



Judicial Council of California

Family & Juvenile Law Advisory
Committee

www.courts.ca.gov/familyjuvenilecomm.htm
familyjuvenilecomm@jud.ca.gov

FAMILY AND JUVENILE LAW ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

April 29, 2024

4:30-5:30 pm

Virtual

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Stephanie E. Hulse (Chair), Hon. Charles F. Adams, Hon. Sue Alexander (Ret.), Hon. Craig E. Arthur, Hon. Brooke A. Blecher, Hon. Tari L. Cody, Ms. Risé A. Donlon, Hon. Ana L. España, Hon. Katherine Fogarty, Hon. Suzanne Gazzaniga, Hon. Susan M. Gill, Hon. Jennifer L. Giuliani, Ms. Julia Hanagan, Ms. Leslie Heimov, Mx. Cory Hernandez, Ms. Rose Klein, Ms. Selis Koker, Mr. Joseph Koller, Mr. Jonathan Laba, Ms. Sharon M. Lawrence, Hon. Frank J. Menetrez, Hon. Laura H. Miller, Mr. Joe Navarro, Ms. Sherry Peterson, Ms. Melissa J. Poulos, Mr. Brian J. Richart, Hon. Lawrence P. Riff, and Ms. Susan Thrall.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi, Hon. Brett Bianco, Ms. Diane Iglesias, Hon. Mary Kreber Varipapa, Hon. B. Scott Thomsen, Hon. Rubén A. Villalobos, and Hon. Monica F. Wiley.

Others Present: Mr. Tony Cheng, Ms. Charli Depner, Ms. Audrey Fancy, Ms. Diana Glick, Ms. Tracy Kenny, Ms. Stephanie Lacambra, Ms. Kelly Meehleib, Ms. Ella Miles-Urdan, Ms. Amanda Morris, Ms. Melissa Rodgers, Hon. Amy Pellman (Ret.), Hon. Cheri Pham, Ms. Sarah Saria, Ms. Gabrielle Selden, Ms. Christy Simons, and Ms. Marina Soto.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and took roll call.

Approval of Past Meeting Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the open session of the April 8, 2024, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee meeting.

ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 2)

Item 1

Juvenile Law: FY 2024-25 Funding Allocations for Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

Local Assistance

Presenter: Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

The judicial branch budget for Judicial Council Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) grants for fiscal year (FY) 2024–25 is \$2.713 million, which as of FY 2018–19 includes an ongoing \$500,000 funding augmentation to support efforts to increase the number of foster children served and reduce backlogs of youth in local courts waiting for a volunteer assignment.

The committee reviewed the proposed funding methodology and agreed to recommend that the Judicial Council amend its funding methodology to include an ongoing allocation of the \$500,000 funding augmentation with the following parameters: (1) the augmentation will be allocated as a separate growth-based incentive, (2) this growth-based incentive will be allocated to a total of 30 eligible local CASA programs, comprised of 15 large and 15 small programs, based on the current methodology for determining incentive funding eligibility for large and small programs; and (3) this funding will be allocated equally among the 30 eligible local CASA programs. The committee further recommends that the allocation of \$2.713 million for FY 2024–25 for the CASA Local Assistance program be based on the amended funding methodology. The allocations would fund 45 CASA programs serving 52 counties.

Action: *The committee reviewed and approved the proposed recommendations to the Judicial Council for the CASA Local Assistance funding allocations for fiscal year 2024-25 without objection.*

Item 2

Report to the Legislature: Report on California Court Appointed Special Advocate Association Funding Allocations and Program Development for FY 2023-24

Presenter: Kelly Meehleib, Supervising Analyst, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

The Budget Act of 2022 appropriated a \$60 million one-time General Fund to the California CASA Association for support of local CASA programs, including \$20 million in FY 2022-23, \$20 million in FY 2023-24, and \$20 million in FY 2024-25. The Budget Act requires that the Judicial Council report annually to the Legislature on CASA program implementation and outcomes. The year-two report is due on July 1, 2024, and must describe funding allocations and program development.

Action: *The committee reviewed and approved the draft report for FY 2023-24 without objection.*

C L O S E D S E S S I O N (R U L E 1 0 . 7 5 (C) (3))

Approval of Past Meeting Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the closed session of the April 8, 2024, Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee meeting.

Item 1

Legislative Review

Presenter: Tracy Kenny, Supervising Attorney, Office of Governmental Affairs

Staff reviewed upcoming bills for the 2024-2025 legislative cycle that bear on family and juvenile law issues.

The next meeting will be held on May 13, 2024.

Adjourned closed session at 5:21pm.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



Judicial Council of California

Family & Juvenile Law Advisory
Committee

www.courts.ca.gov/familyjuvenilecomm.htm
familyjuvenilecomm@jud.ca.gov

FAMILY AND JUVENILE LAW ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING

September 23, 2024

4:30-5:30 p.m.

Virtual

Advisory Body Members Present: Hon. Tari Cody (Cochair), Hon. Stephanie E. Hulse (Cochair), Hon. Craig E. Arthur, Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi, Hon. Brooke Blecher, Hon. Roger C. Chan, Hon. Ana España, Comm. Katherine Fogarty, Ms. Risé Donlon, Hon. Susan M. Gill, Ms. Julia Hanagan, Ms. Leslie Heimov, Mx. Cory Hernandez, Hon. Esther P. Kim, Ms. Rose Klein, Mr. Joseph Koller, Hon. Mary Kreber Varipapa, Mr. Jonathan Laba, Ms. Sharon Lawrence, Mr. Joe Navarro, Hon. Kelly L. Neel, Ms. Sherry Peterson, Hon. Cheri Pham, Melissa Poulos, Ms. Susan Thrall, Ms. Hon. Ruben Villalobos, and Hon. Monica Wiley.

Advisory Body Members Absent: Hon. Akemi Arakaki, Hon. Brett Bianco, Hon. Jennifer L. Guiliani, Ms. Diane Iglesias, Ms. Selis Koker, Hon. Frank J. Menetrez, Mr. Brian Richart, Hon. Lawrence Riff, and Hon. B Scott Thomsen.

Others Present: Comm. Sue Alexander (Ret.), Mr. Tony Cheng, Ms. Charlene Depner, Ms. Audrey Fancy, Ms. Diana Glick, Ms. Frances Ho, Ms. Sarah Jacobvitz, Ms. Stephanie Lacambra, Ms. Anna Maves, Ms. Amanda Morris, Ms. Marci Reichbach, Ms. Melissa Rogers, Ms. Sarah Saria, Ms. Christy Simons, Ms. Marymichael Smrdeli, Mr. Gregory Tanaka, and Mr. Rodney Trevino.

OPEN MEETING

Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and took roll call.

ACTION ITEM (ITEM 1)

Item 1

Firearm Relinquishment Grant Program Recommendations

Presenter: Frances Ho, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts, Judicial Council of California
The committee considered recommendations for funding Cycle 3 of this program.

Action: *The committee approved of the proposed recommendations for funding Cycle 3 of this program.*

The next meeting will be held on October 7, 2024

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



Judicial Council of California

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

Telephone 415-865-4200 · Fax 415-865-4205

M E M O R A N D U M

Date

April 15, 2025

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Members of the Family and Juvenile Law
Advisory Committee

Deadline

April 28, 2025

From

Anna L. Maves, Principal Managing
Attorney/AB 1058 Program Manager

Contact

Anna L. Maves
916-263-8624 phone
anna.maves@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Draft Judicial Council Report Regarding
AB 1058 Program 2024–25 Funding
Allocations

Background

The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee was formed in 2015 to review the historical AB 1058 program funding methodology. On January 16, 2019, the Judicial Council approved a new workload-based funding methodology for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner program while maintaining the historical Family Law Facilitator funding methodology until 2021–22 as recommended by the subcommittee.¹ On July 9, 2021, the Judicial Council approved a new population-based methodology for the FLF program and maintained the workload-based methodology with updated workload data for the CSC program. The Judicial Council directed that each methodology be updated with new data every two years.

¹ More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the January 2019 meeting: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation* (Nov. 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6953308&GUID=A6F15A78-08B6-42DA-8826-19A6AF0B7CB1>.

For 2025-26, the Child Support Commissioner funding methodology was updated with new workload data and the Family Law Facilitator was updated with updated population data consistent with the previously adopted methodologies.

The committee is therefore asked to review the draft Judicial Council report and make recommendations on funding allocations discussed in the report. The draft Judicial Council Report recommendations from the Judicial Branch Budget Committee are as follows:

Proposal

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to take the following actions:

1. Approve the recommendation for fiscal year 2025-26 AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner program funding comprised of the base funding allocations and federal drawdown funding using the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council in January 2019 as set forth Attachment C1.
2. Approve the recommendation for fiscal year 2025-26 AB 1058 Family Law Facilitator program funding comprised of the base funding allocations and federal drawdown funding using the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council in January 2021 as set forth Attachment C2.

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 July 17–18, 2025

Title

Child Support: Updating AB 1058 Program
Funding Methodologies and Approving 2025–
26 Funding Allocations

Report Type

Action Required

Effective Date

July 18, 2025

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

April 11, 2025

Recommended by

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair
Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Vice-Chair

Contact

Anna L. Maves, 916-263-8624
anna.maves@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends allocating funds for the Assembly Bill 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program based on the current funding methodologies, with updated workload and population data. The Child Support Commissioner program workload-based funding methodology was implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2019–20, the Family Law Facilitator program population-based funding methodology was implemented in FY 2021–22, and the underlying data for both are updated every two years. The committee also recommends approving base and federal drawdown allocations for the Assembly Bill 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding for fiscal year 2025–26. The funds are provided through a cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council, which requires the council to annually approve these funding allocations.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 18, 2025:

1. Approve the committee’s recommended base allocation for the Child Support Commissioner program for 2025–26 and 2026–27, as described below and set forth in Attachment A, maintaining the current funding methodology approved by the council in 2019 with updated workload data.
2. Approve the committee’s recommended base allocation for the Family Law Facilitator program for 2025–26 and 2026–27, as described below and set forth in Attachment B, maintaining the current funding methodology approved by the council in 2021 with updated population data.
3. Approve the committee’s recommendation for 2025–26 AB 1058 program funding for the courts comprised of the base funding allocations derived from recommendations 1 and 2, and federal drawdown funding based using the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council in January 2019 as set forth in Attachments C1 and C2.

This recommendation was presented to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee on May 16, 2025, and approved for consideration by the Judicial Council.

Relevant Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council is required to annually allocate non-trial court funding to 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 at the end of the fiscal year revert to the state General Fund and cannot be used in subsequent years.

The AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee was formed in 2015 to review the historical AB 1058 program funding methodology. On January 15, 2019, the council approved a new workload-based funding methodology for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner (CSC) program while maintaining the historical Family Law Facilitator (FLF) program funding methodology until FY 2021–22, as recommended by the subcommittee.² On July 9, 2021, the council approved a new population-based methodology for the FLF program and maintained the workload-based methodology, with updated workload data, for the CSC program and directed

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.”

² More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the January 2019 meeting: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation* (Nov. 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6953308&GUID=A6F15A78-08B6-42DA-8826-19A6AF0B7CB1>.

that each methodology be updated every two years with updated data.³ Additionally, the council directed the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to make a recommendation for the CSC program for funding a minimum service level for smaller courts and reviewing the implementation of the Child Support Commissioner workload-based methodology until 2023–24.⁴

On July 21, 2023, the Judicial Council approved the funding allocation for FY 2023–24 with updated workload data for the CSC program and updated population data for the FLF program. The council also confirmed that for the CSC program, funding for the smallest courts and courts in a cooperative agreement to share services will to be allocated based on the courts’ historical allocations.⁵

Analysis/Rationale

Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator base funding allocations

The Child Support Commissioner funding methodology was approved by the Judicial Council effective January 2019 and the effectiveness of its implementation reviewed July 2023. This recommendation included that funds should continue to be reallocated on an ongoing basis every two years with updated workload data. The committee recommends the funding for the Child Support Commissioner program to be allocated using the existing funding methodology, which caps funding changes at no greater than five percent. Attachment A details the Child Support Commissioner base allocation using 2023–24 funding levels and updated workload metrics.

The Family Law Facilitator funding methodology was approved by the Judicial Council effective July 2021. This recommendation included that funds should continue to be reallocated on an ongoing basis every two years with updated population data. The committee recommends the funding for the Family Law Facilitator program to be allocated using the existing funding methodology, which caps funding changes at no greater than five percent. Attachment B details the Family Law Facilitator base allocation using 2023–24 funding levels and updated population data.

³ More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the July 2021 meeting: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Child Support: Updating Workload Data for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner Funding Methodology, Adopting a Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Methodology, and Adopting 2021–22 AB 1058 Program Funding Allocations* (May 14, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9508521&GUID=BC737E96-AFD8-4E22-A046-AE9E16A5C422>.

⁴ More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the July 2021 meeting: Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Child Support: Updating Workload Data for the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner Funding Methodology, Adopting a Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Methodology, and Adopting 2021–22 AB 1058 Program Funding Allocations* (May 14, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9508521&GUID=BC737E96-AFD8-4E22-A046-AE9E16A5C422>.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Child Support: Updating AB 1058 Program Funding Methodologies and Adopting Fiscal Year 2023–24 Funding Allocations* (June 29, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12128370&GUID=89F3B1A2-851D-4C5B-9966-A563AFCD50E5>.

2025–26 AB 1058 program funding

The total AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding for the courts is comprised of the base funding allocations and federal drawdown funding with specific amounts designated for each side of the program. Base funding is derived from the respective funding methodologies for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator programs. As approved by the Judicial Council in January 2019, federal drawdown funds are allocated proportionally to each court based on the new funding allocations up to the amount that a court requests and can match. If the request for federal drawdown funds exceeds the amount available to allocate, these funds are allocated in proportion to a court's base funding. This proportional allocation is continued until all drawdown funds are allocated to those courts that are willing and able to provide the matching funds.

Funding for 2025–26 for the Child Support Commissioner program will be \$35.0 million in base funding and \$13 million in federal drawdown funding. Funding for 2025–26 for the Family Law Facilitator program will be \$11.9 million in base funding and \$4.4 million in federal drawdown funds. The total program base allocation is \$48.6 million, and the total federal drawdown allocation is \$17.5

Policy implications

Approval of these recommendations allows for the continued funding of the CSC and FLF programs, supporting courts in meeting mandates under Family Code sections 4251 and 10002 to hire sufficient child support commissioners and family law facilitators, respectively, to provide AB 1058 services to the public. Approval of these recommendations also fulfills the requirements of the contract between the council and the California Department of Child Support Services. Continued biannual allocations based on the approved methodology will ensure courts continue to meet federal performance measures that ensure ongoing federal funding for the program.

Comments

The report was not circulated for comment and no comments were received in advance of the meeting.

Alternatives considered

No alternatives were considered because the recommended allocations contained in Attachment A, Attachment B, and Attachments C1 and C2 were calculated using the approved funding methodology for the AB 1058 CSC and FLF Program.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

The committee does not anticipate that these recommendations will result in any costs to the branch, but the reallocation of funds will decrease funds available for some courts, which may impact their ability to meet program objectives.

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 and Links

1. Attachment A: Recommended Child Support Commissioner Funding Allocation Model (+/- Maximum 5% Change)
2. Attachment B: Recommended Family Law Facilitator Funding Allocation Model (+/- Maximum 5% Change)
3. Attachment C1: Child Support Commissioner (CSC) Program Allocation, 2025–26
4. Attachment C2: Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program Allocation, 2025–26

Attachment A: Recommended Child Support Commissioner Funding Allocation Model (+/- Maximum 5% Change)

Cluster Col. A	Court Col. B	CSC Funding Need Col. C	CSC Staff (non- FLF Funding Need Col. D	Total CSC and Staff Need (C+D) Col. E	Prorate to available funding Col. F	JC FY 23-24 Base Allocation Col. G	Final Allocation Adjust to limit to max. 5% increase/ decrease Col. H	Difference (H-G) Col. I	Percentage Difference Col. I/Col. G Col. J
4	Alameda	346,411	1,540,733	1,887,144	1,049,091	1,535,919	1,459,123	(76,796)	-5.0%
1	Alpine	141	494	635	353		0		
1	Amador	11,990	44,745	56,735	31,540	140,250	140,250	0	0.0%
2	Butte	59,978	184,406	244,383	135,856	259,055	246,102	(12,953)	-5.0%
1	Calaveras	12,112	43,163	55,275	30,728	132,667	132,667	0	0.0%
1	Colusa	11,139	35,867	47,005	26,131	45,691	45,691	0	0.0%
3	Contra Costa	191,715	801,180	992,895	551,965	753,850	716,158	(37,693)	-5.0%
1	Del Norte	20,629	71,729	92,358	51,343	64,458	64,458	0	0.0%
2	El Dorado	35,547	133,897	169,443	94,196	203,169	203,169	0	0.0%
3	Fresno	794,297	2,445,680	3,239,977	1,801,151	1,719,354	1,773,471	54,117	3.1%
1	Glenn	20,109	76,420	96,529	53,662	120,030	120,030	0	0.0%
2	Humboldt	60,799	170,248	231,046	128,442	119,314	123,261	3,947	3.3%
2	Imperial	116,511	300,424	416,935	231,780	223,254	228,895	5,641	2.5%
1	Inyo	5,330	18,577	23,908	13,291	79,264	79,264	0	0.0%
3	Kern	504,479	1,568,808	2,073,287	1,152,571	1,075,343	1,110,916	35,572	3.3%
2	Kings	81,227	253,195	334,423	185,911	261,308	248,243	(13,065)	-5.0%
2	Lake	41,072	115,039	156,112	86,785	133,954	127,256	(6,698)	-5.0%
1	Lassen	10,323	36,045	46,368	25,777	60,000	60,000	0	0.0%
4	Los Angeles	3,545,665	15,045,835	18,591,499	10,335,291	6,897,225	7,125,385	228,160	3.3%
2	Madera	109,031	335,851	444,881	247,316	246,952	247,193	241	0.1%
2	Marin	33,506	136,041	169,547	94,254	108,983	103,534	(5,449)	-5.0%
1	Mariposa	7,071	24,799	31,870	17,717	75,216	75,216	0	0.0%
2	Mendocino	40,080	113,827	153,907	85,559	147,030	139,679	(7,352)	-5.0%
2	Merced	223,175	636,368	859,543	477,833	479,882	477,833	(2,049)	-0.4%
1	Modoc	7,464	21,136	28,600	15,899		0		
1	Mono	2,306	8,737	11,042	6,139	45,974	45,974	0	0.0%
3	Monterey	159,313	608,014	767,327	426,568	347,451	358,944	11,494	3.3%
2	Napa	24,764	103,109	127,873	71,087	95,820	91,029	(4,791)	-5.0%
2	Nevada	33,960	121,519	155,479	86,433	327,593	327,593	0	0.0%
4	Orange	728,802	2,741,304	3,470,106	1,929,084	2,146,724	2,039,387	(107,336)	-5.0%
2	Placer	108,235	424,200	532,435	295,988	296,704	295,988	(716)	-0.2%
1	Plumas	9,289	30,762	40,051	22,265	95,777	95,777	0	0.0%
4	Riverside	739,876	2,549,318	3,289,194	1,828,512	1,629,505	1,683,409	53,904	3.3%
4	Sacramento	461,846	1,872,602	2,334,448	1,297,754	1,440,658	1,368,625	(72,033)	-5.0%
1	San Benito	22,501	91,323	113,824	63,276	135,384	135,384	0	0.0%
4	San Bernardino	1,312,056	4,736,777	6,048,833	3,362,636	3,247,991	3,323,840	75,849	2.3%
4	San Diego	784,887	2,907,869	3,692,756	2,052,858	1,961,174	2,021,832	60,658	3.1%
4	San Francisco	158,957	794,565	953,521	530,077	779,283	740,318	(38,964)	-5.0%
3	San Joaquin	413,326	1,392,939	1,806,265	1,004,130	863,354	891,914	28,560	3.3%
2	San Luis Obispo	68,241	232,847	301,089	167,380	199,204	189,244	(9,960)	-5.0%
3	San Mateo	85,977	413,719	499,696	277,788	336,483	319,659	(16,824)	-5.0%
3	Santa Barbara	80,611	304,039	384,650	213,833	413,356	392,688	(20,668)	-5.0%
4	Santa Clara	226,015	1,004,022	1,230,037	683,796	1,531,621	1,455,040	(76,581)	-5.0%
2	Santa Cruz	23,547	87,377	110,924	61,664	168,434	160,012	(8,422)	-5.0%
2	Shasta	96,548	329,807	426,355	237,017	417,575	417,575	0	0.0%
1	Sierra	854	2,859	3,713	2,064		0	0	0.0%
2	Siskiyou	19,730	53,697	73,427	40,819	112,559	106,931	(5,628)	-5.0%
3	Solano	204,948	761,694	966,642	537,370	534,566	536,421	1,855	0.3%
3	Sonoma	86,011	325,898	411,909	228,986	430,721	409,185	(21,536)	-5.0%
3	Stanislaus	294,249	1,000,014	1,294,263	719,500	665,867	687,893	22,027	3.3%
2	Sutter	50,365	168,829	219,194	121,853	173,492	164,817	(8,675)	-5.0%
2	Tehama	50,851	147,685	198,536	110,369	114,033	114,033	0	0.0%
1	Trinity	8,651	27,070	35,721	19,858		0	0	0.0%
3	Tulare	388,914	1,347,719	1,736,634	965,420	482,111	498,059	15,948	3.3%
2	Tuolumne	15,699	50,880	66,579	37,012	158,566	150,638	(7,928)	-5.0%
3	Ventura	123,338	487,889	611,227	339,790	501,078	476,024	(25,054)	-5.0%
2	Yolo	46,276	207,660	253,937	141,167	216,063	205,259	(10,803)	-5.0%
2	Yuba	52,259	213,069	265,327	147,499	203,149	203,149	0	0.0%
	Total	13,173,002	49,704,318	62,877,319	34,954,436	34,954,436	34,954,436		

Attachment B: Recommended Family Law Facilitator Funding Allocation Model (+/- Maximum 5% Change)

Cluster Col. A	Court Col. B	Population Based Methodology Col. C	JC FY 2023-24 Base Allocation Col. D	Difference Col. E	Final Allocation Max. 5% increase/ decrease Col. F	Difference (F-D) Col. G	Percentage Difference Col. H
4	Alameda	452,314	427,656	24,658	433,683	6,028	1.4%
1	Alpine	34,301		34,301	0		
1	Amador	44,138	47,097	(2,959)	47,097	0	0.0%
2	Butte	85,955	93,008	(7,053)	88,358	(4,650)	-5.0%
1	Calaveras	45,403	70,907	(25,503)	70,907	0	0.0%
1	Colusa	39,531	38,685	846	38,924	239	0.6%
3	Contra Costa	325,746	325,463	282	325,543	80	0.0%
1	Del Norte	40,781	50,155	(9,374)	50,155	0	0.0%
2	El Dorado*	81,979	107,111	(25,132)	107,111	0	0.0%
3	Fresno	291,157	361,481	(70,323)	343,407	(18,074)	-5.0%
1	Glenn	41,260	75,971	(34,710)	75,971	0	0.0%
2	Humboldt	68,083	81,205	(13,122)	77,145	(4,060)	-5.0%
2	Imperial	79,840	69,686	10,154	70,668	982	1.4%
1	Inyo	38,799	57,289	(18,490)	57,289	0	0.0%
3	Kern	264,648	325,360	(60,712)	309,092	(16,268)	-5.0%
2	Kings	72,602	68,120	4,482	69,080	960	1.4%
2	Lake	51,014	52,299	(1,286)	51,014	(1,286)	-2.5%
1	Lassen	41,347	65,167	(23,820)	65,167	0	0.0%
4	Los Angeles	2,530,146	2,354,734	175,412	2,387,923	33,189	1.4%
2	Madera	74,155	73,759	395	73,871	111	0.2%
2	Marin	98,632	124,657	(26,026)	118,424	(6,233)	-5.0%
1	Mariposa	38,313	45,491	(7,178)	45,491	0	0.0%
2	Mendocino	56,761	56,553	208	56,611	59	0.1%
2	Merced	106,490	103,021	3,469	103,999	978	0.9%
1	Modoc	36,172	70,995	(34,822)	70,995	0	0.0%
1	Mono	37,336	48,322	(10,986)	48,322	0	0.0%
3	Monterey	144,429	139,169	5,261	140,652	1,483	1.1%
2	Napa	68,324	67,700	624	67,876	176	0.3%
2	Nevada*	59,541	116,579	(57,039)	116,579	0	0.0%
4	Orange	833,838	719,452	114,386	729,593	10,140	1.4%
2	Placer	138,226	116,133	22,092	117,770	1,637	1.4%
1	Plumas	38,803	55,935	(17,131)	55,935	0	0.0%
4	Riverside	652,142	647,113	5,029	648,531	1,418	0.2%
4	Sacramento	434,352	382,653	51,700	388,046	5,393	1.4%
1	San Benito	50,624	60,627	(10,003)	60,627	0	0.0%
4	San Bernardino	587,448	546,115	41,332	553,813	7,697	1.4%
4	San Diego	868,921	774,012	94,909	784,922	10,909	1.4%
4	San Francisco	247,878	249,644	(1,767)	247,878	(1,767)	-0.7%
3	San Joaquin	233,627	222,201	11,427	225,333	3,132	1.4%
2	San Luis Obispo	104,982	88,799	16,182	90,051	1,252	1.4%
3	San Mateo	222,791	184,398	38,394	186,997	2,599	1.4%
3	Santa Barbara	146,616	156,466	(9,850)	148,643	(7,823)	-5.0%
4	Santa Clara	516,296	506,978	9,318	509,605	2,627	0.5%
2	Santa Cruz	101,045	92,216	8,829	93,515	1,300	1.4%
2	Shasta*	79,588	186,519	(106,932)	186,519	0	0.0%
1	Sierra	34,811		34,811	0	0	
2	Siskiyou	45,059	67,608	(22,549)	64,228	(3,380)	-5.0%
3	Solano	147,296	141,837	5,460	143,376	1,539	1.1%
3	Sonoma	155,827	154,217	1,610	154,671	454	0.3%
3	Stanislaus	173,082	200,661	(27,579)	190,628	(10,033)	-5.0%
2	Sutter	59,169	60,351	(1,182)	59,169	(1,182)	-2.0%
2	Tehama	50,419	39,713	10,706	40,272	560	1.4%
1	Trinity	38,051		38,051	0	0	
3	Tulare	154,863	280,401	(125,538)	266,381	(14,020)	-5.0%
2	Tuolumne	47,902	58,532	(10,630)	55,606	(2,927)	-5.0%
3	Ventura	244,107	245,297	(1,191)	244,107	(1,191)	-0.5%
2	Yolo	90,115	86,762	3,353	87,707	945	1.1%
2	Yuba	55,050	59,845	(4,795)	56,852	(2,992)	-5.0%
	Total	11,902,126	11,902,126		11,902,126		

Child Support Commissioner (CSC) Program Allocation, 2025–26							
		A	B	C	D	E	F
#	CSC Court	Base Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Federal Share 66% (Column B * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column B * .34)	Total Allocation (A + B)	Contract Amount (A + C)
1	Alameda	\$1,459,123	\$549,815	\$362,878	\$186,937	\$2,008,938	\$1,822,001
2	Alpine (see El Dorado)	0					
3	Amador	140,250	45,736	30,186	15,550	185,986	170,436
4	Butte	246,102	0	0	0	246,102	246,102
5	Calaveras	132,667	10,000	6,600	3,400	142,667	139,267
6	Colusa	45,691	15,809	10,434	5,375	61,500	56,125
7	Contra Costa	716,158	0	0	0	716,158	716,158
8	Del Norte	64,458	29,023	19,155	9,868	93,481	83,613
9	El Dorado	203,169	100,382	66,252	34,130	303,551	269,421
10	Fresno	1,773,471	1,187,832	783,969	403,863	2,961,303	2,557,440
11	Glenn	120,030	0	0	0	120,030	120,030
12	Humboldt	123,261	21,340	14,084	7,255	144,600	137,345
13	Imperial	228,895	149,031	98,360	50,670	377,926	327,255
14	Inyo	79,264	0	0	0	79,264	79,264
15	Kern	1,110,916	109,223	72,087	37,136	1,220,139	1,183,003
16	Kings	248,243	75,000	49,500	25,500	323,243	297,743
17	Lake	127,256	90,500	59,730	30,770	217,756	186,986
18	Lassen	60,000	0	0	0	60,000	60,000
19	Los Angeles	7,125,385	3,198,270	2,110,858	1,087,412	10,323,655	9,236,243
20	Madera	247,193	88,000	58,080	29,920	335,193	305,273
21	Marin	103,534	41,384	27,313	14,070	144,917	130,847
22	Mariposa	75,216	0	0	0	75,216	75,216
23	Mendocino	139,679	56,550	37,323	19,227	196,229	177,002
24	Merced	477,833	297,354	196,254	101,100	775,187	674,087
25	Modoc	0					
26	Mono	45,974	0	0	0	45,974	45,974
27	Monterey	358,944	166,550	109,923	56,627	525,494	468,867
28	Napa	91,029	0	0	0	91,029	91,029
29	Nevada	327,593	0	0	0	327,593	327,593
30	Orange	2,039,387	595,474	393,013	202,461	2,634,861	2,432,400
31	Placer	295,988	20,870	13,774	7,096	316,858	309,763
32	Plumas	95,777	0	0	0	95,777	95,777
33	Riverside	1,683,409	41,240	27,218	14,021	1,724,648	1,710,627
34	Sacramento	1,368,625	614,817	405,779	209,038	1,983,442	1,774,405
35	San Benito	135,384	30,000	19,800	10,200	165,384	155,184
36	San Bernardino	3,323,840	954,601	630,037	324,564	4,278,441	3,953,877
37	San Diego	2,021,832	1,204,380	794,890	409,489	3,226,211	2,816,722
38	San Francisco	740,318	363,320	239,791	123,529	1,103,638	980,110
39	San Joaquin	891,914	83,046	54,810	28,236	974,960	946,724
40	San Luis Obispo	189,244	127,093	83,881	43,212	316,337	273,125
41	San Mateo	319,659	163,455	107,880	55,575	483,114	427,539
42	Santa Barbara	392,688	297,025	196,036	100,988	689,713	588,725
43	Santa Clara	1,455,040	977,183	644,941	332,242	2,432,223	2,099,981
44	Santa Cruz	160,012	99,848	65,900	33,948	259,860	225,912
45	Shasta	417,575	239,030	157,760	81,270	656,605	575,335
46	Sierra (see Nevada)	0					
47	Siskiyou	106,931	0	0	0	106,931	106,931
48	Solano	536,421	95,481	63,017	32,464	631,902	599,439
49	Sonoma	409,185	0	0	0	409,185	409,185
50	Stanislaus	687,893	406,836	268,512	138,324	1,094,729	956,405
51	Sutter	164,817	63,487	41,901	21,586	228,304	206,719
52	Tehama	114,033	56,982	37,608	19,374	171,015	151,641
53	Trinity (see Shasta)	0					
54	Tulare	498,059	104,642	69,064	35,578	602,701	567,123
55	Tuolumne	150,638	78,346	51,708	26,638	228,984	202,346
56	Ventura	476,024	175,000	115,500	59,500	651,024	591,524
57	Yolo	205,259	15,000	9,900	5,100	220,259	215,159
58	Yuba	203,149	0	0	0	203,149	203,149
TOTAL		\$34,954,436	\$13,038,953	\$8,605,709	\$4,433,244	\$47,993,389	\$43,560,145

CSC Base Funds	\$34,954,436
CSC Federal Drawdown	\$13,038,953
Total Funding Allocated	\$47,993,389

Family Law Facilitator (FLF) Program Allocation, 2025–26							
		A	B	C	D	E	F
#	FLF Court	Base Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Federal Share 66% (Column B * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column B * .34)	Total Allocation (A + B)	Contract Amount (A + C)
1	Alameda	\$433,683	\$252,301	\$166,519	\$85,782	\$685,984	\$600,202
2	Alpine (see El Dorado)	0					
3	Amador	47,097	4,701	3,103	1,598	51,798	50,200
4	Butte	88,358	61,250	40,425	20,825	149,608	128,783
5	Calaveras	70,907	8,000	5,280	2,720	78,907	76,187
6	Colusa	38,924	8,900	5,874	3,026	47,824	44,798
7	Contra Costa	325,543	0	0	0	325,543	325,543
8	Del Norte	50,155	5,971	3,941	2,030	56,126	54,095
9	El Dorado	107,111	50,384	33,253	17,131	157,495	140,364
10	Fresno	343,407	198,952	131,308	67,644	542,359	474,715
11	Glenn	75,971	0	0	0	75,971	75,971
12	Humboldt	77,145	13,414	8,854	4,561	90,559	85,998
13	Imperial	70,668	36,940	24,380	12,560	107,608	95,049
14	Inyo	57,289	0	0	0	57,289	57,289
15	Kern	309,092	214,590	141,629	72,960	523,682	450,721
16	Kings	69,080	0	0	0	69,080	69,080
17	Lake	51,014	29,180	19,259	9,921	80,194	70,273
18	Lassen	65,167	695	458	236	65,862	65,626
19	Los Angeles	2,387,923	803,431	530,264	273,167	3,191,354	2,918,187
20	Madera	73,871	27,723	18,297	9,426	101,594	92,168
21	Marin	118,424	0	0	0	118,424	118,424
22	Mariposa	45,491	0	0	0	45,491	45,491
23	Mendocino	56,611	30,722	20,277	10,445	87,333	76,888
24	Merced	103,999	72,011	47,527	24,484	176,010	151,526
25	Modoc	70,995	1,247	823	424	72,242	71,818
26	Mono	48,322	1,350	891	459	49,672	49,213
27	Monterey	140,652	63,298	41,777	21,521	203,950	182,428
28	Napa	67,876	42,148	27,817	14,330	110,024	95,694
29	Nevada	116,579	0	0	0	116,579	116,579
30	Orange	729,593	137,558	90,788	46,770	867,150	820,381
31	Placer	117,770	0	0	0	117,770	117,770
32	Plumas	55,935	596	393	203	56,531	56,328
33	Riverside	648,531	247,124	163,102	84,022	895,654	811,632
34	Sacramento	388,046	228,157	150,584	77,573	616,203	538,630
35	San Benito	60,627	30,632	20,217	10,415	91,259	80,845
36	San Bernardino	553,813	336,866	222,332	114,535	890,679	776,144
37	San Diego	784,922	287,647	189,847	97,800	1,072,569	974,769
38	San Francisco	247,878	2,144	1,415	729	250,022	249,293
39	San Joaquin	225,333	88,008	58,085	29,923	313,341	283,418
40	San Luis Obispo	90,051	32,246	21,282	10,964	122,297	111,333
41	San Mateo	186,997	94,661	62,476	32,185	281,658	249,473
42	Santa Barbara	148,643	77,323	51,033	26,290	225,966	199,676
43	Santa Clara	509,605	210,712	139,070	71,642	720,317	648,675
44	Santa Cruz	93,515	47,055	31,056	15,999	140,570	124,572
45	Shasta	186,519	114,145	75,336	38,809	300,664	261,855
46	Sierra (see Nevada)	0					
47	Siskiyou	64,228	38,032	25,101	12,931	102,259	89,328
48	Solano	143,376	39,710	26,209	13,501	183,086	169,584
49	Sonoma	154,671	0	0	0	154,671	154,671
50	Stanislaus	190,628	126,365	83,401	42,964	316,992	274,029
51	Sutter	59,169	32,131	21,207	10,925	91,300	80,376
52	Tehama	40,272	3,535	2,333	1,202	43,807	42,605
53	Trinity (see Shasta)	0					
54	Tulare	266,381	144,866	95,612	49,255	411,248	361,993
55	Tuolumne	55,606	30,084	19,855	10,229	85,690	75,461
56	Ventura	244,107	88,735	58,565	30,170	332,842	302,672
57	Yolo	87,707	39,193	25,867	13,326	126,900	113,574
58	Yuba	56,852	44,953	29,669	15,284	101,805	86,521
TOTAL		\$11,902,126	\$4,449,685	\$2,936,792	\$1,512,893	\$16,351,811	\$14,838,918

FLF Base Funds	\$11,902,126
FLF Federal Drawdown	\$4,449,685
Total Funding Allocated	\$16,351,811



Judicial Council of California

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

Telephone 415-865-4200 · Fax 415-865-4205

M E M O R A N D U M

Date

April 15, 2025

Action Requested

Please Review

To

Members of the Family and Juvenile Law
Advisory Committee

Deadline

April 28, 2025

From

Christy Simons, Supervising Attorney

Contact

Christy Simons, 415-865-7694
christy.simons@jud.ca.gov

Subject

Fiscal Year 2025–26 Funding Allocations for
Court Appointed Special Advocate Local
Assistance

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory committee serves as the oversight body for Judicial Council's Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) program funding and annually recommends allocations to the Judicial Council. The committee is asked to review the attached draft Judicial Council report and make recommendations, as detailed in the attached report and set forth in Attachment A, to propose funding allocations for fiscal year 2025–26.



Judicial Council of California

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 25-106

For business meeting on July 18, 2025

Title

Juvenile Law: Fiscal Year 2025–26 Funding
Allocations for Court Appointed Special
Advocate Local Assistance

Report Type

Action Required

Effective Date

July 1, 2025

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

April 15, 2025

Recommended by

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory
Committee
Hon. Tari L. Cody, Cochair
Hon. Stephanie E. Hulsey, Chair

Contact

Christy Simons, 415-865-7694
christy.simons@jud.ca.gov
Arlene Negapatan, 415-865-4564
arlene.negapatan@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The fiscal year 2025–26 judicial branch budget includes \$2.713 million for Judicial Council Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) grants. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends the Judicial Council allocate \$2.713 million to fund 45 CASA programs serving 52 counties and approximately 10,470 children statewide.

Recommendation

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2025, allocate the \$2.713 million in total grant funds for fiscal year 2025–26 using the amended funding methodology approved by the council on July 12, 2024. Proposed allocations are detailed in Attachment A.

Relevant Previous Council Action

A CASA program is a nonprofit organization that supports trained volunteers appointed by a judicial officer to provide advocacy for a child who is under the jurisdiction of a juvenile court.

A CASA volunteer spends time with the child, monitors the child's needed services, and provides child-focused recommendations to the court based on the best interests of the child. Forty-five programs in 52 counties serve approximately 10,470 children with 6,750 trained volunteers.¹

In August 2003, at the recommendation of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, the Executive Committee approved a formula-based method for distributing Judicial Council CASA program funding to California CASA programs. The new funding approach replaced the previous competitive request-for-proposals process with predetermined program awards. Then on August 23, 2013, the Judicial Council approved a new funding methodology that was formula-based and used program data submitted by local programs to evaluate the efficiency and growth of those programs.²

On July 20, 2018, the Judicial Council adopted a revised methodology that provides a larger percentage of funds as base funding and replaced the two existing incentives with a growth incentive for those programs that are eligible.³ The revised methodology made no changes to the four-tiered base funding portion of the methodology.

The Budget Act of 2018 included a \$500,000 augmentation to Judicial Council CASA funding, which increased funding from \$2.213 million to \$2.713 million to promote program growth. On September 21, 2018, the Judicial Council approved the allocation of these funds to CASA programs as additional base funding for fiscal years (FYs) 2018–19 and 2019–20 using the existing methodology.⁴ In this report to the council, the committee noted that it would develop recommendations for a methodology specific to these funds for implementation in FY 2020–21. The committee deferred this item during the pandemic.⁵

¹ California CASA Association, *Report to the Judicial Council on CASA Funding and Program Development*, Feb. 7, 2025, p.3.

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court Appointed Special Advocate Program Funding Methodology* (July 19, 2013), <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20130823-itemm.pdf>.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Judicial Council Budget: Court Appointed Special Advocate Funding Methodology and FY 2018–19 Allocations* (June 28, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6357571&GUID=C010F4D4-28C5-4868-871C-94B763688ACA>.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Judicial Council Budget: Allocation of Augmented Funding for Court Appointed Special Advocate Grant Program* (Aug. 14, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6612315&GUID=5A5F8317-1BC8-45A1-8CB8-AB2BEA0C37EE>.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Law: Fiscal Year 2021–22 Funding Allocations for Court Appointed Special Advocate Local Assistance* (June 16, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9487734&GUID=BD0E146D-4BF6-40A9-B325-779E70763AAD>.

At its July 2023 meeting, the Judicial Council approved recommendations to continue allocation of the \$500,000 funding augmentation using the existing methodology.⁶ The council also directed the committee to continue to review data regarding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the child welfare system and local CASA programs and present recommendations for a funding methodology for this \$500,000 augmentation for FY 2024–25.

At its July 2024 meeting, the Judicial Council adopted an ongoing funding methodology for the \$500,000 augmentation.⁷ The methodology allocates the \$500,000 as a separate growth-based incentive, to a total of 30 eligible local CASA programs, composed of 15 small and 15 large programs, with equal allocation among the 30 eligible programs.

Analysis/Rationale

A total of \$2.713 million is included in the annual state budget for Judicial Council CASA grants. The FY 2025–26 proposed allocations in Attachment A were derived using the funding methodology approved by the Judicial Council as detailed in the Judicial Council reports listed above.

Policy implications

There are no policy implications to consider for the recommended allocation.

Comments

Public comments were not solicited for this proposal because the recommendations are within the Judicial Council’s purview to approve without circulation.

Alternatives considered

No alternatives were considered because the recommended allocation outlined in Attachment A was determined using the methodology approved by the council.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This recommendation is for the allocation of funds that are included in the FY 2025–26 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Proposed Allocation for FY 2025–26 Judicial Council Court Appointed Special Advocate Local Assistance Funding

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Law: Court Appointed Special Advocate Funding Methodology, Program Expansion, and Fiscal Year 2023–2024 Allocations* (June 21, 2023), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12124955&GUID=4BBC2005-07B6-4FC7-AF49-155BED6339E0>.

⁷ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Court Appointed Special Advocate Funding Methodology and Fiscal Year 2024–25 Allocations* (July 3, 2024), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13082727&GUID=AF8564C9-F4CB-4A77-A7AF-057412B47816>.

Judicial Council Court-Appointed Special Advocate Local Assistance Funding

Local CASA Programs by County(ies)	Base Allocations	Growth Incentive A \$500,000	Growth Incentive B	Total Proposed JC Local Assistance Grant
Alameda	\$57,500.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$78,227.66
Amador /Calaveras	\$44,850.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$44,850.00
Butte/Glenn	\$58,650.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$79,377.66
Contra Costa	\$57,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$57,500.00
Del Norte	\$29,900.00	\$16,666.66	\$0.00	\$46,566.66
El Dorado	\$39,100.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$59,827.66
Fresno/Madera	\$86,250.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$86,250.00
Humboldt	\$29,900.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$29,900.00
Imperial	\$39,100.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$59,827.66
Inyo/Mono	\$44,850.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$65,577.66
Kern	\$57,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$57,500.00
Kings	\$39,100.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$39,100.00
Lassen	\$29,900.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$50,627.66
Los Angeles	\$57,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$57,500.00
Marin	\$39,100.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$59,827.66
Mariposa	\$29,900.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$50,627.66
Mendocino/Lake	\$58,650.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$58,650.00
Merced	\$39,100.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$39,100.00
Modoc	\$29,900.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$50,627.66
Monterey	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$69,027.66
Napa	\$39,100.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$59,827.66
Nevada	\$29,900.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$50,627.66
Orange	\$57,500.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$78,227.66
Placer/Yuba	\$72,450.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$93,177.66
Plumas	\$29,900.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$29,900.00
Riverside	\$57,500.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$78,227.66
Sacramento	\$57,500.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$78,227.66
San Benito	\$29,900.00	\$16,666.66	\$0.00	\$46,566.66
San Bernardino	\$57,500.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$78,227.66
San Diego	\$57,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$57,500.00
San Francisco	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$0.00	\$64,966.66
San Joaquin	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$69,027.66
San Luis Obispo	\$39,100.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$59,827.66
San Mateo	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$69,027.66
Santa Barbara	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$69,027.66
Santa Clara	\$57,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$57,500.00
Santa Cruz	\$39,100.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$59,827.66
Shasta/Tehama	\$58,650.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$58,650.00

Judicial Council Court-Appointed Special Advocate Local Assistance Funding

Local CASA Programs by County(ies)	Base Allocations	Growth Incentive A \$500,000	Growth Incentive B	Total Proposed JC Local Assistance Grant
Siskiyou	\$29,900.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$50,627.66
Solano	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$69,027.66
Sonoma	\$48,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$48,300.00
Stanislaus	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$69,027.66
Tulare	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$69,027.66
Ventura	\$48,300.00	\$16,666.66	\$4,061.00	\$69,027.66
Yolo	\$39,100.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$39,100.00
<u>Totals</u>	<u>\$2,103,350.00</u>	<u>\$499,999.80</u>	<u>\$109,647.00</u>	<u>\$2,712,996.80</u>

Total Local Assistance Grant	\$2,713,000.00
Total Base Amounts	\$2,103,350.00
Growth Incentive A Awards for Top 30 Programs (15 Small & 15 Large)	\$499,999.80
Growth Incentive B Awards for Top 27 Programs (13 Small & 14 Large)	\$109,647.00

**Base Allocations are based on the four-tier methodology*

After allocating funds to the base according to the methodology, \$4,061.00 per qualified program was available for Growth Incentive B funding.