



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MATERIALS FOR APRIL 23, 2018

#### Meeting Contents

<a href="#">Agenda</a> .....	1
<a href="#">Minutes</a>	
Draft Minutes from the April 5, 2018 Meeting .....	3
<b>Discussion and Possible Action Items</b>	
<a href="#">Item 1</a> – Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Revenue Backfill Shortfall (Action Required) .....	7
<a href="#">Attachment 1</a> : Pro Rata Allocation of Estimated TCTF Backfill Shortfall .....	10
<a href="#">Attachment 2</a> : Judicial Council Report on Trial Court Allocations (July 2017) .....	12
<a href="#">Attachment 3</a> : TCTF Fund Condition Statement (April 2018) .....	57



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

Request for ADA accommodations  
should be made at least three business  
days before the meeting and directed to:  
[JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov](mailto:JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov)

## TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING

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

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

---

**Date:** April 23, 2018  
**Time:** 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.  
**Public Call-in Number:** 1-877-820-7831; passcode 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.

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be e-mailed to [tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov).

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

---

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

---

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

##### **Approval of Minutes**

Approve minutes of the April 5, 2018 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting.

---

#### II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(1))

---

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to [tcbac@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tcbac@jud.ca.gov) or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Ms. Brandy Sanborn. Only written comments received by 12:00 p.m. on April 20, 2018 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEM 1)**

---

**Item 1**

**Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) Revenue Backfill Shortfall (Action Required)**

Review options and develop a recommendation on addressing the current year TCTF shortfall.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Angela Guzman, Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services;  
Ms. Donna Newman, Supervisor, Judicial Council Budget Services

---

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

---

**None**

---

**V. ADJOURNMENT**

---

**Adjourn**



# JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

## TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

April 5, 2018

10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

Veranda Rooms: 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA, 95833

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Judges: Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Hon. Andrew S. Blum, Hon. Daniel J. Buckley, Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, Hon. James E. Herman (phone), Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs, Hon. Patricia M. Lucas, Hon. Charles Margines, and Hon. Paul M. Marigonda.

Executive Officers: Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Ms. Nancy Eberhardt, Mr. Chad Finke, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Ms. Kimberly Flener, Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Michael D. Planet, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Ms. Linda Romero-Soles, Mr. Brian Taylor (phone), Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco (phone), and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Judicial Council staff advisory members: Mr. John Wordlaw and Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic.

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Judges: Hon. Brian L. McCabe

**Others Present:** Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Mr. James Baird, Ms. Suzanne Blihovde, Ms. Rose Livingston, Ms. Donna Newman, Ms. Angela Guzman, Mr. Don Will, Ms. Penny Davis, Ms. Michele Allan, Mr. Colin Simpson, Ms. Keri Brasil, and Mr. Samuel Hamrick.

#### OPEN MEETING

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:17 a.m. and roll was called.

##### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the February 15, 2018 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

#### DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-5)

##### Item 1 – Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Process (ARP) Referrals (Action Required)

Review and referral of 2019-20 ARP submissions to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. James Baird, Senior Budget Analyst, Judicial Council Budget Services

*Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously approved to send the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) Adjustment Request Procedures to the Funding Methodology Subcommittee.*

**Item 2 – Minimum Operating and Emergency Reserve Policy (Action Required)**

Consideration of maintaining the suspension of the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Ms. Brandy Sanborn, Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services

*Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously approved to extend the suspension of the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy for two fiscal years until June 30, 2020—or earlier if Government Code section 77203 is repealed or amended—while in the interim the council continues to seek the repeal of Government Code section 77203.*

**Item 3 – Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program and Court Appointed Counsel Unspent Funding Allocations (Action Required)**

Consideration of allocating 2016-17 collection monies and 2017-18 expected unspent funding to trial courts as well as augmenting the small court reserve.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Don Will, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children, & the Courts

*Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously approved the following recommendations:*

- 1. Allocate \$542,892, the 2016-17 Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) funds remitted in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs, to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its August 23, 2013, business meeting.*
- 2. Allocate \$679,351, the 2017-18 Court Appointed Counsel expected unspent funding, to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at January 22, 2015, business meeting.*

**Item 4 – Adjustments to Council-Approved 2017-18 Allocations from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund (IMF) (Action Required)**

Consideration of recommendations of the Revenue and Expenditure (R&E) Subcommittee to adjust 2017-18 Judicial Council approved allocations for the Language Access Plan & Support for the Court Interpreters related to a 2017-18 approved Budget Change Proposal and the Jury Management program.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Cochair, Revenue & Expenditure Subcommittee; Ms. Sherri Carter, Cochair, Revenue & Expenditure Subcommittee, and Ms. Donna Newman, Budget Supervisor, Judicial Council Budget Services

*Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously approved to adopt a recommendation for a total of \$692,000 as an augmentation to the 2017-18 allocations for the Court Operations Office and*

*the Information Technology offices for consideration by the Judicial Council at its May 24-25, 2018 meeting.*

**Item 5 – Revise Reporting Requirement for Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and IMF Encumbrances (Action Required)**

Consideration of a recommendation of the R&E Subcommittee to revise the reporting requirement for outstanding encumbrances for all programs funded from the TCTF and/or IMF from semi-annual to annual.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Cochair, Revenue & Expenditure Subcommittee; Ms. Sherri Carter, Cochair, Revenue & Expenditure Subcommittee, and Ms. Donna Newman, Budget Supervisor, Judicial Council Budget Services

*Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously approved to adopt the recommendation to approve the reduction in reporting on the encumbrances for all programs funded from the TCTF and IMF from semi-annual to annual, for consideration by the Judicial Council at its May 24-25, 2018 meeting. The new reporting requirement would be as follows: By March 31st of each year an annual report of outstanding encumbrances as of December 31st for all programs funded from TCTF and/or IMF that support the trial courts, which should identify the amount and purpose of each encumbrance, the name and the vendor/contractor for which the funds are encumbered, the equipment or services related to each encumbrance, and estimated time frames for expenditure or disencumbrance.*

---

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

---

**Info 1 – AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee Update**

Update on the AB 1058 child support court allocation project.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Mark A. Cope, Cochair, AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee

**Info 2 – Budget Update for 2018-19**

Update on the budget for 2018-19.

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

**Info 3 – TCTF Structural Shortfall**

Review of the TCTF fund condition statement and structural shortfall.

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

**Info 4 – Discussion**

General discussion.

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

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:05 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:** Trial Court Trust Fund Revenue Backfill Shortfall  
**Date:** 4/18/2018  
**Contact:** Angela Guzman, Budget Manager, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-643-8041 | [angela.guzman@jud.ca.gov](mailto:angela.guzman@jud.ca.gov)  
Donna Newman, Budget Supervisor, Judicial Council Budget Services  
916-263-7498 | [donna.newman@jud.ca.gov](mailto:donna.newman@jud.ca.gov)

---

**Issue**

The Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) has an estimated current year shortfall of \$7 million (based on five months of actual revenue collections) in the revenue streams that support base trial court allocations. This item requests consideration of options to address the estimated shortfall.

**Background**

Since the Budget Act of 2014, the General Fund has provided funds to the TCTF to backfill revenue shortfalls in the revenue streams that support trial court base allocations. The methodology to calculate the backfill uses 2013-14 as the base year of revenues. Revenue projections for the current period are completed and analyzed against the base year of revenues. If the revenue as compared to the base year is insufficient, Judicial Council staff submits to the Department of Finance the amount of funding needed to backfill the revenue to support trial court base operations, up to the amount included in the annual budget act.

The Budget Act of 2017 includes a \$55 million appropriation for this backfill. The \$55 million backfill value was calculated in the fall of 2016. This estimate was made before the policy changes to driver's license holds was proposed in the 2017-18 Governor's Budget. Based on more recent revenue projections (January 2018), the total backfill need is approximately \$62 million. This reflects an estimated shortfall of \$7 million for the backfill.

Each month, as actual revenue data is collected, projections are updated. Revenue projections are currently being calculated and analyzed for inclusion in the 2018-19 May Revise to the Governor's Budget and it is likely the backfill need will change once the projections are complete. However, the final value of the 2017-18 TCTF backfill shortfall will not be known until September 2018 when all months of actual revenue collections for 2017-18 are received.

Since identifying this shortfall, there have been discussions with the Administration regarding an increase to the current year backfill need; however, it has been determined that no adjustment will be made for the current year. In an effort to avoid this issue in the future, Judicial Council



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

staff will continue to work with the Department of Finance (DOF) to address any shortfalls in current year revenues supporting trial court base allocations. Additionally, given the current position of the DOF regarding shortfalls beyond the amount included in the 2017 Budget Act, Judicial Council staff will re-evaluate the projection methodology used for 2018-19 and ongoing to determine if any adjustments are necessary.

The 2018-19 Governor's Budget includes full funding for the estimated budget year backfill need based on the most recent revenue projections completed, and Judicial Council staff anticipate that this value will remain in the budget through enactment.

**Options to Address Shortfall**

Three options have been developed for consideration in addressing the 2017-18 shortfall in revenue supporting trial court base allocations:

**(1) Allocate a Reduction to the Trial Courts in 2017-18**

This option would allocate a reduction in TCTF distributions to the trial courts on a pro rata basis based upon the 2017-18 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM)-related allocations approved by the Judicial Council on June 28, 2017 (Attachment 1). Attachment Q on page 39 of the attached June 2017 Judicial Council report is provided as reference (Attachment 2). The reduction would be allocated to the courts in their June 2018 distribution on a one-time basis as the 2018-19 backfill is projected to be fully funded.

**(2) Use TCTF Fund Balance to Cover the Shortfall in 2017-18 and Allocate Reductions to All Trial Courts in 2018-19**

This option would use the fund balance in the TCTF to fully fund the shortfall in the trial court base allocation in 2017-18. Then in 2018-19 a reduction would be allocated in the TCTF distribution to all trial courts on a pro rata basis based upon the 2017-18 WAFM - related allocation approved by the Judicial Council on June 28, 2017 (Attachment 1). This would be a one-time reduction in 2018-19 to replenish the fund balance in the TCTF. This option would provide the trial courts additional time to determine how they could absorb the reduction to their distribution, which would be allocated to the courts in a distribution in the first quarter of 2018-19.

**(3) Use TCTF Fund Balance to Cover the Shortfall in 2017-18**

This option would use the fund balance in the TCTF to fully fund the shortfall in the trial court base allocation in 2017-18. This would provide all trial courts with their full 2017-18 allocation as approved by the Judicial Council on June 28, 2017. It would also

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

decrease the fund balance by the amount of the shortfall (currently estimated to be \$7 million) on a one-time basis.

**Recommendation**

As the estimated shortfall in the TCTF is a result of declines in fine and fee revenue that supports trial courts' base allocations, it is recommended that option 3, Use TCTF Fund Balance to Cover the Shortfall in 2017-18, be approved. Using the fund balance in the TCTF to fully fund the shortfall in the trial court base allocations will provide the courts with their full allocation in 2017-18 and negate the need to provide the courts with a reduction this late in the fiscal year. In addition, it is anticipated that the ending fund balance in the TCTF for 2017-18 will be sufficient to address this one-time need (See attachment 3).

**Attachments**

- (1) 2017-18 Pro Rata Allocation of Estimated TCTF Backfill Shortfall
- (2) Report to the Judicial Council Regarding Trial Court Allocations, July 2017
- (3) Trial Court Trust Fund, Fund Condition Statement, as of April 2018

Court	2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation	Percent of Total State Allocation	TCTF Base Distribution June 2018 (Based on Dist's thru Apr)	Pro Rata Reduction to Fund Shortfall	Percent of June Distribution Needed to Fund Shortfall
Alameda	71,177,696	4.1%	3,147,048	285,436	9%
Alpine	750,000	0.0%	11,063	3,008	27%
Amador	2,241,333	0.1%	90,889	8,988	10%
Butte	9,429,305	0.5%	413,732	37,813	9%
Calaveras	2,086,017	0.1%	83,762	8,365	10%
Colusa	1,924,339	0.1%	67,210	7,717	11%
Contra Costa	39,026,415	2.2%	1,579,719	156,503	10%
Del Norte	2,526,250	0.1%	106,359	10,131	10%
El Dorado	6,490,171	0.4%	269,462	26,027	10%
Fresno	46,817,167	2.7%	1,886,914	187,746	10%
Glenn	1,913,869	0.1%	76,855	7,675	10%
Humboldt	6,066,295	0.3%	265,665	24,327	9%
Imperial	8,096,356	0.5%	360,282	32,468	9%
Inyo	1,887,477	0.1%	82,144	7,569	9%
Kern	44,861,835	2.6%	1,808,635	179,904	10%
Kings	6,456,377	0.4%	299,381	25,891	9%
Lake	3,191,914	0.2%	143,099	12,800	9%
Lassen	1,874,999	0.1%	88,988	7,519	8%
Los Angeles	500,921,465	28.7%	21,352,766	2,008,788	9%
Madera	7,217,623	0.4%	303,498	28,944	10%
Marin	11,827,220	0.7%	468,653	47,429	10%
Mariposa	1,243,717	0.1%	50,291	4,988	10%
Mendocino	5,177,799	0.3%	218,493	20,764	10%
Merced	11,120,780	0.6%	445,478	44,596	10%
Modoc	875,000	0.1%	33,967	3,509	10%
Mono	1,870,411	0.1%	58,650	7,501	13%
Monterey	16,672,361	1.0%	737,604	66,859	9%
Napa	6,811,234	0.4%	259,490	27,314	11%
Nevada	4,476,628	0.3%	214,284	17,952	8%
Orange	130,596,195	7.5%	5,480,873	523,715	10%
Placer	15,275,383	0.9%	657,294	61,257	9%
Plumas	1,098,287	0.1%	43,721	4,404	10%
Riverside	83,822,337	4.8%	3,714,480	336,143	9%
Sacramento	72,854,304	4.2%	3,037,036	292,159	10%
San Benito	2,490,431	0.1%	102,021	9,987	10%
San Bernardino	90,574,193	5.2%	4,013,742	363,219	9%
San Diego	131,157,679	7.5%	5,607,340	525,967	9%
San Francisco	51,695,109	3.0%	1,922,827	207,307	11%
San Joaquin	33,424,312	1.9%	1,406,203	134,038	10%

San Luis Obispo	12,318,837	0.7%	530,900	49,401	9%
San Mateo	32,424,159	1.9%	1,338,294	130,027	10%
Santa Barbara	20,357,653	1.2%	855,309	81,638	10%
Santa Clara	74,835,992	4.3%	3,075,990	300,106	10%
Santa Cruz	11,697,897	0.7%	482,864	46,911	10%
Shasta	10,265,807	0.6%	547,941	41,168	8%
Sierra	750,000	0.0%	29,788	3,008	10%
Siskiyou	2,795,948	0.2%	111,546	11,212	10%
Solano	19,955,896	1.1%	872,972	80,027	9%
Sonoma	22,514,091	1.3%	940,923	90,286	10%
Stanislaus	21,192,531	1.2%	858,759	84,986	10%
Sutter	4,842,299	0.3%	201,980	19,419	10%
Tehama	3,860,637	0.2%	156,884	15,482	10%
Trinity	1,383,657	0.1%	76,835	5,549	7%
Tulare	18,414,977	1.1%	793,187	73,847	9%
Tuolumne	3,046,522	0.2%	138,363	12,217	9%
Ventura	33,415,817	1.9%	1,470,377	134,004	9%
Yolo	9,011,585	0.5%	408,858	36,138	9%
Yuba	4,450,232	0.3%	190,450	17,846	9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>		<b>73,992,134</b>	<b>7,000,000</b>	



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on July 28, 2017

**Title**

Trial Court Allocations: General Court  
Operations and Specific Costs for Fiscal Year  
2017–2018

**Agenda Item Type**

Action Required

**Effective Date**

July 28, 2017

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**

None

**Date of Report**

July 24, 2017

**Recommended by**

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee  
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair

**Contact**

Suzanne Blihovde, 916-263-1754  
suzanne.blihovde@jud.ca.gov

### Executive Summary

For 2017–2018, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends the Judicial Council allocate \$1.849 billion to the trial courts from the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) and state General Fund for general court operations and specific costs. The recommended allocations include \$1.821 billion in 2017–2018 beginning base funding for general court operations, each court’s share of \$4.8 million in new funding for non-interpreter employee benefits, a statewide net reallocation of \$720.2 million for general court operations using the Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM), a net zero allocation for the WAFM funding-floor adjustment, a preliminary one-time allocation reduction related to the 1 percent cap on trial court fund balances, \$22 million in new funding for reimbursement of court-appointed dependency counsel costs, and \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs. Assuming approval of the allocations and given current revenue projections and estimated savings from appropriations, the TCTF will end 2017–2018 with a fund balance of \$27.2 million, of which approximately \$10.4 million will be unrestricted.

## Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 28, 2017:

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 of 2016–2017 cost changes in the Budget Act of 2017 (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 in which 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).
6. Approve a preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$7.77 million to 16 courts that are projecting the portion of their 2016–2017 ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent fund balance cap to exceed the cap by \$7.77 million, as required by statute (see Attachment 1B, column 6).
7. Approve an allocation of \$22 million in new funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for reimbursement of court-appointed dependency counsel costs based on the Judicial Council–approved allocation methodology as follows:  
Allocate \$22 million to trial courts with a ratio of 2017–2018 base funding to their workload-based funding need that is below the statewide ratio of 2017–2018 base funding to funding

needed to meet the workload standard for juvenile dependency (see Attachment 1B, column 7).

8. Allocate \$14.66 million from the Programs 0140010 and 0150095 TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations (see Attachment 1D, column F) and \$157.6 million from the Program 0150010—Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation (see Attachment 1E, column C, rows 21–28).

Recommendations 1 through 5 and a portion of recommendation 8 were voted on as a block at the June 8, 2017 meeting and two members opposed. One member did not state a reason for the opposition to the recommendations, and the other voted no due to frustrations related to the continued lack of adequate funding. The substance of the recommendations was not opposed. Recommendation 7 and the balance of recommendation 8 were approved by the majority (with one abstention) in the June 29, 2017, action by email.

For a summary of the allocations by court related to recommendations 1 through 7, see Attachment 1B.

### **Recommendation 1: 2017–2018 Beginning Base Allocation for Court Operations**

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).

#### **Previous council action**

None.

#### **Rationale for recommendation 1**

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:

When setting the allocations for trial courts, the Judicial Council shall set a preliminary allocation in July of each fiscal year. The preliminary allocation shall include an estimate of available trial court reserves as of June 30 of the prior fiscal year and each court's preliminary allocation shall be offset by the amount of reserves in excess of the amount authorized to be carried over pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 77203. In January of each fiscal year, after review of available trial court reserves as of June 30 of the prior fiscal year, the Judicial Council shall finalize allocations to trial courts and each court's finalized

allocation shall be offset by the amount of reserves in excess of the amount authorized to be carried over pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 77203.

Given current revenue projections and estimated savings from appropriations and the proposed 2017–2018 allocations for the eight recommendations discussed in this report, the TCTF will end 2017–2018 with a fund balance of \$27.2 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 TCTF Program 0150037—Court Interpreters appropriation—the unrestricted fund balance is projected to be \$10.4 million (see Attachment 1C, column C, row 43).

### **Recommendation 2: 2016–2017 Benefits Costs Funding**

2. Allocate a total of \$4.8 million for non-interpreter employee benefits funding from the TCTF for each court’s share of 2016–2017 cost changes in the Budget Act of 2017. (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.)

#### **Previous council action**

None.

#### **Rationale for recommendation 2**

In the fall of 2016, a budget augmentation of \$7.1 million was submitted to the Department of Finance 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 provide updated, confirmed amounts. The \$4.96 million in the 2017 May Revise submission reflected a reduction 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. The 2017 Budget Act reflects the reduced total of \$4.96 million (see Attachment 1G, column D).

### **Recommendation 3: 2017–2018 WAFM Reallocation Adjustments**

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).



### **Previous council action**

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 by 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 council adopted a number of revisions to WAFM on February 20, 2014. To determine funding need for courts whose WAFM workload need is fewer than 50 full-time equivalents (FTEs), the council:

- Adopted the use of the most current three-year average salary data to determine each court's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) salary adjustment;
- Adopted a per-FTE dollar allotment floor that is the median, BLS-adjusted, average FTE dollar allotment; and
- Eliminated the "cluster 1" courts' exemption from having their historical base allocations reallocated using the WAFM.

At its June 25–26, 2015 business meeting, the council approved the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee (WAAC) recommendation to use an interim complex civil case weight in the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model for purposes of 2015–2016 budget allocations. The council also approved the TCBAC recommendation to reduce the \$90.6 million of new funding provided in the 2015 Budget Act by the existing \$22.7 million revenue shortfall before allocating the monies using WAFM. The 2017–2018 WAFM computation reflects modifications to the calculation of WAFM operating expenses and equipment (OE&E) per FTE amounts that were approved by the council on April 15, 2016. Changes to the RAS model FTE need parameters were approved by WAAC on May 2, 2017, and are scheduled to go before the Judicial Council for approval at the July 28, 2017 business meeting.

### **Rationale for recommendation 3**

The 2017–2018 WAFM computation reflects the council-approved modifications to the calculation of the WAFM OE&E per FTE amounts and the updated RAS FTE need parameters. 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 through 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 funding in 2013–2014 through 2016–2017, 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 through 2017–2018.

#### **Recommendation 4: 2017–2018 WAFM Funding-Floor Allocation Adjustment**

4. Allocate each court's share of the 2017–2018 WAFM funding-floor allocation adjustment, which includes funding-floor allocations in which 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).

#### **Previous council action**

At its February 20, 2014 meeting, for allocating trial court base funding for court operations, the council established an absolute funding floor (\$750,000 in 2015–2016) 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 2015–2016). The council funded the funding-floor allocation by reducing, pro rata, the allocations of courts that do not qualify for an absolute or graduated funding floor.

#### **Rationale for recommendation 4**

Each court's share of the 2017–2018 WAFM funding-floor allocation adjustment is based on the policy adopted by the council on February 20, 2014: 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.

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 a court is eligible for a funding-floor adjustment and, if so, the court's maximum funding-floor amount. Attachment 1Q displays each court's 2017–2018 WAFM-related base allocation before and after any funding-floor adjustment.

### **Recommendation 5: Criminal Justice Realignment Allocation**

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).

#### **Previous council action**

In 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. Based on the recommendation of the TCBAC, in 2013–2014 the funding was split into two equal amounts. The first half was allocated in July 2013 based on the same methodology as previous allocations. The second half was allocated in February 2014 using a methodology that incorporated population (each court's percentage of the statewide population of individuals on 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) equally. 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.

At its July 28, 2015 business meeting, the Judicial Council approved the TCBAC recommendation of a one-time 2015–2016 allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs. The allocation was based on the most current available PRCS and parole workload data submitted to the 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.

### **Rationale for recommendation 5**

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.

### **Recommendation 6: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance above the 1 Percent Cap**

6. Approve a preliminary one-time allocation reduction of \$7.77 million to 16 courts that are projecting the portion of their 2016–2017 ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent fund balance cap to exceed the cap by \$7.77 million, as required by statute (see Attachment 1B, column 6).

### **Previous council action**

At its July 29, 2014 business meeting, to assist the Judicial Council in complying with Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A), the council approved an annual process starting in 2015–2016 for courts to provide preliminary and final computations of the portion of their ending fund balance that is subject to the 1 percent cap:

- Each year, courts will be required to submit the 1 percent computation form with preliminary year-end information by July 15. The information provided by courts will be used by the council to make the preliminary allocation of reductions as required by statute. Courts would not be required to provide the details related to encumbrances, prepayments, and restricted revenue when submitting the form for the preliminary allocation.
- Each year, courts will be required to submit the 1 percent computation form with final year-end information by October 15.
- Before February, the Judicial Council's Chief Financial Officer will report to the council the information provided by courts for the final allocation reduction, if any.

### **Rationale for recommendation 6**

Government Code section 68502.5(c)(2)(A) requires the council to make a preliminary allocation reduction in July of each fiscal year (see Attachment 1S) and a final allocation reduction before February of each fiscal year to offset the amount of reserves (or fund balance) in excess of the amount authorized by Government Code section 77203 to be carried over from one year to the next beginning June 30, 2014. The reductions reflect the calculated preliminary allocation reduction amounts provided by the courts on the 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form (see Attachment 1T).

### **Recommendation 7: Allocation for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Costs**

7. Approve the allocation of \$22 million in new funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund for reimbursement of court-appointed dependency counsel costs based on the Judicial Council-approved allocation methodology as follows:

Allocate \$22 million to trial courts with a ratio of 2017–2018 base funding to their workload-based funding need that is below the statewide ratio of 2017–2018 base funding to funding needed to meet the workload standard for juvenile dependency (see Attachment 1B, column 7).

### **Previous council action**

The Judicial Council at its April 17, 2015 meeting approved several recommendations from the TCBAC that direct the allocation of court-appointed counsel funding to the courts. The council approved a methodology for allocating the existing base funding of \$103,725,444 in 2014–2015 based on each court’s workload as calculated by the workload model for juvenile dependency, and adjusted to available funding statewide (“workload-based funding”). The council decided to phase in the new allocation methodology with annual increases or reductions in fiscal years 2015–2016, 2016–2017, and 2017–2018, and in 2018–2019 all courts will receive an equivalent percentage of statewide funding as calculated by the workload model. The allocations are to be phased in by basing each court’s annual allocation on a percentage of its historical base in 2014–2015 and a percentage of its workload-based funding in the current fiscal year, with the percentages changing annually as follows

- 2015–2016: 10% of workload-based funding and 90% of historical base;
- 2016–2017: 40% of workload-based funding and 60% of historical base;
- 2017–2018: 80% of workload-based funding and 20% of historical base; and
- 2018–2019: 100% of workload-based funding.

The council also directed that any new state funds designated for court-appointed dependency counsel in addition to the current \$103.7 million be allocated to courts with a ratio of allocated base funding to their calculated workload-based funding need that is below the statewide ratio of base funding to workload-based funding required to meet the workload standard. Additional Judicial Council actions that impact funding allocations in 2015–2016 included revisions to how the workload methodology and funding need is calculated, and directed that a \$100,000 reserve be established for unexpected caseload increases. The council also approved revisions on May 19, 2017, related to small court allocations.<sup>1</sup>

### **Rationale for recommendation 7**

These allocations reflect the methodology and actions taken by the council mentioned above. Attachment 1U summarizes the allocation of \$22 million in new funding for court-appointed dependency counsel funding to the local courts as calculated by this method for 2017–2018.

---

<sup>1</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Small Court Dependency Workload Working Group Final Recommendations* (May 5, 2017), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5150554&GUID=7D8E5F4F-6D83-4C73-A246-4F11E877A411>.

## **Recommendation 8: Allocations for Judicial Council, Support for Operation of Trial Courts, and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts**

8. Allocate \$14.66 million from the Programs 0140010 and 0150095 TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations (see Attachment 1D, columns D and E) and \$157.6 million from the Program 0150010–Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation (see Attachment 1E, column C, rows 21–28).

### **Previous council action**

None.

### **Rationale for recommendation 8**

At its June 8, 2017 meeting, TCBAC approved recommending allocating the following in 2017–2018 from the TCTF: \$13.44 million from the Programs 0140010 and 0150095 TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations and \$135.6 million from the Program 0150010–Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation. This recommendation essentially maintains 2016–2017 allocation levels for discretionary programs and uses the revenue estimates in the Budget Act of 2017 for items funded by restricted revenues.

In its June 29, 2017 action by email, TCBAC approved recommending the 2017–2018 allocation and subsequent distribution reduction of a maximum of \$540,000 for audits completed by the State Controller’s Office on behalf of the trial courts pursuant to Budget Act of 2017, item 0250-101-0932, Provision 15. TCBAC also approved recommending the 2017–2018 allocation of a \$671,000 loan to implement and administer a statewide electronic filing program.

Based on its actions from June 8 and June 29, TCBAC approved recommending the following combined allocation in 2017–2018 from the TCTF:

- \$14.66 million from the Programs 0140010 and 0150095 TCTF Judicial Council and Trial Court Operations appropriations (see Attachment 1D); and
- \$157.6 million from the Program 0150010–Support for Operation of the Trial Courts appropriation (see Attachment 1E, column C, rows 21–28). This total includes the \$114.7 million in existing funding for the Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel program as well as the \$22 million in new funding for this program.

## **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

No public comments were received when the recommendations were considered by the TCBAC at its June 8, 2017 meeting or its June 29, 2017 action by email.

## **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

The implementation requirements, costs, and operational impacts are detailed in the preceding sections.

## **Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment 1B: Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations
2. Attachment 1C: Trial Court Trust Fund—Fund Condition Statement
3. Attachment 1D: TCTF 2017–2018 Judicial Council and Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts Appropriations Allocations (approved by the Judicial Council)
4. Attachment 1E: 2016–17 and 2017–18 Trial Court Trust Fund Support for Operation of the Trial Courts: Appropriation vs. Estimated/Approved Allocations
5. Attachment 1F: 2017–2018 Beginning Base Allocation: 2016–2017 Beginning Base, 2016–2017 Base Allocations, and Annualization
6. Attachment 1G: Proposed Allocation of New Funding for 2016–2017 Benefit Cost Changes
7. Attachment 1H: 2017–2018 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (computation of funding need)
8. Attachment 1I: 2017–2018 RAS FTE Need
9. Attachment 1J: 2017–18 BLS Factor
10. Attachment 1K: 2017–18 FTE Allotment Factor
11. Attachment 1L: 2017–2018 Allocation of New Funding and Reallocation of Historical Funding
12. Attachment 1M: Historical Trial Court Funding Subject to Reallocation Using WAFM
13. Attachment 1N: Summary of Changes from 2016–2017 to 2017–2018 Total WAFM Funding Need
14. Attachment 1O: 2017–2018 Allocation Adjustment Related to Funding Floor
15. Attachment 1P: Determination of Funding Floor
16. Attachment 1Q: Estimated 2017–2018 WAFM-Related Base Allocation
17. Attachment 1R: Allocation of \$9.223 Million of Criminal Justice Realignment Funding
18. Attachment 1S: Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance above the 1% Cap
19. Attachment 1T: 1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form
20. Attachment 1U: Allocation of \$22 Million in New Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding

### Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2	Recommendation 3	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 5	Recommendation 6	Recommendation 7	
	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	Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (one-time)	Total
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Alameda	75,837,757	(117,415)	118,477	(13,184)	252,661	(604,310)	569,404	<b>76,043,391</b>
Alpine	747,863	11,842	(22,964)	11,128	273	(124,881)	288	<b>623,549</b>
Amador	2,282,693	21,663	(76,749)	(415)	5,742	-	21,243	<b>2,254,178</b>
Butte	10,114,841	65,290	(37,056)	(1,747)	86,750	(173,561)	122,046	<b>10,176,563</b>
Calaveras	2,167,578	20,469	(124,146)	(386)	1,641	-	32,964	<b>2,098,120</b>
Colusa	1,859,554	21,699	28,000	(356)	3,691	(150,000)	-	<b>1,762,588</b>
Contra Costa	38,889,573	(627,559)	1,188,741	(7,228)	116,281	(132,189)	346,377	<b>39,773,995</b>
Del Norte	2,633,386	39,609	(159,821)	(468)	8,613	(127,676)	-	<b>2,393,644</b>
El Dorado	6,642,102	38,696	(105,821)	(1,202)	44,298	-	72,078	<b>6,690,151</b>
Fresno	48,290,025	(240,622)	(568,451)	(8,672)	404,626	-	419,102	<b>48,296,009</b>
Glenn	1,863,179	48,933	(9,648)	(354)	2,256	-	-	<b>1,904,365</b>
Humboldt	6,248,744	92,631	(16,433)	(1,124)	51,065	-	-	<b>6,374,883</b>
Imperial	8,619,428	(31,042)	34,558	(1,500)	41,221	-	77,157	<b>8,739,823</b>
Inyo	2,037,844	21,672	(14,883)	(350)	5,947	-	-	<b>2,050,231</b>
Kern	46,077,544	(866,725)	818,353	(8,309)	335,103	(74,550)	411,043	<b>46,692,458</b>
Kings	6,773,927	105,069	194,175	(1,196)	61,319	-	134,165	<b>7,267,459</b>
Lake	3,325,219	48,157	34,075	(591)	12,510	-	-	<b>3,419,370</b>
Lassen	2,252,270	19,933	(217,457)	94,310	6,768	(5,987)	-	<b>2,149,836</b>
Los Angeles	531,344,108	(220,592)	1,019,170	(92,781)	3,128,520	(4,351,972)	10,529,583	<b>541,356,037</b>
Madera	7,708,366	32,254	(200,688)	(1,337)	43,887	-	94,929	<b>7,677,412</b>
Marin	12,036,922	158,933	(441,145)	(2,191)	17,432	-	-	<b>11,769,951</b>
Mariposa	1,125,254	30,528	6,808	75,747	4,512	-	-	<b>1,242,849</b>
Mendocino	5,494,485	(10,851)	(25,473)	(959)	39,786	-	-	<b>5,496,988</b>
Merced	11,970,525	(245,209)	(295,321)	(2,060)	105,207	(107,734)	133,493	<b>11,558,901</b>
Modoc	882,073	4,475	(21,004)	3,187	2,461	-	-	<b>871,192</b>
Mono	1,711,215	66,471	(20,641)	124,225	2,666	-	-	<b>1,883,936</b>
Monterey	17,441,721	42,357	193,761	(3,088)	35,274	-	121,416	<b>17,831,441</b>
Napa	7,474,856	26,037	(50,148)	(1,262)	15,586	(317,287)	52,932	<b>7,200,715</b>
Nevada	4,929,175	119,536	134,931	(829)	2,461	-	-	<b>5,185,274</b>
Orange	140,624,899	(1,248,482)	(3,113,896)	(24,189)	384,528	-	830,179	<b>137,453,039</b>
Placer	15,552,392	199,413	364,804	(2,829)	44,503	(3,993)	160,260	<b>16,314,549</b>
Plumas	1,238,999	8,833	(160,301)	(203)	1,230	-	-	<b>1,088,557</b>
Riverside	83,672,043	1,370,087	2,540,906	(15,526)	915,074	-	1,571,901	<b>90,054,485</b>
Sacramento	74,858,578	(19,335)	1,033,549	(13,494)	143,557	(428,762)	814,561	<b>76,388,654</b>



### Summary of Court-Specific Allocations and Net Reallocations

	Recommendation 1	Recommendation 2	Recommendation 3	Recommendation 4	Recommendation 5	Recommendation 6	Recommendation 7	
	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	Reduction for Fund Balance Above the 1% Cap	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel (one-time)	Total
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
San Benito	2,357,689	8,326	105,382	(461)	8,819	-	19,999	<b>2,499,753</b>
San Bernardino	94,053,222	608,729	1,683,826	(16,776)	915,690	(697,433)	1,550,542	<b>98,097,800</b>
San Diego	134,855,407	1,879,544	(1,770,123)	(24,293)	495,887	-	753,988	<b>136,190,410</b>
San Francisco	56,752,139	314,519	(5,262,207)	(9,575)	45,323	(385,693)	460,215	<b>51,914,722</b>
San Joaquin	32,998,594	346,128	923,398	(6,191)	139,045	-	380,292	<b>34,781,267</b>
San Luis Obispo	13,048,708	282,758	(509,481)	(2,282)	70,753	-	96,497	<b>12,986,954</b>
San Mateo	34,370,309	(536,099)	214,992	(6,006)	42,657	-	180,595	<b>34,266,448</b>
Santa Barbara	21,536,091	(7,453)	225,361	(3,771)	74,240	-	115,756	<b>21,940,224</b>
Santa Clara	75,710,803	1,063,634	(1,844,229)	(13,861)	142,327	-	433,584	<b>75,492,258</b>
Santa Cruz	11,450,901	130,494	52,020	(2,167)	7,998	-	78,500	<b>11,717,747</b>
Shasta	12,716,411	125,540	331,747	(1,901)	73,419	-	101,252	<b>13,346,468</b>
Sierra	747,892	9,859	(23,205)	13,353	205	-	-	<b>748,104</b>
Siskiyou	3,018,787	36,257	(134,605)	(518)	9,229	-	-	<b>2,929,150</b>
Solano	20,251,598	274,323	330,966	(3,696)	122,639	-	120,704	<b>21,096,534</b>
Sonoma	23,077,930	417,021	(167,019)	(4,170)	115,051	-	139,947	<b>23,578,760</b>
Stanislaus	20,973,350	221,251	332,613	(3,925)	63,575	-	147,736	<b>21,734,600</b>
Sutter	4,849,495	118,527	79,670	(897)	19,141	(87,253)	37,897	<b>5,016,580</b>
Tehama	3,709,881	16,974	101,091	(715)	12,305	-	38,029	<b>3,877,565</b>
Trinity	1,839,749	21,055	34,338	(256)	2,393	-	-	<b>1,897,278</b>
Tulare	17,197,347	264,572	1,178,217	(3,411)	88,390	-	290,555	<b>19,015,671</b>
Tuolumne	3,155,789	51,126	139,768	(564)	6,973	-	18,663	<b>3,371,754</b>
Ventura	33,968,245	79,260	1,265,056	(6,189)	351,100	-	335,533	<b>35,993,003</b>
Yolo	9,193,432	38,378	587,674	(1,669)	51,886	-	100,262	<b>9,969,962</b>
Yuba	4,430,456	36,275	96,488	(824)	36,505	-	84,330	<b>4,683,229</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,820,993,364</b>	<b>4,787,751</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>9,223,000</b>	<b>(7,773,282)</b>	<b>22,000,000</b>	<b>1,849,230,834</b>

**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 <b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	6,614,017	34,829,875	32,348,422	27,177,351	17,145,675	6,691,866
2 Prior-Year Adjustments	7,208,461	1,215,301	(528,300)	-	-	-
3 <b>Revenues and Transfers</b>	<b>2,431,232,814</b>	<b>2,489,690,319</b>	<b>2,513,477,404</b>	<b>2,485,775,392</b>	<b>2,485,775,392</b>	<b>2,485,104,392</b>
4 <b>Revenues</b>						
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 <b>Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements</b>						
15 General Fund Transfer	943,724,000	1,021,832,000	970,394,000	970,394,000	970,394,000	970,394,000
16 General Fund Transfer - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	114,700,000	114,700,000	136,700,000	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 General Fund Loan - Statewide E-Filing			671,000			(671,000)
19 Reduction Offset Transfers <sup>2</sup>	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000
20 Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements <sup>3</sup>	13,217,422	11,885,422	13,088,422	13,088,422	13,088,422	13,088,422
<b>Total Resources</b>	<b>2,445,055,292</b>	<b>2,525,735,495</b>	<b>2,545,297,526</b>	<b>2,512,952,743</b>	<b>2,502,921,067</b>	<b>2,491,796,258</b>
21 <b>Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations</b>						
22 Program 30/30.05 (0140010) - Judicial Council	3,620,851	3,035,000	3,825,676	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 <sup>1</sup>	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	136,700,000	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 <sup>4</sup>	-	11,607,369	10,829,437	9,740,431	10,157,431	9,740,431
31 Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	291,169	108,368	-	-	-	-
32 <b>Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations</b>	<b>2,410,225,417</b>	<b>2,493,387,073</b>	<b>2,518,120,175</b>	<b>2,495,807,067</b>	<b>2,496,229,201</b>	<b>2,495,851,105</b>
33 <b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<b>34,829,875</b>	<b>32,348,422</b>	<b>27,177,351</b>	<b>17,145,675</b>	<b>6,691,866</b>	<b>(4,054,847)</b>
35 <i>Emergency Needs Reserve</i>		10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
36 <i>Funds Held on Behalf of the Trial Courts</i>		150,000	100,000	100,000		
37 <i>Court Interpreter Program</i>	9,043,514	7,399,362	5,549,522	3,699,682	1,849,842	(0)
38 <i>Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Collections</i>	2,186,060	1,171,286	1,012,393	1,151,320	1,098,224	1,098,224
39 <i>Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements</i>	636,668	528,300				
40 <i>Refund to courts of overcharges for JCC services</i>						
41 <i>Equal Access Fund</i>	454,039	859,678	-	(0)	(0)	(0)
42 <i>Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel</i>	1,449,503	415,112	75,357	75,357	75,357	75,357
43 <b>Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance</b>	<b>21,060,092</b>	<b>11,824,685</b>	<b>10,440,079</b>	<b>2,119,316</b>	<b>(6,331,557)</b>	<b>(15,228,428)</b>
44 <b>Net Revenue/Transfers Over or (Under) Expenditures</b>	<b>21,007,397</b>	<b>(3,696,754)</b>	<b>(4,642,771)</b>	<b>(10,031,676)</b>	<b>(10,453,809)</b>	<b>(10,746,713)</b>

1. 2017-2018 amount does not include the preliminary 1% fund cap allocation reduction or the offset of the approved TCTF Funds Held on Behalf requests

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	For Judicial Council Approval for 2017-18			Program Allocation Increase/ (Decrease)
		Col. A	Col. B	Col. C (Col. A + B)	Judicial Council (Staff) <sup>1</sup>	Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	Total	Col. G
					Col. D	Col. E	Col. F (Col. D + E)	
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	<b>Programs Funded from Courts' TCTF Allocations</b>							
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	Statewide E-filing Implementation	-	-	-	671,000	-	671,000	671,000
14	SCO Audit - Pilot program per GC 77206 (h)(4)	-	-	-	-	540,000	540,000	540,000
15	<b>Total, Program/Project Allocations</b>	<b>3,035,000</b>	<b>11,464,964</b>	<b>14,499,964</b>	<b>3,825,676</b>	<b>10,829,437</b>	<b>14,655,113</b>	<b>155,149</b>
16	<b>Department of Motor Vehicles Amnesty Program service charges</b>	<b>250,000</b>		<b>250,000</b>	-	-	-	N/A
17	<b>Estimated State Controller's Office services charges</b>	<b>219,399</b>		<b>219,399</b>	<b>303,000</b>	-	<b>303,000</b>	<b>83,601</b>
19	<b>Estimated Budget Act Appropriation and Changes Using Provisional Language Authority<sup>1</sup></b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>4,011,000</b>	<b>13,025,000</b>	<b>17,036,000</b>	N/A
20	<b>Appropriation Balance</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>185,324</b>	<b>2,195,563</b>	<b>2,077,887</b>	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	For Judicial Council Approval for 2017-18
			Budget Act	Budget Act	
			Col. A	Col. B	
1	<b>I. Prior-Year Ending Baseline Allocation</b>	Base	1,704,515,909	1,752,585,987	1,752,585,987
3	<b>II. Adjustments</b>				
4	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-400,067		
5	<b>IV. FY 2016-2017 Allocations (Governor's Budget)</b>				
6	\$8.6 Million in Benefits Cost Changes Funding	Base	8,452,388		
7	FY 2013-14 Restored Benefits Funding	Base	20,292,088		
8	\$412,000 in New Security Funding	Base	411,942		
9	Non-Sheriff's Security BCP Funding	Base	342,506		
10	\$19.6 Million in New Funding	Base	19,588,058		
11	\$25.0 Million in Court Innovations Grants (Total Funding for Both Trial and Appellate Courts)	Non-Base	25,000,000		
12	\$21.4 Million in Proposition 47 Workload Funding	Non-Base	21,400,000		
13					
14	<b>V. Statutory Allocation Adjustments</b>				
15	1% Fund Balance Cap Reduction	Non-Base	-8,781,306	pending	
16	Adjustment for Funding to be Distributed from ICNA	Non-Base	-50,000,000	-50,000,000	
17	Criminal Justice Realignment Funding	Non-Base	9,223,000	9,223,000	
18	Reduction for Appointed Converted SJO Positions	Base	-616,836	pending	
19					
20	<b>VI. Allocation for Reimbursements</b>				
21	Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel <sup>1</sup>	Non-Base	114,700,000	136,700,000	136,700,000
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 <sup>2</sup>	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	For Judicial Council Approval for 2017-18 Col. C
			Budget Act	Budget Act	
			Col. A	Col. B	
29	<b>VII. Estimated Revenue Distributions</b>				
30	Civil Assessment	Non-Base	79,426,599	114,668,986	
31	Fees Returned to Courts	Non-Base	21,348,123	21,272,860	
32	Replacement of 2% automation allocation from TCIF	Non-Base	10,907,494	10,907,494	
33	Children's Waiting Room	Non-Base	3,150,757	3,107,018	
34	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics	Non-Base	2,436,478	2,403,479	
35	Telephonic Appearances Revenue Sharing	Non-Base	943,840	943,840	
36	Prior Year Revenues	Non-Base	0	0	
37	<b>VIII. Miscellaneous Charges</b>				
38	Repayment of Prior Year Cash Advance	Non-Base			
39	State Admin Infrastructure Charges Prior Year Adjustment	Non-Base			
40	Statewide Administrative Infrastructure Charges	Non-Base	-4,389,676	-4,443,676	
41	Prior Year Facility Payments Charge Adjustments	Non-Base			
42	<b>Total</b>		<b>1,998,954,052</b>	<b>2,018,223,275</b>	<b>1,910,140,273</b>
43	Support for Operation of the Trial Courts Appropriation Budget Act <sup>3</sup>		2,047,487,000	2,049,005,000	
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	<b>Adjusted Appropriation</b>		<b>2,047,487,000</b>	<b>2,049,005,000</b>	
47	<b>Estimated Remaining Appropriation</b>		<b>48,532,948</b>	<b>30,781,725</b>	

1 Includes \$22,000,000 in new funding for Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel court audits.

3 Includes the Budget Act Appropriation of \$114,700,000 for Item 0250-102-0932 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel plus \$22M in new funding.

## 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 <sup>1</sup>	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
<b>Court</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4A</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6 = Sum of 1 to 5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9 = Sum of 6 to 8</b>
Alameda	71,747,295	(436,743)	(16,517)	645,929	795,745	-	<b>72,735,710</b>	3,102,047	-	<b>75,837,757</b>
Alpine	725,356	(19,759)	35,931	(17,093)	3,088	-	<b>727,523</b>	20,340	-	<b>747,863</b>
Amador	2,119,319	59,048	(532)	41,319	11,783	-	<b>2,230,937</b>	51,756	-	<b>2,282,693</b>
Butte	9,327,363	375,299	(2,180)	211,906	78,377	-	<b>9,990,764</b>	124,077	-	<b>10,114,841</b>
Calaveras	1,998,768	22,043	(507)	74,133	22,634	-	<b>2,117,072</b>	50,506	-	<b>2,167,578</b>
Colusa	1,659,845	(17,236)	160,044	24,213	7,914	-	<b>1,834,781</b>	24,773	-	<b>1,859,554</b>
Contra Costa	38,588,448	(807,633)	(8,738)	(783,109)	504,413	-	<b>37,493,381</b>	1,396,192	-	<b>38,889,573</b>
Del Norte	2,375,600	82,386	(587)	59,258	22,599	-	<b>2,539,256</b>	94,130	-	<b>2,633,386</b>
El Dorado	6,357,534	(34,774)	(1,520)	98,371	9,371	-	<b>6,428,982</b>	213,120	-	<b>6,642,102</b>
Fresno	41,291,509	2,960,295	(11,030)	252,326	456,561	-	<b>44,949,661</b>	3,340,364	-	<b>48,290,025</b>
Glenn	1,800,097	(94,502)	63,519	27,501	11,899	-	<b>1,808,514</b>	54,665	-	<b>1,863,179</b>
Humboldt	5,878,695	173,992	(1,388)	56,493	67,869	-	<b>6,175,660</b>	73,084	-	<b>6,248,744</b>
Imperial	8,099,425	174,720	(1,872)	120,442	101,174	-	<b>8,493,889</b>	125,539	-	<b>8,619,428</b>
Inyo	1,944,821	(36,939)	(436)	38,621	16,191	-	<b>1,962,258</b>	75,586	-	<b>2,037,844</b>
Kern	38,252,631	3,029,898	(10,404)	988,357	272,793	-	<b>42,533,275</b>	3,544,269	-	<b>46,077,544</b>
Kings	6,320,421	349,995	(1,427)	48,872	10,949	-	<b>6,728,809</b>	45,118	-	<b>6,773,927</b>
Lake	3,183,913	95,340	(721)	35,981	1,582	-	<b>3,316,096</b>	9,123	-	<b>3,325,219</b>
Lassen	2,250,198	(24,851)	(458)	16,783	2,759	-	<b>2,244,431</b>	7,839	-	<b>2,252,270</b>
Los Angeles	501,189,322	6,939,407	(115,500)	(1,336,025)	5,984,546	-	<b>512,661,751</b>	18,887,969	(205,612)	<b>531,344,108</b>
Madera	6,840,957	219,947	(1,711)	241,857	22,490	-	<b>7,323,540</b>	384,826	-	<b>7,708,366</b>
Marin	11,514,997	(519,030)	(2,806)	221,932	177,317	-	<b>11,392,410</b>	644,512	-	<b>12,036,922</b>
Mariposa	1,124,763	(25,442)	(262)	2,134	1,761	-	<b>1,102,953</b>	22,301	-	<b>1,125,254</b>
Mendocino	4,741,649	137,568	(1,208)	188,392	116,313	-	<b>5,182,714</b>	311,771	-	<b>5,494,485</b>
Merced	10,663,269	227,209	(2,697)	154,519	153,398	-	<b>11,195,698</b>	774,827	-	<b>11,970,525</b>
Modoc	893,648	(55,866)	(206)	10,777	1,753	-	<b>850,106</b>	31,967	-	<b>882,073</b>
Mono	1,467,083	33,841	107,760	11,291	5,599	-	<b>1,625,574</b>	85,641	-	<b>1,711,215</b>
Monterey	16,112,007	564,039	(3,808)	361,192	130,795	-	<b>17,164,225</b>	277,496	-	<b>17,441,721</b>
Napa	6,805,485	164,861	(1,587)	106,421	89,880	-	<b>7,165,060</b>	309,796	-	<b>7,474,856</b>
Nevada	4,763,053	(87,424)	(980)	99,540	59,490	-	<b>4,833,680</b>	95,495	-	<b>4,929,175</b>
Orange	132,650,864	(1,851,991)	(31,299)	66,411	2,860,993	-	<b>133,694,978</b>	6,929,921	-	<b>140,624,899</b>
Placer	13,979,681	547,583	(3,419)	253,075	140,675	-	<b>14,917,595</b>	634,797	-	<b>15,552,392</b>
Plumas	1,244,991	(41,600)	4,938	12,766	2,974	-	<b>1,224,070</b>	14,929	-	<b>1,238,999</b>
Riverside	78,274,047	2,225,921	(18,537)	1,454,359	812,595	-	<b>82,748,386</b>	923,657	-	<b>83,672,043</b>
Sacramento	71,279,885	(69,047)	(16,579)	(1,032,400)	1,136,127	-	<b>71,297,986</b>	3,560,592	-	<b>74,858,578</b>
San Benito	2,387,768	(104,676)	(551)	32,176	8,330	-	<b>2,323,047</b>	34,642	-	<b>2,357,689</b>

## 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 <sup>1</sup>	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	87,615,726	2,446,434	(20,474)	2,087,322	659,482	-	<b>92,788,489</b>	1,264,733	-	<b>94,053,222</b>
San Diego	132,336,756	(2,953,490)	(30,342)	1,021,966	2,038,142	(200,528)	<b>132,212,504</b>	2,853,599	(210,696)	<b>134,855,407</b>
San Francisco	52,204,792	(350,192)	(13,130)	(1,316,245)	739,779	-	<b>51,265,004</b>	5,487,135	-	<b>56,752,139</b>
San Joaquin	29,298,243	1,772,837	(7,450)	424,617	264,991	-	<b>31,753,237</b>	1,245,357	-	<b>32,998,594</b>
San Luis Obispo	12,841,872	(4,685)	(2,902)	60,624	60,453	(189,796)	<b>12,765,566</b>	298,958	(15,816)	<b>13,048,708</b>
San Mateo	31,789,179	(174,732)	(7,682)	54,150	298,280	-	<b>31,959,196</b>	2,411,113	-	<b>34,370,309</b>
Santa Barbara	19,404,818	427,936	(4,669)	50,020	60,324	-	<b>19,938,429</b>	1,597,662	-	<b>21,536,091</b>
Santa Clara	72,569,297	(165,418)	(17,232)	606,490	408,201	-	<b>73,401,336</b>	2,309,467	-	<b>75,710,803</b>
Santa Cruz	10,973,474	166,897	(2,614)	238,885	76,312	(16,381)	<b>11,436,574</b>	203,558	(189,231)	<b>11,450,901</b>
Shasta	11,781,356	348,727	(2,276)	235,389	90,993	-	<b>12,454,189</b>	262,222	-	<b>12,716,411</b>
Sierra	735,183	(39,021)	28,370	9,323	4,422	-	<b>738,276</b>	9,616	-	<b>747,892</b>
Siskiyou	2,924,261	(162,978)	(672)	137,750	29,388	-	<b>2,927,749</b>	91,038	-	<b>3,018,787</b>
Solano	19,069,043	(10,465)	(4,488)	597,865	245,864	-	<b>19,897,819</b>	353,779	-	<b>20,251,598</b>
Sonoma	21,951,153	(409,145)	(5,158)	63,956	305,073	-	<b>21,905,880</b>	1,172,050	-	<b>23,077,930</b>
Stanislaus	18,420,143	752,566	(4,784)	95,213	404,982	-	<b>19,668,120</b>	1,305,230	-	<b>20,973,350</b>
Sutter	4,344,980	276,084	(1,076)	34,036	35,710	-	<b>4,689,734</b>	159,761	-	<b>4,849,495</b>
Tehama	3,360,712	174,873	(866)	54,682	12,296	-	<b>3,601,697</b>	108,184	-	<b>3,709,881</b>
Trinity	1,700,727	65,685	(308)	10,086	9,880	-	<b>1,786,070</b>	53,679	-	<b>1,839,749</b>
Tulare	15,593,035	1,112,551	(3,937)	410,850	51,104	-	<b>17,163,603</b>	33,744	-	<b>17,197,347</b>
Tuolumne	2,932,871	72,658	(664)	91,053	9,519	-	<b>3,105,437</b>	50,352	-	<b>3,155,789</b>
Ventura	31,195,656	1,092,944	(7,430)	450,232	268,090	-	<b>32,999,492</b>	968,753	-	<b>33,968,245</b>
Yolo	8,373,491	405,133	(1,944)	123,356	83,319	-	<b>8,983,355</b>	210,077	-	<b>9,193,432</b>
Yuba	3,598,815	586,977	(1,000)	122,050	32,747	-	<b>4,339,589</b>	90,867	-	<b>4,430,456</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,704,870,290</b>	<b>19,588,058</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>8,452,388</b>	<b>20,292,088</b>	<b>(406,705)</b>	<b>1,752,796,119</b>	<b>68,818,601</b>	<b>(621,355)</b>	<b>1,820,993,364</b>

1) Includes Judicial Council approved Non-sheriff Security Non-BCP funding and Non-sheriff BCP funding allocations that are now part of the base allocation

1,752,174,763



**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
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6,846,924</b>	<b>219,170</b>	<b>7,066,095</b>	<b>4,787,751</b>	<b>173,566</b>	<b>4,961,317</b>



2017-2018 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

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

2017-2018 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology

		RAS II Model FTE Need <sup>(1)</sup>			FTE Need Multiplied by FTE Allotment Factor, Prior to BLS Adjustment			Adjust Base Dollars for Local Cost of Labor; Apply FTE Dollar Factor	
Cluster	Court	RAS Program 10 FTE Need	RAS Program 90 FTE Need	RAS Total FTE Need	RAS FTE Need multiplied by allotment factor <sup>(2)</sup>	CEO Cluster Average Salary (as of 7/1/2016)	RAS FTE Need plus CEO, multiplied by Allotment Factor	BLS Factor <sup>(3)</sup>	Pre-Benefits Adjusted Base
		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	$K = (A * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor} * I1) + (E * G * J1)$	$L = (((B - 1) * FTE \text{ Dollar Factor}) + E * G * J1) + (B * J2)$	$M = (K + L)$	$N = C * OE\&E$	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		
											Average % of Salary-Driven Benefits (Program 10)	Average Actual Non-Salary-Driven Benefits per FTE (Program 10)
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

Weighted Mean	OE&E / FTE	Cluster 1
	\$32,622	
	\$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
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,412.5</b>	<b>4,174.0</b>	<b>2,828.6</b>	<b>3,183.9</b>	<b>1,037.6</b>	<b>912.3</b>	<b>13,548.9</b>	<b>727.2</b>		<b>1,422.2</b>	<b>14,998.0</b>	<b>1,761.9</b>		<b>2,421.0</b>	<b>17,419</b>

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

## 2017-18 BLS Factor

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

FY 2017-18 FTE Allotment Factor

Cluster	Court	BLS Factor 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	<b>1,829,656</b>
2	Sutter	3,403,045	0.24%	0.29%	122.4%	(1,701,523)	2,083,376	<b>381,853</b>
2	Tehama	2,907,298	0.20%	0.23%	113.2%	(1,453,649)	1,645,783	<b>192,134</b>
1	Trinity	990,359	0.07%	0.07%	95.3%	(495,179)	471,907	<b>(23,272)</b>
3	Tulare	12,293,011	0.85%	1.11%	130.4%	(6,146,506)	8,014,884	<b>1,868,378</b>
2	Tuolumne	2,589,803	0.18%	0.17%	94.1%	(1,294,901)	1,218,883	<b>(76,018)</b>
3	Ventura	24,366,827	1.69%	2.01%	119.1%	(12,183,413)	14,509,278	<b>2,325,865</b>
2	Yolo	6,504,149	0.45%	0.55%	121.2%	(3,252,074)	3,942,247	<b>690,172</b>
2	Yuba	3,225,076	0.22%	0.27%	119.1%	(1,612,538)	1,919,879	<b>307,341</b>
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>1,440,487,965</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>(720,243,983)</b>	<b>720,243,983</b>	<b>0</b>
						(720,243,983)		

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	-
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>233,788,058</b>	<b>(233,788,058)</b>	<b>0</b>	-	-	-	<b>233,788,058</b>	-
		233,788,058			-			233,788,058	-

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)
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(233,788,058)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(0)</b>

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

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

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

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

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

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

Description	Change in Variable			
	2016-17 Amount	2017-18 Amount	Change in Amount	% Change
	A	B	C (B - A)	D (C / A)
<b>Total Funding Need</b>	<b>\$ 2,350,120,506</b>	<b>\$ 2,336,697,645</b>	<b>\$ (13,422,861)</b>	<b>-0.6%</b>
RAS FTE Need Adjustment	17,978	17,419	(559)	-3.1%
RAS-Related Salary Adjustment	\$ 58,336	\$ 59,494	\$ 1,158	2.0%
OE&E per FTE Adjustment	\$29,621 / \$20,941	\$32,622 / \$22, 756	\$3,001/ \$1,815	10.1% / 8.7%
Benefits Adjustment	\$ 730,675,209	\$ 708,861,998	\$ (21,813,211)	-3.0%
BLS Salary Adjustment	\$ 1,281,014,437	\$ 1,270,152,113	(10,862,324)	-0.8%
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)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>	<b>7,364,127</b>	<b>321,949</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>(321,949)</b>

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	Tulumne	3,954,439	0.17%	3,047,086	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
3	Ventura	47,072,655	2.01%	33,422,006	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yolo	12,789,887	0.55%	9,013,254	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Yuba	6,228,690	0.27%	4,451,056	1,874,999	N	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>2,336,697,645</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>					<b>7,364,127</b>

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

	2016-17 Ending TCTF and GF Base	TCTF Reduction for SJO Conversions	Security Base (FY 10-11) Adjustment	SJO Adjustment <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (15-16)	Estimated 2016-17 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	WAFM 17-18 Adjustment	Total 2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)	WAFM 17-18 Funding Floor Adjustment	Total 2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J (Sum A:I)	K	L (Sum J:K)
Alameda	75,837,756	-	(3,212,246)	(2,059,535)	101,575	424,792	97,474	(117,415)	118,477	71,190,880	(13,184)	71,177,696
Alpine	747,863	-	-	-	83	2,034	14	11,842	(22,964)	738,872	11,128	750,000
Amador	2,282,693	-	-	-	2,565	11,006	570	21,663	(76,749)	2,241,748	(415)	2,241,333
Butte	10,114,840	-	(472,190)	(324,964)	14,608	59,332	11,191	65,290	(37,056)	9,431,052	(1,747)	9,429,305
Calaveras	2,167,577	-	-	-	3,074	18,652	776	20,469	(124,146)	2,086,403	(386)	2,086,017
Colusa	1,859,554	-	-	-	1,447	13,708	288	21,699	28,000	1,924,695	(356)	1,924,339
Contra Costa	38,889,572	-	-	(764,779)	69,231	218,186	60,251	(627,559)	1,188,741	39,033,643	(7,228)	39,026,415
Del Norte	2,633,385	-	-	-	1,964	11,208	373	39,609	(159,821)	2,526,718	(468)	2,526,250
El Dorado	6,642,102	-	-	(153,227)	11,851	54,374	3,399	38,696	(105,821)	6,491,374	(1,202)	6,490,171
Fresno	48,290,025	-	-	(954,187)	60,497	181,080	57,496	(240,622)	(568,451)	46,825,838	(8,672)	46,817,167
Glenn	1,863,179	-	(9,885)	-	1,927	19,264	454	48,933	(9,648)	1,914,224	(354)	1,913,869
Humboldt	6,248,744	-	(169,612)	(151,920)	8,913	48,160	6,936	92,631	(16,433)	6,067,418	(1,124)	6,066,295
Imperial	8,619,427	-	(425,020)	(186,361)	11,204	67,678	7,411	(31,042)	34,558	8,097,855	(1,500)	8,096,356
Inyo	2,037,844	-	(188,674)	-	1,245	30,402	221	21,672	(14,883)	1,887,827	(350)	1,887,477
Kern	46,077,544	-	(66,275)	(1,475,361)	52,450	277,328	52,832	(866,725)	818,353	44,861,145	(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 <sup>1</sup>	Self-Help	Replacement of 2% Automation	Automated Recordkeeping and Micrographics Distribution (15-16)	Estimated 2016-17 Benefits Funding (Full-Year)	WAFM 17-18 Adjustment	Total 2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation (Prior to implementing funding floor)	WAFM 17-18 Funding Floor Adjustment	Total 2017-18 WAFM-Related Allocation
Court	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J (Sum A:I)	K	L (Sum J:K)
San Mateo	34,370,308	-	(447,827)	(1,561,631)	48,700	329,518	12,205	(536,099)	214,992	<b>32,430,165</b>	(6,006)	<b>32,424,159</b>
Santa Barbara	21,536,091	-	(1,066,507)	(540,097)	28,356	162,858	22,814	(7,453)	225,361	<b>20,361,424</b>	(3,771)	<b>20,357,653</b>
Santa Clara	75,710,803	-	-	(739,281)	119,260	452,782	86,883	1,063,634	(1,844,229)	<b>74,849,853</b>	(13,861)	<b>74,835,992</b>
Santa Cruz	11,656,512	-	-	(281,243)	17,644	113,210	11,426	130,494	52,020	<b>11,700,064</b>	(2,167)	<b>11,697,897</b>
Shasta	12,716,411	-	(2,662,303)	(303,623)	12,206	44,394	3,337	125,540	331,747	<b>10,267,709</b>	(1,901)	<b>10,265,807</b>
Sierra	747,892	-	-	-	235	1,830	36	9,859	(23,205)	<b>736,647</b>	13,353	<b>750,000</b>
Siskiyou	3,018,786	-	-	(164,928)	3,104	37,000	852	36,257	(134,605)	<b>2,796,466</b>	(518)	<b>2,795,948</b>
Solano	20,251,598	-	(440,102)	(633,026)	28,439	119,364	28,032	274,323	330,966	<b>19,959,592</b>	(3,696)	<b>19,955,896</b>
Sonoma	23,077,929	-	(444,752)	(543,792)	32,278	119,004	27,592	417,021	(167,019)	<b>22,518,261</b>	(4,170)	<b>22,514,091</b>
Stanislaus	20,973,350	-	(9,427)	(473,697)	34,594	88,718	29,055	221,251	332,613	<b>21,196,457</b>	(3,925)	<b>21,192,531</b>
Sutter	4,849,495	-	(249,739)	-	6,150	37,382	1,711	118,527	79,670	<b>4,843,196</b>	(897)	<b>4,842,299</b>
Tehama	3,709,881	-	-	-	4,138	28,100	1,168	16,974	101,091	<b>3,861,352</b>	(715)	<b>3,860,637</b>
Trinity	1,839,749	-	(520,479)	-	943	7,648	660	21,055	34,338	<b>1,383,914</b>	(256)	<b>1,383,657</b>
Tulare	17,197,347	-	(15,744)	(462,276)	28,289	204,932	23,051	264,572	1,178,217	<b>18,418,388</b>	(3,411)	<b>18,414,977</b>
Tuolumne	3,155,788	-	(222,898)	(98,238)	3,916	16,642	982	51,126	139,768	<b>3,047,086</b>	(564)	<b>3,046,522</b>
Ventura	33,968,245	-	(1,575,996)	(624,561)	54,971	205,304	49,729	79,260	1,265,056	<b>33,422,006</b>	(6,189)	<b>33,415,817</b>
Yolo	9,193,431	-	(589,184)	(286,928)	12,802	48,556	8,526	38,378	587,674	<b>9,013,254</b>	(1,669)	<b>9,011,585</b>
Yuba	4,430,455	-	(134,001)	-	4,696	15,788	1,354	36,275	96,488	<b>4,451,056</b>	(824)	<b>4,450,232</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,822,021,399</b>	<b>(616,836)</b>	<b>(41,737,537)</b>	<b>(54,858,243)</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>	<b>10,907,494</b>	<b>2,550,795</b>	<b>4,787,751</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>1,745,554,822</b>

1. Does not include compensation for AB 1058 commissioners.

**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 <sup>1,2</sup>	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 <sup>1,2</sup>	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 <sup>1,2</sup>	93	0.21%	\$19,141
Tehama <sup>1,2</sup>	60	0.13%	\$12,305
Trinity <sup>1</sup>	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
<b>Total (statewide)</b>	<b>44,972</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$9,223,000</b>

<sup>1</sup>proxy used for missing PRCS petitions (average of populated quarters)

\$9,223,000

<sup>2</sup>proxy used for missing Parole petitions (average of populated quarters)

**Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance above the 1% Cap  
(as of July 21, 2017)**

Court	Cap	FY 2016-17 Fund Balance	Encumbrances	Restricted	Prepayments	Balance of Approved 2016-2017 TCTF Funds Held on Behalf	Fund Balance Subject to Cap	Current Year Reduction	Prior Year Disencumbrance	Total Preliminary Reduction	Approved 2017-2018 TCTF Funds Held on Behalf <sup>1</sup>	Net Reduction after Funds held on Behalf
	Col. A	Col. B									Col. C	
ALAMEDA	995,803	2,129,765	259,572	937,111	0	859,203	73,879	-	(604,310)	(604,310)	-	(604,310)
ALPINE	6,080	148,959	0	9,947	8,051	0	130,961	(124,881)	-	(124,881)	-	(124,881)
AMADOR	30,029	194,005	150,000	24,730	841	0	18,434	-	-	-	-	0
BUTTE	130,856	708,241	12,697	309,427	81,700	0	304,417	(173,561)	-	(173,561)	-	(173,561)
CALAVERAS	27,423	397,098	90,000	144,141	159,798	0	3,159	-	-	-	-	0
COLUSA	20,619	443,079	49,543	222,917	0	0	170,619	(150,000)	-	(150,000)	150,000	0
CONTRA COSTA	554,346	4,081,000	1,719,968	2,156,293	0	0	204,738	-	(132,189)	(132,189)	-	(132,189)
DEL NORTE	33,534	686,140	40,298	484,632	0	0	161,210	(127,676)	-	(127,676)	-	(127,676)
EL DORADO	87,287	27,818	0	0	21,147	0	6,671	-	-	-	-	0
FRESNO	638,518	2,536,925	16,160	2,100,857	0	0	419,908	-	-	-	-	0
GLENN	30,902	165,029	88,679	37,777	0	29,000	9,574	-	-	-	-	0
HUMBOLDT	85,161	289,588	35,014	145,141	59,000	0	50,433	-	-	-	-	0
IMPERIAL	124,070	2,477,031	1,280,695	944,482	204,445	0	47,409	-	-	-	-	0
INYO	26,654	460,342	10,558	427,086	645	0	22,053	-	-	-	-	0
KERN	666,644	6,660,794	1,830,750	2,783,995	628,167	676,688	741,194	(74,550)	-	(74,550)	-	(74,550)
KINGS	92,095	314,329	87,602	141,447	0	0	85,280	-	-	-	-	0
LAKE	40,448	259,619	79,581	142,171	0	0	37,867	-	-	-	-	0
LASSEN	28,725	342,235	146,918	110,608	0	75,925	8,784	-	(5,987)	(5,987)	-	(5,987)
LOS ANGELES	7,335,766	79,594,664	54,702,484	16,298,775	2,822,836	0	5,770,568	-	(4,351,972)	(4,351,972)	5,200,000	0
MADERA	105,085	1,186,896	756,251	430,253	0	0	392	-	-	-	-	0
MARIN	142,953	1,135,854	356,132	632,209	10,000	0	137,513	-	-	-	-	0
MARIPOSA	15,849	28,050	5,945	19,634	0	0	2,471	-	-	-	-	0
MENDOCINO	69,786	450,000	238,189	152,406	0	0	59,405	-	-	-	-	0
MERCED	169,298	3,872,838	581,312	2,765,048	159,919	298,878	67,681	-	(107,734)	(107,734)	-	(107,734)
MODOC	12,904	105,158	85,626	19,532	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	0
MONO	22,509	276,491	251,452	0	7,116	0	17,923	-	-	-	75,000	0
MONTEREY	227,338	1,375,132	308,739	747,167	73,750	51,914	193,562	-	-	-	-	0
NAPA	98,140	1,270,576	57,582	587,192	0	212,862	412,940	(314,800)	(2,487)	(317,287)	-	(317,287)
NEVADA	69,184	214,259	0	196,498	0	0	17,761	-	-	-	-	0
ORANGE	1,954,493	8,954,223	439,962	5,657,364	1,017,977	642,384	1,196,536	-	-	-	-	0
PLACER	207,532	1,669,684	776,956	425,809	57,744	199,650	209,525	(1,993)	(2,000)	(3,993)	-	(3,993)
PLUMAS	15,969	180,224	125,714	44,841	5,303	0	4,367	-	-	-	-	0
RIVERSIDE	1,501,785	8,437,553	3,761,244	3,327,089	0	0	1,349,220	-	-	-	-	0
SACRAMENTO	929,787	7,264,794	2,653,422	1,758,160	220,097	1,639,586	993,529	(63,742)	(365,020)	(428,762)	333,133	(95,629)
SAN BENITO	30,403	210,629	107,918	53,921	20,744	0	28,046	-	-	-	-	0
SAN BERNARDINO	1,197,465	12,375,799	5,700,336	2,519,580	4,155,882	0	0	-	(697,433)	(697,433)	1,718,000	0
SAN DIEGO	1,741,906	16,013,344	2,833,347	12,179,540	764,467	0	235,990	-	-	-	-	0
SAN FRANCISCO	777,343	5,101,601	3,104,482	1,547,022	0	0	450,097	-	(385,693)	(385,693)	447,147	0
SAN JOAQUIN	413,725	2,714,038	827,358	1,601,112	170,720	0	114,848	-	-	-	-	0
SAN LUIS OBISPO	167,949	2,248,127	578,491	1,516,880	0	0	152,756	-	-	-	-	0
SAN MATEO	406,309	2,855,778	1,371,356	1,184,417	0	0	300,005	-	-	-	-	0
SANTA BARBARA	319,598	3,281,512	185,510	2,837,593	116,738	0	141,671	-	-	-	-	0
SANTA CLARA	1,009,457	1,504,807	56,471	1,387,853	0	0	60,483	-	-	-	-	0
SANTA CRUZ	151,695	835,316	213,889	514,736	0	0	106,691	-	-	-	-	0

**Preliminary One-Time Allocation Reduction for Fund Balance above the 1% Cap  
(as of July 21, 2017)**

Court	Cap	FY 2016-17 Fund Balance	Encumbrances	Restricted	Prepayments	Balance of Approved 2016-2017 TCTF Funds Held on Behalf	Fund Balance Subject to Cap	Current Year Reduction	Prior Year Disencumbrance	Total Preliminary Reduction	Approved 2017-2018 TCTF Funds Held on Behalf <sup>1</sup>	Net Reduction after Funds held on Behalf
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. F (B - C - D - E - F)	Col. G (F - A)	Col. H	Col. I (G + H)	Col. J	Col. K (I + J)
SHASTA	181,660	544,645	55,067	310,216	0	0	179,363	-	-	-	-	0
SIERRA	8,382	240,601	199,972	9,257	31,097	0	275	-	-	-	-	0
SISKIYOU	44,312	212,314	53,062	144,207	0	0	15,046	-	-	-	-	0
SOLANO	256,075	1,442,576	413,367	889,867	0	0	139,342	-	-	-	-	0
SONOMA	294,080	2,544,073	19,615	1,587,777	477,093	452,298	7,290	-	-	-	-	0
STANISLAUS	277,344	1,019,803	646,280	102,643	222,345	0	48,535	-	-	-	-	0
SUTTER	64,775	840,469	482,312	255,913	9,763	60,840	31,641	-	(87,253)	(87,253)	80,837	(6,416)
TEHAMA	49,439	867,127	678,622	137,161	8,473	0	42,871	-	-	-	-	0
TRINITY	21,059	45,658	0	28,359	0	0	17,299	-	-	-	-	0
TULARE	285,022	1,651,001	1,138,625	211,992	130,035	0	170,348	-	-	-	49,200	0
TUOLUNME	40,965	107,267	0	66,302	0	0	40,965	-	-	-	-	0
VENTURA	517,580	3,694,160	3,382,663	123,161	0	0	188,335	-	-	-	-	0
YOLO	135,485	1,005,353	385,513	449,885	46,322	0	123,633	-	-	-	-	0
YUBA	65,844	729,384	537,971	80,642	48,303	0	62,468	-	-	-	-	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24,955,445</b>	<b>200,423,775</b>	<b>93,971,273</b>	<b>73,924,774</b>	<b>11,740,517</b>	<b>5,199,228</b>	<b>15,587,983</b>	<b>(1,031,203)</b>	<b>(6,742,079)</b>	<b>(7,773,282)</b>	<b>8,053,317</b>	<b>(1,774,214)</b>

1. The approved TCTF Funds Held on Behalf Requests do not include those requests pending before the Judicial Council at its July 28, 2017 meeting

1% Fund Balance Cap Calculation Form

2016-17 SUMMARY					
	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Instructions for current fiscal year only	
<b>Part A - Computation of Cap</b>					
1	Expenditures	2,293,600,876	2,375,268,993	2,447,015,179	Court enters expenditures for ending fiscal year
2	Accruals	77,296,083	93,529,935	53,758,664	Court enters expense accruals for ending fiscal year
3	Less: Expenses related to Encumbrance Reserves for FY13/14	(61,278,971)	(38,372,588)	306,172	Current year expenditures relating to prior year encumbrance reserves.
4	Less: Expenses related to Encumbrance Reserves for FY14/15	-	(33,391,308)	(20,276,778)	Court enters current year expenditures relating to prior year encumbrance reserves. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
5	Less: Expenses related to Encumbrance Reserves for FY15/16	-	-	(51,431,795)	Court enters current year expenditures relating to prior year encumbrance reserves. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
6	Encumbrance Reserves as of June 30	109,465,327	117,105,715	93,971,273	Court enters total year ending fund balance reserved for encumbrances <b>(Do not include TCTF Funds Held Purchase Order)</b>
7	Less: remaining Encumbrance Reserves from FY13/14	(45,701,195)	(7,501,128)	-	The amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrances (line 6) that is related to prior fiscal years.
8	Less: remaining Encumbrance Reserves from FY14/15	-	(29,236,488)	-	The amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrances (line 6) that is related to prior fiscal years.
9	Less: remaining Encumbrance Reserves from FY15/16	-	(342,890)	(27,798,177)	Court enters the amount of the fund balance reserved for encumbrances (line 6) that is related to prior fiscal years. <b>Enter a negative number.</b>
10	<b>Operating Budget</b>	<b>2,373,382,119</b>	<b>2,477,060,242</b>	<b>2,495,544,538</b>	This row calculates Operating Budget
11	<b>Fund Balance Cap (1% of Operating Budget)</b>	<b>23,733,821</b>	<b>24,770,602</b>	<b>24,955,445</b>	This row calculates Fund Balance Cap
<b>Part B - Computation of Fund Balance Subject to Cap</b>					
12	Ending fund balance	197,508,937	212,948,908	200,423,775	Court enters actual year end fund balance
13	Less: Encumbrance Reserves as of June 30	109,465,327	117,105,715	93,971,273	This line is the encumbrance reserves amount entered above from line 6
14	Less: Excluded Funds Per GC 77203	64,347,339	69,471,669	73,924,774	Current year cell is formula driven. Court enters details on the Excluded Detail tab. <b>Any amounts entered on line 20 should not be included on this total.</b>
15	Less: Prepayments	6,386,967	8,584,958	11,740,517	Court enters Prepayment amounts, if any.
16	Less: TCTF Funds Held	-	-	5,199,228	Cell is formula driven. Court enters TCTF Funds Held requested and approved on the TCTF Funds Held tab, if any.
17	<b>Fund Balance Subject to Cap</b>	<b>17,309,304</b>	<b>17,786,566</b>	<b>15,587,983</b>	This calculated line is what will be compared to the cap above on line 11.
<b>Part C - Potential Additional Allocation Reduction</b>					
18	Amount above cap if no Encumbrance Reserves	103,132,622	110,858,201	84,603,810	
19	Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that, if not expensed in the next two years, is subject to the cap	64,289,003	78,790,967	84,603,810	These amounts will be liquidated 3 years from the original date of the encumbrance reserves if not spent (year of encumbrance, plus 2 additional). These are the encumbrance amounts for the fiscal year listed above.
20	<b>Less: Encumbrance Reserves from Excluded Funds Per GC 77203</b>	<b>598,584</b>	<b>476,138</b>	<b>2,943,112</b>	This is the amount that is included on line 13 that represents excluded funds encumbered and therefore are not subject to reversion.
21	Maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction	6,305,330	7,633,764	9,367,462	This total is the threshold the court can disencumber without having to reduce their allocations.
<b>Part D - Liquidations</b>					
22	FY13/14 Liquidation in second year	557,257	-	115,819,965	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in year following original encumbrance.
23	FY13/14 Liquidation in third year	431	6,556,868	9,367,463	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance.
24	FY14/15 Liquidation in second year	-	904,087	-	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in year following original encumbrance.
25	FY14/15 Liquidation in third year	-	-	9,191,958	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in second year following original encumbrance.
26	FY15/16 Liquidation in second year	-	-	1,138,127	This is the amount of unused encumbrance on closed contracts in year following original encumbrance.
<b>Part E - Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction</b>					
27	Current Year Subject to Cap	<b>178,123</b>	<b>2,117,636</b>	-	This is the amount of fund balance over the cap
28	FY13/14 Encumbered Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction	81,187	5,445,552	-	FY13/14 total liquidation less maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction
29	FY14/15 Encumbered Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction	-	33,095	6,661,707	FY14/15 total liquidation less maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction
30	FY15/16 Encumbered Fund Balance Subject to Allocation Reduction	-	-	80,372	FY15/16 total liquidation less maximum amount of encumbered fund balance that can be disencumbered without resulting in an allocation reduction
31	<b>Total Allocation Reduction</b>	<b>300,137</b>	<b>8,763,541</b>	<b>7,773,282</b>	This is the amount that will revert to the Trial Court Trust Fund



**2017-2018 Allocation of \$22 Million in new Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Funding**

Court	FY 2017-18 Allocation at \$114,700,000	FY 2017-18 Proposed Allocation of New \$22,000,000 in funding	FY 2017-18 Total Allocation
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C
Alameda	\$2,996,225	\$569,404	\$3,565,629
Alpine	\$1,510	\$288	\$1,799
Amador	\$122,453	\$21,243	\$143,696
Butte	\$672,500	\$122,046	\$794,546
Calaveras	\$187,858	\$32,964	\$220,822
Colusa	\$43,948	\$0	\$43,948
Contra Costa	\$2,017,233	\$346,377	\$2,363,610
Del Norte	\$214,730	\$0	\$214,730
El Dorado	\$476,686	\$72,078	\$548,764
Fresno	\$2,596,644	\$419,102	\$3,015,746
Glenn	\$111,158	\$0	\$111,158
Humboldt	\$522,682	\$0	\$522,682
Imperial	\$498,993	\$77,157	\$576,150
Inyo	\$45,459	\$0	\$45,459
Kern	\$2,253,767	\$411,043	\$2,664,810
Kings	\$566,591	\$134,165	\$700,757
Lake	\$272,201	\$0	\$272,201
Lassen	\$106,891	\$0	\$106,891
Los Angeles	\$50,031,302	\$10,529,583	\$60,560,884
Madera	\$440,145	\$94,929	\$535,074
Marin	\$311,538	\$0	\$311,538
Mariposa	\$38,070	\$0	\$38,070
Mendocino	\$440,581	\$0	\$440,581
Merced	\$710,767	\$133,493	\$844,260
Modoc	\$24,065	\$0	\$24,065
Mono	\$13,956	\$0	\$13,956
Monterey	\$561,158	\$121,416	\$682,574
Napa	\$262,119	\$52,932	\$315,051
Nevada	\$202,832	\$0	\$202,832
Orange	\$4,535,960	\$830,179	\$5,366,139
Placer	\$735,292	\$160,260	\$895,552
Plumas	\$151,555	\$0	\$151,555
Riverside	\$7,234,109	\$1,571,901	\$8,806,009
Sacramento	\$4,794,519	\$814,561	\$5,609,080
San Benito	\$92,411	\$19,999	\$112,410
San Bernardino	\$6,964,161	\$1,550,542	\$8,514,703
San Diego	\$5,378,633	\$753,988	\$6,132,621
San Francisco	\$2,600,758	\$460,215	\$3,060,973
San Joaquin	\$2,099,985	\$380,292	\$2,480,278
San Luis Obispo	\$606,504	\$96,497	\$703,001
San Mateo	\$780,308	\$180,595	\$960,903
Santa Barbara	\$863,531	\$115,756	\$979,287
Santa Clara	\$2,790,328	\$433,584	\$3,223,912
Santa Cruz	\$519,814	\$78,500	\$598,314
Shasta	\$578,824	\$101,252	\$680,076
Sierra	\$9,848	\$0	\$9,848
Siskiyou	\$245,373	\$0	\$245,373
Solano	\$762,644	\$120,704	\$883,349
Sonoma	\$778,154	\$139,947	\$918,101
Stanislaus	\$944,769	\$147,736	\$1,092,505
Sutter	\$182,614	\$37,897	\$220,511
Tehama	\$281,764	\$38,029	\$319,793
Trinity	\$96,021	\$0	\$96,021
Tulare	\$1,300,677	\$290,555	\$1,591,232
Tuolumne	\$140,483	\$18,663	\$159,147
Ventura	\$1,500,220	\$335,533	\$1,835,753
Yolo	\$496,241	\$100,262	\$596,503
Yuba	\$390,438	\$84,330	\$474,768
Reserve	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$114,700,000</b>	<b>\$22,000,000</b>	<b>\$136,700,000</b>

Trial Court Trust Fund - Detailed Fund Condition Statement								
	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22
	Year-End Financial Statement	Year-End Financial Statement	Year-End Financial Statement	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated	Estimated
<b>Beginning Fund Balance</b>	21,218,232	6,614,017	34,829,875	66,569,098	55,208,186	44,902,561	59,834,444	47,720,632
Prior-Year Adjustments <sup>1</sup>	5,624,798	7,208,461	5,759,000	2,479,627	-	-	-	-
<b>Revenues and Transfers</b>	2,333,631,984	2,431,232,814	2,486,227,327	2,464,977,324	2,641,096,419	2,630,663,817	2,608,663,817	2,608,663,817
<i>Total Revenues</i>	1,341,324,951	1,294,611,392	1,270,421,327	1,267,154,024	1,258,365,437	1,249,701,823	1,249,701,823	1,249,701,823
<b>Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements</b>								
General Fund Transfer	922,648,255	943,724,000	1,021,832,000	986,281,000	1,158,535,000	1,158,535,000	1,158,535,000	1,158,535,000
General Fund Transfer - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel		114,700,000	114,700,000	136,700,000	136,700,000	136,700,000	114,700,000	114,700,000
General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill	30,900,000	58,900,000	61,300,000	55,000,000	89,094,000	89,094,000	89,094,000	89,094,000
<i>GF Backfill Adjustments</i>					(21,260,318)	(22,538,306)	(22,538,306)	(22,538,306)
<i>Proposed backfill for Civil Assessments</i>				-	-			
General Fund Loan - Statewide E-Filing				671,000	491,000			
Reduction Offset Transfers <sup>2</sup>	26,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000	6,080,000
Net Other Transfers/Charges/Reimbursements <sup>3</sup>	12,678,778	13,217,422	11,894,000	13,091,300	13,091,300	13,091,300	13,091,300	13,091,300
<b>Total Resources</b>	2,360,475,014	2,445,055,292	2,526,816,202	2,534,026,049	2,696,304,605	2,675,566,378	2,668,498,261	2,656,384,449
<b>Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations</b>								
Program 30/30.05 (0140010) - Judicial Council (AOC Staff)	4,095,938	3,620,851	2,306,934	3,842,676	3,616,676	3,127,676	3,127,676	3,130,676
Program 30.15 (Formerly Program 45.10) (0140019) - Trial Court Op	15,622,980	12,369,281	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program 45.10 (0150010) - Support for Operation of the Trial Courts	1,883,174,214	1,816,242,767	1,860,003,547	1,839,647,639	2,009,126,713	1,983,417,296	1,989,061,432	1,989,061,432
Program 0150011 - Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel	-	114,387,117	114,699,919	136,700,000	136,700,000	136,700,000	136,700,000	136,700,000
Program 45.15 - Trial Court Security	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Program 45.25 (0150019) - Compensation of Superior Court Judges	319,803,869	330,369,783	335,384,000	338,231,000	338,161,000	338,161,000	338,161,000	338,231,000
Program 45.35 (0150028) - Assigned Judges	24,792,538	25,199,733	25,923,351	27,005,000	28,117,000	28,117,000	28,117,000	28,117,000
Program 45.45 (0150037) - Court Interpreters	96,802,928	99,598,715	102,282,915	105,481,840	115,749,840	106,615,840	106,615,842	103,632,000
9892 Supplemental Pension Payments (State Ops)					98,000	105,000	169,000	177,000
Program 0150095 - Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts <sup>4</sup>	-	-	11,391,069	11,341,570	10,636,887	10,745,269	10,033,380	10,450,380
<i>General Fund Transfer - Revenue Backfill Shortfall</i>				7,000,000				
Item 601 - Redevelopment Agency Writ Case Reimbursements	704,280	291,169	108,368	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total, Expenditures/Encumbrances/Allocations</b>	2,353,860,997	2,410,225,417	2,460,247,104	2,478,817,863	2,651,402,044	2,615,731,934	2,620,777,629	2,618,288,787
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	6,614,017	34,829,875	66,569,098	55,208,186	44,902,561	59,834,444	47,720,632	38,095,662
<i>Total Restricted Funds</i>	16,294,708	13,769,783	23,922,139	24,389,519	21,767,628	19,880,690	17,880,848	17,880,848
<b>Ending Unrestricted Fund Balance</b>	(9,680,691)	21,060,092	42,646,960	30,818,667	23,134,932	39,953,755	29,839,784	20,214,814
<b>Net Revenue/Transfers Over or (Under) Expenditures</b>	(20,229,013)	21,007,397	25,980,223	(13,840,539)	(10,305,625)	14,931,883	(12,113,812)	(9,624,970)
<b>Appropriation Authority</b>	2,374,768,317	2,422,079,000	2,492,488,255	2,584,707,000	2,676,591,000	2,670,958,000	2,670,958,000	2,670,958,000
<b>Appropriation Authority Surplus/(Deficit)</b>	20,907,320	11,853,583	32,241,151	105,889,137	25,188,956	55,226,066	50,180,371	52,669,213