



## 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: July 29, 2016

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Allocations: Funding for General Court Operations and Specific Costs in Fiscal Year 2016–2017	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	July 29, 2016
Recommended by	Date of Report
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair	July 19, 2016
	Contact
	Colin Simpson, 415-865-4566 <a href="mailto:colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov">colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov</a>

---

### Executive Summary

For fiscal year (FY) 2016–2017, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends the Judicial Council allocate \$1.842 billion to the trial courts from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and state General Fund for general court operations and specific costs. The recommended allocations include an allocation of \$1.773 billion in 2016–2017 beginning base funding for general court operations, each court’s share of \$28.7 million in new and 2015–2016 funding for noninterpreter employee benefits, \$754,000 for court-provided security costs, a statewide net allocation of \$19.6 million for general court operations using the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), a net-zero allocation for the WAFM funding-floor adjustment, a preliminary one-time allocation reduction related to the 1 percent cap on trial court fund balances, and one-time allocations of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs and \$21.4 million in new funding for Proposition 47–related workload costs. Assuming approval of the allocations and given current revenue projections and estimated savings from appropriations, the TCTF will end FY 2016–2017 with a fund balance of \$25.3 million, of which approximately \$4.7 million will be unrestricted.

## Recommendation

Based on actions taken at its July 7, 2016 meeting the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) unanimously recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 29, 2016:

1. Approve the 2016–2017 beginning base allocation for court operations of \$1.773 billion (see Attachment E, column 9), which carries forward the ending 2015–2016 Trial Court Trust Fund base allocation (column 6), and adds the General Fund benefits base allocation (column 7) and adjustments to annualize partial-year allocations made in 2015–2016 (column 8) (see Attachment A, column 1).
2. Allocate each court’s share of \$28.7 million in new and FY 2015–2016 funding for noninterpreter employee benefits cost changes from the Trial Court Trust Fund. The remaining \$603,000 provided for 2015–2016 court interpreter benefits cost changes in the Budget Act of 2016 was added to the TCTF Program 0150037–Court Interpreters appropriation (formerly Program 45.45) as follows:
  - a. \$8.4 million for each court’s share 2015–2016 cost changes (see Attachment A, column 2); and
  - b. \$7.0 million for courts unfunded 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases in addition to the \$13.3 million provided in the 2015 Budget Act totaling \$20.3 million (see Attachment A, column 3)
3. Allocate a total of \$754,000 for court-provided security costs from the TCTF as follows:
  - a. Allocate the amount of \$412,000 based on the Judicial Council-approved methodology<sup>1</sup> that beginning in 2016–2017 and beyond, if any new General Fund (GF) augmentation is received, courts with court-provided (nonsheriff) security since 2010–2011 would be provided funding based on either the same growth funding percentage that the county sheriff receives or the percentage of the GF increase to the trial courts—whichever is lower (see Attachment A, column 4); and
  - b. Allocate the amount of \$343,000 included in the 2016 Budget Act to address the increased costs for marshals in two courts (see Attachment A, column 5).
4. Allocate each court’s share of a net allocation increase of \$19.6 million from the TCTF using the 2016–2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) consisting of a reallocation of 40 percent (\$576.2 million) and an additional \$233.8 million of courts’ historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, reallocation of \$214.2 million in new funding provided from 2013–2014 through 2015–2016 for general court operations, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (July 28, 2015), p. 11; see [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150728-minutes.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150728-minutes.pdf)

allocation of \$19.6 million in new funding provided in 2016–2017 for general court operations (see Attachment A, column 6).

5. Allocate each court’s share of the 2016–2017 WAFM funding-floor allocation adjustment, which includes that funding-floor allocations for six courts receive a total of \$400,562 in floor adjustments and all other courts are allocated a reduction totaling \$400,562, for a net-zero total allocation (see Attachment A, column 7).
6. Approve a preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$10.3 million to 20 courts that are projecting the portion of their 2015–2016 ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent fund balance cap to exceed the cap by \$10.3 million, as required by statute (see Attachment A, column 8).
7. Approve a one-time allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs from the TCTF based on the most current available postrelease community supervision (PRCS) and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council’s Criminal Justice Services office pursuant to Penal Code section 13155—each court’s percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole (see Attachment A, column 9).
8. Approve a one-time allocation of \$21.4 million in new funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for Proposition 47–related workload costs in the following manner:
  - a. Allocate \$10.7 million based on each court’s share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from October 1, 2015, to March 31, 2016, with funding to be distributed in August 2016 (see Attachment A, column 10); and
  - b. Allocate \$10.7 million based on each court’s share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from April 1, 2016, to September 30, 2016, with funding to be distributed in January 2017 (see Attachment A, column 11).

A summary of the allocations by court related to recommendations 1 through 8 is displayed in Attachment A.

### **Recommendation 1: 2016–2017 Beginning Base Allocation for Court Operations**

1. Approve the 2016–2017 beginning base allocation for court operations of \$1.773 billion (see Attachment E, column 9), which carries forward the ending 2015–2016 Trial Court Trust Fund base allocation (column 6), and adds the General Fund benefits base allocation (column 7) and adjustments to annualize partial-year allocations made in 2015–2016 (column 8) (see Attachment A, column 1).

### **Previous council action**

None.

### **Rationale for recommendation 1**

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

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

(Gov. Code, § 68502.5(c)(2)(A))

Given current revenue projections and estimated savings from appropriations, the 2016–2017 allocations already approved under the appropriations for Programs 0140010–Judicial Council (formerly 30.05); 0150010–Support for Operation of Trial Courts (formerly 45.10); and 0150095–Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts (formerly 30.15); and the eight recommendations discussed in this report, the TCTF will end FY 2016–2017 with a fund balance of \$25.3 million (see Attachment B, column E, row 35 as well as Attachments C and D). Excluding about \$20.6 million in fund balance that is either statutorily restricted or restricted by the council—mainly the emergency needs reserve and savings related to the Program 45.45 court interpreter appropriation—the unrestricted fund balance is projected to be \$4.7 million (see Attachment 4C, column C, row 45).

### **Recommendation 2: 2015–2016 and Previously Unfunded 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 Benefits Costs Funding**

2. Allocate each court's share of \$28.7 million in new and FY 2015–2016 funding for noninterpreter employee benefits cost changes from the Trial Court Trust Fund. The remaining \$603,000 provided for 2015–2016 court interpreter benefits cost changes in the Budget Act of 2016 was added to the TCTF Program 0150037–Court Interpreters appropriation (formerly Program 45.45) as follows:
  - a. \$8.4 million for each court's share of 2015–2016 cost changes (see Attachment A, column 2); and

- b. \$7.0 million for courts unfunded 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases in addition to the \$13.3 million provided in the 2015 Budget Act totaling \$20.3 million (see Attachment A, column 3).

**Previous council action**

None.

**Rationale for recommendation 2**

In the fall of 2015, a budget augmentation in the amount of \$15.6 million was submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) to address the full-year impact to the trial courts in 2016–2017 of changes in costs for retirement, retiree health, and employee health that were anticipated to occur in 2015–2016. Many of the health-related costs were unconfirmed at that time. The understanding was that a revised request would be submitted in mid-March 2016 that would have updated, confirmed amounts. The Governor’s Proposed Budget included the entire \$15.6 million. Of this amount, \$7.4 million was to restore the remaining needed portion of the \$22 million reduction included in the Budget Act of 2014 (Stats. 2014, ch. 25), which had been based on the DOF estimate of what the trial courts were currently spending to cover the employee share of costs for retirement. Additional courts had negotiated with employee unions to either eliminate or reduce the amount they were contributing to the employee share of retirement (EPMC). The \$7.4 million was an acknowledgement that courts were continuing to make progress towards meeting the Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 standard (PEPRA).

The \$16.1 million in the 2016 May Revise submission reflects an increase in the augmentation of \$0.5 million from the Governor’s initial proposal, which is attributed to employee and retiree health premiums and/or employer share amounts coming in lower than estimated by courts at the time of original submission. The amount provided for retirement reduction restoration increased from \$7.4 million to \$7.5 million (\$7.1 million for noninterpreters and \$446,000 for interpreters).

***\$8.6 million for 2015–2016 benefit cost changes***

A total of \$8.6 million of the \$16.1 million May Revise request is specifically to address increased cost changes for retirement, health, and retiree health benefits. Of this amount, \$8.4 million is to augment TCTF Program 0150010–Support for Operation of Trial Courts, and \$157,000 is to augment the Program 0150037–Court Interpreter appropriation, which is allocated by region and not by individual trial court (see Attachment F, Columns D and E).

There were seven courts that had unconfirmed employee or retiree health premiums or employer share amounts as of the date the updated cost changes were given to the DOF in March 2016. Of these seven, all are now confirmed. For four of the courts, the costs remain unchanged, while the cost changes for three courts have increased by \$69,000 for employee health and retiree health.

### ***\$7.5 million in restored benefits funding***

In the fall of 2013, a budget change proposal in the amount of \$64.8 million was submitted to the DOF to address the ongoing cost to the trial courts in 2014–2015 of the retirement, employee health, and retiree health cost changes that occurred in 2012–2013 and were anticipated to occur in 2013–2014. The 2014 Budget Act included an augmentation of \$42.8 million specifically for the benefit cost changes in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014, which took into account a reduction in the amount of \$22 million, based on the DOF estimate of what the trial courts were currently spending to cover the employee share of costs for retirement. The Judicial Council at its July 29, 2014 meeting approved the TCBAC recommendation allocating the new benefits funding by prorating \$41.0 million (noninterpreters) to the trial courts based on each court's percentage of the total 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost change of \$61.3 million (noninterpreters). (The remaining \$1.8 million in new benefits funding was for court interpreter benefits, and staff coordinated with the Department of Finance to augment the TCTF Program 0150037–Court Interpreters appropriation.)

The 2015 Budget Act included a total of \$38.8 million for benefits; \$25.4 million in funding for retirement, retiree health, and employee health cost increases; and \$13.4 million (\$13.3 million noninterpreters and \$100,000 for interpreters)<sup>2</sup> for trial courts that had made progress towards meeting the Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) standard. The Judicial Council at its June 26, 2015 meeting approved the TCBAC recommendation for allocating the \$13.3 million for 2015–2016, and for the allocation of funding in 2016–2017:

### ***2015–2016***

- Allocate 50 percent to all courts; allocate an additional 50 percent to courts with no retirement employer-paid share (EPS) and courts with 10 percent EPS of cost increases; and to courts with EPS reduction of 30 percent or more.
- Allocate by prorating 50 percent in restored benefits funding to all the trial courts (\$6.637 million).
- The additional 50 percent (\$6.637 million) would be prorated (1) to courts that do not pay towards the employee share of costs for retirement in 2015–2016, (2) to courts where only 10 percent or less is paid towards the employee share of retirement of total costs increases, and (3) to courts in which the employer-paid portion of the employee share of costs for retirement was reduced in FY 2014–2015 by at least 30 percent.
- Courts will be included in the additional 50 percent proration if they meet the defined criteria as of May 14, 2015.
- Courts that do not pay towards the employee share of costs for retirement or courts with employer-paid share (EPS) amounts of 10 percent or less than cost increases, and courts that have reduced the employee share of costs for retirement by 30 percent would receive

---

<sup>2</sup> The remaining \$128,000 in restored benefits funding is for court interpreter benefits, and was appropriated to TCTF Program 0150037–Court Interpreters.

90 percent of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases. Courts that do pay towards the employee share of costs for retirement and do not fall into the other categories would receive 78 percent of their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases.

- This 50/50 allocation methodology would be done on a one-time basis for 2015–2016.

### **2016–2017**

- Beginning in 2016–2017, courts that continue to provide EPS of the employee retirement contribution would be reduced by the actual outstanding funding not restored by the DOF that is attributed to their court. This funding will then be distributed to those courts that do not make EPS of employee retirement payments in order to make their benefit cost funding whole.

With the \$7.1 million (noninterpreter) funding included in the 2016 Budget Act, a total amount of \$20.3 million (noninterpreters) will have been restored and the trial courts will be made whole for their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases. There is sufficient funding available for courts that no longer pay any portion of the employee’s share of retirement costs to now be fully funded for their 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases. There also is enough to fund the \$1.1 million needed to restore the courts that still contribute at least some portion of the employee’s share of costs for retirement to be fully funded (see Attachment G, columns F, G, and H).

### **Recommendation 3: 2016–2017 Nonsheriff’s Security Funding**

3. Allocate a total of \$754,000 for court-provided security costs from the TCTF as follows:
  - a. Allocate the amount of \$412,000 based on the Judicial Council-approved methodology<sup>3</sup> that beginning in 2016–2017 and beyond, if any new General Fund (GF) augmentation is received, courts with court-provided (nonsheriff) security since 2010–2011 would be provided funding based on either the same growth funding percentage that the county sheriff receives or the percentage of the GF increase to the trial courts—whichever is lower (see Attachment A, column 4); and
  - b. Allocate the amount of \$343,000 included in the 2016 Budget Act to address the increased costs for marshals in two courts (see Attachment A, column 5).

---

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (July 28, 2015), p. 11; see [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150728-minutes.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150728-minutes.pdf)

### **Previous council action**

#### ***BCP spring 2015 submission***

At its January 22, 2015 business meeting, the Judicial Council approved the TCBAC's recommendation for the preparation and submission of an FY 2015–2016 spring budget change proposal (BCP) to the DOF for trial court–provided security.

In February 2015, a spring BCP for 2015–2016 was submitted to the DOF. The BCP request by the Judicial Council was for a GF augmentation of \$3.7 million to address increased costs for court-provided (nonsheriff) security for the maintenance of funding at 2010–2011 security levels. The DOF did not approve the GF augmentation requested in the BCP and, subsequently, it was not included in the Governor's 2015 May Revise. The DOF's reasoning was that the trial courts should prioritize security expenses against other costs and utilize their GF augmentation (i.e., \$60 million in 2013–2014, \$86.3 million in 2014–2015, and \$90.6 million in 2015–2016).

#### ***BCP fall 2016 submission***

At the Judicial Council meeting on July 28, 2015, the council approved the TCBAC recommendation to submit a BCP to address increased costs for court-provided (nonsheriff) security for the maintenance of funding at FY 2010–2011 security levels. In addition, beginning in FY 2016–2017 and beyond, if any new General Fund augmentation for general trial court operations is received, courts with court-provided (nonsheriff) security since 2010–2011 would be provided funding based on the lesser of the growth funding percentage that the county sheriff received or the General Fund augmentation percentage increased. The growth funding would cease if a court discontinued its court-provided security services.

### **Rationale for recommendation 3**

When criminal justice realignment occurred in 2011, funding for sheriff-provided security was transferred to the counties. As a result, in July 2011, trial court base budgets were reduced by the total amount for sheriff-provided security—\$484.6 million—while a total of \$41.0 million remained in court base budgets for those with court-provided security costs (private security contracts, court attendants, marshals, and other costs such as alarm systems).

Currently, county-provided sheriff security receives growth funding from the Trial Court Security Growth Special Account; however, courts have not received any funding for increased costs for private security contracts since 2010–2011. Courts do, however, receive funding for benefit adjustments for marshal and court security staff through the benefit funding process.

In September 2015, a BCP for 2016–2017 was submitted to the DOF. The BCP request by the Judicial Council was for a GF augmentation of \$3.97 million to address increased costs for court-provided (nonsheriff) security for the maintenance of funding at 2010–2011 security levels. The \$3.97 million was for increased costs for marshals, court attendants, and private security contracts for entrance screening since the 2011 Public Safety Realignment. The 2016 Governor's



budget included a GF augmentation of \$343,000 to address only the increased costs for marshals and, subsequently, this amount was included in 2016 Budget Act (see Attachment H, column E). There was no explanation given as to why the other court-provided security costs were not funded. However, in prior years, the DOF's reasoning was that the trial courts should prioritize security expenses against other costs and utilize the GF augmentations received in 2013–2014, 2014–2015, and 2015–2016.

For 2016–2017, the county sheriff increase is estimated to be 2.21% in the 2016 May Revise, based on estimated growth of 2.42% in 2015–2016. The \$20 million GF augmentation included in the 2016 Budget Act is a 1.08% increase to the 2016–2017 Governor's Proposed Budget 45.10 (0150010) appropriation, excluding one-time allocations and the \$20 million in funding. As a result, based on the council-approved methodology, the 1.08% GF increase would be used for calculating the 2016–2017 nonsheriff's security allocation adjustment, as it is lower than the 2.21% sheriff-estimated growth. This equates to a \$412,000 increase for those courts with nonsheriff's security allocations that did not receive an increase through the BCP (see Attachment H, column D).

#### **Recommendation 4: 2016–2017 WAFM Allocation Adjustments**

4. Allocate each court's share of a net allocation increase of \$19.6 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund using the 2016–2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) consisting of a reallocation of 40 percent (\$576.2 million) and an additional \$233.8 million of courts' historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, reallocation of \$214.2 million in new funding provided from 2013–2014 through 2015–2016 for general court operations, and allocation of \$19.6 million in new funding provided in 2016–2017 for general court operations (see Attachment A, column 6).

#### **Previous council action**

On April 26, 2013, the council adopted a policy to phase in the use of WAFM for reallocating courts' historical WAFM base funding, as of the end of 2012–2013, over a five-year period starting in 2013–2014, in which 50 percent of historical funding would be reallocated according to WAFM by 2017–2018. For 2016–2017, 40 percent of courts' historical base funding would be subject to reallocation based on WAFM. The council adopted an exception to the phase-in of reallocation of historical funding in years when new funding for general court operations was provided. In such years, additional historical funding, above and beyond the phase-in level and up to the level of the new funding amount, would be reallocated.

The council adopted a number of revisions to the WAFM on February 20, 2014. To determine funding need for courts whose WAFM workload need is less than 50 full-time equivalents (FTEs), the council adopted using the most current three-year average salary data to determine each court's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) salary adjustment and adopted a per-FTE dollar

allotment floor that is the median, BLS-adjusted, average FTE dollar allotment; the council eliminated the “cluster 1” courts’ exemption from having their historical base allocations reallocated using the WAFM. At its June 25–26, 2015 business meeting, the council approved both the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) recommendation to use an interim complex civil case weight for use in the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model for purposes of FY 2015–2016 budget allocations and the TCBAC recommendation to reduce the \$90.6 million of new funding provided in the 2015 Budget Act by the existing \$22.7 million revenue shortfall before allocating the monies using the WAFM. The 2016–2017 WAFM computation reflects the modifications to the calculation of the WAFM operating expenses and equipment (OE&E) per full-time equivalent (FTE) amounts that were approved by the council on April 15, 2016. It also reflects an update to the RAS model FTE need parameters as approved by the WAAC on April 28, 2016.

#### **Rationale for recommendation 4**

The allocation adjustments reflect the current WAFM, which incorporates the revisions adopted by the council on February 20, 2014, June 25–26, 2015, and April 15, 2016, and allocates funding as directed by Judicial Council action on June 26, 2015. The 2016–2017 WAFM is updated to include 2015–2016 Schedule 7A salary and benefit budgets (as of July 1, 2015), average filings from 2012–2013 to 2014–2015, three-year average salary data from 2012 to 2014 from the BLS, three-year average OE&E data from 2012–2013 to 2014–2015 from courts’ fourth quarter Quarterly Financial Statements, and 2014–2015 AB 1058 child support grant reimbursement data (see Attachment I).

As noted in the narrative for recommendation 3, at its July 28, 2015 business meeting, the Judicial Council directed that beginning in FY 2016–2017 and beyond, if any new General Fund augmentation for general trial court operations is received, courts with court-provided (nonsheriff) security since 2010–2011 would be provided funding based on the lesser of the growth funding percentage that the county sheriff received or the General Fund augmentation percentage increased. As a result, those courts that did not receive a funding increase through the 2016–2017 BCP will receive a 1.08% increase—the General Fund augmentation percentage increase—to their security allocations equaling \$411,942 from the \$20 million General Fund increase provided in the 2016 Budget Act. An allocation of each court’s share of a net allocation increase of \$19.6 million (\$20.0 million less \$0.4 million for security) is provided by using the 2016–2017 WAFM to (1) reallocate 40 percent (\$576.2 million) and an additional \$233.8 million of courts’ historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, (2) reallocate \$214.2 million in new funding provided from 2013–2014 through 2015–2016 for general court operations, and (3) allocate \$19.6 million in new funding provided in 2016–2017 for general court operations.

Attachment K displays the various WAFM allocation adjustments by court, which net to a total of \$19.6 million, as displayed in column R. Column G displays the net reallocation of 40 percent (\$576.2 million) of courts’ historical base funding using the current WAFM. Column P displays

the reversal of the reallocation of 30 percent of courts' historical base funding that was allocated on an ongoing basis in 2015–2016. The sum of columns G and P provides the net change that is being reallocated in 2016–2017 due to the phase-in of WAFM. Columns J and N display the updated net reallocation of \$214.2 million in historical base funding using the current WAFM and the updated allocation of \$214.2 million in new 2013–2014 through 2015–2016 funding, respectively. Column Q displays the reversal of the ongoing allocations made in 2015–2016 related to the \$214.2 million. The sum of columns J, N, and Q provides the net change in the \$214.2 million that is being allocated in 2016–2017. Column M displays the net reallocation of \$19.6 million in historical base funding. Column O displays the allocation of \$19.6 million in new funding for general court operations provided in 2016–2017.

Other attachments provide detail underlying the information displayed in Attachments I and K. Attachments J1, J2, and J3 provide detail related to the RAS workload/FTE need, BLS factor, and FTE allotment factor, respectively, displayed in Attachment I. Attachment K1 provides the details of courts' historical WAFM-related base allocations of the \$1.44 billion that is used in Attachment K. Attachments L and M provide a summary and detailed comparison of changes in WAFM need and its components by court and cluster from FY 2015–2016 to FY 2016–2017.

### **Recommendation 5: 2016–2017 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment**

5. Allocate each court's share of the 2016–2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology funding-floor allocation adjustment, which includes that funding-floor allocations for six courts receive a total of \$400,562 in floor adjustments and that all other courts are allocated a reduction totaling \$400,562, for a net-zero total allocation (see Attachment A, column 7).

#### **Previous council action**

At its February 20, 2014, meeting, for allocating trial court base funding for court operations, the council established an absolute funding floor (\$750,000 in FY 2015–2016) and a graduated funding floor that is based on a court's WAFM funding need (\$875,000, \$1,250,000, and \$1,875,000 in FY 2015–2016); and funded the funding-floor allocation by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor.

#### **Rationale for recommendation 5**

Each court's share of the 2016–2017 WAFM funding-floor allocation adjustment is based on the policy adopted by the council on February 20, 2014. Six courts receive a total of \$400,562 in floor adjustments and all other courts are allocated a reduction totaling \$400,562, for a net-zero total allocation.

The allocation adjustment for each court is displayed in Attachment A (summary table) and Attachment N (columns C and E). The funding-floor allocations that six courts received are

displayed in column C of Attachment N. As displayed in Attachment O1, two courts were eligible for the absolute funding-floor level of \$750,000, one court for the graduated level of \$1,250,000, and three courts for the graduated level of \$1,874,999. The funding-floor adjustment for courts that did not receive a funding-floor allocation is displayed in column E of Attachment N. Attachment O1 displays whether or not a court is eligible for a funding-floor adjustment and, if a court is eligible, what the maximum funding-floor amount is for the court. Attachment O2 displays each court's 2015–2016 WAFM-related base allocation. Attachment O3 displays each court's 2016–2017 WAFM-related base allocation before and after any funding-floor adjustment.

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

6. Approve a preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$10.3 million to 20 courts that are projecting the portion of their 2015–2016 ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent fund balance cap to exceed the cap by \$10.3 million, as required by statute (see Attachment A, column 8).

#### **Previous council action**

At its July 29, 2014 business meeting, to assist the council in complying with Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A), the Judicial Council approved an annual process, starting in 2015–2016, for courts to provide preliminary and final computations of the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap:

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

#### **Rationale for recommendation 6**

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the council to make a preliminary allocation reduction in July of each fiscal year (see Attachment P) and a final allocation reduction before February of each fiscal year to offset the amount of reserves (or fund balance) in excess of the amount authorized by Government Code section 77203 to be carried over from one year to the next beginning June 30, 2014. The reductions reflect the calculated preliminary allocation reduction amounts provided by the courts on the 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form (see Attachment Q).

\$6.4 million of the reductions relate to requests from 13 courts under the Judicial Council–adopted process that allows courts to request funding reduced as a result of a court’s exceeding the 1 percent fund balance cap, to be retained in the Trial Court Trust Fund for the benefit of that court. Requests from 11 of the courts have already been approved with 2 court requests submitted for the Judicial Council’s consideration at today’s, July 29, 2016 business meeting. Four courts did not submit preliminary fund balance information as of July 19, 2016.

### **Recommendation 7: Allocation for Criminal Justice Realignment Costs**

7. Approve a one-time allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs from the Trial Court Trust Fund based on the most current, available postrelease community supervision (PRCS) and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council’s Criminal Justice Services office pursuant to Penal Code section 13155 (each court’s percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole) (see Attachment A, column 9).

### **Previous council action**

In fiscal years 2011–2012 and 2012–2013, the funding provided in the Budget Act to address costs related to the Criminal Justice Realignment Act of 2011 was allocated to the trial courts based on each court’s percentage of the total estimated petitions for revocation, as estimated by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Based on the recommendation of the TCBAC, the funding was split in FY 2013–2014 into two equal amounts with the first half being allocated in July 2013 based on the same methodology as previous allocations, and the second half in February 2014 using a methodology that incorporated equally both population (each court’s percentage of the statewide population of individuals on PRCS and parole) and workload (each court’s percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole). The Judicial Council approved the TCBAC’s recommendation for the FY 2014–2015 criminal realignment allocation that it should be split into two equal amounts with the first half being allocated in July 2014 using the same population and workload methodology, but that the second half in January 2015 be allocated based solely on workload related to PRCS and parole.

At the Judicial Council’s July 28, 2015 business meeting, the council approved the TCBAC recommendation of a one-time FY 2015–2016 allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs based on the most current available PRCS and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council’s Criminal Justice Services office pursuant to Penal Code section 13155—each court’s percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole.

### **Rationale for recommendation 7**

Each court's share of the 2016–2017 criminal justice realignment funding is based on each court's percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole from January 1, 2015, to December 31, 2015, consistent with the methodology adopted by the council on July 28, 2015 (see Attachment R).

### **Recommendation 8: Allocation for Proposition 47 Workload Costs**

8. Approve a one-time allocation of \$21.4 million in new funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for Prop. 47–related workload costs in the following manner:
  - a. Allocate \$10.7 million based on each court's share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from October 1, 2015, to March 31, 2016, with funding to be distributed in August 2016 (see Attachment A, column 10); and
  - b. Allocate \$10.7 million based on each court's share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from April 1, 2016, to September 30, 2016, with funding to be distributed in January 2017 (see Attachment A, column 11).

### **Previous council action**

On July 28, 2015, the Judicial Council approved the TCBAC's recommendation for the 2015–2016 allocation of \$26.9 million in new funding as follows<sup>4</sup>:

- a. Allocate \$6.73 million based on each court's share of the 10-year average of statewide felony filings;
- b. Allocate \$6.73 million based on each court's share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from November 5, 2014, to May 31, 2015; and
- c. Allocate \$13.45 million based on each court's share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from June 1, 2015, to November 30, 2015, with funding to be distributed in January 2016.

### **Rationale for recommendation 8**

The TCBAC recommends the funding should be allocated in two distributions to ensure that the most accurate and timely data is used in the distribution. This will ensure that newer workload associated with processing juvenile Prop. 47 relief cases are included<sup>5</sup> and correct for fluctuations in data related to early Prop. 47 implementation and data collection challenges.

The California Department of Finance (DOF) requested information from the Judicial Council regarding the impact of Prop. 47 on the courts in 2016–2017. In response to this request in December 2015, Judicial Council staff submitted a Budget Change Proposal on December 31,

---

<sup>4</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., mins. (July 28, 2015), p. 5; see [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150728-minutes.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150728-minutes.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> *Alejandro N. v. Superior Court of San Diego County* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1209, (review denied Oct. 14, 2015), found that both the sentence reduction provisions and offense reclassification provisions of Prop. 47 apply to juvenile offenders. Prior to that decision, Prop. 47 jurisdiction over juveniles was uncertain.

2015, requesting \$21.4 million. The trial courts needed \$13.8 million more than the original 2016–2017 allocation of \$7.6 million, for a total of \$21.4 million in 2016–2017. This was based on updated information which reflects that as of June 30, 2015, the courts received over 165,000 petitions for Prop. 47 relief.<sup>6</sup> Courts redirected resources in order to process these cases. The 2015–2016 augmentation assisted the courts by mitigating many of the workload effects of the proposition implementation, but additional help was needed for 2016–2017.

Judicial Council staff estimated prior to Prop. 47 implementation that courts would conduct approximately 120,000 resentencing hearings, which translates to approximately 1.8 million minutes of court time at a cost of \$34.5 million statewide. Subsequently, Judicial Council staff collected data on the actual number of Prop. 47 relief petitions received that indicate that the original estimate is low. The revised estimate of court time needed to process Prop. 47 cases is approximately 2.49 million minutes at a total cost of \$48.4 million statewide.

The Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee met on June 22, 2016, to consider options for the allocation of the \$21.4 million. The subcommittee considered the data collection time frames to include the allocations with the understanding that the data is now collected on a quarterly basis, and whether the funding should be distributed in one allocation or two. After considering both options, the subcommittee recommended the option of two allocations for the reasons explained above.

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

No public comments were received when the recommendations were considered by the TCBAC at its July 7, 2016 meeting.

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

The implementation requirements, costs, and operational impacts are detailed in the preceding sections.

### **Attachments**

1. Attachment A: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations
2. Attachment B: Trial Court Trust Fund—Fund Condition Statement
3. Attachment C: TCTF Judicial Council and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts  
Appropriations Allocations
4. Attachment D: FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations

---

<sup>6</sup> As of March 31, 2016, the courts have received over 235,000 Prop. 47 petitions for relief. See [http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/for-publication\\_prop-47.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/for-publication_prop-47.pdf).

5. Attachment E: 2016–2017 Beginning Base Allocation: 2015–2016 Beginning Base, 2015–2016 Base Allocations, and Annualization
6. Attachment F: Proposed Allocation of New Funding for 2015–2016 Benefit Cost Changes
7. Attachment G: Allocation of \$7.1 Million Requested for Inclusion in the 2016 Budget Act for Restored Funding for Cost Changes
8. Attachment H: FY 2016–2017 Non-Sheriff's Security Allocations
9. Attachment I: 2016–2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology
10. Attachment J1: FY 2016-17 RAS FTE Need
11. Attachment J2: 2016-17 BLS Factor
12. Attachment J3: FY 2016-17 FTE Allotment Factor
13. Attachment K: 2016–2017 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding
14. Attachment K1: Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM
15. Attachment L: Summary of Changes from 2015–2016 to 2016–2017 Total WAFM Funding Need
16. Attachment M: Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster
17. Attachment N: FY 2016–2017 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor
18. Attachment O1: Determination of Funding Floor
19. Attachment O2: Estimated FY 2015–2016 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
20. Attachment O3: Estimated FY 2016–2017 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
21. Attachment P: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap
22. Attachment Q: 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form
23. Attachment R: Allocation of \$9.2 Million of Criminal Justice Realignment Funding
24. Attachment S: Two Distributions of \$10.7 Million Based on Most Recent Proposition 47 Petitions and Applications



## Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2a	Recommendation 2b	Recommendation 3a	Recommendation 3b	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 5	Recommendation 6	Recommendation 7	Recommendation 8a	Recommendation 8b	Total	
Preliminary 2016-2017 Base Allocation (TCTF and GF)	Estimated 2015-16 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2012-13 & 2013-14 Previously Unfunded Benefits Costs Allocation	Non-Sheriff's Security Non-BCP Funding	Non-Sheriff's Security BCP Funding	2016-17 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2016-17 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment	Preliminary Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	Criminal Justice Realignment	Proposition 47 Funding (1st Half)	Proposition 47 Funding (2nd Half)		
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Alameda	74,815,021	645,929	795,745	34,322	-	(436,743)	(16,517)	(2,015,955)	237,286	338,212	pending	74,397,300
Alpine	745,696	(17,093)	3,088	-	-	(19,759)	35,931	(201,656)	-	-	pending	546,206
Amador	2,171,075	41,319	11,783	-	-	59,048	(532)	-	6,114	8,713	pending	2,297,520
Butte	9,446,395	211,906	78,377	5,045	-	375,299	(2,180)	(11,112)	71,071	57,821	pending	10,232,621
Calaveras	2,049,274	74,133	22,634	-	-	22,043	(507)	-	3,821	6,072	pending	2,177,471
Colusa	1,684,618	24,213	7,914	-	-	(17,236)	160,044	-	3,821	528	pending	1,863,903
Contra Costa	39,984,640	(783,109)	504,413	-	-	(807,633)	(8,738)	(881,244)	83,872	112,737	pending	38,204,938
Del Norte	2,469,730	59,258	22,599	-	-	82,386	(587)	(100,344)	7,833	8,977	pending	2,549,852
El Dorado	6,570,654	98,371	9,371	-	-	(34,774)	(1,520)	(1,593)	35,536	30,891	pending	6,706,936
Fresno	44,631,873	252,326	456,561	-	-	2,960,295	(11,030)	-	371,404	340,324	pending	49,001,752
Glenn	1,854,657	27,501	11,899	106	-	(94,502)	63,519	(90,000)	2,802	5,280	pending	1,781,261
Humboldt	5,949,966	56,493	67,869	1,812	-	173,992	(1,388)	-	39,166	17,425	pending	6,305,335
Imperial	8,220,423	120,442	101,174	4,541	-	174,720	(1,872)	-	32,670	21,650	pending	8,673,747
Inyo	2,018,391	38,621	16,191	2,016	-	(36,939)	(436)	-	1,719	528	pending	2,040,092
Kern	41,796,192	988,357	272,793	708	-	3,029,898	(10,404)	(1,614,583)	308,166	1,149,022	pending	45,920,148
Kings	6,360,982	48,872	10,949	4,557	-	349,995	(1,427)	-	58,080	69,966	pending	6,901,973
Lake	3,190,914	35,981	1,582	2,122	-	95,340	(721)	(84,253)	12,609	12,673	pending	3,266,248
Lassen	2,254,864	16,783	2,759	3,173	-	(24,851)	(458)	(132,148)	4,967	7,921	pending	2,133,011
Los Angeles	519,922,911	(1,336,025)	5,984,546	154,380	-	6,939,407	(115,500)	-	3,471,211	2,614,341	pending	537,635,271
Madera	7,221,663	241,857	22,490	4,119	-	219,947	(1,711)	-	41,840	21,386	pending	7,771,592
Marin	12,159,405	221,932	177,317	104	-	(519,030)	(2,806)	-	15,284	36,963	pending	12,089,169
Mariposa	1,147,064	2,134	1,761	-	-	(25,442)	(262)	-	2,484	2,640	pending	1,130,378
Mendocino	5,050,187	188,392	116,313	3,233	-	137,568	(1,208)	-	29,422	-	pending	5,523,907
Merced	11,438,096	154,519	153,398	-	-	227,209	(2,697)	(298,878)	99,729	31,419	pending	11,802,795
Modoc	925,607	10,777	1,753	9	-	(55,866)	(206)	-	764	-	pending	882,838
Mono	1,552,463	11,291	5,599	261	-	33,841	107,760	-	382	2,376	pending	1,713,974
Monterey	16,380,107	361,192	130,795	9,396	-	564,039	(3,808)	(51,915)	42,222	36,699	pending	17,468,727
Napa	7,112,089	106,421	89,880	3,192	-	164,861	(1,587)	(113,793)	14,010	-	pending	7,375,074
Nevada	4,853,867	99,540	59,490	4,681	-	(87,424)	(980)	-	6,496	4,488	pending	4,940,159
Orange	139,551,260	66,411	2,860,993	29,525	-	(1,851,991)	(31,299)	(857,269)	386,688	741,900	pending	140,896,218
Placer	14,614,478	253,075	140,675	-	-	547,583	(3,419)	(272,716)	30,759	29,834	pending	15,340,269
Plumas	1,259,920	12,766	2,974	-	-	(41,600)	4,938	-	1,911	264	pending	1,241,173
Riverside	79,176,844	1,454,359	812,595	20,860	-	2,225,921	(18,537)	-	813,878	347,980	pending	84,833,901
Sacramento	74,820,341	(1,032,400)	1,136,127	20,136	-	(69,047)	(16,579)	(1,810,775)	160,101	107,721	pending	73,315,625
San Benito	2,422,410	32,176	8,330	-	-	(104,676)	(551)	-	9,170	5,808	pending	2,372,668
San Bernardino	88,845,149	2,087,322	659,482	35,310	-	2,446,434	(20,474)	-	804,899	665,598	pending	95,523,720
San Diego	135,183,257	1,021,966	2,038,142	7,098	-	(2,953,490)	(30,342)	-	492,530	493,984	pending	136,253,146
San Francisco	57,691,927	(1,316,245)	739,779	-	-	(350,192)	(13,130)	-	54,641	71,286	pending	56,878,066
San Joaquin	30,540,492	424,617	264,991	3,108	-	1,772,837	(7,450)	-	166,979	526,195	pending	33,691,768
San Luis Obispo	13,138,220	60,624	60,453	2,610	-	(4,685)	(2,902)	-	62,474	49,636	pending	13,366,430
San Mateo	34,195,508	54,150	298,280	4,785	-	(174,732)	(7,682)	-	30,568	695,961	pending	35,096,838
Santa Barbara	20,991,085	50,020	60,324	11,395	-	427,936	(4,669)	(522,282)	77,185	48,580	pending	21,139,574
Santa Clara	74,878,764	606,490	408,201	-	-	(165,418)	(17,232)	-	125,903	294,384	pending	76,131,090
Santa Cruz	11,177,032	238,885	76,312	-	-	166,897	(2,614)	-	30,568	208,577	pending	11,895,659

## Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2a	Recommendation 2b	Recommendation 3a	Recommendation 3b	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 5	Recommendation 6	Recommendation 7	Recommendation 8a	Recommendation 8b	
	Preliminary 2016-2017 Base Allocation (TCTF and GF)	Estimated 2015-16 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2012-13 & 2013-14 Previously Unfunded Benefits Costs Allocation	Non-Sheriff's Security Non-BCP Funding	Non-Sheriff's Security BCP Funding	2016-17 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2016-17 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment	Preliminary Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	Criminal Justice Realignment	Proposition 47 Funding (1st Half)	Proposition 47 Funding (2nd Half)	Total
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Shasta	11,770,943	235,389	90,993	-	272,635	348,727	(2,276)	-	85,209	83,959	pending	12,885,579
Sierra	744,799	9,323	4,422	-	-	(39,021)	28,370	-	764	-	pending	748,656
Siskiyou	3,015,299	137,750	29,388	-	-	(162,978)	(672)	(29,481)	11,654	2,904	pending	3,003,865
Solano	19,418,119	597,865	245,864	4,702	-	(10,465)	(4,488)	-	112,338	123,562	pending	20,487,498
Sonoma	23,118,451	63,956	305,073	4,752	-	(409,145)	(5,158)	(842,106)	104,696	54,916	pending	22,395,436
Stanislaus	19,725,272	95,213	404,982	101	-	752,566	(4,784)	-	88,839	242,636	pending	21,304,825
Sutter	4,502,072	34,036	35,710	2,668	-	276,084	(1,076)	(347,495)	17,577	-	pending	4,519,577
Tehama	3,468,896	54,682	12,296	-	-	174,873	(866)	-	17,959	12,673	pending	3,740,513
Trinity	1,684,534	10,086	9,880	-	69,871	65,685	(308)	-	2,675	2,904	pending	1,845,328
Tulare	15,626,610	410,850	51,104	168	-	1,112,551	(3,937)	-	78,140	136,235	pending	17,411,722
Tuolumne	2,980,842	91,053	9,519	2,382	-	72,658	(664)	-	5,349	20,858	pending	3,181,996
Ventura	32,147,570	450,232	268,090	16,839	-	1,092,944	(7,430)	-	362,615	529,363	pending	34,860,223
Yolo	8,577,273	123,356	83,319	6,295	-	405,133	(1,944)	-	41,649	254,517	pending	9,489,598
Yuba	3,688,250	122,050	32,747	1,432	-	586,977	(1,000)	-	40,503	8,713	pending	4,479,671
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,772,934,442</b>	<b>8,452,388</b>	<b>20,292,088</b>	<b>411,942</b>	<b>342,506</b>	<b>19,588,058</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(10,279,597)</b>	<b>9,223,000</b>	<b>10,700,000</b>	<b>10,700,000</b>	<b>1,842,364,828</b>

## Trial Court Trust Fund -- Fund Condition Statement

#	Description	FY 2014-15 (Year End Financial Statement)	FY 2015-16 (Estimated)	FY 2016-17 (Estimated)	FY 2017-18 (Estimated)
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D
1	Beginning Balance	21,218,232	6,614,017	24,170,507	25,308,871
2	Prior-Year Adjustments	5,624,798	6,965,354	-	-
3	<b>Adjusted Beginning Fund Balance</b>	<b>26,843,030</b>	<b>13,579,371</b>	<b>24,170,507</b>	<b>25,308,871</b>
4	Revenue	1,341,324,951	1,286,787,373	1,279,239,688	1,330,399,506
5	<i>Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>	<i>659,050,502</i>
6	<i>Civil Fee Revenue</i>	<i>355,952,541</i>	<i>360,155,277</i>	<i>355,903,523</i>	<i>347,426,760</i>
7	<i>Court Operations Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>139,931,778</i>	<i>114,747,955</i>	<i>107,352,371</i>	<i>131,519,771</i>
8	<i>Civil Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>159,372,012</i>	<i>125,982,647</i>	<i>130,260,171</i>	<i>165,473,655</i>
9	<i>Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue</i>	<i>24,994,594</i>	<i>24,685,754</i>	<i>24,578,702</i>	<i>24,472,115</i>
10	<i>Interest from SMIF</i>	<i>151,376</i>	<i>272,747</i>	<i>272,747</i>	<i>272,747</i>
11	<i>Sanctions and Contempt Fines</i>	<i>1,586,715</i>	<i>1,402,426</i>	<i>1,402,426</i>	<i>1,402,426</i>
12	<i>Miscellaneous Revenue</i>	<i>285,431</i>	<i>490,065</i>	<i>419,246</i>	<i>781,530</i>
13	General Fund Transfer	922,648,255	943,724,000	1,016,691,000	960,291,000
14	General Fund Transfer - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	-	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000
15	General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	30,900,000	58,900,000	70,500,000	47,000,000
16	Reduction Offset Transfers	26,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000
17	Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements	12,678,778	13,217,422	13,217,422	13,217,422
18	<b>Total Revenue and Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements</b>	<b>2,333,631,984</b>	<b>2,423,408,794</b>	<b>2,500,428,109</b>	<b>2,471,687,927</b>
19	<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>2,360,475,014</b>	<b>2,436,988,166</b>	<b>2,524,598,616</b>	<b>2,496,996,798</b>
20	<b>Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations</b>				
21	Program 30 (0140) - Expenditures/Allocations	19,718,918	16,040,772	3,145,000	2,785,399
22	Program 30.05 (0140010) - Judicial Council (Staff)	4,095,938	3,577,143	3,145,000	2,785,399
23	Program 30.15 (0140019) - Trial Court Operations	15,622,980	12,463,629	-	-
24					
25	Program 45 (0150) - Expenditures/Allocations	2,333,437,799	2,396,485,718	2,496,144,745	2,476,628,505
26	Program 45.10 (0150010) - Support for Trial Court Operations	1,883,174,214	1,813,848,884	1,896,754,798	1,886,039,197
27	Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	-	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000
28	Program 45.25 (0150019) - Comp. of Superior Court Judges	319,803,869	333,156,000	333,449,000	333,449,000
29	Program 45.35 (0150028) - Assigned Judges	24,792,538	26,646,000	26,646,000	26,646,000
30	Program 45.45 (0150037) - Court Interpreters	96,802,928	99,599,020	103,458,000	103,559,000
31	Program 45.55 (0150046) - Grants	8,864,250	8,535,814	8,559,493	8,622,308
32	Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	-	-	12,577,453	3,613,000
33	Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	704,280	291,169	-	-
34	<b>Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations</b>	<b>2,353,860,997</b>	<b>2,412,817,659</b>	<b>2,499,289,745</b>	<b>2,479,413,904</b>
35	<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>6,614,017</b>	<b>24,170,507</b>	<b>25,308,871</b>	<b>17,582,894</b>
36					
37	<b>Fund Balance Detail</b>				
38	Restricted Fund Balance	16,294,708	12,106,481	20,611,115	20,870,773
39	<i>Emergency Needs Reserve</i>	-	-	<i>10,000,000</i>	<i>10,000,000</i>
40	<i>Court Interpreter Program</i>	<i>10,917,600</i>	<i>9,043,209</i>	<i>9,043,209</i>	<i>9,043,209</i>
41	<i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	<i>1,574,692</i>	<i>751,218</i>	<i>931,238</i>	<i>1,190,897</i>
42	<i>Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements</i>	<i>927,837</i>	<i>636,668</i>	<i>636,668</i>	<i>636,668</i>
43	<i>Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services</i>	<i>380,151</i>	-	-	-
44	<i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel</i>	<i>2,494,429</i>	<i>1,675,387</i>	-	-
45	Unrestricted Fund Balance	(9,680,691)	12,064,026	4,697,756	(3,287,879)
46					
47	<b>Revenue and Transfers Annual Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	<b>(20,229,013)</b>	<b>10,591,135</b>	<b>1,138,364</b>	<b>(7,725,977)</b>

TCTF Judicial Council and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts Appropriations Allocations

#	Project and Program Title	2015-16 JC-Approved Allocation	2015-16 Funded from Courts' Program 45.10 TCTF Allocations	2015-16 Approved Total Allocation	2016-17 Judicial Council-approved Allocations		
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C (Col A + B)	Judicial Council (Staff) <sup>1</sup>	Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	Total
					Col. D	Col. E	Col F (Col. D + E)
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	113,000		113,000	-	113,000	113,000
2	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	8,293,000		8,293,000	500,000	7,793,000	8,293,000
3	Equal Access Fund	163,000		163,000	194,000	-	194,000
4	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000		260,000	260,000	-	260,000
5	Revenue and Collections Program	625,000		625,000	625,000	-	625,000
6	<b>Programs Funded from Courts' TCTF Allocations</b>						
7	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS		644,320	644,320	-	564,000	564,000
8	California Courts Technology Center		1,472,029	1,472,029	-	1,472,000	1,472,000
9	Interim Case Management System		842,232	842,232	-	842,000	842,000
10	Phoenix Financial Services		106,434	106,434	107,000	-	107,000
11	Phoenix HR Services		1,349,000	1,349,000	1,349,000	-	1,349,000
12	Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations		524,750	524,750	-	-	-
13	<b>Total, Program/Project Allocations</b>	<b>9,454,000</b>	<b>4,938,765</b>	<b>14,392,765</b>	<b>3,035,000</b>	<b>10,784,000</b>	<b>13,819,000</b>
14	<b>Department of Motor Vehicles Amnesty Program service charges</b>	<b>250,000</b>		<b>250,000</b>	-	-	-
15	<b>Estimated State Controller's Office services charges</b>	<b>219,399</b>		<b>219,399</b>	<b>83,000</b>	-	<b>83,000</b>
17	<b>Estimated Budget Act Appropriation and Changes Using Provisional Language Authority<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3,490,100</b>	<b>13,025,000</b>	<b>16,515,100</b>
18	<b>Appropriation Balance</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>372,100</b>	<b>2,241,000</b>	<b>2,613,100</b>

1. Provisional language in the State Budget Act for 2016 allows the Judicial Council appropriation authority to be increased for support to the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot, Equal Access Fund, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections. Provisional language also allows up to \$11.274 million to be transferred to the Judicial Council appropriation authority for the recovery of costs for administrative services provided to the trial courts.

**FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts:  
Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	2015-16	2016-17	Allocations for TCBAC Consideration	Explanation for Items Not Considered
			May Revise Estimate	Budget Act		
			Col. A	Col. B		
1	<b>I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation</b>	<b>Base</b>	<b>1,614,580,055</b>	<b>1,704,515,909</b>	<b>1,717,790,706</b>	
3	<b>II. Adjustments</b>					
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-817,737	-400,067	-400,067	JC policy
6	<b>III. FY 2015-2016 Allocations</b>					
7	\$25.4 Million in FY 2014-15 Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	24,229,808			prior year
8	\$13.4 Million in FY 2013-14 Restored Benefits Funding	Non-Base	13,274,798			prior year
9	\$90.6 Million in New Funding Offset by \$22.7 Million Revenue Shortfall	Base	67,900,000			prior year
10	\$26.9 Million Proposition 47 Workload Funding	Non-Base	26,900,000			prior year
12	<b>IV. FY 2016-2017 Allocations (Governor's Budget)</b>					
13	\$8.6 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base		8,452,388	8,452,388	Item 4, B
14	\$7.5 Million in FY 2013-14 Restored Benefits Funding	Base		20,292,088	20,292,088	Item 4, B
15	\$412,000 in New Security Funding	Base		411,942	411,942	Item 4, C
16	Non-Sheriff's Security BCP Funding	Base		342,506	342,506	Item 4, C
17	\$19.6 Million in New Funding	Base		19,588,058	19,588,058	Item 4, D & E
18	\$25.0 Million in Court Innovations Grants (Total Funding for Both Trial and Appellate Courts)	Non-Base		pending		JC Budget Committee
19	\$21.4 Million in Proposition 47 Workload Funding	Non-Base		21,400,000	21,400,000	Item 3
21	<b>V. Statutory Allocation Adjustments</b>					
22	2.0% Holdback	Non-Base	-37,677,580			N/A
23	1.5% & 0.5% Emergency Funding & Unspent Funding Allocated Back to	Non-Base	37,677,580			N/A
24	1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-392,853	pending		pending - July 15
25	Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-50,000,000	-50,000,000		Budget Act
26	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000	9,223,000	Item 4, F
27	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-1,376,217	pending		JC policy
29	<b>VI. Allocation for Reimbursements</b>					
30	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	114,700,000	114,700,000		
31	Jury	Non-Base	14,500,000	14,500,000		JC approved
32	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000	2,286,000		JC approved
33	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000	2,500,000		JC approved
34	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000	332,000		JC approved
35	CSA Audits <sup>1</sup>	Non-Base	325,000	0		JC approved
36	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement Rollover	Non-Base	782,231	pending		JC approved
37	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement	Non-Base	872,692	751,217		JC approved

**FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts:  
Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	2015-16	2016-17	Allocations for TCBAC Consideration	Explanation for Items Not Considered
			May Revise Estimate	Budget Act		
			Col. A	Col. B		
39	<b>VII. Estimated Revenue Distributions</b>					
40	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	77,679,917	81,957,442		JC policy
41	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	22,191,753	22,151,825		statutory
42	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494	10,907,494		statutory
43	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	3,358,433	3,348,619		JC policy/statute
44	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,564,426	2,556,538		JC policy
45	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	943,840		JC policy/statute
46	Prior Year Revenues	Non-Base	15,983	0		JC policy/statute
48	<b>VIII. Miscellaneous Charges</b>					
49	Repayment of Prior Year Cash Advance	Non-Base	-24,670,650			Non-allocation
50	State Admin Infrastructure Charges Prior Year Adjustment	Non-Base	482,279			JC policy
51	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-4,909,732	-4,306,000		JC policy
52	Prior Year Facility Payments Charge Adjustments	Non-Base	166,364			JC policy
53	<b>Total</b>		<b>1,928,548,884</b>	<b>1,986,454,798</b>	<b>1,797,100,621</b>	
55	Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriation Budget Act <sup>2</sup>		1,998,579,000	2,047,487,000		
56	Transfer to Compensation of Superior Court Judges appropriation due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships		-4,949,000			
57	Transfer to Court Interpreters appropriation due to court interpreter portion of \$42.8 million for new benefits funding		-1,766,000			
59	<b>Adjusted Appropriation</b>		<b>1,991,864,000</b>	<b>2,047,487,000</b>		
61	<b>Estimated Remaining Appropriation</b>		<b>63,315,116</b>	<b>61,032,202</b>		

1 Provision 12 of the 2015 Budget Act requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits.

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

## 2016-2017 Beginning Base Allocation: 2015-2016 Beginning Base, 2015-2016 Base Allocations, and Annualization

	Beginning 2015-2016 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	WAFM Allocation	WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	2014-15 Benefits Funding	TCTF Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Ending 2015-2016 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (2010- 11 and 2011-12)	Annualization of Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Preliminary Beginning Base in 2016-2017
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6 = Sum of 1 to 5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9 = Sum of 6 to 8</b>
Alameda	72,438,839	(1,264,416)	(23,470)	562,020	-	71,712,974	3,102,047	-	74,815,021
Alpine	727,493	(44,027)	36,601	5,289	-	725,356	20,340	-	745,696
Amador	2,086,181	18,171	(726)	15,693	-	2,119,319	51,756	-	2,171,075
Butte	8,837,870	418,401	(2,905)	68,952	-	9,322,318	124,077	-	9,446,395
Calaveras	1,943,653	25,667	(691)	30,138	-	1,998,768	50,506	-	2,049,274
Colusa	1,510,299	11,496	127,447	10,604	-	1,659,845	24,773	-	1,684,618
Contra Costa	36,351,158	1,659,325	(12,908)	590,873	-	38,588,448	1,396,192	-	39,984,640
Del Norte	2,395,840	(92,520)	(791)	73,071	-	2,375,600	94,130	-	2,469,730
El Dorado	6,129,016	140,211	(2,148)	90,455	-	6,357,534	213,120	-	6,570,654
Fresno	36,317,187	3,407,730	(14,653)	1,581,245	-	41,291,509	3,340,364	-	44,631,873
Glenn	1,808,349	(109,604)	69,935	31,311	-	1,799,992	54,665	-	1,854,657
Humboldt	5,567,578	264,310	(1,900)	46,895	-	5,876,882	73,084	-	5,949,966
Imperial	7,516,498	485,034	(2,573)	95,925	-	8,094,884	125,539	-	8,220,423
Inyo	1,996,477	(50,400)	3,850	(7,122)	-	1,942,805	75,586	-	2,018,391
Kern	33,743,176	4,739,894	(13,527)	(217,620)	-	38,251,923	3,544,269	-	41,796,192
Kings	5,956,575	331,857	(1,910)	29,342	-	6,315,864	45,118	-	6,360,982
Lake	3,199,899	(50,322)	(987)	33,201	-	3,181,791	9,123	-	3,190,914
Lassen	2,259,875	(18,996)	(657)	6,803	-	2,247,025	7,839	-	2,254,864
Los Angeles	467,859,807	26,818,347	(163,090)	7,896,395	(1,128,690)	501,282,769	18,887,969	(247,827)	519,922,911
Madera	6,348,235	267,872	(2,290)	223,020	-	6,836,837	384,826	-	7,221,663
Marin	12,313,085	(715,208)	(4,090)	(78,894)	-	11,514,893	644,512	-	12,159,405
Mariposa	1,049,471	15,835	54,687	4,769	-	1,124,763	22,301	-	1,147,064
Mendocino	4,557,139	126,710	(1,607)	56,174	-	4,738,416	311,771	-	5,050,187
Merced	9,914,474	590,591	(3,718)	161,921	-	10,663,269	774,827	-	11,438,096
Modoc	900,123	(15,665)	(309)	9,491	-	893,640	31,967	-	925,607
Mono	1,338,300	(8,570)	126,524	10,568	-	1,466,822	85,641	-	1,552,463
Monterey	15,271,747	630,401	(5,124)	205,587	-	16,102,611	277,496	-	16,380,107
Napa	6,583,023	224,679	(2,173)	(3,237)	-	6,802,293	309,796	-	7,112,089
Nevada	4,687,440	(7,657)	(1,394)	79,983	-	4,758,372	95,495	-	4,853,867
Orange	126,892,239	2,324,353	(45,022)	3,449,769	-	132,621,339	6,929,921	-	139,551,260
Placer	12,925,172	974,682	(4,604)	84,431	-	13,979,681	634,797	-	14,614,478
Plumas	1,357,701	(114,763)	(421)	2,474	-	1,244,991	14,929	-	1,259,920
Riverside	72,072,647	6,856,320	(25,208)	(650,572)	-	78,253,187	923,657	-	79,176,844
Sacramento	67,293,541	3,657,752	(23,950)	332,406	-	71,259,749	3,560,592	-	74,820,341

## 2016-2017 Beginning Base Allocation: 2015-2016 Beginning Base, 2015-2016 Base Allocations, and Annualization

	Beginning 2015-2016 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	WAFM Allocation	WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	2014-15 Benefits Funding	TCTF Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Ending 2015-2016 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (2010- 11 and 2011-12)	Annualization of Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Preliminary Beginning Base in 2016-2017
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6 = Sum of 1 to 5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9 = Sum of 6 to 8</b>
San Benito	2,458,182	(91,160)	(810)	21,556	-	<b>2,387,768</b>	34,642	-	<b>2,422,410</b>
San Bernardino	79,329,723	6,757,237	(27,713)	1,521,168	-	<b>87,580,416</b>	1,264,733	-	<b>88,845,149</b>
San Diego	128,840,017	1,471,869	(43,501)	2,061,274	-	<b>132,329,658</b>	2,853,599	-	<b>135,183,257</b>
San Francisco	51,250,749	341,981	(19,228)	631,291	-	<b>52,204,792</b>	5,487,135	-	<b>57,691,927</b>
San Joaquin	26,262,051	2,224,751	(9,901)	818,234	-	<b>29,295,135</b>	1,245,357	-	<b>30,540,492</b>
San Luis Obispo	12,345,167	497,227	(4,103)	972	-	<b>12,839,262</b>	298,958	-	<b>13,138,220</b>
San Mateo	30,954,404	477,303	(10,796)	363,484	-	<b>31,784,395</b>	2,411,113	-	<b>34,195,508</b>
Santa Barbara	18,963,060	209,451	(6,510)	227,423	-	<b>19,393,423</b>	1,597,662	-	<b>20,991,085</b>
Santa Clara	73,626,361	(2,883,909)	(24,455)	1,851,301	-	<b>72,569,297</b>	2,309,467	-	<b>74,878,764</b>
Santa Cruz	10,519,150	371,304	(3,603)	86,623	-	<b>10,973,474</b>	203,558	-	<b>11,177,032</b>
Shasta	10,844,018	532,744	(3,053)	135,012	-	<b>11,508,721</b>	262,222	-	<b>11,770,943</b>
Sierra	738,243	(44,895)	38,053	3,781	-	<b>735,183</b>	9,616	-	<b>744,799</b>
Siskiyou	3,039,649	(154,682)	(968)	40,262	-	<b>2,924,261</b>	91,038	-	<b>3,015,299</b>
Solano	18,224,539	750,033	(6,207)	95,975	-	<b>19,064,340</b>	353,779	-	<b>19,418,119</b>
Sonoma	20,518,574	609,606	(7,452)	825,673	-	<b>21,946,401</b>	1,172,050	-	<b>23,118,451</b>
Stanislaus	17,251,929	1,464,546	(6,521)	(289,912)	-	<b>18,420,042</b>	1,305,230	-	<b>19,725,272</b>
Sutter	4,012,547	302,731	(1,431)	28,465	-	<b>4,342,311</b>	159,761	-	<b>4,502,072</b>
Tehama	3,078,188	210,687	(1,160)	72,996	-	<b>3,360,712</b>	108,184	-	<b>3,468,896</b>
Trinity	1,524,852	(35,061)	103,171	37,893	-	<b>1,630,855</b>	53,679	-	<b>1,684,534</b>
Tulare	14,330,707	1,113,228	(5,107)	353,922	(92,549)	<b>15,700,201</b>	33,744	(107,335)	<b>15,626,610</b>
Tuolumne	2,879,651	(13,277)	(894)	65,010	-	<b>2,930,490</b>	50,352	-	<b>2,980,842</b>
Ventura	29,181,161	1,719,233	(10,082)	288,505	-	<b>31,178,817</b>	968,753	-	<b>32,147,570</b>
Yolo	7,983,099	438,940	(2,736)	147,776	(154,978)	<b>8,412,102</b>	210,077	(44,906)	<b>8,577,273</b>
Yuba	3,456,186	132,620	(1,191)	9,769	-	<b>3,597,383</b>	90,867	-	<b>3,688,250</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,613,762,317</b>	<b>67,900,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24,229,808</b>	<b>(1,376,217)</b>	<b>1,704,515,908</b>	<b>68,818,601</b>	<b>(400,067)</b>	<b>1,772,934,442</b>



## Proposed Allocation of New Funding for 2015-2016 Benefit Cost Changes

Court	2015-2016 Total Benefit Cost Changes 2016 Spring DOF Submission <sup>1</sup>			2015-2016 Total Benefit Cost Changes 2016 Spring Submission for Inclusion in 2016 Budget Act <sup>1</sup>		
	Total Non-Interpreter Cost Changes	Total Interpreter Cost Changes	Total Cost Changes as of 2016 Spring Request	Total Confirmed Non-Interpreter Cost Changes	Total Confirmed Interpreter Cost Changes	Proposed Allocation of Total Confirmed Cost Changes (D + E)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alameda	645,929	13,513	659,443	645,929	13,513	659,443
Alpine	(17,093)	-	(17,093)	(17,093)	-	(17,093)
Amador	41,319	-	41,319	41,319	-	41,319
Butte	211,906	-	211,906	211,906	-	211,906
Calaveras	74,133	-	74,133	74,133	-	74,133
Colusa	24,213	-	24,213	24,213	-	24,213
Contra Costa	(783,109)	(32,585)	(815,694)	(783,109)	(32,585)	(815,694)
Del Norte	59,258	-	59,258	59,258	-	59,258
El Dorado	98,371	2,193	100,564	98,371	2,193	100,564
Fresno	252,326	11,253	263,580	252,326	11,253	263,580
Glenn	27,501	-	27,501	27,501	-	27,501
Humboldt	56,493	-	56,493	56,493	-	56,493
Imperial <sup>2</sup>	120,442	3,350	123,792	120,442	3,350	123,792
Inyo	38,621	-	38,621	38,621	-	38,621
Kern	988,357	51,279	1,039,636	988,357	51,279	1,039,636
Kings	48,872	2,010	50,882	48,872	2,010	50,882
Lake	35,981	-	35,981	35,981	-	35,981
Lassen	16,783	-	16,783	16,783	-	16,783
Los Angeles	(1,336,025)	(169,325)	(1,505,350)	(1,336,025)	(169,325)	(1,505,350)
Madera	241,857	10,845	252,703	241,857	10,845	252,703
Marin	221,932	5,597	227,529	221,932	5,597	227,529
Mariposa <sup>2</sup>	2,134	-	2,134	2,134	-	2,134
Mendocino	188,392	(1,151)	187,241	188,392	(1,151)	187,241
Merced	154,519	6,081	160,600	154,519	6,081	160,600
Modoc	10,777	-	10,777	10,777	-	10,777
Mono	11,291	-	11,291	11,291	-	11,291
Monterey	361,192	16,576	377,768	361,192	16,576	377,768
Napa	106,421	4,950	111,371	106,421	4,950	111,371
Nevada	99,540	-	99,540	99,540	-	99,540
Orange	66,411	(3,280)	63,131	66,411	(3,280)	63,131
Placer	253,075	1,417	254,493	253,075	1,417	254,493
Plumas	12,766	-	12,766	12,766	-	12,766
Riverside	1,454,359	35,495	1,489,853	1,454,359	35,495	1,489,853
Sacramento	(1,032,400)	(36,736)	(1,069,136)	(1,032,400)	(36,736)	(1,069,136)
San Benito	32,176	-	32,176	32,176	-	32,176
San Bernardino <sup>2</sup>	2,087,322	100,137	2,187,459	2,087,322	100,137	2,187,459
San Diego	1,021,966	37,916	1,059,882	1,021,966	37,916	1,059,882
San Francisco	(1,316,245)	4,118	(1,312,127)	(1,316,245)	4,118	(1,312,127)
San Joaquin	424,617	9,681	434,297	424,617	9,681	434,297
San Luis Obispo	60,624	1,901	62,524	60,624	1,901	62,524
San Mateo	54,150	(4,299)	49,851	54,150	(4,299)	49,851
Santa Barbara	50,020	1,126	51,146	50,020	1,126	51,146
Santa Clara	606,490	22,193	628,683	606,490	22,193	628,683
Santa Cruz	238,885	13,057	251,942	238,885	13,057	251,942
Shasta	235,389	-	235,389	235,389	-	235,389
Sierra	9,323	-	9,323	9,323	-	9,323
Siskiyou	137,750	-	137,750	137,750	-	137,750
Solano	597,865	15,036	612,901	597,865	15,036	612,901
Sonoma	63,956	(1,422)	62,534	63,956	(1,422)	62,534
Stanislaus	95,213	1,321	96,535	95,213	1,321	96,535
Sutter	34,036	924	34,960	34,036	924	34,960
Tehama	54,682	860	55,542	54,682	860	55,542
Trinity	10,086	-	10,086	10,086	-	10,086
Tulare	410,850	10,326	421,176	410,850	10,326	421,176
Tuolumne	91,053	-	91,053	91,053	-	91,053
Ventura	450,232	20,180	470,411	450,232	20,180	470,411
Yolo	123,356	2,066	125,421	123,356	2,066	125,421
Yuba	122,050	-	122,050	122,050	-	122,050
<b>Total:</b>	<b>8,452,388</b>	<b>156,604</b>	<b>8,608,992</b>	<b>8,452,388</b>	<b>156,604</b>	<b>8,608,992</b>

1) Totals include 2014-15 true-up adjustments for several courts.

2) Employer share changed for health and/or retiree health after spring submission. A 2015-16 adjustment will be made in the 2016-17 submission to DOF.

## Allocation of \$7.1 Million Requested for Inclusion in the 2016 Budget Act for Restored Funding for Cost Changes

	2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Benefit Cost Increases (non-interpreters)	Allocation Approved by Judicial Council July 29, 2014	Total Allocation of \$13.3 Million of Previously Unfunded Cost Increases	Allocation with \$13.3 Million Approved by Judicial Council June, 26, 2015	DOF Remaining Estimate of EPMC <sup>c</sup>	100% Funding of Benefit Cost Increases to Courts no EPMC <sup>c</sup>	100% Funded of Benefit Cost Increases to Courts with EPMC <sup>c</sup>	All Courts Funded 100% for 2012-13 and 2013- 14 Benefit Cost Increases (Col. D + F + G)	Proposed Allocation of \$7.02 Million for 100% Funding All Courts (Col. F + G)	Total Allocation of \$20.3 Million of Previously Unfunded Cost Increases (Col. C + I)
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Alameda	2,404,882	1,609,137	558,169	2,167,305	-	237,577		2,404,882	237,577	795,745
Alpine	9,334	6,245	2,166	8,412	-	922		9,334	922	3,088
Amador	35,611	23,828	8,265	32,093	-	3,518		35,611	3,518	11,783
Butte	236,868	158,491	25,636	184,128	-	52,740		236,868	52,740	78,377
Calaveras	68,405	45,771	15,877	61,647	7,558		6,758	68,405	6,758	22,634
Colusa	23,919	16,004	5,551	21,556	-	2,363		23,919	2,363	7,914
Contra Costa	1,524,425	1,020,012	353,816	1,373,828	9,731		150,597	1,524,425	150,597	504,413
Del Norte	68,299	45,700	15,852	61,552	-	6,747		68,299	6,747	22,599
El Dorado	28,321	18,950	6,573	25,523	-	2,798		28,321	2,798	9,371
Fresno	1,379,806	923,246	320,250	1,243,496	-	136,310		1,379,806	136,310	456,561
Glenn	35,960	24,061	8,346	32,408	-	3,552		35,960	3,552	11,899
Humboldt	205,112	137,243	47,606	184,849	-	20,263		205,112	20,263	67,869
Imperial	305,765	204,591	70,967	275,559	-	30,206		305,765	30,206	101,174
Inyo	48,932	32,741	11,357	44,098	-	4,834		48,932	4,834	16,191
Kern	824,430	551,636	191,349	742,985	81,129		81,445	824,430	81,445	272,793
Kings	33,089	22,140	7,680	29,820	-	3,269		33,089	3,269	10,949
Lake	4,780	3,199	1,110	4,308	-	472		4,780	472	1,582
Lassen	8,339	5,580	1,935	7,515	-	824		8,339	824	2,759
Los Angeles	18,086,349	12,101,803	4,197,807	16,299,610	-	1,786,739		18,086,349	1,786,739	5,984,546
Madera	67,969	45,479	15,775	61,254	-	6,715		67,969	6,715	22,490
Marin	535,883	358,566	124,378	482,944	-	52,940		535,883	52,940	177,317
Mariposa	5,321	3,560	1,235	4,795	-	526		5,321	526	1,761
Mendocino	351,518	235,205	81,587	316,792	-	34,726		351,518	34,726	116,313
Merced	463,597	310,199	107,600	417,799	-	45,798		463,597	45,798	153,398
Modoc	5,296	3,544	1,229	4,773	-	523		5,296	523	1,753
Mono	16,922	11,323	3,928	15,250	-	1,672		16,922	1,672	5,599
Monterey	395,286	264,491	91,745	356,236	-	39,050		395,286	39,050	130,795
Napa	271,633	181,753	63,045	244,798	-	26,834		271,633	26,834	89,880
Nevada	179,790	120,300	41,729	162,029	15,787		17,761	179,790	17,761	59,490
Orange	8,646,423	5,785,430	2,006,818	7,792,248	-	854,174		8,646,423	854,174	2,860,993
Placer	425,144	284,469	98,675	383,144	-	42,000		425,144	42,000	140,675
Plumas	8,989	6,015	973	6,988	-	2,001		8,989	2,001	2,974
Riverside	2,455,806	1,643,210	569,988	2,213,198	167,545		242,607	2,455,806	242,607	812,595
Sacramento	3,433,576	2,297,449	796,927	3,094,376	-	339,201		3,433,576	339,201	1,136,127
San Benito	25,173	16,844	5,843	22,687	-	2,487		25,173	2,487	8,330
San Bernardino	1,993,070	1,333,588	462,588	1,796,176	10,424		196,894	1,993,070	196,894	659,482
San Diego	6,159,623	4,121,481	666,662	4,788,143	-	1,371,480		6,159,623	1,371,480	2,038,142
San Francisco	2,235,743	1,495,964	518,912	2,014,875	-	220,868		2,235,743	220,868	739,779
San Joaquin	800,849	535,858	185,876	721,734	-	79,115		800,849	79,115	264,991
San Luis Obispo	182,698	122,246	19,774	142,019	39,402		40,679	182,698	40,679	60,453
San Mateo	901,455	603,175	97,565	700,740	183,757		200,715	901,455	200,715	298,280
Santa Barbara	182,310	121,986	42,314	164,300	-	18,010		182,310	18,010	60,324
Santa Clara	1,233,654	825,453	286,329	1,111,782	533,980		121,872	1,233,654	121,872	408,201
Santa Cruz	230,629	154,317	53,529	207,845	10,638		22,784	230,629	22,784	76,312
Shasta	274,996	184,003	63,826	247,829	-	27,167		274,996	27,167	90,993
Sierra	13,363	8,941	3,101	12,043	-	1,320		13,363	1,320	4,422
Siskiyou	88,816	59,428	20,614	80,042	-	8,774		88,816	8,774	29,388
Solano	743,044	497,180	172,459	669,639	-	73,405		743,044	73,405	245,864
Sonoma	921,983	616,911	213,991	830,901	-	91,082		921,983	91,082	305,073
Stanislaus	1,223,925	818,944	284,071	1,103,015	-	120,911		1,223,925	120,911	404,982
Sutter	107,922.07	72,212.01	25,048.51	97,260.52	-	10,662		107,922	10,662	35,710
Tehama	37,162	24,866	8,625	33,491	-	3,671		37,162	3,671	12,296
Trinity	29,858	19,978	6,930	26,908	-	2,950		29,858	2,950	9,880
Tulare	154,445	103,341	35,846	139,187	-	15,257		154,445	15,257	51,104
Tuolumne	28,768	19,249	6,677	25,926	-	2,842		28,768	2,842	9,519
Ventura	810,216	542,126	188,050	730,175	-	80,041		810,216	80,041	268,090

## Allocation of \$7.1 Million Requested for Inclusion in the 2016 Budget Act for Restored Funding for Cost Changes

	2012-2013 and 2013-2014 Benefit Cost Increases (non-interpreters)	Allocation Approved by Judicial Council July 29, 2014	Total Allocation of \$13.3 Million of Previously Unfunded Cost Increases	Allocation with \$13.3 Million Approved by Judicial Council June, 26, 2015	DOF Remaining Estimate of EPMC*	100% Funding of Benefit Cost Increases to Courts no EPMC*	100% Funded of Benefit Cost Increases to Courts with EPMC*	All Courts Funded 100% for 2012-13 and 2013-14 Benefit Cost Increases (Col. D + F + G)	Proposed Allocation of \$7.02 Million for 100% Funding All Courts (Col. F + G)	Total Allocation of \$20.3 Million of Previously Unfunded Cost Increases (Col. C + I)
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Yolo	251,806	168,486	27,253	195,739	22,341		56,066	251,806	56,066	83,319
Yuba	98,968	66,221	22,970	89,191	-	9,777		98,968	9,777	32,747
<b>Total</b>	<b>61,326,254</b>	<b>41,034,166</b>	<b>13,274,798</b>	<b>54,308,964</b>	<b>1,082,293</b>	<b>5,879,113</b>	<b>1,138,178</b>	<b>61,326,254</b>	<b>7,017,290</b>	<b>20,292,088</b>

\*Employer Paid Member (Employee) Share.

**Funding Summary 2014-15 to 2016-17:**

Total Unfunded 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increa:	\$ (61,326,254)
Allocation Approved by Judicial Council July 29, 2014:	41,034,166
Unfunded 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases:	(20,292,088)
2015 Budget Act \$13.3 million Restored Funding:	13,274,798
2016 May Revise Request \$7.1 million Restored Funding:	7,068,880
Funding for 2016-2017 benefit cost increases:	\$ 51,589

## FY 2016-2017 Non-Sheriff's Security Allocations

	Security Base (FY 10-11) Allocation	Received 2016- 17 BCP Funding for Security?	Non-BCP Adjusted Security Base Allocations	1.08% Increase for Non-BCP Adjusted Security Base Allocations	2016-17 BCP Funding for Security	Subtotal, 2016-17 Security Base Allocation Adjustments	Total, 2016-17 Security Base Allocations
<b>Court</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D (C * 1.08%)</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F (D + E)</b>	<b>G (A + F)</b>
Alameda	3,177,924	N	3,177,924	34,322	-	<b>34,322</b>	<b>3,212,246</b>
Alpine	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Amador	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Butte	467,145	N	467,145	5,045	-	<b>5,045</b>	<b>472,190</b>
Calaveras	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Colusa	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Fresno	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Glenn	9,779	N	9,779	106	-	<b>106</b>	<b>9,885</b>
Humboldt	167,800	N	167,800	1,812	-	<b>1,812</b>	<b>169,612</b>
Imperial	420,479	N	420,479	4,541	-	<b>4,541</b>	<b>425,020</b>
Inyo	186,658	N	186,658	2,016	-	<b>2,016</b>	<b>188,674</b>
Kern	65,567	N	65,567	708	-	<b>708</b>	<b>66,275</b>
Kings	421,918	N	421,918	4,557	-	<b>4,557</b>	<b>426,475</b>
Lake	196,493	N	196,493	2,122	-	<b>2,122</b>	<b>198,615</b>
Lassen	293,836	N	293,836	3,173	-	<b>3,173</b>	<b>297,009</b>
Los Angeles	14,294,467	N	14,294,467	154,380	-	<b>154,380</b>	<b>14,448,847</b>
Madera	381,406	N	381,406	4,119	-	<b>4,119</b>	<b>385,525</b>
Marin	9,625	N	9,625	104	-	<b>104</b>	<b>9,729</b>
Mariposa	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Mendocino	299,349	N	299,349	3,233	-	<b>3,233</b>	<b>302,582</b>
Merced	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Modoc	789	N	789	9	-	<b>9</b>	<b>798</b>
Mono	24,156	N	24,156	261	-	<b>261</b>	<b>24,417</b>
Monterey	870,000	N	870,000	9,396	-	<b>9,396</b>	<b>879,396</b>
Napa	295,552	N	295,552	3,192	-	<b>3,192</b>	<b>298,744</b>
Nevada	433,431	N	433,431	4,681	-	<b>4,681</b>	<b>438,112</b>
Orange	2,733,776	N	2,733,776	29,525	-	<b>29,525</b>	<b>2,763,301</b>
Placer	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Plumas	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Riverside	1,931,520	N	1,931,520	20,860	-	<b>20,860</b>	<b>1,952,380</b>
Sacramento	1,864,424	N	1,864,424	20,136	-	<b>20,136</b>	<b>1,884,560</b>
San Benito	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
San Bernardino	3,269,446	N	3,269,446	35,310	-	<b>35,310</b>	<b>3,304,756</b>
San Diego	657,192	N	657,192	7,098	-	<b>7,098</b>	<b>664,290</b>
San Francisco	-	N	-	-	-	-	-

## FY 2016-2017 Non-Sheriff's Security Allocations

	Security Base (FY 10-11) Allocation	Received 2016- 17 BCP Funding for Security?	Non-BCP Adjusted Security Base Allocations	1.08% Increase for Non-BCP Adjusted Security Base Allocations	2016-17 BCP Funding for Security	Subtotal, 2016-17 Security Base Allocation Adjustments	Total, 2016-17 Security Base Allocations
<b>Court</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D (C * 1.08%)</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F (D + E)</b>	<b>G (A + F)</b>
San Joaquin	287,747	N	287,747	3,108	-	<b>3,108</b>	<b>290,855</b>
San Luis Obispo	241,676	N	241,676	2,610	-	<b>2,610</b>	<b>244,286</b>
San Mateo	443,042	N	443,042	4,785	-	<b>4,785</b>	<b>447,827</b>
Santa Barbara	1,055,112	N	1,055,112	11,395	-	<b>11,395</b>	<b>1,066,507</b>
Santa Clara	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Cruz	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Shasta	2,389,668	Y	-	-	272,635	<b>272,635</b>	<b>2,662,303</b>
Sierra	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Solano	435,400	N	435,400	4,702	-	<b>4,702</b>	<b>440,102</b>
Sonoma	440,000	N	440,000	4,752	-	<b>4,752</b>	<b>444,752</b>
Stanislaus	9,326	N	9,326	101	-	<b>101</b>	<b>9,427</b>
Sutter	247,071	N	247,071	2,668	-	<b>2,668</b>	<b>249,739</b>
Tehama	-	N	-	-	-	-	-
Trinity	450,608	Y	-	-	69,871	<b>69,871</b>	<b>520,479</b>
Tulare	15,576	N	15,576	168	-	<b>168</b>	<b>15,744</b>
Tuolumne	220,516	N	220,516	2,382	-	<b>2,382</b>	<b>222,898</b>
Ventura	1,559,157	N	1,559,157	16,839	-	<b>16,839</b>	<b>1,575,996</b>
Yolo	582,889	N	582,889	6,295	-	<b>6,295</b>	<b>589,184</b>
Yuba	132,569	N	132,569	1,432	-	<b>1,432</b>	<b>134,001</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>40,983,089</b>		<b>38,142,813</b>	<b>411,942</b>	<b>342,506</b>	<b>754,448</b>	<b>41,737,537</b>

20,000,000 2016-17 General Court Operations Funding  
2016-17 Governor's Proposed Budget 45.10 (0150010)  
1,855,755,000 Appropriation, excluding one-time and \$20M funding  
1.08% 2016-17 % Increase in General Court Operations Funding  
411,942 1.08% of Non-BCP Adjusted Security Base Allocations

2016-2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need <sup>(1)</sup>			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor <sup>(2)</sup>	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2015)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor <sup>(3)</sup>	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
Cluster	Court	A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1)* Dollar Factor	E	F = D+E	G	H=(C-1)*BLS-Adjusted Dollar Factor+(E*G)
4	Alameda	507	82	589	\$34,301,500	223,392	34,524,892	1.42	49,186,640
1	Alpine	2	1	3	\$116,672	117,915	234,587	0.86	201,883
1	Amador	21	5	26	\$1,458,397	117,915	1,576,312	1.00	1,576,918
2	Butte	114	21	135	\$7,817,009	158,808	7,975,817	0.91	7,231,596
1	Calaveras	21	5	26	\$1,458,397	117,915	1,576,312	0.90	1,411,421
1	Colusa	14	3	17	\$933,374	117,915	1,051,289	0.72	815,763
3	Contra Costa	322	51	373	\$21,700,949	191,473	21,892,422	1.25	27,378,952
1	Del Norte	23	5	28	\$1,575,069	117,915	1,692,984	0.77	1,323,149
2	El Dorado	70	12	82	\$4,725,207	158,808	4,884,015	1.01	4,932,482
3	Fresno	471	74	545	\$31,734,721	191,473	31,926,195	0.97	31,113,088
1	Glenn	16	4	20	\$1,108,382	117,915	1,226,297	0.68	947,699
2	Humboldt	77	13	90	\$5,191,894	158,808	5,350,702	0.78	4,159,298
2	Imperial	114	22	136	\$7,875,344	158,808	8,034,152	0.79	6,367,714
1	Inyo	15	4	19	\$1,050,046	117,915	1,167,961	0.84	978,616
3	Kern	451	74	525	\$30,568,003	191,473	30,759,477	1.05	32,423,394
2	Kings	86	15	101	\$5,833,588	158,808	5,992,396	0.88	5,303,177
2	Lake	40	7	47	\$2,683,451	158,808	2,842,259	0.75	2,219,434
1	Lassen	21	5	26	\$1,458,397	117,915	1,576,312	0.80	1,257,958
4	Los Angeles	4,265	656	4,921	\$287,012,551	223,392	287,235,943	1.36	390,673,143
2	Madera	79	14	93	\$5,366,901	158,808	5,525,709	0.94	5,188,283
2	Marin	85	14	99	\$5,716,917	158,808	5,875,725	1.29	7,553,267
1	Mariposa	9	3	12	\$641,695	117,915	759,610	0.81	611,557
2	Mendocino	57	10	67	\$3,850,168	158,808	4,008,976	0.82	3,271,867
2	Merced	121	21	142	\$8,225,360	158,808	8,384,168	0.89	7,489,922
1	Modoc	7	2	9	\$466,687	117,915	584,602	0.57	432,635
1	Mono	10	3	13	\$700,031	117,915	817,946	1.10	895,694
3	Monterey	164	27	191	\$11,083,818	191,473	11,275,291	1.19	13,426,025
2	Napa	61	11	72	\$4,141,848	158,808	4,300,656	1.22	5,230,276
2	Nevada	42	8	50	\$2,858,458	158,808	3,017,266	0.98	2,955,581

2016-2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need <sup>(1)</sup>			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor <sup>(2)</sup>	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2015)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor <sup>(3)</sup>	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
Cluster	Court	A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1)* Dollar Factor	E	F = D+E	G	H = (C-1)*BLS-Adjusted Dollar Factor + (E*G)
4	Orange	1,070	172	1,242	\$72,394,833	223,392	72,618,225	1.30	94,134,681
2	Placer	140	23	163	\$9,450,413	158,808	9,609,221	1.19	11,449,813
1	Plumas	11	3	14	\$758,366	117,915	876,282	0.70	675,775
4	Riverside	923	146	1,069	\$62,302,725	223,392	62,526,117	1.10	68,476,932
4	Sacramento	618	94	712	\$41,476,814	223,392	41,700,206	1.28	53,401,230
1	San Benito	21	4	25	\$1,400,061	117,915	1,517,976	0.97	1,469,309
4	San Bernardino	1,007	151	1,158	\$67,494,618	223,392	67,718,010	1.06	71,954,216
4	San Diego	1,063	163	1,226	\$71,461,458	223,392	71,684,850	1.18	84,387,946
4	San Francisco	333	53	386	\$22,459,316	223,392	22,682,708	1.70	38,651,783
3	San Joaquin	320	49	369	\$21,467,605	191,473	21,659,079	1.09	23,669,350
2	San Luis Obispo	126	21	147	\$8,517,039	158,808	8,675,847	1.06	9,236,139
3	San Mateo	237	38	275	\$15,984,032	191,473	16,175,506	1.44	23,246,104
3	Santa Barbara	181	31	212	\$12,308,872	191,473	12,500,345	1.19	14,886,316
4	Santa Clara	501	75	576	\$33,543,134	223,392	33,766,526	1.44	48,518,418
2	Santa Cruz	108	21	129	\$7,466,993	158,808	7,625,801	1.14	8,707,674
2	Shasta	118	27	145	\$8,400,367	158,808	8,559,175	0.87	7,445,260
1	Sierra	2	1	3	\$116,672	117,915	234,587	0.62	164,648
2	Siskiyou	28	5	33	\$1,866,748	158,808	2,025,556	0.70	1,572,091
3	Solano	182	28	210	\$12,192,200	191,473	12,383,673	1.18	14,614,473
3	Sonoma	187	31	218	\$12,658,887	191,473	12,850,360	1.13	14,492,849
3	Stanislaus	240	38	278	\$16,159,040	191,473	16,350,513	1.01	16,547,143
2	Sutter	53	10	63	\$3,616,825	158,808	3,775,633	0.96	3,616,622
2	Tehama	46	8	54	\$3,091,802	158,808	3,250,610	0.79	2,574,634
1	Trinity	11	3	14	\$758,366	117,915	876,282	0.65	670,627
3	Tulare	212	35	247	\$14,350,628	191,473	14,542,101	0.84	12,259,665
2	Tuolumne	33	6	39	\$2,216,764	158,808	2,375,572	0.81	1,930,811
3	Ventura	302	56	358	\$20,825,911	191,473	21,017,384	1.22	25,588,584
2	Yolo	86	16	102	\$5,891,924	158,808	6,050,732	1.04	6,320,894
2	Yuba	46	8	54	\$3,091,802	158,808	3,250,610	1.17	3,793,016
Statewide		15,490	2,488	17,978			1,054,949,762		1,281,014,437

NOTES:

(1) Estimated need based on 3-year average filings data from **FY 2012-2013 through FY 2014-2015**.

**\$58,336**

(2) Unadjusted base funding per RAS FTE, based on **FY 2015-2016 Schedule 7A** ; does not include collections staff, SJOs, CEO, security, n

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

2016-2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 2015-16 Schedule 7A)				Projected Benefits Expenses (Salary-driven benefits based on Adjusted Base)			OE&E (Based on Cluster Average OE&E / FTE) (Cluster 1: \$29,621; Clusters 2-4 \$20,941)	Remove AB 1058 staff/FLF costs (Using FY 2014-15 data)	Total WAFM Funding Need	Proportion of Total WAFM Estimated Funding Need	
		Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 90)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 90)	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 10 FTE Need	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 90 FTE Need	Total Benefit Need Based on RAS FTE Need	Estimated OE&E Needed (Excludes funding for operations contracts) (Using FY 2012-13 to 2014-15 data)				
Cluster	Court	I1	I2	J1	J2	$K = (A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G * J1 + (B * J2)$		$L = (((B-1) * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G * J1) + (B * J2)$	$M = (K + L)$	$N = C * OE\&E$	$O$	$P = (H + M + N) - O$	$Q = P / \text{Statewide}$
4	Alameda	37.7%	\$13,709	38.1%	\$13,774	22,818,655	3,814,957	26,633,612	12,334,326	1,558,998	86,595,580	3.68%	
1	Alpine	19.8%	\$23,503	23.6%	\$23,503	66,920	47,484	114,403	88,863	-	405,149	0.02%	
1	Amador	26.2%	\$10,466	26.2%	\$10,066	541,427	142,554	683,981	770,150	107,903	2,923,146	0.12%	
2	Butte	26.7%	\$11,194	26.6%	\$11,187	2,889,086	554,699	3,443,785	2,827,053	352,027	13,150,407	0.56%	
1	Calaveras	21.4%	\$16,073	21.9%	\$19,884	572,613	168,290	740,903	770,150	162,217	2,760,256	0.12%	
1	Colusa	38.8%	\$15,976	39.6%	\$16,706	471,712	119,977	591,688	503,559	68,859	1,842,151	0.08%	
3	Contra Costa	42.1%	\$15,193	42.1%	\$16,690	14,772,851	2,487,115	17,259,966	7,811,041	1,206,638	51,243,320	2.18%	
1	Del Norte	23.5%	\$29,601	23.5%	\$30,787	927,541	218,096	1,145,637	829,392	97,322	3,200,856	0.14%	
2	El Dorado	23.2%	\$16,189	23.2%	\$14,883	2,088,991	365,955	2,454,945	1,717,173	336,202	8,768,398	0.37%	
3	Fresno	68.8%	\$11,217	69.6%	\$10,872	23,714,429	3,824,725	27,539,153	11,412,916	1,613,374	68,451,784	2.91%	
1	Glenn	28.6%	\$12,924	32.3%	\$21,730	416,001	157,123	573,123	592,423	194,907	1,918,339	0.08%	
2	Humboldt	31.3%	\$9,598	31.3%	\$10,419	1,831,087	344,245	2,175,332	1,884,702	145,969	8,073,363	0.34%	
2	Imperial	28.0%	\$4,359	28.9%	\$5,927	1,973,169	447,549	2,420,718	2,847,994	229,050	11,407,375	0.49%	
1	Inyo	25.8%	\$15,115	22.1%	\$16,006	415,984	118,381	534,365	562,802	119,838	1,955,945	0.08%	
3	Kern	59.9%	\$16,118	59.9%	\$16,118	23,889,392	4,001,848	27,891,240	10,994,093	1,190,224	70,118,504	2.98%	
2	Kings	20.8%	\$9,188	20.8%	\$10,637	1,713,967	339,188	2,053,155	2,115,054	330,887	9,140,499	0.39%	
2	Lake	22.1%	\$8,593	22.1%	\$10,383	747,817	159,691	907,508	984,233	160,465	3,950,710	0.17%	
1	Lassen	22.3%	\$11,181	22.3%	\$11,354	452,638	119,226	571,864	770,150	59,956	2,540,016	0.11%	
4	Los Angeles	23.9%	\$23,878	34.0%	\$20,883	182,717,950	31,454,409	214,172,359	103,051,301	7,326,422	700,570,381	29.81%	
2	Madera	30.7%	\$15,511	30.7%	\$15,504	2,555,096	481,691	3,036,786	1,947,525	274,213	9,898,382	0.42%	
2	Marin	31.2%	\$13,632	29.2%	\$13,632	3,145,608	534,716	3,680,323	2,073,172	232,511	13,074,251	0.56%	
1	Mariposa	31.9%	\$10,309	29.8%	\$15,416	227,719	102,490	330,208	355,454	75,371	1,221,848	0.05%	
2	Mendocino	47.6%	\$9,589	46.4%	\$10,446	1,837,680	363,386	2,201,067	1,403,056	195,607	6,680,383	0.28%	
2	Merced	59.8%	\$14,059	63.4%	\$15,029	5,474,107	1,066,578	6,540,685	2,973,640	437,688	16,566,558	0.70%	
1	Modoc	25.2%	\$12,649	25.2%	\$12,649	169,014	53,764	222,778	266,590	73,377	848,627	0.04%	
1	Mono	37.5%	\$24,532	37.5%	\$23,785	484,827	167,668	652,495	385,075	80,231	1,853,033	0.08%	
3	Monterey	20.6%	\$15,383	20.4%	\$17,602	4,869,795	889,682	5,759,477	3,999,756	535,888	22,649,370	0.96%	
2	Napa	19.0%	\$20,876	19.1%	\$22,496	2,095,460	420,285	2,515,744	1,507,761	229,011	9,024,771	0.38%	
2	Nevada	36.8%	\$12,525	38.3%	\$11,200	1,410,320	302,217	1,712,536	1,047,057	448,497	5,266,676	0.22%	



2016-2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 2015-16 Schedule 7A)				Projected Benefits Expenses (Salary-driven benefits based on Adjusted Base)			OE&E (Based on Cluster Average OE&E / FTE) (Cluster 1: \$29,621; Clusters 2-4 \$20,941)	Remove AB 1058 staff/FLF costs (Using FY 2014-15 data)	Total WAFM Funding Need	Proportion of Total WAFM Estimated Funding Need
Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 90)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 90)	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 10 FTE Need	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 90 FTE Need	Total Benefit Need Based on RAS FTE Need	Estimated OE&E Needed (Excludes funding for operations contracts) (Using FY 2012-13 to 2014-15 data)					
Cluster	Court	I1	I2	J1	J2	$K = (A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + (E * G) * J1$	$L = (((B-1) * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + (B * J2))$	$M = (K + L)$	$N = C * OE\&E$	O	$P = (H + M + N) - O$	$Q = P / \text{Statewide}$
4	Orange	37.6%	\$11,870	37.3%	\$13,209	43,111,259	7,204,233	50,315,492	26,008,883	2,051,102	168,407,955	7.17%
2	Placer	30.6%	\$19,323	30.6%	\$19,323	5,683,703	970,513	6,654,216	3,413,404	409,199	21,108,235	0.90%
1	Plumas	25.9%	\$14,139	25.9%	\$19,320	285,548	102,896	388,443	414,696	146,291	1,332,623	0.06%
4	Riverside	26.3%	\$10,013	26.4%	\$11,294	24,750,120	4,162,845	28,912,965	22,386,068	1,630,212	118,145,753	5.03%
4	Sacramento	37.0%	\$16,888	38.0%	\$17,181	27,518,245	4,362,757	31,881,002	14,910,085	1,456,982	98,735,335	4.20%
1	San Benito	25.7%	\$12,321	25.7%	\$16,948	563,221	140,596	703,817	740,529	171,036	2,742,618	0.12%
4	San Bernardino	33.0%	\$9,364	36.8%	\$11,201	30,011,769	5,195,817	35,207,586	24,249,829	2,648,382	128,763,249	5.48%
4	San Diego	50.3%	\$10,112	48.6%	\$11,054	47,498,593	7,337,022	54,835,615	25,673,825	2,470,806	162,426,582	6.91%
4	San Francisco	28.4%	\$28,568	27.8%	\$28,552	18,906,524	3,057,201	21,963,725	8,083,276	1,339,350	67,359,435	2.87%
3	San Joaquin	45.5%	\$13,763	47.4%	\$9,437	13,693,970	2,012,047	15,706,016	7,727,277	649,535	46,453,108	1.98%
2	San Luis Obispo	40.3%	\$10,554	45.0%	\$10,697	4,481,429	859,049	5,340,478	3,078,346	386,372	17,268,592	0.73%
3	San Mateo	39.4%	\$17,127	40.9%	\$14,301	11,882,898	1,924,796	13,807,694	5,758,811	614,025	42,198,583	1.80%
3	Santa Barbara	40.2%	\$7,270	42.1%	\$7,755	6,373,112	1,213,452	7,586,564	4,439,520	482,556	26,429,843	1.12%
4	Santa Clara	32.0%	\$26,098	31.5%	\$27,572	26,504,376	4,120,777	30,625,153	12,062,091	2,065,347	89,140,315	3.79%
2	Santa Cruz	24.7%	\$16,073	24.7%	\$16,880	3,512,171	727,601	4,239,772	2,701,406	188,001	15,460,851	0.66%
2	Shasta	23.4%	\$9,789	25.4%	\$12,360	2,555,828	703,420	3,259,249	3,036,464	516,322	13,224,651	0.56%
1	Sierra	32.0%	\$16,500	32.0%	\$16,500	62,227	39,975	102,202	88,863	5,105	350,609	0.01%
2	Siskiyou	29.9%	\$18,295	29.9%	\$16,782	894,501	171,746	1,066,247	691,057	337,980	2,991,415	0.13%
3	Solano	32.6%	\$13,339	32.6%	\$17,537	6,510,007	1,170,515	7,680,522	4,397,637	591,804	26,100,828	1.11%
3	Sonoma	43.6%	\$19,772	43.6%	\$20,097	9,055,853	1,578,749	10,634,601	4,565,166	661,274	29,031,343	1.24%
3	Stanislaus	29.0%	\$18,521	28.8%	\$19,430	8,560,109	1,424,380	9,984,489	5,821,634	1,023,886	31,329,380	1.33%
2	Sutter	32.5%	\$14,094	33.5%	\$17,246	1,709,008	391,693	2,100,701	1,319,291	246,089	6,790,525	0.29%
2	Tehama	24.0%	\$18,556	24.0%	\$18,680	1,362,948	257,094	1,620,043	1,130,821	96,481	5,229,016	0.22%
1	Trinity	33.4%	\$13,614	38.0%	\$13,462	317,380	104,445	421,825	414,696	55,135	1,452,014	0.06%
3	Tulare	20.6%	\$20,182	20.9%	\$20,743	6,431,233	1,109,091	7,540,324	5,172,459	631,759	24,340,690	1.04%
2	Tuolumne	29.1%	\$13,812	30.1%	\$13,849	910,414	193,356	1,103,770	816,704	223,059	3,628,227	0.15%
3	Ventura	38.2%	\$9,290	40.6%	\$11,636	10,998,309	2,331,204	13,329,513	7,496,925	872,953	45,542,069	1.94%
2	Yolo	31.7%	\$14,013	33.9%	\$24,492	2,868,264	758,060	3,626,324	2,135,995	232,248	11,850,964	0.50%
2	Yuba	19.1%	\$13,804	19.1%	\$14,916	1,231,596	245,425	1,477,021	1,130,821	215,238	6,185,620	0.26%

Statewide 623,536,466 107,138,743 730,675,209 378,693,038 40,262,178 2,350,120,506 100%

NOTES:

\$58,336 for vacant positions; in January 2014 the TCBAC approved a dollar factor adjustment for courts with fewer than 100 employees. Salaries of Local Government used for 2012 through 2014. Salaries of Local Government used for courts with fewer than 100 employees in which case three-

Weighted Mean	OE&E \$ / FTE	Cluster 1
	\$29,621	Clusters 2-4

## FY 2016-17 RAS FTE Need

	Program 10 (Operations) Staff Need											Program 90 (Administration) Staff Need			Total RAS Need
	Infractions	Criminal	Civil	Family Law	Pr/MH	Juvenile	Total Program 10 Need (A thru F)	Court interpreter FTEs	Manager/Supervisor Ratio (by cluster)	Manager/Supervisor Need	Total Program 10 Need (rounded up)	Non-RAS FTE (for Program 90 Need Calculation)*	Program 90 ratio (by cluster)	Program 90 Need (rounded up)	
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J ((G+H)/I)	K (H + J)	L	M	N ((K+L)/M)	O (K+N)
Alameda	69.3	122.2	116.3	103.4	33.5	18.0	462.7	34.5	11.3	44.0	507	80.6	7.2	82	589
Alpine	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	1.1	-	7.1	0.2	2	0.6	5.7	1	3
Amador	2.1	7.1	2.5	3.6	1.3	1.0	17.7	-	7.1	2.5	21	2.3	5.7	5	26
Butte	9.3	33.6	14.9	23.9	12.8	6.6	101.2	-	8.2	12.3	114	15.5	6.4	21	135
Calaveras	1.6	5.3	3.0	4.4	2.0	1.8	18.1	0.4	7.1	2.6	21	2.5	5.7	5	26
Colusa	3.2	4.6	0.8	1.5	0.6	0.9	11.7	0.3	7.1	1.7	14	1.6	5.7	3	17
Contra Costa	29.4	63.9	65.5	80.5	26.2	19.8	285.3	13.2	8.2	36.4	322	21.2	6.8	51	373
Del Norte	2.3	5.7	2.4	4.6	2.6	1.8	19.3	0.1	7.1	2.7	23	3.0	5.7	5	28
El Dorado	6.9	16.6	11.5	15.5	4.7	6.3	61.5	1.2	8.2	7.6	70	5.1	6.4	12	82
Fresno	37.8	167.9	64.2	92.9	27.9	26.6	417.3	16.2	8.2	52.9	471	27.5	6.8	74	545
Glenn	3.8	3.3	1.1	3.2	1.4	1.1	13.7	0.2	7.1	2.0	16	1.2	5.7	4	20
Humboldt	7.2	27.6	9.0	13.4	7.0	3.7	67.9	-	8.2	8.3	77	2.0	6.4	13	90
Imperial	22.4	32.1	9.5	25.8	5.3	5.1	100.3	4.0	8.2	12.7	114	21.3	6.4	22	136
Inyo	3.8	3.9	1.1	2.4	0.8	0.6	12.6	-	7.1	1.8	15	3.0	5.7	4	19
Kern	39.1	172.8	42.7	92.6	29.2	23.2	399.6	15.0	8.2	50.6	451	49.5	6.8	74	525
Kings	9.9	34.7	6.3	15.9	4.2	5.2	76.2	2.0	8.2	9.5	86	4.6	6.4	15	101
Lake	2.2	14.1	5.5	8.0	3.3	1.7	34.9	-	8.2	4.3	40	1.7	6.4	7	47
Lassen	2.6	6.2	2.5	4.2	1.2	1.0	17.6	-	7.1	2.5	21	2.0	5.7	5	26
Los Angeles	391.4	1,102.9	978.1	803.5	256.7	364.0	3,896.7	259.0	11.3	367.8	4,265	471.0	7.2	656	4,921
Madera	5.3	26.7	8.9	18.5	4.2	5.5	69.2	4.0	8.2	8.9	79	5.6	6.4	14	93
Marin	15.5	16.7	17.3	15.8	7.2	2.8	75.4	3.0	8.2	9.6	85	4.7	6.4	14	99
Mariposa	0.9	3.4	0.7	1.5	0.7	0.4	7.6	-	7.1	1.1	9	3.6	5.7	3	12
Mendocino	5.2	19.2	7.3	9.9	4.0	4.4	50.1	1.0	8.2	6.2	57	3.4	6.4	10	67
Merced	16.1	34.6	13.5	26.6	7.3	8.0	106.2	8.0	8.2	13.9	121	13.3	6.4	21	142
Modoc	0.6	2.3	0.6	1.6	0.5	0.4	6.0	-	7.1	0.8	7	2.0	5.7	2	9
Mono	2.4	3.9	1.0	0.8	0.2	0.2	8.5	0.5	7.1	1.3	10	1.8	5.7	3	13
Monterey	18.4	57.1	21.1	31.1	8.4	8.5	144.6	8.0	8.2	18.6	164	13.3	6.8	27	191
Napa	6.3	18.6	8.5	11.8	4.7	3.3	53.2	3.0	8.2	6.9	61	6.3	6.4	11	72
Nevada	7.0	11.9	6.0	7.7	3.2	1.5	37.3	0.3	8.2	4.6	42	8.4	6.4	8	50
Orange	99.2	304.5	244.8	226.8	60.1	41.5	976.8	65.8	11.3	92.3	1,070	170.3	7.2	172	1,242
Placer	12.4	36.6	25.1	29.8	8.8	11.2	123.9	1.0	8.2	15.2	140	7.0	6.4	23	163
Plumas	1.0	2.8	1.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	8.8	0.1	7.1	1.2	11	1.1	5.7	3	14
Riverside	79.0	251.1	170.3	229.7	47.2	67.6	844.8	33.5	11.3	77.7	923	127.2	7.2	146	1,069
Sacramento	49.2	168.2	128.5	143.8	47.4	28.4	565.4	26.5	11.3	52.4	618	59.6	7.2	94	712
San Benito	1.8	6.8	3.5	4.2	1.1	1.1	18.4	-	7.1	2.6	21	1.3	5.7	4	25
San Bernardino	62.9	339.4	174.5	227.1	54.7	62.9	921.4	39.6	11.3	85.0	1,007	81.6	7.2	151	1,158
San Diego	117.5	269.0	240.9	252.0	55.3	38.4	973.1	42.3	11.3	89.9	1,063	109.6	7.2	163	1,226
San Francisco	52.9	49.4	98.9	52.5	32.5	17.0	303.2	25.3	11.3	29.1	333	46.3	7.2	53	386
San Joaquin	24.7	112.7	46.4	61.0	23.0	15.9	283.7	6.9	8.2	35.4	320	11.8	6.8	49	369
San Luis Obispo	13.5	49.6	14.5	18.2	9.9	6.0	111.8	4.5	8.2	14.2	126	8.5	6.4	21	147
San Mateo	36.7	62.5	31.7	44.0	13.2	21.5	209.6	13.3	8.2	27.2	237	19.3	6.8	38	275
Santa Barbara	28.8	59.1	24.8	27.5	10.6	9.4	160.2	8.9	8.2	20.6	181	27.7	6.8	31	212
Santa Clara	48.4	150.7	98.3	107.7	36.7	16.2	458.0	26.4	11.3	42.9	501	37.4	7.2	75	576
Santa Cruz	16.7	34.2	14.0	19.4	4.8	6.1	95.2	7.3	8.2	12.5	108	21.6	6.4	21	129
Shasta	11.3	45.9	12.5	20.6	7.8	7.0	105.0	-	8.2	12.8	118	51.9	6.4	27	145
Sierra	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	1.5	-	7.1	0.2	2	1.1	5.7	1	3
Siskiyou	5.7	7.5	2.8	5.3	1.9	1.5	24.6	0.2	8.2	3.0	28	4.1	6.4	5	33
Solano	17.4	47.4	30.2	44.5	14.8	6.8	161.2	2.5	8.2	20.0	182	7.5	6.8	28	210
Sonoma	22.6	55.4	28.5	35.3	17.0	6.9	165.6	8.5	8.2	21.2	187	22.5	6.8	31	218
Stanislaus	16.9	83.0	29.5	54.8	19.4	9.1	212.7	4.0	8.2	26.4	240	11.6	6.8	38	278
Sutter	5.2	16.9	6.6	10.9	4.5	2.2	46.4	1.5	8.2	5.8	53	8.7	6.4	10	63
Tehama	5.3	16.7	4.8	8.4	2.6	2.7	40.5	1.3	8.2	5.1	46	3.3	6.4	8	54
Trinity	0.7	3.5	1.1	2.1	0.8	0.9	9.1	-	7.1	1.3	11	5.0	5.7	3	14
Tulare	22.6	73.3	25.2	39.8	11.5	15.5	187.8	6.0	8.2	23.6	212	22.9	6.8	35	247
Tuolumne	2.5	11.3	3.5	6.2	2.3	2.9	28.8	0.3	8.2	3.5	33	2.0	6.4	6	39
Ventura	33.5	71.8	52.1	64.4	25.3	21.1	268.3	6.8	8.2	33.5	302	76.1	6.8	56	358
Yolo	9.9	30.6	9.8	15.5	5.0	5.3	76.1	1.0	8.2	9.4	86	12.0	6.4	16	102
Yuba	4.3	14.8	4.8	9.1	3.0	4.1	40.2	-	8.2	4.9	46	3.8	6.4	8	54
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,525.3</b>	<b>4,394.3</b>	<b>2,951.0</b>	<b>3,187.7</b>	<b>983.5</b>	<b>953.5</b>	<b>13,995.4</b>	<b>707.0</b>		<b>1,463.2</b>	<b>15,490</b>	<b>1,740.8</b>		<b>2,488.0</b>	<b>17,978</b>

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

## 2016-17 BLS Factor

Cluster	County	% Local	% State	State Employment More than 50% of Govt Workforce?	3-Year Avg BLS Local (92)	3-Year Avg BLS (State & Local 92)	3-Year Avg (2011-2013) BLS Factor (50% Workforce Threshold)
4	Alameda	84%	16%	No	1.42	1.28	1.42
1	Alpine	100%	0%	No	0.86	0.86	0.86
1	Amador	34%	66%	Yes	0.96	1.00	1.00
2	Butte	88%	12%	No	0.91	0.89	0.91
1	Calaveras	92%	8%	No	0.90	0.92	0.90
1	Colusa	96%	4%	No	0.72	0.90	0.72
3	Contra Costa	96%	4%	No	1.25	1.12	1.25
1	Del Norte	33%	68%	Yes	0.61	0.77	0.77
2	El Dorado	96%	4%	No	1.01	1.06	1.01
3	Fresno	70%	30%	No	0.97	1.04	0.97
1	Glenn	96%	4%	No	0.68	0.80	0.68
2	Humboldt	83%	17%	No	0.78	0.92	0.78
2	Imperial	50%	50%	No	0.79	0.86	0.79
1	Inyo	72%	28%	No	0.84	0.89	0.84
3	Kern	61%	39%	No	1.05	1.00	1.05
2	Kings	33%	67%	Yes	0.86	0.88	0.88
2	Lake	96%	4%	No	0.75	0.82	0.75
1	Lassen	20%	80%	Yes	0.67	0.80	0.80
4	Los Angeles	92%	8%	No	1.36	1.26	1.36
2	Madera	40%	60%	Yes	0.83	0.94	0.94
2	Marin	67%	33%	No	1.29	1.14	1.29
1	Mariposa	93%	7%	No	0.81	0.93	0.81
2	Mendocino	84%	16%	No	0.82	0.84	0.82
2	Merced	100%	0%	No	0.89	0.89	0.89
1	Modoc	88%	12%	No	0.57	0.84	0.57
1	Mono	93%	7%	No	1.10	1.00	1.10
3	Monterey	62%	38%	No	1.19	1.06	1.19
2	Napa	80%	20%	No	1.22	1.02	1.22
2	Nevada	91%	9%	No	0.98	0.92	0.98
4	Orange	91%	9%	No	1.30	1.19	1.30
2	Placer	95%	5%	No	1.19	1.03	1.19
1	Plumas	94%	6%	No	0.70	0.75	0.70
4	Riverside	80%	20%	No	1.10	0.98	1.10
4	Sacramento	15%	85%	Yes	1.21	1.28	1.28
1	San Benito	100%	0%	No	0.97	0.97	0.97
4	San Bernardino	82%	18%	No	1.06	1.09	1.06
4	San Diego	85%	15%	No	1.18	1.15	1.18
4	San Francisco	53%	47%	No	1.70	1.60	1.70
3	San Joaquin	69%	31%	No	1.09	1.07	1.09
2	San Luis Obispo	57%	43%	No	1.06	1.09	1.06
3	San Mateo	95%	5%	No	1.44	1.16	1.44
3	Santa Barbara	93%	7%	No	1.19	1.08	1.19
4	Santa Clara	94%	6%	No	1.44	1.19	1.44
2	Santa Cruz	90%	10%	No	1.14	0.93	1.14
2	Shasta	63%	37%	No	0.87	0.94	0.87
1	Sierra	100%	0%	No	0.62	0.62	0.62
2	Siskiyou	84%	16%	No	0.70	0.74	0.70
3	Solano	61%	39%	No	1.18	1.08	1.18
3	Sonoma	89%	11%	No	1.13	1.08	1.13
3	Stanislaus	96%	4%	No	1.01	0.96	1.01
2	Sutter	95%	5%	No	0.96	0.95	0.96
2	Tehama	95%	5%	No	0.79	0.88	0.79
1	Trinity	93%	7%	No	0.65	0.79	0.65
3	Tulare	93%	7%	No	0.84	0.89	0.84
2	Tuolumne	52%	48%	No	0.81	0.88	0.81
3	Ventura	91%	9%	No	1.22	1.10	1.22
2	Yolo	82%	18%	No	1.04	1.29	1.04
2	Yuba	46%	54%	Yes	0.94	1.17	1.17

## FY 2016-17 FTE Allotment Factor

Cluster	Court	BLS Factor	FTE Dollar Factor Applied (Current -- \$58,336*BLS )	FTE Need	Eligible for FTE Floor ?	Has FTE Need <50 AND FTE Dollar Factor is Less Than Median of \$45,655?	Final FTE Dollar Factor
		A	B	C	D	E	F
4	Alameda	1.42	\$ 83,109	589			\$ 83,109
1	Alpine	0.86	\$ 50,203	3	Yes		\$ 50,203
1	Amador	1.00	\$ 58,358	26	Yes		\$ 58,358
2	Butte	0.91	\$ 52,893	135			\$ 52,893
1	Calaveras	0.90	\$ 52,234	26	Yes		\$ 52,234
1	Colusa	0.72	\$ 42,192	17	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
3	Contra Costa	1.25	\$ 72,956	373			\$ 72,956
1	Del Norte	0.77	\$ 44,756	28	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
2	El Dorado	1.01	\$ 58,915	82			\$ 58,915
3	Fresno	0.97	\$ 56,850	545			\$ 56,850
1	Glenn	0.68	\$ 39,704	20	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
2	Humboldt	0.78	\$ 45,347	90			\$ 45,347
2	Imperial	0.79	\$ 46,236	136			\$ 46,236
1	Inyo	0.84	\$ 48,879	19	Yes		\$ 48,879
3	Kern	1.05	\$ 61,492	525			\$ 61,492
2	Kings	0.88	\$ 51,626	101			\$ 51,626
2	Lake	0.75	\$ 43,825	47	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
1	Lassen	0.80	\$ 46,554	26	Yes		\$ 46,554
4	Los Angeles	1.36	\$ 79,343	4,921			\$ 79,343
2	Madera	0.94	\$ 54,774	93			\$ 54,774
2	Marin	1.29	\$ 74,991	99			\$ 74,991
1	Mariposa	0.81	\$ 46,966	12	Yes		\$ 46,966
2	Mendocino	0.82	\$ 47,610	67			\$ 47,610
2	Merced	0.89	\$ 52,114	142			\$ 52,114
1	Modoc	0.57	\$ 33,342	9	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
1	Mono	1.10	\$ 63,881	13	Yes		\$ 63,881
3	Monterey	1.19	\$ 69,463	191			\$ 69,463
2	Napa	1.22	\$ 70,946	72			\$ 70,946
2	Nevada	0.98	\$ 57,143	50			\$ 57,143
4	Orange	1.30	\$ 75,621	1,242			\$ 75,621
2	Placer	1.19	\$ 69,510	163			\$ 69,510
1	Plumas	0.70	\$ 40,697	14	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
4	Riverside	1.10	\$ 63,888	1,069			\$ 63,888
4	Sacramento	1.28	\$ 74,705	712			\$ 74,705
1	San Benito	0.97	\$ 56,466	25	Yes		\$ 56,466
4	San Bernardino	1.06	\$ 61,985	1,158			\$ 61,985
4	San Diego	1.18	\$ 68,673	1,226			\$ 68,673
4	San Francisco	1.70	\$ 99,406	386			\$ 99,406
3	San Joaquin	1.09	\$ 63,750	369			\$ 63,750
2	San Luis Obispo	1.06	\$ 62,103	147			\$ 62,103
3	San Mateo	1.44	\$ 83,836	275			\$ 83,836
3	Santa Barbara	1.19	\$ 69,471	212			\$ 69,471
4	Santa Clara	1.44	\$ 83,822	576			\$ 83,822
2	Santa Cruz	1.14	\$ 66,612	129			\$ 66,612
2	Shasta	0.87	\$ 50,744	145			\$ 50,744
1	Sierra	0.62	\$ 36,283	3	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
2	Siskiyou	0.70	\$ 40,823	33	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
3	Solano	1.18	\$ 68,845	210			\$ 68,845
3	Sonoma	1.13	\$ 65,792	218			\$ 65,792
3	Stanislaus	1.01	\$ 59,037	278			\$ 59,037
2	Sutter	0.96	\$ 55,879	63			\$ 55,879
2	Tehama	0.79	\$ 46,205	54			\$ 46,205
1	Trinity	0.65	\$ 38,150	14	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,655
3	Tulare	0.84	\$ 49,180	247			\$ 49,180
2	Tuolumne	0.81	\$ 47,414	39	Yes		\$ 47,414
3	Ventura	1.22	\$ 71,024	358			\$ 71,024
2	Yolo	1.04	\$ 60,941	102			\$ 60,941
2	Yuba	1.17	\$ 68,070	54			\$ 68,070

<b>WAFM Post BLS FTE Allotment: Median</b>
\$ 45,655

Cluster	Court	(Historical) Funding Subject to Reallocation	Court's Share of Current Historical Funding vs. FY 16-17 WAFM Funding Need		Re-allocation Ratio	Reallocation of 40%			New Reallocation of \$214.2M		
			Share of Historical Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM	Share of Total WAFM Funding Need (FY 16-17)		40 Percent of Funding Subject to Reallocation	Reallocation Using WAFM Proportion	Net	Allocation of \$214.2 Million Using 16-17 WAFM	Original Share of \$214.2 Million of Historical Allocation To Be Reallocated	Net
		A	B	C	D = C / B	E = 40% * Col. A	F = \$576.2M * Col. C	G = E + F	H = \$214.2M*C	I = -\$214.2M*B	J = H + I
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.83%	3.68%	76.3%	(27,834,747)	21,231,233	(6,603,514)	7,892,690	(10,347,540)	(2,454,850)
1	Alpine	52,142	0.04%	0.02%	45.0%	(220,857)	99,333	(121,523)	36,927	(82,103)	(45,176)
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.14%	0.12%	86.1%	(832,197)	716,688	(115,509)	266,428	(309,368)	(42,940)
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.51%	0.56%	110.6%	(2,915,124)	3,224,176	309,051	1,198,584	(1,083,695)	114,890
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.14%	0.12%	86.7%	(780,357)	676,751	(103,606)	251,582	(290,097)	(38,515)
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.09%	0.08%	82.5%	(547,321)	451,653	(95,668)	167,902	(203,466)	(35,564)
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.28%	2.18%	95.4%	(13,162,584)	12,563,677	(598,907)	4,670,535	(4,893,178)	(222,643)
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.15%	0.14%	89.1%	(880,928)	784,776	(96,152)	291,740	(327,484)	(35,745)
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.41%	0.37%	91.4%	(2,352,360)	2,149,808	(202,552)	799,189	(874,488)	(75,299)
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.39%	2.91%	121.8%	(13,782,490)	16,782,794	3,000,304	6,238,987	(5,123,627)	1,115,360
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.13%	0.08%	64.9%	(724,683)	470,332	(254,350)	174,846	(269,400)	(94,555)
2	Humboldt	5,005,941	0.35%	0.34%	98.9%	(2,002,376)	1,979,402	(22,975)	735,841	(744,381)	(8,541)
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.44%	0.49%	111.1%	(2,517,714)	2,796,825	279,110	1,039,717	(935,958)	103,759
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.12%	0.08%	69.6%	(688,984)	479,552	(209,432)	178,273	(256,129)	(77,856)
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.00%	2.98%	149.3%	(11,512,714)	17,191,435	5,678,721	6,390,899	(4,279,840)	2,111,059
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.33%	0.39%	117.6%	(1,906,204)	2,241,039	334,835	833,104	(708,629)	124,475
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.20%	0.17%	83.4%	(1,161,488)	968,623	(192,865)	360,085	(431,782)	(71,698)
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.13%	0.11%	82.3%	(756,265)	622,753	(133,512)	231,508	(281,141)	(49,633)
1	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.25%	29.81%	109.4%	(156,992,865)	171,763,652	14,770,787	63,852,971	(58,361,945)	5,491,026
2	Madera	5,953,244	0.41%	0.42%	101.9%	(2,381,297)	2,426,854	45,557	902,181	(885,245)	16,936
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.93%	0.56%	60.1%	(5,335,519)	3,205,504	(2,130,015)	1,191,643	(1,983,474)	(791,831)
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.06%	0.05%	81.4%	(368,237)	299,569	(68,668)	111,364	(136,892)	(25,527)
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.30%	0.28%	93.5%	(1,751,630)	1,637,875	(113,755)	608,879	(651,167)	(42,288)
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.63%	0.70%	112.4%	(3,613,347)	4,061,737	448,390	1,509,947	(1,343,258)	166,688
1	Modoc	890,668	0.06%	0.04%	58.4%	(356,267)	208,064	(148,203)	77,347	(132,442)	(55,094)
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.09%	0.08%	92.2%	(492,939)	454,321	(38,618)	168,893	(183,250)	(14,356)
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.90%	0.96%	106.7%	(5,203,650)	5,553,102	349,452	2,064,360	(1,934,452)	129,908
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.42%	0.38%	90.8%	(2,435,591)	2,212,665	(222,926)	822,556	(905,429)	(82,872)
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.26%	0.22%	84.6%	(1,526,890)	1,291,267	(235,623)	480,027	(567,620)	(87,593)
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.54%	7.17%	83.9%	(49,193,396)	41,289,735	(7,903,661)	15,349,419	(18,287,597)	(2,938,178)
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.77%	0.90%	116.4%	(4,445,657)	5,175,251	729,594	1,923,894	(1,652,669)	271,226
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.10%	0.06%	56.7%	(576,415)	326,728	(249,686)	121,461	(214,282)	(92,821)
4	Riverside	57,140,417	3.97%	5.03%	126.7%	(22,856,167)	28,966,606	6,110,439	10,768,307	(8,496,758)	2,271,550
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.27%	4.20%	98.3%	(24,627,192)	24,207,620	(419,572)	8,999,159	(9,155,135)	(155,975)
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.17%	0.12%	67.3%	(998,410)	672,427	(325,983)	249,974	(371,158)	(121,184)
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.26%	5.48%	128.7%	(24,534,059)	31,569,770	7,035,711	11,736,031	(9,120,512)	2,615,519
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.52%	6.91%	81.1%	(49,094,658)	39,823,241	(9,271,417)	14,804,251	(18,250,891)	(3,446,640)
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.68%	2.87%	77.9%	(21,195,263)	16,514,975	(4,680,288)	6,139,426	(7,879,318)	(1,739,892)
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.64%	1.98%	120.4%	(9,455,728)	11,389,228	1,933,500	4,233,934	(3,515,158)	718,777
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.74%	0.73%	99.8%	(4,241,977)	4,233,859	(8,117)	1,573,933	(1,576,951)	(3,018)
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.07%	1.80%	86.9%	(11,908,024)	10,346,116	(1,561,908)	3,846,159	(4,426,796)	(580,638)
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.27%	1.12%	88.2%	(7,346,130)	6,479,986	(866,144)	2,408,929	(2,730,917)	(321,988)
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.16%	3.79%	73.6%	(29,706,983)	21,855,143	(7,851,840)	8,124,628	(11,043,542)	(2,918,914)
2	Santa Cruz	9,910,386	0.69%	0.66%	95.6%	(3,964,154)	3,790,643	(173,511)	1,409,168	(1,473,671)	(64,503)
2	Shasta	7,409,092	0.51%	0.56%	109.4%	(2,963,637)	3,242,379	278,742	1,205,351	(1,101,729)	103,622
1	Sierra	542,215	0.04%	0.01%	39.6%	(216,886)	85,961	(130,925)	31,956	(80,627)	(48,671)
2	Siskiyou	3,254,627	0.23%	0.13%	56.3%	(1,301,851)	733,426	(568,425)	272,650	(483,962)	(211,311)
3	Solano	15,704,185	1.09%	1.11%	101.9%	(6,281,674)	6,399,319	117,645	2,378,941	(2,335,206)	43,734
3	Sonoma	18,845,883	1.31%	1.24%	94.4%	(7,538,353)	7,117,814	(420,539)	2,646,040	(2,802,375)	(156,335)
3	Stanislaus	15,497,803	1.08%	1.33%	123.9%	(6,199,121)	7,681,239	1,482,118	2,855,493	(2,304,517)	550,976
2	Sutter	3,403,045	0.24%	0.29%	122.3%	(1,361,218)	1,664,880	303,662	618,917	(506,031)	112,886
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.20%	0.22%	110.2%	(1,162,919)	1,282,034	119,115	476,595	(432,314)	44,281
1	Trinity	990,359	0.07%	0.06%	89.9%	(396,143)	356,000	(40,143)	132,343	(147,266)	(14,923)
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.85%	1.04%	121.4%	(4,917,205)	5,967,774	1,050,570	2,218,514	(1,827,966)	390,548
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.18%	0.15%	85.9%	(1,035,921)	889,557	(146,364)	330,692	(385,103)	(54,411)
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.69%	1.94%	114.6%	(9,746,731)	11,165,862	1,419,131	4,150,898	(3,623,338)	527,561
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.45%	0.50%	111.7%	(2,601,659)	2,905,582	303,923	1,080,147	(967,164)	112,983
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.22%	0.26%	117.6%	(1,290,030)	1,516,571	226,541	563,784	(479,568)	84,216
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,440,487,965</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>(576,195,186)</b>	<b>576,195,186</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>214,200,000</b>	<b>(214,200,000)</b>	<b>0</b>

Cluster	Court	Reallocation of \$19.6M			Allocation of New Money		Reversal of 2015-16 WAFM Allocation		Estimated 2016-17 Net Total Adjustments to Allocation	Estimated 2016-17 Funding Floor Adjustment
		Allocation of \$19.6 Million Using 16-17 WAFM	Original Share of \$19.6 Million of Historical Allocation To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$214.2 Million Using 16-17 WAFM	Allocation of \$19.6 Million Using 16-17 WAFM	30% Reallocation	\$214.2M Reallocation		
		K = \$19.6M*C	L = -\$19.6M*B	M = K + L	N = \$214.2M * C	O = \$20.0M * C	P	Q		
4	Alameda	721,767	(946,257)	(224,490)	7,892,690	721,767	5,312,625	(5,080,972)	(436,743)	(16,517)
1	Alpine	3,377	(7,508)	(4,131)	36,927	3,377	96,855	13,913	(19,759)	35,931
1	Amador	24,364	(28,291)	(3,927)	266,428	24,364	120,523	(189,891)	59,048	(532)
2	Butte	109,608	(99,101)	10,506	1,198,584	109,608	(142,440)	(1,224,900)	375,299	(2,180)
1	Calaveras	23,007	(26,529)	(3,522)	251,582	23,007	91,996	(198,898)	22,043	(507)
1	Colusa	15,354	(18,606)	(3,252)	167,902	15,354	69,029	(135,036)	(17,236)	160,044
3	Contra Costa	427,109	(447,469)	(20,360)	4,670,535	427,109	(85,464)	(4,977,901)	(807,633)	(8,738)
1	Del Norte	26,679	(29,948)	(3,269)	291,740	26,679	113,802	(214,669)	82,386	(587)
2	El Dorado	73,084	(79,970)	(6,886)	799,189	73,084	126,637	(748,948)	(34,774)	(1,520)
3	Fresno	570,540	(468,543)	101,997	6,238,987	570,540	(1,478,040)	(6,588,854)	2,960,295	(11,030)
1	Glenn	15,989	(24,636)	(8,647)	174,846	15,989	171,551	(99,336)	(94,502)	63,519
2	Humboldt	67,291	(68,072)	(781)	735,841	67,291	74,090	(670,933)	173,992	(1,388)
2	Imperial	95,080	(85,591)	9,488	1,039,717	95,080	(209,145)	(1,143,290)	174,720	(1,872)
1	Inyo	16,303	(23,422)	(7,120)	178,273	16,303	160,206	(97,312)	(36,939)	(436)
3	Kern	584,432	(391,381)	193,051	6,390,899	584,432	(3,840,861)	(8,087,404)	3,029,898	(10,404)
2	Kings	76,185	(64,802)	11,383	833,104	76,185	(161,378)	(868,609)	349,995	(1,427)
2	Lake	32,929	(39,485)	(6,557)	360,085	32,929	203,496	(230,050)	95,340	(721)
1	Lassen	21,171	(25,710)	(4,539)	231,508	21,171	96,064	(185,910)	(24,851)	(458)
4	Los Angeles	5,839,196	(5,337,055)	502,141	63,852,971	5,839,196	(12,632,140)	(70,884,573)	6,939,407	(115,500)
2	Madera	82,502	(80,953)	1,549	902,181	82,502	28,357	(857,134)	219,947	(1,711)
2	Marin	108,973	(181,384)	(72,411)	1,191,643	108,973	1,585,917	(411,306)	(519,030)	(2,806)
1	Mariposa	10,184	(12,518)	(2,334)	111,364	10,184	43,404	(93,864)	(25,442)	(262)
2	Mendocino	55,680	(59,548)	(3,867)	608,879	55,680	142,662	(509,742)	137,568	(1,208)
2	Merced	138,081	(122,838)	15,243	1,509,947	138,081	(355,481)	(1,695,658)	227,209	(2,697)
1	Modoc	7,073	(12,111)	(5,038)	77,347	7,073	100,682	(32,632)	(55,866)	(206)
1	Mono	15,445	(16,758)	(1,313)	168,893	15,445	43,710	(139,919)	33,841	107,760
3	Monterey	188,781	(176,901)	11,880	2,064,360	188,781	(123,480)	(2,056,862)	564,039	(3,808)
2	Napa	75,221	(82,799)	(7,578)	822,556	75,221	244,003	(663,541)	164,861	(1,587)
2	Nevada	43,897	(51,907)	(8,010)	480,027	43,897	144,374	(424,497)	(87,424)	(980)
4	Orange	1,403,666	(1,672,355)	(268,689)	15,349,419	1,403,666	5,420,018	(12,914,566)	(1,851,991)	(31,299)
2	Placer	175,935	(151,132)	24,803	1,923,894	175,935	(464,614)	(2,113,255)	547,583	(3,419)
1	Plumas	11,107	(19,596)	(8,488)	121,461	11,107	196,406	(19,579)	(41,600)	4,938
4	Riverside	984,735	(777,007)	207,728	10,768,307	984,735	(4,830,980)	(13,285,857)	2,225,921	(18,537)
4	Sacramento	822,951	(837,214)	(14,264)	8,999,159	822,951	(73,424)	(9,227,922)	(69,047)	(16,579)
1	San Benito	22,859	(33,941)	(11,082)	249,974	22,859	226,932	(146,193)	(104,676)	(551)
4	San Bernardino	1,073,231	(834,048)	239,183	11,736,031	1,073,231	(5,590,597)	(14,662,644)	2,446,434	(20,474)
4	San Diego	1,353,812	(1,668,999)	(315,187)	14,804,251	1,353,812	6,112,788	(12,191,097)	(2,953,490)	(30,342)
4	San Francisco	561,435	(720,544)	(159,109)	6,139,426	561,435	3,719,901	(4,191,666)	(350,192)	(13,130)
3	San Joaquin	387,183	(321,452)	65,730	4,233,934	387,183	(1,030,029)	(4,536,258)	1,772,837	(7,450)
2	San Luis Obispo	143,932	(144,208)	(276)	1,573,933	143,932	(67,386)	(1,643,753)	(4,685)	(2,902)
3	San Mateo	351,722	(404,820)	(53,098)	3,846,159	351,722	1,129,811	(3,306,780)	(174,732)	(7,682)
3	Santa Barbara	220,291	(249,736)	(29,445)	2,408,929	220,291	877,409	(1,861,115)	427,936	(4,669)
4	Santa Clara	742,977	(1,009,904)	(266,927)	8,124,628	742,977	6,552,502	(4,547,845)	(165,418)	(17,232)
2	Santa Cruz	128,865	(134,764)	(5,899)	1,409,168	128,865	173,978	(1,301,201)	166,897	(2,614)
2	Shasta	110,226	(100,750)	9,476	1,205,351	110,226	(129,040)	(1,229,650)	348,727	(2,276)
1	Sierra	2,922	(7,373)	(4,451)	31,956	2,922	95,802	14,345	(39,021)	28,370
2	Siskiyou	24,933	(44,257)	(19,324)	272,650	24,933	413,021	(74,522)	(162,978)	(672)
3	Solano	217,548	(213,549)	3,999	2,378,941	217,548	(219,515)	(2,552,818)	(10,465)	(4,488)
3	Sonoma	241,974	(256,270)	(14,296)	2,646,040	241,974	48,404	(2,754,391)	(409,145)	(5,158)
3	Stanislaus	261,128	(210,742)	50,385	2,855,493	261,128	(1,076,173)	(3,371,361)	752,566	(4,784)
2	Sutter	56,598	(46,275)	10,323	618,917	56,598	(160,832)	(665,470)	276,084	(1,076)
2	Tehama	43,583	(39,534)	4,049	476,595	43,583	(40,393)	(472,357)	174,873	(866)
1	Trinity	12,102	(13,467)	(1,365)	132,343	12,102	62,740	(85,069)	65,685	(308)
3	Tulare	202,878	(167,163)	35,715	2,218,514	202,878	(480,938)	(2,304,735)	1,112,551	(3,937)
2	Tuolumne	30,241	(35,217)	(4,976)	330,692	30,241	151,947	(234,473)	72,658	(664)
3	Ventura	379,589	(331,345)	48,244	4,150,898	379,589	(908,509)	(4,523,970)	1,092,944	(7,430)
2	Yolo	98,777	(88,445)	10,332	1,080,147	98,777	(117,442)	(1,083,588)	405,133	(1,944)
2	Yuba	51,557	(43,855)	7,701	563,784	51,557	66,662	(413,484)	586,977	(1,000)
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>19,588,058</b>	<b>(19,588,058)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>214,200,000</b>	<b>19,588,058</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(214,200,000)</b>	<b>19,588,058</b>	<b>(0)</b>

### Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

	2013-14 Beginning Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (11-12)	Total	% of Total
	TCTF and GF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)		
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Alameda	74,069,725	(3,177,924)	(1,958,825)	101,575	424,792	127,523	<b>69,586,867</b>	4.83%
Alpine	549,977	-	-	83	2,034	47	<b>552,142</b>	0.04%
Amador	2,066,138	-	-	2,565	11,006	783	<b>2,080,491</b>	0.14%
Butte	7,956,105	(467,145)	(291,613)	14,608	59,332	16,523	<b>7,287,810</b>	0.51%
Calaveras	1,927,985	-	-	3,074	18,652	1,180	<b>1,950,892</b>	0.14%
Colusa	1,352,785	-	-	1,447	13,708	363	<b>1,368,302</b>	0.09%
Contra Costa	34,237,741	-	(1,705,774)	69,231	218,186	87,076	<b>32,906,460</b>	2.28%
Del Norte	2,315,586	-	(126,942)	1,964	11,208	505	<b>2,202,321</b>	0.15%
El Dorado	5,867,266	-	(57,081)	11,851	54,374	4,491	<b>5,880,901</b>	0.41%
Fresno	35,177,288	-	(1,032,025)	60,497	181,080	69,384	<b>34,456,224</b>	2.39%
Glenn	1,799,795	(9,779)	-	1,927	19,264	500	<b>1,811,707</b>	0.13%
Humboldt	5,258,372	(167,800)	(150,006)	8,913	48,160	8,302	<b>5,005,941</b>	0.35%
Imperial	6,805,406	(420,479)	(180,405)	11,204	67,678	10,882	<b>6,294,286</b>	0.44%
Inyo	1,919,492	(186,658)	(42,314)	1,245	30,402	294	<b>1,722,461</b>	0.12%
Kern	30,203,399	(65,567)	(1,750,452)	52,450	277,328	64,629	<b>28,781,786</b>	2.00%
Kings	5,292,481	(421,918)	(181,060)	9,935	57,026	9,045	<b>4,765,510</b>	0.33%
Lake	3,130,735	(196,493)	(56,758)	4,311	20,328	1,596	<b>2,903,720</b>	0.20%
Lassen	2,161,420	(293,836)	-	2,384	20,156	538	<b>1,890,662</b>	0.13%
Los Angeles	428,645,200	(14,294,467)	(26,758,268)	689,065	3,144,530	1,056,102	<b>392,482,162</b>	27.25%
Madera	6,269,329	(381,406)	-	9,711	52,502	3,108	<b>5,953,244</b>	0.41%
Marin	13,587,985	(9,625)	(391,957)	17,038	114,766	20,590	<b>13,338,797</b>	0.93%
Mariposa	943,529	-	(28,406)	1,225	3,904	341	<b>920,593</b>	0.06%
Mendocino	4,636,654	(299,349)	-	6,083	30,068	5,619	<b>4,379,075</b>	0.30%
Merced	9,195,644	-	(250,840)	16,595	55,652	16,318	<b>9,033,368</b>	0.63%
Modoc	947,828	(789)	(63,471)	662	6,134	304	<b>890,668</b>	0.06%
Mono	1,251,020	(24,156)	(8,201)	914	12,446	324	<b>1,232,348</b>	0.09%
Monterey	13,973,323	(870,000)	(333,656)	28,573	183,464	27,420	<b>13,009,124</b>	0.90%
Napa	6,628,648	(295,552)	(287,148)	9,042	30,550	3,438	<b>6,088,978</b>	0.42%
Nevada	4,478,125	(433,431)	(292,045)	6,730	49,946	7,900	<b>3,817,225</b>	0.26%
Orange	127,622,123	(2,733,776)	(3,329,845)	206,630	923,882	294,477	<b>122,983,490</b>	8.54%
Placer	11,920,337	-	(933,901)	21,287	77,378	29,042	<b>11,114,142</b>	0.77%
Plumas	1,429,991	-	-	1,442	9,206	398	<b>1,441,037</b>	0.10%
Riverside	61,221,794	(1,931,520)	(2,882,751)	131,371	532,226	69,297	<b>57,140,417</b>	3.97%
Sacramento	64,637,712	(1,864,424)	(1,824,452)	93,189	340,254	185,701	<b>61,567,979</b>	4.27%
San Benito	2,476,122	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,327	<b>2,496,024</b>	0.17%

### Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

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

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.



## Summary of Changes from 2015–2016 to 2016-2017 Total WAFM Funding Need

Description	Change in Variable				Change in WAFM Estimated Need				
	2015-16 Amount	2016-17 Amount	Change in Amount	% Change	Change in Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base	Change in Estimated Benefit Need	Change in Estimated OE&E Needed	Total Change in Estimated Need	% Change in Total Estimated Need
	A	B	C (B - A)	D (C / A)	E	F	G	H Sum (E : G)	I (H / \$2.380B)
<b>Total Funding Need</b>	<b>\$ 2,380,284,755</b>	<b>\$ 2,350,120,506</b>	<b>\$ (30,164,249)</b>	<b>-1.3%</b>	<b>(5,324,808)</b>	<b>(23,963,127)</b>	<b>(743,437)</b>	<b>(30,164,249)</b>	<b>-1.3%</b>
RAS FTE Need Adjustment	18,603	17,978	(625)	-3.4%	(44,569,827)	(25,512,196)	(12,763,590)	(82,845,614)	-3.5%
RAS-Related Salary Adjustment	\$ 56,871	\$ 58,336	\$ 1,465	2.6%	31,847,912	11,377,481		43,225,393	1.8%
OE&E per FTE Adjustment	\$27,928 / \$20,287	\$29,621 / \$20,941	\$1,693 / \$654	6.1% / 3.2%			12,020,154	12,020,154	0.5%
Benefits Adjustment	\$ 742,216,937	\$ 730,675,209	\$ (11,541,729)	-1.6%		(11,541,729)		(11,541,729)	-0.5%
BLS Salary Adjustment	\$ 1,273,617,330	\$ 1,281,014,437	7,397,107	0.6%	7,397,107	1,713,318		9,110,425	0.4%
AB 1058 Funding Adjustment	40,129,299	40,262,178	132,878	0.3%				(132,878)	0.0%

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

Cluster	County	(Historical) WAFM Funding Subject to Reallocation	% of Statewide Historical WAFM Funding	WAFM Funding Need								
				15-16 Total WAFM Funding Need	% of 15-16 Statewide WAFM Funding Need	15-16 Re- allocation Ratio	WAFM Funding Need	% of Statewide WAFM Funding Need	Re- allocation Ratio	Change in WAFM Funding Need	% Change in WAFM Funding Need	Change in % of Statewide WAFM Funding Need
				Update	Update Label	Update Label						
A	B	C	D	E = (D / B)	F	G	H = (G / B)	I = (F - C)	J = (I / C)	K = (G / D) -100%		
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.8%	85,724,209	3.6%	74.6%	86,595,580	3.7%	76.3%	871,371	1.0%	2.3%
1	Alpine	552,142	0.0%	378,883	0.0%	41.5%	405,149	0.0%	45.0%	26,267	6.9%	8.3%
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.1%	2,773,992	0.1%	80.7%	2,923,146	0.1%	86.1%	149,154	5.4%	6.7%
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.5%	12,827,059	0.5%	106.5%	13,150,407	0.6%	110.6%	323,348	2.5%	3.8%
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.1%	2,716,963	0.1%	84.3%	2,760,256	0.1%	86.7%	43,294	1.6%	2.9%
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.1%	1,880,790	0.1%	83.2%	1,842,151	0.1%	82.5%	(38,638)	-2.1%	-0.8%
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.3%	54,845,890	2.3%	100.9%	51,243,320	2.2%	95.4%	(3,602,569)	-6.6%	-5.4%
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.2%	3,012,322	0.1%	82.8%	3,200,856	0.1%	89.1%	188,534	6.3%	7.6%
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.4%	9,020,166	0.4%	92.8%	8,768,398	0.4%	91.4%	(251,768)	-2.8%	-1.5%
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.4%	65,077,123	2.7%	114.3%	68,451,784	2.9%	121.8%	3,374,661	5.2%	6.5%
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.1%	2,048,781	0.1%	68.4%	1,918,339	0.1%	64.9%	(130,442)	-6.4%	-5.2%
2	Humboldt	5,005,941	0.3%	7,863,801	0.3%	95.1%	8,073,363	0.3%	98.9%	209,561	2.7%	4.0%
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.4%	11,552,757	0.5%	111.1%	11,407,375	0.5%	111.1%	(145,381)	-1.3%	0.0%
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.1%	1,963,799	0.1%	69.0%	1,955,945	0.1%	69.6%	(7,855)	-0.4%	0.9%
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.0%	68,715,131	2.9%	144.5%	70,118,504	3.0%	149.3%	1,403,372	2.0%	3.4%
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.3%	8,763,482	0.4%	111.3%	9,140,499	0.4%	117.6%	377,017	4.3%	5.6%
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.2%	3,677,284	0.2%	76.6%	3,950,710	0.2%	83.4%	273,426	7.4%	8.8%
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.1%	2,595,035	0.1%	83.1%	2,540,016	0.1%	82.3%	(55,019)	-2.1%	-0.9%
4	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.2%	718,122,121	30.2%	110.7%	700,570,381	29.8%	109.4%	(17,551,740)	-2.4%	-1.2%
2	Madera	5,953,244	0.4%	9,681,041	0.4%	98.4%	9,898,382	0.4%	101.9%	217,341	2.2%	3.6%
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.9%	13,305,924	0.6%	60.4%	13,074,251	0.6%	60.1%	(231,673)	-1.7%	-0.5%
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.1%	1,282,132	0.1%	84.3%	1,221,848	0.1%	81.4%	(60,284)	-4.7%	-3.5%
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.3%	6,450,265	0.3%	89.1%	6,680,383	0.3%	93.5%	230,118	3.6%	4.9%
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.6%	16,884,889	0.7%	113.1%	16,566,558	0.7%	112.4%	(318,331)	-1.9%	-0.6%
1	Modoc	890,668	0.1%	917,190	0.0%	62.3%	848,627	0.0%	58.4%	(68,563)	-7.5%	-6.3%
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.1%	1,795,596	0.1%	88.2%	1,853,033	0.1%	92.2%	57,437	3.2%	4.5%
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.9%	22,176,616	0.9%	103.2%	22,649,370	1.0%	106.7%	472,754	2.1%	3.4%
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.4%	8,717,542	0.4%	86.6%	9,024,771	0.4%	90.8%	307,229	3.5%	4.9%
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.3%	5,512,421	0.2%	87.4%	5,266,676	0.2%	84.6%	(245,745)	-4.5%	-3.2%
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.5%	173,366,093	7.3%	85.3%	168,407,955	7.2%	83.9%	(4,958,138)	-2.9%	-1.6%
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.8%	20,924,301	0.9%	113.9%	21,108,235	0.9%	116.4%	183,934	0.9%	2.2%
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.1%	1,299,380	0.1%	54.6%	1,332,623	0.1%	56.7%	33,244	2.6%	3.9%
4	Riverside	57,140,417	4.0%	121,029,006	5.1%	128.2%	118,145,753	5.0%	126.7%	(2,883,253)	-2.4%	-1.1%
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.3%	102,140,312	4.3%	100.4%	98,735,335	4.2%	98.3%	(3,404,977)	-3.3%	-2.1%
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.2%	2,874,516	0.1%	69.7%	2,742,618	0.1%	67.3%	(131,897)	-4.6%	-3.4%
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.3%	132,144,453	5.6%	130.4%	128,763,249	5.5%	128.7%	(3,381,204)	-2.6%	-1.3%
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.5%	169,142,391	7.1%	83.4%	162,426,582	6.9%	81.1%	(6,715,809)	-4.0%	-2.7%
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.7%	67,069,047	2.8%	76.6%	67,359,435	2.9%	77.9%	290,388	0.4%	1.7%
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.6%	44,735,436	1.9%	114.5%	46,453,108	2.0%	120.4%	1,717,673	3.8%	5.2%
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.7%	17,894,938	0.8%	102.1%	17,268,592	0.7%	99.8%	(626,347)	-3.5%	-2.3%
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.1%	42,969,454	1.8%	87.3%	42,198,583	1.8%	86.9%	(770,871)	-1.8%	-0.5%
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.3%	25,514,338	1.1%	84.1%	26,429,843	1.1%	88.2%	915,505	3.6%	4.9%
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.2%	86,629,182	3.6%	70.6%	89,140,315	3.8%	73.6%	2,511,134	2.9%	4.2%

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

Cluster	County	(Historical) WAFM Funding Subject to Reallocation	% of Statewide Historical WAFM Funding	WAFM Funding Need								
				15-16 Total WAFM Funding Need	% of 15-16 Statewide WAFM Funding Need	15-16 Re-allocation Ratio	WAFM Funding Need	% of Statewide WAFM Funding Need	Re-allocation Ratio	Change in WAFM Funding Need	% Change in WAFM Funding Need	Change in % of Statewide WAFM Funding Need
				Update	Update Label	Update Label						
A	B	C	D	E = (D / B)	F	G	H = (G / B)	I = (F - C)	J = (I / C)	K = (G / D) -100%		
2	Santa Cruz	9,910,386	0.7%	15,417,797	0.6%	94.1%	15,460,851	0.7%	95.6%	43,054	0.3%	1.6%
2	Shasta	7,409,092	0.5%	12,953,657	0.5%	105.8%	13,224,651	0.6%	109.4%	270,994	2.1%	3.4%
1	Sierra	542,215	0.0%	368,280	0.0%	41.1%	350,609	0.0%	39.6%	(17,671)	-4.8%	-3.6%
2	Siskiyou	3,254,627	0.2%	3,103,058	0.1%	57.7%	2,991,415	0.1%	56.3%	(111,642)	-3.6%	-2.4%
3	Solano	15,704,185	1.1%	27,158,939	1.1%	104.7%	26,100,828	1.1%	101.9%	(1,058,111)	-3.9%	-2.7%
3	Sonoma	18,845,883	1.3%	30,874,621	1.3%	99.1%	29,031,343	1.2%	94.4%	(1,843,278)	-6.0%	-4.8%
3	Stanislaus	15,497,803	1.1%	31,536,429	1.3%	123.1%	31,329,380	1.3%	123.9%	(207,050)	-0.7%	0.6%
2	Sutter	3,403,045	0.2%	6,509,119	0.3%	115.8%	6,790,525	0.3%	122.3%	281,407	4.3%	5.7%
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.2%	5,026,551	0.2%	104.6%	5,229,016	0.2%	110.2%	202,466	4.0%	5.4%
1	Trinity	990,359	0.1%	1,290,907	0.1%	78.9%	1,452,014	0.1%	89.9%	161,107	12.5%	13.9%
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.9%	22,962,196	1.0%	113.0%	24,340,690	1.0%	121.4%	1,378,494	6.0%	7.4%
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.2%	3,442,496	0.1%	80.4%	3,628,227	0.2%	85.9%	185,730	5.4%	6.7%
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.7%	45,268,238	1.9%	112.4%	45,542,069	1.9%	114.6%	273,831	0.6%	1.9%
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.5%	11,394,431	0.5%	106.0%	11,850,964	0.5%	111.7%	456,533	4.0%	5.3%
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.2%	4,961,988	0.2%	93.1%	6,185,620	0.3%	117.6%	1,223,632	24.7%	26.3%
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,440,487,965</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,380,284,755</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>2,350,120,506</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>(30,164,249)</b>	<b>-1.3%</b>	

Court % Changes in Relative WAFM Funding Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Relative decrease of <-5%	13% (2)	0% (0)	8% (1)	0% (0)	5% (3)
Relative change within +/- 5%	60% (9)	68% (15)	67% (8)	100% (9)	71% (41)
Relative increase of >5%	27% (4)	32% (7)	25% (3)	0% (0)	24% (14)
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>58</b>

Range of % Changes in Relative WAFM Funding Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	13.9%	26.3%	7.4%	4.2%	26.3%
Median	0.9%	3.7%	2.6%	-1.2%	2.0%
Low	-6.3%	-3.2%	-5.4%	-2.7%	-6.3%

Court % Changes in WAFM Funding Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in Need of <-5%	13% (2)	0% (0)	17% (2)	0% (0)	7% (4)
Need change within +/-5%	60% (9)	86% (19)	67% (8)	100% (9)	78% (45)
Increase in Need of >5%	27% (4)	14% (3)	17% (2)	0% (0)	16% (9)
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>58</b>

Range of % Changes in WAFM Funding Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	12.5%	24.7%	6.0%	2.9%	24.7%
Median	-0.4%	2.4%	1.3%	-2.4%	0.7%
Low	-7.5%	-4.5%	-6.6%	-4.0%	-7.5%

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

Cluster	County	RAS FTE Need						
		15-16 RAS FTE Need	% of 15-16 Statewide RAS FTE Need	RAS FTE Need	% of Statewide RAS FTE Need	Change in RAS FTE Need	% Change in RAS FTE Need	% Change in % of Statewide RAS FTE Need
		Update	Update Label					
		L	M	N	O	P = (N - L)	Q = (P / L)	R =(O/M) -100%
4	Alameda	601	3.2%	589	3.3%	(12)	-2.0%	1.4%
1	Alpine	3	0.0%	3	0.0%	-	0.0%	3.5%
1	Amador	26	0.1%	26	0.1%	-	0.0%	3.5%
2	Butte	134	0.7%	135	0.8%	1	0.7%	4.2%
1	Calaveras	27	0.1%	26	0.1%	(1)	-3.7%	-0.4%
1	Colusa	18	0.1%	17	0.1%	(1)	-5.6%	-2.3%
3	Contra Costa	381	2.0%	373	2.1%	(8)	-2.1%	1.3%
1	Del Norte	29	0.2%	28	0.2%	(1)	-3.4%	-0.1%
2	El Dorado	87	0.5%	82	0.5%	(5)	-5.7%	-2.5%
3	Fresno	533	2.9%	545	3.0%	12	2.3%	5.8%
1	Glenn	22	0.1%	20	0.1%	(2)	-9.1%	-5.9%
2	Humboldt	91	0.5%	90	0.5%	(1)	-1.1%	2.3%
2	Imperial	138	0.7%	136	0.8%	(2)	-1.4%	2.0%
1	Inyo	20	0.1%	19	0.1%	(1)	-5.0%	-1.7%
3	Kern	535	2.9%	525	2.9%	(10)	-1.9%	1.5%
2	Kings	99	0.5%	101	0.6%	2	2.0%	5.6%
2	Lake	46	0.2%	47	0.3%	1	2.2%	5.7%
1	Lassen	28	0.2%	26	0.1%	(2)	-7.1%	-3.9%
4	Los Angeles	5,202	28.0%	4,921	27.4%	(281)	-5.4%	-2.1%
2	Madera	96	0.5%	93	0.5%	(3)	-3.1%	0.2%
2	Marin	106	0.6%	99	0.6%	(7)	-6.6%	-3.4%
1	Mariposa	13	0.1%	12	0.1%	(1)	-7.7%	-4.5%
2	Mendocino	66	0.4%	67	0.4%	1	1.5%	5.0%
2	Merced	150	0.8%	142	0.8%	(8)	-5.3%	-2.0%
1	Modoc	10	0.1%	9	0.1%	(1)	-10.0%	-6.9%
1	Mono	13	0.1%	13	0.1%	-	0.0%	3.5%
3	Monterey	193	1.0%	191	1.1%	(2)	-1.0%	2.4%
2	Napa	72	0.4%	72	0.4%	-	0.0%	3.5%
2	Nevada	54	0.3%	50	0.3%	(4)	-7.4%	-4.2%
4	Orange	1,311	7.0%	1,242	6.9%	(69)	-5.3%	-2.0%
2	Placer	168	0.9%	163	0.9%	(5)	-3.0%	0.4%
1	Plumas	14	0.1%	14	0.1%	-	0.0%	3.5%
4	Riverside	1,100	5.9%	1,069	5.9%	(31)	-2.8%	0.6%
4	Sacramento	729	3.9%	712	4.0%	(17)	-2.3%	1.1%
1	San Benito	27	0.1%	25	0.1%	(2)	-7.4%	-4.2%
4	San Bernardino	1,201	6.5%	1,158	6.4%	(43)	-3.6%	-0.2%
4	San Diego	1,277	6.9%	1,226	6.8%	(51)	-4.0%	-0.7%
4	San Francisco	390	2.1%	386	2.1%	(4)	-1.0%	2.4%
3	San Joaquin	369	2.0%	369	2.1%	-	0.0%	3.5%
2	San Luis Obispo	154	0.8%	147	0.8%	(7)	-4.5%	-1.2%
3	San Mateo	280	1.5%	275	1.5%	(5)	-1.8%	1.6%
3	Santa Barbara	215	1.2%	212	1.2%	(3)	-1.4%	2.0%
4	Santa Clara	582	3.1%	576	3.2%	(6)	-1.0%	2.4%

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

Cluster	County	RAS FTE Need						
		15-16 RAS FTE Need	% of 15-16 Statewide RAS FTE Need	RAS FTE Need	% of Statewide RAS FTE Need	Change in RAS FTE Need	% Change in RAS FTE Need	% Change in % of Statewide RAS FTE Need
		L	M	N	O	P = (N - L)	Q = (P / L)	R = (O/M) - 100%
		Update	Update Label					
2	Santa Cruz	132	0.7%	129	0.7%	(3)	-2.3%	1.1%
2	Shasta	148	0.8%	145	0.8%	(3)	-2.0%	1.4%
1	Sierra	3	0.0%	3	0.0%	-	0.0%	3.5%
2	Siskiyou	35	0.2%	33	0.2%	(2)	-5.7%	-2.4%
3	Solano	222	1.2%	210	1.2%	(12)	-5.4%	-2.1%
3	Sonoma	231	1.2%	218	1.2%	(13)	-5.6%	-2.3%
3	Stanislaus	287	1.5%	278	1.5%	(9)	-3.1%	0.2%
2	Sutter	62	0.3%	63	0.4%	1	1.6%	5.1%
2	Tehama	54	0.3%	54	0.3%	-	0.0%	3.5%
1	Trinity	13	0.1%	14	0.1%	1	7.7%	11.4%
3	Tulare	244	1.3%	247	1.4%	3	1.2%	4.7%
2	Tuolumne	38	0.2%	39	0.2%	1	2.6%	6.2%
3	Ventura	367	2.0%	358	2.0%	(9)	-2.5%	0.9%
2	Yolo	103	0.6%	102	0.6%	(1)	-1.0%	2.5%
2	Yuba	54	0.3%	54	0.3%	-	0.0%	3.5%
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>18,603</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>17,978</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>(625)</b>	<b>-3.4%</b>	

Court % Changes in Relative RAS FTE Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Relative decrease of <-5%	13% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3% (2)
Relative change within +/- 5%	80% (12)	77% (17)	92% (11)	100% (9)	84% (49)
Relative increase of >5%	7% (1)	23% (5)	8% (1)	0% (0)	12% (7)
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>58</b>

Range of % Changes in Relative RAS FTE Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	11.4%	6.2%	5.8%	2.4%	11.4%
Median	-0.4%	2.2%	1.6%	0.6%	1.3%
Low	-6.9%	-4.2%	-2.3%	-2.1%	-6.9%

Court % Changes in RAS FTE Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in Need of <-5%	40% (6)	23% (5)	17% (2)	22% (2)	26% (15)
Need change within +/-5%	53% (8)	77% (17)	83% (10)	78% (7)	72% (42)
Increase in Need of >5%	7% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2% (1)
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>58</b>

Range of % Changes in RAS FTE Need by Cluster

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	7.7%	2.6%	2.3%	-1.0%	7.7%
Median	-3.7%	-1.3%	-1.8%	-2.8%	-2.1%
Low	-10.0%	-7.4%	-5.6%	-5.4%	-10.0%

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

Cluster	County	FTE Allotment Factor										
		15-16 FTE Allotment Factor (Floor at bottom)	Eligible for FTE Floor?	Qualifies for FTE Floor Adjustment?	% of 15-16 Statewide FTE Allotment Factor	FTE Allotment Factor (Floor at bottom)	Eligible for FTE Floor?	Qualifies for FTE Floor Adjustment?	% of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor	Change in FTE Allotment Factor	% Change in FTE Allotment Factor	% Change in % of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor
		Update	Update	Update	Update Label				Z	AA = (W - S)	AB = (AA / S)	AC = (Z/V) - 100%
		S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA = (W - S)	AB = (AA / S)	AC = (Z/V) - 100%
4	Alameda	80,846			142.2%	83,109			142.5%	2,264	2.8%	0.2%
1	Alpine	47,133	Yes		82.9%	50,203	Yes		86.1%	3,071	6.5%	3.8%
1	Amador	56,823	Yes		99.9%	58,358	Yes		100.0%	1,536	2.7%	0.1%
2	Butte	51,678			90.9%	52,893			90.7%	1,215	2.4%	-0.2%
1	Calaveras	50,419	Yes		88.7%	52,234	Yes		89.5%	1,815	3.6%	1.0%
1	Colusa	40,314	Yes	Yes	70.9%	42,192	Yes	Yes	72.3%	1,878	4.7%	2.0%
3	Contra Costa	71,248			125.3%	72,956			125.1%	1,707	2.4%	-0.2%
1	Del Norte	43,919	Yes	Yes	77.2%	44,756	Yes	Yes	76.7%	836	1.9%	-0.7%
2	El Dorado	56,637			99.6%	58,915			101.0%	2,278	4.0%	1.4%
3	Fresno	56,230			98.9%	56,850			97.5%	621	1.1%	-1.4%
1	Glenn	39,020	Yes	Yes	68.6%	39,704	Yes	Yes	68.1%	684	1.8%	-0.8%
2	Humboldt	43,884			77.2%	45,347			77.7%	1,463	3.3%	0.7%
2	Imperial	44,514			78.3%	46,236			79.3%	1,722	3.9%	1.3%
1	Inyo	47,341	Yes		83.2%	48,879	Yes		83.8%	1,538	3.2%	0.7%
3	Kern	59,987			105.5%	61,492			105.4%	1,504	2.5%	-0.1%
2	Kings	50,065			88.0%	51,626			88.5%	1,561	3.1%	0.5%
2	Lake	42,777	Yes	Yes	75.2%	43,825	Yes	Yes	75.1%	1,048	2.4%	-0.1%
1	Lassen	45,699	Yes		80.4%	46,554	Yes		79.8%	855	1.9%	-0.7%
4	Los Angeles	76,237			134.1%	79,343			136.0%	3,106	4.1%	1.5%
2	Madera	53,131			93.4%	54,774			93.9%	1,642	3.1%	0.5%
2	Marin	72,718			127.9%	74,991			128.6%	2,273	3.1%	0.5%
1	Mariposa	44,282	Yes		77.9%	46,966	Yes		80.5%	2,684	6.1%	3.4%
2	Mendocino	47,422			83.4%	47,610			81.6%	188	0.4%	-2.1%
2	Merced	51,026			89.7%	52,114			89.3%	1,088	2.1%	-0.4%
1	Modoc	34,148	Yes	Yes	60.0%	33,342	Yes	Yes	57.2%	(806)	-2.4%	-4.8%
1	Mono	65,349	Yes		114.9%	63,881	Yes		109.5%	(1,468)	-2.2%	-4.7%
3	Monterey	67,922			119.4%	69,463			119.1%	1,542	2.3%	-0.3%
2	Napa	69,423			122.1%	70,946			121.6%	1,523	2.2%	-0.4%
2	Nevada	55,103			96.9%	57,143			98.0%	2,040	3.7%	1.1%
4	Orange	73,981			130.1%	75,621			129.6%	1,640	2.2%	-0.4%
2	Placer	66,636			117.2%	69,510			119.2%	2,874	4.3%	1.7%
1	Plumas	39,816	Yes	Yes	70.0%	40,697	Yes	Yes	69.8%	881	2.2%	-0.4%
4	Riverside	61,391			107.9%	63,888			109.5%	2,497	4.1%	1.5%
4	Sacramento	72,898			128.2%	74,705			128.1%	1,807	2.5%	-0.1%
1	San Benito	55,942	Yes		98.4%	56,466	Yes		96.8%	523	0.9%	-1.6%
4	San Bernardino	60,128			105.7%	61,985			106.3%	1,857	3.1%	0.5%
4	San Diego	66,792			117.4%	68,673			117.7%	1,881	2.8%	0.2%
4	San Francisco	95,571			168.1%	99,406			170.4%	3,834	4.0%	1.4%
3	San Joaquin	62,716			110.3%	63,750			109.3%	1,034	1.6%	-0.9%
2	San Luis Obispo	60,964			107.2%	62,103			106.5%	1,140	1.9%	-0.7%
3	San Mateo	82,160			144.5%	83,836			143.7%	1,676	2.0%	-0.5%
3	Santa Barbara	66,307			116.6%	69,471			119.1%	3,163	4.8%	2.1%
4	Santa Clara	81,920			144.0%	83,822			143.7%	1,901	2.3%	-0.2%

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

Cluster	County	FTE Allotment Factor										
		15-16 FTE Allotment Factor (Floor at bottom)	Eligible for FTE Floor?	Qualifies for FTE Floor Adjustment?	% of 15-16 Statewide FTE Allotment Factor	FTE Allotment Factor (Floor at bottom)	Eligible for FTE Floor?	Qualifies for FTE Floor Adjustment?	% of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor	Change in FTE Allotment Factor	% Change in FTE Allotment Factor	% Change in % of Statewide FTE Allotment Factor
		Update	Update	Update	Update Label				Z	AA = (W - S)	AB = (AA / S)	AC = (Z/V) - 100%
		S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA = (W - S)	AB = (AA / S)	AC = (Z/V) - 100%
2	Santa Cruz	65,585			115.3%	66,612			114.2%	1,027	1.6%	-1.0%
2	Shasta	48,587			85.4%	50,744			87.0%	2,157	4.4%	1.8%
1	Sierra	41,587	Yes	Yes	73.1%	36,283	Yes	Yes	62.2%	(5,304)	-12.8%	-14.9%
2	Siskiyou	39,497	Yes	Yes	69.4%	40,823	Yes	Yes	70.0%	1,326	3.4%	0.8%
3	Solano	68,411			120.3%	68,845			118.0%	434	0.6%	-1.9%
3	Sonoma	66,317			116.6%	65,792			112.8%	(525)	-0.8%	-3.3%
3	Stanislaus	57,804			101.6%	59,037			101.2%	1,234	2.1%	-0.4%
2	Sutter	54,267			95.4%	55,879			95.8%	1,613	3.0%	0.4%
2	Tehama	45,390			79.8%	46,205			79.2%	815	1.8%	-0.8%
1	Trinity	37,191	Yes	Yes	65.4%	38,150	Yes	Yes	65.4%	958	2.6%	0.0%
3	Tulare	46,919			82.5%	49,180			84.3%	2,261	4.8%	2.2%
2	Tuolumne	46,997	Yes		82.6%	47,414	Yes		81.3%	417	0.9%	-1.6%
3	Ventura	69,095			121.5%	71,024			121.7%	1,929	2.8%	0.2%
2	Yolo	58,328			102.6%	60,941			104.5%	2,613	4.5%	1.9%
2	Yuba	52,812			92.9%	68,070			116.7%	15,258	28.9%	25.7%
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>56,871</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>58,336</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,465</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	
		<b>44,101</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>45,655</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>78.3%</b>	<b>1,554</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	

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

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

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

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	6.5%	28.9%	4.8%	4.1%	25.7%
Median	-0.4%	0.5%	-0.4%	0.2%	0.0%
Low	-12.8%	0.4%	-0.8%	2.2%	-14.9%

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

Cluster	County	Average % and \$ per FTE for Salary-Driven and Non-Salary-Driven Benefits											
		15-16 Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 10)	15-16 Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	15-16 Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	15-16 Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 10)	Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)	Change in Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Change in Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	Change in Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	Change in Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)
		Update	Update	Update	Update								
		AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK	AL =(AH/AD) -100%	AM =(AI/AE) -100%	AN =(AJ/AF) -100%	AO =(AK/AG) -100%
4	Alameda	36.68%	14,096	35.56%	14,147	37.66%	13,709	38.09%	13,774	2.67%	-2.74%	7.11%	-2.64%
1	Alpine	18.49%	23,750	18.49%	23,750	19.83%	23,503	23.63%	23,503	7.27%	-1.04%	27.82%	-1.04%
1	Amador	25.72%	8,841	25.03%	10,239	26.25%	10,466	26.25%	10,066	2.05%	18.38%	4.84%	-1.68%
2	Butte	26.08%	12,252	26.08%	11,728	26.75%	11,194	26.61%	11,187	2.57%	-8.63%	2.02%	-4.61%
1	Calaveras	21.59%	14,270	21.59%	17,439	21.43%	16,073	21.90%	19,884	-0.75%	12.63%	1.41%	14.02%
1	Colusa	39.81%	15,596	40.66%	16,353	38.81%	15,976	39.56%	16,706	-2.53%	2.44%	-2.71%	2.16%
3	Contra Costa	54.18%	15,741	54.16%	18,402	42.06%	15,193	42.08%	16,690	-22.37%	-3.49%	-22.29%	-9.30%
1	Del Norte	20.15%	24,226	20.15%	25,578	23.49%	29,601	23.50%	30,787	16.60%	22.19%	16.60%	20.37%
2	El Dorado	21.53%	17,051	21.53%	16,480	23.18%	16,189	23.17%	14,883	7.65%	-5.06%	7.65%	-9.69%
3	Fresno	68.65%	9,720	69.03%	9,193	68.83%	11,217	69.64%	10,872	0.27%	15.40%	0.89%	18.26%
1	Glenn	30.63%	13,960	34.54%	16,761	28.64%	12,924	32.32%	21,730	-6.50%	-7.42%	-6.42%	29.65%
2	Humboldt	30.40%	9,188	30.40%	10,056	31.27%	9,598	31.28%	10,419	2.89%	4.47%	2.89%	3.61%
2	Imperial	32.80%	4,926	34.24%	5,799	28.01%	4,359	28.92%	5,927	-14.62%	-11.52%	-15.56%	2.21%
1	Inyo	27.18%	13,930	22.81%	12,607	25.81%	15,115	22.15%	16,006	-5.01%	8.51%	-2.91%	26.96%
3	Kern	55.95%	16,476	55.95%	16,476	59.93%	16,118	59.89%	16,118	7.11%	-2.18%	7.04%	-2.18%
2	Kings	21.05%	8,921	24.58%	9,831	20.81%	9,188	20.81%	10,637	-1.14%	2.99%	-15.34%	8.20%
2	Lake	20.74%	7,723	20.74%	7,804	22.13%	8,593	22.13%	10,383	6.68%	11.26%	6.68%	33.05%
1	Lassen	20.02%	10,523	20.33%	11,354	22.28%	11,181	22.28%	11,354	11.30%	6.25%	9.60%	0.00%
4	Los Angeles	25.65%	22,765	34.68%	19,875	23.90%	23,878	33.97%	20,883	-6.82%	4.89%	-2.06%	5.07%
2	Madera	31.16%	12,584	31.16%	12,582	30.73%	15,511	30.73%	15,504	-1.38%	23.26%	-1.38%	23.22%
2	Marin	28.17%	12,709	26.75%	12,709	31.17%	13,632	29.17%	13,632	10.64%	7.26%	9.05%	7.26%
1	Mariposa	36.33%	10,026	37.13%	15,237	31.92%	10,309	29.78%	15,416	-12.13%	2.83%	-19.79%	1.17%
2	Mendocino	44.88%	9,420	47.25%	9,480	47.58%	9,589	46.39%	10,446	6.01%	1.79%	-1.80%	10.19%
2	Merced	59.03%	14,835	60.00%	14,848	59.83%	14,059	63.42%	15,029	1.35%	-5.23%	5.70%	1.22%
1	Modoc	25.50%	12,586	25.50%	12,586	25.18%	12,649	25.18%	12,649	-1.25%	0.50%	-1.25%	0.50%
1	Mono	34.46%	19,657	36.41%	21,622	37.49%	24,532	37.49%	23,785	8.81%	24.81%	2.98%	10.00%
3	Monterey	19.33%	14,545	19.37%	16,507	20.60%	15,383	20.37%	17,602	6.60%	5.76%	5.21%	6.64%
2	Napa	17.84%	19,706	18.42%	21,372	19.00%	20,876	19.15%	22,496	6.48%	5.94%	3.96%	5.26%
2	Nevada	36.20%	12,328	37.54%	12,649	36.84%	12,525	38.27%	11,200	1.77%	1.60%	1.95%	-11.45%
4	Orange	38.12%	11,036	38.41%	12,150	37.58%	11,870	37.31%	13,209	-1.40%	7.57%	-2.86%	8.72%
2	Placer	29.11%	19,829	29.12%	19,829	30.61%	19,323	30.61%	19,323	5.14%	-2.55%	5.14%	-2.55%
1	Plumas	28.61%	13,693	28.19%	17,914	25.89%	14,139	25.89%	19,320	-9.51%	3.26%	-8.17%	7.85%
4	Riverside	32.54%	9,553	32.34%	10,577	26.30%	10,013	26.44%	11,294	-19.19%	4.81%	-18.24%	6.79%
4	Sacramento	40.28%	19,032	41.20%	18,924	37.00%	16,888	37.99%	17,181	-8.15%	-11.27%	-7.79%	-9.21%
1	San Benito	23.30%	12,269	23.30%	16,695	25.68%	12,321	25.68%	16,948	10.20%	0.42%	10.20%	1.52%
4	San Bernardino	37.93%	8,332	40.66%	9,879	32.97%	9,364	36.75%	11,201	-13.07%	12.38%	-9.61%	13.39%
4	San Diego	56.79%	9,016	56.86%	9,929	50.34%	10,112	48.61%	11,054	-11.36%	12.16%	-14.51%	11.33%
4	San Francisco	32.34%	27,582	31.86%	27,568	28.38%	28,568	27.82%	28,552	-12.27%	3.57%	-12.67%	3.57%
3	San Joaquin	42.58%	13,107	44.41%	8,836	45.54%	13,763	47.40%	9,437	6.94%	5.01%	6.72%	6.80%
2	San Luis Obispo	41.54%	10,221	50.94%	10,374	40.28%	10,554	44.96%	10,697	-3.03%	3.26%	-11.74%	3.11%
3	San Mateo	42.73%	17,464	42.77%	14,572	39.38%	17,127	40.90%	14,301	-7.85%	-1.93%	-4.35%	-1.86%
3	Santa Barbara	39.48%	6,744	42.21%	7,575	40.22%	7,270	42.08%	7,755	1.88%	7.79%	-0.30%	2.38%
4	Santa Clara	30.93%	23,911	30.78%	25,168	31.98%	26,098	31.47%	27,572	3.39%	9.15%	2.23%	9.55%



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

Average % and \$ per FTE for Salary-Driven and Non-Salary-Driven Benefits													
Cluster	County	15-16 Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 10)	15-16 Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	15-16 Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	15-16 Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 10)	Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)	Change in Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Change in Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 10)	Change in Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Prog. 90)	Change in Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Prog. 90)
		Update	Update	Update	Update								
		AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK	AL =(AH/AD) -100%	AM =(AI/AE) -100%	AN =(AJ/AF) -100%	AO =(AK/AG) -100%
2	Santa Cruz	22.70%	16,282	22.71%	17,588	24.69%	16,073	24.65%	16,880	8.76%	-1.29%	8.54%	-4.02%
2	Shasta	22.20%	9,970	23.86%	12,482	23.39%	9,789	25.37%	12,360	5.37%	-1.81%	6.31%	-0.98%
1	Sierra	37.51%	17,520	37.50%	17,520	32.01%	16,500	32.01%	16,500	-14.65%	-5.82%	-14.65%	-5.82%
2	Siskiyou	28.21%	19,216	28.21%	17,008	29.90%	18,295	29.90%	16,782	6.01%	-4.79%	6.01%	-1.33%
3	Solano	32.29%	12,824	34.41%	14,711	32.58%	13,339	32.59%	17,537	0.90%	4.02%	-5.29%	19.21%
3	Sonoma	43.90%	19,989	43.82%	19,951	43.55%	19,772	43.65%	20,097	-0.79%	-1.09%	-0.39%	0.73%
3	Stanislaus	28.87%	17,882	29.38%	18,898	29.04%	18,521	28.85%	19,430	0.62%	3.57%	-1.80%	2.82%
2	Sutter	31.41%	14,487	32.02%	18,269	32.48%	14,094	33.47%	17,246	3.41%	-2.71%	4.51%	-5.60%
2	Tehama	22.92%	17,076	22.92%	16,571	23.97%	18,556	23.97%	18,680	4.58%	8.67%	4.58%	12.73%
1	Trinity	31.80%	13,849	36.06%	13,908	33.38%	13,614	38.04%	13,462	4.95%	-1.70%	5.48%	-3.21%
3	Tulare	21.95%	18,427	22.65%	19,889	20.65%	20,182	20.89%	20,743	-5.95%	9.52%	-7.76%	4.30%
2	Tuolumne	27.20%	13,781	28.18%	13,806	29.06%	13,812	30.11%	13,849	6.81%	0.23%	6.85%	0.31%
3	Ventura	37.50%	9,200	40.36%	11,251	38.20%	9,290	40.58%	11,636	1.86%	0.98%	0.54%	3.42%
2	Yolo	32.36%	12,077	39.94%	19,656	31.73%	14,013	33.91%	24,492	-1.94%	16.03%	-15.11%	24.61%
2	Yuba	17.41%	11,152	17.41%	12,656	19.05%	13,804	19.05%	14,916	9.47%	23.78%	9.47%	17.86%
	Statewide												

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

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in Benefits of <-10%	13% (2)	5% (1)	8% (1)	44% (4)	14% (8)
Benefits change within +/-10%	67% (10)	91% (20)	92% (11)	56% (5)	79% (46)
Increase in Benefits of >10%	20% (3)	5% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (4)
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>58</b>

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

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	16.6%
Median	-0.7%	4.9%	0.8%	-8.1%	1.8%
Low	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	-22.4%

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

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
Decrease in Benefits of <-10%	0% (0)	5% (1)	0% (0)	11% (1)	3% (2)
Benefits change within +/-10%	73% (11)	77% (17)	92% (11)	67% (6)	78% (45)
Increase in Benefits of >10%	27% (4)	18% (4)	8% (1)	22% (2)	19% (11)
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>58</b>

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

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Statewide
High	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	24.8%
Median	2.8%	1.7%	3.8%	4.9%	3.3%
Low	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	#VALUE!	-11.5%

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

Cluster	County	Funding Floor Adjustment					
		15-16 Floor Eligible?	15-16 Floor Allocation Adjustment	% of 15-16 Statewide Floor Allocation Adjustment	Floor Eligible?	Floor Allocation Adjustment	% of Statewide RAS FTE Need
		Update	Update	Update Label			
		AP	AQ	AR	AS	AT	AU
4	Alameda		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Alpine	Yes	36,601	6.5%	Yes	36,601	7.2%
1	Amador		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Butte		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Calaveras		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Colusa	Yes	127,447	22.7%	Yes	127,447	25.2%
3	Contra Costa		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Del Norte		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	El Dorado		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Fresno		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Glenn	Yes	69,935	12.5%	Yes	69,935	13.8%
2	Humboldt		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Imperial		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Inyo	Yes	3,850	0.7%	Yes	3,850	0.8%
3	Kern		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Kings		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Lake		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Lassen		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Los Angeles		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Madera		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Marin		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Mariposa	Yes	54,687	9.8%		-	0.0%
2	Mendocino		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Merced		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Modoc		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Mono	Yes	126,524	22.6%	Yes	126,524	25.0%
3	Monterey		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Napa		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Nevada		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Orange		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Placer		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Plumas		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Riverside		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Sacramento		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	San Benito		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	San Bernardino		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	San Diego		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	San Francisco		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	San Joaquin		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	San Luis Obispo		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	San Mateo		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Santa Barbara		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
4	Santa Clara		-	0.0%		-	0.0%

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

Cluster	County	Funding Floor Adjustment					
		15-16 Floor Eligible?	15-16 Floor Allocation Adjustment	% of 15-16 Statewide Floor Allocation Adjustment	Floor Eligible?	Floor Allocation Adjustment	% of Statewide RAS FTE Need
		Update	Update	Update Label			
		AP	AQ	AR	AS	AT	AU
2	Santa Cruz		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Shasta		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Sierra	Yes	38,053	6.8%	Yes	38,053	7.5%
2	Siskiyou		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Solano		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Sonoma		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Stanislaus		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Sutter		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Tehama		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
1	Trinity	Yes	103,171	18.4%	Yes	103,171	20.4%
3	Tulare		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Tuolumne		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
3	Ventura		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Yolo		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
2	Yuba		-	0.0%		-	0.0%
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>560,269</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>505,582</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## FY 2016-2017 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor

	Total WAFM- Related Allocation for 2016-17 (Prior to implementing funding floor)	Floor Funding	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Share of reduction	Reduction Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E
Alameda	71,312,691	N/A	-	4.12%	(16,517)
Alpine	714,069	750,000	35,931	0.00%	-
Amador	2,297,402	N/A	-	0.13%	(532)
Butte	9,411,313	N/A	-	0.54%	(2,180)
Calaveras	2,190,617	N/A	-	0.13%	(507)
Colusa	1,714,955	1,874,999	160,044	0.00%	-
Contra Costa	37,729,834	N/A	-	2.18%	(8,738)
Del Norte	2,534,040	N/A	-	0.15%	(587)
El Dorado	6,562,099	N/A	-	0.38%	(1,520)
Fresno	47,622,818	N/A	-	2.75%	(11,030)
Glenn	1,811,480	1,874,999	63,519	0.00%	-
Humboldt	5,994,093	N/A	-	0.35%	(1,388)
Imperial	8,083,871	N/A	-	0.47%	(1,872)
Inyo	1,881,511	N/A	-	0.11%	(436)
Kern	44,919,229	N/A	-	2.60%	(10,404)
Kings	6,161,824	N/A	-	0.36%	(1,427)
Lake	3,112,190	N/A	-	0.18%	(721)
Lassen	1,978,689	N/A	-	0.11%	(458)
Los Angeles	498,687,659	N/A	-	28.83%	(115,500)
Madera	7,389,203	N/A	-	0.43%	(1,711)
Marin	12,114,358	N/A	-	0.70%	(2,806)
Mariposa	1,130,914	N/A	-	0.07%	(262)
Mendocino	5,215,881	N/A	-	0.30%	(1,208)
Merced	11,646,113	N/A	-	0.67%	(2,697)
Modoc	888,539	N/A	-	0.05%	(206)
Mono	1,592,614	1,700,374	107,760	0.00%	-
Monterey	16,440,293	N/A	-	0.95%	(3,808)
Napa	6,851,268	N/A	-	0.40%	(1,587)
Nevada	4,229,557	N/A	-	0.24%	(980)
Orange	135,137,660	N/A	-	7.81%	(31,299)
Placer	14,763,447	N/A	-	0.85%	(3,419)
Plumas	1,245,061	1,250,000	4,938	0.00%	-
Riverside	80,034,287	N/A	-	4.63%	(18,537)
Sacramento	71,582,912	N/A	-	4.14%	(16,579)
San Benito	2,377,876	N/A	-	0.14%	(551)
San Bernardino	88,400,894	N/A	-	5.11%	(20,474)
San Diego	131,004,322	N/A	-	7.57%	(30,342)
San Francisco	56,689,451	N/A	-	3.28%	(13,130)
San Joaquin	32,167,556	N/A	-	1.86%	(7,450)
San Luis Obispo	12,529,229	N/A	-	0.72%	(2,902)
San Mateo	33,168,509	N/A	-	1.92%	(7,682)
Santa Barbara	20,159,350	N/A	-	1.17%	(4,669)
Santa Clara	74,402,032	N/A	-	4.30%	(17,232)
Santa Cruz	11,285,953	N/A	-	0.65%	(2,614)
Shasta	9,824,910	N/A	-	0.57%	(2,276)
Sierra	721,630	750,000	28,370	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	2,901,426	N/A	-	0.17%	(672)
Solano	19,376,109	N/A	-	1.12%	(4,488)
Sonoma	22,269,968	N/A	-	1.29%	(5,158)
Stanislaus	20,654,345	N/A	-	1.19%	(4,784)
Sutter	4,646,162	N/A	-	0.27%	(1,076)
Tehama	3,738,288	N/A	-	0.22%	(866)
Trinity	1,328,834	N/A	-	0.08%	(308)
Tulare	17,000,073	N/A	-	0.98%	(3,937)
Tuolumne	2,867,046	N/A	-	0.17%	(664)
Ventura	32,081,745	N/A	-	1.85%	(7,430)
Yolo	8,393,537	N/A	-	0.49%	(1,944)
Yuba	4,319,393	N/A	-	0.25%	(1,000)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,737,291,129</b>	<b>8,200,372</b>	<b>400,562</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>(400,562)</b>

Determination of Funding Floor

Cluster	Court			Current adjusted allocation if no floor applied	Determine Adjusted Allocation if Floor Applies				Funding Floor (for the graduated floor, the lower of the floor or prior-year allocation plus 10%)
		WAFM Calculated Need	% of Statewide Need		Graduated Funding Floor That Would Apply	Apply Floor? Yes, if F>E	Prior Year Plus 10%	Adjusted allocation if no floor applied	
A	B	C	D	E	F	F1	F2	F3	G
4	Alameda	86,595,580	3.68%	71,312,691	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Alpine	405,149	0.02%	714,069	750,000	Y	825,000	714,069	750,000
1	Amador	2,923,146	0.12%	2,297,402	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Butte	13,150,407	0.56%	9,411,313	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Calaveras	2,760,256	0.12%	2,190,617	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Colusa	1,842,151	0.08%	1,714,955	1,874,999	Y	1,876,231	1,714,955	1,874,999
3	Contra Costa	51,243,320	2.18%	37,729,834	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Del Norte	3,200,856	0.14%	2,534,040	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	El Dorado	8,768,398	0.37%	6,562,099	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Fresno	68,451,784	2.91%	47,622,818	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Glenn	1,918,339	0.08%	1,811,480	1,874,999	Y	2,062,499	1,811,480	1,874,999
2	Humboldt	8,073,363	0.34%	5,994,093	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Imperial	11,407,375	0.49%	8,083,871	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Inyo	1,955,945	0.08%	1,881,511	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Kern	70,118,504	2.98%	44,919,229	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Kings	9,140,499	0.39%	6,161,824	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Lake	3,950,710	0.17%	3,112,190	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Lassen	2,540,016	0.11%	1,978,689	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Los Angeles	700,570,381	29.81%	498,687,659	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Madera	9,898,382	0.42%	7,389,203	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Marin	13,074,251	0.56%	12,114,358	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Mariposa	1,221,848	0.05%	1,130,914	875,000	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Mendocino	6,680,383	0.28%	5,215,881	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Merced	16,566,558	0.70%	11,646,113	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Modoc	848,627	0.04%	888,539	875,000	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Mono	1,853,033	0.08%	1,592,614	1,874,999	Y	1,700,374	1,592,614	1,700,374
3	Monterey	22,649,370	0.96%	16,440,293	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Napa	9,024,771	0.38%	6,851,268	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Nevada	5,266,676	0.22%	4,229,557	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Orange	168,407,955	7.17%	135,137,660	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Placer	21,108,235	0.90%	14,763,447	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Plumas	1,332,623	0.06%	1,245,061	1,250,000	Y	1,399,087	1,245,061	1,250,000
4	Riverside	118,145,753	5.03%	80,034,287	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Sacramento	98,735,335	4.20%	71,582,912	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	San Benito	2,742,618	0.12%	2,377,876	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Bernardino	128,763,249	5.48%	88,400,894	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Diego	162,426,582	6.91%	131,004,322	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Francisco	67,359,435	2.87%	56,689,451	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	San Joaquin	46,453,108	1.98%	32,167,556	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	San Luis Obispo	17,268,592	0.73%	12,529,229	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	San Mateo	42,198,583	1.80%	33,168,509	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Santa Barbara	26,429,843	1.12%	20,159,350	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Santa Clara	89,140,315	3.79%	74,402,032	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Santa Cruz	15,460,851	0.66%	11,285,953	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Shasta	13,224,651	0.56%	9,824,910	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Sierra	350,609	0.01%	721,630	750,000	Y	825,000	721,630	750,000
2	Siskiyou	2,991,415	0.13%	2,901,426	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Solano	26,100,828	1.11%	19,376,109	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Sonoma	29,031,343	1.24%	22,269,968	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Stanislaus	31,329,380	1.33%	20,654,345	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Sutter	6,790,525	0.29%	4,646,162	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Tehama	5,229,016	0.22%	3,738,288	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Trinity	1,452,014	0.06%	1,328,834	1,250,000	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Tulare	24,340,690	1.04%	17,000,073	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Tuolumne	3,628,227	0.15%	2,867,046	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Ventura	45,542,069	1.94%	32,081,745	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yolo	11,850,964	0.50%	8,393,537	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yuba	6,185,620	0.26%	4,319,393	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>2,350,120,506</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,737,291,129</b>					<b>8,200,372</b>

## Estimated FY 2015-2016 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

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

## Estimated FY 2015-2016 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2014-15 Ending Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (13-14)	Annualization TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	Estimated 2014-15 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2013-14 Benefits Subsidy Reduction Return Allocation (Pending)	Current-Year Adjusted Allocation	2015-16 WAFM Allocation	Total 2015-16 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)	2015-16 WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	Total 2015-16 WAFM-Related Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J (Sum A:I)	K	L (Sum J:K)	M	N (Sum L:M)
Sutter	4,172,307	(247,071)	-	6,150	37,382	2,089	-	28,465	25,049	<b>4,024,371</b>	302,731	<b>4,327,102</b>	(1,431)	<b>4,325,670</b>
Tehama	3,186,372	-	(5,739)	4,138	28,100	1,378	-	72,996	8,625	<b>3,295,871</b>	210,687	<b>3,506,558</b>	(1,160)	<b>3,505,398</b>
Trinity	1,578,531	(450,608)	-	943	7,648	552	-	37,893	6,930	<b>1,181,889</b>	(35,061)	<b>1,146,829</b>	103,171	<b>1,250,000</b>
Tulare	14,364,451	(15,576)	(670,426)	28,289	204,932	27,186	-	353,922	35,846	<b>14,328,624</b>	1,113,228	<b>15,441,852</b>	(5,107)	<b>15,436,745</b>
Tuolumne	2,930,002	(220,516)	(86,731)	3,916	16,642	977	-	65,010	6,677	<b>2,715,976</b>	(13,277)	<b>2,702,700</b>	(894)	<b>2,701,806</b>
Ventura	30,149,914	(1,559,157)	(617,049)	54,971	205,304	54,112	-	288,505	188,050	<b>28,764,649</b>	1,719,233	<b>30,483,882</b>	(10,082)	<b>30,473,800</b>
Yolo	8,193,175	(582,889)	(24,224)	12,802	48,556	10,078	-	147,776	27,253	<b>7,832,527</b>	438,940	<b>8,271,468</b>	(2,736)	<b>8,268,732</b>
Yuba	3,547,052	(132,569)	-	4,696	15,788	1,586	-	9,769	22,970	<b>3,469,293</b>	132,620	<b>3,601,913</b>	(1,191)	<b>3,600,722</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,683,398,629</b>	<b>(40,983,089)</b>	<b>(58,793,118)</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>	<b>10,907,494</b>	<b>2,727,939</b>	<b>(817,737)</b>	<b>24,229,808</b>	<b>13,274,798</b>	<b>1,636,444,724</b>	<b>67,900,000</b>	<b>1,704,344,724</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,704,344,724</b>

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.





## Estimated FY 2016-2017 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2015-16 Ending TCTF and GF Base	TCTF Reduction and Annualization for SJO Conversions	Non-Sheriff's Security Non- BCP Funding	Non-Sheriff's Security BCP Funding	Security Base Adjustment	SJO Adjustment <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (14-15)	Estimated 2015- 16 Benefits Funding (Full- Year) (Pending Approval)	Subsidy Reduction Return Allocation (Pending Recommendation and Approval)	WAFM 16-17 Adjustment	Total 2016-17 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)	WAFM 16-17 Funding Floor Adjustment	Total 2016-17 WAFM-Related Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M (Sum A:L)	N	O (Sum M:N)
Trinity	1,684,534	-	-	69,871	(520,479)	-	943	7,648	666	10,086	9,880	65,685	<b>1,328,834</b>	(308)	<b>1,328,527</b>
Tulare	15,826,494	(199,884)	168	-	(15,744)	(442,427)	28,289	204,932	23,739	410,850	51,104	1,112,551	<b>17,000,073</b>	(3,937)	<b>16,996,136</b>
Tuolumne	2,980,841	-	2,382	-	(222,898)	(88,005)	3,916	16,642	938	91,053	9,519	72,658	<b>2,867,046</b>	(664)	<b>2,866,382</b>
Ventura	32,147,570	-	16,839	-	(1,575,996)	(627,467)	54,971	205,304	49,258	450,232	268,090	1,092,944	<b>32,081,745</b>	(7,430)	<b>32,074,314</b>
Yolo	8,777,156	(199,884)	6,295	-	(589,184)	(282,563)	12,802	48,556	8,551	123,356	83,319	405,133	<b>8,393,537</b>	(1,944)	<b>8,391,593</b>
Yuba	3,688,250	-	1,432	-	(134,001)	-	4,696	15,788	1,454	122,050	32,747	586,977	<b>4,319,393</b>	(1,000)	<b>4,318,393</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,774,710,700</b>	<b>(1,776,284)</b>	<b>411,942</b>	<b>342,506</b>	<b>(41,737,537)</b>	<b>(58,828,647)</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>	<b>10,907,494</b>	<b>2,428,420</b>	<b>8,452,388</b>	<b>20,292,088</b>	<b>19,588,058</b>	<b>1,737,291,129</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>1,737,291,129</b>

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

**Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap**  
(as of 5:00 pm on July 19, 2016)

Court	Cap	FY 2015-16 Fund Balance	Encumbrances	Restricted	Prepayments	Fund Balance Subject to Cap	Current Year Reduction	Prior Year Disencum- brance	Total Preliminary Reduction	Comments
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F (B - C - D - E)	Col. G (F - A)	Col. H	Col. I (G + H)	
Alameda	1,038,108	4,447,175	1,837,506	741,164	19,074	1,849,431	811,323	1,204,632	2,015,955	
Alpine	5,580	218,290	3,365	7,689	0	207,236	201,656	-	201,656	
Amador	27,541	28,673	11,318	750	0	16,605	-	-	-	
Butte	127,323	485,977	26,275	310,419	21,960	127,323	0	11,112	11,112	
Calaveras	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	Not received
Colusa	23,447	233,146	0	209,786	0	23,360	-	-	-	
Contra Costa	568,509	5,046,456	811,037	2,785,666	0	1,449,753	881,244	-	881,244	
Del Norte	32,713	583,822	40,298	442,971	0	100,553	67,840	32,504	100,344	
El Dorado	87,430	271,281	0	257,067	0	14,214	-	1,593	1,593	
Fresno	637,018	3,242,634	726,536	1,731,305	314,540	470,253	-	-	-	
Glenn	32,503	182,639	90,000	92,639	0	(0)	-	90,000	90,000	
Humboldt	86,499	356,783	97,454	144,468	85,691	29,170	-	-	-	
Imperial	126,244	1,864,899	762,419	892,808	83,952	125,720	-	-	-	
Inyo	27,110	487,824	71,458	389,947	176	26,242	-	-	-	
Kern	682,951	7,690,373	3,061,593	2,570,407	575,909	1,482,464	799,513	815,070	1,614,583	
Kings	89,028	388,170	335,898	52,272	0	0	-	-	-	
Lake	38,780	356,098	195,888	126,271	0	33,940	-	84,253	84,253	
Lassen	31,002	461,422	353,116	88,708	0	19,599	-	132,148	132,148	
Los Angeles	7,221,396	81,141,139	63,191,453	13,128,554	0	4,821,131	-	-	-	
Madera	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	Not received
Marin	144,106	988,941	333,011	511,248	10,000	134,681	-	-	-	
Mariposa	15,892	30,114	0	15,646	0	14,468	-	-	-	
Mendocino	67,606	346,097	161,116	118,489	0	66,492	-	-	-	
Merced	160,811	3,765,652	1,017,186	2,686,713	0	61,753	-	298,878	298,878	
Modoc	13,512	134,321	102,646	26,249	0	5,426	-	-	-	
Mono	20,845	25,158	12,960	11,518	0	681	-	-	-	
Monterey	228,443	1,525,000	574,963	680,295	129,009	140,733	-	51,915	51,915	
Napa	98,390	926,728	316,082	512,711	0	97,935	-	113,793	113,793	
Nevada	69,296	189,363	0	189,363	0	(0)	-	-	-	
Orange	1,967,847	10,661,384	3,300,000	4,789,759	772,831	1,798,794	-	857,269	857,269	
Placer	186,248	1,356,356	676,741	426,127	5,874	247,614	61,366	211,351	272,716	
Plumas	15,556	119,284	70,984	35,440	0	12,860	-	-	-	
Riverside	1,462,341	3,004,504	731,424	2,273,080	0	0	-	-	-	
Sacramento	937,737	7,136,895	4,698,337	1,477,656	38,889	922,013	-	1,810,775	1,810,775	
San Benito	30,130	232,780	122,375	62,036	21,412	26,957	-	-	-	
San Bernardino	1,138,647	13,946,127	9,436,395	1,679,016	2,830,717	0	-	-	-	
San Diego	1,777,541	19,818,215	6,005,598	11,691,950	1,584,829	535,838	-	-	-	
San Francisco	795,834	9,127,886	7,186,544	1,241,342	0	700,000	-	-	-	
San Joaquin	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	Not received

**Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap**  
(as of 5:00 pm on July 19, 2016)

Court	Cap	FY 2015-16 Fund Balance	Encumbrances	Restricted	Prepayments	Fund Balance Subject to Cap	Current Year Reduction	Prior Year Disencum- brance	Total Preliminary Reduction	Comments
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F (B - C - D - E)	Col. G (F - A)	Col. H	Col. I (G + H)	Col. J
San Luis Obispo	172,676	2,360,021	575,402	1,612,959	0	171,660	-	-	-	
San Mateo	425,049	2,199,804	662,936	1,126,438	0	410,430	-	-	-	
Santa Barbara	283,500	3,615,018	0	2,690,343	118,893	805,782	522,282	-	<b>522,282</b>	
Santa Clara	999,128	4,893,423	2,675,121	1,938,009	0	280,293	-	-	-	
Santa Cruz	148,596	541,906	0	393,310	0	148,596	-	-	-	
Shasta	174,580	694,564	329,074	194,393	0	171,097	-	-	-	
Sierra	8,137	104,418	64,398	7,073	25,000	7,947	-	-	-	
Siskiyou	44,865	156,282	0	111,417	0	44,865	-	29,481	<b>29,481</b>	
Solano	254,977	1,246,252	68,526	1,002,148	0	175,577	-	-	-	
Sonoma	300,344	2,692,603	1,185,980	1,467,605	39,019	(0)	-	842,106	<b>842,106</b>	
Stanislaus	264,918	1,916,921	568,165	1,069,822	232,111	46,823	-	-	-	
Sutter	64,987	1,455,102	1,002,852	377,398	10,000	64,852	-	347,495	<b>347,495</b>	
Tehama	53,552	1,083,281	939,401	108,309	24,000	11,571	-	-	-	
Trinity	20,473	27,478	0	27,478	0	(0)	-	-	-	
Tulare	277,914	2,118,430	1,337,103	425,509	85,396	270,422	-	-	-	
Tuolumne	40,444	102,808	0	81,822	0	20,985	-	-	-	
Ventura	460,484	1,672,378	1,497,339	116,282	0	58,757	-	-	-	
Yolo	125,132	626,144	32,024	451,788	17,923	124,409	-	-	-	
Yuba	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	Not received
<b>Total</b>	<b>24,133,720</b>	<b>208,328,439</b>	<b>117,300,298</b>	<b>65,603,632</b>	<b>7,047,202</b>	<b>18,377,307</b>	<b>3,345,224</b>	<b>6,934,373</b>	<b>10,279,597</b>	<b>4</b>

## 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form

Enter Court Name Here

	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	Instructions
<b>1 Part A - Computation of Cap</b>				
2 Expenditures				Court enters expenditures for ending fiscal year
3 Less: Expense related to FY13/14 encumbrances				Court enters current year expenditures as a related to prior year encumbrances. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
Less: Expense related to FY14/15 encumbrances				Court enters current year expenditures as a related to prior year encumbrances. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
Less: Expense related to FY15/16 encumbrances				Court enters current year expenditures as a related to prior year encumbrances. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
4 Accruals				Court enters expense accruals for ending fiscal year
5 Encumbrances as of June 30				Court enters total ending year fund balance reserved for encumbrances
6 Less: remaining Encumbrances from FY13/14	0			Court enters the amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrance (row 5) that is related to prior fiscal years. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
Less: remaining Encumbrances from FY14/15	0	0		Court enters the amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrance (row 5) that is related to prior fiscal years. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
Less: remaining Encumbrances from FY15/16	0	0	0	Court enters the amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrance (row 5) that is related to prior fiscal years. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
7 <b>Operating Budget</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	This cell calculates Operating Budget
8 <b>Fund Balance Cap (1% of Operating Budget)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	This cell calculates fund balance cap
<b>9 Part B - Computation of Fund Balance Subject to Cap</b>				
10 Ending fund balance				Court enters actual year end fund balance
11 Less: Encumbrances as of June 30	0	0	0	This cell uses encumbrance amount entered above
12 Less: Excluded Funds Per GC 77203			0	This cell is populated from Excluded Detail sheet total
13 Less: Prepayments				Court enters Pre Payments
14 <b>Fund Balance Subject to Cap</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	This calculated cell is what will be compared to the cap above
<b>15 Part C - Potential Additional Allocation Reduction</b>				
16 Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that if not expensed in the next two years is subject to the cap	0	0	0	These amounts will be liquidated 3 years from the original date of the encumbrance if not spent (year of encumbrance, plus 2 additional). These are the encumbrance amounts for the fiscal year listed above.
17 <b>Less: Encumbrances from Excluded Funds</b>				This is the amount of encumbrances from cell 11 that represents excluded funds encumbered and therefore not subject to reversion
18 Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction	0	0	0	Self explanatory
<b>25 Part D - Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction</b>				
26 Current Year Only	0	0	0	This is the amount of fund balance over the cap
20 FY13/14 Liquidation in second year	0	0	0	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in year following original encumbrance.
21 FY13/14 Liquidation in third year	0	0	0	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance.
22 FY14/15 Liquidation in second year	0	0	0	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in year following original encumbrance.
23 FY14/15 Liquidation in third year	0	0	0	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance.
24 <b>Total Allocation Reduction</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	This is total amount that will be reduced in the allocation.

**Allocation of \$9.2 Million of Criminal Justice Realignment Funding  
Using Percentage of Petitions to Revoke/Modify Post Release Community Supervision and Parole  
(January 1, 2015-December 31, 2015)**

Court	Total PRCS and Parole only	Percent Statewide (PRCS/Parole)	Current allocation methodology (PRCS+ Parole only)
	Column A	Column B	Column C
Alameda	1,242	2.57%	\$237,286
Alpine <sup>1,2</sup>	-	0.00%	\$0
Amador	32	0.07%	\$6,114
Butte	372	0.77%	\$71,071
Calaveras	20	0.04%	\$3,821
Colusa	20	0.04%	\$3,821
Contra Costa	439	0.91%	\$83,872
Del Norte	41	0.08%	\$7,833
El Dorado	186	0.39%	\$35,536
Fresno	1,944	4.03%	\$371,404
Glenn	15	0.03%	\$2,802
Humboldt	205	0.42%	\$39,166
Imperial	171	0.35%	\$32,670
Inyo	9	0.02%	\$1,719
Kern	1,613	3.34%	\$308,166
Kings	304	0.63%	\$58,080
Lake	66	0.14%	\$12,609
Lassen	26	0.05%	\$4,967
Los Angeles	18,169	37.64%	\$3,471,211
Madera	219	0.45%	\$41,840
Marin	80	0.17%	\$15,284
Mariposa	13	0.03%	\$2,484
Mendocino <sup>1,2</sup>	154	0.32%	\$29,422
Merced <sup>1,2</sup>	522	1.08%	\$99,729
Modoc	4	0.01%	\$764
Mono	2	0.00%	\$382
Monterey	221	0.46%	\$42,222
Napa	73	0.15%	\$14,010
Nevada	34	0.07%	\$6,496
Orange	2,024	4.19%	\$386,688
Placer	161	0.33%	\$30,759
Plumas	10	0.02%	\$1,911
Riverside	4,260	8.82%	\$813,878
Sacramento	838	1.74%	\$160,101
San Benito	48	0.10%	\$9,170
San Bernardino	4,213	8.73%	\$804,899
San Diego	2,578	5.34%	\$492,530
San Francisco	286	0.59%	\$54,641
San Joaquin	874	1.81%	\$166,979
San Luis Obispo	327	0.68%	\$62,474
San Mateo	160	0.33%	\$30,568
Santa Barbara	404	0.84%	\$77,185
Santa Clara	659	1.37%	\$125,903
Santa Cruz	160	0.33%	\$30,568
Shasta	446	0.92%	\$85,209
Sierra	4	0.01%	\$764
Siskiyou	61	0.13%	\$11,654
Solano	588	1.22%	\$112,338
Sonoma	548	1.14%	\$104,696
Stanislaus	465	0.96%	\$88,839
Sutter	92	0.19%	\$17,577
Tehama	94	0.19%	\$17,959
Trinity	14	0.03%	\$2,675
Tulare	409	0.85%	\$78,140
Tuolumne	28	0.06%	\$5,349
Ventura	1,898	3.93%	\$362,615
Yolo	218	0.45%	\$41,649
Yuba	212	0.44%	\$40,503
<b>Total (statewide)</b>	<b>48,275</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$9,223,000</b>

**Two Distributions of \$10.7 Million based on Most Recent Proposition 47 Petitions and Applications  
(October 1, 2015 - March 31, 2016)**

Court	Total Prop 47 Filings (Petitions + Applications)	Percent of Statewide Prop 47 Filings	Current allocation (Column B*\$10.7 Million)
	Column A	Column B	Column C
Alameda	1,281	3.16%	\$338,212
Alpine	-	0.00%	\$0
Amador	33	0.08%	\$8,713
Butte	219	0.54%	\$57,821
Calaveras	23	0.06%	\$6,072
Colusa	2	0.00%	\$528
Contra Costa	427	1.05%	\$112,737
Del Norte	34	0.08%	\$8,977
El Dorado	117	0.29%	\$30,891
Fresno	1,289	3.18%	\$340,324
Glenn	20	0.05%	\$5,280
Humboldt	66	0.16%	\$17,425
Imperial	82	0.20%	\$21,650
Inyo	2	0.00%	\$528
Kern	4,352	10.74%	\$1,149,022
Kings	265	0.65%	\$69,966
Lake	48	0.12%	\$12,673
Lassen	30	0.07%	\$7,921
Los Angeles	9,902	24.43%	\$2,614,341
Madera	81	0.20%	\$21,386
Marin	140	0.35%	\$36,963
Mariposa	10	0.02%	\$2,640
Mendocino	-	0.00%	\$0
Merced	119	0.29%	\$31,419
Modoc	-	0.00%	\$0
Mono	9	0.02%	\$2,376
Monterey	139	0.34%	\$36,699
Napa	-	0.00%	\$0
Nevada	17	0.04%	\$4,488
Orange	2,810	6.93%	\$741,900
Placer	113	0.28%	\$29,834
Plumas	1	0.00%	\$264
Riverside	1,318	3.25%	\$347,980
Sacramento	408	1.01%	\$107,721
San Benito	22	0.05%	\$5,808
San Bernardino	2,521	6.22%	\$665,598
San Diego	1,871	4.62%	\$493,984
San Francisco	270	0.67%	\$71,286
San Joaquin	1,993	4.92%	\$526,195
San Luis Obispo	188	0.46%	\$49,636
San Mateo	2,636	6.50%	\$695,961
Santa Barbara	184	0.45%	\$48,580
Santa Clara	1,115	2.75%	\$294,384
Santa Cruz	790	1.95%	\$208,577
Shasta	318	0.78%	\$83,959
Sierra	-	0.00%	\$0
Siskiyou	11	0.03%	\$2,904
Solano	468	1.15%	\$123,562
Sonoma	208	0.51%	\$54,916
Stanislaus	919	2.27%	\$242,636
Sutter	-	0.00%	\$0
Tehama	48	0.12%	\$12,673
Trinity	11	0.03%	\$2,904
Tulare	516	1.27%	\$136,235
Tuolumne	79	0.19%	\$20,858
Ventura	2,005	4.95%	\$529,363
Yolo	964	2.38%	\$254,517
Yuba	33	0.08%	\$8,713
<b>Total (statewide)</b>	<b>40,527</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$10,700,000</b>