



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: April 14-15, 2016

Title	Agenda Item Type
Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology	Action Required
	Effective Date
	April 15, 2016
Recommended by	Date of Report
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	February 10, 2016
Joint Subcommittee on Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology	Contact
Hon. Mark A. Cope, Cochair	Don Will
Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Cochair	415-865-7557
	don.will@jud.ca.gov
Don Will, Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts	
Steven Chang, Judicial Council Finance	

Executive Summary

On April 17, 2015, the Judicial Council approved recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) to change the methodology used to allocate annual funding for court-appointed dependency counsel among the courts. The purpose was to provide a more equitable allocation of funding among the courts. Rather than using historical funding levels dating back to the adoption of state trial court funding, the new funding methodology is based on the caseload-based calculation of funding for each court provided by the workload model approved by the Judicial Council through the *DRAFT Pilot Program and Court-Appointed Counsel* report of October 26, 2007. One of the recommendations approved by the Judicial

Council was that a joint working group of the TCBCAC and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be formed to review that workload model for possible updates and revisions. After extensive review and public comment, the subcommittee recommends these adjustments to the workload model for consideration by the advisory committees.

Recommendation

The subcommittee was charged with reviewing the workload model for court-appointed dependency counsel and including eight specific issues in its review. In addition the subcommittee determined that to update the workload model, one additional issue needed to be reviewed.

Issues in Judicial Council Charge

1. *Whether attorney salaries should continue to be based on an average salary by region, or whether another method should be used such as an individual county index of salaries. (7.a. in Judicial Council report of April 17, 2015).*

Recommendation:

That attorney salaries used in workload model estimates be based on two factors: (1) the median salary for the first-tier range for county counsel in all counties; and (2) the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Category 92 index that is used in the Workload Allocation Funding Model (WAFM).

2. *Whether the attorney salaries used in the model should be updated (7.b.).*

Recommendation:

That attorney salaries used in the model be updated for each county using the statewide median county counsel salary and the BLS Category 92 index.

3. *Whether the calculation for benefits costs in the model is accurate or if it should be changed (7.c.).*

Recommendation:

That benefits costs not be calculated directly by any formula, but that the costs be estimated as 15 percent of total costs or 33 percent of salary costs.

4. *Whether the calculation for overhead costs in the model is accurate or if it should be changed (7.d.).*

Recommendation:

That the calculation for overhead costs be revised as follows:

- a) Salaries for line attorneys are calculated using the sources described in recommendations 1 and 2 and comprise 45 percent of the total cost.
- b) All nonsalary costs (benefits and overhead) comprise 55 percent of the total cost and be estimated on a statewide level as follows:
 - i. Social worker/investigator/paralegal staff 10%
 - ii. Other salaried workers 15%
 - iii. Benefits 15%
 - iv. Operating costs 15%.

5. *Whether the state child welfare data reported through the University of California, Berkeley accurately represents court-supervised juvenile dependency cases in each county, or whether court filings data or another source of data be used (7.e.).*

Recommendation:

That annual child caseload will be determined for each court using a weighted metric derived from a court's percentage of total original dependency filings and the court's percentage total of child welfare caseload; that the child caseload metric be weighted by 30% of court filings and 70% of child welfare caseload; and that the caseload metric use a rolling average composed of the previous three years.

6. *Whether the ratio used to estimate parent clients in the model is accurate or if it should be changed (7.f.).*

Recommendation:

That the ratio used to estimate parent clients continue to be estimated using the multiplier of 0.8 parent case per 1.0 child case.

7. *Whether a modified methodology be used for funding small courts (7.g.).*

Recommendation:

That a program be established for providing emergency funding to small courts experiencing unexpected short-term caseload increases.

8. *Whether dependency counsel funding should be a court or county obligation (7.h.).*

Recommendation:

That dependency counsel funding is established in statute as a court function.

Additional Workload Model Issues

9. *The subcommittee determined that to review and update the workload model, it needed to consider the caseload standard of 188 cases per attorney when the attorney is supported by a .5 full-time equivalent investigator or social worker.*

Recommendation:

That the caseload standard be set at the alternate standard that is included in the 2007 workload model: 141 cases per attorney without considering investigator or social worker support.

10. *The subcommittee determined that the current workload model is based on data on attorney workload from 2002 and that many of its assumptions are outdated and not supported by current data.*

Recommendation:

That the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee consider a comprehensive update of the attorney workload data and time standards in the current workload model. Since any updates to the workload data and time standards will uniformly impact all trial courts, this pending work should not slow or delay the remaining three-year, phase-in period previously approved by the Judicial Council for implementing the new dependency counsel funding methodology. Rather this recommendation recognizes that a comprehensive update could not be completed within the time frame set by the Judicial Council for final report from the joint committees.

Previous Council Action

Court-appointed dependency counsel became a state fiscal responsibility in 1989 through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (SB 612/AB 1197; Stats. 1988, ch. 945) which added section 77003 to the Government Code, defined “court operations” in that section as including court-appointed dependency counsel, and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations.

In 2001, the Judicial Council incorporated caseload standards, training requirements and guidelines for appointment of counsel for children into California Rules of Court 5.660; and directed Judicial Council staff to undertake a study to identify caseload standards for attorneys representing both parents and children. (April 17, 2001: Counsel for Children (amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 1438). As a result, in 2002 the Judicial Council contracted with the American Humane Association to conduct a quantitative caseload study of court-appointed dependency counsel based on an assessment of the duties required as part of representation and the amount of time needed to perform those tasks. The study was overseen by the Judicial Council Court-Appointed Counsel Caseload Study Working Group. In 2007, based on analysis conducted through the caseload study and through the DRAFT (Dependency Representation,

Administration, Funding and Training) pilot program, implemented by the Judicial Council in 2004 (June 15, 2004: Court-Appointed Counsel: Caseload Standards, Service Delivery Models, and Contract Administration), the Judicial Council adopted a court-appointed counsel caseload standard of 188 clients per attorney with .5 investigator complement; and based on the caseload standard adopted a caseload funding model which calculates funding requirement for each trial court. The Council also requested the Trial Court Budget Working Group to develop an allocation methodology to allocate any Statewide Appropriation Limit (SAL) funding or other new funding to courts by need. (October 26, 2007: DRAFT Pilot Program and Court-Appointed Counsel). In 2008, the Judicial Council submitted a report to the California Legislature on *Dependency Counsel Caseload Standards*. The report acknowledged the need to reduce attorney caseloads to improve the quality of representation for children and parents, thereby enhancing the likelihood of improved permanency and well-being outcomes for children and families; and also highlighted the need for significant additional funding to implement the standards.

In 2010, the Council adopted the Trial Court Budget Working Group recommendation to establish a court-appointed counsel funding baseline of \$103.7 million through a two-year phased reduction. In 2015, Judicial Council approved recommendations of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee to reallocate funding for court-appointed counsel among the trial courts based on the caseload funding model. One of the recommendations approved by the Judicial Council at this time was that a joint working group of the TCBAC and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be formed to review that workload model for possible updates and revisions. (April 17, 2015: Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Reallocation).

Rationale for Recommendations

Background

The Judicial Council adopted a caseload funding model for court-appointed dependency counsel in 2007. The model includes these components:

- A caseload standard of 188 clients per attorney with a .5 investigator/social worker/paralegal complement;
- Attorney salary ranges by economic regions; and
- A method for calculating overhead costs for attorney representation.

This model has been used since 2008 to estimate the number of full-time-equivalent (FTE) dependency attorneys required to meet the statewide needs of parents and children in dependency, and to calculate the total statewide funding need for court-appointed counsel. In fiscal year 2014-2015, the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee appointed a working group to examine the allocation of dependency counsel funding among the courts. While the caseload funding model calculates a funding need for each court, the actual budgets for each court have been based almost entirely on historical funding levels since the implementation of trial court funding. Based on the work of the subcommittee, the Committee recommended to the Judicial Council that court budgets for dependency counsel be based on funding need as

calculated by the existing caseload funding model, and recommended a four year, phased in reallocation of funding to meet that goal. The Judicial Council approved these recommendations in April 2015.

During this process many Working Group and later Committee members pointed out in discussion that the existing caseload funding model was outdated, using data collected between 2002 and 2007, and included many assumptions about attorney workload, pay ranges, and overhead calculations that needed to be revisited. These points were echoed in considerable public comment. As a result, the Committee recommended and the Judicial Council approved that a joint subcommittee of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be appointed to review and recommend changes to the existing workload model by April 2016. The Judicial Council directed that the Committees include these items in their review:

- Whether attorney salaries should continue to be based on an average salary by region, or whether another method should be used such as an individual county index of salaries;
- Whether the attorney salaries used in the model should be updated;
- Whether the calculation for benefits costs in the model is accurate or if it should be changed;
- Whether the calculation for overhead costs in the model is accurate or if it should be changed;
- Whether the state child welfare data reported through U.C. Berkeley accurately represents court-supervised juvenile dependency cases in each county, or whether court filings data or another source of data be used;
- Whether the ratio used to estimate parent clients in the model is accurate or if it should be changed.
- Whether a modified methodology be used for funding small courts.
- Whether dependency counsel funding should be a court or county obligation.

The joint subcommittee held seven meetings, two of them in-person, between July 2015 and February 2016. To support the discussions of the workload model, Judicial Council staff conducted two statewide surveys of attorney providers, four focus groups of dependency line attorneys inquiring into their workload and concerns, a web-based survey of county counsel salary ranges, and a data analysis of attorney workload data derived from the case management system used by the attorneys in the Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) program. Extensive public comment was provided at the subcommittee meetings and also at a stakeholders meeting held at a statewide conference and attended by attorneys and subcommittee members.

The subcommittee noted at the outset that the existing caseload funding model was based on very extensive original research, much of it conducted by research contractors, and it had neither time nor resources to conduct similar studies. The subcommittee also noted that this being the case, much of the data it had access to was administrative data on attorney practice. This data will reflect current practice in the state, but not necessarily best or efficient practice. The

subcommittee made an effort to remedy this by reviewing best practice standards from the American Bar Association, and conducting the qualitative research described above. The subcommittee also recommends that the research and analysis required to create a workload model that is rooted in good practice continue as a part of the work of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.

Attorney Salaries (Recommendations 1—2)

In the existing workload model, attorney salaries are the key cost variable. The caseload estimate for a court (recommendations 5—6) in conjunction with the caseload standard (recommendation 9) yields the number of full time equivalent attorneys required to represent the parents and children in that court. The attorney salary for the court is then used to calculate the total cost of the representation, and additional costs (other staff, benefits, operating costs) are calculated as a percentage of the total attorney cost.

The subcommittee reviewed the Judicial Council and legislative reports establishing the workload model, and attorney salaries and allocation of other costs. The original survey of entry-to-midlevel county counsel salaries in all counties was updated using county salary listings and job announcements posted on the internet (Appendix 1). Staff also conducted a survey of court-appointed dependency provider organizations and solo practitioners to obtain current information on salaries and overhead costs. The subcommittee also reviewed the Bureau of Labor Statistics governmental salary index for California that is used in the WAFM process.

The subcommittee reviewed salary averages from the county counsel and current provider surveys and compared them to the regional salaries now used in the workload model. The committee also reviewed the impact of indexing salaries to the BLS index or to a consolidated form of the economic regions used by the Employment Development Department.

The subcommittee compared information reported on salary, benefits and operating costs to the original caseload funding model; and also reviewed how those allocations differ by organizational model and size.

Recommendation 1 addresses the sources of data used to calculate attorney salaries. The existing workload model used several sources to estimate the cost of attorney compensation. These included a survey of county counsel salaries, a survey of DRAFT provider salaries and costs, and a consultant study that grouped courts by cost of living factors into economic regions. Courts were grouped into four economic regions, and salary ranges were set in lower, mid-range, and upper level tiers. These economic regions are not used in any other Judicial Council budget or workload process. The salaries set through this process have not changed since 2007.

Since the workload model was finalized in 2007, the Judicial Council adopted the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Model (WAFM) that established a standardized methodology for

indexing cost-of-living throughout the state.¹ Courts use the Bureau of Labor Statistics current index for local and state government personnel costs for California counties.

The subcommittee determined that two data sources should be used: current county counsel salaries at the median of the entry-level or first range reported by counties, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics current index. County counsel represent the child welfare department in dependency proceedings and are roughly parallel in skills and experience to court-appointed dependency counsel. County counsel salary information is publically available, so that the workload model can be updated regularly.

Using the BLS index used in the WAFM model provides a way to adjust the median salary to each county's governmental salary market that is consistent with full-time equivalent court personnel adjustments in WAFM. The BLS index is also updated each year and publically available, so that the workload model can be updated regularly.

Benefits and Overhead Calculations (Recommendations 3--4)

There are numerous models of dependency counsel provision among attorneys and organizations around the state. They range from solo practitioners who charge hourly fees to complex non-profit, for-profit, and governmental organizations. The current workload model sets a total funding need for each court by using a standard cost model based on mid-sized to large attorney firms². This cost model has these assumptions:

- a. The number of attorneys required is derived from a caseload of 188 cases per 1.0 attorney FTE with social worker/investigator staff support;
- b. Attorney salaries are set at the middle level of the regional salary tiers;
- c. Supervising attorneys are included at .15 per 1.0 attorney FTE;
- d. Supervisor salaries are set at the upper level of the regional salary tiers;
- e. Social worker/investigators are included at .5 per 1.0 attorney FTE;
- f. Investigator salaries are set at \$55,000 annually, regardless of economic region;
- g. Support staff is included at .33 per each 1.0 attorney FTE;
- h. Support staff salaries are set at \$30,000 annually, regardless of economic region;
- i. Benefits are estimated at 25% of all salaries;
- j. Other operating costs are estimated at an additional 7% of total personnel.

The subcommittee's finding from the survey of attorney firm managers on their budget and organization was that court-appointed dependency counsel use very different organizational models. There is no single method of calculating financial need for court-appointed counsel that accounts for all the variance in organizational models and local costs. Nor is the workload model

¹ Report to the Judicial Council, April 26, 2013 - <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130426-itemO.pdf>

² Dependency Counsel Caseload Standards, A Report to the California Legislature, 2008 (page 19). In materials to Subcommittee June 19, 2015 meeting: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/famjuv-tcbac-20150716-materials.pdf>.

meant to be prescriptive for attorney firms. Rather, the model should provide a means for calculating a total financial need that courts and attorney firms can then implement through a variety of service models.

For that reason the subcommittee does not recommend methods of calculating benefits, rent, supervisory costs, or other factors that are highly specific or dependent on local factors and organizational models. Instead, line attorney salaries calculated using the method described in Recommendations 1—2 above provide a base funding that accounts, through application of the BLS index, for local costs. Setting a proportion for all other costs at 55% of the total means that benefits, rent, and all other costs are also driven by the BLS index and thus adjusted for local costs.

The subcommittee arrived at the percentages for estimated benefits and overhead costs by reviewing the attorney organization survey and comparing reported allocations of direct costs and overhead to the assumptions implicit in the workload model. The following table compares the data reviewed to the final recommendation.

Table x. Allocation of Direct and Indirect Costs: Attorney Organization Survey, Existing Caseload Funding Model and Recommendation

	Staffed attorney firm: Large (n=5)	Staffed attorney firm: Med-sized (n=5)	Governmental Agency (n=4)	Existing Caseload Model (2007)	Recommendation (2016)
Line attorneys	39%	41%	42%	47%	45%
Social workers/ Investigators	5%	5%	5%	13%	10%
Other salaried	25%	18%	15%	5%	15%
Benefits	13%	7%	20%	15%	15%
Contract attorneys	1%	7%	4%	0%	0%
Operating costs	17%	18%	12%	20%	15%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Caseload (Recommendations 5—6)

For the purposes of the workload model, juvenile dependency caseload should estimate the number of cases that require the appointment of a court-appointed attorney in each court. This number should include both children and parents who require representation. The two statewide

data collection systems that report dependency case numbers at least annually are the California Department of Social Services Child Welfare Services Case Management System (CWS/CMS) and the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS).

Both systems define a case as an individual child or youth. A child in foster care is counted as a single case, a group of three siblings in foster care is counted as three cases. All courts report original and subsequent dependency filings to JBSIS. Through CWS/CMS, each county child welfare agency records each case under the supervision of the child welfare agency. This includes cases on voluntary supervision, and supervision after dismissal of dependency. Five years ago, at the request of the Judicial Council, CWS/CMS reports began including a filter so that only cases under court supervision would be counted. (This filter is discussed below.) CWS/CMS reports total cases annually, and provides a point-in-time snapshot of cases quarterly. CWS/CMS contracts with the University of California, Berkeley Center for Social Services Research to analyze the statewide data, prepare longitudinal files, and post state and county level reports on the UC Berkeley website.

The current workload model used to determine the total funding need that court-appointed dependency counsel uses the CWS/CMS point-in-time reports.

There is no statewide source of data for the number of parents represented in each court. The current workload model uses a multiplier of .82 parents represented per child case. This ratio was calculated using data from a 2002 time study of attorneys.³

The subcommittee reviewed a comparative analysis of court filings from JBSIS and child welfare data from CWS/CMS (Appendix 2). The analysis reviewed by the subcommittee included information about the stability of each data source from year to year, how the two data sources are correlated, and differences in how courts rank by total proportion of original dependency filings reported versus child welfare cases reported⁴.

The subcommittee also heard a presentation from the managers of the California Department of Social Services CWS/CMS system and the UC Berkeley Center for Social Services Research on the state child welfare case management system and reports. Much of the discussion centered on the fact that the court-supervision data field was not one of the required fields in the CWS/CMS system and in the managers' opinion, was likely to be used inconsistently across counties. The original research from 2002-2003 on whether caseloads should be weighted by sibling groups and current data on non-minor dependents was also reviewed. Finally, data available

³ In 2002, the Judicial Council contracted with the American Humane Association to conduct a quantitative caseload study of trial-level court-appointed dependency counsel based on an assessment of the duties required as part of representation and the amount of time needed to perform those duties.

⁴ Full materials available in Subcommittee materials for July 16, 2015 meeting at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/famjuv-tcbac-20150716-materials.pdf>.

from DRAFT program⁵ counties was presented to show both the variance in the proportion of child and parent cases in each county.

Advantages of using the counts from the child welfare system include using data from a statewide uniform case management system with a common set of data entry standards and using data that can be reported longitudinally (thus providing a snapshot of cases under supervision at a given time). Disadvantages include the fact that local courts have no control over ensuring the accuracy of the data being reported.

Advantages of using the counts from the JBSIS filings include the control and accountability that derive from using court data to determine court dependency counsel budgets. Disadvantages include the fact that filing counts do not provide a snapshot caseload measure but only a count of case entries.

The subcommittee recommends that the workload model continue to use the child welfare caseload numbers, but that these be combined with JBSIS dependency filings to gain the advantages from both data sources. The subcommittee reviewed a range of models combining child welfare and JBSIS counts, and recommends a combination of 70% child welfare filings and 30% JBSIS filings.

The subcommittee also reviewed data on the number of parent cases in the system and found that, consistent with public comment, there is wide variance among courts in the ratio of parent to child clients. However, the overall ratio in courts able to provide complete caseload data remained approximately .8 parent to 1.0 child client, the ratio set in the 2007 report.

Small courts (Recommendation 7)

The subcommittee reviewed data that confirmed that caseload fluctuations of greater than 10 percent, which can be absorbed within the budgets of larger courts, can represent a large proportion of a small court's entire dependency budget⁶.

The subcommittee discussed whether a minimum level of funding should be provided for small courts. Most small courts are currently able to establish contracts or hourly pay agreements for dependency counsel so the necessity of minimum funding did not seem established. Caseload fluctuations could be addressed by an application process for additional funds. The subcommittee reviewed data on caseload fluctuations in courts divided into two ranges: those with a census of 0-99 children in dependency, and those with 100-199 children. The data showed that about one-half of courts in both groups experience an increase of more than 10 percent in

⁵ The Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding and Training (DRAFT) Program is a program in which the Judicial Council is responsible for direct attorney contracting and service administration for dependency counsel services in select counties.

⁶ Of the five smallest courts experiencing increases, the estimate of the increase as a proportion of their budget as calculated by the workload model (not actual budget) was Sierra 82%, Inyo 30%, Amador 20%, Plumas 19% and Trinity 2%.

child caseload annually⁷. These increases are frequently balanced by subsequent decreases in the following year (Appendix 3)⁸. Assuming that courts can absorb up to a 10 percent caseload increase, these increases yielded, in FY 2014-2015, approximately 91 child cases over and above a 10 percent increase. Applying the multiplier for parents of 1.8, this totals 164 cases that would be eligible for special funding. Applying a statewide average cost per case of \$875 per year yields a total of \$143,500 to be reserved in the court-appointed counsel statewide budget for this purpose.

The subcommittee discussed making the application process as simple as possible for courts, with minimal requirements for staff to evaluate. These criteria are proposed to make the staff review of proposals straightforward:

- That small courts be defined as those courts with 200 or fewer children in dependency. Twenty-two courts met this definition in FY 2014-2015.
- That short term caseload increase be defined as an increase of greater than 10 percent in current child caseload as measured against the child caseload average of the preceding two years.
- That funding be defined as the average funding per case in the court, calculated by this workload model and available funding, applied to the number of cases that have increased over 10 percent of the court's average.
- That "program" in the recommendation be defined as a program administered by Judicial Council staff that consists of a process for a court to demonstrate its increased caseload, the staff to verify that the increase meets the 10 percent guideline above, and provision to the court of the annual average cost per case for the cases meeting the guidelines.

The subcommittee notes that the approximately \$150,000 it estimates is required for this recommendation is more than the \$100,000 that the Judicial Council approved for small court cost overruns in its April, 2015 reallocation model. The subcommittee also recommends that the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee consider a process as part of the court-appointed dependency counsel budget to replenish the \$150,000 if it is expended before the end of the fiscal year.

Court or county obligation (Recommendation 8)

The subcommittee reviewed the legislative history of court-appointed dependency counsel funding in the trial courts. As a result of the enactment of Senate Bill 1195 (Stats. 1986, ch. 1122), the California Senate Select Committee on Children & Youth convened a task force (the

⁷ Child caseloads are the only figure available on a statewide basis in a timely enough way to both verify a court's request and provide assistance within the fiscal year.

⁸ Long term increases in caseload will be accounted for each year when the workload model is run on data from the prior year, and new budget figures generated.

SB 1195 Task Force) to make recommendations to the Legislature to improve coordination among child abuse reporting statutes, child welfare services, and juvenile court proceedings. At the same time, the Legislature was engaged in the Trial Court Funding Program, a multiyear process to promote a more uniform level of judicial services throughout California and to relieve some of the fiscal pressures on county governments. (See Trial Court Funding Act of 1985; Stats. 1985, ch. 1607.)

Among its proposals to amend juvenile court law, the Task Force recommended that both children and parents should receive legal representation once court intervention was determined necessary to protect a child.⁹ The Legislature took the first step toward providing legal representation in dependency proceedings in Senate Bill 243 (Stats. 1987, ch. 1485), which added section 317 to the Welfare & Institutions Code to require appointment of counsel both for an indigent parent whose child had been placed in out-of-home care and for a child who, in the opinion of the court, would benefit from that appointment.¹⁰ (*Id.*, § 21.) The operation of this dual mandate was deferred to January 1, 1989, and conditioned on the enactment of legislation providing funding for trial court operations and defining “court operations” to include the services of court-appointed dependency counsel. (*Id.*, § 53.)

That same year, the Legislature enacted Senate Bill 709 (Stats. 1987, ch. 1211), which made operative the Trial Court Funding Act. Section 41 of SB 709 defined “court operations” eligible for state block grants contingent on the availability of funding to include “court-appointed counsel in juvenile court dependency proceedings.” In 1988, the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (Assem. Bill 1197 [Stats. 1988, ch. 944]; Sen. Bill 612 [Stats. 1988, ch. 945]) amended the trial court funding structure and secured state appropriations to reimburse the costs of trial court operations, including dependency counsel, at the option of each county.

In the years leading up to the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850), the Legislature steadily increased funding for court operations. It also took steps to strengthen the voice of children in dependency proceedings. Perhaps most significant was the recognition of children as full parties to dependency proceedings and the entitlement of all represented parties to competent counsel in 1995. (Sen. Bill 783; Stats. 1994, ch. 1073.) The Lockyer-Isenberg Act, which established mandatory, direct state trial court funding, retained court-appointed dependency counsel in the definition of “court operations” in section 77003 of the Government Code. It remains there today.

In 2013 the joint judicial branch-executive branch Trial Court Funding Workgroup recommended that the branch continue its work to ensure that litigants across the state have equal access to justice and that funding is allocated in a fair and equitable manner that promotes

⁹ SB 1195 Task Force, Child Abuse Reporting Laws, Juvenile Court Dependency Statutes, and Child Welfare Services (Jan. 1988) at pp. 2, 8–9.

¹⁰ In 2000, Senate Bill 2160 amended section 317(c) to require appointment of counsel for a child unless the court finds on the record that the child will not benefit from the appointment. Sen. Bill 2160; Stats. 2000, ch. 450, § 1.

greater access consistent with workload.¹¹ The Workgroup's final report highlighted, as an example of structural improvement, the progress made by the judicial branch's court-appointed dependency counsel programs in reducing disparate caseloads and providing education to attorneys across the state.¹²

Caseload per Attorney (Recommendation 9)

The 2007 workload model set a basic caseload standard of 141 cases per dependency attorney. This standard was qualified by noting that many attorneys have access to paralegal, investigator, or social worker staff for appropriate case work. The 2007 workload model estimates that a one-half time social worker/investigator should enable an attorney to carry a caseload of 188 clients. The subcommittee reviewed the original analysis that supports the 141/188 caseload and an analysis of current workload data (Appendix 4). The subcommittee's conclusion is that attorney workload has changed substantially since the original workload study was conducted in 2002, and that more research needs to be done on attorney workload before a new caseload standard can be set. However, it also appeared to the subcommittee that applying the 188-caseload standard statewide, as the current model does, unfairly disadvantaged the many attorneys who are solo practitioners or who do not have access to investigators and social workers. Therefore, the subcommittee recommends that the basic caseload standard of 141 set in the original report be used for statewide workload calculations. This approach is consistent with the subcommittee's approach to overhead costs in recommendations 3 and 4, which makes line attorney cost the basis for total costs.

Comprehensive Update of Workload Data and Time Standards (Recommendation 10)

This report notes, at the beginning of this section, the subcommittee's recognition that time and resources were not available to repeat the research conducted in 2002 and subsequent years, and produce a comprehensive update of the workload model. However, through both its review of available administrative data and the focus groups and surveys of attorneys, the subcommittee found that the current workload model does not adequately capture the work of dependency attorneys.

The quantitative data which the subcommittee reviewed shows serious shortcomings in the existing caseload funding model when compared to a large group of attorneys practicing in 2014 and 2015. In particular, the model appears to greatly underestimate the amount of attorney time that is required for cases that are in the post-permanency phase (most children in these cases will not be reunified with their parents). While the existing model estimates that 5 percent of an attorney's time will be spent on these cases, children's attorneys in the DRAFT program report spending almost 30 percent of their time on those cases. The existing model also significantly underestimates the proportion of time that attorneys are required to spend to in court. Analysis of

¹¹ Trial Court Funding Workgroup, Report to the Judicial Council of California and Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. (Apr. 2013) at pp. 8–9, 38–43.

¹² *Id.*, at p. 16.

attorney's time logs shows them consistently spending two to four times as long in court as the model estimates is required. (Appendix 4).

The subcommittee also reviewed the many changes that have taken place in dependency law and practice since the initial research for the existing model was conducted in 2002-2004. Changes that have increased attorney workload but that are not reflected in the existing model include the eligibility of non-minors for dependency and representation, the expansion of dependency drug courts, cases involving dual status proceedings, cases involving special immigrant juvenile status proceedings, and the greatly increased focus on family finding.

The subcommittee noted that it was able, through surveys, focus groups, data review, and public comment, to review a wealth of information on dependency practice as it exists today. However, this practice represents what is possible given current attorney resources, rather than what would represent effective practice. For this reason the subcommittee recommends that updated research on attorney time allocation be linked to a process of expert review to develop a new attorney workload model that reflects statewide standards of practice.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

Alternatives Considered

Attorney Salaries (Recommendations 1—2)

The subcommittee considered a number of alternatives to its recommendations.

Update the salaries in the existing workload model.

The existing workload model sets salary ranges in four economic regions. The salary ranges were derived from two data sources. The economic regions were derived from a consultant study conducted for a different purpose for the Judicial Council, and categorizes the courts into regions that are no longer used for Judicial Council planning and budgeting. The subcommittee determined that metrics ought to be whenever possible consistent with those used in WAFM.

Setting salaries within county counsel salaries above the midpoint of the first two ranges.

Each county's salary, for the purposes of calculating a statewide median, was set at the midpoint between the entry level range and the top of the second level range. Some subcommittee members and public commentators strongly recommended setting the salary at the upper level of the second range or within the third range. Discussion centered around two points: that court-appointed dependency counsel should have experience and qualifications equal to county counsel in the third salary range, and that court-appointed dependency counsel salaries must remain competitive with county counsel salaries.

Conduct a more thorough survey of county counsel salaries and benefits.

Posted salary ranges are broad and may not be indicative of the actual salaries and experience levels of county counsel in dependency court. At its November meeting the subcommittee asked

staff to conduct a survey of actual salaries and benefits of county counsel in dependency court. After some outreach to counties, staff concluded that the information the subcommittee wanted could not be gathered in time to review and use in developing recommendations. The subcommittee notes that this survey should be carried out by Judicial Council staff when possible and the results used by the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to examine recommendations 1 and 2 in the course of further study of the workload model.

Benefits and Overhead Calculations (Recommendations 3—4)

The subcommittee considered two alternatives to its recommendations.

Conduct a more thorough survey of county counsel.

Please see recommendations 1—2 above. The subcommittee agreed that it did not have accurate information on the full compensation package, including benefits, that county counsel receive; and that this information was needed to evaluate whether recommendations on salaries and benefits would create a pay structure that was competitive with the counties. As above, the subcommittee notes that this survey should be carried out by Judicial Council staff when possible and the results used by the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee to examine recommendations 1 and 2 in the course of further study of the workload model.

Set overhead calculation rates to closely reflect local rates.

This alternative was raised by subcommittee members and public commentators. Discussion acknowledged that certain cities in California have market rates for rent and other costs that are not affordable by court-appointed counsel, while at the same time the location of the court constrains where attorneys can locate their offices. Members ultimately decided that a statewide data source on overhead rates would be still be required to ensure that consistency of reporting across counties, and that the Bureau of Labor Statistics governmental salary index would serve this purpose.

Caseload (Recommendations 5—6)

These recommendations generated the most discussion and proposed alternatives. Subcommittee members and public commentators made the point that available statewide data to count dependency cases is limited to the California Department of Social Services child welfare case counts and the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS) filings counts, and that both of these sources are open to question. The child welfare data does not count parents who require dependency representation, and the indicator in the case management system to identify court-ordered dependents from the full census of children under supervision is not consistently applied by the counties. JBSIS data does not count parents. It counts children who enter the system as dependents, but does not count them longitudinally so a total census of dependents in the county is not available.

In addition, neither data source makes allowances from differences in practice among courts and counties. Many differences were pointed out. Some counties have the resources to conduct lengthy investigations before deciding to file a dependency petition and others do not, so that in

some counties there are fewer cases filed but the cases have more issues, are likely to stay longer in care and are more time-consuming. Some counties have a much higher proportion of non-minor dependents than others, and some counties have very high levels of out-of-county placement. Some counties have a much higher proportion of parents represented. These and factors make it difficult to know if the amount of work is represented by a child in dependency is the same from court to court.

Create a new system of case counting in which dependency attorneys or courts would report their exact child and parent caseloads.

It is possible that the current system that attorneys use to report their clients in the DRAFT program could be expanded to provide a full coverage of cases in California. At this time, given the staffing available to the trial courts and the Judicial Council, managing such a system is not feasible. Asking trial courts to confirm the attorney case counts would add an additional layer of reporting and require additional resources.

Create a means of making the current statewide data sources more specific to the workload represented by dependency cases in the court.

Alternatives proposed included weighting non-minor dependent cases or the ratio of parents to children represented on a county-by-county basis. The subcommittee discussed these issues at length and decided that there was no clear justification for attempting to account for individual child welfare department practice.

Use a higher or lower proportion of JBSIS filings in the recommended model.

The subcommittee reviewed relative proportions of cases in courts, ranging from the existing model's use of child welfare case counts exclusively, to a model that used only JBSIS filings. It also reviewed analysis showing the change in relative proportions of case counts at 10 percent, 30 percent, and 50 percent JBSIS filings. It discussed and heard comment that recommended the lower proportion of filings, because the child welfare census numbers give a better approximation of workload. Members also noted that the greatest proportion of workload in a dependency case is in the first year, so that a higher proportion of filings is also justified.

Small Courts (Recommendation 7)

The subcommittee discussed, but did not recommend for the reasons given above, setting a minimum budget amount for small courts.

Through public comment a proposal was recommended that the Judicial Council establish a contract for regional attorney services, so that the many small courts in the northern region of the state would have access to trained dependency attorneys when they did experience the need for additional counsel. The subcommittee notes that this proposal could be reviewed by the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee as part of its further work on dependency counsel, should the Judicial Council approve recommendation 10 of this report.

Court or County Obligation (Recommendation 8)

The subcommittee considered the alternative of recommending legislative changes to transfer funding responsibility for dependency counsel services to the counties. In 2015 the Legislature affirmed its commitment to state funding of court-appointed dependency counsel by devoting a separate item to it in the Budget Act of 2015 and increasing the statewide appropriation by \$11 million to its highest level in history. Given the emphasis placed by both the executive and legislative branches of California government on promoting equal access to justice, allocating trial court funding equitably, and adopting uniform standards and procedures, it seems unlikely that responsibility for dependency counsel services will be returned to the counties.¹³

Caseload per Attorney (Recommendation 9)

The subcommittee discussed setting the recommended attorney caseload at a level other than that recommended in the original caseload study. For the reasons given in the rationales for recommendations 9 and 10, the subcommittee noted that it is not possible to develop a new caseload standard from the data currently available.

Attachments and Links

Appendix 1. County Counsel Salary Median

Appendix 2. Comparison of Court Filings and Child Welfare Caseload

Appendix 3. Caseload Changes in Courts

Appendix 4. Workload Study Data Analysis (not completed)

¹³ In 40 states and the District of Columbia, children’s dependency counsel costs (fees and expenses) are paid by the state or the court. In only 12 states is the county responsible for at least some of these costs. Child Welfare Information Gateway, Representation of Children in Child Abuse and Neglect Proceedings (2014) at pp. 4–5.

Associate, Assistant or Deputy County Counsel Salary Information

BLS index applied to median salary

County website searches October 2015

COUNTY	Class I or II	Class I or II	Midrange	BLS Index 2011-2013	Index applied to	Workload
	Min	Max			median salary	Model Estimate
Alameda	73,611	175,115	124,363	1.42	111,072	95,892
Alpine				0.82	64,406	79,539
Amador	72,838	104,878	88,858	0.99	77,602	79,539
Butte	50,714	78,815	64,764	0.92	71,895	67,143
Calaveras	60,307	73,286	66,797	0.86	66,976	79,539
Colusa				0.70	55,066	67,143
Contra Costa	87,010	126,079	106,545	1.25	97,693	114,800
Del Norte	56,117	72,888	64,503	0.79	61,849	67,143
El Dorado	90,210	129,480	109,845	0.99	77,581	79,539
Fresno	49,608	81,146	65,377	1.00	77,958	67,143
Glenn				0.68	53,149	79,539
Humboldt	51,246	77,525	64,386	0.76	59,361	67,143
Imperial	59,400	88,236	73,818	0.77	60,208	67,143
Inyo	68,304	87,240	77,772	0.83	65,027	79,539
Kern	57,830	81,179	69,505	1.05	82,229	79,539
Kings	60,050	85,114	72,582	0.89	69,296	67,143
Lake	47,838	67,314	57,576	0.76	59,366	79,539
Lassen	59,376	71,688	65,532	0.80	62,573	67,143
Los Angeles	65,591	80,084	72,838	1.34	104,396	95,892
Madera	63,646	89,401	76,524	0.94	73,078	79,539
Marin	83,044	119,392	101,218	1.30	101,386	114,800
Mariposa	59,785	79,936	69,861	0.74	57,845	67,143
Mendocino	57,075	72,842	64,958	0.86	67,141	79,539
Merced	58,282	87,526	72,904	0.91	70,923	67,143
Modoc				0.61	47,477	67,143
Mono	108,684	108,684	108,684	1.20	93,721	79,539
Monterey	61,560	100,920	81,240	1.19	93,005	95,892
Napa	80,101	116,917	98,509	1.21	94,625	95,892
Nevada	78,254	105,553	91,904	0.97	75,516	79,539
Orange	70,404	85,116	77,760	1.30	101,519	95,892
Placer	85,051	114,192	99,622	1.14	89,376	95,892
Plumas	52,140	91,788	71,964	0.70	55,081	67,143
Riverside	68,936	121,620	95,278	1.07	83,700	95,892
Sacramento	92,498	106,363	99,430	1.28	99,947	79,539
San Benito	56,856	84,036	70,446	0.97	76,096	79,539
San Bernardino	59,717	100,110	79,914	1.05	82,067	79,539
San Diego	62,754	96,075	79,414	1.17	91,590	95,892
San Francisco	107,952	148,200	128,076	1.61	126,133	114,800

Associate, Assistant or Deputy County Counsel Salary Information
BLS index applied to median salary

County website searches October 2015

COUNTY	Class I or II	Class I or II	Midrange	BLS Index 2011-2013	Index applied to	Workload
	Min	Max			median salary	Model Estimate
San Joaquin	63,379	93,677	78,528	1.11	86,861	79,539
San Luis Obispo	67,870	95,514	81,692	1.07	83,780	79,539
San Mateo	86,194	148,468	117,331	1.45	113,129	114,800
Santa Barbara	107,742	145,422	126,582	1.16	90,285	95,892
Santa Clara	101,419	129,164	115,291	1.47	114,839	114,800
Santa Cruz	65,064	109,968	87,516	1.17	91,510	95,892
Shasta	64,524	89,040	76,782	0.85	66,352	67,143
Sierra				0.71	55,856	67,143
Siskiyou	44,244	63,812	54,028	0.71	55,531	67,143
Solano	68,866	113,279	91,072	1.22	95,677	95,892
Sonoma	83,986	112,162	98,074	1.17	91,243	95,892
Stanislaus	57,658	97,802	77,730	1.02	79,977	79,539
Sutter	73,961	99,654	86,808	0.95	74,181	79,539
Tehama	62,172	83,580	72,876	0.80	62,593	67,143
Trinity				0.65	51,119	67,143
Tulare	57,632	79,913	68,773	0.82	64,264	67,143
Tuolumne	57,969	81,370	69,669	0.91	71,035	79,539
Ventura	65,307	116,912	91,109	1.23	95,917	95,892
Yolo	66,965	100,074	83,520	1.01	79,009	79,539
Yuba	61,638	71,148	66,393	0.94	73,509	79,539
Median salary	64,085	94,595	78,150			

Model Combining Filings and Child Welfare Case Numbers

COUNTY	Average Filings	Average CW	Filings %	Cases %
	12-14	Cases 12-14		
Alameda	628	1,769	1.63%	2.44%
Alpine	0	0	0.00%	0.00%
Amador	37	55	0.10%	0.08%
Butte	268	561	0.70%	0.77%
Calaveras	105	135	0.27%	0.19%
Colusa	28	35	0.07%	0.05%
Contra Costa	728	1,214	1.89%	1.67%
Del Norte	50	111	0.13%	0.15%
El Dorado	197	353	0.51%	0.49%
Fresno	874	1,950	2.27%	2.69%
Glenn	53	100	0.14%	0.14%
Humboldt	146	302	0.38%	0.42%
Imperial	211	372	0.55%	0.51%
Inyo	9	19	0.02%	0.03%
Kern	844	1,805	2.19%	2.49%
Kings	196	478	0.51%	0.66%
Lake	53	133	0.14%	0.18%
Lassen	53	71	0.14%	0.10%
Los Angeles	16,700	29,089	43.38%	40.08%
Madera	227	373	0.59%	0.51%
Marin	63	106	0.16%	0.15%
Mariposa	25	30	0.07%	0.04%
Mendocino	158	298	0.41%	0.41%
Merced	406	688	1.05%	0.95%
Modoc	14	15	0.04%	0.02%
Mono	4	10	0.01%	0.01%
Monterey	160	367	0.41%	0.51%
Napa	87	151	0.23%	0.21%
Nevada	66	117	0.17%	0.16%
Orange	1,389	3,051	3.61%	4.20%
Placer	515	392	1.34%	0.54%
Plumas	33	55	0.08%	0.08%
Riverside	3,035	5,254	7.88%	7.24%
Sacramento	1,121	2,637	2.91%	3.63%
San Benito	58	110	0.15%	0.15%
San Bernardino	2,544	4,700	6.61%	6.48%
San Diego	1,609	3,862	4.18%	5.32%
San Francisco	570	1,296	1.48%	1.79%
San Joaquin	599	1,486	1.56%	2.05%
San Luis Obispo	269	443	0.70%	0.61%
San Mateo	204	485	0.53%	0.67%

Santa Barbara	263	630	0.68%	0.87%
Santa Clara	545	1,495	1.42%	2.06%
Santa Cruz	203	357	0.53%	0.49%
Shasta	256	611	0.66%	0.84%
Sierra	3	3	0.01%	0.00%
Siskiyou	76	118	0.20%	0.16%
Solano	246	440	0.64%	0.61%
Sonoma	259	628	0.67%	0.87%
Stanislaus	390	630	1.01%	0.87%
Sutter	82	155	0.21%	0.21%
Tehama	143	207	0.37%	0.29%
Trinity	47	77	0.12%	0.11%
Tulare	605	1,088	1.57%	1.50%
Tuolumne	73	126	0.19%	0.17%
Ventura	598	1,040	1.55%	1.43%
Yolo	204	336	0.53%	0.46%
Yuba	169	159	0.44%	0.22%
<hr/> Total	38,497	72,577	100.00%	100.00%

Model Combining

COUNTY	10%		30%		50% Filings	Change from 100% CW
	Filings Propor. of state	Change from 100% CW	Filings Propor. of state	Change from 100% CW		
Alameda	2.36%	-3.3%	2.19%	-9.9%	2.03%	-16.5%
Alpine	0.00%	-10.0%	0.00%	-30.0%	0.00%	-50.0%
Amador	0.08%	2.6%	0.08%	7.7%	0.09%	12.8%
Butte	0.76%	-1.0%	0.75%	-2.9%	0.73%	-4.9%
Calaveras	0.19%	4.6%	0.21%	13.8%	0.23%	23.1%
Colusa	0.05%	5.0%	0.05%	15.1%	0.06%	25.2%
Contra Costa	1.69%	1.3%	1.74%	3.9%	1.78%	6.6%
Del Norte	0.15%	-1.5%	0.15%	-4.4%	0.14%	-7.3%
El Dorado	0.49%	0.5%	0.49%	1.5%	0.50%	2.6%
Fresno	2.65%	-1.5%	2.56%	-4.6%	2.48%	-7.7%
Glenn	0.14%	0.0%	0.14%	0.1%	0.14%	0.1%
Humboldt	0.41%	-0.9%	0.41%	-2.7%	0.40%	-4.6%
Imperial	0.52%	0.7%	0.52%	2.1%	0.53%	3.5%
Inyo	0.03%	-1.5%	0.03%	-4.6%	0.02%	-7.7%
Kern	2.46%	-1.2%	2.40%	-3.6%	2.34%	-5.9%
Kings	0.64%	-2.3%	0.61%	-6.8%	0.58%	-11.3%
Lake	0.18%	-2.5%	0.17%	-7.5%	0.16%	-12.4%
Lassen	0.10%	4.0%	0.11%	12.0%	0.12%	19.9%
Los Angeles	40.41%	0.8%	41.07%	2.5%	41.73%	4.1%
Madera	0.52%	1.5%	0.54%	4.4%	0.55%	7.3%
Marin	0.15%	1.1%	0.15%	3.4%	0.15%	5.7%
Mariposa	0.04%	6.1%	0.05%	18.3%	0.05%	30.5%
Mendocino	0.41%	0.0%	0.41%	-0.1%	0.41%	-0.2%
Merced	0.96%	1.1%	0.98%	3.3%	1.00%	5.6%
Modoc	0.02%	8.0%	0.03%	24.0%	0.03%	40.1%
Mono	0.01%	-2.8%	0.01%	-8.5%	0.01%	-14.2%
Monterey	0.50%	-1.8%	0.48%	-5.4%	0.46%	-9.0%
Napa	0.21%	0.8%	0.21%	2.5%	0.22%	4.1%
Nevada	0.16%	0.6%	0.16%	1.8%	0.17%	3.1%
Orange	4.14%	-1.4%	4.03%	-4.3%	3.91%	-7.1%
Placer	0.62%	14.8%	0.78%	44.4%	0.94%	73.9%
Plumas	0.08%	1.1%	0.08%	3.4%	0.08%	5.6%
Riverside	7.30%	0.9%	7.43%	2.7%	7.56%	4.4%
Sacramento	3.56%	-2.0%	3.42%	-6.0%	3.27%	-9.9%
San Benito	0.15%	0.0%	0.15%	0.1%	0.15%	0.1%
San Bernardino	6.49%	0.2%	6.52%	0.6%	6.54%	1.0%
San Diego	5.21%	-2.1%	4.98%	-6.4%	4.75%	-10.7%
San Francisco	1.76%	-1.7%	1.69%	-5.1%	1.63%	-8.5%
San Joaquin	2.00%	-2.4%	1.90%	-7.2%	1.80%	-12.0%
San Luis Obispo	0.62%	1.4%	0.64%	4.3%	0.65%	7.2%
San Mateo	0.65%	-2.1%	0.63%	-6.2%	0.60%	-10.3%

Santa Barbara	0.85%	-2.1%	0.81%	-6.3%	0.78%	-10.6%
Santa Clara	2.00%	-3.1%	1.87%	-9.4%	1.74%	-15.6%
Santa Cruz	0.50%	0.7%	0.50%	2.1%	0.51%	3.5%
Shasta	0.82%	-2.1%	0.79%	-6.3%	0.75%	-10.5%
Sierra	0.00%	15.1%	0.01%	45.4%	0.01%	75.7%
Siskiyou	0.17%	2.2%	0.17%	6.5%	0.18%	10.8%
Solano	0.61%	0.5%	0.62%	1.6%	0.62%	2.7%
Sonoma	0.85%	-2.2%	0.81%	-6.7%	0.77%	-11.1%
Stanislaus	0.88%	1.7%	0.91%	5.1%	0.94%	8.4%
Sutter	0.21%	0.0%	0.21%	-0.1%	0.21%	-0.2%
Tehama	0.29%	3.1%	0.31%	9.2%	0.33%	15.3%
Trinity	0.11%	1.6%	0.11%	4.9%	0.11%	8.2%
Tulare	1.51%	0.5%	1.52%	1.5%	1.54%	2.4%
Tuolumne	0.18%	0.9%	0.18%	2.8%	0.18%	4.7%
Ventura	1.45%	0.8%	1.47%	2.5%	1.49%	4.2%
Yolo	0.47%	1.4%	0.48%	4.3%	0.50%	7.2%
Yuba	0.24%	10.1%	0.28%	30.2%	0.33%	50.4%
<hr/> Total						

Year-to-year changes in court caseload

	Child Welfare Caseload			Change 2013 -- 2015			
	2013	2014	2015	2013-2014	2014-2015	2013-2014	2014-2015
	n	n	n	n	n	%	%
Sierra	1	1	4	0	3	0%	300%
Modoc	11	20	15	9	-5	82%	-25%
Mono	11	9	10	-2	1	-18%	11%
Inyo	23	14	26	-9	12	-39%	86%
Colusa	32	44	31	12	-13	38%	-30%
Mariposa	37	20	17	-17	-3	-46%	-15%
Amador	42	62	85	20	23	48%	37%
Plumas	45	45	65	0	20	0%	44%
Trinity	75	79	89	4	10	5%	13%
Lassen	78	75	61	-3	-14	-4%	-19%
Glenn	86	106	103	20	-3	23%	-3%
Calaveras	105	183	176	78	-7	74%	-4%
Marin	108	116	129	8	13	7%	11%
Siskiyou	109	125	130	16	5	15%	4%
Tuolumne	113	111	132	-2	21	-2%	19%
Nevada	119	112	99	-7	-13	-6%	-12%
Del Norte	122	100	117	-22	17	-18%	17%
San Benito	126	105	99	-21	-6	-17%	-6%
Lake	128	145	142	17	-3	13%	-2%
Napa	140	168	185	28	17	20%	10%
Sutter	152	138	154	-14	16	-9%	12%
Yuba	153	188	234	35	46	23%	24%
Tehama	205	213	251	8	38	4%	18%
Humboldt	280	348	412	68	64	24%	18%
Mendocino	293	337	313	44	-24	15%	-7%
Yolo	310	358	360	48	2	15%	1%
Madera	336	427	359	91	-68	27%	-16%
Monterey	349	407	433	58	26	17%	6%
Santa Cruz	358	303	341	-55	38	-15%	13%
Imperial	360	412	515	52	103	14%	25%
El Dorado	382	366	352	-16	-14	-4%	-4%
Placer	382	429	421	47	-8	12%	-2%
Solano	411	444	532	33	88	8%	20%
San Mateo	469	515	541	46	26	10%	5%
Kings	483	500	653	17	153	4%	31%
San Luis Obispo	486	451	421	-35	-30	-7%	-7%
Butte	498	525	656	27	131	5%	25%
Shasta	614	636	576	22	-60	4%	-9%
Sonoma	617	607	599	-10	-8	-2%	-1%

Stanislaus	634	728	621	94	-107	15%	-15%
Santa Barbara	666	599	577	-67	-22	-10%	-4%
Merced	725	743	660	18	-83	2%	-11%
Ventura	957	1149	1060	192	-89	20%	-8%
Tulare	1020	1121	1257	101	136	10%	12%
Contra Costa	1223	1200	1221	-23	21	-2%	2%
San Francisco	1280	1315	1263	35	-52	3%	-4%
San Joaquin	1437	1627	1643	190	16	13%	1%
Santa Clara	1461	1598	1669	137	71	9%	4%
Alameda	1702	1860	1817	158	-43	9%	-2%
Kern	1789	1647	1800	-142	153	-8%	9%
Fresno	1823	2027	2200	204	173	11%	9%
Sacramento	2346	2879	3091	533	212	23%	7%
Orange	3090	2959	2906	-131	-53	-4%	-2%
San Diego	3832	3726	3653	-106	-73	-3%	-2%
San Bernardino	4618	5040	5687	422	647	9%	13%
Riverside	4931	5536	5669	605	133	12%	2%
Los Angeles	28556	30776	30631	2220	-145	8%	0%
Total	70923	75965	77453	5042	1488	7%	2%