



JUDICIAL COUNCIL  
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR MAY 25, 2017

Meeting Contents

**Agenda**..... 1

**Minutes**

    Draft Minutes from the May 8, 2017 Meeting ..... 4

**Discussion and Possible Action Items**

**Item 1 – 2017–2018 Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Funding Reallocation (Action Required)**..... 6

        Attachment 1B – Summary of Changes from 2016–2017 to 2017-2018 Total WAFM Funding Need

        Attachment 1C – 2017–2018 WAFM computation of total funding need

        Attachment 1D – 2017–2018 RAS FTE need

        Attachment 1E – 2017–2018 BLS Factor

        Attachment 1F – 2017–2018 FTE Allotment Factor

        Attachment 1G – Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

        Attachment 1H– 2017-2018 Allocation and Reallocation of Historical Funding

        Attachment 1I – Estimated 2017–2018 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

        Attachment 1J – Determination of Funding Floor Amount

        Attachment 1K – Floor Allocation Adjustment

**Item 2 – Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on WAFM Calculations (Action Required)**

        Attachment 2 - *2017-2018 WAFM Allocation Adjustments Including Funding Floor, including a comparison with BLS minimum of .9*..... 29

**Item 3 – Finalizing the 2017-2018 FMS Work Plan (Action Required)**

        Attachment 3: Work Plans from May 8, 2017 and May 10, 2016..... 31

**Info 1 – Superior Court of Alameda Presentation (No Action Required)**

        Attachment Info Item1 - Alameda Attachments..... 33



# 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 RECORDED

---

**Date:** May 25, 2017  
**Time:** 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.  
**Location:** American Room, Judicial Council of California  
2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
**Public Call-In Number** 1-877-820-7831, Pass code: 1884843 (listen only)

---

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

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

---

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

---

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

##### Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the May 8, 2017, Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) meeting.

---

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

---

##### Public Comment

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

**Written Comment**

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to [tcbac@jud.ca.gov](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 10:00 a.m., May 24, 2017 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

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

---

**10:10 a.m. – 10:55 a.m.**

**Item 1**

**2017–2018 Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Funding Reallocation (Action Required)**

Discussion of the updated 2017-2018 WAFM funding need estimate and reallocation of 50% of 2013-2014 historical funding per the Judicial Council approved Five-Year WAFM Implementation Schedule.

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

**10:55 a.m. – 11:40 a.m.**

**Item 2**

**Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on WAFM Calculations (Action Required)**

Update on BLS adjustment to .90 for all courts below this BLS level in 2017-2018.

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

**11:40 a.m. – 12:25 p.m.**

**Item 3**

**Finalizing the 2017-2018 FMS Work Plan (Action Required)**

Status update on each item of the 2016-2017 FMS Work Plan and review of the 2017-2018 FMS Work Plan proposed by the subcommittee at its May 8, 2017 meeting to clarify work related specifically to Civil Assessments/Maintenance of Effort revenues.

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

**12:25 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.**

**Break**

---

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

---

**1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.**

**Info 1**

**Superior Court of Alameda Presentation (No Action Required)**

Presentation from the Superior Court of Alameda.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Co-Chair, Funding Methodology Subcommittee; and Hon. Morris D. Jacobson, Presiding Judge, Superior Court of Alameda

---

**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

May 8, 2017

3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Conference Call Line: 1-877-820-7831; Passcode: 1884843 (Listen Only)

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

**Others Present:** Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Brandy Sanborn and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde.

OPEN MEETING

**Call to Order and Roll Call**

The chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. and roll was called.

**Approval of Minutes**

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the April 12, 2017 Funding Methodology Committee Meeting.

ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-3)

**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.

*Action: The Funding Methodology Subcommittee unanimously approved the workload priorities for 2017-2018.*

**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.

*Action: The Funding Methodology Subcommittee unanimously approved the WAFM Adjustment Request Process and WAFM Adjustment Timeline.*

**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.

*Action: The Funding Methodology Subcommittee unanimously approved the following recommendation (based on an understanding that such action was part of the 2016-2017 work plan):*

*Adopt a BLS floor of 0.9 for fiscal year 2017-2018 only. While during fiscal year 2017-2018, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee reviews how to address BLS in the model.*

---

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

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee  
Funding Methodology Subcommittee

(Action Item 1)

**Title:** 2017–2018 Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)  
Funding Reallocation

**Date:** 5/22/2017

**Contact:** Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Budget Services  
916-263-1754 | [suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov](mailto:suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov)

---

Issue

Adopt recommendations for the 2017–2018 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) reallocations from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) for consideration by the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee at its June 8, 2017 meeting and for Judicial Council consideration on July 27-28, 2017.

Background

In April 2013, the Judicial Council approved the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) and the use of WAFM to reallocate, by the end of fiscal year 2017–2018, 50 percent of courts’ pre-WAFM base funding and to allocate all new funding for general court operations. In addition, over and above the scheduled reallocation of historical funding (10 percent in 2013–2014, 15 percent in 2014–2015, 30 percent in 2015–2016, 40 percent in 2016–2017, and 50 percent in 2017–2018), additional historical funding would be reallocated up to the amount of any new funding for general court operations received after 2012–2013.

In February 2014, among a few other adjustments to the WAFM computation of funding need, the council approved allocation funding floors for trial courts—absolute and graduated. The absolute funding floor is set at \$750,000. No court’s WAFM-related allocation is permitted to be less than the floor amount. The graduated funding floors are set at \$870,000, \$1,250,000, and \$1,870,000, with a cap on the amount of the allocation adjustment that courts eligible for funding at the graduated-floor level can receive in a given fiscal year.

WAFM Updates for Allocation in 2017–2018

The 2017–2018 WAFM has been updated to include salary and benefit information from courts’ 2016–2017 Schedule 7A (as of 7/1/2016), Resource Assessment Study (RAS) FTE need based on average filings for the period 2013–2014 to 2015–2016, average operating expenses and equipment (OE&E) expenditure per FTE information from courts’ 2013–2014 to 2015–2016 4<sup>th</sup> quarter Quarterly Financial Statements, average Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) salary data for the calendar years 2013, 2014, and 2015, and AB 1058 funding adjustment from court reimbursement information for 2015–2016. The 2017–2018 WAFM information can be considered final as the 2017 RAS model with revised case weights will not be going to the Judicial Council for approval until the July 27-28 meeting.

The updated WAFM has resulted in a -\$13.4 million, or 0.6% decline in the statewide funding

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
BUDGET SERVICES  
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee  
Funding Methodology Subcommittee

need (see Attachment 1B, column C). The decrease in estimated need was driven primarily by a 3.1% drop in the RAS FTE need from 17,978 to 17,419, a decline in benefit funding need of 2.8%, and the BLS salary adjustment of -0.4%. These declines were a partially offset by increases in costs related to the average RAS-related salary (2.0%), and OE&E per FTE (0.9%), (%). The AB 1058 funding adjustment also had an impact on the funding need, decreasing the total need by 2.1%.

Attached are the following:

*Detail of 2017–2018 WAFM Computation of Funding Need*

- 1B – Summary of Changes from 2016–2017 to 2017-2018 Total WAFM Funding Need
- 1C – 2017–2018 WAFM computation of total funding need
- 1D – 2017–2018 RAS FTE need
- 1E – 2017–2018 BLS Factor
- 1F – 2017–2018 FTE Allotment Factor
- 1G – Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

*WAFM Allocation Adjustments (No New Funding for 2017–2018)*

- 1H– 2017-2018 Allocation and Reallocation of Historical Funding

*Detail of Funding Floor Allocation Adjustments*

- 1I – Estimated 2017–2018 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
- 1J – Determination of Funding Floor Amount
- 1K – Floor Allocation Adjustment

Recommendation:

Recommend the estimated 2017-2018 WAFM Funding Reallocation to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee for the approval by the Judicial Council at its July 27-28 meeting.



### Summary of Changes from 2016–2017 to 2017-2018 Total WAFM Funding Need

Description	Change in Variable			
	2016-17 Amount	2017-18 Amount	Change in Amount	% Change
	A	B	C (B - A)	D (C / A)
<b>Total Funding Need</b>	<b>\$ 2,350,120,506</b>	<b>\$ 2,336,697,645</b>	<b>\$ (13,422,861)</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>
RAS FTE Need Adjustment	17,978	17,419	(559)	-3.1%
RAS-Related Salary Adjustment	\$ 58,336	\$ 59,494	\$ 1,158	2.0%
OE&E per FTE Adjustment	\$29,621 / \$20,941	\$32,622 / \$22,756	\$3,001/ \$1,815	10.1% / 8.7%
Benefits Adjustment	\$ 730,675,209	\$ 710,420,146	\$ (20,255,063)	-2.8%
BLS Salary Adjustment	\$ 1,281,014,437	\$ 1,275,385,942	(5,628,495)	-0.4%
AB 1058 Funding Adjustment	40,262,178	41,108,081	845,903	2.1%

Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need <sup>(1)</sup>			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor <sup>(2)</sup>	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2016)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor <sup>(3)</sup>	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
Cluster	Court	A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1) * Dollar Factor	E	F = D+E	G	H = (C-1) * BLS-Adjusted Dollar Factor + (E * G)
4	Alameda	495	81	576	\$34,208,845	230,748	34,439,594	1.43	49,281,297
1	Alpine	2	1	3	\$118,987	114,099	233,086	0.85	199,006
1	Amador	20	4	24	\$1,368,354	114,099	1,482,453	0.99	1,467,771
2	Butte	109	20	129	\$7,615,186	166,269	7,781,455	0.90	7,013,547
1	Calaveras	20	4	24	\$1,368,354	114,099	1,482,453	0.89	1,314,333
1	Colusa	14	3	17	\$951,898	114,099	1,065,997	0.73	811,721
3	Contra Costa	333	52	385	\$22,845,559	197,644	23,043,203	1.25	28,755,275
1	Del Norte	20	5	25	\$1,427,847	114,099	1,541,946	0.74	1,177,177
2	El Dorado	65	11	76	\$4,462,023	166,269	4,628,292	1.04	4,819,519
3	Fresno	459	72	531	\$31,531,631	197,644	31,729,275	0.98	30,972,667
1	Glenn	16	4	20	\$1,130,379	114,099	1,244,478	0.67	940,703
2	Humboldt	74	12	86	\$5,056,960	166,269	5,223,229	0.77	4,005,583
2	Imperial	110	20	130	\$7,674,680	166,269	7,840,949	0.80	6,245,020
1	Inyo	15	4	19	\$1,070,886	114,099	1,184,984	0.84	995,069
3	Kern	441	74	515	\$30,579,733	197,644	30,777,377	1.04	32,031,662
2	Kings	86	15	101	\$5,949,364	166,269	6,115,633	0.86	5,252,219
2	Lake	40	7	47	\$2,736,708	166,269	2,902,976	0.75	2,218,501
1	Lassen	18	4	22	\$1,249,367	114,099	1,363,465	0.78	1,059,561
4	Los Angeles	4,082	634	4,716	\$280,512,533	230,748	280,743,281	1.37	385,202,236
2	Madera	76	13	89	\$5,235,441	166,269	5,401,709	0.92	4,987,670
2	Marin	83	14	97	\$5,711,390	166,269	5,877,659	1.30	7,625,613
1	Mariposa	9	3	12	\$654,430	114,099	768,529	0.82	630,966
2	Mendocino	55	10	65	\$3,807,593	166,269	3,973,862	0.81	3,201,177
2	Merced	117	21	138	\$8,150,629	166,269	8,316,898	0.88	7,352,718
1	Modoc	7	2	9	\$475,949	114,099	590,048	0.55	426,808
1	Mono	10	3	13	\$713,924	114,099	828,023	1.01	833,061
3	Monterey	159	26	185	\$10,946,831	197,644	11,144,474	1.19	13,248,688
2	Napa	58	11	69	\$4,045,568	166,269	4,211,837	1.22	5,156,483
2	Nevada	42	8	50	\$2,915,189	166,269	3,081,457	0.99	3,056,530

		RAS II Model FTE Need <sup>(1)</sup>			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor <sup>(2)</sup>	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2016)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor <sup>(3)</sup>	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
Cluster	Court	A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1) * Dollar Factor	E	F = D+E	G	H = (C-1) * BLS-Adjusted Dollar Factor + (E * G)
4	Orange	1,032	168	1,200	\$71,332,879	230,748	71,563,628	1.29	92,491,956
2	Placer	134	23	157	\$9,281,009	166,269	9,447,277	1.20	11,366,487
1	Plumas	10	2	12	\$654,430	114,099	768,529	0.69	579,103
4	Riverside	882	141	1,023	\$60,802,504	230,748	61,033,253	1.11	67,779,970
4	Sacramento	614	93	707	\$42,002,513	230,748	42,233,261	1.28	54,054,697
1	San Benito	22	5	27	\$1,546,835	114,099	1,660,934	0.96	1,600,815
4	San Bernardino	970	146	1,116	\$66,335,413	230,748	66,566,162	1.06	70,437,390
4	San Diego	1,030	157	1,187	\$70,559,462	230,748	70,790,211	1.18	83,727,333
4	San Francisco	306	48	354	\$21,001,256	230,748	21,232,005	1.71	36,315,395
3	San Joaquin	314	49	363	\$21,536,699	197,644	21,734,343	1.09	23,685,691
2	San Luis Obispo	118	20	138	\$8,150,629	166,269	8,316,898	1.06	8,818,251
3	San Mateo	237	38	275	\$16,301,259	197,644	16,498,902	1.46	24,005,912
3	Santa Barbara	180	31	211	\$12,493,665	197,644	12,691,309	1.20	15,216,351
4	Santa Clara	490	73	563	\$33,435,428	230,748	33,666,177	1.44	48,381,496
2	Santa Cruz	104	20	124	\$7,317,718	166,269	7,483,987	1.14	8,505,788
2	Shasta	116	27	143	\$8,448,097	166,269	8,614,366	0.88	7,552,196
1	Sierra	2	1	3	\$118,987	114,099	233,086	0.62	161,980
2	Siskiyou	27	5	32	\$1,844,303	166,269	2,010,572	0.70	1,527,341
3	Solano	177	28	205	\$12,136,703	197,644	12,334,347	1.17	14,485,169
3	Sonoma	181	31	212	\$12,553,159	197,644	12,750,803	1.12	14,263,926
3	Stanislaus	232	36	268	\$15,884,803	197,644	16,082,447	1.01	16,274,533
2	Sutter	51	10	61	\$3,569,619	166,269	3,735,887	0.97	3,607,757
2	Tehama	45	8	53	\$3,093,670	166,269	3,259,938	0.79	2,568,331
1	Trinity	11	3	14	\$773,417	114,099	887,516	0.66	666,367
3	Tulare	211	35	246	\$14,575,943	197,644	14,773,587	0.89	13,081,354
2	Tuolumne	34	6	40	\$2,320,252	166,269	2,486,521	0.80	1,993,321
3	Ventura	299	55	354	\$21,001,256	197,644	21,198,900	1.23	26,086,578
2	Yolo	89	16	105	\$6,187,339	166,269	6,353,608	1.07	6,828,892
2	Yuba	45	8	53	\$3,093,670	166,269	3,259,938	1.17	3,805,155

Statewide 14,998 2,421 17,419 1,042,687,016 1,270,152,113

NOTES:

(1) Estimated need based on 3-year average filings data from **FY 2012-2013 through FY 2014-2015**.

**\$59,494**

(2) Unadjusted base funding per RAS FTE, based on **FY 2016-2017 Schedule 7A**; does not include collections staff, SJOs, CEO, security, n

(3) Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Labor adjustment based on Quarterly Census of Wages & Employment, three year average from . comparison based on Public Administration (North American Industrial Classification System, 92) unless proportion of state government year average of local and state salaries for Public Administration is used for comparison.

Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 2016-17 Schedule 7A)				Projected Benefits Expenses (Salary-driven benefits based on Adjusted Base)			OE&E (Based on Cluster Average OE&E / FTE) (Cluster 1: \$32,622; Clusters 2-4 \$22,756)	Remove AB 1058 staff/FLF costs (Using FY 2015-16 data)	Total WAFM Funding Need	Proportion of Total WAFM Estimated Funding Need
Cluster	Court	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 90)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 90)	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 10 FTE Need	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 90 FTE Need	Total Benefit Need Based on RAS FTE Need	Estimated OE&E Needed (Excludes funding for operations contracts) (Using FY 2013-14 to 2015-16 data)			
		I1	I2	J1	J2	$K = \frac{L}{(A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G * J1 + (B * J2)}$		M = (K + L)	N = C * OE&E	O	P = (H + M + N) - O	Q = P / Statewide
4	Alameda	40.3%	\$15,513	40.1%	\$16,876	24,673,000	4,230,168	28,903,168	13,107,375	1,710,153	89,581,687	3.83%
1	Alpine	21.9%	\$25,644	21.9%	\$25,644	73,557	46,998	120,554	97,865	-	417,426	0.02%
1	Amador	27.8%	\$10,718	27.8%	\$10,432	542,120	122,323	664,443	782,923	102,861	2,812,276	0.12%
2	Butte	25.4%	\$11,317	25.4%	\$13,316	2,718,865	562,804	3,281,669	2,935,506	380,315	12,850,408	0.55%
1	Calaveras	19.0%	\$16,609	19.2%	\$18,301	532,549	123,072	655,621	782,923	201,655	2,551,223	0.11%
1	Colusa	41.2%	\$17,778	41.2%	\$17,778	511,558	125,324	636,882	554,571	69,413	1,933,761	0.08%
3	Contra Costa	39.8%	\$14,913	39.7%	\$16,451	14,794,779	2,455,188	17,249,967	8,761,006	1,182,552	53,583,695	2.29%
1	Del Norte	24.5%	\$29,424	24.5%	\$29,448	811,775	212,750	1,024,525	815,545	101,786	2,915,461	0.12%
2	El Dorado	23.8%	\$16,374	23.8%	\$15,127	2,023,691	355,248	2,378,939	1,729,445	318,144	8,609,759	0.37%
3	Fresno	62.3%	\$8,820	62.6%	\$8,686	20,654,875	3,327,891	23,982,766	12,083,362	1,571,803	65,466,991	2.80%
1	Glenn	31.0%	\$14,217	34.4%	\$21,799	453,057	160,414	613,470	652,436	193,117	2,013,492	0.09%
2	Humboldt	32.1%	\$10,169	32.1%	\$10,548	1,837,541	328,842	2,166,383	1,957,004	122,748	8,006,222	0.34%
2	Imperial	27.5%	\$4,849	27.8%	\$6,471	1,966,203	416,577	2,382,780	2,958,262	313,124	11,272,937	0.48%
1	Inyo	24.3%	\$14,995	21.0%	\$15,181	407,360	112,330	519,690	619,814	116,078	2,018,495	0.09%
3	Kern	56.3%	\$15,493	56.2%	\$15,493	22,192,001	3,801,879	25,993,879	11,719,268	1,209,732	68,535,077	2.93%
2	Kings	21.8%	\$9,116	21.8%	\$10,232	1,740,901	340,344	2,081,245	2,298,342	326,203	9,305,603	0.40%
2	Lake	22.4%	\$10,521	22.4%	\$10,521	828,623	162,852	991,475	1,069,525	189,471	4,090,030	0.18%
1	Lassen	22.3%	\$11,180	22.3%	\$11,452	386,655	96,467	483,122	717,680	96,978	2,163,384	0.09%
4	Los Angeles	22.1%	\$24,919	32.5%	\$21,669	175,494,318	30,631,251	206,125,569	107,316,636	7,334,813	691,309,628	29.58%
2	Madera	35.0%	\$10,772	35.0%	\$10,864	2,281,720	426,038	2,707,759	2,025,272	296,055	9,424,646	0.40%
2	Marin	30.1%	\$13,291	29.7%	\$13,291	3,028,549	548,399	3,576,948	2,207,318	230,582	13,179,298	0.56%
1	Mariposa	31.2%	\$10,077	31.2%	\$15,432	227,980	106,059	334,039	391,462	94,433	1,262,034	0.05%
2	Mendocino	45.5%	\$10,989	43.8%	\$11,827	1,803,149	365,829	2,168,978	1,479,131	201,223	6,648,062	0.28%
2	Merced	54.1%	\$12,677	56.0%	\$13,439	4,814,574	953,405	5,767,979	3,140,309	590,548	15,670,457	0.67%
1	Modoc	26.2%	\$12,884	26.2%	\$12,884	173,528	54,090	227,617	293,596	72,673	875,348	0.04%
1	Mono	38.8%	\$25,021	38.8%	\$24,141	482,512	163,436	645,948	424,083	82,255	1,820,837	0.08%
3	Monterey	21.0%	\$15,866	20.8%	\$17,492	4,885,007	870,597	5,755,604	4,209,834	484,812	22,729,314	0.97%
2	Napa	19.4%	\$21,221	20.1%	\$23,442	2,050,430	445,157	2,495,587	1,570,154	238,015	8,984,209	0.38%
2	Nevada	39.5%	\$12,727	41.1%	\$13,020	1,513,005	341,570	1,854,575	1,137,793	430,984	5,617,914	0.24%

		Average Salary-Driven Benefits as % of Salary and Average Non-Salary-Driven Benefits Per FTE (From FY 2016-17 Schedule 7A)				Projected Benefits Expenses (Salary-driven benefits based on Adjusted Base)			OE&E (Based on Cluster Average OE&E / FTE) (Cluster 1: \$32,622; Clusters 2-4 \$22,756)	Remove AB 1058 staff/FLF costs (Using FY 2015-16 data)	Total WAFM Funding Need	Proportion of Total WAFM Estimated Funding Need
Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 10)	Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 90)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 90)	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 10 FTE Need	Benefits Needed for RAS Program 90 FTE Need	Total Benefit Need Based on RAS FTE Need	Estimated OE&E Needed (Excludes funding for operations contracts) (Using FY 2013-14 to 2015-16 data)					
Cluster	Court	I1	I2	J1	J2	$K = (A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + (E * G) * J1$	$L = (((B-1) * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + (B * J2))$	$M = (K + L)$	$N = C * OE\&E$	O	$P = (H + M + N) - O$	$Q = P / \text{Statewide}$
4	Orange	35.8%	\$11,700	36.3%	\$13,152	40,483,794	6,982,978	47,466,772	27,307,032	2,058,332	165,207,428	7.07%
2	Placer	31.8%	\$20,386	31.8%	\$20,386	5,784,953	1,032,980	6,817,933	3,572,670	410,586	21,346,504	0.91%
1	Plumas	27.4%	\$14,627	27.3%	\$19,320	270,730	72,562	343,291	391,462	181,395	1,132,462	0.05%
4	Riverside	27.4%	\$11,129	27.7%	\$12,577	25,798,358	4,406,451	30,204,810	23,279,245	1,799,697	119,464,328	5.11%
4	Sacramento	36.0%	\$17,247	37.1%	\$17,193	27,425,876	4,303,938	31,729,814	16,088,393	1,461,942	100,410,962	4.30%
1	San Benito	26.3%	\$12,920	26.3%	\$16,773	615,868	173,068	788,936	880,789	175,956	3,094,583	0.13%
4	San Bernardino	32.2%	\$10,241	35.3%	\$12,793	29,580,807	5,178,940	34,759,747	25,395,540	2,712,608	127,880,069	5.47%
4	San Diego	50.1%	\$10,347	49.8%	\$11,049	46,937,547	7,338,661	54,276,209	27,011,206	2,438,370	162,576,377	6.96%
4	San Francisco	26.2%	\$17,907	26.1%	\$19,367	13,623,662	2,283,430	15,907,092	8,055,574	1,353,464	58,924,598	2.52%
3	San Joaquin	45.2%	\$14,145	47.6%	\$10,159	13,646,057	2,082,920	15,728,976	8,260,377	621,636	47,053,408	2.01%
2	San Luis Obispo	34.7%	\$11,205	37.9%	\$11,344	3,904,120	748,004	4,652,124	3,140,309	438,989	16,171,695	0.69%
3	San Mateo	34.7%	\$18,716	35.2%	\$18,845	11,558,130	1,944,442	13,502,572	6,257,862	617,695	43,148,650	1.85%
3	Santa Barbara	39.2%	\$7,914	41.3%	\$8,280	6,458,083	1,238,527	7,696,610	4,801,486	566,254	27,148,194	1.16%
4	Santa Clara	31.7%	\$25,337	30.7%	\$26,452	25,693,880	3,922,840	29,616,720	12,811,549	1,945,010	88,864,755	3.80%
2	Santa Cruz	26.3%	\$17,614	26.1%	\$19,058	3,681,892	766,008	4,447,901	2,821,727	215,201	15,560,215	0.67%
2	Shasta	23.7%	\$10,745	24.4%	\$13,111	2,682,708	720,803	3,403,511	3,254,088	545,146	13,664,649	0.58%
1	Sierra	35.2%	\$18,987	35.2%	\$18,987	69,976	43,939	113,915	97,865	6,413	367,347	0.02%
2	Siskiyou	31.4%	\$19,826	31.4%	\$18,525	921,478	186,489	1,107,967	728,188	374,410	2,989,086	0.13%
3	Solano	34.2%	\$14,199	34.3%	\$17,933	6,739,670	1,228,312	7,967,982	4,664,951	573,127	26,544,975	1.14%
3	Sonoma	43.5%	\$19,997	42.5%	\$18,415	8,859,382	1,513,297	10,372,679	4,824,242	717,058	28,743,789	1.23%
3	Stanislaus	30.4%	\$17,465	30.4%	\$19,164	8,295,636	1,390,251	9,685,887	6,098,570	983,141	31,075,849	1.33%
2	Sutter	31.8%	\$13,833	32.8%	\$16,695	1,637,448	389,369	2,026,818	1,388,107	263,557	6,759,126	0.29%
2	Tehama	24.9%	\$19,102	24.9%	\$19,230	1,385,294	268,272	1,653,567	1,206,061	88,521	5,339,437	0.23%
1	Trinity	34.6%	\$14,674	40.3%	\$15,268	334,630	112,562	447,192	456,705	39,251	1,531,014	0.07%
3	Tulare	23.6%	\$20,136	22.8%	\$19,528	6,870,058	1,132,219	8,002,277	5,597,942	678,773	26,002,799	1.11%
2	Tuolumne	30.8%	\$16,328	31.9%	\$16,369	1,054,518	216,929	1,271,446	910,234	220,562	3,954,439	0.17%
3	Ventura	37.5%	\$10,787	39.9%	\$12,802	11,431,296	2,378,110	13,809,406	8,055,574	878,902	47,072,655	2.01%
2	Yolo	31.4%	\$13,683	35.1%	\$25,856	3,002,449	813,259	3,815,708	2,389,365	244,079	12,789,887	0.55%
2	Yuba	19.8%	\$13,134	19.8%	\$13,598	1,209,542	243,413	1,452,955	1,206,061	235,480	6,228,690	0.27%

Statewide 603,861,725 105,000,273 708,861,998 398,791,615 41,108,081 2,336,697,645 100%

NOTES:

\$59,494 for vacant positions; in January 2014 the TCBC approved a dollar factor adjustment for courts with fewer 2013 through 2015. Salaries of Local Government used for workers in total employment exceeds 50% in which case three-

	OE&E \$ / FTE	
Weighted	\$32,622	Cluster 1
Mean	\$22,756	Clusters 2-4

FY 2017-18 RAS FTE Need

Court	Program 10 (Operations) Staff Need											Program 90 (Administration) Staff Need			
	Infractions	Criminal	Civil	Family Law	Pr/MH	Juvenile	Total Program 10 Need	Court interpreter FTEs	Manager/Supervisor Ratio (by cluster)	Manager/Supervisor Need	Total Program 10 Need (rounded up)	Non-RAS FTE (for Program 90 Need Calculation)*	Program 90 ratio (by cluster)	Program 90 Need (rounded up)	Total RAS Need
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G (A thru F)	H	I	J ((G+H)/I)	K (H + J)	L	M	N ((K+L)/M)	O (K+N)
Alameda	62.8	121.7	113.3	107.5	35.3	11.3	451.9	34.9	11.3	43.1	495	85.8	7.2	81	576
Alpine	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	1.1	-	7.1	0.2	2	1.8	5.7	1	3
Amador	2.1	7.0	2.3	3.4	1.4	1.1	17.3	-	7.1	2.4	20	2.3	5.7	4	24
Butte	8.5	32.3	13.5	23.5	12.8	6.4	97.0	-	8.2	11.8	109	15.7	6.4	20	129
Calaveras	1.5	5.0	2.6	4.2	2.2	1.7	17.1	0.4	7.1	2.5	20	2.5	5.7	4	24
Colusa	3.3	4.3	0.8	1.5	0.6	0.8	11.4	0.3	7.1	1.6	14	1.4	5.7	3	17
Contra Costa	40.9	62.6	62.8	80.8	28.9	19.4	295.4	12.7	8.2	37.6	333	17.6	6.8	52	385
Del Norte	2.4	4.6	1.7	4.3	2.4	1.8	17.1	-	7.1	2.4	20	2.9	5.7	5	25
El Dorado	6.1	14.6	10.9	15.3	5.2	5.4	57.4	1.2	8.2	7.1	65	4.7	6.4	11	76
Fresno	34.0	158.5	62.7	97.6	30.4	24.6	407.8	10.9	8.2	51.1	459	23.2	6.8	72	531
Glenn	3.5	3.7	1.3	2.9	1.4	1.0	13.8	-	7.1	1.9	16	6.2	5.7	4	20
Humboldt	6.8	25.9	8.8	13.2	7.1	4.1	65.9	-	8.2	8.0	74	3.0	6.4	12	86
Imperial	23.1	29.9	8.9	24.4	6.0	4.9	97.2	5.0	8.2	12.5	110	15.7	6.4	20	130
Inyo	3.9	3.7	1.1	2.2	0.8	0.5	12.3	-	7.1	1.7	15	3.0	5.7	4	19
Kern	38.0	165.3	45.2	90.0	31.1	21.9	391.4	15.0	8.2	49.6	441	55.0	6.8	74	515
Kings	8.8	35.1	6.7	14.8	4.7	5.5	75.6	2.0	8.2	9.5	86	4.6	6.4	15	101
Lake	2.3	14.1	5.4	8.8	3.5	1.4	35.4	-	8.2	4.3	40	1.7	6.4	7	47
Lassen	2.2	5.9	1.7	3.6	1.0	0.9	15.3	-	7.1	2.2	18	1.3	5.7	4	22
Los Angeles	346.9	999.3	955.1	806.2	267.6	352.3	3,727.4	270.0	11.3	353.8	4,082	497.0	7.2	634	4,716
Madera	5.3	24.3	8.5	18.7	4.6	5.6	67.0	4.0	8.2	8.7	76	5.6	6.4	13	89
Marin	14.1	16.6	16.6	15.1	7.8	2.8	73.2	3.0	8.2	9.3	83	4.7	6.4	14	97
Mariposa	0.8	3.3	0.6	1.5	0.7	0.3	7.2	-	7.1	1.0	9	3.5	5.7	3	12
Mendocino	5.0	18.9	6.9	9.8	3.8	4.2	48.6	1.0	8.2	6.0	55	3.4	6.4	10	65
Merced	13.9	34.1	13.5	27.2	7.8	6.7	103.3	5.5	8.2	13.3	117	13.8	6.4	21	138
Modoc	0.5	2.1	0.5	1.4	0.5	0.4	5.5	-	7.1	0.8	7	2.0	5.7	2	9
Mono	2.5	4.2	0.8	0.7	0.1	0.2	8.6	0.5	7.1	1.3	10	1.8	5.7	3	13
Monterey	16.6	54.5	20.1	31.6	10.2	7.8	140.6	8.0	8.2	18.1	159	13.3	6.8	26	185
Napa	5.7	17.8	8.0	11.1	5.1	3.1	50.9	3.0	8.2	6.6	58	6.3	6.4	11	69
Nevada	7.3	11.4	5.4	7.9	3.4	1.3	36.9	-	8.2	4.5	42	8.4	6.4	8	50
Orange	87.7	293.8	232.8	223.3	66.2	38.2	941.9	68.8	11.3	89.4	1,032	176.1	7.2	168	1,200
Placer	11.4	35.6	22.7	29.5	9.5	9.8	118.4	3.0	8.2	14.8	134	9.0	6.4	23	157
Plumas	0.9	2.7	1.1	2.0	1.0	0.8	8.5	0.1	7.1	1.2	10	1.1	5.7	2	12
Riverside	72.5	227.8	161.9	228.9	51.7	64.3	807.1	39.0	11.3	74.9	882	131.1	7.2	141	1,023
Sacramento	44.8	170.6	123.8	144.1	50.0	28.6	562.0	25.7	11.3	52.0	614	57.3	7.2	93	707
San Benito	1.8	7.1	3.5	3.9	1.4	0.9	18.6	-	7.1	2.6	22	1.3	5.7	5	27
San Bernardino	54.9	315.0	171.5	226.9	54.8	64.3	887.4	40.1	11.3	82.1	970	82.2	7.2	146	1,116
San Diego	106.9	255.7	229.3	256.6	57.3	35.7	941.4	48.6	11.3	87.6	1,030	103.6	7.2	157	1,187
San Francisco	51.7	47.5	79.4	50.2	33.0	17.3	279.1	21.3	11.3	26.6	306	36.3	7.2	48	354
San Joaquin	25.7	106.3	45.7	60.8	24.5	15.6	278.5	7.9	8.2	34.9	314	12.2	6.8	49	363
San Luis Obispo	13.3	44.7	13.0	18.3	10.3	4.8	104.5	4.5	8.2	13.3	118	7.5	6.4	20	138
San Mateo	33.9	68.1	29.2	43.3	14.2	20.9	209.6	13.3	8.2	27.2	237	19.3	6.8	38	275
Santa Barbara	28.0	58.6	23.9	27.1	11.6	9.5	158.7	11.9	8.2	20.8	180	29.1	6.8	31	211
Santa Clara	43.5	155.0	91.2	103.4	39.3	14.8	447.1	27.8	11.3	42.0	490	36.8	7.2	73	563
Santa Cruz	15.7	33.7	13.4	18.5	5.4	5.1	91.7	7.1	8.2	12.1	104	20.4	6.4	20	124
Shasta	12.2	44.2	11.5	20.4	8.3	6.3	102.9	-	8.2	12.5	116	54.0	6.4	27	143
Sierra	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	1.4	-	7.1	0.2	2	1.1	5.7	1	3
Siskiyou	5.2	7.4	2.8	5.2	1.9	1.5	24.0	0.3	8.2	3.0	27	4.4	6.4	5	32
Solano	16.0	46.4	28.4	45.0	15.1	6.5	157.4	2.0	8.2	19.4	177	7.0	6.8	28	205
Sonoma	20.8	54.5	26.4	33.7	17.3	6.9	159.5	8.9	8.2	20.5	181	23.9	6.8	31	212
Stanislaus	14.9	76.9	28.6	55.8	20.7	8.9	205.7	2.0	8.2	25.3	232	10.6	6.8	36	268
Sutter	4.9	16.3	6.3	10.9	4.6	2.1	45.1	1.5	8.2	5.7	51	8.9	6.4	10	61
Tehama	5.2	15.9	4.5	8.0	3.0	2.8	39.5	1.0	8.2	4.9	45	3.0	6.4	8	53
Trinity	0.6	3.4	1.1	2.3	0.6	0.8	8.9	-	7.1	1.3	11	5.0	5.7	3	14
Tulare	20.8	72.8	24.4	40.8	12.1	16.2	187.1	5.0	8.2	23.4	211	20.9	6.8	35	246
Tuolumne	2.4	11.7	3.5	6.2	2.5	3.2	29.5	0.3	8.2	3.6	34	2.1	6.4	6	40
Ventura	33.1	72.8	48.5	65.0	26.1	19.9	265.4	8.0	8.2	33.3	299	74.2	6.8	55	354
Yolo	10.0	33.0	9.4	15.3	5.3	5.3	78.3	2.0	8.2	9.8	89	13.0	6.4	16	105
Yuba	3.8	15.1	4.7	9.0	3.2	3.9	39.7	-	8.2	4.8	45	3.0	6.4	8	53
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,412.5</b>	<b>4,174.0</b>	<b>2,828.6</b>	<b>3,183.9</b>	<b>1,037.6</b>	<b>912.3</b>	<b>13,548.9</b>	<b>727.2</b>		<b>1,422.2</b>	<b>14,998.0</b>	<b>1,761.9</b>		<b>2,421.0</b>	<b>17,419</b>

\*Reported on FY 14-15 Schedule 7A; non-RAS staff include categories such as SJOs, Enhanced Collections Staff, and Interpreters

## 2017-18 BLS Factor

Cluster	County	% Local	% State	State Employment More than 50% of Govt Workforce?	3-Year Avg BLS Local (92)	3-Year Avg BLS (State & Local 92)	3-Year Avg (2013-2015) BLS Factor (50% Workforce Threshold)
4	Alameda	100%	0%	No	1.43	1.43	1.43
1	Alpine	100%	0%	No	0.85	0.85	0.85
1	Amador	34%	66%	Yes	0.96	0.99	0.99
2	Butte	86%	14%	No	0.90	0.90	0.90
1	Calaveras	94%	6%	No	0.89	0.94	0.89
1	Colusa	96%	4%	No	0.73	0.89	0.73
3	Contra Costa	96%	4%	No	1.25	1.12	1.25
1	Del Norte	33%	67%	Yes	0.61	0.74	0.74
2	El Dorado	96%	4%	No	1.04	1.09	1.04
3	Fresno	70%	30%	No	0.98	1.04	0.98
1	Glenn	96%	4%	No	0.67	0.82	0.67
2	Humboldt	84%	16%	No	0.77	0.92	0.77
2	Imperial	51%	49%	No	0.80	0.83	0.80
1	Inyo	72%	28%	No	0.84	0.88	0.84
3	Kern	59%	41%	No	1.04	0.99	1.04
2	Kings	33%	67%	Yes	0.86	0.86	0.86
2	Lake	96%	4%	No	0.75	0.86	0.75
1	Lassen	21%	79%	Yes	0.66	0.78	0.78
4	Los Angeles	92%	8%	No	1.37	1.26	1.37
2	Madera	40%	60%	Yes	0.82	0.92	0.92
2	Marin	67%	33%	No	1.30	1.15	1.30
1	Mariposa	92%	8%	No	0.82	0.96	0.82
2	Mendocino	83%	17%	No	0.81	0.82	0.81
2	Merced	100%	0%	No	0.88	0.88	0.88
1	Modoc	88%	12%	No	0.55	0.79	0.55
1	Mono	93%	7%	No	1.01	0.93	1.01
3	Monterey	63%	37%	No	1.19	1.05	1.19
2	Napa	85%	15%	No	1.22	1.09	1.22
2	Nevada	84%	16%	No	0.99	0.87	0.99
4	Orange	91%	9%	No	1.29	1.17	1.29
2	Placer	95%	5%	No	1.20	1.05	1.20
1	Plumas	93%	7%	No	0.69	0.80	0.69
4	Riverside	81%	19%	No	1.11	1.01	1.11
4	Sacramento	15%	85%	Yes	1.21	1.28	1.28
1	San Benito	100%	0%	No	0.96	0.96	0.96
4	San Bernardino	80%	20%	No	1.06	1.07	1.06
4	San Diego	86%	14%	No	1.18	1.15	1.18
4	San Francisco	53%	47%	No	1.71	1.60	1.71
3	San Joaquin	68%	32%	No	1.09	1.05	1.09
2	San Luis Obispo	57%	43%	No	1.06	1.08	1.06
3	San Mateo	95%	5%	No	1.46	1.17	1.46
3	Santa Barbara	93%	7%	No	1.20	1.10	1.20
4	Santa Clara	95%	5%	No	1.44	1.20	1.44
2	Santa Cruz	91%	9%	No	1.14	0.90	1.14
2	Shasta	64%	36%	No	0.88	0.94	0.88
1	Sierra	100%	0%	No	0.62	0.62	0.62
2	Siskiyou	84%	16%	No	0.70	0.74	0.70
3	Solano	66%	34%	No	1.17	1.06	1.17
3	Sonoma	90%	10%	No	1.12	1.05	1.12
3	Stanislaus	96%	4%	No	1.01	0.97	1.01
2	Sutter	95%	5%	No	0.97	0.94	0.97
2	Tehama	93%	7%	No	0.79	0.96	0.79
1	Trinity	93%	7%	No	0.66	0.81	0.66
3	Tulare	94%	6%	No	0.89	0.90	0.89
2	Tuolumne	52%	48%	No	0.80	0.87	0.80
3	Ventura	91%	9%	No	1.23	1.10	1.23
2	Yolo	81%	19%	No	1.07	1.29	1.07
2	Yuba	46%	54%	Yes	0.94	1.17	1.17

FY 2017-18 FTE Allotment Factor

Cluster	Court	BLS Factor	FTE Dollar Factor Applied (Current -- \$59,494*BLS )	FTE Need	Eligible for FTE Floor ?	Has FTE Need <50 AND FTE Dollar Factor is Less Than Median of \$45,508?	Final FTE Dollar Factor
		A	B	C	D	E	F
4	Alameda	1.43	\$ 85,132	576			\$ 85,132
1	Alpine	0.85	\$ 50,795	3	Yes		\$ 50,795
1	Amador	0.99	\$ 58,904	24	Yes		\$ 58,904
2	Butte	0.90	\$ 53,623	129			\$ 53,623
1	Calaveras	0.89	\$ 52,747	24	Yes		\$ 52,747
1	Colusa	0.73	\$ 43,591	17	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
3	Contra Costa	1.25	\$ 74,241	385			\$ 74,241
1	Del Norte	0.74	\$ 44,319	25	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
2	El Dorado	1.04	\$ 61,952	76			\$ 61,952
3	Fresno	0.98	\$ 58,075	531			\$ 58,075
1	Glenn	0.67	\$ 39,659	20	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
2	Humboldt	0.77	\$ 45,624	86			\$ 45,624
2	Imperial	0.80	\$ 47,384	130			\$ 47,384
1	Inyo	0.84	\$ 49,959	19	Yes		\$ 49,959
3	Kern	1.04	\$ 61,918	515			\$ 61,918
2	Kings	0.86	\$ 51,094	101			\$ 51,094
2	Lake	0.75	\$ 44,782	47	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
1	Lassen	0.78	\$ 46,233	22	Yes		\$ 46,233
4	Los Angeles	1.37	\$ 81,630	4,716			\$ 81,630
2	Madera	0.92	\$ 54,933	89			\$ 54,933
2	Marin	1.30	\$ 77,186	97			\$ 77,186
1	Mariposa	0.82	\$ 48,845	12	Yes		\$ 48,845
2	Mendocino	0.81	\$ 47,926	65			\$ 47,926
2	Merced	0.88	\$ 52,597	138			\$ 52,597
1	Modoc	0.55	\$ 32,718	9	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
1	Mono	1.01	\$ 59,856	13	Yes		\$ 59,856
3	Monterey	1.19	\$ 70,727	185			\$ 70,727
2	Napa	1.22	\$ 72,837	69			\$ 72,837
2	Nevada	0.99	\$ 59,012	50			\$ 59,012
4	Orange	1.29	\$ 76,892	1,200			\$ 76,892
2	Placer	1.20	\$ 71,580	157			\$ 71,580
1	Plumas	0.69	\$ 40,942	12	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
4	Riverside	1.11	\$ 66,070	1,023			\$ 66,070
4	Sacramento	1.28	\$ 76,146	707			\$ 76,146
1	San Benito	0.96	\$ 57,340	27	Yes		\$ 57,340
4	San Bernardino	1.06	\$ 62,954	1,116			\$ 62,954
4	San Diego	1.18	\$ 70,366	1,187			\$ 70,366
4	San Francisco	1.71	\$ 101,758	354			\$ 101,758
3	San Joaquin	1.09	\$ 64,835	363			\$ 64,835
2	San Luis Obispo	1.06	\$ 63,080	138			\$ 63,080
3	San Mateo	1.46	\$ 86,563	275			\$ 86,563
3	Santa Barbara	1.20	\$ 71,330	211			\$ 71,330
4	Santa Clara	1.44	\$ 85,498	563			\$ 85,498
2	Santa Cruz	1.14	\$ 67,616	124			\$ 67,616
2	Shasta	0.88	\$ 52,158	143			\$ 52,158
1	Sierra	0.62	\$ 37,003	3	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
2	Siskiyou	0.70	\$ 41,724	32	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
3	Solano	1.17	\$ 69,868	205			\$ 69,868
3	Sonoma	1.12	\$ 66,554	212			\$ 66,554
3	Stanislaus	1.01	\$ 60,204	268			\$ 60,204
2	Sutter	0.97	\$ 57,453	61			\$ 57,453
2	Tehama	0.79	\$ 46,872	53			\$ 46,872
1	Trinity	0.66	\$ 38,986	14	Yes	Yes	\$ 45,508
3	Tulare	0.89	\$ 52,679	246			\$ 52,679
2	Tuolumne	0.80	\$ 47,693	40	Yes		\$ 47,693
3	Ventura	1.23	\$ 73,211	354			\$ 73,211
2	Yolo	1.07	\$ 63,944	105			\$ 63,944
2	Yuba	1.17	\$ 69,444	53			\$ 69,444

17,419

<b>WAFM Post BLS FTE Allotment: Median</b>
\$ 45,508



### Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

	2013-14 Beginning Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (11-12)	Total	% of Total
	TCTF and GF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)		
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Alameda	74,069,725	(3,177,924)	(1,958,825)	101,575	424,792	127,523	<b>69,586,867</b>	4.83%
Alpine	549,977	-	-	83	2,034	47	<b>552,142</b>	0.04%
Amador	2,066,138	-	-	2,565	11,006	783	<b>2,080,491</b>	0.14%
Butte	7,956,105	(467,145)	(291,613)	14,608	59,332	16,523	<b>7,287,810</b>	0.51%
Calaveras	1,927,985	-	-	3,074	18,652	1,180	<b>1,950,892</b>	0.14%
Colusa	1,352,785	-	-	1,447	13,708	363	<b>1,368,302</b>	0.09%
Contra Costa	34,237,741	-	(1,705,774)	69,231	218,186	87,076	<b>32,906,460</b>	2.28%
Del Norte	2,315,586	-	(126,942)	1,964	11,208	505	<b>2,202,321</b>	0.15%
El Dorado	5,867,266	-	(57,081)	11,851	54,374	4,491	<b>5,880,901</b>	0.41%
Fresno	35,177,288	-	(1,032,025)	60,497	181,080	69,384	<b>34,456,224</b>	2.39%
Glenn	1,799,795	(9,779)	-	1,927	19,264	500	<b>1,811,707</b>	0.13%
Humboldt	5,258,372	(167,800)	(150,006)	8,913	48,160	8,302	<b>5,005,941</b>	0.35%
Imperial	6,805,406	(420,479)	(180,405)	11,204	67,678	10,882	<b>6,294,286</b>	0.44%
Inyo	1,919,492	(186,658)	(42,314)	1,245	30,402	294	<b>1,722,461</b>	0.12%
Kern	30,203,399	(65,567)	(1,750,452)	52,450	277,328	64,629	<b>28,781,786</b>	2.00%
Kings	5,292,481	(421,918)	(181,060)	9,935	57,026	9,045	<b>4,765,510</b>	0.33%
Lake	3,130,735	(196,493)	(56,758)	4,311	20,328	1,596	<b>2,903,720</b>	0.20%
Lassen	2,161,420	(293,836)	-	2,384	20,156	538	<b>1,890,662</b>	0.13%
Los Angeles	428,645,200	(14,294,467)	(26,758,268)	689,065	3,144,530	1,056,102	<b>392,482,162</b>	27.25%
Madera	6,269,329	(381,406)	-	9,711	52,502	3,108	<b>5,953,244</b>	0.41%
Marin	13,587,985	(9,625)	(391,957)	17,038	114,766	20,590	<b>13,338,797</b>	0.93%
Mariposa	943,529	-	(28,406)	1,225	3,904	341	<b>920,593</b>	0.06%
Mendocino	4,636,654	(299,349)	-	6,083	30,068	5,619	<b>4,379,075</b>	0.30%
Merced	9,195,644	-	(250,840)	16,595	55,652	16,318	<b>9,033,368</b>	0.63%
Modoc	947,828	(789)	(63,471)	662	6,134	304	<b>890,668</b>	0.06%
Mono	1,251,020	(24,156)	(8,201)	914	12,446	324	<b>1,232,348</b>	0.09%
Monterey	13,973,323	(870,000)	(333,656)	28,573	183,464	27,420	<b>13,009,124</b>	0.90%
Napa	6,628,648	(295,552)	(287,148)	9,042	30,550	3,438	<b>6,088,978</b>	0.42%
Nevada	4,478,125	(433,431)	(292,045)	6,730	49,946	7,900	<b>3,817,225</b>	0.26%
Orange	127,622,123	(2,733,776)	(3,329,845)	206,630	923,882	294,477	<b>122,983,490</b>	8.54%
Placer	11,920,337	-	(933,901)	21,287	77,378	29,042	<b>11,114,142</b>	0.77%
Plumas	1,429,991	-	-	1,442	9,206	398	<b>1,441,037</b>	0.10%
Riverside	61,221,794	(1,931,520)	(2,882,751)	131,371	532,226	69,297	<b>57,140,417</b>	3.97%
Sacramento	64,637,712	(1,864,424)	(1,824,452)	93,189	340,254	185,701	<b>61,567,979</b>	4.27%
San Benito	2,476,122	-	-	3,876	14,700	1,327	<b>2,496,024</b>	0.17%

### Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

	2013-14 Beginning Base (TCTF and GF)	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (11-12)	Total	% of Total
	TCTF and GF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)	TCTF (45.10)		
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
San Bernardino	66,832,972	(3,269,446)	(2,986,710)	133,960	435,474	188,896	<b>61,335,147</b>	4.26%
San Diego	126,960,874	(657,192)	(4,757,300)	206,259	718,422	265,582	<b>122,736,644</b>	8.52%
San Francisco	55,153,072	-	(2,582,976)	53,715	272,528	91,818	<b>52,988,157</b>	3.68%
San Joaquin	24,406,106	(287,747)	(779,859)	44,944	201,698	54,178	<b>23,639,320</b>	1.64%
San Luis Obispo	11,353,662	(241,676)	(673,831)	17,704	130,020	19,062	<b>10,604,942</b>	0.74%
San Mateo	31,297,630	(443,042)	(1,479,478)	48,700	329,518	16,733	<b>29,770,060</b>	2.07%
Santa Barbara	19,657,482	(1,055,112)	(457,408)	28,356	162,858	29,149	<b>18,365,326</b>	1.27%
Santa Clara	75,407,649	-	(1,833,360)	119,260	452,782	121,126	<b>74,267,457</b>	5.16%
Santa Cruz	10,187,917	-	(424,668)	17,644	113,210	16,283	<b>9,910,386</b>	0.69%
Shasta	10,063,775	(2,389,668)	(326,131)	12,206	44,394	4,517	<b>7,409,092</b>	0.51%
Sierra	540,106	-	-	235	1,830	44	<b>542,215</b>	0.04%
Siskiyou	3,317,504	-	(103,923)	3,104	37,000	943	<b>3,254,627</b>	0.23%
Solano	16,489,461	(435,400)	(535,433)	28,439	119,364	37,755	<b>15,704,185</b>	1.09%
Sonoma	19,577,796	(440,000)	(479,410)	32,278	119,004	36,215	<b>18,845,883</b>	1.31%
Stanislaus	15,772,316	(9,326)	(427,578)	34,594	88,718	39,080	<b>15,497,803</b>	1.08%
Sutter	3,604,262	(247,071)	-	6,150	37,382	2,322	<b>3,403,045</b>	0.24%
Tehama	2,879,149	-	(5,472)	4,138	28,100	1,382	<b>2,907,298</b>	0.20%
Trinity	1,431,739	(450,608)	-	943	7,648	636	<b>990,359</b>	0.07%
Tulare	12,726,148	(15,576)	(679,043)	28,289	204,932	28,262	<b>12,293,011</b>	0.85%
Tuolumne	2,819,593	(220,516)	(30,986)	3,916	16,642	1,152	<b>2,589,803</b>	0.18%
Ventura	26,332,175	(1,559,157)	(731,699)	54,971	205,304	65,233	<b>24,366,827</b>	1.69%
Yolo	7,474,390	(582,889)	(461,445)	12,802	48,556	12,735	<b>6,504,149</b>	0.45%
Yuba	3,335,312	(132,569)	-	4,696	15,788	1,849	<b>3,225,076</b>	0.22%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,529,578,150</b>	<b>(40,983,089)</b>	<b>(64,674,907)</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>	<b>10,907,494</b>	<b>3,160,318</b>	<b>1,440,487,965</b>	100.00%

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

## 2017-2018 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding (assumes \$0 million in new funding)

Cluster	Court	(Historical) Funding Subject to Reallocation	Court's Share of Current Historical Funding vs. FY 17-18 WAFM Funding Need		Reallocation Ratio	Reallocation of 50%		
			Share of Total Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM (Historical funding proportion)	Share of Total WAFM Funding Need (FY 17-18)		50 Percent of Funding Subject to Reallocation	Reallocation Using WAFM Proportion	Net
		A	B	C	D = C / B	E = 50% * Col. A	F = \$720.2M * Col. C	G = E + F
4	Alameda	69,586,867	4.83%	3.83%	79.4%	(34,793,434)	27,611,904	(7,181,529)
1	Alpine	552,142	0.04%	0.02%	46.6%	(276,071)	128,664	(147,407)
1	Amador	2,080,491	0.14%	0.12%	83.3%	(1,040,246)	866,832	(173,413)
2	Butte	7,287,810	0.51%	0.55%	108.7%	(3,643,905)	3,960,901	316,996
1	Calaveras	1,950,892	0.14%	0.11%	80.6%	(975,446)	786,367	(189,078)
1	Colusa	1,368,302	0.09%	0.08%	87.1%	(684,151)	596,046	(88,105)
3	Contra Costa	32,906,460	2.28%	2.29%	100.4%	(16,453,230)	16,516,187	62,957
1	Del Norte	2,202,321	0.15%	0.12%	81.6%	(1,101,160)	898,637	(202,523)
2	El Dorado	5,880,901	0.41%	0.37%	90.3%	(2,940,450)	2,653,800	(286,651)
3	Fresno	34,456,224	2.39%	2.80%	117.1%	(17,228,112)	20,178,993	2,950,881
1	Glenn	1,811,707	0.13%	0.09%	68.5%	(905,853)	620,622	(285,232)
2	Humboldt	5,005,941	0.35%	0.34%	98.6%	(2,502,970)	2,467,770	(35,200)
2	Imperial	6,294,286	0.44%	0.48%	110.4%	(3,147,143)	3,474,675	327,532
1	Inyo	1,722,461	0.12%	0.09%	72.2%	(861,231)	622,164	(239,067)
3	Kern	28,781,786	2.00%	2.93%	146.8%	(14,390,893)	21,124,674	6,733,781
2	Kings	4,765,510	0.33%	0.40%	120.4%	(2,382,755)	2,868,281	485,526
2	Lake	2,903,720	0.20%	0.18%	86.8%	(1,451,860)	1,260,676	(191,184)
1	Lassen	1,890,662	0.13%	0.09%	70.5%	(945,331)	666,823	(278,508)
4	Los Angeles	392,482,162	27.25%	29.58%	108.6%	(196,241,081)	213,083,452	16,842,370
2	Madera	5,953,244	0.41%	0.40%	97.6%	(2,976,622)	2,904,973	(71,649)
2	Marin	13,338,797	0.93%	0.56%	60.9%	(6,669,399)	4,062,276	(2,607,123)
1	Mariposa	920,593	0.06%	0.05%	84.5%	(460,296)	388,999	(71,298)
2	Mendocino	4,379,075	0.30%	0.28%	93.6%	(2,189,538)	2,049,143	(140,395)
2	Merced	9,033,368	0.63%	0.67%	106.9%	(4,516,684)	4,830,130	313,445
1	Modoc	890,668	0.06%	0.04%	60.6%	(445,334)	269,810	(175,524)
1	Mono	1,232,348	0.09%	0.08%	91.1%	(616,174)	561,239	(54,935)
3	Monterey	13,009,124	0.90%	0.97%	107.7%	(6,504,562)	7,005,892	501,330
2	Napa	6,088,978	0.42%	0.38%	91.0%	(3,044,489)	2,769,217	(275,272)
2	Nevada	3,817,225	0.26%	0.24%	90.7%	(1,908,612)	1,731,619	(176,994)
4	Orange	122,983,490	8.54%	7.07%	82.8%	(61,491,745)	50,922,145	(10,569,600)
2	Placer	11,114,142	0.77%	0.91%	118.4%	(5,557,071)	6,579,666	1,022,595
1	Plumas	1,441,037	0.10%	0.05%	48.4%	(720,518)	349,060	(371,458)
4	Riverside	57,140,417	3.97%	5.11%	128.9%	(28,570,208)	36,822,677	8,252,469
4	Sacramento	61,567,979	4.27%	4.30%	100.5%	(30,783,990)	30,949,829	165,839
1	San Benito	2,496,024	0.17%	0.13%	76.4%	(1,248,012)	953,848	(294,164)
4	San Bernardino	61,335,147	4.26%	5.47%	128.5%	(30,667,573)	39,416,674	8,749,101
4	San Diego	122,736,644	8.52%	6.96%	81.7%	(61,368,322)	50,111,172	(11,257,150)
4	San Francisco	52,988,157	3.68%	2.52%	68.6%	(26,494,079)	18,162,421	(8,331,657)
3	San Joaquin	23,639,320	1.64%	2.01%	122.7%	(11,819,660)	14,503,346	2,683,686
2	San Luis Obispo	10,604,942	0.74%	0.69%	94.0%	(5,302,471)	4,984,627	(317,844)
3	San Mateo	29,770,060	2.07%	1.85%	89.4%	(14,885,030)	13,299,776	(1,585,254)
3	Santa Barbara	18,365,326	1.27%	1.16%	91.1%	(9,182,663)	8,367,930	(814,732)
4	Santa Clara	74,267,457	5.16%	3.80%	73.8%	(37,133,729)	27,390,923	(9,742,806)
2	Santa Cruz	9,910,386	0.69%	0.67%	96.8%	(4,955,193)	4,796,149	(159,044)
2	Shasta	7,409,092	0.51%	0.58%	113.7%	(3,704,546)	4,211,876	507,330
1	Sierra	542,215	0.04%	0.02%	41.8%	(271,108)	113,228	(157,880)
2	Siskiyou	3,254,627	0.23%	0.13%	56.6%	(1,627,314)	921,331	(705,983)
3	Solano	15,704,185	1.09%	1.14%	104.2%	(7,852,093)	8,181,999	329,907
3	Sonoma	18,845,883	1.31%	1.23%	94.0%	(9,422,941)	8,859,743	(563,198)
3	Stanislaus	15,497,803	1.08%	1.33%	123.6%	(7,748,902)	9,578,558	1,829,656
2	Sutter	3,403,045	0.24%	0.29%	122.4%	(1,701,523)	2,083,376	381,853

**2017-2018 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding (assumes \$0 million in new funding)**

Cluster	Court	(Historical) Funding Subject to Reallocation	Court's Share of Current Historical Funding vs. FY 17-18 WAFM Funding Need		Reallocation Ratio	Reallocation of 50%		
			Share of Total Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM (Historical funding proportion)	Share of Total WAFM Funding Need (FY 17-18)		50 Percent of Funding Subject to Reallocation	Reallocation Using WAFM Proportion	Net
		A	B	C	D = C / B	E = 50% * Col. A	F = \$720.2M * Col. C	G = E + F
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.20%	0.23%	113.2%	(1,453,649)	1,645,783	<b>192,134</b>
1	Trinity	990,359	0.07%	0.07%	95.3%	(495,179)	471,907	<b>(23,272)</b>
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.85%	1.11%	130.4%	(6,146,506)	8,014,884	<b>1,868,378</b>
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.18%	0.17%	94.1%	(1,294,901)	1,218,883	<b>(76,018)</b>
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.69%	2.01%	119.1%	(12,183,413)	14,509,278	<b>2,325,865</b>
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.45%	0.55%	121.2%	(3,252,074)	3,942,247	<b>690,172</b>
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.22%	0.27%	119.1%	(1,612,538)	1,919,879	<b>307,341</b>
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,440,487,965</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>(720,243,983)</b>	<b>720,243,983</b>	<b>0</b>

(720,243,983)

**2017-2018 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding (assumes \$0 million in new funding)**

Cluster	Court	New Reallocation of \$233.8M			Reallocation of \$0M			Allocation of New Money	
		Allocation of \$233.8Million Using 17-18 WAFM	Original Share of \$233.8Million of Historical Allocation To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$0 Million Using 17-18 WAFM	Original Share of \$20.0 Million of Historical Allocation To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$233.8 Million Using 17-18 WAFM	Allocation of \$0Million Using 17-18 WAFM
		H = \$233.8M*C	I = -\$233.8M*B	J = H + I	K = \$0M*C	L = -\$0M*B	M = K + L	N = \$0M * C	O = \$0M * C
4	Alameda	8,962,704	(11,293,797)	(2,331,093)	-	-	-	8,962,704	-
1	Alpine	41,764	(89,611)	(47,848)	-	-	-	41,764	-
1	Amador	281,370	(337,659)	(56,289)	-	-	-	281,370	-
2	Butte	1,285,691	(1,182,796)	102,896	-	-	-	1,285,691	-
1	Calaveras	255,251	(316,625)	(61,374)	-	-	-	255,251	-
1	Colusa	193,474	(222,072)	(28,598)	-	-	-	193,474	-
3	Contra Costa	5,361,082	(5,340,647)	20,435	-	-	-	5,361,082	-
1	Del Norte	291,694	(357,432)	(65,738)	-	-	-	291,694	-
2	El Dorado	861,412	(954,457)	(93,046)	-	-	-	861,412	-
3	Fresno	6,550,013	(5,592,170)	957,843	-	-	-	6,550,013	-
1	Glenn	201,451	(294,036)	(92,585)	-	-	-	201,451	-
2	Humboldt	801,027	(812,453)	(11,426)	-	-	-	801,027	-
2	Imperial	1,127,864	(1,021,549)	106,316	-	-	-	1,127,864	-
1	Inyo	201,952	(279,552)	(77,600)	-	-	-	201,952	-
3	Kern	6,856,977	(4,671,221)	2,185,756	-	-	-	6,856,977	-
2	Kings	931,031	(773,432)	157,599	-	-	-	931,031	-
2	Lake	409,210	(471,267)	(62,057)	-	-	-	409,210	-
1	Lassen	216,448	(306,850)	(90,402)	-	-	-	216,448	-
4	Los Angeles	69,165,960	(63,699,000)	5,466,960	-	-	-	69,165,960	-
2	Madera	942,942	(966,198)	(23,257)	-	-	-	942,942	-
2	Marin	1,318,597	(2,164,858)	(846,261)	-	-	-	1,318,597	-
1	Mariposa	126,267	(149,410)	(23,143)	-	-	-	126,267	-
2	Mendocino	665,143	(710,714)	(45,572)	-	-	-	665,143	-
2	Merced	1,567,839	(1,466,096)	101,743	-	-	-	1,567,839	-
1	Modoc	87,579	(144,553)	(56,974)	-	-	-	87,579	-
1	Mono	182,176	(200,007)	(17,832)	-	-	-	182,176	-
3	Monterey	2,274,082	(2,111,353)	162,730	-	-	-	2,274,082	-
2	Napa	898,876	(988,228)	(89,352)	-	-	-	898,876	-
2	Nevada	562,076	(619,527)	(57,451)	-	-	-	562,076	-
4	Orange	16,529,106	(19,959,952)	(3,430,846)	-	-	-	16,529,106	-
2	Placer	2,135,731	(1,803,801)	331,930	-	-	-	2,135,731	-
1	Plumas	113,304	(233,877)	(120,574)	-	-	-	113,304	-
4	Riverside	11,952,481	(9,273,765)	2,678,715	-	-	-	11,952,481	-
4	Sacramento	10,046,179	(9,992,349)	53,831	-	-	-	10,046,179	-
1	San Benito	309,615	(405,099)	(95,484)	-	-	-	309,615	-
4	San Bernardino	12,794,481	(9,954,561)	2,839,920	-	-	-	12,794,481	-
4	San Diego	16,265,868	(19,919,890)	(3,654,022)	-	-	-	16,265,868	-
4	San Francisco	5,895,443	(8,599,862)	(2,704,420)	-	-	-	5,895,443	-
3	San Joaquin	4,707,723	(3,836,610)	871,113	-	-	-	4,707,723	-
2	San Luis Obispo	1,617,988	(1,721,159)	(103,171)	-	-	-	1,617,988	-
3	San Mateo	4,317,049	(4,831,616)	(514,567)	-	-	-	4,317,049	-
3	Santa Barbara	2,716,194	(2,980,652)	(264,459)	-	-	-	2,716,194	-
4	Santa Clara	8,890,974	(12,053,446)	(3,162,472)	-	-	-	8,890,974	-
2	Santa Cruz	1,556,809	(1,608,434)	(51,625)	-	-	-	1,556,809	-
2	Shasta	1,367,157	(1,202,479)	164,677	-	-	-	1,367,157	-
1	Sierra	36,753	(88,000)	(51,247)	-	-	-	36,753	-
2	Siskiyou	299,060	(528,219)	(229,159)	-	-	-	299,060	-
3	Solano	2,655,841	(2,548,755)	107,086	-	-	-	2,655,841	-
3	Sonoma	2,875,834	(3,058,646)	(182,812)	-	-	-	2,875,834	-
3	Stanislaus	3,109,158	(2,515,260)	593,898	-	-	-	3,109,158	-
2	Sutter	676,255	(552,307)	123,948	-	-	-	676,255	-

**2017-2018 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding (assumes \$0 million in new funding)**

		New Reallocation of \$233.8M			Reallocation of \$0M			Allocation of New Money	
		Allocation of \$233.8Million Using 17-18 WAFM	Original Share of \$233.8Million of Historical Allocation To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$0 Million Using 17-18 WAFM	Original Share of \$20.0 Million of Historical Allocation To Be Reallocated	Net	Allocation of \$233.8 Million Using 17-18 WAFM	Allocation of \$0Million Using 17-18 WAFM
Cluster	Court	H = \$233.8M*C	I = -\$233.8M*B	J = H + I	K = \$0M*C	L = -\$0M*B	M = K + L	N = \$0M * C	O = \$0M * C
2	Tehama	534,214	(471,848)	62,366	-	-	-	534,214	-
1	Trinity	153,179	(160,733)	(7,554)	-	-	-	153,179	-
3	Tulare	2,601,596	(1,995,129)	606,467	-	-	-	2,601,596	-
2	Tuolumne	395,644	(420,319)	(24,675)	-	-	-	395,644	-
3	Ventura	4,709,649	(3,954,683)	754,966	-	-	-	4,709,649	-
2	Yolo	1,279,636	(1,055,609)	224,027	-	-	-	1,279,636	-
2	Yuba	623,184	(523,423)	99,762	-	-	-	623,184	-
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>233,788,058</b>	<b>(233,788,058)</b>	<b>0</b>	-	-	-	<b>233,788,058</b>	-
		233,788,058			-			233,788,058	-

## 2017-2018 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding (assumes \$0 million in new funding)

Cluster	Court	Reversal of 2016-17 WAFM Allocation		Estimated 2017-18 Net Total Adjustments to Allocation	Estimated 2017-18 Funding Floor Adjustment
		40% Reallocation	\$233.8M Reallocation		
		P	Q	R	S
4	Alameda	6,603,514	(5,935,117)	118,477	(13,184)
1	Alpine	121,523	9,004	(22,964)	11,128
1	Amador	115,509	(243,925)	(76,749)	(415)
2	Butte	(309,051)	(1,433,588)	(37,056)	(1,747)
1	Calaveras	103,606	(232,551)	(124,146)	(386)
1	Colusa	95,668	(144,439)	28,000	(356)
3	Contra Costa	598,907	(4,854,640)	1,188,741	(7,228)
1	Del Norte	96,152	(279,405)	(159,821)	(468)
2	El Dorado	202,552	(790,089)	(105,821)	(1,202)
3	Fresno	(3,000,304)	(8,026,884)	(568,451)	(8,672)
1	Glenn	254,350	(87,633)	(9,648)	(354)
2	Humboldt	22,975	(793,810)	(16,433)	(1,124)
2	Imperial	(279,110)	(1,248,044)	34,558	(1,500)
1	Inyo	209,432	(109,600)	(14,883)	(350)
3	Kern	(5,678,721)	(9,279,441)	818,353	(8,309)
2	Kings	(334,835)	(1,045,147)	194,175	(1,196)
2	Lake	192,865	(314,759)	34,075	(591)
1	Lassen	133,512	(198,507)	(217,457)	94,310
4	Los Angeles	(14,770,787)	(75,685,333)	1,019,170	(92,781)
2	Madera	(45,557)	(1,003,167)	(200,688)	(1,337)
2	Marin	2,130,015	(436,374)	(441,145)	(2,191)
1	Mariposa	68,668	(93,687)	6,808	75,747
2	Mendocino	113,755	(618,404)	(25,473)	(959)
2	Merced	(448,390)	(1,829,959)	(295,321)	(2,060)
1	Modoc	148,203	(24,288)	(21,004)	3,187
1	Mono	38,618	(168,669)	(20,641)	124,225
3	Monterey	(349,452)	(2,394,929)	193,761	(3,088)
2	Napa	222,926	(807,326)	(50,148)	(1,262)
2	Nevada	235,623	(428,322)	134,931	(829)
4	Orange	7,903,661	(13,546,218)	(3,113,896)	(24,189)
2	Placer	(729,594)	(2,395,859)	364,804	(2,829)
1	Plumas	249,686	(31,259)	(160,301)	(203)
4	Riverside	(6,110,439)	(14,232,320)	2,540,906	(15,526)
4	Sacramento	419,572	(9,651,871)	1,033,549	(13,494)
1	San Benito	325,983	(140,568)	105,382	(461)
4	San Bernardino	(7,035,711)	(15,663,964)	1,683,826	(16,776)
4	San Diego	9,271,417	(12,396,236)	(1,770,123)	(24,293)
4	San Francisco	4,680,288	(4,801,860)	(5,262,207)	(9,575)
3	San Joaquin	(1,933,500)	(5,405,624)	923,398	(6,191)
2	San Luis Obispo	8,117	(1,714,572)	(509,481)	(2,282)
3	San Mateo	1,561,908	(3,564,145)	214,992	(6,006)
3	Santa Barbara	866,144	(2,277,786)	225,361	(3,771)
4	Santa Clara	7,851,840	(5,681,764)	(1,844,229)	(13,861)
2	Santa Cruz	173,511	(1,467,632)	52,020	(2,167)
2	Shasta	(278,742)	(1,428,675)	331,747	(1,901)
1	Sierra	130,925	18,244	(23,205)	13,353
2	Siskiyou	568,425	(66,948)	(134,605)	(518)
3	Solano	(117,645)	(2,644,223)	330,966	(3,696)
3	Sonoma	420,539	(2,717,383)	(167,019)	(4,170)
3	Stanislaus	(1,482,118)	(3,717,982)	332,613	(3,925)
2	Sutter	(303,662)	(798,725)	79,670	(897)

**2017-2018 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding (assumes \$0 million in new funding)**

		Reversal of 2016-17 WAFM Allocation		Estimated 2017-18 Net Total Adjustments to Allocation	Estimated 2017-18 Funding Floor Adjustment
		40% Reallocation	\$233.8M Reallocation		
Cluster	Court	P	Q	R	S
2	Tehama	(119,115)	(568,508)	101,091	(715)
1	Trinity	40,143	(128,157)	34,338	(256)
3	Tulare	(1,050,570)	(2,847,655)	1,178,217	(3,411)
2	Tuolumne	146,364	(301,547)	139,768	(564)
3	Ventura	(1,419,131)	(5,106,292)	1,265,056	(6,189)
2	Yolo	(303,923)	(1,302,239)	587,674	(1,669)
2	Yuba	(226,541)	(707,258)	96,488	(824)
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(233,788,058)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(0)</b>



## Estimated FY 2017-2018 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

	2016-17 Ending TCTF and GF Base	TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (15-16)	Estimated 2016-17 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	WAFM 17-18 Adjustment	Total 2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)	WAFM 17-18 Funding Floor Adjustment	Total 2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J (Sum A:I)	K	L (Sum J:K)
Alameda	75,837,756	-	(3,212,246)	(2,059,535)	101,575	424,792	97,474	(117,415)	118,477	71,190,880	(13,184)	71,177,696
Alpine	747,863	-	-	-	83	2,034	14	11,842	(22,964)	738,872	11,128	750,000
Amador	2,282,693	-	-	-	2,565	11,006	570	21,663	(76,749)	2,241,748	(415)	2,241,333
Butte	10,114,840	-	(472,190)	(324,964)	14,608	59,332	11,191	65,290	(37,056)	9,431,052	(1,747)	9,429,305
Calaveras	2,167,577	-	-	-	3,074	18,652	776	20,469	(124,146)	2,086,403	(386)	2,086,017
Colusa	1,859,554	-	-	-	1,447	13,708	288	21,699	28,000	1,924,695	(356)	1,924,339
Contra Costa	38,889,572	-	-	(764,779)	69,231	218,186	60,251	(627,559)	1,188,741	39,033,643	(7,228)	39,026,415
Del Norte	2,633,385	-	-	-	1,964	11,208	373	39,609	(159,821)	2,526,718	(468)	2,526,250
El Dorado	6,642,102	-	-	(153,227)	11,851	54,374	3,399	38,696	(105,821)	6,491,374	(1,202)	6,490,171
Fresno	48,290,025	-	-	(954,187)	60,497	181,080	57,496	(240,622)	(568,451)	46,825,838	(8,672)	46,817,167
Glenn	1,863,179	-	(9,885)	-	1,927	19,264	454	48,933	(9,648)	1,914,224	(354)	1,913,869
Humboldt	6,248,744	-	(169,612)	(151,920)	8,913	48,160	6,936	92,631	(16,433)	6,067,418	(1,124)	6,066,295
Imperial	8,619,427	-	(425,020)	(186,361)	11,204	67,678	7,411	(31,042)	34,558	8,097,855	(1,500)	8,096,356
Inyo	2,037,844	-	(188,674)	-	1,245	30,402	221	21,672	(14,883)	1,887,827	(350)	1,887,477
Kern	46,077,544	-	(66,275)	(1,475,361)	52,450	277,328	52,832	(866,725)	818,353	44,870,145	(8,309)	44,861,835
Kings	6,773,927	-	(426,475)	(263,766)	9,935	57,026	7,682	105,069	194,175	6,457,573	(1,196)	6,456,377
Lake	3,325,218	-	(198,615)	(42,227)	4,311	20,328	1,257	48,157	34,075	3,192,505	(591)	3,191,914
Lassen	2,252,270	-	(297,009)	-	2,384	20,156	413	19,933	(217,457)	1,780,689	94,310	1,874,999
Los Angeles	531,549,720	-	(14,448,847)	(21,541,145)	689,065	3,144,530	822,345	(220,592)	1,019,170	501,014,246	(92,781)	500,921,465
Madera	7,708,366	-	(385,525)	-	9,711	52,502	2,340	32,254	(200,688)	7,218,959	(1,337)	7,217,623
Marin	12,036,922	-	(9,729)	(62,580)	17,038	114,766	15,205	158,933	(441,145)	11,829,411	(2,191)	11,827,220
Mariposa	1,125,254	-	-	-	1,225	3,904	251	30,528	6,808	1,167,970	75,747	1,243,717
Mendocino	5,494,484	-	(302,582)	(17,671)	6,083	30,068	4,699	(10,851)	(25,473)	5,178,758	(959)	5,177,799
Merced	11,970,524	-	-	(391,025)	16,595	55,652	11,623	(245,209)	(295,321)	11,122,840	(2,060)	11,120,780
Modoc	882,073	-	(798)	-	662	6,134	271	4,475	(21,004)	871,813	3,187	875,000
Mono	1,711,215	-	(24,417)	-	914	12,446	198	66,471	(20,641)	1,746,186	124,225	1,870,411
Monterey	17,441,721	-	(879,396)	(354,276)	28,573	183,464	19,246	42,357	193,761	16,675,449	(3,088)	16,672,361
Napa	7,474,856	-	(298,744)	(381,426)	9,042	30,550	2,330	26,037	(50,148)	6,812,496	(1,262)	6,811,234
Nevada	4,929,174	-	(438,112)	(329,444)	6,730	49,946	4,695	119,536	134,931	4,477,457	(829)	4,476,628
Orange	140,624,898	-	(2,763,301)	(4,225,735)	206,630	923,882	216,389	(1,248,482)	(3,113,896)	130,620,384	(24,189)	130,596,195
Placer	15,552,391	-	-	(957,821)	21,287	77,378	20,761	199,413	364,804	15,278,212	(2,829)	15,275,383
Plumas	1,238,999	-	-	-	1,442	9,206	312	8,833	(160,301)	1,098,490	(203)	1,098,287
Riverside	83,672,042	-	(1,952,380)	(2,505,778)	131,371	532,226	49,388	1,370,087	2,540,906	83,837,862	(15,526)	83,822,337
Sacramento	74,858,578	-	(1,884,560)	(1,854,416)	93,189	340,254	300,538	(19,335)	1,033,549	72,867,798	(13,494)	72,854,304
San Benito	2,357,689	-	-	-	3,876	14,700	920	8,326	105,382	2,490,893	(461)	2,490,431
San Bernardino	94,053,222	-	(3,304,756)	(3,157,212)	133,960	435,474	137,726	608,729	1,683,826	90,590,969	(16,776)	90,574,193
San Diego	135,266,631	(411,224)	(664,290)	(4,243,895)	206,259	718,422	200,649	1,879,544	(1,770,123)	131,181,973	(24,293)	131,157,679
San Francisco	56,752,138	-	-	(491,934)	53,715	272,528	65,924	314,519	(5,262,207)	51,704,684	(9,575)	51,695,109
San Joaquin	32,998,593	-	(290,855)	(836,081)	44,944	201,698	42,678	346,128	923,398	33,430,503	(6,191)	33,424,312
San Luis Obispo	13,254,319	(205,612)	(244,286)	(418,156)	17,704	130,020	13,852	282,758	(509,481)	12,321,119	(2,282)	12,318,837
San Mateo	34,370,308	-	(447,827)	(1,561,631)	48,700	329,518	12,205	(536,099)	214,992	32,430,165	(6,006)	32,424,159

	2016-17 Ending TCTF and GF Base	TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (15-16)	Estimated 2016-17 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	WAFM 17-18 Adjustment	Total 2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)	WAFM 17-18 Funding Floor Adjustment	Total 2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation
<b>Court</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>J (Sum A:I)</b>	<b>K</b>	<b>L (Sum J:K)</b>
Santa Barbara	21,536,091	-	(1,066,507)	(540,097)	28,356	162,858	22,814	(7,453)	225,361	<b>20,361,424</b>	(3,771)	<b>20,357,653</b>
Santa Clara	75,710,803	-	-	(739,281)	119,260	452,782	86,883	1,063,634	(1,844,229)	<b>74,849,853</b>	(13,861)	<b>74,835,992</b>
Santa Cruz	11,656,512	-	-	(281,243)	17,644	113,210	11,426	130,494	52,020	<b>11,700,064</b>	(2,167)	<b>11,697,897</b>
Shasta	12,716,411	-	(2,662,303)	(303,623)	12,206	44,394	3,337	125,540	331,747	<b>10,267,709</b>	(1,901)	<b>10,265,807</b>
Sierra	747,892	-	-	-	235	1,830	36	9,859	(23,205)	<b>736,647</b>	13,353	<b>750,000</b>
Siskiyou	3,018,786	-	-	(164,928)	3,104	37,000	852	36,257	(134,605)	<b>2,796,466</b>	(518)	<b>2,795,948</b>
Solano	20,251,598	-	(440,102)	(633,026)	28,439	119,364	28,032	274,323	330,966	<b>19,959,592</b>	(3,696)	<b>19,955,896</b>
Sonoma	23,077,929	-	(444,752)	(543,792)	32,278	119,004	27,592	417,021	(167,019)	<b>22,518,261</b>	(4,170)	<b>22,514,091</b>
Stanislaus	20,973,350	-	(9,427)	(473,697)	34,594	88,718	29,055	221,251	332,613	<b>21,196,457</b>	(3,925)	<b>21,192,531</b>
Sutter	4,849,495	-	(249,739)	-	6,150	37,382	1,711	118,527	79,670	<b>4,843,196</b>	(897)	<b>4,842,299</b>
Tehama	3,709,881	-	-	-	4,138	28,100	1,168	16,974	101,091	<b>3,861,352</b>	(715)	<b>3,860,637</b>
Trinity	1,839,749	-	(520,479)	-	943	7,648	660	21,055	34,338	<b>1,383,914</b>	(256)	<b>1,383,657</b>
Tulare	17,197,347	-	(15,744)	(462,276)	28,289	204,932	23,051	264,572	1,178,217	<b>18,418,388</b>	(3,411)	<b>18,414,977</b>
Tuolumne	3,155,788	-	(222,898)	(98,238)	3,916	16,642	982	51,126	139,768	<b>3,047,086</b>	(564)	<b>3,046,522</b>
Ventura	33,968,245	-	(1,575,996)	(624,561)	54,971	205,304	49,729	79,260	1,265,056	<b>33,422,006</b>	(6,189)	<b>33,415,817</b>
Yolo	9,193,431	-	(589,184)	(286,928)	12,802	48,556	8,526	38,378	587,674	<b>9,013,254</b>	(1,669)	<b>9,011,585</b>
Yuba	4,430,455	-	(134,001)	-	4,696	15,788	1,354	36,275	96,488	<b>4,451,056</b>	(824)	<b>4,450,232</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,822,021,399</b>	<b>(616,836)</b>	<b>(41,737,537)</b>	<b>(54,858,243)</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>	<b>10,907,494</b>	<b>2,550,795</b>	<b>4,787,751</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

Determination of Funding Floor

Cluster	Court			Current adjusted allocation if no floor applied	Determine Adjusted Allocation if Floor Applies				Funding Floor (for the graduated floor, the lower of the floor or prior-year allocation plus 10%)
		WAFM Calculated Need	% of Statewide Need		Graduated Funding Floor That Would Apply	Apply Floor? Yes, if F>E	Prior Year Plus 10%	Adjusted allocation if no floor applied	
A	B	C	D	E	F	F1	F2	F3	G
4	Alameda	89,581,687	3.83%	71,190,880	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Alpine	417,426	0.02%	738,872	750,000	Y	825,000	738,872	750,000
1	Amador	2,812,276	0.12%	2,241,748	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Butte	12,850,408	0.55%	9,431,052	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Calaveras	2,551,223	0.11%	2,086,403	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Colusa	1,933,761	0.08%	1,924,695	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Contra Costa	53,583,695	2.29%	39,033,643	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Del Norte	2,915,461	0.12%	2,526,718	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	El Dorado	8,609,759	0.37%	6,491,374	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Fresno	65,466,991	2.80%	46,825,838	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Glenn	2,013,492	0.09%	1,914,224	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Humboldt	8,006,222	0.34%	6,067,418	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Imperial	11,272,937	0.48%	8,097,855	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Inyo	2,018,495	0.09%	1,887,827	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Kern	68,535,077	2.93%	44,870,145	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Kings	9,305,603	0.40%	6,457,573	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Lake	4,090,030	0.18%	3,192,505	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Lassen	2,163,384	0.09%	1,780,689	1,874,999	Y	2,176,054	1,780,689	1,874,999
4	Los Angeles	691,309,628	29.58%	501,014,246	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Madera	9,424,646	0.40%	7,218,959	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Marin	13,179,298	0.56%	11,829,411	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Mariposa	1,262,034	0.05%	1,167,970	1,250,000	Y	1,243,717	1,167,970	1,243,717
2	Mendocino	6,648,062	0.28%	5,178,758	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Merced	15,670,457	0.67%	11,122,840	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Modoc	875,348	0.04%	871,813	875,000	Y	977,167	871,813	875,000
1	Mono	1,820,837	0.08%	1,746,186	1,874,999	Y	1,870,411	1,746,186	1,870,411
3	Monterey	22,729,314	0.97%	16,675,449	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Napa	8,984,209	0.38%	6,812,496	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Nevada	5,617,914	0.24%	4,477,457	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A

Cluster	Court			Current adjusted allocation if no floor applied	Determine Adjusted Allocation if Floor Applies				Funding Floor (for the graduated floor, the lower of the floor or prior-year allocation plus 10%)
		WAFM Calculated Need	% of Statewide Need		Graduated Funding Floor That Would Apply	Apply Floor? Yes, if F>E	Prior Year Plus 10%	Adjusted allocation if no floor applied	
A	B	C	D	E	F	F1	F2	F3	G
4	Orange	165,207,428	7.07%	130,620,384	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Placer	21,346,504	0.91%	15,278,212	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Plumas	1,132,462	0.05%	1,098,490	875,000	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Riverside	119,464,328	5.11%	83,837,862	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Sacramento	100,410,962	4.30%	72,867,798	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	San Benito	3,094,583	0.13%	2,490,893	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Bernardino	127,880,069	5.47%	90,590,969	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Diego	162,576,377	6.96%	131,181,973	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	San Francisco	58,924,598	2.52%	51,704,684	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	San Joaquin	47,053,408	2.01%	33,430,503	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	San Luis Obispo	16,171,695	0.69%	12,321,119	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	San Mateo	43,148,650	1.85%	32,430,165	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Santa Barbara	27,148,194	1.16%	20,361,424	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	Santa Clara	88,864,755	3.80%	74,849,853	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Santa Cruz	15,560,215	0.67%	11,700,064	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Shasta	13,664,649	0.58%	10,267,709	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Sierra	367,347	0.02%	736,647	750,000	Y	825,000	736,647	750,000
2	Siskiyou	2,989,086	0.13%	2,796,466	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Solano	26,544,975	1.14%	19,959,592	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Sonoma	28,743,789	1.23%	22,518,261	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Stanislaus	31,075,849	1.33%	21,196,457	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Sutter	6,759,126	0.29%	4,843,196	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Tehama	5,339,437	0.23%	3,861,352	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
1	Trinity	1,531,014	0.07%	1,383,914	1,250,000	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Tulare	26,002,799	1.11%	18,418,388	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Tuolumne	3,954,439	0.17%	3,047,086	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Ventura	47,072,655	2.01%	33,422,006	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yolo	12,789,887	0.55%	9,013,254	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yuba	6,228,690	0.27%	4,451,056	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Statewide</b>		<b>2,336,697,645</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>					<b>7,364,127</b>

## FY 2017-2018 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor

	Total WAFM- Related Allocation for 2017-18 (Prior to implementing funding floor)	Floor Funding	Floor Allocation Adjustment	Share of reduction	Reduction Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E
Alameda	71,190,880	N/A	-	4.09%	(13,184)
Alpine	738,872	750,000	11,128	0.00%	-
Amador	2,241,748	N/A	-	0.13%	(415)
Butte	9,431,052	N/A	-	0.54%	(1,747)
Calaveras	2,086,403	N/A	-	0.12%	(386)
Colusa	1,924,695	N/A	-	0.11%	(356)
Contra Costa	39,033,643	N/A	-	2.25%	(7,228)
Del Norte	2,526,718	N/A	-	0.15%	(468)
El Dorado	6,491,374	N/A	-	0.37%	(1,202)
Fresno	46,825,838	N/A	-	2.69%	(8,672)
Glenn	1,914,224	N/A	-	0.11%	(354)
Humboldt	6,067,418	N/A	-	0.35%	(1,124)
Imperial	8,097,855	N/A	-	0.47%	(1,500)
Inyo	1,887,827	N/A	-	0.11%	(350)
Kern	44,870,145	N/A	-	2.58%	(8,309)
Kings	6,457,573	N/A	-	0.37%	(1,196)
Lake	3,192,505	N/A	-	0.18%	(591)
Lassen	1,780,689	1,874,999	94,310	0.00%	-
Los Angeles	501,014,246	N/A	-	28.82%	(92,781)
Madera	7,218,959	N/A	-	0.42%	(1,337)
Marin	11,829,411	N/A	-	0.68%	(2,191)
Mariposa	1,167,970	1,243,717	75,747	0.00%	-
Mendocino	5,178,758	N/A	-	0.30%	(959)
Merced	11,122,840	N/A	-	0.64%	(2,060)
Modoc	871,813	875,000	3,187	0.00%	-
Mono	1,746,186	1,870,411	124,225	0.00%	-
Monterey	16,675,449	N/A	-	0.96%	(3,088)
Napa	6,812,496	N/A	-	0.39%	(1,262)
Nevada	4,477,457	N/A	-	0.26%	(829)
Orange	130,620,384	N/A	-	7.51%	(24,189)
Placer	15,278,212	N/A	-	0.88%	(2,829)
Plumas	1,098,490	N/A	-	0.06%	(203)
Riverside	83,837,862	N/A	-	4.82%	(15,526)
Sacramento	72,867,798	N/A	-	4.19%	(13,494)
San Benito	2,490,893	N/A	-	0.14%	(461)
San Bernardino	90,590,969	N/A	-	5.21%	(16,776)
San Diego	131,181,973	N/A	-	7.55%	(24,293)
San Francisco	51,704,684	N/A	-	2.97%	(9,575)
San Joaquin	33,430,503	N/A	-	1.92%	(6,191)
San Luis Obispo	12,321,119	N/A	-	0.71%	(2,282)
San Mateo	32,430,165	N/A	-	1.87%	(6,006)
Santa Barbara	20,361,424	N/A	-	1.17%	(3,771)
Santa Clara	74,849,853	N/A	-	4.31%	(13,861)
Santa Cruz	11,700,064	N/A	-	0.67%	(2,167)
Shasta	10,267,709	N/A	-	0.59%	(1,901)
Sierra	736,647	750,000	13,353	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	2,796,466	N/A	-	0.16%	(518)
Solano	19,959,592	N/A	-	1.15%	(3,696)
Sonoma	22,518,261	N/A	-	1.30%	(4,170)
Stanislaus	21,196,457	N/A	-	1.22%	(3,925)
Sutter	4,843,196	N/A	-	0.28%	(897)
Tehama	3,861,352	N/A	-	0.22%	(715)
Trinity	1,383,914	N/A	-	0.08%	(256)
Tulare	18,418,388	N/A	-	1.06%	(3,411)
Tuolumne	3,047,086	N/A	-	0.18%	(564)
Ventura	33,422,006	N/A	-	1.92%	(6,189)
Yolo	9,013,254	N/A	-	0.52%	(1,669)
Yuba	4,451,056	N/A	-	0.26%	(824)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>	<b>7,364,127</b>	<b>321,949</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>(321,949)</b>

2017-2018 WAFM Allocation Adjustments Including Funding Floor

Cluster	Court	Net Reallocation of 50 Percent of Historical Funding	Reverse FY 2016-17 Reallocation of 40 Percent of Historical Funding	Allocation of \$233.8 Million in New Funding Using Updated WAFM	Net Reallocation of \$233.8 Million in Historical Funding	Reverse FY 2016-17 Allocation and Reallocation of \$233.8 Million in New Funding	Allocation of \$0 Million in New Funding	Net Reallocation of \$0 Million in Historical Funding	Adjustment Related to WAFM Funding Floor	Total WAFM Adjustments to Base in 2017-18 Including Funding Floor	Estimated 17-18 WAFM adj (adjusted to .9 BLS minimum)	Swing in adjustment between estimated .9 BLS and FY 17-18 BLS adj.
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I (Sum of A to H)		
4	Alameda	(7,181,529)	6,603,514	8,962,704	(2,331,093)	(5,935,117)	-	-	(13,184)	105,294	(26,185)	(131,479)
1	Alpine	(147,407)	121,523	41,764	(47,848)	9,004	-	-	11,128	(11,836)	(11,836)	0
1	Amador	(173,413)	115,509	281,370	(56,289)	(243,925)	-	-	(415)	(77,164)	(81,291)	(4,127)
2	Butte	316,996	(309,051)	1,285,691	102,896	(1,433,588)	-	-	(1,747)	(38,802)	(57,696)	(18,894)
1	Calaveras	(189,078)	103,606	255,251	(61,374)	(232,551)	-	-	(386)	(124,532)	(115,109)	9,424
1	Colusa	(88,105)	95,668	193,474	(28,598)	(144,439)	-	-	(356)	27,643	131,515	103,872
3	Contra Costa	62,957	598,907	5,361,082	20,435	(4,854,640)	-	-	(7,228)	1,181,513	1,102,717	(78,795)
1	Del Norte	(202,523)	96,152	291,694	(65,738)	(279,405)	-	-	(468)	(160,288)	(30,388)	129,900
2	El Dorado	(286,651)	202,552	861,412	(93,046)	(790,089)	-	-	(1,202)	(107,023)	(119,675)	(12,651)
3	Fresno	2,950,881	(3,000,304)	6,550,013	957,843	(8,026,884)	-	-	(8,672)	(577,122)	(673,429)	(96,307)
1	Glenn	(285,232)	254,350	201,451	(92,585)	(87,633)	-	-	(354)	(10,003)	108,070	118,072
2	Humboldt	(35,200)	22,975	801,027	(11,426)	(793,810)	-	-	(1,124)	(17,557)	440,880	458,437
2	Imperial	327,532	(279,110)	1,127,864	106,316	(1,248,044)	-	-	(1,500)	33,059	547,854	514,796
1	Inyo	(239,067)	209,432	201,952	(77,600)	(109,600)	-	-	(350)	(15,232)	27,496	42,728
3	Kern	6,733,781	(5,678,721)	6,856,977	2,185,756	(9,279,441)	-	-	(8,309)	810,043	709,047	(100,997)
2	Kings	485,526	(334,835)	931,031	157,599	(1,045,147)	-	-	(1,196)	192,979	339,668	146,689
2	Lake	(191,184)	192,865	409,210	(62,057)	(314,759)	-	-	(591)	33,484	274,351	240,867
1	Lassen	(278,508)	133,512	216,448	(90,402)	(198,507)	-	-	94,310	(123,148)	(116,018)	7,130
4	Los Angeles	16,842,370	(14,770,787)	69,165,960	5,466,960	(75,685,333)	-	-	(92,781)	926,389	(90,299)	(1,016,689)
2	Madera	(71,649)	(45,557)	942,942	(23,257)	(1,003,167)	-	-	(1,337)	(202,025)	(215,869)	(13,844)
2	Marin	(2,607,123)	2,130,015	1,318,597	(846,261)	(436,374)	-	-	(2,191)	(443,336)	(462,622)	(19,286)
1	Mariposa	(71,298)	68,668	126,267	(23,143)	(93,687)	-	-	75,747	82,555	82,555	0
2	Mendocino	(140,395)	113,755	665,143	(45,572)	(618,404)	-	-	(959)	(26,432)	243,765	270,197
2	Merced	313,445	(448,390)	1,567,839	101,743	(1,829,959)	-	-	(2,060)	(297,381)	(208,183)	89,198
1	Modoc	(175,524)	148,203	87,579	(56,974)	(24,288)	-	-	3,187	(17,817)	44,696	62,512
1	Mono	(54,935)	38,618	182,176	(17,832)	(168,669)	-	-	124,225	103,584	103,584	0
3	Monterey	501,330	(349,452)	2,274,082	162,730	(2,394,929)	-	-	(3,088)	190,673	157,254	(33,419)
2	Napa	(275,272)	222,926	898,876	(89,352)	(807,326)	-	-	(1,262)	(51,410)	(64,610)	(13,200)
2	Nevada	(176,994)	235,623	562,076	(57,451)	(428,322)	-	-	(829)	134,102	125,857	(8,245)
4	Orange	(10,569,600)	7,903,661	16,529,106	(3,430,846)	(13,546,218)	-	-	(24,189)	(3,138,086)	(3,380,588)	(242,503)
2	Placer	1,022,595	(729,594)	2,135,731	331,930	(2,395,859)	-	-	(2,829)	361,974	330,572	(31,402)
1	Plumas	(371,458)	249,686	113,304	(120,574)	(31,259)	-	-	(203)	(160,505)	(8,792)	151,713
4	Riverside	8,252,469	(6,110,439)	11,952,481	2,678,715	(14,232,320)	-	-	(15,526)	2,525,381	2,349,571	(175,809)
4	Sacramento	165,839	419,572	10,046,179	53,831	(9,651,871)	-	-	(13,494)	1,020,055	872,388	(147,667)
1	San Benito	(294,164)	325,983	309,615	(95,484)	(140,568)	-	-	(461)	104,921	100,381	(4,541)
4	San Bernardino	8,749,101	(7,035,711)	12,794,481	2,839,920	(15,663,964)	-	-	(16,776)	1,667,050	1,478,892	(188,158)
4	San Diego	(11,257,150)	9,271,417	16,265,868	(3,654,022)	(12,396,236)	-	-	(24,293)	(1,794,416)	(2,032,945)	(238,528)
4	San Francisco	(8,331,657)	4,680,288	5,895,443	(2,704,420)	(4,801,860)	-	-	(9,575)	(5,271,782)	(5,358,058)	(86,276)
3	San Joaquin	2,683,686	(1,933,500)	4,707,723	871,113	(5,405,624)	-	-	(6,191)	917,207	847,978	(69,229)
2	San Luis Obispo	(317,844)	8,117	1,617,988	(103,171)	(1,714,572)	-	-	(2,282)	(511,763)	(535,520)	(23,758)
3	San Mateo	(1,585,254)	1,561,908	4,317,049	(514,567)	(3,564,145)	-	-	(6,006)	208,986	145,578	(63,408)
3	Santa Barbara	(814,732)	866,144	2,716,194	(264,459)	(2,277,786)	-	-	(3,771)	221,590	181,694	(39,897)

		<i>Net Reallocation of 50 Percent of Historical Funding</i>	<i>Reverse FY 2016-17 Net Reallocation of 40 Percent of Historical Funding</i>	<i>Allocation of \$233.8 Million in New Funding Using Updated WAFM</i>	<i>Net Reallocation of \$233.8 Million in Historical Funding</i>	<i>Reverse FY 2016-17 Allocation and Reallocation of \$233.8 Million in New Funding</i>	<i>Allocation of \$0 Million in New Funding</i>	<i>Net Reallocation of \$0 Million in Historical Funding</i>	<i>Adjustment Related to WAFM Funding Floor</i>	<i>Total WAFM Adjustments to Base in 2017-18 Including Funding Floor</i>		<i>Swing in adjustment between estimated .9 BLS and FY 17-18 BLS adj.</i>
<b>Cluster</b>	<b>Court</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>H</b>	<b>I (Sum of A to H)</b>	<i>Estimated 17-18 WAFM adj (adjusted to .9 BLS minimum)</i>	
4	Santa Clara	(9,742,806)	7,851,840	8,890,974	(3,162,472)	(5,681,764)	-	-	(13,861)	<b>(1,858,090)</b>	(1,988,337)	(130,247)
2	Santa Cruz	(159,044)	173,511	1,556,809	(51,625)	(1,467,632)	-	-	(2,167)	<b>49,854</b>	26,988	(22,866)
2	Shasta	507,330	(278,742)	1,367,157	164,677	(1,428,675)	-	-	(1,901)	<b>329,846</b>	442,890	113,045
1	Sierra	(157,880)	130,925	36,753	(51,247)	18,244	-	-	13,353	<b>(9,852)</b>	9,087	18,939
2	Siskiyou	(705,983)	568,425	299,060	(229,159)	(66,948)	-	-	(518)	<b>(135,123)</b>	50,206	185,329
3	Solano	329,907	(117,645)	2,655,841	107,086	(2,644,223)	-	-	(3,696)	<b>327,270</b>	288,262	(39,008)
3	Sonoma	(563,198)	420,539	2,875,834	(182,812)	(2,717,383)	-	-	(4,170)	<b>(171,189)</b>	(213,390)	(42,201)
3	Stanislaus	1,829,656	(1,482,118)	3,109,158	593,898	(3,717,982)	-	-	(3,925)	<b>328,687</b>	282,929	(45,759)
2	Sutter	381,853	(303,662)	676,255	123,948	(798,725)	-	-	(897)	<b>78,773</b>	68,830	(9,943)
2	Tehama	192,134	(119,115)	534,214	62,366	(568,508)	-	-	(715)	<b>100,376</b>	326,697	226,321
1	Trinity	(23,272)	40,143	153,179	(7,554)	(128,157)	-	-	(256)	<b>34,082</b>	124,220	90,138
3	Tulare	1,868,378	(1,050,570)	2,601,596	606,467	(2,847,655)	-	-	(3,411)	<b>1,174,807</b>	1,283,153	108,347
2	Tuolumne	(76,018)	146,364	395,644	(24,675)	(301,547)	-	-	(564)	<b>139,203</b>	297,921	158,718
3	Ventura	2,325,865	(1,419,131)	4,709,649	754,966	(5,106,292)	-	-	(6,189)	<b>1,258,866</b>	1,189,609	(69,258)
2	Yolo	690,172	(303,923)	1,279,636	224,027	(1,302,239)	-	-	(1,669)	<b>586,004</b>	567,184	(18,821)
2	Yuba	307,341	(226,541)	623,184	99,762	(707,258)	-	-	(824)	<b>95,664</b>	86,501	(9,163)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>233,788,058</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(233,788,058)</b>	-	-	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	(0)	0

## 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



## FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Updated on May 10, 2016

### **FY 2015–2016**

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

### **FY 2016–2017**

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

### **Indefinite**

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

**From:** [Jacobson, Morris](#)  
**To:** [Cantil-Sakauye, Tani](#); [JCC JC Members Only](#); [JCC PJs - All Trial Courts](#); [JCC Court Execs - ALL Trial Courts](#)  
**Cc:** [Hoshino, Martin](#)  
**Subject:** Population to Judge Ratio Funding methodology proposal  
**Attachments:** [Farole Att. 2.2.1 - Methodology Versions.pdf](#)  
[Farole Att. 2.2.2 - Funding Scenarios.pdf](#)  
[Farole Proposal for Alternative Funding Methodology 3.21.17.docx](#)

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

We all strive to speak with one voice in our budget advocacy, as doing so gives us the most strength and makes our message resonate as strongly as possible with the Executive Branch and the Legislature. Unfortunately, our current budget allocation methodology, WAFM, has the unintended consequence of forcing the trial courts into competing “donor” and “recipient” camps, each of which naturally has a very different voice. And while all courts can agree at a high level that the Judicial Branch should be seeking more funding overall, at a more immediate level the interests of the donor courts, the recipient courts, and the rural courts are distinct and often in conflict.

Since February 1, 2017, the Alameda County Superior Court has been working with Deana Farole, a widely respected statistician formerly with the Judicial Council’s Office of Court Research, where for many years she worked on the WAFM and RAS models until her departure in January 2017. The goal was to come up with an alternative to WAFM that is more likely to garner universal support among the trial courts and thus move us all back into a position where we can truly speak with a single, unified voice. The purpose of this email is to share this new model with you all for consideration, and to ask for your support in beginning robust consideration of the new model as an alternative to WAFM as we go forward.

## II. WAFM BACKGROUND

WAFM was created with the best of intentions, and certainly reflected the shared recognition that funding for the 58 trial courts must be allocated in a more equitable way than simply using the historical percentages that were grandfathered in when the trial courts unified. Specifically, the direction of the Trial Court Funding Work Group—the joint group created by Governor Brown and the Chief Justice in 2012 to evaluate the equity and uniformity of trial court funding—was for the Council to adopt a funding model guided by “the principles of uniformity, equality, accountability, and flexibility.” However, while WAFM arose from, and was approved because of, its perceived ability to serve these values, in practice over the years since its inception it has had unintended harmful consequences in direct contravention to its stated goals, including forcing the trial courts into separate, competing camps.

In its real world application, WAFM has several deep flaws that will be difficult to remedy through minor adjustments or tweaks. The most significant flaw lies at the heart of WAFM, namely its use of “filings” as the primary driver of funding adjustments. Although theoretically filings may seem like a logical measure of workload and thus funding, in practice the reportable filing data in a given court is at the mercy of a number of variables that differ from county to county, often due to factors completely outside of the control of the courts (e.g., charging practices of local District Attorneys’ Offices). These variables in turn lead to anomalies in “filings” that are counted for purposes of the WAFM. There are so many examples of these anomalies that they become difficult to explain, much less justify. The mysteries in the reported filing data are amplified by the fact that there is no uniform way for a court to see or understand how the other 57 courts are compiling and reporting their data.

Much of this ambiguity can be traced to the JBSIS Manual—the document that governs what case events are reported as “filings”—which is difficult to use, outdated, and often open to competing interpretations. In the many places where interpretation is needed, that interpretation may differ depending on whether the person making the judgment is an administrator, a statistician, or a legal professional. And while these differences of interpretation certainly arise in good faith, the fact of their existence at all is highly problematic given the central importance of reported “filings” to determining a court’s annual allocation. Put another way, where the stakes involved include things like court closures, labor strife, and lay-offs, it is critical that the drivers of the underlying model be clear, objective, and uniform.

This assessment of WAFM is not intended in any way to cast blame on the Judicial Council. In fact, the Council is particularly victimized by the flaws inherent in WAFM because it has the unenviable task of administering that model. This places the burden on the Council of engaging in an annual process that, by design, will harm one group of its constituent courts in order to redistribute funds to another group. The Council essentially becomes the entity responsible for robbing Peter to pay Paul. Putting the Council at the center of that controversy distracts it from the far more important mission of rallying all the courts to the common cause of articulating to the other two branches the need for more funding overall.

WAFM may have served a purpose as a transitional methodology for weaning the trial courts from the unfair historic share allocation system, but it cannot serve the interests of the branch long term, and certainly not if it were to be used for 100% of trial court funding. Instead, it is time to openly and honestly reassess WAFM and acknowledge the need to abandon the historic share entirely and replace both it and WAFM with a new funding methodology that is fair, transparent, easily understood, and centered on objective criteria. To that end, as we enter the fifth and final year of the WAFM phase-in, the Alameda County Superior Court respectfully requests that the Judicial Council consider an alternative methodology for Judicial Branch funding. In this memorandum we offer one such alternative

for consideration.

### **III. POPULATION TO JUDGE RATIO FUNDING METHODOLOGY**

To come up with a more transparent alternative methodology, we started with a number of goals, including creating an allocation system that is transparent, predictable, fair and unifying. The resulting model that Ms. Farole developed based on those goals (a proposal and two spreadsheets) is attached.

#### **A. How it works**

California has approximately one judge for every 23,000 people. Analysis of this ratio from county to county, like WAFM, captures the disparities in resources; e.g., Alameda County has a ratio of one Judge to about 22,000 people, while Riverside has one Judge for every 38,000 people and San Bernardino has one Judge for every 30,000 people. Such disparities have grown over time as different parts of the state have grown at different rates and the Executive Branch has not added new judgeships at a pace that matches this growth.

Based on the FY 16-17 allocation to the trial courts as a whole, the current statewide funding per judge is about \$1.1 million. Because there is widespread agreement that our Branch remains underfunded generally, the two versions of the proposed new model that are attached set the baseline minimal funding at \$1.2 million and \$1.25 million per judge respectively. This baseline amount is aspirational, and would require additional funding of \$244 million at the 1.2 level and \$321 million at the 1.25 level.

To give context to the aspirational aspect of this targeted minimal baseline, review of the Department of Finance Website (Enacted Budget Details) shows that Judicial Branch funding has increased by about \$550 million in the four years of WAFM; the budget jumped about \$312 million from FY 13-14 to FY 14-15, about \$34 million from FY 14-15 to FY 15-16 and about \$204 million from FY 15-16 to FY 16-17. Thus, the aspirations in these two scenarios are well within the range of funding increases that the Branch has seen in the last three years. If new judgeships are eventually created in the counties that have grown more quickly, additional funds would be needed.

A critical feature of the proposed new model is that it assumes as a starting point that all courts will have their funding locked in at least the current level. That is, under this model no court will take any further reduction below its FY 16-17 funding except in the event of a reduction to the Judicial Branch budget as a whole. This aspect of the model immediately eliminates one of the primary criticisms of WAFM, namely that it pits trial courts against one another by continually taking money from some courts and giving it to others.

Then, from the aspirational starting point of either \$1.2 or \$1.25 million per judge, the model uses a metric called the Population to Judge (PTJ) ratio as a way to increase or decrease each individual court's specific target number. That is, the more a court deviates above or below the statewide average of one judge per 23,000 people, the more its target funding per judge will vary. Thus, courts in counties with large populations but fewer judges would need more funding than courts in less populous counties where there are already sufficient judges.

As new money comes into the Branch, it is allocated to the courts based on their target funding-per-judge that results from the application of the PTJ ratio. Notably, with the minimal funding target of \$1.2 million per Judge, 46 courts will see their allocations increase as we approach that average, while the other 12 will remain constant until all courts have reached the same level of equity; again, no court will see any level of decrease. Alternatively, with the minimal funding baseline at \$1.25 million, only 9 courts would be held constant until the other 49 courts reached the same level of equity. Then, once we get to the overall minimum target funding for the entire Branch (approximately \$244 million or \$321 million), all 58 courts would thereafter gain or lose together at the same percentage, e.g., if the trial courts get a 5% increase, all 58 courts would see a 5% increase in their budget, while if there is a 5% cut, all would see a 5% cut.

## **B. Advantages**

### **1. Absolutely transparent**

This proposed methodology is based on readily available facts that are clear to everyone: population and judgeships. As a result, everyone can see the factors that control funding for everyone else. It is easy to understand, which makes it easy to explain and thus easy to message in our budget advocacy with the Governor, the Department of Finance and the Legislature.

### **2. Stable and predictable**

Although we are about to enter the fourth quarter of this fiscal year, none of us know with any degree of certainty what our budget will be for the next fiscal year. Twelve of our twenty-five donor courts had the experience of learning in June 2016 that effective July 2016 they were no longer recipient courts. Thirty-five of our courts have been a donor court at least once in the four years of WAFM. Many of us have been cut repeatedly.

The uncertainty inherent in WAFM comes from the fact that it is, at heart, a relative system that allows for annual reductions to some, but not all, courts. Any individual court's

filings do not matter except in relationship to the other 57 courts' numbers. Thus, even where a court is certain of its own data—and even if that data shows that that court's filings are up—the court cannot confidently predict that it will be a recipient court because it is unable to know what the data from its colleagues will show.

Under the PTJ methodology we would all know that absent a smaller overall trial court budget from the Governor, none of us would face cuts. Thus, if we were using PTJ now, with a flat budget being proposed, we would all get the same allocation as we had for FY 2016-17. In this scenario, although we would have to deal with absorbing unfunded new workloads and shrinking civil assessments, no one would also have to absorb an additional reduction in total dollars allocated.

### **3. Easy to administer**

Administering WAFM is a most difficult task. Every county seems to do things a bit differently from others. These local differences often influence filings practices. Courts also have divergent data reporting systems. As discussed above, the JBSIS Manual is confusing, subject to interpretation and outdated. The RAS model is not a user friendly tool. Efforts to address these shortcomings by making the JBSIS data reporting process uniform across the trial courts will require auditing of all 58 courts, which the Judicial Council has said will take four years to complete.

The PTJ model would require no auditing. It is straightforward to administer. It is able to capture the differences in resources from county to county, and adjust funding up or down, without being dependent on successfully measuring “apples to apples” in filings.

### **4. Fair**

Because it is based on such basic data, the PTJ model is fair to all. Arguments amongst trial courts about share of funding will be eliminated. If we agree to implement this methodology, each trial court will always know what their share is by simply multiplying the statewide funding per judge number by the number of judges on their bench, and then adding steps ups or downs based on the population factor.

Further, each court will be able to see what every other court's share is under the formula. Similarly, the Governor, the Department of Finance, the Legislature, the Bar and the public will also all be able to see that we are using a transparent, rational system that equitably allocates money.

### **5. Leads to many winners and no losers**

Under WAFM there are many “losers” in the budget allocation each year; they are grouped by region and by size, and they are suffering compounded harm from consecutive years of losing. In FY 16-17, 25 courts were designated as donor courts. These courts all lost money from their respective previous year’s budgets. Half of the 25 donor courts were donors for two or more years in a row. Most of the donor courts are in Northern California, and most have fewer than 20 judges.

Under the PTJ methodology, we eliminate the cuts and thus immediately stop any court from “losing.” While a much smaller number of courts would be frozen at their current funding level for a period, no one would be reduced.

Moreover, under the \$1.2 million baseline scenario, keeping 12 courts from gaining for a limited time is a far better outcome than cutting funding from 25 courts. Under the PTJ model, 46 courts will continue to gain until we reach the target level of \$243 million more in trial court funding. Forty-six courts gaining in the short term is better than the 33 courts that gained under WAFM this year. It is even better for all in the \$1.25 million scenario: only 9 courts are held constant while 49 courts gain immediately until we reach the target level of \$321 million more in Judicial Branch funding.

## **6. Allows us to return to speaking with a united voice**

As noted at the very outset, perhaps the most important benefit of the PTJ proposal is that it will unify the trial courts in terms of their individual funding interests. Once the target funding number is achieved, all courts will have exactly the same interest. If we advocate for a 5% budget increase for the coming fiscal year, we will all know that we are working for a 5% increase for ourselves as well as everyone else. In contrast, under WAFM we first advocate for more funding from the Governor, the Legislature, and the DOF, and then we cannibalize ourselves by the selection of donors and recipients.

## **IV. CONCLUSION**

Our court has spent a significant amount of time working with our consultant to develop the PTJ model, and we believe it to be a sound and superior model for all of the reasons detailed above. We acknowledge, however, that there may be other potential alternatives to WAFM that would also accomplish the goals served by the PTJ model. We hope that you will join us in working to find a methodology that is better for all of our courts, north and south, large and small, be that the PTJ model or some other methodology.

### Overview of Versions of Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology

Version	Description	Notes
2.2.1	Target funding per judge (before population-based adjustments) is \$1.20 million.	12 courts would not be eligible for additional funding because current funding per judge exceeds target.
	Reduces funding per judge by \$200,000 for each 5,000 below statewide PTJ ratio; increases funding by \$200,000 per judge for each 5,000 above statewide ratio.	Population-based adjustments result in 28 courts having the target allocation of \$1.20 million per judge; 30 courts would receive adjustments based on the difference between their PTJ ratio and the statewide ratio.
	The lowest allocation per judge is \$400,000 and highest is \$1,600,000 based on PTJ adjustments alone, so there is no need to establish a funding floor or ceiling.	
2.2.2	Target funding per judge (before population-based adjustments) is \$1.25 million.	9 courts would not be eligible for additional funding because current funding per judge exceeds target.
	Reduces funding per judge by \$200,000 for each 5,000 below statewide PTJ ratio; increases funding by \$200,000 per judge for each 5,000 above statewide ratio.	Population-based adjustments result in 28 courts having the target allocation of \$1.25 million per judge; 30 courts would receive adjustments based on the difference between their PTJ ratio and the statewide ratio (same as Version 2.2.1).
	Funding floor is set at \$400,000 per judge.	



Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.1 Calculations

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio)	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target	Share of Future Funding Increase
Alameda	75	1,637,712	21,836	-1,800	0	\$ 74,361,761	\$ 991,490	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 15,638,239	6.4%
Alpine	2	1,148	574	-23,062	-20,000	\$ 761,868	\$ 380,934	\$ 400,000	1	\$ 38,132	0.0%
Amador	2	37,191	18,596	-5,041	-5,000	\$ 2,229,591	\$ 1,114,796	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Butte	11	225,125	20,466	-3,170	0	\$ 9,819,514	\$ 892,683	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,380,486	1.4%
Calaveras	2	44,791	22,396	-1,241	0	\$ 2,070,810	\$ 1,035,405	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 329,190	0.1%
Colusa	2	22,408	11,204	-12,432	-10,000	\$ 1,827,426	\$ 913,713	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Contra Costa	38	1,129,894	29,734	6,098	5,000	\$ 39,168,269	\$ 1,030,744	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 14,031,731	5.8%
Del Norte	2	27,040	13,520	-10,116	-10,000	\$ 2,551,529	\$ 1,275,765	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
El Dorado	8	184,180	23,023	-614	0	\$ 6,534,360	\$ 816,795	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,065,640	1.3%
Fresno	43	989,183	23,004	-632	0	\$ 47,581,138	\$ 1,106,538	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 4,018,862	1.6%
Glenn	2	29,073	14,537	-9,100	-5,000	\$ 1,823,674	\$ 911,837	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 176,326	0.1%
Humboldt	7	136,086	19,441	-4,195	0	\$ 6,122,570	\$ 874,653	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 2,277,430	0.9%
Imperial	10	187,157	18,716	-4,921	0	\$ 8,393,271	\$ 839,327	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,606,729	1.5%
Inyo	2	18,649	9,325	-14,312	-10,000	\$ 1,981,016	\$ 990,508	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Kern	36	888,994	24,694	1,058	0	\$ 44,815,686	\$ 1,244,880	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Kings	7	149,407	21,344	-2,292	0	\$ 6,709,550	\$ 958,507	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 1,690,450	0.7%
Lake	4	65,128	16,282	-7,354	-5,000	\$ 3,285,533	\$ 821,383	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 714,467	0.3%
Lassen	2	30,645	15,323	-8,314	-5,000	\$ 2,229,555	\$ 1,114,778	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Los Angeles	482	10,229,245	21,223	-2,414	0	\$ 526,746,818	\$ 1,092,836	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 51,653,182	21.2%
Madera	9	155,693	17,299	-6,337	-5,000	\$ 7,439,899	\$ 826,655	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 1,560,101	0.6%
Marin	12	263,257	21,938	-1,698	0	\$ 11,637,569	\$ 969,797	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 2,762,431	1.1%
Mariposa	2	18,055	9,028	-14,609	-10,000	\$ 1,121,360	\$ 560,680	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 478,640	0.2%
Mendocino	8	88,995	11,124	-12,512	-10,000	\$ 5,186,547	\$ 648,318	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 1,213,453	0.5%
Merced	10	272,610	27,261	3,625	0	\$ 11,662,608	\$ 1,166,261	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 337,392	0.1%
Modoc	2	9,469	4,735	-18,902	-15,000	\$ 869,535	\$ 434,768	\$ 600,000	1	\$ 330,465	0.1%
Mono	2	13,785	6,893	-16,744	-15,000	\$ 1,694,064	\$ 847,032	\$ 600,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Monterey	19	441,129	23,217	-419	0	\$ 16,940,338	\$ 891,597	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 5,859,662	2.4%
Napa	6	142,269	23,712	75	0	\$ 7,275,363	\$ 1,212,561	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Nevada	6	98,552	16,425	-7,211	-5,000	\$ 4,765,463	\$ 794,244	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 1,234,537	0.5%
Orange	124	3,181,371	25,656	2,020	0	\$ 137,667,970	\$ 1,110,226	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 11,132,030	4.6%
Placer	10	376,092	37,609	13,973	10,000	\$ 15,158,642	\$ 1,515,864	\$ 1,600,000	1	\$ 841,358	0.3%
Plumas	2	19,494	9,747	-13,889	-10,000	\$ 1,223,258	\$ 611,629	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 376,742	0.2%
Riverside	62	2,360,727	38,076	14,440	10,000	\$ 81,384,228	\$ 1,312,649	\$ 1,600,000	1	\$ 17,815,772	7.3%
Sacramento	62	1,506,677	24,301	665	0	\$ 74,734,715	\$ 1,205,399	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
San Benito	2	58,014	29,007	5,371	5,000	\$ 2,317,183	\$ 1,158,592	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 482,817	0.2%
San Bernardino	71	2,147,933	30,253	6,616	5,000	\$ 91,271,109	\$ 1,285,509	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 8,128,891	3.3%
San Diego	132	3,300,891	25,007	1,370	0	\$ 132,199,425	\$ 1,001,511	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 26,200,575	10.8%



Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.2 Calculations

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target	Share of Future Funding Increase
								(+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio; \$400,000 floor)			
Alameda	75	1,637,712	21,836	-1,800	0	\$ 74,361,761	\$ 991,490	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 19,388,239	6.0%
Alpine	2	1,148	574	-23,062	-20,000	\$ 761,868	\$ 380,934	\$ 400,000	1	\$ 38,132	0.0%
Amador	2	37,191	18,596	-5,041	-5,000	\$ 2,229,591	\$ 1,114,796	\$ 1,050,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Butte	11	225,125	20,466	-3,170	0	\$ 9,819,514	\$ 892,683	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,930,486	1.2%
Calaveras	2	44,791	22,396	-1,241	0	\$ 2,070,810	\$ 1,035,405	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 429,190	0.1%
Colusa	2	22,408	11,204	-12,432	-10,000	\$ 1,827,426	\$ 913,713	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Contra Costa	38	1,129,894	29,734	6,098	5,000	\$ 39,168,269	\$ 1,030,744	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 15,931,731	5.0%
Del Norte	2	27,040	13,520	-10,116	-10,000	\$ 2,551,529	\$ 1,275,765	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
El Dorado	8	184,180	23,023	-614	0	\$ 6,534,360	\$ 816,795	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,465,640	1.1%
Fresno	43	989,183	23,004	-632	0	\$ 47,581,138	\$ 1,106,538	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 6,168,862	1.9%
Glenn	2	29,073	14,537	-9,100	-5,000	\$ 1,823,674	\$ 911,837	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 276,326	0.1%
Humboldt	7	136,086	19,441	-4,195	0	\$ 6,122,570	\$ 874,653	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,627,430	0.8%
Imperial	10	187,157	18,716	-4,921	0	\$ 8,393,271	\$ 839,327	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 4,106,729	1.3%
Inyo	2	18,649	9,325	-14,312	-10,000	\$ 1,981,016	\$ 990,508	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Kern	36	888,994	24,694	1,058	0	\$ 44,815,686	\$ 1,244,880	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 184,314	0.1%
Kings	7	149,407	21,344	-2,292	0	\$ 6,709,550	\$ 958,507	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,040,450	0.6%
Lake	4	65,128	16,282	-7,354	-5,000	\$ 3,285,533	\$ 821,383	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 914,467	0.3%
Lassen	2	30,645	15,323	-8,314	-5,000	\$ 2,229,555	\$ 1,114,778	\$ 1,050,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Los Angeles	482	10,229,245	21,223	-2,414	0	\$ 526,746,818	\$ 1,092,836	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 75,753,182	23.6%
Madera	9	155,693	17,299	-6,337	-5,000	\$ 7,439,899	\$ 826,655	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 2,010,101	0.6%
Marin	12	263,257	21,938	-1,698	0	\$ 11,637,569	\$ 969,797	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,362,431	1.0%
Mariposa	2	18,055	9,028	-14,609	-10,000	\$ 1,121,360	\$ 560,680	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 578,640	0.2%
Mendocino	8	88,995	11,124	-12,512	-10,000	\$ 5,186,547	\$ 648,318	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 1,613,453	0.5%
Merced	10	272,610	27,261	3,625	0	\$ 11,662,608	\$ 1,166,261	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 837,392	0.3%
Modoc	2	9,469	4,735	-18,902	-15,000	\$ 869,535	\$ 434,768	\$ 650,000	1	\$ 430,465	0.1%
Mono	2	13,785	6,893	-16,744	-15,000	\$ 1,694,064	\$ 847,032	\$ 650,000	0	\$ -	0.0%
Monterey	19	441,129	23,217	-419	0	\$ 16,940,338	\$ 891,597	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 6,809,662	2.1%
Napa	6	142,269	23,712	75	0	\$ 7,275,363	\$ 1,212,561	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 224,637	0.1%
Nevada	6	98,552	16,425	-7,211	-5,000	\$ 4,765,463	\$ 794,244	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 1,534,537	0.5%
Orange	124	3,181,371	25,656	2,020	0	\$ 137,667,970	\$ 1,110,226	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 17,332,030	5.4%
Placer	10	376,092	37,609	13,973	10,000	\$ 15,158,642	\$ 1,515,864	\$ 1,650,000	1	\$ 1,341,358	0.4%
Plumas	2	19,494	9,747	-13,889	-10,000	\$ 1,223,258	\$ 611,629	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 476,742	0.1%
Riverside	62	2,360,727	38,076	14,440	10,000	\$ 81,384,228	\$ 1,312,649	\$ 1,650,000	1	\$ 20,915,772	6.5%
Sacramento	62	1,506,677	24,301	665	0	\$ 74,734,715	\$ 1,205,399	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,765,285	0.9%
San Benito	2	58,014	29,007	5,371	5,000	\$ 2,317,183	\$ 1,158,592	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 582,817	0.2%
San Bernardino	71	2,147,933	30,253	6,616	5,000	\$ 91,271,109	\$ 1,285,509	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 11,678,891	3.6%



**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology:  
Comparison of County Shares of Future Funding Increases**

County	Share of Funding Augmentation	
	Version 2.2.1	Version 2.2.2
Alameda	6.4%	6.0%
Alpine	0.0%	0.0%
Amador	0.0%	0.0%
Butte	1.4%	1.2%
Calaveras	0.1%	0.1%
Colusa	0.0%	0.0%
Contra Costa	5.8%	5.0%
Del Norte	0.0%	0.0%
El Dorado	1.3%	1.1%
Fresno	1.6%	1.9%
Glenn	0.1%	0.1%
Humboldt	0.9%	0.8%
Imperial	1.5%	1.3%
Inyo	0.0%	0.0%
Kern	0.0%	0.1%
Kings	0.7%	0.6%
Lake	0.3%	0.3%
Lassen	0.0%	0.0%
Los Angeles	21.2%	23.6%
Madera	0.6%	0.6%
Marin	1.1%	1.0%
Mariposa	0.2%	0.2%
Mendocino	0.5%	0.5%
Merced	0.1%	0.3%
Modoc	0.1%	0.1%
Mono	0.0%	0.0%
Monterey	2.4%	2.1%
Napa	0.0%	0.1%
Nevada	0.5%	0.5%
Orange	4.6%	5.4%
Placer	0.3%	0.4%
Plumas	0.2%	0.1%
Riverside	7.3%	6.5%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.9%
San Benito	0.2%	0.2%
San Bernardino	3.3%	3.6%
San Diego	10.8%	10.2%
San Francisco	0.0%	0.0%
San Joaquin	1.0%	1.2%
San Luis Obispo	0.5%	0.6%
San Mateo	1.0%	1.1%
Santa Barbara	1.6%	1.5%
Santa Clara	8.3%	7.5%

**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology:  
Comparison of County Shares of Future Funding Increases**

<b>County</b>	<b>Share of Funding Augmentation</b>	
	<b>Version 2.2.1</b>	<b>Version 2.2.2</b>
Santa Cruz	0.8%	0.8%
Shasta	0.0%	0.0%
Sierra	0.0%	0.0%
Siskiyou	0.1%	0.2%
Solano	1.9%	1.7%
Sonoma	0.5%	0.7%
Stanislaus	1.9%	1.8%
Sutter	0.5%	0.5%
Tehama	0.1%	0.2%
Trinity	0.0%	0.0%
Tulare	3.0%	2.6%
Tuolumne	0.1%	0.1%
Ventura	3.0%	2.7%
Yolo	1.7%	1.5%
Yuba	0.3%	0.3%

**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.1 Calculations  
Scenario 1: \$50m Budget Cut**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio)	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target	Share of Future Funding Increase	Allocation Under Scenario 1: \$50 million Cut (2.8% of Budget)
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I	J = (H-G)*A (if I = 1)	K = J/ Statewide	L = F*97.2%
Alameda	75	1,637,712	21,836	-1,800	0	\$ 74,361,761	\$ 991,490	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 15,638,239	6.4%	\$ 72,287,540
Alpine	2	1,148	574	-23,062	-20,000	\$ 761,868	\$ 380,934	\$ 400,000	1	\$ 38,132	0.0%	\$ 740,617
Amador	2	37,191	18,596	-5,041	-5,000	\$ 2,229,591	\$ 1,114,796	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 2,167,400
Butte	11	225,125	20,466	-3,170	0	\$ 9,819,514	\$ 892,683	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,380,486	1.4%	\$ 9,545,612
Calaveras	2	44,791	22,396	-1,241	0	\$ 2,070,810	\$ 1,035,405	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 329,190	0.1%	\$ 2,013,048
Colusa	2	22,408	11,204	-12,432	-10,000	\$ 1,827,426	\$ 913,713	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,776,452
Contra Costa	38	1,129,894	29,734	6,098	5,000	\$ 39,168,269	\$ 1,030,744	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 14,031,731	5.8%	\$ 38,075,723
Del Norte	2	27,040	13,520	-10,116	-10,000	\$ 2,551,529	\$ 1,275,765	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 2,480,358
El Dorado	8	184,180	23,023	-614	0	\$ 6,534,360	\$ 816,795	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,065,640	1.3%	\$ 6,352,093
Fresno	43	989,183	23,004	-632	0	\$ 47,581,138	\$ 1,106,538	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 4,018,862	1.6%	\$ 46,253,926
Glenn	2	29,073	14,537	-9,100	-5,000	\$ 1,823,674	\$ 911,837	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 176,326	0.1%	\$ 1,772,805
Humboldt	7	136,086	19,441	-4,195	0	\$ 6,122,570	\$ 874,653	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 2,277,430	0.9%	\$ 5,951,789
Imperial	10	187,157	18,716	-4,921	0	\$ 8,393,271	\$ 839,327	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,606,729	1.5%	\$ 8,159,152
Inyo	2	18,649	9,325	-14,312	-10,000	\$ 1,981,016	\$ 990,508	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,925,758
Kern	36	888,994	24,694	1,058	0	\$ 44,815,686	\$ 1,244,880	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 43,565,613
Kings	7	149,407	21,344	-2,292	0	\$ 6,709,550	\$ 958,507	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 1,690,450	0.7%	\$ 6,522,396
Lake	4	65,128	16,282	-7,354	-5,000	\$ 3,285,533	\$ 821,383	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 714,467	0.3%	\$ 3,193,887
Lassen	2	30,645	15,323	-8,314	-5,000	\$ 2,229,555	\$ 1,114,778	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 2,167,365
Los Angeles	482	10,229,245	21,223	-2,414	0	\$ 526,746,818	\$ 1,092,836	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 51,653,182	21.2%	\$ 512,053,925
Madera	9	155,693	17,299	-6,337	-5,000	\$ 7,439,899	\$ 826,655	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 1,560,101	0.6%	\$ 7,232,373
Marin	12	263,257	21,938	-1,698	0	\$ 11,637,569	\$ 969,797	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 2,762,431	1.1%	\$ 11,312,955
Mariposa	2	18,055	9,028	-14,609	-10,000	\$ 1,121,360	\$ 560,680	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 478,640	0.2%	\$ 1,090,081
Mendocino	8	88,995	11,124	-12,512	-10,000	\$ 5,186,547	\$ 648,318	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 1,213,453	0.5%	\$ 5,041,875
Merced	10	272,610	27,261	3,625	0	\$ 11,662,608	\$ 1,166,261	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 337,392	0.1%	\$ 11,337,295
Modoc	2	9,469	4,735	-18,902	-15,000	\$ 869,535	\$ 434,768	\$ 600,000	1	\$ 330,465	0.1%	\$ 845,280
Mono	2	13,785	6,893	-16,744	-15,000	\$ 1,694,064	\$ 847,032	\$ 600,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,646,810
Monterey	19	441,129	23,217	-419	0	\$ 16,940,338	\$ 891,597	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 5,859,662	2.4%	\$ 16,467,810
Napa	6	142,269	23,712	75	0	\$ 7,275,363	\$ 1,212,561	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 7,072,427
Nevada	6	98,552	16,425	-7,211	-5,000	\$ 4,765,463	\$ 794,244	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 1,234,537	0.5%	\$ 4,632,537
Orange	124	3,181,371	25,656	2,020	0	\$ 137,667,970	\$ 1,110,226	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 11,132,030	4.6%	\$ 133,827,907
Placer	10	376,092	37,609	13,973	10,000	\$ 15,158,642	\$ 1,515,864	\$ 1,600,000	1	\$ 841,358	0.3%	\$ 14,735,812
Plumas	2	19,494	9,747	-13,889	-10,000	\$ 1,223,258	\$ 611,629	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 376,742	0.2%	\$ 1,189,137
Riverside	62	2,360,727	38,076	14,440	10,000	\$ 81,384,228	\$ 1,312,649	\$ 1,600,000	1	\$ 17,815,772	7.3%	\$ 79,114,125
Sacramento	62	1,506,677	24,301	665	0	\$ 74,734,715	\$ 1,205,399	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 72,650,091
San Benito	2	58,014	29,007	5,371	5,000	\$ 2,317,183	\$ 1,158,592	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 482,817	0.2%	\$ 2,252,548
San Bernardino	71	2,147,933	30,253	6,616	5,000	\$ 91,271,109	\$ 1,285,509	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 8,128,891	3.3%	\$ 88,725,224
San Diego	132	3,300,891	25,007	1,370	0	\$ 132,199,425	\$ 1,001,511	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 26,200,575	10.8%	\$ 128,511,900
San Francisco	52	871,185	16,754	-6,883	-5,000	\$ 57,328,605	\$ 1,102,473	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 55,729,501





**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.2 Calculations  
Scenario 1: \$50m Budget Cut**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio; \$400,000 floor)	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target	Share of Future Funding Increase	Allocation Under Scenario 1: \$50 million Cut (2.8% of Budget)
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I	J = (H-G)*A (if I = 1)	K = J/ Statewide	L = F*97.2%
Alameda	75	1,637,712	21,836	-1,800	0	\$ 74,361,761	\$ 991,490	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 19,388,239	6.0%	\$ 72,287,540
Alpine	2	1,148	574	-23,062	-20,000	\$ 761,868	\$ 380,934	\$ 400,000	1	\$ 38,132	0.0%	\$ 740,617
Amador	2	37,191	18,596	-5,041	-5,000	\$ 2,229,591	\$ 1,114,796	\$ 1,050,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 2,167,400
Butte	11	225,125	20,466	-3,170	0	\$ 9,819,514	\$ 892,683	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,930,486	1.2%	\$ 9,545,612
Calaveras	2	44,791	22,396	-1,241	0	\$ 2,070,810	\$ 1,035,405	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 429,190	0.1%	\$ 2,013,048
Colusa	2	22,408	11,204	-12,432	-10,000	\$ 1,827,426	\$ 913,713	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,776,452
Contra Costa	38	1,129,894	29,734	6,098	5,000	\$ 39,168,269	\$ 1,030,744	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 15,931,731	5.0%	\$ 38,075,723
Del Norte	2	27,040	13,520	-10,116	-10,000	\$ 2,551,529	\$ 1,275,765	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 2,480,358
El Dorado	8	184,180	23,023	-614	0	\$ 6,534,360	\$ 816,795	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,465,640	1.1%	\$ 6,352,093
Fresno	43	989,183	23,004	-632	0	\$ 47,581,138	\$ 1,106,538	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 6,168,862	1.9%	\$ 46,253,926
Glenn	2	29,073	14,537	-9,100	-5,000	\$ 1,823,674	\$ 911,837	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 276,326	0.1%	\$ 1,772,805
Humboldt	7	136,086	19,441	-4,195	0	\$ 6,122,570	\$ 874,653	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,627,430	0.8%	\$ 5,951,789
Imperial	10	187,157	18,716	-4,921	0	\$ 8,393,271	\$ 839,327	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 4,106,729	1.3%	\$ 8,159,152
Inyo	2	18,649	9,325	-14,312	-10,000	\$ 1,981,016	\$ 990,508	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,925,758
Kern	36	888,994	24,694	1,058	0	\$ 44,815,686	\$ 1,244,880	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 184,314	0.1%	\$ 43,565,613
Kings	7	149,407	21,344	-2,292	0	\$ 6,709,550	\$ 958,507	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,040,450	0.6%	\$ 6,522,396
Lake	4	65,128	16,282	-7,354	-5,000	\$ 3,285,533	\$ 821,383	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 914,467	0.3%	\$ 3,193,887
Lassen	2	30,645	15,323	-8,314	-5,000	\$ 2,229,555	\$ 1,114,778	\$ 1,050,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 2,167,365
Los Angeles	482	10,229,245	21,223	-2,414	0	\$ 526,746,818	\$ 1,092,836	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 75,753,182	23.6%	\$ 512,053,925
Madera	9	155,693	17,299	-6,337	-5,000	\$ 7,439,899	\$ 826,655	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 2,010,101	0.6%	\$ 7,232,373
Marin	12	263,257	21,938	-1,698	0	\$ 11,637,569	\$ 969,797	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,362,431	1.0%	\$ 11,312,955
Mariposa	2	18,055	9,028	-14,609	-10,000	\$ 1,121,360	\$ 560,680	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 578,640	0.2%	\$ 1,090,081
Mendocino	8	88,995	11,124	-12,512	-10,000	\$ 5,186,547	\$ 648,318	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 1,613,453	0.5%	\$ 5,041,875
Merced	10	272,610	27,261	3,625	0	\$ 11,662,608	\$ 1,166,261	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 837,392	0.3%	\$ 11,337,295
Modoc	2	9,469	4,735	-18,902	-15,000	\$ 869,535	\$ 434,768	\$ 650,000	1	\$ 430,465	0.1%	\$ 845,280
Mono	2	13,785	6,893	-16,744	-15,000	\$ 1,694,064	\$ 847,032	\$ 650,000	0	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,646,810
Monterey	19	441,129	23,217	-419	0	\$ 16,940,338	\$ 891,597	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 6,809,662	2.1%	\$ 16,467,810
Napa	6	142,269	23,712	75	0	\$ 7,275,363	\$ 1,212,561	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 224,637	0.1%	\$ 7,072,427
Nevada	6	98,552	16,425	-7,211	-5,000	\$ 4,765,463	\$ 794,244	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 1,534,537	0.5%	\$ 4,632,537
Orange	124	3,181,371	25,656	2,020	0	\$ 137,667,970	\$ 1,110,226	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 17,332,030	5.4%	\$ 133,827,907
Placer	10	376,092	37,609	13,973	10,000	\$ 15,158,642	\$ 1,515,864	\$ 1,650,000	1	\$ 1,341,358	0.4%	\$ 14,735,812
Plumas	2	19,494	9,747	-13,889	-10,000	\$ 1,223,258	\$ 611,629	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 476,742	0.1%	\$ 1,189,137
Riverside	62	2,360,727	38,076	14,440	10,000	\$ 81,384,228	\$ 1,312,649	\$ 1,650,000	1	\$ 20,915,772	6.5%	\$ 79,114,125
Sacramento	62	1,506,677	24,301	665	0	\$ 74,734,715	\$ 1,205,399	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,765,285	0.9%	\$ 72,650,091
San Benito	2	58,014	29,007	5,371	5,000	\$ 2,317,183	\$ 1,158,592	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 582,817	0.2%	\$ 2,252,548
San Bernardino	71	2,147,933	30,253	6,616	5,000	\$ 91,271,109	\$ 1,285,509	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 11,678,891	3.6%	\$ 88,725,224
San Diego	132	3,300,891	25,007	1,370	0	\$ 132,199,425	\$ 1,001,511	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 32,800,575	10.2%	\$ 128,511,900



**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.1 Calculations**  
**Scenario 2: \$50m Budget Increase**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio)	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I	J = (H-G)*A (if I = 1)
Alameda	75	1,637,712	21,836	-1,800	0	\$ 74,361,761	\$ 991,490	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 15,638,239
Alpine	2	1,148	574	-23,062	-20,000	\$ 761,868	\$ 380,934	\$ 400,000	1	\$ 38,132
Amador	2	37,191	18,596	-5,041	-5,000	\$ 2,229,591	\$ 1,114,796	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -
Butte	11	225,125	20,466	-3,170	0	\$ 9,819,514	\$ 892,683	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,380,486
Calaveras	2	44,791	22,396	-1,241	0	\$ 2,070,810	\$ 1,035,405	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 329,190
Colusa	2	22,408	11,204	-12,432	-10,000	\$ 1,827,426	\$ 913,713	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -
Contra Costa	38	1,129,894	29,734	6,098	5,000	\$ 39,168,269	\$ 1,030,744	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 14,031,731
Del Norte	2	27,040	13,520	-10,116	-10,000	\$ 2,551,529	\$ 1,275,765	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -
El Dorado	8	184,180	23,023	-614	0	\$ 6,534,360	\$ 816,795	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,065,640
Fresno	43	989,183	23,004	-632	0	\$ 47,581,138	\$ 1,106,538	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 4,018,862
Glenn	2	29,073	14,537	-9,100	-5,000	\$ 1,823,674	\$ 911,837	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 176,326
Humboldt	7	136,086	19,441	-4,195	0	\$ 6,122,570	\$ 874,653	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 2,277,430
Imperial	10	187,157	18,716	-4,921	0	\$ 8,393,271	\$ 839,327	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,606,729
Inyo	2	18,649	9,325	-14,312	-10,000	\$ 1,981,016	\$ 990,508	\$ 800,000	0	\$ -
Kern	36	888,994	24,694	1,058	0	\$ 44,815,686	\$ 1,244,880	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -
Kings	7	149,407	21,344	-2,292	0	\$ 6,709,550	\$ 958,507	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 1,690,450
Lake	4	65,128	16,282	-7,354	-5,000	\$ 3,285,533	\$ 821,383	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 714,467
Lassen	2	30,645	15,323	-8,314	-5,000	\$ 2,229,555	\$ 1,114,778	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -
Los Angeles	482	10,229,245	21,223	-2,414	0	\$ 526,746,818	\$ 1,092,836	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 51,653,182
Madera	9	155,693	17,299	-6,337	-5,000	\$ 7,439,899	\$ 826,655	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 1,560,101
Marin	12	263,257	21,938	-1,698	0	\$ 11,637,569	\$ 969,797	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 2,762,431
Mariposa	2	18,055	9,028	-14,609	-10,000	\$ 1,121,360	\$ 560,680	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 478,640
Mendocino	8	88,995	11,124	-12,512	-10,000	\$ 5,186,547	\$ 648,318	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 1,213,453
Merced	10	272,610	27,261	3,625	0	\$ 11,662,608	\$ 1,166,261	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 337,392
Modoc	2	9,469	4,735	-18,902	-15,000	\$ 869,535	\$ 434,768	\$ 600,000	1	\$ 330,465
Mono	2	13,785	6,893	-16,744	-15,000	\$ 1,694,064	\$ 847,032	\$ 600,000	0	\$ -
Monterey	19	441,129	23,217	-419	0	\$ 16,940,338	\$ 891,597	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 5,859,662
Napa	6	142,269	23,712	75	0	\$ 7,275,363	\$ 1,212,561	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -
Nevada	6	98,552	16,425	-7,211	-5,000	\$ 4,765,463	\$ 794,244	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 1,234,537
Orange	124	3,181,371	25,656	2,020	0	\$ 137,667,970	\$ 1,110,226	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 11,132,030
Placer	10	376,092	37,609	13,973	10,000	\$ 15,158,642	\$ 1,515,864	\$ 1,600,000	1	\$ 841,358
Plumas	2	19,494	9,747	-13,889	-10,000	\$ 1,223,258	\$ 611,629	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 376,742
Riverside	62	2,360,727	38,076	14,440	10,000	\$ 81,384,228	\$ 1,312,649	\$ 1,600,000	1	\$ 17,815,772
Sacramento	62	1,506,677	24,301	665	0	\$ 74,734,715	\$ 1,205,399	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -
San Benito	2	58,014	29,007	5,371	5,000	\$ 2,317,183	\$ 1,158,592	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 482,817
San Bernardino	71	2,147,933	30,253	6,616	5,000	\$ 91,271,109	\$ 1,285,509	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 8,128,891
San Diego	132	3,300,891	25,007	1,370	0	\$ 132,199,425	\$ 1,001,511	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 26,200,575
San Francisco	52	871,185	16,754	-6,883	-5,000	\$ 57,328,605	\$ 1,102,473	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -
San Joaquin	29	738,873	25,478	1,842	0	\$ 32,305,879	\$ 1,113,996	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 2,494,121
San Luis Obispo	12	278,917	23,243	-393	0	\$ 13,130,633	\$ 1,094,219	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 1,269,367
San Mateo	26	768,122	29,543	5,907	5,000	\$ 34,013,094	\$ 1,308,196	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 2,386,906

**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.1 Calculations**  
**Scenario 2: \$50m Budget Increase**

County	Share of Future Funding Increase	Scenario 2: \$50m Increase			
		10% Set-Aside for Discretionary Funding	Funding Available for Baseline Increase	Proportional Share of Baseline Increase	Adjusted Allocation
		K = J/ Statewide	L=\$50m*10%	M=\$50m - L	N = K*L
Alameda	6.4%	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 45,000,000	\$ 2,888,691	\$ 77,250,452
Alpine	0.0%			\$ 7,044	\$ 768,912
Amador	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 2,229,591
Butte	1.4%			\$ 624,442	\$ 10,443,956
Calaveras	0.1%			\$ 60,808	\$ 2,131,618
Colusa	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 1,827,426
Contra Costa	5.8%			\$ 2,591,937	\$ 41,760,206
Del Norte	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 2,551,529
El Dorado	1.3%			\$ 566,284	\$ 7,100,644
Fresno	1.6%			\$ 742,363	\$ 48,323,501
Glenn	0.1%			\$ 32,571	\$ 1,856,245
Humboldt	0.9%			\$ 420,686	\$ 6,543,256
Imperial	1.5%			\$ 666,234	\$ 9,059,505
Inyo	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 1,981,016
Kern	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 44,815,686
Kings	0.7%			\$ 312,259	\$ 7,021,809
Lake	0.3%			\$ 131,976	\$ 3,417,509
Lassen	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 2,229,555
Los Angeles	21.2%			\$ 9,541,360	\$ 536,288,178
Madera	0.6%			\$ 288,181	\$ 7,728,080
Marin	1.1%			\$ 510,275	\$ 12,147,844
Mariposa	0.2%			\$ 88,414	\$ 1,209,774
Mendocino	0.5%			\$ 224,149	\$ 5,410,696
Merced	0.1%			\$ 62,323	\$ 11,724,931
Modoc	0.1%			\$ 61,043	\$ 930,578
Mono	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 1,694,064
Monterey	2.4%			\$ 1,082,395	\$ 18,022,733
Napa	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 7,275,363
Nevada	0.5%			\$ 228,043	\$ 4,993,506
Orange	4.6%			\$ 2,056,305	\$ 139,724,275
Placer	0.3%			\$ 155,415	\$ 15,314,057
Plumas	0.2%			\$ 69,592	\$ 1,292,850
Riverside	7.3%			\$ 3,290,924	\$ 84,675,152
Sacramento	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 74,734,715
San Benito	0.2%			\$ 89,186	\$ 2,406,369
San Bernardino	3.3%			\$ 1,501,566	\$ 92,772,675
San Diego	10.8%			\$ 4,839,762	\$ 137,039,187
San Francisco	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 57,328,605
San Joaquin	1.0%			\$ 460,713	\$ 32,766,592
San Luis Obispo	0.5%			\$ 234,477	\$ 13,365,110
San Mateo	1.0%			\$ 440,909	\$ 34,454,003

**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.1 Calculations**  
**Scenario 2: \$50m Budget Increase**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio)	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I	J = (H-G)*A (if I = 1)
Santa Barbara	21	448,353	21,350	-2,286	0	\$ 21,414,352	\$ 1,019,731	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 3,785,648
Santa Clara	79	1,930,215	24,433	797	0	\$ 74,696,114	\$ 945,520	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 20,103,886
Santa Cruz	11	276,249	25,114	1,477	0	\$ 11,341,315	\$ 1,031,029	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 1,858,685
Shasta	10	178,208	17,821	-5,815	-5,000	\$ 12,117,394	\$ 1,211,739	\$ 1,000,000	0	\$ -
Sierra	2	3,140	1,570	-22,066	-20,000	\$ 734,148	\$ 367,074	\$ 400,000	1	\$ 65,852
Siskiyou	4	44,372	11,093	-12,543	-10,000	\$ 2,851,649	\$ 712,912	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 348,351
Solano	20	434,102	21,705	-1,931	0	\$ 19,403,166	\$ 970,158	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 4,596,834
Sonoma	20	503,953	25,198	1,561	0	\$ 22,704,148	\$ 1,135,207	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 1,295,852
Stanislaus	21	545,008	25,953	2,316	0	\$ 20,473,054	\$ 974,907	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 4,726,946
Sutter	5	98,191	19,638	-3,998	0	\$ 4,777,080	\$ 955,416	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 1,222,920
Tehama	4	64,098	16,025	-7,612	-5,000	\$ 3,642,903	\$ 910,726	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 357,097
Trinity	2	13,482	6,741	-16,895	-15,000	\$ 1,749,911	\$ 874,956	\$ 600,000	0	\$ -
Tulare	20	468,235	23,412	-225	0	\$ 16,735,224	\$ 836,761	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 7,264,776
Tuolumne	4	54,282	13,571	-10,066	-10,000	\$ 3,052,836	\$ 763,209	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 147,164
Ventura	29	854,383	29,461	5,825	5,000	\$ 33,233,084	\$ 1,145,968	\$ 1,400,000	1	\$ 7,366,916
Yolo	11	216,866	19,715	-3,921	0	\$ 8,980,462	\$ 816,406	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 4,219,538
Yuba	5	76,129	15,226	-8,410	-5,000	\$ 4,274,227	\$ 854,845	\$ 1,000,000	1	\$ 725,773
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,665</b>	<b>39,354,432</b>	<b>23,636</b>			<b>\$ 1,792,522,493</b>	<b>\$ 1,076,590</b>	<b>Weighted avg.</b>		<b>\$ 243,612,362</b>
							\$ 972,533	Median		
							\$ 967,350	Unweighted avg.		
							\$ 1,222,256	90th percentile		
<b>Data sources:</b>										
Judgeships: California Judicial Officers and Court Employees Map: <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cacourtstaff-letter.pdf">http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cacourtstaff-letter.pdf</a> .										
Population: State of California, Department of Finance, E-2. California County Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year — July 1, 2010–2016, December 2016										
FY 2016-2017 Actual Allocation: July 29, 2016 report to the Judicial Council from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, Attachment A: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations, Columns 1,6,7: <a href="https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&amp;ID=4573624&amp;GUID=801732E8-0BF0-4AA8-A4CA-4B4B12192C8E">https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&amp;ID=4573624&amp;GUID=801732E8-0BF0-4AA8-A4CA-4B4B12192C8E</a> .										



**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.2 Calculations**  
**Scenario 2: \$50m Budget Increase**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio; \$400,000 floor)	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I	J = (H-G)*A (if I = 1)
Alameda	75	1,637,712	21,836	-1,800	0	\$ 74,361,761	\$ 991,490	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 19,388,239
Alpine	2	1,148	574	-23,062	-20,000	\$ 761,868	\$ 380,934	\$ 450,000	1	\$ 138,132
Amador	2	37,191	18,596	-5,041	-5,000	\$ 2,229,591	\$ 1,114,796	\$ 1,050,000	0	\$ -
Butte	11	225,125	20,466	-3,170	0	\$ 9,819,514	\$ 892,683	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,930,486
Calaveras	2	44,791	22,396	-1,241	0	\$ 2,070,810	\$ 1,035,405	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 429,190
Colusa	2	22,408	11,204	-12,432	-10,000	\$ 1,827,426	\$ 913,713	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -
Contra Costa	38	1,129,894	29,734	6,098	5,000	\$ 39,168,269	\$ 1,030,744	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 15,931,731
Del Norte	2	27,040	13,520	-10,116	-10,000	\$ 2,551,529	\$ 1,275,765	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -
El Dorado	8	184,180	23,023	-614	0	\$ 6,534,360	\$ 816,795	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,465,640
Fresno	43	989,183	23,004	-632	0	\$ 47,581,138	\$ 1,106,538	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 6,168,862
Glenn	2	29,073	14,537	-9,100	-5,000	\$ 1,823,674	\$ 911,837	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 276,326
Humboldt	7	136,086	19,441	-4,195	0	\$ 6,122,570	\$ 874,653	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,627,430
Imperial	10	187,157	18,716	-4,921	0	\$ 8,393,271	\$ 839,327	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 4,106,729
Inyo	2	18,649	9,325	-14,312	-10,000	\$ 1,981,016	\$ 990,508	\$ 850,000	0	\$ -
Kern	36	888,994	24,694	1,058	0	\$ 44,815,686	\$ 1,244,880	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 184,314
Kings	7	149,407	21,344	-2,292	0	\$ 6,709,550	\$ 958,507	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,040,450
Lake	4	65,128	16,282	-7,354	-5,000	\$ 3,285,533	\$ 821,383	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 914,467
Lassen	2	30,645	15,323	-8,314	-5,000	\$ 2,229,555	\$ 1,114,778	\$ 1,050,000	0	\$ -
Los Angeles	482	10,229,245	21,223	-2,414	0	\$ 526,746,818	\$ 1,092,836	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 75,753,182
Madera	9	155,693	17,299	-6,337	-5,000	\$ 7,439,899	\$ 826,655	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 2,010,101
Marin	12	263,257	21,938	-1,698	0	\$ 11,637,569	\$ 969,797	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,362,431
Mariposa	2	18,055	9,028	-14,609	-10,000	\$ 1,121,360	\$ 560,680	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 578,640
Mendocino	8	88,995	11,124	-12,512	-10,000	\$ 5,186,547	\$ 648,318	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 1,613,453
Merced	10	272,610	27,261	3,625	0	\$ 11,662,608	\$ 1,166,261	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 837,392
Modoc	2	9,469	4,735	-18,902	-15,000	\$ 869,535	\$ 434,768	\$ 650,000	1	\$ 430,465
Mono	2	13,785	6,893	-16,744	-15,000	\$ 1,694,064	\$ 847,032	\$ 650,000	0	\$ -
Monterey	19	441,129	23,217	-419	0	\$ 16,940,338	\$ 891,597	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 6,809,662
Napa	6	142,269	23,712	75	0	\$ 7,275,363	\$ 1,212,561	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 224,637
Nevada	6	98,552	16,425	-7,211	-5,000	\$ 4,765,463	\$ 794,244	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 1,534,537
Orange	124	3,181,371	25,656	2,020	0	\$ 137,667,970	\$ 1,110,226	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 17,332,030
Placer	10	376,092	37,609	13,973	10,000	\$ 15,158,642	\$ 1,515,864	\$ 1,650,000	1	\$ 1,341,358
Plumas	2	19,494	9,747	-13,889	-10,000	\$ 1,223,258	\$ 611,629	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 476,742
Riverside	62	2,360,727	38,076	14,440	10,000	\$ 81,384,228	\$ 1,312,649	\$ 1,650,000	1	\$ 20,915,772
Sacramento	62	1,506,677	24,301	665	0	\$ 74,734,715	\$ 1,205,399	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,765,285
San Benito	2	58,014	29,007	5,371	5,000	\$ 2,317,183	\$ 1,158,592	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 582,817
San Bernardino	71	2,147,933	30,253	6,616	5,000	\$ 91,271,109	\$ 1,285,509	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 11,678,891
San Diego	132	3,300,891	25,007	1,370	0	\$ 132,199,425	\$ 1,001,511	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 32,800,575
San Francisco	52	871,185	16,754	-6,883	-5,000	\$ 57,328,605	\$ 1,102,473	\$ 1,050,000	0	\$ -
San Joaquin	29	738,873	25,478	1,842	0	\$ 32,305,879	\$ 1,113,996	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 3,944,121
San Luis Obispo	12	278,917	23,243	-393	0	\$ 13,130,633	\$ 1,094,219	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 1,869,367
San Mateo	26	768,122	29,543	5,907	5,000	\$ 34,013,094	\$ 1,308,196	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 3,686,906

**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.2 Calculations**  
**Scenario 2: \$50m Budget Increase**

County	Share of Future Funding Increase	Scenario 2: \$50m Increase			
		10% Set-Aside for Discretionary Funding	Funding Available for Baseline Increase	Proportional Share of Baseline Increase	Adjusted Allocation
		K = J/ Statewide	L=\$50m*10%	M=\$50m - L	N = K*L
Alameda	6.0%	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 45,000,000	\$ 2,717,668	\$ 77,079,429
Alpine	0.0%			\$ 19,362	\$ 781,230
Amador	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 2,229,591
Butte	1.2%			\$ 550,940	\$ 10,370,454
Calaveras	0.1%			\$ 60,160	\$ 2,130,970
Colusa	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 1,827,426
Contra Costa	5.0%			\$ 2,233,166	\$ 41,401,435
Del Norte	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 2,551,529
El Dorado	1.1%			\$ 485,782	\$ 7,020,142
Fresno	1.9%			\$ 864,695	\$ 48,445,833
Glenn	0.1%			\$ 38,733	\$ 1,862,407
Humboldt	0.8%			\$ 368,289	\$ 6,490,859
Imperial	1.3%			\$ 575,644	\$ 8,968,915
Inyo	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 1,981,016
Kern	0.1%			\$ 25,835	\$ 44,841,521
Kings	0.6%			\$ 286,012	\$ 6,995,562
Lake	0.3%			\$ 128,182	\$ 3,413,715
Lassen	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 2,229,555
Los Angeles	23.6%			\$ 10,618,394	\$ 537,365,212
Madera	0.6%			\$ 281,758	\$ 7,721,657
Marin	1.0%			\$ 471,315	\$ 12,108,884
Mariposa	0.2%			\$ 81,109	\$ 1,202,469
Mendocino	0.5%			\$ 226,159	\$ 5,412,706
Merced	0.3%			\$ 117,378	\$ 11,779,986
Modoc	0.1%			\$ 60,339	\$ 929,874
Mono	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 1,694,064
Monterey	2.1%			\$ 954,517	\$ 17,894,855
Napa	0.1%			\$ 31,488	\$ 7,306,851
Nevada	0.5%			\$ 215,097	\$ 4,980,560
Orange	5.4%			\$ 2,429,447	\$ 140,097,417
Placer	0.4%			\$ 188,019	\$ 15,346,661
Plumas	0.1%			\$ 66,825	\$ 1,290,083
Riverside	6.5%			\$ 2,931,783	\$ 84,316,011
Sacramento	0.9%			\$ 387,613	\$ 75,122,328
San Benito	0.2%			\$ 81,694	\$ 2,398,877
San Bernardino	3.6%			\$ 1,637,041	\$ 92,908,150
San Diego	10.2%			\$ 4,597,687	\$ 136,797,112
San Francisco	0.0%			\$ -	\$ 57,328,605
San Joaquin	1.2%			\$ 552,851	\$ 32,858,730
San Luis Obispo	0.6%			\$ 262,031	\$ 13,392,664
San Mateo	1.1%			\$ 516,797	\$ 34,529,891



**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.2 Calculations**  
**Scenario 2: \$50m Budget Increase**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio; \$400,000 floor)	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I	J = (H-G)*A (if I = 1)
Santa Barbara	21	448,353	21,350	-2,286	0	\$ 21,414,352	\$ 1,019,731	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 4,835,648
Santa Clara	79	1,930,215	24,433	797	0	\$ 74,696,114	\$ 945,520	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 24,053,886
Santa Cruz	11	276,249	25,114	1,477	0	\$ 11,341,315	\$ 1,031,029	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,408,685
Shasta	10	178,208	17,821	-5,815	-5,000	\$ 12,117,394	\$ 1,211,739	\$ 1,050,000	0	\$ -
Sierra	2	3,140	1,570	-22,066	-20,000	\$ 734,148	\$ 367,074	\$ 450,000	1	\$ 165,852
Siskiyou	4	44,372	11,093	-12,543	-10,000	\$ 2,851,649	\$ 712,912	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 548,351
Solano	20	434,102	21,705	-1,931	0	\$ 19,403,166	\$ 970,158	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 5,596,834
Sonoma	20	503,953	25,198	1,561	0	\$ 22,704,148	\$ 1,135,207	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 2,295,852
Stanislaus	21	545,008	25,953	2,316	0	\$ 20,473,054	\$ 974,907	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 5,776,946
Sutter	5	98,191	19,638	-3,998	0	\$ 4,777,080	\$ 955,416	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 1,472,920
Tehama	4	64,098	16,025	-7,612	-5,000	\$ 3,642,903	\$ 910,726	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 557,097
Trinity	2	13,482	6,741	-16,895	-15,000	\$ 1,749,911	\$ 874,956	\$ 650,000	0	\$ -
Tulare	20	468,235	23,412	-225	0	\$ 16,735,224	\$ 836,761	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 8,264,776
Tuolumne	4	54,282	13,571	-10,066	-10,000	\$ 3,052,836	\$ 763,209	\$ 850,000	1	\$ 347,164
Ventura	29	854,383	29,461	5,825	5,000	\$ 33,233,084	\$ 1,145,968	\$ 1,450,000	1	\$ 8,816,916
Yolo	11	216,866	19,715	-3,921	0	\$ 8,980,462	\$ 816,406	\$ 1,250,000	1	\$ 4,769,538
Yuba	5	76,129	15,226	-8,410	-5,000	\$ 4,274,227	\$ 854,845	\$ 1,050,000	1	\$ 975,773
Total	1,665	39,354,432	23,636			\$ 1,792,522,493	\$ 1,076,590	Weighted avg.		\$ 321,036,598
							\$ 972,533	Median		
							\$ 967,350	Unweighted avg.		
							\$ 1,222,256	90th percentile		
<b>Data sources:</b>										
Judgeships: California Judicial Officers and Court Employees Map: <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cacourtstaff-letter.pdf">http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cacourtstaff-letter.pdf</a> .										
Population: State of California, Department of Finance, E-2. California County Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year — July 1, 2010–2016, December 2016										
FY 2016-2017 Actual Allocation: July 29, 2016 report to the Judicial Council from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, Attachment A: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations, Columns 1,6,7: <a href="https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&amp;ID=4573624&amp;GUID=801732E8-0BF0-4AA8-A4CA-4B4B12192C8E">https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&amp;ID=4573624&amp;GUID=801732E8-0BF0-4AA8-A4CA-4B4B12192C8E</a> .										



**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.1 Calculations**  
**Scenario 3: \$375m Budget Increase**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio)	Total Target Funding	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I = H * A	J	K = I - F (if J = 1)
Alameda	75	1,637,712	21,836	-1,800	0	\$ 74,361,761	\$ 991,490	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 90,000,000	1	\$ 15,638,239
Alpine	2	1,148	574	-23,062	-20,000	\$ 761,868	\$ 380,934	\$ 400,000	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 38,132
Amador	2	37,191	18,596	-5,041	-5,000	\$ 2,229,591	\$ 1,114,796	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	0	\$ -
Butte	11	225,125	20,466	-3,170	0	\$ 9,819,514	\$ 892,683	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 13,200,000	1	\$ 3,380,486
Calaveras	2	44,791	22,396	-1,241	0	\$ 2,070,810	\$ 1,035,405	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 2,400,000	1	\$ 329,190
Colusa	2	22,408	11,204	-12,432	-10,000	\$ 1,827,426	\$ 913,713	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,600,000	0	\$ -
Contra Costa	38	1,129,894	29,734	6,098	5,000	\$ 39,168,269	\$ 1,030,744	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 53,200,000	1	\$ 14,031,731
Del Norte	2	27,040	13,520	-10,116	-10,000	\$ 2,551,529	\$ 1,275,765	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,600,000	0	\$ -
El Dorado	8	184,180	23,023	-614	0	\$ 6,534,360	\$ 816,795	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 9,600,000	1	\$ 3,065,640
Fresno	43	989,183	23,004	-632	0	\$ 47,581,138	\$ 1,106,538	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 51,600,000	1	\$ 4,018,862
Glenn	2	29,073	14,537	-9,100	-5,000	\$ 1,823,674	\$ 911,837	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	1	\$ 176,326
Humboldt	7	136,086	19,441	-4,195	0	\$ 6,122,570	\$ 874,653	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 8,400,000	1	\$ 2,277,430
Imperial	10	187,157	18,716	-4,921	0	\$ 8,393,271	\$ 839,327	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 12,000,000	1	\$ 3,606,729
Inyo	2	18,649	9,325	-14,312	-10,000	\$ 1,981,016	\$ 990,508	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,600,000	0	\$ -
Kern	36	888,994	24,694	1,058	0	\$ 44,815,686	\$ 1,244,880	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 43,200,000	0	\$ -
Kings	7	149,407	21,344	-2,292	0	\$ 6,709,550	\$ 958,507	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 8,400,000	1	\$ 1,690,450
Lake	4	65,128	16,282	-7,354	-5,000	\$ 3,285,533	\$ 821,383	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	1	\$ 714,467
Lassen	2	30,645	15,323	-8,314	-5,000	\$ 2,229,555	\$ 1,114,778	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	0	\$ -
Los Angeles	482	10,229,245	21,223	-2,414	0	\$ 526,746,818	\$ 1,092,836	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 578,400,000	1	\$ 51,653,182
Madera	9	155,693	17,299	-6,337	-5,000	\$ 7,439,899	\$ 826,655	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 9,000,000	1	\$ 1,560,101
Marin	12	263,257	21,938	-1,698	0	\$ 11,637,569	\$ 969,797	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 14,400,000	1	\$ 2,762,431
Mariposa	2	18,055	9,028	-14,609	-10,000	\$ 1,121,360	\$ 560,680	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,600,000	1	\$ 478,640
Mendocino	8	88,995	11,124	-12,512	-10,000	\$ 5,186,547	\$ 648,318	\$ 800,000	\$ 6,400,000	1	\$ 1,213,453
Merced	10	272,610	27,261	3,625	0	\$ 11,662,608	\$ 1,166,261	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 12,000,000	1	\$ 337,392
Modoc	2	9,469	4,735	-18,902	-15,000	\$ 869,535	\$ 434,768	\$ 600,000	\$ 1,200,000	1	\$ 330,465
Mono	2	13,785	6,893	-16,744	-15,000	\$ 1,694,064	\$ 847,032	\$ 600,000	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -
Monterey	19	441,129	23,217	-419	0	\$ 16,940,338	\$ 891,597	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 22,800,000	1	\$ 5,859,662
Napa	6	142,269	23,712	75	0	\$ 7,275,363	\$ 1,212,561	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 7,200,000	0	\$ -
Nevada	6	98,552	16,425	-7,211	-5,000	\$ 4,765,463	\$ 794,244	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	1	\$ 1,234,537
Orange	124	3,181,371	25,656	2,020	0	\$ 137,667,970	\$ 1,110,226	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 148,800,000	1	\$ 11,132,030
Placer	10	376,092	37,609	13,973	10,000	\$ 15,158,642	\$ 1,515,864	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 16,000,000	1	\$ 841,358
Plumas	2	19,494	9,747	-13,889	-10,000	\$ 1,223,258	\$ 611,629	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,600,000	1	\$ 376,742
Riverside	62	2,360,727	38,076	14,440	10,000	\$ 81,384,228	\$ 1,312,649	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 99,200,000	1	\$ 17,815,772
Sacramento	62	1,506,677	24,301	665	0	\$ 74,734,715	\$ 1,205,399	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 74,400,000	0	\$ -
San Benito	2	58,014	29,007	5,371	5,000	\$ 2,317,183	\$ 1,158,592	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 2,800,000	1	\$ 482,817
San Bernardino	71	2,147,933	30,253	6,616	5,000	\$ 91,271,109	\$ 1,285,509	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 99,400,000	1	\$ 8,128,891
San Diego	132	3,300,891	25,007	1,370	0	\$ 132,199,425	\$ 1,001,511	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 158,400,000	1	\$ 26,200,575
San Francisco	52	871,185	16,754	-6,883	-5,000	\$ 57,328,605	\$ 1,102,473	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 52,000,000	0	\$ -
San Joaquin	29	738,873	25,478	1,842	0	\$ 32,305,879	\$ 1,113,996	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 34,800,000	1	\$ 2,494,121
San Luis Obispo	12	278,917	23,243	-393	0	\$ 13,130,633	\$ 1,094,219	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 14,400,000	1	\$ 1,269,367
San Mateo	26	768,122	29,543	5,907	5,000	\$ 34,013,094	\$ 1,308,196	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 36,400,000	1	\$ 2,386,906

**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.1 Calculations**  
**Scenario 3: \$375m Budget Increase**

County	Share of Future Funding Increase	Scenario 3: \$375m Increase					
		10% Set-Aside for Discretionary Funding	Funding Available for Baseline Increase	Excess Funding for Statewide Distribution	Preliminary Allocation	Excess Funding % Increase Over Preliminary	Final Allocation
		L = K/ Statewide	M = \$375m*10%	N = \$375m - M	O = N - sum(K)	P = Max(F,I)	Q = O/ Statewide P
Alameda	6.4%	\$ 37,500,000	\$337,500,000	\$ 93,887,638	\$ 90,000,000	4.6%	\$ 94,149,965
Alpine	0.0%				\$ 800,000		\$ 836,889
Amador	0.0%				\$ 2,229,591		\$ 2,332,399
Butte	1.4%				\$ 13,200,000		\$ 13,808,661
Calaveras	0.1%				\$ 2,400,000		\$ 2,510,666
Colusa	0.0%				\$ 1,827,426		\$ 1,911,690
Contra Costa	5.8%				\$ 53,200,000		\$ 55,653,090
Del Norte	0.0%				\$ 2,551,529		\$ 2,669,182
El Dorado	1.3%				\$ 9,600,000		\$ 10,042,663
Fresno	1.6%				\$ 51,600,000		\$ 53,979,313
Glenn	0.1%				\$ 2,000,000		\$ 2,092,221
Humboldt	0.9%				\$ 8,400,000		\$ 8,787,330
Imperial	1.5%				\$ 12,000,000		\$ 12,553,329
Inyo	0.0%				\$ 1,981,016		\$ 2,072,362
Kern	0.0%				\$ 44,815,686		\$ 46,882,169
Kings	0.7%				\$ 8,400,000		\$ 8,787,330
Lake	0.3%				\$ 4,000,000		\$ 4,184,443
Lassen	0.0%				\$ 2,229,555		\$ 2,332,361
Los Angeles	21.2%				\$ 578,400,000		\$ 605,070,439
Madera	0.6%				\$ 9,000,000		\$ 9,414,996
Marin	1.1%				\$ 14,400,000		\$ 15,063,994
Mariposa	0.2%				\$ 1,600,000		\$ 1,673,777
Mendocino	0.5%				\$ 6,400,000		\$ 6,695,109
Merced	0.1%				\$ 12,000,000		\$ 12,553,329
Modoc	0.1%				\$ 1,200,000		\$ 1,255,333
Mono	0.0%				\$ 1,694,064		\$ 1,772,179
Monterey	2.4%				\$ 22,800,000		\$ 23,851,324
Napa	0.0%				\$ 7,275,363		\$ 7,610,835
Nevada	0.5%				\$ 6,000,000		\$ 6,276,664
Orange	4.6%				\$ 148,800,000		\$ 155,661,275
Placer	0.3%				\$ 16,000,000		\$ 16,737,771
Plumas	0.2%				\$ 1,600,000		\$ 1,673,777
Riverside	7.3%				\$ 99,200,000		\$ 103,774,183
Sacramento	0.0%				\$ 74,734,715		\$ 78,180,786
San Benito	0.2%				\$ 2,800,000		\$ 2,929,110
San Bernardino	3.3%				\$ 99,400,000		\$ 103,983,405
San Diego	10.8%				\$ 158,400,000		\$ 165,703,938
San Francisco	0.0%				\$ 57,328,605		\$ 59,972,068
San Joaquin	1.0%				\$ 34,800,000		\$ 36,404,653
San Luis Obispo	0.5%				\$ 14,400,000		\$ 15,063,994
San Mateo	1.0%				\$ 36,400,000		\$ 38,078,430

**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.1 Calculations**  
**Scenario 3: \$375m Budget Increase**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio)	Total Target Funding	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I = H * A	J	K = I - F (if J = 1)
Santa Barbara	21	448,353	21,350	-2,286	0	\$ 21,414,352	\$ 1,019,731	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 25,200,000	1	\$ 3,785,648
Santa Clara	79	1,930,215	24,433	797	0	\$ 74,696,114	\$ 945,520	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 94,800,000	1	\$ 20,103,886
Santa Cruz	11	276,249	25,114	1,477	0	\$ 11,341,315	\$ 1,031,029	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 13,200,000	1	\$ 1,858,685
Shasta	10	178,208	17,821	-5,815	-5,000	\$ 12,117,394	\$ 1,211,739	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	0	\$ -
Sierra	2	3,140	1,570	-22,066	-20,000	\$ 734,148	\$ 367,074	\$ 400,000	\$ 800,000	1	\$ 65,852
Siskiyou	4	44,372	11,093	-12,543	-10,000	\$ 2,851,649	\$ 712,912	\$ 800,000	\$ 3,200,000	1	\$ 348,351
Solano	20	434,102	21,705	-1,931	0	\$ 19,403,166	\$ 970,158	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 24,000,000	1	\$ 4,596,834
Sonoma	20	503,953	25,198	1,561	0	\$ 22,704,148	\$ 1,135,207	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 24,000,000	1	\$ 1,295,852
Stanislaus	21	545,008	25,953	2,316	0	\$ 20,473,054	\$ 974,907	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 25,200,000	1	\$ 4,726,946
Sutter	5	98,191	19,638	-3,998	0	\$ 4,777,080	\$ 955,416	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 6,000,000	1	\$ 1,222,920
Tehama	4	64,098	16,025	-7,612	-5,000	\$ 3,642,903	\$ 910,726	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	1	\$ 357,097
Trinity	2	13,482	6,741	-16,895	-15,000	\$ 1,749,911	\$ 874,956	\$ 600,000	\$ 1,200,000	0	\$ -
Tulare	20	468,235	23,412	-225	0	\$ 16,735,224	\$ 836,761	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 24,000,000	1	\$ 7,264,776
Tuolumne	4	54,282	13,571	-10,066	-10,000	\$ 3,052,836	\$ 763,209	\$ 800,000	\$ 3,200,000	1	\$ 147,164
Ventura	29	854,383	29,461	5,825	5,000	\$ 33,233,084	\$ 1,145,968	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 40,600,000	1	\$ 7,366,916
Yolo	11	216,866	19,715	-3,921	0	\$ 8,980,462	\$ 816,406	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 13,200,000	1	\$ 4,219,538
Yuba	5	76,129	15,226	-8,410	-5,000	\$ 4,274,227	\$ 854,845	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	1	\$ 725,773
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,665</b>	<b>39,354,432</b>	<b>23,636</b>			<b>\$ 1,792,522,493</b>	<b>\$ 1,076,590</b>	Weighted avg.	<b>\$ 2,023,600,000</b>		<b>\$ 243,612,362</b>
							\$ 972,533	Median			
							\$ 967,350	Unweighted avg.			
							\$ 1,222,256	90th percentile			
<b>Data sources:</b>											
Judgeships: California Judicial Officers and Court Employees Map: <a href="http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cacourtstaff-letter.pdf">http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cacourtstaff-letter.pdf</a> .											
Population: State of California, Department of Finance, E-2. California County Population Estimates and Components of Change by Year — July 1, 2010–2016, December 2016											
FY 2016-2017 Actual Allocation: July 29, 2016 report to the Judicial Council from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, Attachment A: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations, Columns 1,6,7: <a href="https://jcc.legistar.com/View.aspx?M=F&amp;ID=4573624&amp;GUID=801732E8-0BF0-4AA8-A4CA-4B4B12192C8E">https://jcc.legistar.com/View.aspx?M=F&amp;ID=4573624&amp;GUID=801732E8-0BF0-4AA8-A4CA-4B4B12192C8E</a> .											



**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.2 Calculations**  
**Scenario 3: \$375m Budget Increase**

County	Judgeships	Population	Population Per Judge	Diff. from Statewide Average	Rounded Diff. from Statewide Average	FY 2016-2017 Actual Total Allocation	FY 2016-2017 Actual Funding per Judge	Target Funding per Judge (+/- \$200k for each +/- 5,000 PTJ ratio; \$400,000 floor)	Total Target Funding	Actual Funding per Judge Less Than Target?	Funding Needed to Reach Target
	A	B	C = B/A	D = C - Statewide	E	F	G = F/A	H	I = H * A	J	K = I - F (if J = 1)
Alameda	75	1,637,712	21,836	-1,800	0	\$ 74,361,761	\$ 991,490	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 93,750,000	1	\$ 19,388,239
Alpine	2	1,148	574	-23,062	-20,000	\$ 761,868	\$ 380,934	\$ 450,000	\$ 900,000	1	\$ 138,132
Amador	2	37,191	18,596	-5,041	-5,000	\$ 2,229,591	\$ 1,114,796	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 2,100,000	0	\$ -
Butte	11	225,125	20,466	-3,170	0	\$ 9,819,514	\$ 892,683	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 13,750,000	1	\$ 3,930,486
Calaveras	2	44,791	22,396	-1,241	0	\$ 2,070,810	\$ 1,035,405	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 2,500,000	1	\$ 429,190
Colusa	2	22,408	11,204	-12,432	-10,000	\$ 1,827,426	\$ 913,713	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,700,000	0	\$ -
Contra Costa	38	1,129,894	29,734	6,098	5,000	\$ 39,168,269	\$ 1,030,744	\$ 1,450,000	\$ 55,100,000	1	\$ 15,931,731
Del Norte	2	27,040	13,520	-10,116	-10,000	\$ 2,551,529	\$ 1,275,765	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,700,000	0	\$ -
El Dorado	8	184,180	23,023	-614	0	\$ 6,534,360	\$ 816,795	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 10,000,000	1	\$ 3,465,640
Fresno	43	989,183	23,004	-632	0	\$ 47,581,138	\$ 1,106,538	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 53,750,000	1	\$ 6,168,862
Glenn	2	29,073	14,537	-9,100	-5,000	\$ 1,823,674	\$ 911,837	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 2,100,000	1	\$ 276,326
Humboldt	7	136,086	19,441	-4,195	0	\$ 6,122,570	\$ 874,653	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 8,750,000	1	\$ 2,627,430
Imperial	10	187,157	18,716	-4,921	0	\$ 8,393,271	\$ 839,327	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 12,500,000	1	\$ 4,106,729
Inyo	2	18,649	9,325	-14,312	-10,000	\$ 1,981,016	\$ 990,508	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,700,000	0	\$ -
Kern	36	888,994	24,694	1,058	0	\$ 44,815,686	\$ 1,244,880	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 45,000,000	1	\$ 184,314
Kings	7	149,407	21,344	-2,292	0	\$ 6,709,550	\$ 958,507	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 8,750,000	1	\$ 2,040,450
Lake	4	65,128	16,282	-7,354	-5,000	\$ 3,285,533	\$ 821,383	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 4,200,000	1	\$ 914,467
Lassen	2	30,645	15,323	-8,314	-5,000	\$ 2,229,555	\$ 1,114,778	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 2,100,000	0	\$ -
Los Angeles	482	10,229,245	21,223	-2,414	0	\$ 526,746,818	\$ 1,092,836	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 602,500,000	1	\$ 75,753,182
Madera	9	155,693	17,299	-6,337	-5,000	\$ 7,439,899	\$ 826,655	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 9,450,000	1	\$ 2,010,101
Marin	12	263,257	21,938	-1,698	0	\$ 11,637,569	\$ 969,797	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 15,000,000	1	\$ 3,362,431
Mariposa	2	18,055	9,028	-14,609	-10,000	\$ 1,121,360	\$ 560,680	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,700,000	1	\$ 578,640
Mendocino	8	88,995	11,124	-12,512	-10,000	\$ 5,186,547	\$ 648,318	\$ 850,000	\$ 6,800,000	1	\$ 1,613,453
Merced	10	272,610	27,261	3,625	0	\$ 11,662,608	\$ 1,166,261	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 12,500,000	1	\$ 837,392
Modoc	2	9,469	4,735	-18,902	-15,000	\$ 869,535	\$ 434,768	\$ 650,000	\$ 1,300,000	1	\$ 430,465
Mono	2	13,785	6,893	-16,744	-15,000	\$ 1,694,064	\$ 847,032	\$ 650,000	\$ 1,300,000	0	\$ -
Monterey	19	441,129	23,217	-419	0	\$ 16,940,338	\$ 891,597	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 23,750,000	1	\$ 6,809,662
Napa	6	142,269	23,712	75	0	\$ 7,275,363	\$ 1,212,561	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 7,500,000	1	\$ 224,637
Nevada	6	98,552	16,425	-7,211	-5,000	\$ 4,765,463	\$ 794,244	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 6,300,000	1	\$ 1,534,537
Orange	124	3,181,371	25,656	2,020	0	\$ 137,667,970	\$ 1,110,226	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 155,000,000	1	\$ 17,332,030
Placer	10	376,092	37,609	13,973	10,000	\$ 15,158,642	\$ 1,515,864	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 16,500,000	1	\$ 1,341,358
Plumas	2	19,494	9,747	-13,889	-10,000	\$ 1,223,258	\$ 611,629	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,700,000	1	\$ 476,742
Riverside	62	2,360,727	38,076	14,440	10,000	\$ 81,384,228	\$ 1,312,649	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 102,300,000	1	\$ 20,915,772
Sacramento	62	1,506,677	24,301	665	0	\$ 74,734,715	\$ 1,205,399	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 77,500,000	1	\$ 2,765,285
San Benito	2	58,014	29,007	5,371	5,000	\$ 2,317,183	\$ 1,158,592	\$ 1,450,000	\$ 2,900,000	1	\$ 582,817
San Bernardino	71	2,147,933	30,253	6,616	5,000	\$ 91,271,109	\$ 1,285,509	\$ 1,450,000	\$ 102,950,000	1	\$ 11,678,891
San Diego	132	3,300,891	25,007	1,370	0	\$ 132,199,425	\$ 1,001,511	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 165,000,000	1	\$ 32,800,575
San Francisco	52	871,185	16,754	-6,883	-5,000	\$ 57,328,605	\$ 1,102,473	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 54,600,000	0	\$ -
San Joaquin	29	738,873	25,478	1,842	0	\$ 32,305,879	\$ 1,113,996	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 36,250,000	1	\$ 3,944,121
San Luis Obispo	12	278,917	23,243	-393	0	\$ 13,130,633	\$ 1,094,219	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 15,000,000	1	\$ 1,869,367
San Mateo	26	768,122	29,543	5,907	5,000	\$ 34,013,094	\$ 1,308,196	\$ 1,450,000	\$ 37,700,000	1	\$ 3,686,906

**Proposed Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology: Version 2.2.2 Calculations**  
**Scenario 3: \$375m Budget Increase**

County	Share of Future Funding Increase	Scenario 3: \$375m Increase					
		10% Set-Aside for Discretionary Funding	Funding Available for Baseline Increase	Excess Funding for Statewide Distribution	Preliminary Allocation	Excess Funding % Increase Over Preliminary	Final Allocation
		L = K/ Statewide	M = \$375m*10%	N = \$375m - M	O = N - sum(K)	P = Max(F,I)	Q = O/ Statewide P
Alameda	6.0%	\$ 37,500,000	\$337,500,000	\$ 16,463,402	\$ 93,750,000	0.8%	\$ 94,480,258
Alpine	0.0%				\$ 900,000		\$ 907,010
Amador	0.0%				\$ 2,229,591		\$ 2,246,958
Butte	1.2%				\$ 13,750,000		\$ 13,857,105
Calaveras	0.1%				\$ 2,500,000		\$ 2,519,474
Colusa	0.0%				\$ 1,827,426		\$ 1,841,661
Contra Costa	5.0%				\$ 55,100,000		\$ 55,529,197
Del Norte	0.0%				\$ 2,551,529		\$ 2,571,404
El Dorado	1.1%				\$ 10,000,000		\$ 10,077,894
Fresno	1.9%				\$ 53,750,000		\$ 54,168,681
Glenn	0.1%				\$ 2,100,000		\$ 2,116,358
Humboldt	0.8%				\$ 8,750,000		\$ 8,818,157
Imperial	1.3%				\$ 12,500,000		\$ 12,597,368
Inyo	0.0%				\$ 1,981,016		\$ 1,996,447
Kern	0.1%				\$ 45,000,000		\$ 45,350,524
Kings	0.6%				\$ 8,750,000		\$ 8,818,157
Lake	0.3%				\$ 4,200,000		\$ 4,232,716
Lassen	0.0%				\$ 2,229,555		\$ 2,246,922
Los Angeles	23.6%				\$ 602,500,000		\$ 607,193,126
Madera	0.6%				\$ 9,450,000		\$ 9,523,610
Marin	1.0%				\$ 15,000,000		\$ 15,116,841
Mariposa	0.2%				\$ 1,700,000		\$ 1,713,242
Mendocino	0.5%				\$ 6,800,000		\$ 6,852,968
Merced	0.3%				\$ 12,500,000		\$ 12,597,368
Modoc	0.1%				\$ 1,300,000		\$ 1,310,126
Mono	0.0%				\$ 1,694,064		\$ 1,707,260
Monterey	2.1%				\$ 23,750,000		\$ 23,934,999
Napa	0.1%				\$ 7,500,000		\$ 7,558,421
Nevada	0.5%				\$ 6,300,000		\$ 6,349,073
Orange	5.4%				\$ 155,000,000		\$ 156,207,360
Placer	0.4%				\$ 16,500,000		\$ 16,628,525
Plumas	0.1%				\$ 1,700,000		\$ 1,713,242
Riverside	6.5%				\$ 102,300,000		\$ 103,096,858
Sacramento	0.9%				\$ 77,500,000		\$ 78,103,680
San Benito	0.2%				\$ 2,900,000		\$ 2,922,589
San Bernardino	3.6%				\$ 102,950,000		\$ 103,751,921
San Diego	10.2%				\$ 165,000,000		\$ 166,285,254
San Francisco	0.0%				\$ 57,328,605		\$ 57,775,162
San Joaquin	1.2%				\$ 36,250,000		\$ 36,532,367
San Luis Obispo	0.6%				\$ 15,000,000		\$ 15,116,841
San Mateo	1.1%				\$ 37,700,000		\$ 37,993,661







To: Hon. Morris Jacobson, Presiding Judge, Alameda Superior Court  
From: Deana Farole  
Date: March 21, 2017  
Re: Trial Court Funding Methodology Proposal

---

### **Proposal for an Alternative Trial Court Funding Methodology**

**Issue:** You have contracted with me to work with the Court to develop an alternative to the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) that is currently in place for annual allocations of trial court funding. You asked that the new model meet the following criteria: (a) be based solely on consistent, objective factors; (b) lock each court's current funding in as an absolute floor, unless and until there is an overall reduction in funding to the trial courts as a whole; (c) allocate future funding increases based on need, as defined by the objective criteria referenced above; and (d) withhold some portion of future funding increases for discretionary allocations outside of the model, to account for the unique circumstances faced by some courts.

Although conceptually it makes sense to build a model based on "workload," the primary component of the data currently used to produce workload estimates—court filings data—is unreliable. While the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) Manual does outline counting rules for filings, it has come to light, as more courts have become engaged in review and auditing of their filings data, that courts may not be consistently aware of or adherent to the counting rules. Further, those rules themselves are open to competing interpretations. Additionally, variations in court and justice partners practices from county to county may lead to different patterns of filings that distort their relationship to workload—for example, filing of probation violations vs. new law violations, including all related children in juvenile dependency cases under one case number vs. assigning them separate case numbers. Furthermore, other possible measures related to workload are not consistently reported by the courts, and it would likely take some time to get courts to collect and report on additional data elements.

Small courts have expressed concern that WAFM isn't sufficiently responsive to their unique circumstances and needs. Among other issues, the cost of labor adjustment has been viewed as detrimental to their ability to hire and retain qualified staff.

WAFM makes it very difficult for the courts to anticipate their funding allocations and plan accordingly because it distributes funding to counties based on their proportional shares of the total workload-based funding need. An individual court's funding cannot be evaluated independently, but only in relation to all other courts. If a court's filings increased, it would expect its funding to increase in turn, but if other courts experienced much sharper increases, it would impact the amount of funding available to the first court that experienced the more modest increase. Courts need more predictability to have the time to plan for and implement changes to adjust to funding fluctuations.

**Proposal:** Implement an alternative funding methodology that establishes a baseline funding target for each court based its number of authorized judgeships—with adjustments for courts in counties with higher or lower than average population-to-judge ratios—and includes a provision to make discretionary

funding available if and when additional funds are made available for general trial court operations in future budgets. The proposed methodology uses authorized judgeships, rather than total authorized judicial positions (which includes subordinate judicial officers), as the basis for funding allocations because the number of judges represents a fixed financial obligation for the judicial branch, whereas individual trial courts can expand and contract the pool of commissioners and referees to respond to their budget fluctuations.

**Baseline Funding:** Currently, there are 1,715 authorized judgeships in California. Of those, 50 were not funded<sup>1</sup> and therefore have not been assigned to individual courts, effectively bringing the number of judges to 1,665. Based on the FY 2016–2017 allocation to the trial courts, the current statewide average funding per judge is roughly \$1.1 million, but for the majority of counties, it is lower. Based on the assumption that most courts are underfunded to some degree, the \$1.1 million average is too low.

This proposal would set baseline funding for each court at an aspirational target of \$1.20 or \$1.25 million per judge. Under these scenarios, the total statewide funding target would be \$2.0 to \$2.1 billion—more than the \$1.8 billion currently allocated to the courts, but less than the \$2.35 billion funding need estimated by WAFM. While \$1.2 million may still be too low as an aspirational average, it represents reasonable growth over current funding, particularly in light of concerns raised by the Executive and Legislative branches about the need to be prudent in planning for future fiscal years

The proposed methodology would start each court’s funding at its current level—with the understanding that no court would drop below that level, except in the event of a reduction in the annual allocation to the trial courts generally—in order to prevent the type of redistribution under WAFM that has been a source of concern. If additional funds for general trial court operations are provided in future budgets, any court with an allocation of less than its per-judge funding target would receive a funding increase proportional to its share of the overall funding need of the courts. There would be no change in funding for courts already at or exceeding their per-judge funding targets.

If, on the other hand, funding for general trial court operations is cut in future budgets, each court’s funding would be reduced by the same proportion as the overall statewide cut.

**Adjusted Target Per Judge:** Two versions of a methodology for distributing baseline funding augmentations are presented as options. As previously discussed, the initial target for baseline funding would be set at either \$1.20 million per judge or \$1.25 million per judge. That target would then be adjusted for each court based not on workload or filings data, but rather on a new metric, the population-to-judge (PTJ) ratio. PTJ was selected as the metric for adjusting the target per-judge funding for each court because it appears that the number of authorized judicial positions in each court may not have increased or decreased in line with population changes in the counties. Based on the PTJ ratio of a court, the actual amount needed for court operations may vary from the \$1.20 or \$1.25 million target.

Currently, taking the total population of California and the total number of judgeships, the statewide average PTJ is approximately 23,000. (For reference, the PTJ ratio ranges from a low of roughly 600

---

<sup>1</sup> See “California Judicial Officers and Court Employees” map: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/cacourtstaff-letter.pdf>.

residents per judge in Alpine County to a high of 38,000 residents per judge in Riverside County.) Under the model, for each increase or decrease of 5,000 relative to the statewide PTJ ratio, a court would receive a corresponding increase or decrease of \$200,000 per judge to its target per-judge funding. For example, a court with a PTJ ratio of 28,000 (5,000 more than the average of 23,000) would see its per-judge funding target increase to either \$1.40 million or \$1.45 million (an increase of \$200,000 above the initial target of \$1.20 million or \$1.25 million). Applying current data to this model, the allocation per judge would range from \$400,000 (an amount similar to the WAFM funding floor) to \$1.60 million under the \$1.20 million per judge target, and from and from \$400,000 to \$1.65 million under the \$1.25 million per judge target, given that in the latter scenario, a funding floor is set a \$400,000 per judge.

**Allocation of Future Increases to Trial Court Funding Until Minimum Funding Need is Met:** As noted above, the model assumes that no court will drop below its current funding level unless there is a cut to trial court funding generally. Until full funding is achieved, future increases to trial court funding would be allocated under the model as follows.

Taking each court's adjusted funding target per judge and accounting for the number of judges in each court, there is an overall need statewide for an additional \$244 million in trial court funding to meet the minimum funding needs of all courts under the \$1.20 million per judge target. Each court's specific target funding need can be divided by that total to determine what percentage of a hypothetical \$244 million increase each court would need to receive to achieve its target funding. For example, Riverside Superior Court would need to receive 7.3 percent of a \$244 million funding increase to meet its adjusted per-judge funding target of \$1.60 million.

The model proposes setting aside ten percent of any future funding increases for discretionary funding requests and directing the remaining 90 percent to courts that have not yet reached their target funding. Discretionary funding would be administered by the Judicial Council through a process and committee structure to be determined, and would be available for courts that demonstrate the need for an augmentation due to special circumstances. The exact criteria would need to be developed, but might include, for example, the presence of unique case types, disproportionate increases in high-workload case types, population characteristics such as high non-English language needs, and unique geographic factors.

In the event that future increases to the trial courts fall short of the \$244 million that is needed to achieve minimum statewide trial court funding under the \$1.20 million per judge target, the model proposes using the county's share of the statewide funding need to allocate such funding. Using the same example as above, if trial court funding in a future year were increased by only \$50 million, \$5 million would be set aside for discretionary funding, and Riverside Superior would receive 7.3 percent of the remaining \$45 million.

**Allocation of Future Increases Once the Minimum Funding Level is Met:** Assuming that the trial courts eventually receive an additional \$244 million, and that each court therefore reaches its per-judge funding target (under the \$1.2 million per judge target), the allocation of additional monies above the \$244 million would be handled as follows. Ninety percent of those funds would be allocated equally to all trial courts. For example, if trial court funding as a whole increased by 5 percent, then each court would get a 5 percent increase in its total funding. The remaining 10 percent would be set aside as discretionary funding.