



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

2850 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 300 • Sacramento, California 95833-4348

Telephone 916-263-1400 • Fax 916-643-8028 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date July 27, 2020	Action Requested Please review
To Members of the Family & Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	Deadline July 30, 2020
From Cassandra McTaggart	Contact Cassandra McTaggart, Principal Manager 916-643-7058 cassandra.mctaggart@jud.ca.gov
Subject Draft Judicial Council Report regarding AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Reduction FY 20/21	Anna L. Maves, Supervising Attorney, 916-263-8624 anna.maves@jud.ca.gov

Background

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and the economic downturn that it has caused, the budget passed by the state for FY 2020–21 was revised substantially downward from the previous budgets proposed in January and May. The budget that was enacted and signed into law seeks to close an expected \$54.3 billion shortfall for the current fiscal year.¹

According to the Department of Finance, the enacted budget “includes an ongoing \$46.4 million General Fund reduction for child support administration,” which includes “[s]avings of \$38.1 million to revert Local Child Support Agency Funding to 2018 levels” and “[s]avings of \$8.3 million to reduce state operations and contracts cost.”² The California Department of Child

¹ The budget does contain certain “triggers” should the state receive relief funding from the federal government so that this funding will be fully restored in the event federal funds are made available to the state by October 15, 2020.

² See Entire Department of Child Support Services budget detail at <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2020-21/pdf/Enacted/GovernorsBudget/4000/5175.pdf>.

Support Services (DCSS) has allocated \$2.38 million of the \$8.3 million of their state budget reduction for Fiscal Year 2020-21 to the AB1058 Program. The reduction of the state funds will result in a reduction of federal matching funds of \$4.62 million for a \$7 million total reduction to AB1058 Program for the current fiscal year.

The Judicial Council is required annually to allocate non-trial court funding to the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program (collectively known as the AB 1058 program) and has done so since 1997.³ A cooperative agreement between the DCSS 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.

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee was charged by the Judicial Council in its January 2019 Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation Judicial Council Report to make recommendations to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee on funding methodologies for both Family Law Facilitators and Child Support Commissioners. The Committee is therefore asked to review the draft Judicial Council report and make recommendations on the reduction methodologies discussed in the report.

As such, the draft Judicial Council Report recommendation from the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee is as follows:

Proposal

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2020:

1. Approve the committee's recommended reduction for funding of child support commissioner for FY 2020-2021, as set forth in Attachment F. This methodology distributes 75 percent of the \$7,000,000 reduction to the child support commissioners based on the FY 2020-21 allocation approved by the Judicial Council in January 2019.
2. Approve the committee's recommended reduction for funding of family law facilitator for fiscal year (FY) 2020-2021, as set forth in Attachment C. This methodology

³ Assembly Bill 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."

distributes 25 percent of the \$7,000,000 reduction to the family law facilitators based on the FY 20-21 allocation approved by the Judicial Council in March 2020.

CEAC Subcommittee Comments

The Court Executives Advisory Committee Subcommittee on Child Support Services met twice to discuss the budget reduction and make a recommendation to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee on reduction methodology. The Subcommittee requested and reviewed a range of reduction methodologies. The Subcommittee noted the importance of workload-based reductions and the desirability of a reduction methodology that paralleled the recent Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendation to the Judicial Council on reductions to trial court budget allocations. In this context they also discussed the fact that the Child Support Commissioner allocation is based on a workload methodology approved by the Judicial Council, while a workload methodology for Family Law Facilitators is still under development. This means that a workload-based reduction methodology can only be considered for the Child Support Commissioner allocation. Finally, they noted the importance of preserving core services in the Cluster 1 courts, and recommended the following:

- For both the Family Law Facilitator and the Child Support Commissioner allocation reduction methodologies, Cluster 1 courts should receive only 50 percent of the statewide reduction percentage.
- For Family Law Facilitator allocations, the reductions should be applied pro rata to all courts.
- For Child Support Commissioners, the reductions should be applied as followed:
 - Courts with a ratio of FY 2020-21 budget allocation to total workload-based need (“Ratio”) that is within a band of 2 percent below and above the statewide Ratio receive the average statewide reduction;
 - Courts with a Ratio above the statewide Ratio receive the statewide reduction plus 1 percent;
 - Courts with a Ratio below the statewide Ratio receive the statewide reduction less 1 percent, scaled by their distance below the Ratio;
 - Cluster 1 courts receive 50 percent of the statewide reduction.

Key Issues for Discussion/Consideration

- Impact the reductions will have on the performance of the program as federally mandated.
- Alternatives to the current reductions that have not been considered.

Members of the Family & Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

July 27, 2020

Page 4

Attachments and Links

1. Draft report to the Judicial Council



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.:

For business meeting on September 24-25, 2020

Title

Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support
Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator
Program Funding Reduction FY 20/21

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Recommended by

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

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

July 1, 2020

Date of Report

July 27, 2020

Contact

Cassandra McTaggart, Principal Manager
916-643-7058

cassandra.mctaggart@jud.ca.gov

Anna L. Maves, Supervising Attorney,
916-263-8624

anna.maves@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends approving a temporary budget reduction methodology to allocate the \$7 million budget reduction to the AB 1058 program's FY 20/21 budget resulting from the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) reduction to the Judicial Council's cooperative agreement for Fiscal Year 2020-21. The DCSS has allocated \$2.38 million of the \$8.3 million of their state budget reduction for Fiscal Year 2020-21 to the AB1058 Program. The reduction of the state funds will result in a reduction of federal matching funds of \$4.62 million for a \$7 million total reduction to AB1058 Program for the current fiscal year.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2020:

1. Approve the committee's recommended reduction for funding of child support commissioner for FY 2020-2021, via a 4% banded pro rata methodology that sets the small court reduction to 50 % set forth in Attachment F. This methodology distributes 75 percent of the \$7,000,000 reduction to the child support commissioners based on the FY 2020-21 allocation approved by the Judicial Council in January 2019.
2. Approve the committee's recommended reduction for funding of family law facilitator for fiscal year (FY) 2020-2021, via a pro rata methodology that sets the small court reduction to 50 % as set forth in Attachment C. This methodology distributes 25 percent of the \$7,000,000 reduction to the family law facilitators based on the FY 20-21 allocation approved by the Judicial Council in March 2020.

Relevant 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 (collectively known as the AB 1058 program) and has done so since 1997.¹ A cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) 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.

On January 15, 2019, the Judicial Council approved the recommendations of the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee and:

1. Adopted a new funding methodology for the AB1058 child support commissioner program base funding that is workload-based and employs the same workload and cost structures as the Workload Formula, caps increases or decreases of funding at 5 percent, maintains current funding levels for smaller courts to ensure continued operation of their programs, and reviews the workload measure on a biannual basis;
2. Based on recommendations of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, allocated federal title IV-D (of the Social Security Act) drawdown funds (to be matched

¹ Assembly Bill 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."

by the trial courts) to each court in proportion to the total funds up to the amount the court requests and is prepared to match; and

3. Maintained the historical funding methodology for the family law facilitator program until FY 2021-22.

On March 24, 2020 the Judicial Council approved the allocation of funding for the AB 1058 program for FY 2020–21. For the child support commissioner component of the program, it approved \$31,616,936 in base funding and \$13,038,952 for the federal drawdown option. For the family law facilitator component of the program it approved \$10,789,626 in base funding and \$4,449,685 from the federal drawdown option. Consequently, for the total program the council approved a base allocation of \$44.6 million and a total federal drawdown allocation of \$15.2 million.

Other Background

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and the economic downturn that it has caused, the budget passed by the state for FY 2020–21 was revised substantially downward from the previous budgets proposed in January and May. The budget that was enacted and signed into law seeks to close an expected \$54.3 billion shortfall for the current fiscal year.²

According to the Department of Finance, the enacted budget “includes an ongoing \$46.4 million General Fund reduction for child support administration,” which includes “[s]avings of \$38.1 million to revert Local Child Support Agency Funding to 2018 levels” and “[s]avings of \$8.3 million to reduce state operations and contracts cost.”³ The DCSS has allocated \$2.38 million of the \$8.3 million of their state budget reduction for Fiscal Year 2020-21 to the AB1058 Program. The reduction of the state funds will result in a reduction of federal matching funds of \$4.62 million for a \$7 million total reduction to AB1058 Program for the current fiscal year. The Judicial Council is required annually to allocate non-trial court funding to the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program (collectively known as the AB 1058 program) and has done so since 1997.⁴ A cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) 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).

² The budget does contain certain “triggers” should the state receive relief funding from the federal government so that this funding will be fully restored in the event federal funds are made available to the state by October 15, 2020.

³ See Entire Department of Child Support Services budget detail at <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2020-21/pdf/Enacted/GovernorsBudget/4000/5175.pdf>.

⁴ Assembly Bill 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.”

Any funds left unspent during the fiscal year revert to the state General Fund and cannot be used in subsequent years.

Analysis/Rationale

Current funding for child support commissioners meets only 47 percent of the funding need, as calculated by the workload formula approved by the Judicial Council in January 2019.

The base funding model estimates the workload-based need for child support commissioners and the staff to support those commissioners, excluding the family law facilitator, using the same principles and model parameters as the Funding Formula including the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model. Child support commissioner need is estimated by taking a three-year average of governmental child support filings (FY 2014–15 through FY 2016–17) and multiplying those filings by the caseweight in the Family Law–Other Petitions category (46 minutes). The product is then divided by the judicial workload year value. The result is an estimate of the full-time equivalent (FTE) positions needed for the workload. To convert the FTE estimate into dollars, the subcommittee directed staff to use an average salary for commissioners equivalent to 85 percent of a judge’s salary. A similar approach was taken to estimate the workload-based need for staff support (footnote More details can be found in the January 2019 Judicial Council report).

The 2019 model calculates a funding need of \$67.696 million for child support commissioner services in the courts. The available funding of \$31.617 million is 47 percent of the funding need. The reduction of \$5,250,000 will lower the available funding to \$26.367 million for child support commissioners, reducing the percentage of funding need met to 39 percent.

As the latest judicial needs study did not determine caseweights for title IV-D governmental child support cases specifically, the caseweights for the Family Law–Other Petitions case type was used to assess CSC staffing need for each court. A future judicial needs study will determine a separate caseweight for title IV-D governmental child support cases that can be applied to the CSC funding model.

Despite the pending cut, it is expected that there will actually be an increase in workload for the courts, due to:

- an increase in applications for CalWORKS caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, which will lead to an increase in new title IV-D actions;
- a large increase in applications for unemployment benefits in the state caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, as many Californians have either lost their jobs or seen reduced hours or wages, which will in turn lead to more requests for modification of support orders;

All of these factors will result in an increased workload for child support commissioners and the clerks and other staff that support the program, which will also cause an increase in self-represented litigants seeking assistance from their local family law facilitator for assistance with preparing paperwork and other matters.

The committee recommends using a workload-based reduction allocation methodology that also considers the needs of the smallest courts to ensure they can maintain the statutorily required services.

Policy implications

The funding for the AB 1058 program is grounded in a workload-based methodology that fairly distributes funds for the program, while taking into account the statutory directive that each court provide an AB 1058 commissioner and family law facilitator. To ensure each court can meet that requirement within the funding for the program it is critical that each court receive a level of funding that makes it possible to employ someone in each of these positions. In addition, it is critical that the funding for the program is such that California continues to meet federal performance measures that allow the federal funds to flow to the program. The economic impact of the COVID-19 is extensive and it is critical the budget reduction methodology be implemented to ensure that statewide AB 1058 services can continue and to prevent any loss of performance in the program.

Comments

The Court Executives Advisory Committee Subcommittee on Child Support Services met twice to discuss the budget reduction and make a recommendation to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee on reduction methodology. The Subcommittee requested and reviewed a range of reduction methodologies. The Subcommittee noted the importance of workload-based reductions and the desirability of a reduction methodology that paralleled the recent Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommendation to the Judicial Council on reductions to trial court budget allocations. In this context they also discussed the fact that the Child Support Commissioner allocation is based on a workload methodology approved by the Judicial Council, while a workload methodology for Family Law Facilitators is still under development. This means that a workload-based reduction methodology can only be considered for the Child Support Commissioner allocation. Finally, they noted the importance of preserving core services in the Cluster 1 courts, and recommended the following:

- For both the Family Law Facilitator and the Child Support Commissioner allocation reduction methodologies, Cluster 1 courts should receive only 50 percent of the statewide reduction percentage.
- For Family Law Facilitator allocations, the reductions should be applied pro rata to all courts.
- For Child Support Commissioners, the reductions should be applied as followed:
 - Courts with a ratio of FY 2020-21 budget allocation to total workload-based need (“Ratio”) that is within a band of 2 percent below and above the statewide Ratio receive the average statewide reduction;
 - Courts with a Ratio above the statewide Ratio receive the statewide reduction plus 1 percent;

- Courts with a Ratio below the statewide Ratio receive the statewide reduction less 1 percent, scaled by their distance below the Ratio;
- Cluster 1 courts receive 50 percent of the statewide reduction.

Hold for comments from Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee

Alternatives considered

Each alternative considered includes an option to implement without adjustments, adjust to hold small courts harmless (0% reduction), or adjust to apply 50% of the reduction to small courts. For ease of discussion, the alternatives are laid out without the additional options.

Alternative 1. 4% Banded Reduction for Child Support Commissioners, Pro Rata Reduction for Family Law Facilitators. (Attachments D,E & F)

This alternative distributes the \$7,000,000 total reduction according to the current distribution between Child Support Commissioners (75 percent) and Family Law Facilitators (25 percent). It further uses the existing workload methodology for Child Support Commissioners, approved by the Judicial Council in January 2019, to allocate the reduction in the following groups:

- All small courts and courts that share services receive the average statewide reduction of 16.7 percent.
- All courts within 4 percentage points of the statewide workload-need-to-funding-average receive the average statewide reduction of approximately 16.7 percent.
- All courts above 2 percentage points of the statewide average receive a reduction of approximately 17.7 percent.
- All courts below 2 percentage points of the statewide average receive a reduction of approximately 15.7 percent.

Facilitator services receive a pro rata reduction. The Judicial Council does not have a workload-based methodology for allocating funds to Family Law Facilitator services. (Attachments A-C)

Alternative 2. 6 % Banded Reduction for Child Support Commissioners (Attachments G-I), Pro Rata Reduction for Family Law Facilitators. (Attachments A-C)

This alternative distributes the \$7,000,000 total reduction according to the current distribution between Child Support Commissioners (75 percent) and Family Law Facilitators (25 percent). It further uses the existing workload methodology for Child Support Commissioners, approved by the Judicial Council in January 2019, to allocate the reduction in the following groups:

- All small courts and courts that share services receive the average statewide reduction of 16.7 percent.

- All courts within 6 percentage points of the statewide workload-need-to-funding-average receive the average statewide reduction of 16.7 percent.
- All courts above 3 percentage points of the statewide average receive a reduction of 17.7 percent.
- All courts below 3 percentage points of the statewide average receive a reduction of 15.7 percent.

Facilitator services receive a pro rata reduction. The Judicial Council does not have a workload-based methodology for allocating funds to Family Law Facilitator services.

Alternative 3. Pro Rata Reduction for family law facilitators (Attachment A) and child support commissioners (Attachment D).

This alternative distributes the \$7,000,000 total reduction according to the current distribution between Child Support Commissioners (75 percent) and Family Law Facilitators (25 percent). It further distributes the reduction in each service area strictly based on the FY 2020-21 allocation approved by the Judicial Council in March 2020.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

The proposed budget reduction will result in reducing staff who are critically needed during the recession to maintain service levels. Approximately 80 percent of the AB 1058 funds provided to the trial courts are used for personnel costs. The proposed cut in funding will result in a reduction of court personnel who process filings, assist parents in understanding the child support system, and assist in accurately completing forms and providing necessary documentation. It will also result in reduced hearing time, which will lead to delays in establishing and modifying orders.

This reduction will have substantial negative impacts on trial court operations. It will make it impossible for courts to comply with provisions related to filing time frames and hearing cases that are contained in the contract between DCSS and the Judicial Council, the Judicial Council and the local courts, and the plans of cooperation between the trial courts and the local child support agencies.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A, Family Law Facilitator Reduction Model – Pro Rata
2. Attachment B, Family Law Facilitator Reduction Model - 0% Reduction Small Courts
3. Attachment C, Family Law Facilitator Reduction Model –small courts held at 50%
4. Attachment D, Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model 4% Band
5. Attachment E, Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 4% Band, Small Courts at 0% Reduction

6. Attachment F, Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 4% Band, Small Courts held at 50% of reduction
7. Attachment G, Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 6% Band Pro Rata
8. Attachment H, Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 6% Band small courts at 0% Reduction
9. Attachment I, Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 6% Band Small Courts held at 50% of reduction

DRAFT

Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2020-2021			
A		Scenario 2 Base	
FLF Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Allocation	Difference (B-I)
Alameda	362,939	304,073	58,866
Alpine (see El Dorado)		-	-
Amador	46,885	39,281	7,604
Butte	101,754	85,250	16,504
Calaveras	70,655	59,195	11,460
Colusa	35,600	29,826	5,774
Contra Costa	345,518	289,477	56,041
Del Norte	50,002	41,892	8,110
El Dorado	106,037	88,839	17,198
Fresno	394,558	330,564	63,994
Glenn	75,808	63,512	12,296
Humboldt	89,185	74,720	14,465
Imperial	52,865	44,291	8,574
Inyo	57,185	47,910	9,275
Kern	355,141	297,540	57,601
Kings	58,493	49,006	9,487
Lake	57,569	48,232	9,337
Lassen	65,000	54,457	10,543
Los Angeles	1,890,029	1,583,480	306,549
Madera	80,794	67,690	13,104
Marin	136,581	114,429	22,152
Mariposa	45,390	38,028	7,362
Mendocino	60,462	50,655	9,807
Merced	98,847	82,815	16,032
Modoc	70,941	59,435	11,506
Mono	48,246	40,421	7,825
Monterey	120,688	101,113	19,575
Napa	61,820	51,793	10,027
Nevada	116,010	97,194	18,816
Orange	537,209	450,078	87,131
Placer	89,626	75,089	14,537
Plumas	55,827	46,772	9,055
Riverside	665,441	557,511	107,930
Sacramento	309,597	259,383	50,214
San Benito	60,289	50,511	9,778
San Bernardino	459,342	384,840	74,502
San Diego	605,937	507,658	98,279
San Francisco	245,257	205,478	39,779
San Joaquin	214,154	179,420	34,734
San Luis Obispo	67,010	56,141	10,869
San Mateo	126,800	106,234	20,566
Santa Barbara	170,705	143,018	27,687
Santa Clara	445,545	373,281	72,264
Santa Cruz	74,335	62,278	12,057
Shasta	185,447	155,369	30,078
Sierra (see Nevada)	0	-	-
Siskiyou	74,650	62,542	12,108
Solano	129,070	108,136	20,934
Sonoma	138,141	115,736	22,405
Stanislaus	219,062	183,532	35,530
Sutter	66,292	55,540	10,752
Tehama	27,294	22,867	4,427
Trinity (see Shasta)	0	-	-
Tulare	307,882	257,946	49,936
Tuolumne	64,534	54,067	10,467
Ventura	252,718	211,729	40,989
Yolo	76,604	64,179	12,425
Yuba	65,856	55,175	10,681
Total	10,789,626	9,039,626	1,750,000

		Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2020-2021			
		A			
	FLF Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation		Scenario Base Allocation- Small Courts 0%	Scenario 3 - Difference (B-I)
Clusters	4 Alameda	362,939		300,102	62,837
	1 Alpine (see El Dorado)			-	-
	1 Amador	46,885		46,885	-
	2 Butte	101,754		84,137	17,617
	1 Calaveras	70,655		70,655	-
	1 Colusa	35,600		35,600	-
	3 Contra Costa	345,518		285,697	59,821
	1 Del Norte	50,002		50,002	-
	2 El Dorado	106,037		87,678	18,359
	3 Fresno	394,558		326,247	68,311
	1 Glenn	75,808		75,808	-
	2 Humboldt	89,185		73,744	15,441
	2 Imperial	52,865		43,712	9,153
	1 Inyo	57,185		57,185	-
	3 Kern	355,141		293,654	61,487
	2 Kings	58,493		48,366	10,127
	2 Lake	57,569		47,602	9,967
	1 Lassen	65,000		65,000	-
	4 Los Angeles	1,890,029		1,562,801	327,228
	2 Madera	80,794		66,806	13,988
	2 Marin	136,581		112,934	23,647
	1 Mariposa	45,390		45,390	-
	2 Mendocino	60,462		49,994	10,468
	2 Merced	98,847		81,733	17,114
	1 Modoc	70,941		70,941	-
	1 Mono	48,246		48,246	-
	3 Monterey	120,688		99,793	20,895
	2 Napa	61,820		51,117	10,703
	2 Nevada	116,010		95,925	20,085
	4 Orange	537,209		444,200	93,009
	2 Placer	89,626		74,109	15,517
	1 Plumas	55,827		55,827	-
	4 Riverside	665,441		550,231	115,210
	4 Sacramento	309,597		255,995	53,602
	1 San Benito	60,289		60,289	-
	4 San Bernardino	459,342		379,814	79,528
	4 San Diego	605,937		501,029	104,908
	4 San Francisco	245,257		202,795	42,462
	3 San Joaquin	214,154		177,077	37,077
	2 San Luis Obispo	67,010		55,408	11,602
	3 San Mateo	126,800		104,847	21,953
	3 Santa Barbara	170,705		141,150	29,555
	4 Santa Clara	445,545		368,406	77,139
	2 Santa Cruz	74,335		61,465	12,870
	2 Shasta	185,447		153,340	32,107
	1 Sierra (see Nevada)	0		-	-
	2 Siskiyou	74,650		61,726	12,924
	3 Solano	129,070		106,724	22,346
	3 Sonoma	138,141		114,224	23,917
	3 Stanislaus	219,062		181,135	37,927
	2 Sutter	66,292		54,815	11,477
	2 Tehama	27,294		22,568	4,726
	1 Trinity (see Shasta)	0		-	-
	3 Tulare	307,882		254,577	53,305
	2 Tuolumne	64,534		53,361	11,173
	3 Ventura	252,718		208,964	43,754
	2 Yolo	76,604		63,341	13,263
	2 Yuba	65,856		54,454	11,402
	Total	10,789,626		9,039,626	1,750,000

		Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2020-2021			
		A			
Clusters	FLF Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Scenario Base	Scenario 4 -	
			Allocation - Small Courts Held 50%	Difference (B-I)	
4	Alameda	362,939	302,087	60,852	
1	Alpine (see El Dorado)		-	-	
1	Amador	46,885	43,083	3,802	
2	Butte	101,754	84,694	17,060	
1	Calaveras	70,655	64,925	5,730	
1	Colusa	35,600	32,713	2,887	
3	Contra Costa	345,518	287,587	57,931	
1	Del Norte	50,002	45,947	4,055	
2	El Dorado	106,037	88,258	17,779	
3	Fresno	394,558	328,405	66,153	
1	Glenn	75,808	69,660	6,148	
2	Humboldt	89,185	74,232	14,953	
2	Imperial	52,865	44,001	8,864	
1	Inyo	57,185	52,548	4,637	
3	Kern	355,141	295,597	59,544	
2	Kings	58,493	48,686	9,807	
2	Lake	57,569	47,917	9,652	
1	Lassen	65,000	59,729	5,271	
4	Los Angeles	1,890,029	1,573,141	316,888	
2	Madera	80,794	67,248	13,546	
2	Marin	136,581	113,681	22,900	
1	Mariposa	45,390	41,709	3,681	
2	Mendocino	60,462	50,325	10,137	
2	Merced	98,847	82,274	16,573	
1	Modoc	70,941	65,188	5,753	
1	Mono	48,246	44,333	3,913	
3	Monterey	120,688	100,453	20,235	
2	Napa	61,820	51,455	10,365	
2	Nevada	116,010	96,559	19,451	
4	Orange	537,209	447,139	90,070	
2	Placer	89,626	74,599	15,027	
1	Plumas	55,827	51,300	4,527	
4	Riverside	665,441	553,871	111,570	
4	Sacramento	309,597	257,689	51,908	
1	San Benito	60,289	55,400	4,889	
4	San Bernardino	459,342	382,327	77,015	
4	San Diego	605,937	504,344	101,593	
4	San Francisco	245,257	204,136	41,121	
3	San Joaquin	214,154	178,248	35,906	
2	San Luis Obispo	67,010	55,775	11,235	
3	San Mateo	126,800	105,540	21,260	
3	Santa Barbara	170,705	142,084	28,621	
4	Santa Clara	445,545	370,843	74,702	
2	Santa Cruz	74,335	61,872	12,463	
2	Shasta	185,447	154,354	31,093	
1	Sierra (see Nevada)	0	-	-	
2	Siskiyou	74,650	62,134	12,516	
3	Solano	129,070	107,430	21,640	
3	Sonoma	138,141	114,980	23,161	
3	Stanislaus	219,062	182,333	36,729	
2	Sutter	66,292	55,177	11,115	
2	Tehama	27,294	22,718	4,576	
1	Trinity (see Shasta)	0	-	-	
3	Tulare	307,882	256,262	51,620	
2	Tuolumne	64,534	53,714	10,820	
3	Ventura	252,718	210,346	42,372	
2	Yolo	76,604	63,760	12,844	
2	Yuba	65,856	54,814	11,042	
	Total	10,789,626	9,039,626	1,750,000	

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
3	1	Mono	9,301	45,974	494.27%	16.58%				16.58%	7,622
4	1	Inyo	27,489	79,264	288.35%	16.58%				16.58%	13,142
5	1	Plumas	39,749	95,777	240.95%	16.58%				16.58%	15,880
6	1	Sierra	4,595	11,000	239.42%	16.58%				16.58%	1,824
7	2	Nevada	135,724	316,593	233.26%		17.58%			17.58%	55,657
8	1	Colusa	20,730	45,691	220.41%	16.58%				16.58%	7,576
9	1	Mariposa	35,342	75,216	212.82%	16.58%				16.58%	12,471
10	1	Amador	73,760	140,250	190.14%	16.58%				16.58%	23,253
11	1	San Benito	86,478	135,384	156.55%	16.58%				16.58%	22,447
12	2	Tuolumne	104,455	158,566	151.80%		17.58%			17.58%	27,876
13	1	Glenn	83,419	120,030	143.89%	16.58%				16.58%	19,901
14	1	Calaveras	109,761	132,667	120.87%	16.58%				16.58%	21,996
15	3	Sonoma	429,281	477,253	111.17%		17.58%			17.58%	83,901
16	2	Santa Cruz	168,509	186,631	110.75%		17.58%			17.58%	32,810
17	4	Santa Clara	1,551,874	1,697,087	109.36%		17.58%			17.58%	298,348
18	2	Siskiyou	117,625	124,720	106.03%		17.58%			17.58%	21,926
19	2	Shasta	399,474	398,675	99.80%		17.58%			17.58%	70,087
20	2	Yuba	228,887	203,149	88.76%		17.58%			17.58%	35,714
21	2	Marin	139,003	120,757	86.87%		17.58%			17.58%	21,229
22	3	Contra Costa	973,086	835,291	85.84%		17.58%			17.58%	146,844
23	3	Santa Barbara	554,070	458,012	82.66%		17.58%			17.58%	80,519
24	3	San Mateo	453,725	372,835	82.17%		17.58%			17.58%	65,544
25	2	Lake	185,197	148,425	80.14%		17.58%			17.58%	26,093
26	2	Placer	411,054	328,758	79.98%		17.58%			17.58%	57,796
27	4	San Francisco	1,107,735	863,471	77.95%		17.58%			17.58%	151,798
28	2	San Luis Obispo	293,214	220,725	75.28%		17.58%			17.58%	38,803
29	2	El Dorado	290,358	203,169	69.97%		17.58%			17.58%	35,717
30	2	Mendocino	233,717	162,914	69.71%		17.58%			17.58%	28,640
31	2	Kings	419,007	289,538	69.10%		17.58%			17.58%	50,901
32	3	Tulare	782,899	534,195	68.23%		17.58%			17.58%	93,911
33	2	Butte	465,533	287,042	61.66%		17.58%			17.58%	50,462
34	1	Lassen	98,431	60,000	60.96%	16.58%				16.58%	9,948
35	2	Sutter	321,148	192,235	59.86%		17.58%			17.58%	33,795
36	3	Stanislaus	1,263,676	737,802	58.39%		17.58%			17.58%	129,706
37	3	Solano	874,487	493,537	56.44%		17.58%			17.58%	86,764
38	2	Merced	936,592	516,419	55.14%		17.58%			17.58%	90,786
39	2	Napa	189,565	100,465	53.00%		17.58%			17.58%	17,662
40	4	Orange	4,339,981	2,199,809	50.69%		17.58%			17.58%	386,726
41	3	Fresno	3,143,939	1,547,773	49.23%		17.58%			17.58%	272,098
42	3	Monterey	788,655	375,757	47.65%			16.58%		16.58%	62,301
43	2	Madera	436,283	205,992	47.22%			16.58%		16.58%	34,153
44	3	Ventura	1,181,896	555,211	46.98%			16.58%		16.58%	92,054
45	2	Humboldt	251,220	117,835	46.91%			16.58%		16.58%	19,537
46	4	San Diego	3,746,939	1,755,653	46.86%			16.58%		16.58%	291,087

Draft Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 4% Band

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
47	1	Trinity	41,798	18,900	45.22%	16.58%				16.58%	3,134
48	3	San Joaquin	1,616,992	719,254	44.48%				15.58%	15.58%	112,060
49	2	Tehama	224,963	98,961	43.99%				15.58%	15.58%	15,418
50	2	Yolo	457,344	199,702	43.67%				15.58%	15.58%	31,114
51	4	Alameda	2,621,376	1,119,358	42.70%				15.58%	15.58%	174,396
52	4	San Bernardino	7,550,076	2,698,328	35.74%				15.58%	15.58%	420,399
53	1	Del Norte	142,611	50,404	35.34%	16.58%				16.58%	8,357
54	4	Los Angeles	16,130,495	5,554,479	34.43%				15.58%	15.58%	865,388
55	3	Kern	2,205,847	704,023	31.92%				15.58%	15.58%	109,687
56	4	Sacramento	3,437,294	1,096,727	31.91%				15.58%	15.58%	170,870
57	2	Imperial	635,749	173,631	27.31%				15.58%	15.58%	27,052
58	4	Riverside	5,097,627	1,055,625	20.71%				15.58%	15.58%	164,466
59	1	Modoc	24,662			16.58%				16.58%	
60	1	Alpine	1,103			16.58%				16.58%	
61		Total	67,695,798	31,616,936	46.70%						5,249,646
62											
63											

Draft Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 4% Band
Small Courts at 0% of Reduction

Attachment E

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
3	1	Mono	9,301	45,974	494.27%	0.00%				0.00%	-
4	1	Inyo	27,489	79,264	288.35%	0.00%				0.00%	-
5	1	Plumas	39,749	95,777	240.95%	0.00%				0.00%	-
6	1	Sierra	4,595	11,000	239.42%	0.00%				0.00%	-
7	2	Nevada	135,724	316,593	233.26%		18.13%			18.13%	57,398
8	1	Colusa	20,730	45,691	220.41%	0.00%				0.00%	-
9	1	Mariposa	35,342	75,216	212.82%	0.00%				0.00%	-
10	1	Amador	73,760	140,250	190.14%	0.00%				0.00%	-
11	1	San Benito	86,478	135,384	156.55%	0.00%				0.00%	-
12	2	Tuolumne	104,455	158,566	151.80%		18.13%			18.13%	28,748
13	1	Glenn	83,419	120,030	143.89%	0.00%				0.00%	-
14	1	Calaveras	109,761	132,667	120.87%	0.00%				0.00%	-
15	3	Sonoma	429,281	477,253	111.17%		18.13%			18.13%	86,526
16	2	Santa Cruz	168,509	186,631	110.75%		18.13%			18.13%	33,836
17	4	Santa Clara	1,551,874	1,697,087	109.36%		18.13%			18.13%	307,682
18	2	Siskiyou	117,625	124,720	106.03%		18.13%			18.13%	22,612
19	2	Shasta	399,474	398,675	99.80%		18.13%			18.13%	72,280
20	2	Yuba	228,887	203,149	88.76%		18.13%			18.13%	36,831
21	2	Marin	139,003	120,757	86.87%		18.13%			18.13%	21,893
22	3	Contra Costa	973,086	835,291	85.84%		18.13%			18.13%	151,438
23	3	Santa Barbara	554,070	458,012	82.66%		18.13%			18.13%	83,038
24	3	San Mateo	453,725	372,835	82.17%		18.13%			18.13%	67,595
25	2	Lake	185,197	148,425	80.14%		18.13%			18.13%	26,910
26	2	Placer	411,054	328,758	79.98%		18.13%			18.13%	59,604
27	4	San Francisco	1,107,735	863,471	77.95%		18.13%			18.13%	156,547
28	2	San Luis Obispo	293,214	220,725	75.28%		18.13%			18.13%	40,017
29	2	El Dorado	290,358	203,169	69.97%		18.13%			18.13%	36,835
30	2	Mendocino	233,717	162,914	69.71%		18.13%			18.13%	29,536
31	2	Kings	419,007	289,538	69.10%		18.13%			18.13%	52,493
32	3	Tulare	782,899	534,195	68.23%		18.13%			18.13%	96,850
33	2	Butte	465,533	287,042	61.66%		18.13%			18.13%	52,041
34	1	Lassen	98,431	60,000	60.96%	0.00%				0.00%	-
35	2	Sutter	321,148	192,235	59.86%		18.13%			18.13%	34,852
36	3	Stanislaus	1,263,676	737,802	58.39%		18.13%			18.13%	133,764
37	3	Solano	874,487	493,537	56.44%		18.13%			18.13%	89,478
38	2	Merced	936,592	516,419	55.14%		18.13%			18.13%	93,627
39	2	Napa	189,565	100,465	53.00%		18.13%			18.13%	18,214
40	4	Orange	4,339,981	2,199,809	50.69%		18.13%			18.13%	398,825
41	3	Fresno	3,143,939	1,547,773	49.23%		18.13%			18.13%	280,611
42	3	Monterey	788,655	375,757	47.65%			17.13%		17.13%	64,367
43	2	Madera	436,283	205,992	47.22%			17.13%		17.13%	35,286
44	3	Ventura	1,181,896	555,211	46.98%			17.13%		17.13%	95,108
45	2	Humboldt	251,220	117,835	46.91%			17.13%		17.13%	20,185
46	4	San Diego	3,746,939	1,755,653	46.86%			17.13%		17.13%	300,743

Draft Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 4% Band
Small Courts at 0% of Reduction

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
47	1	Trinity	41,798	18,900	45.22%	0.00%				0.00%	-
48	3	San Joaquin	1,616,992	719,254	44.48%				16.13%	16.13%	116,016
49	2	Tehama	224,963	98,961	43.99%				16.13%	16.13%	15,962
50	2	Yolo	457,344	199,702	43.67%				16.13%	16.13%	32,212
51	4	Alameda	2,621,376	1,119,358	42.70%				16.13%	16.13%	180,552
52	4	San Bernardino	7,550,076	2,698,328	35.74%				16.13%	16.13%	435,240
53	1	Del Norte	142,611	50,404	35.34%	0.00%				0.00%	-
54	4	Los Angeles	16,130,495	5,554,479	34.43%				16.13%	16.13%	895,937
55	3	Kern	2,205,847	704,023	31.92%				16.13%	16.13%	113,559
56	4	Sacramento	3,437,294	1,096,727	31.91%				16.13%	16.13%	176,902
57	2	Imperial	635,749	173,631	27.31%				16.13%	16.13%	28,007
58	4	Riverside	5,097,627	1,055,625	20.71%				16.13%	16.13%	170,272
59	1	Modoc	24,662			0.00%				0.00%	
60	1	Alpine	1,103			0.00%				0.00%	
61		Total	67,695,798	31,616,936	46.70%						5,250,430
62											
63											

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
3	1	Mono	9,301	45,974	494.27%	8.43%				8.43%	3,873
4	1	Inyo	27,489	79,264	288.35%	8.43%				8.43%	6,678
5	1	Plumas	39,749	95,777	240.95%	8.43%				8.43%	8,069
6	1	Sierra	4,595	11,000	239.42%	8.43%				8.43%	927
7	2	Nevada	135,724	316,593	233.26%		17.85%			17.85%	56,512
8	1	Colusa	20,730	45,691	220.41%	8.43%				8.43%	3,849
9	1	Mariposa	35,342	75,216	212.82%	8.43%				8.43%	6,337
10	1	Amador	73,760	140,250	190.14%	8.43%				8.43%	11,816
11	1	San Benito	86,478	135,384	156.55%	8.43%				8.43%	11,406
12	2	Tuolumne	104,455	158,566	151.80%		17.85%			17.85%	28,304
13	1	Glenn	83,419	120,030	143.89%	8.43%				8.43%	10,113
14	1	Calaveras	109,761	132,667	120.87%	8.43%				8.43%	11,177
15	3	Sonoma	429,281	477,253	111.17%		17.85%			17.85%	85,190
16	2	Santa Cruz	168,509	186,631	110.75%		17.85%			17.85%	33,314
17	4	Santa Clara	1,551,874	1,697,087	109.36%		17.85%			17.85%	302,930
18	2	Siskiyou	117,625	124,720	106.03%		17.85%			17.85%	22,262
19	2	Shasta	399,474	398,675	99.80%		17.85%			17.85%	71,163
20	2	Yuba	228,887	203,149	88.76%		17.85%			17.85%	36,262
21	2	Marin	139,003	120,757	86.87%		17.85%			17.85%	21,555
22	3	Contra Costa	973,086	835,291	85.84%		17.85%			17.85%	149,099
23	3	Santa Barbara	554,070	458,012	82.66%		17.85%			17.85%	81,755
24	3	San Mateo	453,725	372,835	82.17%		17.85%			17.85%	66,551
25	2	Lake	185,197	148,425	80.14%		17.85%			17.85%	26,494
26	2	Placer	411,054	328,758	79.98%		17.85%			17.85%	58,683
27	4	San Francisco	1,107,735	863,471	77.95%		17.85%			17.85%	154,130
28	2	San Luis Obispo	293,214	220,725	75.28%		17.85%			17.85%	39,399
29	2	El Dorado	290,358	203,169	69.97%		17.85%			17.85%	36,266
30	2	Mendocino	233,717	162,914	69.71%		17.85%			17.85%	29,080
31	2	Kings	419,007	289,538	69.10%		17.85%			17.85%	51,683
32	3	Tulare	782,899	534,195	68.23%		17.85%			17.85%	95,354
33	2	Butte	465,533	287,042	61.66%		17.85%			17.85%	51,237
34	1	Lassen	98,431	60,000	60.96%	8.43%				8.43%	5,055
35	2	Sutter	321,148	192,235	59.86%		17.85%			17.85%	34,314
36	3	Stanislaus	1,263,676	737,802	58.39%		17.85%			17.85%	131,698
37	3	Solano	874,487	493,537	56.44%		17.85%			17.85%	88,096
38	2	Merced	936,592	516,419	55.14%		17.85%			17.85%	92,181
39	2	Napa	189,565	100,465	53.00%		17.85%			17.85%	17,933
40	4	Orange	4,339,981	2,199,809	50.69%		17.85%			17.85%	392,666
41	3	Fresno	3,143,939	1,547,773	49.23%		17.85%			17.85%	276,277
42	3	Monterey	788,655	375,757	47.65%			16.85%		16.85%	63,315
43	2	Madera	436,283	205,992	47.22%			16.85%		16.85%	34,710
44	3	Ventura	1,181,896	555,211	46.98%			16.85%		16.85%	93,553
45	2	Humboldt	251,220	117,835	46.91%			16.85%		16.85%	19,855
46	4	San Diego	3,746,939	1,755,653	46.86%			16.85%		16.85%	295,828

Draft Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 4% Band
Small Courts 50% of Reduction

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
47	1	Trinity	41,798	18,900	45.22%	8.43%				8.43%	1,592
48	3	San Joaquin	1,616,992	719,254	44.48%				15.85%	15.85%	114,002
49	2	Tehama	224,963	98,961	43.99%				15.85%	15.85%	15,685
50	2	Yolo	457,344	199,702	43.67%				15.85%	15.85%	31,653
51	4	Alameda	2,621,376	1,119,358	42.70%				15.85%	15.85%	177,418
52	4	San Bernardino	7,550,076	2,698,328	35.74%				15.85%	15.85%	427,685
53	1	Del Norte	142,611	50,404	35.34%	8.43%				8.43%	4,247
54	4	Los Angeles	16,130,495	5,554,479	34.43%				15.85%	15.85%	880,385
55	3	Kern	2,205,847	704,023	31.92%				15.85%	15.85%	111,588
56	4	Sacramento	3,437,294	1,096,727	31.91%				15.85%	15.85%	173,831
57	2	Imperial	635,749	173,631	27.31%				15.85%	15.85%	27,521
58	4	Riverside	5,097,627	1,055,625	20.71%				15.85%	15.85%	167,317
59	1	Modoc	24,662			8.43%				8.43%	
60	1	Alpine	1,103			8.43%				8.43%	
61		Total	67,695,798	31,616,936	46.70%						5,249,872
62											
63											

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
3	1	Mono	9,301	45,974	494.27%	16.61%				16.61%	7,634
4	1	Inyo	27,489	79,264	288.35%	16.61%				16.61%	13,162
5	1	Plumas	39,749	95,777	240.95%	16.61%				16.61%	15,904
6	1	Sierra	4,595	11,000	239.42%	16.61%				16.61%	1,827
7	2	Nevada	135,724	316,593	233.26%		17.61%			17.61%	55,736
8	1	Colusa	20,730	45,691	220.41%	16.61%				16.61%	7,587
9	1	Mariposa	35,342	75,216	212.82%	16.61%				16.61%	12,490
10	1	Amador	73,760	140,250	190.14%	16.61%				16.61%	23,289
11	1	San Benito	86,478	135,384	156.55%	16.61%				16.61%	22,481
12	2	Tuolumne	104,455	158,566	151.80%		17.61%			17.61%	27,916
13	1	Glenn	83,419	120,030	143.89%	16.61%				16.61%	19,931
14	1	Calaveras	109,761	132,667	120.87%	16.61%				16.61%	22,029
15	3	Sonoma	429,281	477,253	111.17%		17.61%			17.61%	84,020
16	2	Santa Cruz	168,509	186,631	110.75%		17.61%			17.61%	32,856
17	4	Santa Clara	1,551,874	1,697,087	109.36%		17.61%			17.61%	298,772
18	2	Siskiyou	117,625	124,720	106.03%		17.61%			17.61%	21,957
19	2	Shasta	399,474	398,675	99.80%		17.61%			17.61%	70,187
20	2	Yuba	228,887	203,149	88.76%		17.61%			17.61%	35,764
21	2	Marin	139,003	120,757	86.87%		17.61%			17.61%	21,259
22	3	Contra Costa	973,086	835,291	85.84%		17.61%			17.61%	147,053
23	3	Santa Barbara	554,070	458,012	82.66%		17.61%			17.61%	80,633
24	3	San Mateo	453,725	372,835	82.17%		17.61%			17.61%	65,638
25	2	Lake	185,197	148,425	80.14%		17.61%			17.61%	26,130
26	2	Placer	411,054	328,758	79.98%		17.61%			17.61%	57,878
27	4	San Francisco	1,107,735	863,471	77.95%		17.61%			17.61%	152,014
28	2	San Luis Obispo	293,214	220,725	75.28%		17.61%			17.61%	38,859
29	2	El Dorado	290,358	203,169	69.97%		17.61%			17.61%	35,768
30	2	Mendocino	233,717	162,914	69.71%		17.61%			17.61%	28,681
31	2	Kings	419,007	289,538	69.10%		17.61%			17.61%	50,973
32	3	Tulare	782,899	534,195	68.23%		17.61%			17.61%	94,045
33	2	Butte	465,533	287,042	61.66%		17.61%			17.61%	50,534
34	1	Lassen	98,431	60,000	60.96%	16.61%				16.61%	9,963
35	2	Sutter	321,148	192,235	59.86%		17.61%			17.61%	33,843
36	3	Stanislaus	1,263,676	737,802	58.39%		17.61%			17.61%	129,890
37	3	Solano	874,487	493,537	56.44%		17.61%			17.61%	86,887
38	2	Merced	936,592	516,419	55.14%		17.61%			17.61%	90,915
39	2	Napa	189,565	100,465	53.00%		17.61%			17.61%	17,687
40	4	Orange	4,339,981	2,199,809	50.69%		17.61%			17.61%	387,276
41	3	Fresno	3,143,939	1,547,773	49.23%			16.61%		16.61%	257,008
42	3	Monterey	788,655	375,757	47.65%			16.61%		16.61%	62,394
43	2	Madera	436,283	205,992	47.22%			16.61%		16.61%	34,205
44	3	Ventura	1,181,896	555,211	46.98%			16.61%		16.61%	92,193
45	2	Humboldt	251,220	117,835	46.91%			16.61%		16.61%	19,567
46	4	San Diego	3,746,939	1,755,653	46.86%			16.61%		16.61%	291,526

Draft Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 6% Band Pro Rata

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
47	1	Trinity	41,798	18,900	45.22%	16.61%				16.61%	3,138
48	3	San Joaquin	1,616,992	719,254	44.48%			16.61%		16.61%	119,432
49	2	Tehama	224,963	98,961	43.99%			16.61%		16.61%	16,433
50	2	Yolo	457,344	199,702	43.67%				15.61%	15.61%	31,163
51	4	Alameda	2,621,376	1,119,358	42.70%				15.61%	15.61%	174,676
52	4	San Bernardino	7,550,076	2,698,328	35.74%				15.61%	15.61%	421,074
53	1	Del Norte	142,611	50,404	35.34%	16.61%				16.61%	8,370
54	4	Los Angeles	16,130,495	5,554,479	34.43%				15.61%	15.61%	866,776
55	3	Kern	2,205,847	704,023	31.92%				15.61%	15.61%	109,863
56	4	Sacramento	3,437,294	1,096,727	31.91%				15.61%	15.61%	171,144
57	2	Imperial	635,749	173,631	27.31%				15.61%	15.61%	27,095
58	4	Riverside	5,097,627	1,055,625	20.71%				15.61%	15.61%	164,730
59	1	Modoc	24,662			16.61%				16.61%	
60	1	Alpine	1,103			16.61%				16.61%	
61		Total	67,695,798	31,616,936	46.70%						5,250,254
62											
63											

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
3	1	Mono	9,301	45,974	494.27%	0.00%				0.00%	-
4	1	Inyo	27,489	79,264	288.35%	0.00%				0.00%	-
5	1	Plumas	39,749	95,777	240.95%	0.00%				0.00%	-
6	1	Sierra	4,595	11,000	239.42%	0.00%				0.00%	-
7	2	Nevada	135,724	316,593	233.26%		18.15%			18.15%	57,462
8	1	Colusa	20,730	45,691	220.41%	0.00%				0.00%	-
9	1	Mariposa	35,342	75,216	212.82%	0.00%				0.00%	-
10	1	Amador	73,760	140,250	190.14%	0.00%				0.00%	-
11	1	San Benito	86,478	135,384	156.55%	0.00%				0.00%	-
12	2	Tuolumne	104,455	158,566	151.80%		18.15%			18.15%	28,780
13	1	Glenn	83,419	120,030	143.89%	0.00%				0.00%	-
14	1	Calaveras	109,761	132,667	120.87%	0.00%				0.00%	-
15	3	Sonoma	429,281	477,253	111.17%		18.15%			18.15%	86,621
16	2	Santa Cruz	168,509	186,631	110.75%		18.15%			18.15%	33,873
17	4	Santa Clara	1,551,874	1,697,087	109.36%		18.15%			18.15%	308,021
18	2	Siskiyou	117,625	124,720	106.03%		18.15%			18.15%	22,637
19	2	Shasta	399,474	398,675	99.80%		18.15%			18.15%	72,360
20	2	Yuba	228,887	203,149	88.76%		18.15%			18.15%	36,872
21	2	Marin	139,003	120,757	86.87%		18.15%			18.15%	21,917
22	3	Contra Costa	973,086	835,291	85.84%		18.15%			18.15%	151,605
23	3	Santa Barbara	554,070	458,012	82.66%		18.15%			18.15%	83,129
24	3	San Mateo	453,725	372,835	82.17%		18.15%			18.15%	67,669
25	2	Lake	185,197	148,425	80.14%		18.15%			18.15%	26,939
26	2	Placer	411,054	328,758	79.98%		18.15%			18.15%	59,670
27	4	San Francisco	1,107,735	863,471	77.95%		18.15%			18.15%	156,720
28	2	San Luis Obispo	293,214	220,725	75.28%		18.15%			18.15%	40,061
29	2	El Dorado	290,358	203,169	69.97%		18.15%			18.15%	36,875
30	2	Mendocino	233,717	162,914	69.71%		18.15%			18.15%	29,569
31	2	Kings	419,007	289,538	69.10%		18.15%			18.15%	52,551
32	3	Tulare	782,899	534,195	68.23%		18.15%			18.15%	96,956
33	2	Butte	465,533	287,042	61.66%		18.15%			18.15%	52,098
34	1	Lassen	98,431	60,000	60.96%	0.00%				0.00%	-
35	2	Sutter	321,148	192,235	59.86%		18.15%			18.15%	34,891
36	3	Stanislaus	1,263,676	737,802	58.39%		18.15%			18.15%	133,911
37	3	Solano	874,487	493,537	56.44%		18.15%			18.15%	89,577
38	2	Merced	936,592	516,419	55.14%		18.15%			18.15%	93,730
39	2	Napa	189,565	100,465	53.00%		18.15%			18.15%	18,234
40	4	Orange	4,339,981	2,199,809	50.69%		18.15%			18.15%	399,265
41	3	Fresno	3,143,939	1,547,773	49.23%			17.15%		17.15%	265,443
42	3	Monterey	788,655	375,757	47.65%			17.15%		17.15%	64,442
43	2	Madera	436,283	205,992	47.22%			17.15%		17.15%	35,328
44	3	Ventura	1,181,896	555,211	46.98%			17.15%		17.15%	95,219
45	2	Humboldt	251,220	117,835	46.91%			17.15%		17.15%	20,209
46	4	San Diego	3,746,939	1,755,653	46.86%			17.15%		17.15%	301,095

Attachment C: Draft Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 6% Band
Small Courts at 0% of Reduction

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
47	1	Trinity	41,798	18,900	45.22%	0.00%				0.00%	-
48	3	San Joaquin	1,616,992	719,254	44.48%			17.15%		17.15%	123,352
49	2	Tehama	224,963	98,961	43.99%			17.15%		17.15%	16,972
50	2	Yolo	457,344	199,702	43.67%				16.15%	16.15%	32,252
51	4	Alameda	2,621,376	1,119,358	42.70%				16.15%	16.15%	180,776
52	4	San Bernardino	7,550,076	2,698,328	35.74%				16.15%	16.15%	435,780
53	1	Del Norte	142,611	50,404	35.34%	0.00%				0.00%	-
54	4	Los Angeles	16,130,495	5,554,479	34.43%				16.15%	16.15%	897,048
55	3	Kern	2,205,847	704,023	31.92%				16.15%	16.15%	113,700
56	4	Sacramento	3,437,294	1,096,727	31.91%				16.15%	16.15%	177,121
57	2	Imperial	635,749	173,631	27.31%				16.15%	16.15%	28,041
58	4	Riverside	5,097,627	1,055,625	20.71%				16.15%	16.15%	170,483
59	1	Modoc	24,662			0.00%				0.00%	
60	1	Alpine	1,103			0.00%				0.00%	
61		Total	67,695,798	31,616,936	46.70%						5,249,256
62											
63											

Draft Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 6% Band
Small Courts at 50% of Reduction

Attachment I

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
3	1	Mono	9,301	45,974	494.27%	8.44%				8.44%	3,879
4	1	Inyo	27,489	79,264	288.35%	8.44%				8.44%	6,688
5	1	Plumas	39,749	95,777	240.95%	8.44%				8.44%	8,081
6	1	Sierra	4,595	11,000	239.42%	8.44%				8.44%	928
7	2	Nevada	135,724	316,593	233.26%		17.88%			17.88%	56,591
8	1	Colusa	20,730	45,691	220.41%	8.44%				8.44%	3,855
9	1	Mariposa	35,342	75,216	212.82%	8.44%				8.44%	6,346
10	1	Amador	73,760	140,250	190.14%	8.44%				8.44%	11,834
11	1	San Benito	86,478	135,384	156.55%	8.44%				8.44%	11,423
12	2	Tuolumne	104,455	158,566	151.80%		17.88%			17.88%	28,344
13	1	Glenn	83,419	120,030	143.89%	8.44%				8.44%	10,128
14	1	Calaveras	109,761	132,667	120.87%	8.44%				8.44%	11,194
15	3	Sonoma	429,281	477,253	111.17%		17.88%			17.88%	85,309
16	2	Santa Cruz	168,509	186,631	110.75%		17.88%			17.88%	33,360
17	4	Santa Clara	1,551,874	1,697,087	109.36%		17.88%			17.88%	303,354
18	2	Siskiyou	117,625	124,720	106.03%		17.88%			17.88%	22,294
19	2	Shasta	399,474	398,675	99.80%		17.88%			17.88%	71,263
20	2	Yuba	228,887	203,149	88.76%		17.88%			17.88%	36,313
21	2	Marin	139,003	120,757	86.87%		17.88%			17.88%	21,585
22	3	Contra Costa	973,086	835,291	85.84%		17.88%			17.88%	149,308
23	3	Santa Barbara	554,070	458,012	82.66%		17.88%			17.88%	81,870
24	3	San Mateo	453,725	372,835	82.17%		17.88%			17.88%	66,644
25	2	Lake	185,197	148,425	80.14%		17.88%			17.88%	26,531
26	2	Placer	411,054	328,758	79.98%		17.88%			17.88%	58,766
27	4	San Francisco	1,107,735	863,471	77.95%		17.88%			17.88%	154,345
28	2	San Luis Obispo	293,214	220,725	75.28%		17.88%			17.88%	39,455
29	2	El Dorado	290,358	203,169	69.97%		17.88%			17.88%	36,316
30	2	Mendocino	233,717	162,914	69.71%		17.88%			17.88%	29,121
31	2	Kings	419,007	289,538	69.10%		17.88%			17.88%	51,755
32	3	Tulare	782,899	534,195	68.23%		17.88%			17.88%	95,487
33	2	Butte	465,533	287,042	61.66%		17.88%			17.88%	51,309
34	1	Lassen	98,431	60,000	60.96%	8.44%				8.44%	5,063
35	2	Sutter	321,148	192,235	59.86%		17.88%			17.88%	34,362
36	3	Stanislaus	1,263,676	737,802	58.39%		17.88%			17.88%	131,882
37	3	Solano	874,487	493,537	56.44%		17.88%			17.88%	88,220
38	2	Merced	936,592	516,419	55.14%		17.88%			17.88%	92,310
39	2	Napa	189,565	100,465	53.00%		17.88%			17.88%	17,958
40	4	Orange	4,339,981	2,199,809	50.69%		17.88%			17.88%	393,216
41	3	Fresno	3,143,939	1,547,773	49.23%			16.88%		16.88%	261,187
42	3	Monterey	788,655	375,757	47.65%			16.88%		16.88%	63,409
43	2	Madera	436,283	205,992	47.22%			16.88%		16.88%	34,761
44	3	Ventura	1,181,896	555,211	46.98%			16.88%		16.88%	93,692
45	2	Humboldt	251,220	117,835	46.91%			16.88%		16.88%	19,885
46	4	San Diego	3,746,939	1,755,653	46.86%			16.88%		16.88%	296,267

Draft Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 6% Band
Small Courts at 50% of Reduction

	A	C	F	T	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1	Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
2	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
47	1	Trinity	41,798	18,900	45.22%	8.44%				8.44%	1,595
48	3	San Joaquin	1,616,992	719,254	44.48%			16.88%		16.88%	121,374
49	2	Tehama	224,963	98,961	43.99%			16.88%		16.88%	16,700
50	2	Yolo	457,344	199,702	43.67%				15.88%	15.88%	31,703
51	4	Alameda	2,621,376	1,119,358	42.70%				15.88%	15.88%	177,698
52	4	San Bernardino	7,550,076	2,698,328	35.74%				15.88%	15.88%	428,360
53	1	Del Norte	142,611	50,404	35.34%	8.44%				8.44%	4,253
54	4	Los Angeles	16,130,495	5,554,479	34.43%				15.88%	15.88%	881,774
55	3	Kern	2,205,847	704,023	31.92%				15.88%	15.88%	111,764
56	4	Sacramento	3,437,294	1,096,727	31.91%				15.88%	15.88%	174,105
57	2	Imperial	635,749	173,631	27.31%				15.88%	15.88%	27,564
58	4	Riverside	5,097,627	1,055,625	20.71%				15.88%	15.88%	167,580
59	1	Modoc	24,662			8.44%				8.44%	
60	1	Alpine	1,103			8.44%				8.44%	
61		Total	67,695,798	31,616,936	46.70%						5,250,354
62											
63											