

From: [Rebecca Wightman](#)
To: [Family Juvenile Comm](#)
Cc: [Maves, Anna](#)
Subject: FW: AB1058 Funding Reallocation - PUBLIC COMMENT
Date: Wednesday, August 19, 2015 6:25:33 PM
Attachments: [doc02778220150816175108.pdf](#)

Dear Co-Chairs and All Committee Members of the AB1058 Funding Allocation Joint Sub-Committee:

Attached please find my written public comments concerning the above topic. I am sending this a week in advance of the next hearing on August 25, 2015 in hopes that everyone has an adequate time to read it.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to submit comments. Should any of you have any questions, or wish to discuss the matter further, I will be returning to my court next week, and can be reached via e-mail or phone (415) 551-3679 (chambers).

I have also listed Anna Maves as a "cc" to this e-mail since she is listed in the Notice as the person to receive public comments via mail. I include her here and ask that she please let me know if all pages came through clearly.

Thank you,

Rebecca Wightman
Commissioner (assigned to AB1058)
San Francisco

PUBLIC COMMENT

TO: The HONORABLE CO-CHAIRS, AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS of the
AB1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee

I am an experienced AB1058 Commissioner, who started out sitting in a small county (Marin) when the AB1058 program was just getting started. Three years later, I moved to a larger county (San Francisco) in 2000, and have been sitting as the AB1058 Commissioner since then. In 2002, the state DCSS and then-AOC created a joint committee called the DCSS/Judicial Stakeholders Committee, in which AB1058 Commissioner representatives and Family Law Facilitator representatives – from small and large, rural and urban settings – get together in Sacramento on an almost monthly basis to discuss statewide policy and operational issues of mutual concern. I have been a member of that committee since its inception. I make these comments as an individual Commissioner, and not on the behalf of any court or organization.

INITIAL CONCERNS:

1. Lack of Understanding of the unique operational aspects of the AB1058 program

At this juncture of the process, one of my biggest concerns overall is the lack of understanding of the joint sub-committee, through no fault of the committee members, of the unique operational aspects of the AB1058 program. There is no other case type in the California court system that has, for the bulk of its work, an institutional filer that is required to manage its program in accordance with specified federal performance measures – **which can actually drive the “workload” of a court in different directions in different counties.**

For your information, and to give you an idea of some of the measures that impact the institutional filer—the Department of Child Support Services (“DCSS”)—I have taken a sampling of some data gathered over the years by the state DCSS in which comparative data is reported on the different counties’ performance measures. (See Attachment A – Dec. 2008, Attachment B – Dec. 2011 and Attachment C – June 2015)¹ Please take a moment to look at these.

Although there is one state DCSS, there are multiple local child support agencies (LCSAs) that operate in the various counties. The operational aspects of how a case moves through the court from beginning to end, from county to county, have “evolved” since the inception of the program – and while that process on a “global” level is basically the same (e.g. complaint to Judgment to enforcement activity) – the processes and corresponding workload on a “local” level can vary a

¹ I chose different years to show examples of differences in total number of DCSS cases (between 2008-2015-e.g. Table 2.1) and to show differences in performance measures even when the program was flat funded (between 2011-2015). For each year, I have provided 4 tables: Table 01.1.1 – which is a statewide comparison of 4 of the 5 federal performance measures (listed by county size); Table 1 – which is a summary of the same 4 out of 5 federal performance measure (listed by county size); Table 1b – which shows a ranked version of these same federal performance measures; and Table 2.1 – which shows you the total number of DCSS cases, point-in-time data, broken down between public assistance cases and non-public assistance cases.

great deal more. Thus, one can literally have identical cases/number of cases, yet be able to process the workload in different ways, with vastly different workload implications for the courts.

Put another way, “workload” for a court in a child support case is highly dependent upon, among other things, the operations of the “workflow” between the institutional filer and the court. This “workflow” has evolved over the past 15+ years since the inception of the AB1058 program.

Take the EXACT SAME 10,000 cases:

In County A – the workload for the court in the “life” of these cases would be X

In County B – the workload for the court in the “life” of these cases would be Y

In County C – the workload for the court in the “life” of these cases would be Z

Why? There likely are a number of reasons, however, the unique “evolution” of the operational aspects of the AB1058 program over the past 15+ years – which vary from county to county – can account for a large part of it.² It should also be noted that there are many counties whose courts have worked cooperatively with the LCSAs on an operational level in ways that reduces the workload of the court (and can actually reduce it on both sides, i.e. for the LCSA as well) – not an insignificant point.

When viewed in this context, the preliminary results that one can see in the FOR DISCUSSION ONLY DOCUMENT (re: WAFM/RAS) demonstrate how far off this document is in terms of a good assessment of need of the courts. By way of EXAMPLE:

There is at least one county who according to the RAS model “needs”/would get over \$800,000 more in funding, yet last year that same county turned back over \$100,000 in funds. And, if you look at the “caseload” numbers for that very same county, it is a county where the number of cases has increased *substantially* since the inception of the program (whether looking at DCSS numbers or RAS numbers). Note: The use of statistics is also addressed below.

2. Lack of AB1058-experienced Joint Subcommittee members

In conjunction with the concern regarding the lack of understanding of the AB1058 program, and with absolutely no disrespect meant to the one Commissioner (whom I absolutely respect and I

² Counties that have implemented e-filing and that have case management systems in which orders/files can be viewed have created efficiencies, for example, that lessen the workload of court clerks (not having to submit “research requests” for copies of orders, not having to pull files, easier access to cases for the bench officer, etc.). Courts that have chosen to prepare their own orders creates a different kind of efficiency (shifting the work of the court clerk in a way that does not increase it, yet creates faster processing times on all sides and less burden on file clerks). LCSAs that have a robust pre-court process can create different workloads for the court: those counties with a low default rate have a higher number of court hearings to get to Judgment; those counties with high stipulation rates, save court hearing time. Some LCSAs have had policies on certain types of cases needing to go to court (e.g. CA driver’s license releases), which drives up the court’s workload, whereas other LCSAs are able to address that type of case mainly by stipulation. These are many more examples.

personally know has a lot of experience), and one FLF (less experience) who actually sit on the joint sub-committee, I find it troublesome that there are not a greater number of more experienced AB1058 individuals on this committee, particularly AB1058 Commissioners. There are a total of 16 members on this joint sub-committee, only one with actual court/judicial experience (from a medium-sized county) and one with *relatively* few years FLF experience (from a small-sized county). I suspect that if you compare the number of judges who were involved in the whole WAFM process, you would see a different picture. The danger of not having enough AB1058-experienced individuals sitting on the committee is that policy and budget decisions can be made without understanding the **true** impact to the unique AB1058 program (beyond just the potential loss of jobs/clerks/etc.).³ Such budget decisions may not only have a ripple effect on the federal performance measures previously mentioned (which I understand is not necessarily a direct issue for courts), but which affect the courts in other ways when the LCSAs adjust their operations. Although I am getting into greater detail than I intended, I wonder if this joint sub-committee is aware that in the existing Plan of Cooperation agreement(s), which are signed annually between the each county court and the LCSA, there are provisions in that agreement that contain unique agreed-upon case processing timeframes, and that assigns liability for any federal compliance penalties that may arise if certain processing timeframes and or other work.⁴

³ As a separate/side note: As a member of the DCSS/Judicial Stakeholders Committee, I can say that *other* members on that committee have expressed to me both surprise and disappointment at the fact that this joint sub-committee had not officially reached out to seek input of the more diverse Judicial Stakeholders committee. (I do note that the AB1058 Commissioner member of your committee has done her utmost best to solicit input from all AB1058 Commissioners, but we all know that with press of court business in general, it is hard to get individuals to send in written comments. (How well we all know what it is like when an e-mail comes through about new rules changes and invitations to comment!))

⁴ Standard Plan of Cooperation language in every POC:

ADDITIONAL TERMS [:] Each party accepts responsibility for receiving, replying to and/or complying with any audit by appropriate State and Federal audit agencies that directly relate to the services to be performed under this Plan. In addition, each party agrees to pay the other the amount of the State's Liability to the Federal Government, which results from that party's failure to perform the service or comply with the conditions required by this Plan and identified by said audit.

Each party shall permit the authorized representative of the other party, of the Judicial Council, the California Department of Child Support Services, or other appropriate State and Federal audit agencies to inspect and/or audit, at any reasonable time, all data and records relating to performance, case processing and billing to the State under this agreement.

Should either party be found deficient in any aspects of performance under the Plan or fails to perform under the agreed standards, the deficient party will have the responsibility of submitting a proposed corrective action plan to the other party and the Judicial Council. The

3. Over-reliance on statistics

I attended the initial meeting on June 18, 2015 of this joint sub-committee in person, and have examined the materials handed out. I am very concerned that, again, in part due to the lack of understanding of the unique nature of the AB1058 program, and the lack of experienced AB1058 representatives that work in the courts, there is going to be an over-reliance on statistics (or as we commonly say, “bean-counting”).

I understand the desire not to rely upon data that comes from outside of the court system. I also understand the need and desire to be “fair” to all of the counties. And, by the way, I do agree that the formation of this joint sub-committee, and the time, is ripe to analyze the AB1058 funding allocation methodology. That being said, however, the use of statistics as an anchor – perhaps with some “tweaks” or “adjustments” for this item or that – as a way to re-allocate the budget is not, in my view the best approach.

I have provided some concrete suggestions for this joint sub-committee to consider in the final section, but before that, I have some important comments to make on the record on the following specific aspects of some statistics and reports being reviewed:

- JBSIS: While I may be the only one to note my concern in writing, I am positive I am not the only bench officer of the opinion that *in the particular area of family law*, JBSIS statistics are inherently unreliable. Only in family law do you have court workload that extends for many, many years post-judgment. This is even more true in the “child support world”, where the vast majority of the workload occurs post-judgment (well beyond establishment of parentage and initial support orders, and even well beyond the age where custody and visitation are no long in issue). And only in the child support world do you have a myriad of enforcement activity that occurs in no other family court, due to the unique tools of enforcement that only DCSS exercises. JBSIS definitions are often ambiguous or difficult to apply in the IV-D child support context, and many counties are not accurately reporting, nor fully reporting. (Is this Committee even aware of whether all counties are reporting data in all fields in this area?) Unfortunately, the old adage “GIGO” (garbage in, garbage out) comes to mind.
- Workload Study from 2011 not accurate: After the first meeting, I took it upon myself to read the Workload Study report, and then to actually contact some of my AB1058 colleagues (there are quite a few experienced ones still around) who were sitting in one of the 15 counties that were sampled for the time study that was performed and relied upon in reaching workload assumptions of time spent on a type of case. What I found:

corrective action plan shall identify specific action to be taken to correct the deficient performance and shall be submitted within forty-five (45) days after notification of deficiencies by the other party and the Judicial Council.

- Contrary to what the Workload Study reports, there was NOT 100% participation by the AB1058 Commissioners (the report for the county I am referring to shows 100% participation – and it wasn't the court that had agreed to only have partial participation as noted in the table on p.7 regarding Commissioners). I located at least one Commissioner who had been told there was no need to participate due to their part-time status, and who, in fact, did not participate. (Note: Many smaller counties are not able to hire a full-time AB1058 Commissioner.)
- The length of the time study is very short - from May 10, 2010 to June 6, 2010 (less than one month), which is really not an adequate time for the child support world. Right off, it does not provide a good sampling of case work for smaller counties that may have calendars only once or twice a month. In addition, again, I checked again with a few of my colleagues from those reporting counties, and discovered that some had actually taken time off (vacation/other business) during that one month time frame. Indeed, in my own county (one of the 15 reporting counties), I was out almost one third of the reporting time. Even if there had been a substitute, e.g. Attorney Pro Tem, the workload would not have been captured accurately. This is because often times there are a large number of non-stipulations to such Pro Tems – another unique feature of the AB1058 program not found elsewhere) – which in turn often yields to a number of continuances vs. actual court time on such days.
- RAS model not useful: In view of the above re: JBSIS and the workload study, it is no wonder that the RAS model is not particularly helpful. (Again, it explains why, in the FOR DISCUSSION DOCUMENT ONLY, it slated counties as needing monies when they don't seem to really be needing it, and slated other counties – particularly smaller ones - for losing monies where it could have a tremendous negative impact.

4. Unrealistic Time Frame

I also find it necessary to express my concern about the time frame in which this joint sub-committee has been given to make its recommendations. This joint sub-committee was not even formed until April 2015, and it did not have its first public meeting until July 19, 2015. The notion that solid recommendations can be made, based on a solid understanding of the program, solid data being available and sufficient time to explore what is truly needed and appropriate statewide, in a less than 10 months' time is unrealistic and quite frankly, irresponsible given a program of this magnitude with its unique history (in order for the recommendations to be placed on the Judicial Council agenda for February 2016, in reality the draft report needs to be completed earlier)..

So, given all of the concerns, including the concern surrounding the use of JBSIS/RAS or other statistical models, then what would be helpful?

SUGGESTIONS TO THIS JOINT SUB-COMMITTEE

Because I have been in the program so long, and given the importance of the decision to be made, I really believe that in this instance, **this joint sub-committee would be well served by taking time to gather specific information directly from the counties as to what they need**, I recommend the following:

First and foremost – take a more measured approach, by having an AB1058-experienced consultant – such as a respected retired Commissioner who has sat in numerous counties – to go to the counties and work with the courts to assess their operations and operational needs, i.e. finding out what they really need, and providing critical operational assessment information that can help shape solution(s).

Courts have by in large successfully launched and maintained their IV-D courts over the years since the program’s inception. **Is there really a true need to shake up the permanent funding allocation for virtually ALL counties, if it turns out that what may be needed in one or more courts is help to improve efficiency?** If some courts have fallen behind and/or are truly struggling to meet the workload, it makes much more sense to first determine if the “fix” is one in which certain operational changes can vastly improve the court’s operations – which may or may not take a certain amount of money – before simply *permanently* re-allocating money (whether phased in or not) in a court’s direction.

Recommendations this joint sub-committee will make can and will affect families and children across the state and beyond (IV-D cases impact families beyond CA and the U.S.). Instead of trying to place cookie-cutter numbers in slots, and changing the entire current funding methodology for the entire state, this joint sub-committee’s work and recommendations would be far more justifiable and persuasive if it first took a reasonable period of time to assess the needs of the courts in conjunction with the knowledge of their operations and whether there are better ways to operate.⁵

Second – expand the membership on this joint sub-committee include additional AB1058-experienced Commissioners and FLFs for the reasons set forth above. As you are weighing and mulling over a variety of considerations, the contributions and depth of experience from

⁵ Over the years, I have personally visited many counties courts (and FLF offices) and watched their calendars; I have also done research for a number of presentations on best practices, and have come to learn that no one court/FLF operates the same. I know that there are many opportunities for actual efficiencies – which can translate into savings from a budget perspective – that would far better serve the courts that simply taking more money to continue to do things inefficiently. I know that there are retired AB1058 Commissioners who have just as much, if not more experience than I do who could do a great job in gathering good information for this joint sub-committee so that it can provide good options for the Judicial Council to consider.

those in the field will undoubtedly serve the joint sub-committee well (and help them understand the impacts of recommendations that may otherwise not be known).

Third – in taking a more measured approach, seek any necessary extension of time to complete the charge of this joint sub-committee (e.g. allowing sufficient time for gathering information on what counties truly need via a consultant).

I apologize if this comment is considered long-winded, but I am obviously passionate about the AB1058 program in general and seeing that it is administered in a fair and accurate manner and in a way that enables all courts to successfully serve the families of California.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Wightman

(AB1058 Commissioner from San Francisco)

TABLE 01.1.1
COMPARISON OF FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES
AS CALCULATED IN SUPPORTING TABLES
DECEMBER 2007 AND 2008

		IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP)		Cases with Support Orders Established		Collections on Current Support		Cases with Collections on Arrears	
		December 07	December 08	December 07	December 08	December 07	December 08	December 07	December 08
			From Table 1.1.1		From Table 1.2		From Table 1.3		From Table 1.4
	STATEWIDE	82.5%	88.7%	82.1%	77.7%	51.5%	52.9%	40.6%	41.5%
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	77.5	75.2	76.3	70.1	44.8	49.5	32.2	36.2
	San Bernardino	71.1	96.1	76.0	70.1	50.1	51.3	40.3	39.6
	San Diego	79.6	85.2	86.2	83.8	49.8	50.2	39.5	40.6
	Orange	84.1	97.7	81.2	71.5	53.7	53.5	42.0	42.3
	Riverside	80.0	88.0	76.0	73.4	49.0	51.0	42.2	41.7
	Sacramento	86.3	94.1	84.1	80.3	49.9	51.1	40.7	40.7
	Total	78.2	83.4	78.5	72.9	48.2	50.7	37.0	38.9
Large (10)	Fresno	92.7	96.2	85.6	82.6	52.3	53.7	42.2	43.4
	Santa Clara	78.5	96.9	87.7	84.8	53.8	52.9	44.9	44.2
	Kern	79.0	88.9	84.3	77.6	50.1	53.2	38.4	40.3
	Alameda	92.8	94.7	93.1	89.6	62.4	60.4	55.2	53.8
	Contra Costa	93.8	94.6	87.4	88.9	55.0	54.5	46.7	46.3
	San Joaquin	86.3	97.6	89.1	86.3	52.3	54.1	42.0	42.8
	Tulare	94.4	101.6	89.9	84.5	56.0	55.4	42.0	39.2
	Stanislaus	94.4	107.0	85.8	82.9	54.0	53.5	42.3	41.8
	Ventura	96.5	106.8	89.5	83.3	59.0	55.8	51.8	50.1
	San Francisco	82.9	85.8	88.8	86.3	63.2	66.3	45.2	47.9
Total	88.0	96.3	87.7	84.2	55.3	55.3	44.6	44.6	
Medium (13)	Solano	91.9	106.6	87.2	81.7	56.4	55.8	44.8	43.5
	Monterey	91.2	95.8	87.2	86.2	54.1	53.0	42.7	41.1
	Sonoma	97.1	100.1	87.2	84.4	61.4	58.9	48.7	48.0
	Merced	89.1	104.8	83.4	81.5	53.4	51.7	38.8	37.7
	Shasta	87.7	93.6	89.2	87.3	55.0	56.4	44.5	44.2
	Butte	86.7	96.1	82.1	81.3	53.3	51.6	43.2	43.8
	Santa Barbara	88.8	98.2	80.6	76.9	57.5	56.4	47.1	44.4
	San Mateo	93.8	94.4	85.0	84.2	60.3	60.5	50.4	49.1
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	87.2	93.6	82.9	78.4	52.1	51.8	43.5	41.6
	Imperial	77.6	93.2	81.0	74.6	47.4	50.3	34.9	37.2
	Yolo	98.0	94.0	82.4	84.5	52.7	54.9	41.8	40.6
	Kings	94.5	98.5	89.6	88.6	61.0	60.7	42.7	42.2
	Placer	97.5	103.6	86.5	81.5	56.6	56.7	44.8	44.2
Total	90.5	98.6	85.0	82.2	55.7	55.2	43.8	42.9	
Small (12)	Humboldt	97.2	99.5	92.6	92.6	62.7	60.9	49.9	48.4
	Madera	90.1	99.2	85.5	82.5	57.2	56.2	46.7	43.7
	Yuba	82.5	88.3	80.2	77.2	47.8	51.4	39.9	40.9
	El Dorado	102.0	102.9	90.5	90.5	54.7	56.0	48.1	48.6
	San Luis Obispo	113.0	114.0	93.2	93.3	68.9	66.7	57.8	54.3
	Sutter	104.1	91.3	79.8	82.2	56.6	55.8	42.4	39.9
	Mendocino	94.2	100.5	86.9	85.7	55.0	53.5	45.0	44.8
	Lake	81.9	91.1	87.2	83.0	53.8	55.5	53.1	51.5
	Napa	94.3	98.3	85.9	84.9	57.1	55.7	50.2	46.9
	Tehama	100.3	95.6	89.1	89.2	52.2	53.0	43.4	43.3
	Siskiyou/Modoc	94.4	104.7	93.1	89.5	61.8	62.5	46.2	45.3
	Sierra/Nevada	92.8	101.0	88.7	90.4	55.7	57.3	46.2	47.1
Total	95.2	98.4	87.7	86.9	57.9	57.7	47.4	46.2	
Very Small (11)	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras	98.4	111.7	92.8	90.2	60.0	57.2	46.8	44.5
	Marin	89.9	97.3	91.0	85.8	68.8	62.9	51.3	47.2
	Tuolumne	97.4	102.7	92.7	90.5	67.4	66.4	49.4	49.5
	Del Norte	92.7	108.5	95.0	91.1	60.3	56.5	49.2	43.3
	Lassen	100.6	98.5	85.7	86.2	60.4	59.3	45.7	43.1
	Inyo/Mono	108.9	110.3	93.2	88.1	63.3	61.8	46.6	45.0
	Glenn	99.3	99.2	83.8	83.9	53.5	55.5	42.0	42.3
	Plumas	116.9	106.3	92.7	92.9	61.2	61.6	50.1	49.1
	Trinity	87.1	92.2	86.7	84.3	53.5	49.8	45.1	41.6
	Mariposa	100.0	109.5	91.6	91.2	69.3	62.8	52.1	51.1
Colusa	94.4	103.1	88.1	83.7	58.3	58.4	45.1	50.5	
Total	97.2	103.7	90.8	88.3	63.3	60.5	47.8	45.7	
Regionalized LCSAs (11)	Alpine	89.5	127.6	95.4	92.4	69.5	66.7	60.8	54.1
	Amador	102.8	113.9	93.8	91.5	62.7	57.3	49.0	44.5
	Calaveras	96.1	109.9	91.9	89.1	57.2	56.7	44.5	44.1
	Inyo	110.5	112.2	93.9	88.8	60.7	60.2	43.8	42.4
	Modoc	90.3	114.9	95.6	90.6	61.8	62.9	48.3	49.3
	Mono	103.4	103.7	90.6	85.7	69.7	65.6	59.1	56.7
	Nevada	92.0	100.7	88.8	90.6	56.0	57.5	46.3	47.1
	San Benito	91.1	100.6	87.0	82.8	50.7	49.0	39.4	38.6
	Santa Cruz	85.9	91.3	81.6	77.0	52.4	52.6	45.1	42.7
	Sierra	118.9	108.3	87.6	87.6	48.8	52.0	44.8	47.2
	Siskiyou	95.1	103.0	92.6	89.3	61.8	62.4	45.8	44.5

DECEMBER 2008

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

2/1/09

Note: The formula for IV-D PEP is the current year line 6 divided by previous year line 5. The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1. The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 29 divided by line 28.

ATTACHMENT A
TABLE 01.1
(p. 1 of 4)

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES
AS CALCULATED IN SUPPORTING TABLES
DECEMBER 2008

		IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP)	Cases with Support Orders Established	Collections on Current Support	Cases with Collections on Arrears
		From Table 1.1.1	From Table 1.2	From Table 1.3	From Table 1.4
STATEWIDE		88.7%	77.7%	52.9%	41.5%
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	75.2	70.1	49.5	36.2
	San Bernardino	96.1	70.1	51.3	39.6
	San Diego	85.2	83.8	50.2	40.6
	Orange	97.7	71.5	53.5	42.3
	Riverside	88.0	73.4	51.0	41.7
	Sacramento	94.1	80.3	51.1	40.7
	Total	83.4	72.9	50.7	38.9
Large (10)	Fresno	96.2	82.6	53.7	43.4
	Santa Clara	96.9	84.8	52.9	44.2
	Kern	88.9	77.6	53.2	40.3
	Alameda	94.7	89.6	60.4	53.8
	Contra Costa	94.6	88.9	54.5	46.3
	San Joaquin	97.6	86.3	54.1	42.8
	Tulare	101.6	84.5	55.4	39.2
	Stanislaus	107.0	82.9	53.5	41.8
	Ventura	106.8	83.3	55.8	50.1
	San Francisco	85.8	86.3	66.3	47.9
Total	96.3	84.2	55.3	44.6	
Medium (13)	Solano	106.6	81.7	55.8	43.5
	Monterey	95.8	86.2	53.0	41.1
	Sonoma	100.1	84.4	58.9	48.0
	Merced	104.8	81.5	51.7	37.7
	Shasta	93.6	87.3	56.4	44.2
	Butte	96.1	81.3	51.6	43.8
	Santa Barbara	98.2	76.9	56.4	44.4
	San Mateo	94.4	84.2	60.5	49.1
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	93.6	78.4	51.8	41.6
	Imperial	93.2	74.6	50.3	37.2
	Yolo	94.0	84.5	54.9	40.6
	Kings	98.5	88.6	60.7	42.2
	Placer	103.6	81.5	56.7	44.2
Total	98.6	82.2	55.2	42.9	
Small (12)	Humboldt	99.5	92.6	60.9	48.4
	Madera	99.2	82.5	56.2	43.7
	Yuba	88.3	77.2	51.4	40.9
	El Dorado	102.9	90.5	56.0	48.6
	San Luis Obispo	114.0	93.3	66.7	54.3
	Sutter	91.3	82.2	55.8	39.9
	Mendocino	100.5	85.7	53.5	44.8
	Lake	91.1	83.0	55.5	51.5
	Napa	98.3	84.9	55.7	46.9
	Tehama	95.6	89.2	53.0	43.3
	Siskiyou/Modoc	104.7	89.5	62.5	45.3
	Sierra/Nevada	101.0	90.4	57.3	47.1
Total	98.4	86.9	57.7	46.2	
Very Small (11)	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras	111.7	90.2	57.2	44.5
	Marin	97.3	85.8	62.9	47.2
	Tuolumne	102.7	90.5	66.4	49.5
	Del Norte	108.5	91.1	56.5	43.3
	Lassen	98.5	86.2	59.3	43.1
	Inyo/Mono	110.3	88.1	61.8	45.0
	Glenn	99.2	83.9	55.5	42.3
	Plumas	106.3	92.9	61.6	49.1
	Trinity	92.2	84.3	49.8	41.6
	Mariposa	109.5	91.2	62.8	51.1
	Colusa	103.1	83.7	58.4	50.5
Total	103.7	88.3	60.5	45.7	
Regionalized LCSAs (11)	Alpine	127.6	92.4	66.7	54.1
	Amador	113.9	91.5	57.3	44.5
	Calaveras	109.9	89.1	56.7	44.1
	Inyo	112.2	88.8	60.2	42.4
	Modoc	114.9	90.6	62.9	49.3
	Mono	103.7	85.7	65.6	56.7
	Nevada	100.7	90.6	57.5	47.1
	San Benito	100.6	82.8	49.0	38.6
	Santa Cruz	91.3	77.0	52.6	42.7
	Sierra	108.3	87.6	52.0	47.2
Siskiyou	103.0	89.3	62.4	44.5	

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

2/1/09

Note: The formula for IV-D PEP is the current year line 6 divided by previous year line 5. The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1. The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 29 divided by line 28.

DECEMBER 2008

TABLE 1

A
(p.2 of 4)

TABLE 1b
FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES RANKED
BASED ON CALCULATIONS IN SUPPORTING TABLES
DECEMBER 2008

IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP) From Table 1.1.1	Rank	Cases with Support Orders Established From Table 1.2	Rank	Collections on Current Support From Table 1.3	Rank	Cases with Collections on Arrears From Table 1.4	Rank
88.7%		77.7%		52.9%		41.5%	
Alameda	36	Alameda	10	Alameda	12	Alameda	2
Amador/Alpine/Calaveras	2	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras	9	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras	17	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras	21
Butte	33	Butte	42	Butte	44	Butte	26
Colusa	13	Colusa	32	Colusa	15	Colusa	5
Contra Costa	37	Contra Costa	13	Contra Costa	32	Contra Costa	17
Del Norte	5	Del Norte	5	Del Norte	19	Del Norte	30
El Dorado	14	El Dorado	7	El Dorado	23	El Dorado	10
Fresno	31	Fresno	36	Fresno	34	Fresno	29
Glenn	21	Glenn	30	Glenn	29	Glenn	35
Humboldt	20	Humboldt	3	Humboldt	9	Humboldt	11
Imperial	43	Imperial	48	Imperial	49	Imperial	51
Inyo/Mono	3	Inyo/Mono	15	Inyo/Mono	7	Inyo/Mono	19
Kern	47	Kern	45	Kern	38	Kern	46
Kings	23	Kings	14	Kings	10	Kings	36
Lake	46	Lake	34	Lake	28	Lake	3
Lassen	24	Lassen	19	Lassen	13	Lassen	32
Los Angeles	52	Los Angeles	52	Los Angeles	52	Los Angeles	52
Madera	22	Madera	37	Madera	22	Madera	27
Marin	29	Marin	21	Marin	4	Marin	14
Mariposa	4	Mariposa	4	Mariposa	5	Mariposa	4
Mendocino	18	Mendocino	22	Mendocino	37	Mendocino	20
Merced	10	Merced	40	Merced	43	Merced	50
Monterey	34	Monterey	20	Monterey	40	Monterey	41
Napa	25	Napa	23	Napa	27	Napa	16
Orange	27	Orange	50	Orange	35	Orange	34
Placer	12	Placer	41	Placer	18	Placer	24
Plumas	9	Plumas	2	Plumas	8	Plumas	8
Riverside	49	Riverside	49	Riverside	48	Riverside	38
Sacramento	39	Sacramento	43	Sacramento	47	Sacramento	43
San Bernardino	32	San Bernardino	51	San Bernardino	46	San Bernardino	48
San Diego	51	San Diego	31	San Diego	50	San Diego	44
San Francisco	50	San Francisco	18	San Francisco	3	San Francisco	33
San Joaquin	28	San Joaquin	17	San Joaquin	33	San Joaquin	13
San Luis Obispo	1	San Luis Obispo	1	San Luis Obispo	1	San Luis Obispo	1
San Mateo	38	San Mateo	29	San Mateo	11	San Mateo	9
Santa Barbara	26	Santa Barbara	47	Santa Barbara	20	Santa Barbara	22
Santa Clara	30	Santa Clara	24	Santa Clara	41	Santa Clara	25
Santa Cruz/San Benito	42	Santa Cruz/San Benito	44	Santa Cruz/San Benito	42	Santa Cruz/San Benito	40
Shasta	41	Shasta	16	Shasta	21	Shasta	23
Sierra/Nevada	17	Sierra/Nevada	8	Sierra/Nevada	16	Sierra/Nevada	15
Siskiyou/Modoc	11	Siskiyou/Modoc	11	Siskiyou/Modoc	6	Siskiyou/Modoc	18
Solano	8	Solano	39	Solano	25	Solano	28
Sonoma	19	Sonoma	27	Sonoma	14	Sonoma	12
Stanislaus	6	Stanislaus	35	Stanislaus	36	Stanislaus	37
Sutter	45	Sutter	38	Sutter	26	Sutter	47
Tehama	35	Tehama	12	Tehama	39	Tehama	31
Trinity	44	Trinity	28	Trinity	51	Trinity	39
Tulare	16	Tulare	26	Tulare	30	Tulare	49
Tuolumne	15	Tuolumne	6	Tuolumne	2	Tuolumne	7
Ventura	7	Ventura	33	Ventura	24	Ventura	6
Yolo	40	Yolo	25	Yolo	31	Yolo	45
Yuba	48	Yuba	46	Yuba	45	Yuba	42

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29

Notes: The formula for IV-D PEP is the current year line 6 divided by previous year line 5. The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1. The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 29 divided by line 28.

TABLE 1b

(p.3 of 4)

DECEMBER 2008

TABLE 2.1
LOCAL AGENCY CASES BY CASE TYPE
USING POINT-IN-TIME DATA
DECEMBER 2008

	Cases (Line 1)	Current Assistance		Former Assistance		Never Assistance		
		Cases	Percentage	Cases	Percentage	Cases	Percentage	
STATEWIDE	1,628,706	408,133	25.1%	762,073	46.8%	458,500	28.2%	
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	423,193	103,055	24.4	208,627	49.3	111,511	26.3
	San Bernardino	128,995	37,138	28.8	56,553	43.8	35,304	27.4
	San Diego	98,124	18,835	19.2	43,860	44.7	35,429	36.1
	Orange	104,135	19,051	18.3	40,073	38.5	45,011	43.2
	Riverside	90,688	23,376	25.8	42,152	46.5	25,160	27.7
	Sacramento	83,477	23,332	28.0	39,217	47.0	20,928	25.1
	Total	928,612	224,787	24.2	430,482	46.4	273,343	29.4
Large (10)	Fresno	70,201	21,642	30.8	36,410	51.9	12,149	17.3
	Santa Clara	51,891	11,120	21.4	26,083	50.3	14,688	28.3
	Kern	56,024	23,465	41.9	20,376	36.4	12,183	21.7
	Alameda	38,618	7,512	19.5	19,036	49.3	12,070	31.3
	Contra Costa	36,030	8,534	23.7	16,099	44.7	11,397	31.6
	San Joaquin	34,126	10,459	30.6	15,257	44.7	8,410	24.6
	Tulare	36,311	11,250	31.0	18,205	50.1	6,856	18.9
	Stanislaus	34,105	9,484	27.8	16,626	48.7	7,995	23.4
	Ventura	26,197	4,752	18.1	11,766	44.9	9,679	36.9
	San Francisco	19,098	4,529	23.7	9,131	47.8	5,438	28.5
Total	402,601	112,747	28.0	188,989	46.9	100,865	25.1	
Medium (13)	Solano	24,080	6,071	25.2	11,511	47.8	6,498	27.0
	Monterey	19,276	4,351	22.6	9,487	49.2	5,438	28.2
	Sonoma	17,623	3,495	19.8	8,544	48.5	5,584	31.7
	Merced	21,825	6,755	31.0	9,892	45.3	5,178	23.7
	Shasta	15,119	3,455	22.9	8,371	55.4	3,293	21.8
	Butte	15,274	3,586	23.5	8,733	57.2	2,955	19.3
	Santa Barbara	19,333	4,737	24.5	8,732	45.2	5,864	30.3
	San Mateo	13,940	2,339	16.8	5,557	39.9	6,044	43.4
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	12,354	2,538	20.5	6,031	48.8	3,785	30.6
	Imperial	13,878	4,596	33.1	4,916	35.4	4,366	31.5
	Yolo	9,927	2,150	21.7	5,318	53.6	2,459	24.8
	Kings	10,804	2,992	27.7	5,218	48.3	2,594	24.0
	Placer	10,050	1,912	19.0	4,692	46.7	3,446	34.3
Total	203,483	48,977	24.1	97,002	47.7	57,504	28.3	
Small (12)	Humboldt	8,216	1,623	19.8	4,097	49.9	2,496	30.4
	Madera	7,211	2,253	31.2	3,210	44.5	1,748	24.2
	Yuba	5,914	1,711	28.9	3,078	52.0	1,125	19.0
	El Dorado	7,294	1,336	18.3	3,730	51.1	2,228	30.5
	San Luis Obispo	6,062	1,343	22.2	2,697	44.5	2,022	33.4
	Sutter	6,369	1,536	24.1	3,151	49.5	1,682	26.4
	Mendocino	6,028	1,653	27.4	2,880	47.8	1,495	24.8
	Lake	3,939	1,033	26.2	1,986	50.4	920	23.4
	Napa	5,217	779	14.9	2,338	44.8	2,100	40.3
	Tehama	4,874	1,251	25.7	2,510	51.5	1,113	22.8
	Siskiyou/Modoc	4,461	925	20.7	2,494	55.9	1,042	23.4
	Sierra/Nevada	4,031	740	18.4	2,042	50.7	1,249	31.0
Total	69,616	16,183	23.2	34,213	49.1	19,220	27.6	
Very Small (11)	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras	4,139	935	22.6	1,937	46.8	1,267	30.6
	Marin	3,440	712	20.7	1,203	35.0	1,525	44.3
	Tuolumne	3,427	768	22.4	1,716	50.1	943	27.5
	Del Norte	3,007	809	26.9	1,533	51.0	665	22.1
	Lassen	2,243	547	24.4	1,136	50.6	560	25.0
	Inyo/Mono	1,727	185	10.7	862	49.9	680	39.4
	Glenn	2,290	618	27.0	1,045	45.6	627	27.4
	Plumas	1,214	206	17.0	662	54.5	346	28.5
	Trinity	1,095	245	22.4	460	42.0	390	35.6
	Mariposa	840	213	25.4	370	44.0	257	30.6
	Colusa	972	201	20.7	463	47.6	308	31.7
Total	24,394	5,439	22.3	11,387	46.7	7,568	31.0	
Regionalized LCSAs (11)	Alpine	105	12	11.4	69	65.7	24	22.9
	Amador	1,736	361	20.8	800	46.1	575	33.1
	Calaveras	2,298	562	24.5	1,068	46.5	668	29.1
	Inyo	1,343	139	10.3	731	54.4	473	35.2
	Modoc	702	160	22.8	355	50.6	187	26.6
	Mono	384	46	12.0	131	34.1	207	53.9
	Nevada	3,861	702	18.2	1,956	50.7	1,203	31.2
	San Benito	3,076	799	26.0	1,542	50.1	735	23.9
	Santa Cruz	9,278	1,739	18.7	4,489	48.4	3,050	32.9
	Sierra	170	38	22.4	86	50.6	46	27.1
	Siskiyou	3,759	765	20.4	2,139	56.9	855	22.7

SOURCE: CS 1257 Line 1 (Point-in-Time)

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

Note: The percentage of cases in each assistance category are calculated by taking the number of cases (line 1) by assistance type for each LCSA and dividing by the total number of cases for that LCSA.

21/09

DECEMBER 2008

A
(p. 4 of 4)

TABLE 2.1

TABLE 01.1.1
COMPARISON OF FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES
AS CALCULATED IN SUPPORTING TABLES
DECEMBER 2010 and 2011

	IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP)		Cases with Support Orders Established		Collections on Current Support		Cases with Collections on Arrears		
	Dec 2010**	Dec 2011**	Dec 2010**	Dec 2011	Dec 2010	Dec 2011	Dec 2010**	Dec 2011	
	From Table 1.1.1		From Table 1.2		From Table 1.3		From Table 1.4		
STATEWIDE	75.0%	81.8%	83.1%	86.1%	57.9%	59.7%	44.9%	46.3%	
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	64.4	72.1	74.3	79.9	56.3	56.9	43.3	44.3
	San Bernardino	78.9	87.6	80.5	84.0	55.3	57.5	41.7	43.5
	Riverside	80.9	84.7	78.0	81.1	54.6	56.4	42.1	44.0
	San Diego	72.3	76.9	80.6	85.3	57.8	61.3	45.5	48.2
	Sacramento	85.8	86.7	83.5	87.8	55.5	55.7	42.2	42.7
	Orange	72.5	77.1	85.3	87.4	55.5	61.4	42.7	46.5
	Total	71.3	77.8	78.4	82.9	56.0	58.1	43.0	44.8
Large (10)	Fresno	81.4	89.4	87.7	90.7	59.5	59.3	47.8	47.8
	Kern	75.1	89.6	83.8	83.6	55.7	58.8	41.3	43.9
	Santa Clara	78.2	87.6	88.7	89.9	57.8	58.4	49.1	48.9
	Alameda	82.3	85.6	90.0	89.1	63.2	64.4	54.9	56.6
	San Joaquin	89.3	93.0	92.5	91.6	59.1	60.2	45.2	46.0
	Stanislaus	83.3	84.9	86.6	92.6	58.2	59.7	43.6	44.1
	Contra Costa	85.5	84.8	87.9	90.1	59.8	61.4	48.7	49.5
	Tulare	77.6	79.6	88.6	91.0	60.5	62.3	43.3	44.4
	Ventura	85.1	93.9	93.7	93.8	61.3	63.6	52.3	52.6
	Solano	75.3	90.8	91.8	91.1	60.0	61.4	46.4	48.1
Total	80.9	87.8	88.5	89.8	59.4	60.7	47.2	48.0	
Medium (13)	Merced	84.3	86.6	88.8	89.7	54.0	55.4	39.0	40.2
	Monterey	83.1	89.4	90.5	91.5	58.5	59.2	43.3	45.7
	San Francisco	80.4	81.7	88.0	90.2	69.6	70.7	51.1	53.4
	Santa Barbara	74.9	85.8	85.9	89.2	59.3	60.9	45.6	47.6
	Sonoma	77.2	95.6	92.9	92.5	65.9	67.8	51.4	53.4
	Shasta	84.3	87.0	92.5	92.4	60.5	60.9	46.2	46.7
	Imperial	71.9	86.4	86.6	87.2	53.4	56.1	36.5	39.9
	Butte	81.2	93.3	91.6	93.0	61.8	63.5	49.0	50.6
	San Mateo	83.7	89.7	91.1	91.3	61.7	62.9	49.7	51.1
	Kings	86.0	90.2	90.3	91.5	65.5	66.8	43.5	44.7
	Placer	80.9	87.7	88.5	89.8	59.9	60.3	44.0	43.9
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	73.8	85.1	87.3	87.3	58.8	61.6	46.4	49.6
	Yolo	82.8	84.9	89.5	91.1	57.7	59.7	44.0	45.2
Total	80.3	87.8	89.5	90.6	60.2	61.6	45.3	47.1	
Small (12)	Humboldt	88.0	93.5	94.3	94.4	70.3	68.5	54.0	54.3
	El Dorado	83.2	89.6	93.4	94.1	61.9	63.6	52.6	53.6
	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras/Tuo	82.3	90.1	93.7	93.2	66.1	70.4	46.6	49.9
	Madera	87.9	96.5	91.2	88.4	60.6	60.4	48.5	46.1
	Sutter	76.3	84.8	88.2	88.1	59.1	61.1	41.2	42.3
	Mendocino	81.8	89.2	91.6	90.1	56.4	59.6	44.8	44.8
	San Luis Obispo	97.7	100.8	93.7	93.8	72.0	72.7	56.1	58.5
	Yuba	73.9	83.0	85.7	89.4	58.7	59.7	41.8	44.4
	Tehama	80.9	97.0	92.6	93.7	58.9	59.5	45.6	46.9
	Napa	83.7	87.1	90.7	91.4	64.4	66.7	50.9	54.3
	Sierra/Nevada	76.4	87.0	96.7	96.0	65.3	70.3	51.0	54.0
	Siskiyou/Modoc	87.4	94.4	94.1	94.4	66.3	64.3	50.5	50.0
Total	83.1	91.1	92.1	92.2	63.9	65.4	48.9	50.0	
Very Small (10)	Marin	89.7	93.8	92.4	94.7	65.6	68.4	51.7	54.3
	Lake	73.6	94.6	85.3	85.4	56.8	58.6	52.0	52.6
	Del Norte	91.2	91.8	92.6	93.5	59.1	57.8	44.8	42.5
	Glenn	81.1	84.9	91.4	93.4	58.2	58.6	43.6	45.4
	Lassen	77.4	88.3	90.2	89.8	62.2	65.6	45.0	47.0
	Inyo/Mono	83.4	87.8	93.9	94.0	67.0	65.0	44.7	44.0
	Plumas	89.7	91.5	95.0	96.0	63.5	67.9	50.5	51.9
	Colusa	81.9	83.7	85.9	87.0	61.3	63.1	49.7	51.0
	Trinity	89.1	87.4	91.6	94.8	54.8	53.0	45.8	43.0
	Mariposa	92.8	101.4	95.2	94.0	72.6	68.8	51.8	49.8
Total	83.6	90.8	91.0	91.9	62.7	64.0	48.0	48.4	
Regionalized LCSAs (12)	Alpine	40.0	90.5	98.4	93.4	85.7	73.8	46.6	49.1
	Amador	83.8	97.3	94.2	93.3	66.7	73.9	46.5	52.6
	Calaveras	78.8	87.5	93.2	93.4	65.2	70.2	46.7	49.6
	Inyo	86.9	87.4	94.6	94.3	66.4	61.0	42.3	41.4
	Modoc	81.8	92.6	94.7	93.2	64.7	63.9	50.2	46.7
	Mono	71.0	89.5	91.3	92.6	69.0	76.4	56.8	56.6
	Nevada	76.0	87.1	96.7	96.1	65.6	70.5	51.2	54.2
	San Benito	76.7	87.0	90.7	92.8	60.0	65.6	47.4	50.1
	Santa Cruz	72.7	84.4	85.9	85.3	58.5	60.5	46.1	49.4
	Sierra	90.1	86.3	96.8	94.8	56.4	62.4	43.5	49.2
	Siskiyou	88.4	94.7	94.0	94.6	66.6	64.4	50.5	50.4
	Tuolumne	85.1	88.7	93.8	93.0	68.9	68.9	49.8	48.8

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5a, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29

2/10/2012

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

Note: The formula for IV-D PEP is the current year line 6 divided by line 5a (previous year line 5). The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1. The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 29 divided by line 28.

** Statewide totals may not match CS 1257 due to adjustments made to line counts for data unassigned at the county level.

DECEMBER 2011

ATTACHMENT B
(p. 1 of 4)
TABLE 01.1.1

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES
AS CALCULATED IN SUPPORTING TABLES
DECEMBER 2011

		IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP) *	Cases with Support Orders Established	Collections on Current Support	Cases with Collections on Arrears
		From Table 1.1.1	From Table 1.2	From Table 1.3	From Table 1.4
STATEWIDE		81.8%	86.1%	59.7%	46.3%
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	72.1	79.9	56.9	44.3
	San Bernardino	87.6	84.0	57.5	43.5
	Riverside	84.7	81.1	56.4	44.0
	San Diego	76.9	85.3	61.3	48.2
	Sacramento	86.7	87.8	55.7	42.7
	Orange	77.1	87.4	61.4	46.5
	Total	77.8	82.9	58.1	44.8
Large (10)	Fresno	89.4	90.7	59.3	47.8
	Kern	89.6	83.6	58.8	43.9
	Santa Clara	87.6	89.9	58.4	48.9
	Alameda	85.6	89.1	64.4	56.6
	San Joaquin	93.0	91.6	60.2	46.0
	Stanislaus	84.9	92.6	59.7	44.1
	Contra Costa	84.8	90.1	61.4	49.5
	Tulare	79.6	91.0	62.3	44.4
	Ventura	93.9	93.8	63.6	52.6
	Solano	90.8	91.1	61.4	48.1
	Total	87.8	89.8	60.7	48.0
Medium (13)	Merced	86.6	89.7	55.4	40.2
	Monterey	89.4	91.5	59.2	45.7
	San Francisco	81.7	90.2	70.7	53.4
	Santa Barbara	85.8	89.2	60.9	47.6
	Sonoma	95.6	92.5	67.8	53.4
	Shasta	87.0	92.4	60.9	46.7
	Imperial	86.4	87.2	56.1	39.9
	Butte	93.3	93.0	63.5	50.6
	San Mateo	89.7	91.3	62.9	51.1
	Kings	90.2	91.5	66.8	44.7
	Placer	87.7	89.8	60.3	43.9
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	85.1	87.3	61.6	49.6
	Yolo	84.9	91.1	59.7	45.2
	Total	87.8	90.6	61.6	47.1
Small (12)	Humboldt	93.5	94.4	68.5	54.3
	El Dorado	89.6	94.1	63.6	53.6
	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras/Tuo	90.1	93.2	70.4	49.9
	Madera	96.5	88.4	60.4	46.1
	Sutter	84.8	88.1	61.1	42.3
	Mendocino	89.2	90.1	59.6	44.8
	San Luis Obispo	100.8	93.8	72.7	58.5
	Yuba	83.0	89.4	59.7	44.4
	Tehama	97.0	93.7	59.5	46.9
	Napa	87.1	91.4	66.7	54.3
	Sierra/Nevada	87.0	96.0	70.3	54.0
	Siskiyou/Modoc	94.4	94.4	64.3	50.0
	Total	91.1	92.2	65.4	50.0
Very Small (10)	Marin	93.8	94.7	68.4	54.3
	Lake	94.6	85.4	58.6	52.6
	Del Norte	91.8	93.5	57.8	42.5
	Glenn	84.9	93.4	58.6	45.4
	Lassen	88.3	89.8	65.6	47.0
	Inyo/Mono	87.8	94.0	65.0	44.0
	Plumas	91.5	96.0	67.9	51.9
	Colusa	83.7	87.0	63.1	51.0
	Trinity	87.4	94.8	53.0	43.0
Mariposa	101.4	94.0	68.8	49.8	
	Total	90.8	91.9	64.0	48.4
Regionalized LCSAs (12)	Alpine	90.5	93.4	73.8	49.1
	Amador	97.3	93.3	73.9	52.6
	Calaveras	87.5	93.4	70.2	49.6
	Inyo	87.4	94.3	61.0	41.4
	Modoc	92.6	93.2	63.9	46.7
	Mono	89.5	92.6	76.4	56.6
	Nevada	87.1	96.1	70.5	54.2
	San Benito	87.0	92.8	65.6	50.1
	Santa Cruz	84.4	85.3	60.5	49.4
	Sierra	86.3	94.8	62.4	49.2
	Siskiyou	94.7	94.6	64.4	50.4
	Tuolumne	88.7	93.0	68.9	48.8

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5a, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29

2/10/2012

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

Note: The formula for IV-D PEP is the current year line 6 divided by line 5a (previous year line 5). The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1. The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 29 divided by line 28.

* Statewide totals may not match CS 1257 due to adjustments made to line counts for data unassigned at the county level.

DECEMBER 2011

B
(P. 2 of 4)

TABLE 1

**TABLE 1b
FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES RANKED
BASED ON CALCULATIONS IN SUPPORTING TABLES
DECEMBER 2011**

STATEWIDE	IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP) * From Table 1.1.1	Rank	Cases with Support Orders Established From Table 1.2	Rank	Collections on Current Support From Table 1.3	Rank	Cases with Collections on Arrears From Table 1.4	Rank
	81.8%		86.1%		59.7%		46.3%	
Alameda	85.6	37	89.1	38	64.4	14	56.6	2
Alameda/Alpine/Calaveras/Tuo	90.1	17	93.2	15	70.4	3	49.9	17
Butte	93.3	11	93.0	16	63.5	18	50.6	15
Colusa	83.7	45	87.0	45	63.1	19	51.0	14
Contra Costa	84.8	43	90.1	31	61.4	24	49.5	20
Del Norte	91.8	13	93.5	13	57.8	44	42.5	48
El Dorado	89.6	19	94.1	7	63.6	16	53.6	7
Fresno	89.4	21	90.7	28	59.3	38	47.8	24
Glenn	84.9	41	93.4	14	58.6	41	45.4	33
Humboldt	83.5	10	94.4	6	68.5	6	54.3	5
Imperial	86.4	35	87.2	44	56.1	48	39.9	51
Inyo/Mono	87.8	25	94.0	9	65.0	13	44.0	42
Kern	89.6	20	83.6	49	58.8	40	43.9	43
Kings	90.2	16	91.5	22	66.8	10	44.7	36
Lake	94.6	6	85.4	46	58.6	42	52.6	10
Lassen	88.3	24	89.8	34	65.6	12	47.0	26
Los Angeles	72.1	51	79.9	51	56.9	46	44.3	39
Madera	86.5	4	88.4	39	60.4	30	46.1	30
Marin	93.8	9	94.7	4	68.4	7	54.3	3
Mariposa	101.4	1	94.0	8	68.8	5	49.8	18
Mendocino	89.2	23	90.1	30	59.6	36	44.8	35
Merced	86.6	34	89.7	35	55.4	50	40.2	50
Monterey	89.4	22	91.5	21	59.2	39	45.7	32
Napa	87.1	30	91.4	23	66.7	11	54.3	4
Orange	77.1	49	87.4	42	61.4	23	46.5	29
Placer	87.7	26	89.8	33	60.3	31	43.9	44
Plumas	91.5	14	96.0	1	67.9	8	51.9	12
Riverside	84.7	44	81.1	50	56.4	47	44.0	41
Sacramento	86.7	33	87.8	41	55.7	49	42.7	47
San Bernardino	87.6	28	84.0	48	57.5	45	43.5	45
San Diego	76.9	50	85.3	47	61.3	26	48.2	22
San Francisco	81.7	47	90.2	29	70.7	2	53.4	9
San Joaquin	93.0	12	91.6	20	60.2	32	46.0	31
San Luis Obispo	100.8	2	93.8	10	72.7	1	58.5	1
San Mateo	89.7	18	91.3	24	62.9	20	51.1	13
Santa Barbara	85.8	36	89.2	37	60.9	28	47.6	25
Santa Clara	87.6	27	89.9	32	58.4	43	48.9	21
Santa Cruz/San Benito	85.1	38	87.3	43	61.6	22	49.6	19
Shasta	87.0	32	92.4	19	60.9	29	46.7	28
Sierra/Nevada	87.0	31	96.0	2	70.3	4	54.0	6
Siskiyou/Modoc	94.4	7	94.4	5	64.3	15	50.0	16
Solano	90.8	15	91.1	26	61.4	25	48.1	23
Sonoma	95.6	5	92.5	18	67.8	9	53.4	8
Stanislaus	84.9	40	92.6	17	59.7	33	44.1	40
Sutter	84.8	42	88.1	40	61.1	27	42.3	49
Tehama	97.0	3	93.7	12	59.5	37	46.9	27
Trinity	87.4	29	94.8	3	53.0	51	43.0	46
Tulare	79.6	48	91.0	27	62.3	21	44.4	37
Ventura	93.9	8	93.8	11	63.6	17	52.6	11
Yolo	84.9	39	91.1	25	59.7	34	45.2	34
Yuba	83.0	46	89.4	36	59.7	35	44.4	38

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5a, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29

Notes: The formula for IV-D PEP is the current year line 6 divided by line 5a (previous year line 5). The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1.

The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 25 divided by line 28.

* Statewide totals may not match CS 1257 due to adjustments made to line counts for data unassigned at the county level.

2/10/2012

3
(p. 3 of 4)

DECEMBER 2011

TABLE 2.1
LOCAL AGENCY CASES BY CASE TYPE
USING POINT-IN-TIME DATA
DECEMBER 2011

		Cases		Current Assistance		Former Assistance		Never Assistance	
		(Line 1)	Cases	Percentage	Cases	Percentage	Cases	Percentage	
	STATEWIDE	1,388,283	393,175	28.3%	671,910	48.4%	323,198	23.3%	
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	321,522	103,095	32.1	147,440	45.9	70,987	22.1	
	San Bernardino	120,647	40,037	33.2	56,748	47.0	23,862	19.8	
	Riverside	91,172	27,439	30.1	43,516	47.7	20,217	22.2	
	San Diego	85,810	20,270	23.6	37,514	43.7	28,026	32.7	
	Sacramento	83,618	24,741	29.6	43,088	51.5	15,789	18.9	
	Orange	76,222	17,544	23.0	30,631	40.2	28,047	36.8	
	Total	778,991	233,126	29.9	358,937	46.1	186,928	24.0	
Large (10)	Fresno	60,666	19,091	31.5	33,144	54.6	8,431	13.9	
	Kern	53,101	17,887	33.7	25,488	48.0	9,726	18.3	
	Santa Clara	43,273	9,989	23.1	22,777	52.6	10,507	24.3	
	Alameda	35,322	7,887	22.3	17,583	49.8	9,852	27.9	
	San Joaquin	34,718	10,717	30.9	17,228	49.6	6,773	19.5	
	Stanislaus	31,945	8,972	28.1	17,206	53.9	5,767	18.1	
	Contra Costa	30,739	8,367	27.2	13,700	44.6	8,672	28.2	
	Tulare	30,170	8,326	27.6	17,177	56.9	4,667	15.5	
	Ventura	21,692	3,946	18.2	10,340	47.7	7,406	34.1	
	Solano	19,311	4,816	24.9	10,001	51.8	4,494	23.3	
	Total	360,937	99,998	27.7	184,644	51.2	76,295	21.1	
Medium (13)	Merced	18,213	5,596	30.7	9,530	52.3	3,087	16.9	
	Monterey	18,065	4,254	23.5	9,161	50.7	4,650	25.7	
	San Francisco	15,009	3,164	21.1	7,803	52.0	4,042	26.9	
	Santa Barbara	14,541	3,657	25.1	7,415	51.0	3,469	23.9	
	Sonoma	13,661	3,109	22.8	6,772	49.6	3,780	27.7	
	Shasta	13,269	3,330	25.1	7,576	57.1	2,363	17.8	
	Imperial	12,480	3,689	29.6	5,954	47.7	2,837	22.7	
	Butte	12,224	2,863	23.4	7,285	59.6	2,076	17.0	
	San Mateo	11,987	2,318	19.3	4,913	41.0	4,756	39.7	
	Kings	10,266	2,810	27.4	5,424	52.8	2,032	19.8	
	Placer	9,529	1,798	18.9	4,536	47.6	3,195	33.5	
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	9,307	2,370	25.5	4,613	49.6	2,324	25.0	
	Yolo	8,593	1,824	21.2	4,916	57.2	1,853	21.6	
Total	167,144	40,782	24.4	85,898	51.4	40,464	24.2		
Small (12)	Humboldt	6,931	1,596	23.0	3,655	52.7	1,680	24.2	
	El Dorado	6,593	1,212	18.4	3,605	54.7	1,776	26.9	
	Amador/Alpine/Calaveras/Tuc	6,529	1,576	24.1	3,437	52.6	1,516	23.2	
	Madera	6,593	2,147	32.6	3,019	45.8	1,427	21.6	
	Sutter	5,311	1,312	24.7	2,875	54.1	1,124	21.2	
	Mendocino	5,217	1,284	24.6	2,930	56.2	1,003	19.2	
	San Luis Obispo	4,881	1,306	26.8	2,134	43.7	1,441	29.5	
	Yuba	4,736	1,258	26.6	2,748	58.0	730	15.4	
	Tehama	4,447	1,269	28.5	2,426	54.6	752	16.9	
	Napa	4,273	782	18.3	1,966	46.0	1,525	35.7	
	Sierra/Nevada	4,142	751	18.1	2,265	54.7	1,126	27.2	
	Siskiyou/Modoc	3,924	816	20.8	2,318	59.1	790	20.1	
Total	63,577	15,309	24.1	33,378	52.5	14,890	23.4		
Very Small (10)	Marin	3,012	647	21.5	1,142	37.9	1,223	40.6	
	Lake	2,939	776	26.4	1,604	54.6	559	19.0	
	Del Norte	2,896	765	26.4	1,594	55.0	537	18.5	
	Glenn	1,872	435	23.2	1,060	56.6	377	20.1	
	Lassen	1,874	455	24.3	978	52.2	441	23.5	
	Inyo/Mono	1,593	151	9.5	843	52.9	599	37.6	
	Plumas	1,080	224	20.7	579	53.6	277	25.6	
	Colusa	818	182	22.2	393	48.0	243	29.7	
	Trinity	795	138	17.4	497	62.5	160	20.1	
	Mariposa	755	187	24.8	363	48.1	205	27.2	
Total	17,634	3,960	22.5	9,053	51.3	4,621	26.2		
Regionalized LCSAs (12)	Alpine	61	3	4.9	47	77.0	11	18.0	
	Amador	1,486	350	23.6	748	50.3	388	26.1	
	Calaveras	1,917	487	25.4	1,022	53.3	408	21.3	
	Inyo	1,283	120	9.4	726	56.6	437	34.1	
	Modoc	455	104	22.9	221	48.6	130	28.6	
	Mono	310	31	10.0	117	37.7	162	52.3	
	Nevada	3,989	721	18.1	2,179	54.6	1,089	27.3	
	San Benito	2,472	691	28.0	1,313	53.1	468	18.9	
	Santa Cruz	6,835	1,679	24.6	3,300	48.3	1,856	27.2	
	Sierra	153	30	19.6	86	56.2	37	24.2	
	Siskiyou	3,469	712	20.5	2,097	60.4	660	19.0	
	Tuolumne	3,065	736	24.0	1,620	52.9	709	23.1	

SOURCE: CS 1257 Line 1 (Point-in-Time)

2/10/2012

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

Note: The percentage of cases in each assistance category are calculated by taking the number of cases (line 1) by assistance type for each LCSA and dividing by the total number of cases for that LCSA.

DECEMBER 2011

TABLE 01.1.1
COMPARISON OF FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES
AS CALCULATED IN SUPPORTING TABLES
JUNE 2014 and 2015

		IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP)		Cases with Support Orders Established		Collections on Current Support		Cases with Collections on Arrears	
		Jun 2014	Jun 2015	Jun 2014	Jun 2015	Jun 2014	Jun 2015	Jun 2014	Jun 2015
			From Table 1.1.1		From Table 1.2		From Table 1.3		From Table 1.4
	STATEWIDE	97.4%	98.0%	89.0%	89.1%	64.5%	66.3%	62.5%	63.3%
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	92.1	92.3	84.3	83.4	59.8	61.5	59.7	59.9
	San Bernardino	97.6	97.2	87.5	88.3	63.7	65.2	62.3	63.5
	Riverside	97.3	98.5	84.9	86.2	62.5	64.5	60.7	62.8
	San Diego	95.9	97.9	87.5	88.2	69.3	70.6	66.5	68.1
	Sacramento	100.0	101.3	91.4	92.4	63.1	65.1	60.2	60.1
	Orange	99.0	99.5	88.7	90.1	65.8	67.0	64.7	65.3
	Total	95.3	95.8	86.5	86.7	63.1	64.7	61.7	62.5
Large (10)	Fresno	101.1	104.4	91.8	90.6	61.5	64.6	60.5	62.2
	Kern	95.5	97.2	87.7	85.7	60.4	62.0	55.7	55.7
	Santa Clara	101.6	98.5	91.5	92.8	63.6	66.2	64.5	66.1
	Alameda	98.3	97.6	89.7	89.9	69.0	72.1	72.5	74.3
	San Joaquin	103.5	101.8	93.2	93.1	65.0	66.5	61.1	62.0
	Stanislaus	99.9	98.5	92.4	93.2	65.1	67.2	60.3	61.4
	Contra Costa	98.9	100.3	92.8	94.5	66.7	68.6	65.4	67.1
	Tulare	96.7	99.1	93.3	95.4	71.4	73.5	59.7	60.5
	Ventura	105.4	105.7	93.7	94.0	66.9	68.2	68.2	68.8
	Solano	102.9	101.8	93.2	92.9	66.4	67.7	65.4	66.5
	Total	99.9	100.4	91.5	91.5	65.0	67.1	62.7	63.8
Medium (13)	Merced	101.7	103.0	91.7	91.9	64.1	66.4	60.1	59.7
	Monterey	101.6	104.0	93.4	93.4	63.0	64.7	63.1	64.3
	San Francisco	95.0	96.3	90.7	91.3	73.7	75.1	68.0	69.0
	Santa Barbara	100.9	103.5	93.0	92.8	67.0	68.1	68.7	69.4
	Sonoma	104.1	103.4	95.2	95.8	71.9	74.8	70.4	70.3
	Shasta	100.1	99.3	92.6	93.9	66.6	69.5	60.4	60.3
	Imperial	102.0	104.6	91.7	91.1	64.5	64.7	58.5	59.5
	Butte	102.4	101.8	93.6	94.4	66.7	69.0	63.9	63.1
	San Mateo	99.5	99.1	92.2	92.8	68.1	69.8	66.9	67.8
	Kings	101.6	100.4	93.1	92.7	68.4	69.6	60.5	60.3
	Placer	96.7	100.4	93.7	93.9	65.8	68.4	61.8	64.1
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	100.8	104.2	93.1	93.0	67.2	66.7	66.0	66.9
	Yolo	101.4	100.7	93.0	93.1	65.6	69.6	60.3	64.1
Total	100.7	101.8	92.8	93.1	66.9	68.7	63.8	64.5	
Small (12)	Humboldt	102.5	100.6	95.0	94.7	70.5	70.2	67.9	67.5
	El Dorado	98.6	103.1	94.7	94.9	68.9	69.4	66.0	64.4
	Ama/Alp/Cala/Tuol	105.2	101.5	95.3	95.4	74.7	77.3	68.0	70.3
	Madera	110.3	119.8	92.5	92.2	62.6	65.2	64.8	64.9
	Sutter	103.8	106.3	89.6	88.5	66.7	69.6	58.8	61.7
	Mendocino	101.4	100.9	93.5	93.7	66.8	67.3	62.1	62.8
	San Luis Obispo	113.5	116.9	95.0	96.1	78.5	78.2	79.3	78.9
	Yuba	104.4	100.0	90.8	91.0	65.9	68.3	59.5	61.4
	Tehama	106.5	103.8	92.9	93.3	64.1	67.3	59.5	58.7
	Napa	101.3	102.2	94.2	94.9	69.2	68.6	66.4	66.3
	Sierra/Nevada	99.6	100.8	95.9	96.0	75.7	77.2	68.0	68.4
	Siskiyou/Modoc	102.9	103.9	94.6	95.1	69.9	71.3	62.3	60.9
Total	104.5	105.6	93.7	93.7	70.0	71.2	65.3	65.6	
Very Small (10)	Marin	100.6	103.2	96.5	96.3	78.9	79.2	73.3	74.1
	Lake	104.4	103.8	86.1	87.1	61.8	64.1	64.7	64.8
	Del Norte	97.0	99.0	90.5	93.0	62.4	62.8	54.5	53.3
	Glenn	111.7	104.4	94.4	96.4	64.2	65.5	62.0	60.1
	Lassen	106.0	101.5	91.0	93.4	69.3	72.8	60.4	60.1
	Inyo/Mono	104.6	97.3	92.8	94.3	70.6	74.2	64.1	64.1
	Plumas	104.6	105.6	96.3	96.5	70.7	72.9	69.0	68.1
	Colusa	105.9	100.0	89.5	88.5	66.2	68.2	65.3	70.0
	Trinity	107.0	99.0	91.6	92.3	62.3	62.1	64.4	62.0
	Mariposa	99.7	103.8	95.9	95.3	67.6	69.6	67.8	67.0
Total	103.4	102.0	91.9	93.0	70.7	71.8	63.9	63.5	
Regionalized LCSAs (12)	Alpine	90.5	82.4	100.0	94.9	73.8	80.0	68.9	75.0
	Amador	109.7	98.8	96.7	94.9	77.9	82.3	71.4	72.9
	Calaveras	103.5	107.1	95.0	94.6	73.6	78.2	69.0	71.8
	Inyo	104.2	97.1	92.8	94.0	68.9	74.0	62.2	61.8
	Modoc	97.8	106.3	93.6	94.6	65.6	70.3	54.3	59.6
	Mono	106.4	98.3	92.7	95.5	75.3	74.8	73.2	74.3
	Nevada	99.4	100.9	96.0	96.0	75.6	77.0	68.1	68.5
	San Benito	99.1	104.8	92.8	95.3	71.0	69.2	66.8	65.7
	Santa Cruz	101.5	103.9	93.2	92.2	66.0	65.9	65.7	67.4
	Sierra	106.8	97.7	94.9	95.8	76.4	82.5	64.7	66.3
	Siskiyou	103.7	103.5	94.8	95.2	70.8	71.4	63.3	61.1
	Tuolumne	104.3	99.5	94.8	96.1	73.7	74.5	65.7	68.2

JUNE 2015

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5a, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

Note: The formula for IV-D PEP is line 6 divided by line 5a. The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1. The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 29 divided by line 28.

ATTACHMENT C

TABLE 01.1.1

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES
AS CALCULATED IN SUPPORTING TABLES
JUNE 2015

		IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP)	Cases with Support Orders Established	Collections on Current Support	Cases with Collections on Arrears
		From Table 1.1.1	From Table 1.2	From Table 1.3	From Table 1.4
	STATEWIDE	98.0%	89.1%	66.3%	63.3%
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	92.3	83.4	61.5	59.9
	San Bernardino	97.2	88.3	65.2	63.5
	Riverside	98.5	86.2	64.5	62.8
	San Diego	97.9	88.2	70.6	68.1
	Sacramento	101.3	92.4	65.1	60.1
	Orange	99.5	90.1	67.0	65.3
	Total	95.8	86.7	64.7	62.5
Large (10)	Fresno	104.4	90.6	64.6	62.2
	Kern	97.2	85.7	62.0	55.7
	Santa Clara	98.5	92.8	66.2	66.1
	Alameda	97.6	89.9	72.1	74.3
	San Joaquin	101.8	93.1	66.5	62.0
	Stanislaus	98.5	93.2	67.2	61.4
	Contra Costa	100.3	94.5	68.6	67.1
	Tulare	99.1	95.4	73.5	60.5
	Ventura	105.7	94.0	68.2	68.8
	Solano	101.8	92.9	67.7	66.5
	Total	100.4	91.5	67.1	63.8
Medium (13)	Merced	103.0	91.9	66.4	59.7
	Monterey	104.0	93.4	64.7	64.3
	San Francisco	96.3	91.3	75.1	69.0
	Santa Barbara	103.5	92.8	68.1	69.4
	Sonoma	103.4	95.8	74.8	70.3
	Shasta	99.3	93.9	69.5	60.3
	Imperial	104.6	91.1	64.7	59.5
	Butte	101.8	94.4	69.0	63.1
	San Mateo	99.1	92.8	69.8	67.8
	Kings	100.4	92.7	69.6	60.3
	Placer	100.4	93.9	68.4	64.1
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	104.2	93.0	66.7	66.9
	Yolo	100.7	93.1	69.6	64.1
Total	101.8	93.1	68.7	64.5	
Small (12)	Humboldt	100.6	94.7	70.2	67.5
	El Dorado	103.1	94.9	69.4	64.4
	Ama/Alp/Cala/Tuol	101.5	95.4	77.3	70.3
	Madera	119.8	92.2	65.2	64.9
	Sutter	106.3	88.5	69.6	61.7
	Mendocino	100.9	93.7	67.3	62.8
	San Luis Obispo	116.9	96.1	78.2	78.9
	Yuba	100.0	91.0	68.3	61.4
	Tehama	103.8	93.3	67.3	58.7
	Napa	102.2	94.9	68.6	66.3
	Sierra/Nevada	100.8	96.0	77.2	68.4
	Siskiyou/Modoc	103.9	95.1	71.3	60.9
Total	105.6	93.7	71.2	65.6	
Very Small (10)	Marin	103.2	96.3	79.2	74.1
	Lake	103.8	87.1	64.1	64.8
	Del Norte	99.0	93.0	62.8	53.3
	Glenn	104.4	96.4	65.5	60.1
	Lassen	101.5	93.4	72.8	60.1
	Inyo/Mono	97.3	94.3	74.2	64.1
	Plumas	105.6	96.5	72.9	68.1
	Colusa	100.0	88.5	68.2	70.0
	Trinity	99.0	92.3	62.1	62.0
	Mariposa	103.8	95.3	69.6	67.0
Total	102.0	93.0	71.8	63.5	
Regionalized LCSAs (12)	Alpine	82.4	94.9	80.0	75.0
	Amador	98.8	94.9	82.3	72.9
	Calaveras	107.1	94.6	78.2	71.8
	Inyo	97.1	94.0	74.0	61.8
	Modoc	106.3	94.6	70.3	59.6
	Mono	98.3	95.5	74.8	74.3
	Nevada	100.9	96.0	77.0	68.5
	San Benito	104.8	95.3	69.2	65.7
	Santa Cruz	103.9	92.2	65.9	67.4
	Sierra	97.7	95.8	82.5	66.3
	Siskiyou	103.5	95.2	71.4	61.1
	Tuolumne	99.5	96.1	74.5	68.2

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5a, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29

7/6/2015

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

Note: The formula for IV-D PEP is line 6 divided by line 5a. The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1. The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 29 divided by line 28.

JUNE 2015

TABLE 1

C
(p. 2 of 4)

TABLE 1b
FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES RANKED
AS CALCULATED IN SUPPORTING TABLES
JUNE 2015

IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage (PEP)		Cases with Support Orders Established		Collections on Current Support		Cases with Collections on Arrears	
Rank	Percentage	Rank	Established	Rank	Current Support	Rank	Collections on Arrears
From Table 1.1.1		From Table 1.2		From Table 1.3		From Table 1.4	
98.0%		89.1%		66.3%		63.3%	
STATEWIDE							
Alameda	97.6	Alameda	43	Alameda	11	Alameda	2
Alameda/Alip/Calaveras	101.5	Alameda/Alip/Calaveras	7	Alameda/Alip/Calaveras	3	Alameda/Alip/Calaveras	74.3
Butte	101.8	Butte	15	Butte	22	Butte	63.1
Colusa	100.0	Colusa	45	Colusa	28	Colusa	70.0
Contra Costa	100.3	Contra Costa	14	Contra Costa	24	Contra Costa	67.1
Del Norte	99.0	Del Norte	28	Del Norte	48	Del Norte	53.3
El Dorado	103.1	El Dorado	11	El Dorado	21	El Dorado	64.4
Fresno	104.4	Fresno	41	Fresno	45	Fresno	62.2
Glenn	104.4	Glenn	2	Glenn	39	Glenn	60.1
Humboldt	100.6	Humboldt	13	Humboldt	14	Humboldt	67.5
Imperial	104.6	Imperial	6	Imperial	44	Imperial	59.5
Inyo/Mono	97.3	Inyo/Mono	47	Inyo/Mono	7	Inyo/Mono	64.1
Kern	97.2	Kern	50	Kern	27	Kern	55.7
Kings	100.4	Kings	32	Kings	50	Kings	60.3
Lake	103.8	Lake	12	Lake	19	Lake	64.8
Lassen	101.5	Lassen	48	Lassen	47	Lassen	60.1
Los Angeles	92.3	Los Angeles	21	Los Angeles	10	Los Angeles	60.1
Madera	119.8	Madera	51	Madera	51	Madera	59.9
Marin	103.2	Madera	36	Madera	22	Madera	64.9
Mariposa	103.8	Marin	3	Marin	41	Marin	74.1
Mendocino	100.9	Mariposa	9	Mariposa	1	Mariposa	67.0
Merced	100.9	Mendocino	3	Mendocino	18	Mendocino	62.8
Monterey	103.0	Merced	20	Merced	32	Merced	59.7
Napa	104.0	Monterey	37	Merced	47	Merced	64.3
Napa	102.2	Monterey	22	Monterey	43	Monterey	66.3
Orange	99.5	Napa	42	Napa	34	Napa	65.3
Placer	100.4	Orange	19	Orange	25	Orange	64.1
Plumas	105.6	Placer	42	Placer	34	Placer	68.1
Riverside	98.5	Plumas	1	Plumas	9	Plumas	62.8
Sacramento	101.3	Riverside	49	Riverside	46	Riverside	60.1
San Bernardino	97.2	Sacramento	34	Sacramento	42	Sacramento	63.5
San Diego	97.9	San Bernardino	46	San Bernardino	40	San Bernardino	68.1
San Francisco	96.3	San Diego	47	San Bernardino	13	San Bernardino	69.0
San Joaquin	101.8	San Francisco	38	San Francisco	5	San Francisco	62.0
San Luis Obispo	116.9	San Joaquin	26	San Joaquin	36	San Joaquin	78.9
San Mateo	99.1	San Luis Obispo	4	San Luis Obispo	2	San Luis Obispo	67.8
Santa Barbara	103.5	San Mateo	30	San Mateo	15	San Mateo	69.4
Santa Clara	98.5	Santa Barbara	31	Santa Barbara	29	Santa Barbara	66.1
Santa Cruz/San Benito	104.2	Santa Clara	32	Santa Barbara	38	Santa Clara	66.9
Shasta	99.3	Santa Cruz/San Benito	27	Santa Cruz/San Benito	35	Santa Cruz/San Benito	60.3
Sierra/Nevada	100.8	Shasta	18	Shasta	20	Shasta	68.4
Siskiyou/Modoc	103.9	Sierra/Nevada	5	Sierra/Nevada	4	Sierra/Nevada	60.9
Solano	101.8	Siskiyou/Modoc	10	Siskiyou/Modoc	12	Siskiyou/Modoc	66.5
Sonoma	103.4	Solano	29	Solano	30	Solano	70.3
Stanislaus	98.5	Sonoma	6	Sonoma	6	Sonoma	61.4
Sutter	106.3	Stanislaus	24	Stanislaus	33	Stanislaus	51.7
Tehama	103.8	Sutter	44	Sutter	16	Sutter	58.7
Trinity	99.0	Tehama	23	Tehama	31	Tehama	62.0
Tulare	99.1	Trinity	35	Trinity	49	Trinity	60.5
Ventura	105.7	Tulare	8	Tulare	8	Tulare	68.8
Yolo	100.7	Ventura	17	Ventura	27	Ventura	64.1
Yuba	100.0	Yolo	25	Yolo	17	Yolo	61.4
		Yuba	40	Yuba	26	Yuba	61.4

SOURCE: CS 1257 Lines 1, 2, 5a, 6, 24, 25, 28, 29
Note: The formula for IV-D PEP is line 6 divided by line 5a. The formula for Cases with Support Orders Established is line 2 divided by line 1. The formula for Collections on Current Support is line 25 divided by line 24. The formula for Cases with Collections on Arrears is line 29 divided by line 28.

TABLE 1b

(p. 3 of 4)

JUNE 2015

TABLE 2.1
LOCAL AGENCY CASES BY CASE TYPE
USING POINT-IN-TIME DATA
JUNE 2015

		Cases		Current Assistance		Former Assistance		Never Assistance	
		(Line 1)	Cases	Percentage	Cases	Percentage	Cases	Percentage	
STATEWIDE		1,249,348	334,105	26.7%	636,532	50.9%	278,711	22.3%	
Very Large (6)	Los Angeles	279,310	91,923	32.9	127,642	45.7	59,745	21.4	
	San Bernardino	113,892	35,064	30.8	58,632	51.5	20,196	17.7	
	Riverside	81,191	22,483	27.7	41,140	50.7	17,568	21.6	
	San Diego	72,136	15,632	21.7	32,934	45.7	23,570	32.7	
	Sacramento	76,828	20,417	26.6	43,118	56.1	13,293	17.3	
	Orange	67,985	14,482	21.3	29,290	43.1	24,213	35.6	
	Total	691,342	200,001	28.9	332,756	48.1	158,585	22.9	
Large (10)	Fresno	57,388	17,872	31.1	32,491	56.6	7,025	12.2	
	Kern	51,939	15,926	30.7	27,195	52.4	8,818	17.0	
	Santa Clara	37,425	6,864	18.3	21,096	56.4	9,465	25.3	
	Alameda	32,154	6,896	21.4	16,257	50.6	9,001	28.0	
	San Joaquin	36,720	10,051	27.4	20,271	55.2	6,398	17.4	
	Stanislaus	30,065	8,008	26.6	17,205	57.2	4,852	16.1	
	Contra Costa	28,816	6,426	22.3	14,181	49.2	8,209	28.5	
	Tulare	25,066	5,316	21.2	15,709	62.7	4,041	16.1	
	Ventura	21,295	3,921	18.4	10,532	49.5	6,842	32.1	
	Solano	16,876	3,647	21.6	9,330	55.3	3,899	23.1	
	Total	337,744	84,927	25.1	184,267	54.6	68,550	20.3	
Medium (13)	Merced	16,771	5,235	31.2	9,239	55.1	2,297	13.7	
	Monterey	16,422	3,424	20.9	8,926	54.4	4,072	24.8	
	San Francisco	12,832	2,521	19.6	6,930	54.0	3,381	26.3	
	Santa Barbara	12,441	2,711	21.8	6,672	53.6	3,058	24.6	
	Sonoma	11,976	2,112	17.6	6,182	51.6	3,682	30.7	
	Shasta	12,119	2,720	22.4	7,359	60.7	2,040	16.8	
	Imperial	10,506	2,818	26.8	5,508	52.4	2,180	20.8	
	Butte	11,068	2,574	23.3	6,726	60.8	1,768	16.0	
	San Mateo	10,533	1,570	14.9	4,599	43.7	4,364	41.4	
	Kings	9,478	2,479	26.2	5,232	55.2	1,767	18.6	
	Placer	8,705	1,326	15.2	4,453	51.2	2,926	33.6	
	Santa Cruz/San Benito	7,944	1,662	20.9	4,264	53.7	2,018	25.4	
	Yolo	7,915	1,565	19.8	4,742	59.9	1,608	20.3	
Total	148,710	32,717	22.0	80,832	54.4	35,161	23.6		
Small (12)	Humboldt	6,102	1,399	22.9	3,366	55.2	1,337	21.9	
	El Dorado	5,900	1,134	19.2	3,273	55.5	1,493	25.3	
	Alameda/Calaveras/Tuolumne	5,591	1,259	22.5	3,103	55.5	1,229	22.0	
	Madera	6,184	2,101	34.0	2,964	47.9	1,119	18.1	
	Sutter	4,763	1,190	25.0	2,617	54.9	956	20.1	
	Mendocino	4,292	1,000	23.3	2,547	59.3	745	17.4	
	San Luis Obispo	3,929	851	21.7	1,724	43.9	1,354	34.5	
	Yuba	4,259	1,144	26.9	2,454	57.6	661	15.5	
	Tehama	4,098	1,113	27.2	2,372	57.9	613	15.0	
	Napa	3,776	604	16.0	1,745	46.2	1,427	37.8	
	Sierra/Nevada	3,392	578	17.0	1,924	56.7	890	26.2	
	Siskiyou/Modoc	3,338	709	21.2	2,020	60.5	609	18.2	
Total	55,624	13,082	23.5	30,109	54.1	12,433	22.4		
Very Small (10)	Marin	2,556	359	14.0	1,107	43.3	1,090	42.6	
	Lake	2,899	828	28.6	1,537	53.0	534	18.4	
	Del Norte	2,770	669	24.2	1,671	60.3	430	15.5	
	Glenn	1,670	391	23.4	963	57.7	316	18.9	
	Lassen	1,677	410	24.4	904	53.9	363	21.6	
	Inyo/Mono	1,353	102	7.5	731	54.0	520	38.4	
	Plumas	943	208	22.1	512	54.3	223	23.6	
	Colusa	746	145	19.4	391	52.4	210	28.2	
	Trinity	675	130	19.3	421	62.4	124	18.4	
	Mariposa	639	136	21.3	331	51.8	172	26.9	
Total	15,928	3,378	21.2	8,568	53.8	3,982	25.0		
Regionalized LCSAs (12)	Alpine	39	1	2.6	26	66.7	12	30.8	
	Amador	1,245	248	19.9	687	55.2	310	24.9	
	Calaveras	1,657	429	25.9	894	54.0	334	20.2	
	Inyo	1,089	88	8.1	623	57.2	378	34.7	
	Modoc	390	94	24.1	204	52.3	92	23.6	
	Mono	264	14	5.3	108	40.9	142	53.8	
	Nevada	3,272	557	17.0	1,855	56.7	860	26.3	
	San Benito	2,132	457	21.4	1,228	57.6	447	21.0	
	Santa Cruz	5,812	1,205	20.7	3,036	52.2	1,571	27.0	
	Sierra	120	21	17.5	69	57.5	30	25.0	
	Siskiyou	2,948	615	20.9	1,816	61.6	517	17.5	
	Tuolumne	2,650	581	21.9	1,496	56.5	573	21.6	

SOURCE: CS 1257 Line 1 (Point-in-Time)

7/6/2015

Total: Represents the total of the scores in the Caseload Grouping

Note: The Percentage of Cases in each assistance category is calculated by dividing the number of Cases in each assistance category by the total number of Cases for each individual LCSA.

JUNE 2015

TABLE 2.1

(p. 4 of 4)

Bernabe, Carolynn

Sent: Monday, August 24, 2015 9:17 AM
To: Family Juvenile Comm
Subject: AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee meeting comment
Attachments: AB 1058 Funding Reallocation Letter 8.21.15.pdf

Attached please find a letter on behalf of our court's administration and judicial officers regarding the proposed reallocation of funds.

Gary Slossberg
Family Law Facilitator
El Dorado Superior Court
495 Main Street
Placerville, CA 95667
tel: 530.621.6433
fax: 530.622.9774
email: gslossberg@eldoradocourt.org

Walk-in services are provided on every Tuesday and Wednesday from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. and on every Friday from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. on a first-come, first-serve basis.

NOTICE: This E-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521. The contents of this message, together with any attachments, are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed and may contain information that is legally privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this message, or any attachment, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by return E-mail and delete this message, along with any attachments, from your computer. Thank you.

Thanks,

Carolynn C. Bernabe, Senior Administrative Coordinator
Center for Families, Children & the Courts | Operations & Programs Division
Judicial Council of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
415-865-7556 | carolynn.bernabe@jud.ca.gov | www.courts.ca.gov



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF EL DORADO

495 Main Street
Placerville, California 95667

August 21, 2015

AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee
Judicial Council of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

Dear Subcommittee Members:

I am submitting this comment for consideration at the August 25 meeting of the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee on behalf of the Presiding Judge, Assistant Presiding Judge, and Court Executive Officer of the El Dorado Superior Court. Our Court has serious concerns about the proposed reallocation using the RAS reporting data, as it would have devastating consequences for our AB 1058 program. Even with the current levels of funding, our Commissioner program exhausts virtually all of its funds, while the Facilitator program has had to expend an average of \$36,804 per year in additional funds over the past 3 years from other funding sources to maintain its level of service. Any further cuts threaten to cripple both programs. With that in mind, we request that the Subcommittee consider the following.

The RAS reporting data is an incomplete measurement of Facilitator and Commissioner workloads.

Using the RAS reporting data is problematic for many reasons. First, by only counting cases opened by DCSS, it fails to include the entire caseload handled by Family Law Facilitators and Child Support Commissioners. Often, DCSS will intervene in an existing family law case, and the frequency of such interventions, as opposed to the opening of an independent child support case, may vary from county to county depending upon the programmatic preferences of the individual offices. Therefore, this measurement poorly reflects the true workload in each county.

Additionally, the number of existing cases does not account for the level of activity of each case. Whereas one county may have several cases with minimal activity (e.g., due to difficulty locating and serving the obligor or a high number of default cases), others may have a high number of heavily-active cases, with several contested hearings and highly-involved litigants. Thus, to accurately measure workload, the Subcommittee should expand its measures to include number of hearings (including number of evidentiary hearings versus law and motion hearings), number of motions filed, and number of cases with orders, among other variables.

Importantly, using the same data to determine the funding reallocation for both the Facilitator and the Commissioner program comes with problems. While the number of cases with court activity may be a good starting point to measure the workload of a

Commissioner, this measure does not capture all of the cases handled by Facilitators, who spend significant time with litigants who may consider involving DCSS, but ultimately decide not to do so. Moreover, many litigants may have related custody issues that require substantial assistance from Facilitators. If resolved effectively, it can reduce conflict between the parties and encourage settlement of their child support issues, which could include the decision to not involve DCSS or to close existing DCSS cases. In turn, this can lessen the burden on the courtroom, increasing the efficiency of child support enforcement, while not reducing the workload of the Facilitators. Similarly, many child support cases involve represented parties, whose cases may have significant courtroom activity, while the parties have no contact with the Facilitators office. The RAS reporting data does not account for these differences and using this data to assess both programs fails to recognize the different measurements required to accurately determine Commissioner and Facilitator workload.

The Subcommittee should focus on a qualitative, rather than quantitative, analysis.

Basing the reallocation primarily on quantitative data, whether it be on the RAS reporting data or on some other numeric measure, rather than on qualitative data, obscures the true level of funding needed for each county to serve its child support litigants. While numbers no doubt matter, they provide only a partial picture. They do not accurately assess the effectiveness of programs, including the depth of services provided to individual litigants, which may serve to avoid the need for future litigation. To the contrary, basing funding on a quantitative analysis can create perverse incentives to chase the numbers, such as filing new cases or keeping existing cases open when the circumstances do not warrant it, rather than chasing productivity and results.

Further, it fails to consider resources outside of the court that impact the program. For instance, the statistics do not account for the availability of legal services in the area that might reduce the burden on the Facilitators office or increase the chances of settlement outside of court reducing the need for contested hearings in front of Commissioners. More so, the availability of volunteers and interns in larger counties from local law schools and universities to provide support to existing staff is an important factor. On the other hand, small, rural counties often have little outside support on which to rely. As a result, the Facilitators office may serve de facto as the only legal services option in the county.

This highlights the need to go beyond the numbers in assessing the actual funding needs of the various courts. While it may have made sense to use the percentage of open cases statewide to establish a base level of funding at the inception of the AB 1058 program, nearly 20 years later, after programs have been well-established and after the public has grown to rely on and expect a particular level of service, any reduction in funding to individual courts should be proposed only after a more comprehensive analysis of the needs in each county. Of note, since the overall level of funding statewide to the AB 1058 program is not decreasing, rather than moving quickly to reallocate funds based on quantitative data, the Subcommittee should take the time to engage Commissioners, Facilitators, and other stakeholders throughout the state to get a more complete picture of funding needs.

Any reallocation should ensure a base level of funding for smaller courts.

Of primary concern is that the reallocation will undermine the ability of smaller courts to maintain its AB 1058 program. Each court, regardless of size, has certain minimum costs required to keep the program running, and basing funding on the percentage of open cases, or some other similar measure, threatens the ability of small courts to cover these minimum costs. Only after establishing a base level of funding should the differences in number of filings and court size be considered. In this way, services to litigants statewide can be guaranteed.

We are fully aware of the difficult task facing the Subcommittee in reallocating the AB 1058 funds. Given the magnitude of the task, we encourage the Subcommittee to proceed cautiously with additional opportunities for input from the various stakeholders. Much is at stake, and therefore it is vital to consider all factors when assessing the needs of each county to ensure a successful AB 1058 program everywhere.

Sincerely,



Gary Slossberg
Family Law Facilitator
El Dorado Superior Court