

**MEMORANDUM  
PLACER COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE**

**TO:** Honorable Board of Supervisors

**FROM:** Thomas M. Miller, County Executive Officer  
Bekki Riggan, Principal Management Analyst

**DATE:** July 25, 2011

**SUBJECT:** The Governor's FY 2011-12 Revised Public Safety Realignment  
Implementation and Funding Plan

---

---

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Receive an update on the Governor's revised FY 2011-12 public safety realignment implementation and funding plan.

**BACKGROUND:**

On June 30, 2011, the Governor signed the State Budget and numerous budget trailer bills needed to implement the Fiscal Year 2011-12 budget agreement. The Budget contains \$15.0 billion in spending reductions, including \$5 billion in health and human services, \$1.3 billion in higher education, one billion dollars in corrections, \$400 million in California Community Colleges, \$350 million in trial courts and \$700 million in staffing and other organizational reductions. The budget also assumes \$4 billion in additional revenues over previously forecast levels. Should these revenues fail to materialize, the budget provides a formula for distributing up to \$2.5 billion in additional cuts to public education, public safety, higher education and health and human services which would occur automatically as soon as January 1, 2012.

The Budget also includes the Governor's revised plan for a major realignment of public safety programs and responsibilities from the state to local governments. Specific programs to be realigned include: court security; low-level offenders and adult parole; mental health services, substance abuse treatment, foster care and child welfare services; and adult protective services with the goals of:

"...moving government programs closer to the people where local decision-makers can best tailor programs to meet their community needs, to eliminate duplication and to refocus state efforts on monitoring and program oversight."

Under the enacted plan, counties will assume responsibility for \$5.6 billion in program costs in FY 2011-12, which is projected to increase to \$6.8 billion at full implementation in FY 2014-15. Funding for realigned responsibilities will be provided through the transfer of state sales tax of \$5.1 billion and reconfigured Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenues of \$453.4 million. The Budget Act reconfigures VLF revenues to be comprised of a \$12 increase to the base vehicle registration fee of \$300 million and a shift of a portion of the 0.65 percent rate of VLF allocated for general local government purposes of \$153.4 million. These reconfigured VLF revenues will continue to fund a number of local public safety subvention programs previously funded through the temporary VLF rate increase that expired on June 30, 2011, including State funded Jail

Booking Fees, Rural Counties Front Line Law Enforcement funding, Citizens Option for Public Safety (COPS) Supplemental Law Enforcement Services (SLESF), Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act programs, and Juvenile Camps.

Although the Legislature did not provide the constitutional protections for future funding that counties were seeking, the Governor has expressed his commitment to achieving those protections for counties at a later date. A series of budget trailer bills clarify many aspects of realignment implementation and funding, but given the sweeping nature of these shifts in public policy further refinements are anticipated to occur over the remainder of the legislative session.

While realignment legislation is certainly a state budget balancing measure, it is also the central component of the State's plan to meet requirements set out in the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision regarding overcrowding in the state prison system. On May 23, 2011, the Supreme Court affirmed the lower court's 2009 finding that medical and mental health care for inmates falls below a constitutional level of care and that the only way to meet these requirements is to reduce prison populations. Accordingly, the State must reduce the total population in California's 33 adult prisons to 137.5 percent of its design capacity - a reduction of over 30,000 inmates - within two years, by May 24, 2013. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) reports that curtailing the influx of new offenders and parole violators through implementation of AB 109 will reduce prison population sufficiently so that early release of prison inmates should not be needed in order to meet its population requirements.

The public safety programs not directly related to the implementation of criminal justice realignment (AB 109), such as child welfare services, mental health services, substance abuse treatment, and adult protective services, will continue on with minimal changes until additional 2011 realignment legislation is enacted later in this legislative session. Accordingly, this update will focus on the realignment of criminal justice programs, the methodology for allocating funds to counties for these programs, and the planning process Placer County is undertaking in preparation for this historical shift in criminal justice policy.

**State Implementation of Criminal Justice Realignment (AB 109, 117 and 118):**

AB 109, signed into law in April 2011, contains the major framework for realigning criminal justice programs from the state to the counties. Under the enacted plan, the State will continue to manage offenders who commit serious, violent or sex-based crimes and counties will, on a prospective basis, assume responsibility for sentencing, housing, supervising, and rehabilitating low-level felons and adult parolees. It is important to note that: 1) No inmates currently in state prison will be released early - all felons currently sentenced to state prison will continue serving their full sentence in prison, and, 2) All felons who are convicted of serious violent offenses in the future - including sex offenders and child molesters - can still be sentenced to state prison.

**Attachment 1** from the California State Association of Counties contains the key provisions of AB 109 and subsequent revisions contained in AB 117. Collectively this legislation:

- Defers prospective implementation from July 1, 2011 to October 1, 2011;
- Revises the definition of a felony to include specified lower-level crimes that would be punishable in jail or other local sentencing options for more than one year (approximately 60 additional crimes were excluded from the "low-level" definition due to concerns raised by local public safety officials);
- Makes changes to state parole and creates Post Release Community Supervision for county-level supervision of offenders released from prison (state parole continues for more serious or violent offenders);
- Enhances local custody and supervision options to include alternatives to custody including use of home detention;
- Expands the role and purpose of the previously established Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) to develop and recommend to the Board of Supervisors a local realignment implementation plan;
- Creates an Executive Committee from the CCP to include the Chief Probation Officer (Chair), Presiding Judge, Chief of Police, Sheriff, District Attorney, and the Director of Health and Human Services;
- Adds funding for district attorneys and public defenders to cover new costs associated with local revocation hearings;
- Provides one-time funding for one-time start-up costs (hiring, retention, training, data improvements, contracting, capacity planning) and to support CCP planning costs;
- Defers the implementation of Department of Juvenile Justice policy shifts previously proposed for consideration.

**Attachment 2** contains Department of Finance and CDCR projections of the anticipated population impacts resulting from implementation of AB 109 at full-rollout in Year 4. The impact is expressed as Average Daily Population (ADP) which reflects one inmate in one bed for one year, rather than reflecting the actual number of individuals who move in or out of the justice system over the course of a year.

Projected ADP is an important calculation for counties as the following allocation formula reflects: 60% ADP (Caseload); 30% county population (18 to 64 years); and 10% Community Supervision success rates (SB 678). SB 678 was enacted specifically to support more successful probation supervision through the use of evidence-based practices. SB 678 establishes a system of performance-based funding for county probation departments and allows these savings to be shared with the counties in proportion to their success in reducing probation failures.

The Department of Finance projects an increased ADP at full-implementation of 429 for Placer County as follows:

- 251 low-level offenders who prior to AB 109 would have received State prison sentences:
  - 133 offenders with a sentence length of less than three years;
  - 118 with a sentence length of greater than 3 years;
- 153 on Post Release Community Supervision; and
- 25 on Parole - Return to Custody (RTC).

**Attachment 3** contains AB 109 funding allocations for individual counties as prescribed through AB 118. This legislation creates and funds a Community Corrections Grant Program and converts \$5.1 billion in state sales tax to local sales tax and reconfigured Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenues of \$453.4 million to pay for the realigned programs. It further clarifies that allocation formulas apply only to the first year of realignment and that funding methodologies for FY 2012-13 and beyond are subject to revision. Placer's FY 2011-12 AB 109 allocations are as follows:

- Incarceration/ Alternative Sanctions Programs: \$2,986,395
- District Attorney and Public Defender Parole Revocation Costs: \$107,048
- Evidence Based Practices Training (one-time): \$210,000
- Community Corrections Partnership Planning (one-time): \$150,000
  - **Total Year-One Funding Allocation to Placer County \$3,453,443**

### **Community Corrections Partnership (CCP) and the Executive Committee**

Realigned funding comes with the requirement to develop a "justice reinvestment strategy" that fits the priorities and approaches of each county and that manages criminal justice populations more cost-effectively, generating savings that can be reinvested in evidence-based strategies that increase public safety while holding offenders accountable. Each county must establish a Community Corrections Partnership and an Executive Committee (both chaired by the Chief Probation Officer) to develop and recommend an AB 109 implementation plan to its Board of Supervisors for approval and funding. The first meeting of Placer County's CCP was convened on July 21, 2011 by Chief Probation Officer Marshall Hopper. Placer County's CCP is comprised as follows:

- Chief Probation Officer (Chair);
- Presiding Judge;
- County Supervisor;
- District Attorney;
- Public Defender;
- Sheriff;
- Chief of Police;
- County Executive Office;
- Health and Human Services;
- Community-Based Organization representative with experience in rehabilitative services for criminal offenders;
- Victims' representative.

The Executive Committee is defined by legislation as follows:

- Chief Probation Officer (chair);
- Presiding judge;
- Chief of Police;
- Sheriff;
- District Attorney;
- Director of Health and Human Services.

### **Discussion and Analysis**

*It is important to note that neither the projected county ADP nor the county funding allocations under the Governor's realignment plan are reflective of the State's existing ADP or of its current costs. A central assumption in the Governor's realignment plan is that local governments will handle their realigned offender populations in a different manner than the CDCR by utilizing a hybrid of incarceration, community supervision, treatment and/or alternative custody and diversion programs during the offender's sentence.*

All stakeholders in this process can agree that there is simply not enough funding in the enacted legislation for local jurisdictions to continue to incarcerate these realigned offenders under the same sentencing construct as CDCR. This necessitates the utilization of Evidence-Based Practices that have been scientifically studied and found to provide the best chance of reducing risk to reoffend, thereby reducing recidivism. If implemented with fidelity to the research, this could yield significant benefits. Some marginal number of offenders (research suggests 15-30%) would commit fewer crimes, yielding fewer victims, fewer visits to court and shorter periods of incarceration. These outcomes would translate to lower costs to all criminal justice and health and human services agencies, and eventually, to more offenders becoming contributing members of the community.

The CCP will be tasked with developing a more robust continuum of sanctions – including custodial and non-custodial responses - to achieve the legislative intent of improved public safety returns in its criminal justice system. Commonly utilized options include: expanded use of risk and needs assessments, intensive supervision, flash incarceration, cognitive skills training, community reporting centers, GPS and electronic-monitoring, substance abuse, mental health treatment, aftercare and housing assistance.

### **Placer County Roadmap for Realignment Planning and Implementation**

As noted above, this realignment proposal assumes local governments will handle this offender population in a different manner than CDCR. The system changes envisioned in AB 109, including the development of a local process that allows for this research-based approach to take root, will be significant. The comfort level of our justice system and our community to accept the central realignment concepts of reduced length of incarceration with increased programming and community supervision structure - which, according to the research, will reduce recidivism - is yet to be determined. However, Placer County is well positioned to handle offenders differently and to put in place a process that assures the best chance of positive outcomes for these offenders and for

the public safety of its constituents. Placer County, its justice officials, and its treatment providers have a long history of utilizing Evidence-Based Practices in developing effective juvenile justice programs, addressing and reducing numbers of repeat DUI offenders, and managing our local adult jail population. The Community Corrections Partnership and Executive Committee planning process prescribed by AB 109 legislation will rely on the same collaborations, partnerships and strategic planning approaches that have been used very effectively over the years in Placer County.

Accordingly, Placer County's roadmap for implementing AB 109 is as follows:

- July – Convene the Community Corrections Partnership and the Executive Committee under the leadership of the Chief Probation Officer;
- September – Conduct an Evidence-Based Practices seminar with the Administrative Offices of the Court, Placer County Superior Court, County justice officials, local law enforcement and community services providers;
- October – Conduct an assessment of Placer County's custodial and non-custodial sanctions with justice officials to determine overall system needs;
- October thru December – Community Corrections Partnership and the Executive Committee finalize Placer County's AB 109 Implementation Plan;
- Early 2012 – Present final AB 109 Implementation Plan and funding recommendations to the Placer County Board of Supervisors for consideration and approval;
- Return to the Placer County Board of Supervisors at regular intervals for SB 109 implementation progress reports and outcome measures.

Attachments: Key Provisions in AB 109 & AB 117 / 2011 Public Safety Realignment  
Average Daily Population at Full Rollout (Year 4) of AB 109 by County  
2011-12 AB 109 Allocations

**Brief Summary\* of Key Provisions in AB 109 & AB 117:  
2011 Public Safety Realignment  
Updated July 2011**

**Main components**

- Defines local custody for non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offenders
- Makes changes to state parole and creates local "post-release community supervision"

**Local planning process**

- Expands role and purpose of the Community Corrections Partnership (CCP), which was previously established in Penal Code §1230
- Requires CCP to develop and recommend to the board of supervisors an **implementation plan** for 2011 public safety realignment
- Creates an Executive Committee from the CCP members comprised of:
  - Chief probation officer (chair)
  - Chief of police
  - Sheriff
  - District Attorney
  - Public Defender
  - Presiding judge of the superior court (or his or her designee)
  - A representative from either the County Department of Social Services, Mental Health, or Alcohol and Substance Abuse Programs, as appointed by the County Board of Supervisors
- The implementation plan is deemed accepted by the County Board of Supervisors unless the Board rejects the plan by a four-fifths vote.

→ *The meetings of the CCP and its Executive Counties are subject to the Brown Act. Counties are advised to consult with counsel regarding the application of the open meeting law in this regard.*

**Timeframe**

- All provisions are **prospective** and applied on October 1, 2011
  - AB 118 provides the statutory framework, allocation methodology and revenue to implement public safety realignment
- **No state prison inmates will be transferred to county jails.**

**Local custody**

- Revises the definition of felony to include specified lower-level crimes that would be punishable in jail or another local sentencing option for more than one year.
- Maintains length of sentences.
- Time served in jails instead of prisons:
  - Non-violent offenders
  - Non-serious offenders
  - Non-sex offenders
- Enhanced local custody and supervision tools
  - Alternative custody tools for county jails
  - Home detention for low-level offenders
  - Local jail credits mirror current prison credits (day-for-day)
  - Broaden maximum allowable hospital costs for jail inmates and remove sunset date.

**State custody**

- Convictions/priors for following offenses require state prison term:
  - Prior or current serious or violent felony as described in PC 1192.7 (c) or 667.5 (c)
  - The defendant is required to register as a sex offender pursuant to PC 290
- Other specified crimes (approximately 60 additional exclusions from "low-level" definition) will still require term in state prison

### Contracting back

- Counties permitted to contract back with the state to send local offenders to state prison.
- Authorize counties to contract with public community correctional facilities (CCFs).
- Contracting back *does not* extend to parole revocations.

### Post-release (county-level) community supervision

- Prospectively, county-level supervision for offenders upon release from prison will include:
  - Current non-violent offenders (irrespective of priors)
  - Current non-serious offenders (irrespective of priors)
  - Sex offenders
- County-level supervision *will not include*:
  - 3rd strikers
  - Individuals with a serious commitment offense
  - Individuals with a violent commitment offense
  - High risk sex offenders as defined by CDCR
- Board of Supervisors designates a county agency to be responsible for Post Release Supervision and provide that information to CDCR by August 1, 2011.
- CDCR must notify counties as to who is being released on post-release supervision at least one month prior to their release.
- CDCR has no jurisdiction over any person who is under post-release community supervision
- No person shall be returned to prison except for persons previously sentenced to a term of life (and only after a court order).

### Post-release revocations

- Revocations are capped at 180 days with day-for-day credit earning.
- Authorizes discharging individuals on post-release community supervision who have no violations for six months.

### Ongoing state parole

- CDCR continues to have jurisdiction over all offenders on state parole prior to July 1, 2011 implementation
- State parole will continue for the following:
  - The offender's committing offense is a serious or violent felony as described in PC §§1192.7(c) or 667.5(c);
  - The offender has been convicted of a third strike;
  - The person is classified as a high risk sex offender; or
  - The person is classified as a Mentally Disordered Offender (MDO).

### Parole revocations

- Prospectively, the parole revocation process continues under Board of Parole Hearings (BPH) until July 1, 2013.
- Parole revocations will be served in county jail and not to exceed 180 days.
- Contracting back to the state for revocations is not an option.
- Only persons previously sentenced to a term of life can be revoked to prison.
- For the remaining low level offenders on parole after implementation of realignment, parole has the authority to discharge after six months if no violations have occurred.

### Juvenile Justice

- AB 109 limited the future juvenile court commitments to state juvenile detention (Division of Juvenile Justice or DJJ); this provision was removed in AB 117. Consequently, there are no changes to the state juvenile justice system in realignment.

**Average Daily Population at Full Rollout (Year 4) of AB 109 by County (Department of Finance estimates)**

County	Low-level (N/N/N) Offenders			Postrelease Community Supervision Population Totals 1	RTC ADP 30-Day ALOS 1, 7
	Total Inmates N/N/N	Short-term Inmates N/N/N w/no Prior S/V w Sentence Length < 3 Years 1, 2, 3, 5, 6	Long-term Inmates N/N/N w/no Prior S/V w Sentence Length > 3 Years 1, 2, 4, 5, 6		
	no Prior S/V ADP 1, 2, 5				
Alameda	267	181	86	848	132
Alpine	2	2	-	-	-
Amador	53	35	18	43	6
Butte	268	161	108	181	36
Calaveras	21	12	8	25	5
Colusa	23	16	6	9	1
Contra Costa	104	60	44	318	56
Del Norte	11	2	9	20	5
El Dorado	68	45	23	81	10
Fresno	518	357	161	971	218
Glenn	28	18	10	19	3
Humboldt	137	108	29	126	15
Imperial	90	53	37	107	11
Inyo	15	7	7	15	3
Kern	1,019	784	236	1,040	154
Kings	321	201	120	185	39
Lake	73	39	34	75	11
Lassen	32	19	13	26	6
Los Angeles	8,342	5,767	2,576	9,791	530
Madera	111	67	44	150	24
Marin	66	27	39	53	8
Mariposa	13	9	5	11	2
Mendocino	75	38	37	50	8
Merced	171	100	71	214	42
Modoc	2	1	1	3	1
Mono	3	2	1	7	1
Monterey	308	176	132	309	34
Napa	70	44	26	69	7
Nevada	23	16	7	17	6
Orange	1,464	1,038	427	1,750	220
Placer	251	133	118	153	25
Plumas	9	7	3	12	1
Riverside	1,601	990	611	1,683	262
Sacramento	895	505	390	1,203	208
San Benito	52	30	22	23	4
San Bernardino	2,301	1,638	663	2,521	348
San Diego	1,821	1,043	778	2,038	256
San Francisco	164	114	50	421	61
San Joaquin	450	311	138	639	126
San Luis Obispo	140	88	52	136	22
San Mateo	208	139	70	351	33
Santa Barbara	294	181	112	288	37
Santa Clara	693	402	291	1,067	115
Santa Cruz	78	72	6	69	17
Shasta	326	147	178	201	40
Sierra	1	1	-	1	-
Siskiyou	34	12	21	23	8
Solano	278	162	116	363	53
Sonoma	231	116	115	164	21
Stanislaus	540	316	224	426	66
Sutter	103	67	35	108	21
Tehama	154	94	60	50	13
Trinity	9	8	1	9	1
Tulare	520	292	228	388	70
Tuolumne	47	13	33	33	4
Ventura	380	210	170	363	60
Yolo	277	130	147	215	37
Yuba	94	64	30	88	19
<b>Total Projected:</b>	<b>25,651</b>	<b>16,673</b>	<b>8,978</b>	<b>29,550</b>	<b>3,525</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58,726</b>				

1 Numbers are based upon full implementation.  
 2 Numbers have been adjusted for excluded crimes.  
 3 Numbers reflect sentence lengths 3 years or less.  
 4 Numbers reflect sentence lengths above 3 years. Population serving longer than 3 years will be significantly less due to day for day credit earning.  
 5 Judicial decisions could decrease this population dramatically.  
 6 This population is a subset of the total low level offender population.  
 7 Assumes 30-Day Average Length of Stay for Locally Supervised Violators and State Parole Violators.

23

2011-12 AB 109 Allocations

	[1] 2011-12 Allocation for AB 109 PROGRAMS	[2] 2011-12 Allocation for AB 109 DA/PD Activities (revocation)	[3] 2011-12 allocation for training, retention purposes (one-time)	[4] 2011-12 allocation for Comm Corrections Partnership planning (one-time) *
ALAMEDA	\$9,221,012	\$330,530	\$650,650	\$200,000
ALPINE	\$76,883	\$2,756	\$5,425	\$100,000
AMADOR	\$543,496	\$19,482	\$38,350	\$100,000
BUTTE	\$2,735,905	\$98,069	\$193,050	\$150,000
CALAVERAS	\$350,757	\$12,573	\$24,750	\$100,000
COLUSA	\$214,352	\$7,684	\$15,125	\$100,000
CONTRA COSTA	\$4,572,950	\$163,919	\$322,675	\$200,000
DEL NORTE	\$221,438	\$7,938	\$15,625	\$100,000
EL DORADO	\$1,210,643	\$43,396	\$85,425	\$100,000
FRESNO	\$8,838,368	\$316,814	\$623,650	\$200,000
GLENN	\$331,271	\$11,875	\$23,375	\$100,000
HUMBOLDT	\$1,526,679	\$54,724	\$107,725	\$100,000
IMPERIAL	\$1,296,384	\$46,469	\$91,475	\$100,000
INYO	\$190,968	\$6,845	\$13,475	\$100,000
KERN	\$10,834,140	\$388,353	\$764,475	\$200,000
KINGS	\$2,862,035	\$102,591	\$201,950	\$100,000
LAKE	\$820,913	\$29,426	\$57,925	\$100,000
LASSEN	\$384,770	\$13,792	\$27,150	\$100,000
LOS ANGELES	\$112,558,276	\$4,034,688	\$7,942,300	\$200,000
MADERA	\$1,688,240	\$60,516	\$119,125	\$100,000
MARIN	\$1,304,178	\$46,749	\$92,025	\$150,000
MARIPOSA	\$165,458	\$5,931	\$11,675	\$100,000
MENDOCINO	\$993,812	\$35,624	\$70,125	\$100,000
MERCED	\$2,498,524	\$89,560	\$176,300	\$150,000
MODOC	\$76,883	\$2,756	\$5,425	\$100,000
MONO	\$100,267	\$3,594	\$7,075	\$100,000
MONTEREY	\$3,846,989	\$137,897	\$271,450	\$150,000
NAPA	\$1,051,917	\$37,706	\$74,225	\$100,000
NEVADA	\$515,152	\$18,466	\$36,350	\$100,000
ORANGE	\$23,078,393	\$827,253	\$1,628,450	\$200,000
PLACER	\$2,986,395	\$107,048	\$210,725	\$150,000
PLUMAS	\$153,766	\$5,512	\$10,850	\$100,000
RIVERSIDE	\$21,074,473	\$755,421	\$1,487,050	\$200,000
SACRAMENTO	\$13,140,278	\$471,018	\$927,200	\$200,000
SAN BENITO	\$547,748	\$19,634	\$38,650	\$100,000
SAN BERNARDINO	\$25,785,600	\$924,293	\$1,819,475	\$200,000
SAN DIEGO	\$25,105,698	\$899,922	\$1,771,500	\$200,000
SAN FRANCISCO	\$5,049,838	\$181,013	\$356,325	\$200,000
SAN JOAQUIN	\$6,785,908	\$243,243	\$478,825	\$150,000
SAN LUIS OBISPO	\$2,200,557	\$78,880	\$155,275	\$150,000
SAN MATEO	\$4,222,902	\$151,371	\$297,975	\$150,000
SANTA BARBARA	\$3,878,876	\$139,040	\$273,700	\$150,000
SANTA CLARA	\$12,566,312	\$450,444	\$886,700	\$200,000
SANTA CRUZ	\$1,662,730	\$59,601	\$117,325	\$150,000
SHASTA	\$2,988,875	\$107,137	\$210,900	\$100,000
SIERRA	\$76,883	\$2,756	\$5,425	\$100,000
SISKIYOU	\$445,001	\$15,951	\$31,400	\$100,000
SOLANO	\$3,807,662	\$136,487	\$268,675	\$150,000
SONOMA	\$3,240,428	\$116,154	\$228,650	\$150,000
STANISLAUS	\$6,010,700	\$215,456	\$424,125	\$150,000
SUTTER	\$1,167,419	\$41,847	\$82,375	\$100,000
TEHAMA	\$1,212,415	\$43,459	\$85,550	\$100,000
TRINITY	\$144,554	\$5,182	\$10,200	\$100,000
TULARE	\$5,657,817	\$202,806	\$399,225	\$150,000
TUOLUMNE	\$598,767	\$21,463	\$42,250	\$100,000
VENTURA	\$5,696,790	\$204,203	\$401,975	\$200,000
YOLO	\$2,974,703	\$106,629	\$209,900	\$150,000
YUBA	\$1,005,858	\$36,055	\$70,975	\$100,000
TOTAL	\$354,300,000	\$12,700,000	\$25,000,000	\$7,850,000

\* Allocation based on population

County population	Grant level
Up to 200,000	\$100,000
200,001 to 749,999	\$150,000
Over 750,000	\$200,000