

**TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**AOC San Francisco Office – Judicial Council Boardroom**  
**July 9, 2013**

**10:00am to 11:00am (Information Only Session)**

1. Orientation for New Committee Members

**11:00am to 4:00pm (Business Meeting)**

2. Projected 2013-14 Workload; Subcommittees
  - a. Revenue & Expenditure, Funding Methodology, Criminal Justice Realignment
3. Criminal Justice Realignment Funding [pages 1 to 5] **(action item)**
4. Trial Court Trust Fund Allocations [pages 6 to 13] **(action item)**
  - a. Program 45.10 -- court-appointed dependency counsel, jury, screening stations, self-help, elder abuse
5. Base Allocation for Court Operations [pages 7 to 34] **(action item)**
  - a. Beginning 2013–2014 base allocation and allocation of \$261 million ongoing reduction [page 14]
  - b. WAFM
    - i. BLS adjustment [pages 15 to 18]
    - ii. Unique/Omitted factors (information only)
    - iii. WAFM computation [page 19]
  - c. Allocation of \$60 million new ongoing funding and reallocation of \$60 million in base funding [pages 19 to 20]
    - i. Discuss legislative reporting template
6. Allocation of 2% Reserve (holdback from allocation) [pages 35 to 37] **(action item)**
7. Budget Change Proposals
  - a. Security, AB 109, technology, others.
8. Benefits Funding
  - a. 2012-13 full-year cost changes [page 38]
  - b. Survey of 2013-14 cost changes
10. Update on Ad Hoc Court Interpreter Working Group
11. Liaisons to Technology Advisory Groups
12. Wrap Up and Next Steps

**Action Item 1**  
**Allocation of Criminal Justice Realignment Act Funding**

**Issue**

What should happen to the funding held in reserve from FY 2012–2013 and any unspent funding distributed to the courts in that fiscal year? Also, what methodology should be used to allocate the realignment funds for FY 2013–2014 and what should be done to determine whether additional funding is needed to address the trial courts’ new parole workload effective July 1, 2013?

**Background**

In July 2012, the Revocation Subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Working Group (TCBWG) met to discuss various allocation issues related to the funding provided to address the workload created by the Criminal Justice Realignment Act of 2011. The issues discussed concerned multiple fiscal years. The following four recommendations were presented to the TCBWG for consideration:

1. Unspent realignment funding should not be reallocated to the courts that spent more than they received in FY 2011–2012, because these funds were included in the calculation of a court’s June 30, 2012 reserve funding and cannot be redistributed in FY 2011–2012.
2. Any unspent realignment funding that has not been swept from a court should remain with the court to be used to complete implementation of their revocation realignment program.
3. The same funding formula as used in FY 2011–2012 should be used to allocate the realignment funds for FY 2012–2013, because the data necessary to adopt a new formula is not yet available and will not be until at least the end of 2013. A reserve of \$150,000 of the FY 2012–2013 funding should be set aside to cover unforeseen court expenses.
4. Because Penal Code section 13155 requires the Administrative Office of the Courts to collect statistics from the trial courts regarding implementation of criminal justice realignment, it is recommended that the AOC’s Criminal Justice Court Services Office develop the statistics and make them available to the TCBWG. The Realignment Subcommittee will then review the statistics and make recommendations on allocation of the realignment funding beginning in FY 2013–2014 to the full TCBWG.

On July 17, 2012, the TCBWG approved all of the subcommittee’s recommendations. At its July 27, 2012, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved the allocation of the \$9.223 million as proposed by the TCBWG.

### Issues Related to FY 2012–2013

Issue 1: What should happen to the \$150,000 held in reserve?

In FY 2012–2013 \$150,000 of the \$9.223 million was held in reserve to be allocated to courts to address unforeseen expenditures related to the new workload required by criminal realignment. Only two courts, both of which received no realignment funding in FY 2012–2013, requested that they receive funding for their realignment activity. Only one of the courts – the Superior Court of Mariposa County – provided statistical information related to realignment. The methodology used to determine the allocation of funding in FY 2011–2012 and FY 2012–2013 was based on estimates of filings of petitions for revocation provided by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). The subcommittee discussed the information provided by the Mariposa Court and agreed that the most appropriate action would be to use the same methodology as used for the original allocation. The court reported the filing of four petitions to revoke, and applying the \$1,296 per petition that was used in FY 2012–2013, the court was recommended to receive \$5,184.

If this funding is allocated to the Mariposa Court, \$144,817 would remain in the reserve. Because so little of the reserve was used for FY 2012–2013 expenditures, the subcommittee agreed that these funds should be held over in reserve for FY 2013–2014 and that no additional reserve funds would need to be set aside in FY 2013–2014.

Issue 2: What should happen to any unspent FY 2012–2013 realignment funds distributed to the courts?

Based on actual and projected expenditure information obtained through a survey of all of the courts near the end of FY 2011–2012, there was a significant amount of distributed but unspent funding remaining with the courts at the end of the fiscal year. Almost half of the funding provided by the Budget Act in that year was one-time, to allow the courts to address the one-time costs involved in preparing for these new responsibilities. The TCBWG decided that the courts should be able to keep any unspent funds FY 2011–2012 realignment funds they received. These funds had already been used in calculating a court's reserve for FY 2012–2013. Similarly, this year, the subcommittee recommends that the courts continue to retain any of these unspent funds.

### Issues Related to FY 2013–2014

Issue 3: What methodology should be used to allocate funding for criminal realignment for FY 2013–2014?

The AOC is required by Penal Code section 13155 to collect statistics from the trial courts regarding implementation of criminal justice realignment. These statistics were to be reviewed by the Revocation Subcommittee in their development of a proposal for the FY 2013–2014 allocation. As of the current date, 56 of the 58 courts have submitted at least some of the statistics for the first quarter of calendar year 2013. The AOC’s Criminal Justice Court Services Office has been reviewing the data. This data does not, of course, include any of the new workload that courts will experience beginning July 1, 2013. Data regarding this increased workload will not be received from the courts until October 2013. Mid-December is the earliest time by which this data can be received and analyzed, and a proposed allocation presented to the Judicial Council. While the subcommittee wants to incorporate a review of the data into the allocation for FY 2013–2014, they agreed that it might not be a good idea to hold off allocating any funds until that time. For that reason, they recommend allocating half of the \$9.233 million based on the current methodology and allocating the remainder of the funds after the first quarter FY 2013–2014 realignment statistics have been reviewed and an appropriate methodology developed.

Issue 4: What should be done to determine if additional funding is needed to address the trial courts’ new parole workload effective July 1, 2013?

The funding provided to address realignment costs for FY 2013–2014 is the same amount as that provided for FY 2012–2013. However, the courts will assume new responsibilities starting July 1, 2013 when the courts take over from the Board of Parole Hearings, the adjudication of petitions to revoke parole. There is much uncertainty over how much additional work the courts may experience as a result of this change. The AOC has been having discussions with the Department of Finance about the possibility that the existing funding will be insufficient for the courts to perform these new obligations. In order to demonstrate any increase in costs, it will be necessary for the courts to provide expenditure information for the new workload in FY 2013–2014. The subcommittee recommends that AOC staff send out a survey to the courts to obtain their expenditures. During this time, staff will develop the ability for courts to report this data in Phoenix so that the information can be extracted centrally and courts will not need to be continually surveyed for this information.

### **Recommendations**

The Revocation Subcommittee makes the following recommendations to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee:

1. Allocate \$5,183 to the Superior Court of Mariposa County for the four petitions for revocation filed in FY 2012–2013 based on the FY 2012–2013 methodology (\$1,296 per petition) from the \$150,000 held in reserve from the FY 2012–2013 realignment funding.

The remaining \$144,817 will continue to be held in reserve to address costs that exceed a court's FY 2013–2014 allocation.

2. Courts should retain any unspent FY 2012–2013 realignment funding.
3. Allocate initially one-half of the \$9.223 million in ongoing realignment funding to the trial courts in July based on the allocation methodology used in FY 2012–2013 (see column F, Table 1A) After the first quarter of FY 2013–2014 realignment data collected from the courts as required by Penal Code section 13155 has been received and analyzed, a new methodology will be developed and proposed for allocation the funding.
4. AOC staff will survey courts to obtain their FY 2013–2014 expenditures on both parole and post release community supervision related to criminal justice realignment. This information, in conjunction with the workload data that courts are collecting, will be used to determine if additional funding beyond the \$9.223 million is needed to address these costs. If funding is required, the information will be presented to the Department of Finance in support of a request for augmentation. During this same period, staff will develop the capability for courts to report the expenditure data in Phoenix.

Option 1 (related to Issue and Recommendation 1)

Allocate \$7,776 or \$1,296 per petition to the Superior Court of Trinity County from the \$150,000 reserve. The court submitted FY 2012–2013 realignment statistics after the subcommittee met and made its recommendations. The court's information indicates that 6 petitions to revoke post release community supervision were filed in FY 2012–2013.

**Criminal Justice Realignment  
Initial Allocations for FY 2013-2014**

**Attachment 1A**

Court	FY 2012-2013 Approved Allocation			Proposed Initial Allocation for FY 2013-2014		
	Total Estimated Petitions to Revoke*	Percentage of Statewide Petitions to Revoke (A/7,003)	Allocation of \$9.073 Million in FY 2012-2013 (Bx\$9,073,000)	Total Estimated Petitions to Revoke*	Percentage of Statewide Petitions to Revoke (D/7,007)	Proposed Initial FY 2013-2014 Allocation
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alameda	388	5.54%	\$ 502,724	388	5.54%	\$ 255,518
Alpine	1	0.01%	1,296	1	0.01%	\$ 659
Amador	3	0.04%	3,239	3	0.04%	\$ 1,646
Butte	58	0.83%	75,149	58	0.83%	\$ 38,196
Calaveras	1	0.01%	1,296	1	0.01%	\$ 659
Colusa	1	0.01%	1,296	1	0.01%	\$ 659
Contra Costa	134	1.91%	172,973	134	1.91%	\$ 87,916
Del Norte	3	0.04%	3,887	3	0.04%	\$ 1,976
El Dorado	29	0.41%	37,575	29	0.41%	\$ 19,098
Fresno	336	4.80%	435,349	336	4.80%	\$ 221,273
Glenn	8	0.11%	9,718	8	0.11%	\$ 4,939
Humboldt	60	0.86%	77,741	60	0.86%	\$ 39,513
Imperial	31	0.44%	40,166	31	0.44%	\$ 20,415
Inyo	3	0.04%	3,239	3	0.04%	\$ 1,646
Kern	221	3.16%	286,345	221	3.16%	\$ 145,540
Kings	28	0.39%	35,631	28	0.39%	\$ 18,110
Lake	16	0.23%	20,731	16	0.23%	\$ 10,537
Lassen	3	0.04%	3,887	3	0.04%	\$ 1,976
Los Angeles	1,942	27.73%	2,515,563	1,942	27.73%	\$ 1,278,576
Madera	40	0.56%	51,179	40	0.56%	\$ 26,013
Marin	10	0.14%	12,957	10	0.14%	\$ 6,586
Mariposa	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	\$ -
Mendocino	25	0.35%	31,744	25	0.35%	\$ 16,134
Merced	66	0.94%	85,515	66	0.94%	\$ 43,464
Modoc	1	0.01%	1,296	1	0.01%	\$ 659
Mono	1	0.01%	1,296	1	0.01%	\$ 659
Monterey	128	1.83%	165,847	128	1.83%	\$ 84,294
Napa	11	0.16%	14,252	11	0.16%	\$ 7,244
Nevada	4	0.06%	5,183	4	0.06%	\$ 2,634
Orange	328	4.68%	424,335	328	4.68%	\$ 215,675
Placer	41	0.59%	53,123	41	0.59%	\$ 27,001
Plumas	2	0.02%	1,944	2	0.02%	\$ 988
Riverside	266	3.80%	344,651	266	3.80%	\$ 175,174
Sacramento	479	6.83%	619,983	479	6.83%	\$ 315,116
San Benito	6	0.09%	7,774	6	0.09%	\$ 3,951
San Bernardino	415	5.92%	537,059	415	5.92%	\$ 272,969
San Diego	354	5.06%	458,671	354	5.06%	\$ 233,127
San Francisco	201	2.87%	260,432	201	2.87%	\$ 132,369
San Joaquin	180	2.56%	232,575	180	2.56%	\$ 118,210
San Luis Obispo	47	0.67%	60,897	47	0.67%	\$ 30,952
San Mateo	69	0.99%	89,402	69	0.99%	\$ 45,440
Santa Barbara	62	0.89%	80,332	62	0.89%	\$ 40,830
Santa Clara	245	3.49%	316,794	245	3.49%	\$ 161,016
Santa Cruz	45	0.64%	58,306	45	0.64%	\$ 29,635
Shasta	62	0.88%	79,684	62	0.88%	\$ 40,501
Sierra	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	\$ -
Siskiyou	7	0.10%	9,070	7	0.10%	\$ 4,610
Solano	145	2.06%	187,226	145	2.06%	\$ 95,161
Sonoma	68	0.96%	87,458	68	0.96%	\$ 44,452
Stanislaus	113	1.61%	146,412	113	1.61%	\$ 74,416
Sutter	21	0.29%	26,561	21	0.29%	\$ 13,500
Tehama	21	0.29%	26,561	21	0.29%	\$ 13,500
Trinity	-	0.00%	-	-	0.00%	\$ -
Tulare	47	0.66%	60,249	47	0.66%	\$ 30,623
Tuolumne	6	0.08%	7,126	6	0.08%	\$ 3,622
Ventura	151	2.15%	195,000	151	2.15%	\$ 99,112
Yolo	46	0.65%	58,953	46	0.65%	\$ 29,964
Yuba	35	0.50%	45,349	35	0.50%	\$ 23,049
<b>Total:</b>	<b>7,003</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 9,073,000</b>	<b>7,003</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 4,611,500</b>

\* Source: CA Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation 2010. FY 2013-2014 column Includes 4 petitions for Mariposa based on their statistics.

## **Action Item 2**

### **Allocations for Various Trial Court Costs Reimbursed from the Trial Court Trust Fund (Program 45.10 Expenditure Authority)**

#### **Issue**

Should the 2013–2014 allocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for court-appointed dependency counsel (\$103.7 million), jury (\$16 million), self-help center (\$2.5 million), replacement screening stations (\$2.3 million), and elder abuse (\$332,000) be maintained at the 2012–2013 levels and not be part of the upcoming review for possible funding reductions of various projects and programs funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) and TCTF Program 30 appropriations (e.g., case management systems)?

#### **2013–2014 TCTF Program 45.10 Expenditure Authority**

Assuming the five allocations remain at their current levels (see rows 20 to 24, Table 2A) and given all the other known or estimated allocations, there is projected to be about \$18 million of TCTF Program 45.10 (Support for Operation of the Trial Courts) expenditure authority (see row 51, Table 2A) available that can be used to distribute the backfill of 2011–2012 benefits cost increases (\$4.7 million) that could not be distributed using 2012–2013 expenditure authority due to insufficient authority. While there will be sufficient expenditure authority, it is possible that there will be insufficient 2013–2014 revenues in the TCTF to fully distribute the \$29.4 million for unfunded 2012–2013 benefits cost increase (see row 15, Table 2A).

#### **New Reimbursement Item**

Provision 14 of the Budget Act of 2013 requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits incurred by the California State Auditor pursuant to Section 19210 of the Public Contract Code (see row 25, Table 2A).

#### **Allocation Items for Reimbursement of Various Trial Court Costs**

Each of the five allocation items were reviewed by the Trial Court Budget Working Group's expenditure subcommittee at the beginning of the previous fiscal year (2012–2013).

#### Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel

For 2012–2013, the Trial Court Budget Working Group (TCBWG) recommended and the council approved that the program's \$103.725 million annual allocation be maintained at the most recent base level for court-appointed counsel in juvenile dependency proceedings. The council allocated one-time augmentations of \$7.1 million in 2010–2011 and \$3.5 million in 2011–2012 to reimburse court expenses in excess of the base level. Total 2012–2013 reimbursements are estimated to be about \$104 million. A statewide increase in juvenile dependency filings has increased the demand for dependency representation.

This allocation funds court-appointed dependency counsel, who represent approximately 125,000 parent and child clients in the state. Representation begins at the initial filing of a petition to remove a child from the home, and extends – sometimes for many years -- through the processes of reunification, termination of parental rights, adoption, or emancipation of the child.

In juvenile dependency proceedings, the trial court is required by law to appoint counsel for a parent or guardian if the parent desires counsel but is financially unable to afford counsel and the agency has recommended that the child be placed in out-of-home care; and to appoint counsel for a child unless the court finds that the child would not benefit from the appointment of counsel (W&I 317, CRC 5.660, etc.).

For the twenty courts in the Dependency Representation Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) program, the AOC, in partnership with local court leadership, directly manages contracts with dependency attorney organizations, including solicitations, negotiation, financial management, invoicing and payment, statistical reporting, training, and other technical assistance. The twenty DRAFT courts account for approximately 60 percent of juvenile dependency filings statewide. The remaining courts receive a base allocation for dependency counsel at the beginning of the year, manage their own dependency counsel contracts, and are reimbursed through the monthly TCTF distribution process for up to 100 percent of their budget. In the past year, many courts not in the DRAFT program have begun to adopt aspects of the DRAFT model, particularly by negotiating deliverables-based rather than time-based contracts. Use of this model is allowing courts to lower costs spent on court-appointed counsel without reducing the level of service to the courts, parents, and children.

Training and performance standards for dependency attorneys are laid down in California Rules of Court, rule 5.660. Adequately funding effective counsel for parents and children has resulted in numerous benefits both for the courts and for children in foster care. Effective counsel can ensure that the complex requirements in juvenile law for case planning, notice, and timeliness are adhered to, thereby reducing case delays and improving court case processing and the quality of information provided to the judge. Unnecessary delays also result in children spending long periods of time in foster care, a situation that has improved greatly in the past few years through the courts' focus on effective representation and adherence to statutory timelines.

### Jury

For 2012–2013, the TCBWG recommended and the council approved that the program's \$29.6 million annual allocation be reduced permanently by \$13.6 million to \$16 million, which should be sufficient to allow courts to be fully reimbursed for eligible juror costs, which in the past nine years through 2011–2012 have averaged \$15.9 million. The 2012–2013 reimbursement is estimated to be \$14.5 million.



The purpose of the jury funding is to reimburse courts for 100 percent of their eligible jury expenditures, which includes the following types of jury costs in criminal cases and nonreimbursed civil cases:

- Jury per diem (\$15 per day after the first day, per Code of Civil Procedure section 215)
- Mileage (\$0.34 per mile one-way only, after the first day, per Code of Civil Procedure section 215)
- Meals and lodging for sequestered jurors
- Public transportation (criminal cases only, one-way only)

### Self-Help Center

For 2012–2013, the TCBWG recommended and the council approved that the program’s \$2.5 million annual allocation be maintained at the \$2.5 million level for distribution to all 58 trial courts for self-help centers. The estimated 2012–2013 total distribution to courts is \$2.5 million.

Funding for self-help centers comes from both the TCTF (\$6.2 million, of which \$3.7 million is in courts’ base allocation) and the IMF (\$5 million). When combining the two fund sources, the minimum allocation for any court is \$34,000, with the remainder distributed according to population size in the county where the trial court is located.

Self-help centers, which provide assistance to self-represented litigants in a wide array of civil law matters to save the courts significant time and expense in the clerk’s office and in the courtroom, serve over 450,000 persons per year. Self-help staffing reduces the number of questions and issues at the public counter increases substantially, therefore reducing line lengths and wait times. Similarly, self-help services improve the quality of documents filed, thereby reducing follow-up and clean-up work in the clerk’s office. Evaluations show that court-based assistance to self-represented litigants is operationally effective and carries measurable short and long-term cost benefits to the court. One study found that self-help centers workshops save \$1.00 for every \$0.23 spent. When the court provides one-on-one individual assistance to self-represented litigants, savings of \$1.00 can be achieved from expenditures ranging from \$0.36 to \$0.55. If the self-help center also provides assistance to self-represented litigants to bring their cases to disposition at the first court appearance, the court saves \$1.00 for every \$0.45 spent.

Demand for self-help services is strong and growing. Courts, struggling with budget reductions, indicate that they are not able to keep up with increasing public demand for self-help services and need additional staff. In a 2007 survey, the courts identified a need of \$44 million in additional funds to fully support self-help.

The Statewide Action Plan for Serving Self-Represented Litigants, which was approved by the Judicial Council in 2004, calls for self-help centers in all counties. California Rule of Court 10.960 provides that self-help services are a core function of courts and should be budgeted for accordingly. The Budget Act provides that “up to \$5,000,000 [from the Trial Court Improvement

Fund] shall be available for support of services for self-represented litigants.” Based upon recommendations by the TCBWG, the Judicial Council has allocated an additional \$6,200,000 for self-help services from the Trial Court Trust Fund since 2007.

#### Replacement Screening Stations

For 2012–2013, the TCBWG recommended and the council approved that the program’s \$2.286 million annual allocation be reduced one-time by \$1 million in 2012–2013 as expenditures for 2012–2013 were estimated at \$1.2 million and actual expenses will likely be at that level. The estimated 2013–2014 expense is \$2.286 million. The estimated cost for equipment replacement is \$1,785,600 and service agreement renewal is \$495,300 in 2013-2014.

The Screening Equipment Replacement Program is a reimbursement program that replaces and maintains x-ray machines and magnetometers in the trial courts. The equipment is replaced on an eight-year cycle and is the property of the court. Funds are allocated to courts for replacement based on the age and condition of the equipment and the status of service agreements.

Master Agreements which include pricing for the equipment, installation, training and maintenance, as well as removal of the old x-ray units are used for program purchases. The purchase price includes 5 years of service. These are the second set of agreements to be executed as a result of a competitive bid process. The previous Master Agreements included a one- or two-year equipment warranty followed by separate service agreements to bring the coverage period to a total of five years. Contracts with the original vendors were extended to allow for the purchase of service agreements on equipment that was purchased under the initial contract. As the warranties and service agreements on equipment purchased in the first years of the program expired, program funds were used to purchase service agreements to cover the remainder of the 8-year replacement cycle.

There are approximately 830 pieces of equipment in use in court facilities, many of which have exceeded the initial 5 year coverage period. The program covers the costs of service for the life of the equipment. In order to address increasing service agreement costs, a Request for Proposal will be released in 2013-2014.

Code compliance requires an annual radiation survey to be performed on the x-ray equipment. Current service agreements include an annual preventative maintenance and radiation survey in addition to service calls and replacement parts as needed. The RFP will ask for pricing and details on this type of agreement as well as an option that includes only the preventative maintenance and radiation survey with repairs to be billed on a time and materials basis. Since most equipment has been replaced within the last seven years, the need for repairs is lower and a time and materials option could result in savings.

Without this program, the courts will be entirely responsible for the purchase and maintenance of the equipment. The cost of an x-ray unit with a five-year service period is approximately \$36,000. The cost of a magnetometer with a five-year service period is approximately \$5,600. Reimbursing the costs of screening equipment is particularly critical to the smaller courts, where equipment and service agreements can represent a huge unfunded expenditure relative to their overall budget. The cost of a single year's equipment replacement and service agreement renewal costs in a large court can result in expenditures of several hundred thousand dollars. For example, in 2010–2011, the Los Angeles Superior Court was reimbursed by the program for \$718,000 in equipment and service agreements and \$694,000 in 2011–2012

The program also offers a service to the court staff responsible for the equipment. The Office of Security staff member who manages the program also acts as a liaison to the courts and assists in resolving issues with the vendors and the AOC Customer Service Center and acts as a subject matter expert on radiation and code compliance associated with the x-ray equipment.

If a court chooses to purchase equipment or service that is not covered by the Master Agreements, the court is required to go out to bid. That process represents a direct cost to the court in staff time and in the overall cost of the purchase, as well as inconsistency in response to service calls.

#### Elder Abuse

For 2012–2013, the TCBWG recommended and the council approved that the program's \$332,000 allocation be retained at the 2011–2012 level and that courts be reimbursed quarterly, even though this allocation level would likely result in courts being reimbursed at about 70 percent of eligible reimbursements. Through the third quarter in 2012–2013 eligible reimbursements totaled \$436,970.

The TCBWG considered reducing the reimbursement rate from \$185 to \$75 per filing of Form EA-100. A reimbursement of \$75 per filing would be sufficient to cover the actual costs of a court clerk to process Form EA-100 for most courts based on: 1) information provided by a sampling of nine small to large courts that on average take up to two hours for a clerk to process a petition; and 2) the estimated average hourly rate for a clerk or equivalent, based on courts' current Schedule 7A compensation budgets, is just over \$37.

AB 59 (Stats. 1999, ch. 561) authorized elders and dependent adults to seek protective orders. As specified by this bill, the council approved form EA-100 – Petition for Protective Orders (Elder or Dependent Adult Abuse) – effective April 2000. At its April 27, 2001, meeting, the council approved the allocation of these funds to the courts by the end of that fiscal year. The reimbursement rate for each filing was set at \$185. It appears the rate was set at the level of the lowest first paper filing fee in limited civil cases, and was not intended to cover the actual cost to

a court of processing an order. Since 2001–2002, courts that seek reimbursement are required to report quarterly to the AOC the number of EA-100 forms filed.

**Table 1 -- Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Allocation Savings and Shortfalls, 2001–2002 to 2011–2012**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>EA-100 Filings Reported by Courts</b>	<b>Eligible Reimbursement Amount Based on Filings (\$185 per filing)</b>	<b>Available Funding</b>	<b>Reverted Savings*/ (Funding Shortfalls)</b>
2001–2002	1,073	\$ 198,505	\$ 1,175,000	\$ 976,495
2002–2003	1,110	205,350	1,175,000	969,650
2003–2004	1,198	221,630	1,175,000	953,370
2004–2005	1,515	280,275	1,175,000	894,725
2005–2006	1,704	315,240	300,000	(15,240)
2006–2007	1,813	335,405	350,000	14,595
2007–2008	1,761	325,785	368,340	42,555
2008–2009	1,832	338,920	368,340	29,420
2009–2010	2,033	376,105	368,340	(7,765)
2010–2011	2,511	464,535	356,340	(108,195)
2011–2012	2,751	508,935	332,465	(176,470)

\* The savings from 2001–2002 to 2004–2005 were reverted back to the state General Fund.

**FY 2013-14 Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.10: Appropriation vs.  
Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	Estimated and Approved 2013-14
1	<b>I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation</b>	<b>Base</b>	1,693,270,804
3	<b>II. Adjustments</b>		
4	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position		-1,101,465
5	Annualization of New Screening Station Funding		184,486
6	<b>Total, Adjustments</b>		<b>-916,979</b>
8	<b>III. FY 2013-2014 Allocations</b>		
9	\$261 Million Court Operations Reduction	Base	-261,000,000
10	\$60 million in new funding	Base	60,000,000
11	\$50 Million Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-50,000,000
12	2.0% Holdback	Non-Base	-35,178,540
13	1.5% & 0.5% Emergency Funding & Unspent Funding Allocated Back to Courts	Non-Base	35,178,540
14	San Luis Obispo CMS Replacement	Non-Base	1,500,000
15	2012-13 Full-Year Benefits Cost Increases	Base	29,402,766
16	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Base	9,223,000
17	<b>Total, FY 2013-2014 Allocations</b>		<b>-210,874,234</b>
19	<b>IV. Allocation for Reimbursements</b>		
20	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	103,725,000
21	Jury	Non-Base	16,000,000
22	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000
23	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000
24	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000
25	Audits (per Budget Act of 2013, Provision 14)	Non-Base	325,000
26	<b>Total, Reimbursements</b>		<b>125,168,000</b>
28	<b>V. Estimated Revenue Distributions</b>		
29	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	97,000,000
30	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	18,010,000
31	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494
32	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	4,020,000
33	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	3,200,000
34	Court Reporter Services for Proceedings Under One Hour	Non-Base	3,800,000
35	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840
36	<b>Total, Revenue Distributions</b>		<b>137,881,334</b>
38	<b>VI. Miscellaneous Charges</b>		

**FY 2013-14 Trial Court Trust Fund Program 45.10: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	Estimated and Approved 2013-14
39	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges (paid from Prog. 30)	Non-Base	-5,800,000
40	<b>Total, Miscellaneous Charges</b>		<b>-5,800,000</b>
42	<b>Total, Base Program 45.10 Allocations</b>		<b>1,529,979,591</b>
43	<b>Total, Non-Base Program 45.10 Allocations</b>		<b>208,417,334</b>
45	<b>Total, Estimated FY 2013-14 Program 45.10 Trial Court Allocations</b>		<b>1,738,396,925</b>
47	Program 45.10 Appropriation Budget Act		1,758,927,000
48	Transfer to Program 45.25 (Compensation of Superior Court Judges) due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions		-2,504,000
49	<b>Adjusted Appropriation</b>		<b>1,756,423,000</b>
51	<b>Estimated Remaining Program 45.10 Appropriation</b>		<b>18,026,075</b>
54	2011-12 Benefits Cost Increases -- Undistributed Backfill		4,700,000
55	<b>Estimated Remaining Appropriation</b>		<b>13,326,075</b>

**Action Item 3A**  
**Allocation of \$261 Million Ongoing Reduction**

**Issue**

Using the most current base allocations, reaffirm the methodology for allocating a \$261 million ongoing reduction that was recommended by the Trial Court Budget Working Group and approved by the council at its April 2013 meeting.

**Background**

The April 2013 computation of each court's share of a \$261 million reduction (see column 11, Table 3A) was based on the known base allocations for court operations at that time. The current computation is based on the most current base allocations for court operations (see column 10, Table 3A).

Table 3B provides a history of General Fund reductions to trial courts, reduction offsets, new revenues, and the resulting net cumulative allocation reductions to courts from 2009–2010 to 2013–2014 since 2008–2009.

**Action Item 1B**  
**WAFM Cost of Labor Adjustment**

**Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee**  
**Trial Court Funding Methodology Subcommittee**  
**Update to Cost of Labor Adjustment**

**Issue**

Approve the cost of labor adjustment process recommended by the Trial Court Budget Working Group's Trial Court Funding Methodology Subcommittee.

**Background**

On April 26, 2013, the Judicial Council adopted the new Workload-based Allocation and Funding Model (WAFM) as proposed by the Trial Court Funding Methodology Subcommittee (subcommittee). At that meeting, the subcommittee noted that a key "parking lot" item was an immediate reevaluation of the use of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) adjustment to court salaries. A number of courts had expressed concern that the methodology was not accurately adjusting salaries in their jurisdiction.

In early May 2013, the subcommittee tasked a smaller working group to reevaluate the cost of labor adjustment and determine whether any changes were required. The cost of labor working group identified:

1. The BLS data was reconfirmed as the most appropriate source for computing an adjustment factor for cost of living/goods differences.
2. The "BLS adjustment" as identified in the original report to the Judicial Council was calculated using an overly complicated model.
3. The "BLS adjustment" as identified in the original report used a broader sample of industries than intended by the subcommittee.
4. A simpler and more transparent calculation that adjusted for cost of living/goods/labor was needed (for simplicity, this adjustment is termed cost of labor for the balance of this document).

**AMENDED COST OF LABOR ADJUSTMENT**

The subcommittee recommends a refined method of calculating the cost of labor adjustment. The key elements are outlined below. A brief statement is also provided on how this proposed method of calculating the cost of labor adjustment differs from the method used in previous calculations of the WAFM. For reference, the cost of labor adjustment was displayed on columns D through J on the table presented on page A-35 of the Trial Court Funding: Recommendation



of New Budget Development and Allocation Methodology report to the Judicial Council dated April 11, 2013. The balance of the methodology remains unchanged.

**Elements of Amended Method of Calculation:** In the previous method of calculation a court's actual average salaries for Program 10 and 90 were multiplied by RAS FTE need, summed, and then adjusted up or down to an "expected value" by inflating or deflating a court's average salaries. The proposed amended method is based on a calculation that includes the following:

- **Establish the unadjusted base per RAS FTE value to apply to each position estimated in the model** – Using FY 12/13 Trial Court 7A data, calculate the average salary of a position in the trial courts. This was a two step process. 1) Calculate the average salary in each trial court by dividing total salary costs on the 7A by total positions (excluding positions not included in the workload model and excluding the CEO's salary) then 2) Averaging the values of all 58 courts. This resulted in a single unadjusted base to use per calculated FTE for the workload model. **This figure is not meant to establish an average salary for individual trial court employees.** Although a single state average is used to calculate need, this does not presume nor imply a single salary statewide. Because the average includes all RAS related employees – clerks, custodians, mediators, investigators, court reporters, management, etc – and because not every court uses employees for these functions (for example, a small court does not have sufficient workload to have a full-time employee) it is simply an estimation tool and should not be used to evaluate individual salaries.

Additionally, because the average 1) is an average of all positions within a court that is then 2) averaged between all courts, it provides only a baseline factor that can be used in conjunction with the BLS adjustment factor (below) to project total salary needs. An average of averages is used because the same methodology is used to calculate the BLS salary adjustment factor outlined below.

- **Compute Unadjusted Base Total** – A total unadjusted base for each court is computed by multiplying the projected number of FTE for each court (less one FTE for the CEO) by the unadjusted base per FTE calculated above.
- **Add Court Executive Salary based on the cluster average** – Previously the CEO actual salary was added into the salary need after adjustment. In the amended method the CEO salary will be added to the unadjusted salary total using the cluster average CEO salary.
- **Adjust the unadjusted base for local cost of labor using BLS Category 92**
- – The BLS identifies multiple industry categories. The work group is recommending the use of Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages

(QCEW) for “Public Administration 92”, which included the closest match to trial court salaries<sup>1</sup>. The BLS series reports an average salary for this set of government entities for each county. The average includes **all classifications**. An average of the BLS county averages is calculated. A ratio for each county is then calculated by dividing the BLS series average for a specific county by the state BLS average. The ratio indicates what each county’s average is relative to the state average.

County’s Category 92 Average Salary  
---divided by--  
Statewide Category 92 Average Salary  
=County’s “New” Salary Adjustment Factor

---

**To perform a query on the BLS site, go to the following link:**

<http://www.bls.gov/data/#wages>

**Scroll** down to the section titled “Pay (from an Employment Survey),” then **Scroll** to “State and County Wages (Quarterly Census of Employment & Wages – QCEW)”

**Select** “One-Screen Data-Search” (this will be a green icon to the right of section name)

1. Select “California”
2. Select “[County]”
3. Select “NAICS 92 Public Administration”
4. Select “State Government” or “Local Government”
5. Select “all establishment sizes”
6. Select “average annual pay”
7. Select “Get Data”

(After performing steps 1-7 data will generate on a separate screen.)

- 
- **Review government employment mix when determining the use of BLS Category 92** – Category 92 can be limited to local government or can include both state and local government employment. The original application of the BLS in the WAFM compared court salaries to local government salaries. Some courts, however, were concerned that their local cost of labor was driven more by state government employee salaries rather than local government employee salaries. To address this issue, the subcommittee is recommending that:

---

<sup>1</sup> Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Labor adjustment based on Quarterly Census of Wages & Employment, 2011. Salaries of Local or State Government are used for comparison based on Public Administration (North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS), 92)

For courts where the government workforce is less than 50% state employees – the Category 92 – Local Government will be used.

For courts where the government workforce is more than 50% state employees – the Category 92 – State and Local Government will be used.

In both cases, government workforce is determined using data available from BLS.

Table 1C shows how the BLS adjustment was calculated for each court.

- **Determine Total Pre-Benefits Workload Allocation Need** –The total unadjusted base for each county is then multiplied by the BLS Salary Adjustment Factor to project a total adjusted base need amount for each trial court.

### Summary

The amended method of calculating the cost of labor adjustment more clearly, transparently, and equitably estimates the total costs needed for the estimated workload. Rather than creating a confusing “inflater” or “deflator” on actual salaries in a specific court – the methodology creates a base value that is adjusted for the local cost of government employee labor in each county.

It is important to remember that the calculation still relies on the “FTE” calculated by the RAS model. The total FTE (minus one for the CEO) for each court is then multiplied by the unadjusted base per FTE (pre-benefits). The cluster average salary for the CEO is then added. The total unadjusted base is then multiplied by the court’s “new” salary adjustment factor.

The remainder of the calculation remains unchanged (addition of benefits and operating expenses).

### **Action Item 3C WAFM Computation**

#### **Issue**

Approve the WAFM computation of each court's share of total funding need based on workload that was captured by the Resource Assessment Study (see columns Q and Q1, Table 3E).

#### **Background**

The council approved the general WAFM at its April 26, 2013 business meeting. Table 3D contains the following updates: base allocations, adjustment related subordinate judicial officers, and 2012–2013 full-year benefits cost changes and \$261 million reduction. Table 3E contains the WAFM computation incorporating the updates in Tables 3A and 3D and the proposed cost of labor adjustment discussed in Action Item 3B report.

### **Action Item 3D Computation and Allocation of Adjustments to Base Funding**

#### **Issue**

On April 26, 2013, the council approved two types of allocation adjustments for 2013–2014. One adjustment is based on “old” monies or the current base funding, of which 90% is allocated using each court's current historic share and of which 10% is allocated using the WAFM share (see Table 3F). The fifteen “cluster 1” courts are exempt from this adjustment. Based on the WAFM computations contained in Table 3E, Table 3F displays the allocation in column F2.

The second adjustment is related to new funding. A recommendation from the funding subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Working Group is pending. Table 3G displays two options based on the WAFM computations contained in Table 3E. In both options, all courts receive a WAFM share of the \$60 million (see columns F and J). Option 1 would exempt the fifteen “cluster 1” courts from the reallocation of \$60 million base funding (see columns G and H). Excluding “cluster 1” courts, \$60 million of base funding is reduced based on the current percentage share, then is reallocated according to the WAFM share. Option 2 would not exempt the cluster 1 groups from the reallocation of \$60 million base funding (see columns K and L). For all courts, \$60 million of base funding is reduced based on the current percentage share, then is reallocated according to the WAFM share. Column N displays the variance in the allocation adjustment between the two options.

#### **Background**

The Budget Act of 2013 requires the following:

- “\$60,000,000 shall be allocated by the Judicial Council to trial courts based on the funding methodology approved by Judicial Council on April 26, 2013.”
- “Funding identified in this provision shall be made available to an individual trial court only upon receipt of a written plan meeting the following criteria:
  - An individual court plan shall be submitted by the Administrative Office of the Courts to each fiscal and policy committee in each house of the Legislature responsible for court issues on or before September 1, 2013.
  - An individual court plan shall only include activities intended to maintain or increase public access.”
- “On or after April 14, 2014, but in no event later than May 14, 2014, the Judicial Council shall file a written report to the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature on how funds identified in this provision were or will be expended during the 2013–14 fiscal year.”

## Allocation of \$261 Million Ongoing Reduction

	Ending 2012-2013 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	of New Screening Station Funding	Marshall and Sheriff Funding (2010- 11 base)	Benefits Base Allocation (2010- 11 and 2011-12)	Benefits Allocation (2012- 13) <sup>1</sup>			Share of \$261M reduction	Share of \$261M reduction (April 2013 computation)	Current as a % of April Computation
	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	GF	TCTF (45.10)	Total	% of Total			
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>
Alameda	82,797,354	(280,818)			3,102,046	1,117,440	86,736,022	4.85%	(12,666,297)	(12,719,212)	99.58%
Alpine	615,729	-		-	20,340	7,957	644,026	0.04%	(94,049)	(94,229)	99.81%
Amador	2,366,091	-		-	51,756	1,611	2,419,458	0.14%	(353,320)	(353,997)	99.81%
Butte	9,017,311	-		(467,145)	124,076	95,367	8,769,610	0.49%	(1,280,650)	(1,276,057)	100.36%
Calaveras	2,147,857	-		-	50,506	59,318	2,257,681	0.13%	(329,695)	(326,310)	101.04%
Colusa	1,547,989	-		-	24,773	11,356	1,584,118	0.09%	(231,333)	(231,034)	100.13%
Contra Costa	37,809,243	-		-	1,396,191	887,134	40,092,568	2.24%	(5,854,827)	(5,854,742)	100.00%
Del Norte	2,554,514	-		-	94,129	62,921	2,711,563	0.15%	(395,977)	(393,405)	100.65%
El Dorado	6,636,067	-		-	213,119	21,412	6,870,599	0.38%	(1,003,332)	(1,011,804)	99.16%
Fresno	36,976,272	-		-	3,340,364	876,146	41,192,782	2.30%	(6,015,494)	(6,027,314)	99.80%
Glenn	2,021,838	-			54,665	31,067	2,107,569	0.12%	(307,774)	(306,113)	100.54%
Humboldt	6,001,052	-			73,084	83,444	6,157,580	0.34%	(899,208)	(896,655)	100.28%
Imperial	7,569,524	-	44,091		125,538	230,012	7,969,165	0.45%	(1,163,759)	(1,152,628)	100.97%
Inyo	2,117,611	-			75,586	54,537	2,247,734	0.13%	(328,243)	(325,228)	100.93%
Kern	31,195,006	-			3,544,269	629,057	35,368,332	1.98%	(5,164,934)	(5,174,828)	99.81%
Kings	6,145,453	-			45,117	6,952	6,197,522	0.35%	(905,041)	(906,775)	99.81%
Lake	3,657,433	-			9,123	(449)	3,666,107	0.21%	(535,372)	(536,352)	99.82%
Lassen	2,516,565	-			7,839	6,630	2,531,034	0.14%	(369,614)	(369,954)	99.91%
Los Angeles	475,480,138	(213,400)			18,887,969	7,790,986	501,945,693	28.08%	(73,300,493)	(73,193,743)	100.15%
Madera	6,818,752	-			384,825	137,838	7,341,416	0.41%	(1,072,087)	(1,067,259)	100.45%
Marin	15,039,941	(97,145)			644,512	324,291	15,911,599	0.89%	(2,323,614)	(2,353,837)	98.72%
Mariposa	1,076,161	-			22,300	6,416	1,104,877	0.06%	(161,348)	(161,517)	99.90%
Mendocino	4,877,913	-			311,770	239,862	5,429,546	0.30%	(792,891)	(799,646)	99.16%
Merced	9,819,677	(95,552)			774,827	269,194	10,768,145	0.60%	(1,572,501)	(1,603,662)	98.06%
Modoc	1,076,671	-			31,967	1,273	1,109,911	0.06%	(162,083)	(162,394)	99.81%
Mono	1,346,961	-			85,641	32,349	1,464,951	0.08%	(213,931)	(211,615)	101.09%
Monterey	15,857,765	-			277,496	227,572	16,362,832	0.92%	(2,389,509)	(2,383,025)	100.27%
Napa	7,344,709	-			309,796	107,676	7,762,180	0.43%	(1,133,532)	(1,127,411)	100.54%
Nevada	5,048,233	-			95,494	100,179	5,243,907	0.29%	(765,782)	(766,086)	99.96%
Orange	138,844,789	-			6,929,920	3,671,441	149,446,150	8.36%	(21,824,027)	(21,755,368)	100.32%
Placer	13,085,520	-			634,796	238,459	13,958,775	0.78%	(2,038,438)	(2,031,677)	100.33%
Plumas	1,659,324	-			14,929	273	1,674,526	0.09%	(244,536)	(245,004)	99.81%
Riverside	70,306,201	(223,977)			923,657	685,149	71,691,030	4.01%	(10,469,236)	(10,520,881)	99.51%
Sacramento	70,647,290	(190,573)			3,560,591	1,673,778	75,691,087	4.24%	(11,053,375)	(11,055,158)	99.98%
San Benito	2,856,231	-			34,642	8,678	2,899,551	0.16%	(423,429)	(424,240)	99.81%
San Bernardino	75,985,239	-			1,264,732	1,011,776	78,261,748	4.38%	(11,428,776)	(11,448,843)	99.82%
San Diego	142,312,011	-			2,853,598	3,506,215	148,671,824	8.32%	(21,710,950)	(21,742,047)	99.86%
San Francisco	59,097,392	-			5,487,134	-	64,584,526	3.61%	(9,431,454)	(9,449,521)	99.81%
San Joaquin	26,578,282	-			1,245,356	756,034	28,579,673	1.60%	(4,173,567)	(4,152,484)	100.51%
San Luis Obispo	12,959,466	-			298,958	36,773	13,295,196	0.74%	(1,941,534)	(1,945,182)	99.81%
San Mateo	34,027,500	-			2,411,112	211,070	36,649,683	2.05%	(5,352,053)	(5,347,230)	100.09%
Santa Barbara	21,302,406	-	140,395		1,597,242	(21,451)	23,019,011	1.29%	(3,361,529)	(3,350,855)	100.32%

## Allocation of \$261 Million Ongoing Reduction

	Ending 2012-2013 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	of New Screening Station Funding	Marshall and Sheriff Funding (2010- 11 base)	Benefits Base Allocation (2010- 11 and 2011-12)	Benefits Allocation (2012- 13) <sup>1</sup>	Total	% of Total	Share of \$261M reduction	Share of \$261M reduction (April 2013 computation)	Current as a % of April Computation
	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	GF	TCTF (45.10)					
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>
Santa Clara	84,872,848	-		-	2,309,467	1,120,423	<b>88,302,738</b>	4.94%	<b>(12,895,089)</b>	<b>(12,919,791)</b>	99.81%
Santa Cruz	11,552,123	-		-	203,557	174,422	<b>11,930,102</b>	0.67%	<b>(1,742,185)</b>	<b>(1,735,273)</b>	100.40%
Shasta	11,152,721	-		(2,389,668)	262,222	(38,857)	<b>8,986,418</b>	0.50%	<b>(1,312,311)</b>	<b>(1,321,019)</b>	99.34%
Sierra	613,583	-		-	9,615	9,268	<b>632,466</b>	0.04%	<b>(92,361)</b>	<b>(92,831)</b>	99.49%
Siskiyou	3,733,650	-		-	91,037	60,127	<b>3,884,814</b>	0.22%	<b>(567,310)</b>	<b>(565,472)</b>	100.33%
Solano	18,538,187	-			353,779	417,276	<b>19,309,242</b>	1.08%	<b>(2,819,781)</b>	<b>(2,802,158)</b>	100.63%
Sonoma	21,168,908	-			1,172,049	584,741	<b>22,925,698</b>	1.28%	<b>(3,347,902)</b>	<b>(3,354,315)</b>	99.81%
Stanislaus	16,160,857	-			1,305,230	1,003,375	<b>18,469,461</b>	1.03%	<b>(2,697,146)</b>	<b>(2,678,940)</b>	100.68%
Sutter	4,036,090	-			159,760	24,759	<b>4,220,609</b>	0.24%	<b>(616,347)</b>	<b>(617,054)</b>	99.89%
Tehama	3,246,020	-		-	108,184	17,294	<b>3,371,498</b>	0.19%	<b>(492,349)</b>	<b>(492,577)</b>	99.95%
Trinity	1,529,277	-		(450,608)	53,679	16,561	<b>1,148,910</b>	0.06%	<b>(167,778)</b>	<b>(167,587)</b>	100.11%
Tulare	14,741,608	-			33,744	127,031	<b>14,902,384</b>	0.83%	<b>(2,176,236)</b>	<b>(2,180,438)</b>	99.81%
Tuolumne	3,248,790	-			50,351	2,616	<b>3,301,758</b>	0.18%	<b>(482,165)</b>	<b>(483,963)</b>	99.63%
Ventura	29,449,865	-			968,752	416,492	<b>30,835,110</b>	1.73%	<b>(4,502,935)</b>	<b>(4,493,928)</b>	100.20%
Yolo	8,336,100	-			210,076	206,373	<b>8,752,549</b>	0.49%	<b>(1,278,158)</b>	<b>(1,272,033)</b>	100.48%
Yuba	3,748,696	-			90,867	66,104	<b>3,905,667</b>	0.22%	<b>(570,355)</b>	<b>(567,297)</b>	100.54%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,693,270,804</b>	<b>(1,101,465)</b>	<b>184,486</b>	<b>(3,307,421)</b>	<b>68,818,575</b>	<b>29,405,750</b>	<b>1,787,270,729</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>(261,000,000)</b>	<b>(261,000,000)</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

1. TCTF resources in 2013-2014 might not be sufficient to distribute the entire allocation.

### Trial Court Funding Reduction History

Table 3B

		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
#	<b>I. General Fund Reduction</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>
1	Ongoing	-260,809,000	-285,809,000	-285,809,000	-726,766,575	-726,766,575
2	One-Time	-100,000,000	-30,000,000		-415,000,000	
3	Budget Act/Council Action			-319,957,575		
4	<b>Total, Reduction</b>	<b>-360,809,000</b>	<b>-315,809,000</b>	<b>-605,766,575</b>	<b>-1,141,766,575</b>	<b>-726,766,575</b>
6	<b>II. Offsets</b>	<b>135,000,000</b>	<b>160,000,000</b>	<b>302,400,000</b>	<b>401,000,000</b>	<b>110,000,000</b>
8	<b>III. New Revenues</b>	<b>18,000,000</b>	<b>66,290,000</b>	<b>70,580,000</b>	<b>120,980,000</b>	<b>120,980,000</b>
10	<b>Total Net Reduction</b>	<b>-207,809,000</b>	<b>-89,519,000</b>	<b>-232,786,575</b>	<b>-619,786,575</b>	<b>-495,786,575</b>
12	<b>IV. Reduction Adjustments</b>	<b>17,682,408</b>	<b>13,687,000</b>	<b>18,701,944</b>	<b>20,701,944</b>	<b>20,701,944</b>
14	<b>Cumulative net court operations reduction from 2008-09</b>	<b>-190,126,592</b>	<b>-75,832,000</b>	<b>-214,084,631</b>	<b>-599,084,631</b>	<b>-475,084,631</b>
15	<b>Previous Ongoing</b>	n/a	-190,126,592	-190,126,592	-214,084,631	-214,084,631
16	<b>New Ongoing</b>	n/a	0	-23,958,039	0	-261,000,000
17	<b>One-Time</b>	n/a	114,294,592	0	-385,000,000	
18	<b>Total</b>	n/a	<b>-75,832,000</b>	<b>-214,084,631</b>	<b>-599,084,631</b>	<b>-475,084,631</b>



**Table 3C - BLS Data Comparison - Determine Local Only (Majority)  
or State and Local (If High % of State Employment)**

Cluster	Court	Local Govt Employment (number employed)	State Govt Employment (number employed)	Total Employment	% Local	% State	State Employment is More than 50% of Govt Workforce?	Local (92)	AVG (State and Local 92)	BLS Factor to Use (50% Workforce Threshold)
4	Alameda	18,010	3,367	21,377	84%	16%	No	1.42	1.27	1.42
1	Alpine*	151		151	100%	0%	No	0.77	0.77	0.77
1	Amador	848	1,737	2,585	33%	67%	Yes	0.92	0.97	0.97
2	Butte	3,173	389	3,562	89%	11%	No	0.91	0.89	0.91
1	Calaveras	601	66	667	90%	10%	No	0.86	0.96	0.86
1	Colusa	938	55	993	94%	6%	No	0.70	0.92	0.70
3	Contra Costa	11,242	497	11,739	96%	4%	No	1.26	1.12	1.26
1	Del Norte	733	1,631	2,364	31%	69%	Yes	0.64	0.79	0.79
2	El Dorado	2,790	123	2,913	96%	4%	No	0.99	1.09	0.99
3	Fresno	11,138	4,780	15,918	70%	30%	No	1.01	1.09	1.01
1	Glenn	838	32	870	96%	4%	No	0.68	0.84	0.68
2	Humboldt	3,604	763	4,367	83%	17%	No	0.76	0.93	0.76
2	Imperial	3,494	2,998	6,492	54%	46%	No	0.76	0.83	0.76
1	Inyo	828	308	1,136	73%	27%	No	0.83	0.89	0.83
3	Kern	9,340	6,459	15,799	59%	41%	No	1.05	1.01	1.05
2	Kings	1,840	4,100	5,940	31%	69%	Yes	0.85	0.87	0.87
2	Lake	1,206	47	1,253	96%	4%	No	0.75	0.77	0.75
1	Lassen	679	2,685	3,364	20%	80%	Yes	0.68	0.79	0.79
4	Los Angeles	122,061	12,183	134,244	91%	9%	No	1.33	1.25	1.33
2	Madera	1,653	2,669	4,322	38%	62%	Yes	0.83	0.92	0.92
2	Marin	3,949	2,128	6,077	65%	35%	No	1.30	1.11	1.30
1	Mariposa	374	29	403	93%	7%	No	0.75	0.91	0.75
2	Mendocino	1,969	342	2,311	85%	15%	No	0.87	0.83	0.87
2	Merced*	3,180		3,180	100%	0%	No	0.92	0.92	0.92
1	Modoc	245	50	295	83%	17%	No	0.62	0.78	0.62
1	Mono	409	39	448	91%	9%	No	1.19	0.91	1.19
3	Monterey	5,633	3,628	9,261	61%	39%	No	1.19	1.06	1.19
2	Napa	2,257	592	2,849	79%	21%	No	1.23	1.03	1.23
2	Nevada	1,307	140	1,447	90%	10%	No	0.96	0.88	0.96
4	Orange	32,230	3,105	35,335	91%	9%	No	1.30	1.20	1.30
2	Placer	5,259	289	5,548	95%	5%	No	1.14	1.00	1.14
1	Plumas	563	38	601	94%	6%	No	0.71	0.73	0.71
4	Riverside*	26,593		26,593	100%	0%	No	1.07	1.07	1.07
4	Sacramento	17,900	98,190	116,090	15%	85%	Yes	1.19	1.28	1.28
1	San Benito*	711		711	100%	0%	No	0.98	0.98	0.98
4	San Bernardino	23,073	5,317	28,390	81%	19%	No	1.05	1.07	1.05
4	San Diego*	34,895		34,895	100%	0%	No	1.18	1.18	1.18
4	San Francisco	14,358	12,709	27,067	53%	47%	No	1.62	1.58	1.62
3	San Joaquin	7,652	3,386	11,038	69%	31%	No	1.12	1.09	1.12
2	San Luis Obispo	4,183	3,470	7,653	55%	45%	No	1.08	1.08	1.08
3	San Mateo	8,378	474	8,852	95%	5%	No	1.45	1.16	1.45
3	Santa Barbara	6,054	464	6,518	93%	7%	No	1.14	1.06	1.14
4	Santa Clara*	19,230		19,230	100%	0%	No	1.47	1.47	1.47
2	Santa Cruz*	3,008		3,008	100%	0%	No	1.17	1.17	1.17
2	Shasta*	3,199		3,199	100%	0%	No	0.85	0.85	0.85
1	Sierra*	121		121	100%	0%	No	0.73	0.73	0.73
2	Siskiyou	820	189	1,009	81%	19%	No	0.71	0.77	0.71
3	Solano	5,341	3,454	8,795	61%	39%	No	1.24	1.11	1.24
3	Sonoma	5,698	856	6,554	87%	13%	No	1.22	1.13	1.22
3	Stanislaus	4,497	211	4,708	96%	4%	No	1.02	0.99	1.02
2	Sutter	1,450	73	1,523	95%	5%	No	0.95	0.93	0.95
2	Tehama	942	49	991	95%	5%	No	0.81	0.91	0.81
1	Trinity*		29	29	0%	100%	Yes		1.00	1.00
3	Tulare	6,848	673	7,521	91%	9%	No	0.81	0.84	0.81
2	Tuolumne	1,096	1,241	2,337	47%	53%	Yes	0.83	0.91	0.91
3	Ventura	9,534	1,086	10,620	90%	10%	No	1.22	1.13	1.22
2	Yolo	3,319	625	3,944	84%	16%	No	1.01	1.31	1.01
2	Yuba*	998		998	100%	0%	No	0.92	0.92	0.92
	STATEWIDE	438,253	183,989	622,242	70%	50%		1.00	1.00	

\* Counties marked with an asterisk either do not have data reported at that particular level of government, or the data that is reported does not meet BLS standards. BLS does not display data that does not meet standards.

Notes: Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Labor adjustment based on Quarterly Census of Wages & Employment, 2011. Salaries of Local Government used for comparison based on Public Administration (North American Industrial Classification System, 92) unless proportion of state government workers in total employment exceeds 50% in which case average of local and state salaries for Public Administration is used for comparison.

**Table 3D: Trial Court Funding to be Compared to Workload-Driven Allocation Funding Model Need**

Updated: 7/1/13

	Current TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	Annualization of New Screening Station Funding	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment (does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners, updated 4/4/13)	\$261M Reduction	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (11-12)	Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	Benefits Base Allocation (12-13) <sup>1</sup>	Total
Court	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	GF	TCTF	12
Alameda	82,797,354	(280,818)		(3,177,924)	(1,958,825)	(12,666,297)	101,575	424,792	127,523	3,102,046	1,117,440	69,586,867
Alpine	615,729	-		-	-	(94,049)	83	2,034	47	20,340	7,957	552,142
Amador	2,366,091	-		-	-	(353,320)	2,565	11,006	783	51,756	1,611	2,080,491
Butte	9,017,311	-		(467,145)	(291,613)	(1,280,650)	14,608	59,332	16,523	124,076	95,367	7,287,810
Calaveras	2,147,857	-		-	-	(329,695)	3,074	18,652	1,180	50,506	59,318	1,950,892
Colusa	1,547,989	-		-	-	(231,333)	1,447	13,708	363	24,773	11,356	1,368,302
Contra Costa	37,809,243	-		-	(1,705,774)	(5,854,827)	69,231	218,186	87,076	1,396,191	887,134	32,906,460
Del Norte	2,554,514	-		-	(126,942)	(395,977)	1,964	11,208	505	94,129	62,921	2,202,321
El Dorado	6,636,067	-		-	(57,081)	(1,003,332)	11,851	54,374	4,491	213,119	21,412	5,880,901
Fresno	36,976,272	-		-	(1,032,025)	(6,015,494)	60,497	181,080	69,384	3,340,364	876,146	34,456,224
Glenn	2,021,838	-		(9,779)	-	(307,774)	1,927	19,264	500	54,665	31,067	1,811,707
Humboldt	6,001,052	-		(167,800)	(150,006)	(899,208)	8,913	48,160	8,302	73,084	83,444	5,005,941
Imperial	7,569,524	-	44,091	(420,479)	(180,405)	(1,163,759)	11,204	67,678	10,882	125,538	230,012	6,294,286
Inyo	2,117,611	-		(186,658)	(42,314)	(328,243)	1,245	30,402	294	75,586	54,537	1,722,461
Kern	31,195,006	-		(65,567)	(1,750,452)	(5,164,934)	52,450	277,328	64,629	3,544,269	629,057	28,781,786
Kings	6,145,453	-		(421,918)	(181,060)	(905,041)	9,935	57,026	9,045	45,117	6,952	4,765,510
Lake	3,657,433	-		(196,493)	(56,758)	(535,372)	4,311	20,328	1,596	9,123	(449)	2,903,720
Lassen	2,516,565	-		(293,836)	-	(369,614)	2,384	20,156	538	7,839	6,630	1,890,662
Los Angeles	475,480,138	(213,400)		(14,294,467)	(26,758,268)	(73,300,493)	689,065	3,144,530	1,056,102	18,887,969	7,790,986	392,482,162
Madera	6,818,752	-		(381,406)	-	(1,072,087)	9,711	52,502	3,108	384,825	137,838	5,953,244
Marin	15,039,941	(97,145)		(9,625)	(391,957)	(2,323,614)	17,038	114,766	20,590	644,512	324,291	13,338,797
Mariposa	1,076,161	-		-	(28,406)	(161,348)	1,225	3,904	341	22,300	6,416	920,593
Mendocino	4,877,913	-		(299,349)	-	(792,891)	6,083	30,068	5,619	311,770	239,862	4,379,075
Merced	9,819,677	(95,552)		-	(250,840)	(1,572,501)	16,595	55,652	16,318	774,827	269,194	9,033,368
Modoc	1,076,671	-		(789)	(63,471)	(162,083)	662	6,134	304	31,967	1,273	890,668
Mono	1,346,961	-		(24,156)	(8,201)	(213,931)	914	12,446	324	85,641	32,349	1,232,348
Monterey	15,857,765	-		(870,000)	(333,656)	(2,389,509)	28,573	183,464	27,420	277,496	227,572	13,009,124
Napa	7,344,709	-		(295,552)	(287,148)	(1,133,532)	9,042	30,550	3,438	309,796	107,676	6,088,978
Nevada	5,048,233	-		(433,431)	(292,045)	(765,782)	6,730	49,946	7,900	95,494	100,179	3,817,225
Orange	138,844,789	-		(2,733,776)	(3,329,845)	(21,824,027)	206,630	923,882	294,477	6,929,920	3,671,441	122,983,490
Placer	13,085,520	-		-	(933,901)	(2,038,438)	21,287	77,378	29,042	634,796	238,459	11,114,142
Plumas	1,659,324	-		-	-	(244,536)	1,442	9,206	398	14,929	273	1,441,037
Riverside	70,306,201	(223,977)		(1,931,520)	(2,882,751)	(10,469,236)	131,371	532,226	69,297	923,657	685,149	57,140,417
Sacramento	70,647,290	(190,573)		(1,864,424)	(1,824,452)	(11,053,375)	93,189	340,254	185,701	3,560,591	1,673,778	61,567,979
San Benito	2,856,231	-		-	-	(423,429)	3,876	14,700	1,327	34,642	8,678	2,496,024
San Bernardino	75,985,239	-		(3,269,446)	(2,986,710)	(11,428,776)	133,960	435,474	188,896	1,264,732	1,011,776	61,335,147
San Diego	142,312,011	-		(657,192)	(4,757,300)	(21,710,950)	206,259	718,422	265,582	2,853,598	3,506,215	122,736,644
San Francisco	59,097,392	-		-	(2,582,976)	(9,431,454)	53,715	272,528	91,818	5,487,134	-	52,988,157
San Joaquin	26,578,282	-		(287,747)	(779,859)	(4,173,567)	44,944	201,698	54,178	1,245,356	756,034	23,639,320
San Luis Obispo	12,959,466	-		(241,676)	(673,831)	(1,941,534)	17,704	130,020	19,062	298,958	36,773	10,604,942
San Mateo	34,027,500	-		(443,042)	(1,479,478)	(5,352,053)	48,700	329,518	16,733	2,411,112	211,070	29,770,060
Santa Barbara	21,302,406	-	140,395	(1,055,112)	(457,408)	(3,361,529)	28,356	162,858	29,149	1,597,662	(21,451)	18,365,326
Santa Clara	84,872,848	-		-	(1,833,360)	(12,895,089)	119,260	452,782	121,126	2,309,467	1,120,423	74,267,457
Santa Cruz	11,552,123	-		-	(424,668)	(1,742,185)	17,644	113,210	16,283	203,557	174,422	9,910,386
Shasta	11,152,721	-		(2,389,668)	(326,131)	(1,312,311)	12,206	44,394	4,517	262,222	(38,857)	7,409,092
Sierra	613,583	-		-	-	(92,361)	235	1,830	44	9,615	9,268	542,215

Updated: 7/1/13

	Current TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	Annualization of New Screening Station Funding	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment (does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners, updated 4/4/13)	\$261M Reduction	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (11-12)	Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	Benefits Base Allocation (12-13) <sup>1</sup>	Total
	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	GF	TCTF	
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>
Siskiyou	3,733,650	-		-	(103,923)	(567,310)	3,104	37,000	943	91,037	60,127	<b>3,254,627</b>
Solano	18,538,187	-		(435,400)	(535,433)	(2,819,781)	28,439	119,364	37,755	353,779	417,276	<b>15,704,185</b>
Sonoma	21,168,908	-		(440,000)	(479,410)	(3,347,902)	32,278	119,004	36,215	1,172,049	584,741	<b>18,845,883</b>
Stanislaus	16,160,857	-		(9,326)	(427,578)	(2,697,146)	34,594	88,718	39,080	1,305,230	1,003,375	<b>15,497,803</b>
Sutter	4,036,090	-		(247,071)	-	(616,347)	6,150	37,382	2,322	159,760	24,759	<b>3,403,045</b>
Tehama	3,246,020	-		-	(5,472)	(492,349)	4,138	28,100	1,382	108,184	17,294	<b>2,907,298</b>
Trinity	1,529,277	-		(450,608)	-	(167,778)	943	7,648	636	53,679	16,561	<b>990,359</b>
Tulare	14,741,608	-		(15,576)	(679,043)	(2,176,236)	28,289	204,932	28,262	33,744	127,031	<b>12,293,011</b>
Tuolumne	3,248,790	-		(220,516)	(30,986)	(482,165)	3,916	16,642	1,152	50,351	2,616	<b>2,589,803</b>
Ventura	29,449,865	-		(1,559,157)	(731,699)	(4,502,935)	54,971	205,304	65,233	968,752	416,492	<b>24,366,827</b>
Yolo	8,336,100	-		(582,889)	(461,445)	(1,278,158)	12,802	48,556	12,735	210,076	206,373	<b>6,504,149</b>
Yuba	3,748,696	-		(132,569)	-	(570,355)	4,696	15,788	1,849	90,867	66,104	<b>3,225,076</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,693,270,804</b>	<b>(1,101,465)</b>	<b>184,486</b>	<b>(40,983,089)</b>	<b>(64,674,907)</b>	<b>(261,000,000)</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>	<b>10,907,494</b>	<b>3,160,318</b>	<b>68,818,575</b>	<b>29,405,750</b>	<b>1,440,487,965</b>

1. TCTF resources in 2013-2014 might not be sufficient to distribute the entire allocation.

**Table 3E - Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Model**

		RAS II Model FTE Need <sup>(1)</sup>			Establish Unadjusted Base Dollars			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 12-13 Schedule 7A)			
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	Unadjusted Base <sup>(2)</sup>	CEO Cluster Average Salary	Total Unadjusted Base	BLS Factor <sup>(3)</sup>	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base	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)
		A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1) * 55,992	E	F = D+E	G	H = F * G	I1	I2	J1	J2
4	Alameda	632	101	733	\$40,986,144	211,950	41,198,094	1.42	58,336,899	39.0%	\$11,227	37.1%	\$11,343
1	Alpine	2	1	3	\$111,984	113,772	225,756	0.77	173,949	19.0%	\$20,445	18.6%	\$20,445
1	Amador	21	4	25	\$1,343,808	113,772	1,457,580	0.97	1,413,997	31.7%	\$8,743	31.4%	\$10,702
2	Butte	120	22	142	\$7,894,872	157,013	8,051,885	0.91	7,317,854	28.3%	\$11,576	28.3%	\$10,867
1	Calaveras	23	5	28	\$1,511,784	113,772	1,625,556	0.86	1,397,978	26.4%	\$10,420	26.1%	\$10,446
1	Colusa	15	3	18	\$951,864	113,772	1,065,636	0.70	751,234	46.7%	\$14,702	43.8%	\$14,702
3	Contra Costa	383	60	443	\$24,748,464	182,361	24,930,825	1.26	31,459,570	51.8%	\$13,375	51.7%	\$14,461
1	Del Norte	27	5	32	\$1,735,752	113,772	1,849,524	0.79	1,452,115	29.4%	\$23,203	28.4%	\$24,547
2	El Dorado	83	14	97	\$5,375,232	157,013	5,532,245	0.99	5,450,073	26.4%	\$16,310	26.9%	\$18,430
3	Fresno	480	75	555	\$31,019,568	182,361	31,201,929	1.01	31,579,093	67.6%	\$8,000	67.3%	\$7,818
1	Glenn	21	5	26	\$1,399,800	113,772	1,513,572	0.68	1,035,629	34.0%	\$10,763	37.9%	\$9,732
2	Humboldt	80	13	93	\$5,151,264	157,013	5,308,277	0.76	4,029,098	29.8%	\$6,871	29.5%	\$8,776
2	Imperial	127	23	150	\$8,342,808	157,013	8,499,821	0.76	6,420,977	33.7%	\$5,615	34.5%	\$6,816
1	Inyo	18	4	22	\$1,175,832	113,772	1,289,604	0.83	1,073,654	30.5%	\$13,352	28.7%	\$13,914
3	Kern	469	78	547	\$30,571,632	182,361	30,753,993	1.05	32,320,300	56.6%	\$15,979	56.4%	\$15,979
2	Kings	92	16	108	\$5,991,144	157,013	6,148,157	0.87	5,356,583	23.0%	\$7,709	25.4%	\$8,981
2	Lake	40	7	47	\$2,575,632	157,013	2,732,645	0.75	2,059,827	33.8%	\$6,635	32.8%	\$6,795
1	Lassen	27	6	33	\$1,791,744	113,772	1,905,516	0.79	1,505,532	27.6%	\$9,791	26.9%	\$8,991
4	Los Angeles	4,990	770	5,760	\$322,457,928	211,950	322,669,878	1.33	427,644,216	28.1%	\$16,702	36.7%	\$14,264
2	Madera	91	16	107	\$5,935,152	157,013	6,092,165	0.92	5,624,373	28.3%	\$11,579	28.2%	\$11,574
2	Marin	101	18	119	\$6,607,056	157,013	6,764,069	1.30	8,800,523	28.6%	\$10,161	29.1%	\$10,161
1	Mariposa	12	3	15	\$783,888	113,772	897,660	0.75	672,734	38.7%	\$9,022	37.7%	\$14,510
2	Mendocino	63	11	74	\$4,087,416	157,013	4,244,429	0.87	3,684,624	43.6%	\$9,077	45.7%	\$6,135
2	Merced	159	27	186	\$10,358,520	157,013	10,515,533	0.92	9,667,781	53.6%	\$13,000	54.2%	\$12,941
1	Modoc	7	2	9	\$447,936	113,772	561,708	0.62	345,464	29.5%	\$12,056	29.1%	\$12,056
1	Mono	11	3	14	\$727,896	113,772	841,668	1.19	998,520	36.3%	\$17,663	37.7%	\$19,632
3	Monterey	194	31	225	\$12,542,208	182,361	12,724,569	1.19	15,118,334	27.2%	\$11,792	26.6%	\$14,520
2	Napa	69	12	81	\$4,479,360	157,013	4,636,373	1.23	5,696,428	19.2%	\$15,847	18.8%	\$17,226
2	Nevada	50	9	59	\$3,247,536	157,013	3,404,549	0.96	3,277,505	40.5%	\$10,448	40.9%	\$10,594
4	Orange	1,289	204	1,493	\$83,540,064	211,950	83,752,014	1.30	108,943,556	33.8%	\$9,935	33.9%	\$10,509
2	Placer	166	28	194	\$10,806,456	157,013	10,963,469	1.14	12,485,457	28.8%	\$18,610	28.4%	\$18,611
1	Plumas	13	3	16	\$839,880	113,772	953,652	0.71	676,241	25.1%	\$14,824	26.8%	\$17,766
4	Riverside	1,067	165	1,232	\$68,926,152	211,950	69,138,102	1.07	73,920,999	32.4%	\$7,681	33.4%	\$8,809
4	Sacramento	746	112	858	\$47,985,144	211,950	48,197,094	1.28	61,609,127	38.4%	\$14,589	38.1%	\$15,110
1	San Benito	28	6	34	\$1,847,736	113,772	1,961,508	0.98	1,923,623	29.5%	\$13,373	29.1%	\$15,632
4	San Bernardino	1,243	184	1,427	\$79,844,592	211,950	80,056,542	1.05	84,075,966	33.0%	\$7,909	36.0%	\$9,559
4	San Diego	1,277	192	1,469	\$82,196,256	211,950	82,408,206	1.18	97,495,408	54.3%	\$6,322	53.7%	\$6,907
4	San Francisco	387	57	444	\$24,804,456	211,950	25,016,406	1.62	40,548,366	31.2%	\$19,697	30.3%	\$20,365
3	San Joaquin	370	57	427	\$23,852,592	182,361	24,034,953	1.12	26,812,190	37.6%	\$13,271	39.5%	\$7,839
2	San Luis Obispo	140	23	163	\$9,070,704	157,013	9,227,717	1.08	9,991,359	43.0%	\$9,158	46.8%	\$8,817
3	San Mateo	282	46	328	\$18,309,384	182,361	18,491,745	1.45	26,861,672	40.8%	\$13,643	41.4%	\$12,342
3	Santa Barbara	206	35	241	\$13,438,080	182,361	13,620,441	1.14	15,495,670	38.4%	\$6,933	38.8%	\$7,432
4	Santa Clara	602	90	692	\$38,690,472	211,950	38,902,422	1.47	57,204,985	37.7%	\$20,694	37.6%	\$21,909
2	Santa Cruz	117	22	139	\$7,726,896	157,013	7,883,909	1.17	9,257,088	21.9%	\$14,276	21.9%	\$14,987
2	Shasta	128	29	157	\$8,734,752	157,013	8,891,765	0.85	7,524,770	29.2%	\$7,474	31.8%	\$9,835

**Table 3E - Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Model**

		RAS II Model FTE Need <sup>(1)</sup>			Establish Unadjusted Base Dollars			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 12-13 Schedule 7A)			
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	Unadjusted Base <sup>(2)</sup>	CEO Cluster Average Salary	Total Unadjusted Base	BLS Factor <sup>(3)</sup>	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base	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)
		A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1) * 55,992	E	F = D+E	G	H = F * G	I1	I2	J1	J2
1	Sierra	3	1	4	\$167,976	113,772	281,748	0.73	206,029	39.5%	\$14,054	39.9%	\$14,054
2	Siskiyou	33	6	39	\$2,127,696	157,013	2,284,709	0.71	1,613,778	28.0%	\$13,442	26.7%	\$14,082
3	Solano	233	36	269	\$15,005,856	182,361	15,188,217	1.24	18,891,403	34.4%	\$9,752	35.5%	\$9,555
3	Sonoma	231	38	269	\$15,005,856	182,361	15,188,217	1.22	18,502,836	46.3%	\$17,295	47.2%	\$18,019
3	Stanislaus	288	44	332	\$18,533,352	182,361	18,715,713	1.02	19,082,850	32.2%	\$15,733	31.6%	\$15,824
2	Sutter	58	11	69	\$3,807,456	157,013	3,964,469	0.95	3,749,358	39.0%	\$11,388	39.7%	\$15,336
2	Tehama	48	8	56	\$3,079,560	157,013	3,236,573	0.81	2,607,797	23.5%	\$14,865	21.9%	\$14,652
1	Trinity	12	4	16	\$839,880	113,772	953,652	1.00	957,934	33.6%	\$14,034	33.7%	\$12,943
3	Tulare	221	37	258	\$14,389,944	182,361	14,572,305	0.81	11,836,377	20.8%	\$19,587	21.0%	\$22,145
2	Tuolumne	35	6	41	\$2,239,680	157,013	2,396,693	0.91	2,177,455	34.3%	\$12,051	34.5%	\$12,069
3	Ventura	354	64	418	\$23,348,664	182,361	23,531,025	1.22	28,704,103	35.3%	\$8,829	37.2%	\$10,785
2	Yolo	98	18	116	\$6,439,080	157,013	6,596,093	1.01	6,648,844	36.0%	\$11,629	40.6%	\$25,191
2	Yuba	45	8	53	\$2,911,584	157,013	3,068,597	0.92	2,811,742	17.6%	\$9,221	17.0%	\$12,657
Statewide		18,127	2,878	21,005			1,182,121,172		1,427,281,849				

NOTES:

(1) Estimated need based on 3-year average filings data from FY 08-09 through FY10-11.

\$55,992

(2) Unadjusted base funding per RAS FTE, based on FY 12-13 Schedule 7A ; does not include collections staff, SJOs, CEO, security, nor vacant positions.

(3) Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Labor adjustment based on Quarterly Census of Wages & Employment, 2011. Salaries of Local Government used for comparison based on Public Administration (North American Industrial Classification System, 92) unless proportion of state government workers in total employment exceeds 50% in which case average of local and state salaries for Public Administration is used for comparison.

**Table 3E - Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Model**

	Projected Benefits Expenses (Salary-driven benefits based on Adjusted Base)			OE&E (Based on Cluster Average OE&E / FTE) (Cluster 1: \$27,928; Clusters 2-4 \$20,287)	Remove AB 1058 staff/FLF costs (Using FY 10-11 data from CFCC)	Total WAFM Funding Need	Proportion of Total WAFM Estimated Funding Need	Proportion of WAFM funding need for FY 13-14	Historic Trial Court Funding to be Compared to Workload- Driven Trial Court Funding Need			
	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)					Trial Court Funding to be Compared to Total WAFM Funding Need (Excludes all non-RAS Resources)	Proportion of Trial Court Funding to be Compared to Workload-Driven Trial Court Funding Need	Proportions for FY 13-14 allocation	
	$(A * 55,992 * G * I) + (A * I^2)$	$1 * 55,992 + E * G * I + (B * I^2)$	$M$ $= (K + L)$	$N$ $= C * OE\&E$	$O$	$P$ $= (H + M + N) - O$	$Q$ $= P / \text{Statewide}$	$Q1$	$R$	$S$ $= R / \text{Statewide}$	$S1$	
4	Alameda	26,638,949	4,202,330	30,841,279	14,870,567	1,423,006	102,625,738	3.95%	3.99%	69,586,867	4.83%	4.91%
1	Alpine	57,312	36,762	94,074	83,784	38,723	313,085	0.01%		552,142	0.04%	
1	Amador	545,425	128,765	674,190	698,201	127,617	2,658,772	0.10%		2,080,491	0.14%	
2	Butte	3,114,476	581,338	3,695,815	2,880,792	353,331	13,541,129	0.52%	0.53%	7,287,810	0.51%	0.51%
1	Calaveras	531,547	127,938	659,484	781,985	113,042	2,726,406	0.10%		1,950,892	0.14%	
1	Colusa	497,230	113,814	611,044	502,705	74,587	1,790,396	0.07%		1,368,302	0.09%	
3	Contra Costa	19,138,638	3,140,325	22,278,963	8,987,259	1,266,996	61,458,796	2.36%	2.39%	32,906,460	2.28%	2.32%
1	Del Norte	975,464	198,072	1,173,536	893,698	91,900	3,427,449	0.13%		2,202,321	0.15%	
2	El Dorado	2,562,249	492,838	3,055,087	1,967,865	90,353	10,382,673	0.40%	0.40%	5,880,901	0.41%	0.41%
3	Fresno	22,225,268	3,534,945	25,760,214	11,259,433	1,953,433	66,645,307	2.56%	2.59%	34,456,224	2.39%	2.43%
1	Glenn	499,233	136,303	635,537	726,129	260,080	2,137,215	0.08%		1,811,707	0.13%	
2	Humboldt	1,564,296	299,767	1,864,064	1,886,716	215,566	7,564,312	0.29%	0.29%	5,005,941	0.35%	0.35%
2	Imperial	2,525,874	518,928	3,044,803	3,043,090	261,411	12,247,459	0.47%	0.48%	6,294,286	0.44%	0.44%
1	Inyo	496,527	123,045	619,572	614,417	132,572	2,175,071	0.08%		1,722,461	0.12%	
3	Kern	23,107,176	3,911,049	27,018,225	11,097,135	1,239,606	69,196,054	2.66%	2.69%	28,781,786	2.00%	2.03%
2	Kings	1,741,296	364,051	2,105,347	2,191,025	300,000	9,352,955	0.36%	0.36%	4,765,510	0.33%	0.34%
2	Lake	835,293	169,347	1,004,640	953,502	135,588	3,882,381	0.15%	0.15%	2,903,720	0.20%	0.20%
1	Lassen	593,694	137,558	731,252	921,626	191,413	2,966,996	0.11%		1,890,662	0.13%	
4	Los Angeles	187,216,864	32,007,870	219,224,733	116,854,657	6,875,174	756,848,432	29.11%	29.45%	392,482,162	27.25%	27.67%
2	Madera	2,383,912	444,263	2,828,174	2,170,738	266,913	10,536,371	0.40%	0.40%	5,953,244	0.41%	0.42%
2	Marin	3,127,026	602,784	3,729,809	2,414,185	202,794	14,741,723	0.57%	0.57%	13,338,797	0.93%	0.94%
1	Mariposa	303,090	107,299	410,390	418,921	76,788	1,425,256	0.05%		920,593	0.06%	
2	Mendocino	1,907,072	351,804	2,258,876	1,501,258	219,800	7,224,958	0.28%	0.28%	4,379,075	0.30%	0.31%
2	Merced	6,456,599	1,152,712	7,609,311	3,773,432	650,966	20,399,558	0.78%	0.79%	9,033,368	0.63%	0.64%
1	Modoc	155,487	54,462	209,949	251,352	71,198	735,568	0.03%		890,668	0.06%	
1	Mono	459,705	159,974	619,679	390,993	52,152	1,957,040	0.08%		1,232,348	0.09%	
3	Monterey	5,804,307	1,037,798	6,842,105	4,564,635	415,302	26,109,772	1.00%	1.02%	13,009,124	0.90%	0.92%
2	Napa	2,004,794	385,027	2,389,821	1,643,269	671,935	9,057,582	0.35%	0.35%	6,088,978	0.42%	0.43%
2	Nevada	1,613,552	333,656	1,947,207	1,196,949	125,677	6,295,984	0.24%	0.24%	3,817,225	0.26%	0.27%
4	Orange	44,548,221	7,248,065	51,796,286	30,288,890	2,335,502	188,693,229	7.26%	7.34%	122,983,490	8.54%	8.67%
2	Placer	6,132,611	1,060,989	7,193,599	3,935,730	363,353	23,251,433	0.89%	0.90%	11,114,142	0.77%	0.78%
1	Plumas	322,377	96,262	418,639	446,849	100,856	1,440,873	0.06%		1,441,037	0.10%	
4	Riverside	28,899,305	4,805,258	33,704,563	24,993,913	1,401,236	131,218,239	5.05%	5.11%	57,140,417	3.97%	4.03%
4	Sacramento	31,368,181	4,825,899	36,194,080	17,406,475	1,470,734	113,738,948	4.38%	4.43%	61,567,979	4.27%	4.34%
1	San Benito	828,645	206,115	1,034,760	949,554	213,688	3,694,249	0.14%		2,496,024	0.17%	
4	San Bernardino	33,986,990	5,707,581	39,694,571	28,949,930	2,088,309	150,632,158	5.79%	5.86%	61,335,147	4.26%	4.32%
4	San Diego	54,017,665	8,253,992	62,271,657	29,801,995	2,302,775	187,266,285	7.20%	7.29%	122,736,644	8.52%	8.65%
4	San Francisco	18,568,198	2,803,100	21,371,298	9,007,547	1,355,984	69,571,227	2.68%	2.71%	52,988,157	3.68%	3.74%
3	San Joaquin	13,597,901	1,908,568	15,506,469	8,662,663	618,427	50,362,896	1.94%	1.96%	23,639,320	1.64%	1.67%
2	San Luis Obispo	4,928,758	905,830	5,834,588	3,306,825	399,000	18,733,772	0.72%	0.73%	10,604,942	0.74%	0.75%
3	San Mateo	13,198,675	2,190,764	15,389,440	6,654,224	671,296	48,234,039	1.86%	1.88%	29,770,060	2.07%	2.10%
3	Santa Barbara	6,464,953	1,181,127	7,646,080	4,889,231	506,118	27,524,863	1.06%	1.07%	18,365,326	1.27%	1.29%
4	Santa Clara	31,161,456	4,845,432	36,006,887	14,038,789	1,679,649	105,571,012	4.06%	4.11%	74,267,457	5.16%	5.24%
2	Santa Cruz	3,351,664	672,492	4,024,157	2,819,930	194,782	15,906,393	0.61%	0.62%	9,910,386	0.69%	0.70%
2	Shasta	2,724,781	749,520	3,474,300	3,185,101	185,683	13,998,489	0.54%	0.54%	7,409,092	0.51%	0.52%

**Table 3E - Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Model**

		Projected Benefits Expenses (Salary-driven benefits based on Adjusted Base)			OE&E (Based on Cluster Average OE&E / FTE) (Cluster 1: \$27,928; Clusters 2-4 \$20,287)	Remove AB 1058 staff/FLF costs (Using FY 10-11 data from CFCC)	Total WAFM Funding Need	Proportion of Total WAFM Estimated Funding Need	Proportion of WAFM funding need for FY 13-14	Historic Trial Court Funding to be Compared to Workload- Driven Trial Court Funding Need		
		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)					Trial Court Funding to be Compared to Total WAFM Funding Need (Excludes all non-RAS Resources)	Proportion of Trial Court Funding to be Compared to Workload-Driven Trial Court Funding Need	Proportions for FY 13-14 allocation
		$K = 1 * 55,992 * G * 11 + (A * 12)$	$L = (((B - 1) * 55,992) + E) * G * 11 + (B * 12)$	$M = (K + L)$	$N = C * OE\&E$	$O$	$P = (H + M + N) - O$	$Q = P / \text{Statewide}$	$Q1$	$R$	$S = R / \text{Statewide}$	$S1$
1	Sierra	90,635	47,220	137,855	111,712	125,677	<b>329,919</b>	0.01%		542,215	0.04%	
2	Siskiyou	809,585	166,947	976,532	791,203	342,735	<b>3,038,779</b>	0.12%	0.12%	3,254,627	0.23%	0.23%
3	Solano	7,847,086	1,289,209	9,136,295	5,457,275	619,065	<b>32,865,908</b>	1.26%	1.28%	15,704,185	1.09%	1.11%
3	Sonoma	11,290,544	1,981,183	13,271,727	5,457,275	646,368	<b>36,585,471</b>	1.41%	1.42%	18,845,883	1.31%	1.33%
3	Stanislaus	9,827,558	1,530,435	11,357,993	6,735,373	804,613	<b>36,371,603</b>	1.40%	1.42%	15,497,803	1.08%	1.09%
2	Sutter	1,858,020	437,742	2,295,761	1,399,821	259,121	<b>7,185,820</b>	0.28%	0.28%	3,403,045	0.24%	0.24%
2	Tehama	1,222,869	214,027	1,436,896	1,136,087	84,151	<b>5,096,629</b>	0.20%	0.20%	2,907,298	0.20%	0.20%
1	Trinity	395,391	147,169	542,559	446,849	66,076	<b>1,881,266</b>	0.07%		990,359	0.07%	
3	Tulare	6,418,358	1,193,623	7,611,981	5,234,115	465,001	<b>24,217,472</b>	0.93%	0.94%	12,293,011	0.85%	0.87%
2	Tuolumne	1,032,730	209,419	1,242,148	831,778	259,688	<b>3,991,693</b>	0.15%	0.16%	2,589,803	0.18%	0.18%
3	Ventura	11,652,021	2,374,948	14,026,969	8,480,078	751,311	<b>50,459,838</b>	1.94%	1.96%	24,366,827	1.69%	1.72%
2	Yolo	3,131,332	906,861	4,038,193	2,353,323	213,933	<b>12,826,427</b>	0.49%	0.50%	6,504,149	0.45%	0.46%
2	Yuba	820,350	186,693	1,007,043	1,075,225	209,223	<b>4,684,787</b>	0.18%	0.18%	3,225,076	0.22%	0.23%

Statewide 782,580,509 428,388,072 38,632,274 **2,599,618,155** 100% FY 13-14 Funding Need 1,440,487,965 100% FY 13-14 Funding  
2,569,958,594 FY 13-14 Funding Need for 1,418,395,745 FY 13-14 Funding for all b

NOTES:  
\$55,992

	OE&E / FTE	
Weighted	\$27,928	Cluster 1
Mean	\$20,287	Clusters 2-4

**Table 3F - Allocation Adjustment Based on 90/10 Computation and No New Monies**

Cluster	Court	Court's Share of Current Base vs. WAFM					90/10 Allocation with No New Money	
		Baseline Operations Funding (Historical Funding Less \$261 Million)	Baseline Funding (Comparable to WAFM) Proportions - All Courts	Baseline Funding (Comparable to WAFM) Proportions - Excluding Cluster 1 Courts	WAFM Funding Proportions - All Courts	WAFM Funding Proportions - Excluding Cluster 1 Courts	Operations Funding (90% Old Model; 10% New Model) *	Allocation Adjustment to Base
		A	B	C	D	E	F1	F2 = F1 - A
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.83%	4.91%	3.95%	3.99%	68,292,237	(1,294,630)
1	Alpine	552,142	0.04%		0.01%		552,142	-
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.14%		0.10%		2,080,491	-
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.51%	0.51%	0.52%	0.53%	7,306,383	18,573
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.14%		0.10%		1,950,892	-
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.09%		0.07%		1,368,302	-
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.28%	2.32%	2.36%	2.39%	33,007,810	101,350
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.15%		0.13%		2,202,321	-
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.41%	0.41%	0.40%	0.40%	5,865,845	(15,056)
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.39%	2.43%	2.56%	2.59%	34,688,848	232,624
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.13%		0.08%		1,811,707	-
2	Humboldt	5,005,941	0.35%	0.35%	0.29%	0.29%	4,922,832	(83,109)
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.44%	0.44%	0.47%	0.48%	6,340,811	46,526
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.12%		0.08%		1,722,461	-
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.00%	2.03%	2.66%	2.69%	29,722,633	940,847
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.33%	0.34%	0.36%	0.36%	4,805,161	39,652
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.20%	0.20%	0.15%	0.15%	2,827,622	(76,098)
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.13%		0.11%		1,890,662	-
4	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.25%	27.67%	29.11%	29.45%	395,005,459	2,523,297
2	Madera	5,953,244	0.41%	0.42%	0.40%	0.40%	5,929,502	(23,742)
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.93%	0.94%	0.57%	0.57%	12,818,534	(520,264)
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.06%		0.05%		920,593	-
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.30%	0.31%	0.28%	0.28%	4,339,923	(39,152)
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.63%	0.64%	0.78%	0.79%	9,255,911	222,543
1	Modoc	890,668	0.06%		0.03%		890,668	-
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.09%		0.08%		1,232,348	-
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.90%	0.92%	1.00%	1.02%	13,149,246	140,122
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.42%	0.43%	0.35%	0.35%	5,979,980	(108,997)
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.26%	0.27%	0.24%	0.24%	3,782,987	(34,238)
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.54%	8.67%	7.26%	7.34%	121,099,382	(1,884,108)
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.77%	0.78%	0.89%	0.90%	11,286,007	171,865
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.10%		0.06%		1,441,037	-
4	Riverside	57,140,417	3.97%	4.03%	5.05%	5.11%	58,668,491	1,528,075
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.27%	4.34%	4.38%	4.43%	61,688,592	120,612
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.17%		0.14%		2,496,024	-
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.26%	4.32%	5.79%	5.86%	63,515,230	2,180,083
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.52%	8.65%	7.20%	7.29%	120,798,465	(1,938,179)



**Table 3F - Allocation Adjustment Based on 90/10 Computation and No New Monies**

Cluster	Court	Court's Share of Current Base vs. WAFM					90/10 Allocation with No New Money	
		Baseline Operations Funding (Historical Funding Less \$261 Million)	Baseline Funding (Comparable to WAFM) Proportions - All Courts	Baseline Funding (Comparable to WAFM) Proportions - Excluding Cluster 1 Courts	WAFM Funding Proportions - All Courts	WAFM Funding Proportions - Excluding Cluster 1 Courts	Operations Funding (90% Old Model; 10% New Model) *	Allocation Adjustment to Base
		A	B	C	D	E	F1	F2 = F1 - A
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.68%	3.74%	2.68%	2.71%	51,529,074	(1,459,083)
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.64%	1.67%	1.94%	1.96%	24,054,986	415,666
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.74%	0.75%	0.72%	0.73%	10,578,390	(26,551)
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.07%	2.10%	1.86%	1.88%	29,455,158	(314,903)
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.27%	1.29%	1.06%	1.07%	18,047,928	(317,397)
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.16%	5.24%	4.06%	4.11%	72,667,322	(1,600,135)
2	Santa Cruz	9,910,386	0.69%	0.70%	0.61%	0.62%	9,797,243	(113,143)
2	Shasta	7,409,092	0.51%	0.52%	0.54%	0.54%	7,440,779	31,687
1	Sierra	542,215	0.04%		0.01%		542,215	-
2	Siskiyou	3,254,627	0.23%	0.23%	0.12%	0.12%	3,096,879	(157,748)
3	Solano	15,704,185	1.09%	1.11%	1.26%	1.28%	15,947,682	243,496
3	Sonoma	18,845,883	1.31%	1.33%	1.41%	1.42%	18,980,497	134,615
3	Stanislaus	15,497,803	1.08%	1.09%	1.40%	1.42%	15,955,422	457,619
2	Sutter	3,403,045	0.24%	0.24%	0.28%	0.28%	3,459,336	56,291
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	2,897,858	(9,440)
1	Trinity	990,359	0.07%		0.07%		990,359	-
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.85%	0.87%	0.93%	0.94%	12,400,306	107,295
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.18%	0.18%	0.15%	0.16%	2,551,129	(38,673)
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.69%	1.72%	1.94%	1.96%	24,715,092	348,266
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.45%	0.46%	0.49%	0.50%	6,561,642	57,493
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.22%	0.23%	0.18%	0.18%	3,161,128	(63,948)
	Statewide	<b>1,440,487,965</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,440,487,965</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 3G - Allocation Adjustment Related to \$60 Million in New Money

Cluster	Court	Court's Share of Current Base vs. WAFM					Option 1 - Exempt Cluster 1 Courts from Reallocation of "Old" Money				Option 2 - Do Not Exempt Cluster 1 Courts from Reallocation of "Old" Money				Variance
		Baseline Operations Funding (Historical Funding Less \$261 Million)	Baseline Funding (Comparable to WAFM) Proportions - All Courts	Baseline Funding (Comparable to WAFM) Proportions - Excluding Cluster 1 Courts	WAFM Funding Proportions - All Courts	WAFM Funding Proportions - Excluding Cluster 1 Courts	Share of \$60M of New Money Allocated According to WAFM	New Share of \$60M of "Old" Money Allocated According to WAFM*	Original Share of \$60 Million of "Old" Money To Be Redistributed*	Total Adjustment Due to \$60 Million in New Money	Share of \$60M of New Money Allocated According to WAFM	New Share of \$60M of "Old" Money Allocated According to WAFM*	Original Share of \$60 Million of "Old" Money To Be Redistributed*	Total Adjustment Due to \$60 Million in New Money	
		A	B	C	D	E	F = \$60M*D	G = \$60M*E	H = -\$60M*C	I=F+G+H	J = \$60M*D	K = \$60M*D	L = -\$60M*B	M=J+K+L	
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.83%	4.91%	3.95%	3.99%	2,368,634	2,395,970	(2,943,616)	1,820,989	2,368,634	2,368,634	(2,898,471)	1,838,798	(17,809)
1	Alpine	552,142	0.04%		0.01%		7,226	-	-	7,226	7,226	7,226	(22,998)	(8,546)	15,772
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.14%		0.10%		61,365	-	-	61,365	61,365	61,365	(86,658)	36,073	25,292
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.51%	0.51%	0.52%	0.53%	312,533	316,140	(308,284)	320,390	312,533	312,533	(303,556)	321,511	(1,121)
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.14%		0.10%		62,926	-	-	62,926	62,926	62,926	(81,260)	44,593	18,333
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.09%		0.07%		41,323	-	-	41,323	41,323	41,323	(56,993)	25,653	15,670
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.28%	2.32%	2.36%	2.39%	1,418,488	1,434,859	(1,391,986)	1,461,361	1,418,488	1,418,488	(1,370,638)	1,466,338	(4,978)
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.15%		0.13%		79,107	-	-	79,107	79,107	79,107	(91,732)	66,481	12,626
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.41%	0.41%	0.40%	0.40%	239,635	242,401	(248,770)	233,266	239,635	239,635	(244,955)	234,316	(1,050)
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.39%	2.43%	2.56%	2.59%	1,538,195	1,555,947	(1,457,543)	1,636,598	1,538,195	1,538,195	(1,435,190)	1,641,199	(4,602)
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.13%		0.08%		49,328	-	-	49,328	49,328	49,328	(75,462)	23,193	26,135
2	Humboldt	5,005,941	0.35%	0.35%	0.29%	0.29%	174,587	176,602	(211,758)	139,430	174,587	174,587	(208,510)	140,663	(1,233)
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.44%	0.44%	0.47%	0.48%	282,675	285,937	(266,257)	302,356	282,675	282,675	(262,173)	303,177	(821)
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.12%		0.08%		50,201	-	-	50,201	50,201	50,201	(71,745)	28,658	21,544
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.00%	2.03%	2.66%	2.69%	1,597,067	1,615,498	(1,217,507)	1,995,057	1,597,067	1,597,067	(1,198,835)	1,995,298	(241)
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.33%	0.34%	0.36%	0.36%	215,869	218,360	(201,587)	232,642	215,869	215,869	(198,496)	233,243	(600)
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.20%	0.20%	0.15%	0.15%	89,607	90,641	(122,831)	57,416	89,607	89,607	(120,947)	58,266	(850)
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.13%		0.11%		68,479	-	-	68,479	68,479	68,479	(78,751)	58,207	10,272
4	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.25%	27.67%	29.11%	29.45%	17,468,299	17,669,898	(16,602,510)	18,535,686	17,468,299	17,468,299	(16,347,884)	18,588,713	(53,027)
2	Madera	5,953,244	0.41%	0.42%	0.40%	0.40%	239,028	241,787	(251,830)	228,985	239,028	239,028	(247,968)	230,089	(1,104)
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.93%	0.94%	0.93%	0.94%	340,244	344,170	(564,249)	120,165	340,244	340,244	(555,595)	124,892	(4,727)
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.06%		0.05%		32,895	-	-	32,895	32,895	32,895	(38,345)	27,446	5,450
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.30%	0.31%	0.28%	0.28%	166,754	168,679	(185,241)	150,192	166,754	166,754	(182,400)	151,109	(916)
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.63%	0.64%	0.78%	0.79%	470,828	476,262	(382,123)	564,967	470,828	470,828	(376,263)	565,393	(427)
1	Modoc	890,668	0.06%		0.03%		16,977	-	-	16,977	16,977	16,977	(37,099)	(3,144)	20,121
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.09%		0.08%		45,169	-	-	45,169	45,169	45,169	(51,330)	39,008	6,161
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.90%	0.92%	1.00%	1.02%	602,622	609,576	(550,303)	661,895	602,622	602,622	(541,863)	663,380	(1,485)
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.42%	0.43%	0.35%	0.35%	209,052	211,464	(257,572)	162,945	209,052	209,052	(253,621)	164,482	(1,538)
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.26%	0.27%	0.24%	0.24%	145,313	146,990	(161,474)	130,830	145,313	145,313	(158,997)	131,629	(799)
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.54%	8.67%	7.26%	7.34%	4,355,099	4,405,360	(5,202,363)	3,558,096	4,355,099	4,355,099	(5,122,576)	3,587,621	(29,525)
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.77%	0.78%	0.89%	0.90%	536,650	542,844	(470,143)	609,351	536,650	536,650	(462,932)	610,368	(1,017)
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.10%		0.06%		33,256	-	-	33,256	33,256	33,256	(60,023)	6,489	26,767
4	Riverside	57,140,417	3.97%	4.03%	5.05%	5.11%	3,028,558	3,063,510	(2,417,115)	3,674,954	3,028,558	3,028,558	(2,380,044)	3,677,072	(2,118)
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.27%	4.34%	4.38%	4.43%	2,625,130	2,655,427	(2,604,406)	2,676,151	2,625,130	2,625,130	(2,564,463)	2,685,798	(9,647)
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.17%		0.14%		85,264	-	-	85,264	85,264	85,264	(103,966)	66,563	18,701
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.26%	4.32%	5.79%	5.86%	3,476,637	3,516,761	(2,594,557)	4,398,841	3,476,637	3,476,637	(2,554,765)	4,398,509	332
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.52%	8.65%	7.20%	7.29%	4,322,164	4,372,046	(5,191,921)	3,502,289	4,322,164	4,322,164	(5,112,294)	3,532,034	(29,745)
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.68%	3.74%	2.68%	2.71%	1,605,726	1,624,257	(2,241,469)	988,514	1,605,726	1,605,726	(2,207,092)	1,004,359	(15,845)
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.64%	1.67%	1.96%	1.96%	1,162,391	1,175,806	(999,974)	1,338,224	1,162,391	1,162,391	(984,638)	1,340,145	(1,921)
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.74%	0.75%	0.72%	0.73%	432,381	437,371	(448,603)	421,150	432,381	432,381	(441,723)	423,040	(1,890)
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.07%	2.10%	1.86%	1.88%	1,113,257	1,126,105	(1,259,313)	980,049	1,113,257	1,113,257	(1,239,999)	986,514	(6,466)
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.27%	1.29%	1.06%	1.07%	635,282	642,614	(776,877)	501,019	635,282	635,282	(764,963)	505,602	(4,583)
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.16%	5.24%	4.06%	4.11%	2,436,612	2,464,733	(3,141,611)	1,759,734	2,436,612	2,436,612	(3,093,429)	1,779,795	(20,061)
2	Santa Cruz	9,910,386	0.69%	0.70%	0.62%	0.61%	367,125	371,361	(419,222)	319,264	367,125	367,125	(412,793)	321,456	(2,193)
2	Shasta	7,409,092	0.51%	0.52%	0.54%	0.54%	323,090	326,818	(313,414)	336,493	323,090	323,090	(308,608)	337,571	(1,078)
1	Sierra	542,215	0.04%		0.01%		7,615	-	-	7,615	7,615	7,615	(22,585)	(7,355)	14,970
2	Siskiyou	3,254,627	0.23%	0.23%	0.12%	0.12%	70,136	70,945	(137,675)	3,406	70,136	70,136	(135,564)	4,708	(1,302)
3	Solano	15,704,185	1.09%	1.11%	1.26%	1.28%	758,555	767,310	(664,308)	861,558	758,555	758,555	(654,119)	862,991	(1,434)
3	Sonoma	18,845,883	1.31%	1.33%	1.41%	1.42%	844,404	854,149	(797,206)	901,348	844,404	844,404	(784,979)	903,829	(2,481)
3	Stanislaus	15,497,803	1.08%	1.09%	1.40%	1.42%	839,468	849,156	(655,577)	1,033,047	839,468	839,468	(645,523)	1,033,413	(366)
2	Sutter	3,403,045	0.24%	0.24%	0.28%	0.28%	165,851	167,765	(143,953)	189,663	165,851	165,851	(141,746)	189,956	(294)
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	0.20%	117,632	118,989	(122,983)	113,639	117,632	117,632	(121,096)	114,167	(529)

**Table 3G - Allocation Adjustment Related to \$60 Million in New Money**

Cluster	Court	Court's Share of Current Base vs. WAFM					Option 1 - Exempt Cluster 1 Courts from Reallocation of "Old" Money				Option 2 - Do Not Exempt Cluster 1 Courts from Reallocation of "Old" Money				Variance
		Baseline Operations Funding (Historical Funding Less \$261 Million)	Baseline Funding (Comparable to WAFM) Proportions - All Courts	Baseline Funding (Comparable to WAFM) Proportions - Excluding Cluster 1 Courts	WAFM Funding Proportions - All Courts	WAFM Funding Proportions - Excluding Cluster 1 Courts	Share of \$60M of New Money Allocated According to WAFM	New Share of \$60M of "Old" Money Allocated According to WAFM*	Original Share of \$60 Million of "Old" Money To Be Redistributed*	Total Adjustment Due to \$60 Million in New Money	Share of \$60M of New Money Allocated According to WAFM	New Share of \$60M of "Old" Money Allocated According to WAFM*	Original Share of \$60 Million of "Old" Money To Be Redistributed*	Total Adjustment Due to \$60 Million in New Money	
		A	B	C	D	E	F = \$60M*D	G = \$60M*E	H = -\$60M*C	I=F+G+H	J = \$60M*D	K = \$60M*D	L = -\$60M*B	M=J+K+L	
1	Trinity	990,359	0.07%		0.07%		43,420	-	-	43,420	43,420	43,420	(41,251)	45,589	(2,169)
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.85%	0.87%	0.93%	0.94%	558,947	565,398	(520,011)	604,334	558,947	558,947	(512,035)	605,858	(1,524)
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.18%	0.18%	0.15%	0.16%	92,130	93,193	(109,552)	75,770	92,130	92,130	(107,872)	76,387	(617)
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.69%	1.72%	1.94%	1.96%	1,164,629	1,178,070	(1,030,749)	1,311,950	1,164,629	1,164,629	(1,014,941)	1,314,317	(2,367)
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.45%	0.46%	0.49%	0.50%	296,038	299,454	(275,134)	320,358	296,038	296,038	(270,914)	321,161	(803)
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.22%	0.23%	0.18%	0.18%	108,126	109,374	(136,425)	81,076	108,126	108,126	(134,333)	81,920	(844)
	Statewide	1,440,487,965	100%	100%	100%	100%	60,000,000	60,000,000	(60,000,000)	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	(60,000,000)	60,000,000	(0)

(Funding Available in FY 13-14; cluster 1 court)

\*Note Cluster 1 courts exempted from 10/90 split and the reallocation of matching funds for any new money in FY 13-14. Not exempted from new money.

**Action Item 4**  
**Allocation of 2% Reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund**

**Issue**

Should the methodology for allocating each court's contribution towards the statutorily required 2% reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) in 2013–2014 be the same as that used in 2012–2013 (see Table 4A)?

**Background**

The 2% reserve amount in 2013–2014 is \$35.2 million, which is 2% of the 2013–2014 TCTF Program 45.10 appropriation of \$1,758,927,000. In 2012–2013, the amount was \$27.8 million. In 2012–2013 the Trial Court Budget Working Group recommended and the council approved using each court's share of the base allocations for court operations (both from the TCTF and the General Fund) less the 2011–2012 allocation for non-sheriff security to allocate each court's contribution towards the required 2% reserve in 2012–2013. The main rationale for excluding security allocations from the holdback computation is that it treats the 39 courts with non-sheriff security costs the same as the 19 courts where sheriffs provide 100 percent of court security and thus have zero security allocation in their base allocation.

Although Government Code section 68502.5 prescribes unambiguously how the total 2% reserve or set-aside amount is to be computed, it does not prescribe how each court's share should be computed. As such, the council has discretion in how to allocate each court's share of the holdback.

GC section 68502.5(c)(2)(B) reads as follows:

Upon preliminary determination of the allocations to trial courts pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Judicial Council shall set aside 2 percent of the total funds appropriated in Program 45.10 of Item 0250-101-0932 of the annual Budget Act and these funds shall remain in the Trial Court Trust Fund. These funds shall be administered by the Judicial Council and be allocated to trial courts for unforeseen emergencies, unanticipated expenses for existing programs, or unavoidable funding shortfalls. Unavoidable funding shortfall requests for up to 1.5 percent of these funds shall be submitted by the trial courts to the Judicial Council no later than October 1 of each year. The Judicial Council shall, by October 31 of each year, review and evaluate all requests submitted, select trial courts to receive funds, and notify those selected trial courts. By March 15 of each year, the Judicial Council shall distribute the remaining funds if there has been a request from a trial court for unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses that has been reviewed, evaluated, and approved. Any unexpended funds shall be distributed to the trial courts on a prorated basis.

## FY 2013-2014 Allocation of 2% Holdback

	Ending 2012-2013 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	Annualization of New Screening Station Funding	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (12-13) <sup>2</sup>	\$261 Million Reduction	WAFM 90/10 Adjustment to Base	\$60 Million New Funding Adjustment	Total	2011-2012 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation <sup>1</sup>	Adjusted Base	% of Total Adjusted Base	Recommended Pro-Rata Share of 2% Holdback
Court	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	A9	B	C (A9-B)	D	E
Alameda	82,797,354	(280,818)		3,102,046	1,117,440	(12,666,297)	(1,294,630)	1,838,428	74,613,523	3,177,924	71,435,599	4.6%	(1,622,761)
Alpine	615,729	-		20,340	7,957	(94,049)	-	(8,547)	541,430	-	541,430	0.0%	(12,299)
Amador	2,366,091	-		51,756	1,611	(353,320)	-	36,063	2,102,201	-	2,102,201	0.1%	(47,754)
Butte	9,017,311	-		124,076	95,367	(1,280,650)	18,573	321,462	8,296,140	467,145	7,828,995	0.5%	(177,847)
Calaveras	2,147,857	-		50,506	59,318	(329,695)	-	53,956	1,981,941	-	1,981,941	0.1%	(45,023)
Colusa	1,547,989	-		24,773	11,356	(231,333)	-	25,646	1,378,431	-	1,378,431	0.1%	(31,313)
Contra Costa	37,809,243	-		1,396,191	887,134	(5,854,827)	101,350	1,466,117	35,805,208	-	35,805,208	2.3%	(813,366)
Del Norte	2,554,514	-		94,129	62,921	(395,977)	-	66,469	2,382,055	-	2,382,055	0.2%	(54,112)
El Dorado	6,636,067	-		213,119	21,412	(1,003,332)	(15,056)	234,279	6,086,489	-	6,086,489	0.4%	(138,263)
Fresno	36,976,272	-		3,340,364	876,146	(6,015,494)	232,624	1,640,959	37,050,872	-	37,050,872	2.4%	(841,663)
Glenn	2,021,838	-		54,665	31,067	(307,774)	-	23,185	1,822,981	9,779	1,813,202	0.1%	(41,189)
Humboldt	6,001,052	-		73,084	83,444	(899,208)	(83,109)	140,636	5,315,898	167,800	5,148,098	0.3%	(116,946)
Imperial	7,569,524	-	44,091	125,538	230,012	(1,163,759)	46,526	303,133	7,155,065	420,479	6,734,586	0.4%	(152,986)
Inyo	2,117,611	-		75,586	54,537	(328,243)	-	28,650	1,948,142	186,658	1,761,484	0.1%	(40,015)
Kern	31,195,006	-		3,544,269	629,057	(5,164,934)	940,847	1,995,049	33,139,295	65,567	33,073,728	2.1%	(751,317)
Kings	6,145,453	-		45,117	6,952	(905,041)	39,652	233,209	5,565,342	421,918	5,143,424	0.3%	(116,840)
Lake	3,657,433	-		9,123	(449)	(535,372)	(76,098)	58,252	3,112,889	196,493	2,916,396	0.2%	(66,250)
Lassen	2,516,565	-		7,839	6,630	(369,614)	-	58,197	2,219,617	293,836	1,925,781	0.1%	(43,747)
Los Angeles	475,480,138	(213,400)		18,887,969	7,790,986	(73,300,493)	2,523,297	18,585,985	449,754,481	14,294,467	435,460,014	28.1%	(9,892,094)
Madera	6,818,752	-		384,825	137,838	(1,072,087)	(23,742)	230,051	6,475,638	381,406	6,094,232	0.4%	(138,439)
Marin	15,039,941	(97,145)		644,512	324,291	(2,323,614)	(520,264)	124,839	13,192,560	9,625	13,182,935	0.9%	(299,469)
Mariposa	1,076,161	-		22,300	6,416	(161,348)	-	27,441	970,969	-	970,969	0.1%	(22,057)
Mendocino	4,877,913	-		311,770	239,862	(792,891)	(39,152)	151,083	4,748,585	299,349	4,449,236	0.3%	(101,071)
Merced	9,819,677	(95,552)		774,827	269,194	(1,572,501)	222,543	565,320	9,983,507	-	9,983,507	0.6%	(226,790)
Modoc	1,076,671	-		31,967	1,273	(162,083)	-	(3,147)	944,681	789	943,892	0.1%	(21,442)
Mono	1,346,961	-		85,641	32,349	(213,931)	-	39,001	1,290,021	24,156	1,265,865	0.1%	(28,756)
Monterey	15,857,765	-		277,496	227,572	(2,389,509)	140,122	663,286	14,776,732	870,000	13,906,732	0.9%	(315,911)
Napa	7,344,709	-		309,796	107,676	(1,133,532)	(108,997)	164,450	6,684,100	295,552	6,388,548	0.4%	(145,125)
Nevada	5,048,233	-		95,494	100,179	(765,782)	(34,238)	131,607	4,575,493	433,431	4,142,062	0.3%	(94,093)
Orange	138,844,789	-		6,929,920	3,671,441	(21,824,027)	(1,884,108)	3,586,941	129,324,955	2,733,776	126,591,179	8.2%	(2,875,699)
Placer	13,085,520	-		634,796	238,459	(2,038,438)	171,865	610,284	12,702,486	-	12,702,486	0.8%	(288,555)
Plumas	1,659,324	-		14,929	273	(244,536)	-	6,484	1,436,474	-	1,436,474	0.1%	(32,632)
Riverside	70,306,201	(223,977)		923,657	685,149	(10,469,236)	1,528,075	3,676,599	66,426,467	1,931,520	64,494,947	4.2%	(1,465,094)
Sacramento	70,647,290	(190,573)		3,560,591	1,673,778	(11,053,375)	120,612	2,685,387	67,443,711	1,864,424	65,579,287	4.2%	(1,489,727)
San Benito	2,856,231	-		34,642	8,678	(423,429)	-	66,550	2,542,671	-	2,542,671	0.2%	(57,760)
San Bernardino	75,985,239	-		1,264,732	1,011,776	(11,428,776)	2,180,083	4,397,966	73,411,021	3,269,446	70,141,575	4.5%	(1,593,366)
San Diego	142,312,011	-		2,853,598	3,506,215	(21,710,950)	(1,938,179)	3,531,359	128,554,054	657,192	127,896,862	8.3%	(2,905,359)
San Francisco	59,097,392	-		5,487,134	-	(9,431,454)	(1,459,083)	1,004,109	54,698,097	-	54,698,097	3.5%	(1,242,545)
San Joaquin	26,578,282	-		1,245,356	756,034	(4,173,567)	415,666	1,339,963	26,161,735	287,747	25,873,988	1.7%	(587,764)
San Luis Obispo	12,959,466	-		298,958	36,773	(1,941,534)	(26,551)	422,972	11,750,083	241,676	11,508,407	0.7%	(261,430)
San Mateo	34,027,500	-		2,411,112	211,070	(5,352,053)	(314,903)	986,341	31,969,068	443,042	31,526,026	2.0%	(716,159)
Santa Barbara	21,302,406	-	140,395	1,597,662	(21,451)	(3,361,529)	(317,397)	505,503	19,845,588	1,055,112	18,790,476	1.2%	(426,852)
Santa Clara	84,872,848	-		2,309,467	1,120,423	(12,895,089)	(1,600,135)	1,779,414	75,586,928	-	75,586,928	4.9%	(1,717,065)
Santa Cruz	11,552,123	-		203,557	174,422	(1,742,185)	(113,143)	321,399	10,396,173	-	10,396,173	0.7%	(236,164)
Shasta	11,152,721	-		262,222	(38,857)	(1,312,311)	31,687	337,521	10,432,983	2,389,668	8,043,315	0.5%	(182,715)

## FY 2013-2014 Allocation of 2% Holdback

	Ending 2012-2013 TCTF Program 45.10 Base Allocation	Annualization of Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Position	Annualization of New Screening Station Funding	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (10-11 and 11-12)	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (12-13) <sup>2</sup>	\$261 Million Reduction	WAFM 90/10 Adjustment to Base	\$60 Million New Funding Adjustment	Total	2011-2012 Non-Sheriff Security Allocation <sup>1</sup>	Adjusted Base	% of Total Adjusted Base	Recommended Pro-Rata Share of 2% Holdback
Court	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	A9	B	C (A9-B)	D	E
Sierra	613,583	-		9,615	9,268	(92,361)	-	(7,357)	532,749	-	532,749	0.0%	(12,102)
Siskiyou	3,733,650	-		91,037	60,127	(567,310)	(157,748)	4,697	3,164,453	-	3,164,453	0.2%	(71,885)
Solano	18,538,187	-		353,779	417,276	(2,819,781)	243,496	862,873	17,595,830	435,400	17,160,430	1.1%	(389,824)
Sonoma	21,168,908	-		1,172,049	584,741	(3,347,902)	134,615	903,697	20,616,108	440,000	20,176,108	1.3%	(458,329)
Stanislaus	16,160,857	-		1,305,230	1,003,375	(2,697,146)	457,619	1,033,282	17,263,216	9,326	17,253,890	1.1%	(391,947)
Sutter	4,036,090	-		159,760	24,759	(616,347)	56,291	189,931	3,850,483	247,071	3,603,412	0.2%	(81,857)
Tehama	3,246,020	-		108,184	17,294	(492,349)	(9,440)	114,149	2,983,858	-	2,983,858	0.2%	(67,783)
Trinity	1,529,277	-		53,679	16,561	(167,778)	-	45,583	1,477,322	450,608	1,026,714	0.1%	(23,323)
Tulare	14,741,608	-		33,744	127,031	(2,176,236)	107,295	605,771	13,439,214	15,576	13,423,638	0.9%	(304,937)
Tuolumne	3,248,790	-		50,351	2,616	(482,165)	(38,673)	76,373	2,857,293	220,516	2,636,777	0.2%	(59,898)
Ventura	29,449,865	-		968,752	416,492	(4,502,935)	348,266	1,314,135	27,994,576	1,559,157	26,435,419	1.7%	(600,518)
Yolo	8,336,100	-		210,076	206,373	(1,278,158)	57,493	321,115	7,852,999	582,889	7,270,110	0.5%	(165,151)
Yuba	3,748,696	-		90,867	66,104	(570,355)	(63,948)	81,903	3,353,268	132,569	3,220,699	0.2%	(73,163)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,693,270,804</b>	<b>(1,101,465)</b>	<b>184,486</b>	<b>68,818,575</b>	<b>29,405,750</b>	<b>(261,000,000)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>60,000,000</b>	<b>1,589,578,150</b>	<b>40,983,089</b>	<b>1,548,595,061</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>(35,178,540)</b>

1. Butte's sheriff allocation was not transferred to the court's sheriff, so it remains in the court's TCTF base allocation.

2. TCTF resources in 2013-2014 might not be sufficient to distribute the entire allocation.

**Information Item 1**  
**Full Year Cost in FY 2013-2014 of FY 2012-2013 Trial Court**  
**Benefit Cost Changes**

	A	B	C
<b>Court</b>	<b>Total Full-Year Benefit Cost Changes for all Employees</b>	<b>Full-Year Benefit Cost Changes for Interpreters*</b>	<b>Full Year Benefit Cost Changes for Non-Interpreter Employees</b>
Alameda	1,154,820	37,380	1,117,440
Alpine	7,957	-	7,957
Amador	1,611	-	1,611
Butte	95,367	-	95,367
Calaveras	59,318	-	59,318
Colusa	11,356	-	11,356
Contra Costa	906,487	19,353	887,134
Del Norte	62,921	-	62,921
El Dorado	21,599	187	21,412
Fresno	913,343	37,197	876,146
Glenn	31,067	-	31,067
Humboldt	83,444	-	83,444
Imperial	245,548	15,537	230,012
Inyo	54,537	-	54,537
Kern	655,924	26,867	629,057
Kings	6,952	-	6,952
Lake	(449)	-	(449)
Lassen	6,630	-	6,630
Los Angeles	8,211,381	420,395	7,790,986
Madera	143,691	5,853	137,838
Marin	335,809	11,518	324,291
Mariposa	6,416	-	6,416
Mendocino	243,718	3,856	239,862
Merced	282,141	12,947	269,194
Modoc	1,273	-	1,273
Mono	32,349	-	32,349
Monterey	230,741	3,169	227,572
Napa	113,273	5,597	107,676
Nevada	100,179	-	100,179
Orange	3,758,953	87,512	3,671,441
Placer	239,339	880	238,459
Plumas	273	-	273
Riverside	712,376	27,227	685,149
Sacramento	1,742,153	68,375	1,673,778
San Benito	8,678	-	8,678
San Bernardino	1,067,819	56,043	1,011,776
San Diego	3,657,873	151,658	3,506,215
San Francisco	-	-	-
San Joaquin	773,882	17,848	756,034
San Luis Obispo	37,688	915	36,773
San Mateo	219,412	8,342	211,070
Santa Barbara	(21,748)	(297)	(21,451)
Santa Clara	1,152,849	32,426	1,120,423
Santa Cruz	180,934	6,512	174,422
Shasta	(38,857)	-	(38,857)
Sierra	9,268	-	9,268
Siskiyou	60,127	-	60,127
Solano	422,948	5,672	417,276
Sonoma	609,658	24,917	584,741
Stanislaus	1,016,106	12,732	1,003,375
Sutter	25,362	602	24,759
Tehama	17,294	-	17,294
Trinity	16,561	-	16,561
Tulare	132,354	5,323	127,031
Tuolumne	2,616	-	2,616
Ventura	425,174	8,681	416,492
Yolo	210,391	4,018	206,373
Yuba	66,104	-	66,104
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 30,524,991</b>	<b>\$ 1,119,241</b>	<b>\$ 29,405,750</b>