



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
May 30, 2018	Please review and approve
To	Deadline
Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	June 4, 2018
From	Contact
Penelope Davis Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts	Penelope Davis 415-865-8815 phone penny.davis@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
Proposed Funding Allocation Methodology for Court Appointed Special Advocates Grant Program and Process for Certifying New CASA Programs	

As you may recall, the proposed funding allocation methodology for the Court Appointed Special Advocates Grant Program described below was discussed at the Family Law and Juvenile Law Committee meeting on April 9, 2018. Four alternatives were also presented. Please see the attached memorandum¹ for detailed information on these alternatives.

After discussion, the committee requested that the California Court Appointed Special Advocates Association (Cal CASA) survey all CASA programs for feedback on the proposed methodology and report back to the committee for review and approval.

¹ The attached memorandum, from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee meeting of April 9, 2018, provides background and details of the current methodology and contains information on the proposed methodology and alternatives.

This memorandum also includes information about the data underlying the methodology and on the process to certify new CASA programs for funding eligibility.

Proposed Funding Allocation Methodology

Staff recommends replacing the current funding allocation methodology with the methodology outlined below. Allocations based on current data can be found in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 of the attached memorandum.

Base Funding:

- Base funds would continue to be distributed based on the 4 tiers adopted in 2013.
- Add 15% to each CASA base allocation for increased costs in operating expenses. This would increase the current percentage of total funds allocated as base funding from 81% to 93%.

Incentives:

- Exempt any county with less than 50 children in foster care from receiving an incentive.
- Reduce incentives from two to one and reduce the amount to \$5,000.
- Replace existing incentives with a new incentive based on growth in number of children served.
- Separate programs into large and small categories based on total county population. Each category is eligible for only one growth incentive.
- Evaluate large programs based on the number of children served by CASAs compared to the previous year with the top 14 programs with the largest increase receiving an incentive.
- Evaluate small programs based on the percentage of children in foster care served by CASAs for current year, with the top 13 programs serving the largest percentage of children receiving an incentive. (There is one less incentive for the small programs given that there were fewer of them than the large programs.)

Feedback Received from CASA Network Regarding Proposed Funding Allocation

As requested by the committee during the April 9, 2018 meeting, Cal CASA advised all local CASA program directors about the proposed funding methodology and requested their input and

feedback. The information provided to CASA programs included a pro forma chart showing allocation amounts using data from previous years. Programs were informed that the allocations would not be based on that data, but rather, updated numbers received by the Judicial Council.

More than 52% of programs (23 of 44 programs) provided feedback. Of those, 74% (17 programs) supported the revised methodology while 26% (6 programs) disapproved.

Cal CASA reports that five of the six programs that do not support the proposed methodology are small CASA programs. Specific objections to the proposal were not provided to Judicial Council CASA program staff, but staff notes that it is possible that these small programs will see a decrease in funding. For example, review of a small program that received two incentives in FY 2017-2018 shows that this small program will be ineligible for the incentive under the proposed methodology and their allocation would be reduced from \$46,900 to \$29,900. While small programs previously eligible for two incentives will see a decrease in funding, it is important to consider that small programs, in general, have received a much larger per child amount compared to larger CASA programs, and this will not change with the revised funding methodology.

Cal CASA reports that one large CASA program disapproved of the proposed methodology based on a philosophical change by that program, from a goal of increasing the number of children served by CASA to a “deeper” provision of services to the children currently being served.

Concerns about Data

At the April 9th meeting Cal CASA staff shared that CASA programs expressed concern about the numbers used in the pro forma chart. Judicial Council CASA program staff has conferred with Cal CASA and local CASA programs about this issue. While the data is self-reported by the local CASA programs, it appears there was some confusion by local program directors regarding the time period of data collection and the numbers associated with the children served. This may be a result of two issues. One, various definitions of, and potential discrepancies in, the way individual programs count “children served.” Second, to meet Judicial Council deadlines for contract development, the allocations were based on three quarters as opposed to a full year of data.

To address this confusion, Judicial Council CASA program staff will work with Cal CASA to develop a unified definition and standards for counting “children served.” This will help ensure that self-reporting practices are accurate and consistent among all CASA programs. In addition, Judicial Council CASA program staff will continue to send the self-reported data received to CASA program directors for their review and verification prior to calculation of funding.

Process for Certifying New CASA Programs

On April 9, 2018, Judicial Council CASA program staff also recommended developing a process to certify new CASA programs and include them in the following year's budget allocation. CASA program staff will work to develop options and bring them to the committee for discussion and consideration at a later date.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date	Action Requested
April 5, 2018	Please review
To	Deadline
Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	April 9, 2018
From	Contact
Penelope Davis, Supervising Analyst	Penny Davis 415-865-8815 phone penny.davis@jud.ca.gov
Subject	
Preliminary Discussion on Proposed Funding Allocation Methodology for Court Appointed Special Advocates Grant Program	

Staff supporting the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) grant program requests the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory (F&J) to review and discuss proposals received from the California Court Appointed Special Advocates Association (Cal CASA) to improve the methodology in allocating CASA funding.

Background

The current funding methodology for the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) grant program was approved by the Judicial Council on August 23, 2013. Over the past five years CASA programs have expressed concern with the methodology stating that the incentives (based on retention of volunteers and number of children served) are not equitable.

In response to concerns raised about the 2013 methodology, in developing its 2018 annual agenda, this committee included conducting a 5-year review of the methodology adopted in 2013:

Recommend annual funding to local programs pursuant to the methodology approved by the Judicial Council in August 2013. Conduct 5-year review of 2013 methodology and recommend changes as necessary.

To address concerns from the CASA programs, the committee requested guidance and input from the California Court Appointed Special Advocates Association (Cal CASA). Cal CASA convened a small task force (“task force”) consisting of the Executive Director, a Cal CASA staff member and three CASA Executive Directors representing small (Del Norte), medium (Santa Cruz) and large (Los Angeles) counties. All of the proposals considered by the task force are listed below for discussion and consideration by F&J. The proposal will then be presented to the CASA Executive Director leadership.

Current Methodology

The current methodology is a two-step approach, with the first step establishing a base amount and the second step, awarding up to two (2) incentives at a fixed amount for each can be applied on top of the based amount if the program qualifies.

Step 1, base amounts

The range between the lowest and highest county populations was utilized to determine tiers, with Tier 1 comprising lower county populations and Tier 4 comprising the most populous counties. The county population of each local program determines the tier to establish the base amount. This method provides a stable grant award that local CASA programs can expect and consider for budget planning moving into subsequent fiscal years. The funding methodology provides a greater difference between each tier (\$8,000), does not deviate immensely from current large county program median awards, and reserves approximately 20% of total program funds for award incentives.

Two- and multi-county programs will factor in the sum of their combined county populations for their tier category. These programs experience an added challenge working across two or more jurisdictions while sharing limited resources under one program administration. The base allocation amount of each of the five currently operating two-county programs would be multiplied by 1.5 to cover increased costs of this type of collaboration. (Please note Amador and Calaveras became a two-county program in 2017).

Award methodology step 2, incentive funding

The second step in the proposed funding methodology will include two types of incentive awards that can be added on top of the base amounts. The incentive funding focuses on measurable criteria that are strong indicators of a thriving program and its ability to grow. Each incentive award will be worth a fixed amount and will be given on top of the base amounts of the twenty local programs (44%) that achieve the greatest results in *each* of the two incentive categories.

This is a competitive component to the formula and there may be programs that do not qualify for any incentives, only receiving the base amount as determined in step 1.

- **Incentive A, Volunteer Retention Rate.** The number of volunteers assigned minus the number of volunteers trained, divided by 100. This rate speaks to how successful local programs are at training and retaining CASA volunteers, from completing training to getting sworn-in as an officer of the court by the judge, and being assigned a child. This incentive also recognizes the number of CASAs that remain assigned to a dependent child or youth beyond the 12-month commitment period and who take on another case after one has closed.
- **Incentive B, Dependency Proportion Served.** Comparing two factors in this incentive option allows smaller counties to be recognized for serving a high proportion of their dependency children or youth. While larger counties may have a higher number served overall, any potential inequality can be addressed by considering that larger counties are given a higher base amount to start.

Proposed Methodology

The task force considered several alternatives and recommends replacing the current methodology with the following below. Spreadsheets indicating the allocations based on current data can be found in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3.

Base Funding:

- Add 15 percent to each CASA base allocation for increased costs in operating expenses.

Incentives:

- Reduce incentives from two to one and reduce the amount to \$5,000. Exempt any county with less than 50 children in foster care from receiving an incentive.
- Separate programs into large and small categories based on total county population. Each category is eligible for only one growth incentive.
- Evaluate large programs based on the number of children served by CASAs compared to the previous year with the top 14 programs with the largest increase receiving an incentive.
- Evaluate small programs based on the percentage of children in foster care served by CASAs for current year, with the top 13 programs serving the largest percentage of children receiving an incentive. (There is one less incentive for the small programs given that there were fewer of them than the large programs.)

Other Alternatives Considered

The task force also considered several alternatives to the above recommendation. These are summarized in Table 8.

Discussion Items

Programs Serving More than One County

Maintain current formula allowing two county programs to receive a higher base amount currently at 1.5 times the county's allocation. However, for any two-county program in which the number of children served by CASAs is 200 children or more per county, those counties will be kept as separate counties. The task force came to this conclusion since many CASA programs serve less than 200 children and it seemed reasonable to reward larger programs by keeping them separate once a threshold was reached.

New CASA Programs

There is no existing policy on accepting new CASA programs. Staff recommends developing a process to certify new CASA programs and including them in the following year's budget allocation.

Table 1 - Recommendation All

Local CASA Programs by Counties	Base Allocations	Proposed Additional Allocation	Incentive: Number Growth	Incentive: Percentage Growth	Proposed FY18-19 Allocation	Number of children in FC (2016)	Number of children served by CASAs (2016)	Number of children in FC (2015)	Number of children served by CASAs (2015)	Percent of children served by CASAs (2016)	Net, Number of Children Served (2015 vs. 2016)
Alameda	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	1,741	228	1,778	328	13.10%	(100)
Amador	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$5,000	\$34,900	100	34	54	36	34.00%	(2)
Butte/Glenn	\$51,000	\$7,650		\$5,000	\$63,650	718	78	583	71	10.86%	7
Contra Costa	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000		\$62,500	1,236	108	1,165	156	8.74%	(48)
Del Norte	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	119	25	95	47	21.01%	(22)
El Dorado	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$5,000	\$44,100	328	200	358	295	60.98%	(95)
Fresno/Madera	\$75,000	\$11,250	\$5,000		\$91,250	2,443	173	2,303	252	7.08%	(79)
Humboldt	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	434	89	313	124	20.51%	(35)
Imperial	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$5,000	\$44,100	488	367	373	444	75.20%	(77)
Inyo/Mono	\$39,000	\$5,850			\$44,850	42	21	21	25	50.00%	(4)
Kern	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000		\$62,500	1,833	238	1,634	289	12.98%	(51)
Kings	\$34,000	\$5,100			\$39,100	675	22	468	20	3.26%	2
Lassen	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$5,000	\$34,900	72	32	68	44	44.44%	(12)
Los Angeles	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	30,719	489	29,029	853	1.59%	(364)
Marin	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$5,000	\$44,100	91	63	104	127	69.23%	(64)
Mariposa	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	28	33	25	22	117.86%	11
Mendocino/Lake	\$51,000	\$7,650			\$58,650	496	64	445	56	12.90%	8
Merced	\$34,000	\$5,100			\$39,100	617	114	715	120	18.48%	(6)
Modoc	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	20	9	16	9	45.00%	0
Monterey	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000		\$53,300	413	140	372	192	33.90%	(52)
Napa	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$5,000	\$44,100	169	125	160	183	73.96%	(58)
Nevada	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$5,000	\$34,900	71	64	101	105	90.14%	(41)
Orange	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	2,842	596	2,974	809	20.97%	(213)
Placer	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	358	263	364	404	73.46%	(141)
Plumas	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	71	10	37	19	14.08%	(9)
Riverside	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000		\$62,500	5,183	243	5,155	166	4.69%	77
Sacramento	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000		\$62,500	3,042	194	2,770	225	6.38%	(31)
San Benito	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$5,000	\$34,900	74	28	97	44	37.84%	(16)
San Bernardino	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000		\$62,500	5,993	114	4,761	194	1.90%	(80)
San Diego	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000		\$62,500	3,444	3,726	3,642	1,982	108.19%	1,744
San Francisco	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000		\$53,300	1,159	181	1,261	213	15.62%	(32)
San Joaquin	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000		\$53,300	1,665	77	1,528	109	4.62%	(32)
San Luis Obispo	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$5,000	\$44,100	450	167	423	224	37.11%	(57)
San Mateo	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	468	206	423	289	44.02%	(83)
Santa Barbara	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	532	333	619	458	62.59%	(125)
Santa Clara	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	1,579	464	1,481	719	29.39%	(255)
Santa Cruz	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$5,000	\$44,100	336	181	308	218	53.87%	(37)
Shasta/Tehama	\$51,000	\$7,650	\$5,000		\$63,650	813	66	825	78	8.12%	(12)
Siskiyou	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$5,000	\$34,900	135	43	121	59	31.85%	(16)
Solano	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000		\$53,300	496	101	433	134	20.36%	(33)
Sonoma	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000		\$53,300	597	177	608	221	29.65%	(44)
Stanislaus	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000		\$53,300	660	147	767	139	22.27%	8
Tulare	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	1,284	244	1,094	377	19.00%	(133)
Ventura	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000		\$53,300	1,042	238	1,053	282	22.84%	(44)
Yolo	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$5,000	\$44,100	361	92	368	116	25.48%	(24)
Totals	\$1,795,000	\$269,250	\$75,000	\$65,000	\$2,204,250	75,437	10,607	71,292	11,277		

Table 2 -Recommendation for Large Counties

Local CASA Programs by Counties	Base Allocations	Proposed Additional Allocation	Incentive Raw Growth	FY2016 # of Kids Served with CASAs	Variance, Number of Children Served FY16 vs. FY17
San Diego	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000	3,726	1,744
Riverside	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000	243	77
Stanislaus	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000	147	8
Sacramento	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000	194	(31)
San Francisco	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000	181	(32)
San Joaquin	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000	77	(32)
Solano	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000	101	(33)
Sonoma	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000	177	(44)
Ventura	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000	238	(44)
Contra Costa	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000	108	(48)
Kern	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000	238	(51)
Monterey	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$5,000	140	(52)
Fresno/Madera	\$75,000	\$11,250	\$5,000	173	(79)
San Bernardino	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$5,000	114	(80)
San Mateo	\$42,000	\$6,300		206	(83)
Alameda	\$50,000	\$7,500		228	(100)
Santa Barbara	\$42,000	\$6,300		333	(125)
Tulare	\$42,000	\$6,300		244	(133)
Placer	\$42,000	\$6,300		263	(141)
Orange	\$50,000	\$7,500		596	(213)
Santa Clara	\$50,000	\$7,500		464	(255)
Los Angeles	\$50,000	\$7,500		489	(364)
Totals	\$1,037,000	\$155,550	\$70,000	8,680	

Table 3 Recommendation for Small Counties

Local CASA Programs by Counties	Base Allocations	Proposed Additional Allocation	Incentive Percentage of Growth	Proposed Total Allocation FY18-19	FY2016 Total # of Children in Care	Percentage of Kids Served by CASA in FY2016	Variance, Number of Children Served FY15 vs. FY16
Mariposa	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$29,900	28	117.86%	11
Nevada	\$26,000	\$3,900	\$5,000	\$34,900	71	90.14%	(41)
Imperial	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$5,000	\$44,100	488	75.20%	(77)
Napa	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$5,000	\$44,100	169	73.96%	(58)
Marin	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$5,000	\$44,100	91	69.23%	(64)
El Dorado	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$5,000	\$44,100	328	60.98%	(95)
Santa Cruz	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$5,000	\$44,100	336	53.87%	(37)
Inyo/Mono	\$39,000	\$5,850		\$44,850	42	50.00%	(4)
Modoc	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$29,900	20	45.00%	0
Lassen	\$26,000	\$3,900	\$5,000	\$34,900	72	44.44%	(12)
San Benito	\$26,000	\$3,900	\$5,000	\$34,900	74	37.84%	(16)
San Luis Obispo	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$5,000	\$44,100	450	37.11%	(57)
Amador/Calaveras	\$39,000	\$5,850	\$5,000	\$49,850	100	34.00%	(2)
Siskiyou	\$26,000	\$3,900	\$5,000	\$34,900	135	31.85%	(16)
Yolo	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$5,000	\$44,100	361	25.48%	(24)
Del Norte	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$29,900	119	21.01%	(22)
Humboldt	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$29,900	434	20.51%	(35)
Merced	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$39,100	617	18.48%	(6)
Plumas	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$29,900	71	14.08%	(9)
Mendocino/Lake	\$51,000	\$7,650		\$58,650	496	12.90%	8
Butte/Glenn	\$51,000	\$7,650	\$5,000	\$63,650	718	10.86%	7
Shasta/Tehama	\$51,000	\$7,650		\$58,650	813	8.12%	(12)
Kings	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$39,100	675	3.26%	2
Totals	\$771,000	\$115,650	\$65,000	\$951,650	6,708		

Table 4 - Alternative 1

Local CASA Programs by Counties	Base Allocations	Proposed Additional Allocation	Incentive: Number Growth	Incentive: Percentage Growth	Proposed FY18-19 Allocation	Number of children in FC (2016)	Number of children served by CASAs (2016)	Number of children in FC (2015)	Number of children served by CASAs (2015)	Percent of children served by CASAs (2016)	Net, Number of Children Served (2015 vs. 2016)
Alameda	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	1,741	228	1,778	328	13.10%	(100)
Amador	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$5,225	\$5,225	\$41,094	100	34	54	36	34.00%	(2)
Butte/Glenn	\$51,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$60,869	718	78	583	71	10.86%	7
Contra Costa	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	1,236	108	1,165	156	8.74%	(48)
Del Norte	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$35,869	119	25	95	47	21.01%	(22)
El Dorado	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$43,869	328	200	358	295	60.98%	(95)
Fresno/Madera	\$75,000	\$4,644			\$79,644	2,443	173	2,303	252	7.08%	(79)
Humboldt	\$26,000	\$4,644			\$30,644	434	89	313	124	20.51%	(35)
Imperial	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$43,869	488	367	373	444	75.20%	(77)
Inyo/Mono	\$39,000	\$4,644	\$5,225	\$5,225	\$54,094	42	21	21	25	50.00%	(4)
Kern	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	1,833	238	1,634	289	12.98%	(51)
Kings	\$34,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$43,869	675	22	468	20	3.26%	2
Lassen	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$5,225	\$5,225	\$41,094	72	32	68	44	44.44%	(12)
Los Angeles	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	30,719	489	29,029	853	1.59%	(364)
Marin	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$43,869	91	63	104	127	69.23%	(64)
Mariposa	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$5,225	\$5,225	\$41,094	28	33	25	22	117.86%	11
Mendocino/Lake	\$51,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$60,869	496	64	445	56	12.90%	8
Merced	\$34,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$43,869	617	114	715	120	18.48%	(6)
Modoc	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$5,225	\$5,225	\$41,094	20	9	16	9	45.00%	0
Monterey	\$42,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$51,869	413	140	372	192	33.90%	(52)
Napa	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$43,869	169	125	160	183	73.96%	(58)
Nevada	\$26,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$35,869	71	64	101	105	90.14%	(41)
Orange	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	2,842	596	2,974	809	20.97%	(213)
Placer	\$42,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$51,869	358	263	364	404	73.46%	(141)
Plumas	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$35,869	71	10	37	19	14.08%	(9)
Riverside	\$50,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$59,869	5,183	243	5,155	166	4.69%	77
Sacramento	\$50,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$59,869	3,042	194	2,770	225	6.38%	(31)
San Benito	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$5,225	\$5,225	\$41,094	74	28	97	44	37.84%	(16)
San Bernardino	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	5,993	114	4,761	194	1.90%	(80)
San Diego	\$50,000	\$4,644	\$5,225	\$5,225	\$65,094	3,444	3,726	3,642	1,982	108.19%	1,744
San Francisco	\$42,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$51,869	1,159	181	1,261	213	15.62%	(32)
San Joaquin	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	1,665	77	1,528	109	4.62%	(32)
San Luis Obispo	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$43,869	450	167	423	224	37.11%	(57)
San Mateo	\$42,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$51,869	468	206	423	289	44.02%	(83)
Santa Barbara	\$42,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$51,869	532	333	619	458	62.59%	(125)
Santa Clara	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	1,579	464	1,481	719	29.39%	(255)
Santa Cruz	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$43,869	336	181	308	218	53.87%	(37)
Shasta/Tehama	\$51,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$60,869	813	66	825	78	8.12%	(12)
Siskiyou	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$5,225	\$5,225	\$41,094	135	43	121	59	31.85%	(16)
Solano	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	496	101	433	134	20.36%	(33)
Sonoma	\$42,000	\$4,644		\$5,225	\$51,869	597	177	608	221	29.65%	(44)
Stanislaus	\$42,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$51,869	660	147	767	139	22.27%	8
Tulare	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	1,284	244	1,094	377	19.00%	(133)
Ventura	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	1,042	238	1,053	282	22.84%	(44)
Yolo	\$34,000	\$4,644	\$5,225		\$43,869	361	92	368	116	25.48%	(24)
Totals	\$1,795,000	\$209,000	\$104,500	\$104,500	\$2,213,000	75,437	10,607	71,292	11,277		

Table 5 - Alternative 2

Local CASA Programs by Counties	Base Allocations	Additional Allocation (DELETED)	Incentive: Number Growth	Incentive: Percentage Growth	Proposed FY18-19 Allocation	Number of children in FC (2016)	Number of children served by CASAs (2016)	Number of children in FC (2015)	Number of children served by CASAs (2015)	Percent of children served by CASAs (2016)	Net, Number of Children Served (2015 vs. 2016)
Alameda	\$50,000				\$50,000	1,741	228	1,778	328	13.10%	(100)
Amador	\$26,000		\$10,450	\$10,450	\$46,900	100	34	54	36	34.00%	(2)
Butte/Glenn	\$51,000		\$10,450		\$61,450	718	78	583	71	10.86%	7
Contra Costa	\$50,000				\$50,000	1,236	108	1,165	156	8.74%	(48)
Del Norte	\$26,000		\$10,450		\$36,450	119	25	95	47	21.01%	(22)
El Dorado	\$34,000			\$10,450	\$44,450	328	200	358	295	60.98%	(95)
Fresno/Madera	\$75,000				\$75,000	2,443	173	2,303	252	7.08%	(79)
Humboldt	\$26,000				\$26,000	434	89	313	124	20.51%	(35)
Imperial	\$34,000			\$10,450	\$44,450	488	367	373	444	75.20%	(77)
Inyo/Mono	\$39,000		\$10,450	\$10,450	\$59,900	42	21	21	25	50.00%	(4)
Kern	\$50,000				\$50,000	1,833	238	1,634	289	12.98%	(51)
Kings	\$34,000		\$10,450		\$44,450	675	22	468	20	3.26%	2
Lassen	\$26,000		\$10,450	\$10,450	\$46,900	72	32	68	44	44.44%	(12)
Los Angeles	\$50,000				\$50,000	30,719	489	29,029	853	1.59%	(364)
Marin	\$34,000			\$10,450	\$44,450	91	63	104	127	69.23%	(64)
Mariposa	\$26,000		\$10,450	\$10,450	\$46,900	28	33	25	22	117.86%	11
Mendocino/Lake	\$51,000		\$10,450		\$61,450	496	64	445	56	12.90%	8
Merced	\$34,000		\$10,450		\$44,450	617	114	715	120	18.48%	(6)
Modoc	\$26,000		\$10,450	\$10,450	\$46,900	20	9	16	9	45.00%	0
Monterey	\$42,000			\$10,450	\$52,450	413	140	372	192	33.90%	(52)
Napa	\$34,000			\$10,450	\$44,450	169	125	160	183	73.96%	(58)
Nevada	\$26,000			\$10,450	\$36,450	71	64	101	105	90.14%	(41)
Orange	\$50,000				\$50,000	2,842	596	2,974	809	20.97%	(213)
Placer	\$42,000			\$10,450	\$52,450	358	263	364	404	73.46%	(141)
Plumas	\$26,000		\$10,450		\$36,450	71	10	37	19	14.08%	(9)
Riverside	\$50,000		\$10,450		\$60,450	5,183	243	5,155	166	4.69%	77
Sacramento	\$50,000		\$10,450		\$60,450	3,042	194	2,770	225	6.38%	(31)
San Benito	\$26,000		\$10,450	\$10,450	\$46,900	74	28	97	44	37.84%	(16)
San Bernardino	\$50,000				\$50,000	5,993	114	4,761	194	1.90%	(80)
San Diego	\$50,000		\$10,450	\$10,450	\$70,900	3,444	3,726	3,642	1,982	108.19%	1,744
San Francisco	\$42,000		\$10,450		\$52,450	1,159	181	1,261	213	15.62%	(32)
San Joaquin	\$42,000				\$42,000	1,665	77	1,528	109	4.62%	(32)
San Luis Obispo	\$34,000			\$10,450	\$44,450	450	167	423	224	37.11%	(57)
San Mateo	\$42,000			\$10,450	\$52,450	468	206	423	289	44.02%	(83)
Santa Barbara	\$42,000			\$10,450	\$52,450	532	333	619	458	62.59%	(125)
Santa Clara	\$50,000				\$50,000	1,579	464	1,481	719	29.39%	(255)
Santa Cruz	\$34,000			\$10,450	\$44,450	336	181	308	218	53.87%	(37)
Shasta/Tehama	\$51,000		\$10,450		\$61,450	813	66	825	78	8.12%	(12)
Siskiyou	\$26,000		\$10,450	\$10,450	\$46,900	135	43	121	59	31.85%	(16)
Solano	\$42,000				\$42,000	496	101	433	134	20.36%	(33)
Sonoma	\$42,000			\$10,450	\$52,450	597	177	608	221	29.65%	(44)
Stanislaus	\$42,000		\$10,450		\$52,450	660	147	767	139	22.27%	8
Tulare	\$42,000				\$42,000	1,284	244	1,094	377	19.00%	(133)
Ventura	\$42,000				\$42,000	1,042	238	1,053	282	22.84%	(44)
Yolo	\$34,000		\$10,450		\$44,450	361	92	368	116	25.48%	(24)
Totals	\$1,795,000	\$0	\$209,000	\$209,000	\$2,213,000	75,437	10,607	71,292	11,277		

Table 6 - Alternative 3

Local CASA Programs by Counties	Base Allocations	Proposed Additional Allocation	Incentive: Number Growth	Incentive: Percentage Growth	Proposed FY18-19 Allocation	Number of children in FC (2016)	Number of children served by CASAs (2016)	Number of children in FC (2015)	Number of children served by CASAs (2015)	Percent of children served by CASAs (2016)	Net, Number of Children Served (2015 vs. 2016)
Alameda	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	1,741	228	1,778	328	13.10%	(100)
Amador	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$10,450		\$41,094	100	34	54	36	34.00%	(2)
Butte/Glenn	\$51,000	\$4,644	\$10,450		\$66,094	718	78	583	71	10.86%	7
Contra Costa	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	1,236	108	1,165	156	8.74%	(48)
Del Norte	\$26,000	\$4,644			\$30,644	119	25	95	47	21.01%	(22)
El Dorado	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$10,450	\$49,094	328	200	358	295	60.98%	(95)
Fresno/Madera	\$75,000	\$4,644			\$79,644	2,443	173	2,303	252	7.08%	(79)
Humboldt	\$26,000	\$4,644			\$30,644	434	89	313	124	20.51%	(35)
Imperial	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$10,450	\$49,094	488	367	373	444	75.20%	(77)
Inyo/Mono	\$39,000	\$4,644	\$10,450		\$54,094	42	21	21	25	50.00%	(4)
Kern	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	1,833	238	1,634	289	12.98%	(51)
Kings	\$34,000	\$4,644	\$10,450		\$49,094	675	22	468	20	3.26%	2
Lassen	\$26,000	\$4,644			\$30,644	72	32	68	44	44.44%	(12)
Los Angeles	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	30,719	489	29,029	853	1.59%	(364)
Marin	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$10,450	\$49,094	91	63	104	127	69.23%	(64)
Mariposa	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$10,450	\$10,450	\$51,544	28	33	25	22	117.86%	11
Mendocino/Lake	\$51,000	\$4,644	\$10,450		\$66,094	496	64	445	56	12.90%	8
Merced	\$34,000	\$4,644			\$38,644	617	114	715	120	18.48%	(6)
Modoc	\$26,000	\$4,644	\$10,450		\$41,094	20	9	16	9	45.00%	0
Monterey	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	413	140	372	192	33.90%	(52)
Napa	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$10,450	\$49,094	169	125	160	183	73.96%	(58)
Nevada	\$26,000	\$4,644		\$10,450	\$41,094	71	64	101	105	90.14%	(41)
Orange	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	2,842	596	2,974	809	20.97%	(213)
Placer	\$42,000	\$4,644		\$10,450	\$57,094	358	263	364	404	73.46%	(141)
Plumas	\$26,000	\$4,644			\$30,644	71	10	37	19	14.08%	(9)
Riverside	\$50,000	\$4,644	\$10,450		\$65,094	5,183	243	5,155	166	4.69%	77
Sacramento	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	3,042	194	2,770	225	6.38%	(31)
San Benito	\$26,000	\$4,644			\$30,644	74	28	97	44	37.84%	(16)
San Bernardino	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	5,993	114	4,761	194	1.90%	(80)
San Diego	\$50,000	\$4,644	\$10,450	\$10,450	\$75,544	3,444	3,726	3,642	1,982	108.19%	1,744
San Francisco	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	1,159	181	1,261	213	15.62%	(32)
San Joaquin	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	1,665	77	1,528	109	4.62%	(32)
San Luis Obispo	\$34,000	\$4,644			\$38,644	450	167	423	224	37.11%	(57)
San Mateo	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	468	206	423	289	44.02%	(83)
Santa Barbara	\$42,000	\$4,644		\$10,450	\$57,094	532	333	619	458	62.59%	(125)
Santa Clara	\$50,000	\$4,644			\$54,644	1,579	464	1,481	719	29.39%	(255)
Santa Cruz	\$34,000	\$4,644		\$10,450	\$49,094	336	181	308	218	53.87%	(37)
Shasta/Tehama	\$51,000	\$4,644			\$55,644	813	66	825	78	8.12%	(12)
Siskiyou	\$26,000	\$4,644			\$30,644	135	43	121	59	31.85%	(16)
Solano	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	496	101	433	134	20.36%	(33)
Sonoma	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	597	177	608	221	29.65%	(44)
Stanislaus	\$42,000	\$4,644	\$10,450		\$57,094	660	147	767	139	22.27%	8
Tulare	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	1,284	244	1,094	377	19.00%	(133)
Ventura	\$42,000	\$4,644			\$46,644	1,042	238	1,053	282	22.84%	(44)
Yolo	\$34,000	\$4,644			\$38,644	361	92	368	116	25.48%	(24)
Totals	\$1,795,000	\$209,000	\$104,500	\$104,500	\$2,213,000	75,437	10,607	71,292	11,277		

Table 7 - Alternative 4

Local CASA Programs by Counties	Base Allocations	Proposed Additional Allocation	Incentive: Number Growth	Incentive: Percentage Growth	Proposed FY18-19 Allocation	Number of children in FC (2016)	Number of children served by CASAs (2016)	Number of children in FC (2015)	Number of children served by CASAs (2015)	Percent of children served by CASAs (2016)	Net, Number of Children Served (2015 vs. 2016)
Alameda	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	1,741	228	1,778	328	13.10%	(100)
Amador	\$26,000	\$3,900	\$7,500		\$37,400	100	34	54	36	34.00%	(2)
Butte/Glenn	\$51,000	\$7,650	\$7,500		\$66,150	718	78	583	71	10.86%	7
Contra Costa	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	1,236	108	1,165	156	8.74%	(48)
Del Norte	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	119	25	95	47	21.01%	(22)
El Dorado	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$7,500	\$46,600	328	200	358	295	60.98%	(95)
Fresno/Madera	\$75,000	\$11,250			\$86,250	2,443	173	2,303	252	7.08%	(79)
Humboldt	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	434	89	313	124	20.51%	(35)
Imperial	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$7,500	\$46,600	488	367	373	444	75.20%	(77)
Inyo/Mono	\$39,000	\$5,850	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$59,850	42	21	21	25	50.00%	(4)
Kern	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	1,833	238	1,634	289	12.98%	(51)
Kings	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$7,500		\$46,600	675	22	468	20	3.26%	2
Lassen	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	72	32	68	44	44.44%	(12)
Los Angeles	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	30,719	489	29,029	853	1.59%	(364)
Marin	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$7,500	\$46,600	91	63	104	127	69.23%	(64)
Mariposa	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	28	33	25	22	117.86%	11
Mendocino/Lake	\$51,000	\$7,650	\$7,500		\$66,150	496	64	445	56	12.90%	8
Merced	\$34,000	\$5,100	\$7,500		\$46,600	617	114	715	120	18.48%	(6)
Modoc	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	20	9	16	9	45.00%	0
Monterey	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	413	140	372	192	33.90%	(52)
Napa	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$7,500	\$46,600	169	125	160	183	73.96%	(58)
Nevada	\$26,000	\$3,900		\$7,500	\$37,400	71	64	101	105	90.14%	(41)
Orange	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	2,842	596	2,974	809	20.97%	(213)
Placer	\$42,000	\$6,300		\$7,500	\$55,800	358	263	364	404	73.46%	(141)
Plumas	\$26,000	\$3,900	\$7,500		\$37,400	71	10	37	19	14.08%	(9)
Riverside	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$7,500		\$65,000	5,183	243	5,155	166	4.69%	77
Sacramento	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	3,042	194	2,770	225	6.38%	(31)
San Benito	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	74	28	97	44	37.84%	(16)
San Bernardino	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	5,993	114	4,761	194	1.90%	(80)
San Diego	\$50,000	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$72,500	3,444	3,726	3,642	1,982	108.19%	1,744
San Francisco	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	1,159	181	1,261	213	15.62%	(32)
San Joaquin	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	1,665	77	1,528	109	4.62%	(32)
San Luis Obispo	\$34,000	\$5,100			\$39,100	450	167	423	224	37.11%	(57)
San Mateo	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	468	206	423	289	44.02%	(83)
Santa Barbara	\$42,000	\$6,300		\$7,500	\$55,800	532	333	619	458	62.59%	(125)
Santa Clara	\$50,000	\$7,500			\$57,500	1,579	464	1,481	719	29.39%	(255)
Santa Cruz	\$34,000	\$5,100		\$7,500	\$46,600	336	181	308	218	53.87%	(37)
Shasta/Tehama	\$51,000	\$7,650			\$58,650	813	66	825	78	8.12%	(12)
Siskiyou	\$26,000	\$3,900			\$29,900	135	43	121	59	31.85%	(16)
Solano	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	496	101	433	134	20.36%	(33)
Sonoma	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	597	177	608	221	29.65%	(44)
Stanislaus	\$42,000	\$6,300	\$7,500		\$55,800	660	147	767	139	22.27%	8
Tulare	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	1,284	244	1,094	377	19.00%	(133)
Ventura	\$42,000	\$6,300			\$48,300	1,042	238	1,053	282	22.84%	(44)
Yolo	\$34,000	\$5,100			\$39,100	361	92	368	116	25.48%	(24)
Totals	\$1,795,000	\$269,250	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$2,214,250	75,437	10,607	71,292	11,277		

Table 8. Alternatives Considered

Recommendation or Alternative	Base Funding	Base Augmentation	Incentive 1	Amount	# Counties Receiving Incentive	Incentive 2	Amount	# Counties Receiving Incentive
Recommendation	Same as FY 17-18	15% increase all programs' base	Net increase children served for 14 largest counties % of dependency pop served for 13 smaller counties No incentive for programs serving 50 children or fewer	\$5,000 \$5,000	27	None		
Alternative 1	Same as FY 17-18	\$4,644 flat increase all programs	Net increase children served	\$5,225	20	% of dependency pop served	\$5,225	20
Alternative 2	Same as FY 17-18	None	Net increase children served	\$10,450	20	% of dependency pop served	\$10,450	20
Alternative 3	Same as FY 17-18	\$4,644 flat increase all programs	Net increase children served	\$10,450	10	% of dependency pop served	\$10,450	10

Alternative 4	Same as FY 17-18	15% increase all programs' base	Net increase children served No incentive for programs serving 50 children or fewer	\$6,750	10	% of dependency pop served No incentive for programs serving 50 children or fewer	\$6,750	10
---------------	------------------	---------------------------------	--	---------	----	--	---------	----