



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on May 24, 2018

Title

Juvenile Dependency: Fiscal Year 2017–18
Allocation for Juvenile Dependency Counsel
Collections Program and Court-Appointed
Counsel Expected Unspent Funding
Reallocation

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected
None

Recommended by

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

May 24, 2018

Date of Report

May 7, 2018

Contact

Don Will, 415-865-7557

don.will@jud.ca.gov

Michele Allan, 916-263-1374

michele.allan@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends two redistributions of funding for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel for fiscal year (FY) 2017–18: (1) The recommendation is made to allocate \$542,892 to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its August 23, 2013, business meeting; and (2) reallocate unspent dependency counsel funding from courts that have identified funds they do not intend to spend to courts funded at below the average statewide funding level.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective May 24, 2018:

1. Allocate \$542,892, the FY 2016–17 Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) funds remitted in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs, to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its

August 23, 2013, business meeting (Attachment A shows projected allocations based on information received at the time of this report).

2. Allocate \$679,351, the FY 2017–18 Court-Appointed Counsel expected unspent funding, to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at January 22, 2015, business meeting. Attachment B (column J) shows projected allocations based on information obtained from trial courts at the time of this report.

The recommended allocation outlined in Attachment A was determined using the methodology approved by the council at its August 23, 2013, meeting.¹

Relevant Previous Council Action

Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program

At its October 26, 2012, meeting, the Judicial Council adopted the JDCCP guidelines,² which fulfilled the council’s legislative mandate to “establish a program to collect reimbursements from the person liable for the costs of counsel appointed to represent parents or minors pursuant to [Welfare & Institutions Code] Section 903.1 in dependency proceedings.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 903.47(a).)³ As required by statute, the guidelines include a statewide standard for determining an obligated person’s ability to pay reimbursement as well as policies and procedures to allow courts to recover costs associated with implementing the program.

At its August 23, 2013, meeting, the council adopted amendments to the guidelines by adding current section 14, which addresses the outstanding issue of how the Judicial Council can equitably allocate the funds remitted through the JDCCP among the trial courts in compliance with the statutory mandate that the funds be used to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads. Section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines describes the allocation methodology, which considers each court’s participation in the program and each court’s percentage of the statewide court-appointed counsel funding need.

The council then, at its February 20, 2014, meeting, allocated funds remitted through the JDCCP for the first time since the JDCCP’s inception.⁴ At this meeting, the council approved an allocation of \$2.3 million to eligible trial courts using the methodology in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines. This allocation represented funds collected from January 1, 2010, through June 30, 2013. In FYs 2014–15, 2015–16, and 2016–17, the council approved allocations of

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program Guidelines* (August 15, 2013), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemF.pdf.

² The guidelines took effect January 1, 2013, and are published as Appendix F of the California Rules of Court. See www.courts.ca.gov/documents/appendix_f.pdf.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program* (Sept. 14, 2012), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-itemA20.pdf.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency Collections Program* (February 20, 2014), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-itemJ.pdf.

\$525,139, \$872,692, and \$629,077, respectively, to eligible trial courts. Any portion of a court's allocated funds not spent and distributed carry forward for distribution to the court in FY 2017–18 and subsequent years, even if a court is ineligible for an allocation in the current fiscal year.

When establishing the program, the Legislature authorized the Judicial Council to expend up to \$556,000 of these funds for administrative services provided to the trial courts in support of the court-appointed dependency counsel program. The language authorizes the Judicial Council to use the funds in support of the dependency counsel program, not simply in support of the collections component of the program.

Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Reallocation

The Judicial Council approved the methodology for reallocating funds unspent by courts for court-appointed counsel in dependency cases at its April 17, 2015, business meeting.⁵

Analysis/Rationale

Policy implications

Recommendation 1. The estimates of courts' funding needs are computed using the dependency workload model approved by the council on April 15, 2016, and updated in July 2016.⁶ The current base allocation for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$136.7 million—less than the estimated need.

In FY 2016–17, the trial courts remitted a total of \$542,892 to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), excluding monies recovered to offset their cost of collections and dependency counsel program administrative costs, under the JDCCP and as directed in statute. These monies are part of the restricted TCTF fund balance available for use in FY 2017–18 and beyond. Statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council's approved standard.

For a court to be eligible to receive an allocation of these funds, it must meet the participation and funding need requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines.⁷ Every court that has satisfied those requirements receives an allocation. Each eligible court's allocated share of the JDCCP funds is equivalent to its share of the aggregate funding need of all the eligible courts. Attachment A displays the recommended allocation amount for each court.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed-Counsel Funding Reallocation* (April 17, 2015), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150417-item1.pdf.

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (April 1, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2603151&GUID=823D2AF5-E76A-434D-A863-8E325AC8901E>.

⁷ As described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines, a court demonstrates its participation in the program by submitting an annual report required by section 13 of the program guidelines and adopting a rule or policy to inquire about a responsible person's ability to reimburse the cost of appointed counsel at each dispositional hearing.

Recommendation 2. Trial courts whose spending patterns at midyear indicated they may not spend their full FY 2017–18 allocation were identified and contacted. Of those courts, six confirmed that they would not spend the full allocation and provided an estimate of unspent funding. Attachment B shows the total estimate and reallocation.

Comments

This report was not required to circulate for public comment.

Alternatives considered

Because the recommended allocations outlined in Attachments A and B were determined using the methodology approved by the council at its August 2013 and April 2015 meetings, respectively, no alternatives to this proposal were considered.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This proposal is for the allocation of funds that have already been collected or included in the FY 2017–18 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: *Recommended FY 2017–2018 Trial Court Allocations of \$542,892 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds*
2. Attachment B: *Recommended FY 2017–2018 Trial Court Allocations of \$679,351 in Unspent Funding*

Recommended FY 2017-2018 Trial Court Allocations of \$542,892 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

Attachment A

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - May 2017)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2017-18	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2017-18 (Col. C Total)	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total)	Recommended2 017-18 Allocation of JDCCP Collections (Col. G x \$542,892)	Trial Court Allocations Through 2016-17	Trial Court Distributions Through August 2017	Undistributed Trial Court Allocations Through August 2017
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
Alameda	\$5,428,356.57	2.60%	\$3,565,629.00	2.61%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Alpine*	2,741.55	0.00%	1,798.00	0.00%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Amador	213,189.32	0.10%	143,696.00	0.11%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Butte	1,193,803.02	0.57%	794,546.00	0.58%	N	-	0.00%	-	35,484.54	-	35,484.54
Calaveras	328,660.96	0.16%	220,822.00	0.16%	N	-	0.00%	-	5,737.02	-	5,737.02
Colusa†	57,953.65	0.03%	43,948.00	0.03%	N	-	0.00%	-	293.14	-	293.14
Contra Costa	3,496,733.70	1.67%	2,363,610.00	1.73%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	202,582.18	0.10%	214,730.00	0.16%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	784,556.33	0.38%	548,764.00	0.40%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Fresno	4,386,779.82	2.10%	3,015,746.00	2.21%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Glenn	143,728.97	0.07%	111,158.00	0.08%	N	-	0.00%	-	5,261.46	5,261.00	0.46
Humboldt	690,576.59	0.33%	522,682.00	0.38%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Imperial	828,559.42	0.40%	576,150.00	0.42%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Inyo	38,173.48	0.02%	45,459.00	0.03%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Kern	4,009,478.84	1.92%	2,664,810.00	1.95%	N	-	0.00%	-	142,792.33	142,792.00	0.33
Kings	1,139,660.36	0.55%	700,757.00	0.51%	Y	1,139,660.36	0.95%	5,163.92	34,743.67	34,744.00	(0.33)
Lake	204,890.91	0.10%	272,201.00	0.20%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Lassen	131,433.21	0.06%	106,891.00	0.08%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	95,006,949.33	45.50%	60,560,885.00	44.30%	Y	95,006,949.33	79.30%	430,486.42	2,902,175.17	2,902,174.78	0.39
Madera	845,621.66	0.40%	535,074.00	0.39%	N	-	0.00%	-	16,068.83	-	16,068.83
Marin	311,538.29	0.15%	311,538.00	0.23%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	46,955.72	0.02%	38,070.00	0.03%	N	-	0.00%	-	1,817.86	-	1,817.86
Mendocino	593,827.96	0.28%	440,581.00	0.32%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Merced	1,280,964.56	0.61%	844,260.00	0.62%	N	-	0.00%	-	32,783.77	-	32,783.77
Modoc	24,826.13	0.01%	24,065.00	0.02%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mono	20,868.65	0.01%	13,956.00	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-	103.62	104.00	(0.38)
Monterey	1,079,771.33	0.52%	682,575.00	0.50%	N	-	0.00%	-	19,795.72	19,796.00	(0.28)
Napa	488,212.44	0.23%	315,051.00	0.23%	N	-	0.00%	-	9,391.29	-	9,391.29
Nevada	201,190.74	0.10%	202,832.00	0.15%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Orange	8,081,953.90	3.87%	5,366,139.00	3.93%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Placer	1,419,821.80	0.68%	895,552.00	0.66%	Y	1,419,821.80	1.19%	6,433.36	38,816.23	38,816.00	0.23
Plumas	104,297.23	0.05%	151,555.00	0.11%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Riverside	13,948,263.50	6.68%	8,806,010.00	6.44%	Y	13,948,263.50	11.64%	63,201.04	514,653.52	-	514,653.52
Sacramento	8,273,801.59	3.96%	5,609,080.00	4.10%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Benito	177,832.94	0.09%	112,410.00	0.08%	Y	177,832.94	0.15%	805.78	9,491.79	4,345.00	5,146.79
San Bernardino	13,587,086.05	6.51%	8,514,703.00	6.23%	N	-	0.00%	-	242,055.83	2,641.00	239,414.83
San Diego	8,599,188.10	4.12%	6,132,621.00	4.49%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Francisco	4,566,501.73	2.19%	3,060,973.00	2.24%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	3,724,351.20	1.78%	2,480,277.00	1.81%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	1,018,678.13	0.49%	703,001.00	0.51%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	1,551,694.88	0.74%	960,903.00	0.70%	Y	1,551,694.88	1.30%	7,030.89	50,327.49	29,275.00	21,052.49
Santa Barbara	1,357,964.93	0.65%	979,287.00	0.72%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	4,642,320.33	2.22%	3,223,912.00	2.36%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-

Recommended FY 2017-2018 Trial Court Allocations of \$542,892 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

Attachment A

Court	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - May 2017) Col. A	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total) Col. B	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2017-18 Col. C	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2017-18 (Col. C Total) Col. D	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹ Col. E	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. E equals "Y") Col. F	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total) Col. G	Recommended2 017-18 Allocation of JDCCP Collections (Col. G x \$542,892) Col. H	Trial Court Allocations Through 2016-17 Col. I	Trial Court Distributions Through August 2017 Col. J	Undistributed Trial Court Allocations Through August 2017 Col. K
Santa Cruz	855,116.96	0.41%	598,314.00	0.44%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Shasta	1,011,306.62	0.48%	680,076.00	0.50%	N	-	0.00%	-	38,437.49	38,437.00	0.49
Sierra	6,124.77	0.00%	9,848.00	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	213,532.93	0.10%	245,373.00	0.18%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Solano	1,278,216.20	0.61%	883,348.00	0.65%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	1,375,919.83	0.66%	918,101.00	0.67%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Stanislaus	1,575,804.12	0.75%	1,092,505.00	0.80%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sutter	344,486.34	0.16%	220,511.00	0.16%	Y	344,486.34	0.29%	1,560.90	13,896.13	-	13,896.13
Tehama	444,201.05	0.21%	319,794.00	0.23%	N	-	0.00%	-	16,222.20	-	16,222.20
Trinity	113,344.89	0.05%	96,021.00	0.07%	N	-	0.00%	-	1,996.54	-	1,996.54
Tulare	2,541,743.41	1.22%	1,591,232.00	1.16%	Y	2,541,743.41	2.12%	11,516.91	79,682.35	53,170.00	26,512.35
Tuolumne	220,201.53	0.11%	159,146.00	0.12%	N	-	0.00%	-	7,054.13	-	7,054.13
Ventura	2,933,400.90	1.40%	1,835,753.00	1.34%	Y	2,933,400.90	2.45%	13,291.55	96,912.58	78,215.00	18,697.58
Yolo	924,496.45	0.44%	596,503.00	0.44%	N	-	0.00%	-	17,813.11	-	17,813.11
Yuba	750,640.44	0.36%	474,768.00	0.35%	Y	750,640.44	0.63%	3,401.23	8,100.16	-	8,100.16
Unallocated			100,000.00			-		-			
Total	\$208,824,878.48		\$136,700,000.00			\$119,814,493.90	100.00%	\$542,892.00	\$4,341,907.99	\$3,349,770.78	\$992,137.21
Reserved for admin.								260,086.00	1,041,720.14		
Distribution amount available to courts								542,892.00	5,383,628.13		
Total collected								802,978.00			

1. A court is eligible for an allocation if the court has met both the Funding Need and Participation requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. This table indicates a court's eligibility to receive an allocation based on the Funding Need criteria. Courts that meet the Funding Need criteria must also meet the Participation requirements in order to receive an allocation.

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - May 2017)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2017-18	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2017-18 (Col. C Total)	Est. Unspent Funding 2017-18	Eligible for Reallocated Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended ² 017-18 Reallocation
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J
Alameda	\$5,428,356.57	2.60%	\$3,565,629.00	2.61%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Alpine*	2,741.55	0.00%	1,798.00	0.00%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Amador	213,189.32	0.10%	143,696.00	0.11%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Butte	1,193,803.02	0.57%	794,546.00	0.58%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Calaveras	328,660.96	0.16%	220,822.00	0.16%	39,094	N	-	0.00%	-
Colusa†	57,953.65	0.03%	43,948.00	0.03%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Contra Costa	3,496,733.70	1.67%	2,363,610.00	1.73%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Del Norte	202,582.18	0.10%	214,730.00	0.16%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
El Dorado	784,556.33	0.38%	548,764.00	0.40%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Fresno	4,386,779.82	2.10%	3,015,746.00	2.21%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Glenn	143,728.97	0.07%	111,158.00	0.08%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Humboldt	690,576.59	0.33%	522,682.00	0.38%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Imperial	828,559.42	0.40%	576,150.00	0.42%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Inyo	38,173.48	0.02%	45,459.00	0.03%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Kern	4,009,478.84	1.92%	2,664,810.00	1.95%	400,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Kings	1,139,660.36	0.55%	700,757.00	0.51%	125,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Lake	204,890.91	0.10%	272,201.00	0.20%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Lassen	131,433.21	0.06%	106,891.00	0.08%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Los Angeles	95,006,949.33	45.50%	60,560,885.00	44.30%	0	Y	95,006,949.33	70.63%	479,801.86
Madera	845,621.66	0.40%	535,074.00	0.39%	0	Y	845,621.66	0.63%	4,270.54
Marin	311,538.29	0.15%	311,538.00	0.23%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Mariposa	46,955.72	0.02%	38,070.00	0.03%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Mendocino	593,827.96	0.28%	440,581.00	0.32%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Merced	1,280,964.56	0.61%	844,260.00	0.62%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Modoc	24,826.13	0.01%	24,065.00	0.02%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Mono	20,868.65	0.01%	13,956.00	0.01%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Monterey	1,079,771.33	0.52%	682,575.00	0.50%	78,543	N	-	0.00%	-
Napa	488,212.44	0.23%	315,051.00	0.23%	0	Y	488,212.44	0.36%	2,465.56
Nevada	201,190.74	0.10%	202,832.00	0.15%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Orange	8,081,953.90	3.87%	5,366,139.00	3.93%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Placer	1,419,821.80	0.68%	895,552.00	0.66%	0	Y	1,419,821.80	1.06%	7,170.35
Plumas	104,297.23	0.05%	151,555.00	0.11%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Riverside	13,948,263.50	6.68%	8,806,010.00	6.44%	0	Y	13,948,263.50	10.37%	70,441.19
Sacramento	8,273,801.59	3.96%	5,609,080.00	4.10%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
San Benito	177,832.94	0.09%	112,410.00	0.08%	0	Y	177,832.94	0.13%	898.09
San Bernardino	13,587,086.05	6.51%	8,514,703.00	6.23%	0	Y	13,587,086.05	10.10%	68,617.18
San Diego	8,599,188.10	4.12%	6,132,621.00	4.49%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
San Francisco	4,566,501.73	2.19%	3,060,973.00	2.24%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
San Joaquin	3,724,351.20	1.78%	2,480,277.00	1.81%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
San Luis Obispo	1,018,678.13	0.49%	703,001.00	0.51%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
San Mateo	1,551,694.88	0.74%	960,903.00	0.70%	0	Y	1,551,694.88	1.15%	7,836.33
Santa Barbara	1,357,964.93	0.65%	979,287.00	0.72%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Santa Clara	4,642,320.33	2.22%	3,223,912.00	2.36%	0	N	-	0.00%	-

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - May 2017)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2017-18	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2017-18 (Col. C Total)	Est. Unspent Funding 2017-18	Eligible for Reallocated Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended ² 017-18 Reallocation
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J
Santa Cruz	855,116.96	0.41%	598,314.00	0.44%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Shasta	1,011,306.62	0.48%	680,076.00	0.50%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Sierra	6,124.77	0.00%	9,848.00	0.01%	7,873	N	-	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	213,532.93	0.10%	245,373.00	0.18%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Solano	1,278,216.20	0.61%	883,348.00	0.65%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Sonoma	1,375,919.83	0.66%	918,101.00	0.67%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Stanislaus	1,575,804.12	0.75%	1,092,505.00	0.80%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Sutter	344,486.34	0.16%	220,511.00	0.16%	0	Y	344,486.34	0.26%	1,739.72
Tehama	444,201.05	0.21%	319,794.00	0.23%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Trinity	113,344.89	0.05%	96,021.00	0.07%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Tulare	2,541,743.41	1.22%	1,591,232.00	1.16%	0	Y	2,541,743.41	1.89%	12,836.25
Tuolumne	220,201.53	0.11%	159,146.00	0.12%	28,841	N	-	0.00%	-
Ventura	2,933,400.90	1.40%	1,835,753.00	1.34%	0	Y	2,933,400.90	2.18%	14,814.19
Yolo	924,496.45	0.44%	596,503.00	0.44%	0	Y	924,496.45	0.69%	4,668.87
Yuba	750,640.44	0.36%	474,768.00	0.35%	0	Y	750,640.44	0.56%	3,790.87
Unallocated			100,000.00				-		-
Total	\$208,824,878.48		\$136,700,000.00		\$679,351.00		\$134,520,250.13	100.00%	\$679,351.00
Total Returned									
									\$679,351.00