

Funding Formula Options for the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape

Report to the Pennsylvania General Assembly Per Act 87 of 2012

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare

Tom Corbett
Governor

Gary Alexander
Secretary of Public Welfare

January 31, 2013

Table of Contents

1. Purpose
2. Background
3. Survey Methodology and Results
4. Potential Demographics to be Used in a Funding Formula
5. Overview of Funding Models Considered
6. Recommendations
7. Appendices
 - A. Rape Crisis Centers in Pennsylvania and Counties Served
 - B. History of PCAR Funding Formulas
 - C. Survey of Rape Crisis Centers
 - D. Top 20 Rape Crisis Centers by Hours and Clients Served
 - E. Data Definitions and Sources
 - F. Summary Results of Formula Models

Purpose

Act 87 of 2012 requires the Department of Public Welfare (DPW or Department) to conduct a study examining how funds are allocated to rape crisis programs and the impact associated with this funding method. The language of Act 87 of 2012 states:

The Department shall conduct a study to analyze the impact of the current funding formula and the factors weighted to determine statewide distribution of funding unmet needs; access to sexual assault victim services; and the relationship of the funding to rural, urban, and suburban regions of this Commonwealth. This study shall include input from a geographic cross section of the sub-grantees operating the rape crisis programs and providing direct services, including programs which serve the majority of sexual assault victims. The Department shall, by January 31, 2013, report its findings, including the rationale for the current weighted formula and any recommendations for formula changes, to the Chair of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the Chair of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. The Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape shall provide data and otherwise cooperate with the Department to conduct the study.

The goal of this report is to provide the General Assembly with information on the current funding formula for services to victims of sexual violence and how it may be altered to best meet the needs of victims of sexual violence.

Background

The Department annually distributes funding for sexual assault services and rape crisis to the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape (PCAR). In fiscal year 2012-13 PCAR received a total of \$8,737,000 with \$1,721,000 in federal funds and \$7,016,000 in state funds. The Department annually funds PCAR who then subcontracts with 50 rape crisis centers serving all 67 counties to provide direct services for victims of sexual violence.

Of the 50 rape crisis centers, there are 13 centers that serve more than one county and the remaining 37 rape crisis centers serve only one county. See **Appendix A** for a list of the current rape crisis centers and the counties they serve.

Funding is provided to PCAR for distribution to the rape crisis centers through the following funding streams:¹

1) ACT 44²

These funds pass through the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare and fund direct services and/or prevention education activities as well as any administrative line items. Rape crisis programs utilize the funding to provide direct services and to provide prevention education activities.

2) Title XX (Social Services Block Grant [SSBG])

These federal funds pass through the Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare and fund services and/or prevention education activities as well as any administrative line items.

3) Pennsylvania Health and Health Services Block Grant (PHHSBG)

These funds are passed through the Pennsylvania Department of Health and are federal funds allocated through the Preventative Health and Health Services Block Grant for direct services.

4) Rape Prevention and Education (RP&E)

These are federal funds passed through the Pennsylvania Department of Health for prevention education activities for persons 12 years and older. The funds may be used for the primary prevention of sexual violence, but can only cover specific expenditures. The Rape Prevention and

¹ The PCAR funding formula is only applied to Title XX and Act 44 funds.

² Act 44 of 1988 – Requires the Department of Public Welfare to make grants to Domestic Violence Centers and Rape Crisis Centers for the operation of domestic violence and rape crisis programs. In awarding grants, population, geographic area, scope of services, need for services, and other additional funding should be considered.

Education Grant Program can be used to strengthen the prevention of violence against women by supporting efforts to increase awareness, education, and training, and the operation of hotlines.

5) Sexual Assault Service Program Funding (SASP)

These funds are passed through the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency and fund direct services. The funding originated through the federal Violence Against Women Act of 2000, Title IV, and are within the same guidelines as Act 44 and Title XX funding.

6) Additional Funding Streams

Centers may also receive funding from sources such as The United Way, VOCA funds (Victims of Crime Act), community block grants, private donations, fund raising events, and other federal or state grants awarded for a specific purpose. These other funds are not taken into account when determining Act 44, Title XX, PHHSBG, RP&E and SASP funding.

Between 2001 and 2011 several state and federal funding streams were either reduced or eliminated. Additionally, centers have faced reductions in United Way, VOCA and individual contributions. With increasing operational costs, including salaries, many centers have had to reduce or eliminate staff positions, and provide group rather than individual counseling and/or schedule appointments less frequently. Some centers have outsourced fiscal functions and/or have moved to smaller buildings as a way to decrease costs.

PCAR, through a competitive bidding process, awards five year subcontracts to local rape crisis centers. PCAR, as required through its grant with the Department, develops a funding formula, which the Department approves. The approved formula is then used to allocate funds to each rape crisis center. The current formula distributes these funds based on the following factors and weights and includes a hold harmless clause that no center will lose or gain more than 5%. Each county is guaranteed a minimum funding of either \$62,250 or \$18,000. The \$62,250 is reserved for primary counties and the

\$18,000 is reserved for satellite counties. (See **Appendix B** for a history of PCAR funding formulas):

- 20% - number of clients (3 year average)
- 20% - number of client hours (3 year average)
- 30% - population
- 30% - square miles

Rape crisis centers were founded primarily to provide short term counseling, court advocacy and medical accompaniment to adult women who were victims of sexual assault. The assault was typically a single event often from someone they knew. Increasingly, centers are now serving clients with multiple victimizations either from the same offender or multiple offenders. Over time the demographics of clients served have changed, now children and male survivors and even seniors are increasingly being served, often many years after the event. Centers are also serving more non-English and limited English individuals. .

As part of their subcontract, each rape crisis center is required to provide the following services:

- 24 Hour Hotline
- Accompaniment to Medical Facilities, Police Investigations, and Court Proceedings
- Crisis Intervention
- Crisis Counseling
- Individual Advocacy
- Information and Referral
- Supportive Counseling

Many programs also provide additional services, though are not required. For example, some centers provide domestic violence services, transitional housing, homeless shelters, elder abuse services, anger management, and a host of other services.

Survey Methodology and Results

Overview

Consistent with the provisions of Act 87, the Department conducted a survey of all current rape crisis centers that have a contract with PCAR. The purpose of this survey was to understand, from the service provider standpoint, what are some of the current issues related to providing services to victims of sexual violence and what factors should be considered when allocating funds. (See **Appendix C** for the text of the survey.) This report focuses on the funding formula, the results from the survey, and data provided by PCAR.

In analyzing the responses to the survey and to better understand the differences between the diverse geographic regions of Pennsylvania, the rape crisis centers were divided into four categories: Urban, Urban-Mix, Rural-Mix, and Rural. These categories are based upon county population. The population ranges that each of these categories were assigned to are as follows:

- **Urban** - $\geq 500,000$
- **Urban-Mix** - 145,000 to 499,999
- **Rural-Mix** - 45,000 to 144,999
- **Rural** - $\leq 44,999$

(See **Appendix A** for geographic regions and county class size.)

General Survey and Rape Crisis Background Information

In total, 43 rape crisis centers, or 84% of the rape crisis centers in the state, responded. Respondents represented the majority of programs serving sexual violence victims.³ (See **Appendix D** for the top 20 centers by clients and hours served.) Of the 43 centers that responded, 11 serve multiple counties (25 in total). The remaining 32 centers serve only one county. The following shows the number of respondents/counties within each demographic category:

³ All 50 rape crisis centers provided input either by survey or through a phone interview.

- **Urban** - 6
- **Urban-Mix** - 16
- **Rural-Mix** - 25
- **Rural** - 10

For all 43 rape crisis centers there are a total of 765 paid staff, 569 full-time staff and 196 part-time staff. Respondents also indicated that they have a total of 1,120 volunteers working for them.

Challenges to Serving Victims of Sexual Violence and Unmet Needs

The survey revealed that the most significant challenge to providing direct services is “staffing.” Specifically, 65% of the respondents indicated staff is a significant challenge in their ability to serve every victim of sexual violence that requests help. For example, one rape crisis center said:

“The lack of funding for staff to meet the demands of victims is reaching a critical state. In the very near future [our center] will be at capacity, and cannot meet victims in the ER or provide an advocate for court.”^{4 5}

The most identified challenge with staffing was the lack of staff; the rape crisis centers indicated throughout the survey that they simply do not have enough staff to cover the demand. When asked the same question with respect to specific direct services such as accompaniment to medical facilities, police investigations, and court proceedings, “staffing” was again the most heavily indicated challenge to providing services:

- 58% of respondents indicated “staffing” as a challenge for accompaniment to medical facilities
- 65% indicated “staffing” as a challenge for accompaniment to police investigations
- 82% indicated “staffing” as a challenge for accompaniment to court proceedings

⁴ To preserve anonymity but still provide demographic information, quotes from primary rape crisis centers are identified by their demographic category.

⁵ Urban Rape Crisis Center

Rape crisis centers also indicated transportation as a challenge and cited a variety of reasons for this:

“Transportation costs [for] staff to cover our large county area [and] finding locations in our rural community where we are able to provide [off-site] counseling to victims to minimize their transportation costs...”⁶

“For court accompaniment we provide transportation for clients that need it. But it is very difficult because we only have seven employees that serve three counties.”⁷

“Working in [our county] can be very difficult. In a county with no taxis and no public transportation, staff and clients sometimes have a fifty mile drive one way.”⁸

Other difficulties rape crisis centers have regarding transportation include the lack of public transportation or taxis. Further compounding their transportation challenges are the large service areas some rape crisis centers serve. This is not just a rural center issue, urban rape crisis centers that serve smaller counties have a significantly higher number of locations they must visit and serve more victims. For example, when asked about accompaniment services one center indicated that to provide these services they travel to 26 district courts, 6 hospitals, and 42 police departments. Because of these challenges, the number of hours of service they can provide to individual clients is often diminished.

“There was a time where we provided between 10-12 hours on average of crises intervention services per client over a 6 week period. Now, clients receive about 4-5 hours for every 6 weeks.”⁹

⁶ Rural-Mix Rape Crisis Center

⁷ Rural-Mix Rape Crisis Center

⁸ Urban-Mix Rape Crisis Center

⁹ Urban-Mix Rape Crisis Center

In terms of unmet needs, 63% of the centers who responded indicated they are able to serve every victim of sexual violence that requests help and 38% reported that they have waiting lists.

Breaking down the responses regarding ability to serve every victim according to demographic segments reveals:

- 83% of the **urban** rape crisis centers who responded are able to serve every victim.
- 70% of the **rural** rape crisis centers who responded are able to serve every victim
- 64% of the **rural-mix** rape crisis centers who responded are able to serve every victim
- 50% of the **urban-mix** rape crisis centers who responded are able to serve every victim

Rape crisis centers prioritize client's cases based on urgency of need. Those not in immediate crisis could be put on a waitlist. One center provided the following explanation for why they don't have waiting lists:

"We do not have waiting lists because our staff often provide services on their own time."¹⁰

Though almost 2/3 of the rape crisis centers indicated they are able to serve everyone, many commented that they wish they could do more. Some rape crisis centers provided input regarding additional services they would like to provide beyond those required as part of their subcontract with PCAR. The following list includes some of those additional services:

- More Prevention Education and Outreach
- Child care
- Sexual Assault Response Teams (SART)

¹⁰ Urban-Mix Rape Crisis Center

- Support Groups
- Child Advocacy Centers and Designated Children’s Counselors
- Bi-Lingual Services
- More specialized staff: legal and medical advocates, child advocates, outreach counselor

Factors for Funding Allocations

Rape crisis centers were asked their preference for what factors should be considered when allocating funds for these services. The survey asked the rape crisis centers to select 3 – 5 data factors that should be used to determine how to allocate funds to local entities. Notably, there was no consensus among respondents regarding what combination of factors should be used, let alone the weights to be applied. There were however, seven factors that stood out as top choices. Those seven factors include the following:

- 70% of the respondents chose **total population**
- 67% of the respondents chose **clients served**
- 67% of the respondents chose **total service hours**
- 63% of the respondents chose **square mileage**
- 54% of the respondents chose **prevention education training**
- 39% of the respondents chose **poverty**
- 12% of the respondents chose **population density**

The rape crisis centers also offered a variety of opinions regarding the impact the factors and structure of the funding formula have on their rape crisis centers and the state as a whole. Below are a few of their thoughts:

“There are probably many factors which influence a fair funding formula. I believe the factors that have been identified in previous versions of the formula are valid (i.e. total clients, total hours, number of educational programs). County population may be useful in determining a fair formula

although I believe the current formula weighs population and square miles too heavily.”¹¹

“It is important that rape crisis services be available to all residents of Pennsylvania. Small, rural programs will never serve as many people as larger programs in more populated counties. It is unfair and unrealistic to expect that they will. Programs in poor counties do not have as many resources available to them as other programs. Fundraising is more difficult. Other sources of funding can be nearly non-existent...It is also difficult to find qualified staff in poor, rural counties who are willing to work for the wages that we can offer...Rape crisis centers in rural counties see fewer people but the provision and availability of services to those people is no less important than to people in more populated areas.”¹²

“Pennsylvania should continue a funding formula that supports services across the Commonwealth. One of the values of the current formula is that it takes into account not only volume of service (which is weighted towards areas with high population centers) but also square miles (which takes into account the challenge of rural communities in reaching a widely dispersed population). In addition, attention should continue to be paid to consistency and accuracy in any of the formula components that are agency derived.”¹³

“The problem with using victims served and counseling hours is that these are considered "outputs." Outputs are easily manipulated and they are dependent upon "inputs." If, for example, a center loses a funding source, it may adversely impact their ability to serve victims and generate counseling hours. Then, in the following year, the funding formula would exacerbate the problem by decreasing the funding further which, in turn, would reduce the number of victims and counseling hours even further.

¹¹ Urban-Mix Rape Crisis Center

¹² Rural Rape Crisis Center

¹³ Urban-Mix Rape Crisis Center

On the other hand, the advantage of using a variable like square miles is that it is constant and it mitigates against the fluxuations in other variables, such as population...The solution is simple. Run the formula (regardless of what it is) with new monies only. In other words, all of the rape crisis centers are maintained at their current levels and the formula is restricted to any new appropriations to determine how these dollars will be distributed.”¹⁴

The results from the rape crisis centers’ most chosen factors were used to help identify what could be included in a funding formula.

Factors Considered for the Funding Formula

The legislative request was to provide the rationale for the current formula that allocates funds to rape crisis centers and discuss options for new funding formulas. The current funding formula is based upon the following factors and weights:¹⁵

- 20% - number of clients (3 year average)
- 20% - number of client hours (3 year average)
- 30% - population
- 30% - square miles

With the current funding formula, each county is guaranteed a minimum funding of either \$62,250 or \$18,000. The \$62,250 is reserved for primary counties and the \$18,000 is reserved for satellite counties. The current formula also includes a hold harmless provision so that any one county would not lose or gain more than 5%. This formula was developed by PCAR, approved by their board and then approved by the Department, and was first used in state fiscal year 2010-11. The formula did not

¹⁴ Rural-Mix Rape Crisis Center

¹⁵ The PA Coalition Against Domestic Violence also developed a funding formula at the same time. PCADV submitted a formula that included counseling hours (20%), shelter days (40%) and population (40%). Minimum budgets were set at \$150,000 with \$50,000 for each additional county served and included a 5% hold harmless provision. Domestic violence services include more expensive residential shelter services, which is why the minimum is higher.

affect the total amount of funding that was available, but it did change the distribution of funds among counties.

The rationale provided to the Department from PCAR for the formula is as follows:

- This scenario results in the least amount of loss for the least amount of counties
- By weighting services provided at a total of 40%, programs providing a high level of services will receive higher levels of funding
- The goal was to target funds to areas of the state where services are most needed, but also in a way that would ensure services remain statewide
- The inclusion of square mileage meets a requirement of Act 44 and provides for rural programs with large geographical areas
- The inclusion of population also meets a requirement of Act 44 and provides for urban programs with a large population

In terms of the request to analyze other allocation methodologies, consistent with the legislative request, the Department considered the input of the current rape crisis centers in what should be included in a formula. Based upon the feedback from the survey, DPW took six out of the seven factors identified by respondents, they are:

- **County Population** (2011, U.S. Census Bureau)
- **County Square Miles** (2011, U.S. Census Bureau)
- **Poverty Level** (2006–2010, average poverty rates, U.S. Census Bureau)
- **Number of Clients Served** (2009-2010 to 2011-2012, three year average, reported by rape crisis centers)
- **Client Hours** (2009–2010 to 2011-2012, three year average, reported by rape crisis centers)
- **Population Density** (2011 Population divided by 2011 Square miles)

The use of population and square miles also helps meet the legislative requirement of considering the impact on funding for rural, urban and suburban areas. The one factor

that appeared in the top six of the survey results but was not considered in the funding methodologies was the number of prevention and education programs. This was not included because there is not a measurable, consistent definition, of what is included and required to administer these programs. More importantly, the resources and intensity of different trainings are not reflected in these numbers, which would be important to equitably allocate resources.

Appendix E provides definitions and data sources for each of these factors. As will be discussed in the next section, each of these elements was considered in some form in the different models developed by DPW but not every factor was used in each model.

Overview of Funding Models Considered

DPW developed 11 models to compare potential funding allocations, by county, for PCAR's rape crisis centers. Each model consisted of one or more of the identified demographic factors described in the previous section and assigned a different weight to each factor. Each model was run two ways. In the first method, the model assumed no caps on the amount of increase or decrease a county could receive when compared to their current allocation. The second method assured that each county received a minimum of either \$62,500 or if the county served other counties in addition to their own they received an additional \$18,000 per county served. The goal of developing these models was to identify if there was a more equitable and beneficial way to allocate funds when compared to the current methodology. Below is a description of each model developed. **Appendix F** provides more detail on each option in terms of specific county allocations and the percentage change in allocation compared to current allocations.

Option A:

Under this option, five different demographic factors are included with each factor having an equal weight of 20%. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 20% County Population
- 20% County Land Area (square miles)
- 20% County Poverty Rate
- 20% Clients Served (three year average)
- 20% Client hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 30 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 37 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 16 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 30 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 18 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 19 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 4 lose more than 20 percent.

Option B

Under this option, five different demographic factors are included with each factor having a different weight. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 60% County Population
- 10% County Land Area (square miles)
- 10% County Poverty Rate
- 10% Clients Served (three year average)
- 10% Client hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 30 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 37 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 27 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 31 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 15 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 21 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 7 lose more than 20 percent.

Option C

Under this option, four different demographic factors are included with each factor having a different weight. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 30% County Population
- 30% County Land Area (square miles)
- 20% Clients Served (three year average)
- 20% Client hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 38 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 29 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, nine lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 38 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 17 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 12 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 5 lose more than 20 percent.

Option D

Under this option, four different demographic factors are included with each factor having an equal weight of 20%. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 20% County Population
- 30% County Land Area (square miles)

- 30% Clients Served (three year average)
- 20% Client hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 38 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 29 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 10 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 38 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 17 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 12 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 6 lose more than 20 percent.

Option E

Under this option, two different demographic factors are included with each factor having an equal weight of 50%. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 50% County Population
- 50% Clients Served (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 24 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 34 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 29 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 24 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 22 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 21 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 6 lose more than 20 percent.

Option F

Under this option, four different demographic factors are included with each factor having a different weight. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 30% County Population
- 10% County Land Area (square miles)
- 30% Clients Served (three year average)
- 30% Client hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 25 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 42 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 23 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 24 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 21 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 22 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 6 lose more than 20 percent.

Option G

Under this option, three different demographic factors are included with each factor having a different weight. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 40% County Population
- 40% County Land Area (square miles)
- 20% Clients Served (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 42 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 25 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 42 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 19 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 6 counties

receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 9 lose more than 20 percent.

Option H

Under this option, three different demographic factors are included with each factor having a different weight. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 40% County Population
- 40% County Land Area (square miles)
- 20% Client hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 42 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 25 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 12 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 43 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 18 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 6 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 8 lose more than 20 percent.

Option I

Under this option, three different demographic factors are included with each factor having a different weight. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 50% Population Density
- 25% Clients Served (three year average)
- 25% Client hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 20 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 47 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 41 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 20 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 25 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 22 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 15 lose more than 20 percent.

Option J

Under this option, four different demographic factors are included with each factor having a different weight. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 25% Population Density
- 25% Number of Persons in Poverty
- 25% Clients Served (three year average)
- 25% Client Hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 18 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 49 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 32 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 18 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 25 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 24 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 9 lose more than 20 percent.

Option K

Under this option, three different demographic factors are included with each factor having a different weight. Specifically, the factors and weights are:

- 20% Population Density
- 40% Clients Served (three year average)
- 40% Client hours (three year average)

Under this option with no caps, 21 counties receive funding above their current allocation and 46 counties receive less funding than their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 37 lose more than 20%.

Under the method containing caps, 21 counties receive funding above their current allocation, 23 counties receive less funding than their current allocation, and 23 counties receive the same funding as their current allocation. Of those counties that receive less funding, 12 lose more than 20 percent.

Recommendations

The Department does not believe there is a “perfect” model that will result in an equal distribution of funds, moving from one funding methodology to another results in both increases and decreases for any rape crisis center. Any formula will create winners and losers. After analyzing the survey responses and funding data, the Department provides the following observations and recommendations regarding PCAR’s funding formula:

- Stability is extremely important in the delivery of services to victims of sexual violence. A funding formula should only be applied when overall funding is increased; a formula should not be used during times of level or decreased funding.
- The funding formula should use a ceiling and floor to minimize how much a county may gain or lose. In doing so, the impact is minimized on current rape crisis services.

- A staggered implementation period should be used so that any rape crisis center losses would be gradual and allow time for any adverse impacts to be minimized.
- A funding formula should contain reliable and objective data. It should contain a mix of reported and concrete sources.
- The current fiscal climate faced by the Commonwealth and rape crisis centers requires a thoughtful and planned process to allocate funds. Part of this process should include looking at new and efficient ways for service delivery.

Appendix A: Rape Crisis Centers and Counties Served

	Counties	Rape Crisis Center ¹⁶	Category	County Class
1	Adams	Survivors, Inc.	Rural	8
2	Allegheny	Center for Victims & Pittsburgh Action Against Rape	Urban	2
3	Armstrong	Helping All Victims In Need	Rural-Mix	6
4	Beaver	Women's Center of Beaver County	Urban-Mix	4
5	Bedford	Your "Safe Haven", Inc.	Rural-Mix	6
6	Berks	Berks Women In Crisis	Urban-Mix	3
7	Blair	Family Services of Blair County Inc.	Rural-Mix	5
8	Bradford	Abuse and Rape Crisis Center	Rural-Mix	6
9	Bucks	Network of Victim Assistance	Urban	2-A
10	Butler	Victims Outreach Intervention Center	Urban-Mix	4
11	Cambria	Victim Services, Inc. (Primary Office)	Urban-Mix	4
12	Cameron	Citizens Against Physical, Emotional, and Sexual Abuse, Inc. (Satellite Office of Elk County)	Rural	8
13	Carbon	Victims Resource Center (Satellite Office of Luzerne County)	Rural-Mix	6
14	Centre	Centre County Women's Resource Center, Inc.	Urban-Mix	4
15	Chester	The Crime Victims Center of Chester County, Inc.	Urban-Mix	3

¹⁶ There are 50 rape crisis centers serving all 67 counties in Pennsylvania. 13 "primary" rape crisis centers serve a total of 30 counties. 17 of those 30 are "satellite" rape crisis centers and are labeled as a "Satellite Office" in this table. The 13 "primary" rape crisis centers are labeled as a "Primary Office" in this table. The remaining 37 rape crisis centers that serve only one county do not have any additional labels.

16	Clarion	Passages, Inc. (Primary Office)	Rural-Mix	6
17	Clearfield	Passages, Inc. (Satellite Office of Clarion County)	Rural-Mix	6
18	Clinton	Clinton County Women's Center	Rural-Mix	6
19	Columbia	The Women's Center, Inc. of Columbia and Montour (Primary Office)	Rural-Mix	6
20	Crawford	Women's Services, Inc.	Rural-Mix	6
21	Cumberland	YWCA of Carlisle-Sexual Assault/Rape Crisis Services	Urban-Mix	3
22	Dauphin	YWCA-Violence Intervention Prevention Program (Primary Office)	Urban-Mix	3
23	Delaware	Delaware County Women Against Rape	Urban	2-A
24	Elk	Citizens Against Physical, Emotional, and Sexual Abuse, Inc. (Primary Office)	Rural-Mix	6
25	Erie	Crime Victim Center of Erie County, Inc.	Urban-Mix	3
26	Fayette	Community Resources of Fayette County, Inc.	Urban-Mix	4
27	Forest	A Safe Place (Satellite Office of Warren County)	Rural	8
28	Franklin	Women In Need / Victim Services (Primary Office)	Urban-Mix	4
29	Fulton	Women In Need / Victim Services (Satellite Office of Franklin County)	Rural	8
30	Greene	SPHS C.A.R.E. Center S.T.T.A.R.S. Program (Satellite Office of Washington County)	Rural-Mix	6
31	Huntingdon	The Abuse Network (Satellite Office of Mifflin County)	Rural-Mix	6
32	Indiana	Alice Paul House	Rural-Mix	6
33	Jefferson	Passages, Inc. (Satellite Office of Clarion County)	Rural-Mix	6
34	Juniata	The Abuse Network (Satellite Office of Mifflin County)	Rural	7

35	Lackawanna	Women's Resource Center, Inc. (Primary Office)	Urban-Mix	3
36	Lancaster	YWCA of Lancaster-Sexual Assault Prevention and Counseling Center	Urban-Mix	3
37	Lawrence	Crisis Shelter of Lawrence County	Rural-Mix	5
38	Lebanon	Sexual Assault Resource and Counseling Center	Rural-Mix	5
39	Lehigh	Crime Victims Council of Lehigh Valley, Inc. (Primary Office)	Urban-Mix	3
40	Luzerne	Victims Resource Center (Primary Office)	Urban-Mix	3
41	Lycoming	YWCA - Wise Options	Rural-Mix	5
42	McKean	YWCA - Victim's Resource Center	Rural-Mix	6
43	Mercer	Aware, Inc.	Rural-Mix	5
44	Mifflin	The Abuse Network (Primary Office)	Rural-Mix	6
45	Monroe	Women's Resources of Monroe County, Inc.	Urban-Mix	4
46	Montgomery	Victim Services Center of Montgomery County, Inc.	Urban	2-A
47	Montour	The Women's Center, Inc. of Columbia and Montour (Satellite Office of Columbia County)	Rural	8
48	Northampton	Crime Victims Council of Lehigh Valley, Inc. (Satellite Office of Lehigh County)	Urban-Mix	3
49	Northumberland	Susquehanna Valley women in Transition (Satellite Office of Union County)	Rural-Mix	5
50	Perry	YWCA-Violence Intervention Prevention Program (Satellite Office of Dauphin County)	Rural-Mix	6
51	Philadelphia	Women Organized Against Rape	Urban	1
52	Pike	Safe Haven of Pike County, Inc.	Rural-Mix	6
53	Potter	A Way Out: Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Services	Rural	8

54	Schuylkill	Sexual Assault Resource and Counseling Center	Urban-Mix	4
55	Snyder	Susquehanna Valley women in Transition (Satellite Office of Union County)	Rural	7
56	Somerset	Victim Services, Inc. (Satellite Office of Cambria County)	Rural-Mix	6
57	Sullivan	Victims Services	Rural	8
58	Susquehanna	Women's Resource Center, Inc. (Satellite Office of Lackawanna County)	Rural-Mix	6
59	Tioga	Haven of Tioga County	Rural-Mix	6
60	Union	Susquehanna Valley women in Transition (Primary Office)	Rural	7
61	Venango	PPC Violence Free Network	Rural-Mix	6
62	Warren	A Safe Place (Primary Office)	Rural-Mix	6
63	Washington	SPHS C.A.R.E. Center S.T.T.A.R.S. Program (Primary Office)	Urban-Mix	4
64	Wayne	Victims Intervention Program	Rural-Mix	6
65	West Moreland	Blackburn Center Against Domestic and Sexual Violence	Urban-Mix	3
66	Wyoming	Victims Resource Center (Satellite Office of Luzerne County)	Rural	7
67	York	YWCA of York/Victim Assistance Center	Urban-Mix	3

Appendix B: History of PCAR Funding Formulas

1997 – 2008

- Formula 1
 - Total Service Hours – 25%
 - Total Clients Served – 25%
 - Total County Population – 25%
 - Total Number of Prevention Education Programs – 25%

2008 – 2010

- No funding formula was run from 2008 to 2010. Any increases or decreases were based on the percentage of funding the rape crisis center received in the prior year

2010 – 2013

- Formula 2
 - Total Service Hours (3 year average) – 20%
 - Total Clients Served (3 year average) – 20%
 - Total County Population – 30%
 - Total County Square Mileage – 30%

Appendix C: Survey of Rape Crisis Centers

1. What is the name of your Rape Crisis Center?
2. Please name a point of contact for your center and include their phone number and email address.
3. Do you serve more than one county?
4. How many offices are in each county that you serve? Please include administrative offices that are separate and distinct from offices that service clients.
5. Please provide the total number of offices you serve. Please include administrative offices that are separate and distinct from offices that service clients.
6. How many full-time staff do you have? (Do not include subcontractors)
7. How many part-time staff do you have? (Do not include subcontractors)
8. Over the past 3 years, have your paid staff numbers increased or decreased? (full-time + part-time)
9. How many unpaid staff, volunteers, or interns work for you annually?
10. Over the past 3 years, have your unpaid staff, volunteers, or interns' numbers increased or decreased?
11. What percent of your staff are assigned to these duties or responsibilities? Include full-time and part-time paid staff, as well as unpaid staff, volunteers, and interns.
 - For example, you may have:
 - 5% of your staff assigned to General Administrative Duties (mailings, scheduling, accounting)
 - 75% of your staff assigned to Direct Services (crisis intervention, counseling, accompaniment for police investigations, medical examinations, court proceedings, etc.)
 - 20% of your staff assigned to Prevention Education Programming (community education and outreach, systems advocacy, etc.)
12. PCAR requires all of its Rape Crisis Centers to provide the following direct services:
 1. 24 Hour Hotline
 2. Accompaniment to Medical Facilities, Police Investigations, and Court Proceedings
 3. Crisis Intervention
 4. Crisis Counseling
 5. Individual Advocacy

6. Information and Referral
7. Supportive Counseling

What additional services do you provide? If there are none, please put "None" as your answer.

13. Do you provide additional services not related to sexual assault? Check all that apply.
14. What types of fundraising do you use? For example: flower sales, thrift shops, capital campaigns, raffles, private donations, etc. If you don't do any fundraising, please put "None" as your answer.
15. Are you able to serve every victim of sexual violence that requests help?
16. When providing accompaniment services for court proceedings, what are some challenges that sometimes prevent or reduce your ability to provide these services? For example: court operating hours, court location, transportation costs, lack of staff, not enough training, etc.
17. When providing accompaniment services to medical examinations, what are some challenges that sometimes prevent or reduce your ability to provide these services? For example: hospital operating hours, hospital location, transportation costs, lack of staff, not enough training, etc.
18. When providing accompaniment services to police investigations, what are some challenges that sometimes prevent or reduce your ability to provide these services? For example: meeting times, office location, transportation costs, lack of staff, not enough training, etc.
19. What challenges do you face that prevent or inhibit your ability to serve every victim of sexual violence that requests help? (For example: lack of staffing, transportation costs, etc.)
20. Do you have a waiting list for clients?
21. On average, how long are clients on your waiting list?
22. Please list any services you would like to provide but currently can't. If there are none, please put "None" as your answer.

FUNDING FORMULA:

A funding formula is used to allocate funds for Rape Crisis Centers. The current funding formula uses a set of factors and weights to come up with a funding level. There is a four step process to allocate funds.

1. Data is collected on population, number of square miles, people served, and counseling hours.
2. A weight is applied to the factors:

- a. Population is weighed 30%
 - b. Number of square miles is weighed 30%
 - c. Clients served is weighed 20%
 - d. Counseling hours is weighed 20%
3. A Minimum budget is set at \$62,250 plus \$18,000 for each additional county served.
 4. Hold harmless one year changes in the allocation are limited to no more (plus or minus) 5%.

23. We want to know what you think should be looked at when allocating funds to rape crisis centers. Please choose 3 to 5 data sources from the list below that you think should be used to decide how funds will be allocated. If you want to choose the current data sources PCAR uses to allocate funds, you can choose total population, square mileage, total clients served and total service hours. Note: You must choose at least 3 to continue with the survey.

1. Total Population (total number of people in your county)
2. Square Mileage (total number of square miles in your county)
3. Population Density (total population divided by square mileage)
4. Total Clients Served (total number of clients served by your center)
5. Total Service Hours (total hours of service provided to clients by your center)
6. Number of Prevention Education Programs (number of programs your center provides for the purpose of preventing sexual violence)
7. Sexual Violence Statistics (number of sexually violent crimes in your county)
8. Crime Statistics (number of violent crimes reported in your county)
9. Poverty (percent of county population below the U.S. Poverty Line)
10. Unemployment (percent of unemployed people in your county)
11. Other (Please Specify Below)

24. Now that you have chosen your preferred data sources, how would you weight them?

For example if you choose population, clients served and counseling hours you might want to weight them based on which factors are more important.

1. Population = 50%
2. Clients served = 25%
3. Counseling hours = 25%

NOTE: To continue the survey please weigh at least 3 data sources. Also, please make sure your weights = 100%

25. Additional space to be used in answering the previous question. Please skip this question if you do not have additional data sources that need to be weighted.

26. Please use the space below to express any additional comments or concerns that you may have.

Appendix D – Top 20 Rape Crisis Centers by Clients and Hours Served

	Top 20 Counties	Clients Served
1	Allegheny	3,972
2	Philadelphia	2,640
3	Delaware	1,993
4	Bucks	1,833
5	Chester	1,314
6	Dauphin	1,286
7	Erie	1,193
8	Luzerne	1,005
9	York	914
10	Lehigh	845
11	Montgomery	845
12	Westmoreland	763
13	Lancaster	758
14	Beaver	681
15	Butler	554
16	Union	547
17	Berks	527
18	Cambria	526
19	Cumberland	500
20	Schuylkill	487

	Top 20 Counties	Hours Served
1	Allegheny	24,565
2	Delaware	15,301
3	Bucks	13,127
4	Philadelphia	11,501
5	Chester	11,267
6	Butler	7,325
7	Erie	7,119
8	York	6,943
9	Luzerne	4,944
10	Beaver	4,312
11	Lehigh	3,437
12	Lackawanna	3,274
13	Montgomery	2,911
14	Lancaster	2,793
15	Northampton	2,548
16	Columbia	2,414
17	Lebanon	2,395
18	Berks	2,360
19	Dauphin	2,220
20	Schuylkill	1,940

Appendix E - Data Definitions and Sources

County Population – United States Census Bureau (www.census.gov) State and County Quick Facts. An area's resident population consists of those persons "usually resident" in that particular area (where they live and sleep most of the time). This number does not include individuals that reside in State Correctional Facilities.

Poverty Level - United States Census Bureau (www.census.gov) State and County Quick Facts. Following the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Statistical Policy Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty. If a family's total income is less than the family's threshold, then that family and every individual in it is considered in poverty. The official poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but they are updated for inflation using Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The official poverty definition uses money income before taxes and does not include capital gains or noncash benefits (such as public housing, Medicaid, and food stamps).

Square Mileage – The total number of square miles in each county. This data comes from the U.S. Census.

Average Number of Clients Served – The average number of clients served over the past three years. This information is submitted by each rape crisis center.

Average Number of Hours – The average number of service hours provided to clients over the past three years. This information is submitted by each rape crisis center.

Population Density – The total number of individuals residing in the county divided by the square miles in the county. This data comes from the Census Bureau and is from 2011.

Prevention Education Programs – The total number of prevention education programs a rape crisis centers provides. This information is submitted to PCAR by each rape crisis center.

Sexual Violence Statistics – The total number of sexually violent crimes committed within a county. This data comes from the Pennsylvania State Police's Uniform Crime Report.

Crime Statistics – The total number of violent crimes committed within a county. This data comes from the Pennsylvania State Police's Uniform Crime Report.

Unemployment – The number of unemployed individuals divided by the current labor force in the county. This data comes from the U.S. Department of Labor: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Appendix F: Summary Results of Each Model

OPTION A

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option A	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option A with Cap at 13.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$53,719.00	-13.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$714,119.14	1.4%	\$714,119.14	1.4%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$44,824.43	-28.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$122,414.01	-17.8%	\$122,414.01	-17.8%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$71,159.23	14.3%	\$70,373.63	13.1%
Berks	\$145,081	\$169,974.33	17.2%	\$164,014.24	13.1%
Blair	\$62,250	\$61,469.27	-1.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$67,815.66	-18.5%	\$67,815.66	-18.5%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$324,812.92	4.2%	\$324,812.92	4.2%
Butler	\$123,002	\$152,964.25	24.4%	\$139,053.99	13.1%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$98,792.32	-6.0%	\$98,792.32	-6.0%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$16,232.74	-9.8%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$46,573.08	39.1%	\$37,838.29	13.1%
Centre	\$76,218	\$93,194.56	22.3%	\$86,163.94	13.1%
Chester	\$274,959	\$274,638.48	-0.1%	\$274,638.48	-0.1%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$39,184.93	-37.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$68,467.63	53.2%	\$50,536.97	13.1%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$48,770.88	-21.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$69,397.58	-0.4%	\$69,397.58	-0.4%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$81,201.20	-36.3%	\$81,201.20	-36.3%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$97,555.26	1.6%	\$97,555.26	1.6%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$159,469.88	16.7%	\$154,506.34	13.1%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option A	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option A with Cap at 13.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Delaware	\$308,747	\$350,405.46	13.5%	\$349,038.65	13.1%
Elk	\$62,250	\$52,649.84	-15.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Erie	\$244,352	\$219,786.26	-10.1%	\$219,786.26	-10.1%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$92,090.33	-10.0%	\$92,090.33	-10.0%
Forest	\$18,000	\$17,098.41	-5.0%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$76,283.84	-8.2%	\$76,283.84	-8.2%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$23,012.03	27.8%	\$20,349.00	13.1%
Greene	\$18,000	\$44,584.46	147.7%	\$20,349.00	13.1%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$45,389.30	-27.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$80,979.91	-4.3%	\$80,979.91	-4.3%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$39,974.78	78.6%	\$25,302.85	13.1%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$20,169.47	12.1%	\$20,169.47	12.1%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$109,220.63	11.2%	\$109,220.63	11.2%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$200,209.62	24.3%	\$182,061.32	13.1%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$67,463.65	-30.1%	\$67,463.65	-30.1%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$79,967.37	-19.9%	\$79,967.37	-19.9%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$162,303.33	27.4%	\$144,067.30	13.1%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$199,296.04	-3.4%	\$199,296.04	-3.4%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$81,741.17	19.8%	\$77,157.59	13.1%
McKean	\$62,250	\$50,468.49	-18.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$62,251.94	-9.8%	\$62,251.94	-9.8%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$33,295.46	-46.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$69,505.99	11.7%	\$69,505.99	11.7%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$217,305.88	-18.7%	\$217,305.88	-18.7%
Montour	\$18,000	\$13,809.14	-23.3%	\$18,000.00	0.0%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option A	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option A with Cap at 13.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Northampton	\$85,270	\$112,718.71	32.2%	\$96,397.85	13.1%
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$52,192.86	11.2%	\$52,192.86	11.2%
Perry	\$18,000	\$37,568.00	108.7%	\$20,349.00	13.1%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$770,723.56	11.6%	\$770,723.56	11.6%
Pike	\$62,250	\$36,724.79	-41.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$46,168.94	-25.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$99,617.37	-33.2%	\$99,617.37	-33.2%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$24,026.83	33.5%	\$20,349.68	13.1%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$68,808.52	78.2%	\$43,651.71	13.1%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$18,375.67	-70.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$46,502.73	158.3%	\$20,349.00	13.1%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$57,551.70	-7.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Union	\$62,250	\$49,181.81	-21.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$52,265.48	-21.0%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$46,682.57	-25.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$107,520.65	3.9%	\$107,520.65	3.9%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$56,360.39	-9.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$157,256.58	-24.8%	\$157,256.58	-24.8%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$35,200.95	50.2%	\$26,498.19	13.1%
York	\$168,475	\$222,176.73	31.9%	\$190,460.87	13.1%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.43		\$7,383,498.32	

OPTION B

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option B	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option B with Cap at 11.8% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$56,246.56	-9.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$712,560.33	1.2%	\$712,560.33	1.2%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$42,277.47	-32.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$110,578.68	-25.8%	\$110,578.68	-25.8%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$49,989.80	-19.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Berks	\$145,081	\$204,575.59	41.0%	\$162,200.73	11.8%
Blair	\$62,250	\$67,557.26	8.5%	\$67,557.26	8.5%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$52,135.90	-37.4%	\$62,250.00	-25.2%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$344,016.15	10.4%	\$344,016.15	10.4%
Butler	\$123,002	\$130,035.56	5.7%	\$130,035.56	5.7%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$91,036.47	-13.3%	\$91,036.47	-13.3%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$9,567.85	-46.8%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$42,162.70	26.0%	\$37,419.91	11.8%
Centre	\$76,218	\$91,422.73	19.9%	\$85,211.22	11.8%
Chester	\$274,959	\$283,306.31	3.0%	\$283,306.31	3.0%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$31,184.87	-49.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$57,829.74	29.4%	\$49,978.18	11.8%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$35,744.63	-42.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$54,247.67	-22.2%	\$62,250.00	-10.7%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$66,310.01	-48.0%	\$66,310.01	-48.0%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$117,698.77	22.5%	\$107,394.24	11.8%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$157,661.91	15.4%	\$152,797.95	11.8%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$337,297.14	9.2%	\$337,297.14	9.2%
Elk	\$62,250	\$35,523.70	-42.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option B	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option B with Cap at 11.8% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Erie	\$244,352	\$191,299.01	-21.7%	\$191,299.01	-21.7%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$85,474.66	-16.5%	\$85,474.66	-16.5%
Forest	\$18,000	\$10,747.86	-40.3%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$81,834.29	-1.5%	\$81,834.29	-1.5%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$15,794.10	-12.3%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Greene	\$18,000	\$33,481.93	86.0%	\$20,124.00	11.8%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$35,985.38	-42.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$66,361.02	-21.6%	\$66,361.02	-21.6%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$33,017.66	47.5%	\$25,023.08	11.8%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$17,153.81	-4.7%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$116,657.65	18.8%	\$109,766.97	11.8%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$251,798.41	56.4%	\$180,048.25	11.8%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$59,961.27	-37.9%	\$62,250.00	-35.5%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$78,895.74	-21.0%	\$78,895.74	-21.0%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$183,406.09	43.9%	\$142,474.34	11.8%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$192,545.77	-6.7%	\$192,545.77	-6.7%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$74,694.07	9.4%	\$74,694.07	9.4%
McKean	\$62,250	\$37,756.35	-39.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$64,792.43	-6.1%	\$64,792.43	-6.1%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$30,223.25	-51.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$83,970.54	34.9%	\$69,595.50	11.8%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$341,645.51	27.8%	\$298,986.46	11.8%
Montour	\$18,000	\$12,205.21	-32.2%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$142,832.65	67.5%	\$95,331.97	11.8%
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$53,491.41	14.0%	\$52,457.12	11.8%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option B	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option B with Cap at 11.8% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Perry	\$18,000	\$32,123.11	78.5%	\$20,124.00	11.8%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$830,502.15	20.2%	\$772,272.03	11.8%
Pike	\$62,250	\$34,833.33	-44.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$28,140.88	-54.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$92,545.57	-37.9%	\$92,545.57	-37.9%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$23,549.62	30.8%	\$20,124.67	11.8%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$56,829.73	47.2%	\$43,169.05	11.8%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$11,064.91	-82.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$35,764.78	98.7%	\$20,124.00	11.8%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$41,065.31	-34.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Union	\$62,250	\$37,583.80	-39.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$41,975.28	-36.5%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$35,347.41	-43.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$114,102.97	10.2%	\$114,102.97	10.2%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$43,536.30	-30.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$184,221.40	-11.9%	\$184,221.40	-11.9%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$25,830.15	10.2%	\$25,830.15	10.2%
York	\$168,475	\$237,627.66	41.0%	\$188,354.94	11.8%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.27		\$7,383,273.61	0.0%

OPTION C

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option C	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option C with Cap at 48.5% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$60,948.38	-2.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$656,159.29	-6.8%	\$656,159.29	-6.8%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$52,076.45	-16.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$121,777.03	-18.3%	\$121,777.03	-18.3%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$84,468.86	35.7%	\$84,468.86	35.7%
Berks	\$145,081	\$160,172.65	10.4%	\$160,172.65	10.4%
Blair	\$62,250	\$62,181.89	-0.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$82,396.25	-1.0%	\$82,396.25	-1.0%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$342,390.30	9.9%	\$342,390.30	9.9%
Butler	\$123,002	\$162,344.71	32.0%	\$162,344.71	32.0%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$100,070.39	-4.7%	\$100,070.39	-4.7%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$22,527.82	25.2%	\$22,527.82	25.2%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$50,247.32	50.1%	\$49,703.54	48.5%
Centre	\$76,218	\$93,715.02	23.0%	\$93,715.02	23.0%
Chester	\$274,959	\$287,012.43	4.4%	\$287,012.43	4.4%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$45,507.89	-26.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$80,884.13	80.9%	\$66,384.25	48.5%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$60,014.76	-3.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$72,637.17	4.2%	\$72,637.17	4.2%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$89,939.93	-29.4%	\$89,939.93	-29.4%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$105,884.11	10.2%	\$105,884.11	10.2%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$153,794.41	12.5%	\$153,794.41	12.5%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$336,687.93	9.0%	\$336,687.93	9.0%
Elk	\$62,250	\$64,877.71	4.2%	\$64,877.71	4.2%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option C	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option C with Cap at 48.5% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Erie	\$244,352	\$208,273.98	-14.8%	\$208,273.98	-14.8%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$88,588.48	-13.4%	\$88,588.48	-13.4%
Forest	\$18,000	\$23,757.68	32.0%	\$23,757.68	32.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$86,204.02	3.8%	\$86,204.02	3.8%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$29,249.85	62.5%	\$26,730.00	48.5%
Greene	\$18,000	\$50,296.65	179.4%	\$26,730.00	48.5%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$57,591.69	-7.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$84,273.49	-0.4%	\$84,273.49	-0.4%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$47,586.76	112.6%	\$33,237.27	48.5%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$26,148.10	45.3%	\$26,148.10	45.3%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$102,775.67	4.7%	\$102,775.67	4.7%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$198,639.73	23.3%	\$198,639.73	23.3%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$67,870.61	-29.7%	\$67,870.61	-29.7%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$82,545.02	-17.3%	\$82,545.02	-17.3%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$149,182.67	17.1%	\$149,182.67	17.1%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$191,497.51	-7.2%	\$191,497.51	-7.2%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$93,062.97	36.4%	\$93,062.97	36.4%
McKean	\$62,250	\$63,515.18	2.0%	\$63,515.18	2.0%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$65,743.50	-4.7%	\$65,743.50	-4.7%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$36,704.12	-41.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$72,869.68	17.1%	\$72,869.68	17.1%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$229,770.47	-14.1%	\$229,770.47	-14.1%
Montour	\$18,000	\$15,136.94	-15.9%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$111,557.07	30.8%	\$111,557.07	30.8%
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$52,063.73	11.0%	\$52,063.73	11.0%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option C	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option C with Cap at 48.5% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Perry	\$18,000	\$45,418.90	152.3%	\$26,730.00	48.5%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$501,405.07	-27.4%	\$501,405.07	-27.4%
Pike	\$62,250	\$44,387.87	-28.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$62,609.68	0.6%	\$62,609.68	0.6%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$104,602.24	-29.8%	\$104,602.24	-29.8%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$27,402.92	52.2%	\$26,730.89	48.5%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$81,687.84	111.6%	\$57,339.93	48.5%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$25,237.30	-59.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$58,031.08	222.4%	\$26,730.00	48.5%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$72,453.81	16.4%	\$72,453.81	16.4%
Union	\$62,250	\$51,711.80	-16.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$58,534.66	-11.5%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$58,947.45	-5.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$113,479.79	9.6%	\$113,479.79	9.6%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$66,004.28	6.0%	\$66,004.28	6.0%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$161,938.32	-22.6%	\$161,938.32	-22.6%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$40,508.86	72.8%	\$34,807.43	48.5%
York	\$168,475	\$225,654.34	33.9%	\$225,654.34	33.9%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.60		\$7,383,466.41	

OPTION D

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option D	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option D with Cap at 50.0% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$57,881.88	-7.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$679,945.56	-3.4%	\$679,945.56	-3.4%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$50,301.17	-19.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$128,178.95	-14.0%	\$128,178.95	-14.0%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$86,714.95	39.3%	\$86,714.95	39.3%
Berks	\$145,081	\$148,844.37	2.6%	\$148,844.37	2.6%
Blair	\$62,250	\$58,878.47	-5.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$82,668.40	-0.7%	\$82,668.40	-0.7%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$349,856.58	12.3%	\$349,856.58	12.3%
Butler	\$123,002	\$164,876.40	34.0%	\$164,876.40	34.0%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$104,315.81	-0.7%	\$104,315.81	-0.7%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$22,723.26	26.2%	\$22,723.26	26.2%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$51,210.04	53.0%	\$50,205.60	50.0%
Centre	\$76,218	\$88,803.07	16.5%	\$88,803.07	16.5%
Chester	\$274,959	\$289,196.98	5.2%	\$289,196.98	5.2%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$46,000.33	-26.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$78,983.83	76.7%	\$67,054.80	50.0%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$59,239.96	-4.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$76,562.93	9.9%	\$76,562.93	9.9%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$89,305.08	-29.9%	\$89,305.08	-29.9%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$104,044.30	8.3%	\$104,044.30	8.3%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$168,930.05	23.6%	\$168,930.05	23.6%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$351,871.51	14.0%	\$351,871.51	14.0%
Elk	\$62,250	\$67,497.21	8.4%	\$67,497.21	8.4%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option D	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option D with Cap at 50.0% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Erie	\$244,352	\$220,492.17	-9.8%	\$220,492.17	-9.8%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$88,036.45	-14.0%	\$88,036.45	-14.0%
Forest	\$18,000	\$23,588.69	31.0%	\$23,588.69	31.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$83,859.79	1.0%	\$83,859.79	1.0%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$30,040.56	66.9%	\$27,000.00	50.0%
Greene	\$18,000	\$51,554.44	186.4%	\$27,000.00	50.0%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$56,693.36	-8.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$87,062.22	2.9%	\$87,062.22	2.9%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$46,788.29	109.0%	\$33,573.00	50.0%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$25,498.73	41.7%	\$25,498.73	41.7%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$97,317.85	-0.9%	\$97,317.85	-0.9%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$186,416.70	15.8%	\$186,416.70	15.8%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$71,750.25	-25.7%	\$71,750.25	-25.7%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$84,827.76	-15.0%	\$84,827.76	-15.0%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$148,925.80	16.9%	\$148,925.80	16.9%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$196,926.23	-4.5%	\$196,926.23	-4.5%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$90,359.37	32.4%	\$90,359.37	32.4%
McKean	\$62,250	\$63,574.82	2.1%	\$63,574.82	2.1%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$62,020.20	-10.1%	\$62,250.00	-9.8%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$36,521.23	-41.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$67,023.57	7.7%	\$67,023.57	7.7%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$203,350.05	-24.0%	\$203,350.05	-24.0%
Montour	\$18,000	\$15,486.25	-14.0%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$103,698.50	21.6%	\$103,698.50	21.6%
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$50,813.05	8.3%	\$50,813.05	8.3%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option D	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option D with Cap at 50.0% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Perry	\$18,000	\$46,207.00	156.7%	\$27,000.00	50.0%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$475,435.53	-31.2%	\$475,435.53	-31.2%
Pike	\$62,250	\$43,259.60	-30.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$62,968.02	1.2%	\$62,968.02	1.2%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$107,696.69	-27.8%	\$107,696.69	-27.8%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$26,282.15	46.0%	\$26,282.15	46.0%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$81,383.29	110.8%	\$57,919.13	50.0%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$25,339.66	-59.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$57,065.24	217.0%	\$27,000.00	50.0%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$71,954.80	15.6%	\$71,954.80	15.6%
Union	\$62,250	\$62,188.37	-0.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$61,258.73	-7.4%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$58,871.40	-5.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$112,336.41	8.5%	\$112,336.41	8.5%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$68,403.60	9.9%	\$68,403.60	9.9%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$159,046.87	-23.9%	\$159,046.87	-23.9%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$42,310.88	80.5%	\$35,159.03	50.0%
York	\$168,475	\$222,172.90	31.9%	\$222,172.90	31.9%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.60		\$7,383,315.96	

OPTION E

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option E	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option E with Cap at 8.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$43,441.65	-30.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$829,932.85	17.9%	\$761,059.29	8.1%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$30,854.11	-50.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$130,752.95	-12.2%	\$130,752.95	-12.2%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$40,050.86	-35.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Berks	\$145,081	\$182,535.48	25.8%	\$156,832.72	8.1%
Blair	\$62,250	\$57,128.13	-8.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$37,816.90	-54.6%	\$62,250.00	-25.2%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$400,550.78	28.5%	\$336,915.59	8.1%
Butler	\$123,002	\$119,765.30	-2.6%	\$119,765.30	-2.6%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$104,507.74	-0.5%	\$104,507.74	-0.5%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$3,880.17	-78.4%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$42,565.91	27.2%	\$36,181.50	8.1%
Centre	\$76,218	\$65,091.14	-14.6%	\$65,091.14	-14.6%
Chester	\$274,959	\$302,896.84	10.2%	\$297,231.17	8.1%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$25,647.00	-58.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$37,690.33	-15.7%	\$37,690.33	-15.7%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$18,844.35	-69.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$58,726.56	-15.7%	\$62,250.00	-10.7%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$48,244.53	-62.2%	\$62,250.00	-51.2%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$128,643.21	33.9%	\$103,840.05	8.1%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$231,532.12	69.4%	\$147,741.13	8.1%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$400,106.75	29.6%	\$333,755.67	8.1%
Elk	\$62,250	\$31,495.01	-49.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option E	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option E with Cap at 8.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Erie	\$244,352	\$223,902.72	-8.4%	\$223,902.72	-8.4%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$76,098.84	-25.6%	\$76,098.84	-25.6%
Forest	\$18,000	\$3,552.36	-80.3%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$75,663.59	-8.9%	\$75,663.59	-8.9%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$12,529.73	-30.4%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Greene	\$18,000	\$28,668.36	59.3%	\$19,458.00	8.1%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$22,089.78	-64.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$65,685.78	-22.4%	\$65,685.78	-22.4%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$22,068.21	-1.4%	\$22,068.21	-1.4%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$10,891.28	-39.5%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$96,805.58	-1.4%	\$96,805.58	-1.4%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$242,272.07	50.4%	\$174,089.59	8.1%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$71,857.10	-25.5%	\$71,857.10	-25.5%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$89,237.85	-10.6%	\$89,237.85	-10.6%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$203,224.53	59.5%	\$137,759.18	8.1%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$212,939.11	3.2%	\$212,939.11	3.2%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$54,128.99	-20.7%	\$62,250.00	-8.8%
McKean	\$62,250	\$25,342.45	-59.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$48,716.42	-29.4%	\$62,250.00	-9.8%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$26,236.59	-57.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$69,204.53	11.2%	\$67,292.25	8.1%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$333,883.05	24.8%	\$289,091.56	8.1%
Montour	\$18,000	\$12,347.85	-31.4%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$133,653.73	56.7%	\$92,176.98	8.1%
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$48,536.58	3.4%	\$48,536.58	3.4%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option E	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option E with Cap at 8.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Perry	\$18,000	\$30,618.69	70.1%	\$19,458.00	8.1%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$760,433.06	10.1%	\$746,713.83	8.1%
Pike	\$62,250	\$27,300.54	-56.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$11,904.55	-80.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$100,946.00	-32.3%	\$100,946.00	-32.3%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$17,468.60	-3.0%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$43,328.20	12.2%	\$41,740.38	8.1%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$4,265.95	-93.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$20,197.66	12.2%	\$19,458.00	8.1%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$22,083.89	-64.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Union	\$62,250	\$78,368.65	25.9%	\$67,292.25	8.1%
Venango	\$66,138	\$45,305.43	-31.5%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$23,632.02	-62.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$114,968.43	11.1%	\$111,887.23	8.1%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$42,708.82	-31.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$196,728.98	-5.9%	\$196,728.98	-5.9%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$25,469.44	8.7%	\$25,337.94	8.1%
York	\$168,475	\$235,671.42	39.9%	\$182,121.37	8.1%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.10		\$7,383,211.49	

OPTION F

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option F	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option F with Cap at 15.4% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$52,648.82	-15.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$835,420.35	18.7%	\$812,453.68	15.4%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$34,427.21	-44.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$142,745.83	-4.2%	\$142,745.83	-4.2%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$63,911.25	2.7%	\$63,911.25	2.7%
Berks	\$145,081	\$154,911.67	6.8%	\$154,911.67	6.8%
Blair	\$62,250	\$51,856.61	-16.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$51,853.80	-37.7%	\$62,250.00	-25.2%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$424,198.48	36.1%	\$359,667.53	15.4%
Butler	\$123,002	\$181,902.65	47.9%	\$141,944.54	15.4%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$97,855.39	-6.8%	\$97,855.39	-6.8%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$10,470.62	-41.8%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$47,675.56	42.4%	\$38,624.84	15.4%
Centre	\$76,218	\$63,017.53	-17.3%	\$63,017.53	-17.3%
Chester	\$274,959	\$343,374.16	24.9%	\$317,303.21	15.4%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$30,081.05	-51.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$48,130.05	7.7%	\$48,130.05	7.7%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$35,325.95	-43.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$75,187.36	7.9%	\$62,250.00	-10.7%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$68,728.10	-46.1%	\$62,250.00	-51.2%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$106,644.85	11.0%	\$106,644.85	11.0%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$176,987.40	29.5%	\$157,718.10	15.4%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$445,785.24	44.4%	\$356,294.21	15.4%
Elk	\$62,250	\$46,769.83	-24.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option F	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option F with Cap at 15.4% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Erie	\$244,352	\$241,831.46	-1.0%	\$241,831.46	-1.0%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$75,404.98	-26.3%	\$75,404.98	-26.3%
Forest	\$18,000	\$10,303.05	-42.8%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$71,596.02	-13.8%	\$71,596.02	-13.8%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$17,316.09	-3.8%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Greene	\$18,000	\$38,822.02	115.7%	\$20,772.00	15.4%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$31,882.39	-48.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$70,880.87	-16.3%	\$70,880.87	-16.3%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$29,787.64	33.1%	\$25,828.83	15.4%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$14,497.62	-19.5%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$109,033.50	11.1%	\$109,033.50	11.1%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$197,938.41	22.9%	\$185,845.87	15.4%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$73,249.12	-24.1%	\$73,249.12	-24.1%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$91,245.13	-8.6%	\$91,245.13	-8.6%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$173,161.16	35.9%	\$147,062.07	15.4%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$207,952.77	0.8%	\$207,952.77	0.8%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$58,485.84	-14.3%	\$62,250.00	-8.8%
McKean	\$62,250	\$34,958.96	-43.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$49,668.07	-28.0%	\$62,250.00	-9.8%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$27,243.03	-56.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$59,405.32	-4.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$246,858.25	-7.7%	\$246,858.25	-7.7%
Montour	\$18,000	\$13,592.75	-24.5%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$120,042.02	40.8%	\$98,401.70	15.4%
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$43,402.31	-7.5%	\$43,402.31	-7.5%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option F	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option F with Cap at 15.4% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Perry	\$18,000	\$32,275.67	79.3%	\$20,772.00	15.4%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$610,820.07	-11.6%	\$610,820.07	-11.6%
Pike	\$62,250	\$30,164.43	-51.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$29,942.12	-51.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$99,109.76	-33.5%	\$99,109.76	-33.5%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$18,657.70	3.7%	\$18,657.70	3.7%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$53,750.07	39.2%	\$44,559.11	15.4%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$11,304.95	-81.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$35,731.90	98.5%	\$20,772.00	15.4%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$39,507.81	-36.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Union	\$62,250	\$55,419.29	-11.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$44,103.80	-33.3%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$33,752.69	-45.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$102,618.39	-0.9%	\$102,618.39	-0.9%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$52,489.99	-15.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$151,879.75	-27.4%	\$151,879.75	-27.4%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$35,345.76	50.8%	\$27,049.01	15.4%
York	\$168,475	\$248,295.59	47.4%	\$194,420.03	15.4%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.27		\$7,382,995.39	

OPTION G

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option G	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option G with Cap at 123.4% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$63,368.77	1.8%	\$63,368.77	1.8%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$522,365.85	-25.8%	\$522,365.85	-25.8%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$63,405.33	1.9%	\$63,405.33	1.9%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$100,744.96	-32.4%	\$100,744.96	-32.4%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$88,606.11	42.3%	\$88,606.11	42.3%
Berks	\$145,081	\$177,387.59	22.3%	\$177,387.59	22.3%
Blair	\$62,250	\$72,288.24	16.1%	\$72,288.24	16.1%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$98,157.60	17.9%	\$98,157.60	17.9%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$272,754.55	-12.5%	\$272,754.55	-12.5%
Butler	\$123,002	\$121,382.80	-1.3%	\$121,382.80	-1.3%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$103,897.05	-1.1%	\$103,897.05	-1.1%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$28,287.71	57.2%	\$28,287.71	57.2%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$49,756.92	48.7%	\$49,756.92	48.7%
Centre	\$76,218	\$117,232.20	53.8%	\$117,232.20	53.8%
Chester	\$274,959	\$229,094.55	-16.7%	\$229,094.55	-16.7%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$54,556.41	-12.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$100,077.21	123.9%	\$99,866.95	123.4%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$70,696.77	13.6%	\$70,696.77	13.6%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$63,200.16	-9.3%	\$63,200.16	-9.3%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$96,403.26	-24.4%	\$96,403.26	-24.4%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$115,031.43	19.8%	\$115,031.43	19.8%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$158,442.06	15.9%	\$158,442.06	15.9%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$237,015.70	-23.2%	\$237,015.70	-23.2%
Elk	\$62,250	\$70,891.36	13.9%	\$70,891.36	13.9%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option G	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option G with Cap at 123.4% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Erie	\$244,352	\$174,875.15	-28.4%	\$174,875.15	-28.4%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$98,381.49	-3.9%	\$98,381.49	-3.9%
Forest	\$18,000	\$30,499.12	69.4%	\$30,499.12	69.4%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$98,716.45	18.8%	\$98,716.45	18.8%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$35,609.70	97.8%	\$35,609.70	97.8%
Greene	\$18,000	\$53,961.55	199.8%	\$40,212.00	123.4%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$71,886.98	15.5%	\$71,886.98	15.5%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$91,214.80	7.8%	\$91,214.80	7.8%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$57,106.15	155.1%	\$50,001.39	123.4%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$33,017.07	83.4%	\$33,017.07	83.4%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$93,844.93	-4.4%	\$93,844.93	-4.4%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$219,886.95	36.5%	\$219,886.95	36.5%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$62,878.00	-34.8%	\$62,878.00	-34.8%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$75,144.28	-24.7%	\$75,144.28	-24.7%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$144,976.17	13.8%	\$144,976.17	13.8%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$181,105.22	-12.2%	\$181,105.22	-12.2%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$116,279.93	70.4%	\$116,279.93	70.4%
McKean	\$62,250	\$79,782.59	28.2%	\$79,782.59	28.2%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$77,350.00	12.1%	\$77,350.00	12.1%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$43,056.84	-30.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$87,521.91	40.6%	\$87,521.91	40.6%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$258,635.61	-3.3%	\$258,635.61	-3.3%
Montour	\$18,000	\$15,656.51	-13.0%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$112,452.64	31.9%	\$112,452.64	31.9%
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$60,629.52	29.2%	\$60,629.52	29.2%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option G	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option G with Cap at 123.4% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Perry	\$18,000	\$53,984.21	199.9%	\$40,212.00	123.4%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$491,081.28	-28.9%	\$491,081.28	-28.9%
Pike	\$62,250	\$53,481.27	-14.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$78,162.07	25.6%	\$78,162.07	25.6%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$108,870.34	-27.0%	\$108,870.34	-27.0%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$33,299.99	85.0%	\$33,299.99	85.0%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$97,220.38	151.8%	\$86,260.88	123.4%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$32,157.64	-48.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$67,439.51	274.7%	\$40,212.00	123.4%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$88,590.56	42.3%	\$88,590.56	42.3%
Union	\$62,250	\$57,402.39	-7.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$68,968.26	4.3%	\$68,968.26	4.3%
Warren	\$62,250	\$72,617.13	16.7%	\$72,617.13	16.7%
Washington	\$103,503	\$126,694.14	22.4%	\$126,694.14	22.4%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$71,122.66	14.3%	\$71,122.66	14.3%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$188,757.18	-9.7%	\$188,757.18	-9.7%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$39,706.65	69.4%	\$39,706.65	69.4%
York	\$168,475	\$204,569.00	21.4%	\$204,569.00	21.4%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.76		\$7,383,553.91	

OPTION H

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option H	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option H with Cap at 102.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$69,763.27	12.1%	\$69,763.27	12.1%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$549,534.71	-21.9%	\$549,534.71	-21.9%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$62,433.35	0.3%	\$62,433.35	0.3%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$106,272.64	-28.7%	\$106,272.64	-28.7%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$93,800.05	50.7%	\$93,800.05	50.7%
Berks	\$145,081	\$173,046.01	19.3%	\$173,046.01	19.3%
Blair	\$62,250	\$70,101.20	12.6%	\$70,101.20	12.6%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$97,141.23	16.7%	\$97,141.23	16.7%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$301,108.39	-3.4%	\$301,108.39	-3.4%
Butler	\$123,002	\$159,584.48	29.7%	\$159,584.48	29.7%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$94,610.93	-9.9%	\$94,610.93	-9.9%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$28,385.40	57.7%	\$28,385.40	57.7%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$50,841.67	51.9%	\$50,841.67	51.9%
Centre	\$76,218	\$112,890.23	48.1%	\$112,890.23	48.1%
Chester	\$274,959	\$265,831.19	-3.3%	\$265,831.19	-3.3%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$52,119.70	-16.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$98,856.23	121.1%	\$90,345.17	102.1%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$73,946.37	18.8%	\$73,946.37	18.8%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$68,848.37	-1.2%	\$68,848.37	-1.2%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$102,773.19	-19.4%	\$102,773.19	-19.4%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$104,780.94	9.1%	\$104,780.94	9.1%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$116,602.35	-14.7%	\$116,602.35	-14.7%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$276,935.68	-10.3%	\$276,935.68	-10.3%
Elk	\$62,250	\$71,452.43	14.8%	\$71,452.43	14.8%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option H	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option H with Cap at 102.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Erie	\$244,352	\$180,744.34	-26.0%	\$180,744.34	-26.0%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$94,849.18	-7.3%	\$94,849.18	-7.3%
Forest	\$18,000	\$30,705.61	70.6%	\$30,705.61	70.6%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$94,897.53	14.2%	\$94,897.53	14.2%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$34,031.45	89.1%	\$34,031.45	89.1%
Greene	\$18,000	\$55,047.71	205.8%	\$36,378.00	102.1%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$71,163.91	14.3%	\$71,163.91	14.3%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$87,169.84	3.0%	\$87,169.84	3.0%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$57,344.32	156.2%	\$45,234.02	102.1%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$32,491.26	80.5%	\$32,491.26	80.5%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$108,857.78	10.9%	\$108,857.78	10.9%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$208,322.23	29.4%	\$208,322.23	29.4%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$60,776.28	-37.0%	\$62,250.00	-35.5%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$76,168.19	-23.7%	\$76,168.19	-23.7%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$134,941.66	5.9%	\$134,941.66	5.9%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$176,753.14	-14.3%	\$176,753.14	-14.3%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$111,980.20	64.1%	\$111,980.20	64.1%
McKean	\$62,250	\$77,050.65	23.8%	\$77,050.65	23.8%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$77,556.02	12.4%	\$77,556.02	12.4%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$41,137.79	-33.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$84,756.67	36.2%	\$84,756.67	36.2%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$243,984.13	-8.8%	\$243,984.13	-8.8%
Montour	\$18,000	\$15,527.47	-13.7%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$116,080.02	36.1%	\$116,080.02	36.1%
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$56,650.30	20.7%	\$56,650.30	20.7%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option H	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option H with Cap at 102.1% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Perry	\$18,000	\$50,275.16	179.3%	\$36,378.00	102.1%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$466,529.04	-32.5%	\$466,529.04	-32.5%
Pike	\$62,250	\$52,343.39	-15.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$78,726.13	26.5%	\$78,726.13	26.5%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$102,715.28	-31.1%	\$102,715.28	-31.1%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$32,761.72	82.0%	\$32,761.72	82.0%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$95,541.58	147.4%	\$78,036.37	102.1%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$32,082.27	-48.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$71,048.84	294.7%	\$36,378.00	102.1%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$89,704.24	44.1%	\$89,704.24	44.1%
Union	\$62,250	\$33,374.52	-46.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$61,045.29	-7.7%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$71,288.78	14.5%	\$71,288.78	14.5%
Washington	\$103,503	\$117,840.43	13.9%	\$117,840.43	13.9%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$70,108.60	12.6%	\$70,108.60	12.6%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$163,559.68	-21.8%	\$163,559.68	-21.8%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$41,815.63	78.4%	\$41,815.63	78.4%
York	\$168,475	\$222,230.52	31.9%	\$222,230.52	31.9%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.76		\$7,383,617.78	

OPTION I

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option I	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option I with Cap at 41.2% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$45,011.51	-27.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$705,748.36	0.2%	\$705,748.36	0.2%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$22,100.01	-64.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$134,322.54	-9.8%	\$134,322.54	-9.8%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$37,902.61	-39.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Berks	\$145,081	\$114,109.50	-21.3%	\$114,109.50	-21.3%
Blair	\$62,250	\$45,955.64	-26.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$24,757.17	-70.3%	\$62,250.00	-25.2%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$376,186.32	20.7%	\$376,186.32	20.7%
Butler	\$123,002	\$141,487.81	15.0%	\$141,487.81	15.0%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$75,777.68	-27.9%	\$75,777.68	-27.9%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$4,035.52	-77.6%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$45,101.65	34.8%	\$45,101.65	34.8%
Centre	\$76,218	\$31,206.82	-59.1%	\$62,250.00	-18.3%
Chester	\$274,959	\$281,668.71	2.4%	\$281,668.71	2.4%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$18,828.59	-69.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$20,922.60	-53.2%	\$20,922.60	-53.2%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$16,731.86	-73.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$62,638.34	-10.1%	\$62,638.34	-10.1%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$40,790.99	-68.0%	\$62,250.00	-51.2%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$98,120.52	2.1%	\$98,120.52	2.1%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$161,459.66	18.1%	\$161,459.66	18.1%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$645,272.80	109.0%	\$435,950.98	41.2%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option I	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option I with Cap at 41.2% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Elk	\$62,250	\$27,503.82	-55.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Erie	\$244,352	\$191,119.64	-21.8%	\$191,119.64	-21.8%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$52,474.17	-48.7%	\$62,250.00	-39.2%
Forest	\$18,000	\$3,697.82	-79.5%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$50,129.63	-39.6%	\$62,250.00	-25.1%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$10,240.88	-43.1%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Greene	\$18,000	\$26,710.66	48.4%	\$25,416.00	41.2%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$14,054.04	-77.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$47,437.12	-44.0%	\$62,250.00	-26.5%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$17,430.31	-22.1%	\$18,000.00	-19.6%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$10,486.04	-41.7%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$108,303.19	10.3%	\$108,303.19	10.3%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$141,264.58	-12.3%	\$141,264.58	-12.3%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$72,680.67	-24.7%	\$72,680.67	-24.7%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$95,192.80	-4.7%	\$95,192.80	-4.7%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$208,495.04	63.6%	\$179,940.76	41.2%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$156,890.77	-24.0%	\$156,890.77	-24.0%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$26,088.93	-61.8%	\$62,250.00	-8.8%
McKean	\$62,250	\$14,588.46	-76.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$35,595.15	-48.4%	\$62,250.00	-9.8%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$23,648.59	-62.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$49,323.93	-20.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$278,071.95	4.0%	\$278,071.95	4.0%
Montour	\$18,000	\$23,381.30	29.9%	\$23,381.30	29.9%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$146,522.94	71.8%	\$120,401.38	41.2%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option I	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option I with Cap at 41.2% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$40,390.88	-13.9%	\$40,390.88	-13.9%
Perry	\$18,000	\$22,447.18	24.7%	\$22,447.18	24.7%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$1,629,987.73	136.0%	\$975,356.09	41.2%
Pike	\$62,250	\$21,657.14	-65.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$9,448.46	-84.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$72,761.19	-51.2%	\$72,761.19	-51.2%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$19,483.77	8.2%	\$19,483.77	8.2%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$27,264.14	-29.4%	\$27,264.14	-29.4%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$3,985.51	-93.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$18,355.07	2.0%	\$18,355.07	2.0%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$15,579.70	-75.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Union	\$62,250	\$52,006.67	-16.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$29,081.94	-56.0%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$15,469.23	-75.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$72,096.88	-30.3%	\$72,096.88	-30.3%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$34,662.66	-44.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$101,288.63	-51.6%	\$101,288.63	-51.6%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$28,271.00	20.6%	\$28,271.00	20.6%
York	\$168,475	\$187,930.70	11.5%	\$187,930.70	11.5%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.10		\$7,382,553.25	

OPTION J

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option J	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option J with Cap at 23.3% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$42,538.81	-31.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$783,455.89	11.3%	\$783,455.89	11.3%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$25,312.49	-59.3%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$133,413.06	-10.4%	\$133,413.06	-10.4%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$42,865.14	-31.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Berks	\$145,081	\$145,632.14	0.4%	\$145,632.14	0.4%
Blair	\$62,250	\$50,924.79	-18.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$31,537.68	-62.1%	\$62,250.00	-25.2%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$351,181.30	12.7%	\$351,181.30	12.7%
Butler	\$123,002	\$145,655.95	18.4%	\$145,655.95	18.4%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$86,530.55	-17.6%	\$86,530.55	-17.6%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$3,960.63	-78.0%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$43,068.69	28.7%	\$41,269.00	23.3%
Centre	\$76,218	\$56,473.80	-25.9%	\$62,250.00	-18.3%
Chester	\$274,959	\$278,760.52	1.4%	\$278,760.52	1.4%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$22,306.99	-64.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$30,737.10	-31.2%	\$30,737.10	-31.2%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$21,241.75	-65.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$65,241.50	-6.4%	\$65,241.50	-6.4%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$52,029.97	-59.2%	\$62,250.00	-51.2%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$90,585.73	-5.7%	\$90,585.73	-5.7%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$168,789.43	23.5%	\$168,515.10	23.3%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$528,055.34	71.0%	\$380,685.24	23.3%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option J	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option J with Cap at 23.3% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Elk	\$62,250	\$29,332.38	-52.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Erie	\$244,352	\$221,703.22	-9.3%	\$221,703.22	-9.3%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$72,901.93	-28.8%	\$72,901.93	-28.8%
Forest	\$18,000	\$3,692.49	-79.5%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$53,115.86	-36.1%	\$62,250.00	-25.1%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$10,555.40	-41.4%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Greene	\$18,000	\$30,311.42	68.4%	\$22,194.00	23.3%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$17,086.44	-72.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$60,508.62	-28.5%	\$62,250.00	-26.5%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$20,583.94	-8.0%	\$20,583.94	-8.0%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$9,192.27	-48.9%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$113,951.72	16.1%	\$113,951.72	16.1%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$168,048.30	4.3%	\$168,048.30	4.3%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$71,277.80	-26.1%	\$71,277.80	-26.1%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$87,369.05	-12.5%	\$87,369.05	-12.5%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$197,545.61	55.0%	\$157,129.57	23.3%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$187,084.38	-9.3%	\$187,084.38	-9.3%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$40,156.93	-41.2%	\$62,250.00	-8.8%
McKean	\$62,250	\$19,018.10	-69.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$43,377.49	-37.1%	\$62,250.00	-9.8%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$24,567.23	-60.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$53,574.78	-13.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$232,955.63	-12.9%	\$232,955.63	-12.9%
Montour	\$18,000	\$17,485.60	-2.9%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$129,814.74	52.2%	\$105,138.03	23.3%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option J	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option J with Cap at 23.3% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$44,744.68	-4.6%	\$44,744.68	-4.6%
Perry	\$18,000	\$22,441.71	24.7%	\$22,194.00	23.3%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$1,407,994.50	103.8%	\$851,709.67	23.3%
Pike	\$62,250	\$21,312.54	-65.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$11,519.54	-81.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$82,152.98	-44.9%	\$82,152.98	-44.9%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$17,816.25	-1.0%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$34,703.55	-10.1%	\$34,703.55	-10.1%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$4,313.71	-93.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$20,979.37	16.6%	\$20,979.37	16.6%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$21,215.72	-65.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Union	\$62,250	\$50,277.58	-19.2%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Venango	\$66,138	\$34,353.79	-48.1%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$18,625.87	-70.1%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$83,142.53	-19.7%	\$83,142.53	-19.7%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$37,125.76	-40.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$122,206.27	-41.6%	\$122,206.27	-41.6%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$27,691.98	18.1%	\$27,691.98	18.1%
York	\$168,475	\$205,509.15	22.0%	\$205,509.15	22.0%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.10		\$7,383,534.85	

OPTION K

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option K	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option K with Cap at 16.8% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Adams	\$62,250	\$44,461.86	-28.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Allegheny	\$704,033	\$892,371.14	26.8%	\$822,310.14	16.8%
Armstrong	\$62,250	\$20,568.67	-67.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Beaver	\$148,979	\$159,678.06	7.2%	\$159,678.06	7.2%
Bedford	\$62,250	\$53,720.76	-13.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Berks	\$145,081	\$114,667.91	-21.0%	\$114,667.91	-21.0%
Blair	\$62,250	\$39,468.31	-36.6%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Bradford	\$83,226	\$31,884.92	-61.7%	\$62,250.00	-25.2%
Bucks	\$311,670	\$455,734.60	46.2%	\$364,030.91	16.8%
Butler	\$123,002	\$193,351.88	57.2%	\$143,666.57	16.8%
Cambria	\$105,042	\$91,822.82	-12.6%	\$91,822.82	-12.6%
Cameron	\$18,000	\$4,675.17	-74.0%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Carbon	\$33,470	\$48,095.50	43.7%	\$39,093.43	16.8%
Centre	\$76,218	\$30,288.60	-60.3%	\$62,250.00	-18.3%
Chester	\$274,959	\$356,064.16	29.5%	\$321,152.64	16.8%
Clarion	\$62,250	\$20,741.88	-66.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Clearfield	\$44,703	\$23,450.86	-47.5%	\$23,450.86	-47.5%
Clinton	\$62,250	\$20,549.34	-67.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Columbia	\$69,698	\$80,540.87	15.6%	\$80,540.87	15.6%
Crawford	\$127,476	\$52,913.43	-58.5%	\$62,250.00	-51.2%
Cumberland	\$96,059	\$95,538.95	-0.5%	\$95,538.95	-0.5%
Dauphin	\$136,671	\$186,150.48	36.2%	\$159,631.49	16.8%
Delaware	\$308,747	\$603,603.90	95.5%	\$360,616.67	16.8%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option K	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option K with Cap at 16.8% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Elk	\$62,250	\$38,598.63	-38.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Erie	\$244,352	\$256,247.87	4.9%	\$256,247.87	4.9%
Fayette	\$102,348	\$59,694.41	-41.7%	\$62,250.00	-39.2%
Forest	\$18,000	\$3,413.31	-81.0%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Franklin	\$83,062	\$52,688.93	-36.6%	\$62,250.00	-25.1%
Fulton	\$18,000	\$11,618.95	-35.5%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Greene	\$18,000	\$33,287.88	84.9%	\$21,024.00	16.8%
Huntingdon	\$62,250	\$15,095.87	-75.7%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Indiana	\$84,646	\$60,685.06	-28.3%	\$62,250.00	-26.5%
Jefferson	\$22,382	\$18,174.92	-18.8%	\$18,174.92	-18.8%
Juniata	\$18,000	\$7,992.36	-55.6%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Lackawanna	\$98,182	\$107,550.44	9.5%	\$107,550.44	9.5%
Lancaster	\$161,045	\$147,852.91	-8.2%	\$147,852.91	-8.2%
Lawrence	\$96,505	\$80,672.88	-16.4%	\$80,672.88	-16.4%
Lebanon	\$99,842	\$100,003.94	0.2%	\$100,003.94	0.2%
Lehigh	\$127,437	\$189,510.37	48.7%	\$148,846.18	16.8%
Luzerne	\$206,303	\$200,277.81	-2.9%	\$200,277.81	-2.9%
Lycoming	\$68,251	\$28,352.58	-58.5%	\$62,250.00	-8.8%
McKean	\$62,250	\$17,121.89	-72.5%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Mercer	\$68,985	\$32,607.04	-52.7%	\$62,250.00	-9.8%
Mifflin	\$62,250	\$21,774.16	-65.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Monroe	\$62,250	\$39,566.09	-36.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Montgomery	\$267,430	\$210,320.14	-21.4%	\$210,320.14	-21.4%
Montour	\$18,000	\$17,615.60	-2.1%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Northampton	\$85,270	\$120,666.75	41.5%	\$99,595.48	16.8%

County	Current Funding (2011-12)	Option K	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option	Option K with Cap at 16.8% and Minimum Funding	Percent Change in Funding from Current to Proposed Option with Cap and Minimum Funding
Northumberland	\$46,921	\$35,557.46	-24.2%	\$35,557.46	-24.2%
Perry	\$18,000	\$24,150.80	34.2%	\$21,024.00	16.8%
Philadelphia	\$690,762	\$993,517.96	43.8%	\$806,810.13	16.8%
Pike	\$62,250	\$19,951.55	-67.9%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Potter	\$62,250	\$12,843.24	-79.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Schuylkill	\$149,092	\$89,722.81	-39.8%	\$89,722.81	-39.8%
Snyder	\$18,001	\$14,104.97	-21.6%	\$18,000.00	0.0%
Somerset	\$38,613	\$33,470.72	-13.3%	\$33,470.72	-13.3%
Sullivan	\$62,250	\$4,347.80	-93.0%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Susquehanna	\$18,000	\$21,977.10	22.1%	\$21,024.00	16.8%
Tioga	\$62,250	\$19,655.70	-68.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Union	\$62,250	\$63,211.77	1.5%	\$63,211.77	1.5%
Venango	\$66,138	\$35,103.78	-46.9%	\$62,250.00	-5.9%
Warren	\$62,250	\$18,146.24	-70.8%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Washington	\$103,503	\$81,109.12	-21.6%	\$81,109.12	-21.6%
Wayne	\$62,250	\$45,167.22	-27.4%	\$62,250.00	0.0%
Westmoreland	\$209,120	\$112,082.25	-46.4%	\$112,082.25	-46.4%
Wyoming	\$23,439	\$35,159.60	50.0%	\$27,377.16	16.8%
York	\$168,475	\$232,623.12	38.1%	\$196,778.68	16.8%
PA TOTAL	\$7,383,638	\$7,383,638.10		\$7,381,435.99	