



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
www.courts.ca.gov

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on July 20, 2018

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Budget: 2018–19 Trial Court Base Allocations	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
N/A	July 20, 2018
Recommended by	Date of Report
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	June 8, 2018
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair	Contact
	Lucy Fogarty, Deputy Director
	Budget Services
	415-865-7587
	<a href="mailto:lucy.fogarty@jud.ca.gov">lucy.fogarty@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve \$1.940 billion in trial court base allocations. Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the Judicial Council to make a preliminary allocation for the trial courts in July of each fiscal year and a final allocation in January. The recommended allocations include \$47.8 million in new funding for courts below the average statewide funding ratio, \$19.1 million in new self-help funding, and \$23.8 million for employee benefits.

### Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 20, 2018:

1. Approve option 1 as the methodology for allocation of the \$47.8 million intended to equalize funding among courts by bringing courts up to the statewide average funding level;
2. Approve 2018–19 self-help funding allocations based on updated population data;

3. Approve the 2018–19 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) allocation of \$1.835 billion; and
4. Approve other 2018–19 allocations of \$105.0 million.

### **Relevant Previous Council Action**

Allocation of trial court funds is one of the principal responsibilities of the Judicial Council. The council approves preliminary trial court base allocations annually in July of each fiscal year. Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A)<sup>1</sup> requires the council to make a preliminary allocation for the trial courts in July of each fiscal year and a final allocation in January.

On January 12, 2018, the council approved a new WAFM that eliminated the historical base to improve transparency, accountability, and predictability and to simplify reporting. In addition, as identified in the January 2018 report to the council, the TCBC established the “[p]rinciples of WAFM for 2018–19 and [b]eyond,” which included “[s]implification of reporting while maintaining transparency.”<sup>2</sup>

### **Analysis/Rationale**

To meet the stated principle of WAFM referenced above, the allocation displays attached to this report are simplified in nature to improve transparency. In addition to the allocation displays, each trial court will be provided with a one-page allocation summary (Attachment A) that reflects current funding and staffing, changes from the prior year, local allocation amounts, and related statewide perspectives for reference. Details such as self-help funding and civil assessments are highlighted for 2018–19; however, these displays are intended to showcase relevant areas of focus and will change year to year. Finally, there is an acronym legend on the bottom that may also be updated year to year, depending on how the information in this document changes.

Details regarding the complex calculations underlying the allocation models are posted on the California Courts website for those who are interested (Link A).

### **Recommendation 1**

Approve option 1 as the methodology for allocation of the \$47.8 million intended to equalize funding among courts by bringing courts that are below the statewide average funding level up to the average.

The Budget Act of 2018 includes \$47.8 million to be allocated to trial courts that are below 76.9 percent of their overall need according to WAFM. This augmentation is intended to equalize

---

<sup>1</sup> See [http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=68502.5.&lawCode=GOV](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=68502.5.&lawCode=GOV).

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology* (Dec. 8, 2017), p. 7, <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5722980&GUID=EB419556-68BE-4685-A012-6A8D8502A126>.

funding by bringing trial courts up to 76.9 percent, the statewide average funding level, according to updated case weights.

The dollar amount and average funding level identified in the Governor's proposed budget were based on the most current data available at the time. However, since the proposed budget in January 2018, a number of updates have been made to the data inputs that are used to compute WAFM-related funding need, the WAFM base allocation, and the statewide average funding level. As a result, the \$47.8 million in funding identified to bring courts up to the statewide average, and the statewide average funding level of 76.9 percent, no longer reflect the correct funding levels and percentages. Consequently, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) of the TCBAC was tasked with determining how to allocate the \$47.8 million in funding to best comply with the spirit of the budget language.

After research and examination, the FMS came up with two options to bring before the TCBAC. Both options start by allocating funding to bring courts to at least 76.9 percent, as stated in the Governor's proposed budget language. Option 1 focuses on allocating the remaining dollars to the courts furthest away from the statewide average need, reducing funding inequity across the courts and raising the statewide funding average. Option 2 allocates funding to all courts below the new statewide average. Although option 2 funds a greater number of courts, it distributes less funding to those courts farthest away from the statewide average funding level. The net effect is that option 1 makes greater progress toward equitable funding of the trial courts. At its May 31, 2018, meeting, the TCBAC considered a recommendation from the FMS to allocate this funding consistent with option 1, as shown in Attachment B.

## **Recommendation 2**

Approve 2018–19 self-help funding allocations with updated population data.

The allocation methodology for self-help funding provides a baseline level of funding of \$34,000 to each of the 58 courts, with the remaining funds allocated based on the county population as a proportion of total state population.

In prior years, the population data used to allocate funding was the 2005 U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey. This recommendation updates the population data by drawing from the *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State—January 1, 2016 and 2017*.<sup>3</sup> This was the most current data as of April 2018.

The updated population data will be used to reallocate existing self-help funding, totaling \$11.2 million, and to allocate the \$19.1 million in new self-help funding in the Budget Act of 2018 (Attachment C). The baseline level of funding, totaling \$1.972 million, will be allocated from the \$6.2 million distributed from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). The remaining

---

<sup>3</sup> State of Cal., Dept. of Finance, *E-1 Population Estimates for Cities and Counties, and the State—January 1, 2016 and 2017* (Sacramento, May 2017).

\$4.228 million from the TCTF and \$5 million from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund will be distributed based on population.

### **Recommendation 3**

Approve the 2018–19 WAFM allocation of \$1.835 billion.

Changes to the prior-year allocation (Attachment D) are:

1. Reductions for subordinate judicial officer (SJO) conversions totaling \$1,007,523;
2. Adjustment to SJO allocation totaling \$776,791;
3. Difference in Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics collections from 2015–16 to 2016–17;
4. 2017–18 cost changes for noninterpreter employee benefits totaling \$23,816,127;<sup>4</sup>
5. Adjustments to TCTF self-help allocations using updating population based on current census data;<sup>5</sup>
6. Allocation of \$47.8 million in new funding for courts below the statewide average funding ratio expected to be provided in the Budget Act of 2018;<sup>6</sup>
7. Allocation of \$19.1 million in new self-help funding expected to be provided in the Budget Act of 2018;<sup>7</sup> and
8. 2018–19 WAFM funding-floor adjustment, which includes funding-floor allocations for four courts totaling \$177,480, with all other courts sharing pro rata in the reduction to cover the funding-floor allocations. The funding-floor adjustment may change with additional WAFM-related allocations in the Budget Act of 2018.

### **Recommendation 4**

Approve other 2018–19 allocations of \$105.0 million.

2018–19 other allocations (Attachment D) include:

1. \$41.7 million in nonsheriff security funding;
2. \$54.1 million for SJO salaries and benefits, not including child support commissioners funded by Assembly Bill 1058; and
3. \$9.2 million in criminal justice realignment costs based on the most current available postrelease community supervision and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council’s Criminal Justice Services office under Penal Code section 13155.

---

<sup>4</sup> Court interpreter benefits costs changes are added to the Court Interpreter Program.

<sup>5</sup> See recommendation 2.

<sup>6</sup> See recommendation 1.

<sup>7</sup> See note 4.

### **Pending allocations**

The following allocations are pending:

1. Reduction amounts related to trial court reserves above the 1 percent cap referenced in Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) because these will not be available for consideration by TCBAC before the Judicial Council meeting on July 19–20, 2018;<sup>8</sup> and
2. Allocation of the \$75.0 million in the Budget Act of 2018, pending review by the TCBAC in August 2018.

### **Policy implications**

These recommendations are consistent with the statutory requirement for the council to make a preliminary allocation for the trial courts in July of each fiscal year.

All items were voted on unanimously by the TCBAC save for one no vote on recommendation 3. The member voting no asserted that the reduction the court was receiving related to benefits funding was an allocation reduction and was inconsistent with existing council policy as approved on January 12, 2018. As stated by a number of members on the committee, this is a fiscally neutral change because it reflects an equivalent reduction in costs and is not inconsistent with existing council policy. The display as provided in Attachment D was updated with a second header indicating “fiscal neutral cost change” to be explicit about the nature of the change in benefits allocations in column F.

### **Comments**

No public comment was received for these items when they were considered by the FMS on March 26 and May 21, 2018, or by the TCBAC on May 31, 2018.

### **Alternatives considered**

An alternative for recommendation 1 was provided in option 2. The TCBAC recommends option 1 because it makes more progress toward equitable funding of the trial courts.

For recommendation 2, an alternative would be not to update the population data. Because this is a workload model based on population, the committee did not consider it feasible to continue to allocate funds based on 2005 census data.

No alternatives were considered for recommendations 3 and 4 because they are not policy recommendations. They are required for the council to meet its statutory obligation to provide preliminary allocations to the trial courts in July of each fiscal year.

---

<sup>8</sup> Courts have until July 14, 2018, to provide preliminary 2017–18 ending fund balances. TCBAC will consider final allocation reductions before the Judicial Council meeting in January 2019.

## **Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

If the recommendations to allocate funds were not approved, the fiscal and operational impacts to the trial courts would be significant.

## **Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: Superior Court of California 2018–19 Allocation Summary
2. Attachment B: Allocation Methodology for \$47.8 Million
3. Attachment C: 2018–19 Self-Help Allocations
4. Attachment D: 2018–19 Trial Court Base Allocations
5. Link A: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/trial-court-base-allocations.pdf>



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**2018-19 ALLOCATION SUMMARY\***  
MAY 2018

**Court Perspective**

**Statewide Perspective**

	Prior Year 2017-18	Current Year 2018-19	Difference	Prior Year 2017-18	Current Year 2018-19	Difference
<b>WAFM Funding Need</b>	<b>12,345,678</b>	<b>16,966,674</b>	<b>4,620,996</b>	<b>2,225,678,910</b>	<b>2,217,013,520</b>	<b>(8,665,390)</b>
WAFM-Related Allocation	12,318,837	13,573,327*	1,254,490	1,745,554,822	1,840,427,086	23,424,481
<i>*Share of \$47.8m New Funding</i>	0	937,173		0	47,800,000	
<i>Percent of Need Funded via WAFM</i>	99.8%	80.0%		74.4%	83.0%	
Other Allocations	500,866	1,849,845	1,348,979	30,000,000	21,900,000	(8,100,000)
<b>Total Estimated Allocation</b>	<b>12,819,703</b>	<b>15,423,172</b>	<b>2,603,469</b>	<b>1,826,192,314</b>	<b>2,013,020,396</b>	<b>186,828,082</b>
	Prior Year 2016-17	Current Year 2017-18	Difference	Prior Year 2016-17	Current Year 2017-18	Difference
<b>RAS FTE Need</b>	<b>138.00</b>	<b>139.00</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>20,222.00</b>	<b>20,111.00</b>	<b>(111.00)</b>

**Additional Court Information**

**WAFM 2018-19 Allocation Highlights**

TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	0
SJO Adjustment (2017-18)	15,487
Auto. Recordkeeping/Micrographics (2016-17)	14,981
Full-Year Benefits Funding (2017-18)	132,962
Replacement of 2% Automation	130,020
WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	574

**Other 2018-19 Allocations Highlights**

Non-Sheriff Security Base	244,286
Subordinate Judicial Officers	417,124
Criminal Justice Realignment	70,753

<b>Self-Help Funding</b>			
<b>Statewide Perspective</b>			
<b>TCTF</b>	<b>IMF</b>	<b>New</b>	<b>Total</b>
6.2m	5.0m	TBD	TBD
<b>Court Perspective</b>			
	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>Difference</b>
TCTF	53,934	63,934	10,000
IMF	49,000	50,000	1,000
New Funding	0	132,540	132,540
<b>Total</b>	<b>102,934</b>	<b>246,474</b>	<b>143,540</b>

<b>2016-17 Civil Assessments</b>		
<b>State</b>		
<b>Total Collected</b>	<b>MOE Obligation</b>	<b>Distributed</b>
111.7m	48.3m	67.2m
<b>Court</b>		
<b>Total Collected</b>	<b>MOE Obligation</b>	<b>Distributed</b>
143,000	85,000	58,000
Annual MOE obligations not met with court collections are covered by the TCTF.		
In 2016-17, the TCTF fund balance covered 4.2m.		

**FTE**  
FULL-TIME  
EQUIVALENT

**IMF**  
STATE TRIAL COURT  
IMPROVEMENT AND  
MODERNIZATION  
FUND

**MOE**  
MAINTENANCE  
OF EFFORT

**RAS**  
RESOURCE  
ASSESSMENT  
STUDY

**SJO**  
SUBORDINATE  
JUDICIAL  
OFFICER

**TCTF**  
TRIAL COURT  
TRUST FUND

**WAFM**  
WORKLOAD-BASED  
ALLOCATION AND  
FUNDING  
METHODOLOGY

\*Not inclusive of all allocations such as restricted funding and reimbursements.

**DRAFT SCENARIO 01-26-18 - WILL CHANGE BASED UPON THE 2018 BUDGET ACT**

Cluster	Court	Total 2018-19 WAFM-Related Allocation (Before New Money)	Total 2018-19 WAFM Need	% Need	Option 1: Additional Funding Needed	Option 1: Final Total 2018-19 WAFM-Related Allocation	Option 1: New % Need	Option 2: Additional Funding Needed	Option 2: Final Total 2018-19 WAFM-Related Allocation	Option 2: New % Need
4	Alameda	\$ 71,216,156	\$ 83,101,281	85.7%	\$ -	\$ 71,216,156	85.7%	\$ -	\$ 71,216,156	85.7%
1	Alpine	\$ 750,000	\$ 423,378	177.1%	\$ -	\$ 750,000	177.1%	\$ -	\$ 750,000	177.1%
1	Amador	\$ 2,241,405	\$ 2,875,338	78.0%	\$ 8,876	\$ 2,250,281	78.3%	\$ 2,928	\$ 2,244,333	78.1%
2	Butte	\$ 9,426,399	\$ 13,374,586	70.5%	\$ 1,040,743	\$ 10,467,143	78.3%	\$ 1,013,078	\$ 10,439,477	78.1%
1	Calaveras	\$ 2,086,027	\$ 2,611,213	79.9%	\$ -	\$ 2,086,027	79.9%	\$ -	\$ 2,086,027	79.9%
1	Colusa	\$ 1,924,378	\$ 1,994,918	96.5%	\$ -	\$ 1,924,378	96.5%	\$ -	\$ 1,924,378	96.5%
3	Contra Costa	\$ 38,944,771	\$ 51,871,341	75.1%	\$ 1,650,483	\$ 40,595,254	78.3%	\$ 1,543,185	\$ 40,487,957	78.1%
1	Del Norte	\$ 2,409,926	\$ 2,821,677	85.4%	\$ -	\$ 2,409,926	85.4%	\$ -	\$ 2,409,926	85.4%
2	El Dorado	\$ 6,488,321	\$ 8,706,791	74.5%	\$ 325,738	\$ 6,814,060	78.3%	\$ 307,728	\$ 6,796,049	78.1%
3	Fresno	\$ 46,755,051	\$ 63,106,468	74.1%	\$ 2,632,974	\$ 49,388,025	78.3%	\$ 2,502,436	\$ 49,257,487	78.1%
1	Glenn	\$ 1,913,843	\$ 2,131,424	89.8%	\$ -	\$ 1,913,843	89.8%	\$ -	\$ 1,913,843	89.8%
2	Humboldt	\$ 6,057,587	\$ 7,859,201	77.1%	\$ 93,136	\$ 6,150,723	78.3%	\$ 76,879	\$ 6,134,466	78.1%
2	Imperial	\$ 8,284,100	\$ 10,646,871	77.8%	\$ 48,293	\$ 8,332,393	78.3%	\$ 26,270	\$ 8,310,370	78.1%
1	Inyo	\$ 1,887,466	\$ 2,005,208	94.1%	\$ -	\$ 1,887,466	94.1%	\$ -	\$ 1,887,466	94.1%
3	Kern	\$ 44,807,319	\$ 64,925,575	69.0%	\$ 6,004,365	\$ 50,811,684	78.3%	\$ 5,870,065	\$ 50,677,384	78.1%
2	Kings	\$ 6,455,083	\$ 8,937,534	72.2%	\$ 539,559	\$ 6,994,642	78.3%	\$ 521,072	\$ 6,976,154	78.1%
2	Lake	\$ 3,168,841	\$ 4,564,560	69.4%	\$ 403,450	\$ 3,572,290	78.3%	\$ 394,008	\$ 3,562,848	78.1%
1	Lassen	\$ 1,874,990	\$ 2,147,967	87.3%	\$ -	\$ 1,874,990	87.3%	\$ -	\$ 1,874,990	87.3%
4	Los Angeles	\$ 500,585,968	\$ 638,818,504	78.4%	\$ -	\$ 500,585,968	78.4%	\$ 1,690,540	\$ 502,276,508	78.6%
2	Madera	\$ 7,217,836	\$ 9,793,233	73.7%	\$ 446,488	\$ 7,664,324	78.3%	\$ 426,231	\$ 7,644,067	78.1%
2	Marin	\$ 11,889,816	\$ 12,566,813	94.6%	\$ -	\$ 11,889,816	94.6%	\$ -	\$ 11,889,816	94.6%
1	Mariposa	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,345,390	92.9%	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000	92.9%	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000	92.9%
2	Mendocino	\$ 5,177,238	\$ 7,193,346	72.0%	\$ 452,378	\$ 5,629,616	78.3%	\$ 437,498	\$ 5,614,736	78.1%
2	Merced	\$ 11,118,343	\$ 15,841,209	70.2%	\$ 1,279,214	\$ 12,397,557	78.3%	\$ 1,246,446	\$ 12,364,789	78.1%
1	Modoc	\$ 875,002	\$ 1,028,453	85.1%	\$ -	\$ 875,002	85.1%	\$ -	\$ 875,002	85.1%
1	Mono	\$ 1,874,999	\$ 1,921,934	97.6%	\$ -	\$ 1,874,999	97.6%	\$ -	\$ 1,874,999	97.6%
3	Monterey	\$ 16,656,950	\$ 23,133,666	72.0%	\$ 1,447,788	\$ 18,104,739	78.3%	\$ 1,399,935	\$ 18,056,886	78.1%
2	Napa	\$ 6,805,669	\$ 8,401,485	81.0%	\$ -	\$ 6,805,669	81.0%	\$ -	\$ 6,805,669	81.0%
2	Nevada	\$ 4,485,467	\$ 5,843,488	76.8%	\$ 87,730	\$ 4,573,197	78.3%	\$ 75,642	\$ 4,561,110	78.1%
4	Orange	\$ 130,557,838	\$ 158,475,388	82.4%	\$ -	\$ 130,557,838	82.4%	\$ -	\$ 130,557,838	82.4%
2	Placer	\$ 15,381,448	\$ 20,277,183	75.9%	\$ 487,765	\$ 15,869,213	78.3%	\$ 445,821	\$ 15,827,269	78.1%
1	Plumas	\$ 1,098,234	\$ 1,248,151	88.0%	\$ -	\$ 1,098,234	88.0%	\$ -	\$ 1,098,234	88.0%
4	Riverside	\$ 83,795,307	\$ 115,864,478	72.3%	\$ 6,881,892	\$ 90,677,199	78.3%	\$ 6,642,223	\$ 90,437,530	78.1%
4	Sacramento	\$ 74,207,648	\$ 94,570,263	78.5%	\$ -	\$ 74,207,648	78.5%	\$ 149,029	\$ 74,356,677	78.6%
1	San Benito	\$ 2,490,581	\$ 3,296,299	75.6%	\$ 89,149	\$ 2,579,730	78.3%	\$ 82,331	\$ 2,572,912	78.1%
4	San Bernardino	\$ 90,489,654	\$ 122,745,316	73.7%	\$ 5,572,587	\$ 96,062,241	78.3%	\$ 5,318,685	\$ 95,808,339	78.1%
4	San Diego	\$ 131,053,036	\$ 149,938,144	87.4%	\$ -	\$ 131,053,036	87.4%	\$ -	\$ 131,053,036	87.4%
4	San Francisco	\$ 51,680,101	\$ 50,233,195	102.9%	\$ -	\$ 51,680,101	102.9%	\$ -	\$ 51,680,101	102.9%
3	San Joaquin	\$ 33,539,705	\$ 44,763,531	74.9%	\$ 1,492,875	\$ 35,032,580	78.3%	\$ 1,400,280	\$ 34,939,985	78.1%
2	San Luis Obispo	\$ 12,320,922	\$ 16,966,674	72.6%	\$ 957,440	\$ 13,278,362	78.3%	\$ 922,344	\$ 13,243,265	78.1%
3	San Mateo	\$ 32,338,069	\$ 44,666,431	72.4%	\$ 2,618,519	\$ 34,956,588	78.3%	\$ 2,526,126	\$ 34,864,194	78.1%
3	Santa Barbara	\$ 20,368,953	\$ 27,024,093	75.4%	\$ 780,489	\$ 21,149,442	78.3%	\$ 724,589	\$ 21,093,542	78.1%
4	Santa Clara	\$ 74,824,230	\$ 84,089,003	89.0%	\$ -	\$ 74,824,230	89.0%	\$ -	\$ 74,824,230	89.0%
2	Santa Cruz	\$ 11,476,219	\$ 15,685,523	73.2%	\$ 799,496	\$ 12,275,715	78.3%	\$ 767,050	\$ 12,243,269	78.1%
2	Shasta	\$ 10,247,416	\$ 14,686,813	69.8%	\$ 1,246,694	\$ 11,494,110	78.3%	\$ 1,216,314	\$ 11,463,730	78.1%
1	Sierra	\$ 750,000	\$ 384,424	195.1%	\$ -	\$ 750,000	195.1%	\$ -	\$ 750,000	195.1%
2	Siskiyou	\$ 2,797,889	\$ 2,947,579	94.9%	\$ -	\$ 2,797,889	94.9%	\$ -	\$ 2,797,889	94.9%
3	Solano	\$ 19,959,262	\$ 26,313,149	75.9%	\$ 633,784	\$ 20,593,047	78.3%	\$ 579,355	\$ 20,538,617	78.1%
3	Sonoma	\$ 22,498,598	\$ 26,973,505	83.4%	\$ -	\$ 22,498,598	83.4%	\$ -	\$ 22,498,598	83.4%
3	Stanislaus	\$ 21,175,789	\$ 31,118,112	68.0%	\$ 3,177,690	\$ 24,353,480	78.3%	\$ 3,113,322	\$ 24,289,111	78.1%
2	Sutter	\$ 4,842,312	\$ 6,637,590	73.0%	\$ 352,361	\$ 5,194,673	78.3%	\$ 338,631	\$ 5,180,943	78.1%
2	Tehama	\$ 3,854,151	\$ 5,482,510	70.3%	\$ 436,540	\$ 4,290,691	78.3%	\$ 425,199	\$ 4,279,350	78.1%
1	Trinity	\$ 1,383,823	\$ 1,577,454	87.7%	\$ -	\$ 1,383,823	87.7%	\$ -	\$ 1,383,823	87.7%
3	Tulare	\$ 18,410,572	\$ 26,630,928	69.1%	\$ 2,431,174	\$ 20,841,746	78.3%	\$ 2,376,087	\$ 20,786,659	78.1%
2	Tuolumne	\$ 3,054,903	\$ 4,353,128	70.2%	\$ 351,918	\$ 3,406,821	78.3%	\$ 342,913	\$ 3,397,816	78.1%
3	Ventura	\$ 33,385,142	\$ 44,626,190	74.8%	\$ 1,539,953	\$ 34,925,095	78.3%	\$ 1,447,642	\$ 34,832,784	78.1%
2	Yolo	\$ 9,273,164	\$ 13,540,159	68.5%	\$ 1,323,558	\$ 10,596,722	78.3%	\$ 1,295,549	\$ 10,568,714	78.1%
2	Yuba	\$ 4,450,227	\$ 5,960,508	74.7%	\$ 214,552	\$ 4,664,779	78.3%	\$ 202,222	\$ 4,652,450	78.1%
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 1,746,334,148</b>	<b>\$ 2,221,068,575</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>\$ 47,849,651</b>	<b>\$ 1,794,183,799</b>	<b>80.8%</b>	<b>\$ 47,849,651</b>	<b>\$ 1,794,183,799</b>	<b>80.8%</b>



## 2018-19 Self-help Allocations

County	Total Population*	% of State Population	Base \$34,000	TCTF Base Self-Help Funding	IMF Self-Help Funds	New \$19.1M	Total Self-Help Allocation
	A	B	C	D (B*4,228,000)+C	E B*5,000,000	F B*19,100,000	G D:F
Alameda	1,645,359	4.163%	34,000	210,011	208,149	795,129	1,213,288
Alpine	1,151	0.003%	34,000	34,123	146	556	34,825
Amador	38,382	0.097%	34,000	38,106	4,856	18,548	61,510
Butte	226,404	0.573%	34,000	58,219	28,642	109,411	196,272
Calaveras	45,168	0.114%	34,000	38,832	5,714	21,828	66,374
Colusa	22,043	0.056%	34,000	36,358	2,789	10,652	49,799
Contra Costa	1,139,513	2.883%	34,000	155,898	144,156	550,676	850,730
Del Norte	27,124	0.069%	34,000	36,902	3,431	13,108	53,441
El Dorado	185,062	0.468%	34,000	53,797	23,412	89,432	166,641
Fresno	995,975	2.520%	34,000	140,543	125,997	481,310	747,851
Glenn	28,731	0.073%	34,000	37,073	3,635	13,884	54,593
Humboldt	136,953	0.347%	34,000	48,650	17,325	66,183	132,159
Imperial	188,334	0.477%	34,000	54,147	23,826	91,013	168,986
Inyo	18,619	0.047%	34,000	35,992	2,355	8,998	47,345
Kern	895,112	2.265%	34,000	129,754	113,238	432,568	675,559
Kings	149,537	0.378%	34,000	49,997	18,917	72,265	141,179
Lake	64,945	0.164%	34,000	40,947	8,216	31,385	80,548
Lassen	30,918	0.078%	34,000	37,307	3,911	14,941	56,160
Los Angeles	10,241,278	25.912%	34,000	1,129,551	1,295,590	4,949,153	7,374,294
Madera	156,492	0.396%	34,000	50,741	19,797	75,626	146,163
Marin	263,604	0.667%	34,000	62,199	33,348	127,388	222,935
Mariposa	18,148	0.046%	34,000	35,941	2,296	8,770	47,007
Mendocino	89,134	0.226%	34,000	43,535	11,276	43,074	97,886
Merced	274,665	0.695%	34,000	63,382	34,747	132,733	230,862
Modoc	9,580	0.024%	34,000	35,025	1,212	4,630	40,866
Mono	13,713	0.035%	34,000	35,467	1,735	6,627	43,829
Monterey	442,365	1.119%	34,000	81,322	55,962	213,775	351,059
Napa	142,408	0.360%	34,000	49,234	18,016	68,819	136,069
Nevada	98,828	0.250%	34,000	44,572	12,502	47,759	104,834
Orange	3,194,024	8.081%	34,000	375,678	404,065	1,543,529	2,323,272
Placer	382,837	0.969%	34,000	74,954	48,431	185,008	308,393
Plumas	19,819	0.050%	34,000	36,120	2,507	9,578	48,205
Riverside	2,384,783	6.034%	34,000	289,110	301,691	1,152,459	1,743,260
Sacramento	1,514,770	3.833%	34,000	196,041	191,628	732,021	1,119,690
San Benito	56,854	0.144%	34,000	40,082	7,192	27,475	74,749
San Bernardino	2,160,256	5.466%	34,000	265,091	273,287	1,043,955	1,582,333
San Diego	3,316,192	8.390%	34,000	388,746	419,520	1,602,568	2,410,835
San Francisco	874,228	2.212%	34,000	127,520	110,596	422,475	660,591
San Joaquin	746,868	1.890%	34,000	113,895	94,484	360,928	569,307
San Luis Obispo	280,101	0.709%	34,000	63,964	35,435	135,360	234,758
San Mateo	770,203	1.949%	34,000	116,392	97,436	372,205	586,032
Santa Barbara	450,663	1.140%	34,000	82,209	57,012	217,785	357,006
Santa Clara	1,938,180	4.904%	34,000	241,335	245,193	936,636	1,423,164
Santa Cruz	276,603	0.700%	34,000	63,589	34,992	133,670	232,251
Shasta	178,605	0.452%	34,000	53,106	22,595	86,312	162,013
Sierra	3,207	0.008%	34,000	34,343	406	1,550	36,299
Siskiyou	44,688	0.113%	34,000	38,780	5,653	21,596	66,030
Solano	436,023	1.103%	34,000	80,643	55,160	210,710	346,513
Sonoma	505,120	1.278%	34,000	88,035	63,901	244,102	396,038
Stanislaus	548,057	1.387%	34,000	92,628	69,333	264,852	426,812
Sutter	96,956	0.245%	34,000	44,372	12,266	46,855	103,492
Tehama	63,995	0.162%	34,000	40,846	8,096	30,926	79,868
Trinity	13,628	0.034%	34,000	35,458	1,724	6,586	43,768
Tulare	471,842	1.194%	34,000	84,475	59,691	228,020	372,186
Tuolumne	54,707	0.138%	34,000	39,852	6,921	26,437	73,210
Ventura	857,386	2.169%	34,000	125,718	108,465	414,336	648,519
Yolo	218,896	0.554%	34,000	57,416	27,692	105,783	190,891
Yuba	74,577	0.189%	34,000	41,978	9,434	36,040	87,452
<b>Total</b>	<b>39,523,613</b>	<b>100.000%</b>	<b>1,972,000</b>	<b>6,200,000</b>	<b>5,000,000</b>	<b>19,100,000</b>	<b>30,300,000</b>

2018-19 Trial Court Base Allocations  
May 2018

Court	2017-18 Total Base Allocation	Changes to WAFM Allocation									2018-19 WAFM Allocation
		Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Fiscal Neutral Offset	Change in Revenue Collected	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Population Methodology	RAS Methodology	Population Methodology	RAS Methodology		
		TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversion	SJO Adjustment (Change from PY)	Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics (Change from PY)	2017-18 Benefits Funding <sup>2</sup>	TCTF Self-Help Adjustment (Change from PY)	2018-19 Funding for Courts Below the Average	2018-19 Self-Help Funding	2018-19 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment		
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K (B-J)	
Alameda	76,715,321	71,190,879	-	39,794	(890)	(1,495,764)	9,225	-	795,129	(6,837)	70,531,536
Alpine	739,145	738,872	-	-	18	10,855	(38)	-	556	(263)	750,000
Amador	2,247,491	2,241,749	-	-	86	19,838	(505)	20,210	18,548	(223)	2,299,704
Butte	10,314,956	9,431,053	-	(5,083)	2,236	149,298	(1,061)	1,035,340	109,411	(1,039)	10,720,154
Calaveras	2,088,044	2,086,404	-	-	23	42,045	(802)	-	21,828	(208)	2,149,290
Colusa	1,928,387	1,924,696	-	-	51	5,523	(194)	-	10,652	(188)	1,940,540
Contra Costa	39,914,703	39,033,643	-	(85,393)	3,992	355,758	10,511	7,771	550,676	(3,865)	39,873,093
Del Norte	2,535,333	2,526,719	-	(116,360)	50	(26,419)	(915)	-	13,108	(232)	2,395,951
El Dorado	6,688,898	6,491,374	-	(1,531)	(279)	38,823	(535)	380,365	89,432	(678)	6,996,971
Fresno	48,184,650	46,825,837	-	(64,488)	2,664	1,821,733	9,236	206,520	481,310	(4,777)	49,278,036
Glenn	1,926,364	1,914,224	-	-	(14)	31,893	(405)	-	13,884	(190)	1,959,392
Humboldt	6,440,016	6,067,419	-	(9,182)	512	54,891	(924)	123,006	66,183	(611)	6,301,294
Imperial	8,750,458	8,097,856	-	35,138	1,436	30,188	2,617	280,294	91,013	(828)	8,537,715
Inyo	2,082,448	1,887,827	-	-	1	100,316	(249)	-	8,998	(194)	1,996,699
Kern	46,870,883	44,870,144	-	(56,019)	1,782	(251,715)	15,388	6,934,144	432,568	(5,035)	51,941,257
Kings	7,209,133	6,457,573	-	(1,708)	454	14,771	(1,760)	621,965	72,265	(694)	7,162,866
Lake	3,445,858	3,192,506	-	(23,140)	86	55,181	(751)	397,775	31,385	(354)	3,652,688
Lassen	2,084,467	1,780,690	-	-	2	77,313	(1,582)	-	14,941	3,635	1,874,999
Los Angeles	538,865,942	499,747,429	(1,007,523)	1,685,798	47,759	10,054,336	(152,335)	-	4,949,153	(49,951)	515,274,666
Madera	7,648,372	7,218,959	-	-	259	144,168	692	406,148	75,626	(761)	7,845,091
Marin	11,919,150	11,829,410	-	(2,249)	91	(7,814)	(1,346)	-	127,388	(1,158)	11,944,322
Mariposa	1,172,483	1,167,971	-	-	24	5,308	(285)	-	8,770	68,211	1,250,000
Mendocino	5,538,797	5,178,759	-	(259)	(270)	91,311	(1,642)	439,507	43,074	(557)	5,749,924
Merced	11,619,071	11,122,840	-	(3,142)	775	33,898	2,873	1,411,609	132,733	(1,231)	12,700,355
Modoc	875,071	871,813	-	-	8	7,971	(205)	-	4,630	(86)	884,130
Mono	1,773,269	1,746,186	-	-	(30)	26,337	(173)	-	6,627	96,052	1,874,999
Monterey	17,944,396	16,675,449	-	(16,019)	712	54,552	(2,184)	1,642,389	213,775	(1,800)	18,566,875
Napa	7,508,251	6,812,495	-	(5,501)	(22)	93,079	(126)	-	68,819	(675)	6,968,069
Nevada	5,247,474	4,477,457	-	8,749	119	63,674	(1,768)	88,152	47,759	(454)	4,683,689
Orange	137,993,948	130,620,384	-	(56,426)	18,884	937,524	(16,968)	-	1,543,529	(12,896)	133,034,030
Placer	16,280,536	15,278,212	-	(12,289)	144	269,927	10,811	541,685	185,008	(1,577)	16,271,921
Plumas	1,099,721	1,098,490	-	-	(46)	(10,218)	(697)	-	9,578	(106)	1,097,001
Riverside	89,211,094	83,837,862	-	(34,526)	8,019	1,594,161	71,884	6,452,686	1,152,459	(9,023)	93,073,521
Sacramento	76,750,330	72,867,797	-	(61,352)	(103,437)	946,700	9,691	1,238,313	732,021	(7,331)	75,622,402
San Benito	2,499,711	2,490,893	-	-	166	48,238	(1,032)	77,117	27,475	(256)	2,642,600
San Bernardino	97,968,627	90,590,969	-	(93,977)	10,002	774,587	9,904	6,098,018	1,043,955	(9,541)	98,423,917
San Diego	136,586,044	131,181,972	-	(120,383)	16,557	3,734,322	12,925	-	1,602,568	(13,224)	136,414,737
San Francisco	52,241,942	51,704,684	-	(16,908)	2,222	984,589	5,842	-	422,475	(5,147)	53,097,757
San Joaquin	34,696,484	33,430,503	-	(17,891)	4,103	(43,342)	8,481	2,112,908	360,928	(3,476)	35,852,214
San Luis Obispo	13,054,314	12,321,118	-	1,032	1,129	127,602	48	1,002,293	135,360	(1,317)	13,587,266
San Mateo	34,482,280	32,430,165	-	(86,706)	817	692,007	68	2,403,438	372,205	(3,471)	35,808,521
Santa Barbara	22,042,267	20,361,423	-	10,761	665	325,925	552	742,298	217,785	(2,099)	21,657,311
Santa Clara	75,731,460	74,849,852	-	(13,171)	1,877	(122,098)	12,314	-	936,636	(7,334)	75,658,075
Santa Cruz	11,783,694	11,494,453	-	(16,684)	689	107,215	(548)	860,214	133,670	(1,219)	12,577,791
Shasta	13,307,053	10,267,708	-	(18,593)	265	91,670	(3,352)	1,293,888	86,312	(1,136)	11,716,763
Sierra	736,853	736,648	-	-	(5)	2,345	(120)	-	1,550	9,582	750,000
Siskiyou	2,970,624	2,796,467	-	2,025	(66)	144,829	(1,023)	-	21,596	(287)	2,963,539

<sup>1</sup> Prior to implementation of the funding floor adjustments.

<sup>2</sup> Benefits funding reflects actual cost changes as identified by the court and is fiscally neutral.

<sup>3</sup> Not inclusive of all allocations such as restricted funding and reimbursements.

2018-19 Trial Court Base Allocations  
May 2018

Court	2017-18 Total Base Allocation	2017-18 WAFM Allocation <sup>1</sup>	Changes to WAFM Allocation								2018-19 WAFM Allocation
			Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Fiscal Neutral Offset	Change in Revenue Collected	Fiscal Neutral Cost Change	Population Methodology	RAS Methodology	Population Methodology	RAS Methodology	
			TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversion	SJO Adjustment (Change from PY)	Automated Recordkeeping & Micrographics (Change from PY)	2017-18 Benefits Funding <sup>2</sup>	TCTF Self-Help Adjustment (Change from PY)	2018-19 Funding for Courts Below the Average	2018-19 Self-Help Funding	2018-19 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	
Solano	21,155,359	19,959,592	-	2,439	1,052	339,071	(3,170)	578,591	210,710	(2,044)	21,086,241
Sonoma	23,621,856	22,518,260	-	(15,166)	(187)	126,428	(1,207)	-	244,102	(2,217)	22,870,014
Stanislaus	21,743,154	21,196,456	-	(17,831)	1,221	522,902	268	2,986,976	264,852	(2,419)	24,952,424
Sutter	5,112,077	4,843,196	-	-	43	210,891	(66)	212,389	46,855	(515)	5,312,793
Tehama	3,873,657	3,861,352	-	(6,478)	16	22,267	(334)	473,168	30,926	(425)	4,380,493
Trinity	1,906,786	1,383,914	-	-	174	13,842	(299)	-	6,586	(136)	1,404,080
Tulare	18,984,798	18,418,388	-	(6,815)	2,525	338,976	5,747	2,370,947	228,020	(2,070)	21,355,717
Tuolumne	3,375,195	3,047,087	-	8,406	(6)	(18,494)	(1,683)	418,591	26,437	(337)	3,480,001
Ventura	35,973,663	33,422,006	-	(32,463)	1,996	(86,784)	(2,724)	2,105,586	414,336	(3,472)	35,818,481
Yolo	9,941,251	9,013,254	-	381	759	135,685	3,855	1,561,631	105,783	(1,049)	10,820,299
Yuba	4,621,562	4,451,057	-	-	23	4,011	77	274,066	36,040	(462)	4,764,813
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,849,901,174</b>	<b>1,744,082,393</b>	<b>(1,007,523)</b>	<b>776,791</b>	<b>31,239</b>	<b>23,816,127</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>47,800,000</b>	<b>19,100,000</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>1,834,599,027</b>

<sup>1</sup> Prior to implementation of the funding floor adjustments.

<sup>2</sup> Benefits funding reflects actual cost changes as identified by the court and is fiscally neutral.

<sup>3</sup> Not inclusive of all allocations such as restricted funding and reimbursements.

2018-19 Trial Court Base Allocations  
May 2018

Court	2018-19 WAFM Need	WAFM Funding to Need	Other Allocations				2018-19 Total Base Allocation <sup>3</sup>
			Non-Sheriff Security	SJOs (excludes AB 1058)	Criminal Justice Realignment	Total Other Allocations	
			N	O	P	Q (N:P)	
L	M (K/L)	R (K+Q)					
Alameda	81,002,945	87.1%	3,212,246	2,019,741	291,550	5,523,537	76,055,073
Alpine	423,375	177.1%	-	-	202	202	750,202
Amador	2,875,289	80.0%	-	-	7,470	7,470	2,307,175
Butte	13,374,342	80.2%	472,190	330,047	99,741	901,978	11,622,132
Calaveras	2,611,172	82.3%	-	-	6,663	6,663	2,155,952
Colusa	1,994,887	97.3%	-	-	5,653	5,653	1,946,193
Contra Costa	49,564,075	80.4%	-	850,172	109,836	960,008	40,833,101
Del Norte	2,821,641	84.9%	-	116,360	12,922	129,282	2,525,233
El Dorado	8,706,630	80.4%	-	154,758	43,409	198,167	7,195,138
Fresno	61,505,974	80.1%	-	1,018,675	422,788	1,441,463	50,719,499
Glenn	2,131,394	91.9%	9,885	-	2,625	12,509	1,971,902
Humboldt	7,859,064	80.2%	169,612	161,102	55,120	385,834	6,687,128
Imperial	10,646,670	80.2%	425,020	151,222	40,785	617,027	9,154,742
Inyo	2,005,177	99.6%	188,674	-	6,461	195,135	2,191,834
Kern	64,924,267	80.0%	66,275	1,531,380	350,708	1,948,363	53,889,620
Kings	8,937,370	80.1%	426,475	265,474	64,206	756,154	7,919,020
Lake	4,564,481	80.0%	198,615	65,367	13,931	277,914	3,930,602
Lassen	2,147,934	87.3%	297,009	-	7,067	304,076	2,179,075
Los Angeles	638,806,215	80.7%	14,448,847	19,855,347	2,710,165	37,014,359	552,289,025
Madera	9,793,045	80.1%	385,525	-	37,554	423,079	8,268,170
Marin	12,566,559	95.0%	9,729	64,829	21,604	96,162	12,040,483
Mariposa	1,345,369	92.9%	-	-	5,451	5,451	1,255,451
Mendocino	7,193,213	79.9%	302,582	17,930	45,025	365,536	6,115,460
Merced	15,840,897	80.2%	-	394,167	105,192	499,359	13,199,714
Modoc	1,028,437	86.0%	798	-	808	1,605	885,735
Mono	1,921,905	97.6%	24,417	-	1,211	25,628	1,900,628
Monterey	23,133,221	80.3%	879,396	370,295	34,929	1,284,621	19,851,495
Napa	8,401,332	82.9%	298,744	386,927	-	685,671	7,653,740
Nevada	5,843,371	80.2%	438,112	320,695	2,423	761,230	5,444,919
Orange	158,456,848	84.0%	2,763,301	4,282,161	467,207	7,512,669	140,546,700
Placer	20,276,800	80.2%	-	970,110	39,775	1,009,885	17,281,806
Plumas	1,248,131	87.9%	-	-	404	404	1,097,405
Riverside	115,862,199	80.3%	1,952,380	2,540,304	788,437	5,281,122	98,354,643
Sacramento	94,395,798	80.1%	1,884,560	1,915,768	127,604	3,927,931	79,550,333
San Benito	3,296,242	80.2%	-	-	10,095	10,095	2,652,695
San Bernardino	122,742,865	80.2%	3,304,756	3,251,190	1,025,271	7,581,217	106,005,134
San Diego	149,934,947	91.0%	664,290	4,364,278	572,803	5,601,370	142,016,107
San Francisco	50,232,141	105.7%	-	508,842	53,303	562,145	53,659,902
San Joaquin	44,735,096	80.1%	290,855	853,972	141,535	1,286,362	37,138,576
San Luis Obispo	16,955,493	80.1%	244,286	417,124	83,992	745,402	14,332,668
San Mateo	44,665,811	80.2%	447,827	1,648,337	57,947	2,154,111	37,962,632
Santa Barbara	27,023,513	80.1%	1,066,507	529,336	71,070	1,666,913	23,324,224
Santa Clara	84,090,893	90.0%	-	752,452	185,752	938,205	76,596,280
Santa Cruz	15,685,230	80.2%	-	297,927	202	298,129	12,875,920
Shasta	14,659,632	79.9%	2,662,303	322,217	85,406	3,069,925	14,786,688
Sierra	384,421	195.1%	-	-	808	808	750,808
Siskiyou	2,947,529	100.5%	-	162,904	7,067	169,970	3,133,510

<sup>1</sup> Prior to implementation of the funding floor adjustments.

<sup>2</sup> Benefits funding reflects actual cost changes as identified by the court and is fiscally neutral.

<sup>3</sup> Not inclusive of all allocations such as restricted funding and reimbursements.

2018-19 Trial Court Base Allocations  
May 2018

Court	2018-19 WAFM Need	WAFM Funding to Need	Other Allocations				2018-19 Total Base Allocation <sup>3</sup>
			Non-Sheriff Security	SJOs (excludes AB 1058)	Criminal Justice Realignment	Total Other Allocations	
Solano	26,312,624	80.1%	440,102	630,587	107,817	1,178,506	22,264,748
Sonoma	26,972,981	84.8%	444,752	558,958	119,527	1,123,238	23,993,252
Stanislaus	31,117,525	80.2%	9,427	491,527	95,097	596,051	25,548,475
Sutter	6,637,467	80.0%	249,739	-	28,065	277,804	5,590,597
Tehama	5,482,422	79.9%	-	6,478	14,335	20,813	4,401,305
Trinity	1,577,430	89.0%	520,479	-	1,413	521,893	1,925,973
Tulare	26,630,469	80.2%	15,744	469,091	98,731	583,567	21,939,284
Tuolumne	4,353,053	79.9%	222,898	89,831	7,067	319,796	3,799,797
Ventura	44,625,264	80.3%	1,575,996	657,024	448,228	2,681,248	38,499,729
Yolo	13,505,143	80.1%	589,184	286,546	47,246	922,976	11,743,275
Yuba	5,960,394	79.9%	134,001	-	31,295	165,296	4,930,109
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,214,738,616</b>	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>41,737,537</b>	<b>54,081,452</b>	<b>9,223,000</b>	<b>105,041,989</b>	<b>1,939,641,016</b>

<sup>1</sup> Prior to implementation of the funding floor adjustments.

<sup>2</sup> Benefits funding reflects actual cost changes as identified by the court and is fiscally neutral.

<sup>3</sup> Not inclusive of all allocations such as restricted funding and reimbursements.