



## 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 July 19-20, 2018

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Title  | Agenda Item Type  |
| Criminal Law: Judicial Council Appointment to Board of State and Community Corrections | Action Required   |
| Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected  | Effective Date  |
| None   | July 1, 2018  |
| Recommended by   | Date of Report  |
| Executive and Planning Committee<br>Hon. Douglas P. Miller, Chair                      | July 5, 2018  |
|  | Contact   |
|  | Deirdre Benedict, 415-865-7543<br>deirdre.benedict@jud.ca.gov |

---

### Executive Summary

The Executive and Planning Committee recommends that the Judicial Council appoint Judge Gordon S. Baranco (Ret.) to the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC). The BSCC is an independent statutory agency that provides leadership to the adult and juvenile criminal justice systems and expertise on public safety realignment issues. The BSCC is composed of 13 members, including a judge appointed by the Judicial Council.

### Recommendation

The Executive and Planning Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2018, appoint Judge Gordon S. Baranco (Ret.) to the Board of State and Community Corrections for a term ending July 1, 2021.

### Relevant Previous Council Action

On June 25, 2015, the council appointed Judge Ramona Joyce Garrett (Ret.) to the BSCC from July 1, 2015 to July 1, 2018.

## **Analysis/Rationale**

### **Background**

Established in 2012, the California Board of State and Community Corrections is an independent statutory agency that provides leadership to the adult and juvenile criminal justice systems, expertise on Public Safety Realignment issues, a data and information clearinghouse, and technical assistance on a wide range of community corrections issues. (Pen. Code, § 6024–6025.)

The BSCC acts as the supervisory board of state planning under federal acts such as the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and the federal Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968. It establishes priorities for the use of the federal funds under these acts, approves expenditures, and evaluates the recipients of the program's funding.

The BSCC is the successor entity to the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA), which was abolished in July of 2012. The BSCC absorbed the previous functions of the CSA, as well as certain other programs previously administered by the California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA). Additionally, it assumed the roles of the California Council on Criminal Justice (CCCJ) and the Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy (OGYVP).

### **Role of the board**

Policy for the BSCC is set by a 13-member board, whose members are prescribed by statute, appointed by the Governor, the Legislature, and the Judicial Council; and subject to approval by the state Senate. The chair of the BSCC board is Linda Penner, former chief probation officer for Fresno County. The board is composed of representatives from local detention facilities, the courts, county administration, probation, law enforcement, treatment, and youth advocacy. One board position is reserved for a “judge appointed by the Judicial Council of California.” (Pen. Code, § 6025(a)(8).) The BSCC has a variety of subcommittees, several with members representing the judicial branch.

### **Term**

The most recent appointee, Judge Garrett, stepped down from her position in March 2018. Her term expired June 2018. Terms of office are three years. The appointee receives no compensation but is reimbursed for expenses incurred in the performance of BSCC duties. The board meets bimonthly, primarily in Sacramento and occasionally in Southern California.

### **Recommendation**

Judge Baranco (Ret.) is recommended to replace Judge Garrett. A judge of the Superior Court of Alameda County since 1980, Judge Baranco has extensive experience in collaborative courts and criminal court assignments. He was the founding judge of the Alameda County Homeless and Caring Court and also of the Alameda County Parolee Reentry Court. He served as Vice-Chair of the Judicial Council's Access and Fairness Committee, a member of the Collaborative Justice Courts Committee, and a member of the Task Force for Collaboration on Mental Health Issues, (See Attachment A for a biography of Judge Baranco.)

**Policy implications**

None.

**Comments**

Public comment has not been solicited on this recommendation.

**Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

The BSCC is staffed by employees of the BSCC. The appointees to the BSCC receive no compensation but are reimbursed from the BSCC budget for expenses incurred in the performance of BSCC duties. (Pen. Code, § 6025.1.)

**Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: Short Biography, Hon. Gordon S. Baranco
2. Link A: Attachment B: Penal Code sections 6024–6032,  
[http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes\\_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=6024.&lawCode=PEN](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=6024.&lawCode=PEN)

## **Attachment A: Biography of Gordon Baranco**

Gordon Baranco graduated from the University of California at Davis with a B.A. degree in Political Science, receiving the Lindley Award for Athletic and Scholastic Achievement; and from King Hall (UC Davis) Law School, receiving a J.D. degree.

He has been employed as a Graduate Legal Assistant in the office of the California State Attorney General; a Deputy District Attorney in the office of the San Francisco District Attorney; Managing Attorney for San Francisco Neighborhood Legal Assistance Foundation; and Assistant to the City Attorney in Oakland.

He was appointed by Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. as a judge to the Oakland – Piedmont – Emeryville Municipal Court, at the age of 32. After serving as a presiding judge of that court, he was appointed by Governor George Deukmejian as a judge of the Alameda County Superior Court, at the age of 36. He retired from that Court on December 31, 2016.

He currently serves on the Oakland and the World Advisory Board. He was the Founding Judge of the Alameda County Homeless and Caring Court and the Founding Judge of the Alameda County Parolee Reentry Court. He has recently served as a member of the American Bar Association Commission on Homelessness and Poverty and the Fred Finch Youth Center Board. He has previously served as Vice-Chair of the California Judicial Council Access and Fairness Committee, a member of the California Judicial Council Collaborative Justice Courts Committee, a member of the California Judicial Council Task Force for Collaboration on Mental Health Issues, Chair of the Alameda County Superior Court Community Focused Court Planning Committee, and on the boards of the Metropolitan Oakland YMCA, the Urban Strategies Council, the Glide Memorial Methodist Church, and the M. Robinson Baker YMCA.

In addition to serving as a panelist for numerous continuing legal education programs, he has received the following awards: California Commission on Access to Justice, Benjamin Aranda III Access to Justice Award; Charles Houston Bar Association Lifetime Achievement Award, National Bar Association Judicial Council, Sara J. Harper Humanitarian Award; Alameda County Bar Association Distinguished Judicial Service Award; Charles Houston Bar Association Hall of Fame; Charles Houston Bar Association Judicial Excellence Award; The California Public Defenders Association Rose Bird Judicial Excellence Award; Alameda/Contra Costa Trial Lawyers, Judge of the Year; The Alameda County Lawyers Club, Judge of the Year; The Bernard Jefferson Outstanding Jurist Award; California Association of Black Lawyers (twice); Charles Houston Bar Association Community Service Award; Bay Area Urban League Civic Achievement Award; Progressive Transitions Outstanding Public Service Award; Options Recovery Services, Father Bill O'Donnell Human Dignity Award; Distinguished Alumnus Award from King Hall, UC Davis School of Law; The UC Davis Young Alumnus of the Year Award; The UC Davis Citation of Excellence; The Greater Oakland YMCA President's Award; and the Marcus Foster Institute Outstanding Public Schools Alumnus Award. The Honorable Gordon S. Baranco Award is presented annually to a UC Davis Varsity Basketball Player "who has displayed exceptional leadership, unselfishness, work ethic and commitment to his team."

He has been the commencement speaker for UC Davis College of Letters and Science, and for the African and African-American Students of UC Davis commencement.

He is married to Barbara Gee, a retired school administrator and has two adult children Lauren and Brandon.

DRAFT



## 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 July 20, 2018

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Title  | Agenda Item Type  |
| Judicial Council Budget: Court Appointed<br>Special Advocate Funding Methodology and<br>FY 2018-19 Allocations | Action Required   |
| Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected  | Effective Date  |
| None   | July 20, 2018   |
| Recommended by   | Date of Report  |
| Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee<br>Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Cochair                                  | June 28, 2018   |
|  | Contact   |
|  | Penelope Davis,<br>415-865-8815<br>penny.davis@jud.ca.gov |

---

### Executive Summary

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends approving a revised allocation methodology for Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) local assistance funding beginning in fiscal year (FY) 2018–19. The committee also recommends applying the revised methodology for allocations beginning in FY 2018–19. The revised allocation methodology would provide all CASA programs with a larger percentage of funds as baseline funding and, for those programs that are eligible, a growth incentive. The state judicial budget for Judicial Council CASA Grants for FY 2018-19 is \$2.213 million.<sup>1</sup> The allocations would fund 45 CASA programs serving 51 counties.

### Recommendation

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 20, 2018:

---

<sup>1</sup> An additional \$500,000 was approved in the Governor's Budget on June 27, 2018. Allocation of these funds will be presented to the Judicial Council at its September 2018 meeting.

1. Approve a revised allocation methodology for Court Appointed Special Advocate local assistance funding and apply the revised methodology to funding allocations beginning in FY 2018–19.
2. Approve the allocations applying the revised methodology as shown on Attachment A.

### **Relevant Previous Council Action**

Legislation (Stats. 1988, ch. 723) amended Welfare and Institutions Code section 100 et seq. to require the Judicial Council to establish guidelines encouraging the development of local CASA programs that assist abused and neglected children who are the subject of judicial proceedings. The legislation also called for the establishment of a CASA grant program to be administered by the Judicial Council and required CASA programs to provide local matching or in-kind funds equal to program funding received from the Judicial Council. At its August 23, 2013 meeting, the Judicial Council approved a new funding methodology as discussed below.<sup>2</sup>

### **Analysis/Rationale**

In developing its 2018 annual agenda, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee included conducting a five-year review of the methodology adopted in 2013 in response to concerns raised about the methodology from the CASA programs.

To address those concerns, the committee requested guidance and input from the California Court Appointed Special Advocates Association (Cal CASA). Cal CASA convened a small task force consisting of a representative sample of CASA program executive directors. The methodology recommended in this proposal is a result of collaboration between the Cal CASA task force and Judicial Council CASA program staff.

### **Current methodology**

The current methodology involves a two-step approach: step 1 is the establishment of a base funding allocation and step 2 is the award of up to two fixed-amount incentives that can be applied on top of the base funding allocation for qualifying programs.

CASA programs are required, through both a contract and an evaluation process, to demonstrate that they meet a number of objectives, including compliance with rule 5.655 of the California Rules of Court and local rules of court, as well as requirements relating to volunteer recruitment and training, board development, sound fiscal management, and other requirements as outlined in the National CASA Association Standards. This methodology (1) establishes equitable allocations for CASA programs and eliminates wide funding variations resulting from historical funding formulas and grant applications; (2) supplements funding to local programs that work

---

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court Appointed Special Advocate Program Funding Methodology* (Aug. 23, 2013), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemM.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemM.pdf) (as of June 21, 2018).

toward efficiency, effectiveness, and program growth; and (3) increases the number of dependency youth and, potentially, the number of courts served by CASA programs.

### ***Step 1, base funding allocation***

Four county population tiers were established, with tier 1 comprising the least populous counties and tier 4 comprising the most populous counties. A base allocation amount was set for each tier. The county population of each local program determines its tier and thus its base funding amount. This method provides a stable grant award that local CASA programs can expect and consider for budget planning moving into subsequent fiscal years.

Two-county and multi-county programs factor in the sum of their combined county populations to determine their tier category. Because these programs experience an added challenge working across two or more jurisdictions while sharing limited resources under one program administration, the base allocation amount is multiplied by 1.5.

### ***Step 2, incentive funding***

The second step in the current funding methodology includes two types of incentive awards that can be added on top of the base funding allocation amounts. The incentive funding focuses on measurable criteria that are strong indicators of a thriving program and its ability to grow. Each incentive award is a fixed amount that is awarded to the top 20 local programs (44 percent) that achieve the greatest results in *each* of the two incentive categories. This is a competitive component to the formula and there may be some programs that do not qualify for either incentive.

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

### **Recommended revised methodology**

The committee recommends replacing the current methodology with one that would provide a larger percentage of funds as base funding. The committee also recommends replacing the two existing incentives available to all programs meeting the eligibility requirements with a new incentive available to most, but not all, programs. The proposed methodology follows:



### ***Base funding***

- Continue to distribute base funds in accordance with the four tiers adopted in 2013. Maintain the current formula allowing two-county programs to receive a higher base amount at 1.5 times the county's allocation. However, for any two-county program in which the number of children served by CASAs is 200 or more per county, counties in those programs will be treated as separate counties.
- Add 15 percent to each CASA base allocation for increased costs and operating expenses. For FY 2018–19, this would increase the percentage of total funds allocated as base funding from 81 to 93 percent.

### ***Incentives***

- Eliminate incentives for any county with fewer than 50 children in foster care.
- Reduce the number of incentives from two to one and reduce the incentive award amount from \$10,450 to \$4,955.
- Separate programs into large and small categories based on total county population.
- Evaluate large programs based on the *number of children* served by CASAs compared to the previous year, with the top 14 programs with the largest increase receiving an incentive.
- Evaluate small programs based on the *percentage of children* in foster care served by CASAs for the current year, with the top 13 programs serving the largest percentage receiving an incentive.<sup>3</sup>

### **Comments**

The committee did not seek formal comment. However, Cal CASA surveyed the network of CASA programs by e-mail and the network was given the opportunity to provide input and feedback on the proposed revised funding methodology.

Over 52 percent of the programs (23 out of 44) provided feedback. Of the programs that provided feedback, 74 percent (17 programs) support the revised methodology, while 26 percent (6 programs) disapprove. Five of the six programs that do not support the proposed methodology are small CASA programs. One large CASA program disapproves of the proposed methodology based on a philosophical change of the program's goal from increasing the number of children served by CASA to a "deeper" provision of services to children currently being served.

### **Alternatives considered**

***Alternative 1.*** Give every CASA program its previous year's base allocation and a *flat increase* for operating costs and expenses. This increase did not seem equitable given that some programs have higher expenses than others. Additionally, some programs were eligible for two incentives

---

<sup>3</sup> The committee proposes that there be one less incentive available for the small CASA programs given that there are fewer of them than the large programs.

based on the number of children served and the percentage of children with CASAs as compared to the total number of children in foster care. Providing for some programs to receive two incentives seemed out of scale compared to the number of children served and the overall budget of the program. The growth incentive that we believe favors the larger programs is the raw number of children, while the percentage of children served with CASAs as compared to the number in foster care favors the smaller programs.

**Alternative 2.** Maintain the CASA program's previous year base allocation with *no increase*. The same incentives were used as in Alternative 1 but the top 20 programs in each category received a larger incentive. Again, some programs received both incentives, which did not seem equitable given the number of children served and the small budgets of those programs.

**Alternative 3.** Give every CASA program its previous year's base allocation and a *flat increase* for operating costs and expenses. The same incentives were used as in Alternative 1 and the top 10 programs in each category received a larger incentive. Again, some small programs received both incentives, which did not seem equitable, as under this proposal only 20 programs would receive incentives, which was considered to be too few.

**Alternative 4.** Give every CASA program its previous year's base allocation and a *percentage increase* for operating costs and expenses. The same incentives were used as in Alternative 1 and the top 10 programs in each category received a larger incentive. Incentives were eliminated for counties with fewer than 50 children in foster care. Under this proposal, only 20 programs would receive incentives, which was considered to be too few.

**Alternative 5.** Maintain the status quo with use of the current CASA grants allocation methodology approved by the council in 2013. Allocation of the \$2.213 million for 2018–19 for CASA local assistance grants would be based on the current methodology. (See Attachment B.)

### **Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

Implementation of this CASA funding methodology would be effective for FY 2018–19. Currently, local programs are required to collect and submit to the Judicial Council a variety of data, including statistics on the number of children served and the number of new volunteers trained. This methodology would require no additional data collection because information is already collected as part of grant contract deliverables.

Small programs will likely experience reduced funding. Small programs that received two incentives under the 2013 methodology will likely not be eligible for the incentive under the revised funding methodology. The revised methodology will work toward equalizing funding on a per child basis. It is notable that small CASA programs, in general, have received a much larger per child amount compared to larger programs and, while reduced, this will not change with the revised funding methodology.

## **Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: Proposed Allocation for FY 2018–2019 Judicial Council Local Assistance (revised methodology)
2. Attachment B: Proposed Allocation for FY 2018–2019 Judicial Council Local Assistance (current methodology, established in 2013)

DRAFT

Attachment A (Revised): Proposed Allocation for FY 2018-2019  
Judicial Council Local Assistance

| <b>Local CASA Programs by County(ies)</b> | <b>Base Allocations</b> | <b>15% Base Increase</b> | <b>Total Base Allocations</b> | <b>Growth Incentive</b> | <b>Total JC Local Assistance Grant</b> |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Alameda                                   | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$4,955                 | \$62,455                               |
| Amador /Calaveras                         | \$39,000                | \$5,850                  | \$44,850                      | 4,955                   | \$49,805                               |
| Butte/Glenn                               | \$51,000                | \$7,650                  | \$58,650                      | \$0                     | \$58,650                               |
| Contra Costa                              | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$4,955                 | \$62,455                               |
| Del Norte                                 | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$4,955                 | \$34,855                               |
| El Dorado                                 | \$34,000                | \$5,100                  | \$39,100                      | \$4,955                 | \$44,055                               |
| Fresno/Madera                             | \$75,000                | \$11,250                 | \$86,250                      | \$4,955                 | \$91,205                               |
| Humboldt                                  | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$0                     | \$29,900                               |
| Imperial                                  | \$34,000                | \$5,100                  | \$39,100                      | \$4,955                 | \$44,055                               |
| Inyo/Mono                                 | \$39,000                | \$5,850                  | \$44,850                      | \$0                     | \$44,850                               |
| Kern                                      | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$4,955                 | \$62,455                               |
| Kings                                     | \$34,000                | \$5,100                  | \$39,100                      | \$0                     | \$39,100                               |
| Lassen                                    | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$4,955                 | \$34,855                               |
| Los Angeles                               | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$4,955                 | \$62,455                               |
| Marin                                     | \$34,000                | \$5,100                  | \$39,100                      | \$4,955                 | \$44,055                               |
| Mariposa                                  | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$0                     | \$29,900                               |
| Mendocino/Lake                            | \$51,000                | \$7,650                  | \$58,650                      | \$0                     | \$58,650                               |
| Merced                                    | \$34,000                | \$5,100                  | \$39,100                      | \$4,955                 | \$44,055                               |
| Modoc                                     | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$0                     | \$29,900                               |
| Monterey                                  | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$4,955                 | \$53,255                               |
| Napa                                      | \$34,000                | \$5,100                  | \$39,100                      | \$4,955                 | \$44,055                               |
| Nevada                                    | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$0                     | \$29,900                               |
| Orange                                    | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$0                     | \$57,500                               |
| Placer                                    | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$0                     | \$48,300                               |
| Plumas                                    | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$0                     | \$29,900                               |
| Riverside                                 | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$4,955                 | \$62,455                               |
| Sacramento                                | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$4,955                 | \$62,455                               |
| San Benito                                | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$4,955                 | \$34,855                               |
| San Bernardino                            | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$4,955                 | \$62,455                               |
| San Diego                                 | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$0                     | \$57,500                               |
| San Francisco                             | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$4,955                 | \$53,255                               |
| San Joaquin                               | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$4,955                 | \$53,255                               |
| San Luis Obispo                           | \$34,000                | \$5,100                  | \$39,100                      | \$4,955                 | \$44,055                               |
| San Mateo                                 | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$0                     | \$48,300                               |
| Santa Barbara                             | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$0                     | \$48,300                               |
| Santa Clara                               | \$50,000                | \$7,500                  | \$57,500                      | \$0                     | \$57,500                               |
| Santa Cruz                                | \$34,000                | \$5,100                  | \$39,100                      | \$4,955                 | \$44,055                               |
| Shasta/Tehama                             | \$51,000                | \$7,650                  | \$58,650                      | \$0                     | \$58,650                               |
| Siskiyou                                  | \$26,000                | \$3,900                  | \$29,900                      | \$4,955                 | \$34,855                               |
| Solano                                    | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$4,955                 | \$53,255                               |
| Sonoma                                    | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$4,955                 | \$53,255                               |
| Stanislaus                                | \$42,000                | \$6,300                  | \$48,300                      | \$4,955                 | \$53,255                               |

Attachment A (Revised): Proposed Allocation for FY 2018-2019  
Judicial Council Local Assistance

|         |             |           |             |           |             |
|---------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Tulare  | \$42,000    | \$6,300   | \$48,300    | \$0       | \$48,300    |
| Ventura | \$42,000    | \$6,300   | \$48,300    | \$0       | \$48,300    |
| Yolo    | \$34,000    | \$5,100   | \$39,100    | \$4,955   | \$44,055    |
|         | \$1,808,000 | \$271,200 | \$2,079,200 | \$133,785 | \$2,212,985 |

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Total Local Assistance Grant  | \$2,213,000 |
| Total Base Amounts  | \$2,079,200 |
| <b>Incentives Awards for Top 27 Programs</b><br>(Small 13 & Large 14) | \$133,785   |
| <b>Total Allocations = Base + 27 incentives</b>                       | \$2,212,985 |

*The CASA Methodology specifies \$5,000 for incentives. After allocating funds to the base according to the methodology, \$4,955 per qualified program was available for incentive funding.*

DRAFT

**Attachment B: Proposed Allocation for FY 2018-2019  
Judicial Council Local Assistance**

| <b>Local CASA Programs by County(ies)</b> | <b>Base Allocations</b> | <b>Incentive 2A*</b> | <b>Incentive 2B*</b> | <b>Total Incentives</b> | <b>Total JC Local Assistance Grant</b> |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Alameda                                   | \$50,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$50,000                               |
| Amador /Calaveras                         | \$39,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$39,000                               |
| Butte/Glenn                               | \$51,000                | 1                    | 0                    | \$10,125                | \$61,125                               |
| Contra Costa                              | \$50,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$50,000                               |
| Del Norte                                 | \$26,000                | 1                    | 0                    | \$10,125                | \$36,125                               |
| El Dorado                                 | \$34,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$54,250                               |
| Fresno/Madera                             | \$75,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$75,000                               |
| Humboldt                                  | \$26,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$26,000                               |
| Imperial                                  | \$34,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$54,250                               |
| Inyo/Mono                                 | \$39,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$59,250                               |
| Kern                                      | \$50,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$50,000                               |
| Kings                                     | \$34,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$34,000                               |
| Lassen                                    | \$26,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$46,250                               |
| Los Angeles                               | \$50,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$50,000                               |
| Marin                                     | \$34,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$44,125                               |
| Mariposa                                  | \$26,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$36,125                               |
| Mendocino/Lake                            | \$51,000                | 1                    | 0                    | \$10,125                | \$61,125                               |
| Merced                                    | \$34,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$34,000                               |
| Modoc                                     | \$26,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$46,250                               |
| Monterey                                  | \$42,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$42,000                               |
| Napa                                      | \$34,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$54,250                               |
| Nevada                                    | \$26,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$36,125                               |
| Orange                                    | \$50,000                | 1                    | 0                    | \$10,125                | \$60,125                               |
| Placer                                    | \$42,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$52,125                               |
| Plumas                                    | \$26,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$36,125                               |
| Riverside                                 | \$50,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$50,000                               |
| Sacramento                                | \$50,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$50,000                               |
| San Benito                                | \$26,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$46,250                               |
| San Bernardino                            | \$50,000                | 1                    | 0                    | \$10,125                | \$60,125                               |
| San Diego                                 | \$50,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$70,250                               |
| San Francisco                             | \$42,000                | 1                    | 0                    | \$10,125                | \$52,125                               |
| San Joaquin                               | \$42,000                | 0                    | 0                    | \$0                     | \$42,000                               |
| San Luis Obispo                           | \$34,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$44,125                               |
| San Mateo                                 | \$42,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$52,125                               |
| Santa Barbara                             | \$42,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$52,125                               |
| Santa Clara                               | \$50,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$60,125                               |
| Santa Cruz                                | \$34,000                | 0                    | 1                    | \$10,125                | \$44,125                               |
| Shasta/Tehama                             | \$51,000                | 1                    | 0                    | \$10,125                | \$61,125                               |
| Siskiyou                                  | \$26,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$46,250                               |
| Solano                                    | \$42,000                | 1                    | 0                    | \$10,125                | \$52,125                               |
| Sonoma                                    | \$42,000                | 1                    | 1                    | \$20,250                | \$62,250                               |

**Attachment B: Proposed Allocation for FY 2018-2019  
Judicial Council Local Assistance**

|            |             |    |    |           |             |
|------------|-------------|----|----|-----------|-------------|
| Stanislaus | \$42,000    | 0  | 0  | \$0       | \$42,000    |
| Tulare     | \$42,000    | 0  | 0  | \$0       | \$42,000    |
| Ventura    | \$42,000    | 1  | 0  | \$10,125  | \$52,125    |
| Yolo       | \$34,000    | 1  | 0  | \$10,125  | \$44,125    |
|            | \$1,808,000 | 20 | 20 | \$405,000 | \$2,213,000 |

\*Incentive 2A funding is earned by the top 20 programs with the highest volunteer retention rate. Incentive 2B funding is earned by the top 20 programs with the highest dependency proportion served.

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Total Local Assistance Grant                                 | \$2,213,000 |
| Total Base Amounts   | \$1,808,000 |
| <b>Incentive Award for Top 20 Programs @ \$10,125 (x 40)</b> | \$405,000   |
| <b>Total Allocations = Base + 40 incentives</b>              | \$2,213,000 |

DRAFT