



Judicial Council of California . Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: April 29, 2011

Title	Agenda Item Type
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act: Selection of Pilot Projects	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
None	July 1, 2011
Recommended by	Date of Report
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee Justice Earl Johnson, Jr. (Ret.), Chair	April 7, 2011
	Contact
	Bonnie Rose Hough, 415-865-7668 bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee recommends that the Judicial Council award \$9.5 million in grants to seven qualified legal service organizations and court partners for pilot projects to provide legal representation and improved court procedures for eligible low-income litigants in civil cases affecting basic human needs.

Recommendation

The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2011, approve Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act grants in an amount not to exceed \$9.5 million¹ for distribution to the following legal service agencies and superior courts for pilot projects to provide legal representation and improved court services to eligible low-income litigants:

¹ Subject to the availability of funding.

Bar Association of San Francisco Voluntary Legal Services Program
Superior Court of San Francisco County
 Child Custody Pilot Project..... \$350,000

Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance
Superior Court of Kern County
 Housing Pilot Project..... \$560,043

Legal Aid Society of San Diego
Superior Court of San Diego County
 Housing Pilot Project..... \$1,873,919
 Child Custody Pilot Project..... \$700,000

Legal Aid Society of Santa Barbara County
Superior Court of Santa Barbara County
 Housing Pilot Project..... \$465,439
 Probate Guardianship Pilot Project..... \$482,981

Legal Services of Northern California
Superior Court of Sacramento County
Superior Court of Yolo County
 Housing Pilot Project..... \$1,408,077

Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice
Superior Court of Los Angeles County
 Child Custody/Domestic Violence Project..... \$850,000

Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County
Superior Court of Los Angeles County
 Housing Pilot Project..... \$2,809,601

A chart of all of the proposals submitted, a roster of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee, and a copy of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (Assem. Bill 590 [Feuer]; Stats. 2009, ch. 457) are attached at pages 6–17.

Previous Council Action

None.

Rationale for Recommendation

The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (AB 590) provides that, commencing in fiscal year 2011–2012, one or more pilot projects selected by the Judicial Council will be funded to provide legal representation and improved court services to low-income parties on critical legal issues affecting basic human needs. The pilot projects will be operated by legal services nonprofit corporations working in collaboration with their local superior courts.

The purpose of the pilot projects is to improve timely and effective access to justice in civil cases and thereby avoid undue risk of erroneous court decisions resulting from the nature and complexity of the law in the specific proceeding or the disparities between parties in legal representation, education, sophistication, language proficiency, and lack of access to self-help or alternative dispute resolution services.

Selected legal services agencies will provide legal representation to low-income Californians who are at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level and need representation in one or more of the following areas:

- Housing-related matters;
- Domestic violence and civil harassment restraining orders;
- Elder abuse;
- Guardianship of the person;
- Probate conservatorship; or
- Child custody actions by a parent seeking sole legal or physical custody of a child, particularly where the opposing side is represented by counsel.

Government Code section 68651(b)(2) states that pilot projects that provide legal representation in child custody cases in which a parent is seeking sole legal or physical custody, particularly when one side is represented and the other is not, should be given the highest priority for funding. Up to 20 percent of available funding must be designated for these types of child custody actions. The committee recommends that three child custody projects share the maximum 20 percent of available funding.

Each pilot project must be a partnership between the court, a legal services agency that shall serve as lead agency for case assessment and direction, and other legal services providers in the community. To the extent practical, legal services agencies must identify and make use of pro bono services from attorneys in order to maximize available services efficiently and economically.

Government Code section 68651(b)(4) recognizes that even with the new funding available under the legislation, not all eligible low-income parties with meritorious cases can be provided with legal representation. So, in addition to the legal representation provided by the legal services providers, the statute provides for funds to courts to adopt innovative practices, which can include “procedures, personnel, training, and case management and administration practices that reflect best practices to ensure unrepresented parties meaningful access to justice and to guard against the involuntary waiver of rights, as well as to encourage fair and expeditious voluntary dispute resolution, consistent with principles of judicial neutrality.”

Government Code section 68651(b)(5) requires the Judicial Council to appoint a committee to select pilot projects to recommend to the Judicial Council for funding. The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee, chaired by Justice Earl Johnson, Jr. (Ret.), was appointed by Chief Justice Ronald M. George on September 1, 2010. A detailed summary of projects recommended by the committee for funding follows this report in Attachment A, and a roster of committee members is found in Attachment B.

Government Code section 68651(b)(5) also requires that selected pilot projects be authorized for the period from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2014. Grants may be renewed by the Judicial Council for a period not exceeding three years, or one or more of the initial grantees may be replaced by a different grantee for that period, unless the Legislature extends the statutory authority for the pilot projects beyond the end of fiscal year 2017. Total available funding for all projects is expected to be approximately \$10 million per year, funded by a \$10 fee increase on certain postjudgment court services. The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) will receive approximately \$500,000 each year to cover the costs of the evaluation required by Government Code section 68651(c) and administration of the program.

The AOC issued a request for proposals on January 10, 2011. Eighteen proposals were received, eight of which are recommended by the committee for funding.² The committee was impressed by the quality of the proposals and hopes that additional funding becomes available to fund more pilots in the future. In selecting which pilot projects to recommend, the committee used the criteria set forth in Government Code section 68651(b)(5), which include:

- The applicant’s capacity for success, innovation, and efficiency;
- The likelihood that the proposed pilot project would deliver quality representation in an effective manner that would meet critical needs of the community;
- Whether the pilot project would address the needs of the court with regards to access to justice and calendar management;
- Whether the pilot project meets unmet needs for representation in the community;
- The likelihood that representation in the proposed case type tends to affect whether a party prevails or otherwise obtains a significantly more favorable outcome in a matter

² Legal Services of Northern California submitted separate proposals for Yolo and Sacramento Counties. The committee recommends that Legal Services of Northern California be awarded one grant for both counties.

in which they would otherwise frequently have judgment entered against them or suffer the deprivation of the basic human need at issue;

- The likelihood of reducing the risk of erroneous court decisions;
- The nature and severity of potential consequences for the unrepresented party regarding the basic human need at stake if representation is not provided;
- Whether the provision of legal services may eliminate or reduce the potential need for and cost of public social services regarding the basic human need at stake for the client and others in the client's household; and
- The availability and effectiveness of other types of court services, such as self-help.

Selecting the pilot projects and distributing the funding once it becomes available through the state budget will put the funds available under the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act into the hands of qualified legal services providers and the courts to provide legal representation and improved court services to qualified low-income litigants. Grant funds will be provided to the selected pilot projects commencing on October 1, 2011, provided that a state budget that includes funds for this purpose has been approved.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

The recommendation for the selection of the pilot projects has been made by the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee as provided by Government Code section 68651(b)(5). The statutory scheme does not contemplate public comment.

The council may select pilot projects other than the ones recommended by the implementation committee, provided that the pilot projects are selected based on the statutory criteria and the funding for the pilot projects does not exceed the amount of available funding.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

Grant conditions will require courts that have elected to participate in the pilot projects to cooperate with the local legal services providers and provide court services in the manner specified in the grant proposals. Courts will receive funding for the services that they provide through intra-branch agreements between the AOC and each court.

AOC staff will administer the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act pilot project funding, including fulfillment of the statutory requirements for an evaluation of the pilot projects and a report to the Legislature. Staff will provide oversight and technical assistance for the selected pilot projects to ensure that funding is spent for the purposes intended by the legislation. Staff will also provide support to the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee. Costs for AOC staff support and the evaluation will be covered by the provision for administrative costs in the budget act appropriation.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

This recommendation helps implement goal 1 (Access, Fairness, and Diversity) of the Judicial Council's strategic plan by increasing representation and court services for low-income persons.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Proposal Summary
2. Attachment B: Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee Roster
3. Attachment C: Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act

Attachment A

Pilot Project Applications for Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Funding

#	Pilot Project Name, Lead Agency & Court	Project Summary	Budget request 3 years
1.	<p>Alameda County Bar Association and ACBA Volunteer Legal Services Corporation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Bay Area Legal Aid b) Centro Legal de la Raza c) East Bay Community Law Center d) Eviction Defense Center e) Family Violence Law Center f) Housing and Economic Rights Advocates g) Legal Assistance for Seniors <p>Court: Alameda</p>	<p>Unlawful detainers, other housing, domestic violence, contested custody with domestic violence, elder abuse.</p> <p>“Housing Stabilization Program”</p> <p>Oakland, Alameda & Hayward Courts.</p> <p>Full scope legal representation, limited scope legal representation, unbundled legal services, self-help services.</p>	<p>\$3,086,343 \$3,191,923 \$3,296,408</p>
2.	<p>Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance, Inc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Contract with private attorneys who serve as Early Dispute Resolution panel members b) Volunteer Attorney Program <p>Court: Kern</p>	<p>Housing-related matters: Mortgage default and foreclosure issues for homeowners; Eviction defense, including post-judgment motions (stays and set-asides); Breach of covenants (habitability, quiet enjoyment); Demand notices and termination notices for renters; Recovery of renter's security deposits (and related small claims matters); Landlord-tenant dispute resolution (pre-litigation, pending litigation, and post-judgment).</p> <p>Full legal representation, self-help services, early dispute resolution, referrals to government and community social services.</p>	<p>\$560,043 \$523,103 \$539,418</p>
3.	<p>Bet Tzedek Legal Services –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Alliance for Children's Rights b) Center for Civic Mediation c) Los Angeles Dependency Lawyers 	<p>Probate guardianship</p> <p>Stanley Mosk Courthouse</p> <p>Legal representation, special guardianship calendars, Assistance at status conferences, education, ADR</p>	<p>\$1,506,476 \$1,384,001 \$1,393,671</p>

#	Pilot Project Name, Lead Agency & Court	Project Summary	Budget request 3 years
	Court: Los Angeles		
4.	Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County a) Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles b) Inner City Law Center c) Public Counsel Court: Los Angeles	Housing (eviction defense). Stanley Mosk Courthouse. Full legal representation, self-help services, ADR, code enforcement services, referrals to government and community social services.	\$2,809,601 \$2,759,601 \$2,759,601
5.	Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice (LACLJ) a) Levitt & Quinn Family Law Center b) Asian Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California Court: Los Angeles	High conflict custody cases involving domestic violence. Stanley Mosk Courthouse. Full legal representation, advice and counsel, special mediation program, parenting classes.	\$870,094 \$902,085 \$940,276
6.	Legal Aid of Marin a) Family & Children's Law Center b) Marin County Bar Association Court: Marin	Housing-related matters, particularly tenant evictions; domestic violence and civil harassment restraining orders; elder abuse matters, particularly financial elder abuse; guardianship of the person; probate conservatorships; and child custody. Full representation, limited scope representation.	\$865,000 \$886,625 \$908,790
7.	Legal Aid Society of Orange County a) Public Law Center b) Justice in Education c) University of California, Irvine School of Law d) Orange County Bar Association e) Orange County Human Relations Commission Court: Orange	Civil limited residential unlawful detainers. Central Justice Center in Santa Ana, CA and the North Justice Center in Fullerton, CA. Full legal representation, UD clinic, other self-help services, mediation, education and outreach.	\$1,430,433 \$1,399,433 \$1,399,433
8.	Legal Services of Northern California	Unlawful Detainer Actions, Affirmative Habitability	\$1,071,985

#	Pilot Project Name, Lead Agency & Court	Project Summary	Budget request 3 years
	("LSNC") Sacramento County Office a) Pacific McGeorge School of Law Court: Sacramento	Actions. Full legal representation, limited scope representation, mediation, special master-housing inspector, self-help services.	\$1,072,302 \$1,092,378
9.	Legal Aid Society of San Diego, a) San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Program Court: San Diego	Housing cases (civil unlawful detainer) and child custody cases. Full representation, limited scope representation	\$2,885,493 \$2,900,400 \$3,033,908
10.	Volunteer Legal Services Program of the Bar Association of San Francisco a) Cooperative Restraining Order Clinic Court: San Francisco	Child custody. Full representation, limited scope representation, advice and assistance, social services, ADR	\$497,810 \$504,480 \$526,621
11.	Volunteer Legal Services Program of the Bar Association of San Francisco a) Eviction Defense Collaborative b) AIDS Legal Referral Panel c) Lawyer Referral and Information Service Court: San Francisco	Housing – unlawful detainer. Full legal representation, limited scope legal representation, post-judgment assistance, social services, trust account administration.	\$2,012,243 \$2,406,900 \$2,396,792
12.	Legal Aid Foundation of Santa Barbara County a) Local attorneys – both contract and pro bono Court: Santa Barbara	Unlawful detainers, mortgage foreclosures, discrimination, habitability, security deposits, appeals, guardianship of a person, conservatorship of a person. Full legal representation, self-help, expanded settlement assistance.	\$1,126,804 \$1,075,062 \$1,077,158
13.	Law Foundation of Silicon Valley	Unlawful detainers.	\$2,012,641

#	Pilot Project Name, Lead Agency & Court	Project Summary	Budget request 3 years
	a) Pro Bono Project b) Bay Area Legal Aid c) Asian Law Alliance d) Project Sentinel e) Senior Adults Legal Assistance Court: Santa Clara	"Unified Housing Justice Project " Full legal representation, limited scope representation, self-help services.	\$1,904,857 \$1,955,342
14.	Pro Bono Project Silicon Valley a) Bay Area Legal Aid b) Law Foundation of Silicon Valley Court: Santa Clara	Child custody Limited scope representation, legal advice and information, self-help services, ADR.	\$1,660,774 \$1,687,053 \$1,747,889
15.	Pro Bono Project Silicon Valley a) Bay Area Legal Aid b) Senior Adults Legal Assistance c) Law Foundation of Silicon Valley Court: Santa Clara	Elder abuse, domestic violence, and guardianship Full legal representation, limited scope representation, advice and counsel, self-help services.	\$1,522,134 \$1,539,918 \$1,586,968
16.	Legal Aid of Sonoma County a) Family Law Conflicts Attorney Panel b) Pro Bono Panel c) ADR Attorney Panel d) Mentor Panel Court: Sonoma	Contested custody, guardianship. Full legal representation, advice and counsel, self-help services, ADR.	\$558,615 \$546,340 \$561,467
17.	California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. a) Private attorney panel b) Stanislaus Family Justice Center Court: Stanislaus	Housing, with an emphasis on unlawful detainer defense; elder abuse. Full legal representation, limited scope legal representation, self- help services.	\$823,500 \$848,207 \$873,655

#	Pilot Project Name, Lead Agency & Court	Project Summary	Budget request 3 years
18.	Legal Services of Northern California ("LSNC") Yolo County Office a) Yolo County Health Department Court: Yolo	Housing - Unlawful detainer cases Full legal representation, self help services, voluntary dispute resolution services.	\$336,092 \$339,376 \$346,976

Grand Total of all Applicants (1st year): \$ 25,636,081

Attachment B
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee

As of April 5, 2011

Hon. Earl Johnson, Jr. (Ret.), Chair
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
1525 Ocean Drive
Channel Islands Beach, CA 93035
(805) 985-8599
JUSTEJ@aol.com

Hon. Terry B. Friedman (Ret.)
1601 Cloverfield Blvd., Suite 370 – South
Santa Monica, CA 90404
(310) 309-6206
Cell (310) 990-7494
Fax (310) 396-7576
tbfjams@verizon.net

Mr. Kevin G. Baker
Deputy Chief Counsel for the
Committee on the Judiciary
California State Assembly
P.O. Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0001
(916) 319-2334
Fax (916) 319-2188
Kevin.Baker@asm.ca.gov

Ms. Pauline W. Gee
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244
(916) 323-0335
Fax (916) 323-6882
pauline.gee@doj.ca.gov

Ms. Mary Lavery Flynn
Director, Office of Legal Services
State Bar of California
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 538-2251
Cell (510) 387-6490
Fax (415) 538-2524
mary.flynn@calbar.ca.gov

Ms. Luz E. Herrera
Assistant Professor
Thomas Jefferson School of Law
2121 San Diego Avenue
San Diego, CA 92110
(619) 374-6961
Cell (562) 631-5561
Fax (619) 296-4284
lherrera@tjssl.edu

Ms. Erika Frank
General Counsel
California Chamber of Commerce
1215 K Street, Suite 1400
Sacramento, CA 95812-1736
(916) 444-6670
Fax (916) 325-1272
erika.frank@calchamber.com

Mr. Bruce G. Iwasaki
Lim, Ruger & Kim LLP
1055 West Seventh Street
Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2554
(213) 955-9500 x 154
(213) 553-1105
Fax (213) 955-9511
bruce.iwasaki@limruger.com

Attachment B
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee

As of April 5, 2011

Hon. James R. Lambden

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
First Appellate District, Division Two
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102-3600
(415) 865-7380
Fax (415) 865-7309
james.lambden@jud.ca.gov

Ms. S. Lynn Martinez

Western Center on Law and Poverty
3701 Wilshire Boulevard, #208
Los Angeles, CA 90010
(213) 235-2630
Cell (707) 373-4572
Fax (213) 487-0242
smartinez@wclp.org

Mr. John F. O'Toole

Director
National Center for Youth Law
405 14th Street, 15th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612-2777
(510) 835-8098 ext. 3012
Fax (510) 835-8099
otoole@youthlaw.org

Ms. Clare Pastore

Professor of the Practice of Law
University of Southern California
Gould School of Law
699 Exposition Boulevard, Room 448
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0071
(213) 821-4410
Fax (213) 740-5502
cpastore@law.usc.edu

Mr. Thomas Smegal

Law Offices of Thomas F. Smegal, Jr.
333 Bush Street, 21st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 399-0804
tomsmegal@smegallaw.com

Ms. Alicia Valdez-Wright

Self-Help Center / Family Law Facilitator Office
Superior Court of California
County of San Luis Obispo
1120 Mill Street, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
(805) 788-2485
Fax (805) 788-2490
alicia.wright@slo.courts.ca.gov

Ms. Julia R. Wilson

Executive Director
Legal Aid Association of California
433 California Street, Suite 815
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 834-0100
Executive Assistant, Thieu Do (415) 834-0100 x
320
Fax (415) 834-0202
jwilson@one-justice.org

Hon. Laurie D. Zelon

Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal
Second Appellate District, Division Seven
300 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90013
(213) 830-7403
Fax (213) 897-2429
laurie.zelon@jud.ca.gov

Attachment B
Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act Implementation Committee

As of April 5, 2011

AOC COMMITTEE STAFF

Ms. Bonnie Rose Hough

Managing Attorney
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
(415) 865-7668
Fax (415) 865-7217
bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov

Mr. Don Will

Manager
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
(415) 865-7557
Fax (415) 865-7217
don.will@jud.ca.gov

Mr. Patrick O'Donnell

Supervising Attorney
Office of General Counsel
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
(415) 865-7665
patrick.o'donnell@jud.ca.gov

Mr. Joseph Nguyen

Administrative Coordinator
Center for Families, Children & the Courts
Administrative Office of the Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
(415) 865-7533
Fax (415) 865-7217
joseph.nguyen@jud.ca.gov

Attachment C

The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act

GOVERNMENT CODE

CHAPTER 2.1. CIVIL LEGAL REPRESENTATION

68650. This chapter shall be known, and may be cited, as the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act.

68651. (a) Legal counsel shall be appointed to represent low-income parties in civil matters involving critical issues affecting basic human needs in those specified courts selected by the

Judicial Council as provided in this section.

(b) (1) Subject to funding specifically provided for this purpose pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 70626, the Judicial Council shall develop one or more model pilot projects in selected courts pursuant to a competitive grant process and a request for proposals. Projects authorized under this section shall provide representation of counsel for low-income persons who require legal services in civil matters involving housing-related matters, domestic violence and civil harassment restraining orders, probate conservatorships, guardianships of the person, elder abuse, or actions by a parent to obtain sole legal or physical custody of a child, as well as providing court procedures, personnel, training, and case management and administration methods that reflect best practices to ensure unrepresented parties in those cases have meaningful access to justice, and to gather information on the outcomes associated with providing these services, to guard against the involuntary waiver of those rights or their disposition by default. These pilot projects should be designed to address the substantial inequities in timely and effective access to justice that often give rise to an undue risk of erroneous decision because of the nature and complexity of the law and the proceeding or disparities between the parties in education, sophistication, language proficiency, legal representation, access to self-help, and alternative dispute resolution services. In order to ensure that the scarce funds available for the program are used to serve the most critical cases and the parties least able to access the courts without representation, eligibility for representation shall be limited to clients whose household income falls at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level. Projects shall impose asset limitations consistent with their existing practices in order to ensure optimal use of funds.

(2) (A) In light of the significant percentage of parties who are unrepresented in family law matters, proposals to provide counsel in child custody cases should be considered among the highest priorities for funding, particularly when one side is represented and the other is not.

(B) Up to 20 percent of available funds shall be directed to projects regarding civil matters involving actions by a parent to obtain sole legal or physical custody of a child. This subparagraph shall not apply to distributions made pursuant to paragraph (3).

(3) For the 2012-13 fiscal year, and each subsequent fiscal year, any amounts collected pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 70626 in excess of the total amount transferred to

the Trial Court Trust Fund in the 2011-12 fiscal year pursuant to subparagraph (E) of paragraph

(1) of subdivision (c) of Section 68085.1 and subdivision (d) of Section 70626 shall be distributed by the Judicial Council without regard to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2). Those amounts may be distributed by the Judicial Council as set forth in this subdivision beginning July 1, 2012. If the funds are to be distributed to new projects, the Judicial Council shall distribute those amounts pursuant to the process set forth in this subdivision.

(4) Each project shall be a partnership between the court, a qualified legal services project, as defined by subdivision (a) of Section 6213 of the Business and Professions Code, that shall serve as the lead agency for case assessment and direction, and other legal services providers in the community who are able to provide the services for the project. The lead legal services agency shall be the central point of contact for receipt of referrals to the project and to make determinations of eligibility based on uniform criteria. The lead legal services agency shall be responsible for providing representation to the clients or referring the matter to one of the organization or individual providers with whom the lead legal services agency contracts to provide the service. Funds received by a qualified legal services project shall not qualify as expenditures for the purposes of the distribution of funds pursuant to Section 6216 of the Business and Professions Code. To the extent practical, the lead legal services agency shall identify and make use of pro bono services in order to maximize available services efficiently and economically. Recognizing that not all indigent parties can be afforded representation, even when they have meritorious cases, the court partner shall, as a corollary to the services provided by the lead legal services agency, be responsible for providing procedures, personnel, training, and case management and administration practices that reflect best practices to ensure unrepresented parties meaningful access to justice and to guard against the involuntary waiver of rights, as well as to encourage fair and expeditious voluntary dispute resolution, consistent with principles of judicial neutrality.

(5) The participating projects shall be selected by a committee appointed by the Judicial Council with representation from key stakeholder groups, including judicial officers, legal services providers, and others, as appropriate. The committee shall assess the applicants' capacity for success, innovation, and efficiency, including, but not limited to, the likelihood that the project would deliver quality representation in an effective manner that would meet critical needs in the community and address the needs of the court with regard to access to justice and calendar management, and the unique local unmet needs for representation in the community. Projects approved pursuant to this section shall initially be authorized for a three-year period, commencing July 1, 2011, subject to renewal for a period to be determined by the Judicial Council, in consultation with the participating project in light of the project's capacity and success. After the initial three-year period, the Judicial Council shall distribute any future funds available as the result of the termination or nonrenewal of a project pursuant to the process set forth in this subdivision. Projects shall be selected on the basis of whether in the cases proposed for service the persons to be assisted are likely to be opposed by a party who is represented by counsel. The Judicial Council shall also consider the following factors in selecting the projects:

(A) The likelihood that representation in the proposed case type tends to affect whether a party prevails or otherwise obtains a significantly more favorable outcome in a matter in which they would otherwise frequently have judgment entered against them or suffer the deprivation of the basic human need at issue.

(B) The likelihood of reducing the risk of erroneous decision.

(C) The nature and severity of potential consequences for the unrepresented party regarding the basic human need at stake if representation is not provided.

(D) Whether the provision of legal services may eliminate or reduce the potential need for and cost of public social services regarding the basic human need at stake for the client and others in the client's household.

(E) The unmet need for legal services in the geographic area to be served.

(F) The availability and effectiveness of other types of court services, such as self-help.

(6) Each applicant shall do all of the following:

(A) Identify the nature of the partnership between the court, the lead legal services agency, and the other agencies or other providers that would work within the project.

(B) Describe the referral protocols to be used, the criteria that would be employed in case assessment, why those cases were selected, the manner to address conflicts without violating any attorney-client privilege when adverse parties are seeking representation through the project, and the means for serving potential clients who need assistance with English.

(C) Describe how the project would be administered, including how the data collection requirements would be met without causing an undue burden on the courts, clients, or the providers, the particular objectives of the project, strategies to evaluate their success in meeting those objectives, and the means by which the project would serve the particular needs of the community, such as by providing representation to limited-English-speaking clients.

(7) To ensure the most effective use of the funding available, the lead legal services agency shall serve as a hub for all referrals, and the point at which decisions are made about which referrals will be served and by whom. Referrals shall emanate from the court, as well as from the other agencies providing services through the program, and shall be directed to the lead legal services agency for review. That agency, or another agency or attorney in the event of conflict, shall collect the information necessary to assess whether the case should be served. In performing that case assessment, the agency shall determine the relative need for representation of the litigant, including all of the following:

(A) Case complexity.

(B) Whether the other party is represented.

(C) The adversarial nature of the proceeding.

(D) The availability and effectiveness of other types of services, such as self-help, in light of the potential client and the nature of the case.

(E) Language issues.

(F) Disability access issues.

(G) Literacy issues.

(H) The merits of the case.

(I) The nature and severity of potential consequences for the potential client if representation is not provided.

(J) Whether the provision of legal services may eliminate or reduce the need for and cost of public social services for the potential client and others in the potential client's household.

(8) If both parties to a dispute are financially eligible for representation, each proposal shall ensure that representation for both sides is evaluated. In these and other cases in which conflict issues arise, the lead legal services agency shall have referral protocols with other agencies and providers, such as a private attorney panel, to address those conflicts.

(9) Each pilot project shall be responsible for keeping records on the referrals accepted and those not accepted for representation, and the reasons for each, in a manner that does not violate any privileged communications between the agency and the prospective client. Each pilot project shall be provided with standardized data collection tools, and required to track case information for each referral to allow the evaluation to measure the number of cases served, the level of service required, and the outcomes for the clients in each case. In addition to this information on the effect of the representation on the clients, data shall be collected regarding the outcomes for the trial courts.

(10) A local advisory committee shall be formed for each pilot project, to include representatives of the bench and court administration, the lead legal services agency, and the other agencies or providers that are part of the local project team. The role of the advisory committee is to facilitate the administration of the local pilot project, and to ensure that the project is fulfilling its objectives. In addition, the committee shall resolve any issues that arise during the course of the pilot project, including issues concerning case eligibility, and recommend changes in project administration in response to implementation challenges. The committee shall meet at least monthly for the first six months of the project and no less than quarterly for the duration of the pilot period. Each authorized pilot project shall catalog changes to the program made during the three-year period based on its experiences with best practices in serving the eligible population.

(c) The Judicial Council shall conduct a study to demonstrate the effectiveness and continued need for the pilot program established pursuant to this section and shall report its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on or before January 31, 2016. The study shall report on the percentage of funding by case type and shall include data on the impact of counsel on equal access to justice and the effect on court administration and efficiency, and enhanced coordination between courts and other government service providers and community resources. This report shall describe the benefits of providing representation to those who were previously not represented, both for the clients and the courts, as well as strategies and recommendations for maximizing the benefit of that representation in the future. The report shall describe and include data, if available, on the impact of the pilot program on families and children. The report also shall include an assessment of the continuing unmet needs and, if available, data regarding those unmet needs.

(d) This section shall not be construed to negate, alter, or limit any right to counsel in a criminal or civil action or proceeding otherwise provided by state or federal law.

(e) The section shall become operative on July 1, 2011.