



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Materials for January 14, 2016 Meeting
Table of Contents**

Draft Minutes from November 24, 2015 Meeting.....	1
<u>Action and Discussion Items</u>	
Item 1 – Governor’s Budget Proposal for 2016–2017 (Discussion Item)	
Attachment 1A – 2016–2017 Judicial Branch Budget Memo	3
Attachment 1B – Governor’s Budget Proposal Judicial Branch Detail.....	10
Item 3 – Recommendations of the Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Allocation	
Methodology Joint Subcommittee (Action Item)	41
Item 4 – Recommendations of the AB 1058 Allocation Joint Subcommittee (Action Item)	
Attachment 4A – Report of the Joint Subcommittee to the Judicial Council.....	46
Attachment 4B – Revised Report to the AB 1058 Allocation Joint Subcommittee	55
Item 5 – Update from the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (Discussion Item).....	82
Item 6 – TCBAC Annual Agenda (Discussion Item).....	83



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

November 24, 2015
12:19 p.m. to 12:45 p.m.
Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Hon. James E. Herman, Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Hon. Lesley D. Holland, Hon. Ira Kaufman, Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, Hon. Cynthia Ming-mei Lee, Hon. Paul M. Marigonda, Hon. Brian McCabe, Hon. Glenda Sanders, and Hon. Winifred Younge Smith.

Executive Officers: Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, Ms. Tammy L. Grimm, Mr. José Octavio Guillén, Mr. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Jeffrey E. Lewis, Mr. Michael D. Planet, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Ms. Mary Beth Todd, and Mr. David H. Yamasaki.

Judicial Council staff advisory members: Jody Patel and Zlatko Theodorovic.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Judges: Hon. Mark Ashton Cope and Hon. Barry P. Goode.
Executive Officers: Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Mr. Brian Taylor, Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco, and Ms. Christina M. Volkers.

Others Present: Judicial Council staff: Steven Chang, Lucy Fogarty, and Millicent Tidwell.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 12:19 pm and roll was taken.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the August 5 and October 12, 2015 meetings.

Public Comment

None.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

**Item 1 - Proposed Change to the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 30.15 (Trial Court Operations)
State Operations Appropriation and New Special Display Related to State Trial Court Funding Not
Distributed to the Trial Courts (Action Item)**

The TCBAC unanimously supported the following recommendations:

1. Have the Judicial Council of California (JCC) continue to use (i) state operations appropriations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund and the Trial Court Trust Fund for JCC staff costs (including operating expenses and overhead) related to providing services to trial courts and (ii) local assistance appropriations related to state trial court funding from all funds for (a) direct distributions to court, (b) direct distributions to non-trial-court local entities, and (c) expenses made on behalf of the courts by JCC staff.
2. Consistent with Recommendation 1, have the JCC request that the Department of Finance change the Trial Court Trust Fund Program 30.15 (Trial Court Operations and Fi\$CAL program code 0140019) state operations appropriation reference item 001 to a new state trial court funding Fi\$CAL program code schedule, with the label to be determined by the DOF (possibly "Expenses on Behalf of Trial Courts), and a local assistance appropriation, with the reference item to be determined by the DOF.
3. Have JCC Finance staff request that the Governor include a new special display in the Governor's Proposed Budget starting with the Governor's Proposed Budget for 2016–2017 that provides additional detail on state trial court funding not distributed to trial courts, as provided in Attachment G of the joint working group's report.
4. Have JCC Finance staff revise the special display in the Governor's Proposed Budget for 2015–2016 so that its relationship to the proposed new additional special display is clear or at least clearer to the public, as provided in Attachment F of the joint working group's report.
5. Have the JCC post additional information on the California Courts website that further elaborates on state trial court funding that is not distributed to courts.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on _____, 2015.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
 455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
 Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
January 7, 2016	For Your Information
To	Deadline
Judicial Officers and Employees of the California Judicial Branch	N/A
From	Contact
Martin Hoshino Administrative Director	Zlatko Theodorovic, Finance Director 916-263-1397 phone zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
2016–2017 Judicial Branch Budget	Cory Jasperson, Governmental Affairs Director 916-323-3121 phone cory.jasperson@jud.ca.gov

The Governor's proposed 2016–2017 budget released today provides \$3,968.3 million for the judicial branch and includes \$146.3 million in new funding. The proposed new funding would be allocated for innovation grants, language access expansion in civil proceedings, workload associated with Proposition 47 implementation, Trial Court Trust Fund revenue shortfall backfill, and court construction projects.

The Administration has included a proposal to eliminate the existing withholding of the two percent state-level reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund, and instead provide \$10 million in new funding to be held at the state level for urgent needs for the trial courts. Elimination of the two percent set-aside would allow for the direct allocation of approximately \$35 million to the trial courts in their initial operating budgets at the beginning of the new fiscal year. This welcome change in process will facilitate more effective expenditure planning for each court relative to their individual needs.

The Administration proposes to reallocate up to five vacant superior court judgeships and the staffing and security complements to implement the proposal and efficiently enhance access to justice. The Judicial Council will work collaboratively with the Administration to better understand the reallocation and potential impacts to trial court operations.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 7, 2016
Page 2

The \$3,968.3 million budget proposal for the judicial branch includes \$1,702 million in General Fund monies, representing 1.4 percent of all General Fund spending. The judicial branch represents 2.1 percent of total state funds of \$170.7 billion. Approximately 77 percent of the branch's operational budget is allocated to the trial courts.

Governor's Budget Summary

The Governor's Budget Summary statement with respect to the judicial branch budget is attached. The Administration recognizes and encourages courts to expand and develop new ways to deliver service and is committed to working with the Judicial Council on improving access and modernizing court operations through innovative approaches.

A breakdown of the proposed 2016–2017 budget for all judicial branch entities is provided below:

Judicial Branch Entity	Proposed Total Funding Level
Supreme Court	\$46.4 m
Courts of Appeal	\$224.8 m
Trial Courts	\$2,804.7 m
Judicial Council	\$133.2 m
Judicial Branch Facility Program	\$409.9 m
Habeas Corpus Resource Center	\$15.0 m
Subtotal, Operational Budget	\$3,634.0 m
Offset from Local Property Tax Revenue	-\$30.0 m
Adjusted Operational Budget	\$3,604.0 m
Less Non-State Funds ¹	-\$95.3m
Adjusted Operational Budget, State Funds	\$3,508.8m
Court Construction Projects	\$364.3 m
Total Funding²	\$3,968.3 m

¹ Nonstate funds include federal funds and reimbursements.

² Includes General Fund; special, bond, federal, and nongovernmental cost funds; and reimbursements.

Note: Some totals will not be exact due to rounding.

Specifics on the proposals that provide the foundation for budget discussions with the Legislature and the Administration over the next several months are outlined below.

Trial Courts

The Governor's Proposal includes \$91.4 million in new funding from the General Fund to support trial court operations for a total of \$2,804.7 million. The breakdown is as follows:

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 7, 2016
Page 3

Employee Costs: \$15.6 million for retirement and health benefit costs for trial court employees.

Judicial Compensation Adjustments: \$8.3 million for previously approved judicial officer salary and benefit cost increases. Judicial salaries are set by the Governor and Legislature in statute (Gov. Code, § 68200 et seq.) and are directly tied to state employee salaries. The increase reflects the average salary increase for the current fiscal year for California state employees as explained in Government Code section 68203(a).

Revenue Backfill: An additional \$8.8 million to address anticipated revenue shortfalls in the Trial Court Trust Fund due to lower filing fee and criminal assessment revenues. With this augmentation, up to \$75 million is available in revenue backfill. Because this amount backfills a corresponding loss in other revenue sources, this action does not increase the total amount of funding appropriated for trial court operations.

Proposition 47 Implementation Costs: \$21.4 million to address increased trial court workload associated with voter approval of Proposition 47 (the Safe Neighborhoods and Schools Act), which reduced many possessory drug offenses and low-value property thefts to misdemeanors. This second year of proposed new funding is \$13.8 million more than originally estimated for 2016–2017. It will allow trial courts to manage the significant workload resulting from the passage of Proposition 47 without impacting other mandated court operations.

Language Access: \$7 million to support implementation of a key element of the Judicial Council-approved Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts by expanding interpreter access into all civil proceedings. This investment will improve access to justice for the seven million limited-English-proficient Californians and promote efficiency for the courts. Expansion of interpreter access to all civil proceedings supports the intent of new state law under Government Code section 68092.1 and Evidence Code section 756.

Court Operations: \$20 million to help meet existing court workload obligations and ongoing baseline cost increases. The additional funding will provide flexibility to address the critical funding needs of each court, including reducing backlogs and restoring clerk operating hours.

Statewide Emergency Funding: \$10 million to be administered by the Judicial Council to fund trial court emergencies in the fiscal year. Providing this funding will eliminate the statutorily required contribution by each court to a two percent state reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund at the beginning of the fiscal year, resulting in more funding being provided to trial courts in their initial allocations. Additional statutory changes are required to implement the new process.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 7, 2016
Page 4

Deferred Maintenance: \$60 million, one-time General Fund for deferred maintenance in the courts as prioritized by the Judicial Council. These funds are contained in a separate budget item and not reflected in the proposed expenditures for the branch.

Court Security for Courts with Marshals: The budget proposes \$343,000 for cost increases related to court security services provide by marshals in the Superior Courts of Shasta and Trinity Counties. The funds are necessary to address increased costs for court-provided (nonsheriff) security to maintain funding at 2010–2011 security levels. Trial courts have not received any funding specifically for increased costs for marshals since the 2011 Public Safety Realignment.

The Governor’s Budget also includes proposals for statutory changes related to the allocation of vacant judgeships and to jury trials:

Judgeships: The Administration proposes to work with the Judicial Council to develop a statutory framework that would authorize the Judicial Council to reallocate up to five existing vacant judgeships to areas with the greatest need.

Peremptory Challenges: The Administration also proposes to reduce the number of peremptory challenges in misdemeanor jury trials from ten to six in an effort to achieve further efficiencies in trial court operations.

Statewide Programs

The Governor’s Proposal includes \$41.9 million in General Fund monies to support programs administered by the Judicial Council.

Court Innovations Grant Program: \$30 million in one-time funding to develop and implement a competitive grant program to fund trial and appellate court programs and practices that promote efficiencies, including the development of new programs or practices and the adoption of existing best practices. Following enactment of the 2015 State Budget last June, the Chief Justice and the Judicial Council signaled a commitment to the expansion of local court innovations and efficiencies to enhance modernization efforts for courts statewide. The Governor’s approach in designating specific funds for this purpose will benefit individual courts and facilitate statewide replication or development of local innovation.

Centralized Support of the Phoenix Financial System: \$8.7 million to support state operations costs of core services to all 58 superior courts previously funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 7, 2016
Page 5

Information System Control Enhancements: \$3.2 million to strengthen judicial branch information technology security controls and enhance data reliability. System improvements will provide for risk assessments, contingency planning, and safeguarding of data in accordance with industry standards to minimize risk for compromise and data loss. These efforts are consistent with the Judicial Branch Strategic Plan for Technology and guiding technology principles adopted by the Judicial Council. It also helps address findings and recommendations of the recent California State Auditor report.

Judicial Entities at the State Level

The Governor's proposal includes the following for state level entities:

Courts of Appeal Court Appointed Counsel Program: \$4.3 million General Fund to increase the hourly rate for the statewide Court of Appeal panel attorney program for indigent defendants by \$10.

Employee Costs: \$7 million General Fund to support retirement and health benefit cost adjustments for employees of the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, Judicial Council, and Habeas Corpus Resource Center, consistent with all other state employees. The budget also proposes a 2.5 percent cost-of-living adjustment for these same entities, consistent with the increases already provided to all other state employees in previous years.

Rent Costs: \$1.7 million is provided for rent increases in buildings occupied by these same entities.

Improved Budget Displays on Trial Court and Judicial Council Expenditures

Consistent with recommendations of the California State Auditor (CSA), the Governor's Budget includes an update to an existing Governor's Budget special display that will further clarify Local Assistance expenditures for the trial courts to more clearly identify which expenditures are made directly by trial courts, and which expenditures are made by the Judicial Council on behalf of trial courts or other entities.

The proposal also includes a new display that provides 2014–2015 and 2015–2016 expenditure and position detail for each office within the Judicial Council. This display provides greater transparency regarding the council's budget and also addresses a CSA recommendation.

Other Judicial Branch Budget Proposals

Several other judicial branch proposals including modification of the one percent fund balance policy for trial court fund balances and additional support for judicial branch technology needs were not addressed in the Governor's initial budget. We will continue to work with the Administration and the Legislature to address these important issues.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 7, 2016
Page 6

Judicial Branch Construction Program

The Governor's proposal for the Facility Construction Program, which appears as a separate line item in the State Budget, includes funding from various branch construction funds for seven projects that are either in acquisition, preliminary plans, working drawings, or construction phase (see below).

Court Facility Construction Projects

1. Imperial New El Centro Courthouse	\$39,277,000	Construction
2. Mendocino (Reappropriation) New Ukiah Courthouse	\$6,068,000	Working Drawings
3. Riverside New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse	\$44,074,000	Construction
4. Riverside New Mid-County Civil Courthouse	\$5,666,000	Working Drawings
5. Shasta New Redding Courthouse	\$135,204,000	Construction
6. Stanislaus (Reappropriation) New Modesto Courthouse	\$15,252,000	Working Drawings
7. Tuolumne New Sonora Courthouse	\$55,455,000	Construction
Carryover funding available for expenditure in 2016–2017 Various Projects	\$63,301,000	Various Project Phases

Significant State Budget Proposals

Recession Planning: The Budget assumes the continued expansion of the economy but cautions that another recession is inevitable. While Capital Gains are at an all-time high, under Proposition 2, these spikes will be used to save money for the next recession and pay down the state's debt and liabilities. One of the primary fiscal goals of the state is to increase the Rainy Day Fund by \$2 billion, which will bring the total balance to \$8 billion by the end of the year.

Strengthening California's Infrastructure: The construction and maintenance of key physical infrastructure is one of the core functions of state government. Despite investment of tens of billions of dollars over the past decade, the state's infrastructure demands continue to grow and deferred maintenance is estimated at \$77 billion. The Budget includes \$807 million (\$500 million General Fund) for critical deferred maintenance at levees, state parks, universities, community colleges, prisons, state hospitals, and other state facilities. Importantly, \$60 million is provided to the judicial branch for deferred maintenance projects.

Judicial Officers and Employees of the
California Judicial Branch
January 7, 2016
Page 7

Climate Change: The Budget provides \$3.1 billion Cap and Trade expenditures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through programs that support clean transportation, reduce short-lived climate pollutants, protect natural ecosystems, and benefit disadvantaged communities.

Next Steps

The Governor's proposal for the 2016–2017 fiscal year that begins on July 1, 2016, marks the next stage in the ongoing budget development cycle for the state. Next steps include continued discussions with the Administration, legislative hearings, meetings with legislators and their respective staff, updated state revenue numbers in April, a May Revision to the Governor's proposed budget, and then an intensive period of legislative activity to pass a balanced budget by the June 15 deadline.

This initial budget provides new funding for our courts and signals continued progress on several important issues for improving judicial branch operations.

After three years of experience with the two percent state set-aside from the Trial Court Trust Fund and the associated challenges for courts with the distribution of remaining reserve funds late in the fiscal year, this proposed change to no longer require this reserve and instead add \$10 million in new funding represents a positive development for trial courts.

The Department of Finance sought and was provided with information by the branch on the array of efficiency measures instituted by courts in response to the budget reductions of the past several years. Input from the trial court presiding judges and court executives under the leadership of Presiding Judge Brian McCabe and Court Executive Officer Rick Feldstein was especially helpful in demonstrating the resourcefulness of our judicial system. The Governor's approach in designating specific funds for court innovations will support further local initiatives and facilitate replication or adaptation for other courts.

While the judicial branch, like many areas of state government, has responded to budget cuts with innovations and efficiencies, difficult decisions still needed to be made that have curtailed the delivery of vital public services. The Chief Justice and the Judicial Council, with the support of trial and appellate court leaders, the bar, and other justice system stakeholders, will continue to advocate with the Governor and the Legislature on behalf of the public for sufficient, stable funding for branch operations, in addition to advancing solutions for the delivery of equal and timely access to justice for all Californians.

The Governor's proposed 2016–2017 budget may be reviewed at: www.ebudget.ca.gov.

Attachment

JUDICIAL BRANCH

The Judicial Branch consists of the Supreme Court, courts of appeal, trial courts, and the Judicial Council. The trial courts are funded with a combination of funding from the General Fund, county maintenance-of-effort requirements, fines, fees, and other charges. Other levels of the Judicial Branch receive most of their funding from the General Fund. The Budget includes total funding of \$3.8 billion (\$1.8 billion General Fund and \$2 billion other funds) in 2016-17 for the Judicial Branch, of which \$2.8 billion is provided to support trial court operations. The Judicial Council is responsible for managing the resources of the Judicial Branch.

In 1998, California voters passed a constitutional amendment that provided for voluntary unification of the superior and municipal courts in each county into a single, countywide trial court system. By 2001, all 58 counties had voted to unify their municipal and superior court operations. This was the culmination of over a decade of preparation and work to improve court coordination and uniform access to justice. The Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 consolidated the costs of operating California's trial courts at the state level. The Act was based on the premise that state funding of court operations was necessary to provide more uniform standards and procedures, economies of scale, structural efficiency and access for the public. The Act created a state-funded trial court system and capped county contributions, having the state assume responsibility for growth in the costs of court operations. Prior to state funding, many small courts were in financial crisis and needed emergency state funding to keep their doors open.

Judicial Branch

The Budget contains the following proposals to support efforts by the Judicial Council to improve court operations and increase access.

IMPROVING CALIFORNIA'S COURT SYSTEM

In planning for future court demands, the Chief Justice has created the Commission on the Future of California's Court System. The Commission expects to release initial recommendations in the summer of 2016 on initiatives to effectively and efficiently enhance access to justice. The Administration is committed to working with the Judiciary on improving access and modernizing court operations through innovative approaches.

To this end, the Administration is proposing to work with the Judicial Council to reallocate up to five vacant superior court judgeships and the staffing and security complements needed to support and implement the proposal. This will shift judgeships where the workload is highest without needing to increase the overall number of judges. The Administration also proposes to reduce the current allowable number of 10 peremptory challenges per side in misdemeanor trials to 6 challenges per side. Six challenges per side is the current average, and additional challenges unnecessarily add delays to proceedings.

The Administration is working collaboratively with the Judicial Council to develop and administer a competitive grant program to encourage courts to develop new ways of doing business. The projects funded by the grants must have measurable results or benefits that have a demonstrated impact on the court and the public it serves. The Budget includes \$30 million General Fund on a one-time basis to fund these grants.

Many courts have demonstrated the capacity to adapt and innovate, resulting in programs and practices that save money and better serve the public. Successful examples of these improvements include: Fresno Superior Court's remote video proceedings for traffic violations, Imperial Superior Court's Binational Justice Project, Contra Costa Superior Court's efforts related to online probable cause determinations, and San Bernardino Superior Court's automated payment processing. Additional innovative programs could include a self-scheduling system for traffic courts, the use of kiosks for traffic court proceedings, and the development of electronic recordings in family courts.

2016-17 BUDGET

During the recession, General Fund support for the Judicial Branch was reduced like every area of state government; however, the state mitigated the impact of the reductions on the Judicial Branch through increased user fees, the redirection of various

JUDICIAL BRANCH

special funds, and the expenditure of trial court reserves. During the fiscal crisis, some trial courts were forced to reduce service hours, furlough and lay off employees, and close courtrooms, while other courts were able to fully maintain operations and even provide salary increases. The disparity in how trial courts handled the reductions highlighted the need for a comprehensive evaluation of the state's progress in achieving the goals outlined in the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997. A working group composed of Administration and Judicial Branch appointees made recommendations to better allocate existing resources. The Chief Justice and the Judicial Council, through a modification of the Workload Allocation Funding Model, have taken significant steps to promote equal access to justice by allocating funding more equitably to the trial courts.

As shown in Figure JUD-01, after making various budget adjustments, trial court funding is proposed to be 10.5 percent above 2007-08 in 2016-17.

Figure JUD-01
Judicial Branch Expenditures
(Dollars in Thousands)

Judicial Branch Expenditures by Program	2007-08 Actual	2015-16 Estimated	2016-17 Governor's Budget
Supreme Court	44,397	46,519	46,438
Courts of Appeal	200,706	219,274	224,784
Judicial Council	130,396	134,203	133,173
Habeas Corpus Resource Center	12,553	14,525	15,015
Facility Program	(49,965)	(369,788)	(409,904)
Staff and OE&E ¹	22,634	35,196	42,825
Trial Court Facility Expenses	27,331	334,592	367,079
Trial Courts	3,288,873	2,674,738	2,804,693
Total	\$3,726,890	\$3,459,047	\$3,634,007
Adjustments to Trial Courts	\$3,288,873	\$2,674,738	\$2,804,693
Trial Court Facility Expenses	\$27,331	\$334,592	\$367,079
Sub-total, Trial Courts	\$3,316,204	\$3,009,330	\$3,171,772
Trial Court Security Costs ²	-444,901		
Adjusted Total, Trial Courts	\$2,871,303	\$3,009,330	\$3,171,772

¹ Increase in Facility Program due to new construction and facility management projects.

² For comparison purposes, court security costs for 2007-08 are removed from trial court expenditure totals due to the realignment of court security costs beginning in 2011-12.

Judicial Branch

Significant Adjustments:

- Trial Court Employee Costs—The Budget includes \$15.6 million General Fund for trial court employee benefit costs, of which \$7.4 million reflects funding for trial courts that have made progress towards meeting the Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 standard for employees sharing the cost of pension funding. Recognizing that many of these costs are beyond the control of the trial courts, the Administration will continue to fund future increases related to existing health benefits and retirement costs for trial court employees and retirees.
- Trial Court Trust Fund Revenues—The Budget includes a total of \$75 million General Fund to backfill a continued reduction of fines and penalty revenues expected in 2016-17. This reflects an increase of \$8.8 million compared to the amount needed in 2015-16.
- Proposition 47—Following the passage of Proposition 47 in November 2014, the trial courts have experienced increased workload due to the requirement that courts reclassify and resentence certain drug and property crimes that involve less than \$950 from felonies to misdemeanors. The Budget includes \$21.4 million General Fund to reflect the projected resentencing hearings in 2016-17. By the end of 2016-17, the Administration expects that the courts' workload associated with Proposition 47 will be significantly reduced or eliminated.
- Court Innovations Grant Program—The Budget includes an increase of \$30 million General Fund on a one-time basis for a grant program that promotes improvement, efficiencies, and access to justice in the courts.
- Language Access—Given California's diversity, the court system is faced with significant linguistic challenges. The Judicial Council's current annual budget allocation for interpreter services is \$94.5 million. To improve language access for limited English proficient court users, the Budget includes an additional \$7 million General Fund to provide court interpreter services in civil proceedings.
- Trial Court Funding—An augmentation of \$20 million General Fund for discretionary trial court operations.
- Fund Shift for Financial System—The Budget includes \$8.7 million General Fund to fund the Phoenix Financial System, operated by Judicial Council staff, that provides the state with consistent financial information of trial court expenditures. It was previously funded from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF). The IMF is intended to pay for innovative approaches to technology to support

JUDICIAL BRANCH

the trial courts. This fund shift is part of a multi-pronged approach to help with the solvency of the IMF and preserve critical programs.

- State-Level Reserve—Currently, 2 percent of annual trial court allocations are held back until each spring, in case a court needs an emergency allocation. Any unused funds are allocated to all trial courts late in the year. The Budget proposes a new reserve policy for trial courts that avoids late allocations by providing \$10 million General Fund one-time as a reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund. If any funds from the reserve are used, they would be replenished annually out of base allocations to the trial courts.
- Deferred Maintenance—The Budget proposes \$60 million one-time General Fund for deferred maintenance in the courts as prioritized by the Judicial Council. (For more information about deferred maintenance please see the Statewide Issues Chapter.)

0250 Judicial Branch

Article VI of the Constitution creates the Supreme Court of California and the Courts of Appeal to exercise the judicial power of the state at the appellate level. Article VI also creates the Judicial Council of California to administer the state's judicial system. Chapter 869, Statutes of 1997, created the California Habeas Corpus Resource Center to represent any person financially unable to employ appellate counsel in capital cases.

The Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (Chapter 850, Statutes of 1997) provided a stable and consistent funding source for the trial courts. Beginning with fiscal year 1997-98, consolidation of the costs of operation of the trial courts was implemented at the state level, with the exception of facility, revenue collection, and local judicial benefit costs. This implementation capped the counties' general purpose revenue contributions to trial court costs at a revised 1994-95 level. The county contributions become part of the Trial Court Trust Fund, which supports all trial court operations. Fine and penalty revenue collected by each county is retained or distributed in accordance with statute. Each county makes quarterly payments to the Trial Court Trust Fund equal to the fine and penalty revenue received by the state General Fund in 1994-95, as adjusted by amounts equivalent to specified fine and fee revenues that counties benefited from in 2003-04. The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 (Chapter 1082, Statutes of 2002) provided a process for the responsibility for court facilities to be transferred from the counties to the state by July 1, 2007, which was extended to December 31, 2009, by Chapter 9, Statutes of 2008. The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 also established several new revenue sources, which went into effect on January 1, 2003. These revenues are deposited into the State Court Facilities Construction Fund for the purpose of funding the construction and maintenance of court facilities throughout the state. Counties contribute revenues for the ongoing operation and maintenance of court facilities based upon historical expenditures for facilities transferred to the state.

The mission of the Judicial Branch is to resolve disputes arising under the law and to interpret and apply the law consistently, impartially, and independently to protect the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitutions of California and the United States, in a fair, accessible, effective, and efficient manner.

Since department programs drive the need for infrastructure investment, each department has a related capital outlay program to support this need. For the specifics on the Judicial Branch's Capital Outlay Program see "Infrastructure Overview."

3-YR EXPENDITURES AND POSITIONS

	Positions			Expenditures		
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0130 Supreme Court	165.2	156.2	156.2	\$43,363	\$46,519	\$46,438
0135 Courts of Appeal	788.7	795.0	795.0	211,101	219,274	224,784
0140 Judicial Council	596.0	550.5	553.5	134,104	134,203	133,173
0145 Judicial Branch Facility Program	124.2	131.2	131.2	320,469	369,788	409,904
0150 State Trial Court Funding	-	-	-	2,537,897	2,674,738	2,804,693
0155 Habeas Corpus Resource Center	78.1	81.1	81.1	12,819	14,525	15,015
0170 Offset from Local Property Tax Revenue	-	-	-	-30,756	-30,000	-30,000
TOTALS, POSITIONS AND EXPENDITURES (All Programs)	1,752.2	1,714.0	1,717.0	\$3,228,997	\$3,429,047	\$3,604,007
FUNDING				2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0001 General Fund				\$1,404,319	\$1,597,899	\$1,702,070
0044 Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund				187	198	199
0159 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund				24,934	23,010	28,108
0327 Court Interpreters Fund				163	163	164
0587 Family Law Trust Fund				1,206	1,813	1,736
0890 Federal Trust Fund				3,994	6,660	6,656
0932 Trial Court Trust Fund				1,400,313	1,290,085	1,332,312
0942 Special Deposit Fund				15	338	-
0995 Reimbursements				74,375	85,586	88,589
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund				118,522	141,237	142,829
3060 Appellate Court Trust Fund				2,660	6,774	6,684
3066 Court Facilities Trust Fund				105,637	109,711	104,030
3085 Mental Health Services Fund				1,058	1,070	1,078
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund				90,996	148,399	188,550
3259 Recidivism Reduction Fund				1,483	14,827	-
8059 State Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund				931	1,275	1,000
9728 Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund				-1,796	2	2

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

FUNDING	<u>2014-15*</u>	<u>2015-16*</u>	<u>2016-17*</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS	\$3,228,997	\$3,429,047	\$3,604,007

LEGAL CITATIONS AND AUTHORITY

DEPARTMENT AUTHORITY

California Constitution, Article VI.

PROGRAM AUTHORITY

0150-State Trial Court Funding:

California Constitution, Article VI, Section 4.

0150037-Court Interpreters:

Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, Government Code Sections 71800-71829.

0155-Habeas Corpus Resource Center:

Government Code Sections 68660-68666.

DETAILED BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS

	2015-16*			2016-17*		
	General Fund	Other Funds	Positions	General Fund	Other Funds	Positions
Workload Budget Adjustments						
Workload Budget Change Proposals						
• Proposition 47 Workload	\$-	\$-	-	\$21,400	\$-	-
• Support to Trial Court Operations	-	-	-	20,000	-	-
• Judicial Council State Operations	-	-	-	8,700	-	-
• Language Access	-	-	-	7,000	-	-
• Appellate Court - Appointed Counsel	-	-	-	4,301	-	-
• Information System Control Enhancements	-	-	-	3,191	-	3.0
• Court Provided Non-Sheriff Security	-	-	-	343	-	-
• Trial Court Facilities Costs	-	-	-	-	3,500	-
• New Alameda Courthouse Funding Plan	-	-	-	-	377	-
Totals, Workload Budget Change Proposals	\$-	\$-	-	\$64,935	\$3,877	3.0
Other Workload Budget Adjustments						
• Court Innovations Grant Program	\$-	\$-	-	\$30,000	\$-	-
• Expenditure by Category Redistribution	20,675	7,278	-	20,675	7,278	-
• Trial Court Employee Health Benefit & Retirement Adjustment	-	-	-	15,593	-	-
• State-Level Reserve	-	-	-	10,000	-	-
• Trial Court Trust Fund Revenue Shortfall	-	-	-	8,800	-8,800	-
• Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	-	-	-	-	-	-
• Salary Adjustments	11,923	652	-	11,923	652	-
• Benefit Adjustments	1,675	356	-	2,108	456	-
• Retirement Rate Adjustments	1,329	284	-	1,329	284	-
• Pro Rata	-	-	-	-	1,178	-
• Carryover/Reappropriation	-	15,068	-	-	-	-
• SWCAP	-	-	-	-	-9	-
• Lease Revenue Debt Service Adjustment	-1,119	324	-	-1,458	35,024	-
• Budget Position Transparency	-20,675	-7,278	-248.3	-20,675	-7,278	-248.3
• Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustments	-6,321	-59,814	-	-28,353	-42,928	-

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2015-16*			2016-17*		
	General Fund	Other Funds	Positions	General Fund	Other Funds	Positions
Totals, Other Workload Budget Adjustments	\$7,487	-\$43,130	-248.3	\$49,942	-\$14,143	-248.3
Totals, Workload Budget Adjustments	\$7,487	-\$43,130	-248.3	\$114,877	-\$10,266	-245.3
Totals, Budget Adjustments	\$7,487	-\$43,130	-248.3	\$114,877	-\$10,266	-245.3

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

Trial Court Funding, Expenditures, and Positions - 2014-15 and 2015-16

State and Non-State Trial Court Funding, Expenditures, and Positions - 2014-15 and 2015-16

Section 1. Actual and Estimated Funding, Expenditures, and Positions by Trial Court	Prior-Year Actual				Current-Year Estimated			
	State Funding ¹ (Program 45 - 0150)	Non-State Funding ¹	Total Court Expenditures ¹	Filled Positions as of 7/1/2014 ²	State Funding ³ (Program 45 - 0150)	Non-State Funding ³	Total Court Expenditures ³	Filled Positions as of 7/1/2015 ²
Alameda	93,978,564	8,498,228	124,379,482	672	93,439,723	9,072,813	105,370,702	690
Alpine	108,728	31,966	596,595	3	660,332	31,293	728,050	4
Amador	2,412,363	141,969	2,457,190	27	2,538,054	146,316	2,727,914	27
Butte	11,225,764	868,961	12,290,381	109	11,973,547	863,484	13,719,821	112
Calaveras	2,540,723	172,545	2,930,043	27	2,659,419	184,774	2,997,179	25
Colusa	1,700,941	195,042	2,115,819	13	2,086,287	222,786	2,294,671	15
Contra Costa	52,493,027	5,686,455	57,986,194	315	54,288,049	4,596,546	61,460,324	324
Del Norte	2,581,496	261,471	3,497,803	27	2,916,006	329,859	3,522,914	26
El Dorado	7,929,062	479,854	8,712,886	74	8,541,821	568,537	9,352,263	75
Fresno	55,161,195	3,709,016	59,819,328	414	61,905,349	3,764,554	66,392,230	433
Glenn	2,313,121	496,160	3,093,742	23	2,309,128	658,619	3,132,900	23
Humboldt	7,876,721	309,871	8,350,936	87	8,108,989	200,554	8,272,031	88
Imperial	10,121,775	1,991,401	12,287,466	138	11,199,397	2,145,882	13,479,597	141
Inyo	2,555,954	178,778	2,927,887	15	2,498,895	183,070	2,710,865	16
Kern	50,120,552	12,818,092	66,576,447	396	54,553,115	13,918,503	70,322,023	418
Kings	8,492,336	808,122	9,196,065	81	8,613,202	852,200	9,603,227	79
Lake	3,702,079	56,159	3,738,954	30	3,894,389	56,800	4,244,383	30
Lassen	2,716,530	224,316	2,935,940	22	2,760,334	227,350	3,465,631	21
Los Angeles	648,202,601	33,672,838	662,336,806	4,220	698,911,000	32,326,000	781,513,000	4,189
Madera	9,047,669	332,204	9,209,474	96	9,373,126	339,488	10,148,118	92
Marin	14,771,536	556,144	15,144,464	114	13,658,476	479,500	13,993,449	103
Mariposa	1,334,064	173,116	1,517,852	14	1,454,227	193,692	1,617,731	14
Mendocino	5,681,902	111,711	6,565,005	56	6,347,517	437,662	6,986,575	57
Merced	14,630,814	422,127	14,692,463	123	15,588,399	480,400	17,357,747	126
Modoc	1,110,144	76,509	1,167,246	11	1,259,734	72,202	1,367,049	9
Mono	1,733,102	71,477	1,829,505	15	1,795,245	73,300	1,868,545	12
Monterey	20,173,244	606,784	20,456,034	172	21,638,220	707,523	23,217,971	178
Napa	8,607,940	722,696	9,339,765	72	8,836,276	671,950	9,861,302	67
Nevada	6,321,827	554,052	6,831,068	60	6,424,595	752,533	7,198,057	57
Orange	167,455,509	25,765,125	194,637,053	1,416	178,925,307	21,975,895	202,031,584	1,400
Placer	16,332,545	930,056	17,201,944	105	17,376,658	806,000	18,444,961	113
Plumas	1,598,829	10,554	1,594,413	11	1,510,313	9,472	1,572,979	10
Riverside	114,788,094	22,592,558	140,116,466	1,033	125,119,636	23,388,451	153,245,035	1,105
Sacramento	83,422,451	5,815,090	89,658,677	613	89,804,804	5,656,275	98,016,302	650
San Benito	3,018,992	81,346	3,190,921	26	2,970,869	70,119	3,179,653	26
San Bernardino	98,916,405	7,102,906	103,784,602	892	109,122,508	6,083,528	115,206,033	927
San Diego	156,778,220	12,760,804	168,826,039	1,262	164,382,708	12,386,973	175,384,126	1,205
San Francisco	73,987,648	5,510,602	79,242,806	437	74,702,269	4,895,369	79,973,346	462
San Joaquin	31,478,222	4,595,786	36,339,509	287	35,320,859	2,739,905	39,546,825	295
San Luis Obispo	15,387,875	1,408,955	16,358,909	131	16,032,126	1,249,678	17,697,259	131
San Mateo	39,222,696	1,407,766	41,344,136	244	40,762,599	1,645,470	45,043,245	257
Santa Barbara	25,450,634	2,643,972	29,030,657	232	25,875,261	2,691,832	30,464,408	225
Santa Clara	90,678,125	10,313,083	100,056,936	706	88,446,737	9,118,600	103,034,714	652
Santa Cruz	13,319,138	730,538	14,936,291	121	14,198,380	728,955	15,229,428	122
Shasta	13,100,909	3,159,491	16,246,218	174	14,343,662	3,150,573	17,231,776	157
Sierra	782,111	46,050	832,653	4	751,844	41,200	742,058	5
Siskiyou	4,097,942	365,894	4,646,807	38	4,071,273	366,821	4,712,818	34
Solano	21,970,955	1,348,452	23,549,874	211	23,389,627	1,387,761	24,827,296	203
Sonoma	25,813,373	2,309,872	29,267,478	167	27,776,880	2,415,350	29,567,961	169
Stanislaus	22,070,930	1,945,374	23,909,340	217	24,101,743	1,957,681	26,750,485	227
Sutter	5,460,895	564,058	5,745,945	52	5,656,127	426,800	6,947,869	54
Tehama	3,851,460	933,641	4,500,471	37	4,690,293	297,967	5,898,868	39
Trinity	1,758,386	53,785	1,859,021	15	1,864,711	43,479	1,925,762	15
Tulare	20,201,177	4,371,725	24,203,802	222	22,876,104	4,522,872	27,723,012	235
Tuolumne	3,554,307	208,032	3,746,111	35	3,714,722	190,551	3,880,832	34
Ventura	36,448,317	8,659,229	45,232,352	348	39,457,371	9,028,437	47,983,584	350
Yolo	10,842,795	1,324,893	12,552,806	99	11,324,076	1,210,770	12,569,132	101
Yuba	4,614,235	577,055	5,279,830	46	4,960,865	539,712	5,832,743	44
Subtotal, Section 1	2,156,048,946	201,764,754	2,370,874,904	16,604	2,293,763,183	193,584,686	2,573,590,363	16,695
Section 2: Funding Not Yet Allocated or Not Distributed to the Trial Courts								
Pending State Funding to the Trial Courts⁴								
Return of 2% Set-Aside Reserve ⁵	-	-	-	-	37,677,580	-	-	-
Proposition 47 Workload Funding ⁶	-	-	-	-	13,450,000	-	-	-
Subtotal, State Funding to the Trial Courts	2,156,048,946	-	-	-	2,344,890,763	-	-	-
State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts⁷								
	411,790,796	-	-	-	428,244,444	-	-	-
Less: Expenses Made on Behalf of Courts from Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding⁸								
	(37,516,593)	-	-	-	(32,440,752)	-	-	-
Other⁹	23,197,527	-	-	-	(54,066,455)	-	-	-
State Trial Court Funding Total¹⁰	2,553,520,676	-	-	-	2,686,628,000	-	-	-

¹ Reflects the 2014-15 4th quarter Quarterly Financial Statement information submitted by the superior courts. A detailed breakdown of this data can be found in the Report of Trial Court Revenue, Expenditure, and Fund Balance Constraints for Fiscal Year 2014-15. Non-state funding includes local fees and non-fee revenue, enhanced collections and other reimbursements, grants from non-state entities, etc.

² Reflects the filled full-time equivalent positions reported on the Schedule 7As submitted by the superior courts. Does not include judges, who are constitutional officers and not court employees.

³ Reflects the budgets of all 58 superior courts based on courts' 2015-16 Schedule 1 submissions as of December 8, 2015.

⁴ Reflects pending allocations from the Judicial Council. Courts may have budgeted for some of these funds in Section 1 above in anticipation of their allocation.

⁵ GC section 68502.5(c)(2)(B) requires 2 percent of the amount appropriated to FISCAL program code 0150010 (Program 45.10) in the Budget Act to be set-aside by the Judicial Council for allocation to the trial courts "for unforeseen emergencies, unanticipated expenses for existing programs, or unavoidable funding shortfalls". Any amounts unallocated by March 15 are to be returned to the courts pro rata.

⁶ Reflects half of total funding (\$26.9 million). Allocation pending updated workload metrics from the courts related to 2015-16.

⁷ See the "State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts" display for more detail. Funds either disbursed on behalf of trial courts, for statewide programs, for judges compensation, or to non-court entities, and as a result are not included in the superior courts' state funding in Section 1.

⁸ See the "State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts" display for more detail. These expenses are funded by the trial courts opting to participate in those programs from their "State Funding" revenue distribution amounts reported in Section 1 of the "State and Non-State Trial Court Funding, Expenditures, and Positions" display. Because the funding for these expenses is already included in Section 1, they are subtracted from the total "State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to Trial Courts" amount used to calculate the total expenditures displayed for "State Trial Court Funding Total".

⁹ For the prior year, primarily reflects a 2015-16 net cash advance of \$24.67 million in June 2015 that was recorded as a 2014-15 state trial court funding expense, but was recorded as a 2015-16 revenue by the trial courts in Section 1. Also recognizes that the revenues courts report individually as received or to be received from the state will not be equal to the "State Trial Court Funding" expenditure amount reported at the state level due to timing and accounting differences. For the current year, this category reflects either differences in local versus state revenue projections, pending court budgets, or unallocated appropriation.

¹⁰ Total state funding for trial courts ties to actual and accrued expenditures for 2014-15 and estimated expenditures for 2015-16 for Program 45 (0150) "State Trial Court Funding" as well as Program 30.15 (0140019) "Trial Court Operations" included in the 2016-17 Governor's Budget.

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts - 2014-15 and 2015-16

Programs by Category ¹	Fund	Prior-Year Actual		Current-Year Estimated	
		Not From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding	From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding ²	Not From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding	From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding ²
Center for Children, Families, & the Courts Programs					
Children in Dependency Cases Training	TCTF	95,423	-	113,000	-
Court-Appointed Special Advocate Program	TCTF	2,213,000	-	2,213,000	-
Direct Payments for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel ³	TCTF	69,363,002	-	75,644,056	-
Domestic Violence - Family Law Interpreter Program	IMF	21,765	-	17,000	-
Educational Programs	IMF	91,521	-	67,000	-
Equal Access Fund	TCTF	4,517,250	-	5,482,000	-
Equal Access Fund	GF	10,392,000	-	10,392,000	-
Interactive Software - Self-Rep Electronic Forms	IMF	59,706	-	60,000	-
Publications	IMF	20,000	-	20,000	-
Sargent Shriver Civil Representation Pilot Program	TCTF	8,535,237	-	7,793,153	-
Self-represented Litigants Statewide Support	IMF	100,645	-	100,000	-
Court Operations Special Services Programs					
Assigned Judges	TCTF	24,792,538	-	26,646,000	-
Database Development - Court Interpreters	TCTF	87,000	-	87,000	-
Court Interpreter - Testing, Development, Recruitment and Education	IMF	172,050	-	143,000	-
JusticeCorps	IMF	347,550	-	-	-
Trial Court Performance Measures Study	IMF	1,069	-	13,000	-
Trial Court Security Grants	IMF	1,199,427	-	-	-
Education Programs					
Distance Learning	IMF	142,348	-	138,000	-
Essential/Other Education for Court Management	IMF	30,967	-	20,000	-
Essential/Other Education for Court Personnel	IMF	80,724	-	140,000	-
Faculty and Curriculum Development	IMF	307,062	-	250,000	-
Mandated, Essential & Other Education for Judicial Officers	IMF	789,152	-	654,000	-
Facilities Management Programs					
Facility-Related Costs Incurred on Behalf of the Courts	TCTF	-	17,537,127	-	8,900,000
Finance Programs					
Budget Focused Training and Meetings	IMF	46,499	-	50,000	-
Compensation of Superior Court Judges ⁴	TCTF	209,455,409	-	220,401,184	-
Other Post Employment Benefits Valuation	TCTF	-	-	-	650,000
Human Resources Programs					
Human Resources - Court Investigation	IMF	94,500	-	-	-
Human Resources - Court Investigation	TCTF	-	-	-	94,500
Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program ⁵	TCTF	1,350,000	16,536,000	1,350,000	19,347,252
Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Program ⁵	JBWCF	(1,306,892)	-	1,000	-
Trial Court Labor Relations Academies and Forums	IMF	35,637	-	25,700	-
Information Technology Programs					
California Courts Technology Center	IMF	8,543,320	-	6,642,769	-
California Courts Technology Center	TCTF	-	1,579,775	-	1,581,000
California Courts Protective Order Registry	IMF	194,797	-	744,900	-
Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	TCTF	3,257,894	804,863	-	625,000
Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) Case Management System	IMF	-	-	4,227,790	-
CLETS Services/Integration	IMF	294,853	-	-	-
CLETS Services/Integration	TCTF	-	-	-	400,000
Criminal and Traffic (V2) Case Management System	TCTF	286,334	107,621	-	-
Data Integration	IMF	2,722,070	-	3,272,500	-
Enterprise Policy/Planning (Statewide Development)	IMF	5,024,661	-	2,832,140	-
Interim Case Management Systems	IMF	1,008,796	-	1,246,800	-
Interim Case Management Systems	TCTF	-	951,207	-	843,000
Telecommunications Support	IMF	11,701,245	-	16,159,000	-
Enterprise Test Management Suite (Testing Tools)	IMF	491,575	-	-	-
Legal Services Programs					
Judicial Performance Defense Insurance	IMF	920,794	-	966,600	-
Jury System Improvement Projects	IMF	11,423	-	19,000	-
Litigation Management Program	IMF	4,073,816	-	4,000,000	-
Trial Courts Transactional Assistance Program	IMF	451,000	-	451,000	-
Trial Court Administrative Services Programs					

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts - 2014-15 and 2015-16

Programs by Category ¹	Fund	Prior-Year Actual		Current-Year Estimated	
		Not From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding	From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding ²	Not From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding	From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding ²
Court-Ordered Debt Task Force	IMF	11,217	-	19,000	-
Phoenix Program	IMF	2,241,193	-	3,402,100	-
Phoenix Program	TCTF	4,626	-	-	-
Subtotal, Not From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding		374,274,203		395,803,692	
Subtotal, From Courts' Share of State Trial Court Funding²			37,516,593		32,440,752
Total, State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts			411,790,796		428,244,444
Subtotal by Fund					
Trial Court Trust Fund	TCTF		361,474,307		372,170,145
State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	IMF		41,231,381		45,681,299
Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund	JBWCF		(1,306,892)		1,000
General Fund	GF		10,392,000		10,392,000
Total, State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts			411,790,796		428,244,444

1. Includes all Program 45 (0150) "State Trial Court Funding" as well as Program 30.15 (0140019) "Trial Court Operations" expenses from all funds, including the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF), General Fund (GF), and Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund (JBWCF). The expenses do not necessarily represent all expenses for those programs have a state operations component (e.g., Equal Access Fund) and/or a distribution that is made directly to courts (e.g., court-appointed dependency counsel).

2. These expenses are funded by the trial courts opting to participate in those programs from their "State Funding" revenue distribution amounts reported in Section 1 of the "State and Non-State Trial Court Funding, Expenditures, and Positions" display. Because the funding for these expenses is already included in Section 1, they are subtracted from the total "State Trial Court Funding Not Distributed to the Trial Courts" amount used to calculate the total expenditures displayed for "State Trial Court Funding Total".

3. Reflects actual or estimated payments made directly to court-appointed dependency counsel from the TCTF on behalf of superior courts participating in the Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) Program. Courts not participating in the DRAFT program are reimbursed up to a maximum amount from the TCTF for payments to court-appointed dependency counsel.

4. This reflects judges' compensation paid excluding any amounts related to the reimbursement of courts for payments of judges' compensation as these amounts are already included in the courts' "State Funding" revenue amounts reported in the Trial Court Information section (\$109 million in 2014-15 and \$114.6 million in 2015-16). Judges from the Los Angeles, Riverside, and Ventura County Superior Courts are compensated locally and the court/county is reimbursed by the TCTF. In addition, 26 courts in 2014-15 and 2015-16 participate in the local salary reimbursement program in which a small portion of the judges' salary is paid locally and reimbursed by the TCTF.

5. For the TCTF, expenses are the annual premiums for 57 participating trial courts from their allocations and for superior court judges from the appropriation for the Compensation of Superior Court Judges that are transferred to the JBWCF. For the JBWCF, these expenses reflect payments of trial court employee and judge related workers' compensation claims from the JBWCF less the amount transferred from the TCTF.

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

Judicial Council of California

Expenditures and Positions
By Office - 2014-15 and 2015-16

Office	Fund*	2014-15 Actual		2015-16 Estimated	
		Positions	Expenditures	Positions	Expenditures
Executive	GF	7.9	2,961,495	7.0	2,971,611
	SDF	-	15,139	-	187,000
Legal Services	GF	30.5	6,390,791	45.0	7,102,232
	IMF	7.8	1,342,929	8.0	1,460,000
	SCFCF	5.0	1,120,635	5.0	1,842,042
Office of Governmental Affairs	GF	11.2	1,846,392	12.0	1,783,421
Center for Families, Children and the Courts	GF	36.4	3,548,047	45.0	3,575,831
	FLTF	-	1,207,239	-	1,813,000
	FTF	14.5	2,648,716	16.0	3,359,000
	TCTF	-	9,394,095	-	8,940,253
	REIMB	-	3,323,958	-	5,612,404
	MHSF	5.7	1,057,957	6.0	1,070,000
Center for Judicial Education and Research	GF	42.4	7,756,438	48.5	7,939,127
	REIMB	-	10,000	-	-
Finance	GF	55.3	14,683,966	67.3	13,326,155
	IMF	2.8	329,271	4.0	469,091
	TCTF	4.0	523,308	4.0	1,229,313
	REIMB	-	1,000,000	-	-
	SCFCF	11.2	2,034,409	13.0	2,391,969
Information Technology	GF	68.7	18,149,010	76.0	19,818,204
	IMF	26.7	4,586,623	32.0	4,884,228
	TCTF	9.0	8,496,179	9.0	3,049,000
	REIMB	-	155,170	-	277,993
	SCFCF	5.6	1,010,533	7.0	1,314,265
Human Resources	GF	31.8	6,643,545	36.0	6,876,995
	SCFCF	4.0	660,596	4.0	932,716
	JBWCF	-	(287,927)	-	2,000
Trial Court Administrative Services	GF	20.6	4,540,437	22.0	4,808,958
	IMF	50.8	6,461,829	55.0	6,763,386
	TCTF	10.3	1,305,335	11.0	1,455,434
Court Operations Special Services	GF	34.9	5,868,406	40.6	6,348,061
	CIF	-	163,019	-	163,000
	REIMB	-	26,369	-	65,273
	SCFCF	3.5	634,438	4.0	690,873
Administrative Services	GF	29.9	3,247,899	30.0	3,375,131
Appellate Court Services	GF	4.3	1,908,657	7.0	2,215,625
Criminal Justice Court Services	GF	10.6	764,891	13.0	1,075,752
	MVA	-	186,821	-	198,000
	REIMB	-	201,572	-	120,330
	SCCPIF	4.4	931,103	2.0	1,275,000
Communications	GF	7.0	1,132,879	7.0	1,300,040
Judicial Council Support Services	GF	11.6	1,623,485	11.8	1,673,411
Trial Court Liaison	GF	8.0	1,274,122	8.0	1,353,215
Special Projects	GF	6.1	894,006	7.0	1,541,135
Internal Audits	GF	8.9	1,611,844	9.0	1,569,096
	IMF	3.6	568,612	4.0	660,000
	SCFCF	1.0	151,251	1.0	171,135
	¹ IMF				(4,847,705)
Budget Position Transparency				(126.7)	
Judicial Council of California Office Total		596.0	134,105,491	550.5	134,203,000

* Fund description included on first page of the Governor's Budget.

¹ Appropriation augmentation pending--increase appropriation authority consistent with Judicial Council approved allocations.

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

0130 - SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court is the highest court in the California judicial system. Its decisions are binding on all other California state courts. The Chief Justice of California and the six Associate Justices entertain petitions seeking review of decisions from the Courts of Appeal, original petitions for extraordinary relief (such as writs of mandate or habeas corpus), and recommendations for discipline of judicial officers and attorneys. The Court grants review and issues opinions in order to settle legal questions of statewide importance. In addition, under the California Constitution, all death penalty judgments are appealed directly to the Supreme Court.

0135 - COURTS OF APPEAL

Established by a constitutional amendment in 1904, the Courts of Appeal are California's intermediate courts of review. The six District Courts of Appeal hear appeals and original proceedings at nine different locations around the state. Cases before the Courts of Appeal involve every area of civil and criminal law.

0140 - JUDICIAL COUNCIL

The Judicial Council of California is the constitutional policy-making body for the state judiciary. The Council consists of 21 voting members and 11 advisory members; the Chief Justice of California serves as chair. The Judicial Council staff serve as the administrative arm of the Council. Staff provide policy support to the Council, administrative accountability in the operation of the courts as specified by law, strategic planning for capital outlay, design, and construction of court facilities; and administrative support for courts in areas such as budget, fiscal services, coordination of the assignment of retired judges, technology, education, legal advice and services, human resources, legislative advocacy, and research.

Consistent with the judiciary's mission, the Judicial Council is guided by the following principles:

- To make decisions in the best interests of the public and the court system as a whole.
- To conduct the Council's business based on an underlying commitment to equal and timely justice and public access to an independent forum for the resolution of disputes.
- To provide leadership in the administration of justice by planning and advocating for policies and resources that are necessary for courts to fulfill their mission.
- To ensure the continued development of an accessible, independent court system through planning, research, and evaluation programs, and through the use of modern management approaches and technological developments.
- To provide leadership in the administration of justice by establishing broad and consistent policies for the operation of the courts and appropriate uniform statewide rules and forms.
- To promote a competent, responsive, and ethical judiciary and staff through a comprehensive program of judicial education and training for court employees.
- To contribute to the public's understanding of the judicial process through a continuing program of public education.
- To provide assistance to the courts in developing action plans that are consistent with the Council's Strategic Plan and that address local needs and priorities.

0145 - JUDICIAL BRANCH FACILITY PROGRAM

The Judicial Branch Facility Program administers the acquisition, planning, construction, operations, and maintenance of judicial branch facilities. This program is responsible for the development of long-term facilities master plans, facility and real estate management, and new courthouse planning, design, and construction.

0150 - STATE TRIAL COURT FUNDING

0150010 - SUPPORT FOR THE OPERATION OF THE TRIAL COURTS

This program's objective is to provide the resources necessary for the statewide trial court system to adjudicate civil and criminal cases. This program includes all allowable trial court administrative costs under Chapter 850, Statutes of 1997, except salaries and benefits of Superior Court judges, compensation for assigned judges, and support for language interpreters.

0150019 - COMPENSATION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

This program provides funding for the salaries and state benefits for Superior Court judges.

0150028 - ASSIGNED JUDGES

This program provides support for the salaries and related costs of retired as well as active judges who are assigned by the Chief Justice to positions in courts which require assistance due to caseload backlogs or other factors impacting the ability of a court to avoid case delay.

0150037 - COURT INTERPRETERS

This program supports the provision of qualified language interpreters in criminal or juvenile proceedings as required by

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

statute.

0155 - HABEAS CORPUS RESOURCE CENTER

The Habeas Corpus Resource Center provides legal representation for indigent petitioners in death penalty habeas corpus proceedings before the Supreme Court of California and the federal courts. The Center also recruits and trains attorneys to expand the pool of private counsel qualified to accept appointments in death penalty habeas corpus proceedings, serves as a resource to them, and thereby helps to reduce the number of unrepresented indigents on California's death row.

DETAILED EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM

		<u>2014-15*</u>	<u>2015-16*</u>	<u>2016-17*</u>
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS				
0130	SUPREME COURT			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$43,067	\$45,349	\$45,283
3060	Appellate Court Trust Fund	364	1,170	1,155
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-68	-	-
	Totals, State Operations	\$43,363	\$46,519	\$46,438
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS				
0135	COURTS OF APPEAL			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$208,909	\$213,669	\$219,255
0995	Reimbursements	-	1	-
3060	Appellate Court Trust Fund	2,296	5,604	5,529
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-104	-	-
	Totals, State Operations	\$211,101	\$219,274	\$224,784
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS				
0140	JUDICIAL COUNCIL			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$84,846	\$88,654	\$99,764
0044	Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund	187	198	199
0159	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	13,289	9,389	9,533
0327	Court Interpreters Fund	163	163	164
0587	Family Law Trust Fund	1,206	1,813	1,736
0890	Federal Trust Fund	2,649	3,359	3,355
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	19,719	14,674	3,309
0942	Special Deposit Fund	15	187	-
0995	Reimbursements	4,717	6,076	6,082
3037	State Court Facilities Construction Fund	5,612	7,343	6,951
3085	Mental Health Services Fund	1,058	1,070	1,078
8059	State Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund	931	1,275	1,000
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-288	2	2
	Totals, State Operations	\$134,104	\$134,203	\$133,173
SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS				
0140010	Judicial Council			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$84,846	\$88,654	\$99,764
0044	Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund	187	198	199
0159	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	13,289	9,389	9,533

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

		2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0327	Court Interpreters Fund	163	163	164
0587	Family Law Trust Fund	1,206	1,813	1,736
0890	Federal Trust Fund	2,649	3,359	3,355
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	4,096	2,784	3,309
0942	Special Deposit Fund	15	187	-
0995	Reimbursements	4,717	6,076	6,082
3037	State Court Facilities Construction Fund	5,612	7,343	6,951
3085	Mental Health Services Fund	1,058	1,070	1,078
8059	State Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund	931	1,275	1,000
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-288	2	2
	Totals, State Operations	\$118,481	\$122,313	\$133,173
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0140019	Trial Court Operations			
	State Operations:			
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	\$15,623	\$11,890	\$-
	Totals, State Operations	\$15,623	\$11,890	\$-
	PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0145	JUDICIAL BRANCH FACILITY PROGRAM			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$8,398	\$8,631	\$9,446
0942	Special Deposit Fund	-	151	-
0995	Reimbursements	12,528	19,002	22,000
3037	State Court Facilities Construction Fund	112,910	133,894	135,878
3066	Court Facilities Trust Fund	105,637	109,711	104,030
3138	Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund	80,996	98,399	138,550
	Totals, State Operations	\$320,469	\$369,788	\$409,904
	PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150	STATE TRIAL COURT FUNDING			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$1,077,010	\$1,258,097	\$1,344,333
0159	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	11,645	13,621	18,575
0890	Federal Trust Fund	1,345	2,275	2,275
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	1,380,594	1,275,411	1,329,003
0995	Reimbursements	57,130	60,507	60,507
3138	Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund	10,000	50,000	50,000
3259	Recidivism Reduction Fund	1,483	14,827	-
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-1,310	-	-
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$2,537,897	\$2,674,738	\$2,804,693
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150010	Support for Operation of Trial Courts			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$616,545	\$663,158	\$741,397
0159	State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund	11,645	13,621	18,575

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

		<u>2014-15*</u>	<u>2015-16*</u>	<u>2016-17*</u>
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	1,379,243	1,275,411	1,317,678
0995	Reimbursements	-	1	1
3138	Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund	10,000	50,000	50,000
3259	Recidivism Reduction Fund	1,483	14,827	-
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	<u>-5,220</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$2,013,696	\$2,017,018	\$2,127,651
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150011	Court Appointed Dependency Counsel			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	<u>\$-</u>	<u>\$114,700</u>	<u>\$114,700</u>
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$-	\$114,700	\$114,700
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150019	Compensation of Superior Court Judges			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$318,454	\$336,356	\$336,649
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	1,350	-	-
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	<u>3,910</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$323,714	\$336,356	\$336,649
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150028	Assigned Judges			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$24,792	\$26,646	\$26,646
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$24,793	\$26,646	\$26,646
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150037	Court Interpreters			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	<u>\$96,803</u>	<u>\$95,856</u>	<u>\$103,560</u>
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$96,803	\$95,856	\$103,560
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150051	Child Support Commissioner Program (AB 1058)			
	Local Assistance:			
0995	Reimbursements	<u>53,936</u>	<u>54,332</u>	<u>54,332</u>
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$53,936	\$54,332	\$54,332
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150055	California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$1,160	\$1,160	\$1,160
0995	Reimbursements	<u>1,973</u>	<u>4,588</u>	<u>4,588</u>
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$3,133	\$5,748	\$5,748
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150059	Federal Child Access and Visitation Grant Program			
	Local Assistance:			
0890	Federal Trust Fund	<u>\$770</u>	<u>\$800</u>	<u>\$800</u>
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$770	\$800	\$800
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150063	Federal Court Improvement Grant Program			

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

		<u>2014-15*</u>	<u>2015-16*</u>	<u>2016-17*</u>
	Local Assistance:			
0890	Federal Trust Fund	\$96	\$700	\$700
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$96	\$700	\$700
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150067	Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)			
	Program			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$2,213	\$2,213	\$2,213
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$2,213	\$2,213	\$2,213
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150071	Model Self-Help Program			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$957	\$957	\$957
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$957	\$957	\$957
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150075	Grants-Other			
	Local Assistance:			
0995	Reimbursements	1,221	1,586	1,586
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$1,221	\$1,586	\$1,586
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150079	Federal Grants-Other			
	Local Assistance:			
0890	Federal Trust Fund	\$479	\$775	\$775
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$479	\$775	\$775
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150083	Equal Access Fund			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$14,909	\$15,874	\$15,874
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$14,909	\$15,874	\$15,874
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150087	Family Law Information Centers			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$345	\$345	\$345
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$345	\$345	\$345
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150091	Civil Case Coordination			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	\$832	\$832	\$832
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$832	\$832	\$832
	SUBPROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0150095	Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts			
	Local Assistance:			
0932	Trial Court Trust Fund	\$-	\$-	\$11,325
	Totals, Local Assistance	\$-	\$-	\$11,325
	PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0155	HABEAS CORPUS RESOURCE CENTER			
	State Operations:			
0001	General Fund	\$12,845	\$13,499	\$13,989

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

		<u>2014-15*</u>	<u>2015-16*</u>	<u>2016-17*</u>
0890	Federal Trust Fund	-	1,026	1,026
9728	Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund	-26	-	-
	Totals, State Operations	\$12,819	\$14,525	\$15,015
	PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS			
0170	OFFSET FROM LOCAL PROPERTY TAX REVENUE			
	Local Assistance:			
0001	General Fund	-\$30,756	-\$30,000	-\$30,000
	Totals, Local Assistance	-\$30,756	-\$30,000	-\$30,000
	TOTALS, EXPENDITURES			
	State Operations	721,856	784,309	829,314
	Local Assistance	<u>2,507,141</u>	<u>2,644,738</u>	<u>2,774,693</u>
	Totals, Expenditures	\$3,228,997	\$3,429,047	\$3,604,007

EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORY

	1 State Operations			Expenditures		
	<u>2014-15</u>	<u>2015-16</u>	<u>2016-17</u>	<u>2014-15*</u>	<u>2015-16*</u>	<u>2016-17*</u>
PERSONAL SERVICES						
Baseline Positions	1,962.8	1,962.3	1,962.3	\$202,530	\$204,969	\$204,969
Budget Position Transparency	-	-248.3	-248.3	-	-27,953	-27,953
Total Adjustments	<u>-210.6</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>-23,690</u>	<u>4,379</u>	<u>4,686</u>
Net Totals, Salaries and Wages	1,752.2	1,714.0	1,717.0	\$178,840	\$181,395	\$190,402
Staff Benefits	-	-	-	70,565	82,883	83,585
Totals, Personal Services	1,752.2	1,714.0	1,717.0	\$249,405	\$264,278	\$273,987
OPERATING EXPENSES AND EQUIPMENT				\$396,237	\$440,241	\$478,394
SPECIAL ITEMS OF EXPENSES				<u>76,214</u>	<u>79,790</u>	<u>76,933</u>
TOTALS, POSITIONS AND EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (State Operations)				\$721,856	\$784,309	\$829,314

DETAIL OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS

1 STATE OPERATIONS	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0001 General Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$343,748	\$351,288	\$374,721
Allocation for employee compensation	717	3,727	-
Allocation for staff benefits	1,350	1,556	-
Budget Position Transparency	-	-20,675	-
Expenditure by Category Redistribution	-	20,675	-
Past Year Adjustment	224	-	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	4,372	1,329	-
Tenant Rent Adjustment	-	-281	-
003 Budget Act appropriation	5,046	4,967	4,962
Lease Revenue	-	-838	-
Section 4.30 lease revenue payment adjustment	-63	-	-
011 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund)	1	1	1
Past Year Adjustment	1,073	-	-

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

1 STATE OPERATIONS	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
012 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Court Facilities Trust Fund)	8,053	8,053	8,053
Totals Available	\$364,521	\$369,802	\$387,737
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-6,456	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$358,065	\$369,802	\$387,737
0044 Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$195	\$198	\$199
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	4	-	-
Totals Available	\$199	\$198	\$199
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-12	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$187	\$198	\$199
0159 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$9,216	\$9,533	\$9,533
Allocation for employee compensation	-	178	-
Allocation for staff benefits	17	100	-
Budget Position Transparency	-	-2,044	-
Expenditure by Category Redistribution	-	2,044	-
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	1,450	-500	-
Past Year Adjustment	2,839	-	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	300	78	-
Totals Available	\$13,822	\$9,389	\$9,533
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-533	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$13,289	\$9,389	\$9,533
0327 Court Interpreters Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$164	\$163	\$164
Totals Available	\$164	\$163	\$164
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-1	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$163	\$163	\$164
0587 Family Law Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Family Code section 1852	\$1,675	\$1,813	\$1,736
Allocation for staff benefits	1	-	-
Past Year Adjustment	-499	-	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	29	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,206	\$1,813	\$1,736
0890 Federal Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$4,249	\$4,321	\$4,381
Allocation for employee compensation	-	33	-
Allocation for staff benefits	3	17	-
Budget Position Transparency	-	-260	-
Expenditure by Category Redistribution	-	260	-
Past Year Adjustment	-1,663	-	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	60	14	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$2,649	\$4,385	\$4,381

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

1 STATE OPERATIONS	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0932 Trial Court Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$24,459	\$17,877	\$3,309
Allocation for employee compensation	-	41	-
Allocation for staff benefits	4	26	-
Budget Position Transparency	-	-613	-
Expenditure by Category Redistribution	-	613	-
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	-2,748	-3,288	-
Past Year Adjustment	3,022	-	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	51	18	-
Totals Available	\$24,788	\$14,674	\$3,309
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-5,069	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$19,719	\$14,674	\$3,309
0942 Special Deposit Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Carryover	-	\$187	-
Carryover for Administration of Justice Fund	99	-	-
Past Year Adjustment	-84	-	-
Carryover	-	151	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$15	\$338	\$-
0995 Reimbursements			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Reimbursements	\$17,245	\$25,079	\$28,082
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$17,245	\$25,079	\$28,082
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$78,580	\$79,946	\$81,922
7A FISCAL Current Service Level Adjustment	-1	-	-
Allocation for employee compensation	-	352	-
Allocation for staff benefits	121	183	-
Budget Position Transparency	-	-4,076	-
Expenditure by Category Redistribution	-	4,076	-
Past Year Adjustment	4,447	-	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	528	154	-
003 Budget Act appropriation	51,097	60,872	60,907
Lease Revenue	-	-270	-
Section 4.30 lease revenue payment adjustment	137	-	-
Totals Available	\$134,909	\$141,237	\$142,829
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-16,387	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$118,522	\$141,237	\$142,829
3060 Appellate Court Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$6,791	\$6,756	\$6,684
Allocation for employee compensation	-	9	-
Allocation for staff benefits	2	5	-
Budget Revision (BR-002)	6,143	-	-
Past Year Adjustment	-6,143	-	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	14	4	-

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
1 STATE OPERATIONS			
Totals Available	\$6,807	\$6,774	\$6,684
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-4,147	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$2,660	\$6,774	\$6,684
3066 Court Facilities Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$109,809	\$111,734	\$112,083
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	6,143	-	-
Past Year Adjustment	25	-	-
Provision 1 Item 0250-001-3066 - Increased operational costs	-	6,030	-
014 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund)	-	-	(377)
Totals Available	\$115,977	\$117,764	\$112,083
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-2,287	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$113,690	\$117,764	\$112,083
Less funding provided by General Fund	-8,053	-8,053	-8,053
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$105,637	\$109,711	\$104,030
3085 Mental Health Services Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$1,037	\$1,050	\$1,078
Allocation for employee compensation	-	10	-
Allocation for staff benefits	6	6	-
Budget Position Transparency	-	-134	-
Expenditure by Category Redistribution	-	134	-
Section 3.60 pension contribution adjustment	15	4	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,058	\$1,070	\$1,078
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
001 Budget Act appropriation	\$27,177	\$30,239	\$35,886
002 Budget Act appropriation	54,214	54,214	54,320
003 Budget Act appropriation	528	13,352	48,344
Lease Revenue	-	594	-
Section 4.30 lease revenue payment adjustment	-7	-	-
Totals Available	\$81,912	\$98,399	\$138,550
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-916	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$80,996	\$98,399	\$138,550
8059 State Community Corrections Performance Incentive Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Carryover	-	\$271	-
Carryover for Community Corrections Grant Fund	206	-	-
Penal Code section 1233.6	1,000	1,000	1,000
Budget Position Transparency	-	-151	-
Carryover	-	4	-
Expenditure by Category Redistribution	-	151	-
Totals Available	\$1,206	\$1,275	\$1,000
Balance available in subsequent years	-275	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$931	\$1,275	\$1,000
9728 Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

1 STATE OPERATIONS	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
Government Code section 68114.10	\$3	\$3	\$3
Past Year Adjustment	<u>584</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$587	\$3	\$3
Less funding provided by General Fund	<u>-1,073</u>	<u>-1</u>	<u>-1</u>
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	<u>-\$486</u>	<u>\$2</u>	<u>\$2</u>
Total Expenditures, All Funds, (State Operations)	\$721,856	\$784,309	\$829,314
2 LOCAL ASSISTANCE	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0001 General Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	\$17,753	\$17,753	\$17,753
Past Year Adjustment	3,376	-	-
102 Budget Act appropriation	71,502	71,502	71,502
111 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	911,419	935,409	1,021,160
Allocation for employee compensation	9,528	8,196	-
Allocation for staff benefits	1,702	119	-
Past Year Adjustment	-1	-	-
112 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund)	38,709	44,218	44,218
113 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	30,900	66,200	75,000
114 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	<u>-</u>	<u>114,700</u>	<u>114,700</u>
Totals Available	\$1,084,888	\$1,258,097	\$1,344,333
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	<u>-7,878</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,077,010	\$1,258,097	\$1,344,333
Offset from local property tax revenue per Control Section 15.45	<u>-30,756</u>	<u>-30,000</u>	<u>-30,000</u>
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,046,254	\$1,228,097	\$1,314,333
0159 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
102 Budget Act appropriation	\$63,000	\$60,359	\$62,793
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	-7,601	-2,520	-
Past Year Adjustment	7,601	-	-
111 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	<u>(20,594)</u>	<u>(594)</u>	<u>(594)</u>
Totals Available	\$63,000	\$57,839	\$62,793
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	<u>-12,646</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$50,354	\$57,839	\$62,793
Less funding provided by General Fund	<u>-38,709</u>	<u>-44,218</u>	<u>-44,218</u>
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$11,645	\$13,621	\$18,575
0890 Federal Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	\$2,275	\$2,275	\$2,275
Past Year Adjustment	<u>-930</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,345	\$2,275	\$2,275
0932 Trial Court Trust Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	\$2,335,226	\$2,337,627	\$2,425,162
Allocation for employee compensation	9,528	8,196	-
Allocation for staff benefits	1,702	119	-
Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustment	<u>-42,409</u>	<u>-61,536</u>	<u>-</u>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

2 LOCAL ASSISTANCE	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
Past Year Adjustment	28,102	-	-
102 Budget Act appropriation	-	114,700	114,700
115 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund)	1	1	1
Past Year Adjustment	17,886	-	-
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Chapter 193, Statutes of 2011	1	-	-
Chapter 26, Statutes of 2012	<u>1,632</u>	<u>928</u>	<u>-</u>
Totals Available	\$2,351,669	\$2,400,035	\$2,539,863
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-16,598	-	-
Balance available in subsequent years	<u>-929</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$2,334,142	\$2,400,035	\$2,539,863
Less funding provided by General Fund	-30,900	-66,200	-75,000
Less funding provided by General Fund	-922,648	-943,724	-1,021,160
Less funding provided by General Fund	<u>-</u>	<u>-114,700</u>	<u>-114,700</u>
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,380,594	\$1,275,411	\$1,329,003
0995 Reimbursements			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Reimbursements	<u>\$57,130</u>	<u>\$60,507</u>	<u>\$60,507</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$57,130	\$60,507	\$60,507
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
111 Budget Act appropriation (transfer to Trial Court Trust Fund)	<u>(\$5,486)</u>	<u>(\$5,486)</u>	<u>(\$5,486)</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$-	\$-	\$-
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$10,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
3259 Recidivism Reduction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
101 Budget Act appropriation	\$15,000	\$1,300	-
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Item 0250-101-3259, Budget Act of 2014	<u>-</u>	<u>13,527</u>	<u>-</u>
Totals Available	\$15,000	\$14,827	\$-
Balance available in subsequent years	<u>-13,517</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$1,483	\$14,827	\$-
9728 Judicial Branch Workers Compensation Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
Government Code section 68114.10	\$1	\$1	\$1
Past Year Adjustment	<u>16,575</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$16,576	\$1	\$1
Less funding provided by Trial Court Trust Fund	<u>-17,886</u>	<u>-1</u>	<u>-1</u>
NET TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	-\$1,310	\$-	\$-
Total Expenditures, All Funds, (Local Assistance)	\$2,507,141	\$2,644,738	\$2,774,693
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS (State Operations and Local Assistance)	\$3,228,997	\$3,429,047	\$3,604,007

FUND CONDITION STATEMENTS

	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
--	----------	----------	----------

0159 State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund ^s

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$26,206	\$9,255	\$8,451
Prior Year Adjustments	2,877	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$29,083	\$9,255	\$8,451
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
414000 Document Sales	533	597	552
416300 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	101	85	85
4171400 Escheat - Unclaimed Checks, Warrants, Bonds, and Coupons	2	-	-
4172000 Fines and Forfeitures	38,433	35,515	33,111
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	28	-	-
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Government Code Section 77209(j)	-13,397	-13,397	-13,397
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Item 0250-111-0159, Budget Acts of 2014, 2015, and 2016	-20,594	-594	-594
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	\$5,106	\$22,206	\$19,757
Total Resources	\$34,189	\$31,461	\$28,208
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	13,289	9,389	9,533
0250 Judicial Branch (Local Assistance)	50,354	57,839	62,793
Expenditure Adjustments:			
Less funding provided by General Fund (Local Assistance)	-38,709	-44,218	-44,218
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	\$24,934	\$23,010	\$28,108
FUND BALANCE	\$9,255	\$8,451	\$100
Reserve for economic uncertainties	9,255	8,451	100
0327 Court Interpreters Fund ^s			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$438	\$505	\$583
Prior Year Adjustments	-9	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$429	\$505	\$583
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4129400 Other Regulatory Licenses and Permits	239	241	241
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	\$239	\$241	\$241
Total Resources	\$668	\$746	\$824
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	163	163	164
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	\$163	\$163	\$164
FUND BALANCE	\$505	\$583	\$660
Reserve for economic uncertainties	505	583	660
0587 Family Law Trust Fund ^s			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$3,131	\$4,108	\$4,433
Prior Year Adjustments	21	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$3,152	\$4,108	\$4,433
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	9	8	8

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	2,154	2,130	2,084
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$2,163</u>	<u>\$2,138</u>	<u>\$2,092</u>
Total Resources	\$5,315	\$6,246	\$6,525
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	1,207	1,813	1,736
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$1,207</u>	<u>\$1,813</u>	<u>\$1,736</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$4,108	\$4,433	\$4,789
Reserve for economic uncertainties	4,108	4,433	4,789
0932 Trial Court Trust Fund^s			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$21,217	\$7,157	\$35,929
Prior Year Adjustments	5,626	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	<u>\$26,843</u>	<u>\$7,157</u>	<u>\$35,929</u>
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4135000 Local Agencies - Miscellaneous Revenue	498,600	498,600	498,600
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	151	287	287
4170700 Civil and Criminal Violation Assessment	159,372	137,781	134,692
4171200 Court Filing Fees and Surcharges	495,884	475,437	456,632
4171400 Escheat - Unclaimed Checks, Warrants, Bonds, and Coupons	109	46	36
4172000 Fines and Forfeitures	162,037	161,495	161,416
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	176	166	316
4173000 Penalty Assessments - Other	24,995	25,742	25,812
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Government Code Section 77209(j)	13,397	13,397	13,397
Revenue Transfer from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Item 0250-111-3037, Budget Acts of 2014, 2015, and 2016	5,486	5,486	5,486
Revenue Transfer from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Item 0250-111-0159, Budget Acts of 2014, 2015, and 2016	20,594	594	594
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$1,380,801</u>	<u>\$1,319,031</u>	<u>\$1,297,268</u>
Total Resources	\$1,407,644	\$1,326,188	\$1,333,197
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	19,719	14,674	3,309
0250 Judicial Branch (Local Assistance)	2,334,142	2,400,035	2,539,863
0840 State Controller (State Operations)	174	174	174
Expenditure Adjustments:			
Less funding provided by General Fund (Local Assistance)	-	-114,700	-114,700
Less funding provided by General Fund (Local Assistance)	-922,648	-943,724	-1,021,160
Less funding provided by General Fund (Local Assistance)	<u>-30,900</u>	<u>-66,200</u>	<u>-75,000</u>
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$1,400,487</u>	<u>\$1,290,259</u>	<u>\$1,332,486</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$7,157	\$35,929	\$711
Reserve for economic uncertainties	7,157	35,929	711
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund^s			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$132,833	\$244,952	\$419,664
Prior Year Adjustments	-189	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	<u>\$132,644</u>	<u>\$244,952</u>	<u>\$419,664</u>

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4135000 Local Agencies - Miscellaneous Revenue	60	60	10,061
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	263	263	263
4171200 Court Filing Fees and Surcharges	22,509	20,862	19,348
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	2,868	50	50
4172900 Penalty Assessments - Criminal Fines	71,142	67,854	65,173
4173000 Penalty Assessments - Other	12,558	12,346	12,263
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Loan Repayment from the General Fund to the State Court Facilities Construction Fund per Item 0250-012-3037, Budget Act of 2011	130,000	220,000	-
Revenue Transfer from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund to the Trial Court Trust Fund per Item 0250-111-3037, Budget Acts of 2014, 2015, and 2016	-5,486	-5,486	-5,486
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$233,914</u>	<u>\$315,949</u>	<u>\$101,672</u>
Total Resources	\$366,558	\$560,901	\$521,336
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	118,523	141,237	142,829
0250 Judicial Branch (Capital Outlay)	3,083	-	-
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$121,606</u>	<u>\$141,237</u>	<u>\$142,829</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$244,952	\$419,664	\$378,507
Reserve for economic uncertainties	244,952	419,664	378,507
3060 Appellate Court Trust Fund^s			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$4,592	\$7,729	\$6,383
Prior Year Adjustments	-4	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	<u>\$4,588</u>	<u>\$7,729</u>	<u>\$6,383</u>
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	16	13	13
4171200 Court Filing Fees and Surcharges	5,785	5,415	5,181
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$5,801</u>	<u>\$5,428</u>	<u>\$5,194</u>
Total Resources	\$10,389	\$13,157	\$11,577
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	2,660	6,774	6,684
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$2,660</u>	<u>\$6,774</u>	<u>\$6,684</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$7,729	\$6,383	\$4,893
Reserve for economic uncertainties	7,729	6,383	4,893
3066 Court Facilities Trust Fund^s			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$8,134	\$12,292	\$8,545
Prior Year Adjustments	2,842	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	<u>\$10,976</u>	<u>\$12,292</u>	<u>\$8,545</u>
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4135000 Local Agencies - Miscellaneous Revenue	98,909	98,361	99,026
4152500 Rental of State Property	7,942	7,554	6,775
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	93	45	45
4171400 Escheat - Unclaimed Checks, Warrants, Bonds, and Coupons	3	2	2

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	6	2	2
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Revenue Transfer to the Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund from the Court Facilities Trust Fund per Item 0250-014-3066, Budget Act of 2016	-	-	-377
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$106,953</u>	<u>\$105,964</u>	<u>\$105,473</u>
Total Resources	\$117,929	\$118,256	\$114,018
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	113,690	117,764	112,083
Expenditure Adjustments:			
Less funding provided by General Fund (State Operations)	<u>-8,053</u>	<u>-8,053</u>	<u>-8,053</u>
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$105,637</u>	<u>\$109,711</u>	<u>\$104,030</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$12,292	\$8,545	\$9,988
Reserve for economic uncertainties	12,292	8,545	9,988
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund^s			
BEGINNING BALANCE	\$86,266	\$152,622	\$186,222
Prior Year Adjustments	<u>1,321</u>	-	-
Adjusted Beginning Balance	\$87,587	\$152,622	\$186,222
REVENUES, TRANSFERS, AND OTHER ADJUSTMENTS			
Revenues:			
4152500 Rental of State Property	4	4	-
4163000 Investment Income - Surplus Money Investments	196	196	196
4171200 Court Filing Fees and Surcharges	25,415	23,429	21,659
4172500 Miscellaneous Revenue	19,192	19,567	26,734
4172900 Penalty Assessments - Criminal Fines	164,090	155,425	149,191
4173000 Penalty Assessments - Other	25,915	25,445	25,079
4173800 Traffic Violations	26,133	23,892	22,472
Transfers and Other Adjustments			
Revenue Transfer from the Court Facilities Trust Fund to the Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund per Item 0250-014-3066, Budget Act of 2016	-	-	377
Total Revenues, Transfers, and Other Adjustments	<u>\$260,945</u>	<u>\$247,958</u>	<u>\$245,708</u>
Total Resources	\$348,532	\$400,580	\$431,930
EXPENDITURE AND EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENTS			
Expenditures:			
0250 Judicial Branch (State Operations)	80,996	98,399	138,550
0250 Judicial Branch (Local Assistance)	10,000	50,000	50,000
0250 Judicial Branch (Capital Outlay)	<u>104,914</u>	<u>65,959</u>	<u>91,538</u>
Total Expenditures and Expenditure Adjustments	<u>\$195,910</u>	<u>\$214,358</u>	<u>\$280,088</u>
FUND BALANCE	\$152,622	\$186,222	\$151,842
Reserve for economic uncertainties	152,622	186,222	151,842

CHANGES IN AUTHORIZED POSITIONS

	Positions			Expenditures		
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
Baseline Positions	1,962.8	1,962.3	1,962.3	\$202,530	\$204,969	\$204,969
Budget Position Transparency	-	-248.3	-248.3	-	-27,953	-27,953
Salary and Other Adjustments	-210.6	-	-	-23,690	4,379	4,379
Workload and Administrative Adjustments						

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

	Positions			Expenditures		
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
Information System Control Enhancements						
Various	-	-	3.0	-	-	307
TOTALS, WORKLOAD AND ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	3.0	\$-	\$-	\$307
Totals, Adjustments	-210.6	-248.3	-245.3	-\$23,690	-\$23,574	-\$14,567
TOTALS, SALARIES AND WAGES	1,752.2	1,714.0	1,717.0	\$178,840	\$181,395	\$190,402

INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW

The Judicial Council facilities consist of the offices of its staff, the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeal, the Habeas Corpus Resource Center, the Commission on Judicial Performance, and all Trial Courts statewide. The Supreme Court is located within the Earl Warren Building of the Ronald M. George State Office Complex in San Francisco (98,155 square feet) and the Ronald Reagan State Building in Los Angeles (7,598 sf). The Courts of Appeal are organized into six districts, operate in nine different locations, and consist of 508,386 sf. The Trial Courts are located in 58 counties statewide consisting of more than 500 buildings and 2,100 courtrooms and approximately 13 million sf of usable area. The space includes public areas, such as courtrooms, waiting areas, clerks' offices, child waiting, records viewing, rooms for jury assembly and deliberation, and centers for self-help, alternative dispute resolution, and mediation, as well as private areas, such as judicial officer chambers, staff workspace, storage space, training rooms, and conference rooms. Judicial Council staff facilities, occupying approximately 261,500 sf, are located in San Francisco (Headquarters), Burbank, Sacramento, and field offices throughout the state. Judicial Council responsibility and management has gradually increased to what is now approximately 20 million square feet of facility space statewide.

MAJOR PROJECT CHANGES

- The Governor's Budget proposes a total of \$279.7 million (\$272.4 million lease revenue bond funds and \$5.6 million special funds) for the continuing phases of active projects on the Judicial Council's immediate and critical needs list.

SUMMARY OF PROJECTS

		State Building Program Expenditures	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0165	CAPITAL OUTLAY Projects				
0000071	Alameda County: New East County Courthouse Acquisition		39,113	-	-
			39,113	-	-
0000072	Butte County: New North County Courthouse Construction		-	2,692	-
			-	2,692	-
0000076	El Dorado County: New Placerville Courthouse Acquisition		-	4,780	-
			-	1,084	-
	Preliminary Plans		-	3,696	-
0000078	Glenn County: Renovation and Addition to Willows Courthouse Construction		-	34,793	-
			-	34,729	-
	Design Build		-	64	-
0000079	Imperial County: New El Centro Courthouse Working Drawings		3,344	-	39,277
			3,344	-	-
	Construction		-	-	39,277
0000080	Inyo County: New Inyo County Courthouse Acquisition		-	-	1,930
			-	-	696
	Preliminary Plans		-	-	1,234
0000083	Kings County: New Hanford Courthouse Construction		-	9,558	-
			-	9,558	-
0000084	Lake County: New Lakeport Courthouse Working Drawings		4,450	40,803	-
			4,450	-	-
	Construction		-	40,803	-

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

State Building Program Expenditures		2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0000086	Los Angeles County: New Eastlake Juvenile Courthouse	-	-	18,891
	Acquisition	-	-	18,891
0000088	Los Angeles County: Hollywood Courthouse Modernization	2,500	-	42,103
	Design Build	2,500	-	42,103
0000092	Mendocino County: New Ukiah Courthouse	-	8,016	6,068
	Acquisition	-	3,466	-
	Preliminary Plans	-	4,550	-
	Working Drawings	-	-	6,068
0000093	Merced County: New Los Banos Courthouse	21,889	-	-
	Construction	21,889	-	-
0000101	Riverside County: New Indio Juvenile and Family Courthouse	3,484	-	44,074
	Working Drawings	3,484	-	-
	Construction	-	-	44,074
0000102	Riverside County: New Mid-County Civil Courthouse	-	4,259	5,666
	Preliminary Plans	-	4,259	-
	Working Drawings	-	-	5,666
0000103	Sacramento County: New Sacramento Courthouse	17,347	16,000	-
	Acquisition	6,347	-	-
	Preliminary Plans	11,000	-	-
	Working Drawings	-	16,000	-
0000104	San Benito County: New Hollister Courthouse	130	-	-
	Construction	130	-	-
0000106	San Diego County: New San Diego Courthouse	1,497	832	-
	Construction	1,497	832	-
0000107	San Joaquin County: New Stockton Courthouse	-	244	-
	Construction	-	244	-
0000109	Santa Barbara County: New Santa Barbara Criminal Courthouse	4,411	6,294	-
	Preliminary Plans	4,411	-	-
	Working Drawings	-	5,894	-
	Construction	-	400	-
0000110	Santa Clara County: New Family Justice Center	-	2,886	-
	Construction	-	2,886	-
0000111	Shasta County: New Redding Courthouse	6,028	8,849	135,204
	Preliminary Plans	6,028	-	-
	Working Drawings	-	8,675	-
	Construction	-	174	135,204
0000112	Siskiyou County: New Yreka Courthouse	4,518	56,936	-
	Working Drawings	4,518	-	-
	Construction	-	56,936	-
0000113	Solano County: Renovation to Old Solano Courthouse	55	-	-
	Construction	55	-	-
0000114	Sonoma County: New Santa Rosa Criminal Courthouse	7,670	11,252	-
	Preliminary Plans	7,670	-	-
	Working Drawings	-	11,252	-
0000115	Stanislaus County: New Modesto Courthouse	12,083	-	15,252
	Acquisition	1,057	-	-
	Preliminary Plans	11,026	-	-

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

State Building Program Expenditures		2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
	Working Drawings	-	-	15,252
0000116	Sutter County: New Yuba City Courthouse	1,500	9,879	-
	Construction	1,500	9,879	-
0000117	Tehama County: New Red Bluff Courthouse	46,275	-	387
	Construction	46,275	-	387
0000119	Tuolumne County: New Sonora Courthouse	3,049	4,066	55,445
	Preliminary Plans	3,049	-	-
	Working Drawings	-	4,066	-
	Construction	-	-	55,445
0000120	Yolo County: New Woodland Courthouse	-	17,581	-
	Construction	-	17,581	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL PROJECTS		\$179,343	\$239,720	\$364,297
FUNDING		2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0660	Public Buildings Construction Fund	\$185	\$244	\$-
0668	Public Buildings Construction Fund Subaccount	71,161	173,517	272,759
3037	State Court Facilities Construction Fund	3,083	-	-
3138	Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund	104,914	65,959	91,538
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES, ALL FUNDS		\$179,343	\$239,720	\$364,297

DETAIL OF APPROPRIATIONS AND ADJUSTMENTS

3 CAPITAL OUTLAY	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
0660 Public Buildings Construction Fund			
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Item 0250-301-0660, Budget Act of 2010 as reappropriated by Items 0250-490 and 0250-491, BA of 2011 and as partially reappropriated by Item 0250-490, BA of 2013	-	244	-
0000104 - San Benito County, Hollister Courthouse: Augmentation per Government Code 16352 - C	130	-	-
0000113 - Old Solano Courthouse Renovation, Solano County - Augmentation per Government Code Sections 16352, 16409, and 16354 - C	55	-	-
Various Projects: Carryover/Reappropriation Adjustments	244	-	-
Totals Available	\$429	\$244	\$-
Balance available in subsequent years	-244	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$185	\$244	\$-
0668 Public Buildings Construction Fund Subaccount			
APPROPRIATIONS			
301 Budget Act appropriation	\$101,733	\$97,739	\$272,372
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Item 0250-301-0668, Budget Act of 2012	41,210	41,210	-
Item 0250-301-0668, Budget Act of 2013	-	1,497	-
Item 0250-301-0668, Budget Act of 2014 as reappropriated by Item 0250-493, Budget Act of 2015	-	33,182	-
Item 0250-302-0668, Budget Act of 2012 as added by Chapter 29, Statutes of 2012	2,886	2,886	-
Various Projects: Carryover Adjustments	-	-1,110	387
Various Projects: Carryover/Reappropriation Adjustments	1,497	-	-
Various Projects: Miscellaneous Baseline Adjustments	-	-1,500	-
Totals Available	\$147,326	\$173,904	\$272,759

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

0250 Judicial Branch - Continued

3 CAPITAL OUTLAY	2014-15*	2015-16*	2016-17*
Balance available in subsequent years	-76,165	-387	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$71,161	\$173,517	\$272,759
3037 State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
301 Budget Act appropriation	\$3,083	-	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$3,083	\$-	\$-
3138 Immediate and Critical Needs Account, State Court Facilities Construction Fund			
APPROPRIATIONS			
301 Budget Act appropriation	\$142,254	\$51,781	\$7,294
Various Projects: Carryover/Reappropriation Adjustments	27,000	-	-
Prior Year Balances Available:			
Item 0250-301-3138, Budget Act of 2012 as reappropriated by Item 0250-490, Budget Act of 2015 and as reverted by Item 0250-495, Budget Act of 2013	47,925	2,194	-
Item 0250-301-3138, Budget Act of 2013 as reappropriated by Item 0250-490, Budget Act of 2014	6,828	-	-
Item 0250-301-3138, Budget Act of 2014 as reappropriated by Item 0250-491, Budget Act of 2015	-	32,588	-
0000092 - Mendocino County: New Ukiah Courthouse - COBCP - W	-	-	6,068
0000115 - Stanislaus County: New Modesto Courthouse - COBCP - W	-	-	15,252
Item 0250-302-3138, Budget Act of 2014 as added by Chapter 663, Statutes of 2014	-	16,000	-
Various Projects: Carryover Adjustments	-	48,054	62,924
Various Projects: Carryover/Reappropriation Adjustments	-10,227	-	-
Totals Available	\$213,780	\$150,617	\$91,538
Unexpended balance, estimated savings	-10,030	-414	-
Balance available in subsequent years	-98,836	-84,244	-
TOTALS, EXPENDITURES	\$104,914	\$65,959	\$91,538
Total Expenditures, All Funds, (Capital Outlay)	\$179,343	\$239,720	\$364,297

* Dollars in thousands, except in Salary Range. Numbers may not add or match to other statements due to rounding of budget details.

January 11, 2016

Interim Report to the Judicial Council from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

Recommendations on the Judicial Council's Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload Model

Executive Summary

On April 17, 2015 the Judicial Council approved recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to change the methodology used to allocate annual funding for court-appointed dependency counsel among the courts. The purpose was to provide a more equitable allocation of funding among the courts. Rather than using historical funding levels established in 2010, the new funding methodology is based on the caseload-based calculation of funding for each court provided by the workload model approved by the Judicial Council through the *DRAFT Pilot Program and Court-Appointed Counsel* report of October 26, 2007. One of the recommendations approved by the Judicial Council was that a joint working group of the TCBAC and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee (FamJuv) be formed to review that workload model for possible updates and revisions. The joint working group was charged with bringing recommendations to the Judicial Council for its April 2016 meeting. The working group formed is called the Subcommittee on Court-Appointed Dependency Council Workload and Funding Methodology ("subcommittee"). In an effort to keep the Judicial Council informed of the progress of the subcommittee, particularly as it relates to potential increased statewide funding needs for dependency counsel, this report presents the draft recommendations of the subcommittee as an informational item.

Recommendations

The subcommittee was charged with reviewing the workload model for court-appointed dependency counsel and including 8 specific issues in its review. In addition the subcommittee realized that to update the workload model, one additional issue needed to be reviewed.

Issues in Judicial Council Charge

1. *Whether attorney salaries should continue to be based on an average salary by region, or whether another method should be used such as an individual county index of salaries. (7.a. in Judicial Council report).*

Recommendation:

That attorney salaries used in workload model estimates be based on two factors: (1) the median salary for the first tier range for county counsel in all counties; and (2) the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Category 92 index that is used in the Workload Allocation Funding Model (WAFM).

2. *Whether the attorney salaries used in the model should be updated (7.b.).*

Recommendation:

That attorney salaries used in the model be updated for each county using the statewide median county counsel salary and the BLS Category 92 index.

3. *Whether the calculation for benefits costs in the model is accurate or if it should be changed (7.c.).*

Recommendation:

That benefits costs not be calculated directly by any formula, but that the costs be estimated as 15 percent of total costs or 33 percent of salary costs.

4. *Whether the calculation for overhead costs in the model is accurate or if it should be changed (7.d.).*

Recommendation:

That the calculation for overhead costs be revised as follows:

- a) Salaries for line attorneys are calculated using the sources described in recommendations 1 and 2 and comprise 45 percent of the total cost;
 - b) All non-salary costs (benefits and overhead) comprise 55 percent of the total cost and be estimated on a statewide level as follows:
 - i. Social worker/investigator/paralegal staff 10%
 - ii. Other salaried workers 15%
 - iii. Benefits 15%
 - iv. Operating costs 15%.
5. *Whether the state child welfare data reported through U.C. Berkeley accurately represents court-supervised juvenile dependency cases in each county, or whether court filings data or another source of data be used (7.e.).*

Recommendation:

That annual child caseload will be determined for each court using a weighted metric derived from a court's percentage of total original dependency filings and the court's percentage total of child welfare caseload; that the child caseload metric be weighted by 30% of court filings and 70% of child welfare caseload; and that the caseload metric use a rolling average composed of the previous three years.

6. *Whether the ratio used to estimate parent clients in the model is accurate or if it should be changed (7.f.).*

Recommendation:

That the ratio used to estimate parent clients continue to be estimated using the multiplier of 0.8 parent case per 1.0 child case.

7. *Whether a modified methodology be used for funding small courts (7.g).*

Recommendation:

That a program be established for providing emergency funding to small courts experiencing unexpected short-term caseload increases.

8. *Whether dependency counsel funding should be a court or county obligation (7.h.).*

Recommendation:

That dependency counsel funding is established in statute as a court function.

Additional Workload Model Issues

9. *The subcommittee determined that to review and update the workload model, it needed to consider the caseload standard of 188 cases per attorney when the attorney is supported by a .5 full-time equivalent investigator or social worker.*

Recommendation:

That the caseload standard be set at the alternate standard that is included in the 2007 workload model: 141 cases per attorney without considering investigator or social worker support.

10. *The subcommittee determined that the current workload model is based on data on attorney workload from 2002 and that many of its assumptions are outdated and not supported by current data.*

Recommendation:

That the Family and Juvenile Law Committee consider a comprehensive update of the attorney workload data and time standards in the current workload model. Since any updates to the workload data and time standards will uniformly impact all trial courts, this pending work should not slow or delay the remaining three-year phase-in period previously approved by the Judicial Council for implementing the new dependency counsel funding methodology. Rather this recommendation recognizes that a comprehensive update could not be completed within the time frame set by the Judicial Council for final report from the Joint Committees.

Rationale for Recommendations

Background to Subcommittee Recommendations

The subcommittee held 6 meetings, two of them in-person, between July and November, 2015. To support the discussions of the workload model, Judicial Council staff conducted two statewide surveys of attorney providers, four focus groups of dependency line attorneys inquiring into their workload and concerns, a web-based survey of county counsel salary ranges, and a data analysis of attorney workload data derived from the case management system used by the attorneys in the Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding and Training (DRAFT) program. Extensive public comment was provided at the subcommittee meetings and also at a stakeholders meeting held at a statewide conference and attended by attorneys and subcommittee members.

Recommendations 1 – 4: Fiscal Calculations

The subcommittee chose the median of statewide county salaries at the first tier of salaries because county counsel at this range should be roughly parallel in skills and experience to court-appointed dependency counsel, and because the salary information is publically available and can be updated. Using the same BLS index used in the WAFM model provides a way to adjust the median salary to each county's governmental salary market that is consistent with full-time equivalent salary adjustments in WAFM.

The subcommittee's finding from the survey of attorney firm managers on their budget and organization was that court-appointed dependency counsel use very different organizational models. There is no single method of calculating financial need for court-appointed counsel that accounts for all the variance in organizational models and local costs. Nor is the workload model meant to be prescriptive for attorney firms. Rather, the model should provide a means for calculating a total financial need that courts and attorney firms can then implement through a variety of service models.

For that reason the subcommittee does not recommend methods of calculating benefits, rent, supervisory costs, or other factors that are highly dependent on local factors and organizational models. Instead, line attorney salaries calculated using the method described above provides a base funding that accounts for local costs. The subcommittee points out that setting a proportion for all other costs at 55% of the total means that benefits, rent, and all other costs are also driven by the BLS index and thus adjusted for local costs.

Recommendations 5-7: Caseload

The subcommittee carried out an extensive review of the child welfare caseload counts provided by the California Department of Social Services, and compared them to the dependency filings reported through the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Advantages of the child welfare counts include using data from a statewide uniform case management system with a common set of data entry standards and using data that can be reported longitudinally (thus

providing a snapshot of cases under supervision at a given time). Disadvantages include the fact that local courts have no control over ensuring the accuracy of the data being reported.

Advantages of using the JBSIS filings counts include the control and accountability that derive from using court data to determine court dependency counsel budgets. Disadvantages include the fact that filing counts do not provide a snapshot caseload measure but only a count of case entries.

The subcommittee recommends that the workload model continue to use the child welfare caseload numbers, but that these be combined with JBSIS dependency filings to gain the advantages from both data sources. The weighting recommended is 70% child welfare filings and 30% JBSIS filings.

The subcommittee also reviewed data on the number of parent cases in the system and found that, consistent with public comment, there is wide variance among courts in the ratio of parent to child clients. However, the overall ratio in courts able to provide complete caseload data remained approximately .8 parent to 1.0 child client, the ratio set in the 2007 report.

Recommendation 9: Caseload per Attorney

The 2007 workload model set a “basic” caseload standard of 141 cases per dependency attorney. This standard was qualified by noting that many attorneys have access to paralegal, investigator or social worker staff for appropriate case work. The 2007 workload model estimates that a one-half time social worker/investigator should enable an attorney to carry a caseload of 188 clients.

The subcommittee reviewed the original analysis that supports the 141/188 caseload and an analysis of current workload data. The subcommittee’s conclusion is that attorney workload has changed substantially since the original workload study was conducted in 2002, and that more research needs to be done on attorney workload before a new caseload standard can be set.

However, it also appeared to the subcommittee that applying the 188 caseload standard statewide, as the current model does, unfairly disadvantaged the many attorneys who are solo practitioners or who do not have access to investigators and social workers. Therefore the subcommittee recommends that the “basic” caseload standard of 141 be used for statewide workload calculations. This approach is consistent with the subcommittee’s approach to overhead costs in recommendations 3 and 4, which makes line attorney cost the basis for total costs.

Next Steps

The committees will make formal recommendations to the Judicial Council at the April meeting, and provide a full report on the subcommittee’s work at that time.

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: February 25, 2016

Title	Agenda Item Type
Child Support: Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation	Action Required
	Effective Date
	February 25, 2016
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Date of Report
None	December 23, 2015
Recommended by	Contact
AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee	Anna L. Maves, Supervising Attorney
Hon. Irma Poole Asberry, Cochair	916-263-8624
Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Cochair	anna.maves@jud.ca.gov
Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, Cochair	

Executive Summary

At its meeting on April 17, 2015, the Judicial Council approved the recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee that the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee be established to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program. The subcommittee which included representatives from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) was charged with reconsidering the allocation methodology developed in 1997 and report back at the February 2016 Judicial Council meeting. The joint subcommittee completed its work in November 2015 after extensive discussions and review of the relevant information.

The joint subcommittee was asked to report back to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee by December 31, 2015, and report back to the council at its February 2016 meeting. This report is being provided in response to that directive and includes the recommendation of the subcommittee as well as the report back from the three respective advisory committees

Recommendation

The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective February 25, 2016:

1. Continue to allocate funding using the historical funding methodology, coordinate with California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies, and review the funding methodology for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators at the conclusion of the DCSS program review.
2. When developing a funding methodology in the future, determine whether there is sufficient data to determine the specific workload of the family law facilitator, which may be different than how workload for the child support commissioner is determined¹; and
3. Adopt the recommendation of the joint subcommittee for revising the process of how funds are moved from one court to another during a fiscal year to maximize program resources. This process would include providing questionnaires for the courts to identify funds available for redistribution and courts requesting additional funds. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee would make recommendations to the Judicial Council for reallocation of these available funds. The Judicial Council would direct the Administrative Director to continue to monitor spending patterns of the courts and provide a survey with a financial analysis to the courts towards the end of the fiscal year to determine if additional funds are available to be reallocated to courts who have exhausted their Ab1058 allocation. The Administrative Director would reallocate the available funds and report back to the Judicial Council on any action taken once the fiscal year has closed.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council is required annually to allocate non-Trial Court Trust Funds to the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program, and has done so since 1997.² The council receives recommendations on these allocations annually from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. Funds for this program are provided through a cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) and the Judicial Council. The agreement requires the council to annually approve the funding allocation for each court for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators. Two-thirds of the funds are provided from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, Office of Child Support Enforcement, through the 1996 Federal

¹ The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommend a minor edit to this recommendation as discussed below.

² AB 1058 added article 4 to chapter 2, of part 2, of division 9 of the Family Code, which at section 4252(b)(6) requires the Judicial Council to “[e]stablish procedures for the distribution of funding to the courts for child support commissioners, family law facilitators pursuant to [Family Code] Division 14 (commencing with Section 10000) and related allowable costs.”

Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Recovery Act (PRWORA) and one-third of the funds come from the state General Fund (non-Trial Court Trust Fund court funding). This funding is commonly referred to as “base funding.” Any funds left unspent during the fiscal year revert to the state General Fund and cannot be used in subsequent years. In addition, to the base funding, DCSS and the Judicial Council of California provide a mechanism for the courts to voluntarily participate in the federal drawdown option whereby courts could receive two-thirds of additional program funding by paying one-third of program costs from local trial court funds and receiving two-thirds federal matching funds.

In addition to allocating funds for each fiscal year, in order to maximize use of program resources, under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, the Judicial Council at midyear redistributes both base funding and federal drawdown funds to courts who indicate a need for additional funds any unallocated funds and any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants.

Rationale for Recommendation

Subcommittee Process

The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee met initially on June 18, 2015, again on August 25, 2015, and finally on November 19, 2015. Each aspect of the AB 1058 funding methodology (initial, mid-year, and federal draw down) was reviewed by members with assistance from staff and input from DCSS.

At the June meeting, Judicial Council staff from Finance and the Office of Court Research provided a presentation on the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), including the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) which is the basis for computing trial court workload for the WAFM. This background provided information about current data available through the courts and the methodology for allocating trial court funds. As part of the discussion, materials included a document (for discussion only) showing three year average annual filing numbers for DCSS cases, as reported by courts to the Judicial Council via Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS), for use in the annual Court Statistics Report and for the use in the RAS/WAFM model. These numbers were used to illustrate what would happen if the limited funds available were allocated using the RAS 3-year average filing numbers, demonstrating that additional work was necessary to develop other possible approaches to allocation of AB 1058 funds.

Also at the June meeting, staff from the Center for Families, Children & the Courts provided an overview of the AB 1058 Program including historical background and information about the funding of the AB 1058 Program. This included information about how funding decisions originally made by the council were based on a workload assessment based on data provided by Department of Social Services³. The data used was the number of cases opened in the local child

³ California's title IV-D program was managed by the Department of Social Services before the creation of the Department of Child Support Services in 2000.

support agency that had a child support order. In addition, minimum funding was provided to all of the courts regardless of caseload size. The allocation for Family Law Facilitators was based on the allocation each court received for the Child Support Commissioners.

Starting in 1997, each fiscal year the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee reviews the funds available for allocation for the courts for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators and makes recommendation the Judicial Council regarding funding allocation. Questionnaires are sent annually to each court requesting the information needed to evaluate appropriate funding levels. Courts who have indicated an exceptional need, such as increased workload or increased costs have received an adjustment to the allocation with increased funding. This increased funding was made available via the contract with DCSS or with funds available from courts who requested reduced funds.

Since 2008, due to the state budget crisis, the title IV-D program has been flat funded. Because there are no additional funds available for the program, the Judicial Council has allocated funds to the courts at the same level the court received in the prior fiscal year, less any amount a court indicated that they did not need, for both the Child Support Commissioner Program and Family Law Facilitator Program. Funds available because a court has indicated that it won't spend them have been allocated among all the courts requesting additional funds proportionate to their share of the total base funding. This has provided courts with funds consistent with the funding they received in the prior fiscal year and provided all courts that have requested additional funds with some additional funds. Although there has been an adjustment to the funding based on the questionnaires completed annual by the courts, there has not been an adjustment to the funding methodology based on workload.

At this meeting, the group decided that the first step in considering possible approaches to developing a funding methodology was to analyze the available data to determine workload/caseload for each court. The discussion of the subcommittee focused on which data to use to accurately determine the workload/caseload for each court. A subcommittee of the workgroup was formed to review options associated with reallocation of funds during a fiscal year.

At the August meeting the group reviewing the midyear reallocation reported back to the larger group as follows:

Midyear Reallocation: In December/January, each court responds to questionnaires for the child support commissioner program and family law facilitator program indicating whether they wish to maintain their base funding and federal draw down allocations for each program, return funds they do not anticipate expending, or request additional funds. As with the original allocations, requests for additional funds far exceed funds returned. The proposed reallocations are reviewed, revised, and recommended by the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and approved by the Judicial Council. Courts that voluntarily return funds and courts that are allocated additional funds must enter into an amended contract with the revised funding. The following issues were identified and discussed by the reallocation workgroup:

- There are insufficient funds to entirely fund the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program statewide. Despite some courts not expending all allocated funds resulting in approximately 2.5% of funds available for title IV-D services being unexpended annually, many courts spend their entire allocation and supplement the program with trial court funds to provide basic services.
- In order to participate in the federal drawdown program, courts must contribute the state match of 34% from trial court trust funds. At the end of the fiscal year, some courts lack sufficient funds to contribute the court's required match. Although the court's inability to participate in the federal drawdown program does not result in funds reverting to the General Fund, inability to move these funds to courts able to provide the match results in not all available title IV-D funds being maximized for the benefit of the program.
- Processing of midyear reallocation takes too much time. The current process which requires approval by the Judicial Council and contract amendments with the courts does not allow for last minute movement of funds from courts that will not expend all allocated title IV-D funds to courts that have already expended all allocated funds and are using trial court funds to continue to provide services. In addition, this process takes place in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year, when Finance staff in the courts and Judicial Council already have their heaviest workload.
- Although during the current reallocation process, some funds are identified which can be reallocated to other courts, some courts do not voluntarily return funds despite spending patterns that might suggest they are not projected to fully spend their allocation. These funds are then not spent and not made available to another court.

As a result of this analysis, the group recommended the following process for the mid-year reallocation:

- In December, Judicial Council staff will provide each court with a questionnaire inquiring about each court's current budget. This will identify any funds available for reallocation to other courts in that fiscal year and courts that need additional funds in that fiscal year.
- The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee will review the funds available and the requests for additional funds provided by each court and develop recommendations for reallocating funds that the Judicial Council would consider during their February meeting. The Judicial Council decides during their February meeting on the reallocation of amounts voluntarily forfeited by courts to those courts requesting additional AB 1058 funds.

- The Judicial Council require the Administrative Director to continue to monitor spending patterns of each of the courts throughout the remainder of the fiscal year. In April, Judicial Council staff would send each court a survey for courts to identify any expected savings or expenditures for any remaining funding. Included in this survey, each court would be provided with a financial analysis which shows spending projections for the remainder of the fiscal year based on invoices received to date. Courts would be required to certify their budgets to show that they will spend all of the remaining funds allocated to them and have sufficient trial court budget funds to provide the match necessary to receive federal drawdown funds. The Administrative Director would then be authorized to adjust the midyear reallocations based on the information provided by the courts in order to redistribute funds to those courts that have already provided valid unreimbursed claims and then to courts that are projected to have unreimbursed expenditures during the remainder of the current fiscal year (May and June). Courts would be noticed of the change in the Judicial Council's reallocation of funds based on the additional funds available due to the courts' spending projection for the remainder of the fiscal year.
- Once the Director has calculated the redistribution based on the information provided by the courts, revised contracts shall be provided to the impacted courts and a report shall be provided to the Council regarding the revision to the allocation. After each fiscal year has closed, staff will also provide the Judicial Council and all trial courts with an annual report which displays the final adjusted allocations, each court's actual expenditures and any unspent funds, both base funds and federal drawdown funds by court.
- Judicial Council staff will provide information and education to the courts regarding this change to the reallocation processes, specifically at Court Executive Advisory Committee meeting, Chief Financial Officer Roundtable, the courts' annual budget meeting, AB 1058 Annual Conference, and Beyond the Bench.

The group also recommended that ongoing work be conducted to consider improvements to other aspects of the AB 1058 program, including but not limited to policies and procedures, increased use of technology, communication and training.

Additionally, at the August meeting members discussed data reliability and the use of filing data vs. DCSS caseload data. Members also discussed what other factors should be considered in any funding methodology and decided that the primary components in a revised funding methodology should include:

1. Comparative workload data based on DCSS caseload statistics;
2. Factoring in differences in local costs of labor;
3. A minimum funding floor for small courts; and
4. Gradual phase-in to minimize the impact of any shifts in funding.

A smaller subcommittee was established to explore and present specific options for the full subcommittee's consideration at its next meeting.

At the November 19, 2015 meeting, the full subcommittee had an extensive discussion about the information available and the best way to proceed. The subcommittee received extensive statewide input including 26 separate email messages and letters from judicial officers, child support commissioners, family law facilitators and court administrators and in person comments from judicial officers and a court executive.

The smaller subcommittee tasked with proposing a funding methodology incorporating the factors specified above, reported back to the joint subcommittee. A report was provided which showed possible funding allocation options. It also showed different options for phasing-in any change in allocation over three or four years. The subcommittee recognized some public comments received from trial courts and acknowledged that the reports prepared erroneously combined funding for courts that have reached agreements to share resources and that any funding allocation methodology should take that into account the concerns raised.

Alisha Griffin, Director of the DCSS which is the state agency designated to administer the Title IV-D state plan, reported to the subcommittee that DCSS has instituted a review of its allocation methodology for allocating funding to the local child support agencies. This comprehensive two year review will include evaluating the cost for providing services, determining increased efficiencies that could be adopted statewide, and encouraging uniformity among the local child support agencies. This information could then be used to justify increased investment by the legislature to increase funding for the program. Director Griffin advised that revising the current funding methodology might negatively impact the work that the funder is currently undertaking to potentially increase funding for the Title IV-D program which would include additional funds for the courts.

After a comprehensive discussion and in consideration of the input provided from the public comment, the Joint Subcommittee reconsidered the funding allocation methodology for distributing base funds and federal drawdown funds for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators and made the following recommendation based on a 10-5 vote:

1. Continue to allocate funding using the historical funding methodology, coordinate with DCSS on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies, and review the funding methodology for the child support commissioners and family law facilitators at the conclusion of the DCSS program review.
2. When developing a funding methodology, determine whether there is sufficient data to determine the specific workload of the family law facilitator, which may be different than how workload for the child support commissioner is determined.

3. Adopt the recommendation of the mid-year reallocation subcommittee for revising the process of how funds are moved from one court to another during a fiscal year to maximize program resources.

Subsequent Advisory Committee Input

Workload Assessment Advisory Committee:

The Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) met on December 2, 2015, to review and discuss the recommendations that were approved by the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee at its November 19, 2015, meeting. WAAC voted unanimously to support all three recommendations in concept, with the suggestion of a non-substantive amendment to Recommendation 2, in order to clarify its intent and avoid confusion with the workload measurement that is under WAAC's charge through the Resource Assessment Study (RAS). The proposed amendment to Recommendation 2 is as follows:

“When developing a funding methodology, determine whether the family law facilitator methodology should use different underlying data than the child support commissioner methodology, and identify what data should be used, given that different factors drive commissioner and facilitator workloads.”

In addition to voting in support of the joint subcommittee's recommendations, WAAC is committing to improving the data related to AB 1058 case processing through its own work, both by exploring with the Court Executives Advisory Committee the concerns expressed regarding the consistency and reliability of DCSS filings data (and associated JBSIS reporting guidelines), and by ensuring that the full range of AB 1058 workload is captured in the 2016 update of the staff workload study. Although WAAC recognizes that whatever funding methodology is eventually adopted may not function in the same way as the RAS model, the data from the staff workload study may nonetheless prove useful in the development of the methodology.

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee:

The committee met on December 8, 2015, by phone to discuss the recommendations of the Joint Subcommittee. Members appreciated the work that was done and agreed that going forward the advisory committee should continue to pursue its role of providing recommendations to the Judicial Council regarding the AB 1058 program and to coordinate with DCSS on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies, and provide information to the Judicial Council at the conclusion of the DCSS program review and throughout the process. The committee will seek to provide this input as part of the Annual Agenda process and through its work crafting recommendations on AB 1058, as approved by RUPRO and the Judicial Council. The committee also indicated support for the friendly amendment that WAAC was considering as discussed above.

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee:

This space is reserved to include the report back from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

This recommendation was included in materials provided to the joint subcommittee for its public meeting on November 19, 2015. All three joint subcommittee meetings were open to the public. Twenty-six written comments from superior court judges, child support commissioners, family law facilitators and administrators were received and distributed to members for the November 19 meeting and in person public comments were provided by three public commentators representing two superior courts.

Alternatives considered for allocating funding

The joint subcommittee discussed a number of factors that should be included in any funding allocation methodology. These included identifying workload for each court, either using court data or data provide by DCSS, including a funding floor for small courts, and phasing in any change so that courts can make appropriate adjustment. Ultimately, the joint subcommittee determined that it had insufficient information to make a recommendation for a change to the current funding methodology and that there was not an urgent need to change to the current methodology.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

There are no implementation requirements and costs other than the completion of an additional budget survey by each court to determine available funds that could be provided to courts that have already exhausted their AB 1058 budget and are using trial court funds to maintain service levels.

Overview of Process for Developing Recommendations for AB 1058 Funding Allocation Methodology

Background

At the August 25, 2015, meeting of the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee, members voted to include four primary components in any funding allocation methodologies to be considered:

1. the model should be based on some measure of workload;
2. the model should factor in differences in local costs of labor between different jurisdictions;
3. the model should incorporate a minimum funding floor for small courts; and
4. the model should be phased in gradually to minimize the impact of any shifts in funding.

A smaller subcommittee was established to explore and present specific options for the full subcommittee's consideration. Following is an overview of the group's work and resulting recommendations. Where feasible, the group used approaches consistent with the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), which allocates the annual state trial court operations funds and was developed in an effort to more equitably distribute funding across courts, relative to historical funding levels.

Workload Measures

At its August 25, 2015, meeting, the joint subcommittee explored using both court filings (JBSIS) data and DCSS caseload data (cases with support orders established during the federal fiscal year) and determined that the latter would be more reflective of court workload and likely more reliable and consistently collected and reported, given that the data are audited. However, some members expressed a greater degree of comfort in using data generated and maintained by the courts. Other possibilities for workload measures included hearings and filings of requests for order (RFOs), but neither is consistently collected on a statewide basis, so using them would require placing additional reporting requirements on the courts.

The subcommittee opted to take an approach consistent with WAFM and use a three-year average of DCSS caseload, rather than a single year of data, in order to smooth over any spikes in volume. The first step in the allocation model involves summing the individual courts' three-year averages to arrive at a statewide total, then calculating each court's percentage of the total and multiplying it by total available funding to establish the initial, unadjusted pro rata share of funding.

DRAFT – For deliberative purposes only

Cost of Labor Adjustment

The subcommittee voted to incorporate a cost of labor adjustment into the methodology because there are significant labor cost differences across courts. WAFM uses a local cost of labor adjustment factor based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data on local government employee salaries. Given that this seems to be an appropriate index for such adjustments, and because there are benefits to using consistent metrics where possible, the draft methodology incorporates the same BLS factors as WAFM.

AB 1058 funding supports both salaries and operating expenses. Only the portion of funding that covers salaries should be subject to the cost of labor adjustment. To determine that portion of funding, actual expenditure data from FY 2013-14 were used to calculate average salary expenditures (including paid benefits, which function like salaries, and costs of contract staff) as a percentage of total base funding. Although a court may pay salaries out of both base and drawdown funding, it seemed safer to operate under the assumption to include all of the salary in the base, given that some courts do not participate in the drawdown. Additionally, because there is little variation in commissioner salaries from county to county, only support staff salaries are subject to the cost of labor adjustment in the Child Support Commissioner allocations.

The next steps in the allocation model involve applying the average salary percentages to the initial, unadjusted pro rata share of funding to determine the amount subject to the cost of labor adjustment, multiplying that amount by the BLS factor, and adding back in the non-salary portion of the allocation to come up with a total adjusted allocation. Applying the cost of labor adjustments results in a statewide total that exceeds available funding, so at a later point in the model, further adjustments need to be made to rescale the allocations to available funding.

Funding Floor

The subcommittee opted to retain the assumption in the original allocation model that each court, regardless of workload, should be provided with a minimum of 0.3 FTE child support commissioner and 0.3 FTE family law facilitator. Unlike the original model, however, there is no allowance for minimum support staff since that would already be provided through the WAFM funding floor. To establish what that floor translates to in dollars, actual FY 2013-14 expenditure data were used to calculate the average salary, benefits, and travel and training costs for the Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 courts (the smallest courts that would be subject to the funding floor). Using these data, the funding floor would be roughly \$45,600 for the family law facilitator program and roughly \$62,600 for the child support commissioner program.

The final steps in the allocation model involve comparing the adjusted allocation to the funding floor and assigning the floor to those courts with a lower adjusted allocation. The remaining funding is then distributed proportionately to the BLS-adjusted share of the total among the courts not subject to the funding floor.

DRAFT – For deliberative purposes only

Implementation and Phase-In

The workload-based methodology would, if implemented, result in changed allocations for courts throughout the state. Again consistent with WAFM, phasing in the new allocation methodology over time would ease the transition for courts. Three different phase-in options are proposed:

- A. a 3-year phase-in that is 33% workload-based (67% historical) in year 1, 67% workload-based in year 2, and 100% workload-based in year 3;
- B. a 4-year phase-in that is 25% workload-based (75% historical) in year 1, 50% workload-based in year 2, 75% workload-based in year 3, and 100% workload-based in year 4; and
- C. a 4-year phase-in that is 15% workload-based (85% historical) in year 1, 45% workload-based in year 2, 70% workload-based in year 3, and 100% workload-based in year 4 (an approach that would reduce the immediate impact relative to option B).

The full subcommittee may also wish to consider whether to implement the new allocation methodology immediately (i.e., FY 2016-17) or delay until FY 2017-18 in order to give the courts additional time to prepare for the transition.

County	3-Year Avg. DCSS Caseload (Line 17)	% of Total DCSS Caseload	Pro Rata CSC Base Allocation	Support Salary Only (Assuming 43% of Base)	BLS Factor	Salary w/ BLS Adjustment	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (no floor)
Alameda	2,308	2.66%	\$855,578	\$366,448	1.42	\$520,356	\$1,009,486
Alpine	1	0.00%	\$494	\$212	0.83	\$176	\$458
Alpine-El Dorado	432						
Amador	84	0.10%	\$31,134	\$13,335	1.00	\$13,335	\$31,134
Butte	735	0.85%	\$272,549	\$116,734	0.91	\$106,228	\$262,043
Calaveras	126	0.15%	\$46,702	\$20,003	0.89	\$17,802	\$44,501
Colusa	51	0.06%	\$19,027	\$8,149	0.71	\$5,786	\$16,663
Contra Costa	2,394	2.76%	\$887,330	\$380,048	1.25	\$475,060	\$982,342
Del Norte	193	0.22%	\$71,411	\$30,586	0.77	\$23,551	\$64,377
El Dorado	431	0.50%	\$159,749	\$68,421	1.00	\$68,421	\$159,749
Fresno	4,202	4.85%	\$1,557,584	\$667,121	0.99	\$660,450	\$1,550,912
Glenn	153	0.18%	\$56,585	\$24,236	0.69	\$16,723	\$49,072
Humboldt	388	0.45%	\$143,935	\$61,648	0.77	\$47,469	\$129,756
Imperial	1,002	1.16%	\$371,389	\$159,068	0.78	\$124,073	\$336,394
Inyo	61	0.07%	\$22,733	\$9,737	0.83	\$8,081	\$21,078
Kern	3,545	4.09%	\$1,313,945	\$562,769	1.05	\$590,907	\$1,342,083
Kings	714	0.82%	\$264,766	\$113,400	0.88	\$99,792	\$251,158
Lake	190	0.22%	\$70,299	\$30,110	0.75	\$22,582	\$62,772
Lassen	154	0.18%	\$57,080	\$24,448	0.80	\$19,558	\$52,190
Los Angeles	16,118	18.60%	\$5,974,217	\$2,558,787	1.34	\$3,428,774	\$6,844,204
Madera	676	0.78%	\$250,434	\$107,262	0.93	\$99,754	\$242,926
Marin	195	0.22%	\$72,153	\$30,903	1.28	\$39,556	\$80,806
Mariposa	41	0.05%	\$15,197	\$6,509	0.78	\$5,077	\$13,765
Mendocino	328	0.38%	\$121,449	\$52,017	0.83	\$43,174	\$112,606
Merced	1,400	1.62%	\$518,906	\$222,250	0.90	\$200,025	\$496,681
Modoc	26	0.03%	\$9,637	\$4,128	0.60	\$2,477	\$7,986
Mono	16	0.02%	\$5,807	\$2,487	1.15	\$2,860	\$6,180
Monterey	1,391	1.60%	\$515,570	\$220,821	1.19	\$262,777	\$557,526
Napa	309	0.36%	\$114,654	\$49,107	1.22	\$59,910	\$125,457
Nevada	185	0.21%	\$68,693	\$29,422	0.97	\$28,539	\$67,811
Nevada-Sierra	193						
Orange	4,398	5.07%	\$1,630,107	\$698,183	1.30	\$907,638	\$1,839,562
Placer	558	0.64%	\$206,698	\$88,530	1.17	\$103,580	\$221,748
Plumas	67	0.08%	\$24,710	\$10,583	0.70	\$7,408	\$21,535

County	3-Year Avg.	% of Total DCSS Caseload	Pro Rata CSC Base Allocation	Support	BLS Factor	Salary w/ BLS Adjustment	Total
	DCSS Caseload (Line 17)			Salary Only (Assuming 43% of Base)			Adjusted Base Allocation (no floor)
Riverside	6,608	7.62%	\$2,449,361	\$1,049,073	1.08	\$1,132,999	\$2,533,287
Sacramento	5,777	6.66%	\$2,141,106	\$917,046	1.28	\$1,173,819	\$2,397,879
San Benito	180	0.21%	\$66,717	\$28,575	0.98	\$28,004	\$66,145
San Bernardino	9,486	10.94%	\$3,515,960	\$1,505,903	1.06	\$1,596,257	\$3,606,315
San Diego	4,230	4.88%	\$1,567,838	\$671,513	1.17	\$785,670	\$1,681,995
San Francisco	762	0.88%	\$282,557	\$121,020	1.68	\$203,314	\$364,851
San Joaquin	3,299	3.81%	\$1,222,889	\$523,769	1.10	\$576,146	\$1,275,266
San Luis Obispo	436	0.50%	\$161,479	\$69,162	1.07	\$74,003	\$166,320
San Mateo	642	0.74%	\$237,956	\$101,918	1.44	\$146,761	\$282,799
Santa Barbara	1,013	1.17%	\$375,466	\$160,814	1.17	\$188,152	\$402,804
Santa Clara	2,305	2.66%	\$854,466	\$365,972	1.44	\$526,999	\$1,015,493
Santa Cruz	408	0.47%	\$151,224	\$64,770	1.15	\$74,486	\$160,940
Shasta	772	0.89%	\$286,016	\$122,502	0.85	\$104,127	\$267,641
Shasta-Trinity	811						
Sierra	7	0.01%	\$2,718	\$1,164	0.73	\$850	\$2,404
Siskiyou	167	0.19%	\$61,775	\$26,458	0.69	\$18,256	\$53,572
Solano	1,202	1.39%	\$445,395	\$190,765	1.20	\$228,918	\$483,547
Sonoma	830	0.96%	\$307,761	\$131,815	1.17	\$154,224	\$330,169
Stanislaus	1,813	2.09%	\$672,107	\$287,867	1.02	\$293,624	\$677,864
Sutter	350	0.40%	\$129,603	\$55,510	0.95	\$52,734	\$126,828
Tehama	345	0.40%	\$127,750	\$54,716	0.80	\$43,773	\$116,807
Trinity	39	0.05%	\$14,579	\$6,244	0.65	\$4,059	\$12,393
Tulare	1,260	1.45%	\$467,016	\$200,025	0.83	\$166,021	\$433,011
Tuolumne	189	0.22%	\$70,176	\$30,057	0.83	\$24,947	\$65,066
Ventura	1,371	1.58%	\$508,157	\$217,646	1.21	\$263,352	\$553,863
Yolo	463	0.53%	\$171,733	\$73,554	1.03	\$75,761	\$173,940
Yuba	280	0.32%	\$103,658	\$44,397	0.93	\$41,289	\$100,550
Total	86,675	100.00%	\$32,125,980	\$13,759,715		\$15,990,446	\$34,356,711

CSC Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Support Staff Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	Adjusted Base Greater Than Floor Allocation?	If "No," Floor Allocation Amount	Adjusted Base Allocation Excluding Floor Courts	% of Total Adjusted Base Allocation	Adjusted Salary Rescaled to Available Allocation	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (with floor)	Pro Rata CSC Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)
Alameda	Yes		\$1,009,486	3.00%	\$926,797	\$926,797	\$215,014
Alpine	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$124
Alpine-El Dorado						\$209,222	\$40,271
Amador	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$7,824
Butte	Yes		\$262,043	0.78%	\$240,579	\$240,579	\$68,494
Calaveras	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$11,737
Colusa	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$4,782
Contra Costa	Yes		\$982,342	2.92%	\$901,876	\$901,876	\$222,994
Del Norte	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$17,946
El Dorado	Yes		\$159,749	0.47%	\$146,664	\$146,664	\$40,146
Fresno	Yes		\$1,550,912	4.60%	\$1,423,874	\$1,423,874	\$391,434
Glenn	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$14,220
Humboldt	Yes		\$129,756	0.39%	\$119,127	\$119,127	\$36,172
Imperial	Yes		\$336,394	1.00%	\$308,839	\$308,839	\$93,333
Inyo	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$5,713
Kern	Yes		\$1,342,083	3.98%	\$1,232,151	\$1,232,151	\$330,206
Kings	Yes		\$251,158	0.75%	\$230,585	\$230,585	\$66,538
Lake	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$17,667
Lassen	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$14,345
Los Angeles	Yes		\$6,844,204	20.31%	\$6,283,583	\$6,283,583	\$1,501,373
Madera	Yes		\$242,926	0.72%	\$223,027	\$223,027	\$62,936
Marin	Yes		\$80,806	0.24%	\$74,187	\$74,187	\$18,133
Mariposa	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$3,819
Mendocino	Yes		\$112,606	0.33%	\$103,382	\$103,382	\$30,521
Merced	Yes		\$496,681	1.47%	\$455,997	\$455,997	\$130,406
Modoc	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$2,422
Mono	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$1,459
Monterey	Yes		\$557,526	1.65%	\$511,858	\$511,858	\$129,567
Napa	Yes		\$125,457	0.37%	\$115,181	\$115,181	\$28,813
Nevada	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$17,263
Nevada-Sierra						\$125,116	\$17,946
Orange	Yes		\$1,839,562	5.46%	\$1,688,880	\$1,688,880	\$409,660
Placer	Yes		\$221,748	0.66%	\$203,584	\$203,584	\$51,945
Plumas	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$6,210

CSC Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Support Staff Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	Adjusted Base Greater Than Floor Allocation?	If "No," Floor Allocation Amount	Adjusted Base Allocation Excluding Floor Courts	% of Total Adjusted Base Allocation	Adjusted Salary Rescaled to Available Allocation	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (with floor)	Pro Rata CSC Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)
Riverside	Yes		\$2,533,287	7.52%	\$2,325,781	\$2,325,781	\$615,546
Sacramento	Yes		\$2,397,879	7.12%	\$2,201,464	\$2,201,464	\$538,079
San Benito	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$16,766
San Bernardino	Yes		\$3,606,315	10.70%	\$3,310,915	\$3,310,915	\$883,592
San Diego	Yes		\$1,681,995	4.99%	\$1,544,220	\$1,544,220	\$394,011
San Francisco	Yes		\$364,851	1.08%	\$334,965	\$334,965	\$71,009
San Joaquin	Yes		\$1,275,266	3.78%	\$1,170,807	\$1,170,807	\$307,323
San Luis Obispo	Yes		\$166,320	0.49%	\$152,696	\$152,696	\$40,581
San Mateo	Yes		\$282,799	0.84%	\$259,635	\$259,635	\$59,800
Santa Barbara	Yes		\$402,804	1.20%	\$369,810	\$369,810	\$94,358
Santa Clara	Yes		\$1,015,493	3.01%	\$932,312	\$932,312	\$214,735
Santa Cruz	Yes		\$160,940	0.48%	\$147,757	\$147,757	\$38,004
Shasta	Yes		\$267,641	0.79%	\$245,718	\$245,718	\$71,878
Shasta-Trinity						\$308,276	\$75,542
Sierra	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$683
Siskiyou	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$15,524
Solano	Yes		\$483,547	1.43%	\$443,939	\$443,939	\$111,932
Sonoma	Yes		\$330,169	0.98%	\$303,125	\$303,125	\$77,343
Stanislaus	Yes		\$677,864	2.01%	\$622,339	\$622,339	\$168,906
Sutter	Yes		\$126,828	0.38%	\$116,439	\$116,439	\$32,570
Tehama	Yes		\$116,807	0.35%	\$107,239	\$107,239	\$32,105
Trinity	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$3,664
Tulare	Yes		\$433,011	1.28%	\$397,543	\$397,543	\$117,365
Tuolumne	No	\$62,558				\$62,558	\$17,636
Ventura	Yes		\$553,863	1.64%	\$508,495	\$508,495	\$127,704
Yolo	Yes		\$173,940	0.52%	\$159,692	\$159,692	\$43,158
Yuba	Yes		\$100,550	0.30%	\$92,314	\$92,314	\$26,050
Total		\$1,188,603	\$33,697,608	100.00%	\$30,937,377	\$32,125,980	\$8,073,539

FLF Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	DCSS	DCSS	DCSS	3-Year Avg.	% of Total DCSS Caseload	Pro Rata FLF Base Allocation	Salary Only (Assuming 91% of Base)	Salary w/ BLS Adjustment	BLS Factor	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (no floor)
	Caseload FFY 2013	Caseload FFY 2014	Caseload FFY 2015	DCSS Caseload (Line 17)						
Alameda	2,027	2,421	2,477	2,308	2.66%	\$292,695	\$265,968	1.42	\$377,675	\$404,401
Alpine	1	1	2	1	0.00%	\$169	\$154	0.83	\$128	\$143
Alpine-El Dorado	481	402	414	432						
Amador	107	80	65	84	0.10%	\$10,651	\$9,679	1.00	\$9,679	\$10,651
Amador-Calaveras	254	204	172	210						
Butte	770	700	736	735	0.85%	\$93,240	\$84,726	0.91	\$77,100	\$85,614
Calaveras	147	124	107	126	0.15%	\$15,977	\$14,518	0.89	\$12,921	\$14,380
Colusa	53	60	41	51	0.06%	\$6,509	\$5,915	0.71	\$4,199	\$4,794
Contra Costa	2,070	2,726	2,386	2,394	2.76%	\$303,557	\$275,839	1.25	\$344,799	\$372,517
Del Norte	167	179	232	193	0.22%	\$24,430	\$22,199	0.77	\$17,093	\$19,324
El Dorado	480	401	412	431	0.50%	\$54,650	\$49,660	1.00	\$49,660	\$54,650
Fresno	3,944	3,960	4,703	4,202	4.85%	\$532,852	\$484,197	0.99	\$479,355	\$528,010
Glenn	163	163	132	153	0.18%	\$19,358	\$17,590	0.69	\$12,137	\$13,905
Humboldt	383	426	356	388	0.45%	\$49,240	\$44,744	0.77	\$34,453	\$38,949
Imperial	1,060	976	970	1,002	1.16%	\$127,053	\$115,451	0.78	\$90,052	\$101,653
Inyo	61	66	57	61	0.07%	\$7,777	\$7,067	0.83	\$5,866	\$6,576
Kern	4,809	3,302	2,524	3,545	4.09%	\$449,503	\$408,458	1.05	\$428,881	\$469,926
Kings	756	681	706	714	0.82%	\$90,577	\$82,306	0.88	\$72,429	\$80,700
Lake	124	196	249	190	0.22%	\$24,050	\$21,854	0.75	\$16,390	\$18,586
Lassen	140	161	161	154	0.18%	\$19,527	\$17,744	0.80	\$14,195	\$15,978
Los Angeles	19,801	10,622	17,932	16,118	18.60%	\$2,043,791	\$1,857,170	1.34	\$2,488,608	\$2,675,228
Madera	648	698	681	676	0.78%	\$85,674	\$77,851	0.93	\$72,401	\$80,224
Marin	226	187	171	195	0.22%	\$24,684	\$22,430	1.28	\$28,710	\$30,964
Mariposa	32	53	38	41	0.05%	\$5,199	\$4,724	0.78	\$3,685	\$4,159
Mendocino	422	298	263	328	0.38%	\$41,548	\$37,754	0.83	\$31,336	\$35,130
Merced	1,536	1,255	1,409	1,400	1.62%	\$177,519	\$161,309	0.90	\$145,178	\$161,388
Modoc	25	20	33	26	0.03%	\$3,297	\$2,996	0.60	\$1,797	\$2,098
Mono	13	23	11	16	0.02%	\$1,987	\$1,805	1.15	\$2,076	\$2,257
Monterey	1,512	1,375	1,286	1,391	1.60%	\$176,378	\$160,272	1.19	\$190,724	\$206,829
Napa	339	312	277	309	0.36%	\$39,223	\$35,642	1.22	\$43,483	\$47,064
Nevada	181	202	173	185	0.21%	\$23,500	\$21,354	0.97	\$20,714	\$22,859
Nevada-Sierra	189	211	178	193						
Orange	4,254	3,910	5,030	4,398	5.07%	\$557,663	\$506,742	1.30	\$658,764	\$709,685
Placer	572	598	503	558	0.64%	\$70,712	\$64,255	1.17	\$75,178	\$81,635

FLF Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	DCSS	DCSS	DCSS	3-Year Avg.	% of Total	Pro Rata FLF	Salary Only	BLS Factor	Salary w/ BLS Adjustment	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (no floor)
	Caseload FFY 2013	Caseload FFY 2014	Caseload FFY 2015	DCSS Caseload (Line 17)	DCSS Caseload	Base Allocation	(Assuming 91% of Base)			
Plumas	61	69	70	67	0.08%	\$8,453	\$7,681	0.70	\$5,377	\$6,149
Riverside	6,320	6,831	6,674	6,608	7.62%	\$837,931	\$761,419	1.08	\$822,332	\$898,844
Sacramento	5,972	5,738	5,620	5,777	6.66%	\$732,476	\$665,593	1.28	\$851,959	\$918,842
San Benito	170	194	176	180	0.21%	\$22,824	\$20,740	0.98	\$20,325	\$22,409
San Bernardino	9,662	9,763	9,033	9,486	10.94%	\$1,202,817	\$1,092,986	1.06	\$1,158,565	\$1,268,396
San Diego	4,085	4,423	4,182	4,230	4.88%	\$536,360	\$487,385	1.17	\$570,240	\$619,216
San Francisco	742	837	708	762	0.88%	\$96,663	\$87,837	1.68	\$147,566	\$156,392
San Joaquin	3,491	3,511	2,896	3,299	3.81%	\$418,353	\$380,152	1.10	\$418,168	\$456,368
San Luis Obispo	449	420	438	436	0.50%	\$55,242	\$50,198	1.07	\$53,712	\$58,756
San Mateo	708	645	573	642	0.74%	\$81,405	\$73,972	1.44	\$106,519	\$113,953
Santa Barbara	1,262	944	833	1,013	1.17%	\$128,448	\$116,719	1.17	\$136,561	\$148,290
Santa Clara	2,281	2,351	2,284	2,305	2.66%	\$292,314	\$265,623	1.44	\$382,497	\$409,188
Santa Cruz	599	346	279	408	0.47%	\$51,734	\$47,010	1.15	\$54,062	\$58,786
Shasta	689	918	708	772	0.89%	\$97,847	\$88,912	0.85	\$75,575	\$84,510
Shasta-Trinity	730	965	738	811						
Sierra	8	9	5	7	0.01%	\$930	\$845	0.73	\$617	\$702
Siskiyou	168	160	172	167	0.19%	\$21,133	\$19,203	0.69	\$13,250	\$15,180
Solano	1,431	1,195	979	1,202	1.39%	\$152,370	\$138,457	1.20	\$166,149	\$180,062
Sonoma	916	790	785	830	0.96%	\$105,286	\$95,672	1.17	\$111,936	\$121,550
Stanislaus	1,787	1,892	1,761	1,813	2.09%	\$229,929	\$208,934	1.02	\$213,113	\$234,108
Sutter	360	371	318	350	0.40%	\$44,337	\$40,289	0.95	\$38,274	\$42,323
Tehama	360	376	298	345	0.40%	\$43,703	\$39,713	0.80	\$31,770	\$35,761
Trinity	41	47	30	39	0.05%	\$4,987	\$4,532	0.65	\$2,946	\$3,401
Tulare	1,118	1,248	1,414	1,260	1.45%	\$159,767	\$145,178	0.83	\$120,498	\$135,087
Tuolumne	245	165	158	189	0.22%	\$24,007	\$21,815	0.83	\$18,107	\$20,299
Ventura	1,116	1,264	1,733	1,371	1.58%	\$173,842	\$157,968	1.21	\$191,141	\$207,015
Yolo	472	481	437	463	0.53%	\$58,750	\$53,386	1.03	\$54,987	\$60,352
Yuba	320	270	249	280	0.32%	\$35,461	\$32,223	0.93	\$29,968	\$33,206
Total	91,656	81,434	86,936	86,675	100.00%	\$10,990,357	\$9,986,816		\$11,605,883	\$12,609,424

FLF Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	Adjusted Base Greater Than Floor Allocation?	If "No," Floor Allocation Amount	Adjusted Base Allocation Excluding Floor Courts	% of Total Adjusted Base Allocation	Adjusted Salary Rescaled to Available Allocation	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (with floor)	Pro Rata FLF Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)
Alameda	Yes		\$404,401	3.35%	\$326,506	\$326,506	\$73,483
Alpine	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$42
Alpine-El Dorado	No					\$91,195	\$13,763
Amador	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$2,674
Amador-Calaveras	No					\$91,195	\$6,685
Butte	Yes		\$85,614	0.71%	\$69,123	\$69,123	\$23,408
Calaveras	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$4,011
Colusa	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$1,634
Contra Costa	Yes		\$372,517	3.08%	\$300,763	\$300,763	\$76,210
Del Norte	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$6,133
El Dorado	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$13,720
Fresno	Yes		\$528,010	4.37%	\$426,305	\$426,305	\$133,775
Glenn	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$4,860
Humboldt	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$12,362
Imperial	Yes		\$101,653	0.84%	\$82,073	\$82,073	\$31,897
Inyo	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$1,952
Kern	Yes		\$469,926	3.89%	\$379,409	\$379,409	\$112,850
Kings	Yes		\$80,700	0.67%	\$65,156	\$65,156	\$22,740
Lake	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$6,038
Lassen	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$4,902
Los Angeles	Yes		\$2,675,228	22.13%	\$2,159,926	\$2,159,926	\$513,104
Madera	Yes		\$80,224	0.66%	\$64,772	\$64,772	\$21,509
Marin	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$6,197
Mariposa	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$1,305
Mendocino	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$10,431
Merced	Yes		\$161,388	1.34%	\$130,301	\$130,301	\$44,567
Modoc	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$828
Mono	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$499
Monterey	Yes		\$206,829	1.71%	\$166,990	\$166,990	\$44,281
Napa	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$9,847
Nevada	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$5,900
Nevada-Sierra	No					\$91,195	\$6,133
Orange	Yes		\$709,685	5.87%	\$572,986	\$572,986	\$140,004
Placer	Yes		\$81,635	0.68%	\$65,910	\$65,910	\$17,753

FLF Base Funding Allocated Pro Rata by Share of DCSS Caseload, Applying BLS Adjustment to Salaries, Using Funding Floor Attachment 4B

County	Adjusted Base Greater Than Floor Allocation?	If "No," Floor Allocation Amount	Adjusted Base Allocation Excluding Floor Courts	% of Total Adjusted Base Allocation	Adjusted Salary Rescaled to Available Allocation	Total Adjusted Base Allocation (with floor)	Pro Rata FLF Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)
Plumas	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$2,122
Riverside	Yes		\$898,844	7.44%	\$725,709	\$725,709	\$210,367
Sacramento	Yes		\$918,842	7.60%	\$741,855	\$741,855	\$183,892
San Benito	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$5,730
San Bernardino	Yes		\$1,268,396	10.49%	\$1,024,077	\$1,024,077	\$301,973
San Diego	Yes		\$619,216	5.12%	\$499,942	\$499,942	\$134,656
San Francisco	Yes		\$156,392	1.29%	\$126,268	\$126,268	\$24,268
San Joaquin	Yes		\$456,368	3.78%	\$368,462	\$368,462	\$105,030
San Luis Obispo	Yes		\$58,756	0.49%	\$47,438	\$47,438	\$13,869
San Mateo	Yes		\$113,953	0.94%	\$92,003	\$92,003	\$20,437
Santa Barbara	Yes		\$148,290	1.23%	\$119,726	\$119,726	\$32,247
Santa Clara	Yes		\$409,188	3.39%	\$330,370	\$330,370	\$73,387
Santa Cruz	Yes		\$58,786	0.49%	\$47,462	\$47,462	\$12,988
Shasta	Yes		\$84,510	0.70%	\$68,232	\$68,232	\$24,565
Shasta-Trinity	No					\$113,829	\$25,817
Sierra	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$233
Siskiyou	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$5,306
Solano	Yes		\$180,062	1.49%	\$145,378	\$145,378	\$38,253
Sonoma	Yes		\$121,550	1.01%	\$98,137	\$98,137	\$26,432
Stanislaus	Yes		\$234,108	1.94%	\$189,014	\$189,014	\$57,725
Sutter	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$11,131
Tehama	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$10,972
Trinity	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$1,252
Tulare	Yes		\$135,087	1.12%	\$109,066	\$109,066	\$40,110
Tuolumne	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$6,027
Ventura	Yes		\$207,015	1.71%	\$167,140	\$167,140	\$43,644
Yolo	Yes		\$60,352	0.50%	\$48,727	\$48,727	\$14,750
Yuba	No	\$45,597				\$45,597	\$8,903
Total		\$1,231,130	\$12,087,525	100.00%	\$9,759,227	\$10,990,357	\$2,759,186

CSC Allocation, Based on DCSS Caseload, Using BLS Adjustment & Funding Floor

County	Base Allocation			Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)			Total Allocation		
	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference
Alameda	\$926,797	\$1,055,625	-12.2%	\$215,014	\$344,419	-37.6%	\$1,141,811	\$1,400,044	-18.4%
Alpine-El Dorado	\$209,222	\$206,440	1.3%	\$40,271	\$61,641	-34.7%	\$249,492	\$268,081	-6.9%
Amador	\$62,558	\$142,508	-56.1%	\$7,824	\$28,085	-72.1%	\$70,382	\$170,593	-58.7%
Butte	\$240,579	\$363,685	-33.8%	\$68,494	\$23,968	185.8%	\$309,073	\$387,653	-20.3%
Calaveras	\$62,558	\$133,526	-53.1%	\$11,737	\$24,558	-52.2%	\$74,295	\$158,084	-53.0%
Colusa	\$62,558	\$45,987	36.0%	\$4,782	\$12,628	-62.1%	\$67,340	\$58,615	14.9%
Contra Costa	\$901,876	\$1,014,068	-11.1%	\$222,994	\$28,066	694.5%	\$1,124,870	\$1,042,134	7.9%
Del Norte	\$62,558	\$48,315	29.5%	\$17,946	\$14,427	24.4%	\$80,504	\$62,742	28.3%
Fresno	\$1,423,874	\$1,601,818	-11.1%	\$391,434	\$508,183	-23.0%	\$1,815,309	\$2,110,001	-14.0%
Glenn	\$62,558	\$121,963	-48.7%	\$14,220	\$38,693	-63.2%	\$76,779	\$160,656	-52.2%
Humboldt	\$119,127	\$122,985	-3.1%	\$36,172	\$36,722	-1.5%	\$155,299	\$159,707	-2.8%
Imperial	\$308,839	\$163,746	88.6%	\$93,333	\$48,894	90.9%	\$402,172	\$212,640	89.1%
Inyo	\$62,558	\$80,540	-22.3%	\$5,713	\$14,264	-59.9%	\$68,271	\$94,804	-28.0%
Kern	\$1,232,151	\$663,938	85.6%	\$330,206	\$210,636	56.8%	\$1,562,357	\$874,574	78.6%
Kings	\$230,585	\$302,515	-23.8%	\$66,538	\$95,974	-30.7%	\$297,123	\$398,489	-25.4%
Lake	\$62,558	\$157,624	-60.3%	\$17,667	\$18,894	-6.5%	\$80,225	\$176,518	-54.6%
Lassen	\$62,558	\$94,874	-34.1%	\$14,345	\$28,329	-49.4%	\$76,903	\$123,203	-37.6%
Los Angeles	\$6,283,583	\$5,238,223	20.0%	\$1,501,373	\$1,431,302	4.9%	\$7,784,956	\$6,669,525	16.7%
Madera	\$223,027	\$215,224	3.6%	\$62,936	\$42,414	48.4%	\$285,963	\$257,638	11.0%
Marin	\$74,187	\$128,240	-42.2%	\$18,133	\$3,451	425.4%	\$92,319	\$131,691	-29.9%
Mariposa	\$62,558	\$76,427	-18.1%	\$3,819	\$22,820	-83.3%	\$66,377	\$99,247	-33.1%
Mendocino	\$103,382	\$173,010	-40.2%	\$30,521	\$23,100	32.1%	\$133,903	\$196,110	-31.7%
Merced	\$455,997	\$548,422	-16.9%	\$130,406	\$163,755	-20.4%	\$586,403	\$712,177	-17.7%
Modoc	\$62,558	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$2,422	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$64,980	\$0	#DIV/0!
Mono	\$62,558	\$45,960	36.1%	\$1,459	\$1,237	18.0%	\$64,017	\$47,197	35.6%
Monterey	\$511,858	\$381,807	34.1%	\$129,567	\$110,854	16.9%	\$641,426	\$492,661	30.2%
Napa	\$115,181	\$185,081	-37.8%	\$28,813	\$58,718	-50.9%	\$143,994	\$243,799	-40.9%
Nevada-Sierra	\$125,116	\$332,867	-62.4%	\$17,946	\$99,393	-81.9%	\$143,062	\$432,260	-66.9%
Orange	\$1,688,880	\$2,336,135	-27.7%	\$409,660	\$298,377	37.3%	\$2,098,540	\$2,634,512	-20.3%
Placer	\$203,584	\$377,583	-46.1%	\$51,945	\$43,443	19.6%	\$255,529	\$421,026	-39.3%

CSC Allocation, Based on DCSS Caseload, Using BLS Adjustment & Funding Floor

County	Base Allocation			Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)			Total Allocation		
	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference
Plumas	\$62,558	\$96,396	-35.1%	\$6,210	\$11,153	-44.3%	\$68,768	\$107,549	-36.1%
Riverside	\$2,325,781	\$995,520	133.6%	\$615,546	\$315,832	94.9%	\$2,941,327	\$1,311,352	124.3%
Sacramento	\$2,201,464	\$1,061,319	107.4%	\$538,079	\$336,707	59.8%	\$2,739,543	\$1,398,026	96.0%
San Benito	\$62,558	\$136,260	-54.1%	\$16,766	\$13,539	23.8%	\$79,325	\$149,799	-47.0%
San Bernardino	\$3,310,915	\$2,544,692	30.1%	\$883,592	\$759,828	16.3%	\$4,194,507	\$3,304,520	26.9%
San Diego	\$1,544,220	\$1,820,467	-15.2%	\$394,011	\$577,550	-31.8%	\$1,938,232	\$2,398,017	-19.2%
San Francisco	\$334,965	\$916,982	-63.5%	\$71,009	\$341,446	-79.2%	\$405,974	\$1,258,428	-67.7%
San Joaquin	\$1,170,807	\$689,435	69.8%	\$307,323	\$65,511	369.1%	\$1,478,129	\$754,946	95.8%
San Luis Obispo	\$152,696	\$232,181	-34.2%	\$40,581	\$73,661	-44.9%	\$193,277	\$305,842	-36.8%
San Mateo	\$259,635	\$395,940	-34.4%	\$59,800	\$129,184	-53.7%	\$319,435	\$525,124	-39.2%
Santa Barbara	\$369,810	\$474,006	-22.0%	\$94,358	\$137,624	-31.4%	\$464,167	\$611,630	-24.1%
Santa Clara	\$932,312	\$1,756,347	-46.9%	\$214,735	\$380,836	-43.6%	\$1,147,047	\$2,137,183	-46.3%
Santa Cruz	\$147,757	\$193,147	-23.5%	\$38,004	\$55,840	-31.9%	\$185,761	\$248,987	-25.4%
Shasta-Trinity	\$308,276	\$423,384	-27.2%	\$75,542	\$126,420	-40.2%	\$383,818	\$549,804	-30.2%
Siskiyou	\$62,558	\$239,894	-73.9%	\$15,524	\$76,108	-79.6%	\$78,083	\$316,002	-75.3%
Solano	\$443,939	\$524,122	-15.3%	\$111,932	\$67,092	66.8%	\$555,871	\$591,214	-6.0%
Sonoma	\$303,125	\$502,025	-39.6%	\$77,343	\$159,269	-51.4%	\$380,468	\$661,294	-42.5%
Stanislaus	\$622,339	\$783,525	-20.6%	\$168,906	\$128,748	31.2%	\$791,246	\$912,273	-13.3%
Sutter	\$116,439	\$195,330	-40.4%	\$32,570	\$36,591	-11.0%	\$149,009	\$231,921	-35.8%
Tehama	\$107,239	\$94,859	13.1%	\$32,105	\$30,095	6.7%	\$139,343	\$124,954	11.5%
Tulare	\$397,543	\$552,849	-28.1%	\$117,365	\$77,452	51.5%	\$514,908	\$630,301	-18.3%
Tuolumne	\$62,558	\$161,119	-61.2%	\$17,636	\$48,109	-63.3%	\$80,194	\$209,228	-61.7%
Ventura	\$508,495	\$579,328	-12.2%	\$127,704	\$183,795	-30.5%	\$636,200	\$763,123	-16.6%
Yolo	\$159,692	\$193,254	-17.4%	\$43,158	\$57,705	-25.2%	\$202,850	\$250,959	-19.2%
Yuba	\$92,314	\$204,463	-54.9%	\$26,050	\$46,201	-43.6%	\$118,364	\$250,664	-52.8%
Total	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980		\$8,073,539	\$8,073,541		\$40,199,519	\$40,199,521	
Average change			-12.8%			17.4%			-12.9%
# of courts w/ funding increase			14			22			14
# of courts w/ funding decrease			41			33			41

FLF Allocation, Based on DCSS Caseload, Using BLS Adjustment & Funding Floor

County	Base Allocation			Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)			Total Allocation		
	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference
Alameda	\$326,506	\$369,025	-11.5%	\$73,483	\$107,336	-31.5%	\$399,988	\$476,361	-16.0%
Alpine-El Dorado	\$91,195	\$108,332	-15.8%	\$13,763	\$30,671	-55.1%	\$104,958	\$139,003	-24.5%
Amador-Calaveras	\$91,195	\$119,392	-23.6%	\$6,685	\$7,211	-7.3%	\$97,880	\$126,603	-22.7%
Butte	\$69,123	\$103,647	-33.3%	\$23,408	\$29,103	-19.6%	\$92,532	\$132,750	-30.3%
Colusa	\$45,597	\$53,758	-15.2%	\$1,634	\$14,692	-88.9%	\$47,232	\$68,450	-31.0%
Contra Costa	\$300,763	\$352,361	-14.6%	\$76,210	\$3,456	2105.1%	\$376,972	\$355,817	5.9%
Del Norte	\$45,597	\$51,084	-10.7%	\$6,133	\$3,892	57.6%	\$51,731	\$54,976	-5.9%
Fresno	\$426,305	\$401,222	6.3%	\$133,775	\$113,593	17.8%	\$560,080	\$514,815	8.8%
Glenn	\$45,597	\$77,449	-41.1%	\$4,860	\$21,926	-77.8%	\$50,457	\$99,375	-49.2%
Humboldt	\$45,597	\$91,116	-50.0%	\$12,362	\$24,902	-50.4%	\$57,959	\$116,018	-50.0%
Imperial	\$82,073	\$53,758	52.7%	\$31,897	\$15,219	109.6%	\$113,970	\$68,977	65.2%
Inyo	\$45,597	\$58,423	-22.0%	\$1,952	\$16,541	-88.2%	\$47,550	\$74,964	-36.6%
Kern	\$379,409	\$361,140	5.1%	\$112,850	\$102,244	10.4%	\$492,259	\$463,384	6.2%
Kings	\$65,156	\$59,589	9.3%	\$22,740	\$16,871	34.8%	\$87,895	\$76,460	15.0%
Lake	\$45,597	\$58,640	-22.2%	\$6,038	\$16,466	-63.3%	\$51,635	\$75,106	-31.3%
Lassen	\$45,597	\$79,131	-42.4%	\$4,902	\$31,252	-84.3%	\$50,500	\$110,383	-54.3%
Los Angeles	\$2,159,926	\$1,921,963	12.4%	\$513,104	\$492,952	4.1%	\$2,673,030	\$2,414,915	10.7%
Madera	\$64,772	\$82,062	-21.1%	\$21,509	\$15,208	41.4%	\$86,280	\$97,270	-11.3%
Marin	\$45,597	\$139,122	-67.2%	\$6,197	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$51,794	\$139,122	-62.8%
Mariposa	\$45,597	\$46,234	-1.4%	\$1,305	\$0	#DIV/0!	\$46,903	\$46,234	1.4%
Mendocino	\$45,597	\$61,300	-25.6%	\$10,431	\$17,830	-41.5%	\$56,028	\$79,130	-29.2%
Merced	\$130,301	\$100,217	30.0%	\$44,567	\$28,140	58.4%	\$174,868	\$128,357	36.2%
Modoc	\$45,597	\$72,130	-36.8%	\$828	\$823	0.6%	\$46,425	\$72,953	-36.4%
Mono	\$45,597	\$49,203	-7.3%	\$499	\$828	-39.8%	\$46,096	\$50,031	-7.9%
Monterey	\$166,990	\$122,948	35.8%	\$44,281	\$34,808	27.2%	\$211,270	\$157,756	33.9%
Napa	\$45,597	\$62,978	-27.6%	\$9,847	\$17,830	-44.8%	\$55,445	\$80,808	-31.4%
Nevada-Sierra	\$91,195	\$118,168	-22.8%	\$6,133	\$33,180	-81.5%	\$97,328	\$151,348	-35.7%
Orange	\$572,986	\$548,837	4.4%	\$140,004	\$155,384	-9.9%	\$712,990	\$704,221	1.2%
Placer	\$65,910	\$91,566	-28.0%	\$17,753	\$25,923	-31.5%	\$83,663	\$117,489	-28.8%
Plumas	\$45,597	\$56,866	-19.8%	\$2,122	\$4,788	-55.7%	\$47,720	\$61,654	-22.6%

FLF Allocation, Based on DCSS Caseload, Using BLS Adjustment & Funding Floor

County	Base Allocation			Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)			Total Allocation		
	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference	Workload- Based	Historical	Difference
Riverside	\$725,709	\$676,683	7.2%	\$210,367	\$184,943	13.7%	\$936,076	\$861,626	8.6%
Sacramento	\$741,855	\$314,827	135.6%	\$183,892	\$89,133	106.3%	\$925,747	\$403,960	129.2%
San Benito	\$45,597	\$61,300	-25.6%	\$5,730	\$17,213	-66.7%	\$51,327	\$78,513	-34.6%
San Bernardino	\$1,024,077	\$467,102	119.2%	\$301,973	\$132,244	128.3%	\$1,326,051	\$599,346	121.2%
San Diego	\$499,942	\$619,053	-19.2%	\$134,656	\$154,721	-13.0%	\$634,598	\$773,774	-18.0%
San Francisco	\$126,268	\$250,566	-49.6%	\$24,268	\$70,940	-65.8%	\$150,536	\$321,506	-53.2%
San Joaquin	\$368,462	\$217,745	69.2%	\$105,030	\$45,300	131.9%	\$473,492	\$263,045	80.0%
San Luis Obispo	\$47,438	\$68,337	-30.6%	\$13,869	\$19,347	-28.3%	\$61,307	\$87,684	-30.1%
San Mateo	\$92,003	\$129,159	-28.8%	\$20,437	\$37,567	-45.6%	\$112,440	\$166,726	-32.6%
Santa Barbara	\$119,726	\$173,589	-31.0%	\$32,247	\$47,442	-32.0%	\$151,974	\$221,031	-31.2%
Santa Clara	\$330,370	\$453,072	-27.1%	\$73,387	\$128,273	-42.8%	\$403,757	\$581,345	-30.5%
Santa Cruz	\$47,462	\$75,590	-37.2%	\$12,988	\$21,401	-39.3%	\$60,450	\$96,991	-37.7%
Shasta-Trinity	\$113,829	\$164,554	-30.8%	\$25,817	\$44,974	-42.6%	\$139,646	\$209,528	-33.4%
Siskiyou	\$45,597	\$75,822	-39.9%	\$5,306	\$21,290	-75.1%	\$50,903	\$97,112	-47.6%
Solano	\$145,378	\$131,471	10.6%	\$38,253	\$24,365	57.0%	\$183,632	\$155,836	17.8%
Sonoma	\$98,137	\$140,877	-30.3%	\$26,432	\$39,885	-33.7%	\$124,569	\$180,762	-31.1%
Stanislaus	\$189,014	\$223,137	-15.3%	\$57,725	\$62,654	-7.9%	\$246,739	\$285,791	-13.7%
Sutter	\$45,597	\$67,534	-32.5%	\$11,131	\$19,121	-41.8%	\$56,729	\$86,655	-34.5%
Tehama	\$45,597	\$27,802	64.0%	\$10,972	\$2,169	405.9%	\$56,569	\$29,971	88.7%
Tulare	\$109,066	\$312,151	-65.1%	\$40,110	\$80,697	-50.3%	\$149,177	\$392,848	-62.0%
Tuolumne	\$45,597	\$65,735	-30.6%	\$6,027	\$18,458	-67.3%	\$51,625	\$84,193	-38.7%
Ventura	\$167,140	\$257,724	-35.1%	\$43,644	\$72,965	-40.2%	\$210,784	\$330,689	-36.3%
Yolo	\$48,727	\$77,898	-37.4%	\$14,750	\$22,054	-33.1%	\$63,476	\$99,952	-36.5%
Yuba	\$45,597	\$66,968	-31.9%	\$8,903	\$18,961	-53.0%	\$54,500	\$85,929	-36.6%
Total	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357		\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186		\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	
Average change			-11.0%			31.9%			-11.6%
# of courts w/ funding increase			14			17			16
# of courts w/ funding decrease			40			35			38

County	3-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation											
	Base Allocation				Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)				Total Allocation			
	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)
Alameda	\$1,055,625	\$1,012,682	\$969,740	\$926,797	\$344,419	\$301,284	\$258,149	\$215,014	\$1,400,044	\$1,313,966	\$1,227,889	\$1,141,811
Alpine-El Dorado	\$206,440	\$207,367	\$208,294	\$209,222	\$61,641	\$54,518	\$47,394	\$40,271	\$268,081	\$261,885	\$255,689	\$249,492
Amador	\$142,508	\$115,858	\$89,208	\$62,558	\$28,085	\$21,331	\$14,578	\$7,824	\$170,593	\$137,189	\$103,786	\$70,382
Butte	\$363,685	\$322,650	\$281,614	\$240,579	\$23,968	\$38,810	\$53,652	\$68,494	\$387,653	\$361,460	\$335,266	\$309,073
Calaveras	\$133,526	\$109,870	\$86,214	\$62,558	\$24,558	\$20,284	\$16,010	\$11,737	\$158,084	\$130,154	\$102,224	\$74,295
Colusa	\$45,987	\$51,511	\$57,034	\$62,558	\$12,628	\$10,013	\$7,397	\$4,782	\$58,615	\$61,523	\$64,431	\$67,340
Contra Costa	\$1,014,068	\$976,671	\$939,273	\$901,876	\$28,066	\$93,042	\$158,018	\$222,994	\$1,042,134	\$1,069,713	\$1,097,291	\$1,124,870
Del Norte	\$48,315	\$53,063	\$57,810	\$62,558	\$14,427	\$15,600	\$16,773	\$17,946	\$62,742	\$68,663	\$74,584	\$80,504
Fresno	\$1,601,818	\$1,542,503	\$1,483,189	\$1,423,874	\$508,183	\$469,267	\$430,351	\$391,434	\$2,110,001	\$2,011,770	\$1,913,539	\$1,815,309
Glenn	\$121,963	\$102,161	\$82,360	\$62,558	\$38,693	\$30,535	\$22,378	\$14,220	\$160,656	\$132,697	\$104,738	\$76,779
Humboldt	\$122,985	\$121,699	\$120,413	\$119,127	\$36,722	\$36,539	\$36,355	\$36,172	\$159,707	\$158,238	\$156,768	\$155,299
Imperial	\$163,746	\$212,110	\$260,475	\$308,839	\$48,894	\$63,707	\$78,520	\$93,333	\$212,640	\$275,817	\$338,995	\$402,172
Inyo	\$80,540	\$74,546	\$68,552	\$62,558	\$14,264	\$11,414	\$8,563	\$5,713	\$94,804	\$85,960	\$77,115	\$68,271
Kern	\$663,938	\$853,342	\$1,042,747	\$1,232,151	\$210,636	\$250,493	\$290,349	\$330,206	\$874,574	\$1,103,835	\$1,333,096	\$1,562,357
Kings	\$302,515	\$278,538	\$254,562	\$230,585	\$95,974	\$86,162	\$76,350	\$66,538	\$398,489	\$364,700	\$330,912	\$297,123
Lake	\$157,624	\$125,935	\$94,247	\$62,558	\$18,894	\$18,485	\$18,076	\$17,667	\$176,518	\$144,420	\$112,323	\$80,225
Lassen	\$94,874	\$84,102	\$73,330	\$62,558	\$28,329	\$23,668	\$19,006	\$14,345	\$123,203	\$107,770	\$92,336	\$76,903
Los Angeles	\$5,238,223	\$5,586,676	\$5,935,130	\$6,283,583	\$1,431,302	\$1,454,659	\$1,478,016	\$1,501,373	\$6,669,525	\$7,041,335	\$7,413,146	\$7,784,956
Madera	\$215,224	\$217,825	\$220,426	\$223,027	\$42,414	\$49,255	\$56,096	\$62,936	\$257,638	\$267,080	\$276,522	\$285,963
Marin	\$128,240	\$110,222	\$92,204	\$74,187	\$3,451	\$8,345	\$13,239	\$18,133	\$131,691	\$118,567	\$105,443	\$92,319
Mariposa	\$76,427	\$71,804	\$67,181	\$62,558	\$22,820	\$16,486	\$10,153	\$3,819	\$99,247	\$88,290	\$77,334	\$66,377
Mendocino	\$173,010	\$149,801	\$126,591	\$103,382	\$23,100	\$25,574	\$28,047	\$30,521	\$196,110	\$175,374	\$154,639	\$133,903
Merced	\$548,422	\$517,614	\$486,805	\$455,997	\$163,755	\$152,639	\$141,522	\$130,406	\$712,177	\$670,252	\$628,328	\$586,403
Modoc	\$0	\$20,853	\$41,705	\$62,558	\$0	\$807	\$1,615	\$2,422	\$0	\$21,660	\$43,320	\$64,980
Mono	\$45,960	\$51,493	\$57,025	\$62,558	\$1,237	\$1,311	\$1,385	\$1,459	\$47,197	\$52,804	\$58,411	\$64,017
Monterey	\$381,807	\$425,157	\$468,508	\$511,858	\$110,854	\$117,092	\$123,330	\$129,567	\$492,661	\$542,249	\$591,838	\$641,426
Napa	\$185,081	\$161,781	\$138,481	\$115,181	\$58,718	\$48,750	\$38,782	\$28,813	\$243,799	\$210,531	\$177,262	\$143,994
Nevada-Sierra	\$332,867	\$263,617	\$194,366	\$125,116	\$99,393	\$72,244	\$45,095	\$17,946	\$432,260	\$335,861	\$239,462	\$143,062
Orange	\$2,336,135	\$2,120,383	\$1,904,632	\$1,688,880	\$298,377	\$335,471	\$372,566	\$409,660	\$2,634,512	\$2,455,855	\$2,277,197	\$2,098,540
Placer	\$377,583	\$319,583	\$261,584	\$203,584	\$43,443	\$46,277	\$49,111	\$51,945	\$421,026	\$365,860	\$310,695	\$255,529
Plumas	\$96,396	\$85,117	\$73,837	\$62,558	\$11,153	\$9,505	\$7,858	\$6,210	\$107,549	\$94,622	\$81,695	\$68,768
Riverside	\$995,520	\$1,438,940	\$1,882,361	\$2,325,781	\$315,832	\$415,737	\$515,641	\$615,546	\$1,311,352	\$1,854,677	\$2,398,002	\$2,941,327
Sacramento	\$1,061,319	\$1,441,367	\$1,821,416	\$2,201,464	\$336,707	\$403,831	\$470,955	\$538,079	\$1,398,026	\$1,845,198	\$2,292,371	\$2,739,543
San Benito	\$136,260	\$111,693	\$87,125	\$62,558	\$13,539	\$14,615	\$15,691	\$16,766	\$149,799	\$126,308	\$102,816	\$79,325
San Bernardino	\$2,544,692	\$2,800,100	\$3,055,507	\$3,310,915	\$759,828	\$801,083	\$842,337	\$883,592	\$3,304,520	\$3,601,182	\$3,897,844	\$4,194,507
San Diego	\$1,820,467	\$1,728,385	\$1,636,302	\$1,544,220	\$577,550	\$516,370	\$455,191	\$394,011	\$2,398,017	\$2,244,755	\$2,091,493	\$1,938,232
San Francisco	\$916,982	\$722,976	\$528,971	\$334,965	\$341,446	\$251,300	\$161,155	\$71,009	\$1,258,428	\$974,277	\$690,125	\$405,974
San Joaquin	\$689,435	\$849,892	\$1,010,349	\$1,170,807	\$65,511	\$146,115	\$226,719	\$307,323	\$754,946	\$996,007	\$1,237,068	\$1,478,129
San Luis Obispo	\$232,181	\$205,686	\$179,191	\$152,696	\$73,661	\$62,634	\$51,608	\$40,581	\$305,842	\$268,320	\$230,799	\$193,277
San Mateo	\$395,940	\$350,505	\$305,070	\$259,635	\$129,184	\$106,056	\$82,928	\$59,800	\$525,124	\$456,561	\$387,998	\$319,435
Santa Barbara	\$474,006	\$439,274	\$404,542	\$369,810	\$137,624	\$123,202	\$108,780	\$94,358	\$611,630	\$562,476	\$513,322	\$464,167
Santa Clara	\$1,756,347	\$1,481,669	\$1,206,991	\$932,312	\$380,836	\$325,469	\$270,102	\$214,735	\$2,137,183	\$1,807,138	\$1,477,092	\$1,147,047
Santa Cruz	\$193,147	\$178,017	\$162,887	\$147,757	\$55,840	\$49,895	\$43,949	\$38,004	\$248,987	\$227,912	\$206,836	\$185,761
Shasta-Trinity	\$423,384	\$385,015	\$346,645	\$308,276	\$126,420	\$109,461	\$92,501	\$75,542	\$549,804	\$494,475	\$439,147	\$383,818
Siskiyou	\$239,894	\$180,782	\$121,670	\$62,558	\$76,108	\$55,913	\$35,719	\$15,524	\$316,002	\$236,696	\$157,389	\$78,083
Solano	\$524,122	\$497,394	\$470,667	\$443,939	\$67,092	\$82,039	\$96,985	\$111,932	\$591,214	\$579,433	\$567,652	\$555,871

County	3-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation											
	Base Allocation				Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)				Total Allocation			
	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)
Sonoma	\$502,025	\$435,725	\$369,425	\$303,125	\$159,269	\$131,960	\$104,652	\$77,343	\$661,294	\$567,685	\$474,076	\$380,468
Stanislaus	\$783,525	\$729,796	\$676,068	\$622,339	\$128,748	\$142,134	\$155,520	\$168,906	\$912,273	\$871,931	\$831,588	\$791,246
Sutter	\$195,330	\$169,033	\$142,736	\$116,439	\$36,591	\$35,251	\$33,911	\$32,570	\$231,921	\$204,284	\$176,646	\$149,009
Tehama	\$94,859	\$98,986	\$103,112	\$107,239	\$30,095	\$30,765	\$31,435	\$32,105	\$124,954	\$129,750	\$134,547	\$139,343
Tulare	\$552,849	\$501,080	\$449,311	\$397,543	\$77,452	\$90,756	\$104,061	\$117,365	\$630,301	\$591,837	\$553,372	\$514,908
Tuolumne	\$161,119	\$128,265	\$95,412	\$62,558	\$48,109	\$37,951	\$27,794	\$17,636	\$209,228	\$166,217	\$123,205	\$80,194
Ventura	\$579,328	\$555,717	\$532,106	\$508,495	\$183,795	\$165,098	\$146,401	\$127,704	\$763,123	\$720,815	\$678,507	\$636,200
Yolo	\$193,254	\$182,067	\$170,879	\$159,692	\$57,705	\$52,856	\$48,007	\$43,158	\$250,959	\$234,923	\$218,886	\$202,850
Yuba	\$204,463	\$167,080	\$129,697	\$92,314	\$46,201	\$39,484	\$32,767	\$26,050	\$250,664	\$206,564	\$162,464	\$118,364
Total	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,539	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,519

4-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation: 25% Workload First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
		Year 1 (25%)	Year 2 (50%)	Year 3 (75%)	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1 (25%)	Year 2 (50%)	Year 3 (75%)	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1 (25%)	Year 2 (50%)	Year 3 (75%)	Year 4 (100%)
	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)
Alameda	\$1,055,625	\$1,023,418	\$991,211	\$959,004	\$926,797	\$344,419	\$312,068	\$279,717	\$247,365	\$215,014	\$1,400,044	\$1,335,486	\$1,270,928	\$1,206,369	\$1,141,811
Alpine-El Dorado	\$206,440	\$207,135	\$207,831	\$208,526	\$209,222	\$61,641	\$56,298	\$50,956	\$45,613	\$40,271	\$268,081	\$263,434	\$258,787	\$254,139	\$249,492
Amador	\$142,508	\$122,521	\$102,533	\$82,546	\$62,558	\$28,085	\$23,020	\$17,955	\$12,890	\$7,824	\$170,593	\$145,540	\$120,488	\$95,435	\$70,382
Butte	\$363,685	\$332,908	\$302,132	\$271,355	\$240,579	\$23,968	\$35,100	\$46,231	\$57,363	\$68,494	\$387,653	\$368,008	\$348,363	\$328,718	\$309,073
Calaveras	\$133,526	\$115,784	\$98,042	\$80,300	\$62,558	\$24,558	\$21,353	\$18,147	\$14,942	\$11,737	\$158,084	\$137,137	\$116,189	\$95,242	\$74,295
Colusa	\$45,987	\$50,130	\$54,273	\$58,415	\$62,558	\$12,628	\$10,666	\$8,705	\$6,743	\$4,782	\$58,615	\$60,796	\$62,977	\$65,158	\$67,340
Contra Costa	\$1,014,068	\$986,020	\$957,972	\$929,924	\$901,876	\$28,066	\$76,798	\$125,530	\$174,262	\$222,994	\$1,042,134	\$1,062,818	\$1,083,502	\$1,104,186	\$1,124,870
Del Norte	\$48,315	\$51,876	\$55,437	\$58,997	\$62,558	\$14,427	\$15,307	\$16,187	\$17,066	\$17,946	\$62,742	\$67,183	\$71,623	\$76,064	\$80,504
Fresno	\$1,601,818	\$1,557,332	\$1,512,846	\$1,468,360	\$1,423,874	\$508,183	\$478,996	\$449,809	\$420,622	\$391,434	\$2,110,001	\$2,036,328	\$1,962,655	\$1,888,982	\$1,815,309
Glenn	\$121,963	\$107,112	\$92,261	\$77,409	\$62,558	\$38,693	\$32,575	\$26,457	\$20,339	\$14,220	\$160,656	\$139,687	\$118,717	\$97,748	\$76,779
Humboldt	\$122,985	\$122,021	\$121,056	\$120,092	\$119,127	\$36,722	\$36,585	\$36,447	\$36,310	\$36,172	\$159,707	\$158,605	\$157,503	\$156,401	\$155,299
Imperial	\$163,746	\$200,019	\$236,293	\$272,566	\$308,839	\$48,894	\$60,004	\$71,114	\$82,223	\$93,333	\$212,640	\$260,023	\$307,406	\$354,789	\$402,172
Inyo	\$80,540	\$76,045	\$71,549	\$67,054	\$62,558	\$14,264	\$12,126	\$9,989	\$7,851	\$5,713	\$94,804	\$88,171	\$81,538	\$74,904	\$68,271
Kern	\$663,938	\$805,991	\$948,044	\$1,090,098	\$1,232,151	\$210,636	\$240,528	\$270,421	\$300,313	\$330,206	\$874,574	\$1,046,520	\$1,218,465	\$1,390,411	\$1,562,357
Kings	\$302,515	\$284,532	\$266,550	\$248,567	\$230,585	\$95,974	\$88,615	\$81,256	\$73,897	\$66,538	\$398,489	\$373,147	\$347,806	\$322,464	\$297,123
Lake	\$157,624	\$133,858	\$110,091	\$86,325	\$62,558	\$18,894	\$18,587	\$18,280	\$17,974	\$17,667	\$176,518	\$152,445	\$128,371	\$104,298	\$80,225
Lassen	\$94,874	\$86,795	\$78,716	\$70,637	\$62,558	\$28,329	\$24,833	\$21,337	\$17,841	\$14,345	\$123,203	\$111,628	\$100,053	\$88,478	\$76,903
Los Angeles	\$5,238,223	\$5,499,563	\$5,760,903	\$6,022,243	\$6,283,583	\$1,431,302	\$1,448,820	\$1,466,337	\$1,483,855	\$1,501,373	\$6,669,525	\$6,948,383	\$7,227,241	\$7,506,099	\$7,784,956
Madera	\$215,224	\$217,175	\$219,126	\$221,076	\$223,027	\$42,414	\$47,545	\$52,675	\$57,806	\$62,936	\$257,638	\$264,719	\$271,801	\$278,882	\$285,963
Marin	\$128,240	\$114,727	\$101,213	\$87,700	\$74,187	\$3,451	\$7,121	\$10,792	\$14,462	\$18,133	\$131,691	\$121,848	\$112,005	\$102,162	\$92,319
Mariposa	\$76,427	\$72,960	\$69,493	\$66,025	\$62,558	\$22,820	\$18,070	\$13,320	\$8,569	\$3,819	\$99,247	\$91,030	\$82,812	\$74,595	\$66,377
Mendocino	\$173,010	\$155,603	\$138,196	\$120,789	\$103,382	\$23,100	\$24,955	\$26,811	\$28,666	\$30,521	\$196,110	\$180,558	\$165,007	\$149,455	\$133,903
Merced	\$548,422	\$525,316	\$502,210	\$479,103	\$455,997	\$163,755	\$155,418	\$147,080	\$138,743	\$130,406	\$712,177	\$680,733	\$649,290	\$617,846	\$586,403
Modoc	\$0	\$15,640	\$31,279	\$46,919	\$62,558	\$0	\$605	\$1,211	\$1,816	\$2,422	\$0	\$16,245	\$32,490	\$48,735	\$64,980
Mono	\$45,960	\$50,110	\$54,259	\$58,409	\$62,558	\$1,237	\$1,293	\$1,348	\$1,404	\$1,459	\$47,197	\$51,402	\$55,607	\$59,812	\$64,017
Monterey	\$381,807	\$414,320	\$446,833	\$479,346	\$511,858	\$110,854	\$115,532	\$120,211	\$124,889	\$129,567	\$492,661	\$529,852	\$567,043	\$604,235	\$641,426
Napa	\$185,081	\$167,606	\$150,131	\$132,656	\$115,181	\$58,718	\$51,242	\$43,766	\$36,290	\$28,813	\$243,799	\$218,848	\$193,897	\$168,945	\$143,994
Nevada-Sierra	\$332,867	\$280,929	\$228,992	\$177,054	\$125,116	\$99,393	\$79,031	\$58,670	\$38,308	\$17,946	\$432,260	\$359,961	\$287,661	\$215,362	\$143,062
Orange	\$2,336,135	\$2,174,321	\$2,012,507	\$1,850,694	\$1,688,880	\$298,377	\$326,198	\$354,019	\$381,839	\$409,660	\$2,634,512	\$2,500,519	\$2,366,526	\$2,232,533	\$2,098,540
Placer	\$377,583	\$334,083	\$290,583	\$247,084	\$203,584	\$43,443	\$45,568	\$47,694	\$49,819	\$51,945	\$421,026	\$379,652	\$338,277	\$296,903	\$255,529
Plumas	\$96,396	\$87,937	\$79,477	\$71,018	\$62,558	\$11,153	\$9,917	\$8,681	\$7,446	\$6,210	\$107,549	\$97,854	\$88,158	\$78,463	\$68,768
Riverside	\$995,520	\$1,328,085	\$1,660,650	\$1,993,216	\$2,325,781	\$315,832	\$390,760	\$465,689	\$540,617	\$615,546	\$1,311,352	\$1,718,846	\$2,126,339	\$2,533,833	\$2,941,327
Sacramento	\$1,061,319	\$1,346,355	\$1,631,392	\$1,916,428	\$2,201,464	\$336,707	\$387,050	\$437,393	\$487,736	\$538,079	\$1,398,026	\$1,733,405	\$2,068,785	\$2,404,164	\$2,739,543
San Benito	\$136,260	\$117,835	\$99,409	\$80,984	\$62,558	\$13,539	\$14,346	\$15,153	\$15,960	\$16,766	\$149,799	\$132,180	\$114,562	\$96,943	\$79,325
San Bernardino	\$2,544,692	\$2,736,248	\$2,927,804	\$3,119,359	\$3,310,915	\$759,828	\$790,769	\$821,710	\$852,651	\$883,592	\$3,304,520	\$3,527,017	\$3,749,513	\$3,972,010	\$4,194,507
San Diego	\$1,820,467	\$1,751,405	\$1,682,344	\$1,613,282	\$1,544,220	\$577,550	\$531,665	\$485,781	\$439,896	\$394,011	\$2,398,017	\$2,283,071	\$2,168,124	\$2,053,178	\$1,938,232
San Francisco	\$916,982	\$771,478	\$625,974	\$480,469	\$334,965	\$341,446	\$273,837	\$206,227	\$138,618	\$71,009	\$1,258,428	\$1,045,315	\$832,201	\$619,088	\$405,974
San Joaquin	\$689,435	\$809,778	\$930,121	\$1,050,464	\$1,170,807	\$65,511	\$125,964	\$186,417	\$246,870	\$307,323	\$754,946	\$935,742	\$1,116,538	\$1,297,334	\$1,478,129
San Luis Obispo	\$232,181	\$212,310	\$192,439	\$172,568	\$152,696	\$73,661	\$65,391	\$57,121	\$48,851	\$40,581	\$305,842	\$277,701	\$249,560	\$221,419	\$193,277
San Mateo	\$395,940	\$361,864	\$327,787	\$293,711	\$259,635	\$129,184	\$111,838	\$94,492	\$77,146	\$59,800	\$525,124	\$473,702	\$422,280	\$370,857	\$319,435
Santa Barbara	\$474,006	\$447,957	\$421,908	\$395,859	\$369,810	\$137,624	\$126,807	\$115,991	\$105,174	\$94,358	\$611,630	\$574,764	\$537,899	\$501,033	\$464,167
Santa Clara	\$1,756,347	\$1,550,338	\$1,344,330	\$1,138,321	\$932,312	\$380,836	\$339,311	\$297,785	\$256,260	\$214,735	\$2,137,183	\$1,889,649	\$1,642,115	\$1,394,581	\$1,147,047
Santa Cruz	\$193,147	\$181,799	\$170,452	\$159,104	\$147,757	\$55,840	\$51,381	\$46,922	\$42,463	\$38,004	\$248,987	\$233,180	\$217,374	\$201,567	\$185,761
Shasta-Trinity	\$423,384	\$394,607	\$365,830	\$337,053	\$308,276	\$126,420	\$113,701	\$100,981	\$88,262	\$75,542	\$549,804	\$508,308	\$466,811	\$425,315	\$383,818
Siskiyou	\$239,894	\$195,560	\$151,226	\$106,892	\$62,558	\$76,108	\$60,962	\$45,816	\$30,670	\$15,524	\$316,002	\$256,522	\$197,042	\$137,562	\$78,083
Solano	\$524,122	\$504,076	\$484,031	\$463,985	\$443,939	\$67,092	\$78,302	\$89,512	\$100,722	\$111,932	\$591,214	\$582,378	\$573,542	\$564,707	\$555,871

4-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation: 25% Workload First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
Sonoma	\$502,025	\$452,300	\$402,575	\$352,850	\$303,125	\$159,269	\$138,787	\$118,306	\$97,824	\$77,343	\$661,294	\$591,087	\$520,881	\$450,674	\$380,468
Stanislaus	\$783,525	\$743,229	\$702,932	\$662,636	\$622,339	\$128,748	\$138,788	\$148,827	\$158,867	\$168,906	\$912,273	\$882,016	\$851,759	\$821,503	\$791,246
Sutter	\$195,330	\$175,607	\$155,884	\$136,162	\$116,439	\$36,591	\$35,586	\$34,581	\$33,576	\$32,570	\$231,921	\$211,193	\$190,465	\$169,737	\$149,009
Tehama	\$94,859	\$97,954	\$101,049	\$104,144	\$107,239	\$30,095	\$30,597	\$31,100	\$31,602	\$32,105	\$124,954	\$128,551	\$132,149	\$135,746	\$139,343
Tulare	\$552,849	\$514,022	\$475,196	\$436,369	\$397,543	\$77,452	\$87,430	\$97,409	\$107,387	\$117,365	\$630,301	\$601,453	\$572,604	\$543,756	\$514,908
Tuolumne	\$161,119	\$136,479	\$111,839	\$87,198	\$62,558	\$48,109	\$40,491	\$32,872	\$25,254	\$17,636	\$209,228	\$176,969	\$144,711	\$112,452	\$80,194
Ventura	\$579,328	\$561,620	\$543,912	\$526,203	\$508,495	\$183,795	\$169,772	\$155,750	\$141,727	\$127,704	\$763,123	\$731,392	\$699,661	\$667,931	\$636,200
Yolo	\$193,254	\$184,864	\$176,473	\$168,083	\$159,692	\$57,705	\$54,068	\$50,432	\$46,795	\$43,158	\$250,959	\$238,932	\$226,905	\$214,877	\$202,850
Yuba	\$204,463	\$176,426	\$148,388	\$120,351	\$92,314	\$46,201	\$41,163	\$36,126	\$31,088	\$26,050	\$250,664	\$217,589	\$184,514	\$151,439	\$118,364
Total	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,539	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,519

4-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation: 15% Workload First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
		Year 1 (15%)	Year 2 (45%)	Year 3 (70%)	Year 4 (100%)		Year 1 (15%)	Year 2 (45%)	Year 3 (70%)	Year 4 (100%)		Year 1 (15%)	Year 2 (45%)	Year 3 (70%)	Year 4 (100%)
	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)	Historical	workload)	workload)	workload)	workload)
Alameda	\$1,055,625	\$1,036,301	\$997,652	\$965,445	\$926,797	\$344,419	\$325,008	\$286,187	\$253,836	\$215,014	\$1,400,044	\$1,361,309	\$1,283,839	\$1,219,281	\$1,141,811
Alpine-El Dorado	\$206,440	\$206,857	\$207,692	\$208,387	\$209,222	\$61,641	\$58,435	\$52,024	\$46,682	\$40,271	\$268,081	\$265,293	\$259,716	\$255,069	\$249,492
Amador	\$142,508	\$130,516	\$106,531	\$86,543	\$62,558	\$28,085	\$25,046	\$18,968	\$13,903	\$7,824	\$170,593	\$155,561	\$125,498	\$100,446	\$70,382
Butte	\$363,685	\$345,219	\$308,287	\$277,511	\$240,579	\$23,968	\$30,647	\$44,005	\$55,136	\$68,494	\$387,653	\$375,866	\$352,292	\$332,647	\$309,073
Calaveras	\$133,526	\$122,881	\$101,590	\$83,848	\$62,558	\$24,558	\$22,635	\$18,788	\$15,583	\$11,737	\$158,084	\$145,516	\$120,379	\$99,431	\$74,295
Colusa	\$45,987	\$48,473	\$53,444	\$57,587	\$62,558	\$12,628	\$11,451	\$9,097	\$7,135	\$4,782	\$58,615	\$59,924	\$62,541	\$64,722	\$67,340
Contra Costa	\$1,014,068	\$997,239	\$963,582	\$935,534	\$901,876	\$28,066	\$57,305	\$115,783	\$164,515	\$222,994	\$1,042,134	\$1,054,544	\$1,079,365	\$1,100,049	\$1,124,870
Del Norte	\$48,315	\$50,451	\$54,724	\$58,285	\$62,558	\$14,427	\$14,955	\$16,011	\$16,891	\$17,946	\$62,742	\$65,406	\$70,735	\$75,176	\$80,504
Fresno	\$1,601,818	\$1,575,126	\$1,521,743	\$1,477,257	\$1,423,874	\$508,183	\$490,671	\$455,646	\$426,459	\$391,434	\$2,110,001	\$2,065,797	\$1,977,389	\$1,903,716	\$1,815,309
Glenn	\$121,963	\$113,052	\$95,231	\$80,380	\$62,558	\$38,693	\$35,022	\$27,680	\$21,562	\$14,220	\$160,656	\$148,074	\$122,911	\$101,942	\$76,779
Humboldt	\$122,985	\$122,406	\$121,249	\$120,285	\$119,127	\$36,722	\$36,640	\$36,475	\$36,337	\$36,172	\$159,707	\$159,046	\$157,723	\$156,622	\$155,299
Imperial	\$163,746	\$185,510	\$229,038	\$265,311	\$308,839	\$48,894	\$55,560	\$68,892	\$80,001	\$93,333	\$212,640	\$241,070	\$297,930	\$345,313	\$402,172
Inyo	\$80,540	\$77,843	\$72,448	\$67,953	\$62,558	\$14,264	\$12,981	\$10,416	\$8,278	\$5,713	\$94,804	\$90,824	\$82,864	\$76,231	\$68,271
Kern	\$663,938	\$749,170	\$919,634	\$1,061,687	\$1,232,151	\$210,636	\$228,571	\$264,442	\$294,335	\$330,206	\$874,574	\$977,741	\$1,184,076	\$1,356,022	\$1,562,357
Kings	\$302,515	\$291,725	\$270,146	\$252,164	\$230,585	\$95,974	\$91,559	\$82,728	\$75,369	\$66,538	\$398,489	\$383,284	\$352,874	\$327,533	\$297,123
Lake	\$157,624	\$143,364	\$114,844	\$91,078	\$62,558	\$18,894	\$18,710	\$18,342	\$18,035	\$17,667	\$176,518	\$162,074	\$133,186	\$109,113	\$80,225
Lassen	\$94,874	\$90,027	\$80,332	\$72,253	\$62,558	\$28,329	\$26,231	\$22,036	\$18,540	\$14,345	\$123,203	\$116,258	\$102,368	\$90,793	\$76,903
Los Angeles	\$5,238,223	\$5,395,027	\$5,708,635	\$5,969,975	\$6,283,583	\$1,431,302	\$1,441,813	\$1,462,834	\$1,480,352	\$1,501,373	\$6,669,525	\$6,836,840	\$7,171,469	\$7,450,327	\$7,784,956
Madera	\$215,224	\$216,394	\$218,735	\$220,686	\$223,027	\$42,414	\$45,492	\$51,649	\$56,780	\$62,936	\$257,638	\$261,887	\$270,384	\$277,466	\$285,963
Marin	\$128,240	\$120,132	\$103,916	\$90,403	\$74,187	\$3,451	\$5,653	\$10,058	\$13,728	\$18,133	\$131,691	\$125,785	\$113,974	\$104,131	\$92,319
Mariposa	\$76,427	\$74,347	\$70,186	\$66,719	\$62,558	\$22,820	\$19,970	\$14,270	\$9,519	\$3,819	\$99,247	\$94,317	\$84,456	\$76,238	\$66,377
Mendocino	\$173,010	\$162,566	\$141,677	\$124,270	\$103,382	\$23,100	\$24,213	\$26,440	\$28,295	\$30,521	\$196,110	\$186,779	\$168,117	\$152,565	\$133,903
Merced	\$548,422	\$534,558	\$506,831	\$483,725	\$455,997	\$163,755	\$158,753	\$148,748	\$140,410	\$130,406	\$712,177	\$693,311	\$655,579	\$624,135	\$586,403
Modoc	\$0	\$9,384	\$28,151	\$43,791	\$62,558	\$0	\$363	\$1,090	\$1,695	\$2,422	\$0	\$9,747	\$29,241	\$45,486	\$64,980
Mono	\$45,960	\$48,450	\$53,429	\$57,579	\$62,558	\$1,237	\$1,270	\$1,337	\$1,393	\$1,459	\$47,197	\$49,720	\$54,766	\$58,971	\$64,017
Monterey	\$381,807	\$401,315	\$440,330	\$472,843	\$511,858	\$110,854	\$113,661	\$119,275	\$123,953	\$129,567	\$492,661	\$514,976	\$559,605	\$596,796	\$641,426
Napa	\$185,081	\$174,596	\$153,626	\$136,151	\$115,181	\$58,718	\$54,232	\$45,261	\$37,785	\$28,813	\$243,799	\$228,828	\$198,887	\$173,936	\$143,994
Nevada-Sierra	\$332,867	\$301,704	\$239,379	\$187,441	\$125,116	\$99,393	\$87,176	\$62,742	\$42,380	\$17,946	\$432,260	\$388,880	\$302,121	\$229,822	\$143,062
Orange	\$2,336,135	\$2,239,047	\$2,044,870	\$1,883,056	\$1,688,880	\$298,377	\$315,069	\$348,454	\$376,275	\$409,660	\$2,634,512	\$2,554,116	\$2,393,325	\$2,259,332	\$2,098,540
Placer	\$377,583	\$351,483	\$299,283	\$255,784	\$203,584	\$43,443	\$44,718	\$47,269	\$49,394	\$51,945	\$421,026	\$396,201	\$346,552	\$305,178	\$255,529
Plumas	\$96,396	\$91,320	\$81,169	\$72,709	\$62,558	\$11,153	\$10,412	\$8,929	\$7,693	\$6,210	\$107,549	\$101,732	\$90,097	\$80,402	\$68,768
Riverside	\$995,520	\$1,195,059	\$1,594,137	\$1,926,703	\$2,325,781	\$315,832	\$360,789	\$450,703	\$525,632	\$615,546	\$1,311,352	\$1,555,858	\$2,044,841	\$2,452,334	\$2,941,327
Sacramento	\$1,061,319	\$1,232,341	\$1,574,384	\$1,859,421	\$2,201,464	\$336,707	\$366,913	\$427,324	\$477,667	\$538,079	\$1,398,026	\$1,599,254	\$2,001,709	\$2,337,088	\$2,739,543
San Benito	\$136,260	\$125,205	\$103,094	\$84,669	\$62,558	\$13,539	\$14,023	\$14,991	\$15,798	\$16,766	\$149,799	\$139,228	\$118,085	\$100,467	\$79,325
San Bernardino	\$2,544,692	\$2,659,625	\$2,889,492	\$3,081,048	\$3,310,915	\$759,828	\$778,393	\$815,522	\$846,462	\$883,592	\$3,304,520	\$3,438,018	\$3,705,014	\$3,927,511	\$4,194,507
San Diego	\$1,820,467	\$1,779,030	\$1,696,156	\$1,627,094	\$1,544,220	\$577,550	\$550,019	\$494,958	\$449,073	\$394,011	\$2,398,017	\$2,329,049	\$2,191,114	\$2,076,167	\$1,938,232
San Francisco	\$916,982	\$829,679	\$655,074	\$509,570	\$334,965	\$341,446	\$300,880	\$219,749	\$152,140	\$71,009	\$1,258,428	\$1,130,560	\$874,824	\$661,710	\$405,974
San Joaquin	\$689,435	\$761,641	\$906,052	\$1,026,395	\$1,170,807	\$65,511	\$101,783	\$174,326	\$234,779	\$307,323	\$754,946	\$863,424	\$1,080,379	\$1,261,174	\$1,478,129
San Luis Obispo	\$232,181	\$220,258	\$196,413	\$176,542	\$152,696	\$73,661	\$68,699	\$58,775	\$50,505	\$40,581	\$305,842	\$288,957	\$255,188	\$227,047	\$193,277
San Mateo	\$395,940	\$375,494	\$334,603	\$300,526	\$259,635	\$129,184	\$118,776	\$97,961	\$80,615	\$59,800	\$525,124	\$494,271	\$432,564	\$381,142	\$319,435
Santa Barbara	\$474,006	\$458,377	\$427,118	\$401,069	\$369,810	\$137,624	\$131,134	\$118,154	\$107,338	\$94,358	\$611,630	\$589,511	\$545,272	\$508,406	\$464,167
Santa Clara	\$1,756,347	\$1,632,742	\$1,385,531	\$1,179,523	\$932,312	\$380,836	\$355,921	\$306,090	\$264,565	\$214,735	\$2,137,183	\$1,988,663	\$1,691,622	\$1,444,088	\$1,147,047
Santa Cruz	\$193,147	\$186,338	\$172,721	\$161,374	\$147,757	\$55,840	\$53,165	\$47,814	\$43,355	\$38,004	\$248,987	\$239,503	\$220,535	\$204,729	\$185,761
Shasta-Trinity	\$423,384	\$406,118	\$371,585	\$342,808	\$308,276	\$126,420	\$118,788	\$103,525	\$90,805	\$75,542	\$549,804	\$524,906	\$475,110	\$433,614	\$383,818
Siskiyou	\$239,894	\$213,294	\$160,093	\$115,759	\$62,558	\$76,108	\$67,020	\$48,845	\$33,700	\$15,524	\$316,002	\$280,314	\$208,938	\$149,458	\$78,083
Solano	\$524,122	\$512,095	\$488,040	\$467,994	\$443,939	\$67,092	\$73,818	\$87,270	\$98,480	\$111,932	\$591,214	\$585,913	\$575,310	\$566,474	\$555,871

4-Year Phase-in of CSC Allocation: 15% Workload First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
Sonoma	\$502,025	\$472,190	\$412,520	\$362,795	\$303,125	\$159,269	\$146,980	\$122,402	\$101,921	\$77,343	\$661,294	\$619,170	\$534,922	\$464,716	\$380,468
Stanislaus	\$783,525	\$759,347	\$710,991	\$670,695	\$622,339	\$128,748	\$134,772	\$146,819	\$156,859	\$168,906	\$912,273	\$894,119	\$857,811	\$827,554	\$791,246
Sutter	\$195,330	\$183,496	\$159,829	\$140,106	\$116,439	\$36,591	\$35,988	\$34,782	\$33,777	\$32,570	\$231,921	\$219,484	\$194,611	\$173,883	\$149,009
Tehama	\$94,859	\$96,716	\$100,430	\$103,525	\$107,239	\$30,095	\$30,396	\$30,999	\$31,502	\$32,105	\$124,954	\$127,112	\$131,429	\$135,027	\$139,343
Tulare	\$552,849	\$529,553	\$482,961	\$444,135	\$397,543	\$77,452	\$83,439	\$95,413	\$105,391	\$117,365	\$630,301	\$612,992	\$578,374	\$549,526	\$514,908
Tuolumne	\$161,119	\$146,335	\$116,767	\$92,126	\$62,558	\$48,109	\$43,538	\$34,396	\$26,778	\$17,636	\$209,228	\$189,873	\$151,163	\$118,904	\$80,194
Ventura	\$579,328	\$568,703	\$547,453	\$529,745	\$508,495	\$183,795	\$175,381	\$158,554	\$144,532	\$127,704	\$763,123	\$744,085	\$706,008	\$674,277	\$636,200
Yolo	\$193,254	\$188,220	\$178,151	\$169,761	\$159,692	\$57,705	\$55,523	\$51,159	\$47,522	\$43,158	\$250,959	\$243,743	\$229,310	\$217,283	\$202,850
Yuba	\$204,463	\$187,641	\$153,996	\$125,958	\$92,314	\$46,201	\$43,178	\$37,133	\$32,095	\$26,050	\$250,664	\$230,819	\$191,129	\$158,054	\$118,364
Total	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$32,125,980	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,541	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,540	\$8,073,539	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,521	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,520	\$40,199,519

County	3-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation											
	Base Allocation				Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)				Total Allocation			
	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)
Alameda	\$369,025	\$354,852	\$340,679	\$326,506	\$107,336	\$96,052	\$84,767	\$73,483	\$476,361	\$450,903	\$425,446	\$399,988
Alpine-El Dorado	\$108,332	\$102,620	\$96,907	\$91,195	\$30,671	\$25,035	\$19,399	\$13,763	\$139,003	\$127,655	\$116,306	\$104,958
Amador-Calaveras	\$119,392	\$109,993	\$100,594	\$91,195	\$7,211	\$7,036	\$6,860	\$6,685	\$126,603	\$117,029	\$107,454	\$97,880
Butte	\$103,647	\$92,139	\$80,631	\$69,123	\$29,103	\$27,205	\$25,307	\$23,408	\$132,750	\$119,344	\$105,938	\$92,532
Colusa	\$53,758	\$51,038	\$48,318	\$45,597	\$14,692	\$10,339	\$5,987	\$1,634	\$68,450	\$61,377	\$54,304	\$47,232
Contra Costa	\$352,361	\$335,162	\$317,962	\$300,763	\$3,456	\$27,707	\$51,958	\$76,210	\$355,817	\$362,869	\$369,921	\$376,972
Del Norte	\$51,084	\$49,255	\$47,426	\$45,597	\$3,892	\$4,639	\$5,386	\$6,133	\$54,976	\$53,894	\$52,812	\$51,731
Fresno	\$401,222	\$409,583	\$417,944	\$426,305	\$113,593	\$120,320	\$127,048	\$133,775	\$514,815	\$529,903	\$544,992	\$560,080
Glenn	\$77,449	\$66,832	\$56,215	\$45,597	\$21,926	\$16,237	\$10,549	\$4,860	\$99,375	\$83,069	\$66,763	\$50,457
Humboldt	\$91,116	\$75,943	\$60,770	\$45,597	\$24,902	\$20,722	\$16,542	\$12,362	\$116,018	\$96,665	\$77,312	\$57,959
Imperial	\$53,758	\$63,196	\$72,635	\$82,073	\$15,219	\$20,778	\$26,338	\$31,897	\$68,977	\$83,975	\$98,972	\$113,970
Inyo	\$58,423	\$54,148	\$49,873	\$45,597	\$16,541	\$11,678	\$6,815	\$1,952	\$74,964	\$65,826	\$56,688	\$47,550
Kern	\$361,140	\$367,230	\$373,319	\$379,409	\$102,244	\$105,779	\$109,315	\$112,850	\$463,384	\$473,009	\$482,634	\$492,259
Kings	\$59,589	\$61,445	\$63,300	\$65,156	\$16,871	\$18,827	\$20,784	\$22,740	\$76,460	\$80,272	\$84,084	\$87,895
Lake	\$58,640	\$54,292	\$49,945	\$45,597	\$16,466	\$12,990	\$9,514	\$6,038	\$75,106	\$67,282	\$59,459	\$51,635
Lassen	\$79,131	\$67,953	\$56,775	\$45,597	\$31,252	\$22,469	\$13,686	\$4,902	\$110,383	\$90,422	\$70,461	\$50,500
Los Angeles	\$1,921,963	\$2,001,284	\$2,080,605	\$2,159,926	\$492,952	\$499,669	\$506,387	\$513,104	\$2,414,915	\$2,500,953	\$2,586,992	\$2,673,030
Madera	\$82,062	\$76,299	\$70,535	\$64,772	\$15,208	\$17,308	\$19,409	\$21,509	\$97,270	\$93,607	\$89,944	\$86,280
Marin	\$139,122	\$107,947	\$76,772	\$45,597	\$0	\$2,066	\$4,131	\$6,197	\$139,122	\$110,013	\$80,904	\$51,794
Mariposa	\$46,234	\$46,022	\$45,810	\$45,597	\$0	\$435	\$870	\$1,305	\$46,234	\$46,457	\$46,680	\$46,903
Mendocino	\$61,300	\$56,066	\$50,832	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$15,364	\$12,897	\$10,431	\$79,130	\$71,429	\$63,729	\$56,028
Merced	\$100,217	\$110,245	\$120,273	\$130,301	\$28,140	\$33,616	\$39,091	\$44,567	\$128,357	\$143,861	\$159,365	\$174,868
Modoc	\$72,130	\$63,286	\$54,442	\$45,597	\$823	\$825	\$826	\$828	\$72,953	\$64,110	\$55,268	\$46,425
Mono	\$49,203	\$48,001	\$46,799	\$45,597	\$828	\$718	\$608	\$499	\$50,031	\$48,719	\$47,408	\$46,096
Monterey	\$122,948	\$137,629	\$152,309	\$166,990	\$34,808	\$37,966	\$41,123	\$44,281	\$157,756	\$175,594	\$193,432	\$211,270
Napa	\$62,978	\$57,184	\$51,391	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$15,169	\$12,508	\$9,847	\$80,808	\$72,354	\$63,899	\$55,445
Nevada-Sierra	\$118,168	\$109,177	\$100,186	\$91,195	\$33,180	\$24,164	\$15,149	\$6,133	\$151,348	\$133,341	\$115,335	\$97,328
Orange	\$548,837	\$556,887	\$564,936	\$572,986	\$155,384	\$150,257	\$145,131	\$140,004	\$704,221	\$707,144	\$710,067	\$712,990
Placer	\$91,566	\$83,014	\$74,462	\$65,910	\$25,923	\$23,200	\$20,476	\$17,753	\$117,489	\$106,214	\$94,938	\$83,663
Plumas	\$56,866	\$53,110	\$49,354	\$45,597	\$4,788	\$3,899	\$3,011	\$2,122	\$61,654	\$57,009	\$52,364	\$47,720
Riverside	\$676,683	\$693,025	\$709,367	\$725,709	\$184,943	\$193,418	\$201,892	\$210,367	\$861,626	\$886,443	\$911,259	\$936,076
Sacramento	\$314,827	\$457,170	\$599,512	\$741,855	\$89,133	\$120,719	\$152,306	\$183,892	\$403,960	\$577,889	\$751,818	\$925,747
San Benito	\$61,300	\$56,066	\$50,832	\$45,597	\$17,213	\$13,385	\$9,558	\$5,730	\$78,513	\$69,451	\$60,389	\$51,327
San Bernardino	\$467,102	\$652,760	\$838,419	\$1,024,077	\$132,244	\$188,820	\$245,397	\$301,973	\$599,346	\$841,581	\$1,083,816	\$1,326,051
San Diego	\$619,053	\$579,349	\$539,646	\$499,942	\$154,721	\$148,033	\$141,344	\$134,656	\$773,774	\$727,382	\$680,990	\$634,598
San Francisco	\$250,566	\$209,133	\$167,701	\$126,268	\$70,940	\$55,383	\$39,825	\$24,268	\$321,506	\$264,516	\$207,526	\$150,536
San Joaquin	\$217,745	\$267,984	\$318,223	\$368,462	\$45,300	\$65,210	\$85,120	\$105,030	\$263,045	\$333,194	\$403,343	\$473,492
San Luis Obispo	\$68,337	\$61,371	\$54,405	\$47,438	\$19,347	\$17,521	\$15,695	\$13,869	\$87,684	\$78,892	\$70,100	\$61,307
San Mateo	\$129,159	\$116,774	\$104,388	\$92,003	\$37,567	\$31,857	\$26,147	\$20,437	\$166,726	\$148,631	\$130,536	\$112,440
Santa Barbara	\$173,589	\$155,635	\$137,680	\$119,726	\$47,442	\$42,377	\$37,312	\$32,247	\$221,031	\$198,012	\$174,993	\$151,974
Santa Clara	\$453,072	\$412,171	\$371,271	\$330,370	\$128,273	\$109,978	\$91,682	\$73,387	\$581,345	\$522,149	\$462,953	\$403,757
Santa Cruz	\$75,590	\$66,214	\$56,838	\$47,462	\$21,401	\$18,597	\$15,792	\$12,988	\$96,991	\$84,811	\$72,631	\$60,450
Shasta-Trinity	\$164,554	\$147,646	\$130,737	\$113,829	\$44,974	\$38,588	\$32,203	\$25,817	\$209,528	\$186,234	\$162,940	\$139,646
Siskiyou	\$75,822	\$65,747	\$55,672	\$45,597	\$21,290	\$15,962	\$10,634	\$5,306	\$97,112	\$81,709	\$66,306	\$50,903
Solano	\$131,471	\$136,107	\$140,743	\$145,378	\$24,365	\$28,994	\$33,624	\$38,253	\$155,836	\$165,101	\$174,366	\$183,632
Sonoma	\$140,877	\$126,630	\$112,384	\$98,137	\$39,885	\$35,401	\$30,917	\$26,432	\$180,762	\$162,031	\$143,300	\$124,569

County	3-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation											
	Base Allocation				Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)				Total Allocation			
	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (33% workload)	Year 2 (67% workload)	Year 3 (100% workload)
Stanislaus	\$223,137	\$211,763	\$200,388	\$189,014	\$62,654	\$61,011	\$59,368	\$57,725	\$285,791	\$272,774	\$259,756	\$246,739
Sutter	\$67,534	\$60,222	\$52,910	\$45,597	\$19,121	\$16,458	\$13,794	\$11,131	\$86,655	\$76,680	\$66,704	\$56,729
Tehama	\$27,802	\$33,734	\$39,666	\$45,597	\$2,169	\$5,103	\$8,038	\$10,972	\$29,971	\$38,837	\$47,703	\$56,569
Tulare	\$312,151	\$244,456	\$176,761	\$109,066	\$80,697	\$67,168	\$53,639	\$40,110	\$392,848	\$311,624	\$230,400	\$149,177
Tuolumne	\$65,735	\$59,022	\$52,310	\$45,597	\$18,458	\$14,314	\$10,171	\$6,027	\$84,193	\$73,337	\$62,481	\$51,625
Ventura	\$257,724	\$227,529	\$197,334	\$167,140	\$72,965	\$63,191	\$53,418	\$43,644	\$330,689	\$290,721	\$250,752	\$210,784
Yolo	\$77,898	\$68,174	\$58,451	\$48,727	\$22,054	\$19,619	\$17,184	\$14,750	\$99,952	\$87,793	\$75,635	\$63,476
Yuba	\$66,968	\$59,844	\$52,721	\$45,597	\$18,961	\$15,608	\$12,256	\$8,903	\$85,929	\$75,453	\$64,976	\$54,500
Total	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543

4-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation: 25% First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)
		(25% workload)	(50% workload)	(75% workload)			(25% workload)	(50% workload)	(75% workload)			(25% workload)	(50% workload)	(75% workload)	
Alameda	\$369,025	\$358,395	\$347,765	\$337,135	\$326,506	\$107,336	\$98,873	\$90,409	\$81,946	\$73,483	\$476,361	\$457,268	\$438,175	\$419,081	\$399,988
Alpine-El Dorado	\$108,332	\$104,048	\$99,763	\$95,479	\$91,195	\$30,671	\$26,444	\$22,217	\$17,990	\$13,763	\$139,003	\$130,492	\$121,980	\$113,469	\$104,958
Amador-Calaveras	\$119,392	\$112,343	\$105,293	\$98,244	\$91,195	\$7,211	\$7,080	\$6,948	\$6,817	\$6,685	\$126,603	\$119,422	\$112,241	\$105,061	\$97,880
Butte	\$103,647	\$95,016	\$86,385	\$77,754	\$69,123	\$29,103	\$27,679	\$26,256	\$24,832	\$23,408	\$132,750	\$122,695	\$112,641	\$102,586	\$92,532
Colusa	\$53,758	\$51,718	\$49,678	\$47,638	\$45,597	\$14,692	\$11,428	\$8,163	\$4,899	\$1,634	\$68,450	\$63,145	\$57,841	\$52,536	\$47,232
Contra Costa	\$352,361	\$339,461	\$326,562	\$313,662	\$300,763	\$3,456	\$21,644	\$39,833	\$58,021	\$76,210	\$355,817	\$361,106	\$366,395	\$371,683	\$376,972
Del Norte	\$51,084	\$49,712	\$48,341	\$46,969	\$45,597	\$3,892	\$4,452	\$5,013	\$5,573	\$6,133	\$54,976	\$54,165	\$53,353	\$52,542	\$51,731
Fresno	\$401,222	\$407,493	\$413,763	\$420,034	\$426,305	\$113,593	\$118,639	\$123,684	\$128,730	\$133,775	\$514,815	\$526,131	\$537,448	\$548,764	\$560,080
Glenn	\$77,449	\$69,486	\$61,523	\$53,560	\$45,597	\$21,926	\$17,659	\$13,393	\$9,126	\$4,860	\$99,375	\$87,146	\$74,916	\$62,687	\$50,457
Humboldt	\$91,116	\$79,736	\$68,357	\$56,977	\$45,597	\$24,902	\$21,767	\$18,632	\$15,497	\$12,362	\$116,018	\$101,503	\$86,989	\$72,474	\$57,959
Imperial	\$53,758	\$60,837	\$67,915	\$74,994	\$82,073	\$15,219	\$19,389	\$23,558	\$27,728	\$31,897	\$68,977	\$80,225	\$91,474	\$102,722	\$113,970
Inyo	\$58,423	\$55,217	\$52,010	\$48,804	\$45,597	\$16,541	\$12,894	\$9,247	\$5,600	\$1,952	\$74,964	\$68,110	\$61,257	\$54,403	\$47,550
Kern	\$361,140	\$365,707	\$370,274	\$374,842	\$379,409	\$102,244	\$104,896	\$107,547	\$110,199	\$112,850	\$463,384	\$470,603	\$477,821	\$485,040	\$492,259
Kings	\$59,589	\$60,981	\$62,372	\$63,764	\$65,156	\$16,871	\$18,338	\$19,805	\$21,273	\$22,740	\$76,460	\$79,319	\$82,178	\$85,037	\$87,895
Lake	\$58,640	\$55,379	\$52,119	\$48,858	\$45,597	\$16,466	\$13,859	\$11,252	\$8,645	\$6,038	\$75,106	\$69,238	\$63,371	\$57,503	\$51,635
Lassen	\$79,131	\$70,748	\$62,364	\$53,981	\$45,597	\$31,252	\$24,665	\$18,077	\$11,490	\$4,902	\$110,383	\$95,412	\$80,441	\$65,471	\$50,500
Los Angeles	\$1,921,963	\$1,981,454	\$2,040,945	\$2,100,435	\$2,159,926	\$492,952	\$497,990	\$503,028	\$508,066	\$513,104	\$2,414,915	\$2,479,444	\$2,543,973	\$2,608,502	\$2,673,030
Madera	\$82,062	\$77,739	\$73,417	\$69,094	\$64,772	\$15,208	\$16,783	\$18,358	\$19,934	\$21,509	\$97,270	\$94,523	\$91,775	\$89,028	\$86,280
Marin	\$139,122	\$115,741	\$92,360	\$68,979	\$45,597	\$0	\$1,549	\$3,098	\$4,648	\$6,197	\$139,122	\$117,290	\$95,458	\$73,626	\$51,794
Mariposa	\$46,234	\$46,075	\$45,916	\$45,757	\$45,597	\$0	\$326	\$653	\$979	\$1,305	\$46,234	\$46,401	\$46,568	\$46,735	\$46,903
Mendocino	\$61,300	\$57,374	\$53,449	\$49,523	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$15,980	\$14,130	\$12,281	\$10,431	\$79,130	\$73,355	\$67,579	\$61,804	\$56,028
Merced	\$100,217	\$107,738	\$115,259	\$122,780	\$130,301	\$28,140	\$32,247	\$36,354	\$40,460	\$44,567	\$128,357	\$139,985	\$151,613	\$163,241	\$174,868
Modoc	\$72,130	\$65,497	\$58,864	\$52,231	\$45,597	\$823	\$824	\$825	\$827	\$828	\$72,953	\$66,321	\$59,689	\$53,057	\$46,425
Mono	\$49,203	\$48,302	\$47,400	\$46,499	\$45,597	\$828	\$746	\$663	\$581	\$499	\$50,031	\$49,047	\$48,064	\$47,080	\$46,096
Monterey	\$122,948	\$133,958	\$144,969	\$155,979	\$166,990	\$34,808	\$37,176	\$39,544	\$41,912	\$44,281	\$157,756	\$171,135	\$184,513	\$197,892	\$211,270
Napa	\$62,978	\$58,633	\$54,288	\$49,943	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$15,834	\$13,839	\$11,843	\$9,847	\$80,808	\$74,467	\$68,126	\$61,785	\$55,445
Nevada-Sierra	\$118,168	\$111,425	\$104,681	\$97,938	\$91,195	\$33,180	\$26,418	\$19,657	\$12,895	\$6,133	\$151,348	\$137,843	\$124,338	\$110,833	\$97,328
Orange	\$548,837	\$554,874	\$560,911	\$566,948	\$572,986	\$155,384	\$151,539	\$147,694	\$143,849	\$140,004	\$704,221	\$706,413	\$708,605	\$710,798	\$712,990
Placer	\$91,566	\$85,152	\$78,738	\$72,324	\$65,910	\$25,923	\$23,880	\$21,838	\$19,795	\$17,753	\$117,489	\$109,032	\$100,576	\$92,119	\$83,663
Plumas	\$56,866	\$54,049	\$51,232	\$48,415	\$45,597	\$4,788	\$4,122	\$3,455	\$2,789	\$2,122	\$61,654	\$58,170	\$54,687	\$51,203	\$47,720
Riverside	\$676,683	\$688,940	\$701,196	\$713,453	\$725,709	\$184,943	\$191,299	\$197,655	\$204,011	\$210,367	\$861,626	\$880,238	\$898,851	\$917,463	\$936,076
Sacramento	\$314,827	\$421,584	\$528,341	\$635,098	\$741,855	\$89,133	\$112,823	\$136,512	\$160,202	\$183,892	\$403,960	\$534,407	\$664,854	\$795,300	\$925,747
San Benito	\$61,300	\$57,374	\$53,449	\$49,523	\$45,597	\$17,213	\$14,342	\$11,472	\$8,601	\$5,730	\$78,513	\$71,717	\$64,920	\$58,124	\$51,327
San Bernardino	\$467,102	\$606,346	\$745,590	\$884,834	\$1,024,077	\$132,244	\$174,676	\$217,109	\$259,541	\$301,973	\$599,346	\$781,022	\$962,698	\$1,144,375	\$1,326,051
San Diego	\$619,053	\$589,275	\$559,498	\$529,720	\$499,942	\$154,721	\$149,705	\$144,689	\$139,672	\$134,656	\$773,774	\$738,980	\$704,186	\$669,392	\$634,598
San Francisco	\$250,566	\$219,491	\$188,417	\$157,342	\$126,268	\$70,940	\$59,272	\$47,604	\$35,936	\$24,268	\$321,506	\$278,763	\$236,021	\$193,278	\$150,536
San Joaquin	\$217,745	\$255,424	\$293,104	\$330,783	\$368,462	\$45,300	\$60,232	\$75,165	\$90,097	\$105,030	\$263,045	\$315,657	\$368,268	\$420,880	\$473,492
San Luis Obispo	\$68,337	\$63,112	\$57,888	\$52,663	\$47,438	\$19,347	\$17,977	\$16,608	\$15,238	\$13,869	\$87,684	\$81,090	\$74,496	\$67,901	\$61,307
San Mateo	\$129,159	\$119,870	\$110,581	\$101,292	\$92,003	\$37,567	\$33,285	\$29,002	\$24,720	\$20,437	\$166,726	\$153,155	\$139,583	\$126,012	\$112,440
Santa Barbara	\$173,589	\$160,123	\$146,658	\$133,192	\$119,726	\$47,442	\$43,643	\$39,845	\$36,046	\$32,247	\$221,031	\$203,767	\$186,502	\$169,238	\$151,974
Santa Clara	\$453,072	\$422,397	\$391,721	\$361,046	\$330,370	\$128,273	\$114,552	\$100,830	\$87,109	\$73,387	\$581,345	\$536,948	\$492,551	\$448,154	\$403,757
Santa Cruz	\$75,590	\$68,558	\$61,526	\$54,494	\$47,462	\$21,401	\$19,298	\$17,195	\$15,091	\$12,988	\$96,991	\$87,856	\$78,721	\$69,586	\$60,450
Shasta-Trinity	\$164,554	\$151,873	\$139,191	\$126,510	\$113,829	\$44,974	\$40,185	\$35,396	\$30,606	\$25,817	\$209,528	\$192,057	\$174,587	\$157,116	\$139,646
Siskiyou	\$75,822	\$68,266	\$60,710	\$53,154	\$45,597	\$21,290	\$17,294	\$13,298	\$9,302	\$5,306	\$97,112	\$85,560	\$74,007	\$62,455	\$50,903
Solano	\$131,471	\$134,948	\$138,425	\$141,901	\$145,378	\$24,365	\$27,837	\$31,309	\$34,781	\$38,253	\$155,836	\$162,785	\$169,734	\$176,683	\$183,632
Sonoma	\$140,877	\$130,192	\$119,507	\$108,822	\$98,137	\$39,885	\$36,522	\$33,159	\$29,796	\$26,432	\$180,762	\$166,714	\$152,666	\$138,617	\$124,569

4-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation: 25% First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (25% workload)	Year 2 (50% workload)	Year 3 (75% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
Stanislaus	\$223,137	\$214,606	\$206,075	\$197,545	\$189,014	\$62,654	\$61,422	\$60,189	\$58,957	\$57,725	\$285,791	\$276,028	\$266,265	\$256,502	\$246,739
Sutter	\$67,534	\$62,050	\$56,566	\$51,082	\$45,597	\$19,121	\$17,124	\$15,126	\$13,129	\$11,131	\$86,655	\$79,173	\$71,692	\$64,210	\$56,729
Tehama	\$27,802	\$32,251	\$36,700	\$41,149	\$45,597	\$2,169	\$4,370	\$6,570	\$8,771	\$10,972	\$29,971	\$36,621	\$43,270	\$49,920	\$56,569
Tulare	\$312,151	\$261,380	\$210,609	\$159,837	\$109,066	\$80,697	\$70,550	\$60,404	\$50,257	\$40,110	\$392,848	\$331,930	\$271,012	\$210,094	\$149,177
Tuolumne	\$65,735	\$60,701	\$55,666	\$50,632	\$45,597	\$18,458	\$15,350	\$12,243	\$9,135	\$6,027	\$84,193	\$76,051	\$67,909	\$59,767	\$51,625
Ventura	\$257,724	\$235,078	\$212,432	\$189,786	\$167,140	\$72,965	\$65,635	\$58,304	\$50,974	\$43,644	\$330,689	\$300,713	\$270,736	\$240,760	\$210,784
Yolo	\$77,898	\$70,605	\$63,312	\$56,020	\$48,727	\$22,054	\$20,228	\$18,402	\$16,576	\$14,750	\$99,952	\$90,833	\$81,714	\$72,595	\$63,476
Yuba	\$66,968	\$61,625	\$56,283	\$50,940	\$45,597	\$18,961	\$16,446	\$13,932	\$11,417	\$8,903	\$85,929	\$78,072	\$70,215	\$62,357	\$54,500
Total	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543

4-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation: 15% First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)	Historical	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4 (100%)
		(15% workload)	(45% workload)	(70% workload)			(15% workload)	(45% workload)	(70% workload)			(15% workload)	(45% workload)	(70% workload)	
Alameda	\$369,025	\$362,647	\$349,891	\$339,261	\$326,506	\$107,336	\$102,258	\$92,102	\$83,639	\$73,483	\$476,361	\$464,905	\$441,993	\$422,900	\$399,988
Alpine-El Dorado	\$108,332	\$105,761	\$100,620	\$96,336	\$91,195	\$30,671	\$28,135	\$23,062	\$18,835	\$13,763	\$139,003	\$133,896	\$123,683	\$115,171	\$104,958
Amador-Calaveras	\$119,392	\$115,162	\$106,703	\$99,654	\$91,195	\$7,211	\$7,132	\$6,974	\$6,843	\$6,685	\$126,603	\$122,295	\$113,678	\$106,497	\$97,880
Butte	\$103,647	\$98,468	\$88,111	\$79,480	\$69,123	\$29,103	\$28,249	\$26,540	\$25,117	\$23,408	\$132,750	\$126,717	\$114,652	\$104,597	\$92,532
Colusa	\$53,758	\$52,534	\$50,086	\$48,046	\$45,597	\$14,692	\$12,733	\$8,816	\$5,551	\$1,634	\$68,450	\$65,267	\$58,902	\$53,597	\$47,232
Contra Costa	\$352,361	\$344,621	\$329,142	\$316,242	\$300,763	\$3,456	\$14,369	\$36,195	\$54,384	\$76,210	\$355,817	\$358,990	\$365,337	\$370,626	\$376,972
Del Norte	\$51,084	\$50,261	\$48,615	\$47,243	\$45,597	\$3,892	\$4,228	\$4,901	\$5,461	\$6,133	\$54,976	\$54,489	\$53,516	\$52,704	\$51,731
Fresno	\$401,222	\$404,984	\$412,509	\$418,780	\$426,305	\$113,593	\$116,620	\$122,675	\$127,721	\$133,775	\$514,815	\$521,605	\$535,184	\$546,501	\$560,080
Glenn	\$77,449	\$72,671	\$63,116	\$55,153	\$45,597	\$21,926	\$19,366	\$14,246	\$9,980	\$4,860	\$99,375	\$92,037	\$77,362	\$65,133	\$50,457
Humboldt	\$91,116	\$84,288	\$70,633	\$59,253	\$45,597	\$24,902	\$23,021	\$19,259	\$16,124	\$12,362	\$116,018	\$107,309	\$89,892	\$75,377	\$57,959
Imperial	\$53,758	\$58,005	\$66,500	\$73,578	\$82,073	\$15,219	\$17,721	\$22,724	\$26,894	\$31,897	\$68,977	\$75,726	\$89,224	\$100,472	\$113,970
Inyo	\$58,423	\$56,499	\$52,651	\$49,445	\$45,597	\$16,541	\$14,353	\$9,976	\$6,329	\$1,952	\$74,964	\$70,852	\$62,628	\$55,774	\$47,550
Kern	\$361,140	\$363,880	\$369,361	\$373,928	\$379,409	\$102,244	\$103,835	\$107,017	\$109,668	\$112,850	\$463,384	\$467,715	\$476,378	\$483,596	\$492,259
Kings	\$59,589	\$60,424	\$62,094	\$63,486	\$65,156	\$16,871	\$17,751	\$19,512	\$20,979	\$22,740	\$76,460	\$78,175	\$81,606	\$84,465	\$87,895
Lake	\$58,640	\$56,684	\$52,771	\$49,510	\$45,597	\$16,466	\$14,902	\$11,773	\$9,166	\$6,038	\$75,106	\$71,585	\$64,544	\$58,676	\$51,635
Lassen	\$79,131	\$74,101	\$64,041	\$55,657	\$45,597	\$31,252	\$27,300	\$19,395	\$12,807	\$4,902	\$110,383	\$101,401	\$83,436	\$68,465	\$50,500
Los Angeles	\$1,921,963	\$1,957,657	\$2,029,046	\$2,088,537	\$2,159,926	\$492,952	\$495,975	\$502,021	\$507,059	\$513,104	\$2,414,915	\$2,453,632	\$2,531,067	\$2,595,596	\$2,673,030
Madera	\$82,062	\$79,468	\$74,281	\$69,959	\$64,772	\$15,208	\$16,153	\$18,043	\$19,619	\$21,509	\$97,270	\$95,622	\$92,325	\$89,577	\$86,280
Marin	\$139,122	\$125,093	\$97,036	\$73,655	\$45,597	\$0	\$930	\$2,789	\$4,338	\$6,197	\$139,122	\$126,023	\$99,825	\$77,993	\$51,794
Mariposa	\$46,234	\$46,139	\$45,948	\$45,788	\$45,597	\$0	\$196	\$587	\$914	\$1,305	\$46,234	\$46,334	\$46,535	\$46,702	\$46,903
Mendocino	\$61,300	\$58,945	\$54,234	\$50,308	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$16,720	\$14,500	\$12,651	\$10,431	\$79,130	\$75,665	\$68,734	\$62,959	\$56,028
Merced	\$100,217	\$104,730	\$113,755	\$121,276	\$130,301	\$28,140	\$30,604	\$35,532	\$39,639	\$44,567	\$128,357	\$135,334	\$149,287	\$160,915	\$174,868
Modoc	\$72,130	\$68,150	\$60,190	\$53,557	\$45,597	\$823	\$824	\$825	\$826	\$828	\$72,953	\$68,974	\$61,015	\$54,383	\$46,425
Mono	\$49,203	\$48,662	\$47,580	\$46,679	\$45,597	\$828	\$779	\$680	\$598	\$499	\$50,031	\$49,441	\$48,260	\$47,277	\$46,096
Monterey	\$122,948	\$129,554	\$142,767	\$153,777	\$166,990	\$34,808	\$36,229	\$39,071	\$41,439	\$44,281	\$157,756	\$165,783	\$181,837	\$195,216	\$211,270
Napa	\$62,978	\$60,371	\$55,157	\$50,812	\$45,597	\$17,830	\$16,633	\$14,238	\$12,242	\$9,847	\$80,808	\$77,003	\$69,394	\$63,054	\$55,445
Nevada-Sierra	\$118,168	\$114,122	\$106,030	\$99,287	\$91,195	\$33,180	\$29,123	\$21,009	\$14,247	\$6,133	\$151,348	\$143,245	\$127,039	\$113,534	\$97,328
Orange	\$548,837	\$552,459	\$559,704	\$565,741	\$572,986	\$155,384	\$153,077	\$148,463	\$144,618	\$140,004	\$704,221	\$705,536	\$708,167	\$710,359	\$712,990
Placer	\$91,566	\$87,718	\$80,021	\$73,607	\$65,910	\$25,923	\$24,697	\$22,246	\$20,204	\$17,753	\$117,489	\$112,415	\$102,267	\$93,811	\$83,663
Plumas	\$56,866	\$55,176	\$51,795	\$48,978	\$45,597	\$4,788	\$4,388	\$3,588	\$2,922	\$2,122	\$61,654	\$59,564	\$55,384	\$51,900	\$47,720
Riverside	\$676,683	\$684,037	\$698,745	\$711,001	\$725,709	\$184,943	\$188,757	\$196,384	\$202,740	\$210,367	\$861,626	\$872,793	\$895,128	\$913,741	\$936,076
Sacramento	\$314,827	\$378,881	\$506,990	\$613,747	\$741,855	\$89,133	\$103,347	\$131,775	\$155,464	\$183,892	\$403,960	\$482,228	\$638,764	\$769,211	\$925,747
San Benito	\$61,300	\$58,945	\$54,234	\$50,308	\$45,597	\$17,213	\$15,491	\$12,046	\$9,175	\$5,730	\$78,513	\$74,435	\$66,279	\$59,483	\$51,327
San Bernardino	\$467,102	\$550,648	\$717,741	\$856,985	\$1,024,077	\$132,244	\$157,703	\$208,622	\$251,055	\$301,973	\$599,346	\$708,352	\$926,363	\$1,108,039	\$1,326,051
San Diego	\$619,053	\$601,186	\$565,453	\$535,676	\$499,942	\$154,721	\$151,711	\$145,692	\$140,676	\$134,656	\$773,774	\$752,898	\$711,145	\$676,351	\$634,598
San Francisco	\$250,566	\$231,921	\$194,632	\$163,557	\$126,268	\$70,940	\$63,939	\$49,938	\$38,269	\$24,268	\$321,506	\$295,860	\$244,569	\$201,827	\$150,536
San Joaquin	\$217,745	\$240,353	\$285,568	\$323,247	\$368,462	\$45,300	\$54,259	\$72,178	\$87,111	\$105,030	\$263,045	\$294,612	\$357,746	\$410,358	\$473,492
San Luis Obispo	\$68,337	\$65,202	\$58,933	\$53,708	\$47,438	\$19,347	\$18,525	\$16,882	\$15,512	\$13,869	\$87,684	\$83,727	\$75,814	\$69,220	\$61,307
San Mateo	\$129,159	\$123,586	\$112,439	\$103,150	\$92,003	\$37,567	\$34,998	\$29,859	\$25,576	\$20,437	\$166,726	\$158,583	\$142,297	\$128,726	\$112,440
Santa Barbara	\$173,589	\$165,510	\$149,351	\$135,885	\$119,726	\$47,442	\$45,163	\$40,604	\$36,806	\$32,247	\$221,031	\$210,672	\$189,955	\$172,691	\$151,974
Santa Clara	\$453,072	\$434,667	\$397,856	\$367,181	\$330,370	\$128,273	\$120,040	\$103,574	\$89,853	\$73,387	\$581,345	\$554,707	\$501,431	\$457,034	\$403,757
Santa Cruz	\$75,590	\$71,371	\$62,933	\$55,901	\$47,462	\$21,401	\$20,139	\$17,615	\$15,512	\$12,988	\$96,991	\$91,510	\$80,548	\$71,413	\$60,450
Shasta-Trinity	\$164,554	\$156,945	\$141,728	\$129,046	\$113,829	\$44,974	\$42,100	\$36,353	\$31,564	\$25,817	\$209,528	\$199,046	\$178,081	\$160,611	\$139,646
Siskiyou	\$75,822	\$71,288	\$62,221	\$54,665	\$45,597	\$21,290	\$18,892	\$14,097	\$10,101	\$5,306	\$97,112	\$90,181	\$76,318	\$64,766	\$50,903
Solano	\$131,471	\$133,557	\$137,729	\$141,206	\$145,378	\$24,365	\$26,448	\$30,615	\$34,087	\$38,253	\$155,836	\$160,005	\$168,344	\$175,293	\$183,632
Sonoma	\$140,877	\$134,466	\$121,644	\$110,959	\$98,137	\$39,885	\$37,867	\$33,831	\$30,468	\$26,432	\$180,762	\$172,333	\$155,475	\$141,427	\$124,569

4-Year Phase-in of FLF Allocation: 15% First Year

County	Base Allocation					Drawdown Allocation (Fed. share only)					Total Allocation				
	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)	Historical	Year 1 (15% workload)	Year 2 (45% workload)	Year 3 (70% workload)	Year 4 (100% workload)
Stanislaus	\$223,137	\$218,019	\$207,782	\$199,251	\$189,014	\$62,654	\$61,915	\$60,436	\$59,204	\$57,725	\$285,791	\$279,933	\$268,218	\$258,454	\$246,739
Sutter	\$67,534	\$64,244	\$57,663	\$52,178	\$45,597	\$19,121	\$17,923	\$15,526	\$13,528	\$11,131	\$86,655	\$82,166	\$73,188	\$65,706	\$56,729
Tehama	\$27,802	\$30,471	\$35,810	\$40,259	\$45,597	\$2,169	\$3,489	\$6,130	\$8,331	\$10,972	\$29,971	\$33,961	\$41,940	\$48,590	\$56,569
Tulare	\$312,151	\$281,688	\$220,763	\$169,992	\$109,066	\$80,697	\$74,609	\$62,433	\$52,286	\$40,110	\$392,848	\$356,297	\$283,196	\$222,278	\$149,177
Tuolumne	\$65,735	\$62,714	\$56,673	\$51,639	\$45,597	\$18,458	\$16,593	\$12,864	\$9,756	\$6,027	\$84,193	\$79,308	\$69,537	\$61,395	\$51,625
Ventura	\$257,724	\$244,136	\$216,961	\$194,315	\$167,140	\$72,965	\$68,567	\$59,770	\$52,440	\$43,644	\$330,689	\$312,703	\$276,732	\$246,755	\$210,784
Yolo	\$77,898	\$73,522	\$64,771	\$57,478	\$48,727	\$22,054	\$20,958	\$18,767	\$16,941	\$14,750	\$99,952	\$94,481	\$83,538	\$74,419	\$63,476
Yuba	\$66,968	\$63,762	\$57,351	\$52,009	\$45,597	\$18,961	\$17,452	\$14,435	\$11,920	\$8,903	\$85,929	\$81,215	\$71,786	\$63,929	\$54,500
Total	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$10,990,357	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$2,759,186	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543	\$13,749,543

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Updated on December 16, 2015

Changes highlighted in yellow

FY 2015–2016

1. Identify technology funding streams (with JCTC and CITMF assistance)
2. Joint working group with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to evaluate the allocation methodology for Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding.
3. Evaluate the impact of civil assessments as it relates to the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
4. Plans for FY 2018–2019 and beyond
5. Review operating expenses and equipment (OE&E) calculation and other WAFM components to determine handling of inflation, modification and refresh cycle (moved from 2016-2017)
6. New judgeships staffing complement funding

FY 2016–2017

1. Review self-help funding allocation
2. Review AB 1058 revenue as an offset
3. Identify all funding sources and determine allocation models
4. Review funding floor calculation to determine handling of inflation and refresh cycle
5. Special circumstances cases funding

Indefinite

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

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Annual Agenda—2015
Approved by E&P: April 16, 2015 and June 1¹, 2015

I. ADVISORY BODY INFORMATION

Chair:	Hon. Laurie Earl, Judge of the Superior Court of Sacramento County
Staff:	Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Finance office Mr. Steven Chang, Manager, Judicial Council Finance office
<p>Advisory Body's Charge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 10.64. Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Area of focus</u> The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the council on the preparation, development, and implementation of the budget for the trial courts and provides input to the council on policy issues affecting trial court funding. • <u>Additional duties</u> In addition to the duties specified in rule 10.34, the committee may make recommendations to the council on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trial court budget priorities to guide the development of the budget for the upcoming fiscal year; ○ The allocation of trial court funding, including any changes to existing methodologies for allocating trial court budget augmentations and reductions; and ○ Budget policies and procedures, as appropriate. <p>In addition to the duties described above, the advisory committee may also make recommendations to the council on proposed expenditures from the Trial Court Trust Fund and State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund.</p> <p>The advisory committee currently plans to meet in-person approximately 7 times in 2015 and several more times by teleconference, contingent on available funding.</p>	

¹ The Executive and Planning Committee approved revisions to the committee's annual agenda at a meeting on June 1, 2015.

Advisory Body's Membership:

- Membership
 - The advisory committee consists of an equal number of trial court presiding judges and court executive officers reflecting diverse aspects of state trial courts, including urban, suburban, and rural locales; the size and adequacy of budgets; and the number of authorized judgeships. For purposes of rule 10.64, "presiding judge" means a current presiding judge or an immediate past presiding judge.
 - No more than two members may be from the same court.
 - The chairs of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee serve as ex-officio voting members.
 - Notwithstanding rule 10.31(e), a presiding judge is qualified to complete his or her term on the advisory committee even if his or her term as presiding judge of a trial court ends.
 - The Judicial Council's chief of staff, chief administrative officer, chief operating officer, and director of Finance serve as non-voting members.
- This year marks the first time committee membership has included staggered appointments for one, two, and three year terms and are timed to coincide with Judicial Council roster changes each fall.
- Committee membership requires a commitment of several hours per month on average, but may vary considerably from month to month, depending on the budget issues in any given year.

Subgroups/Working Groups:

- Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee
- Funding Methodology Subcommittee
- Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee
- 2% Funding Request Review Subcommittee*
- 2% Reserve Policy Working Group*
- Benefits Working Group*
- Children's Waiting Room Working Group*
- Court-appointed Dependency Counsel Working Group*
- Security Growth Working Group*

*Indicates advisory bodies established since the last annual agenda was approved.

Advisory Body's Key Objectives for 2015:

- Review allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund as well as Trial Court Trust Fund to ensure consistency with Judicial Council goals and objectives and propose solutions to address any structural shortfall in either fund.
- Ongoing review and refinement of the council-approved Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) to address unresolved issues.
- Develop definitions and policies governing local assistance and state operations expenditures tied to State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund as well as Trial Court Trust Fund allocations.
- Develop an allocation methodology for Prop. 47 funding.
- Develop new allocation methodology for Court Appointed Dependency Counsel funding.
- Review and consider options to the current allocation methodology for Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding.²

II. ADVISORY BODY PROJECTS

: The committee does not have any proposed projects for the year ahead, but is expected to focus on continued efforts indicated in the key objectives section above. Of note:

- As indicated in the charge outlined in the rule, the committee performs an active role in the development of the statewide trial court budget. This includes surveying courts and providing input on trial court budget priorities as well as submitting recommendations to the council, typically in June, on trial court budget change proposals for the upcoming fiscal year.
- In January 2015, the committee conducted new member orientation that was open to Judicial Council members as well as new trial court presiding judges. Due to the significant interest and attendance, the committee intends to follow through with a similar orientation in the next cycle.

² The Executive and Planning Committee approved this revision to the committee's annual agenda at a meeting on June 1, 2015.

III. STATUS OF 2014 PROJECTS:

Not Applicable: The committee did not have specific projects for 2014, but instead addressed a variety of issues throughout the year, including fund balance restrictions, shortfalls in funds supporting trial courts, and funding methodology implementation, among others.

IV. Subgroups/Working Groups - Detail

Subgroups/Working Groups:

- Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee: This subcommittee, formed in July 2013, includes 13 presiding judges and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. The primary focus of this group is the ongoing review of allocations supporting trial court projects and programs as well as any systemic cash flow issues affecting the trial courts. In 2015, a subset of this advisory body will develop recommendations for council consideration relating to the definitions and policies governing local assistance and state operations expenditures tied to State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund as well as Trial Court Trust Fund allocations. This subcommittee meets at least twice per year.
- Funding Methodology Subcommittee: This subcommittee, also formed in July 2013, includes 15 presiding judges and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance with support from the Office of Court Research. This group will continue to focus on the ongoing review and refinement of the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology approved by the council in April 2013. This subcommittee is expected to meet at least twice per year.
- Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee: This subcommittee, which formed in 2013, includes 11 presiding judges and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. This group's focus will be funding methodology and allocations relating to criminal justice realignment, specifically Proposition 47 workload. This subcommittee meets at least twice per year.
- 2% Funding Request Review Subcommittee: This subcommittee, formed in October 2014, includes 7 presiding judges and court executives and is staff by JCC Finance. This group reviews and makes recommendations on court supplemental funding requests received in conjunction with the 2% emergency reserve funding process and that relate to unforeseen emergencies or unanticipated expenses. The group meets as needed.
- 2% Reserve Policy Working Group: This subcommittee, formed in 2014, includes six presiding judges and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. This group is charged with working with the Court Executive Advisory Committee, Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee, and the Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee, to recommend proposed amendments to Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(B), the statute that establishes the 2 percent reserve, to be included as trailer bill language to the 2015 Budget Act. The working group will meet as needed to develop recommended language and is not expected to continue beyond the current fiscal year.

- Benefits Working Group: This group, formed in 2014, includes 9 presiding judges and executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. The working group has been working on various benefit cost and related funding allocation issues over the past several months and is expected to wrap up its duties in the spring of 2015.
- Children's Waiting Room Working Group: This group, formed in late 2014, includes 6 presiding judges and executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. The working group is developing recommendations that include changes and additions to the Judicial Council's policy regarding children's waiting room distributions. Work is expected to be completed in spring 2015.
- Court-appointed Dependency Counsel Working Group: This group has existed in one form or another, supporting Judicial Council advisory bodies, for several years. The current iteration, which includes 9 presiding judges and court executive officers and is primarily staffed by the Center for Families, Children & the Courts, is focused on the allocation methodology for court-appointed dependency counsel funding. The group is expected to conclude its work in the current fiscal year.
- Security Growth Working Group: This group, formed in 2014, includes 5 presiding judge and court executive officers and is staffed by JCC Finance. Their focus is to address the growth in non-sheriff, court-provided security costs. The group's work is expected to run through calendar year 2015.
- Joint Subcommittees with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee³:
 - To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the committee will collaborate with members of Family and Juvenile Law Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and representatives from the California Department of Child Support Services to reconsider the AB 1058 funding allocation methodology developed in 1997 and to report back at the February 2016 Judicial Council meeting.
 - To enrich recommendations to the council and avoid duplication of effort, members of the committee will collaborate with members of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to review the workload model for court-appointed dependency counsel and report back no later than the April 2016 Judicial Council meeting.

³ The Executive and Planning Committee approved this revision to the committee's annual agenda at a meeting on June 1, 2015.