



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR APRIL 12, 2017

Meeting Contents

Agenda..... 3

Minutes

 Draft Minutes from the May 10, 2016 Meeting 6

Discussion and Possible Action Items

Item 1 – Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) Workload Priorities for 2017-2018
 (Discussion Item)..... 9

Item 2 – WAFM Adjustment Request Process and WAFM Adjustment Timeline (Action Item)

 Attachment 2A: *Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment
 Request Procedures*..... 10

 Attachment 2B: Proposed changes to the *Workload-Based Allocation and Funding
 Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedures*..... 12

Item 4 – Scenarios Presented to Small Courts Concerning Impact of Bureau of Labor Statistics
 (BLS) on WAFM calculations (Discussion Item)

 Attachment 4: BLS Scenarios..... 14

Item 5 – WAFM Spreadsheet Displays (Discussion Item)

 Attachment 5: WAFM Related Recommendations from the July 29, 2017 Judicial Council
 Report: *Trial Court Allocations: Funding for General Court Operations and Specific Costs in
 Fiscal Year 2016–2017*..... 16

 Attachment 5A: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations..... 19

 Attachment 5A1: 2016-2017 WAFM Allocation Adjustments Including Funding
 Floor..... 20

 Attachment 5B: 2016-2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology..... 22

 Attachment 5C: FY 2016-17 RAS FTE Need..... 26

 Attachment 5D: 2016-17 BLS Factor..... 27

 Attachment 5E: FY 2016-17 FTE Allotment Factor..... 28

 Attachment 5F: 2016-2017 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding
 (\$19.6 million in new funding)..... 29

 Attachment 5G: Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM..... 31

Attachment 5H: Summary of Changes from 2015–2016 to 2016-2017 Total WAFM Funding Need..... 33

Attachment 5I: Detail and Comparison of Changes in WAFM Need and Components by Court and Cluster..... 34

Attachment 5J: FY 2016-2017 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor..... 44

Attachment 5K: Determination of Funding Floor..... 45

Attachment 5L: Estimated FY 2016-2017 WAFM-Related Base Allocation..... 46

Attachment 5M: 2015-2016 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding (assumes \$90.6 million in new funding then reduced by \$22.7 million revenue shortfall)..... 48



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: April 12, 2017
Time: 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Location: Walnut Room, 2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300
Sacramento CA 95833
Public Call-In Number 1-877-820-7831, Pass code: 1884843 (listen only)

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes from the May 10, 2016 Funding Methodology Subcommittee meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Public Comment

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least one hour prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833, attention: Ms. Suzanne Blihovde. Only written comments received by 10:00 a.m. on April 12, 2017 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

Info 1

Workload-Based Allocation Funding Methodology (WAFM) 2018-2019 Rollout

Review of the recommendation to extend WAFM past the five-year implementation timeframe.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee

Info 2

Status of the Resource Allocation Study (RAS)

Review of the RAS proposed case weights.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Manager, Judicial Council Court Operations Services

IV. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-5)

Item 1

Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) Workload Priorities for 2017-2018 (Discussion Item)

Review the 2016-2017 work plan for FMS and discuss next steps.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget

Item 2

WAFM Adjustment Request Process and WAFM Adjustment Timeline (Discussion Item)

Consider changes to the current Judicial Council approved *Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Process* regarding unaccounted for factors being unique to applicant court(s) or having broader applications, and consider formalizing the current practice to not adjust the WAFM formula after April 1 for implementation on July 1 of the upcoming fiscal year for changes not related to the

Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Process.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget

Item 3

Civil Assessments Budget Change Proposal (Discussion Item)

Update on the 2018-2019 Budget Change Proposal concept for stabilizing Civil Assessment revenues and Maintenance of Effort buyout and discuss next steps.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

Item 4

Scenarios Presented to Small Courts Concerning Impact of Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on WAFM calculations (Discussion Item)

Discussion on the BLS related scenarios requested by the small courts in January 2017.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

Item 5

WAFM Spreadsheet Displays (Discussion Item)

Discussion to consider simplifying changes to the current WAFM spreadsheets that are provided to the Judicial Council and trial courts.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

May 10, 2016

9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Judicial Council, Veranda Room C, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95833

Members Present: Judges: Jonathan B. Conklin (Co-Chair), Mark A. Cope, Barry P. Goode, Lesley D. Holland, and Carolyn B. Kuhl.

Executive Officers: Rebecca Fleming (Co-Chair), Sherri R. Carter, Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Jeffrey E. Lewis (on phone), Michael D. Planet, Michael M. Roddy, and Tania Ugrin-Capobianco.

Members Absent: Judges: Cynthia Ming-Mei Lee

Executive Officers: Tammy L. Grimm and Christina M. Volkers.

Others Present: Judicial Council staff: Leah Rose-Goodwin and Colin Simpson.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The co-chair called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., and took roll call.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the February 5, 2016 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) Funding Methodology Subcommittee meeting.

Public Comment

None received.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-7)

Item 1

Civil Assessments and the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) (Discussion Item)

No action taken. An update from the co-chairs was provided on the activity of the Civil Assessment Working Group.

Item 2

New Judgeships Staffing Complement Funding (Discussion Item)

The subcommittee unanimously approved, with one abstention, two recommendations:

1. For any funding requests related to the staffing complement for new judgeship positions, Judicial Council staff should estimate costs for the staffing complement as follows:
 - a. **Staffing Ratio:** Calculate the ratio of staff to judicial officers by dividing the most recent total Resource Assessment Study (RAS) full-time equivalent (FTE) need by the most recent total Judicial Needs Assessment;
 - b. **Cost per Staff:** Calculate the cost per staff using the most recent WAFM funding need divided by the RAS FTE need.
 - c. **Total Staff Cost per Judgeship:** Multiply the Staffing Ratio by the Cost per Staff.
 - d. **Total Staffing Cost:** Multiply the Total Staff Cost per Judgeship by the number of new judgeships.
 - e. This would exclude any estimates, if needed, for facilities costs.
2. Any new funding appropriated to the judicial branch related to the staffing complement for new judgeships would be allocated to the trial courts based on WAFM with an equal amount of the courts' FY 2013–2014 historical WAFM base allocation being reallocated, if the historical base allocation has not already been fully reallocated.

Item 3

Plans for FY 2018–2019 and Beyond (Discussion Item)

The subcommittee unanimously approved the following recommendation:

1. Beginning in FY 2018–2019, until fully reallocated, each fiscal year reallocate an additional 10 percent, or the remaining amount if less than 10 percent, of the courts' FY 2013–2014 historical WAFM base allocation pursuant to the WAFM. The Judicial Council would continue to allocate any new money appropriated for general trial court operations entirely pursuant to the WAFM; and reallocate applicable base funding pursuant to the WAFM on a dollar-for-dollar basis for any new money appropriated for general trial court operations.

Item 4

Identify Technology Funding Streams (with JCTC and CITMF assistance) (Discussion Item)

No action taken. Judicial Council staff will provide a breakdown of court technology expenditures by fund source for the next meeting.

Item 5

Subcommittee Work Plan (Action Item)

The subcommittee unanimously adopted the following updated work plan:

FY 2015–2016

1. Plans for FY 2018–2019 and beyond (TCBAC recommendation pending)
2. Review operating expenses and equipment (OE&E) calculation and other WAFM components to determine handling of inflation, modification and refresh cycle (TCBAC recommendation approved)
3. New judgeships staffing complement funding (TCBAC recommendation pending)

FY 2016–2017

1. Identify technology funding streams (with JCTC and CITMF assistance)
2. Joint working group with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to evaluate the allocation methodology for Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding including review AB 1058 revenue as an offset to WAFM funding need.
3. Evaluate the impact of civil assessments as it relates to the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
4. Review TCTF and IMF self-help funding allocation
5. Identify all funding sources and determine allocation models
6. Review funding floor calculation to determine handling of inflation and refresh cycle
7. Special circumstances cases funding
8. Allocation methodology for staffing complement funding of reallocated judgeships
9. Allocation methodology for undesignated reductions

Indefinite

1. Evaluate impact of JCC and other provided services
2. Evaluate how to include unfunded costs – courthouse construction

Item 6

FY 2016–2017 WAFM Funding Need (Discussion Item)

No action taken. Discussion of the changes to the WAFM components resulting in the FY 2016–2017 WAFM funding need estimate as well as estimated WAFM adjustments in 2016–2017 and 2017–2018.

Item 7

Open Discussion (Discussion Item)

No action taken.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:51 p.m.

Approved by the subcommittee on.

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Updated on May 10, 2016

FY 2015–2016

1. Plans for FY 2018–2019 and beyond (TCBAC recommendation pending)
2. Review operating expenses and equipment (OE&E) calculation and other WAFM components to determine handling of inflation, modification and refresh cycle (TCBAC recommendation approved)
3. New judgeships staffing complement funding (TCBAC recommendation pending)

FY 2016–2017

1. Identify technology funding streams (with JCTC and CITMF assistance)
2. Joint working group with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to evaluate the allocation methodology for Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding including review AB 1058 revenue as an offset to WAFM funding need.
3. Evaluate the impact of civil assessments as it relates to the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
4. Review TCTF and IMF self-help funding allocation
5. Identify all funding sources and determine allocation models
6. Review funding floor calculation to determine handling of inflation and refresh cycle
7. Special circumstances cases funding
8. Allocation methodology for staffing complement funding of reallocated judgeships
9. Allocation methodology for undesignated reductions

Indefinite

1. Evaluate impact of JCC and other provided services
2. Evaluate how to include unfunded costs – courthouse construction

Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedures

The submission, review and approval process shall be under the direction of the Judicial Council and would be as follows:

1. Initial requests shall be submitted to the Administrative Director of the Courts either by the trial court's Presiding Judge or Executive Officer no later than October 15 of each year, commencing October 15, 2013.
2. The Administrative Director of the Courts shall forward the request to the Co-Chairs of the TCBAC. The Director of the AOC Fiscal Services Office, Co-Chair of the TCBAC, in consultation with his/her Co-Chair of the TCBAC shall review each request, obtain additional information from the trial court as needed and submit a preliminary report to the TCBAC's Funding Methodology Subcommittee no later than January 15. The review of WAFM Adjustment Requests shall include a three-step process including:
 - a) initial review to determine whether the factor identified in a court's request should form the basis of a potential modification to WAFM;
 - b) evaluation of whether and how the modification should occur; and
 - c) evaluation of whether, for those circumstances where it is determined that the factor should ultimately be included in the underlying Resource Assessment Study model (RAS), an interim adjustment should be made to a trial court's WAFM funding need pending a more formal adjustment to the RAS model.
3. The Funding Methodology Subcommittee shall review any requests and present its recommendation(s) to the TCBAC no later than March 15.
4. The TCBAC shall make final recommendations to the Judicial Council for consideration at the April Judicial Council meeting. Any requested adjustments that are approved by the Judicial Council shall be included in the July and/or August allocation.
5. Upon approval by the Judicial Council of an adjustment to WAFM, the Director of the Fiscal Services Office, in consultation with the TCBAC, shall notify all trial courts to allow the opportunity to demonstrate eligibility for similar adjustment. (In some circumstances, the nature of the adjustment will automatically apply to all courts, and demonstration of eligibility may not be necessary).

Adjustments to WAFM will impact the funding need for each trial court that is subject to the adjustment, along with the overall statewide funding need. Therefore, final allocations will be implemented consistent with the WAFM allocation implementation plan as approved by the Judicial Council or as amended in the future. Because funding need is currently greater than available funding and because only a portion of trial court funding is currently allocated under the WAFM, allocated funding will not equal, and may be substantially less than, the funding need identified for the adjustment being made, just as the allocated funding is substantially less than the entire WAFM funding need.

Trial courts requesting an adjustment in accordance with the WAFM Adjustment Request Process shall be required to submit detailed information documenting the need for such adjustment. The Director of Fiscal Services shall develop an application form that solicits at minimum, the following information:

1. A description of how the factor is not currently accounted for in WAFM.
2. Identification and description of the basis for which the adjustment is requested.
3. A detailed analysis of why the adjustment is necessary.
4. A description of whether the unaccounted for factor is unique to the applicant court(s) or has broader applications.
5. Detailed description of staffing need(s) and/or costs required to support the factor that is unaccounted for by WAFM.
6. Description of the consequence to the public and access to justice without the funding.
7. Description of the consequences to the requesting court(s) of not receiving the funding.
8. Any additional information requested by the AOC Fiscal Services Office, Funding Methodology Subcommittee, and/or TCBCAC deemed necessary to fully evaluate the request.

Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedures

The submission, review and approval process shall be under the direction of the Judicial Council and would be as follows:

1. Initial requests shall be submitted to the Administrative Director of the Courts either by the trial court's Presiding Judge or Executive Officer no later than ~~October~~ *January 15* of each year, commencing ~~October~~ *January 15, 2013/2018*.
2. The Administrative Director of the Courts shall forward the request to the ~~Co-Chairs of the TCBAC~~ *Director of Judicial Council Budget Services*. The Director of the ~~AOC Fiscal Judicial Council Budget Services Office, Co-Chair of the TCBAC~~, in consultation with ~~his/her Co-Chair~~ *the Chair of the TCBAC* shall review each request *and refer the request to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee at the April meeting of the TCBAC. obtain additional information from the trial court as needed*
3. *The Funding Methodology Subcommittee shall review the referral from TCBAC and prioritize the request into the proposed annual work plan to be submitted back to TCBAC in July of the new fiscal year.*
4. *Once prioritized, requests will be evaluated by the* ~~and submit a preliminary report to the TCBAC's Funding Methodology Subcommittee. no later than January 15.~~ The review of WAFM Adjustment Requests shall include a three-step process including:
 - a) initial review to determine whether the factor identified in a court's request should form the basis of a potential modification to WAFM;
 - b) evaluation of whether and how the modification should occur; and
 - c) evaluation of whether, for those circumstances where it is determined that the factor should ultimately be included in the underlying Resource Assessment Study model (RAS), an interim adjustment should be made to a trial court's WAFM funding need pending a more formal adjustment to the RAS model.
5. The Funding Methodology Subcommittee shall review any requests and present its recommendation(s) to the TCBAC no later than ~~March 15~~ *January prior to the year proposed for implementation.*
6. The TCBAC shall make final recommendations to the Judicial Council for consideration at the *March/April* Judicial Council meeting. ~~Any~~ *Requested* adjustments that are approved by the Judicial Council shall be included in the ~~July and/or August~~ *allocation based on the timing included in the recommendation. TCBAC will make no further recommendations for changes to the WAFM formulae impacting the next fiscal year after the March/April Judicial Council meeting of the current fiscal year.*

Upon approval by the Judicial Council of an adjustment to WAFM, the Director of the ~~Fiscal Budget Services Office~~, in consultation with the TCBAC, shall notify all trial courts. ~~to allow the opportunity to demonstrate eligibility for similar adjustment.~~ (In some circumstances, the nature

of the adjustment will automatically apply to all courts., and demonstration of eligibility may not be necessary).

7. Adjustments to WAFM will impact the funding need for each trial court that is subject to the adjustment, along with the overall statewide funding need. Therefore, final allocations will be implemented consistent with the WAFM allocation implementation plan as approved by the Judicial Council or as amended in the future. Because funding need is currently greater than available funding and because only a portion of trial court funding is currently allocated under the WAFM, allocated funding will not equal, and may be substantially less than, the funding need identified for the adjustment being made, just as the allocated funding is substantially less than the entire WAFM funding need.

Trial courts requesting an adjustment in accordance with the WAFM Adjustment Request Process shall be required to submit detailed information documenting the need for such adjustment. The Director of ~~Fiscal~~ *Fiscal Budget Services* shall develop an application form that solicits at minimum, the following information:

1. A description of how the factor is not currently accounted for in WAFM.
2. Identification and description of the basis for which the adjustment is requested.
3. A detailed analysis of why the adjustment is necessary.
4. A description of whether the unaccounted for factor is unique to the applicant court(s) or has broader applications.
5. Detailed description of staffing need(s) and/or costs required to support the factor that is unaccounted for by WAFM.
6. Description of the consequence to the public and access to justice without the funding.
7. Description of the consequences to the requesting court(s) of not receiving the funding.
8. Any additional information requested by the ~~AOC Fiscal JCC Budget Services Office~~, Funding Methodology Subcommittee, and/or TCBAC deemed necessary to fully evaluate the request.

WAFM Cost of Labor Factor Scenarios as Requested by Court Representatives from Cluster 1 and 2 Courts

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Cluster	Court	2016-17 Cost of Labor Factor					
		Actual	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5
		3-Year Avg (2011-2013) BLS Factor	BLS Factor (Cluster 1 min. BLS of 1)	BLS Factor (FTE<50 min. BLS of 1)	BLS Factor (Clusters 1 & 2 min. BLS of 1)	BLS Factor (All Courts min. BLS of 1)	BLS Factor (Clusters 1 & 2 min. 7A Factor)
Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F		
4	Alameda	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42
1	Alpine	0.86	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.01
1	Amador	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
2	Butte	0.91	0.91	0.91	1.00	1.00	0.91
1	Calaveras	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95
1	Colusa	0.72	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75
3	Contra Costa	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
1	Del Norte	0.77	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.08
2	El Dorado	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.02
3	Fresno	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	1.00	0.97
1	Glenn	0.68	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.92
2	Humboldt	0.78	0.78	0.78	1.00	1.00	0.79
2	Imperial	0.79	0.79	0.79	1.00	1.00	0.79
1	Inyo	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.89
3	Kern	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05
2	Kings	0.88	0.88	0.88	1.00	1.00	0.88
2	Lake	0.75	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.88
1	Lassen	0.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.90
4	Los Angeles	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36
2	Madera	0.94	0.94	0.94	1.00	1.00	0.94
2	Marin	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29
1	Mariposa	0.81	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.81
2	Mendocino	0.82	0.82	0.82	1.00	1.00	0.89
2	Merced	0.89	0.89	0.89	1.00	1.00	0.89
1	Modoc	0.57	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.96
1	Mono	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
3	Monterey	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19
2	Napa	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.23
2	Nevada	0.98	0.98	0.98	1.00	1.00	0.99
4	Orange	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
2	Placer	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19
1	Plumas	0.70	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97
4	Riverside	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
4	Sacramento	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28
1	San Benito	0.97	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97
4	San Bernardino	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06
4	San Diego	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18
4	San Francisco	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
3	San Joaquin	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09
2	San Luis Obispo	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.09
3	San Mateo	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44
3	Santa Barbara	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19
4	Santa Clara	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44
2	Santa Cruz	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14
2	Shasta	0.87	0.87	0.87	1.00	1.00	0.90
1	Sierra	0.62	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.75
2	Siskiyou	0.70	0.70	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.91
3	Solano	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18
3	Sonoma	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13
3	Stanislaus	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01
2	Sutter	0.96	0.96	0.96	1.00	1.00	0.96
2	Tehama	0.79	0.79	0.79	1.00	1.00	0.89
1	Trinity	0.65	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95
3	Tulare	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	1.00	0.84
2	Tuolumne	0.81	0.81	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.86
3	Ventura	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22
2	Yolo	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04
2	Yuba	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17
		Total					

Cluster	Court	2016-17 WAFM Funding Need					
		Actual	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5
		2016-17 WAFM Funding Need	Funding Need (Cluster 1 min. BLS of 1)	Funding Need (FTE<50 min. BLS of 1)	Funding Need (Clusters 1 & 2 min. BLS of 1)	Funding Need (All Courts min. BLS of 1)	Funding Need (Clusters 1 & 2 min. 7A Factor)
Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L		
86,595,580	86,595,580	86,595,580	86,595,580	86,595,580	86,595,580	86,595,580	
405,149	444,964	444,964	444,964	444,964	444,964	447,444	
2,923,146	2,923,146	2,923,146	2,923,146	2,923,146	2,923,146	2,923,146	
13,150,407	13,150,407	13,150,407	14,093,525	14,093,525	14,093,525	13,150,407	
2,760,256	2,960,659	2,960,659	2,960,659	2,960,659	2,960,659	2,860,837	
1,842,151	2,169,514	2,169,514	2,169,514	2,169,514	2,169,514	2,041,733	
51,243,320	51,243,320	51,243,320	51,243,320	51,243,320	51,243,320	51,243,320	
3,200,856	3,657,584	3,657,584	3,657,584	3,657,584	3,657,584	3,815,731	
8,768,398	8,768,398	8,768,398	8,768,398	8,768,398	8,768,398	8,842,221	
68,451,784	68,451,784	68,451,784	68,451,784	69,825,503	68,451,784	68,451,784	
1,918,339	2,279,513	2,279,513	2,279,513	2,279,513	2,279,513	2,171,661	
8,073,363	8,073,363	8,073,363	9,637,378	9,637,378	9,637,378	8,168,461	
11,407,375	11,407,375	11,407,375	13,543,161	13,543,161	13,543,161	11,407,375	
1,955,945	2,192,426	2,192,426	2,192,426	2,192,426	2,192,426	2,089,067	
70,118,504	70,118,504	70,118,504	70,118,504	70,118,504	70,118,504	70,118,504	
9,140,499	9,140,499	9,140,499	9,973,124	9,973,124	9,973,124	9,140,499	
3,950,710	4,663,104	4,711,347	4,711,347	4,711,347	4,711,347	4,470,309	
2,540,016	2,929,302	2,929,302	2,929,302	2,929,302	2,929,302	2,795,840	
700,570,381	700,570,381	700,570,381	700,570,381	700,570,381	700,570,381	700,570,381	
9,898,382	9,898,382	9,898,382	10,339,499	10,339,499	10,339,499	9,898,382	
13,074,251	13,074,251	13,074,251	13,074,251	13,074,251	13,074,251	13,074,251	
1,221,848	1,416,184	1,416,184	1,416,184	1,416,184	1,416,184	1,330,480	
6,680,383	6,680,383	6,680,383	7,766,691	7,766,691	7,766,691	7,097,171	
16,566,558	16,566,558	16,566,558	18,000,935	18,000,935	18,000,935	16,566,558	
848,627	1,038,859	1,038,859	1,038,859	1,038,859	1,038,859	1,008,114	
1,853,033	1,853,033	1,853,033	1,853,033	1,853,033	1,853,033	1,853,033	
22,649,370	22,649,370	22,649,370	22,649,370	22,649,370	22,649,370	22,649,370	
9,024,771	9,024,771	9,024,771	9,024,771	9,024,771	9,024,771	9,072,030	
5,266,676	5,266,676	5,266,676	5,351,255	5,351,255	5,351,255	5,324,573	
168,407,955	168,407,955	168,407,955	168,407,955	168,407,955	168,407,955	168,407,955	
21,108,235	21,108,235	21,108,235	21,108,235	21,108,235	21,108,235	21,108,235	
1,332,623	1,585,039	1,585,039	1,585,039	1,585,039	1,585,039	1,546,867	
118,145,753	118,145,753	118,145,753	118,145,753	118,145,753	118,145,753	118,145,753	
98,735,335	98,735,335	98,735,335	98,735,335	98,735,335	98,735,335	98,735,335	
2,742,618	2,803,783	2,803,783	2,803,783	2,803,783	2,803,783	2,742,618	
128,763,249	128,763,249	128,763,249	128,763,249	128,763,249	128,763,249	128,763,249	
162,426,582	162,426,582	162,426,582	162,426,582	162,426,582	162,426,582	162,426,582	
67,359,435	67,359,435	67,359,435	67,359,435	67,359,435	67,359,435	67,359,435	
46,453,108	46,453,108	46,453,108	46,453,108	46,453,108	46,453,108	46,453,108	
17,268,592	17,268,592	17,268,592	17,268,592	17,268,592	17,268,592	17,611,165	
42,198,583	42,198,583	42,198,583	42,198,583	42,198,583	42,198,583	42,198,583	
26,429,843	26,429,843	26,429,843	26,429,843	26,429,843	26,429,843	26,429,843	
89,140,315	89,140,315	89,140,315	89,140,315	89,140,315	89,140,315	89,140,315	
15,460,851	15,460,851	15,460,851	15,460,851	15,460,851	15,460,851	15,460,851	
13,224,651	13,224,651	13,224,651	14,603,445	14,603,445	14,603,445	13,588,457	
350,609	442,934	442,934	442,934	442,934	442,934	394,149	
2,991,415	3,518,540	3,580,471	3,580,471	3,580,471	3,580,471	3,401,168	
26,100,828	26,100,828	26,100,828	26,100,828	26,100,828	26,100,828	26,100,828	
29,031,343	29,031,343	29,031,343	29,031,343	29,031,343	29,031,343	29,031,343	
31,329,380	31,329,380	31,329,380	31,329,380	31,329,380	31,329,380	31,329,380	
6,790,525	6,790,525	6,790,525	7,001,472	7,001,472	7,001,472	6,790,525	
5,229,016	5,229,016	5,229,016	6,066,990	6,066,990	6,066,990	5,620,567	
1,452,014	1,729,393	1,729,393	1,729,393	1,729,393	1,729,393	1,666,680	
24,340,690	24,340,690	24,340,690	24,340,690	24,340,690	27,095,207	24,340,690	
3,628,227	4,164,421	4,203,108	4,203,108	4,203,108	4,203,108	3,984,233	
45,542,069	45,542,069	45,542,069	45,542,069	45,542,069	45,542,069	45,542,069	
11,850,964	11,850,964	11,850,964	11,850,964	11,850,964	11,850,964	11,850,964	
6,185,620	6,185,620	6,185,620	6,185,620	6,185,620	6,185,620	6,185,620	
		2,350,120,506	2,354,975,320	2,355,124,180	2,366,073,819	2,370,202,056	2,355,534,817
Change		4,854,814	5,003,675	15,953,314	20,081,551	5,414,312	

WAFM Cost of Labor Factor Scenarios as Requested by Court Representatives from Cluster 1 and 2 Courts

FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

		2016-17 WAFM Allocation Adjustments															
Cluster	Court	Actual	Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4			Scenario 5		
		2016-17 WAFM Allocation	Allocation (Cluster 1 min. BLS of 1)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17	Allocation (FTE<50 min. BLS of 1)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17	Allocation (Cluster 1 & 2 min. BLS of 1)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17	Allocation (All Courts min. BLS of 1)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17	Allocation (Clusters 1 & 2 min. 7A Factor)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17
		Col. M	Col. N	Col. O	Col. P	Col. Q	Col. R	Col. S	Col. T	Col. U	Col. V	Col. W	Col. X	Col. Y	Col. Z	Col. AA	Col. AB
4	Alameda	(684,913)	(755,037)	(70,125)	-10.2%	(757,470)	(72,557)	-10.6%	(935,553)	(250,640)	-36.6%	(1,002,266)	(317,353)	-46.3%	(768,416)	(83,503)	-12.2%
1	Alpine	(94,596)	(94,596)	-	0.0%	(94,596)	-	0.0%	(94,596)	-	0.0%	(94,596)	-	0.0%	(94,596)	-	0.0%
1	Amador	127,884	125,503	(2,381)	-1.9%	125,421	(2,463)	-1.9%	119,410	(8,474)	-6.6%	117,158	(10,726)	-8.4%	125,058	(2,826)	-2.2%
2	Butte	1,740,459	1,729,628	(10,831)	-0.6%	1,729,259	(11,200)	-0.6%	2,118,227	377,768	21.7%	2,107,374	366,915	21.1%	1,727,681	(12,778)	-0.7%
1	Calaveras	128,438	215,005	86,567	67.4%	214,922	86,484	67.3%	208,834	80,397	62.6%	206,554	78,116	60.8%	170,332	41,894	32.6%
1	Colusa	208,815	208,815	-	0.0%	208,815	-	0.0%	208,815	-	0.0%	208,815	-	0.0%	208,815	-	0.0%
3	Contra Costa	4,246,995	4,204,924	(42,070)	-1.0%	4,203,485	(43,509)	-1.0%	4,098,135	(148,860)	-3.5%	4,058,669	(188,326)	-4.4%	4,197,275	(49,719)	-1.2%
1	Del Norte	182,666	382,471	199,805	109.4%	382,368	199,702	109.3%	374,848	192,182	105.2%	372,031	189,365	103.7%	451,988	269,322	147.4%
2	El Dorado	586,017	578,832	(7,185)	-1.2%	578,585	(7,431)	-1.3%	560,558	(25,459)	-4.3%	553,804	(32,212)	-5.5%	610,219	24,202	4.1%
3	Fresno	11,016,159	10,959,604	(56,555)	-0.5%	10,957,682	(58,477)	-0.5%	10,816,973	(199,186)	-1.8%	11,369,140	352,981	3.2%	10,949,552	(66,606)	-0.6%
1	Glenn	(103,198)	(8,597)	94,601	91.7%	(8,661)	94,537	91.6%	(13,350)	89,848	87.1%	(15,106)	88,992	85.4%	(56,738)	46,460	45.0%
2	Humboldt	769,447	762,825	(6,622)	-0.9%	762,598	(6,848)	-0.9%	1,435,875	666,428	86.6%	1,428,453	659,007	85.6%	803,750	34,303	4.5%
2	Imperial	1,525,282	1,515,876	(9,406)	-0.6%	1,515,556	(9,726)	-0.6%	2,434,183	908,902	59.6%	2,423,755	898,474	58.9%	1,514,192	(11,090)	-0.7%
1	Inyo	(100,268)	2,985	103,253	103.0%	2,923	103,191	102.9%	(1,587)	98,681	98.4%	(3,276)	96,992	96.7%	(43,157)	57,111	57.0%
3	Kern	14,947,758	14,889,331	(58,428)	-0.4%	14,887,362	(60,396)	-0.4%	14,743,254	(204,505)	-1.4%	14,689,268	(258,491)	-1.7%	14,879,266	(68,493)	-0.5%
2	Kings	1,378,555	1,370,978	(7,577)	-0.5%	1,370,721	(7,834)	-0.6%	1,719,197	340,643	24.7%	1,711,518	332,964	24.2%	1,369,647	(8,908)	-0.6%
2	Lake	121,173	433,670	312,497	257.9%	454,918	333,745	275.4%	445,232	324,059	267.4%	441,604	320,431	264.4%	347,558	226,385	186.8%
1	Lassen	64,537	234,987	170,450	264.1%	234,905	170,368	264.0%	228,882	164,346	254.7%	226,626	162,090	251.2%	175,421	110,884	171.8%
4	Los Angeles	90,340,620	89,763,260	(577,360)	-0.6%	89,743,589	(597,032)	-0.7%	88,303,416	(2,037,204)	-2.3%	87,763,901	(2,576,719)	-2.9%	89,659,710	(680,911)	-0.8%
2	Madera	1,047,013	1,038,899	(8,113)	-0.8%	1,038,621	(8,391)	-0.8%	1,212,844	165,831	15.8%	1,204,881	157,868	15.1%	1,037,416	(9,597)	-0.9%
2	Marin	(1,696,447)	(1,706,862)	(10,414)	-0.6%	(1,707,229)	(10,782)	-0.6%	(1,734,126)	(37,678)	-2.2%	(1,744,201)	(47,754)	-2.8%	(1,708,962)	(12,515)	-0.7%
1	Mariposa	24,757	144,104	119,348	482.1%	144,104	119,348	482.1%	144,104	119,348	482.1%	144,104	119,348	482.1%	144,104	119,348	482.1%
2	Mendocino	503,441	497,995	(5,446)	-1.1%	497,807	(5,634)	-1.1%	963,232	459,792	91.3%	957,251	453,810	90.1%	681,634	178,193	35.4%
2	Merced	2,275,651	2,261,980	(13,672)	-0.6%	2,261,515	(14,137)	-0.6%	2,860,152	584,500	25.7%	2,846,290	570,639	25.1%	2,259,540	(16,112)	-0.7%
1	Modoc	(124,121)	(40,478)	83,643	67.4%	(40,507)	83,614	67.4%	(42,645)	81,477	65.6%	(43,445)	80,676	65.0%	(54,267)	69,854	56.3%
1	Mono	237,810	237,810	-	0.0%	237,810	-	0.0%	237,810	-	0.0%	237,810	-	0.0%	237,810	-	0.0%
3	Monterey	2,740,573	2,721,948	(18,625)	-0.7%	2,721,312	(19,261)	-0.7%	2,674,749	(65,824)	-2.4%	2,657,306	(83,267)	-3.0%	2,718,581	(21,992)	-0.8%
2	Napa	582,813	575,430	(7,383)	-1.3%	575,177	(7,636)	-1.3%	556,622	(26,192)	-4.5%	549,671	(33,143)	-5.7%	595,008	12,995	2.1%
2	Nevada	191,720	187,441	(4,279)	-2.2%	187,293	(4,427)	-2.3%	213,770	22,050	11.5%	209,647	17,928	9.4%	212,284	20,565	10.7%
4	Orange	5,611,258	5,474,427	(136,831)	-2.4%	5,469,696	(141,561)	-2.5%	5,123,391	(487,866)	-8.7%	4,993,659	(617,599)	-11.0%	5,448,621	(162,637)	-2.9%
2	Placer	3,122,033	3,104,604	(17,430)	-0.6%	3,104,011	(18,022)	-0.6%	3,060,620	(61,413)	-2.0%	3,044,365	(77,668)	-2.5%	3,101,499	(20,534)	-0.7%
1	Plumas	(213,489)	(107,911)	105,577	49.5%	(107,956)	105,533	49.4%	(111,216)	102,273	47.9%	(112,437)	101,051	47.3%	(125,071)	88,417	41.4%
4	Riverside	20,324,222	20,226,333	(97,889)	-0.5%	20,223,016	(101,206)	-0.5%	19,980,171	(344,052)	-1.7%	19,889,196	(435,026)	-2.1%	20,209,113	(115,109)	-0.6%
4	Sacramento	9,215,721	9,134,517	(81,204)	-0.9%	9,131,744	(83,977)	-0.9%	8,928,764	(286,957)	-3.1%	8,852,723	(362,997)	-3.9%	9,119,845	(95,876)	-1.0%
1	San Benito	(185,966)	(161,065)	24,901	13.4%	(161,144)	24,822	13.3%	(166,910)	19,056	10.2%	(169,071)	16,895	9.1%	(188,603)	(2,636)	-1.4%
4	San Bernardino	22,679,201	22,572,666	(106,536)	-0.5%	22,569,050	(110,151)	-0.5%	22,304,372	(374,829)	-1.7%	22,205,219	(473,982)	-2.1%	22,553,828	(125,373)	-0.6%
4	San Diego	3,094,477	2,962,592	(131,886)	-4.3%	2,958,029	(136,448)	-4.4%	2,624,020	(470,458)	-15.2%	2,498,893	(595,584)	-19.2%	2,937,663	(156,815)	-5.1%
4	San Francisco	108,443	54,052	(54,391)	-50.2%	52,160	(56,283)	-51.9%	(86,373)	(194,816)	-179.6%	(138,270)	(246,713)	-227.5%	43,572	(64,870)	-59.8%
3	San Joaquin	7,331,674	7,293,275	(38,399)	-0.5%	7,291,971	(39,703)	-0.5%	7,196,483	(135,191)	-1.8%	7,160,711	(170,963)	-2.3%	7,286,643	(45,211)	-0.6%
2	San Luis Obispo	1,703,552	1,689,351	(14,201)	-0.8%	1,688,866	(14,686)	-0.9%	1,653,365	(50,187)	-2.9%	1,640,066	(63,486)	-3.7%	1,838,559	135,007	7.9%
3	San Mateo	1,994,555	1,960,180	(34,375)	-1.7%	1,958,995	(35,560)	-1.8%	1,872,224	(122,331)	-6.1%	1,839,719	(154,836)	-7.8%	1,953,755	(40,800)	-2.0%
3	Santa Barbara	1,406,973	1,385,364	(21,609)	-1.5%	1,384,621	(22,351)	-1.6%	1,330,280	(76,693)	-5.5%	1,309,923	(97,050)	-6.9%	1,381,377	(25,596)	-1.8%
4	Santa Clara	(2,187,307)	(2,259,365)	(72,058)	-3.3%	(2,261,869)	(74,562)	-3.4%	(2,445,192)	(257,885)	-11.8%	(2,513,869)	(326,561)	-14.9%	(2,273,196)	(85,889)	-3.9%
2	Santa Cruz	1,291,507	1,278,801	(12,706)	-1.0%	1,278,367	(13,140)	-1.0%	1,246,582	(44,925)	-3.5%	1,234,674	(56,832)	-4.4%	1,276,499	(15,008)	-1.2%
2	Shasta	1,705,142	1,694,296	(10,846)	-0.6%	1,693,924	(11,217)	-0.7%	2,274,910	569,769	33.4%	2,263,664	558,522	32.8%	1,853,498	148,356	8.7%
1	Sierra	(120,798)	(108,648)	12,151	10.1%	(108,660)	12,138	10.0%	(109,574)	11,224	9.3%	(109,916)	10,882	9.0%	(120,798)	(0)	0.0%
2	Siskiyou	(502,149)	(270,907)	231,242	46.1%	(243,562)	258,587	51.5%	(250,926)	251,222	50.0%	(253,685)	248,464	49.5%	(323,466)	178,683	35.6%
3	Solano	2,757,380	2,735,972	(21,408)	-0.8%	2,735,239	(22,141)	-0.8%	2,681,578	(75,803)	-2.7%	2,661,475	(95,905)	-3.5%	2,732,067	(25,314)	-0.9%
3	Sonoma	2,291,685	2,267,966	(23,720)	-1.0%	2,267,150	(24,535)	-1.1%	2,207,459	(84,226)	-3.7%	2,185,098	(106,588)	-4.7%	2,263,579	(28,107)	-1.2%
3	Stanislaus	5,195,317	5,169,286	(26,031)	-0.5%	5,168,406	(26,910)	-0.5%	5,104,013	(91,303)	-1.8%	5,079,891	(115,426)	-2.2%	5,164,753	(30,563)	-0.6%
2	Sutter	1,101,310	1,095,690	(5,620)	-0.5%	1,095,499	(5,811)	-0.5%	1,174,588	73,278	6.7%	1,169,197	67,886	6.2%	1,094,698	(6,613)	-0.6%
2	Tehama	686,758	682,450	(4,307)	-0.6%	682,303	(4,454)	-0.6%	1,041,177	354,420	51.6%	1,036,506	349,748	50.9%	855,150	168,392	24.5%
1	Trinity	87,706	209,475	121,768	138.8%	209,426	121,720	138.8%	205,869	118,163	134.7%	204,537	116,831	133.2%	181,421	93,715	106.9%
3	Tulare	3,894,287	3,874,185	(20,102)	-0.5%	3,873,502	(20,785)	-0.5%	3,823,466	(70,820)	-1.8%	5,017,599	1,123,312	28.8%	3,870,607	(23,680)	-0.6%
2	Tuolumne	154,519	389,193	234,674	151.9%	406,219	251,701	162.9%	397,578	243,059	157.3%	394,341	239,822	155.2%	308,738	154,219	99.8%
3	Ventura	6,517,993	6,480,418	(37,576)	-0.6%	6,479,139	(38,854)	-0.6%	6,385,520	(132,474)	-2.0%	6,350,448	(167,545)	-2.6%	6,473,706	(44,287)	-0.7%
2	Yolo	1,604,218	1,594,446	(9,772)	-0.6%	1,594,113	(10,105)	-0.6%	1,569,751	(34,467)	-2.1%	1,560,625	(43,593)	-2.7%	1,592,697	(11,521)	-0.7%
2	Yuba	932,798	927,690	(5,108)	-0.5%	927,516	(5,282)	-0.6%	914,801	(17,997)	-1.9%	910,037	(22,761)	-2.4%	926,780	(6,018)	-0.6%
		233,788,058	233,788,058	(0)		233,788,058	(0)		233,788,058	(0)		233,788,058	(0)		233,788,058	(0)	

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)	-	83,872	112,737	pending	39,086,182
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)	(1,630,121)	308,166	1,149,022	pending	45,904,610
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)	(84,266)	12,609	12,673	pending	3,266,235
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)	(0)	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)	(23,699)	29,422	-	pending	5,500,208
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)	(126,164)	14,010	-	pending	7,362,702
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)	(217,178)	30,759	29,834	pending	15,395,808
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)	(1,872,855)	160,101	107,721	pending	73,253,545
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	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
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)	(29,552)	11,654	2,904	pending	3,003,794
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)	(824,106)	104,696	54,916	pending	22,413,436
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
Total	1,772,934,442	8,452,388	20,292,088	411,942	342,506	19,588,058	(0)	(9,438,587)	9,223,000	10,700,000	10,700,000	1,843,205,837

		<i>Net Reallocation of 40 Percent of Historical Funding</i>	<i>Reverse FY 2015-16 Net Reallocation of 30 Percent of Historical Funding</i>	<i>Allocation of \$214.2 Million in New Funding Using Updated WAFM</i>	<i>Net Reallocation of \$214.2 Million in Historical Funding</i>	<i>Reverse FY 2015-16 Allocation and Reallocation of \$214.2 Million in New Funding</i>	<i>Allocation of \$19.6 Million in New Funding</i>	<i>Net Reallocation of \$19.6 Million in Historical Funding</i>	<i>Adjustment Related to WAFM Funding Floor</i>	<i>Total WAFM Adjustments to Base in 2016-17 Including Funding Floor</i>
Cluster	Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I (Sum of A to H)
4	Alameda	(6,603,514)	5,312,625	7,892,690	(2,454,850)	(5,080,972)	721,767	(224,490)	(16,517)	(453,260)
1	Alpine	(121,523)	96,855	36,927	(45,176)	13,913	3,377	(4,131)	35,931	16,172
1	Amador	(115,509)	120,523	266,428	(42,940)	(189,891)	24,364	(3,927)	(532)	58,516
2	Butte	309,051	(142,440)	1,198,584	114,890	(1,224,900)	109,608	10,506	(2,180)	373,119
1	Calaveras	(103,606)	91,996	251,582	(38,515)	(198,898)	23,007	(3,522)	(507)	21,536
1	Colusa	(95,668)	69,029	167,902	(35,564)	(135,036)	15,354	(3,252)	160,044	142,809
3	Contra Costa	(598,907)	(85,464)	4,670,535	(222,643)	(4,977,901)	427,109	(20,360)	(8,738)	(816,371)
1	Del Norte	(96,152)	113,802	291,740	(35,745)	(214,669)	26,679	(3,269)	(587)	81,799
2	El Dorado	(202,552)	126,637	799,189	(75,299)	(748,948)	73,084	(6,886)	(1,520)	(36,294)
3	Fresno	3,000,304	(1,478,040)	6,238,987	1,115,360	(6,588,854)	570,540	101,997	(11,030)	2,949,265
1	Glenn	(254,350)	171,551	174,846	(94,555)	(99,336)	15,989	(8,647)	63,519	(30,983)
2	Humboldt	(22,975)	74,090	735,841	(8,541)	(670,933)	67,291	(781)	(1,388)	172,604
2	Imperial	279,110	(209,145)	1,039,717	103,759	(1,143,290)	95,080	9,488	(1,872)	172,847
1	Inyo	(209,432)	160,206	178,273	(77,856)	(97,312)	16,303	(7,120)	(436)	(37,374)
3	Kern	5,678,721	(3,840,861)	6,390,899	2,111,059	(8,087,404)	584,432	193,051	(10,404)	3,019,494
2	Kings	334,835	(161,378)	833,104	124,475	(868,609)	76,185	11,383	(1,427)	348,568
2	Lake	(192,865)	203,496	360,085	(71,698)	(230,050)	32,929	(6,557)	(721)	94,619
1	Lassen	(133,512)	96,064	231,508	(49,633)	(185,910)	21,171	(4,539)	(458)	(25,309)
4	Los Angeles	14,770,787	(12,632,140)	63,852,971	5,491,026	(70,884,573)	5,839,196	502,141	(115,500)	6,823,907
2	Madera	45,557	28,357	902,181	16,936	(857,134)	82,502	1,549	(1,711)	218,236
2	Marin	(2,130,015)	1,585,917	1,191,643	(791,831)	(411,306)	108,973	(72,411)	(2,806)	(521,836)
1	Mariposa	(68,668)	43,404	111,364	(25,527)	(93,864)	10,184	(2,334)	(262)	(25,704)
2	Mendocino	(113,755)	142,662	608,879	(42,288)	(509,742)	55,680	(3,867)	(1,208)	136,360
2	Merced	448,390	(355,481)	1,509,947	166,688	(1,695,658)	138,081	15,243	(2,697)	224,512
1	Modoc	(148,203)	100,682	77,347	(55,094)	(32,632)	7,073	(5,038)	(206)	(56,071)
1	Mono	(38,618)	43,710	168,893	(14,356)	(139,919)	15,445	(1,313)	107,760	141,601
3	Monterey	349,452	(123,480)	2,064,360	129,908	(2,056,862)	188,781	11,880	(3,808)	560,231
2	Napa	(222,926)	244,003	822,556	(82,872)	(663,541)	75,221	(7,578)	(1,587)	163,274
2	Nevada	(235,623)	144,374	480,027	(87,593)	(424,497)	43,897	(8,010)	(980)	(88,403)
4	Orange	(7,903,661)	5,420,018	15,349,419	(2,938,178)	(12,914,566)	1,403,666	(268,689)	(31,299)	(1,883,290)
2	Placer	729,594	(464,614)	1,923,894	271,226	(2,113,255)	175,935	24,803	(3,419)	544,164
1	Plumas	(249,686)	196,406	121,461	(92,821)	(19,579)	11,107	(8,488)	4,938	(36,662)
4	Riverside	6,110,439	(4,830,980)	10,768,307	2,271,550	(13,285,857)	984,735	207,728	(18,537)	2,207,385
4	Sacramento	(419,572)	(73,424)	8,999,159	(155,975)	(9,227,922)	822,951	(14,264)	(16,579)	(85,626)
1	San Benito	(325,983)	226,932	249,974	(121,184)	(146,193)	22,859	(11,082)	(551)	(105,227)
4	San Bernardino	7,035,711	(5,590,597)	11,736,031	2,615,519	(14,662,644)	1,073,231	239,183	(20,474)	2,425,960

		<i>Net Reallocation of 40 Percent of Historical Funding</i>	<i>Reverse FY 2015-16 Net Reallocation of 30 Percent of Historical Funding</i>	<i>Allocation of \$214.2 Million in New Funding Using Updated WAFM</i>	<i>Net Reallocation of \$214.2 Million in Historical Funding</i>	<i>Reverse FY 2015-16 Allocation and Reallocation of \$214.2 Million in New Funding</i>	<i>Allocation of \$19.6 Million in New Funding</i>	<i>Net Reallocation of \$19.6 Million in Historical Funding</i>	<i>Adjustment Related to WAFM Funding Floor</i>	<i>Total WAFM Adjustments to Base in 2016-17 Including Funding Floor</i>
Cluster	Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I (Sum of A to H)
4	San Diego	(9,271,417)	6,112,788	14,804,251	(3,446,640)	(12,191,097)	1,353,812	(315,187)	(30,342)	(2,983,832)
4	San Francisco	(4,680,288)	3,719,901	6,139,426	(1,739,892)	(4,191,666)	561,435	(159,109)	(13,130)	(363,322)
3	San Joaquin	1,933,500	(1,030,029)	4,233,934	718,777	(4,536,258)	387,183	65,730	(7,450)	1,765,387
2	San Luis Obispo	(8,117)	(67,386)	1,573,933	(3,018)	(1,643,753)	143,932	(276)	(2,902)	(7,587)
3	San Mateo	(1,561,908)	1,129,811	3,846,159	(580,638)	(3,306,780)	351,722	(53,098)	(7,682)	(182,414)
3	Santa Barbara	(866,144)	877,409	2,408,929	(321,988)	(1,861,115)	220,291	(29,445)	(4,669)	423,267
4	Santa Clara	(7,851,840)	6,552,502	8,124,628	(2,918,914)	(4,547,845)	742,977	(266,927)	(17,232)	(182,650)
2	Santa Cruz	(173,511)	173,978	1,409,168	(64,503)	(1,301,201)	128,865	(5,899)	(2,614)	164,283
2	Shasta	278,742	(129,040)	1,205,351	103,622	(1,229,650)	110,226	9,476	(2,276)	346,452
1	Sierra	(130,925)	95,802	31,956	(48,671)	14,345	2,922	(4,451)	28,370	(10,651)
2	Siskiyou	(568,425)	413,021	272,650	(211,311)	(74,522)	24,933	(19,324)	(672)	(163,650)
3	Solano	117,645	(219,515)	2,378,941	43,734	(2,552,818)	217,548	3,999	(4,488)	(14,952)
3	Sonoma	(420,539)	48,404	2,646,040	(156,335)	(2,754,391)	241,974	(14,296)	(5,158)	(414,303)
3	Stanislaus	1,482,118	(1,076,173)	2,855,493	550,976	(3,371,361)	261,128	50,385	(4,784)	747,782
2	Sutter	303,662	(160,832)	618,917	112,886	(665,470)	56,598	10,323	(1,076)	275,008
2	Tehama	119,115	(40,393)	476,595	44,281	(472,357)	43,583	4,049	(866)	174,008
1	Trinity	(40,143)	62,740	132,343	(14,923)	(85,069)	12,102	(1,365)	(308)	65,377
3	Tulare	1,050,570	(480,938)	2,218,514	390,548	(2,304,735)	202,878	35,715	(3,937)	1,108,614
2	Tuolumne	(146,364)	151,947	330,692	(54,411)	(234,473)	30,241	(4,976)	(664)	71,994
3	Ventura	1,419,131	(908,509)	4,150,898	527,561	(4,523,970)	379,589	48,244	(7,430)	1,085,514
2	Yolo	303,923	(117,442)	1,080,147	112,983	(1,083,588)	98,777	10,332	(1,944)	403,188
2	Yuba	226,541	66,662	563,784	84,216	(413,484)	51,557	7,701	(1,000)	585,977
	Total	0	(0)	214,200,000	0	(214,200,000)	19,588,058	0	(0)	19,588,058

2016-2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need ⁽¹⁾			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 ⁽²⁾	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2015)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor ⁽³⁾	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 ⁽¹⁾			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 ⁽²⁾	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2015)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor ⁽³⁾	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	$L = (((((B-1) * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G) * J1) + (B * J2))$			N = C * OE&E	O	P = (H + M + N) - O	Q = P / 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
Cluster	Court	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)			
		I1	I2	J1	J2	$K = \frac{L}{(A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G * J1 + (B * J2)}$		M = (K + L)	N = C * OE&E	O	P = (H + M + N) - O	Q = P / 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 TCBC approved a dollar factor adjustment for courts with fewer 2012 through 2014. Salaries of Local Government used for workers in total employment exceeds 50% in which case three-

Weighted Mean	OE&E \$ / FTE	Cluster 1
	\$29,621	Clusters 2-4
	\$20,941	

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	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 (A thru F)	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
Statewide	1,525.3	4,394.3	2,951.0	3,187.7	983.5	953.5	13,995.4	707.0		1,463.2	15,490	1,740.8		2,488.0	17,978

*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

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

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)
4	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
	Statewide	1,440,487,965	100%	100%	100%	(576,195,186)	576,195,186	0	214,200,000	(214,200,000)	0

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	R	S
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)
	Statewide	19,588,058	(19,588,058)	0	214,200,000	19,588,058	(0)	(214,200,000)	19,588,058	(0)

Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

	2013-14 Beginning Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment ¹	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)		
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Alameda	74,069,725	(3,177,924)	(1,958,825)	101,575	424,792	127,523	69,586,867	4.83%
Alpine	549,977	-	-	83	2,034	47	552,142	0.04%
Amador	2,066,138	-	-	2,565	11,006	783	2,080,491	0.14%
Butte	7,956,105	(467,145)	(291,613)	14,608	59,332	16,523	7,287,810	0.51%
Calaveras	1,927,985	-	-	3,074	18,652	1,180	1,950,892	0.14%
Colusa	1,352,785	-	-	1,447	13,708	363	1,368,302	0.09%
Contra Costa	34,237,741	-	(1,705,774)	69,231	218,186	87,076	32,906,460	2.28%
Del Norte	2,315,586	-	(126,942)	1,964	11,208	505	2,202,321	0.15%
El Dorado	5,867,266	-	(57,081)	11,851	54,374	4,491	5,880,901	0.41%
Fresno	35,177,288	-	(1,032,025)	60,497	181,080	69,384	34,456,224	2.39%
Glenn	1,799,795	(9,779)	-	1,927	19,264	500	1,811,707	0.13%
Humboldt	5,258,372	(167,800)	(150,006)	8,913	48,160	8,302	5,005,941	0.35%
Imperial	6,805,406	(420,479)	(180,405)	11,204	67,678	10,882	6,294,286	0.44%
Inyo	1,919,492	(186,658)	(42,314)	1,245	30,402	294	1,722,461	0.12%
Kern	30,203,399	(65,567)	(1,750,452)	52,450	277,328	64,629	28,781,786	2.00%
Kings	5,292,481	(421,918)	(181,060)	9,935	57,026	9,045	4,765,510	0.33%
Lake	3,130,735	(196,493)	(56,758)	4,311	20,328	1,596	2,903,720	0.20%
Lassen	2,161,420	(293,836)	-	2,384	20,156	538	1,890,662	0.13%
Los Angeles	428,645,200	(14,294,467)	(26,758,268)	689,065	3,144,530	1,056,102	392,482,162	27.25%
Madera	6,269,329	(381,406)	-	9,711	52,502	3,108	5,953,244	0.41%
Marin	13,587,985	(9,625)	(391,957)	17,038	114,766	20,590	13,338,797	0.93%
Mariposa	943,529	-	(28,406)	1,225	3,904	341	920,593	0.06%
Mendocino	4,636,654	(299,349)	-	6,083	30,068	5,619	4,379,075	0.30%
Merced	9,195,644	-	(250,840)	16,595	55,652	16,318	9,033,368	0.63%
Modoc	947,828	(789)	(63,471)	662	6,134	304	890,668	0.06%
Mono	1,251,020	(24,156)	(8,201)	914	12,446	324	1,232,348	0.09%
Monterey	13,973,323	(870,000)	(333,656)	28,573	183,464	27,420	13,009,124	0.90%
Napa	6,628,648	(295,552)	(287,148)	9,042	30,550	3,438	6,088,978	0.42%
Nevada	4,478,125	(433,431)	(292,045)	6,730	49,946	7,900	3,817,225	0.26%
Orange	127,622,123	(2,733,776)	(3,329,845)	206,630	923,882	294,477	122,983,490	8.54%
Placer	11,920,337	-	(933,901)	21,287	77,378	29,042	11,114,142	0.77%
Plumas	1,429,991	-	-	1,442	9,206	398	1,441,037	0.10%
Riverside	61,221,794	(1,931,520)	(2,882,751)	131,371	532,226	69,297	57,140,417	3.97%
Sacramento	64,637,712	(1,864,424)	(1,824,452)	93,189	340,254	185,701	61,567,979	4.27%
San Benito	2,476,122	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,327	2,496,024	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 ¹	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)		
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
San Bernardino	66,832,972	(3,269,446)	(2,986,710)	133,960	435,474	188,896	61,335,147	4.26%
San Diego	126,960,874	(657,192)	(4,757,300)	206,259	718,422	265,582	122,736,644	8.52%
San Francisco	55,153,072	-	(2,582,976)	53,715	272,528	91,818	52,988,157	3.68%
San Joaquin	24,406,106	(287,747)	(779,859)	44,944	201,698	54,178	23,639,320	1.64%
San Luis Obispo	11,353,662	(241,676)	(673,831)	17,704	130,020	19,062	10,604,942	0.74%
San Mateo	31,297,630	(443,042)	(1,479,478)	48,700	329,518	16,733	29,770,060	2.07%
Santa Barbara	19,657,482	(1,055,112)	(457,408)	28,356	162,858	29,149	18,365,326	1.27%
Santa Clara	75,407,649	-	(1,833,360)	119,260	452,782	121,126	74,267,457	5.16%
Santa Cruz	10,187,917	-	(424,668)	17,644	113,210	16,283	9,910,386	0.69%
Shasta	10,063,775	(2,389,668)	(326,131)	12,206	44,394	4,517	7,409,092	0.51%
Sierra	540,106	-	-	235	1,830	44	542,215	0.04%
Siskiyou	3,317,504	-	(103,923)	3,104	37,000	943	3,254,627	0.23%
Solano	16,489,461	(435,400)	(535,433)	28,439	119,364	37,755	15,704,185	1.09%
Sonoma	19,577,796	(440,000)	(479,410)	32,278	119,004	36,215	18,845,883	1.31%
Stanislaus	15,772,316	(9,326)	(427,578)	34,594	88,718	39,080	15,497,803	1.08%
Sutter	3,604,262	(247,071)	-	6,150	37,382	2,322	3,403,045	0.24%
Tehama	2,879,149	-	(5,472)	4,138	28,100	1,382	2,907,298	0.20%
Trinity	1,431,739	(450,608)	-	943	7,648	636	990,359	0.07%
Tulare	12,726,148	(15,576)	(679,043)	28,289	204,932	28,262	12,293,011	0.85%
Tuolumne	2,819,593	(220,516)	(30,986)	3,916	16,642	1,152	2,589,803	0.18%
Ventura	26,332,175	(1,559,157)	(731,699)	54,971	205,304	65,233	24,366,827	1.69%
Yolo	7,474,390	(582,889)	(461,445)	12,802	48,556	12,735	6,504,149	0.45%
Yuba	3,335,312	(132,569)	-	4,696	15,788	1,849	3,225,076	0.22%
Total	1,529,578,150	(40,983,089)	(64,674,907)	2,500,000	10,907,494	3,160,318	1,440,487,965	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)
Total Funding Need	\$ 2,380,284,755	\$ 2,350,120,506	\$ (30,164,249)	-1.3%	(5,324,808)	(23,963,127)	(743,437)	(30,164,249)	-1.3%
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%

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							% Change in WAFM Funding Need	Change in % of Statewide 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		
				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%
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%

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							% Change in WAFM Funding Need	Change in % of Statewide 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		
				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	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%
	Statewide	1,440,487,965	100.0%	2,380,284,755	100.0%		2,350,120,506	100.0%		(30,164,249)	-1.3%	

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)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

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)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

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%
2	Santa Cruz	132	0.7%	129	0.7%	(3)	-2.3%	1.1%

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

		RAS FTE Need						
Cluster	County	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%
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%
	Statewide	18,603	100.0%	17,978	100.0%	(625)	-3.4%	

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)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

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)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

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							
		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%
2	Santa Cruz	65,585			115.3%	66,612			114.2%	1,027	1.6%	-1.0%

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							
		S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA = (W - S)	AB = (AA / S)	AC = (Z/V) - 100%
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%
	Statewide	56,871	18	9	100.0%	58,336	18	9	100.0%	1,465	2.6%	
		44,101	15	7	77.5%	45,655	15	7	78.3%	1,554	3.5%	

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)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

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%
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%

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	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)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

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)
Total	15	22	12	9	58

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%
2	Santa Cruz		-	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	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%
	Statewide	8	560,269	100.0%	7	505,582	100.0%

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)
Total	1,737,291,129	8,200,372	400,562	100.00%	(400,562)

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
	Statewide	2,350,120,506	100.00%	1,737,291,129					8,200,372

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 ¹	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)
Alameda	74,815,020	-	34,322	-	(3,212,246)	(1,954,952)	101,575	424,792	99,248	645,929	795,745	(436,743)	71,312,691	(16,517)	71,296,174
Alpine	745,696	-	-	-	-	-	83	2,034	20	(17,093)	3,088	(19,759)	714,069	35,931	750,000
Amador	2,171,075	-	-	-	-	-	2,565	11,006	606	41,319	11,783	59,048	2,297,402	(532)	2,296,870
Butte	9,446,394	-	5,045	-	(472,190)	(319,942)	14,608	59,332	12,484	211,906	78,377	375,299	9,411,313	(2,180)	9,409,133
Calaveras	2,049,273	-	-	-	-	-	3,074	18,652	806	74,133	22,634	22,043	2,190,617	(507)	2,190,109
Colusa	1,684,618	-	-	-	-	-	1,447	13,708	291	24,213	7,914	(17,236)	1,714,955	160,044	1,874,999
Contra Costa	39,984,639	-	-	-	-	(1,517,512)	69,231	218,186	61,618	(783,109)	504,413	(807,633)	37,729,834	(8,738)	37,721,095
Del Norte	2,469,729	-	-	-	-	(113,551)	1,964	11,208	447	59,258	22,599	82,386	2,534,040	(587)	2,533,453
El Dorado	6,570,654	-	-	-	-	(151,060)	11,851	54,374	3,313	98,371	9,371	(34,774)	6,562,099	(1,520)	6,560,579
Fresno	44,631,873	-	-	-	-	(977,528)	60,497	181,080	57,714	252,326	456,561	2,960,295	47,622,818	(11,030)	47,611,788
Glenn	1,854,656	-	106	-	(9,885)	-	1,927	19,264	514	27,501	11,899	(94,502)	1,811,480	63,519	1,874,999
Humboldt	5,949,966	-	1,812	-	(169,612)	(151,123)	8,913	48,160	7,622	56,493	67,869	173,992	5,994,093	(1,388)	5,992,704
Imperial	8,220,422	-	4,541	-	(425,020)	(198,987)	11,204	67,678	7,697	120,442	101,174	174,720	8,083,871	(1,872)	8,081,998
Inyo	2,018,391	-	2,016	-	(188,674)	-	1,245	30,402	258	38,621	16,191	(36,939)	1,881,511	(436)	1,881,075
Kern	41,796,192	-	708	-	(66,275)	(1,483,487)	52,450	277,328	51,265	988,357	272,793	3,029,898	44,919,229	(10,404)	44,908,825
Kings	6,360,982	-	4,557	-	(426,475)	(261,635)	9,935	57,026	7,618	48,872	10,949	349,995	6,161,824	(1,427)	6,160,397
Lake	3,190,914	-	2,122	-	(198,615)	(41,076)	4,311	20,328	1,303	35,981	1,582	95,340	3,112,190	(721)	3,111,469
Lassen	2,254,863	-	3,173	-	(297,009)	-	2,384	20,156	430	16,783	2,759	(24,851)	1,978,689	(458)	1,978,231
Los Angeles	521,299,428	(1,376,517)	154,380	-	(14,448,847)	(23,187,085)	689,065	3,144,530	824,777	(1,336,025)	5,984,546	6,939,407	498,687,659	(115,500)	498,572,160
Madera	7,221,663	-	4,119	-	(385,525)	-	9,711	52,502	2,438	241,857	22,490	219,947	7,389,203	(1,711)	7,387,491
Marin	12,159,405	-	104	-	(9,729)	(62,717)	17,038	114,766	15,271	221,932	177,317	(519,030)	12,114,358	(2,806)	12,111,552
Mariposa	1,147,063	-	-	-	-	-	1,225	3,904	269	2,134	1,761	(25,442)	1,130,914	(262)	1,130,652
Mendocino	5,050,186	-	3,233	-	(302,582)	(18,252)	6,083	30,068	4,871	188,392	116,313	137,568	5,215,881	(1,208)	5,214,673
Merced	11,438,095	-	-	-	-	(411,756)	16,595	55,652	12,400	154,519	153,398	227,209	11,646,113	(2,697)	11,643,415
Modoc	925,607	-	9	-	(798)	-	662	6,134	262	10,777	1,753	(55,866)	888,539	(206)	888,333
Mono	1,552,463	-	261	-	(24,417)	-	914	12,446	215	11,291	5,599	33,841	1,592,614	107,760	1,700,374
Monterey	16,380,107	-	9,396	-	(879,396)	(358,944)	28,573	183,464	21,068	361,192	130,795	564,039	16,440,293	(3,808)	16,436,486
Napa	7,112,088	-	3,192	-	(298,744)	(368,350)	9,042	30,550	2,327	106,421	89,880	164,861	6,851,268	(1,587)	6,849,681
Nevada	4,853,866	-	4,681	-	(438,112)	(323,526)	6,730	49,946	4,365	99,540	59,490	(87,424)	4,229,557	(980)	4,228,577
Orange	139,551,260	-	29,525	-	(2,763,301)	(4,106,886)	206,630	923,882	221,138	66,411	2,860,993	(1,851,991)	135,137,660	(31,299)	135,106,361
Placer	14,614,477	-	-	-	-	(912,316)	21,287	77,378	21,288	253,075	140,675	547,583	14,763,447	(3,419)	14,760,028
Plumas	1,259,920	-	-	-	-	-	1,442	9,206	353	12,766	2,974	(41,600)	1,245,061	4,938	1,250,000
Riverside	79,176,843	-	20,860	-	(1,952,380)	(2,417,142)	131,371	532,226	49,633	1,454,359	812,595	2,225,921	80,034,287	(18,537)	80,015,750
Sacramento	74,820,340	-	20,136	-	(1,884,560)	(1,983,656)	93,189	340,254	142,528	(1,032,400)	1,136,127	(69,047)	71,582,912	(16,579)	71,566,333
San Benito	2,422,410	-	-	-	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,061	32,176	8,330	(104,676)	2,377,876	(551)	2,377,326
San Bernardino	88,845,148	-	35,310	-	(3,304,756)	(3,076,341)	133,960	435,474	138,861	2,087,322	659,482	2,446,434	88,400,894	(20,474)	88,380,420
San Diego	135,183,257	-	7,098	-	(664,290)	(4,761,892)	206,259	718,422	208,851	1,021,966	2,038,142	(2,953,490)	131,004,322	(30,342)	130,973,981
San Francisco	57,691,926	-	-	-	-	(470,236)	53,715	272,528	68,176	(1,316,245)	739,779	(350,192)	56,689,451	(13,130)	56,676,321
San Joaquin	30,540,491	-	3,108	-	(290,855)	(837,310)	44,944	201,698	43,036	424,617	264,991	1,772,837	32,167,556	(7,450)	32,160,106
San Luis Obispo	13,138,220	-	2,610	-	(244,286)	(646,028)	17,704	130,020	14,598	60,624	60,453	(4,685)	12,529,229	(2,902)	12,526,327
San Mateo	34,195,507	-	4,785	-	(447,827)	(1,152,416)	48,700	329,518	12,544	54,150	298,280	(174,732)	33,168,509	(7,682)	33,160,827
Santa Barbara	20,991,085	-	11,395	-	(1,066,507)	(528,988)	28,356	162,858	22,871	50,020	60,324	427,936	20,159,350	(4,669)	20,154,681
Santa Clara	74,878,763	-	-	-	-	(1,987,445)	119,260	452,782	89,400	606,490	408,201	(165,418)	74,402,032	(17,232)	74,384,800
Santa Cruz	11,177,032	-	-	-	-	(515,613)	17,644	113,210	11,584	238,885	76,312	166,897	11,285,953	(2,614)	11,283,339
Shasta	11,770,943	-	-	272,635	(2,662,303)	(291,576)	12,206	44,394	3,502	235,389	90,993	348,727	9,824,910	(2,276)	9,822,634
Sierra	744,798	-	-	-	-	-	235	1,830	43	9,323	4,422	(39,021)	721,630	28,370	750,000
Siskiyou	3,015,298	-	-	-	-	(158,972)	3,104	37,000	835	137,750	29,388	(162,978)	2,901,426	(672)	2,900,754
Solano	19,418,119	-	4,702	-	(440,102)	(616,330)	28,439	119,364	28,654	597,865	245,864	(10,465)	19,376,109	(4,488)	19,371,622
Sonoma	23,118,451	-	4,752	-	(444,752)	(548,765)	32,278	119,004	29,116	63,956	305,073	(409,145)	22,269,968	(5,158)	22,264,811
Stanislaus	19,725,272	-	101	-	(9,427)	(468,861)	34,594	88,718	31,187	95,213	404,982	752,566	20,654,345	(4,784)	20,649,561
Sutter	4,502,072	-	2,668	-	(249,739)	-	6,150	37,382	1,799	34,036	35,710	276,084	4,646,162	(1,076)	4,645,086
Tehama	3,468,895	-	-	-	-	(5,934)	4,138	28,100	1,237	54,682	12,296	174,873	3,738,288	(866)	3,737,422

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 ¹	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	1,328,834	(308)	1,328,527
Tulare	15,826,494	(199,884)	168	-	(15,744)	(442,427)	28,289	204,932	23,739	410,850	51,104	1,112,551	17,000,073	(3,937)	16,996,136
Tuolumne	2,980,841	-	2,382	-	(222,898)	(88,005)	3,916	16,642	938	91,053	9,519	72,658	2,867,046	(664)	2,866,382
Ventura	32,147,570	-	16,839	-	(1,575,996)	(627,467)	54,971	205,304	49,258	450,232	268,090	1,092,944	32,081,745	(7,430)	32,074,314
Yolo	8,777,156	(199,884)	6,295	-	(589,184)	(282,563)	12,802	48,556	8,551	123,356	83,319	405,133	8,393,537	(1,944)	8,391,593
Yuba	3,688,250	-	1,432	-	(134,001)	-	4,696	15,788	1,454	122,050	32,747	586,977	4,319,393	(1,000)	4,318,393
Total	1,774,710,700	(1,776,284)	411,942	342,506	(41,737,537)	(58,828,647)	2,500,000	10,907,494	2,428,420	8,452,388	20,292,088	19,588,058	1,737,291,129	(0)	1,737,291,129

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

2015-2016 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding (assumes \$90.6 million in new funding then reduced by \$22.7 million revenue shortfall)

Cluster	Court	(Historical) Funding Subject to Reallocation	Court's Share of Current Historical Funding vs. FY 15-16 WAFM Funding Need			Reallocation of 30%			New Reallocation of \$146.3M			Reallocation of \$67.9M			Allocation of New Money		Reversal of 2014-15 WAFM Allocation		Estimated 2015-16 Net Total Adjustments to Allocation	Estimated 2015-16 Funding Floor Adjustment
			Share of Total Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM (Historical funding)	Share of Total WAFM Funding Need (FY 15-16)	Reallocation Ratio	30 Percent of Funding Subject to Reallocation	Reallocation Using WAFM Proportion	Net	Allocation of \$146.3 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	Original Share of \$146.3 Million of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$67.9M	Original Share of \$67.9M of "Old" Money To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$146.3 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	Allocation of \$67.9 Million Using 15-16 WAFM	15% Reallocation	\$146.3M Reallocation		
	A	B	C	D = C / B	E = 30% * Col. A	F = \$432.1M * Col. C	G = E + F	H = \$146.3M * C	I = \$146.3M * B	J = H + I	K = \$67.9M * C	L = \$67.9M * B	M = K + L	N = \$146.3M * C	O = \$67.9M * C	P	Q	R	S	
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.83%	3.60%	74.6%	(20,876,060)	15,563,435	(5,312,625)	5,268,887	(7,067,437)	(1,798,550)	2,445,369	(3,280,103)	(834,734)	5,268,887	2,445,369	2,563,397	(3,596,160)	(1,264,416)	(23,470)
1	Alpine	552,142	0.04%	0.02%	41.5%	(165,643)	68,787	(96,855)	23,287	(56,077)	(32,790)	10,808	(26,026)	(15,218)	23,287	10,808	52,170	14,570	(44,027)	36,601
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.14%	0.12%	80.7%	(624,147)	503,625	(120,523)	170,499	(211,301)	(40,802)	79,131	(98,068)	(18,937)	170,499	79,131	68,008	(119,205)	18,171	(726)
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.51%	0.54%	106.5%	(2,186,343)	2,328,783	142,440	788,393	(740,170)	48,222	365,905	(343,524)	22,381	788,393	365,905	(88,680)	(860,259)	418,401	(2,905)
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.14%	0.11%	84.3%	(585,267)	493,271	(91,996)	166,993	(198,138)	(31,145)	177,504	(91,959)	(14,455)	166,993	177,504	49,658	(130,892)	25,667	(691)
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.09%	0.08%	83.2%	(410,491)	341,462	(69,029)	115,599	(138,969)	(23,369)	53,651	(64,497)	(10,846)	115,599	53,651	35,876	(90,387)	11,496	127,447
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.28%	2.30%	100.9%	(9,871,938)	9,957,402	85,464	3,371,006	(3,342,072)	28,933	1,564,534	(1,551,105)	13,428	3,371,006	1,564,534	(26,323)	(3,377,718)	1,659,325	(12,908)
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.15%	0.13%	82.8%	(660,696)	546,894	(113,802)	185,147	(223,674)	(38,527)	85,929	(103,810)	(17,881)	185,147	85,929	12,865	(206,252)	(92,520)	(791)
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.41%	0.38%	92.8%	(1,764,270)	1,637,633	(126,637)	554,409	(597,281)	(42,872)	257,309	(277,207)	(19,898)	554,409	257,309	48,927	(531,026)	140,211	(2,148)
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.39%	2.73%	114.3%	(10,336,867)	11,814,617	1,478,040	3,999,850	(3,499,471)	500,380	1,856,390	(1,624,156)	232,234	3,999,850	1,856,390	(492,612)	(4,166,552)	3,407,730	(14,653)
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.13%	0.09%	68.4%	(543,512)	371,961	(171,551)	125,925	(184,002)	(58,077)	58,444	(85,398)	(26,955)	125,925	58,444	62,278	(99,667)	(109,604)	69,935
2	Humboldt	5,005,941	0.35%	0.33%	95.1%	(1,501,782)	1,427,692	(74,090)	483,335	(508,417)	(25,083)	224,323	(235,964)	(11,641)	483,335	224,323	74,712	(407,245)	264,310	(1,900)
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.44%	0.49%	111.1%	(1,888,286)	2,097,431	209,145	710,070	(639,265)	70,804	329,554	(296,963)	32,861	710,070	329,554	(96,907)	(770,494)	485,034	(2,573)
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.12%	0.08%	69.0%	(516,738)	356,532	(160,206)	120,701	(174,938)	(54,237)	56,019	(81,191)	(25,172)	120,701	56,019	79,617	(67,123)	(50,400)	3,850
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.00%	2.89%	144.5%	(8,634,536)	12,475,396	3,840,861	4,223,454	(2,923,159)	1,300,295	1,960,168	(1,356,681)	603,486	4,223,454	1,960,168	(1,811,768)	(5,376,602)	4,739,894	(13,527)
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.33%	0.37%	111.3%	(1,429,653)	1,591,031	161,378	538,632	(483,999)	54,633	249,987	(224,631)	25,356	538,632	249,987	(90,958)	(607,171)	331,857	(1,910)
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.20%	0.15%	76.6%	(871,116)	667,620	(203,496)	226,018	(294,910)	(68,892)	104,898	(136,872)	(31,974)	226,018	104,898	92,616	(169,492)	(50,322)	(987)
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.13%	0.11%	83.1%	(567,199)	471,135	(96,064)	159,499	(192,021)	(32,522)	74,026	(89,120)	(15,094)	159,499	74,026	35,333	(144,174)	(18,996)	(657)
4	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.25%	30.17%	110.7%	(117,744,649)	130,376,788	12,632,140	44,138,108	(39,861,590)	4,276,519	20,485,151	(18,500,355)	1,984,796	44,138,108	20,485,151	(7,151,892)	(49,546,437)	26,818,347	(163,900)
2	Madera	5,953,224	0.41%	0.41%	98.4%	(1,785,973)	1,757,616	(28,357)	595,028	(604,628)	(9,600)	276,161	(179,617)	(4,456)	595,028	276,161	18,573	(579,477)	267,872	(2,290)
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.93%	0.56%	60.4%	(4,001,639)	2,415,722	(1,585,917)	817,825	(1,354,726)	(536,901)	379,565	(628,748)	(249,184)	817,825	379,565	770,602	(311,199)	(715,208)	(4,090)
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.06%	0.05%	84.3%	(276,178)	232,774	(43,404)	78,804	(93,498)	(14,694)	36,574	(43,394)	(6,820)	78,804	36,574	25,008	(59,633)	15,835	54,687
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.30%	0.27%	89.1%	(1,313,723)	1,171,061	(142,662)	396,454	(444,751)	(48,297)	184,000	(206,416)	(22,415)	396,454	184,000	86,816	(327,187)	126,710	(1,607)
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.63%	0.71%	113.1%	(2,710,011)	3,065,492	355,481	1,037,800	(917,454)	120,346	481,658	(425,804)	55,854	1,037,800	481,658	(230,694)	(1,229,854)	590,591	(3,718)
1	Modoc	890,668	0.06%	0.04%	62.3%	(267,200)	166,518	(100,682)	56,373	(90,459)	(36,084)	26,164	(15,819)	(6,819)	56,373	26,164	60,677	(8,292)	(15,665)	(309)
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.09%	0.08%	88.2%	(369,704)	325,995	(43,710)	110,363	(125,161)	(14,798)	51,221	(58,089)	(6,868)	110,363	51,221	8,657	(113,437)	(8,570)	126,524
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.90%	0.93%	103.2%	(3,902,737)	4,026,218	123,480	1,363,047	(1,321,243)	41,803	632,610	(613,209)	19,402	1,363,047	632,610	(97,146)	(1,452,795)	630,401	(5,124)
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.42%	0.37%	86.6%	(1,826,693)	1,582,691	(244,003)	535,808	(618,414)	(82,605)	248,677	(269,417)	(79,057)	535,808	248,677	179,916	(374,776)	224,679	(2,173)
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.26%	0.23%	87.3%	(1,145,167)	1,000,793	(144,374)	338,811	(387,688)	(48,877)	157,247	(179,932)	(22,684)	338,811	157,247	42,439	(330,219)	(7,657)	(1,394)
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.54%	7.28%	85.4%	(36,895,047)	31,475,029	(5,420,018)	10,655,641	(12,490,548)	(1,834,908)	4,945,441	(5,797,049)	(851,608)	10,655,641	4,945,441	3,109,525	(8,729,720)	2,324,353	(45,022)
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.77%	0.88%	113.9%	(3,334,243)	3,798,857	464,614	1,286,075	(1,128,783)	157,292	596,887	(523,885)	73,001	1,286,075	596,887	(201,516)	(1,401,671)	974,682	(4,604)
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.10%	0.05%	54.6%	(432,311)	235,905	(196,406)	79,864	(146,356)	(66,492)	37,066	(67,926)	(30,860)	79,864	37,066	88,532	(26,468)	(114,763)	(421)
4	Riverside	57,140,417	3.97%	5.08%	128.2%	(17,142,125)	21,973,106	4,830,980	7,438,834	(5,803,341)	1,635,493	3,452,473	(2,693,417)	759,057	7,438,834	3,452,473	(2,318,089)	(8,942,429)	6,856,320	(25,208)
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.27%	4.29%	100.4%	(18,470,394)	18,543,818	73,424	6,277,874	(6,253,017)	24,857	2,913,654	(2,902,118)	11,537	6,277,874	2,913,654	258,869	(5,902,464)	3,657,752	(23,950)
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.17%	0.12%	69.7%	(748,807)	521,875	(226,932)	176,677	(253,503)	(76,826)	81,998	(117,655)	(35,656)	176,677	81,998	103,256	(113,677)	(91,160)	(810)
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.26%	5.55%	130.4%	(18,400,544)	23,991,141	5,590,597	8,122,025	(6,229,370)	1,892,656	3,769,553	(2,891,143)	878,410	8,122,025	3,769,553	(3,086,707)	(10,409,297)	6,757,237	(27,713)
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.52%	7.11%	83.4%	(36,820,993)	30,708,206	(6,112,788)	10,396,038	(12,465,478)	(2,069,440)	4,824,956	(5,785,413)	(960,458)	10,396,038	4,824,956	3,338,346	(7,944,787)	1,471,869	(43,501)
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.68%	2.82%	76.6%	(15,896,447)	12,176,546	(3,719,901)	4,122,281	(5,381,626)	(1,259,345)	1,913,212	(2,497,692)	(584,481)	4,122,281	1,913,212	2,230,867	(2,360,651)	341,981	(19,228)
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.64%	1.88%	114.5%	(7,091,796)	8,121,825	1,030,029	2,749,585	(2,400,876)	348,709	1,276,123	(1,114,282)	161,841	2,749,585	1,276,123	(399,572)	(2,941,964)	2,224,751	(9,901)
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.74%	0.75%	101.5%	(3,181,483)	3,248,869	67,386	1,099,881	(1,077,068)	22,813	510,471	(499,883)	10,588	1,099,881	510,471	(58,129)	(1,155,784)	497,227	(4,103)
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.07%	1.81%	87.3%	(8,931,018)	7,801,207	(1,129,811)	2,641,042	(3,023,531)	(382,489)	1,225,747	(1,403,266)	(177,519)	2,641,042	1,225,747	562,349	(2,262,015)	477,303	(10,796)
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.27%	1.07%	84.1%	(5,509,598)	4,632,189	(877,409)	1,568,194	(1,865,234)	(297,040)	727,822	(865,683)	(137,861)	1,568,194	727,822	463,424	(1,237,679)	209,451	(6,510)
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.16%	3.64%	70.6%	(22,280,237)	15,727,735	(6,552,502)	5,324,510	(7,542,811)	(2,218,302)	2,471,184	(3,500,731)	(1,029,547)	5,324,510	2,471,184	2,830,533	(3,709,786)	(2,	