



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 February 25, 2016

Title

Child Support: Midyear Funding Reallocation for Fiscal Year 2015–2016 and Base Funding Allocation for Fiscal Year 2016–2017 for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

February 25, 2016

Date of Report

January 27, 2016

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Contact

Anna L. Maves, Senior Attorney

916-263-8624

anna.maves@jud.ca.gov

Recommended by

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Cochair

Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Cochair

Executive Summary

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends approving the reallocation of funding for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program for the remainder of fiscal year (FY) 2015–2016 and the allocation of funding for this same program for FY 2016–2017, as required by Assembly Bill 1058 (Stats. 1996, ch. 957). The funds are provided through a cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) and the Judicial Council. At midyear, under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, the Judicial Council redistributes to courts with a documented need for additional funds any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants that year, up to the amount of funds available through the contract with DCSS. The courts are also offered an option to use local court funds up to an approved amount to draw down, or qualify for, federal matching funds.

Recommendation

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective February 25, 2016:

1. Approve the reallocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2015–2016, subject to the state Budget Act;
2. Approve the reallocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2015–2016, subject to the state Budget Act;
3. Approve allocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2016–2017, subject to the state Budget Act; and
4. Approve the allocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2016–2017, subject to the state Budget Act.

Attachments A through D contain tables detailing the recommended reallocations and allocations of funding.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council is required annually to allocate non–trial court funding to the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program and has done so since 1997.¹ A cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council provides the funds for this program and requires the council to annually approve the funding allocation. Two-thirds of the funds are federal, and one-third comes from the state General Fund (non–trial court funding). Any funds left unspent during the fiscal year revert to the state General Fund and cannot be used in subsequent years.

Historically, the Judicial Council at midyear redistributes to courts with a documented need for additional funds any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants. In addition, in FY 2007–2008, DCSS and the Judicial Council provided a mechanism for the courts to recover two-thirds of additional program costs beyond the contract maximum covered by local trial court funds. This federal drawdown option continues to be available for FY 2016–2017.

On April 17, 2015, the Judicial Council approved the formation of a joint subcommittee—comprising representatives from the Family and Juvenile Law, Trial Court Budget, and Workload Assessment Advisory Committees and the California Department of Child Support

¹ AB 1058 added article 4 to chapter 2 of part 2 of division 9 of the Family Code, which at section 4252(b)(6) requires the Judicial Council to “[e]stablish procedures for the distribution of funding to the courts for child support commissioners, family law facilitators pursuant to [Family Code] Division 14 (commencing with Section 10000), and related allowable costs.”

Services—to reconsider the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding allocation methodology. The joint subcommittee was charged with examining the myriad factors that must be considered when allocating funding to both optimize program success and provide for mechanisms for all funds to be spent by the end of each fiscal year. The joint subcommittee was asked to report back to the Family and Juvenile Law, Trial Court Budget, and Workload Assessment Advisory Committees by December 31, 2015. The recommendation of the joint subcommittee and the individual advisory committees is on the Judicial Council’s February 25, 2016, agenda for council consideration.

Rationale for Recommendation

Midyear reallocation, FY 2015–2016

The midyear reallocation process is a review of each court’s program funding in the current fiscal year, conducted through a questionnaire distributed to each court to allow courts to indicate whether they anticipate having additional funds that can be reallocated to courts that have demonstrated a need for additional funds. Historically, the midyear reallocation is to meet one-time, nonrecurring special needs, such as equipment purchases or temporary help to clear work backlogs, but because the AB 1058 program funding has been flat since 2008, a number of courts indicated a need for additional funds just to maintain current service levels resulting from increased costs of doing business. In FY 2007–2008, an additional procedure—the federal drawdown option—was put in place to assist in covering the cost of maintaining current program service levels through the use of local trial court used as a match to obtain additional federal funds for the program. Federal drawdown funds voluntarily returned by some courts are also available to be redistributed to courts that have requested additional federal drawdown funds. Therefore, the committee recommends reallocation of the limited amount of funds available based on a proportional formula to all courts that have indicated a need.

In July 2015, the Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council enter into a two-year contract for funding for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program. At the time the Judicial Council allocated funding for fiscal year 2015–2016, the contract for fiscal years 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 had not been entered into with DCSS. Unfortunately, the contract for funding for both fiscal years reduces the amount of base funds available for allocation more than anticipated. On April 17, 2015, the Judicial Council allocated \$32,125,980 in base funding and \$12,232,635 in federal drawdown funds for the Child Support Commissioner Program and \$10,990,357 in base funding and \$4,180,585 in federal drawdown funding for the Family Law Facilitator Program.² The funds available for allocation are \$31,616,936 in base funding and \$13,038,953 in federal drawdown funds for the Child Support Commissioner Program and \$10,789,626 in base funding and \$4,449,685 in federal drawdown funding for the Family Law Facilitator Program. Although overall funding available to the courts for the AB1058 Program remains the same, courts are required to contribute additional matching funds for the federal drawdown funds to be available.

² The Judicial Council revised the allocation for the Family Law Facilitator Program on July 28, 2015, to provide funding for a court that inadvertently did not receive funding, but the same total funding amount was allocated.

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

Historically, base funds and funds under the federal drawdown option, allocated at the beginning of a fiscal year but returned by courts unable to use all of these funds, are reallocated during the midyear process. Because for FY 2015–2016 base funds allocated exceed the base funds available under the contract, any base funds returned by the courts will not be reallocated unless they exceed the difference between the allocated amount and the contract amount. As a result of the midyear reallocation process, for the Child Support Commissioner Program, one court has volunteered to return \$27,512 in base funds and 7 courts have volunteered to return a combined \$627,965 in federal drawdown option funds. For the Family Law Facilitator Program, no courts have volunteered to return base funds, but two court has volunteered to return a combined \$207,075 in federal drawdown option funds.

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

A total of \$627,965 from the Child Support Commissioner Program federal drawdown grant source was available for reallocation to the child support commissioner component of the program. A total of 31 courts requested no change to their child support commissioner base allocations, 26 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, one court offered to return base funds, 7 courts offered to return federal drawdown option funds, 33 courts requested additional base funds for their child support commissioner program, and 24 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

A total of \$207,075 from the Family Law Facilitator Program federal drawdown grant source was available for reallocation to the family law facilitator component of the program. A total of 29 courts requested no change to their family law facilitator base allocations, 27 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, no court offered to return base funds, two courts offered to return federal drawdown funds, 26 courts requested additional base funds for their family law facilitator program, and 28 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

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

Base funding, FY 2016–2017

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

Funding for FY 2016–2017 for the child support commissioner component of the program will be \$31,616,936 base allocation and \$13,038,953 from the federal drawdown option; funding for the family law facilitator component will be \$10,789,626 base allocation and \$4,449,685 from the federal drawdown option, for a total program base allocation of \$42.4 million and a total federal drawdown allocation of \$17.4 million. These amounts reflect a small reduction of base funds and a slight increase of federal drawdown funds for courts as allocated by the Judicial Council in FY 2015–2016.

The committee recommends that courts be allocated base funding, less any amount a court indicated that it wishes to relinquish, for both the Child Support Commissioner Program and the Family Law Facilitator Program as in FY 2015–2016, but that each allocation be reduced in proportion to the share of total base funding among all courts to reflect the total amount of base funding available for program funding. The committee also recommends that courts be allocated federal drawdown funding, less any amount a court indicated that it wishes to relinquish, for both the Child Support Commissioner Program and the Family Law Facilitator Program as in FY 2015–2016, but that each court requesting increased federal drawdown funding be allocated additional funding in proportion to overall funding available for program funding. The committee recommends that the Judicial Council adopt the allocations for the Child Support Commissioner Program detailed in Attachment C and the allocations for the Family Law Facilitator Program detailed in Attachment D.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

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

The committee considered taking no action but rejected this option as inconsistent with Judicial

Council goals because it would result in the reversion of unspent funds to the General Fund. Taking no action would also deprive courts of the option of using federal financial participation to cover two-thirds of some of the existing court contributions to the program. A number of courts commented in their questionnaires about continued shortfalls in program funding, and these concerns have been forwarded to DCSS.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

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

Attachments

1. Attachment A: *Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2015–2016*
2. Attachment B: *Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2015–2016*
3. Attachment C: *Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2016–2017*
4. Attachment D: *Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2016–2017*

*****DRAFT*****

Attachment A

Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2015–2016

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation	Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	Recommended Base Funding Allocation (A + C)	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (B + D)	Federal Share 66% (Column F * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column F * .34)	Total Allocation (E + F)	Contract Amount (E + G)
1 Alameda	1,055,625	521,847	-	53,530	1,055,625	575,377	379,749	195,628	1,631,002	1,435,374
2 Alpine/EL Dorado										
3 Amador	142,508	42,553	-	-	142,508	42,553	28,085	14,468	185,061	170,593
4 Butte	363,685	36,315	-	(36,315)	363,685	-	-	-	363,685	363,685
5 Calaveras	133,526	37,209	-	-	133,526	37,209	24,558	12,651	170,735	158,084
6 Colusa	45,987	19,133	-	1,962	45,987	21,095	13,923	7,172	67,082	59,910
7 Contra Costa	1,014,068	42,524	-	4,362	1,014,068	46,886	30,945	15,941	1,060,954	1,045,013
8 Del Norte	48,315	21,859	-	-	48,315	21,859	14,427	7,432	70,174	62,742
9 El Dorado/Alpine	206,440	93,395	-	-	206,440	93,395	61,641	31,754	299,835	268,081
10 Fresno	1,601,818	769,974	-	-	1,601,818	769,974	508,183	261,791	2,371,792	2,110,001
11 Glenn	121,963	58,626	-	-	121,963	58,626	38,693	19,933	180,589	160,656
12 Humboldt	122,985	55,639	-	-	122,985	55,639	36,722	18,917	178,624	159,707
13 Imperial	163,746	74,082	-	-	163,746	74,082	48,894	25,188	237,828	212,640
14 Inyo	80,540	21,612	-	(5,631)	80,540	15,981	10,547	5,434	96,521	91,087
15 Kern	663,938	319,146	-	32,737	663,938	351,883	232,243	119,640	1,015,821	896,181
16 Kings	302,515	145,415	-	14,917	302,515	160,332	105,819	54,513	462,847	408,334
17 Lake	157,624	28,628	-	-	157,624	28,628	18,894	9,734	186,252	176,518
18 Lassen	94,874	42,923	-	(42,923)	94,874	-	-	-	94,874	94,874
19 Los Angeles	5,238,223	2,168,640	-	222,455	5,238,223	2,391,095	1,578,123	812,972	7,629,318	6,816,346
20 Madera	215,224	64,264	-	-	215,224	64,264	42,414	21,850	279,488	257,638
21 Marin	128,240	5,229	-	-	128,240	5,229	3,451	1,778	133,469	131,691
22 Mariposa	76,427	34,576	-	(5,188)	76,427	29,388	19,396	9,992	105,815	95,823
23 Mendocino	173,010	35,000	-	3,590	173,010	38,590	25,469	13,121	211,600	198,479
24 Merced	548,422	248,113	-	-	548,422	248,113	163,755	84,358	796,535	712,177
25 Modoc										
26 Mono	45,960	1,874	-	-	45,960	1,874	1,237	637	47,834	47,197
27 Monterey	381,807	167,961	-	-	381,807	167,961	110,854	57,107	549,768	492,661
28 Napa	185,081	88,967	-	9,126	185,081	98,093	64,742	33,352	283,174	249,823
29 Nevada/Sierra	332,867	150,595	-	-	332,867	150,595	99,393	51,202	483,462	432,260
30 Orange	2,336,135	452,086	(27,512)	(452,086)	2,308,623	-	-	-	2,308,623	2,308,623
31 Placer	377,583	65,822	-	(59,070)	377,583	6,752	4,456	2,296	384,335	382,039
32 Plumas	96,396	16,899	-	-	96,396	16,899	11,153	5,746	113,295	107,549
33 Riverside	995,520	478,533	-	-	995,520	478,533	315,832	162,701	1,474,053	1,311,352
34 Sacramento	1,061,319	510,162	-	52,331	1,061,319	562,493	371,246	191,248	1,623,812	1,432,565
35 San Benito	136,260	20,513	-	-	136,260	20,513	13,539	6,974	156,773	149,799
36 San Bernardino	2,544,692	1,151,255	-	-	2,544,692	1,151,255	759,828	391,427	3,695,947	3,304,520
37 San Diego	1,820,467	875,076	-	89,763	1,820,467	964,839	636,794	328,045	2,785,306	2,457,261
38 San Francisco	916,982	517,342	-	-	916,982	517,342	341,446	175,896	1,434,324	1,258,428
39 San Joaquin	689,435	99,259	-	10,182	689,435	109,441	72,231	37,210	798,876	761,666
40 San Luis Obispo	232,181	111,607	-	11,448	232,181	123,055	81,217	41,839	355,236	313,398
41 San Mateo	395,940	195,733	-	20,078	395,940	215,811	142,435	73,376	611,751	538,375
42 Santa Barbara	474,006	208,521	-	-	474,006	208,521	137,624	70,897	682,527	611,630
43 Santa Clara	1,756,347	577,024	-	-	1,756,347	577,024	380,836	196,188	2,333,371	2,137,183
44 Santa Cruz	193,147	84,606	-	-	193,147	84,606	55,840	28,766	277,753	248,987
45 Shasta/Trinity	423,384	191,545	-	-	423,384	191,545	126,420	65,125	614,929	549,804
46 Sierra/Nevada										
47 Siskiyou	239,894	115,315	-	11,829	239,894	127,144	83,915	43,229	367,038	323,809
48 Solano	524,122	101,654	-	-	524,122	101,654	67,092	34,562	625,776	591,214
49 Sonoma	502,025	241,316	-	24,754	502,025	266,070	175,606	90,464	768,095	677,631
50 Stanislaus	783,525	195,073	-	(20,000)	783,525	175,073	115,548	59,525	958,598	899,073
51 Sutter	195,330	55,441	-	5,687	195,330	61,128	40,344	20,783	256,458	235,674
52 Tehama	94,859	45,598	-	4,677	94,859	50,275	33,182	17,094	145,134	128,041
53 Trinity/Shasta										
54 Tulare	552,849	117,352	-	12,037	552,849	129,389	85,397	43,992	682,238	638,246
55 Tuolumne	161,119	72,893	-	-	161,119	72,893	48,109	24,784	234,012	209,228
56 Ventura	579,328	278,477	-	28,565	579,328	307,042	202,648	104,393	886,370	781,976
57 Yolo	193,254	87,432	-	-	193,254	87,432	57,705	29,727	280,686	250,959
58 Yuba	204,463	70,002	-	7,182	204,463	77,184	50,941	26,242	281,647	255,404
TOTAL	32,125,980	12,232,635	(27,512)		32,098,468	12,232,635	8,073,541	4,159,094	44,331,103	40,172,009

CSC Base Funds	32,098,468
CSC Federal Drawdown	12,232,635
Total Funding Available	44,331,103

****DRAFT****

Attachment B

Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2015–2016

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation	Federal Share 66% (Column D * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column D * .34)	Total Allocation (C + D)	Contract Amount (C + E)
1 Alameda	369,025	160,062	12,229	172,291	113,712	58,579	541,316	482,737
2 Alpine/El Dorado								
3 Amador/Calaveras								
4 Butte	103,647	44,095	-	44,095	29,103	14,992	147,742	132,750
5 Calaveras/Amador	119,392	10,925	-	10,925	7,211	3,715	130,317	126,603
6 Colusa	53,598	22,261	1,701	23,962	15,815	8,147	77,560	69,413
7 Contra Costa	351,312	2,848	218	3,066	2,023	1,042	354,378	353,335
8 Del Norte	50,932	5,551	-	5,551	3,664	1,887	56,483	54,596
9 El Dorado/Alpine	108,010	45,738	3,494	49,232	32,493	16,739	157,242	140,503
10 Fresno	400,028	169,391	-	169,391	111,798	57,593	569,419	511,826
11 Glenn	77,218	32,697	-	32,697	21,580	11,117	109,915	98,798
12 Humboldt	90,844	37,730	-	37,730	24,902	12,828	128,574	115,746
13 Imperial	53,598	22,696	1,734	24,430	16,124	8,306	78,028	69,722
14 Inyo	58,249	24,666	1,884	26,550	17,523	9,027	84,799	75,772
15 Kern	360,065	152,468	11,648	164,116	108,317	55,800	524,181	468,382
16 Kings	59,411	25,159	1,922	27,081	17,874	9,208	86,492	77,285
17 Lake	58,640	24,948	-	24,948	16,466	8,482	83,588	75,106
18 Lassen	79,131	47,352	(47,352)	-	-	-	79,131	79,131
19 Los Angeles	1,916,241	746,897	57,062	803,959	530,613	273,346	2,720,200	2,446,854
20 Madera	82,062	23,043	1,760	24,803	16,370	8,433	106,865	98,432
21 Marin	139,122		-	-	-	-	139,122	139,122
22 Mariposa	46,234		-	-	-	-	46,234	46,234
23 Mendocino	61,300	26,589	2,031	28,620	18,889	9,731	89,920	80,189
24 Merced	100,217	42,636	-	42,636	28,140	14,496	142,853	128,357
25 Modoc	72,130	1,247	-	1,247	823	424	73,377	72,953
26 Mono	49,055	1,255	-	1,255	828	427	50,310	49,883
27 Monterey	122,582	51,907	3,966	55,873	36,876	18,997	178,455	159,458
28 Napa	62,790	26,589	2,031	28,620	18,889	9,731	91,410	81,679
29 Nevada/Sierra	118,168	50,273	-	50,273	33,180	17,093	168,441	151,348
30 Orange	547,203	231,711	(159,723)	71,988	47,512	24,476	619,191	594,715
31 Placer	91,293	38,657	2,953	41,610	27,463	14,148	132,903	118,756
32 Plumas	56,866	7,254	-	7,254	4,788	2,466	64,120	61,654
33 Riverside	674,668	285,688	21,826	307,514	202,959	104,555	982,182	877,627
34 Sacramento	313,890	132,917	10,155	143,072	94,427	48,644	456,962	408,317
35 San Benito	61,300	26,080	-	26,080	17,213	8,867	87,380	78,513
36 San Bernardino	465,711	197,204	15,066	212,270	140,098	72,172	677,981	605,809
37 San Diego	617,210	230,230	17,589	247,819	163,561	84,259	865,029	780,771
38 San Francisco	249,820	105,787	-	105,787	69,819	35,968	355,607	319,639
39 San Joaquin	217,745	68,636	-	68,636	45,300	23,336	286,381	263,045
40 San Luis Obispo	68,133	28,850	2,204	31,054	20,496	10,558	99,187	88,629
41 San Mateo	129,159	56,021	4,280	60,301	39,799	20,502	189,460	168,958
42 Santa Barbara	173,072	71,882	-	71,882	47,442	24,440	244,954	220,514
43 Santa Clara	451,723	191,283	-	191,283	126,247	65,036	643,006	577,970
44 Santa Cruz	75,365	31,913	2,438	34,351	22,672	11,679	109,716	98,037
45 Shasta /Trinity	188,897	104,038	-	104,038	68,665	35,373	292,935	257,562
46 Sierra/Nevada								
47 Siskiyou	75,822	32,258	-	32,258	21,290	10,968	108,080	97,112
48 Solano	131,471	36,916	-	36,916	24,365	12,551	168,387	155,836
49 Sonoma	140,457	59,478	4,544	64,022	42,255	21,767	204,479	182,712
50 Stanislaus	223,137	94,930	-	94,930	62,654	32,276	318,067	285,790
51 Sutter	67,333	28,513	2,178	30,691	20,256	10,435	98,024	87,589
52 Tehama	27,802	3,286	-	3,286	2,169	1,117	31,088	29,971
53 Trinity/Shasta								
54 Tulare	312,151	120,095	9,175	129,270	85,318	43,952	441,421	397,468

****DRAFT****

55	Tuolumne	65,735	27,967	-	27,967	18,458	9,509	93,702	84,193
56	Ventura	256,956	108,807	8,313	117,120	77,299	39,821	374,076	334,255
57	Yolo	77,666	32,888	2,513	35,401	23,364	12,036	113,067	101,030
58	Yuba	66,769	28,274	2,160	30,434	20,087	10,348	97,203	86,856
TOTAL		10,990,355	4,180,586		4,180,586	2,759,187	1,421,399	15,170,941	13,749,542

FLF Base Funds	10,990,355
FLF Federal Drawdown	<u>4,180,586</u>
Total Funding Available	15,170,941

*****DRAFT*****

Attachment C

Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2016–2017

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Court	Recommended Base Funding Allocation	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option	Total Allocation (A + B)	Federal Share 66% (Column C * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column C * .34)	Contract Amount (B + D)
1 Alameda	1,038,898	597,577	1,636,475	394,401	203,176	1,433,299
2 Alpine/EL Dorado						
3 Amador	140,250	45,736	185,986	30,186	15,550	170,436
4 Butte	357,922	-	357,922	-	-	357,922
5 Calaveras	131,410	39,992	171,403	26,395	13,597	157,805
6 Colusa	45,258	21,910	67,168	14,460	7,449	59,718
7 Contra Costa	998,000	48,695	1,046,695	32,139	16,556	1,030,139
8 Del Norte	47,549	23,494	71,044	15,506	7,988	63,055
9 El Dorado/Alpine	203,169	100,381	303,550	66,252	34,130	269,421
10 Fresno	1,576,437	881,712	2,458,148	581,930	299,782	2,158,367
11 Glenn	120,030	63,012	183,042	41,588	21,424	161,618
12 Humboldt	121,036	59,801	180,837	39,469	20,332	160,505
13 Imperial	161,151	79,624	240,775	52,552	27,072	213,703
14 Inyo	79,264	23,229	102,493	15,331	7,898	94,595
15 Kern	653,418	365,460	1,018,878	241,204	124,256	894,622
16 Kings	297,722	166,517	464,239	109,902	56,616	407,624
17 Lake	155,126	30,770	185,896	20,308	10,462	175,434
18 Lassen	93,371	(0)	93,371	-	-	93,371
19 Los Angeles	5,155,222	2,330,865	7,486,087	1,538,371	792,494	6,693,593
20 Madera	211,814	73,590	285,404	48,569	25,021	260,383
21 Marin	126,208	5,620	131,828	3,709	1,911	129,917
22 Mariposa	75,216	37,162	112,378	24,527	12,635	99,743
23 Mendocino	170,269	40,079	210,348	26,452	13,627	196,721
24 Merced	539,732	266,673	806,405	176,004	90,669	715,736
25 Modoc						
26 Mono	45,232	2,014	47,246	1,329	685	46,561
27 Monterey	375,757	180,525	556,282	119,147	61,379	494,904
28 Napa	182,148	101,878	284,026	67,239	34,638	249,387
29 Nevada/Sierra	327,593	161,860	489,453	106,828	55,032	434,421
30 Orange	2,299,118	189,538	2,488,657	125,095	64,443	2,424,213
31 Placer	371,600	75,374	446,974	49,747	25,627	421,347
32 Plumas	94,869	18,163	113,032	11,988	6,175	106,857
33 Riverside	979,746	514,330	1,494,075	339,458	174,872	1,319,204
34 Sacramento	1,044,502	584,196	1,628,698	385,569	198,627	1,430,071
35 San Benito	134,101	23,490	157,591	15,503	7,987	149,604
36 San Bernardino	2,504,371	1,237,375	3,741,745	816,667	420,707	3,321,038
37 San Diego	1,791,621	1,002,066	2,793,687	661,364	340,702	2,452,985
38 San Francisco	902,452	556,042	1,458,494	366,988	189,053	1,269,440
39 San Joaquin	678,511	113,663	792,174	75,018	38,646	753,529
40 San Luis Obispo	228,502	130,698	359,200	86,260	44,437	314,762
41 San Mateo	389,666	224,138	613,804	147,931	76,207	537,597
42 Santa Barbara	466,495	224,119	690,615	147,919	76,201	614,414
43 Santa Clara	1,728,517	660,761	2,389,278	436,102	224,659	2,164,619
44 Santa Cruz	190,087	90,935	281,021	60,017	30,918	250,104
45 Shasta/Trinity	416,675	205,874	622,549	135,877	69,997	552,552
46 Sierra/Nevada						
47 Siskiyou	236,093	132,049	368,142	87,153	44,897	323,246
48 Solano	515,817	109,258	625,075	72,110	37,148	587,927
49 Sonoma	494,070	276,335	770,406	182,381	93,954	676,451
50 Stanislaus	771,110	209,665	980,775	138,379	71,286	909,489
51 Sutter	192,235	63,487	255,721	41,901	21,585	234,136
52 Tehama	93,356	52,215	145,571	34,462	17,753	127,818
53 Trinity/Shasta						
54 Tulare	544,089	134,382	678,471	88,692	45,690	632,781
55 Tuolumne	158,566	78,346	236,912	51,708	26,638	210,274
56 Ventura	570,148	318,889	889,038	210,467	108,421	780,615
57 Yolo	190,192	93,972	284,164	62,022	31,951	252,214
58 Yuba	201,223	80,161	281,384	52,906	27,255	254,129
TOTAL	31,616,936	13,147,697	44,764,633	8,677,482	4,470,215	40,294,418

CSC Base Funds	31,616,936
CSC Federal Drawdown	13,147,697
Total Funding Available	44,764,633

*****DRAFT*****

Attachment D

Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2016–2017

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Court	Recommended Base Funding Allocation	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option	Total Allocation (A + B)	Federal Share 66% (Column C * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column C * .34)	Contract Amount (B + D)
1 Alameda	362,285	176,319	538,604	116,371	59,949	478,656
2 Alpine/El Dorado						
3 Amador/Calaveras	46,885	4,701	51,586	3,103	1,598	49,988
4 Butte	101,754	47,433	149,187	31,306	16,127	133,060
5 Calaveras/Amador	70,326	7,051	77,377	4,654	2,397	74,980
6 Colusa	52,619	24,522	77,141	16,185	8,337	68,804
7 Contra Costa	344,896	3,137	348,033	2,071	1,067	346,967
8 Del Norte	50,002	5,971	55,973	3,941	2,030	53,943
9 El Dorado/Alpine	106,037	50,384	156,421	33,253	17,130	139,290
10 Fresno	392,722	186,596	579,318	123,153	63,443	515,875
11 Glenn	75,808	35,172	110,980	23,214	11,958	99,022
12 Humboldt	89,185	40,586	129,771	26,788	13,799	115,973
13 Imperial	52,619	25,001	77,620	16,501	8,500	69,120
14 Inyo	57,185	27,171	84,356	17,933	9,238	75,118
15 Kern	353,489	167,954	521,443	110,850	57,104	464,339
16 Kings	58,326	26,904	85,230	17,757	9,148	76,083
17 Lake	57,569	26,836	84,405	17,712	9,124	75,281
18 Lassen	77,686	-	77,686	-	-	77,686
19 Los Angeles	1,881,243	803,434	2,684,676	530,267	273,167	2,411,510
20 Madera	80,563	25,383	105,947	16,753	8,630	97,316
21 Marin	136,581	-	136,581	-	-	136,581
22 Mariposa	45,390	-	45,390	-	-	45,390
23 Mendocino	60,180	29,290	89,470	19,331	9,958	79,511
24 Merced	98,387	45,863	144,250	30,270	15,594	128,657
25 Modoc	70,813	1,341	72,154	885	456	71,698
26 Mono	48,159	1,350	49,509	891	459	49,050
27 Monterey	120,343	57,179	177,522	37,738	19,441	158,081
28 Napa	61,643	29,290	90,933	19,331	9,958	80,974
29 Nevada/Sierra	116,010	39,093	155,103	25,802	13,292	141,812
30 Orange	537,209	255,246	792,454	168,462	86,784	705,671
31 Placer	89,626	41,583	131,209	27,445	14,138	117,071
32 Plumas	55,827	7,803	63,630	5,150	2,653	60,977
33 Riverside	662,346	314,705	977,051	207,705	107,000	870,051
34 Sacramento	308,157	146,417	454,574	96,635	49,782	404,792
35 San Benito	60,180	28,729	88,909	18,961	9,768	79,141
36 San Bernardino	457,205	217,234	674,439	143,374	73,859	600,579
37 San Diego	605,937	253,614	859,551	167,385	86,229	773,322
38 San Francisco	245,257	113,795	359,052	75,105	38,690	320,362
39 San Joaquin	213,768	75,607	289,375	49,901	25,706	263,669
40 San Luis Obispo	66,889	31,780	98,669	20,975	10,805	87,864
41 San Mateo	126,800	61,711	188,511	40,729	20,982	167,529
42 Santa Barbara	169,911	77,323	247,234	51,033	26,290	220,944
43 Santa Clara	443,473	210,711	654,184	139,070	71,642	582,543
44 Santa Cruz	73,989	35,154	109,143	23,202	11,952	97,191
45 Shasta /Trinity	185,447	111,913	297,360	73,863	38,050	259,310
46 Sierra/Nevada						
47 Siskiyou	74,437	34,700	109,137	22,902	11,798	97,339
48 Solano	129,070	39,710	168,780	26,209	13,502	155,279
49 Sonoma	137,892	65,519	203,411	43,243	22,276	181,135
50 Stanislaus	219,062	102,116	321,177	67,396	34,719	286,458
51 Sutter	66,103	31,409	97,512	20,730	10,679	86,833
52 Tehama	27,294	3,535	30,829	2,333	1,202	29,627
53 Trinity/Shasta						
54 Tulare	306,450	132,293	438,743	87,313	44,980	393,763
55 Tuolumne	64,534	30,084	94,618	19,855	10,229	84,389
56 Ventura	252,263	119,858	372,121	79,107	40,752	331,370
57 Yolo	76,248	35,377	111,625	23,349	12,028	99,597
58 Yuba	65,550	31,146	96,695	20,556	10,590	86,106
TOTAL	10,789,626	4,497,037	15,286,662	2,968,048	1,528,989	13,757,674

FLF Base Funds	10,789,626
FLF Federal Drawdown	4,497,037
Total Funding Available	15,286,662