



Judicial Council of California · Administrative Office of the Courts

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on February 20, 2014

Title	Agenda Item Type
Trial Court Allocations: Revisions to the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	February 20, 2014
Recommended by	Date of Report
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Laurie Earl, Judge of Superior Court of Sacramento County, Co-Chair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	February 10, 2014
	Contact
	Steven Chang, 415-865-7195 steven.chang@jud.ca.gov
Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director and Chief Financial Officer, AOC Fiscal Services Office, Co-Chair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	
Mr. Jake Chatters, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of Placer County, Co-Chair of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee	

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends the council approve several revisions to the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology, including one that would establish an absolute funding floor, and direct the Judicial Branch Resource Needs Assessment Advisory

Committee to study special circumstance cases in their next round of updates to the Resource Assessment Study.

Recommendations

Based on actions taken at the committee's January 16, 2014 and January 30, 2014 meetings, which were passed unanimously, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council take the following actions related to the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), effective February 20, 2014:

For determining funding need:

1. Approve the WAFM's use of the most current three-year average salary data for determining each court's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) salary adjustment.
2. For courts whose WAFM workload need is less than 50 full-time equivalents (FTEs), adopt a per-FTE dollar allotment floor that is the median BLS-adjusted average FTE dollar allotment of all courts with a need of fewer than 50 FTEs.

For allocating trial court base funding for court operations:

3. Establish an absolute funding floor (\$750,000 in fiscal year 2014–2015) and fund the shortfall between a court's actual WAFM allocation and the absolute floor by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor.
4. Establish a graduated funding floor that is based on a court's WAFM funding need (\$875,000, \$1,250,000, and \$1,875,000 in fiscal year 2014–2015) and fund the shortfall between a court's actual WAFM allocation and the applicable graduated floor by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor.
5. Adopt a cap on the amount of the allocation adjustment that courts eligible for funding at the graduated floor level can receive in a given fiscal year, as described later in this report.

In addition:

6. Eliminate the cluster 1 courts' exemption from having their historical base allocations be reallocated using the WAFM.
7. Direct the Judicial Branch Resource Needs Assessment Advisory Committee (JBRNAAC) to study special circumstance cases in their next round of workload study updates and direct the Court Executives Advisory Committee to work with the JBRNAAC to determine how best to collect the data necessary to support the study and, when a determination is made, direct the trial courts to start reporting such data.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council approved the current version of the WAFM, which was used to compute courts' funding need and allocation of funding in fiscal year (FY) 2013–2014, at its July 25, 2013 business meeting. In addition, the council directed the TCBAC to address a number of “parking lot” issues, including those related to small courts. When computing WAFM allocation adjustments for fiscal year 2013–2014, the council exempted 15 cluster 1 courts from a reallocation of their historical base allocation using WAFM.

At its December 13, 2013 meeting, the council approved the recommendation of the chairs of its internal committees—the Executive and Planning, Policy Coordination and Liaison, Rules and Projects, and Technology Committees—to establish the Judicial Branch Resource Needs Assessment Advisory Committee (JBRNAAC) as a formal standing Judicial Council advisory committee succeeding the Senate Bill (SB) 56 Working Group.¹

Recommendation 1: BLS Adjustment Using Average Salary Over Three Years

1. Approve the WAFM's use of the most current three-year average salary data for determining each court's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) salary adjustment.

Rationale for recommendation 1

For determining courts' WAFM funding need in a given fiscal year, instead of using the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics' average local or combined state and local government salary data for each county in California for the most current single year available, the TCBAC is recommending that a three-year average for each county be used (similar to using the average of three years of filings to compute workload need) because a three-year average will allow for smoothing of any major economic changes. Attachment A displays the recommended BLS salary adjustment factor for each court based upon the three-year average salary for local government and combined state and local government.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

The TCBAC evaluated continuing to use a single year of BLS data. The choice to use a three-year average lends more stability to the annual funding need projections and allocations.

Recommendation 2: FTE Dollar Allotment Floor

2. For courts whose WAFM workload need is less than 50 full-time equivalents (FTEs), adopt a per-FTE dollar allotment floor that is the median BLS-adjusted average FTE dollar allotment of all courts with a need of fewer than 50 FTEs.

Rationale for recommendation 2

For determining courts' WAFM funding need in a given fiscal year, the TCBAC is recommending that courts whose WAFM workload need is less than 50 FTEs and whose average

¹ See www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20131213-itemW.pdf.

BLS-adjusted FTE dollar allotment is below the median BLS-adjusted FTE dollar allotment of all courts whose workload need is less than 50 FTEs receive an adjustment in the per-FTE allotment. The existing policy of applying BLS with no modifiers has resulted in some rural courts receiving unrealistically low dollar per-FTE allotments. The rationale for this policy is consistent with the federal and state government policies that recognize the special circumstances of employers of fewer than 50 employees. The recommendation would have an impact on both salaries and salary-driven benefits.

In order to receive a funding need adjustment, a court must meet both conditions. The adjustment is computed by taking the difference between the court's BLS-adjusted FTE dollar allotment and the median BLS-adjusted FTE dollar allotment of all courts with a workload need of fewer than 50 FTEs; courts whose average FTE dollar allotment is lower than the median are brought up to the median. Based on an updated, but not final, version of the FY 2014–2015 WAFM, Attachment B indicates the nine courts that would be eligible for the FTE dollar allotment floor of \$43,737 per FTE.

Recommendation 3: Absolute Funding Floor

3. Establish an absolute funding floor (\$750,000 in fiscal year 2014–2015) and fund the shortfall between a court's actual WAFM allocation and the absolute floor by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor.

Rationale for recommendation 3

The TCBAC is recommending that the council establish an absolute funding floor. For FY 2014–2015, it would be \$750,000. There is a minimum level of funding that is required for a court to serve the public. This minimum level is based on practical need so that a court can provide a minimal level of service. A minimum level, or hard floor, establishes a base level of funding to ensure a court can operate in each of the state's 58 counties. Attachment C displays the assumptions and computations behind the \$750,000 floor. It was determined that every trial court needs a minimum of 6.5 full-time equivalents (whether employees, contractors, via collaboration with other courts, or a combination) and about \$28,000 per FTE for operating expenses and equipment (OE&E), which is consistent with the existing WAFM methodology for OE&E per FTE in the cluster 1 courts.

Any additional floor funding provided to a court beyond its FY 2014–2015 WAFM allocation must come from the existing statewide base allocation (i.e., other courts' allocations). Based on an updated, but not final, version of the FY 2014–2015 WAFM that assumes courts will receive an additional \$100 million in FY 2014–2015 and the \$100 million will be allocated using WAFM, column I of Attachment E indicates the two courts that would be allocated the absolute funding floor amount of \$750,000. The additional allocation needed to fund them at the absolute floor is about \$524,000. All courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor would be allocated a pro-rata share of a \$524,000 reduction.

Comments from interested parties

The TCBAC convened a group of leaders of the smallest courts to provide input on the development of this recommendation. Participants were asked about base levels of staffing needed to provide access to justice and were also asked to provide the TCBAC with detailed information about operations expenditures to help arrive at a funding floor amount. The resulting recommendation provides a basic level of funding to courts whose expenditure needs are not sufficiently defined by workload metrics alone. It recognizes that for the smallest courts, it is necessary to fund for a minimum level of service to ensure access to justice. While the funding floor was set at \$750,000 for FY 2014–2015, the amount will be adjusted in subsequent years to reflect changes in the model’s cost drivers

Recommendation 4: Graduated Funding Floor

4. Establish a graduated funding floor that is based on a court’s WAFM funding need (\$875,000, \$1,250,000, or \$1,875,000 in fiscal year 2014–2015) and fund the shortfall between a court’s actual WAFM allocation and the applicable graduated floor by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor.

Rationale for recommendation 4

The TCBAC is recommending that the council establish a graduated funding floor (\$875,000, \$1,250,000, and \$1,875,000 in FY 2014–2015) that is based on a court’s WAFM funding need. A graduated floor recognizes that small courts whose funding is slightly larger than the “hard floor” of \$750,000 also have a minimum amount of funding required plus some workload-driven costs. As filings increase above a certain level, a court’s funding need should begin to correspond closely to workload need. The committee is recommending that the graduated floor be capped at a funding need of \$2,250,000 in FY 2014–2015. The graduated floor amounts will be adjusted in subsequent years to reflect changes in the model’s cost drivers.

Attachment D displays the computation behind the three graduated floors above the absolute floor of \$750,000.

Any additional floor funding provided to a court beyond its FY 2014–2015 WAFM allocation must come from the existing statewide base allocation (i.e., other courts’ allocations). Based on an updated, but not final, version of the FY 2014–2015 WAFM that assumes courts will receive an additional \$100 million in FY 2014–2015 and the \$100 million will be allocated using WAFM, column H of Attachment E indicates the six courts that are eligible for a graduated funding floor. The additional allocation needed to fund them at their applicable graduated floor is about \$1.3 million (see column J of Attachment E). However, as discussed in recommendation 5, the TCBAC is recommending that a cap be placed on the allocation adjustment based in part on the level of a court’s prior-year allocation.

Recommendation 5: Cap Allocation Adjustment for Courts Eligible for Funding at a Graduated Floor Level

5. Adopt a cap on the amount of the allocation adjustment that courts eligible for funding at the graduated floor level can receive in a given fiscal year.

Rationale for recommendation 5

The TCBAC is recommending that the council cap the amount of the allocation adjustment a court that qualifies for funding at a graduated floor level can receive in a given fiscal year.

The computation of the maximum allocation adjustment in a given year is as follows:

- If a court's current WAFM allocation would exceed the funding floor, the court receives its current WAFM allocation (and no floor adjustment is made).
- If a court's current WAFM allocation would be below the funding floor, the court would be allocated either:
 - the applicable graduated floor funding amount if a court's floor allocation is less than the sum of its prior-year WAFM allocation plus 10 percent, or
 - the higher of either: (1) their prior-year WAFM allocation plus 10% or (2) their current WAFM allocation.

Attachment E provides an example of the computation of the absolute and graduated funding floors using an updated, but not final, version of the FY 2014–2015 WAFM.

Based on the cap formula described above, and using the updated, but not final, version of the FY 2014–2015 WAFM that assumes courts will receive an additional \$100 million in FY 2014–2015 and the \$100 million will be allocated using WAFM, instead of a \$1.3 million adjustment, the six courts would receive a total allocation adjustment of about \$192,000 (see column K of Attachment E). All courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor would be allocated a pro-rata share of a \$192,000 reduction.

Recommendation 6: Eliminate Exemption of Cluster 1 Courts from Reallocation of Historical Base Allocation

6. Eliminate the cluster 1 courts' exemption from having their historical base allocations be reallocated using the WAFM.

Rationale for recommendation 6

Although the TCBAC will continue to propose revisions that address the circumstances of small courts, as necessary, recommendations 1 through 5 are designed to address the WAFM model to better meet the needs of the small courts. Recommendation 6 assumes that those adjustments will have been made and that the cluster 1 courts should then be included in the WAFM funding model.

Recommendation 7: Workload Related to Special Circumstances Cases

7. Direct the Judicial Branch Resource Needs Assessment Advisory Committee (JBRNAAC) to study special circumstance cases in their next round of workload study updates and direct the Court Executives Advisory Committee to work with the JBRNAAC to determine how best to collect the data necessary to support the study and, when a determination is made, direct the trial courts to start reporting such data.

Rationale for recommendation 7

The TCBAC is recommending that the JBRNAAC include special circumstance cases in their next round of updates of the Resource Assessment Study (RAS). Special circumstance cases, based on general experience, likely take more staff time than felony cases without special circumstances. Today, the time for these types of cases is included in the total time for felony cases in the RAS. Courts with a historically higher proportion of special circumstances cases relative to other courts may have increased workload need that is not entirely reflected in the current methodology. The TCBAC is recommending this be included in the next RAS update to determine the possibility of developing a separate caseweight for those cases. If one is developed, it is possible it would affect the computation of courts' workload need and therefore funding need.

Alternatives considered and policy implications

Other types of special circumstances cases, such as complex civil cases, were also discussed by the TCBAC. While the workload of special circumstances cases is presently accounted for in the RAS caseweights, developing a separate caseweight for those cases could benefit courts with a higher than average proportion of those cases. The overall workload of the courts will likely not increase because of a corresponding reduction in the caseweight for all other felonies (by excluding special circumstance criminal cases) and unlimited civil (by excluding special circumstance civil cases).

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

AOC staff have already developed a version of the WAFM that reflects the recommendations in this report. None of the recommendations require trial court to implement anything.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: Recommended BLS Salary Adjustment Factor Using Three-Year Average
2. Attachment B: Recommended FTE Floor Allotment for Courts with a Need of Less than 50 FTEs
3. Attachment C: Recommended Absolute Funding Floor
4. Attachment D: Graduated Funding Floor
5. Attachment E: Allocation Adjustment Related to the Absolute and Graduated Funding Floor

Recommended BLS Salary Adjustment Factor Using 3-Year Average

Cluster	County	Local Government	Combined State & Local Government
		A	B
4	Alameda	1.42	1.27
1	Alpine	0.82	0.82
1	Amador	0.94	0.99
2	Butte	0.92	0.89
1	Calaveras	0.86	0.93
1	Colusa	0.70	0.91
3	Contra Costa	1.25	1.12
1	Del Norte	0.64	0.79
2	El Dorado	0.99	1.09
3	Fresno	1.00	1.08
1	Glenn	0.68	0.82
2	Humboldt	0.76	0.93
2	Imperial	0.77	0.85
1	Inyo	0.83	0.89
3	Kern	1.05	1.01
2	Kings	0.85	0.89
2	Lake	0.76	0.78
1	Lassen	0.67	0.80
4	Los Angeles	1.34	1.26
2	Madera	0.84	0.94
2	Marin	1.30	1.12
1	Mariposa	0.74	0.87
2	Mendocino	0.86	0.85
2	Merced	0.91	0.91
1	Modoc	0.61	0.80
1	Mono	1.20	0.93
3	Monterey	1.19	1.06
2	Napa	1.21	1.03
2	Nevada	0.97	0.88
4	Orange	1.30	1.20
2	Placer	1.14	1.01
1	Plumas	0.70	0.72
4	Riverside	1.07	1.07
4	Sacramento	1.20	1.28
1	San Benito	0.97	0.97
4	San Bernardino	1.05	1.08
4	San Diego	1.17	1.16
4	San Francisco	1.61	1.57
3	San Joaquin	1.11	1.10
2	San Luis Obispo	1.07	1.08
3	San Mateo	1.45	1.15
3	Santa Barbara	1.16	1.07
4	Santa Clara	1.47	1.23
2	Santa Cruz	1.17	1.00
2	Shasta	0.85	0.95
1	Sierra	0.71	0.71
2	Siskiyou	0.71	0.75
3	Solano	1.22	1.11
3	Sonoma	1.17	1.11
3	Stanislaus	1.02	0.97
2	Sutter	0.95	0.93
2	Tehama	0.80	0.89
1	Trinity	0.65	0.79
3	Tulare	0.82	0.85
2	Tuolumne	0.84	0.91
3	Ventura	1.23	1.13
2	Yolo	1.01	1.27
2	Yuba	0.94	0.94
	Statewide	1.00	1.00

Recommended FTE Floor Allotment for Courts with a Need of Less than 50 FTEs

		BLS Factor	Statewide Average Salary of Courts ¹	Salary Factor	WAFM FTE Need	Is FTE Need Less than 50?	If FTE Need is Less than 50, is Salary Factor Less than Floor of \$43,737? ²	Eligible for Higher Salary Factor?	Recommended FTE Floor Allotment Salary Factor
Cluster	Court	A	B	C (A*B)	D	E	F	G	H
4	Alameda	1.421	\$ 56,396	\$ 80,153	686			No	\$ 80,153
1	Alpine	0.824	\$ 56,396	\$ 46,478	3	Yes		No	\$ 46,478
1	Amador	0.993	\$ 56,396	\$ 56,001	27	Yes		No	\$ 56,001
2	Butte	0.920	\$ 56,396	\$ 51,882	139			No	\$ 51,882
1	Calaveras	0.857	\$ 56,396	\$ 48,332	27	Yes		No	\$ 48,332
1	Colusa	0.705	\$ 56,396	\$ 39,738	20	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
3	Contra Costa	1.250	\$ 56,396	\$ 70,499	423			No	\$ 70,499
1	Del Norte	0.791	\$ 56,396	\$ 44,633	30	Yes		No	\$ 44,633
2	El Dorado	0.993	\$ 56,396	\$ 55,986	94			No	\$ 55,986
3	Fresno	0.998	\$ 56,396	\$ 56,258	536			No	\$ 56,258
1	Glenn	0.680	\$ 56,396	\$ 38,354	26	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
2	Humboldt	0.760	\$ 56,396	\$ 42,837	93			No	\$ 42,837
2	Imperial	0.770	\$ 56,396	\$ 43,448	149			No	\$ 43,448
1	Inyo	0.832	\$ 56,396	\$ 46,926	21	Yes		No	\$ 46,926
3	Kern	1.052	\$ 56,396	\$ 59,340	542			No	\$ 59,340
2	Kings	0.887	\$ 56,396	\$ 50,006	104			No	\$ 50,006
2	Lake	0.760	\$ 56,396	\$ 42,841	46	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
1	Lassen	0.801	\$ 56,396	\$ 45,155	32	Yes		No	\$ 45,155
4	Los Angeles	1.336	\$ 56,396	\$ 75,336	5,592			No	\$ 75,336
2	Madera	0.935	\$ 56,396	\$ 52,736	102			No	\$ 52,736
2	Marin	1.297	\$ 56,396	\$ 73,164	115			No	\$ 73,164
1	Mariposa	0.740	\$ 56,396	\$ 41,743	15	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
2	Mendocino	0.859	\$ 56,396	\$ 48,451	70			No	\$ 48,451
2	Merced	0.908	\$ 56,396	\$ 51,181	177			No	\$ 51,181
1	Modoc	0.608	\$ 56,396	\$ 34,261	9	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
1	Mono	1.199	\$ 56,396	\$ 67,633	14	Yes		No	\$ 67,633
3	Monterey	1.190	\$ 56,396	\$ 67,116	215			No	\$ 67,116
2	Napa	1.211	\$ 56,396	\$ 68,285	78			No	\$ 68,285
2	Nevada	0.966	\$ 56,396	\$ 54,496	57			No	\$ 54,496
4	Orange	1.299	\$ 56,396	\$ 73,260	1,427			No	\$ 73,260
2	Placer	1.144	\$ 56,396	\$ 64,497	178			No	\$ 64,497
1	Plumas	0.705	\$ 56,396	\$ 39,749	16	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
4	Riverside	1.071	\$ 56,396	\$ 60,401	1,173			No	\$ 60,401

		BLS Factor	Statewide Average Salary of Courts¹	Salary Factor	WAFM FTE Need	Is FTE Need Less than 50?	If FTE Need is Less than 50, is Salary Factor Less than Floor of \$43,737?²	Eligible for Higher Salary Factor?	Recommended FTE Floor Allotment Salary Factor
Cluster	Court	A	B	C (A*B)	D	E	F	G	H
4	Sacramento	1.279	\$ 56,396	\$ 72,126	825			No	\$ 72,126
1	San Benito	0.974	\$ 56,396	\$ 54,914	31	Yes		No	\$ 54,914
4	San Bernardino	1.050	\$ 56,396	\$ 59,223	1,344			No	\$ 59,223
4	San Diego	1.172	\$ 56,396	\$ 66,095	1,444			No	\$ 66,095
4	San Francisco	1.614	\$ 56,396	\$ 91,022	417			No	\$ 91,022
3	San Joaquin	1.111	\$ 56,396	\$ 62,683	398			No	\$ 62,683
2	San Luis Obispo	1.072	\$ 56,396	\$ 60,459	161			No	\$ 60,459
3	San Mateo	1.448	\$ 56,396	\$ 81,638	313			No	\$ 81,638
3	Santa Barbara	1.155	\$ 56,396	\$ 65,153	232			No	\$ 65,153
4	Santa Clara	1.469	\$ 56,396	\$ 82,872	646			No	\$ 82,872
2	Santa Cruz	1.171	\$ 56,396	\$ 66,037	140			No	\$ 66,037
2	Shasta	0.849	\$ 56,396	\$ 47,882	149			No	\$ 47,882
1	Sierra	0.715	\$ 56,396	\$ 40,307	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
2	Siskiyou	0.711	\$ 56,396	\$ 40,074	38	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
3	Solano	1.224	\$ 56,396	\$ 69,044	252			No	\$ 69,044
3	Sonoma	1.168	\$ 56,396	\$ 65,844	259			No	\$ 65,844
3	Stanislaus	1.023	\$ 56,396	\$ 57,714	312			No	\$ 57,714
2	Sutter	0.949	\$ 56,396	\$ 53,532	63			No	\$ 53,532
2	Tehama	0.801	\$ 56,396	\$ 45,170	55			No	\$ 45,170
1	Trinity	0.654	\$ 56,396	\$ 36,889	17	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 43,737
3	Tulare	0.822	\$ 56,396	\$ 46,375	248			No	\$ 46,375
2	Tuolumne	0.909	\$ 56,396	\$ 51,262	40	Yes		No	\$ 51,262
3	Ventura	1.227	\$ 56,396	\$ 69,217	398			No	\$ 69,217
2	Yolo	1.011	\$ 56,396	\$ 57,016	110			No	\$ 57,016
2	Yuba	0.941	\$ 56,396	\$ 53,047	53			No	\$ 53,047

1. As of July 1, 2013, based on Schedule 7A information, the average of all 58 courts RAS-related average salary is \$56,396.

2. Floor is the median salary factory of courts whose FTE need is less than 50.

Recommended Absolute Funding Floor

	"FTE" Count ¹	Program 10 or 90? ²	FTE Salary Floor ³	Salary Driven Benefit ⁴	Non Salary Driven Benefit ⁴	Total
Position Needed	A	B	C	D	E	F (Sum of C, D, and E)
Court Executive Officer	1	90	\$ 115,576	\$ 36,347	\$ 10,702	\$ 162,625
Processing Clerk ⁵	3	10	\$ 43,866	\$ 13,914	\$ 8,743	\$ 199,570
Administrative Support (HR/Fiscal)	1	90	\$ 43,866	\$ 13,795	\$ 10,702	\$ 68,363
Courtroom Clerk	1	10	\$ 43,866	\$ 13,914	\$ 8,743	\$ 66,523
Court Reporter	0.5	10	\$ 43,866	\$ 13,914	\$ 8,743	\$ 33,262
Total Personnel Floor	6.5					\$ 530,344

OE&E per FTE ⁶						\$ 27,928
Total OE&E Floor⁷	6.5					\$ 181,532
Total Floor						\$ 711,876

Round Up to Nearest \$50,000						\$ 750,000
-------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------

OE&E Validation:
 Five Cluster 1 courts volunteered to review detailed actual operating expenses in an effort to identify those costs that reflected the cost of "opening" business. This analysis focused on identifying costs that must exist regardless of whether the court is currently open.
 OE&E "Minimum Needed", Based on Detailed Review of Small Court \$ 168,204

1. Establishes FTE based on practical need **not based on filings.**
2. Designation of "operations", Program 10, or "administration", Program 90.
3. Value is based on 1) CEO = median CEO salary for all Cluster 1 courts and 2) median post BLS adjusted FTE allotment per WAFM for all courts with fewer than 50 FTE 'need.'
4. Based on the **median** salary and non-salary driven benefits for the five courts that participated in the analysis.
5. Includes all leave coverage for processing staff and courtroom clerk. Likely breakdown: 0.75 criminal, 0.75 civil/family, 1.0 traffic, 0.5 coverage.
6. WAFM existing formula provides \$27,928 per "need" FTE for OE&E (compared to \$20,287 for Cluster 2-4). Group compared this outcome to existing OE&E cost in very small court, returning nearly identical OE&E costs.
7. \$27,928 times 6.5.

Graduated Funding Floor

	WAFM Calculated Need	Minimum Floor Factor	Floor "Share" of Need	WAFM Need	Floor Supplement	Recommended Graduated Funding Floor
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Need of equal to or less than the amount in column A.	\$ 749,999	\$ 750,000	100%	\$ -	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000
Need of equal to or less than the amount in column A.	\$ 1,249,999	\$ 750,000	75%	\$ 312,500	\$ 562,500	\$ 875,000
Need of equal to or less than the amount in column A.	\$ 1,749,999	\$ 750,000	50%	\$ 875,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 1,250,000
Need of equal to or less than the amount in column A.	\$ 2,249,999	\$ 750,000	25%	\$ 1,687,499	\$ 187,500	\$ 1,874,999
Need of greater than or equal to the amount in column A.	\$ 2,250,000	\$ 750,000		\$ 1,687,499	\$ 187,500	\$ 1,874,999

Allocation Adjustment Related to the Absolute and Graduated Funding Floor

Court	WAFM Calculated Funding Need	Funding Floor That Would Apply	Estimated 2014-2015 WAFM Base Allocation Prior to Applying Floor	Apply Floor? ¹	Current 2013-2014 WAFM Base Allocation	2013-14 Base Allocation Plus 10%	Estimated 2014-2015 Funding Floor ²	Additional Funding Above Estimated 2014-2015 Allocation Due to Absolute Floor	Additional Funding Above Estimated 2014-2015 Allocation Due to Graduated Floor Without Cap	Additional Funding Above Estimated 2014-2015 Allocation Due to Graduated Floor With Cap	Allocation of Reduction to All Other Courts
A	B	C	D	E	F	G (Col. F * 1.1)	H	I	J	K	L
Alameda	96,937,582	1,874,999	71,793,394	N	70,100,897	77,110,987	N/A	-	-	-	(32,310)
Alpine	343,929	750,000	503,481	Y	559,370	615,307	750,000	246,519	-	-	-
Amador	2,962,963	1,874,999	2,248,434	N	2,141,806	2,355,987	N/A	-	-	-	(1,012)
Butte	13,261,312	1,874,999	8,174,152	N	7,625,444	8,387,988	N/A	-	-	-	(3,679)
Calaveras	2,408,607	1,874,999	2,030,269	N	2,013,605	2,214,966	N/A	-	-	-	(914)
Colusa	2,114,843	1,874,999	1,513,823	Y	1,409,640	1,550,604	1,550,604	-	361,176	36,781	-
Contra Costa	59,701,451	1,874,999	36,866,402	N	34,458,343	37,904,177	N/A	-	-	-	(16,591)
Del Norte	3,234,667	1,874,999	2,400,878	N	2,281,457	2,509,603	N/A	-	-	-	(1,080)
El Dorado	9,872,838	1,874,999	6,422,179	N	6,098,679	6,708,547	N/A	-	-	-	(2,890)
Fresno	63,643,480	1,874,999	38,849,142	N	36,322,351	39,954,586	N/A	-	-	-	(17,484)
Glenn	2,452,846	1,874,999	1,931,234	N	1,861,108	2,047,219	N/A	-	-	-	(869)
Humboldt	7,756,320	1,874,999	5,330,292	N	5,062,000	5,568,200	N/A	-	-	-	(2,399)
Imperial	12,265,021	1,874,999	7,231,639	N	6,642,808	7,307,089	N/A	-	-	-	(3,255)
Inyo	2,109,988	1,874,999	1,789,202	Y	1,772,630	1,949,893	1,874,999	-	85,798	85,798	-
Kern	68,644,062	1,874,999	35,712,131	N	31,712,936	34,884,230	N/A	-	-	-	(16,072)
Kings	9,221,775	1,874,999	5,460,782	N	5,036,666	5,540,333	N/A	-	-	-	(2,458)
Lake	3,848,078	1,874,999	2,954,727	N	2,884,964	3,173,460	N/A	-	-	-	(1,330)
Lassen	2,880,149	1,874,999	2,082,837	N	1,959,125	2,155,038	N/A	-	-	-	(937)
Los Angeles	754,754,313	1,874,999	448,228,057	N	412,930,717	454,223,788	N/A	-	-	-	(201,722)
Madera	10,113,409	1,874,999	6,526,510	N	6,158,273	6,774,100	N/A	-	-	-	(2,937)
Marin	14,565,912	1,874,999	12,728,502	N	12,749,444	14,024,388	N/A	-	-	-	(5,728)
Mariposa	1,465,029	1,250,000	1,027,364	Y	953,476	1,048,824	1,048,824	-	222,636	21,460	-
Mendocino	6,788,965	1,874,999	4,663,457	N	4,489,706	4,938,677	N/A	-	-	-	(2,099)
Merced	19,864,443	1,874,999	10,854,122	N	9,819,087	10,800,996	N/A	-	-	-	(4,885)
Modoc	818,258	875,000	867,769	Y	907,715	998,487	875,000	-	7,231	7,231	-
Mono	1,977,044	1,874,999	1,378,640	Y	1,277,516	1,405,267	1,405,267	-	496,359	26,627	-
Monterey	24,480,743	1,874,999	14,761,575	N	13,808,625	15,189,488	N/A	-	-	-	(6,643)
Napa	8,830,040	1,874,999	6,356,148	N	6,142,631	6,756,895	N/A	-	-	-	(2,861)
Nevada	6,164,242	1,874,999	4,116,057	N	3,912,480	4,303,728	N/A	-	-	-	(1,852)
Orange	182,035,554	1,874,999	128,979,695	N	124,474,029	136,921,432	N/A	-	-	-	(58,046)
Placer	22,095,792	1,874,999	12,860,209	N	11,893,169	13,082,486	N/A	-	-	-	(5,788)
Plumas	1,529,974	1,250,000	1,447,270	N	1,474,251	1,621,676	N/A	-	-	-	(651)
Riverside	127,449,051	1,874,999	68,896,654	N	62,192,490	68,411,739	N/A	-	-	-	(31,006)
Sacramento	112,581,621	1,874,999	69,172,188	N	64,354,121	70,789,533	N/A	-	-	-	(31,130)
San Benito	3,261,803	1,874,999	2,635,732	N	2,581,194	2,839,314	N/A	-	-	-	(1,186)
San Bernardino	146,361,641	1,874,999	76,122,893	N	67,906,320	74,696,952	N/A	-	-	-	(34,259)

Court	WAFM Calculated Funding Need	Funding Floor That Would Apply	Estimated 2014-2015 WAFM Base Allocation Prior to Applying Floor	Apply Floor? ¹	Current 2013-2014 WAFM Base Allocation	2013-14 Base Allocation Plus 10%	Estimated 2014-2015 Funding Floor ²	Additional Funding Above Estimated 2014-2015 Allocation Due to Absolute Floor	Additional Funding Above Estimated 2014-2015 Allocation Due to Graduated Floor Without Cap	Additional Funding Above Estimated 2014-2015 Allocation Due to Graduated Floor With Cap	Allocation of Reduction to All Other Courts
A	B	C	D	E	F	G (Col. F * 1.1)	H	I	J	K	L
San Diego	188,370,734	1,874,999	130,104,242	N	124,088,844	136,497,728	N/A	-	-	-	(58,553)
San Francisco	67,784,108	1,874,999	53,401,058	N	52,511,985	57,763,183	N/A	-	-	-	(24,033)
San Joaquin	47,012,910	1,874,999	27,357,153	N	25,389,188	27,928,106	N/A	-	-	-	(12,312)
San Luis Obispo	18,618,207	1,874,999	11,752,344	N	10,998,380	12,098,218	N/A	-	-	-	(5,289)
San Mateo	46,653,455	1,874,999	31,810,109	N	30,433,712	33,477,083	N/A	-	-	-	(14,316)
Santa Barbara	26,882,010	1,874,999	19,222,944	N	18,547,328	20,402,061	N/A	-	-	-	(8,651)
Santa Clara	99,985,907	1,874,999	75,892,574	N	74,415,844	81,857,428	N/A	-	-	-	(34,155)
Santa Cruz	16,181,638	1,874,999	10,725,553	N	10,114,880	11,126,368	N/A	-	-	-	(4,827)
Shasta	12,816,719	1,874,999	8,171,234	N	7,777,191	8,554,910	N/A	-	-	-	(3,677)
Sierra	235,751	750,000	472,962	Y	549,862	604,848	750,000	277,038	-	-	-
Siskiyou	3,208,541	1,874,999	3,079,098	N	3,100,308	3,410,339	N/A	-	-	-	(1,386)
Solano	30,824,836	1,874,999	18,087,998	N	16,806,315	18,486,947	N/A	-	-	-	(8,140)
Sonoma	34,475,888	1,874,999	21,180,380	N	19,882,335	21,870,568	N/A	-	-	-	(9,532)
Stanislaus	34,968,605	1,874,999	18,809,083	N	16,985,625	18,684,188	N/A	-	-	-	(8,465)
Sutter	6,575,894	1,874,999	3,898,132	N	3,648,754	4,013,629	N/A	-	-	-	(1,754)
Tehama	5,016,634	1,874,999	3,203,717	N	3,011,477	3,312,625	N/A	-	-	-	(1,442)
Trinity	1,659,729	1,250,000	1,122,807	Y	1,033,716	1,137,087	1,137,087	-	127,193	14,280	-
Tulare	23,578,927	1,874,999	14,044,249	N	13,003,562	14,303,918	N/A	-	-	-	(6,321)
Tuolumne	3,756,926	1,874,999	2,703,721	N	2,626,790	2,889,469	N/A	-	-	-	(1,217)
Ventura	49,160,015	1,874,999	28,345,838	N	26,022,064	28,624,270	N/A	-	-	-	(12,757)
Yolo	11,981,499	1,874,999	7,325,542	N	6,880,364	7,568,401	N/A	-	-	-	(3,297)
Yuba	4,887,940	1,874,999	3,411,042	N	3,242,025	3,566,228	N/A	-	-	-	(1,535)
Statewide	2,543,434,623		1,599,039,621		1,499,039,621			523,556	1,300,392	192,176	(715,733)

1. If a court's current-year WAFM allocation is greater than the funding floor, do not apply a floor.

2. If a floor is applied, apply the floor if the prior-year allocation plus 10% is larger than the floor. If the prior-year allocation plus 10% is greater than the floor, apply the floor; if not, apply the greater of the prior-year allocation plus 10% or the current-year allocation.