



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR JUNE 8, 2017

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the May 23, 2017 Meeting	4
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – 2017-2018 Trial Court Allocations for General Court Operations and Specific Costs (Action Item)	7
Attachment 1B: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations	14
Attachment 1C: Trial Court Trust Fund-Fund Condition Statement	16
Attachment 1D: TCTF 2017-18 Judicial Council and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts Appropriations Allocations Approved by the Judicial Council	17
Attachment 1E: 2016-17 and 2017-18 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts: Appropriations vs. Estimated/ Approves Allocations	18
Attachment 1F: 2017-18 Beginning Base Allocations: 2016-2017 Beginning Base, 2016-2017 Base Allocation and Annualization	20
Attachment 1G: Proposed Allocation of New Funding for 2016-2017 Benefit Cost Changes ...	22
Attachment 1H: Computation of Funding Need Using the 2017–2018 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology	23
Attachment 1I: 2017–2018 RAS FTE Need	27
Attachment 1J: BLS Factor	28
Attachment 1K: FTE Allotment Factor	29
Attachment 1L: 2017–2018 Reallocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding	30
Attachment 1M: Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM	36
Attachment 1N: Summary of Changes from 2016–2017 Total WAFM Funding Need	38
Attachment 1O: 2017–2018 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor	39
Attachment 1P: Determination of Funding Floor	40

Attachment 1Q: Estimated 2017–2018 WAFM-Related Base Allocation	41
Attachment 1R: Allocation of \$9.2 Million of Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	43
Item 2 – Recommendation of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) on the 2017-2018 Work Plan (Action Item)	44
Attachment 2: 2017-2018 Funding Methodology Subcommittee Work Plan	45
Item 3 – Recommendation of the FMS on the WAFM Adjustment Request Process and WAFM Adjustment Timeline (Action Item)	46
Attachment 3A: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedures	48
Attachment 3B: Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedures	50
Information Only Items (No Action Required)	
Info 2 – AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee Update	52



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE OPEN MEETING AGENDA

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: June 8, 2017
Time: 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
Location: Veranda Room, 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 23, 2017, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

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

Public Comment

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

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments

should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Ms. Brandy Sanborn. Only written comments received by June 7, 2017 by 10:00 a.m. 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. – 11:10 a.m.

Item 1

2017–2018 Trial Court Allocations for General Court Operations and Specific Costs (Action Required)

Consideration of the 2017–2018 base and base-related allocations from the General Fund and Trial Court Trust Fund, including WAFM, criminal justice realignment, and benefits.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee; Mr. Patrick Ballard, Supervisor, Judicial Council Budget Services; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

11:10 a.m. – 11:55 a.m.

Item 2

Recommendation of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) on the 2017-2018 Work Plan (Action Required)

Consideration of recommendations of the FMS regarding the finalization of the 2017-2018 Work Plan related to WAFM.

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

11:55 a.m. – 12:25 p.m.

Break

12:25 p.m. – 1:10 p.m.

Item 3

Recommendation of the FMS on the WAFM Adjustment Request Process and WAFM Adjustment Timeline (Action Required)

Consideration of recommendations of the FMS regarding the Judicial Council approved *Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Process*, including formalizing the date for when changes to WAFM can be made and implemented.

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

Methodology Subcommittee; and Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

1:10 p.m. – 1:20 p.m.

Info 1

Budget Update for 2017-2018 (No Action Required)

Update on the budget for 2017-2018.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

1:20 p.m. – 1:40 p.m.

Info 2

AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee Update (No Action Required)

Update on the AB 1058 Child Support Court Allocation Project.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Anna Maves, Supervising Attorney/Program Manager, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

1:40 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Info 3

Discussion (No Action Required)

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

May 23, 2017
3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Teleconference

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, , Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Hon. Elizabeth W. Johnson, Hon. Ira R. Kaufman, and Hon. Brian L. McCabe.

Executive Officers: Mr. Jake Chatters, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Jeffrey E. Lewis, Mr. Michael D. Planet, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Ms. Linda Romero-Soles, Mr. Brian Taylor, Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Judges: Hon. Andrew S. Blum, Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Hon. James E. Herman, Hon. Paul M. Marigonda, and Hon. Glenda Sanders.

Executive Officers: Ms. Sherri R. Carter (proxy to Mr. Jake Chatters)

Judicial Council Staff Advisory Members: Ms. Jody Patel, Ms. Millicent Tidwell, Mr. John Wordlaw, and Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic.

Others Present: Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Brandy Sanborn, and Ms. Natalie Daniel.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. and roll was called.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the April 13, 2017 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1)

Item 1 – Prioritization of Trial Court Budget Change Proposal (BCP) Concepts for 2018-2019 (Action Required)

Review and prioritize trial court BCP concepts as well as BCP concept submissions in which the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee was identified as having purview and the opportunity to provide input for submission to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee for its review.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair, Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee voted to approve and prioritize the following Budget Change Proposal Concepts from Table 1 and Table 2 as follows:

1. *Stabilization of Civil Assessment Revenue*
 - Approve: 19
2. *Court Appointed Counsel in Juvenile Dependency Proceedings (combined over a four-year ask of 25 percent per year)*
 - Approve: 19
3. *Support for Trial Court Operations (removing the estimated \$214.4 million for mandated proposition and legislation related workload)*
 - Approve: 17
 - Oppose: 2
4. *Mandated Proposition and Legislation Related Workload (added)*
 - Approve: 18
 - Abstain: 1
5. *Funding for 10 of the 50 Judgeships Authorized by AB 159*
 - Approve: 19
6. *Trial Court Facilities Operations Costs*
 - Approve: 18
 - Abstain: 1
7. *Case Management System Replacement*
 - Approve: 18
 - Abstain: 1
8. *Statewide Security Systems and Equipment - Maintenance and Replacement*
 - Approve: 18
 - Abstain: 1
9. *All remaining BCP Concepts from Table 2 are acknowledged and supported by the TCBCAC but without prioritization or inclusion with the Committee's BCP Concept submissions*
 - Approve: 18
 - Abstain: 1

INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

None

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

(Action Item)

Title: 2017-2018 Trial Court Allocations for General Court Operations and Specific Costs

Date: 6/1/2017

Contact: Patrick Ballard, Supervisor, Budget Services
916-263-2708 | patrick.ballard@jud.ca.gov

Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Analyst, Budget Services
916-263-1754 | suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov

Issue

The Judicial Council is required by statute to set preliminary allocations for trial courts in July of each fiscal year. Consider 2017-2018 base and base-related allocations from the General Fund and Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF), including Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), criminal justice realignment, and benefits.

Background

Fiscal Status of the TCTF

In the proposed 2017-2018 Governor's Budget through the May Revision, up to a \$55.0 million General Fund backfill for the continued shortfall in fee and assessment revenues that support courts' base allocation is provided. Given current revenue projections and estimated savings from appropriations, the 2017–2018 proposed allocations for Programs 0140010 – Judicial Council, 0150010 – Support for Operation of Trial Courts, and 0150095 – Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts, and the six recommendations discussed in this report, the TCTF will end the fiscal year 2017–2018 with a fund balance of \$29.8 million (see Attachment 1C, column C, row 33). Excluding about \$16.7 million in fund balance that is either statutorily restricted or restricted by the council (mainly the emergency needs reserve and savings related to the Program 0150037 court interpreter appropriation), the unrestricted fund balance is projected to be \$13.1 million (see Attachment 1C, column C, row 43). Assuming \$3.2 million in judges' compensation savings in 2017–2018, the TCTF would have a revenue shortfall of \$1.9 million (see Attachment 1C, column C, row 44 – amount includes one-time \$10 million General Fund transfer to establish emergency needs reserve). There is estimated to be \$16.1 million in excess Program 0150010 expenditure authority based on the allocation amounts provided in Attachment 1E (see column B, row 47). This is primarily due to estimated increase in 2017–2018 trial court distributions

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

related to civil assessment revenue resulting from the end of the amnesty program in late 2016-2017 (see Attachment 1E, column B, row 30).

Recommendations

The following recommendations are presented for the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's consideration for recommendation to the Judicial Council at its July 28, 2017 business meeting:

1. Approve the 2017–2018 beginning base allocation for court operations of \$1.821 billion (see Attachment 1F, column 9), which carries forward the ending 2016–2017 TCTF base allocation (column 6), and adds the General Fund benefits base allocation (column 7) and adjustments to annualize partial-year allocations made in 2016–2017 (column 8) (see Attachment 1B, column 1).
2. Allocate a total of \$4.8 million for non-interpreter employee benefits funding from the TCTF for each court's share 2016–2017 cost changes in the 2017 May Revise. (The remaining \$174,000 provided for 2016–2017 court interpreter benefits cost changes would be added to the TCTF Court Interpreter Program 0150037). See Attachment 1B, column 2.
3. Allocate each court's share from the TCTF using the 2017–2018 WAFM consisting of a reallocation of 50 percent (\$720.2 million) and an additional \$233.8 million of courts' historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, and reallocation of \$233.8 million in new funding provided from 2013–2014 through 2016–2017 for general court operations for general court operations for a net zero total allocation (see Attachment 1B, column 3).
4. Allocate each court's share of the 2017–2018 WAFM funding-floor allocation adjustment, which includes funding-floor allocations for six courts receive a total of \$321,949 in floor adjustments and all other courts are allocated a reduction totaling \$321,949, for a net zero total allocation (see Attachment 1B, column 4).
5. Approve a one-time allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs from the TCTF based on the most current available postrelease community supervision (PRCS) and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council's Criminal Justice Services office pursuant to Penal Code section 13155 (see Attachment 1B, column 5).

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

6. Allocate \$13.44 million from the Programs 0140010 and 0150095 - TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations (see Attachment 1D, columns D and E) and \$135.6 million from the Program 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation (see Attachment 1E, column C, rows 21-28).

Rationale for Recommendations

Recommendation 1 – Trial Courts’ 2016–2017 Beginning Base Allocations

The 2017–2018 preliminary beginning base allocation for court operations is \$1.821 billion (see Attachment 1F, column 9), which carries forward the ending 2016–2017 base allocation (column 6), and adds the General Fund benefits base allocation (column 7) and adjustments to annualize partial-year allocations made in 2016–2017 (column 8). Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the council to make a preliminary allocation in July of each fiscal year and a final allocation before February of each fiscal year.

Recommendation 2 – 2016-2017 Benefits Costs Funding

In the fall of 2016, a budget augmentation in the amount of \$7.1 million was submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) to address the full-year impact to the trial courts in 2017–2018 of changes in costs for retirement, retiree health, and employee health that were anticipated to occur in 2016–2017. Many of the health-related costs were unconfirmed at that time. The understanding was that a revised request would be submitted in mid-March 2017 that would have updated, confirmed amounts. The Governor’s Proposed Budget included the entire \$7.1 million.

The \$4.96 million in the 2017 May Revise submission reflects a decrease in the augmentation of \$2.1 million from the Governor’s initial proposal, which is attributed to employee and retiree health premiums and/or employer share amounts coming in lower than estimated by courts at the time of original submission. (See Attachment 1G, columns D).

Recommendation 3 – 2017–2018 WAFM Reallocation Adjustments

On April 26, 2013, the council adopted a policy to phase in the use of WAFM for reallocating courts’ historical WAFM base funding, as of the end of 2012–2013, over a five-year period starting in 2013–2014, in which 50 percent of historical funding would be reallocated according to WAFM in 2017–2018. The council adopted an exception to the phase-in of reallocation of historical funding in years when new funding for general court operations was provided. In such years, additional historical funding, above and beyond the phase-in level and up to the level of the new funding amount, would be reallocated. The 2017–2018 WAFM computation reflects the modifications to the calculation of the WAFM

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

operating expenses and equipment (OE&E) per full-time equivalent (FTE) amounts that were approved by the council on April 15, 2016. It also reflects an update to the Resource Assessment Study model (RAS) FTE need parameters as approved by the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) on May 2, 2017. In addition, the 2017–2018 WAFM is updated to include 2016–2017 Schedule 7A salary and benefit budgets (as of July 1, 2016), average filings from 2013–2014 to 2015–2016, three-year average salary data from 2013 to 2015 from the BLS, three-year average OE&E data from 2013–2014 to 2015–2016 from courts’ fourth quarter Quarterly Financial Statements, and 2015–2016 AB 1058 child support grant reimbursement data (see Attachment 1H).

Attachment 1L displays the various WAFM reallocation adjustments by court. Column G displays the net reallocation of 50 percent (\$720.2 million) of courts’ historical base funding using the current WAFM. Column P displays the reversal of the reallocation of 40 percent of courts’ historical base funding that was allocated on an ongoing basis in 2016–2017. The sum of columns G and P provides the net change that is being reallocated in 2017–2018 due to the phase-in of WAFM. Columns J and N display the updated net reallocation of \$233.8 million in historical base funding using the current WAFM and the updated allocation of \$233.8 million in new 2013–2014 through 2016–2017 funding, respectively. Column Q displays the reversal of the ongoing allocations made in 2016–2017 related to the \$233.8 million. The sum of columns J, N, and Q provides the net change in the \$233.8 million that is being allocated in 2017–2018.

Other attachments provide detail underlying the information displayed in Attachments 1H and 1L. Attachments 1I, 1J, and 1K provide detail related to the RAS workload/FTE need, BLS factor, and FTE allotment factor, respectively, displayed in Attachment 1H. Attachment 1M provides the detail of courts’ historical WAFM-related base allocation of the \$1.44 billion that is used in Attachment 1L. Attachment 1N provides a summary comparison of changes in WAFM need from 2016–2017 to 2017–2018.

At its May 25, 2017 meeting, the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) recommended the 2017-2018 WAFM funding reallocation adjustments to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) for the approval by the Judicial Council at its July 28 meeting.

Recommendation 4 – 2017–2018 WAFM Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment

JCC staff, based on Judicial Council policy adopted on February 20, 2014, has computed each court’s share of the 2017–2018 WAFM funding-floor allocation adjustment: six courts receive a total of \$321,949 in floor adjustments and all other courts are allocated a reduction totaling \$321,949, for a net zero total allocation. For allocating trial court base funding for court operations, the council established an absolute funding floor (\$750,000 in fiscal year

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

2017–2018) and a graduated funding floor that is based on a court’s WAFM funding need (\$875,000, \$1,250,000, and \$1,875,000 in fiscal year 2017–2018); funded the funding-floor allocation by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor.

The allocation adjustment for each court is displayed in Attachment 1B (summary table) and Attachment 1O (columns C and E). The funding-floor allocations that six courts received are displayed in column C of Attachment 1O. As displayed in Attachment 1P, two courts were eligible for the absolute funding-floor level of \$750,000, one court for the graduated level of \$875,000, one for \$1,250,000, and two courts for the graduated level of \$1,874,999. The funding-floor adjustment for courts that did not receive a funding-floor allocation is displayed in column E of Attachment 1O. Attachment 1P displays whether or not a court is eligible for a funding-floor adjustment and, if a court is eligible, what the maximum funding-floor amount is for the court. Attachment 1Q displays each court’s 2017–2018 WAFM-related base allocation before and after any funding-floor adjustment.

At its May 25, 2017 meeting, the FMS recommended the 2017-2018 WAFM funding floor allocation adjustments to the TCBAC for the approval by the Judicial Council at its July 28 meeting.

Recommendation 5 – Criminal Justice Realignment Allocation

Allocate a one-time amount of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs based on the Judicial Council’s approved methodology as indicated in column C of Attachment 1R

In fiscal years 2011–2012 and 2012–2013, the funding provided in the Budget Act to address costs related to the Criminal Justice Realignment Act of 2011 was allocated to the trial courts based on each court’s percentage of the total estimated petitions for revocation, as estimated by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). Based on the recommendation of the TCBAC, the funding was split in 2013–2014 into two equal amounts with the first half being allocated in July 2013 based on the same methodology as previous allocations, and the second half in February 2014 using a methodology that incorporated equally both population (each court’s percentage of the statewide population of individuals on post release community supervision (PRCS) and parole) and workload (each court’s percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole). The Judicial Council approved the TCBAC’s recommendation for the 2014–2015 criminal realignment allocation that it should be split into two equal amounts with the first half being allocated in July 2014 using the same population and workload methodology, but that the second half in January 2015 be allocated based solely on workload related to PRCS and parole.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

At the Judicial Council's July 28, 2015 business meeting, the council approved the TCBAC recommendation of a one-time allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs based on the most current available PRCS and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council's Criminal Justice Services office pursuant to Penal Code section 13155 (each court's percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole).

Recommendation 6 – Other Judicial Council, Support for Operation of Trial Courts, and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts

At its May 30, 2017 meeting, the Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee recommended to allocate the following in 2017–2018 from the TCTF:

- a. \$13.44 million from the Programs 0140010 and 0150095 - TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations (see Attachment 1D);
- b. \$135.6 million from the Program 0150010 - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation (see Attachment 1E, column C, rows 21-28).

This recommendation essentially maintains 2016-2017 allocation levels for discretionary programs and uses the May Revision revenue estimates for items funded by restricted revenues.

Pending and Other Allocations

Two items that will be allocated from the Program 0150010 appropriation are pending (see Attachment 1E, rows 24 and 36). Because the courts have until July 14 to provide their preliminary 2016–2017 ending fund balances, the preliminary reduction amounts related to trial court reserves above the 1% cap referenced in Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) will not be available for TCBAC consideration prior to recommendation to the council on July 28, 2017. However, the TCBAC will consider the final allocation reductions for fund balance above the 1% cap prior to their recommendation to the Judicial Council prior to February 2018. The allocation of monies, using the council-approved formula, collected through the dependency counsel collections program will be brought to the TCBAC and council once final 2016–2017 collections are known.

A number of allocations are required by the Budget Act (a \$50 million distribution from the Immediate & Critical Needs Account for court operations [see Attachment 1E, row 16]); various revenue distributions [see rows 30, 33, and 34]; are required by statute (various revenue distributions [see rows 31, 32, and 35]); or are authorized charges for the cost of programs or cash advances (see rows 38, 39, and 40).

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Attachments

Attachment 1B: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

Attachment 1C: Trial Court Trust Fund—Fund Condition Statement

Attachment 1D: TCTF 2017-18 Judicial Council and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts
Appropriations Allocations Approved by the Judicial Council

Attachment 1E: 2016-17 and 2017-18 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial
Courts: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations

Attachment 1F: 2017-2018 Beginning Base Allocation: 2016-2017 Beginning Base, 2016-2017
Base Allocations, and Annualization

Attachment 1G: Proposed Allocation of New Funding for 2016-2017 Benefit Cost Changes

Attachment 1H: Computation of Funding Need Using the 2017–2018 Workload-Based
Allocation and Funding Methodology

Attachment 1I: 2017–2018 RAS FTE Need

Attachment 1J: BLS Factor

Attachment 1K: FTE Allotment Factor

Attachment 1L: 2017–2018 Reallocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical
Funding

Attachment 1M: Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

Attachment 1N: Summary of Changes from 2016–2017 Total WAFM Funding Need

Attachment 1O: 2017–2018 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor

Attachment 1P: Determination of Funding Floor

Attachment 1Q: Estimated 2017–2018 WAFM-Related Base Allocation

Attachment 1R: Allocation of \$9.2 Million of Criminal Justice Realignment Funding

Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

Court	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2	Recommendation 3	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 5	Pending	Total
	Preliminary 2017-2018 Base Allocation (TCTF and GF)	Estimated 2016-17 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2017-18 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2017-18 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment	Criminal Justice Realignment	Preliminary Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Alameda	75,803,436	(117,415)	118,477	(13,184)	252,661	pending	76,043,975
Alpine	747,863	11,842	(22,964)	11,128	273	pending	748,142
Amador	2,282,693	21,663	(76,749)	(415)	5,742	pending	2,232,935
Butte	10,109,796	65,290	(37,056)	(1,747)	86,750	pending	10,223,033
Calaveras	2,167,578	20,469	(124,146)	(386)	1,641	pending	2,065,155
Colusa	1,859,554	21,699	28,000	(356)	3,691	pending	1,912,588
Contra Costa	38,889,573	(627,559)	1,188,741	(7,228)	116,281	pending	39,559,808
Del Norte	2,633,386	39,609	(159,821)	(468)	8,613	pending	2,521,320
El Dorado	6,642,102	38,696	(105,821)	(1,202)	44,298	pending	6,618,073
Fresno	48,290,025	(240,622)	(568,451)	(8,672)	404,626	pending	47,876,907
Glenn	1,863,073	48,933	(9,648)	(354)	2,256	pending	1,904,259
Humboldt	6,246,932	92,631	(16,433)	(1,124)	51,065	pending	6,373,071
Imperial	8,614,886	(31,042)	34,558	(1,500)	41,221	pending	8,658,124
Inyo	2,035,828	21,672	(14,883)	(350)	5,947	pending	2,048,215
Kern	46,076,836	(866,725)	818,353	(8,309)	335,103	pending	46,355,257
Kings	6,769,371	105,069	194,175	(1,196)	61,319	pending	7,128,737
Lake	3,323,097	48,157	34,075	(591)	12,510	pending	3,417,248
Lassen	2,249,097	19,933	(217,457)	94,310	6,768	pending	2,152,650
Los Angeles	531,395,340	(220,592)	1,019,170	(92,781)	3,128,520	pending	535,229,658
Madera	7,704,247	32,254	(200,688)	(1,337)	43,887	pending	7,578,363
Marin	12,036,818	158,933	(441,145)	(2,191)	17,432	pending	11,769,847
Mariposa	1,125,254	30,528	6,808	75,747	4,512	pending	1,242,849
Mendocino	5,491,252	(10,851)	(25,473)	(959)	39,786	pending	5,493,755
Merced	11,970,525	(245,209)	(295,321)	(2,060)	105,207	pending	11,533,141
Modoc	882,065	4,475	(21,004)	3,187	2,461	pending	871,184
Mono	1,710,955	66,471	(20,641)	124,225	2,666	pending	1,883,675
Monterey	17,432,325	42,357	193,761	(3,088)	35,274	pending	17,700,629
Napa	7,471,664	26,037	(50,148)	(1,262)	15,586	pending	7,461,877
Nevada	4,924,494	119,536	134,931	(829)	2,461	pending	5,180,593
Orange	140,595,374	(1,248,482)	(3,113,896)	(24,189)	384,528	pending	136,593,335
Placer	15,552,392	199,413	364,804	(2,829)	44,503	pending	16,158,282
Plumas	1,238,999	8,833	(160,301)	(203)	1,230	pending	1,088,557
Riverside	83,651,182	1,370,087	2,540,906	(15,526)	915,074	pending	88,461,724
Sacramento	74,838,442	(19,335)	1,033,549	(13,494)	143,557	pending	75,982,720

Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2	Recommendation 3	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 5	Pending	
	Preliminary 2017-2018 Base Allocation (TCTF and GF)	Estimated 2016-17 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	2017-18 WAFM Allocation Adjustments	2017-18 Funding Floor Allocation Adjustment	Criminal Justice Realignment	Preliminary Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	Total
Court	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
San Benito	2,357,689	8,326	105,382	(461)	8,819	pending	2,479,755
San Bernardino	94,017,912	608,729	1,683,826	(16,776)	915,690	pending	97,209,381
San Diego	134,848,310	1,879,544	(1,770,123)	(24,293)	495,887	pending	135,429,325
San Francisco	56,752,139	314,519	(5,262,207)	(9,575)	45,323	pending	51,840,200
San Joaquin	32,995,486	346,128	923,398	(6,191)	139,045	pending	34,397,867
San Luis Obispo	13,046,098	282,758	(509,481)	(2,282)	70,753	pending	12,887,847
San Mateo	34,365,524	(536,099)	214,992	(6,006)	42,657	pending	34,081,068
Santa Barbara	21,524,696	(7,453)	225,361	(3,771)	74,240	pending	21,813,073
Santa Clara	75,710,803	1,063,634	(1,844,229)	(13,861)	142,327	pending	75,058,674
Santa Cruz	11,656,513	130,494	52,020	(2,167)	7,998	pending	11,844,859
Shasta	12,443,776	125,540	331,747	(1,901)	73,419	pending	12,972,581
Sierra	747,892	9,859	(23,205)	13,353	205	pending	748,104
Siskiyou	3,018,787	36,257	(134,605)	(518)	9,229	pending	2,929,150
Solano	20,246,896	274,323	330,966	(3,696)	122,639	pending	20,971,127
Sonoma	23,073,178	417,021	(167,019)	(4,170)	115,051	pending	23,434,061
Stanislaus	20,973,249	221,251	332,613	(3,925)	63,575	pending	21,586,763
Sutter	4,846,827	118,527	79,670	(897)	19,141	pending	5,063,267
Tehama	3,709,881	16,974	101,091	(715)	12,305	pending	3,839,535
Trinity	1,769,878	21,055	34,338	(256)	2,393	pending	1,827,407
Tulare	17,197,179	264,572	1,178,217	(3,411)	88,390	pending	18,724,947
Tuolumne	3,153,407	51,126	139,768	(564)	6,973	pending	3,350,709
Ventura	33,951,406	79,260	1,265,056	(6,189)	351,100	pending	35,640,632
Yolo	9,187,137	38,378	587,674	(1,669)	51,886	pending	9,863,405
Yuba	4,429,024	36,275	96,488	(824)	36,505	pending	4,597,467
Total	1,820,650,140	4,787,751	(0)	(0)	9,223,000	-	1,834,660,891

Trial Court Trust Fund - Fund Condition Statement

	A	B	C	D	E	F
	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21
	Year-End Financial Statement	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated
1 Beginning Fund Balance	6,614,017	34,829,875	32,348,422	29,821,351	22,433,675	14,623,866
2 Prior-Year Adjustments	7,208,461	1,215,301	(528,300)	-	-	-
3 Revenues and Transfers	2,431,232,814	2,489,690,319	2,492,910,404	2,487,879,392	2,487,879,392	2,487,879,392
4 Revenues						
5 Maintenance of Effort Obligation Revenue	659,050,502	659,050,502	659,050,502	659,050,502	659,050,502	659,050,502
6 Civil Fee Revenue	353,216,716	344,838,533	341,184,382	344,514,348	344,514,348	344,514,348
7 Court Security Fee/ Operations Assessment Revenue	120,193,147	106,217,441	131,186,979	122,317,989	122,317,989	122,317,989
8 Civil Assessment Revenue	128,402,757	127,729,329	162,971,715	165,107,610	165,107,610	165,107,610
9 Parking Penalty Assessment Revenue	25,069,491	27,248,562	28,085,130	29,004,384	29,004,384	29,004,384
10 Telephonic Appearances	6,812,310	7,089,512	7,279,711	7,535,874	7,535,874	7,535,874
11 Interest from SMIF	335,260	613,938	613,938	613,938	613,938	613,938
12 Sanctions and Contempt Fines	981,144	978,231	978,231	978,231	978,231	978,231
13 Miscellaneous Revenue	550,065	126,851	193,394	190,095	190,095	190,095
14 Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements						
15 General Fund Transfer	943,724,000	1,021,832,000	972,498,000	972,498,000	972,498,000	972,498,000
16 General Fund Transfer - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000
17 General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	58,900,000	61,300,000	55,000,000	52,200,000	52,200,000	52,200,000
18 Reduction Offset Transfers ²	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000
19 Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements ³	13,217,422	11,885,422	13,088,422	13,088,422	13,088,422	13,088,422
20 Total Resources	2,445,055,292	2,525,735,495	2,524,730,526	2,517,700,743	2,510,313,067	2,502,503,258
21 Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations						
22 Program 30/30.05 (0140010) - Judicial Council	3,620,851	3,035,000	3,154,676	3,110,676	3,108,676	3,108,676
23 Program 30.15 (Formerly Program 45.10) (0140019) - Trial Court Op	12,369,281	-	-	-	-	-
24 Program 45.10 (0150010) - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,816,242,767	1,888,225,367	1,886,804,262	1,889,086,674	1,889,133,601	1,889,172,505
25 Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	114,387,117	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000
26 Program 45.25 (0150019) - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	330,369,783	338,231,000	338,231,000	338,231,000	338,231,000	338,231,000
27 Program 45.35 (0150028) - Assigned Judges	25,199,733	27,005,000	27,005,000	27,005,000	27,005,000	27,005,000
28 Program 45.45 (0150037) - Court Interpreters	99,598,715	102,327,969	105,481,840	105,526,840	105,526,840	105,526,840
29 Program 45.55 (0150046) - Grants	8,146,000	8,147,000	9,242,960	8,406,446	8,366,653	8,366,653
30 Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts ⁴	-	11,607,369	10,289,437	9,200,431	9,617,431	9,200,431
31 Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	291,169	108,368	-	-	-	-
32 Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations	2,410,225,417	2,493,387,073	2,494,909,175	2,495,267,067	2,495,689,201	2,495,311,105
33 Ending Fund Balance	34,829,875	32,348,422	29,821,351	22,433,675	14,623,866	7,192,153
35 Urgent Needs Reserve		10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
36 Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts ⁵		150,000	100,000	100,000		
37 Court Interpreter Funds Held in Reserve	9,043,514	7,399,362	5,549,522	3,699,682	1,849,842	(0)
38 CAC Dependency Collections Held in Reserve	2,186,060	1,171,286	1,012,393	1,151,320	1,098,224	1,098,224
39 Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements Held in Reserve	636,668	528,300				
40 Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services						
41 Equal Access Fund Held in Reserve	454,039	859,678	-	(0)	(0)	(0)
42 Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Held in Reserve	1,449,503	415,112	75,357	75,357	75,357	75,357
43 Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance	21,060,092	11,824,685	13,084,079	7,407,316	1,600,443	(3,981,428)
44 Net Revenue/Transfers Over or (Under) Expenditures	21,007,397	(3,696,754)	(1,998,771)	(7,387,676)	(7,809,809)	(7,431,713)

TCTF 2017-2018 Judicial Council and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts Appropriations Allocations

#	Project and Program Title	2016-17 JC- Approved Allocation	2016-17 Funded from Courts' Program 45.10 TCTF Allocations	2016-17 Approved Total Allocation	TCBAC Revenue and Expenditure Subcommittee FY 2017-18 Preliminary Allocation Recommendations			Program Allocation Increase/ (Decrease)
					Judicial Council (Staff) ¹	Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	Total	
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C (Col A + B)	Col. D	Col. E	Col F (Col. D + E)	Col. G
1	Children in Dependency Case Training	-	113,000	113,000	-	113,000	113,000	-
2	Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot Program	500,000	8,473,964	8,973,964	500,000	7,244,437	7,744,437	(1,229,527)
3	Equal Access Fund	194,000	-	194,000	258,000	-	258,000	64,000
4	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections	260,000	-	260,000	260,000	-	260,000	-
5	Revenue and Collections Program	625,000	-	625,000	625,000	-	625,000	-
6	Programs Funded from Courts' TCTF Allocations							
7	Civil, Small Claims, Probate and Mental Health (V3) CMS	-	564,000	564,000	-	564,000	564,000	-
8	California Courts Technology Center	-	1,472,000	1,472,000	-	1,472,000	1,472,000	-
9	Interim Case Management System	-	842,000	842,000	-	361,000	361,000	(481,000)
10	Phoenix Financial Services	107,000	-	107,000	107,000	-	107,000	-
11	Phoenix HR Services	1,349,000	-	1,349,000	1,404,676	-	1,404,676	55,676
12	Other Post Employment Benefits Valuations	-	-	-	-	535,000	535,000	535,000
13	Total, Program/Project Allocations	3,035,000	11,464,964	14,499,964	3,154,676	10,289,437	13,444,113	(1,055,851)
14	Department of Motor Vehicles Amnesty Program service charges	250,000		250,000	-	-	-	N/A
15	Estimated State Controller's Office services charges	219,399		219,399	303,000	-	303,000	83,601
17	Estimated Budget Act Appropriation and Changes Using Provisional Language Authority¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,340,000	13,025,000	16,365,000	N/A
18	Appropriation Balance	N/A	N/A	N/A	(117,676)	2,735,563	2,617,887	N/A

1. Provisional language in the State Budget Act for 2016 allows the Judicial Council appropriation authority to be increased for support to the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Pilot, Equal Access Fund, and Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections. Provisional language also allows up to \$11.274 million to be transferred to the Judicial Council appropriation authority for the recovery of costs for administrative services provided to the trial courts.

**FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts:
Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	2016-17	2017-18	TCBAC R&E Subcommittee Preliminarily Recommends for 2017-18	Explanation for Items Not Considered
			Budget Act	May Revise		
			Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D
1	I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation	Base	1,704,515,909	1,767,863,005	1,767,863,005	
3	II. Adjustments					
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-400,067	-616,836		JC policy
5	IV. FY 2016-2017 Allocations (Governor's Budget)					
6	\$8.6 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	8,452,000			prior year
7	\$7.5 Million in FY 2013-14 Restored Benefits Funding	Base	7,069,000			prior year
8	\$412,000 in New Security Funding	Base	20,000,000			prior year
9	Non-Sheriff's Security BCP Funding	Base	28,500,000			prior year
10	\$19.6 Million in New Funding	Base	343,000			prior year
11	\$25.0 Million in Court Innovations Grants (Total Funding for Both Trial and Appellate Courts)	Non-Base	25,000,000			prior year
12	\$21.4 Million in Proposition 47 Workload Funding	Non-Base	21,400,000			prior year
13						
14	V. Statutory Allocation Adjustments					
15	1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-8,781,306	pending		pending
16	Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-50,000,000	-50,000,000		Budget Act
17	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000		JC policy
18	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-616,836	pending		JC policy
19						
20	VI. Allocation for Reimbursements					
21	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	Non-Base	114,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000	
22	Jury	Non-Base	14,500,000	14,500,000	14,500,000	
23	Replacement Screening Stations	Non-Base	2,286,000	2,286,000	2,286,000	
24	Self-Help Center	Non-Base	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	
25	Elder Abuse	Non-Base	332,000	332,000	332,000	
26	CSA Audits ¹	Non-Base	0	325,000	325,000	
27	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement Rollover	Non-Base	755,678	pending		
28	CAC Dependency Collections Reimbursement	Non-Base	629,077	911,286	911,286	

**FY 2016-17 and FY 2017-18 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts:
Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations**

#	Description	Type	2016-17	2017-18	TCBAC R&E Subcommittee Preliminarily Recommends for 2017-18	Explanation for Items Not Considered
			Budget Act	May Revise		
			Col. A	Col. B		
29	VII. Estimated Revenue Distributions					
30	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	79,426,599	114,668,986		JC policy
31	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	21,348,123	21,272,860		statutory
32	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494	10,907,494		statutory
33	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	3,150,757	3,107,018		JC policy/statute
34	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,436,478	2,403,479		JC policy
35	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	943,840		JC policy/statute
36	Prior Year Revenues	Non-Base	0	0		JC policy/statute
37	VIII. Miscellaneous Charges					
38	Repayment of Prior Year Cash Advance	Non-Base				Non-allocation
39	State Admin Infrastructure Charges Prior Year Adjustment	Non-Base				JC policy
40	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-4,389,676	-4,443,676		JC policy
41	Prior Year Facility Payments Charge Adjustments	Non-Base				JC policy
42	Total		2,014,231,070	2,010,883,457	1,903,417,291	
43	Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriation Budget Act ²		2,047,487,000	2,027,005,000		
44	Transfer to Compensation of Superior Court Judges appropriation due to conversion of subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships					
45	Transfer to Court Interpreters appropriation due to court interpreter portion of \$42.8 million for new benefits funding					
46	Adjusted Appropriation		2,047,487,000	2,027,005,000		
47	Estimated Remaining Appropriation		33,255,930	16,121,543		

1 Provision 12 of the 2015 Budget Act requires that \$325,000 be allocated by the Judicial Council in order to reimburse the California State Auditor for the costs of trial court audits.

2 Includes the Budget Act Appropriation of \$114,700,000 for Item 0250-102-0932 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel.

2017-2018 Beginning Base Allocation: 2016-17 Beginning Base, 2016-2017 Base Allocations, and Annualization

	Beginning 2016-2017 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	WAFM Allocation	WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	2015-16 Benefits Funding	2012-13 & 2013-14 Previously Unfunded Benefits Costs Allocation	TCTF Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Ending 2016-2017 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (2010- 11 and 2011-12)	Annualization of Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Preliminary Beginning Base in 2017-2018
Court	1	2	3	4	4A	5	6 = Sum of 1 to 5	7	8	9 = Sum of 6 to 8
Alameda	71,712,974	(436,743)	(16,517)	645,929	795,745	-	72,701,389	3,102,047	-	75,803,436
Alpine	725,356	(19,759)	35,931	(17,093)	3,088	-	727,523	20,340	-	747,863
Amador	2,119,319	59,048	(532)	41,319	11,783	-	2,230,937	51,756	-	2,282,693
Butte	9,322,318	375,299	(2,180)	211,906	78,377	-	9,985,719	124,077	-	10,109,796
Calaveras	1,998,768	22,043	(507)	74,133	22,634	-	2,117,072	50,506	-	2,167,578
Colusa	1,659,845	(17,236)	160,044	24,213	7,914	-	1,834,781	24,773	-	1,859,554
Contra Costa	38,588,448	(807,633)	(8,738)	(783,109)	504,413	-	37,493,381	1,396,192	-	38,889,573
Del Norte	2,375,600	82,386	(587)	59,258	22,599	-	2,539,256	94,130	-	2,633,386
El Dorado	6,357,534	(34,774)	(1,520)	98,371	9,371	-	6,428,982	213,120	-	6,642,102
Fresno	41,291,509	2,960,295	(11,030)	252,326	456,561	-	44,949,661	3,340,364	-	48,290,025
Glenn	1,799,992	(94,502)	63,519	27,501	11,899	-	1,808,408	54,665	-	1,863,073
Humboldt	5,876,882	173,992	(1,388)	56,493	67,869	-	6,173,848	73,084	-	6,246,932
Imperial	8,094,884	174,720	(1,872)	120,442	101,174	-	8,489,347	125,539	-	8,614,886
Inyo	1,942,805	(36,939)	(436)	38,621	16,191	-	1,960,242	75,586	-	2,035,828
Kern	38,251,923	3,029,898	(10,404)	988,357	272,793	-	42,532,567	3,544,269	-	46,076,836
Kings	6,315,864	349,995	(1,427)	48,872	10,949	-	6,724,253	45,118	-	6,769,371
Lake	3,181,791	95,340	(721)	35,981	1,582	-	3,313,974	9,123	-	3,323,097
Lassen	2,247,025	(24,851)	(458)	16,783	2,759	-	2,241,258	7,839	-	2,249,097
Los Angeles	501,034,942	6,939,407	(115,500)	(1,336,025)	5,984,546	-	512,507,371	18,887,969	-	531,395,340
Madera	6,836,837	219,947	(1,711)	241,857	22,490	-	7,319,421	384,826	-	7,704,247
Marin	11,514,893	(519,030)	(2,806)	221,932	177,317	-	11,392,306	644,512	-	12,036,818
Mariposa	1,124,763	(25,442)	(262)	2,134	1,761	-	1,102,953	22,301	-	1,125,254
Mendocino	4,738,416	137,568	(1,208)	188,392	116,313	-	5,179,481	311,771	-	5,491,252
Merced	10,663,269	227,209	(2,697)	154,519	153,398	-	11,195,698	774,827	-	11,970,525
Modoc	893,640	(55,866)	(206)	10,777	1,753	-	850,098	31,967	-	882,065
Mono	1,466,822	33,841	107,760	11,291	5,599	-	1,625,314	85,641	-	1,710,955
Monterey	16,102,611	564,039	(3,808)	361,192	130,795	-	17,154,829	277,496	-	17,432,325
Napa	6,802,293	164,861	(1,587)	106,421	89,880	-	7,161,868	309,796	-	7,471,664
Nevada	4,758,372	(87,424)	(980)	99,540	59,490	-	4,828,999	95,495	-	4,924,494
Orange	132,621,339	(1,851,991)	(31,299)	66,411	2,860,993	-	133,665,453	6,929,921	-	140,595,374
Placer	13,979,681	547,583	(3,419)	253,075	140,675	-	14,917,595	634,797	-	15,552,392
Plumas	1,244,991	(41,600)	4,938	12,766	2,974	-	1,224,070	14,929	-	1,238,999
Riverside	78,253,187	2,225,921	(18,537)	1,454,359	812,595	-	82,727,525	923,657	-	83,651,182
Sacramento	71,259,749	(69,047)	(16,579)	(1,032,400)	1,136,127	-	71,277,850	3,560,592	-	74,838,442
San Benito	2,387,768	(104,676)	(551)	32,176	8,330	-	2,323,047	34,642	-	2,357,689

2017-2018 Beginning Base Allocation: 2016-17 Beginning Base, 2016-2017 Base Allocations, and Annualization

	Beginning 2016-2017 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	WAFM Allocation	WAFM Funding Floor Adjustment	2015-16 Benefits Funding	2012-13 & 2013-14 Previously Unfunded Benefits Costs Allocation	TCTF Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Ending 2016-2017 TCTF Program 45.10 (0150010) Base Allocation	General Fund Benefits Base Allocation (2010- 11 and 2011-12)	Annualization of Reduction for SJO Position Converted to Judgeship	Preliminary Beginning Base in 2017-2018
Court	1	2	3	4	4A	5	6 = Sum of 1 to 5	7	8	9 = Sum of 6 to 8
San Bernardino	87,580,416	2,446,434	(20,474)	2,087,322	659,482	-	92,753,179	1,264,733	-	94,017,912
San Diego	132,329,658	(2,953,490)	(30,342)	1,021,966	2,038,142	(200,528)	132,205,407	2,853,599	(210,696)	134,848,310
San Francisco	52,204,792	(350,192)	(13,130)	(1,316,245)	739,779	-	51,265,004	5,487,135	-	56,752,139
San Joaquin	29,295,135	1,772,837	(7,450)	424,617	264,991	-	31,750,129	1,245,357	-	32,995,486
San Luis Obispo	12,839,262	(4,685)	(2,902)	60,624	60,453	(189,796)	12,762,956	298,958	(15,816)	13,046,098
San Mateo	31,784,395	(174,732)	(7,682)	54,150	298,280	-	31,954,411	2,411,113	-	34,365,524
Santa Barbara	19,393,423	427,936	(4,669)	50,020	60,324	-	19,927,034	1,597,662	-	21,524,696
Santa Clara	72,569,297	(165,418)	(17,232)	606,490	408,201	-	73,401,336	2,309,467	-	75,710,803
Santa Cruz	10,973,474	166,897	(2,614)	238,885	76,312	-	11,452,955	203,558	-	11,656,513
Shasta	11,508,721	348,727	(2,276)	235,389	90,993	-	12,181,554	262,222	-	12,443,776
Sierra	735,183	(39,021)	28,370	9,323	4,422	-	738,276	9,616	-	747,892
Siskiyou	2,924,261	(162,978)	(672)	137,750	29,388	-	2,927,749	91,038	-	3,018,787
Solano	19,064,340	(10,465)	(4,488)	597,865	245,864	-	19,893,117	353,779	-	20,246,896
Sonoma	21,946,401	(409,145)	(5,158)	63,956	305,073	-	21,901,128	1,172,050	-	23,073,178
Stanislaus	18,420,042	752,566	(4,784)	95,213	404,982	-	19,668,019	1,305,230	-	20,973,249
Sutter	4,342,311	276,084	(1,076)	34,036	35,710	-	4,687,066	159,761	-	4,846,827
Tehama	3,360,712	174,873	(866)	54,682	12,296	-	3,601,697	108,184	-	3,709,881
Trinity	1,630,855	65,685	(308)	10,086	9,880	-	1,716,199	53,679	-	1,769,878
Tulare	15,592,866	1,112,551	(3,937)	410,850	51,104	-	17,163,435	33,744	-	17,197,179
Tuolumne	2,930,490	72,658	(664)	91,053	9,519	-	3,103,055	50,352	-	3,153,407
Ventura	31,178,817	1,092,944	(7,430)	450,232	268,090	-	32,982,653	968,753	-	33,951,406
Yolo	8,367,196	405,133	(1,944)	123,356	83,319	-	8,977,060	210,077	-	9,187,137
Yuba	3,597,383	586,977	(1,000)	122,050	32,747	-	4,338,157	90,867	-	4,429,024
Total	1,704,115,841	19,588,058	(0)	8,452,388	20,292,088	(390,324)	1,752,058,051	68,818,601	(226,512)	1,820,650,140

Proposed Allocation of New Funding for 2016-2017 Benefit Cost Changes

Court	2016-2017 Total Benefit Cost Changes 2016 Fall Submission Included in 2017 Governor's Budget			2016-2017 Total Benefit Cost Changes 2016 Spring Submission for Inclusion in 2017 Budget Act		
	Total Non-Interpreter Cost Changes	Total Interpreter Cost Changes	Total Cost Changes as of 2016 Fall Request	Total Non-Interpreter Cost Changes	Total Interpreter Cost Changes	Proposed Allocation of Total Cost Changes (D + E)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alameda	(133,809)	(28,184)	(161,993)	(117,415)	(28,184)	(145,600)
Alpine	6,614	-	6,614	11,842	-	11,842
Amador	21,663	-	21,663	21,663	-	21,663
Butte	65,745	-	65,745	65,290	-	65,290
Calaveras	22,185	-	22,185	20,469	-	20,469
Colusa	10,573	-	10,573	21,699	-	21,699
Contra Costa	(176,225)	(12,335)	(188,561)	(627,559)	(24,211)	(651,770)
Del Norte	44,883	-	44,883	39,609	-	39,609
El Dorado	47,636	3,341	50,977	38,696	3,341	42,037
Fresno	(615,644)	(15,679)	(631,323)	(240,622)	(5,414)	(246,036)
Glenn	25,741	-	25,741	48,933	-	48,933
Humboldt	98,823	936	99,759	92,631	780	93,411
Imperial	20,929	18	20,948	(31,042)	(394)	(31,436)
Inyo	37,275	-	37,275	21,672	-	21,672
Kern	(866,725)	(39,596)	(906,322)	(866,725)	(39,596)	(906,322)
Kings	157,933	6,350	164,283	105,069	3,949	109,018
Lake	41,154	-	41,154	48,157	-	48,157
Lassen	16,333	3,389	19,722	19,933	-	19,933
Los Angeles	92,404	(7,168)	85,236	(220,592)	(48,610)	(269,202)
Madera	135,015	9,227	144,242	32,254	55	32,309
Marin	207,082	20,404	227,487	158,933	19,939	178,873
Mariposa	16,764	-	16,764	30,528	-	30,528
Mendocino	6,647	5,135	11,781	(10,851)	4,789	(6,062)
Merced	(101,556)	810	(100,746)	(245,209)	(4,216)	(249,425)
Modoc	4,475	-	4,475	4,475	-	4,475
Mono	64,257	-	64,257	66,471	-	66,471
Monterey	102,885	4,641	107,526	42,357	4,641	46,998
Napa	23,399	2,380	25,779	26,037	2,380	28,416
Nevada	138,923	-	138,923	119,536	-	119,536
Orange	(1,248,482)	(114,482)	(1,362,964)	(1,248,482)	(114,482)	(1,362,964)
Placer	199,413	2,503	201,916	199,413	2,503	201,916
Plumas	7,441	-	7,441	8,833	-	8,833
Riverside	1,801,314	59,988	1,861,302	1,370,087	43,619	1,413,706
Sacramento	304,262	10,827	315,089	(19,335)	(646)	(19,981)
San Benito	8,326	-	8,326	8,326	-	8,326
San Bernardino	585,917	26,421	612,338	608,729	103,097	711,826
San Diego	1,879,544	103,455	1,982,999	1,879,544	103,455	1,982,999
San Francisco	24,373	12,306	36,679	314,519	12,331	326,851
San Joaquin	296,026	8,881	304,907	346,128	10,988	357,116
San Luis Obispo	282,758	9,865	292,624	282,758	10,653	293,411
San Mateo	(185,641)	141	(185,500)	(536,099)	(9,367)	(545,466)
Santa Barbara	(7,453)	(9,435)	(16,887)	(7,453)	(9,435)	(16,887)
Santa Clara	1,063,635	94,312	1,157,947	1,063,634	94,312	1,157,947
Santa Cruz	272,516	28,969	301,485	130,494	8,938	139,432
Shasta	128,636	-	128,636	125,540	-	125,540
Sierra	12,199	-	12,199	9,859	-	9,859
Siskiyou	36,257	-	36,257	36,257	-	36,257
Solano	355,626	4,188	359,814	274,323	2,070	276,393
Sonoma	417,021	11,796	428,817	417,021	11,796	428,817
Stanislaus	212,165	2,343	214,508	221,251	3,024	224,274
Sutter	102,896	3,070	105,966	118,527	3,069	121,596
Tehama	58,190	1,010	59,200	16,974	(104)	16,870
Trinity	21,055	-	21,055	21,055	-	21,055
Tulare	573,588	11,720	585,308	264,572	6,267	270,839
Tuolumne	51,952	-	51,952	51,126	-	51,126
Ventura	(42,435)	(3,921)	(46,356)	79,260	(267)	78,993
Yolo	33,911	1,545	35,457	38,378	2,497	40,875
Yuba	86,536	-	86,536	36,275	-	36,275
Total:	6,846,924	219,170	7,066,095	4,787,751	173,566	4,961,317

2017-2018 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need ⁽¹⁾			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
		RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor ⁽²⁾	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2016)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor ⁽³⁾	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
Cluster	Court	A	B	C = (A + B)	D = (C-1) * Dollar Factor	E	F = D+E	G	H = (C-1) * BLS-Adjusted Dollar Factor + (E * G)
4	Alameda	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

2017-2018 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need ⁽¹⁾			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
Cluster	Court	RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor ⁽²⁾	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2016)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor ⁽³⁾	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
		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, nor vacant positions; in January 2014 the TCBAC approved a dollar factor adjustment for courts with fewer than 50 FTE.

(3) Bureau of Labor Statistics Cost of Labor adjustment based on Quarterly Census of Wages & Employment, three year average from 2013 through 2015. Salaries of Local Government used for comparison based on Public Administration (North American Industrial Classification System, 92) unless proportion of state government workers in total employment exceeds 50% in which case three-year average of local and state salaries for Public Administration is used for comparison.

2017-2018 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
		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	$K = (A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor} * I1) + (A * I2)$	$L = (((((B-1) * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G) * J1) + (B * J2))$	$M = (K + L)$	$N = C * OE\&E$	O	$P = (H + M + N) - O$	$Q = P / \text{Statewide}$
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%

2017-2018 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			
					Estimated OE&E Needed (Excludes funding for operations contracts) (Using FY 2013-14 to 2015-16 data)							
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						
Cluster	Court	I1	I2	J1	J2	$K = (A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor} * I1) + (A * I2) + (B * J2)$	$L = (((B-1) * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G * J1) + (B * J2)$	$M = (K + L)$	$N = C * OE\&E$	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

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

FY 2017-18 RAS FTE Need

Court	Program 10 (Operations) Staff Need											Program 90 (Administration) Staff Need			Total RAS Need
	Infractions	Criminal	Civil	Family Law	Pr/MH	Juvenile	Total Program 10 Need	Court interpreter FTEs	Manager/Supervisor Ratio (by cluster)	Manager/Supervisor Need	Total Program 10 Need (rounded up)	Non-RAS FTE (for Program 90 Need Calculation)*	Program 90 ratio (by cluster)	Program 90 Need (rounded up)	
	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)	
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
Statewide	1,412.5	4,174.0	2,828.6	3,183.9	1,037.6	912.3	13,548.9	727.2		1,422.2	14,998.0	1,761.9		2,421.0	17,419

*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 A	FTE Dollar Factor Applied (Current -- \$59,494*BLS) B	FTE Need C	Eligible for FTE Floor ? D	Has FTE Need <50 AND FTE Dollar Factor is Less Than Median of \$45,508? E	Final FTE Dollar Factor 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

WAFM Post BLS FTE Allotment: Median
\$ 45,508

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)

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
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
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.20%	0.23%	113.2%	(1,453,649)	1,645,783	192,134
1	Trinity	990,359	0.07%	0.07%	95.3%	(495,179)	471,907	(23,272)
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.85%	1.11%	130.4%	(6,146,506)	8,014,884	1,868,378
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.18%	0.17%	94.1%	(1,294,901)	1,218,883	(76,018)
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.69%	2.01%	119.1%	(12,183,413)	14,509,278	2,325,865
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.45%	0.55%	121.2%	(3,252,074)	3,942,247	690,172
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.22%	0.27%	119.1%	(1,612,538)	1,919,879	307,341
	Statewide	1,440,487,965	100%	100%	100%	(720,243,983)	720,243,983	0
						(720,243,983)		

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	-

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
3	Stanislaus	3,109,158	(2,515,260)	593,898	-	-	-	3,109,158	-
2	Sutter	676,255	(552,307)	123,948	-	-	-	676,255	-
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	-
	Statewide	233,788,058	(233,788,058)	0	-	-	-	233,788,058	-
		233,788,058			-			233,788,058	-

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)

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
3	Stanislaus	(1,482,118)	(3,717,982)	332,613	(3,925)
2	Sutter	(303,662)	(798,725)	79,670	(897)
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)
	Statewide	(0)	(233,788,058)	(0)	(0)

Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

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

Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM

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

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

Summary of Changes from 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)
Total Funding Need	\$ 2,350,120,506	\$ 2,336,697,645	\$ (13,422,861)	-0.6%
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%

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)
Total	1,745,554,822	7,364,127	321,949	100.00%	(321,949)

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
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
	Statewide	2,336,697,645	100.00%	1,745,554,822					7,364,127

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 ¹	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	44,861,145	(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

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

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

Allocation of \$9.223 Million of Criminal Justice Realignment Funding
Using Percentage of Petitions to Revoke/Modify Post Release Community Supervision and Parole
 (January 1, 2016-December 31, 2016)

Court	Total Petitions (PRCS + Parole)	Percent of Statewide Total (PRCS+Parole)	Allocation Amount (PRCS+ Parole)
	Column A	Column B	Column C
Alameda	1,232	2.74%	\$252,661
Alpine ^{1,2}	1	0.00%	\$273
Amador	28	0.06%	\$5,742
Butte	423	0.94%	\$86,750
Calaveras	8	0.02%	\$1,641
Colusa	18	0.04%	\$3,691
Contra Costa	567	1.26%	\$116,281
Del Norte	42	0.09%	\$8,613
El Dorado	216	0.48%	\$44,298
Fresno	1,973	4.39%	\$404,626
Glenn	11	0.02%	\$2,256
Humboldt	249	0.55%	\$51,065
Imperial	201	0.45%	\$41,221
Inyo	29	0.06%	\$5,947
Kern	1,634	3.63%	\$335,103
Kings	299	0.66%	\$61,319
Lake	61	0.14%	\$12,510
Lassen	33	0.07%	\$6,768
Los Angeles	15,255	33.92%	\$3,128,520
Madera	214	0.48%	\$43,887
Marin	85	0.19%	\$17,432
Mariposa	22	0.05%	\$4,512
Mendocino	194	0.43%	\$39,786
Merced	513	1.14%	\$105,207
Modoc	12	0.03%	\$2,461
Mono	13	0.03%	\$2,666
Monterey	172	0.38%	\$35,274
Napa	76	0.17%	\$15,586
Nevada	12	0.03%	\$2,461
Orange	1,875	4.17%	\$384,528
Placer	217	0.48%	\$44,503
Plumas ^{1,2}	6	0.01%	\$1,230
Riverside	4,462	9.92%	\$915,074
Sacramento	700	1.56%	\$143,557
San Benito	43	0.10%	\$8,819
San Bernardino	4,465	9.93%	\$915,690
San Diego	2,418	5.38%	\$495,887
San Francisco	221	0.49%	\$45,323
San Joaquin	678	1.51%	\$139,045
San Luis Obispo	345	0.77%	\$70,753
San Mateo	208	0.46%	\$42,657
Santa Barbara	362	0.80%	\$74,240
Santa Clara	694	1.54%	\$142,327
Santa Cruz	39	0.09%	\$7,998
Shasta	358	0.80%	\$73,419
Sierra	1	0.00%	\$205
Siskiyou	45	0.10%	\$9,229
Solano	598	1.33%	\$122,639
Sonoma	561	1.25%	\$115,051
Stanislaus	310	0.69%	\$63,575
Sutter ^{1,2}	93	0.21%	\$19,141
Tehama ^{1,2}	60	0.13%	\$12,305
Trinity ¹	12	0.03%	\$2,393
Tulare	431	0.96%	\$88,390
Tuolumne	34	0.08%	\$6,973
Ventura	1,712	3.81%	\$351,100
Yolo	253	0.56%	\$51,886
Yuba	178	0.40%	\$36,505
Total (statewide)	44,972	100%	\$9,223,000

¹proxy used for missing PRCS petitions (average of populated quarters)

\$9,223,000

²proxy used for missing Parole petitions (average of populated quarters)

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

(Action Item)

Title: Recommendation of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) on the 2017-2018 Work Plan
Date: 6/1/2017
Contact: Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Analyst, Budget Services
916-263-1754 | suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee's (FMS) proposed 2017–2018 Work Plan for the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM).

Background

The FMS prepares an annual work plan to direct its efforts in developing and refining the WAFM model. In past years, the work plan has been submitted to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) as an informational item. This year, the FMS is requesting approval of the TCBAC for its proposed 2017–2018 Work Plan for WAFM.

The FMS met on April 12, 2017 to begin discussions on the work plan for 2017–2018. At its meeting on May 8, 2017, the subcommittee voted on its initial 2017–2018 work plan and then refined its work plan at its May 25, 2017 meeting. The FMS proposed 2017–2018 Work Plan for WAFM can be found on Attachment 2.

Recommendation

The following recommendations are presented for the TCBAC's consideration:

1. Approve the FMS's proposed 2017–2018 Work Plan for WAFM as is.

Or

2. Amend and approve the FMS's proposed 2017–2018 Work Plan for WAFM.

Attachments

Attachment 2: 2017-2018 Funding Methodology Subcommittee Work Plan

FUNDING METHODOLOGY SUBCOMMITTEE WORK PLAN

Updated on May 25, 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. Address impact of BLS in the model

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

(Action Item)

Title: Revision to the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedure

Date: 6/1/2017

Contact: Suzanne Blihovde, Senior Analyst, Budget Services
916-263-1754 | suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov

Issue

Consideration of the Funding Methodology Subcommittee’s (FMS) recommendation to revise the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedure.

Background

On August 22, 2013, the Judicial Council approved the WAFM Adjustment Request Procedure, which provides trial courts the opportunity to identify factors which are not yet accounted for in WAFM, but are essential to the fundamental operation of a trial court, and to request on-going adjustments to the assessed WAFM funding needs. The approved process is provided in Attachment 3A.

At its April 12, 2017 meeting, the FMS discussed the current WAFM Adjustment Request Procedure and identified several areas needing revision to best serve the needs of the courts and to allow ample time frames for implementing any approved adjustments to the WAFM model. The following were identified for revision:

- Technical changes to reflect organizational changes within the Judicial Council of California;
- Change in submittal date and review timelines by the FMS and the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC);
- Formalize that no changes to the WAFM formulae can occur after the March/April Judicial Council meeting if it impacts the subsequent fiscal year; and
- Allow the FMS to take expedited action on the request, if directed by the TCBAC.

At its May 8, 2017 meeting, the FMS voted to recommend the proposed revisions to the WAFM Adjustment Request Procedure to TCBAC (see Attachment 3B).

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Recommendation

Recommend the revisions to the WAFM Adjustment Request Procedure be considered by the Judicial Council at its July 28, 2017 meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



AB1058 Child Support Court Allocation Project

Daniel J. Bauer, esq.

May 11, 2017



Presentation Overview

- Introduction
- What Has Gone Before
- Determining Workload: Volume
- Determining Workload: Duration
- Determining Workload: Extenuating Circumstances
- Strata
- Model Review
 - Model 1: WAFM-based
 - Model 2: Average Salary
 - Model 3: Average Salary with Adjustment
 - Model 4: Model Office

Introduction

- Daniel Bauer is a licensed attorney (2013) with child support administrative experience since 1998
 - Worked in Iowa's administrative program (executive branch)
 - Helped draft administrative rules on case closure, and later helping with performance metrics and budgeting
 - Worked in Michigan's judicial program (executive branch)
 - Helped design the system for child support allocation, distribution, and disbursement
 - Worked in Michigan's judicial program (judicial branch)
 - Wrote confidential reports to judges on the operations of their child support offices
 - Aided DCSS with their 2016 LCSA Allocation project

What Has Gone Before

- Hired by the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) to propose potential workload-based allocation models for the AB1058 courts
- Worked closely with the JCC administrative offices and the Child Support Commissioner (CSC) and Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Subject Matter Expert (SME) workgroups
- Jointly developed **guiding principles**
 - Used for model evaluation
- Jointly identified **driving factors**
 - Driving factors are those tasks which, because of a combination of frequency and duration, identify a majority of the work done in the office

Establishing Guiding principles

Child Support Commissioners

Fully address unique needs of each court

- Comprehensive
- Uniform
- Sufficient
- Tailored
- Ensure access to services

Flexibility

Statewide performance

Reduce use of presumed income

Cooperation

Self-enforcing integrity

Family Law Facilitators

Base level of services

- Inclusive
- Exclude favoritism
- Address unique aspects of service delivery
- Technology
- Effective delivery of services
- Attract and retain competent staff

Flexible yet stable

Transparency

Discussing Driving Factors

Child Support Commissioners

Hearings

- Paternity establishment
- Support order establishment
- Enforcement
- Modification

Pre-hearing work

- Scheduling
- Prep for commissioner to hear case

Post-hearing work

- Completing orders (submission)
- Processing orders

Family Law Facilitators

Triage (answering initial questions, directing people to right service provider)

Providing one-on-one support

- Assistance in completing forms
- Identifying immediate need and providing tools to meet that need

Preparing support schedules (guidelines) – varies by office

Workshops

Determining Workload

- Workload is primarily the result of two items
 - **Volume:** How *much* work there is to do
 - **Duration:** How *long* it takes to do the work
- Can make adjustments due to extenuating circumstances with direct or indirect impacts
 - Directly impact volume or duration for some cases
 - Poverty
 - Limited English proficient (LEP) individuals
 - Indirectly impact volume or duration
 - For example, a geographically large, mountainous jurisdiction has different challenges and potential funding needs than a large urban jurisdiction

Determining Volume: Commissioners & Court Admin

- AB1058 courts are motion-based practice
- Data sources
 - JBSIS
 - Closest to source – court database
 - No mandatory elements that track volume in AB1058 courts
 - CSE
 - Single, statewide database with data from LCSA offices (single largest volume contributor to AB1058 court docket)
 - Does not consistently include information from other litigants
 - Office-to-office inconsistencies
 - Many issues per motion or hearing, or only one issue per motion
 - Detailed pleadings or generic pleadings affect court preparation time
- Data types: Motions or Hearings?

Determining Volume: Motions vs. Hearings

Motions

- *JBS/S*: Not all AB1058 courts reported motion filings
- *CSE*: All offices reported motions; 95% of all motions fell in one of three motion types:
 - Modification: 50% of all
 - Judgment: 27% of all
 - Generic (Other): 18% of all

Hearings

- *JBS/S*: Not all AB1058 courts reported hearings
- *CSE*: All offices reported hearings; 95% of all hearings fell into one of seven motion types
 - Modification: 39% of all
 - Generic (Other): 18% of all
 - Contempt: 15% of all
 - Judgment: 11% of all
 - Seek Work: 5% of all
 - JDE/OEX: 4% of all
 - Set Aside: 3% of all

Determining Volume: Proposal (CSC)

- At this time, CSE is the only source for statewide information regarding volume of data at the AB1058 courts
- Hearing data has the appropriate granularity to match the driving factors identified by the CSC SME workgroup
- Proposed changes for long-term solution:
 - Gather data directly from the AB1058 courts
 - Make motion and hearing data mandatory data elements in JBSIS
 - Include volume and type
 - Create consistency
 - All LCSAs provide uniform, detailed pleadings rather than using generic language
 - CSE able to accurately count the issues presented to the court, regardless of the number of motions filed

Determining Volume: Family Law Facilitators

- Work includes:
 - One-on-one sessions with litigants and potential litigants
 - Group sessions with several litigants at the same time
 - Research into caselaw changes and resources available in jurisdiction
 - General administrative duties (personnel issues, meetings, reporting, etc.)
- Volume is a factor of:
 - People served in one-on-one sessions
 - Number of group sessions (workshops) provided
 - Jurisdiction size

Determining Volume: Sources

- Can derive from number of hearings in AB1058 court
 - Assumes most users do not seek FLF assistance without a hearing already scheduled
 - Excludes users who seek FLF assistance before scheduling a hearing and choose not to file a pleading
- Can count interactions from the FLF database
 - Not designed to be used as a volume tracker for funding purposes
 - May have inconsistent reporting regarding number of FLF office users
 - 1 workshop with 10 attendees may be 1 interaction for Office A, 10 interactions for Office B

Determining Volume: Proposal (FLF)

- Develop one model using percentage of hearings / number of hearings per facilitator office FTE
- Develop remaining models using data regarding interactions from FLF Electronic Database (FLFED)
 - Limit use to one-on-one family law interactions by court
 - Do not use FLF database for count of workshops
- Estimate workshops by office size: daily for largest; monthly for smallest; weekly, semi-weekly, and semi-monthly in between

Determining Duration: Two Methods (Plus One)

- Two methods:
 - Subject matter expert estimates obtained through sequential meetings (Delphi)
 - Self-reported task duration study (Stopwatch time study)
- Plus one:
 - Third-party observed task duration study (observational time study)

Determining Duration: Delphi Meetings

- Different *Delphi* than JCC currently uses for RAS/WAFM
- SMEs individually estimate duration of driving factors and submit estimates to meeting facilitator
- Meeting facilitator compiles all estimates, identifies who provided high- and low-estimates, and facilitates meeting with all SMEs who participated
 - Individual SME providing high estimate explains to group their justification for estimate
 - Individual SME providing low estimate explains to group their justification for estimate
 - Group asks questions for better understanding
- Seek revised estimates from SMEs and repeat

Pros and Cons of Delphi Technique

Pros

- Easy to apply results for non-case specific tasks (research, general administration, workshops, etc.)
- Generates consensus among experts
- Relies on many different perspectives to provide a result
- Easily replicated

Cons

- Can be overwhelming to estimate, if too many driving factors to consider
- Can be time consuming or stressful for experts
- Results in a single result, which may not reflect individuality of all offices statewide
- May not adequately account for the difference between short-cause and long-cause calendars

Determining Duration: Stopwatch Time Study

- Spreadsheet created allowing court users to self-report durations on certain tasks (identified driving factors)
 - Four courts volunteered to require staff to gather data for 26 days
 - 8 hours / day x 5 days per week = 40 hours / week
 - 40 hours / week times 52 weeks = 2,080 hours per year
 - 2,080 hours per year divided by 8 hours per day = 260 work days per year
 - 260 work days per year times 10% = 26 work days
 - Los Angeles, Ventura, Sacramento, Yolo participated
- Reported date, task, start time, stop time, and number of cases worked
- Note: Staffing hours may be less than 2,080 in model to account for holidays, annual or sick leave, trainings, etc.

Pros and Cons of Stopwatch Time Study

Pros

- Easy to apply results to case-specific tasks in hearing or only done by one person (commissioner)
- Durational results more reliable than estimates, as it records actual durations over time
- When all courts follow the same data collection protocols, data gathering is not complex

Cons

- Difficult to determine per-task duration if many people touch the same case outside of hearing time
- Assumes offices participating are a representative sample of similarly sized offices
- Time consuming for staff to record daily tasks – time spent reporting changes hours available to complete work

Determining Workload: Extenuating Circumstances

- Some courts require more staff to deal with the unique needs of the population served
 - Courts are required by court rule to provide LEP court users with an interpreter
 - Interpreter-facilitated interactions are longer than non-interpreter-facilitated interactions on the same topic
 - People living below or near the poverty level typically have challenges to getting to court for hearings, or staying at court for long interactions.
 - Factors that impede court users at or near the poverty level include issues such as access to transportation and child care, as well as the inability to take time off of work
- The models can adjust staffing levels for those courts with high LEP populations or high poverty levels

Strata

- Prior models have identified the need for a “funding floor”
 - As applied, this provided a minimum amount of funding to operate an office
 - It did not account for varied office sizes and only focused on the total allocation
- Proposed models apply minimum staffing needs for offices, based on office strata
 - Strata determined by workload volume (CSE-reported hearings)
 - Each strata can have staffing levels set by lowest number of staff prior to reallocation under the model within that strata

Strata Example

- Courts A, B, and C exist in the same strata, and roughly the same workload volume
- Court A has 6 court administrative staff, Court B has 4 court administrative staff, and Court C has 7 court administrative staff funded by the AB1058 program
- Under the workload based allocation, neither Court A, nor Court B, nor Court C will be allocated fewer than 4 full-time equivalent employees, even if the workload assessment would allocate fewer than 4 FTEs to any of these courts.

Pros and Cons of Strata

Pros

- Accounts for varied office sizes
- Ensures adequate staff for a court based on existing staffing levels for similarly sized courts
- Does not mandate how staff are hired or allocated by local court – only used as a funding allocation
- Strata sizes may be adjusted

Cons

- Assumes each similarly sized office does work in a way that can be staffed by the lowest-staffed office in the strata
- Applying the strata to staffing levels may not protect a court from a large drop in appropriation
- Assumes existing practices in the lowest-staff office are acceptable

One-Time Technology Enhancement

- Courts could request a one-time technology enhancement budget for AB1058 courts
 - If all AB1058 courts had remote video conferencing equipment, litigants could attend hearings remotely, or a commissioner sitting in one courtroom could hear a case from another courtroom, saving travel expenses in some jurisdictions
 - Hardware and software for computer, printer, and CSE access in courtroom would allow minute orders to be printed before a litigant leaves a hearing, or CSE to be updated immediately with order information
 - E-filing may save time, paper, and money (seeking federal IV-D reimbursement may create funding issues)

Model 1: Default-Adjusted Hearing, WAFM

- Determine staffing levels for each office, each court
 - Commissioner and court administrative staff workload volume determined by count of CSE-reported hearings in AB1058 courts.
 - Adjust volume by adding defaults filed by DCSS
 - Facilitator staff workload volume determined by count of one-on-one encounters in FLF database
 - Workload duration determined by Stopwatch time study and (for certain FLF tasks) Delphi study amounts
 - Adjust staffing levels by poverty level and LEP participants
- Use staffing levels as input for the WAFM allocation process used by rest of court.

Pros and Cons of Model 1

Pros

- Follows same funding allocation model as rest of the court system
- Using hearing information tracks to the volume of work the courts hear, independent of the initial pleadings

Cons

- Model may overestimate the actual court need

Model 2: Default-Adjusted Hearing, Average Salary

- Determine staffing levels for each office, each court
 - Commissioner and court administrative staff workload volume determined by count of CSE-reported hearings in AB1058 courts
 - Adjust volume by adding defaults filed by DCSS
 - Facilitator staff workload volume determined by count of one-on-one encounters in FLF database
 - Workload duration determined by Stopwatch time study and (for certain FLF tasks) Delphi study amounts
 - Adjust staffing levels by poverty level and LEP participants
- Multiply staffing levels by average salary, benefit, and overhead costs billed to the AB1058 program

Pros and Cons of Model 2

Pros

- Using average salary and overhead costs already incurred accounts for local variations in pay structure and benefits (skills and experience of staff, years of seniority, benefit computations, etc.)
- A three-year average can be used to “blend out” significant changes in staffing levels or needs

Cons

- Using a different method than the existing WAFM creates administrative difficulties in implementing the model
- Assumes salary and overhead costs are similar in subsequent years – may not account for raises (step or COLA) or decreases following retirements (lower-paid staff hired)

Model 3: Two-Pass Methodology

- Determine allocation as established by Model 2
- Select courts for secondary review for extenuating circumstances not otherwise addressed in the model
 - Geographically large, mountainous jurisdiction with multiple courthouses requires increased funding for travel
 - Court staff participate in fundable tasks outside of existing workload-based allocation model
 - Court has innovative idea for service delivery model that requires additional funding in implementation years
- JCC reviews courts for change in allocation (applied for secondary review, or certain objective standards met), reallocates within existing legislative appropriation

Pros and Cons of Model 3

Pros

- Allows for independent review to ensure that each court has the funds it needs to continue its work
- Allows for innovative service models to be funded on an annual basis

Cons

- Leaves JCC open to allegations of “favoritism” for certain courts
- Reallocation of funds within existing appropriation requires removing funds from some courts not requesting evaluation, creating some uncertainty in budgeting process

Model 4: Model Office

- Determine number of staff needed for each office by dividing volume of work (CSE-reported hearings or FLF encounters) by a fixed number (i.e., each single staff person can handle X number of cases / people per year)
- Adjust staffing levels using LEP and poverty adjustments
- Apply strata as appropriate to each office
- Potential performance enhancement?
 - Increase allocation for fewer days from notice of motion filed to hearing?
 - Increase allocation for fewer days from days from service to order?
 - Other performance-based enhancement?

Pros and Cons of Model 4

Pros

- All courts statewide have same amount of people to work the same amount of cases
- Similar to initial staffing estimates
- Provides support staff for each commissioner and facilitator on an equal basis – all are supported by the same number of FTEs

Cons

- Does not take into account economies of scale (larger offices can work more cases with fewer people)
- Does not take into account different ways to complete the work in each court, which may require more or fewer cases per staff than other courts

Questions and contact information

Questions?

Daniel J. Bauer, *esq.*

DanielJBauer@maximus.com