



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: March 2, 2018

Title

Child Support: Midyear Funding Reallocation for Fiscal Year 2017–2018 and Base Funding Allocation for Fiscal Year 2018–2019 for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

March 2, 2018

Date of Report

January 18, 2018

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Contact

Anna L. Maves, Supervising 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) 2017–2018 and the allocation of funding for this same program for FY 2018–2019, 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 March 2, 2018:

1. Approve the reallocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2017–2018, subject to the state Budget Act;
2. Approve the reallocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2017–2018, subject to the state Budget Act;
3. Approve allocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2018–2019, subject to the state Budget Act; and
4. Approve the allocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2018–2019, 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 nontrial 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 (nontrial 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 2018–2019.

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 was on the Judicial Council’s February 2016 agenda for council consideration. At the February 26, 2016 meeting, the Judicial Council determined that the funds should continue to be allocated using the historical funding allocation model for FY 2016–2017. The council instructed the joint subcommittee to continue to (1) develop a framework for a workload-based funding methodology for implementation no later than FY 2018–2019, and (2) coordinate with DCSS on its current review of funding allocations for the local child support agencies.

Subsequently, because the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee’s (TCBAC) Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) is in the process of evaluating WAFM (Workload-based Funding and Allocation Methodology) and its continued impact on trial court budgets, it was decided that the any decision regarding a funding methodology for AB 1058 should be postponed for at least one additional fiscal year to allow for FMS to complete its work reviewing the WAFM funding methodology for allocating trial court funds and also to allow additional time for the AB 1058 Joint Subcommittee to gather additional information that may impact a proposed AB1058 funding methodology.

Rationale for Recommendation

Midyear reallocation, FY 2017–2018

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. However, since 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 courts used as a match to obtain additional federal funds for the program. Federal drawdown funds voluntarily returned by some courts are also available to be redistributed to courts that have requested additional federal drawdown funds. Therefore, the committee recommends reallocation of the limited amount of funds available based on a proportional formula to all courts that have indicated a need.

Base funds and funds under the federal drawdown option, not requested at the beginning of the fiscal year or allocated at the beginning of the fiscal year but returned by courts unable to use all of the funds, are proposed for reallocation during this midyear process consistent with the funding made available under the contract between the Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council. As a result of the midyear reallocation process for the Child Support Commissioner Program, a total of \$1,725,259 is available because seven courts have volunteered to return \$340,686 in base funds and \$1,384,573 in federal drawdown option funds from unallocated funds at the beginning of the fiscal year and because 16 courts have volunteered to return funds that they do not anticipate needing during fiscal year 2017–2018. For the Family Law Facilitator Program, a total of \$556,522 is available because four courts have volunteered to return \$68,930 in base funds and ten courts have volunteered to return a combined \$487,592 in federal drawdown option funds.

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

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

A total of \$1,725,259 from the Child Support Commissioner Program grant sources was available for reallocation to the child support commissioner component of the program. A total of 38 courts requested no change to their child support commissioner base allocations, 30 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, 7 courts offered to return base funds, 16 courts offered to return federal drawdown option funds, 13 courts requested additional base funds for their child support commissioner program, and 12 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

A total of \$556,522 from the Family Law Facilitator Program grant source was available for reallocation to the family law facilitator component of the program. A total of 36 courts requested no change to their family law facilitator base allocations, 34 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, 4 courts offered to return base funds, 10 courts offered to return federal drawdown funds, 18 courts requested additional base funds for their family law facilitator program, and 14 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

All allocations to courts requesting additional funding have been based on proportionately allocating the available base and federal drawdown funds among the courts requesting additional funds proportionate to their share of the total base funding. Under the established allocation procedures for this program, the request was reviewed by the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. The committee recommends 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 2018–2019

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 2018–2019 for the child support commissioner component of the program will be \$31,616,936 in base funding and \$13,038,953 for the federal drawdown option; funding for the family law facilitator component will be \$10,789,626 in base funding and \$4,449,685 from the federal drawdown option, for a total program base allocation of \$44.6 million and a total federal drawdown allocation of \$15.2 million.

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 2017–2018. 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 2017–2018, but that each court requesting increased base funding, federal drawdown funding, or both 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 2017–2018*
2. Attachment B: *Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2017–2018*
3. Attachment C: *Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2018–2019*
4. Attachment D: *Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2018–2019*

Attachment A

Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2017–2018

#	CSC Court	A Beginning Base Funding Allocation	B Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	C Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation	D Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	E Recommended Base Funding Allocation (A + C)	F Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (B + D)	G Federal Share 66% (Column F * .66)	H Court Share 34% (Column F * .34)	I Total Allocation (E + F)	J Contract Amount (E + G)
1	Alameda	1,048,839	597,577	25,286	409,893	1,074,125	1,007,470	664,930	342,540	2,081,595	1,739,055
2	Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Amador	140,250	45,736	-	-	140,250	45,736	30,186	15,550	185,986	170,436
4	Butte	325,000	-	(75,000)	-	250,000	-	-	-	250,000	250,000
5	CALAVERAS	132,667	39,992	-	-	132,667	39,992	26,395	13,597	172,659	159,062
6	Colusa	45,691	21,910	-	(1,101)	45,691	20,809	13,734	7,075	66,500	59,425
7	Contra Costa	998,000	-	(125,000)	-	873,000	-	-	-	873,000	873,000
8	Del Norte	48,004	32,298	-	-	48,004	32,298	21,317	10,981	80,302	69,321
9	El Dorado	203,169	100,382	-	(36,331)	203,169	64,051	42,274	21,777	267,220	245,443
10	Fresno	1,591,522	716,327	-	-	1,591,522	716,326	472,775	243,551	2,307,848	2,064,297
11	Glenn	120,030	63,012	-	-	120,030	63,012	41,588	21,424	183,042	161,618
12	Humboldt	121,036	59,801	(31,036)	(59,801)	90,000	-	-	-	90,000	90,000
13	Imperial	162,693	79,624	3,922	144,146	166,615	223,770	147,688	76,082	390,385	314,303
14	Inyo	79,264	23,229	-	25,701	79,264	48,930	32,294	16,636	128,194	111,558
15	Kern	659,670	400,000	15,903	50,000	675,573	450,000	297,000	153,000	1,125,573	972,573
16	Kings	297,722	166,518	7,178	26,481	304,900	192,999	127,379	65,620	497,899	432,279
17	Lake	155,126	30,770	-	(5,770)	155,126	25,000	16,500	8,500	180,126	171,626
18	Lassen	60,000	-	-	-	60,000	-	-	-	60,000	60,000
19	Los Angeles	5,204,551	2,330,865	125,473	-	5,330,024	2,330,865	1,538,371	792,494	7,660,889	6,868,395
20	Madera	211,814	73,590	5,106	9,000	216,920	82,590	54,509	28,081	299,510	271,429
21	Marin	126,208	5,620	-	-	126,208	5,620	3,709	1,911	131,828	129,917
22	Mariposa	75,216	-	(2,000)	-	73,216	-	-	-	73,216	73,216
23	Mendocino	170,269	40,079	-	-	170,269	40,079	26,452	13,627	210,348	196,721
24	Merced	539,732	266,673	-	-	539,732	266,673	176,004	90,669	806,405	715,736
25	Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	Mono	45,232	2,014	1,090	-	46,323	2,014	1,329	685	48,336	47,652
27	Monterey	375,757	180,525	-	-	375,757	180,525	119,147	61,379	556,282	494,904
28	Napa	115,000	-	(10,000)	-	105,000	-	-	-	105,000	105,000
29	Nevada	327,593	118,601	-	(118,601)	327,593	-	-	-	327,593	327,593
30	Orange	2,299,118	159,338	-	(151,948)	2,299,118	7,390	4,877	2,513	2,306,508	2,303,995
31	Placer	371,600	-	(28,000)	-	343,600	-	-	-	343,600	343,600
32	Plumas	95,777	18,163	-	-	95,777	18,163	11,988	6,175	113,940	107,765
33	Riverside	989,121	514,330	23,846	114,974	1,012,967	629,304	415,341	213,963	1,642,271	1,428,308
34	Sacramento	1,044,502	584,196	-	(100,010)	1,044,502	484,186	319,563	164,623	1,528,688	1,364,065
35	San Benito	135,384	30,000	-	-	135,384	30,000	19,800	10,200	165,384	155,184
36	San Bernardino	2,528,335	1,237,375	60,954	232,211	2,589,289	1,469,586	969,927	499,659	4,058,875	3,559,216
37	San Diego	1,791,621	1,002,066	-	-	1,791,621	1,002,066	661,364	340,702	2,793,687	2,452,985
38	San Francisco	902,452	556,042	-	(114,246)	902,452	441,796	291,585	150,211	1,344,248	1,194,037
39	San Joaquin	685,004	100,094	-	(53,828)	685,004	46,266	30,536	15,730	731,270	715,540
40	San Luis Obispo	230,689	145,000	-	-	230,689	145,000	95,700	49,300	375,689	326,389
41	San Mateo	389,666	230,496	-	-	389,666	230,496	152,127	78,369	620,162	541,793
42	Santa Barbara	470,959	224,119	11,354	36,094	482,313	260,213	171,741	88,472	742,526	654,054
43	Santa Clara	1,745,057	660,761	42,070	225,233	1,787,127	885,994	584,756	301,238	2,673,121	2,371,883
44	Santa Cruz	191,906	90,935	4,627	(90,935)	196,533	-	-	-	196,533	196,533
45	Shasta	416,675	205,874	-	-	416,675	205,874	135,877	69,997	622,549	552,552
46	Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	Siskiyou	200,000	40,000	(69,650)	(40,000)	130,350	-	-	-	130,350	130,350
48	Solano	515,817	109,258	-	(32,393)	515,817	76,865	50,731	26,134	592,682	566,548
49	Sonoma	498,798	276,335	-	(76,776)	498,798	199,559	131,709	67,850	698,357	630,507
50	Stanislaus	771,110	209,665	-	-	771,110	209,665	138,379	71,286	980,775	909,489
51	Sutter	192,235	63,487	-	-	192,235	63,487	41,901	21,586	255,722	234,136
52	Tehama	94,249	132,000	-	-	94,249	132,000	87,120	44,880	226,249	181,369
53	Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	Tulare	549,295	134,382	-	(81,746)	549,295	52,636	34,740	17,896	601,931	584,035
55	Tuolumne	158,566	78,346	-	-	158,566	78,346	51,708	26,638	236,912	210,274
56	Ventura	575,604	338,463	13,877	110,838	589,480	449,301	296,539	152,762	1,038,782	886,019
57	Yolo	190,192	93,972	-	(61,972)	190,192	32,000	21,120	10,880	222,192	211,312
58	Yuba	203,149	80,161	-	(30,161)	203,149	50,000	33,000	17,000	253,149	236,149
TOTAL		31,616,936	12,710,001			31,616,936	13,038,952	8,605,710	4,433,243	44,655,888	40,222,646

CSC Base Funds 31,616,936
 CSC Federal Drawdown 13,038,952
 Total Funding Allocated 44,655,888

Attachment B

Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2017–2018

		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	362,939	176,319	-	(54,543)	362,939	121,776	80,372	41,404	484,715	443,311
2	Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Amador	46,885	4,701	-	-	46,885	4,701	3,103	1,598	51,586	49,988
4	Butte	101,754	47,433	-	-	101,754	47,433	31,306	16,127	149,187	133,060
5	Calaveras	70,453	7,051	1,315	2,258	71,768	9,309	6,144	3,165	81,077	77,912
6	Colusa	52,619	11,250	(8,119)	(11,250)	44,500	-	-	-	44,500	44,500
7	Contra Costa	345,518	-	-	-	345,518	-	-	-	345,518	345,518
8	Del Norte	50,002	5,971	-	-	50,002	5,971	3,941	2,030	55,973	53,943
9	El Dorado	106,037	50,384	-	-	106,037	50,384	33,253	17,131	156,421	139,290
10	Fresno	393,431	186,596	-	-	393,431	186,596	123,153	63,443	580,027	516,584
11	Glenn	75,808	35,172	-	-	75,808	35,172	23,214	11,958	110,980	99,022
12	Humboldt	89,185	40,588	-	(40,588)	89,185	-	-	-	89,185	89,185
13	Imperial	52,714	25,001	984	8,006	53,698	33,007	21,785	11,222	86,705	75,483
14	Inyo	57,185	27,171	(42,185)	(27,171)	15,000	-	-	-	15,000	15,000
15	Kern	354,127	170,420	6,609	29,580	360,736	200,000	132,000	68,000	560,736	492,736
16	Kings	58,326	26,904	1,089	6,096	59,415	33,000	21,780	11,220	92,415	81,195
17	Lake	57,569	26,836	-	(11,836)	57,569	15,000	9,900	5,100	72,569	67,469
18	Lassen	65,000	-	-	-	65,000	-	-	-	65,000	65,000
19	Los Angeles	1,884,633	803,431	-	-	1,884,633	803,431	530,264	273,167	2,688,064	2,414,897
20	Madera	80,563	25,383	1,504	-	82,067	25,383	16,753	8,630	107,450	98,820
21	Marin	136,581	-	-	-	136,581	-	-	-	136,581	136,581
22	Mariposa	45,390	-	(4,000)	-	41,390	-	-	-	41,390	41,390
23	Mendocino	60,289	29,290	-	-	60,289	29,290	19,331	9,959	89,579	79,620
24	Merced	98,565	46,536	-	-	98,565	46,536	30,714	15,822	145,101	129,279
25	Modoc	70,941	1,247	-	-	70,941	1,247	823	424	72,188	71,764
26	Mono	48,246	1,350	-	-	48,246	1,350	891	459	49,596	49,137
27	Monterey	120,343	57,179	2,246	12,707	122,589	69,886	46,125	23,761	192,475	168,714
28	Napa	61,643	29,290	1,150	-	62,793	29,290	19,331	9,959	92,083	82,124
29	Nevada	116,010	39,094	-	(39,094)	116,010	-	-	-	116,010	116,010
30	Orange	537,209	255,246	-	(255,246)	537,209	-	-	-	537,209	537,209
31	Placer	89,626	-	(14,626)	-	75,000	-	-	-	75,000	75,000
32	Plumas	55,827	7,803	-	-	55,827	7,803	5,150	2,653	63,630	60,977
33	Riverside	663,541	319,325	12,384	102,256	675,925	421,581	278,243	143,337	1,097,506	954,168
34	Sacramento	308,713	146,417	5,762	46,886	314,475	193,303	127,580	65,723	507,778	442,055
35	San Benito	60,289	29,151	-	-	60,289	29,151	19,240	9,911	89,440	79,529
36	San Bernardino	458,030	220,423	8,549	70,585	466,579	291,007	192,065	98,943	757,586	658,644
37	San Diego	605,937	253,614	-	-	605,937	253,614	167,385	86,229	859,551	773,322
38	San Francisco	245,257	113,795	-	-	245,257	113,795	75,105	38,690	359,052	320,362
39	San Joaquin	214,154	71,332	-	-	214,154	71,332	47,079	24,253	285,486	261,233
40	San Luis Obispo	67,010	32,247	-	-	67,010	32,246	21,282	10,964	99,256	88,292
41	San Mateo	126,800	62,617	-	20,051	126,800	82,668	54,561	28,107	209,468	181,361
42	Santa Barbara	170,218	77,323	3,177	19,082	173,395	96,405	63,627	32,778	269,800	237,022
43	Santa Clara	444,273	210,712	8,292	67,475	452,565	278,187	183,603	94,584	730,752	636,168
44	Santa Cruz	74,123	35,154	1,383	(35,154)	75,506	-	-	-	75,506	75,506
45	Shasta	185,447	111,913	-	-	185,447	111,913	73,863	38,050	297,360	259,310
46	Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	Siskiyou	74,437	35,209	1,389	(5,209)	75,826	30,000	19,800	10,200	105,826	95,626
48	Solano	129,070	39,710	-	-	129,070	39,710	26,209	13,501	168,780	155,279
49	Sonoma	138,141	65,519	-	-	138,141	65,519	43,243	22,276	203,660	181,384
50	Stanislaus	219,062	102,115	-	(7,500)	219,062	94,615	62,446	32,169	313,677	281,508
51	Sutter	66,103	31,409	-	-	66,103	31,409	20,730	10,679	97,512	86,833
52	Tehama	27,294	3,535	-	-	27,294	3,535	2,333	1,202	30,829	29,627
53	Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	Tulare	307,003	132,293	5,730	42,363	312,733	174,656	115,273	59,383	487,389	428,006
55	Tuolumne	64,534	30,084	-	-	64,534	30,084	19,855	10,229	94,618	84,389
56	Ventura	252,718	121,619	4,717	38,945	257,435	160,564	105,972	54,592	417,999	363,407
57	Yolo	76,386	35,377	1,425	11,329	77,811	46,706	30,826	15,880	124,517	108,637
58	Yuba	65,668	31,146	1,225	9,974	66,893	41,120	27,139	13,981	108,013	94,032
TOTAL		10,789,626	4,449,685			10,789,626	4,449,685	2,936,792	1,512,893	15,239,312	13,726,418

FLF Base Funds 10,789,626
 FLF Federal Drawdown 4,449,685
 Total Funding Allocated 15,239,311

Attachment C

Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2018–2019

		A	B	C	D	E	F
#	Court	Recommended Base Funding Allocation	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation	Total Allocation (A +B)	Federal Share 66% (Column B * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column B * .34)	Contract Amount (A + D)
1	Alameda	1,066,055	713,526	1,779,581	470,927	242,599	1,536,982
2	Alpine/El Dorado		-	-	-	-	-
3	Amador	140,250	45,736	185,986	30,186	15,550	170,436
4	Butte	300,000	-	300,000	-	-	300,000
5	Calaveras	132,667	39,992	172,659	26,395	13,597	159,062
6	Colusa	45,691	20,809	66,500	13,734	7,075	59,425
7	Contra Costa	873,000	-	873,000	-	-	873,000
8	Del Norte	48,004	32,298	80,302	21,317	10,981	69,321
9	El Dorado/Alpine	203,169	100,382	303,551	66,252	34,130	269,421
10	Fresno	1,617,646	762,100	2,379,746	502,986	259,114	2,120,632
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	165,363	136,662	302,025	90,197	46,465	255,560
14	Inyo	79,264	48,930	128,194	32,294	16,636	111,558
15	Kern	670,498	438,444	1,108,942	289,373	149,071	959,871
16	Kings	302,609	171,250	473,859	113,025	58,225	415,634
17	Lake	155,126	30,770	185,896	20,308	10,462	175,434
18	Lassen	60,000	-	60,000	-	-	60,000
19	Los Angeles	5,289,980	2,780,860	8,070,840	1,835,367	945,492	7,125,347
20	Madera	215,291	76,056	291,347	50,197	25,859	265,488
21	Marin	126,208	5,620	131,828	3,709	1,911	129,917
22	Mariposa	75,216	-	75,216	-	-	75,216
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	45,974	2,926	48,900	1,931	995	47,905
27	Monterey	375,757	180,525	556,282	119,147	61,379	494,904
28	Napa	105,000	-	105,000	-	-	105,000
29	Nevada	327,593	-	327,593	-	-	327,593
30	Orange	2,299,118	66,155	2,365,273	43,662	22,493	2,342,780
31	Placer	343,600	5,151	348,751	3,400	1,751	347,000
32	Plumas	95,777	18,163	113,940	11,988	6,175	107,765
33	Riverside	1,005,357	569,001	1,574,358	375,541	193,460	1,380,898
34	Sacramento	1,044,502	500,000	1,544,502	330,000	170,000	1,374,502
35	San Benito	135,384	30,000	165,384	19,800	10,200	155,184
36	San Bernardino	2,569,836	1,393,318	3,963,154	919,590	473,728	3,489,426
37	San Diego	1,791,621	1,002,066	2,793,687	661,364	340,702	2,452,985
38	San Francisco	902,452	441,796	1,344,248	291,585	150,211	1,194,037
39	San Joaquin	685,004	50,000	735,004	33,000	17,000	718,004
40	San Luis Obispo	230,689	145,000	375,689	95,700	49,300	326,389
41	San Mateo	389,666	239,077	628,743	157,791	81,286	547,457
42	Santa Barbara	478,689	243,496	722,185	160,707	82,789	639,396
43	Santa Clara	1,773,701	739,480	2,513,181	488,057	251,423	2,261,758
44	Santa Cruz	195,056	18,655	213,711	12,312	6,343	207,368
45	Shasta	416,675	205,874	622,549	135,877	69,997	552,552
46	Sierra/ Nevada		-	-	-	-	-
47	Siskiyou	130,350	-	130,350	-	-	130,350
48	Solano	515,817	95,481	611,298	63,017	32,464	578,834
49	Sonoma	498,798	199,559	698,357	131,709	67,850	630,507
50	Stanislaus	771,110	209,665	980,775	138,379	71,286	909,489
51	Sutter	192,235	63,487	255,722	41,901	21,586	234,136
52	Tehama	94,249	132,000	226,249	87,120	44,880	181,369
53	Trinity/ Shasta		-	-	-	-	-
54	Tulare	558,311	68,732	627,043	45,363	23,369	603,674
55	Tuolumne	158,566	78,346	236,912	51,708	26,638	210,274
56	Ventura	575,604	425,000	1,000,604	280,500	144,500	856,104
57	Yolo	190,192	33,000	223,192	21,780	11,220	211,972
58	Yuba	203,149	50,000	253,149	33,000	17,000	236,149
TOTAL		31,616,936	13,038,953	44,655,889	8,605,709	4,433,244	40,222,645

CSC Base Funds 31,616,936
 CSC Federal Drawdown 13,038,953
 Total Funding Available 44,655,889

Attachment D

Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2018–2019

		A	B	C	D	E	F
#	Court	Recommended Base Funding Allocation	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation	Total Allocation (A +B)	Federal Share 66% (Column B * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column B * .34)	Contract Amount (A + D)
1	Alameda	362,939	176,319	539,258	116,370	59,948	479,309
2	Alpine	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Amador	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	70,655	8,000	78,655	5,280	2,720	75,935
6	Colusa	35,600	8,900	44,500	5,874	3,026	41,474
7	Contra Costa	345,518	-	345,518	-	-	345,518
8	Del Norte	50,002	5,971	55,973	3,941	2,030	53,943
9	El Dorado	106,037	50,384	156,421	33,253	17,131	139,290
10	Fresno	394,558	186,596	581,154	123,153	63,443	517,711
11	Glenn	75,808	35,172	110,980	23,214	11,958	99,022
12	Humboldt	89,185	9,774	98,959	6,451	3,323	95,636
13	Imperial	52,865	34,661	87,526	22,876	11,785	75,741
14	Inyo	57,185	27,171	84,356	17,933	9,238	75,118
15	Kern	355,141	200,000	555,141	132,000	68,000	487,141
16	Kings	58,493	26,904	85,397	17,757	9,147	76,250
17	Lake	57,569	26,836	84,405	17,712	9,124	75,281
18	Lassen	65,000	-	65,000	-	-	65,000
19	Los Angeles	1,890,029	803,431	2,693,461	530,264	273,167	2,420,293
20	Madera	80,794	25,383	106,177	16,753	8,630	97,547
21	Marin	136,581	-	136,581	-	-	136,581
22	Mariposa	45,390	-	45,390	-	-	45,390
23	Mendocino	60,462	29,290	89,752	19,331	9,959	79,793
24	Merced	98,847	46,536	145,383	30,714	15,822	129,561
25	Modoc	70,941	1,247	72,188	823	424	71,764
26	Mono	48,246	1,350	49,596	891	459	49,137
27	Monterey	120,688	57,179	177,867	37,738	19,441	158,426
28	Napa	61,820	29,290	91,110	19,331	9,959	81,151
29	Nevada	116,010	-	116,010	-	-	116,010
30	Orange	537,209	66,935	604,144	44,177	22,758	581,386
31	Placer	89,626	-	89,626	-	-	89,626
32	Plumas	55,827	7,803	63,630	5,150	2,653	60,977
33	Riverside	665,441	356,279	1,021,720	235,144	121,135	900,585
34	Sacramento	309,597	202,993	512,590	133,975	69,018	443,572
35	San Benito	60,289	29,151	89,440	19,240	9,911	79,529
36	San Bernardino	459,342	305,595	764,936	201,693	103,902	661,035
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	214,154	71,332	285,486	47,079	24,253	261,233
40	San Luis Obispo	67,010	32,246	99,256	21,282	10,964	88,292
41	San Mateo	126,800	86,812	213,612	57,296	29,516	184,096
42	Santa Barbara	170,705	77,323	248,028	51,033	26,290	221,738
43	Santa Clara	445,545	210,712	656,257	139,070	71,642	584,615
44	Santa Cruz	74,335	-	74,335	-	-	74,335
45	Shasta	185,447	111,913	297,360	73,863	38,050	259,310
46	Sierra	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	Siskiyou	74,650	30,000	104,650	19,800	10,200	94,450
48	Solano	129,070	39,710	168,780	26,209	13,501	155,279
49	Sonoma	138,141	65,519	203,660	43,243	22,276	181,384
50	Stanislaus	219,062	102,115	321,177	67,396	34,719	286,458
51	Sutter	66,292	31,409	97,701	20,730	10,679	87,022
52	Tehama	27,294	3,535	30,829	2,333	1,202	29,627
53	Trinity	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	Tulare	307,882	132,293	440,175	87,313	44,980	395,195
55	Tuolumne	64,534	30,084	94,618	19,855	10,229	84,389
56	Ventura	252,718	168,612	421,330	111,284	57,328	364,002
57	Yolo	76,604	35,377	111,981	23,349	12,028	99,953
58	Yuba	65,856	42,000	107,856	27,720	14,280	93,576
TOTAL		10,789,626	4,449,685	15,239,311	2,936,792	1,512,892	13,726,418

FLF Base Funds	10,789,626
FLF Federal Drawdown	<u>4,449,685</u>
Total Funding Available	15,239,311