

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR AB1058 FUNDING ALLOCATION JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING  
(Conference call scheduled to be held October 9, 2018)

I am a full-time Commissioner from San Francisco, assigned to handle all AB1048 matters. I have been away this week (when the notice regarding this meeting was released), and do not have access to my computer, and am therefore using my iPhone to send this, so please excuse any typos. Unfortunately will also not be able to listen in on Monday's meeting. However, I did want to point out a few things for consideration (including a grammar edit):

-- In the first sentence in the Recommendation section of the draft report published for this meeting, the word "follow" should be "following"

-- Not sure I saw a reference to Attachment A before seeing the reference to Attachment B. (Please ignore if incorrect, as I could only review the draft document on my iPhone)

-- In the Recommendation section, I do not understand why one of the specific recommendations voted upon at the last meeting - which is actually noted in the last sentence of Alternative 4 -- is not also contained in the Recommendation section. This was an important recommendation taking into consideration that the program is a grant program, and the need for courts to both ramp down as well as up. I am concerned that the hard work of this joint sub-committee, with the steep learning curve on the unique aspects of the AB1058 program, will get lost when there are changes in the makeup of various committees that will be dealing with this issues in ensuing years.

-- While I see that one of the guiding principles listed with regard to the development of this methodology is to maintain statewide federal performance measures, I do not believe the report stresses this principle enough, in terms of going forward, and would encourage adding some language acknowledging this principle in the section on Review of Future Commissioner Base Funding Needs and Allocation. Someone is going to have to monitor the impacts using this methodology, as the last thing we want to see is that good money moved is actually hurting statewide performance measures. Much is being focused on county size, but this issue is broader. What was often said at many meetings is that a one-size all approach, using just filings, is not ideal for a grant program. Adding language here would keep this item in the forefront for Fam/Juv and others, including TCBC.

-- I also would recommend that there be an immediate review of the JBSIS definitions being used, to ensure that all counties are being counted and treated equally, given that the court does not have control over what type of filing is presented from the institutional filer. For example, I understand that there are variations between counties and filings of the LCSA for a second child. In some counties, the LCSA may file a new governmental complaint (currently counted in JBSIS), while in other counties the LCSA will file a supplemental complaint (currently not counted). Both situations require the court to make new determinations of parentage for a new child and spend the same time in terms of workload to get the filing to a new judgment.

Finally, I want to express my thanks to the entire joint sub-committee for all of their hard work. While I continue to believe the WAFM model is not a suitable one for such a unique grant, I recognize that something must be done now to start compensating for the shifts in overall cases between counties throughout the state since the program started.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, which are my individual comments, and not that of any organization.

-Rebecca Wightman  
Commissioner  
Superior Court -San Francisco