



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: April 17, 2015

---

**Title**

Child Support: Midyear Funding Reallocation for Fiscal Year 2014–2015 and Base Funding Allocation for Fiscal Year 2015–2016 for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program

**Agenda Item Type**

Action Required

**Effective Date**

April 17, 2015

**Date of Report**

April 8, 2015

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**

None

**Contact**

Anna L. Maves, Senior Attorney

916-263-8624

[anna.maves@jud.ca.gov](mailto:anna.maves@jud.ca.gov)

**Recommended by**

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Cochair

Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Cochair

---

## Executive Summary

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council approve the reallocation of funding for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program for the remainder of fiscal year (FY) 2014–2015. The committee also recommends that the Judicial Council approve the allocation of funding for this same program for FY 2015–2016, as required by Assembly Bill 1058 (Stats. 1996, ch. 957). Finally, the committee seeks approval to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 for implementation in future allocations. The funds are provided through a cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council. At midyear, under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, the Judicial Council redistributes to courts with a documented need for additional funds any unallocated funds and any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants that year. The courts are also offered an option to use local court funds up to an approved amount to draw down, or qualify for, federal matching funds. Finally, the committee

recommends that the Judicial Council approve, with oversight provided by the Executive and Planning Committee, the formation of a joint sub-committee that will include representatives from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, including the cochairs or their designees, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the California Department of Child Support Services to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 and report back at the February 2016 Judicial Council meeting.

## **Recommendation**

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective April 17, 2015:

1. Approve the reallocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2014–2015, subject to the state Budget Act;
2. Approve the reallocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2014–2015, subject to the state Budget Act;
3. Approve allocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2015–2016, subject to the state Budget Act; and
4. Approve the allocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2015–2016, subject to the state Budget Act.
5. Direct the committee to pursue, with oversight provided by the Executive and Planning Committee, formation of a joint sub-committee that will include representatives from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, including the cochairs or their designees, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the California Department of Child Support Services to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 and report back at the February 2016 Judicial Council meeting.

Tables detailing the recommended reallocations and allocations of funding are attached at pages 8–11.

## **Previous Council Action**

The Judicial Council is required annually to allocate nontrial court funding to the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program, and has done so since 1997.<sup>1</sup> A cooperative

---

<sup>1</sup> AB 1058 added article 4 to chapter 2, of part 2, of division 9 of the Family Code, which at section 4252(b)(6) requires the Judicial Council to “[e]stablish procedures for the distribution of funding to the courts for child support commissioners, family law facilitators pursuant to [Family Code] Division 14 (commencing with Section 10000) and related allowable costs.” A copy of the original Judicial Council Report from 1997 is attached that provided the foundation for funding the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program.

agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) and the Judicial Council provides the funds for this program and requires the council to annually approve the funding allocation. Two-thirds of the funds are federal, and one-third comes from the state General Fund (nontrial court funding). Any funds left unspent during the fiscal year revert to the state General Fund and cannot be used in subsequent years.

Under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, the Judicial Council at midyear redistributes to courts with a documented need for additional funds any unallocated funds and any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants. In addition, in FY 2007–2008, DCSS and the Judicial Council of California provided a mechanism for the courts to recover two-thirds of additional program costs beyond the contract maximum covered by use of local trial court funds. This federal drawdown option continues to be available for FY 2015–2016.

## **Rationale for Recommendation**

### **Midyear reallocation, FY 2014–2015**

The midyear reallocation process is a review of each court's program funding in the current fiscal year, conducted through a questionnaire distributed to each court to allow courts to indicate whether or not they anticipate having additional funds that can be reallocated to courts that have demonstrated a need for additional funds. Historically, the midyear reallocation is to meet one-time, nonrecurring special needs, such as equipment purchases or temporary help to clear work backlogs. This year, a number of courts indicated a need for additional funds just to maintain current service levels due to increased costs of doing business. In FY 2007–2008, an additional procedure—the federal drawdown option—was put in place to assist in covering the cost of maintaining current program service levels through the use of local trial court funds spent beyond the current contract maximum and used as a match to obtain additional federal funds for the program. Federal drawdown funds voluntarily returned by some courts are also available to be redistributed to courts that have requested additional federal drawdown funds. Therefore, the committee recommends reallocation of the limited amount of funds available based on a proportional formula to all courts that have indicated a need.

Base funds and funds under the federal drawdown option, allocated at the beginning of this fiscal year but returned by courts unable to use all of these funds, are proposed for reallocation during this midyear process. As a result of the midyear reallocation process, for the Child Support Commissioner Program, a total of \$1,425,701 is available because one court has volunteered to return \$7,780 in base funds, nine courts have volunteered to return a combined \$847,792 in federal drawdown option funds, and \$570,129 is available in previously unallocated base funds. For the Family Law Facilitator Program, a total of \$362,393 is available because one court has volunteered to return \$23,624 in base funds and three courts have volunteered to return a combined \$148,726 in federal drawdown option funds, as well as \$190,043 in previously unallocated base funds.

Under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, a questionnaire is sent to each court requesting the information needed to evaluate appropriate funding levels. In addition to compiling questionnaire responses, Judicial Council staff gathers information on each court's historical spending patterns and calculates projected spending based on invoices received to date for the current fiscal year. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee then recommends proposed funding changes. The criteria for consideration of court requests are caseload, funds available for redistribution, historical spending patterns, special needs, and staffing levels. Funds returned by courts with a historical pattern of underspending, funds voluntarily returned, and any previously unallocated funds are redistributed to courts with documented needs.

This midyear reallocation process ensures that the highest proportion of total funds allocated to the courts is spent where funding is needed. This process also minimizes the amount of unspent funds that revert to the state General Fund.

A total of \$1,425,701 from all child support program grant sources was available for reallocation to the child support commissioner component of the program. A total of 32 courts requested no change to their child support commissioner base allocations, 22 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, one court offered to return base funds, and nine courts offered to return federal drawdown option funds.

A total of \$362,393 from all Family Law Facilitator Program grant sources was available for reallocation to the family law facilitator component of the program. A total of 26 courts requested no change to their family law facilitator base allocations, 22 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, one court offered to return base funds, and three courts offered to return federal drawdown funds.

All allocations to courts requesting additional funding have been based on proportionately allocating the available base and federal drawdown funds among the courts requesting additional funds proportionate to their share of the total base funding. Under the established allocation procedures for this program, the request was reviewed by the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. The committee recommends the Judicial Council adopt the allocations for the Child Support Commissioner Program detailed on the table on page 8 and the allocations for the Family Law Facilitator Program detailed on the table at page 9.

### **Base funding, FY 2015–2016**

The Judicial Council is also responsible for the allocation of base program funding at the beginning of each fiscal year. In 1997, the Judicial Council established staffing standards for child support commissioners under Family Code section 4252(b)(3). Staffing standards are based on the number of local child support agency cases that have established child support orders. In addition, under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, questionnaires are sent annually to each court requesting the information needed to evaluate appropriate funding levels in case of any exceptional needs.

Funding for FY 2015–2016 for the child support commissioner component of the program will be \$32.1 million base allocation and \$12.2 million from the federal drawdown option; funding for the family law facilitator component will be \$10.9 million base allocation and \$4.2 million from the federal drawdown option, for a total program base allocation of \$43.1 million and a total federal drawdown allocation of \$16.4 million. Statewide program funding for FY 2015–2016 is the same amount as for FY 2014–2015.

In 2014–2015, the Superior Court of Contra Costa County voluntarily terminated participation in federal drawdown funding and relinquished those available funds. This has resulted in one less court day per week and has a substantial impact on this court’s ability to meet required federal performance standards. For FY 2015–2016, the Superior Court of Contra Costa County has requested a partial restoration of federal drawdown participation for the Child Support Commissioner Program. In prior years, the Judicial Council has restored funds voluntarily relinquished by courts, when funds were available to do so. This practice helps ensure that courts will return funds that they don’t use but can be used by other courts without concern that those funds will not be available in future fiscal years, if needed. In 2013–2014, the Superior Court of Contra Costa County was allocated \$302,793 in federal drawdown. After doing a detailed analysis of need, the court has requested a partial restoration of \$161,403. Because other courts have requested a decrease in participation in the federal drawdown option for FY 2015–2016, funds are available to restore the federal drawdown funds in the amount requested by the Superior Court of Contra Costa County with additional funds available to allocate to other requesting courts.

In order to ensure that the Superior Court of Contra Costa County can meet the federal performance standards, the committee recommends a partial restoration of federal drawdown funds of \$161,403 be allocated to the Child Support Commissioner Program for the Superior Court of Contra Costa County for FY 2015–2016.

The committee recommends that courts be allocated base funding and federal drawdown funding at the same level, less any amount a court indicated that they wish to relinquish, for both the Child Support Commissioner Program and Family Law Facilitator Program as in FY 2014–2015. The committee further recommends that additional available base and federal drawdown funds, less the amount recommended to be provided to the Superior Court of Contra Costa County, be allocated among all the courts requesting additional funds proportionate to their share of the total base funding. This would provide courts with funds consistent with the funding they received in the prior fiscal year and provide all courts that have requested additional funds with some additional funds. The committee recommends the Judicial Council adopt the allocations for the Child Support Commissioner Program detailed on the table on page 10 and the allocations for the Family Law Facilitator Program detailed on the table at page 11.

#### **Funding Allocation Work Group and revised timing of allocations**

Historically, the Judicial Council has considered midyear reallocations in conjunction with next fiscal year allocations at the April Judicial Council meeting. This has allowed courts time to

spend allocated funds, determine if projections were correct, and either return funds not anticipated to be spent or request additional funding. However, given this timing the reallocations have resulted in some funds reverting to the General Fund each year. Placing this item for discussion earlier in the fiscal year would provide a better balance of identification of funds, time for spending by the courts that receive reallocations, and minimize the risk that funds would go unspent. The committee recommends that the reallocation of base funding and federal draw down funding for FY 2015–2016 be placed on the February 2016 Judicial Council agenda.

The committee will also seek approval from the Judicial Council Rules and Projects Committee to add reconsideration of the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program fiscal allocation methodology to the current annual agenda and for the coming year. In addition, if directed, the committee will pursue—with oversight by the Judicial Council Executive and Planning Committee—formation of a joint sub-committee that will include representation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, including the cochairs or their designees, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the California Department of Child Support Services. The joint sub-committee would be charged with examining the myriad of factors that must be considered when allocating funding to both optimize program success and provide for mechanisms for all funds to be spent by the end of each fiscal year. The joint sub-committee would be asked to report back to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee by December 31, 2015.

### **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

This proposal was not circulated for public comment; however, a detailed funding questionnaire was completed by all 58 courts and used to develop the allocation recommendations.

#### **Alternatives considered for allocating base funding, FY 2015–2016**

The committee considered not restoring the federal drawdown participation for the Superior Court of Contra Costa County’s Child Support Commissioner Program in the specific amount requested and instead allocating funding to that court as part of the overall FY 2015–2016 funding allocation. This option was rejected because, although this allocation would allow some funds to be restored to this court, it is inconsistent with prior Judicial Council action of restoring funds voluntarily relinquished where those funds are available. In addition, the funds available through this allocation would be insufficient to make the changes necessary to meet the federal performance standards.

The committee considered allocating additional available base and federal drawdown funds relinquished by courts for both the Child Support Commissioner Program and Family Law Facilitator Program only to courts that have spent all of the funds allocated to them in the three most recent fiscal years. The committee rejected this option because, although it provides some additional funds to courts that have consistently spent all of the funds allocated to them, it is more appropriate to allocate the funds among all courts that have indicated a need for additional funds.

The committee considered placing the reallocation of base funding and federal drawdown funding for FY 2015–2016 on the December 2015 or April 2016 Judicial Council agenda. The committee rejected placing it on the December 2015 agenda as it would require the courts to notify staff in October of anticipated excess funds. As this is early in the fiscal year, this could result in some funds that could have been reallocated not being identified and reverting to the General Fund. The committee also rejected placing it on the April 2016 agenda. Although continuing to place the issue of midyear reallocation on the April agenda would allow for identification of most funds needing to be reallocated, it will result in courts receiving additional funds later in the fiscal year which may result in funds going unspent and reverting to the General Fund.

### **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

To draw down federal funds, federal provisions require payment of a state share of one-third of total expenditures. Therefore, each participating court will need to provide the one-third share of the court's total cost to draw down two-thirds of total expenditures from federal participation.

### **Attachments**

1. Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2014–2015, at page 8
2. Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2014–2015, at page 9
3. Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2015–2016, at page 10
4. Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2015–2016, at page 11
5. Judicial Council report from 1997 for Child Support Commissioner and Facilitator Allocation Funding, at page 12

**CHILD SUPPORT COMMISSIONER PROGRAM MIDYEAR REALLOCATION, FY 2014-15**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
County	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation	Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	Recommended Base Allocation (A+C)	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (B+D)	Federal Share 66% (Column Fx.66)	Court Share 34% (Column Fx.34)	Total Allocation (Column E+F)	Contract Amount (Column E+G)
1 Alameda	1,055,625	477,580		53,992	1,055,625	531,572	350,838	180,734	1,587,197	1,406,463
2 Alpine					-	-	-	-	-	-
3 Amador	142,508	64,474			142,508	64,474	42,553	21,921	206,982	185,061
4 Butte	363,685	50,315	(7,780)	(50,315)	355,905	-	-	-	355,905	355,905
5 Calaveras	133,526	37,209			133,526	37,209	24,558	12,651	170,735	158,084
6 Colusa	45,987	19,133			45,987	19,133	12,628	6,505	65,120	58,615
7 Contra Costa	1,014,068				1,014,068	-	-	-	1,014,068	1,014,068
8 Del Norte	48,315	21,859			48,315	21,859	14,427	7,432	70,174	62,742
9 El Dorado/Alpine	206,440	93,395		(51,340)	206,440	42,055	27,756	14,299	248,495	234,196
10 Fresno	1,557,552	704,659			1,557,552	704,659	465,075	239,584	2,262,211	2,022,627
11 Glenn	118,593	53,653	6,338	6,686	124,931	60,339	39,824	20,515	185,270	164,755
12 Humboldt	122,985	55,639		(55,639)	122,985	-	-	-	122,985	122,985
13 Imperial	163,746	74,082			163,746	74,082	48,894	25,188	237,828	212,640
14 Inyo	78,314	18,328	4,186	4,653	82,500	22,981	15,167	7,814	105,481	97,667
15 Kern	645,590	292,074	34,503	33,291	680,093	325,365	214,741	110,624	1,005,458	894,834
16 Kings	294,155	133,080	15,721		309,876	133,080	87,833	45,247	442,956	397,709
17 Lake	157,624	22,018		8,657	157,624	30,675	20,246	10,430	188,299	177,870
18 Lassen	94,874	42,923			94,874	42,923	28,329	14,594	137,797	123,203
19 Los Angeles	5,093,465	2,168,640		257,839	5,093,465	2,426,479	1,601,476	825,003	7,519,944	6,694,941
20 Madera	215,224	97,370			215,224	97,370	64,264	33,106	312,594	279,488
21 Marin	124,696		6,664	6,994	131,360	6,994	4,616	2,378	138,354	135,976
22 Mariposa	76,427	34,576		(23,191)	76,427	11,385	7,514	3,871	87,812	83,941
23 Mendocino	173,010	78,273		(43,273)	173,010	35,000	23,100	11,900	208,010	196,110
24 Merced	548,422	248,113			548,422	248,113	163,755	84,358	796,535	712,177
25 Modoc	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-
26 Mono	44,688				44,688	-	-	-	44,688	44,688
27 Monterey	371,256	167,961	19,842		391,098	167,961	110,854	57,107	559,059	501,952
28 Napa	179,966	81,420	9,618	9,785	189,584	91,205	60,195	31,010	280,789	249,779
29 Nevada/Sierra	332,867	150,595			332,867	150,595	99,393	51,202	483,462	432,260
30 Orange	2,271,576	802,864		(498,955)	2,271,576	303,909	200,580	103,329	2,575,485	2,472,156
31 Placer	367,149	81,015	19,622	(27,355)	386,771	53,660	35,416	18,244	440,431	422,187
32 Plumas	93,732	12,968	5,009	5,431	98,741	18,399	12,143	6,256	117,140	110,884
33 Riverside	968,009	437,940	51,735	49,568	1,019,744	487,508	321,755	165,753	1,507,252	1,341,499
34 Sacramento	1,031,990	466,886	55,154	52,798	1,087,144	519,684	342,991	176,693	1,606,828	1,430,135
35 San Benito	136,260	20,513			136,260	20,513	13,539	6,974	156,773	149,799
36 San Bernardino	2,544,692	1,151,255			2,544,692	1,151,255	759,828	391,427	3,695,947	3,304,520
37 San Diego	1,770,159	800,845	94,605	90,065	1,864,764	890,910	588,001	302,909	2,755,674	2,452,765
38 San Francisco	891,641	479,952	47,653	45,713	939,294	525,665	346,939	178,726	1,464,959	1,286,233
39 San Joaquin	689,435	70,348		35,505	689,435	105,853	69,863	35,990	795,288	759,298
40 San Luis Obispo	225,765	102,140	12,066	12,097	237,831	114,237	75,396	38,841	352,068	313,227
41 San Mateo	395,940	179,129		20,688	395,940	199,817	131,879	67,938	595,757	527,819
42 Santa Barbara	460,907	208,521	24,633		485,540	208,521	137,624	70,897	694,061	623,164
43 Santa Clara	1,707,810	505,408	91,273	86,917	1,799,083	592,325	390,935	201,391	2,391,408	2,190,018
44 Santa Cruz	187,809	76,730		5,270	187,809	82,000	54,120	27,880	269,809	241,929
45 Shasta /Trinity	423,384	191,545			423,384	191,545	126,420	65,125	614,929	549,804
46 Sierra	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-
47 Siskiyou	233,265	105,533	12,467	12,475	245,732	118,008	77,885	40,123	363,740	323,617
48 Solano	524,122	153,727			524,122	153,727	101,460	52,267	677,849	625,582
49 Sonoma	488,152	220,846	26,089	25,343	514,241	246,189	162,485	83,704	760,430	676,726
50 Stanislaus	783,525	195,073			783,525	195,073	128,748	66,325	978,598	912,273
51 Sutter	195,330	55,441			195,330	55,441	36,591	18,850	250,771	231,921
52 Tehama	92,238	41,730		5,356	92,238	47,086	31,077	16,009	139,324	123,315
53 Trinity	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-
54 Tulare	552,849	179,730		(77,779)	552,849	101,951	67,288	34,663	654,800	620,137
55 Tuolumne	161,119	72,893			161,119	72,893	48,109	24,784	234,012	209,228
56 Ventura	563,318	254,855	30,106	18,669	593,424	273,524	180,526	92,998	866,948	773,950
57 Yolo	193,254	87,432			193,254	87,432	57,705	29,727	280,686	250,959
58 Yuba	198,813	89,947	10,625	(19,945)	209,438	70,002	46,201	23,801	279,440	255,639
<b>Totals</b>	<b>31,555,851</b>	<b>12,232,635</b>	<b>570,129</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>32,125,980</b>	<b>12,232,635</b>	<b>8,073,539</b>	<b>4,159,096</b>	<b>44,358,615</b>	<b>40,199,519</b>

CSC Base Funds 32,125,980  
 CSC Federal Drawdown 8,073,539  
 Total Funding Available 40,199,519



**FAMILY LAW FACILITATOR PROGRAM MIDYEAR REALLOCATION, FY 2014-15**

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
County	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation	Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	Recommended Base Allocatio (Column A+C)	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (Column B+D)	Federal Share 66% (Column Fx.66)	Court Share 34% (Column Fx.34)	Total Allocation (Column E+F)	Contract Amount (Column E+G)
1 Alameda	369,025	156,997		7,915	369,025	164,912	108,842	56,070	533,937	477,867
2 Alpine/Ed Dorado					-	-	-	-	-	-
3 Amador/Calaveras					-	-	-	-	-	-
4 Butte	103,647	44,095			103,647	44,095	29,103	14,992	147,742	132,750
5 Calaveras/Amador	119,392	10,925			119,392	10,925	7,211	3,715	130,317	126,603
6 Colusa	52,326	22,261	2,356	1,122	54,682	23,383	15,433	7,950	78,065	70,115
7 Contra Costa	342,973		15,440	7,356	358,413	7,356	4,855	2,501	365,769	363,268
8 Del Norte	49,723	5,138	2,238	1,066	51,961	6,204	4,095	2,109	58,165	56,056
9 El Dorado/Alpine	105,446	44,862	4,747	2,262	110,193	47,124	31,102	16,022	157,317	141,295
10 Fresno	390,532	166,148			390,532	166,148	109,658	56,490	556,680	500,190
11 Glenn	75,385	32,071	3,394	1,617	78,779	33,688	22,234	11,454	112,467	101,013
12 Humboldt	88,688	37,730	3,993		92,681	37,730	24,902	12,828	130,411	117,583
13 Imperial	52,326	22,261	2,356	1,122	54,682	23,383	15,433	7,950	78,065	70,115
14 Inyo	56,866	24,194	2,560	1,220	59,426	25,414	16,773	8,641	84,840	76,199
15 Kern	351,518	149,548	15,825	7,539	367,343	157,087	103,677	53,410	524,430	471,020
16 Kings	58,001	24,677	2,611		60,612	24,677	16,287	8,390	85,289	76,899
17 Lake	58,640	24,948		(14,948)	58,640	10,000	6,600	3,400	68,640	65,240
18 Lassen	111,304	47,352			111,304	47,352	31,252	16,100	158,656	142,556
19 Los Angeles	1,870,754	746,897		40,123	1,870,754	787,020	519,433	267,587	2,657,774	2,390,187
20 Madera	82,062	34,913			82,062	34,913	23,043	11,870	116,975	105,105
21 Marin	139,122	59,187		(59,187)	139,122	-	-	-	139,122	139,122
22 Mariposa	46,234		(23,624)		22,610	-	-	-	22,610	22,610
23 Mendocino	61,300	26,080		1,315	61,300	27,395	18,081	9,314	88,695	79,381
24 Merced	100,217	42,636			100,217	42,636	28,140	14,496	142,853	128,357
25 Modoc	72,130	1,889			72,130	1,889	1,247	642	74,019	73,377
26 Mono	47,891	1,255			47,891	1,255	828	427	49,146	48,719
27 Monterey	119,672	50,913	5,387	2,567	125,059	53,480	35,297	18,183	178,539	160,356
28 Napa	61,300	26,080	2,761	1,315	64,061	27,395	18,081	9,314	91,456	82,142
29 Nevada/Sierra	118,168	50,273			118,168	50,273	33,180	17,093	168,441	151,348
30 Orange	534,214	227,274		(74,591)	534,214	152,683	100,771	51,912	686,897	634,985
31 Placer	89,126	37,917	4,012	1,912	93,138	39,829	26,287	13,542	132,967	119,425
32 Plumas	56,866	7,254			56,866	7,254	4,788	2,466	64,120	61,654
33 Riverside	658,653	280,217	29,651	14,126	688,304	294,343	194,266	100,077	982,647	882,570
34 Sacramento	306,439	130,372	13,795	6,572	320,234	136,944	90,383	46,561	457,178	410,617
35 San Benito	61,300	26,080			61,300	26,080	17,213	8,867	87,380	78,513
36 San Bernardino	454,656	193,428			454,656	193,428	127,662	65,766	648,084	582,318
37 San Diego	602,559	225,226	27,126	12,923	629,685	238,149	157,178	80,971	867,834	786,863
38 San Francisco	243,890	103,761	10,979	5,231	254,869	108,992	71,935	37,057	363,861	326,804
39 San Joaquin	217,745	68,636			217,745	68,636	45,300	23,336	286,381	263,045
40 San Luis Obispo	66,516	28,298	2,994	1,427	69,510	29,725	19,619	10,107	99,235	89,129
41 San Mateo	129,159	54,948		2,770	129,159	57,718	38,094	19,624	186,877	167,253
42 Santa Barbara	168,964	71,882	7,606		176,570	71,882	47,442	24,440	248,452	224,012
43 Santa Clara	441,000	187,620	19,853	9,458	460,853	197,078	130,071	67,007	657,931	590,924
44 Santa Cruz	73,576	31,302		1,578	73,576	32,880	21,701	11,179	106,456	95,277
45 Shasta/Trinity	160,170	68,142	7,211	3,435	167,381	71,577	47,241	24,336	238,958	214,622
46 Sierra/Nevada					-	-	-	-	-	-
47 Siskiyou	75,822	32,258			75,822	32,258	21,290	10,968	108,080	97,112
48 Solano	131,471	55,933			131,471	55,933	36,916	19,017	187,404	168,387
49 Sonoma	137,123	58,339	6,173	2,941	143,296	61,280	40,445	20,835	204,576	183,741
50 Stanislaus	223,137	94,930			223,137	94,930	62,654	32,276	318,067	285,791
51 Sutter	65,735	27,967	2,959	1,410	68,694	29,377	19,389	9,988	98,071	88,083
52 Tehama	27,802	3,286			27,802	3,286	2,169	1,117	31,088	29,971
53 Trinity/Shasta					-	-	-	-	-	-
54 Tulare	312,151	117,503			312,151	117,503	77,552	39,951	429,654	389,703
55 Tuolumne	65,735	27,967			65,735	27,967	18,458	9,509	93,702	84,193
56 Ventura	250,857	106,724	11,293	5,380	262,150	112,104	73,989	38,115	374,254	336,139
57 Yolo	75,822	32,258	3,413	1,626	79,235	33,884	22,363	11,521	113,119	101,598
58 Yuba	65,184	27,733	2,934	1,398	68,118	29,131	19,226	9,905	97,249	87,344
<b>Totals</b>	<b>10,800,314</b>	<b>4,180,585</b>	<b>190,043</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10,990,357</b>	<b>4,180,585</b>	<b>2,759,186</b>	<b>1,421,399</b>	<b>15,170,942</b>	<b>13,749,543</b>

FLF Base Funds 10,990,357  
 FLF Federal Drawdown 4,180,585  
 Total Funding Available 15,170,942

**CHILD SUPPORT COMMISSIONER PROGRAM ALLOCATION, FY 2015-16**

	A	B	C	D	E	F
COURT	Recommended Base Fundibng Allocation	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option	Federal Share 66% (Column Bx.66)	Court Share 34% (Column B x.34)	Total Allocation (Column A+B)	Contract Amount (Column A+C)
Unallocated fund						
1 Alameda	1055625	521847	344,419	177,428	1,577,472	1,400,044
2 Alpine	0	0	-	-	-	-
3 Amador	142508	42553	28,085	14,468	185,061	170,593
4 Butte	363685	36315	23,968	12,347	400,000	387,653
5 Calaveras	133526	37209	24,558	12,651	170,735	158,084
6 Colusa	45987	19133	12,628	6,505	65,120	58,615
7 Contra Costa	1014068	42524	28,066	14,458	1,056,592	1,042,134
8 Del Norte	48315	21859	14,427	7,432	70,174	62,742
9 El Dorado/Alpine	206440	93395	61,641	31,754	299,835	268,081
10 Fresno	1601818	769974	508,183	261,791	2,371,792	2,110,001
11 Glenn	121963	58626	38,693	19,933	180,589	160,656
12 Humboldt	122985	55639	36,722	18,917	178,624	159,707
13 Imperial	163746	74082	48,894	25,188	237,828	212,640
14 Inyo	80540	21612	14,264	7,348	102,152	94,804
15 Kern	663938	319146	210,636	108,510	983,084	874,574
16 Kings	302515	145415	95,974	49,441	447,930	398,489
17 Lake	157624	28628	18,894	9,734	186,252	176,518
18 Lassen	94874	42923	28,329	14,594	137,797	123,203
19 Los Angeles	5238223	2168640	1,431,302	737,338	7,406,863	6,669,525
20 Madera	215224	64264	42,414	21,850	279,488	257,638
21 Marin	128240	5229	3,451	1,778	133,469	131,691
22 Mariposa	76427	34576	22,820	11,756	111,003	99,247
23 Mendocino	173010	35000	23,100	11,900	208,010	196,110
24 Merced	548422	248113	163,755	84,358	796,535	712,177
25 Modoc	0	0	-	-	-	-
26 Mono	45960	1874	1,237	637	47,834	47,197
27 Monterey	381807	167961	110,854	57,107	549,768	492,661
28 Napa	185081	88967	58,718	30,249	274,048	243,799
29 Nevada/Sierra	332867	150595	99,393	51,202	483,462	432,260
30 Orange	2336135	452086	298,377	153,709	2,788,221	2,634,512
31 Placer	377583	65822	43,443	22,379	443,405	421,026
32 Plumas	96396	16899	11,153	5,746	113,295	107,549
33 Riverside	995520	478533	315,832	162,701	1,474,053	1,311,352
34 Sacramento	1061319	510162	336,707	173,455	1,571,481	1,398,026
35 San Benito	136260	20513	13,539	6,974	156,773	149,799
36 San Bernardino	2544692	1151255	759,828	391,427	3,695,947	3,304,520
37 San Diego	1820467	875076	577,550	297,526	2,695,543	2,398,017
38 San Francisco	916982	517342	341,446	175,896	1,434,324	1,258,428
39 San Joaquin	689435	99259	65,511	33,748	788,694	754,946
40 San Luis Obispo	232181	111607	73,661	37,946	343,788	305,842
41 San Mateo	395940	195733	129,184	66,549	591,673	525,124
42 Santa Barbara	474006	208521	137,624	70,897	682,527	611,630
43 Santa Clara	1756347	577024	380,836	196,188	2,333,371	2,137,183
44 Santa Cruz	193147	84606	55,840	28,766	277,753	248,987
45 Shasta /Trinity	423384	191545	126,420	65,125	614,929	549,804
46 Sierra	0	0	-	-	-	-
47 Siskiyou	239894	115315	76,108	39,207	355,209	316,002
48 Solano	524122	101654	67,092	34,562	625,776	591,214
49 Sonoma	502025	241316	159,269	82,047	743,341	661,294
50 Stanislaus	783525	195073	128,748	66,325	978,598	912,273
51 Sutter	195330	55441	36,591	18,850	250,771	231,921
52 Tehama	94859	45598	30,095	15,503	140,457	124,954
53 Trinity	0	0	-	-	-	-
54 Tulare	552849	117352	77,452	39,900	670,201	630,301
55 Tuolumne	161119	72893	48,109	24,784	234,012	209,228
56 Ventura	579328	278477	183,795	94,682	857,805	763,123
57 Yolo	193254	87432	57,705	29,727	280,686	250,959
58 Yuba	204463	70002	46,201	23,801	274,465	250,664
<b>Totals</b>	<b>32,125,980</b>	<b>12,232,635</b>	<b>8,073,539</b>	<b>4,159,096</b>	<b>44,358,615</b>	<b>40,199,519</b>

CSC Base Funds 32,125,980  
 CSC Federal Drawdown 8,073,539  
 Total Funding Available 40,199,519

**FAMILY LAW FACILITATOR PROGRAM ALLOCATION, FY 2015-16**

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>COURT</b>	Recommended Base Funding Allocation	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option	Federal Share 66% (Column B x .66)	Court Share 34% (Column B x .34)	Total Allocation (Column A + B)	Contract Amount (Column A + C)
1 Alameda	369025	161948	107,336	55,294	531,656	476,361
2 Alpine/Ed Dorado	-	0	-	-	-	-
3 Amador/Calaveras	-	0	-	-	-	-
4 Butte	103,647	44095	29,103	14,992	147,742	132,750
5 Calaveras/Amador	119,392	10925	7,211	3,715	130,317	126,603
6 Colusa	53,758	22261	14,692	7,569	76,180	68,611
7 Contra Costa	352,361	4602	3,456	1,780	358,651	356,870
8 Del Norte	51,084	5805	3,892	2,005	57,134	55,129
9 El Dorado/Alpine	108,332	46277	30,671	15,800	155,128	139,328
10 Fresno	401,222	171388	113,593	58,517	574,532	516,014
11 Glenn	77,449	33082	21,926	11,295	110,902	99,606
12 Humboldt	91,116	37730	24,902	12,828	129,118	116,290
13 Imperial	53,758	22963	15,219	7,840	76,979	69,139
14 Inyo	58,423	24957	16,541	8,521	83,659	75,138
15 Kern	361,140	154265	102,244	52,671	517,134	464,463
16 Kings	59,589	25455	16,871	8,691	85,329	76,638
17 Lake	58,640	24948	16,466	8,482	83,588	75,106
18 Lassen	79,131	47352	31,252	16,100	126,483	110,383
19 Los Angeles	1,921,963	746897	492,952	253,945	2,674,605	2,420,660
20 Madera	82,062	23043	15,208	7,835	105,105	97,270
21 Marin	139,122	0	-	-	139,122	139,122
22 Mariposa	46,234	0	-	-	46,234	46,234
23 Mendocino	61,300	26903	17,830	9,185	88,316	79,130
24 Merced	100,217	42636	28,140	14,496	142,853	128,357
25 Modoc	72,130	1247	823	424	73,377	72,953
26 Mono	49,203	1255	828	427	50,604	50,177
27 Monterey	122,948	52519	34,808	17,932	176,055	158,124
28 Napa	62,978	26904	17,830	9,185	90,182	80,997
29 Nevada/Sierra	118,168	50273	33,180	17,093	168,441	151,348
30 Orange	548,837	234442	155,384	80,046	785,908	705,861
31 Placer	91,566	39113	25,923	13,354	131,117	117,763
32 Plumas	56,866	7254	4,788	2,466	64,120	61,654
33 Riverside	676,683	289055	184,943	95,274	938,870	843,596
34 Sacramento	314,827	134484	89,133	45,917	450,819	404,902
35 San Benito	61,300	26080	17,213	8,867	87,380	78,513
36 San Bernardino	467,102	199528	132,244	68,125	668,867	600,741
37 San Diego	619,053	233311	154,721	79,705	855,329	775,624
38 San Francisco	250,566	107033	70,940	36,545	358,800	322,255
39 San Joaquin	217,745	68636	45,300	23,336	286,381	263,045
40 San Luis Obispo	68,337	29190	19,347	9,967	97,855	87,888
41 San Mateo	129,159	56681	37,567	19,353	186,079	166,726
42 Santa Barbara	173,589	71882	47,442	24,440	245,990	221,550
43 Santa Clara	453,072	193537	128,273	66,080	648,779	582,699
44 Santa Cruz	75,590	32289	21,401	11,025	108,241	97,217
45 Shasta/Trinity	164,554	70291	44,974	23,168	228,312	205,144
46 Sierra/Nevada	-	0	-	-	-	-
47 Siskiyou	75,822	32258	21,290	10,968	108,080	97,112
48 Solano	131,471	36916	24,365	12,551	168,387	155,836
49 Sonoma	140,877	60179	39,885	20,547	201,730	181,183
50 Stanislaus	223,137	94930	62,654	32,276	318,067	285,791
51 Sutter	67,534	28849	19,121	9,850	96,707	86,857
52 Tehama	27,802	3286	2,169	1,117	31,088	29,971
53 Trinity/Shasta	-	0	-	-	-	-
54 Tulare	312,151	121691	80,697	41,571	434,420	392,848
55 Tuolumne	65,735	27967	18,458	9,509	93,702	84,193
56 Ventura	257,724	110090	72,965	37,588	369,048	331,460
57 Yolo	77,898	33275	22,054	11,361	111,546	100,185
58 Yuba	66,968	28608	18,961	9,768	95,897	86,129
<b>Totals</b>	<b>10,990,357</b>	<b>4,180,585</b>	<b>2,759,186</b>	<b>1,421,399</b>	<b>15,170,942</b>	<b>13,749,543</b>

FLF Base Funds 10,990,357  
FLF Federal Drawdown 4,180,585  
Total Funding Available 15,170,942