

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EMMA C., et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
DELAINE EASTIN, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 96-cv-04179-TEH

**REVISED ORDER ON FY 2015-2016  
BUDGET**

It has come to the Court’s attention that the Monitor’s budget was incorrectly allocated in the Court’s recent Budget Order (Docket No. 2064). Consistent with the long-standing principle that State Defendants should share a portion (20% this year) of the costs for District-related expenses, the appropriate allocation of the Monitor’s budget should be as follows:

Budget Items		CDE		District	
		Allocation	Amount	Allocation	Amount
Office	\$86,767	60.00%	\$52,060.20	40.00%	\$34,706.80
Consultants	\$108,000	40.00%	\$43,200	60.00%	\$64,800
Parent Advocacy <sup>1</sup>	\$74,000	20.00%	\$14,800	80.00%	\$59,200
Monitor’s Salary	\$140,000	60.00%	\$84,000	40.00%	\$56,000
<b>Budget Totals</b>	<b>\$408,767</b>	<b>47.47%</b>	<b>\$194,060.20</b>	<b>52.53%</b>	<b>\$214,706.80</b>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 06/18/15



THELTON E. HENDERSON  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> The budget item for “Parent Advocacy” remains unchanged as it was correctly allocated at 20%/80% in the previous Order.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California