



CALIFORNIA PROBATION, PAROLE AND CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION

To: All CPPCA Members

From: Danielle Sanchez, Legislative Representative, Dsanchez@warnerandpank.com

Date: June 19, 2015

Subject: Legislature and Governor Reach Budget Agreement: Legislature Passes 2015-16 Budget

Today, the Legislature took further action to complete approval of a comprehensive budget plan negotiated by the Governor, Senate, and Assembly. The budget includes \$115.4 billion in General Fund spending, up from \$113.3 billion as proposed in January, and \$167.6 billion in total spending, up from \$164.7 billion as proposed in January. As you know, the Legislature approved a budget bill and four trailer bills on Monday, June 15, and the votes today approved the remainder of the budget package, including the compromises that allowed the Governor and the Legislature to reach agreement.

This comprehensive budget package remains based on the revenue estimates provided by the Department of Finance, which are \$3 billion lower than the estimates relied upon for the budget plan adopted by the Legislature on Monday. Despite sticking with the more conservative revenue projections, the compromise includes new spending on child care, health and human services, and higher education without substantially increasing the overall General Fund spending level. This was achieved through updated savings projections and program efficiencies.

As previously reported, state coffers have received nearly \$7 billion more than initial General Fund projections, and most of this money is directed to educational purposes and the Rainy Day Fund by the mandates of Proposition 98 and Proposition 2, respectively. This budget plan continues on the path set by Governor Brown throughout his recent tenure. Specifically, new spending is generally limited and the focus remains on addressing long-term liabilities while planning for inevitable economic downturns.

The final budget must be signed into law by July 1, 2015. Below is a list of priority public safety items of interest as well as related funding charts.

PROBATION RELATED ITEMS

SB 678 – The Legislature passed \$125.9 million for SB 678 for 2015-16. The Legislature has passed a compromise revised SB 678 formula which appropriates \$125.1 million for 2015-16. The revised formula stabilizes funding swings while maintaining a performance based funding mechanism. Part of the funding will be based on a probation department's highest year of funding from the first four years. Each year a department will receive a percentage of the highest year based their probation failure rate (PFR). The percentage ranges from 40%-100% of the highest year. The second part of the funding accessible to probation departments compares a department's individual success year over year. A department will receive 35% of the state contract bed rate based on their own improvement on prison revocation rate. The formula is based on prison revocation rates on all supervised populations for felony probation, PRCS and Mandatory Supervision.

The formula also contains a minimum payment of \$200,000. The funding will continue to support successful probation supervision and programming for adult offenders and renews the commitment of the Legislature and the Governor to fund practices crucial to ensuring public safety in our communities. *See attachments for more details.*

Funding for PRCS Second-Strike Offenders with Enhanced Credit Earnings –The Legislature approved \$11.9 million to be appropriated directly to probation departments to address accelerated release of some PRCS offenders as a result of the Three Judge Panel orders. We would note that because this funding is tied to workload, we expect this number to change year over year and is viewed by the Legislature as limited term funding. *See attached chart.*

CCP Implementation Grants –The Legislature approved \$7.9 million to go out to the counties that report on their realignment efforts to the BSCC. The funds would be distributed based on the most recent county population as follows: (1) \$100,000 to each county with a population of 0 to 200,000, inclusive, (2) \$150,000 to each county with a population of 200,001 to 749,999, inclusive, and (3) \$200,000 to each county with a population of 750,000 and above.

REALIGNMENT (*see attached chart*)

Realignment Base Funding – The May Revise assumes funding for the AB 109 Community Corrections Subaccount of \$934.1 million for 2014-15 and \$1.069.5 billion for 2015-16. Additionally, projected funding in the Law Enforcement Activities Account is \$489.9 million for 2014-15 as well as 2015-16 (this base number is fixed). Finally, projected funding for the Trial Court Security Subaccount is \$518.1 million in 2014-15 and \$536.1 million in 2015-16.

Realignment Growth Funding – The budget anticipates that the growth in the AB 109 Community Corrections Subaccount is \$135.4 million for 2014-15 and \$110.3 million for 2015-16. Additionally, projected growth in the Law Enforcement Activities Account is \$73.7 million for 2014-15 and \$89.6 million for 2015-16. Finally, projected growth for the Trial Court Security Subaccount is \$18.1 million in 2014-15 and \$14.7 million in 2015-16. You will note that these figures are projected (subject to change) and dependent upon the actual collection of sales tax and vehicle license fees. For this reason, growth funds are not actually distributed until the Fall subsequent to the close of the fiscal year. For example, 2014-15 growth will not actually be paid until October or November of 2015.

CDCR

Population – Based on updated population figures and estimates, spring projections by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) show an average daily population reduction of 5,100 inmates in the budget year, largely attributable to the inmate releases granted pursuant to Proposition 47.

Out-Of-State Inmates – The budget includes a plan to return approximately 4,000 inmates currently housed out-of-state to California facilities. Specifically, 2,700 inmates will be returned by December 2015 and an additional 1,300 will be returned by June 2016. This course of action will result in a one-time reduction of CDCR's budget by \$73.3 million. The savings is scored as one-time savings to maintain flexibility should a population spike necessitate more utilization of out-of-state beds in the future.

The plan assumes removing all California inmates from two facilities and reducing the use of others. While this plan leaves approximately 4,200 inmates in out-of-state placements, the Administration is concerned that bringing back a higher number of inmates threatens the ability of CDCR to continue achieving the Three-Judge Panel's population benchmarks.

Activation of Infill Facilities – The 2012 Budget authorized the construction of three level II dormitory housing facilities at existing prisons. Two of these new dormitory housing facilities will be located adjacent to Mule Creek State Prison in Ione, and the third is to be located at the Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility in San Diego. Construction is expected to be completed by February 2016. The budget includes \$35.5 million to activate the three new infill facilities. The activation of these facilities adds 2,376 beds to the prison's design capacity by February 2016. The infill projects also expand the number of educational and vocational programming slots by 1,266.

Durable Solutions – While the budget takes no specific action, the Administration plans to provide a blueprint for a durable solution to prison overcrowding in the 2016-17 budget. The plan mentions contract beds, dealing with CRC (Norco prison that the Administration has previously proposed closing), fire camps, durable population reduction measures, rehabilitation goals, and housing limitations. The Legislature also added a problematic finding in the public safety trailer bill that "given the reduction in the prison population, further investment in building additional prisons is unnecessary at this time." Adding state correctional capacity must remain on the table as long-term, comprehensive correctional system discussions move forward.

Long-Term Infrastructure – In conjunction with the release of the January budget, the Department of Finance released the State's 2015 Five-Year Infrastructure plan. Of particular note is that the Plan proposes a total of \$126 million for CDCR for eight projects over the next five years. The budget includes a total of \$20.4 million General Fund in 2015-16 to address critical infrastructure and fire and life safety deficiencies as follows:

- \$18.1 million for construction of a new boiler facility at San Quentin State Prison.
- \$997,000 for design of two new kitchen and dining facilities at the California Correctional Center in Susanville.
- \$792,000 for the design of solid cell fronts at the Deuel Vocational Institution in Tracy.
- \$500,000 to conduct studies necessary to prepare plans and develop design information for future capital outlay projects.

RECIDIVISM REDUCTION FUND

Recidivism Reduction Fund – The budget compromise allocates the remaining \$18.8 million of one-time funding from the Recidivism Reduction Fund as follows: approximately \$6.8 million to CDCR for substance use treatment, \$3 million for additional innovative programming at CDCR, \$1.3 million for collaborative courts (Judicial Council), an additional \$1.7 million for Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Grants (expected to apply to conditional awards already made by the BSCC), \$4 million for additional community recidivism reduction grants (BSCC), grants for workforce training for supervised populations (administered by the Workforce Investment Boards), and \$500,000 for the evaluation of career technical education programs at CDCR.

POST

POST Budgeting Update – The January Budget proposed a reduction of \$5.2 million to the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training’s (POST) state administrative costs beginning in 2015-16. The budget maintains this reduction, but further develops the proposal by specifying that \$800,000 of the cut will come from eliminating vacant positions and realizing savings from a recent building relocation. Further savings of \$1.9 million result from reductions to contracted, non-mandated programs and \$2.5 million in savings comes from continuing ongoing suspended backfill reimbursements. Because the plan is a continuation of existing reductions, there should not be further impacts on current services offered. Conversely, the budget provides an additional \$4.4 million for Plan IV reimbursements (travel and per diem) made available by reductions and the unpaid court debt amnesty program.

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Incompetent to Stand Trial (IST) Waitlist – Despite adding 192 IST beds since 2013 and implementing additional measures to mitigate the backlog of persons awaiting transport to the Department of State Hospitals (DSH), there are approximately 300 IST patients waiting to be admitted to DSH. To address this, the budget adds additional capacity at the state hospitals as well as provides funding to increase capacity through partnerships with local governments and the private sector. Specifically, the proposed budget provides \$17.3 million for an additional 105 beds at Atascadero and Coalinga State Hospitals, \$32 million (with ongoing staffing costs of approximately \$48 million) to eventually add approximately 200 new IST treatment beds and 32 skilled nursing facility beds to Metropolitan State Hospital, and \$10.1 million to expand the Restoration of Competency (ROC) program by up to 108 beds. The budget also deletes the sunset on the authority to operate ROC programs and includes trailer bill language to streamline the process whereby ROC programs can be implemented in participating counties.

High-Cost Drugs – The budget calls for \$51.8 million in the current year and \$60.6 million in FY 2015-16 for treating CDCR inmates with Hepatitis C.

JUDICIAL BRANCH

The budget includes an increase in \$180 million for the judiciary. Consistent with the proposed two-year strategy beginning in 2014, the budget includes an augmentation of \$90.1 million General Fund to support trial court operations. In addition, the budget includes the following adjustments:

Trial Court Employee Costs – The budget includes \$42.7 million General Fund for trial court employee benefit costs, of which \$10.8 million reflects funding for trial courts that have now made progress towards meeting the Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act of 2013 standard. The Administration is committed to funding future increases related to existing health benefits and retirement costs for trial court employees and retirees.

Proposition 47 – The budget includes \$26.9 million in General Fund to deal with the expected increase in workload associated with the passage of Proposition 47 (e.g., petitions for resentencing, etc.)

Trial Court Trust Fund Revenues – The budget provides an additional \$19.8 million in addition to the \$15.5 million included in the May Revision to the Trial Court Trust Fund to address estimates of lower fine and penalty collection in the budget year.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Pre-2004 Mandate Debt – The 2014-15 state budget made a \$100 million repayment on pre-2004 mandate debt owed to counties, cities, and special districts. The Governor’s January Budget noted that projected revenues would trigger another payment in the amount of \$533 million to local governments to retire this debt. Based on actual increased revenues, the budget allocates \$765 million to complete payment of this state obligation. Of the total amount, 77% will go to counties, 22% will go to cities, and 1% will go to special districts. The Administration has stated that “It remains the Administration’s expectation that local governments use these funds for core services such as public safety, particularly to improve the implementation of 2011 Realignment and address mental health issues of local offenders.” *See attached chart.*

Redevelopment Agencies – As the state continues to wind down the workload of the state’s former redevelopment agencies (RDAs), the budget anticipates that in 2014-15 and 2015-16 combined, cities will receive an additional \$580 million, counties \$660 million, and special districts \$200 million. The budget anticipates ongoing property tax revenues of more than \$900 million annually will be distributed to cities, counties, and special districts. This is a significant amount of unrestricted funding that can be used by local governments to fund police, fire, and other critical public services, though there is no guarantee that such will be the case.

OTHER ITEMS

City Law Enforcement Grants – The Governor’s January budget proposed \$40 million for front line law enforcement activities. The BSCC allocates funds to individual cities acting as the fiduciary agent within each county receiving the funds. This temporary program has been funded for the last three years and the Governor proposed a fourth year of funding. During the budget process, the Assembly and Senate both took actions to attach conditions to the funds and earmark portions for non-discretionary uses. The final budget compromise provides \$20 million for front line law enforcement grants with the sole condition being recipient cities must “agree to provide data on the number of use-of-force incidents that result in hospitalization or death.”

The budget also includes \$5 million for three city police infrastructure projects in Kings County. Additionally, \$6 million is budgeted for the BSCC to provide grants to local law enforcement for “programs and initiatives intended to strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve.” Applicants for these grants are required to be in full compliance with existing law (PC 11108) that requires law enforcement to submit information pertaining to seized firearms to the Department of Justice’s Automated Firearms System (AFS).

Adult Education in Correctional Facilities – The January Budget and the May Revision create a \$500 million block grant for Adult Education. The purpose of this fund is to provide flexible spending ability with local priorities in mind. In past years, approximately \$15 million for the Adults in Correctional Facilities program has been kept separate from the other categorical funds that were rolled into a block grant. The January budget proposed the block grant model without carving out the inmate educational funds. In the May Revision, the Administration proposed that the Adults in Correctional Facilities program would be funded separately, as it has been previously. The budget adopts this separate funding.

CHP Body Cameras – The budget provides, upon the order of the Director of Finance, \$1 million to the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for the purpose of conducting a pilot program to study the use of body-worn cameras, and provides that the funds shall not be available until the CHP outlines the proposed scope of the study in writing to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the chairpersons of the budget subcommittees in both the Senate and Assembly.

Additionally, trailer bill language specifies that the CHP shall develop their plan by January 1, 2016, and that the plan shall explore, but not be limited to, all of the following:

- The types of officers that should be assigned or permitted to wear a body-worn camera and the circumstances under which the body-worn camera should be worn.
- The minimum specifications for body-worn cameras to be utilized in the body-worn camera program.
- The practicality of an officer using a privately owned body-worn camera while on duty.
- The best locations on the officer’s body where a body-worn camera should be worn.
- Best practices for officers notifying members of the public that the officer’s body-worn camera is recording.
- The identity of the individual responsible for uploading recorded body-worn camera data and images.
- The circumstances during which recorded body-worn camera data should be uploaded.
- Best practices for recorded body-worn camera data storage.
- Random reviews of recorded body-worn camera data for compliance with the pilot program and overall officer performance.
- Best practices on accessing recorded body-worn camera data for an officer’s personal use.
- Best practices for officer review of recorded body-worn camera data.
- Best practices for sharing recorded body-worn camera data internally.
- Best practices for sharing recorded body-worn camera data externally with the public and the news media.
- Body-worn camera usage training.
- A schedule for reviewing body-worn camera policies and protocols.

Budget Bills and Language of Interest

Bill Number	Subject	Link to Bill Language
AB 93	2015-16 STATE BUDGET (MAIN BUDGET BILL)	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_0051-0100/ab_93_bill_20150616_enrolled.pdf
SB 97	MAIN BUDGET BILL AUGMENTATION	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_97_bill_20150616_amended_asm_v98.pdf
AB 95	TRANSPORTATION	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_0051-0100/ab_95_bill_20150611_amended_sen_v98.pdf
AB 104	K-12 OMNIBUS	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_0101-0150/ab_104_bill_20150616_amended_sen_v98.pdf
AB 114	PUBLIC WORKS: BUILDING CONSTRUCTION	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_0101-0150/ab_114_bill_20150611_amended_sen_v98.pdf

AB 116	BUDGET ACT OF 2014: AUGMENTATION	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_0101-0150/ab_116_bill_20150615_enrolled.pdf
AB 117	GENERAL GOVERNMENT 2	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_0101-0150/ab_117_bill_20150616_amended_sen_v98.pdf
AB 119	PUBLIC HEALTH: MEDI-CAL-NURSING FACILITIES	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/asm/ab_0101-0150/ab_119_bill_20150611_amended_sen_v98.pdf
SB 75	HEALTH OMNIBUS	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_75_bill_20150616_amended_asm_v96.pdf
SB 78	LCFF CLEAN-UP	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_78_bill_20150616_amended_asm_v98.pdf
SB 79	HUMAN SERVICES	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_79_bill_20150617_amended_asm_v98.pdf
SB 80	EITC	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_80_bill_20150616_amended_asm_v98.pdf
SB 81	HIGHER EDUCATION	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_81_bill_20150616_amended_asm_v98.pdf
SB 82	DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_82_bill_20150616_amended_asm_v98.pdf
SB 83	RESOURCES OMNIBUS	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_83_bill_20150617_amended_asm_v97.pdf
SB 84	GENERAL GOVERNMENT	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_84_bill_20150616_amended_asm_v98.pdf
SB 85	PUBLIC SAFETY	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_85_bill_20150617_amended_asm_v98.pdf
SB 88	DROUGHT	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_88_bill_20150617_amended_asm_v98.pdf
SB 98	STATE GOVERNMENT	http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_98_bill_20150616_amended_asm_v98.pdf

SB678 Revised Formula – Budget Compromise

	SB 678 Revised Formula
Populations	PRCS, Mandatory Supervision, and Felony Probationers revoked to state prison
High performance grant	No longer applicable.
Past Performance Funding	Counties receive a percentage of their highest payment from the first 4 years of the program based on the current year PFR. The tiers are based on statewide PFRs from past years: 100%: Less than or equal to 1.5% PFR 70%: Greater than 1.5%, but less than/= 3.2% 60%: Greater than 3.2%, but less than/= 5.5% 50%: Greater than 5.5%, but less than/= 6.1% 40%: Greater than 6.1%, but less than/= 7.9% *counties can move between tiers depending on performance that year but the highest year payment remains static see chart attached
Incentive Funding	Counties reducing their prison revocation rate compared to the previous year receive 35% of the contract bed rate. There is no longer a baseline, other than the previous year's performance. All revocation types are weighted equally, as are populations.
Minimum Annual Payment	\$200,000 minimum payment

The initial process engaged by Chiefs developed 4 goals, and these were met to various degrees:

1. Increase Stability

- Counties will now have a minimum amount of payment as a portion of their past success. This is based on tiers that define how much the county receives, and may vary year to year but likely not as dramatically as the current formula. In addition, each county's payment will be dictated by your own performance and not dependent on statewide performance.

2. Pay for Past Success

- Counties receive a portion of their past success, which is dependent on the current year PFR and forms a continued incentive to keep PFR's low. A county can continue to improve and move up the tiers, as well as lose funding if performance decreases. Any change in the tiers (up or down), would still allow for counties to know what funding will result based on their performance. This provision does remove some of the volatility experienced in years past.

3. Include Realigned Populations

- All supervised populations are included: PRCS, MS, and felony probation. Only revocations to state prison is measured, no jail revocations.

4. Limit Complexity

- The data collection requirements will stay the same. Some of the complexity has been removed. It should be easier to assess what policies and programs help maximize your performance under the formula. CPOC will be a training to convey the new formula.

**Community Corrections Performance Incentive Grant Allocations
2015-16**

		County 2014 PFR compared to Historical PFRs					2014 PFR compared to 2013 PFR	\$200k	Total County
		<1.5%	>=1.5% and <=3.2%	>3.2% and <=5.5%	>5.5% and <=6.1%	>6.1% and <=7.9%	2014 Incentive funding	Minimum	Funding
Contract Bed Rate	\$26,012								
County 2014 PFR compared to Historical PFRs									
<1.5%	100%								
>=1.5% and <=3.2%	70%								
>3.2% and <=5.5%	60%								
>5.5% and <=6.1%	50%								
>6.1% and <=7.9%	40%								
Year-over-Year Incentive payment 2014	35%								
Formula Results									
Year-over-Year Incentive Payment	\$17,848,616								
Past-Performance Payment (based on newest PFR)	\$106,556,857								
Minimums	\$691,119								
Total Funding	\$125,096,592								
California	\$8,680,627	\$69,563,022	\$15,878,911	\$10,496,934	\$1,937,362	\$17,848,616	\$691,119	\$125,096,592	
Alameda		\$2,243,488				\$0		\$2,243,488	
Alpine						\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000	
Amador		\$140,000				\$48,865	\$11,135	\$200,000	
Butte						\$370,116		\$370,116	
Calaveras			\$244,435			\$0		\$244,435	
Colusa			\$132,997			\$28,527	\$38,476	\$200,000	
Contra Costa		\$4,573,373				\$73,920		\$4,647,293	
Del Norte			\$165,687			\$45,510		\$211,197	
El Dorado		\$280,105				\$72,861		\$352,966	
Fresno			\$2,844,283			\$526,676		\$3,370,959	
Glenn		\$184,810				\$17,837		\$202,647	
Humboldt			\$431,140			\$42,890		\$474,030	
Imperial			\$120,000			\$32,261	\$47,739	\$200,000	
Inyo		\$162,338				\$0	\$37,662	\$200,000	
Kern			\$1,271,534			\$1,443,766		\$2,715,301	
Kings			\$998,540			\$207,571		\$1,206,112	
Lake			\$392,188			\$16,808		\$408,995	
Lassen			\$127,839			\$101,987		\$229,826	
Los Angeles		\$36,557,344				\$6,749,550		\$43,306,893	
Madera		\$1,080,042				\$0		\$1,080,042	
Marin		\$935,898				\$10,490		\$946,388	
Mariposa	\$200,000					\$21,920		\$221,920	
Mendocino			\$358,389			\$79,012		\$437,401	
Merced	\$1,675,043					\$0		\$1,675,043	
Modoc	\$200,000					\$73,053		\$273,053	
Mono	\$227,576					\$21,430		\$249,006	
Monterey			\$136,627			\$55,872	\$7,502	\$200,000	
Napa	\$543,647					\$24,332		\$567,979	
Nevada	\$587,404					\$9,874		\$597,278	
Orange		\$4,584,067				\$0		\$4,584,067	
Placer		\$537,136				\$0		\$537,136	
Plumas	\$442,681					\$20,407		\$463,088	
Riverside			\$6,385,763			\$771,837		\$7,157,600	
Sacramento					\$9,913,796	\$244,204		\$10,158,000	
San Benito		\$140,000				\$12,762	\$47,238	\$200,000	
San Bernardino		\$7,411,317				\$4,916,233		\$12,327,550	
San Diego						\$170,240	\$982,396	\$1,152,636	
San Francisco	\$2,757,568					\$37,757		\$2,795,325	
San Joaquin		\$2,135,537				\$246,139		\$2,381,676	
San Luis Obispo			\$1,274,765			\$38,220		\$1,312,985	
San Mateo		\$987,098				\$241,130		\$1,228,228	
Santa Barbara		\$1,278,421				\$174,832		\$1,453,253	
Santa Clara		\$1,201,774				\$0		\$1,201,774	
Santa Cruz	\$1,745,642					\$150,541		\$1,896,183	
Shasta						\$0	\$504,851	\$504,851	
Sierra			\$120,000			\$10,242	\$69,758	\$200,000	
Siskiyou			\$199,112			\$14,225		\$213,337	
Solano		\$575,120				\$14,910		\$590,030	
Sonoma		\$738,077				\$20,810		\$758,887	
Stanislaus			\$675,613			\$498,432		\$1,174,045	
Sutter		\$610,406				\$253,382		\$863,787	
Tehama						\$77,342	\$122,658	\$200,000	
Trinity	\$301,066					\$4,909		\$305,975	
Tulare		\$1,635,534				\$0		\$1,635,534	
Tuolumne		\$290,657				\$10,613		\$301,270	
Ventura					\$583,138	\$149,984		\$733,122	
Yolo		\$1,280,479				\$53,406		\$1,333,885	
Yuba						\$80,000	\$108,951	\$200,000	

Post Release Community Supervision Impact by County and Funding for 2 for 1 Credit Earnings

Rate Per Average Daily Population: \$10,250

*Assumes 12-months on PRCS

	ADP Impact*		ADP Impact*			
	225		139			
	2015-16		2016-17		Total	
	ADP Impact	Funding			ADP Impact	Funding
Alameda	2.00	\$20,500	1.00	\$10,250	3.00	\$30,750
Alpine	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Amador	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Butte	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Calaveras	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Colusa	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Contra Costa	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Del Norte	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
El Dorado	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Fresno	7.00	\$71,750	4.00	\$41,000	11.00	\$112,750
Glenn	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Humboldt	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Imperial	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Inyo	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Kern	8.00	\$82,000	5.00	\$51,250	13.00	\$133,250
Kings	3.00	\$30,750	2.00	\$20,500	5.00	\$51,250
Lake	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Lassen	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Los Angeles	82.00	\$840,500	51.00	\$522,750	133.00	\$1,363,250
Madera	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Marin	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Mariposa	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Mendocino	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Merced	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Modoc	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Mono	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Monterey	3.00	\$30,750	2.00	\$20,500	5.00	\$51,250
Napa	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Nevada	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Orange	8.00	\$82,000	5.00	\$51,250	13.00	\$133,250
Placer	2.00	\$20,500	1.00	\$10,250	3.00	\$30,750
Plumas	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Riverside	21.00	\$215,250	13.00	\$133,250	34.00	\$348,500
Sacramento	13.00	\$133,250	8.00	\$82,000	21.00	\$215,250
San Benito	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
San Bernardino	24.00	\$246,000	15.00	\$153,750	39.00	\$399,750
San Diego	18.00	\$184,500	11.00	\$112,750	29.00	\$297,250
San Francisco	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
San Joaquin	4.00	\$41,000	2.00	\$20,500	6.00	\$61,500
San Luis Obispo	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
San Mateo	2.00	\$20,500	1.00	\$10,250	3.00	\$30,750
Santa Barbara	2.00	\$20,500	1.00	\$10,250	3.00	\$30,750
Santa Clara	8.00	\$82,000	5.00	\$51,250	13.00	\$133,250
Santa Cruz	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Shasta	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Sierra	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Siskiyou	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Solano	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Sonoma	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Stanislaus	5.00	\$51,250	3.00	\$30,750	8.00	\$82,000
Sutter	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Tehama	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Trinity	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Tulare	4.00	\$41,000	3.00	\$30,750	7.00	\$71,750
Tuolumne	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Ventura	3.00	\$30,750	2.00	\$20,500	5.00	\$51,250
Yolo	2.00	\$20,500	1.00	\$10,250	3.00	\$30,750
Yuba	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Total	262	\$2,685,500	177	\$1,814,250	439	\$4,499,750

**Post Release Community Supervision Impact by County and Funding for the New 50 Percent Second Striker Parole Process
at 2015-16 May Revision**

Rate Per Average Daily Population: \$10,250

*Assumes 12-months on PRCS

2015-16	ADP Impact* 865		ADP Impact* 965		Total	
	2015-16		2016-17		Total	
	ADP Impact	Funding	ADP Impact	Funding	ADP Impact	Funding
Alameda	7.00	\$71,750	7.00	\$71,750	14.00	\$143,500
Alpine	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Amador	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Butte	2.00	\$20,500	3.00	\$30,750	5.00	\$51,250
Calaveras	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Colusa	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Contra Costa	4.00	\$41,000	5.00	\$51,250	9.00	\$92,250
Del Norte	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
El Dorado	2.00	\$20,500	3.00	\$30,750	5.00	\$51,250
Fresno	24.00	\$246,000	27.00	\$276,750	51.00	\$522,750
Glenn	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Humboldt	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Imperial	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Inyo	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Kern	31.00	\$317,750	35.00	\$358,750	66.00	\$676,500
Kings	9.00	\$92,250	10.00	\$102,500	19.00	\$194,750
Lake	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Lassen	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Los Angeles	315.00	\$3,228,750	351.00	\$3,597,750	666.00	\$6,826,500
Madera	7.00	\$71,750	8.00	\$82,000	15.00	\$153,750
Marin	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Mariposa	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Mendocino	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Merced	7.00	\$71,750	8.00	\$82,000	15.00	\$153,750
Modoc	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Mono	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Monterey	10.00	\$102,500	11.00	\$112,750	21.00	\$215,250
Napa	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Nevada	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Orange	30.00	\$307,500	33.00	\$338,250	63.00	\$645,750
Placer	5.00	\$51,250	6.00	\$61,500	11.00	\$112,750
Plumas	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Riverside	78.00	\$799,500	87.00	\$891,750	165.00	\$1,691,250
Sacramento	47.00	\$481,750	53.00	\$543,250	100.00	\$1,025,000
San Benito	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
San Bernardino	93.00	\$953,250	103.00	\$1,055,750	196.00	\$2,009,000
San Diego	68.00	\$697,000	76.00	\$779,000	144.00	\$1,476,000
San Francisco	3.00	\$30,750	3.00	\$30,750	6.00	\$61,500
San Joaquin	13.00	\$133,250	14.00	\$143,500	27.00	\$276,750
San Luis Obispo	3.00	\$30,750	4.00	\$41,000	7.00	\$71,750
San Mateo	7.00	\$71,750	7.00	\$71,750	14.00	\$143,500
Santa Barbara	6.00	\$61,500	7.00	\$71,750	13.00	\$133,250
Santa Clara	29.00	\$297,250	33.00	\$338,250	62.00	\$635,500
Santa Cruz	3.00	\$30,750	3.00	\$30,750	6.00	\$61,500
Shasta	8.00	\$82,000	9.00	\$92,250	17.00	\$174,250
Sierra	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Siskiyou	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Solano	4.00	\$41,000	4.00	\$41,000	8.00	\$82,000
Sonoma	4.00	\$41,000	5.00	\$51,250	9.00	\$92,250
Stanislaus	18.00	\$184,500	20.00	\$205,000	38.00	\$389,500
Sutter	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Tehama	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Trinity	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Tulare	13.00	\$133,250	15.00	\$153,750	28.00	\$287,000
Tuolumne	2.00	\$20,500	2.00	\$20,500	4.00	\$41,000
Ventura	10.00	\$102,500	11.00	\$112,750	21.00	\$215,250
Yolo	6.00	\$61,500	7.00	\$71,750	13.00	\$133,250
Yuba	1.00	\$10,250	1.00	\$10,250	2.00	\$20,500
Total	899	\$9,214,750	1,001	\$10,260,250	1,900	\$19,475,000

2011 Realignment Estimate¹ - at 2015-16 May Revision

	2013-14	2013-14	2014-15	2014-15	2015-16	2015-16
		Growth		Growth		Growth
Law Enforcement Services	\$2,124.3		\$2,078.3		\$2,258.8	
Trial Court Security Subaccount	508.0	9.8	518.1	18.1	536.1	14.7
Enhancing Law Enforcement Activities Subaccount ¹	489.9	24.6	489.9	73.7	489.9	89.6
Community Corrections Subaccount ²	998.9	73.1	934.1	135.4	1,069.5	110.3
District Attorney and Public Defender Subaccount ²	17.1	4.9	15.8	9.0	24.8	7.4
Juvenile Justice Subaccount	110.4	9.8	120.4	18.1	138.5	14.7
<i>Youthful Offender Block Grant Special Account</i>	<i>(104.3)</i>	<i>(9.3)</i>	<i>(113.8)</i>	<i>(17.1)</i>	<i>(130.8)</i>	<i>(13.9)</i>
<i>Juvenile Reentry Grant Special Account</i>	<i>(6.1)</i>	<i>(0.5)</i>	<i>(6.6)</i>	<i>(1.0)</i>	<i>(7.6)</i>	<i>(0.8)</i>
Growth, Law Enforcement Services	122.2	122.2	254.3	254.4	236.7	236.6
Mental Health³	1,120.6	9.1	1,120.6	16.8	1,120.6	13.7
Support Services	2,829.4		3,022.0		3,340.7	
Protective Services Subaccount	1,837.0	112.0	1,970.7	162.2	2,133.0	122.9
Behavioral Health Subaccount ⁴	992.4	60.0	1,051.3	156.4	1,207.7	136.6
<i>Women and Children's Residential Treatment Services</i>	<i>(5.1)</i>	-	<i>(5.1)</i>	-	<i>(5.1)</i>	-
Growth, Support Services	181.1	181.1	335.4	335.4	273.2	273.2
Account Total and Growth	\$6,377.6		\$6,810.6		\$7,230.0	
Revenue						
1.0625% Sales Tax	5,863.1		6,247.0		6,650.5	
Motor Vehicle License Fee	514.5		563.6		579.5	
Revenue Total	\$6,377.6		\$6,810.6		\$7,230.0	

This chart reflects estimates of the 2011 Realignment subaccount and growth allocations based on current revenue forecasts and in accordance with the formulas outlined in Chapter 40, Statutes of 2012 (SB 1020).

¹ Allocation is capped at \$489.9 million. 2013-14 growth will not add to subsequent fiscal year's subaccount base allocations.

² 2013-14 is not added to subsequent fiscal year's subaccount base allocations.

³ Growth does not add to base.

⁴ The Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment and Drug Medi-Cal programs within the Behavioral Health Subaccount do not yet have a permanent base.

Claimant Name	Payable Balance	Interest*	Total
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	21,224,682	4,909,472	26,134,154
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	19,096,848	4,417,283	23,514,131
COUNTY OF ALPINE	0	0	0
COUNTY OF AMADOR	890,905	206,075	1,096,980
COUNTY OF BUTTE	2,938,993	679,817	3,618,810
COUNTY OF CALAVERAS	323,126	74,742	397,868
COUNTY OF COLUSA	73,096	16,908	90,004
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA	10,439,227	2,414,693	12,853,920
COUNTY OF DEL NORTE	276,315	63,914	340,229
COUNTY OF EL DORADO	2,910,283	673,176	3,583,459
COUNTY OF FRESNO	9,614,979	2,224,037	11,839,016
COUNTY OF GLENN	276,515	63,961	340,476
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT	1,151,294	266,305	1,417,599
COUNTY OF IMPERIAL	1,276,201	295,197	1,571,398
COUNTY OF INYO	384,842	89,018	473,860
COUNTY OF KERN	7,982,762	1,846,489	9,829,251
COUNTY OF KINGS	1,315,949	304,392	1,620,341
COUNTY OF LAKE	624,796	144,521	769,317
COUNTY OF LASSEN	228,849	52,935	281,784
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	109,387,708	25,302,423	134,690,131
COUNTY OF MADERA	679,111	157,085	836,196
COUNTY OF MARIN	9,428,301	2,180,856	11,609,157
COUNTY OF MARIPOSA	346,432	80,133	426,565
COUNTY OF MENDOCINO	2,298,542	531,675	2,830,217
COUNTY OF MERCED	1,595,638	369,086	1,964,724
COUNTY OF MODOC	115,388	26,690	142,078
COUNTY OF MONO	224,429	51,913	276,342
COUNTY OF MONTEREY	10,917,616	2,525,349	13,442,965
COUNTY OF NAPA	3,935,901	910,412	4,846,313
COUNTY OF NEVADA	1,281,148	296,342	1,577,490
COUNTY OF ORANGE	48,693,646	11,263,306	59,956,952
COUNTY OF PLACER	8,133,881	1,881,444	10,015,325
COUNTY OF PLUMAS	246,668	57,057	303,725
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE	33,159,116	7,670,021	40,829,137
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO	18,117,459	4,190,741	22,308,200
COUNTY OF SAN BENITO	564,298	130,528	694,826
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO	15,584,574	3,604,861	19,189,435
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO	29,613,383	6,849,859	36,463,242
COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN	4,867,872	1,125,985	5,993,857
COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO	4,268,992	987,459	5,256,451
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO	11,159,956	2,581,405	13,741,361
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA	6,430,434	1,487,421	7,917,855
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA	26,969,236	6,238,242	33,207,478
COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ	4,383,911	1,014,041	5,397,952
COUNTY OF SHASTA	1,892,167	437,676	2,329,843
COUNTY OF SISKIYOU	1,617,343	374,107	1,991,450
COUNTY OF SOLANO	6,880,023	1,591,415	8,471,438
COUNTY OF SONOMA	6,018,132	1,392,051	7,410,183
COUNTY OF STANISLAUS	5,352,285	1,238,035	6,590,320
COUNTY OF SUTTER	1,495,217	345,858	1,841,075
COUNTY OF TEHAMA	1,389,111	321,315	1,710,426
COUNTY OF TRINITY	132,915	30,745	163,660
COUNTY OF TULARE	1,865,499	431,508	2,297,007
COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE	912,089	210,975	1,123,064
COUNTY OF VENTURA	14,743,672	3,410,352	18,154,024
COUNTY OF YOLO	2,799,457	647,541	3,446,998
COUNTY OF YUBA	570,860	132,045	702,905
SIERRA COUNTY	23,569	5,452	29,021
TOTALS	\$479,125,641	\$110,826,341	\$589,951,982

Mandate
Repayments

*These are estimated interest calculations. Final amount will be calculated by the SCO when they cut the checks for distribution