



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

---

### MEMORANDUM

---

**Date**

September 10, 2014

**Action Requested**

Action Required

**To**

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory  
Committee

**Deadline**

September 18, 2014

**From**

Amy Nuñez, Supervisor  
Don Will, Manager

**Contact**

Amy Nuñez  
415-865-7564 phone  
415-865-7217 fax  
amy.nunez@jud.ca.gov

**Subject**

Juvenile Dependency: Proposed Allocation  
for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 for Court  
Appointed Special Advocate Local Assistance  
& Potential Modifications to the Methodology

---

### Executive Summary

Each year the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee (“committee”) recommends to the Judicial Council allocations for Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) programs. This funding is allocated to county-based programs that have been designated by the superior court and that meet the criteria in rule 5.655 and the program standards of the National CASA Association. On the recommendation of this committee, the Judicial Council at its August 23, 2013 meeting adopted a new methodology for allocations with the intention of applying that methodology in fiscal year 2013-2014 and in subsequent years. Allocations are typically considered by the Judicial Council at the October meeting.

This memo presents background information and options for the committee to use in formulating recommendations for CASA grant funding in FY 2014-2015, including:

1. A discussion of a situation not foreseen in the funding methodology. Although a program was funded in the prior year to serve Riverside county, it is no longer the court's designated CASA program. The court expects to have a new CASA program designated within a few months;
2. An update on organizational changes in CASA programs designated to receive funding since the FY 2013-2014 funding allocation;
3. Two proposed tables of grant allocations arrived at by applying the methodology.

## **Discussion**

Item 1. CASA program received funding in FY 2013-2014 but is no longer designated as the CASA program by the superior court.

Effective September 1, 2014, the Superior Court of California, Riverside County elected not to enter into a new memorandum of understanding with the program "CASA for Riverside". The court expects to be able to designate a new program to provide CASA services within the next 2-5 months. The funding methodology does not include a way to reserve funds to restore service to youth in a county that had a CASA program in the previous funding cycle but which does not have a program at the time allocations are made. The only option under the current methodology is to add the funds previously allocated to that program into the overall statewide base and distribute it to all current programs. In FY 2013-2014 \$50,000 was allocated to the CASA program serving youth in Riverside. Under the current methodology, these funds would be added to the base for allocation to other programs and a new Riverside CASA program, once established would not have Judicial Council funding until the 2015-2016 fiscal year.

Given this unforeseen situation, the committee may wish to recommend modifying the methodology to allow reserving the funding previously allocated to serve youth in a particular county for a future CASA program. In the current situation, and likely in any future circumstance, the court and community partners are working energetically to recruit a non-profit organization that can take over supervision of CASA volunteers. Start up costs for a new CASA program are considerable. Generally CASA program staff must spend a number of months setting up processes for compliance with rule of court 5.655 and National CASA standards before beginning to train and supervise volunteers. Not having access to CASA grants funding in the first year of operation will make it difficult to establish a new program.

Options to address this issue include:

1. Recommend no change to the CASA grants allocation methodology. No funding would be allocated or reserved for a county without a CASA program designated by the superior court. All funding will be distributed to existing CASA programs.

2. Recommend a change to CASA grants allocation methodology to reserve limited start-up funding (\$10,000) when a CASA program received funding in the prior allocation cycle.
3. Recommend a change to CASA grants allocation methodology to reserve operations funding. If recommending a change, the options include:
  - a. Recommend that funding can be reserved only when a CASA program received funding to serve the county in the prior allocation cycle;
  - b. Recommend that the amount of funding be set at the base allocation received in the prior cycle (no incentive funds would be reserved);
  - c. Recommend a time limit of 6 months from the date of the funding allocation (April 1, 2015 in this fiscal year) for an eligible program to be designated by the superior court as the CASA program and receive the reserved funding;
  - d. Recommend that reserved funding not awarded be distributed to programs pro-rata, after 6 months (each program receives a percentage of reserved funding equal to the percentage they receive of total funding).

Item 2. Other changes in CASA programs designated to receive funding since the FY 2013-2014 funding allocation. These organizational changes do not require committee approval or recommendations.

- The Superior Court of California, Amador County has elected to designate a different non-profit organization, Amador County Foundation (ACF) as its CASA provider for FY 2014-2015. The incentive allocations for Amador will be based on data provided by the program which operated as the CASA in Amador in FY 2012-2013, Amador-Tuolumne Community Actions Agency (ATCAA).
- The CASA program in Shasta, lead by the non-profit organization called Northern Valley Catholic Social Service (NVCSS), has expanded its program to include services in Tehama county, creating a new dual county program. The CASA funding methodology has a method for determining how two county programs should be awarded.

Item 3. Tables of grant allocations.

The tables of proposed grant allocations based on the methodology are attached. Table 1 demonstrates the allocation amounts if no funding is allocated to a program serving children in Riverside county. Table 2 demonstrates setting aside as base funding for a program serving

Riverside county an amount equal to the amount received in the FY 2013-2014 funding cycle. Both allocations account for the changes discussed in item 2 above.

## **Summary**

In order for the committee to recommend CASA grant allocations to the Judicial Council, staff request that the committee

1. Determine which course of action to take on the issue of reserving funds (Item 1);
2. Recommend allocations for FY 2014-2015;
3. Direct staff to prepare a Judicial Council report with recommended funding methodology changes, if any, and the final recommended funding allocations for the approval of the committee co-chairs.

## **Attachments**

1. Attachment A: Proposed Allocation Alternatives for FY 2014–2015 Judicial Council Local Assistance, Including Riverside
2. Attachment B: Proposed Allocation Alternatives for FY 2014–2015 Judicial Council Local Assistance, Excluding Riverside

**Attachment A. Proposed Allocation Alternatives for FY2014-2015  
Judicial Council Local Assistance, Including Riverside**

<b>County</b>	<b>Base Allo- cations A</b>	<b>Incentive 2A*</b>	<b>Incentive 2B*</b>	<b>Total Incentives</b>	<b>Total JC Local Assistance Grant FY2014-15</b>
Alameda County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Amador County	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$46,500
Butte/Glenn Counties	\$51,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$61,250
Contra Costa County	\$50,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$60,250
Del Norte County	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$46,500
El Dorado County	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$54,500
Fresno/Madera County	\$75,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$85,250
Humboldt County	\$26,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$36,250
Imperial County	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$54,500
Inyo/Mono Counties	\$39,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$59,500
Kern County	\$50,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$60,250
Kings County	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
Lassen County	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$46,500
Los Angeles County	\$50,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$60,250
Marin County	\$34,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$54,500
Mariposa County	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$46,500
Mendocino/Lake Counties	\$51,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$61,250
Merced County	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
Modoc County	\$26,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$36,250
Monterey County	\$42,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$52,250
Napa County	\$34,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$44,250
Nevada County	\$26,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$36,250
Orange County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Placer County	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$52,250
Plumas County	\$26,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$46,500
Riverside County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Sacramento County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
San Benito County	\$26,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$36,250
San Bernardino County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
San Diego County	\$50,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$60,250
San Francisco County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
San Joaquin County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
San Luis Obispo County	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$52,250
San Mateo County	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$52,250
Santa Barbara County	\$42,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$52,250
Santa Clara County	\$50,000	1	1	\$20,500	\$70,500
Santa Cruz County	\$34,000	0	1	\$10,250	\$44,250
Shasta/Tehama Counties	\$51,000	0	0	\$0	\$51,000
Siskiyou County	\$26,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$36,250
Solano County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Sonoma County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Stanislaus County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000

**Attachment A. Proposed Allocation Alternatives for FY2014-2015  
Judicial Council Local Assistance, Including Riverside**

Tulare County	\$42,000	1	0	\$10,250	\$52,250
Ventura County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Yolo County	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
	\$1,803,000	20	20	\$410,000	\$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	\$1,803,000
<b>Incentive Award for Top 20 Programs @ \$10,250 (x 40)</b>	\$410,000
<b>Total expenditures= Base + 40 incentives + Technical Assistance</b>	\$2,213,000

**Attachment B. Proposed Allocation Alternatives for FY2014-2015  
Judicial Council Local Assistance, Excluding Riverside**

<b>County</b>	<b>Base Allocations</b>	<b>Incentive 2A*</b>	<b>Incentive 2B*</b>	<b>Total Incentives Plan A</b>	<b>Total JC Local Assistance Grant FY2014-15 Plan A</b>
Alameda County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Amador County	\$26,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$49,000
Butte/Glenn Counties	\$51,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$62,500
Contra Costa County	\$50,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$61,500
Del Norte County	\$26,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$49,000
El Dorado County	\$34,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$57,000
Fresno/Madera County	\$75,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$86,500
Humboldt County	\$26,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$37,500
Imperial County	\$34,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$57,000
Inyo/Mono Counties	\$39,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$62,000
Kern County	\$50,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$61,500
Kings County	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
Lassen County	\$26,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$49,000
Los Angeles County	\$50,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$61,500
Marin County	\$34,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$57,000
Mariposa County	\$26,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$49,000
Mendocino/Lake Counties	\$51,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$62,500
Merced County	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
Modoc County	\$26,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$37,500
Monterey County	\$42,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$53,500
Napa County	\$34,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$45,500
Nevada County	\$26,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$37,500
Orange County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
Placer County	\$42,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$53,500
Plumas County	\$26,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$49,000
Riverside County	\$0	0	0	\$0	\$0
Sacramento County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
San Benito County	\$26,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$37,500
San Bernardino County	\$50,000	0	0	\$0	\$50,000
San Diego County	\$50,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$61,500
San Francisco County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
San Joaquin County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
San Luis Obispo County	\$42,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$53,500
San Mateo County	\$42,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$53,500
Santa Barbara County	\$42,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$53,500
Santa Clara County	\$50,000	1	1	\$23,000	\$73,000
Santa Cruz County	\$34,000	0	1	\$11,500	\$45,500
Shasta/Tehama Counties	\$51,000	0	0	\$0	\$51,000
Siskiyou County	\$26,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$37,500
Solano County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Sonoma County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Stanislaus County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000

**Attachment B. Proposed Allocation Alternatives for FY2014-2015  
Judicial Council Local Assistance, Excluding Riverside**

Tulare County	\$42,000	1	0	\$11,500	\$53,500
Ventura County	\$42,000	0	0	\$0	\$42,000
Yolo County	\$34,000	0	0	\$0	\$34,000
	\$1,753,000	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>\$460,000</b>	<b>\$2,213,000</b>

\*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	\$1,753,000
<b>Incentive Award for Top 20 Programs @ \$11,500 (x 40)</b>	\$460,000
<b>Total expenditures= Base + 40 incentives + Technical Assistance</b>	<b>\$2,213,000</b>