



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MATERIALS FOR NOVEMBER 10, 2016

Meeting Contents

Agenda	1
Minutes	
Draft Minutes from the July 7, 2016 Meeting	3
Draft Minutes from the August 8, 2016 Action by E-mail Between Meetings	9
Draft Minutes from the October 12, 2016 Action by E-mail Between Meetings	11
Discussion and Possible Action Items	
Item 1 – Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee Interim Report (No Action Required)	12
Item 2 – Minimum Operating and Emergency Reserve Policy (Action Required)	16
Item 3 – Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Allocation (Action Required)	18



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

OPEN MEETING AGENDA

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

Date: November 10, 2016
Time: 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Location: Veranda Room, 2860 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95833
Public Call-In Number 1-877-820-7831, Pass code: 3775936 (listen only)

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))

Call to Order and Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

Approve minutes of the July 7, 2016 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee meeting, and of the August 8, 2016 and October 12, 2016 Action by E-mail Between Meetings.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(2))

Public Comment

Members of the public requesting to speak during the public comment portion of the meeting must place the speaker's name, the name of the organization that the speaker represents if any, and the agenda item that the public comment will address, on the public comment sign-up sheet. The sign-up sheet will be available at the meeting location at least one hour prior to the meeting start time. The Chair will establish speaking limits at the beginning of the public comment session. While the advisory body welcomes and encourages public comment, time may not permit all persons requesting to speak to be heard at this meeting.

Written Comment

In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to tcbac@jud.ca.gov or mailed or delivered to Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, attention: Ms. Brandy Sanborn. Only written comments received by 10:00 a.m. on November 9, 2016 will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1–3)

Item 1

Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee Interim Report (No Action Required)

In preparation for reporting back to the Judicial Council at the December 2016 council meeting, the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee is providing a report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to ensure statewide input.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, Co-Chair, AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee; Ms. Anna Maves, Supervising Attorney/Program Manager, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Item 2

Minimum Operating and Emergency Reserve Policy (Action Required)

Consideration of maintaining the suspension of the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Judicial Council Budget Services

Item 3

Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Allocation (Action Required)

Consideration of allocating Fiscal Year 2015-2016 collection monies to trial courts.

Presenter(s)/Facilitator(s): Mr. Don Will, Principal Manager, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts

IV. INFORMATION ONLY ITEMS (NO ACTION REQUIRED)

None

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

July 7, 2016

10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

JCC Boardroom, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102

Advisory Body Members Present: Judges: Jonathan B. Conklin (Chair), Hon. Jeffrey B. Barton, Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Hon. James E. Herman, Hon. Joyce D. Hinrichs (telephone), Hon. Lesley D. Holland, Hon. Ira R. Kaufman, Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, Hon. Cynthia Ming-mei Lee, Hon. Paul M. Marigonda, Hon. Brian L. McCabe, Hon. Glenda Sanders, and Hon. Winifred Younge Smith.

Executive Officers: Ms. Sherri R. Carter, Mr. Richard D. Feldstein, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Ms. Tammy L. Grimm, Mr. Jose Octavio Guillen, Mr. W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr., Mr. Kevin Harrigan, Mr. Jeffrey E. Lewis, Mr. Michael M. Roddy, Ms. Linda Romero-Soles, Mr. Brian Taylor, Ms. Tania Ugrin-Capobianco, and Mr. David Yamasaki.

Judicial Council staff advisory members: Ms. Millicent Tidwell, Zlatko Theodorovic.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Judges: Hon. Barry P. Goode.
Executive Officers: Mr. Michael D. Planet, Ms. Christina M. Volkers,

Others Present: Ms. Lucy Fogarty, Mr. Steven Chang, Mr. Patrick Ballard, Mr. Colin Simpson, and Mr. Don Will (telephone), Ms. Leah Rose-Goodwin, Mr. Cory Jasperson, Ms. Christine Padilla, Mr. Bob Fleshman,

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. Roll was called.

Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the May 19, 2016 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-6)

Item 1 – Budget Act of 2016 (Discussion Item)

Mr. Zlatko Theodorovic discussed the funding provided for trial courts in the Budget Act of 2016.

Action: This was a discussion item with no action taken.

Item 2 – Allocation for Court- Appointed Dependency Counsel (Action Item)

Judge Conklin, Judge Cope and Mr. Don Will presented information to be provided to the Judicial Council at its July 2016 meeting.

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the following options:

1. Joint Subcommittee Recommendation on Small Court Pilot Projects.
3. New Allocation Approach: One-Time Suspension of the Reallocation of \$406,000 and Set Aside \$200,000 for Eligible Courts

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee did not vote on option 2.

2. Joint Subcommittee Option and TCBCAC Recommendation to Set Aside \$150,000 for Small Courts.

Item 3 – Allocation of 2016-2017 Proposition 47 Funding (Action Item)

Judge Kuhl and Mr. Yamasaki presented information on the Criminal Justice Realignment Subcommittee's recommendation.

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the following option:

Option 2: Two distributions based on each court's proportion of most recent Proposition 47 petitions for relief.

First Distribution July 2016: \$10.7 million

- Allocate \$10.7 million based on each court's share of statewide petitions for resentencing and classification from October 1, 2015- March 31, 2016.

Second Distribution January 2017: \$10.7 million

- Allocate \$10.7 million based on each court's share of statewide petitions for resentencing and reclassification from most recent 6 months of data available in January 2017 (April 1, 2016- September 30, 2016).

Item 4 – 2016-2017 Trial Court Allocations for General Court Operations and Specific Costs (Action Item)

Mr. Colin Simpson and Mr. Patrick Ballard presented information on 2016-2017 base and base-related allocations from the General Fund and Trial Court Trust Fund.

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations:

1. Approve the 2016–2017 beginning base allocation for court operations of \$1.773 billion, which carries forward the ending 2015–2016 Trial Court Trust Fund base allocation, and adds the General Fund benefits base allocation and adjustments to annualize partial-year allocations made in 2015–2016.
2. Allocate each court's share of \$28.7 million in new and FY 2015–2016 funding for non-interpreter employee benefits cost changes from the Trial Court Trust Fund (The remaining \$603,000 provided for 2015–2016 court interpreter benefits cost changes in the Budget Act of 2016 was added to the TCTF Program 0150037 – Court Interpreters appropriation (formerly Program 45.45)) as follows:
 - a. \$8.4 million for each court's share 2015–2016 cost changes;
 - b. \$7.0 million for courts unfunded 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 benefits cost increases in addition to the \$13.3 million provided in the 2015 Budget Act totaling \$20.3 million.
3. Allocate a total of \$754,000 for court-provided security costs from the TCTF as follows:
 - a. Allocate the amount of \$412,000 based on the Judicial Council-approved methodology that beginning in 2016-2017 and beyond, if any new General Fund (GF) augmentation is received, courts with court-provided (non-sheriff) security since 2010–2011 would be provided funding based on either the same growth funding percentage that the county sheriff receives or the percentage of the GF increase to the trial courts—whichever is lower;
 - b. Allocate the amount of \$343,000 included in the 2016 Budget Act to address the increased costs for marshals in two courts.
4. Allocate each court's share of a net allocation increase of \$19.6 million from the Trial Court Trust Fund using the 2016–2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) consisting of a reallocation of 40 percent (\$576.2 million) and an additional \$233.8 million of courts' historical WAFM-related base allocation of \$1.44 billion, reallocation of \$214.2 million in new funding provided from 2013–2014 through 2015–2016 for general court operations, and allocation of \$19.6 million in new funding provided in 2016–2017 for general court operations.
5. Allocate each court's share of the 2016–2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology funding-floor allocation adjustment, which includes funding-floor allocations for six courts receive a total of \$400,562 in floor adjustments and all other courts are allocated a reduction totaling \$400,562, for a net zero total allocation.
6. Approve a one-time allocation of \$9.2 million for criminal justice realignment costs from the Trial Court Trust Fund based on the most current available post release community supervision (PRCS) and parole workload data submitted to the Judicial Council's Criminal Justice Services office pursuant to Penal Code section 13155 (each court's percentage of the statewide number of petitions filed and court motions made to revoke/modify PRCS and parole).

Item 5 – Proposed Calculation and Allocation of Additional Funding for Staffing Complement of New Judgeships (Action Item)

Ms. Rebecca Fleming and Mr. Colin Simpson presented information on the Funding Methodology Subcommittee's recommendation

Action: The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the following recommendations:

1. Direct that any new funding appropriated to the judicial branch related to the staffing complement for new judgeships will be allocated to the trial courts based on WAFM with an equal amount of the courts' FY 2013–2014 historical WAFM base allocation being reallocated, if the historical base allocation has not already been fully reallocated.
2. Direct that for any funding requests related to the staffing complement for new judgeship positions, Judicial Council staff should estimate costs for the staffing complement as follows:
 - a. Staffing Ratio: Utilize the staff to judgeship ratio currently calculated by dividing the most recent total Resources Assessment Study (RAS) full time equivalent (FTE) need by the most recent total Judicial Needs Assessment as approved by WAAC;
 - b. Cost per Staff: Calculate the cost per staff using the most recent WAFM funding need divided by the RAS FTE need;
 - c. Total Staff Cost per Judgeship: Multiply the Staffing Ratio by the Cost per Staff;
 - d. Total Staffing Cost: Multiply the Total Staff Cost per Judgeship by the number of new judgeships; and
 - e. This would exclude any estimates, if needed, for facilities costs.

In addition, Judicial Council staff propose a recommendation to add to Recommendation 2 to clarify what other ratios and cost estimates are not included in the staffing complement estimate and that, if needed, would be provided in addition to this estimate.

2. f. This estimate only contemplates Program 0150010 – Support for Operation of Trial Courts funding. Estimates, as needed, for any additional costs including, but not limited to, judges' compensation, sheriff's security, and court interpreters will need to be calculated separately

Item 6 – Proposed Schedule for WAFM- based Reallocation of Remaining Historical-based Allocation beginning 2018-2019 (Action Item)

Judge Kuhl, Ms. Rebecca Fleming, and Mr. Colin Simpson presented information in the Funding Methodology Subcommittee's recommendation.

Action: After lengthy discussion, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee adopted the following recommendation in a vote as follows:

- Yes = 15
 - No = 12
 - Absent = 3
1. The Funding Methodology Subcommittee recommends that beginning in FY 2018–2019, until fully reallocated, each fiscal year reallocate an additional 10 percent, or the remaining amount if less than 10 percent, of the courts' FY 2013–2014 historical Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) base allocation pursuant to the WAFM. The Judicial Council would continue to allocate any new money appropriated for general trial court operations entirely pursuant to the WAFM; and reallocate applicable base funding pursuant to the WAFM on a dollar-for-dollar basis for any new money appropriated for general trial court operations. Assuming no new money is appropriated for general trial court operations after FY 2016–2017, under this recommendation the courts' FY 2013–2014 historical WAFM base allocation would see additional reallocations beginning in FY 2018–2019 as follows:
 - FY 2018–2019: an additional 10% reallocation, or scheduled 60% reallocation, of the historical base;
 - FY 2019–2020: an additional 10% reallocation, or scheduled 70% reallocation, of the historical base;
 - FY 2020–2021: an additional 10% reallocation, or scheduled 80% reallocation, of the historical base;
 - FY 2021–2022: an additional 3.8% reallocation, or scheduled 83.8% reallocation, of the historical base; and
 - The other 16.2% of the historical base will have been reallocated based on the new funding received through FY 2016–2017.

Item 7 – Prioritization of Trial Court BCPs for 2017-2018 (Action Item)

Ms. Lucy Fogarty presented information on trial court funding priorities for 2017- 2018 Budget Change Proposals.

Action: After discussion, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee moved to combine options 1 and 2 into one BCP and have the consolidated BCP remain as the number one priority:

- Yes = 18
- No = 9
- Absent = 3

1. Trial Court Operations Discretionary Funding and Trial Court Employee Compensation.

After discussion, the Trial Court Budget Committee moved to add an additional BCP priority to seek backfill of \$48 million in civil assessment revenues. In addition, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to approve the following BCPs in priority order:

2. Court Appointed Dependency Counsel
3. New Judgeships (AB 159)

4. Civil Assessment Backfill
5. Self- Help Services
6. Language Access Plan Implementation
7. Increases Cost for New Court Facilities

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee unanimously voted to recommend:

The Judicial Council Finance department will prepare proposed BCP concepts consistent with the prior practice of estimating the costs necessary to support the BCP. That information will be brought back to the members for an email vote within 5 business days of the information being provided.

A D J O U R N M E N T

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS August 8, 2016

Email Proposal

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) was asked to vote on proposed dollar amounts for five budget change proposals previously approved for recommendation to the Judicial Council at its August 26, 2016 meeting:

- 1) **Trial Court Operations Discretionary Funding and Employee Compensation.** Proposed ongoing augmentation of \$158 million in support of trial court operations, which will allow the trial courts to hire additional staff, retain existing staff, and improve the public's access to justice. The request consists of the following: 1) \$117.506 million, the equivalent of 5 percent of the amount of funding needed by the trial courts based on the 2016–2017 Workload-Based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) estimate, to reduce the gap between the funding needed to support trial court operations and the funding available; and 2) \$40.983 million to fund the equivalent of a 2.5% cost of living increase for all trial court employees, consistent with the salary increases provided for executive branch staff in FY 2015–2016 and half of the 5% increase for state employees of the judicial branch in FY 2016–2017 and FY 2017–2018; The \$40.983 million augmentation would be utilized to provide any of the following (or any combination thereof): the reduction or elimination of budget reduction-related concessions such as furloughs, reduced work weeks, previously enacted or planned future layoffs; a cost of living increase; enhanced employee benefits; or to address other personnel matters as deemed appropriate by each trial court in negotiations with their related employee representatives.
- 2) **Dependency Counsel.** Proposed ongoing augmentation of \$22 million to support court-appointed dependency counsel workload. The need based on the current workload model to achieve the Judicial Council's statewide caseload standard of 141 clients per attorney is \$202.9 million. This request represents 25 percent of the \$88.2 million required to fully fund the adequate and competent representation for parents and children at every stage of the dependency proceeding, from the initial detention hearing until the court terminates its jurisdiction.
- 3) **New Judgeships (AB 159).** Proposed augmentation of \$8.3 million for 10 of the 50 trial court judgeships authorized by AB 159. This includes \$8.2 million in ongoing funding (\$117,000 one-time) for the 10 judgeships and accompanying support staff. While the latest Judicial Needs Assessment

(2014) shows that the branch needs just over 269 judgeships based on workload metrics, efforts to secure funding for the 50 previously-authorized judgeships have been unsuccessful. This request for a more modest amount of 10 judgeships to begin to address the critical resource shortfalls in trial courts with the greatest need.

- 4) Self-Help Services.** Proposed ongoing augmentation of \$22 million to support self-help centers in trial court facilities. The need, based on a 2006 survey to support self-help centers in all trial court facilities, is \$44 million. Currently, \$11.2 million is allocated for self-help centers and this request represents approximately 67 percent of the \$32.8 million remaining need. This request will allocate \$20 million for attorney and qualified paralegal staff at each court and \$2 million to promote cooperative projects across county lines such as increased technology, sharing of bilingual resources, and ideas to provide services as cost-effectively as possible.
- 5) Increased Costs for New Court Facilities.** This proposal would address increased operating costs for new facilities opening in 2017-2018 (operations and maintenance, utilities, and insurance). As there are currently no new facilities scheduled to open in 2017-2018, this BCP will not be submitted.

Notice

On August 1, 2016, a notice was posted advising that the TCBAC was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(A).

Public Comment

The public comment period ended at 9 a.m., Monday, August 8, 2016. No comments were received.

Action Taken

TCBAC members were asked to vote between 9:16 a.m. August 8, 2016 and 5 p.m. August 8, 2016. Twenty-six members submitted votes via e-mail. All votes were in favor of the proposed recommendations save for three no votes for item 1 and one no vote for item 3.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

www.courts.ca.gov/tcbac.htm
tcbac@jud.ca.gov

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS October 12, 2016

Email Proposal

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) was asked to vote on a recommendation of the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee for consideration by the Judicial Council at its October 28, 2016 meeting, and the TCBAC was asked to vote on a recommendation of the Fiscal Planning Subcommittee for the TCBAC to review and clarify the *Children's Waiting Room (CWR) Distribution and Fund Balance Policy*:

Recommendation #1 - The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee unanimously recommends that the TCBAC recommend the Judicial Council to approve the following increases in the amount of the FY 2016–2017 cap on the Children's Waiting Room fund balance the named courts can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next:

- a. \$67,946 for the Superior Court of Contra Costa County.
- b. \$552,329 for the Superior Court of Orange County.
- c. \$455,732 for the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County.

Recommendation #2 – The Fiscal Planning Subcommittee unanimously recommends that the TCBAC review, and clarify if necessary, the *Children's Waiting Room (CWR) Distribution and Fund Balance Policy* regarding CWR cap adjustment requests covering more than one fiscal year.

Notice

On October 5, 2016, a notice was posted advising that the TCBAC was proposing to act by email between meetings under California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(o)(1)(A).

Public Comment

The public comment period ended at 10 a.m., Wednesday, October 12, 2016. One public comment was received and reviewed by the committee.

Action Taken

TCBAC members were asked to vote between 10:32 a.m. October 12, 2016 and 4 p.m. October 12, 2016. Twenty-three members submitted votes via e-mail. For the proposed recommendations, twenty-one members voted “yes,” one member voted “no,” one member abstained, and four members did not vote.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: December 15-16, 2016

Title

Child Support: Child Support Commissioner
and Family Law Facilitator Program
Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee
Interim Report

Agenda Item Type

Information Only

Date of Report

November 4, 2016

Submitted by

AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint
Subcommittee
Hon. Irma Poole Asberry, Cochair
Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Cochair
Hon. Mark Ashton Cope, Cochair

Contact

Anna L. Maves, 916-263-8624
Anna.Maves@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

At its meeting on April 17, 2015, the Judicial Council approved the recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee that the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee be established to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program. The subcommittee, which included representatives from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the California Department of Child Support Services was charged to reconsider the allocation methodology developed in 1997 and report back at the February 2016 Judicial Council meeting.

At the February 2016 meeting, the Judicial Council approved the subcommittee's recommendations, with modifications, to allocate funding using the historical funding methodology and to develop a workload-based funding methodology for implementation beginning in fiscal year 2018-2019. The Judicial Council additionally reconstituted the subcommittee and directed it to report back at the December 2016 council meeting on its

progress in developing a recommendation for the Judicial Council on a workload-based funding methodology. This report is to provide an update to the council on the subcommittee's progress.

Previous Council Action

At its meeting on April 17, 2015, the council approved the recommendation from the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee that the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee be established to review the allocation methodology developed in 1997 for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program. After three open meetings, the subcommittee presented its recommendations and the separate recommendations of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, and the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee to the council at its February 26, 2016 meeting. At that meeting, the council approved the following:

- Adopt the recommendation of the subcommittee for revising the process of how funds are moved from one court to another during a fiscal year to maximize program resources;
- Reappoint the joint subcommittee for at least fiscal year 2016- 2017 to continue consideration of the allocation of the AB 1058 funds;
- Continue to allocate funding using the historical model for fiscal years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. Develop a workload-based funding methodology to begin implementation in FY 2018-2019. Coordinate with the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) on their current review of funding allocations for local child support agencies;
- That the subcommittee continue its work to determine accurate and complete workload numbers to include in a funding methodology for both child support commissioners and family law facilitators;
- When developing a funding methodology, determine whether the family law facilitator methodology should use different underlying data than the child support commissioner methodology, and identify what data should be used, given that different factors drive commissioner and facilitator workloads;
- As part of the subcommittee's funding methodology determination, that a subject-matter-expert group be established comprising both child support commissioners and family law facilitators to provide input and expertise to the joint subcommittee; and
- That the subcommittee report back to the council at its December 2016 meeting after providing a report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee, the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee, and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to ensure statewide input.

Subcommittee process

The new AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee began its work with an initial meeting on June 30, 2016. This meeting served to orient members to the history of AB 1058 funding and the prior work of the subcommittee as well as to discuss next steps. The subcommittee's two subsequent meetings were both open meetings. No public comments were received for either meeting, although members of the public did call into the listen-only line. At its August 8, 2016 meeting staff from the Office of Court Research who support the Workload Assessment Advisory Committee presented information on the Resource Assessment Study (RAS). At its September 22, 2016 meeting, Ms. Alisha Griffin, Director of DCSS, presented on the funding methodology review process for the local child support agencies. Ms. Griffin explained that DCSS created an internal committee, the Budget Allocation Methodology Committee, to investigate various factors for possible inclusion in the final methodology. Two models are currently being reviewed, one model which mathematically merges several factors and apportions funds based on each county's part of the whole and a second model which mathematically establishes a base and modifies up or down based on additional factors. DCSS expects to develop a consensus on the base components of a funding methodology within the next few months. DCSS additionally plans on requesting additional funding from the legislature in the fall of 2017, which would allow any increases to be implemented in the 2018-2019 fiscal year.

Subject Matter Expert groups

Pursuant to the council's directive, two subject matter expert (SME) groups were formed, one comprised of child support commissioners (CSCs) and another comprised of family law facilitators (FLFs) to provide input and expertise to the joint subcommittee. The membership for the CSC group was selected by the California Court Commissioner Association and the membership for the FLF group was selected by California Family Law Facilitator Association. There are nine CSC members and seven FLF members, representing courts of various sizes both in population and geography throughout the state. The chairperson for the CSC SME group and the chairperson FLF SME group are also members of the joint subcommittee. These chairpersons facilitate communication and instructions from the joint subcommittee to the SME groups and update the joint subcommittee on the information gathered by the SME groups.

The CSC SME group has held five conference calls and the FLF SME group has held seven conference calls with additional calls scheduled. Each group developed an exploratory survey which was distributed to all CSCs and FLFs throughout the state in an attempt to identify unique factors that may impact workload. The surveys were not intended to measure workload, but rather were to uncover possible variables worth further consideration. The SME groups used the information obtained from the surveys to conduct focus groups at AB 1058 Child Support Training Conference. The SME groups continue to meet as needed to serve as a vehicle for further input from CSCs and FLFs to the subcommittee.

In addition to identifying unique factors in the child support program that impact workload, the joint subcommittee has also instructed the SME groups to identify best practices that can create

efficiency within the program. These innovative practices could then be replicated in other courts to ensure that the program goals could continue to be met even if a court receives a different funding allocation.

Additional statewide input

The AB 1058 Child Support Training Conference in Los Angeles on August 30, 2016 provided additional opportunity for statewide input from CSCs and, FLFs. The conference included a plenary session dedicated to the issue of the funding allocation methodology. The panelists provided information about the history of AB1058 funding, updates about the joint subcommittee meetings, an overview of RAS and the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology (WAFM) and the work of the SME groups, including the preliminary results of the surveys distributed to their respective constituencies.

After the plenary session, each SME group held a focus group session, at which the attending CSCs and FLFs had an opportunity to provide more in-depth input about factors affecting workload as well as to ask questions about the funding allocation methodology review process. Subcommittee members who attended the conference provided information about the focus group discussions at the subcommittee meeting on September 22, 2016.

Next Steps

The subcommittee will continue to work on its development of a workload-based funding methodology for the AB 1058 program in coordination with the DCSS funding methodology review process, consistent with the directives of the council. It is anticipated that the subcommittee will have a recommendation on a new funding methodology for consideration by the council at its December 2017 meeting to provide adequate time for implementation of the new methodology for the 2018-2019 fiscal year.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

(Action Item)

Title: Minimum Operating and Emergency Reserve Policy
Date: 10/25/2016
Contact: Brandy Sanborn, Budget Manager, Budget Services
415-865-7195 | brandy.sanborn@jud.ca.gov

Issue

The Judicial Council's suspension on the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy expired as of July 1, 2016.

Background

On August 31, 2012, the council suspended the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy through June 30, 2014, which required courts to maintain a fund balance or reserve that was approximately 3 to 5 percent of their prior year general fund expenditures. The council's action was taken in the context of two statutory changes. First, Government Code section 68502.5 required, starting in 2012-2013, the establishment of the 2 percent reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund. Each court contributed towards the reserve from its base allocation for operations. Second, GC section 77203 imposed, effective June 30, 2014, a 1 percent cap on fund balance that courts can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next. In recognition of the efforts to either eliminate or increase the 1% cap, the council suspended, instead of eliminated, the minimum operating and fund balance policy.

On October 28, 2014, the council extended the suspension on the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy for two more fiscal years until June 30, 2016. The council requested that the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy be in addition to the 1 percent reserve cap while in the interim seeking the repeal of Government Code section 77203.

Effective July 1, 2016, the 2 percent reserve requirement in the Trial Court Trust Fund which each court contributed from its base allocation for operations has been replaced with a new reserve policy for trial courts by providing \$10 million General Fund one-time as a reserve in the Trial Court Trust Fund. If any funds from the reserve are used, they would be replenished annually out of base allocations to trial courts. The 1 percent cap on fund balances that courts can carry forward from one fiscal year to the next is still in place.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET SERVICES
Report to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

Recommendation

Extend the suspension of the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy for two fiscal years until June 30, 2018, and request that the minimum operating and emergency fund balance policy be in addition to the 1 percent reserve cap while in the interim continue seeking the repeal of Government Code section 77203.



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: December 15-16, 2016

Title

Juvenile Dependency: Proposed Allocation
for Fiscal Year 2016–2017 for Juvenile
Dependency Counsel Collections Program

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

December 15, 2016

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

November 11, 2016

Recommended by

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair

Contact

Don Will, 415-865-7557

don.will@jud.ca.gov

Colin Simpson, 415-865-7195

colin.simpson@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

Under the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) and as directed in statute¹, courts collect reimbursements from parents and other responsible persons liable for the cost of dependency-related legal services to the extent that those persons are able to pay. The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends allocating \$629,077, the fiscal year 2015–2016 statutorily restricted funds remitted in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs, to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its August 23, 2013, business meeting.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, allocate \$629,077, the fiscal year 2015–2016 Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program

¹ Welfare & Institutions Code Section 903.1

funds remitted in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs, to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its August 23, 2013, business meeting (Attachment A shows projected allocations based on information received at the time of this report). The recommended allocation outlined in Attachment A has been determined using the methodology approved by the council at its August 23, 2013, meeting.²

Previous Council Action

At its October 26, 2012, meeting, the Judicial Council adopted the JDCCP guidelines,³ which fulfilled the council's legislative mandate to "establish a program to collect reimbursements from the person liable for the costs of counsel appointed to represent parents or minors pursuant to [Welfare & Institutions Code] Section 903.1 in dependency proceedings." (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 903.47(a).)⁴ As required by statute, the guidelines include a statewide standard for determining an obligated person's ability to pay reimbursement as well as policies and procedures to allow courts to recover costs associated with implementing the program.

At its August 23, 2013, meeting, the council adopted amendments to the guidelines by adding current section 14, which addresses the outstanding issue of how the Judicial Council can equitably allocate the funds remitted through the JDCCP among the trial courts in compliance with the statutory mandate that the funds be used to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads. Section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines describes the allocation methodology, which considers each court's participation in the program and each court's percentage of the statewide court-appointed counsel funding need.

The council then allocated funds remitted through the JDCCP for the first time since the JDCCP's inception at the February 20, 2014, Judicial Council meeting.⁵ At this meeting, the council approved an allocation of \$2.3 million to eligible trial courts using the methodology in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines. This allocation represented funds collected from January 1, 2010 through June 30, 2013. In FY 2014–2015 and FY 2015–2016, the council approved allocations of \$525,139 and \$872,692, respectively, to eligible trial courts.⁶ Any portion of a court's allocated funds not spent and distributed has been carried forward for distribution to the court in FY 2016–2017 and subsequent years, even if a court is ineligible for an allocation in the current fiscal year.

² Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program Guidelines* (August 23, 2013), <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemF.pdf>.

³ The guidelines took effect January 1, 2013, and are published as Appendix F of the California Rules of Court. See www.courts.ca.gov/documents/appendix_f.pdf.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program* (October 26, 2012), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-itemA20.pdf.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., *Trial Court Allocations: Criminal Justice Realignment, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel, and Workers' Compensation Liabilities* (February 20, 2014), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-itemJ.pdf.

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Proposed Allocation for Fiscal Year 2014–2015 for Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program* (October 28, 2014), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20141028-itemK.pdf.

When establishing the program the legislature authorized the Judicial Council to expend up to \$556,000 of these funds for administrative services provided to the trial courts in support of the court appointed dependency counsel program. The language authorizes the Judicial Council to use the funds in support of the dependency counsel program, not simply in support of the collections component of the program.

Rationale for Recommendation

The estimates of courts' funding needs are computed using the dependency workload model approved by the council in April 2016 and updated in July 2016⁷. The current base allocation for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$114.7 million—less than the estimated need.

In FY 2015–2016, the trial courts remitted a total of \$629,077, excluding monies recovered to offset their cost of collections and dependency counsel program administrative costs, under the JDCCP and as directed in statute to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). These monies are part of the restricted TCTF fund balance available for use in 2016–2017 and beyond. Statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council's approved standard.

For a court to be eligible to receive an allocation of these funds, it must meet the participation and funding need requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines.⁸ Every court that has satisfied those requirements receives an allocation. Each eligible court's allocated share of the JDCCP funds is equivalent to its share of the aggregate funding need of all the eligible courts. Attachment A displays the recommended allocation amount for each court.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

Because the recommended allocation outlined in Attachment A was determined using the methodology approved by the council at its August 2013 meeting, no alternatives to this proposal were considered. This report is not required to circulate for public comment.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

This proposal is for the allocation of funds that have already been collected, including funds to cover the cost of distribution. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

⁷ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (April 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=2603151&GUID=823D2AF5-E76A-434D-A863-8E325AC8901E>.

⁸ As described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines, a court demonstrates its participation in the program by submitting an annual report required by section 13 of the program guidelines and adopting a rule or policy to inquire regarding a responsible person's ability to reimburse the cost of appointed counsel at each dispositional hearing.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

The JDCCP aligns with Judicial Council strategic Goal II, Independence and Accountability. Goal II specifies that “[t]he judiciary must maintain its status as an independent, separate, and co-equal branch of government . . . The judiciary will unify in its advocacy for resources and policies that support and protect independent and impartial judicial decision-making in accordance with the constitution and the law. The branch will maintain the highest standards of accountability for its use of public resources, and adherence to its statutory and constitutional mandates.” The courts’ collective efforts to implement the JDCCP—and the funds allocated from their collections efforts—demonstrate the branch’s adherence to statutory and constitutional mandates and highlight the judiciary’s unity in advocating for much-needed resources.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: Recommended FY 2016-2017 Trial Court Allocations of \$629,077 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

	Child Client Numbers by Period			Avg. Client Numbers Based on Reported Periods (Col. A-C)		Funding Analysis											
Court	CWS/CMS Child Clients	CWS/CMS Child Clients	CWS/CMS Child Clients	CWS/CMS Average Child Clients	CWS/CMS Average Total Clients ‡	Estimated Funding Need per Caseload Funding Model (CFM)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in FY 15-16	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in FY 15-16 (Col. C Total)	Has program if eligible	Eligible for JDCCP Funding¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total)	Preliminary Allocation of FY 14-15 JDCCP Collections	Allocated to Courts in FY 13-14 & FY 14-15	FY 13-14 & FY 14-15 Allocation Spent through 8/31/15	FY 13-14 & FY 14-15 Allocation Remaining
	1-Apr-13	1-Apr-14	1-Apr-15								Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	\$872,692	\$2,840,138.97		
	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D		Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M	Col. N
Alameda	1,702	1,860	1,817	1,793	3,263	\$3,568,391.25	2.50%	\$4,037,391.42	3.52%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Alpine*	-	1	1	1	-	-	0.00%	-	0.00%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Amador	42	62	85	63	115	108,977.36	0.08%	115,232.82	0.10%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Butte	498	525	656	560	1,019	857,644.89	0.60%	664,922.53	0.58%	Y	Y	857,644.89	1.03%	9,007.58	26,476.96	-	26,476.96
Calaveras	105	183	176	155	281	267,542.13	0.19%	123,939.87	0.11%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	5,737.02	-	5,737.02
Colusa†	32	44	31	36	65	54,656.35	0.04%	38,470.84	0.03%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	293.14	-	293.14
Contra Costa	1,223	1,200	1,221	1,215	2,211	2,783,093.72	1.95%	3,030,406.45	2.64%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	122	100	117	113	206	173,163.98	0.12%	214,730.47	0.19%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	382	366	352	367	667	634,259.75	0.44%	788,644.04	0.69%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Fresno	1,823	2,027	2,200	2,017	3,670	3,090,382.13	2.16%	2,900,593.50	2.53%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Glenn	86	106	103	98	179	170,096.83	0.12%	90,417.17	0.08%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	5,261.47	5,261.00	0.47
Humboldt	280	348	412	347	631	531,239.24	0.37%	543,896.35	0.47%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Imperial	360	412	515	429	781	657,410.15	0.46%	591,127.67	0.52%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Inyo	23	14	26	21	38	36,325.76	0.03%	72,277.40	0.06%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Kern	1,789	1,647	1,800	1,745	3,177	3,019,074.60	2.11%	2,347,547.69	2.05%	Y	Y	3,019,074.60	3.63%	31,708.42	111,083.91	111,084.00	(0.09)
Kings	483	500	653	545	993	835,680.19	0.59%	354,778.66	0.31%	Y	Y	835,680.19	1.01%	8,776.89	19,983.69	19,984.00	(0.31)
Lake	128	145	142	138	252	239,288.90	0.17%	296,119.41	0.26%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Lassen	78	75	61	71	130	109,312.69	0.08%	106,890.87	0.09%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	28,556	30,776	30,631	29,988	54,578	59,680,829.60	41.81%	40,230,156.50	35.07%	Y	Y	59,680,829.60	71.82%	626,809.52	1,780,277.05	1,780,277.05	-
Madera	336	427	359	374	681	646,944.56	0.45%	225,443.30	0.20%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	16,068.83	-	16,068.83
Marin	108	116	129	118	214	269,602.68	0.19%	388,488.02	0.34%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	37	20	17	25	45	37,799.72	0.03%	38,070.02	0.03%		N	-	0.00%	-	1,817.86	-	1,817.86
Mendocino	293	337	313	314	572	543,733.58	0.38%	711,060.06	0.62%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Merced	725	743	660	709	1,291	1,086,997.22	0.76%	738,248.37	0.64%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	32,783.77	-	32,783.77
Modoc	11	20	15	15	28	23,497.12	0.02%	16,089.69	0.01%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mono	11	9	10	10	18	17,297.98	0.01%	13,956.28	0.01%		N	-	0.00%	-	103.62	104.00	(0.38)
Monterey	349	407	433	396	721	788,774.34	0.55%	434,540.70	0.38%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	19,795.72	15,927.00	3,868.72
Napa	140	168	185	164	299	327,052.78	0.23%	212,285.18	0.19%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	9,391.29	-	9,391.29
Nevada	119	112	99	110	200	190,277.81	0.13%	226,123.46	0.20%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Orange	3,090	2,959	2,906	2,985	5,433	5,940,684.83	4.16%	6,418,278.21	5.60%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Placer	382	429	421	411	747	817,300.25	0.57%	518,086.51	0.45%	Y	Y	817,300.25	0.98%	8,583.85	21,945.48	-	21,945.48
Plumas	45	45	65	52	94	79,175.27	0.06%	154,059.11	0.13%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Riverside	4,931	5,536	5,669	5,379	9,789	10,704,510.37	7.50%	6,080,321.99	5.30%	Y	Y	10,704,510.37	12.88%	112,426.20	327,502.87	-	327,502.87
Sacramento	2,346	2,879	3,091	2,772	5,045	4,795,003.68	3.36%	5,205,426.30	4.54%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Benito	126	105	99	110	200	190,277.81	0.13%	89,163.23	0.08%	Y	Y	190,277.81	0.23%	1,998.43	6,334.31	-	6,334.31
San Bernardino	4,618	5,040	5,687	5,115	9,309	8,847,918.22	6.20%	4,963,161.38	4.33%	N	N	-	0.00%	-	242,055.83	2,641.00	239,414.83
San Diego	3,832	3,726	3,653	3,737	6,801	7,437,299.56	5.21%	9,408,199.40	8.20%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Francisco	1,280	1,315	1,263	1,286	2,341	2,946,535.55	2.06%	3,761,098.38	3.28%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	1,437	1,627	1,643	1,569	2,856	2,714,055.11	1.90%	2,982,578.46	2.60%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	486	451	421	453	824	783,022.49	0.55%	699,248.41	0.61%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	469	515	541	508	925	1,164,714.03	0.82%	554,581.81	0.48%	Y	Y	1,164,714.03	1.40%	12,232.64	29,275.16	29,275.00	0.16
Santa Barbara	666	599	577	614	1,117	1,221,970.01	0.86%	1,557,378.94	1.36%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	1,461	1,598	1,669	1,576	2,868	3,610,995.66	2.53%	4,508,063.17	3.93%		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-

1. A court is eligible for an allocation if the court has met both the *Funding Need* and *Participation* requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. This table indicates a court's eligibility to receive an allocation based on the *Funding Need* criteria. Courts that meet the *Funding Need* criteria must also meet the *Participation* requirements in order to receive an allocation.

Recommended FY 2016-2017 Trial Court Allocations of \$629,077 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

Attachment A

Court	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2016) Col. A	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total) Col. B	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in FY 16- 17 Col. C	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in FY 16-17 (Col. C Total) Col. D	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹ Col. E	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. E equals "Y") Col. F	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total) Col. G	Recommended FY 16-17 Allocation of JDCCP Collections (Col. G x \$629,077) Col. H	Trial Court Allocations Through FY 15-16 Col. I	Trial Court Distributions Through August 2016 Col. J	Undistributed Trial Court Allocations Through August 2016 Col. K
Alameda	\$5,383,316.90	2.65%	\$3,618,313.44	3.15%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Alpine*	1,286.18	0.00%	399.40	0.00%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Amador	178,286.62	0.09%	115,232.82	0.10%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Butte	1,106,812.58	0.55%	627,554.46	0.55%	N	-	0.00%	-	35,484.54	-	35,484.54
Calaveras	333,724.33	0.16%	142,757.91	0.12%	N	-	0.00%	-	5,737.02	-	5,737.02
Colusa†	66,498.71	0.03%	40,667.26	0.04%	N	-	0.00%	-	293.14	-	293.14
Contra Costa	3,506,911.67	1.73%	2,600,337.31	2.27%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	204,589.68	0.10%	214,730.47	0.19%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	786,288.94	0.39%	655,569.07	0.57%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Fresno	4,328,262.54	2.13%	2,670,600.45	2.33%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Glenn	151,336.59	0.07%	90,417.17	0.08%	N	-	0.00%	-	5,261.47	5,261.00	0.47
Humboldt	601,875.76	0.30%	462,558.00	0.40%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Imperial	742,948.53	0.37%	518,512.14	0.45%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Inyo	37,749.09	0.02%	72,277.40	0.06%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Kern	3,925,556.90	1.93%	2,277,752.96	1.98%	N	-	0.00%	-	142,792.33	111,084.00	31,708.33
Kings	1,100,786.63	0.54%	443,477.85	0.39%	Y	1,100,786.63	0.95%	5,983.09	28,760.58	19,984.00	8,776.58
Lake	220,141.96	0.11%	296,119.41	0.26%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Lassen	134,195.49	0.07%	106,890.87	0.09%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	91,087,855.31	44.89%	45,149,389.17	39.33%	Y	91,087,855.31	78.70%	495,088.60	2,407,086.57	2,407,086.57	0.00
Madera	862,871.88	0.43%	293,833.31	0.26%	N	-	0.00%	-	16,068.83	-	16,068.83
Marin	333,014.78	0.16%	388,488.02	0.34%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	44,150.16	0.02%	38,070.02	0.03%	N	-	0.00%	-	1,817.86	-	1,817.86
Mendocino	582,177.26	0.29%	566,908.04	0.49%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Merced	1,434,600.34	0.71%	751,396.71	0.65%	N	-	0.00%	-	32,783.77	-	32,783.77
Modoc	28,094.83	0.01%	17,127.56	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mono	21,537.62	0.01%	13,956.28	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-	103.62	104.00	(0.38)
Monterey	1,048,356.90	0.52%	494,823.26	0.43%	N	-	0.00%	-	19,795.72	19,796.00	(0.28)
Napa	455,792.67	0.22%	232,362.40	0.20%	N	-	0.00%	-	9,391.29	-	9,391.29
Nevada	219,989.00	0.11%	226,123.46	0.20%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Orange	8,189,943.48	4.04%	5,648,064.84	4.92%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Placer	1,524,646.26	0.75%	687,985.18	0.60%	Y	1,524,646.26	1.32%	8,286.89	30,529.33	-	30,529.33
Plumas	90,648.50	0.04%	154,059.11	0.13%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Riverside	13,748,021.77	6.78%	6,411,054.48	5.58%	Y	13,748,021.77	11.88%	74,724.44	439,929.07	-	439,929.07
Sacramento	7,760,416.47	3.82%	4,832,997.22	4.21%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Benito	213,243.00	0.11%	89,163.23	0.08%	Y	213,243.00	0.18%	1,159.04	8,332.74	4,345.00	3,987.74
San Bernardino	12,529,694.37	6.18%	5,731,209.73	4.99%	N	-	0.00%	-	242,055.83	2,641.00	239,414.83
San Diego	8,931,746.94	4.40%	7,711,176.54	6.72%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Francisco	4,585,273.25	2.26%	3,296,145.80	2.87%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	3,623,924.05	1.79%	2,601,178.01	2.27%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	1,082,018.15	0.53%	647,979.76	0.56%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	1,622,673.01	0.80%	668,642.84	0.58%	Y	1,622,673.01	1.40%	8,819.69	41,507.80	29,275.00	12,232.80
Santa Barbara	1,446,032.59	0.71%	1,267,448.41	1.10%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	4,616,974.79	2.28%	3,780,955.53	3.29%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-

Recommended FY 2016-2017 Trial Court Allocations of \$629,077 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

Attachment A

Court	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2016) Col. A	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total) Col. B	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in FY 16- 17 Col. C	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in FY 16-17 (Col. C Total) Col. D	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹ Col. E	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. E equals "Y") Col. F	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total) Col. G	Recommended FY 16-17 Allocation of JDCCP Collections (Col. G x \$629,077) Col. H	Trial Court Allocations Through FY 15-16 Col. I	Trial Court Distributions Through August 2016 Col. J	Undistributed Trial Court Allocations Through August 2016 Col. K
Santa Cruz	849,078.98	0.42%	713,676.26	0.62%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Shasta	1,042,834.92	0.51%	621,700.06	0.54%	N	-	0.00%	-	38,437.50	28,641.00	9,796.50
Sierra	5,694.63	0.00%	13,758.53	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	200,532.61	0.10%	245,373.43	0.21%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Solano	1,271,812.02	0.63%	801,056.91	0.70%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	1,446,554.35	0.71%	990,020.72	0.86%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Stanislaus	1,573,914.45	0.78%	1,004,469.68	0.87%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sutter	331,108.83	0.16%	146,804.14	0.13%	Y	331,108.83	0.29%	1,799.67	12,096.46	-	12,096.46
Tehama	417,450.14	0.21%	177,633.97	0.15%	Y	417,450.14	0.36%	2,268.96	13,953.23	-	13,953.23
Trinity	118,304.32	0.06%	93,829.12	0.08%	N	-	0.00%	-	1,996.54	-	1,996.54
Tulare	2,235,713.06	1.10%	1,032,410.38	0.90%	Y	2,235,713.06	1.93%	12,151.74	67,530.61	-	67,530.61
Tuolumne	222,597.40	0.11%	110,593.02	0.10%	N	-	0.00%	-	7,054.13	-	7,054.13
Ventura	2,890,556.68	1.42%	1,284,628.22	1.12%	Y	2,890,556.68	2.50%	15,711.00	81,201.57	59,142.36	22,059.21
Yolo	833,176.04	0.41%	430,428.87	0.37%	N	-	0.00%	-	17,813.12	-	17,813.12
Yuba	567,380.60	0.28%	278,909.42	0.24%	Y	567,380.60	0.49%	3,083.88	5,016.28	-	5,016.28
Unallocated			200,000.00			-					
Total	\$202,900,975.53		\$114,800,000.00			\$115,739,435.30	100.00%	\$629,077.00	\$3,712,830.96	\$2,687,359.93	\$1,025,471.03
Reserved for admin.								252,982.00	845,548.66		
Total collected								882,059.00	4,558,379.62		

1. A court is eligible for an allocation if the court has met both the Funding Need and Participation requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. This table indicates a court's eligibility to receive an allocation based on the Funding Need criteria. Courts that meet the Funding Need criteria must also meet the Participation requirements in order to receive an allocation.