	\$1,258,428	\$1,130,560	\$874,824	\$661,710	\$405,974
San Joaquin	\$689,435	\$761,641	\$906,052	\$1,026,395	\$1,170,807	\$65,511	\$101,783	\$174,326	\$234,779	\$307,323	\$754,946	\$863,424	\$1,080,379	\$1,261,174	\$1,478,129
San Luis Obispo	\$232,181	\$220,258	\$196,413	\$176,542	\$152,696	\$73,661	\$68,699	\$58,775	\$50,505	\$40,581	\$305,842	\$288,957	\$255,188	\$227,047	\$193,277
San Mateo	\$395,940	\$375,494	\$334,603	\$300,526	\$259,635	\$129,184	\$118,776	\$97,961	\$80,615	\$59,800	\$525,124	\$494,271	\$432,564	\$381,142	\$319,435
Santa Barbara	\$474,006	\$458,377	\$427,118	\$401,069	\$369,810	\$137,624	\$131,134	\$118,154	\$107,338	\$94,358	\$611,630	\$589,511	\$545,272	\$508,406	\$464,167
Santa Clara	\$1,756,347	\$1,632,742	\$1,385,531	\$1,179,523	\$932,312	\$380,836	\$355,921	\$306,090	\$264,565	\$214,735	\$2,137,183	\$1,988,663	\$1,691,622	\$1,444,088	\$1,147,047
Santa Cruz	\$193,147	\$186,338	\$172,721	\$161,374	\$147,757	\$55,840	\$53,165	\$47,814	\$43,355	\$38,004	\$248,987	\$239,503	\$220,535	\$204,729	\$185,761
Shasta-Trinity	\$423,384	\$406,118	\$371,585	\$342,808	\$308,276	\$126,420	\$118,788	\$103,525	\$90,805	\$75,542	\$549,804	\$524,906	\$475,110	\$433,614	\$383,818
Siskiyou	\$239,894	\$213,294	\$160,093	\$115,759	\$62,558	\$76,108	\$67,020	\$48,845	\$33,700	\$15,524	\$316,002	\$280,314	\$208,938	\$149,458	\$78,083
Solano	\$524,122	\$512,095	\$488,040	\$467,994	\$443,939	\$67,092	\$73,818	\$87,270	\$98,480	\$111,932	\$591,214	\$585,913	\$575,310	\$566,474	\$555,871



4-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation: 15% Workload First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
Sonoma	\$502,025	\$472,190	\$412,520	\$362,795	\$303,125	\$159,269	\$146,980	\$122,402	\$101,921	\$77,343	\$661,294	\$619,170	\$534,922	\$464,716	\$380,468
Stanislaus	\$783,525	\$759,347	\$710,991	\$670,695	\$622,339	\$128,748	\$134,772	\$146,819	\$156,859	\$168,906	\$912,273	\$894,119	\$857,811	\$827,554	\$791,246
Sutter	\$195,330	\$183,496	\$159,829	\$140,106	\$116,439	\$36,591	\$35,988	\$34,782	\$33,777	\$32,570	\$231,921	\$219,484	\$194,611	\$173,883	\$149,009
Tehama	\$94,859	\$96,716	\$100,430	\$103,525	\$107,239	\$30,095	\$30,396	\$30,999	\$31,502	\$32,105	\$124,954	\$127,112	\$131,429	\$135,027	\$139,343
Tulare	\$552,849	\$529,553	\$482,961	\$444,135	\$397,543	\$77,452	\$83,439	\$95,413	\$105,391	\$117,365	\$630,301	\$612,992	\$578,374	\$549,526	\$514,908
Tuolumne	\$161,119	\$146,335	\$116,767	\$92,126	\$62,558	\$48,109	\$43,538	\$34,396	\$26,778	\$17,636	\$209,228	\$189,873	\$151,163	\$118,904	\$80,194
Ventura	\$579,328	\$568,703	\$547,453	\$529,745	\$508,495	\$183,795	\$175,381	\$158,554	\$144,532	\$127,704	\$763,123	\$744,085	\$706,008	\$674,277	\$636,200
Yolo	\$193,254	\$188,220	\$178,151	\$169,761	\$159,692	\$57,705	\$55,523	\$51,159	\$47,522	\$43,158	\$250,959	\$243,743	\$229,310	\$217,283	\$202,850
Yuba	\$204,463	\$187,641	\$153,996	\$125,958	\$92,314	\$46,201	\$43,178	\$37,133	\$32,095	\$26,050	\$250,664	\$230,819	\$191,129	\$158,054	\$118,364
Total	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,539	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,519

3-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation												
County	Base Allocation				Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)				Total Allocation			
	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)
Alameda	\$369,025	\$354,852	\$340,679	\$326,506	\$107,336	\$96,052	\$84,767	\$73,483	\$476,361	\$450,903	\$425,446	\$399,988
Alpine-El Dorado	\$108,332	\$102,620	\$96,907	\$91,195	\$30,671	\$25,035	\$19,399	\$13,763	\$139,003	\$127,655	\$116,306	\$104,958
Amador-Calaveras	\$119,392	\$109,993	\$100,594	\$91,195	\$7,211	\$7,036	\$6,860	\$6,685	\$126,603	\$117,029	\$107,454	\$97,880
Butte	\$103,647	\$92,139	\$80,631	\$69,123	\$29,103	\$27,205	\$25,307	\$23,408	\$132,750	\$119,344	\$105,938	\$92,532
Colusa	\$53,758	\$51,038	\$48,318	\$45,597	\$14,692	\$10,339	\$5,987	\$1,634	\$68,450	\$61,377	\$54,304	\$47,232
Contra Costa	\$352,361	\$335,162	\$317,962	\$300,763	\$3,456	\$27,707	\$51,958	\$76,210	\$355,817	\$362,869	\$369,921	\$376,972
Del Norte	\$51,084	\$49,255	\$47,426	\$45,597	\$3,892	\$4,639	\$5,386	\$6,133	\$54,976	\$53,894	\$52,812	\$51,731
Fresno	\$401,222	\$409,583	\$417,944	\$426,305	\$113,593	\$120,320	\$127,048	\$133,775	\$514,815	\$529,903	\$544,992	\$560,080
Glenn	\$77,449	\$66,832	\$56,215	\$45,597	\$21,926	\$16,237	\$10,549	\$4,860	\$99,375	\$83,069	\$66,763	\$50,457
Humboldt	\$91,116	\$75,943	\$60,770	\$45,597	\$24,902	\$20,722	\$16,542	\$12,362	\$116,018	\$96,665	\$77,312	\$57,959
Imperial	\$53,758	\$63,196	\$72,635	\$82,073	\$15,219	\$20,778	\$26,338	\$31,897	\$68,977	\$83,975	\$98,972	\$113,970
Inyo	\$58,423	\$54,148	\$49,873	\$45,597	\$16,541	\$11,678	\$6,815	\$1,952	\$74,964	\$65,826	\$56,688	\$47,550
Kern	\$361,140	\$367,230	\$373,319	\$379,409	\$102,244	\$105,779	\$109,315	\$112,850	\$463,384	\$473,009	\$482,634	\$492,259
Kings	\$59,589	\$61,445	\$63,300	\$65,156	\$16,871	\$18,827	\$20,784	\$22,740	\$76,460	\$80,272	\$84,084	\$87,895
Lake	\$58,640	\$54,292	\$49,945	\$45,597	\$16,466	\$12,990	\$9,514	\$6,038	\$75,106	\$67,282	\$59,459	\$51,635
Lassen	\$79,131	\$67,953	\$56,775	\$45,597	\$31,252	\$22,469	\$13,686	\$4,902	\$110,383	\$90,422	\$70,461	\$50,500
Los Angeles	\$1,921,963	\$2,001,284	\$2,080,605	\$2,159,926	\$492,952	\$499,669	\$506,387	\$513,104	\$2,414,915	\$2,500,953	\$2,586,992	\$2,673,030
Madera	\$82,062	\$76,299	\$70,535	\$64,772	\$15,208	\$17,308	\$19,409	\$21,509	\$97,270	\$93,607	\$89,944	\$86,280
Marin	\$139,122	\$107,947	\$76,772	\$45,597	\$0	\$2,066	\$4,131	\$6,197	\$139,122	\$110,013	\$80,904	\$51,794
Mariposa	\$46,234	\$46,022	\$45,810	\$45,597	\$0	\$435	\$870	\$1,305	\$46,234	\$46,457	\$46,680	\$46,903
Mendocino	\$61,300	\$56,066	\$50,832	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$15,364	\$12,897	\$10,431	\$79,130	\$71,429	\$63,729	\$56,028
Merced	\$100,217	\$110,245	\$120,273	\$130,301	\$28,140	\$33,616	\$39,091	\$44,567	\$128,357	\$143,861	\$159,365	\$174,868
Modoc	\$72,130	\$63,286	\$54,442	\$45,597	\$823	\$825	\$826	\$828	\$72,953	\$64,110	\$55,268	\$46,425
Mono	\$49,203	\$48,001	\$46,799	\$45,597	\$828	\$718	\$608	\$499	\$50,031	\$48,719	\$47,408	\$46,096
Monterey	\$122,948	\$137,629	\$152,309	\$166,990	\$34,808	\$37,966	\$41,123	\$44,281	\$157,756	\$175,594	\$193,432	\$211,270
Napa	\$62,978	\$57,184	\$51,391	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$15,169	\$12,508	\$9,847	\$80,808	\$72,354	\$63,899	\$55,445
Nevada-Sierra	\$118,168	\$109,177	\$100,186	\$91,195	\$33,180	\$24,164	\$15,149	\$6,133	\$151,348	\$133,341	\$115,335	\$97,328
Orange	\$548,837	\$556,887	\$564,936	\$572,986	\$155,384	\$150,257	\$145,131	\$140,004	\$704,221	\$707,144	\$710,067	\$712,990
Placer	\$91,566	\$83,014	\$74,462	\$65,910	\$25,923	\$23,200	\$20,476	\$17,753	\$117,489	\$106,214	\$94,938	\$83,663
Plumas	\$56,866	\$53,110	\$49,354	\$45,597	\$4,788	\$3,899	\$3,011	\$2,122	\$61,654	\$57,009	\$52,364	\$47,720
Riverside	\$676,683	\$693,025	\$709,367	\$725,709	\$184,943	\$193,418	\$201,892	\$210,367	\$861,626	\$886,443	\$911,259	\$936,076
Sacramento	\$314,827	\$457,170	\$599,512	\$741,855	\$89,133	\$120,719	\$152,306	\$183,892	\$403,960	\$577,889	\$751,818	\$925,747
San Benito	\$61,300	\$56,066	\$50,832	\$45,597	\$17,213	\$13,385	\$9,558	\$5,730	\$78,513	\$69,451	\$60,389	\$51,327
San Bernardino	\$467,102	\$652,760	\$838,419	\$1,024,077	\$132,244	\$188,820	\$245,397	\$301,973	\$599,346	\$841,581	\$1,083,816	\$1,326,051
San Diego	\$619,053	\$579,349	\$539,646	\$499,942	\$154,721	\$148,033	\$141,344	\$134,656	\$773,774	\$727,382	\$680,990	\$634,598
San Francisco	\$250,566	\$209,133	\$167,701	\$126,268	\$70,940	\$55,383	\$39,825	\$24,268	\$321,506	\$264,516	\$207,526	\$150,536
San Joaquin	\$217,745	\$267,984	\$318,223	\$368,462	\$45,300	\$65,210	\$85,120	\$105,030	\$263,045	\$333,194	\$403,343	\$473,492
San Luis Obispo	\$68,337	\$61,371	\$54,405	\$47,438	\$19,347	\$17,521	\$15,695	\$13,869	\$87,684	\$78,892	\$70,100	\$61,307
San Mateo	\$129,159	\$116,774	\$104,388	\$92,003	\$37,567	\$31,857	\$26,147	\$20,437	\$166,726	\$148,631	\$130,536	\$112,440
Santa Barbara	\$173,589	\$155,635	\$137,680	\$119,726	\$47,442	\$42,377	\$37,312	\$32,247	\$221,031	\$198,012	\$174,993	\$151,974
Santa Clara	\$453,072	\$412,171	\$371,271	\$330,370	\$128,273	\$109,978	\$91,682	\$73,387	\$581,345	\$522,149	\$462,953	\$403,757
Santa Cruz	\$75,590	\$66,214	\$56,838	\$47,462	\$21,401	\$18,597	\$15,792	\$12,988	\$96,991	\$84,811	\$72,631	\$60,450
Shasta-Trinity	\$164,554	\$147,646	\$130,737	\$113,829	\$44,974	\$38,588	\$32,203	\$25,817	\$209,528	\$186,234	\$162,940	\$139,646
Siskiyou	\$75,822	\$65,747	\$55,672	\$45,597	\$21,290	\$15,962	\$10,634	\$5,306	\$97,112	\$81,709	\$66,306	\$50,903
Solano	\$131,471	\$136,107	\$140,743	\$145,378	\$24,365	\$28,994	\$33,624	\$38,253	\$155,836	\$165,101	\$174,366	\$183,632
Sonoma	\$140,877	\$126,630	\$112,384	\$98,137	\$39,885	\$35,401	\$30,917	\$26,432	\$180,762	\$162,031	\$143,300	\$124,569

County	3-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation											
	Base Allocation				Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)				Total Allocation			
	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)
Stanislaus	\$223,137	\$211,763	\$200,388	\$189,014	\$62,654	\$61,011	\$59,368	\$57,725	\$285,791	\$272,774	\$259,756	\$246,739
Sutter	\$67,534	\$60,222	\$52,910	\$45,597	\$19,121	\$16,458	\$13,794	\$11,131	\$86,655	\$76,680	\$66,704	\$56,729
Tehama	\$27,802	\$33,734	\$39,666	\$45,597	\$2,169	\$5,103	\$8,038	\$10,972	\$29,971	\$38,837	\$47,703	\$56,569
Tulare	\$312,151	\$244,456	\$176,761	\$109,066	\$80,697	\$67,168	\$53,639	\$40,110	\$392,848	\$311,624	\$230,400	\$149,177
Tuolumne	\$65,735	\$59,022	\$52,310	\$45,597	\$18,458	\$14,314	\$10,171	\$6,027	\$84,193	\$73,337	\$62,481	\$51,625
Ventura	\$257,724	\$227,529	\$197,334	\$167,140	\$72,965	\$63,191	\$53,418	\$43,644	\$330,689	\$290,721	\$250,752	\$210,784
Yolo	\$77,898	\$68,174	\$58,451	\$48,727	\$22,054	\$19,619	\$17,184	\$14,750	\$99,952	\$87,793	\$75,635	\$63,476
Yuba	\$66,968	\$59,844	\$52,721	\$45,597	\$18,961	\$15,608	\$12,256	\$8,903	\$85,929	\$75,453	\$64,976	\$54,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>

## 4-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation: 25% First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)
		(25% workload)	(50% workload)	(75% workload)			(25% workload)	(50% workload)	(75% workload)			(25% workload)	(50% workload)	(75% workload)	
Alameda	\$369,025	\$358,395	\$347,765	\$337,135	\$326,506	\$107,336	\$98,873	\$90,409	\$81,946	\$73,483	\$476,361	\$457,268	\$438,175	\$419,081	\$399,988
Alpine-El Dorado	\$108,332	\$104,048	\$99,763	\$95,479	\$91,195	\$30,671	\$26,444	\$22,217	\$17,990	\$13,763	\$139,003	\$130,492	\$121,980	\$113,469	\$104,958
Amador-Calaveras	\$119,392	\$112,343	\$105,293	\$98,244	\$91,195	\$7,211	\$7,080	\$6,948	\$6,817	\$6,685	\$126,603	\$119,422	\$112,241	\$105,061	\$97,880
Butte	\$103,647	\$95,016	\$86,385	\$77,754	\$69,123	\$29,103	\$27,679	\$26,256	\$24,832	\$23,408	\$132,750	\$122,695	\$112,641	\$102,586	\$92,532
Colusa	\$53,758	\$51,718	\$49,678	\$47,638	\$45,597	\$14,692	\$11,428	\$8,163	\$4,899	\$1,634	\$68,450	\$63,145	\$57,841	\$52,536	\$47,232
Contra Costa	\$352,361	\$339,461	\$326,562	\$313,662	\$300,763	\$3,456	\$21,644	\$39,833	\$58,021	\$76,210	\$355,817	\$361,106	\$366,395	\$371,683	\$376,972
Del Norte	\$51,084	\$49,712	\$48,341	\$46,969	\$45,597	\$3,892	\$4,452	\$5,013	\$5,573	\$6,133	\$54,976	\$54,165	\$53,353	\$52,542	\$51,731
Fresno	\$401,222	\$407,493	\$413,763	\$420,034	\$426,305	\$113,593	\$118,639	\$123,684	\$128,730	\$133,775	\$514,815	\$526,131	\$537,448	\$548,764	\$560,080
Glenn	\$77,449	\$69,486	\$61,523	\$53,560	\$45,597	\$21,926	\$17,659	\$13,393	\$9,126	\$4,860	\$99,375	\$87,146	\$74,916	\$62,687	\$50,457
Humboldt	\$91,116	\$79,736	\$68,357	\$56,977	\$45,597	\$24,902	\$21,767	\$18,632	\$15,497	\$12,362	\$116,018	\$101,503	\$86,989	\$72,474	\$57,959
Imperial	\$53,758	\$60,837	\$67,915	\$74,994	\$82,073	\$15,219	\$19,389	\$23,558	\$27,728	\$31,897	\$68,977	\$80,225	\$91,474	\$102,722	\$113,970
Inyo	\$58,423	\$55,217	\$52,010	\$48,804	\$45,597	\$16,541	\$12,894	\$9,247	\$5,600	\$1,952	\$74,964	\$68,110	\$61,257	\$54,403	\$47,550
Kern	\$361,140	\$365,707	\$370,274	\$374,842	\$379,409	\$102,244	\$104,896	\$107,547	\$110,199	\$112,850	\$463,384	\$470,603	\$477,821	\$485,040	\$492,259
Kings	\$59,589	\$60,981	\$62,372	\$63,764	\$65,156	\$16,871	\$18,338	\$19,805	\$21,273	\$22,740	\$76,460	\$79,319	\$82,178	\$85,037	\$87,895
Lake	\$58,640	\$55,379	\$52,119	\$48,858	\$45,597	\$16,466	\$13,859	\$11,252	\$8,645	\$6,038	\$75,106	\$69,238	\$63,371	\$57,503	\$51,635
Lassen	\$79,131	\$70,748	\$62,364	\$53,981	\$45,597	\$31,252	\$24,665	\$18,077	\$11,490	\$4,902	\$110,383	\$95,412	\$80,441	\$65,471	\$50,500
Los Angeles	\$1,921,963	\$1,981,454	\$2,040,945	\$2,100,435	\$2,159,926	\$492,952	\$497,990	\$503,028	\$508,066	\$513,104	\$2,414,915	\$2,479,444	\$2,543,973	\$2,608,502	\$2,673,030
Madera	\$82,062	\$77,739	\$73,417	\$69,094	\$64,772	\$15,208	\$16,783	\$18,358	\$19,934	\$21,509	\$97,270	\$94,523	\$91,775	\$89,028	\$86,280
Marin	\$139,122	\$115,741	\$92,360	\$68,979	\$45,597	\$0	\$1,549	\$3,098	\$4,648	\$6,197	\$139,122	\$117,290	\$95,458	\$73,626	\$51,794
Mariposa	\$46,234	\$46,075	\$45,916	\$45,757	\$45,597	\$0	\$326	\$653	\$979	\$1,305	\$46,234	\$46,401	\$46,568	\$46,735	\$46,903
Mendocino	\$61,300	\$57,374	\$53,449	\$49,523	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$15,980	\$14,130	\$12,281	\$10,431	\$79,130	\$73,355	\$67,579	\$61,804	\$56,028
Merced	\$100,217	\$107,738	\$115,259	\$122,780	\$130,301	\$28,140	\$32,247	\$36,354	\$40,460	\$44,567	\$128,357	\$139,985	\$151,613	\$163,241	\$174,868
Modoc	\$72,130	\$65,497	\$58,864	\$52,231	\$45,597	\$823	\$824	\$825	\$827	\$828	\$72,953	\$66,321	\$59,689	\$53,057	\$46,425
Mono	\$49,203	\$48,302	\$47,400	\$46,499	\$45,597	\$828	\$746	\$663	\$581	\$499	\$50,031	\$49,047	\$48,064	\$47,080	\$46,096
Monterey	\$122,948	\$133,958	\$144,969	\$155,979	\$166,990	\$34,808	\$37,176	\$39,544	\$41,912	\$44,281	\$157,756	\$171,135	\$184,513	\$197,892	\$211,270
Napa	\$62,978	\$58,633	\$54,288	\$49,943	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$15,834	\$13,839	\$11,843	\$9,847	\$80,808	\$74,467	\$68,126	\$61,785	\$55,445
Nevada-Sierra	\$118,168	\$111,425	\$104,681	\$97,938	\$91,195	\$33,180	\$26,418	\$19,657	\$12,895	\$6,133	\$151,348	\$137,843	\$124,338	\$110,833	\$97,328
Orange	\$548,837	\$554,874	\$560,911	\$566,948	\$572,986	\$155,384	\$151,539	\$147,694	\$143,849	\$140,004	\$704,221	\$706,413	\$708,605	\$710,798	\$712,990
Placer	\$91,566	\$85,152	\$78,738	\$72,324	\$65,910	\$25,923	\$23,880	\$21,838	\$19,795	\$17,753	\$117,489	\$109,032	\$100,576	\$92,119	\$83,663
Plumas	\$56,866	\$54,049	\$51,232	\$48,415	\$45,597	\$4,788	\$4,122	\$3,455	\$2,789	\$2,122	\$61,654	\$58,170	\$54,687	\$51,203	\$47,720
Riverside	\$676,683	\$688,940	\$701,196	\$713,453	\$725,709	\$184,943	\$191,299	\$197,655	\$204,011	\$210,367	\$861,626	\$880,238	\$898,851	\$917,463	\$936,076
Sacramento	\$314,827	\$421,584	\$528,341	\$635,098	\$741,855	\$89,133	\$112,823	\$136,512	\$160,202	\$183,892	\$403,960	\$534,407	\$664,854	\$795,300	\$925,747
San Benito	\$61,300	\$57,374	\$53,449	\$49,523	\$45,597	\$17,213	\$14,342	\$11,472	\$8,601	\$5,730	\$78,513	\$71,717	\$64,920	\$58,124	\$51,327
San Bernardino	\$467,102	\$606,346	\$745,590	\$884,834	\$1,024,077	\$132,244	\$174,676	\$217,109	\$259,541	\$301,973	\$599,346	\$781,022	\$962,698	\$1,144,375	\$1,326,051
San Diego	\$619,053	\$589,275	\$559,498	\$529,720	\$499,942	\$154,721	\$149,705	\$144,689	\$139,672	\$134,656	\$773,774	\$738,980	\$704,186	\$669,392	\$634,598
San Francisco	\$250,566	\$219,491	\$188,417	\$157,342	\$126,268	\$70,940	\$59,272	\$47,604	\$35,936	\$24,268	\$321,506	\$278,763	\$236,021	\$193,278	\$150,536
San Joaquin	\$217,745	\$255,424	\$293,104	\$330,783	\$368,462	\$45,300	\$60,232	\$75,165	\$90,097	\$105,030	\$263,045	\$315,657	\$368,268	\$420,880	\$473,492
San Luis Obispo	\$68,337	\$63,112	\$57,888	\$52,663	\$47,438	\$19,347	\$17,977	\$16,608	\$15,238	\$13,869	\$67,684	\$81,090	\$74,496	\$67,901	\$61,307
San Mateo	\$129,159	\$119,870	\$110,581	\$101,292	\$92,003	\$37,567	\$33,285	\$29,002	\$24,720	\$20,437	\$166,726	\$153,155	\$139,583	\$126,012	\$112,440
Santa Barbara	\$173,589	\$160,123	\$146,658	\$133,192	\$119,726	\$47,442	\$43,643	\$39,845	\$36,046	\$32,247	\$221,031	\$203,767	\$186,502	\$169,238	\$151,974
Santa Clara	\$453,072	\$422,397	\$391,721	\$361,046	\$330,370	\$128,273	\$114,552	\$100,830	\$87,109	\$73,387	\$581,345	\$536,948	\$492,551	\$448,154	\$403,757
Santa Cruz	\$75,590	\$68,558	\$61,526	\$54,494	\$47,462	\$21,401	\$19,298	\$17,195	\$15,091	\$12,988	\$96,991	\$87,856	\$78,721	\$69,586	\$60,450
Shasta-Trinity	\$164,554	\$151,873	\$139,191	\$126,510	\$113,829	\$44,974	\$40,185	\$35,396	\$30,606	\$25,817	\$209,528	\$192,057	\$174,587	\$157,116	\$139,646
Siskiyou	\$75,822	\$68,266	\$60,710	\$53,154	\$45,597	\$21,290	\$17,294	\$13,298	\$9,302	\$5,306	\$97,112	\$85,560	\$74,007	\$62,455	\$50,903
Solano	\$131,471	\$134,948	\$138,425	\$141,901	\$145,378	\$24,365	\$27,837	\$31,309	\$34,781	\$38,253	\$155,836	\$162,785	\$169,734	\$176,683	\$183,632
Sonoma	\$140,877	\$130,192	\$119,507	\$108,822	\$98,137	\$39,885	\$36,522	\$33,159	\$29,796	\$26,432	\$180,762	\$166,714	\$152,666	\$138,617	\$124,569

4-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation: 25% First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
Stanislaus	\$223,137	\$214,606	\$206,075	\$197,545	\$189,014	\$62,654	\$61,422	\$60,189	\$58,957	\$57,725	\$285,791	\$276,028	\$266,265	\$256,502	\$246,739
Sutter	\$67,534	\$62,050	\$56,566	\$51,082	\$45,597	\$19,121	\$17,124	\$15,126	\$13,129	\$11,131	\$86,655	\$79,173	\$71,692	\$64,210	\$56,729
Tehama	\$27,802	\$32,251	\$36,700	\$41,149	\$45,597	\$2,169	\$4,370	\$6,570	\$8,771	\$10,972	\$29,971	\$36,621	\$43,270	\$49,920	\$56,569
Tulare	\$312,151	\$261,380	\$210,609	\$159,837	\$109,066	\$80,697	\$70,550	\$60,404	\$50,257	\$40,110	\$392,848	\$331,930	\$271,012	\$210,094	\$149,177
Tuolumne	\$65,735	\$60,701	\$55,666	\$50,632	\$45,597	\$18,458	\$15,350	\$12,243	\$9,135	\$6,027	\$84,193	\$76,051	\$67,909	\$59,767	\$51,625
Ventura	\$257,724	\$235,078	\$212,432	\$189,786	\$167,140	\$72,965	\$65,635	\$58,304	\$50,974	\$43,644	\$330,689	\$300,713	\$270,736	\$240,760	\$210,784
Yolo	\$77,898	\$70,605	\$63,312	\$56,020	\$48,727	\$22,054	\$20,228	\$18,402	\$16,576	\$14,750	\$99,952	\$90,833	\$81,714	\$72,595	\$63,476
Yuba	\$66,968	\$61,625	\$56,283	\$50,940	\$45,597	\$18,961	\$16,446	\$13,932	\$11,417	\$8,903	\$85,929	\$78,072	\$70,215	\$62,357	\$54,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)
		(15% workload)	(45% workload)	(70% workload)			(15% workload)	(45% workload)	(70% workload)			(15% workload)	(45% workload)	(70% workload)	
Alameda	\$369,025	\$362,647	\$349,891	\$339,261	\$326,506	\$107,336	\$102,258	\$92,102	\$83,639	\$73,483	\$476,361	\$464,905	\$441,993	\$422,900	\$399,988
Alpine-El Dorado	\$108,332	\$105,761	\$100,620	\$96,336	\$91,195	\$30,671	\$28,135	\$23,062	\$18,835	\$13,763	\$139,003	\$133,896	\$123,683	\$115,171	\$104,958
Amador-Calaveras	\$119,392	\$115,162	\$106,703	\$99,654	\$91,195	\$7,211	\$7,132	\$6,974	\$6,843	\$6,685	\$126,603	\$122,295	\$113,678	\$106,497	\$97,880
Butte	\$103,647	\$98,468	\$88,111	\$79,480	\$69,123	\$29,103	\$28,249	\$26,540	\$25,117	\$23,408	\$132,750	\$126,717	\$114,652	\$104,597	\$92,532
Colusa	\$53,758	\$52,534	\$50,086	\$48,046	\$45,597	\$14,692	\$12,733	\$8,816	\$5,551	\$1,634	\$68,450	\$65,267	\$58,902	\$53,597	\$47,232
Contra Costa	\$352,361	\$344,621	\$329,142	\$316,242	\$300,763	\$3,456	\$14,369	\$36,195	\$54,384	\$76,210	\$355,817	\$358,990	\$365,337	\$370,626	\$376,972
Del Norte	\$51,084	\$50,261	\$48,615	\$47,243	\$45,597	\$3,892	\$4,228	\$4,901	\$5,461	\$6,133	\$54,976	\$54,489	\$53,516	\$52,704	\$51,731
Fresno	\$401,222	\$404,984	\$412,509	\$418,780	\$426,305	\$113,593	\$116,620	\$122,675	\$127,721	\$133,775	\$514,815	\$521,605	\$535,184	\$546,501	\$560,080
Glenn	\$77,449	\$72,671	\$63,116	\$55,153	\$45,597	\$21,926	\$19,366	\$14,246	\$9,980	\$4,860	\$99,375	\$92,037	\$77,362	\$65,133	\$50,457
Humboldt	\$91,116	\$84,288	\$70,633	\$59,253	\$45,597	\$24,902	\$23,021	\$19,259	\$16,124	\$12,362	\$116,018	\$107,309	\$89,892	\$75,377	\$57,959
Imperial	\$53,758	\$58,005	\$66,500	\$73,578	\$82,073	\$15,219	\$17,721	\$22,724	\$26,894	\$31,897	\$68,977	\$75,726	\$89,224	\$100,472	\$113,970
Inyo	\$58,423	\$56,499	\$52,651	\$49,445	\$45,597	\$16,541	\$14,353	\$9,976	\$6,329	\$1,952	\$74,964	\$70,852	\$62,628	\$55,774	\$47,550
Kern	\$361,140	\$363,880	\$369,361	\$373,928	\$379,409	\$102,244	\$103,835	\$107,017	\$109,668	\$112,850	\$463,384	\$467,715	\$476,378	\$483,596	\$492,259
Kings	\$59,589	\$60,424	\$62,094	\$63,486	\$65,156	\$16,871	\$17,751	\$19,512	\$20,979	\$22,740	\$76,460	\$78,175	\$81,606	\$84,465	\$87,895
Lake	\$58,640	\$56,684	\$52,771	\$49,510	\$45,597	\$16,466	\$14,902	\$11,773	\$9,166	\$6,038	\$75,106	\$71,585	\$64,544	\$58,676	\$51,635
Lassen	\$79,131	\$74,101	\$64,041	\$55,657	\$45,597	\$31,252	\$27,300	\$19,395	\$12,807	\$4,902	\$110,383	\$101,401	\$83,436	\$68,465	\$50,500
Los Angeles	\$1,921,963	\$1,957,657	\$2,029,046	\$2,088,537	\$2,159,926	\$492,952	\$495,975	\$502,021	\$507,059	\$513,104	\$2,414,915	\$2,453,632	\$2,531,067	\$2,595,596	\$2,673,030
Madera	\$82,062	\$79,468	\$74,281	\$69,959	\$64,772	\$15,208	\$16,153	\$18,043	\$19,619	\$21,509	\$97,270	\$95,622	\$92,325	\$89,577	\$86,280
Marin	\$139,122	\$125,093	\$97,036	\$73,655	\$45,597	\$0	\$930	\$2,789	\$4,338	\$6,197	\$139,122	\$126,023	\$99,825	\$77,993	\$51,794
Mariposa	\$46,234	\$46,139	\$45,948	\$45,788	\$45,597	\$0	\$196	\$587	\$914	\$1,305	\$46,234	\$46,334	\$46,535	\$46,702	\$46,903
Mendocino	\$61,300	\$58,945	\$54,234	\$50,308	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$16,720	\$14,500	\$12,651	\$10,431	\$79,130	\$75,665	\$68,734	\$62,959	\$56,028
Merced	\$100,217	\$104,730	\$113,755	\$121,276	\$130,301	\$28,140	\$30,604	\$35,532	\$39,639	\$44,567	\$128,357	\$135,334	\$149,287	\$160,915	\$174,868
Modoc	\$72,130	\$68,150	\$60,190	\$53,557	\$45,597	\$823	\$824	\$825	\$826	\$828	\$72,953	\$68,974	\$61,015	\$54,383	\$46,425
Mono	\$49,203	\$48,662	\$47,580	\$46,679	\$45,597	\$828	\$779	\$680	\$598	\$499	\$50,031	\$49,441	\$48,260	\$47,277	\$46,096
Monterey	\$122,948	\$129,554	\$142,767	\$153,777	\$166,990	\$34,808	\$36,229	\$39,071	\$41,439	\$44,281	\$157,756	\$165,783	\$181,837	\$195,216	\$211,270
Napa	\$62,978	\$60,371	\$55,157	\$50,812	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$16,633	\$14,238	\$12,242	\$9,847	\$80,808	\$77,003	\$69,394	\$63,054	\$55,445
Nevada-Sierra	\$118,168	\$114,122	\$106,030	\$99,287	\$91,195	\$33,180	\$29,123	\$21,009	\$14,247	\$6,133	\$151,348	\$143,245	\$127,039	\$113,534	\$97,328
Orange	\$548,837	\$552,459	\$559,704	\$565,741	\$572,986	\$155,384	\$153,077	\$148,463	\$144,618	\$140,004	\$704,221	\$705,536	\$708,167	\$710,359	\$712,990
Placer	\$91,566	\$87,718	\$80,021	\$73,607	\$65,910	\$25,923	\$24,697	\$22,246	\$20,204	\$17,753	\$117,489	\$112,415	\$102,267	\$93,811	\$83,663
Plumas	\$56,866	\$55,176	\$51,795	\$48,978	\$45,597	\$4,788	\$4,388	\$3,588	\$2,922	\$2,122	\$61,654	\$59,564	\$55,384	\$51,900	\$47,720
Riverside	\$676,683	\$684,037	\$698,745	\$711,001	\$725,709	\$184,943	\$188,757	\$196,384	\$202,740	\$210,367	\$861,626	\$872,793	\$895,128	\$913,741	\$936,076
Sacramento	\$314,827	\$378,881	\$506,990	\$613,747	\$741,855	\$89,133	\$103,347	\$131,775	\$155,464	\$183,892	\$403,960	\$482,228	\$638,764	\$769,211	\$925,747
San Benito	\$61,300	\$58,945	\$54,234	\$50,308	\$45,597	\$17,213	\$15,491	\$12,046	\$9,175	\$5,730	\$78,513	\$74,435	\$66,279	\$59,483	\$51,327
San Bernardino	\$467,102	\$550,648	\$717,741	\$856,985	\$1,024,077	\$132,244	\$157,703	\$208,622	\$251,055	\$301,973	\$599,346	\$708,352	\$926,363	\$1,108,039	\$1,326,051
San Diego	\$619,053	\$601,186	\$565,453	\$535,676	\$499,942	\$154,721	\$151,711	\$145,692	\$140,676	\$134,656	\$773,774	\$752,898	\$711,145	\$676,351	\$634,598
San Francisco	\$250,566	\$231,921	\$194,632	\$163,557	\$126,268	\$70,940	\$63,939	\$49,938	\$38,269	\$24,268	\$321,506	\$295,860	\$244,569	\$201,827	\$150,536
San Joaquin	\$217,745	\$240,353	\$285,568	\$323,247	\$368,462	\$45,300	\$54,259	\$72,178	\$87,111	\$105,030	\$263,045	\$294,612	\$357,746	\$410,358	\$473,492
San Luis Obispo	\$68,337	\$65,202	\$58,933	\$53,708	\$47,438	\$19,347	\$18,525	\$16,882	\$15,512	\$13,869	\$87,684	\$83,727	\$75,814	\$69,220	\$61,307
San Mateo	\$129,159	\$123,586	\$112,439	\$103,150	\$92,003	\$37,567	\$34,998	\$29,859	\$25,576	\$20,437	\$166,726	\$158,583	\$142,297	\$128,726	\$112,440
Santa Barbara	\$173,589	\$165,510	\$149,351	\$135,885	\$119,726	\$47,442	\$45,163	\$40,604	\$36,806	\$32,247	\$221,031	\$210,672	\$189,955	\$172,691	\$151,974
Santa Clara	\$453,072	\$434,667	\$397,856	\$367,181	\$330,370	\$128,273	\$120,040	\$103,574	\$89,853	\$73,387	\$581,345	\$554,707	\$501,431	\$457,034	\$403,757
Santa Cruz	\$75,590	\$71,371	\$62,933	\$55,901	\$47,462	\$21,401	\$20,139	\$17,615	\$15,512	\$12,988	\$96,991	\$91,510	\$80,548	\$71,413	\$60,450
Shasta-Trinity	\$164,554	\$156,945	\$141,728	\$129,046	\$113,829	\$44,974	\$42,100	\$36,353	\$31,564	\$25,817	\$209,528	\$199,046	\$178,081	\$160,611	\$139,646
Siskiyou	\$75,822	\$71,288	\$62,221	\$54,665	\$45,597	\$21,290	\$18,892	\$14,097	\$10,101	\$5,306	\$97,112	\$90,181	\$76,318	\$64,766	\$50,903
Solano	\$131,471	\$133,557	\$137,729	\$141,206	\$145,378	\$24,365	\$26,448	\$30,615	\$34,087	\$38,253	\$155,836	\$160,005	\$168,344	\$175,293	\$183,632
Sonoma	\$140,877	\$134,466	\$121,644	\$110,959	\$98,137	\$39,885	\$37,867	\$33,831	\$30,468	\$26,432	\$180,762	\$172,333	\$155,475	\$141,427	\$124,569

4-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation: 15% First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
Stanislaus	\$223,137	\$218,019	\$207,782	\$199,251	\$189,014	\$62,654	\$61,915	\$60,436	\$59,204	\$57,725	\$285,791	\$279,933	\$268,218	\$258,454	\$246,739
Sutter	\$67,534	\$64,244	\$57,663	\$52,178	\$45,597	\$19,121	\$17,923	\$15,526	\$13,528	\$11,131	\$86,655	\$82,166	\$73,188	\$65,706	\$56,729
Tehama	\$27,802	\$30,471	\$35,810	\$40,259	\$45,597	\$2,169	\$3,489	\$6,130	\$8,331	\$10,972	\$29,971	\$33,961	\$41,940	\$48,590	\$56,569
Tulare	\$312,151	\$281,688	\$220,763	\$169,992	\$109,066	\$80,697	\$74,609	\$62,433	\$52,286	\$40,110	\$392,848	\$356,297	\$283,196	\$222,278	\$149,177
Tuolumne	\$65,735	\$62,714	\$56,673	\$51,639	\$45,597	\$18,458	\$16,593	\$12,864	\$9,756	\$6,027	\$84,193	\$79,308	\$69,537	\$61,395	\$51,625
Ventura	\$257,724	\$244,136	\$216,961	\$194,315	\$167,140	\$72,965	\$68,567	\$59,770	\$52,440	\$43,644	\$330,689	\$312,703	\$276,732	\$246,755	\$210,784
Yolo	\$77,898	\$73,522	\$64,771	\$57,478	\$48,727	\$22,054	\$20,958	\$18,767	\$16,941	\$14,750	\$99,952	\$94,481	\$83,538	\$74,419	\$63,476
Yuba	\$66,968	\$63,762	\$57,351	\$52,009	\$45,597	\$18,961	\$17,452	\$14,435	\$11,920	\$8,903	\$85,929	\$81,215	\$71,786	\$63,929	\$54,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$10,990,357</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$2,759,186</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>	<b>\$13,749,543</b>