



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR MAY 8, 2017

Meeting Contents

<b>Agenda</b> .....	2
<b>Minutes</b>	
Draft Minutes from the April 12, 2017 Meeting .....	4
<b>Discussion and Possible Action Items</b>	
<b>Item 1</b> – Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) Workload Priorities for 2017-2018 (Action Item) Attachment 1: Funding Methodology Subcommittee Work Plan.....	7
<b>Item 2</b> – WAFM Adjustment Request Process and WAFM Adjustment Timeline (Action Item) Attachment 2A: <i>Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedures</i> .....	8
Attachment 2B: Proposed changes to the <i>Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedures</i> .....	10
<b>Item 3</b> – Impact of Adjusting Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on WAFM calculations (Action Item) Attachment 3: BLS Scenarios.....	12



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm)  
[tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov)

## TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))  
THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS  
THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

---

**Date:** May 8, 2017  
**Time:** 3:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.  
**Public Call-in Number:** 1-877-820-7831, Pass code: 1884843 (listen only)

---

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

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

---

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

---

#### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

#### **Approval of Minutes**

Approve minutes of the April 12, 2017, Funding Methodology Subcommittee meeting.

---

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

---

#### **Written Comment**

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to [tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov) or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833, attention: Ms. Suzanne Blihovde. Only written comments received by May 5, 2017 by 3:30 p.m. will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)**

---

*Items 1-3 were previously discussion items from the Funding Methodology Subcommittee meeting held on April 12, 2017. These items are now action items.*

**Item 1**

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

Confirm the 2016-2017 work plan for FMS.

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

**Item 2**

**WAFM Adjustment Request Process and WAFM Adjustment Timeline (Action Item)**

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

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

**Item 3**

**Impact of Adjusting Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on WAFM calculations (Action Item)**

Confirm impact of adjusting BLS to different percentages for all courts and its effect on funding floor in WAFM calculations.

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

---

**IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)**

---

**No Items**

---

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

---

**Adjourn**



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

[www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm)  
[tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov)

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

April 12, 2017

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

JCC Walnut Room, 2580 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Co-Chair), Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, and Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs.

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

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Judges:  
Executive Officers:

**Others Present:** Hon. Morris Jacobson, Mr. Chad Fine, Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Ms. Leah Rose Goodwin, and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde.

---

OPEN MEETING

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

The chair called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. Members introduced themselves, and roll was called.

**Approval of Minutes**

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the May 10, 2016 Funding Methodology Committee Meeting.

---

INFORMATIONAL ONLY ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

**Info 1 - Workload-Based Allocation Funding Methodology (WAFM) 2018-2019 Rollout**

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

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

**Info 2 - Status of the Resource Allocation Study (RAS)**

Review of the RAS proposed case weights.

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

---

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1 – 3)**

---

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

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

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

*Action: The Funding Methodology Subcommittee discussed this item and put together a plan for possible action items for the next meeting.*

**Item 2 – WAFM Adjustment Request Process and WAFM Adjustment Timeline (Discussion Item)**

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

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

*Action: The Funding Methodology Subcommittee discussed this item and put together a plan for possible action items for the next meeting.*

**Item 3 – Civil Assessments Budget Change Proposal (Discussion Item)**

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

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

*Action: The Funding Methodology Subcommittee discussed this item and put together a plan for possible action items for the next meeting.*

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

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

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

*Action: The Funding Methodology Subcommittee discussed this item and put together a plan for possible action items for the next meeting.*

**Item 5 – WAFM Spreadsheet Displays (Discussion Item)**

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

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

*Action: The Funding Methodology Subcommittee discussed this item and put together a plan for possible action items for the next meeting.*

---

**A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

## FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Updated on May 8, 2017

### **FY 2017–2018**

1. Plans for FY 2018–2019 and year 6 and beyond
  - a. Simplify display of worksheets for after year 5
2. New judgeships staffing complement funding
3. Track technology funding streams (quarterly updates from JCTC and CITMF)
4. Track joint working group with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to evaluate the allocation methodology for Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding including. Subsequent to receiving information from working group, FMS will start to review AB 1058 revenue as an offset to WAFM funding need.
5. Evaluate the impact of civil assessments as it relates to the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)
6. Review TCTF and IMF self-help funding allocation
7. Identify all funding sources and determine allocation models
8. Review funding floor calculation to determine handling of inflation and refresh cycle
9. Special circumstances cases funding
10. Evaluate impact of JCC and other provided services
11. Evaluate how to include unfunded costs – courthouse construction
12. Look at how to address regional impact of BLS in the model

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. Adjustments to WAFM will impact the funding need for each trial court that is subject to the adjustment, along with the overall statewide funding need. Therefore, final allocations will be implemented consistent with the WAFM allocation implementation plan as approved by the Judicial Council or as amended in the future. Because funding need is currently greater than available funding and because only a portion of trial court funding is currently allocated under the WAFM, allocated funding will not equal, and may be substantially less than, the funding need identified for the adjustment being made, just as the allocated funding is substantially less than the entire WAFM funding need.
8. *This policy does not preclude the Funding Methodology subcommittee from taking expedited action per the direction of the TCBAC committee.*

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

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

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

\*FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY\*

		2016-17 Cost of Labor Factor				
		Actual	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Cluster	Court	3-Year Avg (2011-2013) BLS Factor	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .8)	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .85)	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .9)	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .95)
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E
4	Alameda	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42	1.42
1	Alpine	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.90	0.95
1	Amador	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
2	Butte	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.95
1	Calaveras	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.95
1	Colusa	0.72	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
3	Contra Costa	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
1	Del Norte	0.77	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
2	El Dorado	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01
3	Fresno	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97
1	Glenn	0.68	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
2	Humboldt	0.78	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
2	Imperial	0.79	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
1	Inyo	0.84	0.84	0.85	0.90	0.95
3	Kern	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05
2	Kings	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.90	0.95
2	Lake	0.75	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
1	Lassen	0.80	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
4	Los Angeles	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36	1.36
2	Madera	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.95
2	Marin	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29	1.29
1	Mariposa	0.81	0.81	0.85	0.90	0.95
2	Mendocino	0.82	0.82	0.85	0.90	0.95
2	Merced	0.89	0.89	0.89	0.90	0.95
1	Modoc	0.57	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
1	Mono	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
3	Monterey	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19
2	Napa	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22
2	Nevada	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98
4	Orange	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
2	Placer	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19
1	Plumas	0.70	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
4	Riverside	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
4	Sacramento	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.28
1	San Benito	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97	0.97
4	San Bernardino	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06
4	San Diego	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18
4	San Francisco	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
3	San Joaquin	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.09
2	San Luis Obispo	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06
3	San Mateo	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44
3	Santa Barbara	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19	1.19
4	Santa Clara	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44	1.44
2	Santa Cruz	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14	1.14
2	Shasta	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.90	0.95
1	Sierra	0.62	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
2	Siskiyou	0.70	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
3	Solano	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18	1.18
3	Sonoma	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.13
3	Stanislaus	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01
2	Sutter	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96
2	Tehama	0.79	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
1	Trinity	0.65	0.80	0.85	0.90	0.95
3	Tulare	0.84	0.84	0.85	0.90	0.95
2	Tuolumne	0.81	0.81	0.85	0.90	0.95
3	Ventura	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22	1.22
2	Yolo	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04
2	Yuba	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17

58.38

2016-17 WAFM Funding Need				
Actual	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
2016-17 WAFM Funding Need	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .8)	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .85)	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .9)	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .95)
Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
86,595,580	86,595,580	86,595,580	86,595,580	86,595,580
405,149	405,149	405,149	416,405	430,685
2,923,146	2,923,146	2,923,146	2,923,146	2,923,146
13,150,407	13,150,407	13,150,407	13,150,407	13,588,155
2,760,256	2,760,256	2,760,256	2,768,418	2,864,869
1,842,151	1,877,309	1,950,360	2,023,412	2,096,463
51,243,320	51,243,320	51,243,320	51,243,320	51,243,320
3,200,856	3,239,434	3,343,971	3,448,509	3,553,046
8,768,398	8,768,398	8,768,398	8,768,398	8,768,398
68,451,784	68,451,784	68,451,784	68,451,784	68,451,784
1,918,339	1,961,855	2,041,269	2,120,684	2,200,098
8,073,363	8,232,551	8,583,758	8,934,965	9,286,171
11,407,375	11,483,772	11,998,619	12,513,466	13,028,314
1,955,945	1,955,945	1,973,619	2,046,554	2,119,490
70,118,504	70,118,504	70,118,504	70,118,504	70,118,504
9,140,499	9,140,499	9,140,499	9,249,201	9,611,163
3,950,710	4,017,114	4,190,672	4,364,231	4,537,789
2,540,016	2,543,513	2,640,173	2,736,549	2,832,926
700,570,381	700,570,381	700,570,381	700,570,381	700,570,381
9,898,382	9,898,382	9,898,382	9,898,382	9,978,311
13,074,251	13,074,251	13,074,251	13,074,251	13,074,251
1,221,848	1,221,848	1,266,623	1,316,477	1,366,330
6,680,383	6,680,383	6,880,462	7,175,872	7,471,281
16,566,558	16,566,558	16,566,558	16,656,109	17,328,522
848,627	892,498	929,088	965,679	1,002,269
1,853,033	1,853,033	1,853,033	1,853,033	1,853,033
22,649,370	22,649,370	22,649,370	22,649,370	22,649,370
9,024,771	9,024,771	9,024,771	9,024,771	9,024,771
5,266,676	5,266,676	5,266,676	5,266,676	5,266,676
168,407,955	168,407,955	168,407,955	168,407,955	168,407,955
21,108,235	21,108,235	21,108,235	21,108,235	21,108,235
1,332,623	1,364,410	1,419,568	1,474,725	1,529,882
118,145,753	118,145,753	118,145,753	118,145,753	118,145,753
98,735,335	98,735,335	98,735,335	98,735,335	98,735,335
2,742,618	2,742,618	2,742,618	2,742,618	2,742,618
128,763,249	128,763,249	128,763,249	128,763,249	128,763,249
162,426,582	162,426,582	162,426,582	162,426,582	162,426,582
67,359,435	67,359,435	67,359,435	67,359,435	67,359,435
46,453,108	46,453,108	46,453,108	46,453,108	46,453,108
17,268,592	17,268,592	17,268,592	17,268,592	17,268,592
42,198,583	42,198,583	42,198,583	42,198,583	42,198,583
26,429,843	26,429,843	26,429,843	26,429,843	26,429,843
89,140,315	89,140,315	89,140,315	89,140,315	89,140,315
15,460,851	15,460,851	15,460,851	15,460,851	15,460,851
13,224,651	13,224,651	13,224,651	13,543,998	14,073,722
350,609	380,999	396,483	411,967	427,451
2,991,415	3,054,227	3,185,788	3,317,349	3,448,910
26,100,828	26,100,828	26,100,828	26,100,828	26,100,828
29,031,343	29,031,343	29,031,343	29,031,343	29,031,343
31,329,380	31,329,380	31,329,380	31,329,380	31,329,380
6,790,525	6,790,525	6,790,525	6,790,525	6,790,525
5,229,016	5,261,066	5,462,547	5,664,028	5,865,509
1,452,014	1,493,455	1,552,439	1,611,424	1,670,408
24,340,690	24,340,690	24,462,725	25,340,219	26,217,713
3,628,227	3,628,227	3,742,521	3,896,050	4,049,579
45,542,069	45,542,069	45,542,069	45,542,069	45,542,069
11,850,964	11,850,964	11,850,964	11,850,964	11,850,964
6,185,620	6,185,620	6,185,620	6,185,620	6,185,620
2,350,120,506	2,350,785,595	2,353,176,986	2,357,055,474	2,362,589,451
Change	665,090	3,056,480	6,934,968	12,468,945

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

\*FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY\*

Cluster	Court	2016-17 WAFM Allocation Adjustments												
		Actual	Scenario 1			Scenario 2			Scenario 3			Scenario 4		
		2016-17 WAFM Allocation	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .8)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .85)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .9)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17	BLS Factor (Min. BLS of .95)	Change from Actual 2016-17	% Change from Actual 2016-17
		Col. M	Col. N	Col. O	Col. P	Col. Q	Col. R	Col. S	Col. T	Col. U	Col. V	Col. W	Col. X	Col. Y
4	Alameda	(684,913)	(693,615)	(8,702)	-1.3%	(733,859)	(48,946)	-7.1%	(794,068)	(109,155)	-15.9%	(881,551)	(196,638)	-28.7%
1	Alpine	(94,596)	(94,596)	-	0.0%	(94,596)	-	0.0%	(94,596)	-	0.0%	(94,596)	-	0.0%
1	Amador	127,884	127,587	(297)	-0.2%	126,230	(1,654)	-1.3%	124,193	(3,691)	-2.9%	121,237	(6,648)	-5.2%
2	Butte	1,740,459	1,739,094	(1,365)	-0.1%	1,733,006	(7,453)	-0.4%	1,723,804	(16,656)	-1.0%	1,903,838	163,378	9.4%
1	Calaveras	128,438	128,158	(280)	-0.2%	126,876	(1,561)	-1.2%	128,567	130	0.1%	168,373	39,935	31.1%
1	Colusa	208,815	208,815	-	0.0%	208,815	-	0.0%	208,815	-	0.0%	208,815	-	0.0%
3	Contra Costa	4,246,995	4,241,709	(5,286)	-0.1%	4,217,968	(29,027)	-0.7%	4,182,152	(64,843)	-1.5%	4,130,237	(116,757)	-2.7%
1	Del Norte	182,666	199,467	16,801	9.2%	244,321	61,655	33.8%	288,274	105,608	57.8%	330,961	148,295	81.2%
2	El Dorado	586,017	585,116	(901)	-0.2%	581,051	(4,965)	-0.8%	574,927	(11,090)	-1.9%	566,048	(19,969)	-3.4%
3	Fresno	11,016,159	11,009,013	(7,146)	-0.1%	10,977,346	(38,813)	-0.4%	10,929,386	(86,773)	-0.8%	10,859,946	(156,212)	-1.4%
1	Glenn	(103,198)	(103,198)	-	0.0%	(103,198)	(0)	0.0%	(79,953)	23,245	22.5%	(47,011)	56,187	54.4%
2	Humboldt	769,447	839,283	69,836	9.1%	991,215	221,768	28.8%	1,140,709	371,262	48.3%	1,286,788	517,341	67.2%
2	Imperial	1,525,282	1,558,009	32,728	2.1%	1,781,010	255,728	16.8%	2,000,552	475,270	31.2%	2,215,276	689,994	45.2%
1	Inyo	(100,268)	(100,456)	(188)	-0.2%	(93,532)	6,736	6.7%	(62,601)	37,667	37.6%	(32,443)	67,825	67.6%
3	Kern	14,947,758	14,940,321	(7,438)	0.0%	14,907,946	(39,812)	-0.3%	14,858,657	(89,102)	-0.6%	14,787,400	(160,358)	-1.1%
2	Kings	1,378,555	1,377,595	(960)	-0.1%	1,373,369	(5,186)	-0.4%	1,415,085	36,530	2.6%	1,565,583	187,029	13.6%
2	Lake	121,173	150,250	29,077	24.0%	225,352	104,179	86.0%	299,272	178,099	147.0%	371,519	250,346	206.6%
1	Lassen	64,537	65,831	1,294	2.0%	107,515	42,978	66.6%	148,344	83,807	129.9%	188,146	123,609	191.5%
4	Los Angeles	90,340,620	90,267,833	(72,787)	-0.1%	89,943,544	(397,076)	-0.4%	89,453,170	(887,451)	-1.0%	88,742,863	(1,597,757)	-1.8%
2	Madera	1,047,013	1,045,995	(1,018)	-0.1%	1,041,407	(5,605)	-0.5%	1,034,493	(12,520)	-1.2%	1,059,775	12,762	1.2%
2	Marin	(1,696,447)	(1,697,720)	(1,273)	-0.1%	(1,703,818)	(7,371)	-0.4%	(1,712,852)	(16,405)	-1.0%	(1,726,017)	(29,569)	-1.7%
1	Mariposa	24,757	24,638	(119)	-0.5%	144,104	119,348	482.1%	144,104	119,348	482.1%	144,104	119,348	482.1%
2	Mendocino	503,441	502,761	(680)	-0.1%	588,388	84,948	16.9%	714,382	210,941	41.9%	837,608	334,167	66.4%
2	Merced	2,275,651	2,273,926	(1,726)	-0.1%	2,266,260	(9,392)	-0.4%	2,294,306	18,655	0.8%	2,574,437	298,785	13.1%
1	Modoc	(124,121)	(104,725)	19,396	15.6%	(88,917)	35,205	28.4%	(73,356)	50,766	40.9%	(58,163)	65,958	53.1%
1	Mono	237,810	237,810	-	0.0%	237,810	-	0.0%	237,810	-	0.0%	237,810	-	0.0%
3	Monterey	2,740,573	2,738,229	(2,344)	-0.1%	2,727,740	(12,833)	-0.5%	2,711,900	(28,673)	-1.0%	2,688,946	(51,627)	-1.9%
2	Napa	582,813	581,889	(925)	-0.2%	577,704	(5,109)	-0.9%	571,405	(11,408)	-2.0%	562,269	(20,545)	-3.5%
2	Nevada	191,720	191,187	(533)	-0.3%	188,741	(2,978)	-1.6%	185,075	(6,645)	-3.5%	179,751	(11,969)	-6.2%
4	Orange	5,611,258	5,594,227	(17,031)	-0.3%	5,516,019	(95,238)	-1.7%	5,398,779	(212,479)	-3.8%	5,228,528	(382,729)	-6.8%
2	Placer	3,122,033	3,119,832	(2,201)	-0.1%	3,110,066	(11,968)	-0.4%	3,095,280	(26,754)	-0.9%	3,073,870	(48,164)	-1.5%
1	Plumas	(213,489)	(204,734)	8,755	4.1%	(180,910)	32,579	15.3%	(157,471)	56,017	26.2%	(134,594)	78,895	37.0%
4	Riverside	20,324,222	20,311,823	(12,399)	-0.1%	20,257,202	(67,021)	-0.3%	20,174,334	(149,889)	-0.7%	20,054,413	(269,809)	-1.3%
4	Sacramento	9,215,721	9,205,502	(10,219)	-0.1%	9,159,777	(55,944)	-0.6%	9,090,720	(125,001)	-1.4%	8,990,655	(225,066)	-2.4%
1	San Benito	(185,966)	(186,238)	(272)	-0.1%	(187,515)	(1,549)	-0.8%	(189,416)	(3,450)	-1.9%	(192,183)	(6,217)	-3.3%
4	San Bernardino	22,679,201	22,665,723	(13,478)	-0.1%	22,606,174	(73,027)	-0.3%	22,515,908	(163,293)	-0.7%	22,385,249	(293,952)	-1.3%
4	San Diego	3,094,477	3,078,071	(16,406)	-0.5%	3,002,631	(91,846)	-3.0%	2,889,582	(204,895)	-6.6%	2,725,401	(369,077)	-11.9%
4	San Francisco	108,443	101,711	(6,732)	-6.2%	70,386	(38,056)	-35.1%	23,603	(84,840)	-78.2%	(44,407)	(152,850)	-140.9%
3	San Joaquin	7,331,674	7,326,820	(4,854)	-0.1%	7,305,332	(26,342)	-0.4%	7,272,779	(58,895)	-0.8%	7,225,651	(106,023)	-1.4%
2	San Luis Obispo	1,703,552	1,701,765	(1,787)	-0.1%	1,693,768	(9,784)	-0.6%	1,681,691	(21,862)	-1.3%	1,664,190	(39,363)	-2.3%
3	San Mateo	1,994,555	1,990,266	(4,289)	-0.2%	1,970,681	(23,874)	-1.2%	1,941,275	(53,280)	-2.7%	1,898,592	(95,963)	-4.8%
4	Santa Barbara	1,406,973	1,404,268	(2,705)	-0.2%	1,392,011	(14,961)	-1.1%	1,373,568	(33,405)	-2.4%	1,346,814	(60,158)	-4.3%
4	Santa Clara	(2,187,307)	(2,196,234)	(8,927)	-0.4%	(2,237,678)	(50,371)	-2.3%	(2,299,615)	(112,307)	-5.1%	(2,389,636)	(202,329)	-9.3%
2	Santa Cruz	1,291,507	1,289,909	(1,598)	-0.1%	1,282,747	(8,759)	-0.7%	1,271,937	(19,569)	-1.5%	1,256,271	(35,236)	-2.7%
2	Shasta	1,705,142	1,703,780	(1,361)	-0.1%	1,697,652	(7,490)	-0.4%	1,829,803	124,662	7.3%	2,050,076	344,934	20.2%
1	Sierra	(120,798)	(120,798)	(0)	0.0%	(120,798)	-	0.0%	(120,798)	-	0.0%	(116,150)	4,648	3.8%
2	Siskiyou	(502,149)	(474,553)	27,596	5.5%	(417,637)	84,512	16.8%	(361,588)	140,561	28.0%	(306,815)	195,334	38.9%
3	Solano	2,757,380	2,754,693	(2,687)	-0.1%	2,742,598	(14,783)	-0.5%	2,724,362	(33,019)	-1.2%	2,697,924	(59,456)	-2.2%
3	Stanoma	2,291,685	2,288,718	(2,967)	-0.1%	2,275,253	(16,432)	-0.7%	2,254,999	(36,686)	-1.6%	2,225,617	(66,068)	-2.9%
3	Stanislaus	5,195,317	5,192,011	(3,305)	-0.1%	5,177,536	(17,780)	-0.3%	5,155,538	(39,779)	-0.8%	5,123,719	(71,597)	-1.4%
2	Sutter	1,101,310	1,100,599	(711)	-0.1%	1,097,459	(3,851)	-0.3%	1,092,698	(8,612)	-0.8%	1,085,807	(15,503)	-1.4%
2	Tehama	686,758	700,442	13,685	2.0%	787,356	100,599	14.6%	872,736	185,979	27.1%	955,990	269,233	39.2%
1	Trinity	87,706	105,961	18,255	20.8%	131,422	43,716	49.8%	156,462	68,756	78.4%	180,892	93,186	106.2%
3	Tulare	3,894,287	3,891,748	(2,539)	-0.1%	3,934,604	40,317	1.0%	4,305,977	411,690	10.6%	4,667,879	773,592	19.9%
2	Tuolumne	154,519	154,151	(368)	-0.2%	203,152	48,633	31.5%	268,518	113,999	73.8%	332,392	177,873	115.1%
3	Ventura	6,517,993	6,513,251	(4,742)	-0.1%	6,492,176	(25,817)	-0.4%	6,460,284	(57,709)	-0.9%	6,414,098	(103,895)	-1.6%
2	Yolo	1,604,218	1,602,985	(1,233)	-0.1%	1,597,500	(6,718)	-0.4%	1,589,203	(15,015)	-0.9%	1,577,186	(27,032)	-1.7%
2	Yuba	932,798	932,153	(645)	-0.1%	929,291	(3,507)	-0.4%	924,958	(7,840)	-0.8%	918,684	(14,115)	-1.5%
		<b>233,788,058</b>	<b>233,788,058</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>233,788,058</b>	<b>(0)</b>		<b>233,788,058</b>	<b>(0)</b>		<b>233,788,058</b>	<b>(0)</b>	