



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TRIAL COURT BUDGET
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TRIAL COURT BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**MATERIALS FOR JANUARY 24, 2020
ACTION BY EMAIL BETWEEN MEETINGS**

Meeting Contents

Item 1 – Midyear Funding Reallocation for 2019-20 and Base Funding Allocation for 2020-21 for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program (Action Required)	1
Attachment A: Child Support Commissioner Program 2019-20 Midyear Reallocation	8
Attachment B: Family Law Facilitator Program 2019-20 Midyear Reallocation	9
Attachment C: Child Support Commissioner Program 2020-21 Allocation	10
Attachment D: Family Law Facilitator Program 2020-21 Allocation	11
Item 2 – 2019-20 Midyear Allocation of Model Self-Help Program Funds (Action Required)	12



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 March 23–24, 2020

Title

Child Support: Midyear Funding
Reallocation for Fiscal Year 2019–20 and
Base Funding Allocation for Fiscal Year
2020–21 for the Child Support
Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator
Program

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

March 24, 2020

Date of Report

January 22, 2020

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Contact

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

Recommended by

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair
Family and Juvenile Law Advisory
Committee
Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Cochair
Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Cochair

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommend approving the reallocation of funding for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program for the remainder of fiscal year (FY) 2019–20 and the allocation of funding for this same program for FY 2020–21, as required by Assembly Bill 1058 (Stats. 1996, ch. 957). The funds are provided through a cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective March 24, 2020:

1. Approve reallocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2019–20, subject to the state Budget Act;
2. Approve reallocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2019–20, subject to the state Budget Act;
3. Approve allocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2020–21, subject to the state Budget Act; and
4. Approve allocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2020–21, subject to the state Budget Act.

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

Relevant Previous Council Action

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

Historically, the Judicial Council at midyear redistributes—to courts with a documented need for additional funds—any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants. In addition, in FY 2007–08, DCSS and the Judicial Council provided a mechanism for the courts to recover two-thirds of additional program costs beyond the contract maximum covered by local trial court funds. This federal drawdown option continues to be available for FY 2020–21.

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

1. Adopt a new funding methodology for the base funding for AB 1058 child support commissioner side of the program that is workload-based and employs the same workload and cost structures as the Workload Formula, caps increases or decreases of funding at 5 percent, maintains current funding levels for smaller courts to ensure continued operation of their programs, and reviews the workload measure biannually;

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

2. Based on recommendations of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, allocate federal title IV-D (of the Social Security Act) drawdown funds (to be matched by the trial courts) to each court in proportion to the total funds, up to the amount the court requests and is prepared to match; and
3. Maintain the historical funding methodology for the family law facilitator side of the program until FY 2021–22.

Analysis/Rationale

Midyear reallocation, FY 2019–2020

The midyear reallocation process is a review of each court’s program funding in the current fiscal year, conducted through a questionnaire distributed to each court, to allow courts to indicate whether they anticipate having additional funds that can be reallocated to courts that have demonstrated a need for additional funds. Historically, the midyear reallocation is to meet one-time, nonrecurring special needs, such as equipment purchases or temporary help to clear work backlogs. However, because AB 1058 program funding has been flat since 2008, a number of courts indicated a need for additional funds just to maintain current service levels resulting from increased costs of doing business.

In FY 2007–08, an additional procedure—the federal drawdown option—was put in place to assist in covering the cost of maintaining current program service levels using local trial court funds as a match to obtain additional federal funds for the program. Like state funds, federal drawdown funds voluntarily returned by courts are also available to be redistributed to courts that have requested additional federal drawdown funds.

Base funds and funds under the federal drawdown option not requested or allocated at the beginning of the fiscal year but returned by courts unable to use all the funds are proposed for reallocation during this midyear process consistent with the funding made available under the contract between DCSS and the Judicial Council. As a result of the midyear reallocation process for the child support commissioner portion of the program, a total of \$2,219,180 is available: \$188,414 in base funds from unallocated funds at the beginning of the fiscal year and from 5 courts that volunteered to return funds and \$2,030,766² in federal drawdown option funds from 15 courts that volunteered to return funds that they do not anticipate needing during fiscal year 2019–20. For the family law facilitator portion of the program, a total of \$345,266 is available: \$46,999 in base funds that 4 courts volunteered to return and \$298,267 in federal drawdown option funds from unallocated funds at the beginning of the fiscal year and from 5 courts that have volunteered to return federal drawdown option funds for allocation to other courts.

² Of the \$2,030,766 in federal drawdown funds made available by courts for reallocation, courts requested \$1,211,413 in additional federal drawdown funds, leaving an unallocated balance of \$819,353. Program staff will monitor court spending through the fiscal year and make these funds available to courts that exhaust their allocation.

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

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

As stated above, \$2,219,180 was available for reallocation to the child support commissioner component of the program. A total of 38 courts requested no change to their child support commissioner base allocations, 28 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, 5 courts offered to return base funds, 15 offered to return federal drawdown option funds, 14 requested additional base funds, and 14 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

Likewise, \$345,266 was available for reallocation to the family law facilitator component of the program. A total of 33 courts requested no change to their family law facilitator base allocations, 46 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, 4 courts offered to return base funds, 5 offered to return federal drawdown option funds, 21 requested additional base funds, and 7 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

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

Base funding, FY 2020–21

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

Funding for FY 2020–21 for the child support commissioner component of the program will be \$31,616,936 in base funding and \$13,038,952 for the federal drawdown option; funding for the family law facilitator component will be \$10,789,626 in base funding and \$4,449,685 from the federal drawdown option. The total program base allocation will be \$42.4 million, and the total federal drawdown allocation will be \$17.4 million.

On January 15, 2019, the council approved a new funding methodology for base funding for the child support commissioner program, while maintaining the historical methodology for base funding for the family law facilitator program. The committees recommend that the Judicial Council adopt the allocations for the child support commissioner program detailed in Attachment C and the allocations for the family law facilitator program detailed in Attachment D, which follow the respective approved methodologies for each program as described below.

Child support commissioner program funding allocations, FY 2019–20

The approved child support commissioner program base funding allocation methodology estimates the workload-based need for child support commissioners and the staff to support those commissioners, excluding the family law facilitator, using the same principles and model parameters as the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model and the Workload Formula. Child support commissioner need is estimated by taking a three-year average of governmental child support filings (FY 2014–15 through FY 2016–17) and multiplying that average by the case weight as determined by the RAS for cases in the Family Law—Other Petitions category (i.e., 46 minutes), which includes title IV-D child support cases. The product is then divided by the judicial workload year value (i.e., the estimated yearly workload for judicial officers measured in minutes). The result is an estimate of the full-time equivalent (FTE) positions needed for the workload. A similar approach is taken to estimate the workload-based need for staff support, with estimates for managers/supervisors and administrative staff (human resources, information technology, finance) included by using the same ratios of line staff to supervisory/administrative staff as in the RAS model. A ratio of 1.25 court reporters to each judicial officer needed is used to establish a court reporter need, and the salary, benefits, and labor costs for each staff position (following the Workload Formula framework) are used to convert the FTE need to dollars. Finally, the Operating Expenses & Equipment factor used in the Workload Formula was also applied on the staff side. Applying this methodology shows that the amount needed to fully fund the program greatly exceeds the funding available.

However, because this methodology would result in dramatic funding cuts or increases in most courts, which would impact the courts' ability to provide the services required to meet federal and state law and contractual provisions associated with the funding, the council approved the joint subcommittee's recommendation that the initial reallocation be capped at 5 percent of the total amount that each court's program can be cut or increased. Additionally, recognizing the important collaborations between small courts via intra-branch agreements to share child support commissioners to ensure that each court's limited funding does not prevent it from being able to meet federal, state, and contractual requirements, the council approved the joint subcommittee's recommendation that these courts (cluster 1 courts and any courts with an existing intra-branch

agreement with another court for AB 1058 services) be funded at no less than their current levels for FY 2019–20 and FY 2020–21.

With these new child support commissioner program base allocations, courts were directed to reassess their federal drawdown funding need and request a federal drawdown amount for FY 2020–21 by responding to a questionnaire distributed to the courts. The council adopted the joint subcommittee’s recommendation that federal drawdown funds be allocated proportionally to each court based on the new funding allocations up to the amount that a court requests and can match. The council further determined that if the request for federal drawdown funds exceeds the amount available to allocate, these funds should be 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.

The committees recommend that courts be allocated base and federal drawdown funding for the child support commissioner program for FY 2020–21 following these methodologies, as shown on Attachment C.

Family law facilitator program funding allocations, FY 2019–20

Per the historic funding allocation methodology, a questionnaire is sent to each court requesting the information needed to evaluate appropriate funding levels for the family law facilitator base funds and family law facilitator federal drawdown funds. The committees recommend that courts be allocated base and/or federal drawdown funding, less any amount a court indicated that it wishes to relinquish, for the family law facilitator program as in FY 2019–20, but that each court requesting increased base funding, federal drawdown funding, or both be allocated additional funding in proportion to overall funding available for program funding.

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee reviewed the allocation of base funding for the Child Support Commissioner and the Family Law Facilitator Program, and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee reviewed the allocation of the federal drawdown funding for the Child Support Commissioner and the Family Law Facilitator Program, as directed by the Judicial Council. The committees recommend adopting the base funding and federal drawdown allocations for FY 20120–21 as shown on Attachments C and D.

Policy Implications

Approval of these recommendations allows for the continued funding of the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program, supporting courts in meeting their 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 Judicial Council and DCSS.

Comments

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

Alternatives considered

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

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

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

Attachments

1. Attachment A: Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2019–2020
2. Attachment B: Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2019–2020
3. Attachment C: Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2020–2021
4. Attachment D: Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2020–2021

Attachment A

Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2019–2020

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
#	CSC Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation	Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	Recommended Base Funding Allocation (A + C)	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (B + D)	Federal Share 66% (Column F * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column F * .34)	Total Allocation (E + F)	Contract Amount (E + G)
1	Alameda	1,119,358	549,815	0	0	1,119,358	549,815	362,878	186,937	1,669,173	1,482,236
2	Alpine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Amador	140,250	45,736	0	0	140,250	45,736	30,186	15,550	185,986	170,436
4	Butte	250,000	0	-20,000	0	230,000	0	0	0	230,000	230,000
5	Calaveras	132,667	10,000	0	-6,000	132,667	4,000	2,640	1,360	136,667	135,307
6	Colusa	45,691	20,809	0	0	45,691	20,809	13,734	7,075	66,500	59,425
7	Contra Costa	835,291	0	10,000	10,000	845,291	10,000	6,600	3,400	855,291	851,891
8	Del Norte	50,404	29,023	0	0	50,404	29,023	19,155	9,868	79,427	69,559
9	El Dorado	203,169	100,382	0	0	203,169	100,382	66,252	34,130	303,551	269,421
10	Fresno	1,547,773	843,800	0	0	1,547,773	843,800	556,908	286,892	2,391,573	2,104,681
11	Glenn	120,030	63,012	0	-53,012	120,030	10,000	6,600	3,400	130,030	126,630
12	Humboldt	117,835	59,801	0	0	117,835	59,801	39,469	20,332	177,636	157,304
13	Imperial	173,631	99,977	4,164	104,590	177,795	204,567	135,014	69,553	382,362	312,809
14	Inyo	79,264	45,640	0	-41,640	79,264	4,000	2,640	1,360	83,264	81,904
15	Kern	704,023	405,377	-45,000	-45,000	659,023	360,377	237,849	122,528	1,019,400	896,872
16	Kings	289,538	166,716	6,944	75,045	296,482	241,761	159,562	82,199	538,243	456,044
17	Lake	148,425	37,000	3,560	60,690	151,985	97,690	64,475	33,215	249,675	216,460
18	Lassen	60,000	0	1,439	124,599	61,439	124,599	82,235	42,364	186,038	143,674
19	Los Angeles	5,554,479	3,198,270	0	-574,270	5,554,479	2,624,000	1,731,840	892,160	8,178,479	7,286,319
20	Madera	205,992	83,000	4,940	55,900	210,932	138,900	91,674	47,226	349,832	302,606
21	Marin	120,757	34,980	2,896	10,020	123,653	45,000	29,700	15,300	168,653	153,353
22	Mariposa	75,216	0	-27,946	0	47,270	0	0	0	47,270	47,270
23	Mendocino	162,914	51,250	0	0	162,914	51,250	33,825	17,425	214,164	196,739
24	Merced	516,419	297,354	12,385	13,652	528,804	311,006	205,264	105,742	839,810	734,068
25	Modoc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	Mono	45,974	5,000	0	0	45,974	5,000	3,300	1,700	50,974	49,274
27	Monterey	375,757	100,556	0	0	375,757	100,556	66,367	34,189	476,313	442,124
28	Napa	100,465	0	0	0	100,465	0	0	0	100,465	100,465
29	Nevada	327,593	0	0	0	327,593	0	0	0	327,593	327,593
30	Orange	2,199,809	326,142	-43,709	-326,142	2,156,100	0	0	0	2,156,100	2,156,100
31	Placer	328,758	51,092	0	-12,092	328,758	39,000	25,740	13,260	367,758	354,498
32	Plumas	95,777	0	0	0	95,777	0	0	0	95,777	95,777
33	Riverside	1,055,625	244,375	0	-70,000	1,055,625	174,375	115,088	59,288	1,230,000	1,170,713
34	Sacramento	1,096,727	500,000	0	-100,000	1,096,727	400,000	264,000	136,000	1,496,727	1,360,727
35	San Benito	135,384	30,000	0	0	135,384	30,000	19,800	10,200	165,384	155,184
36	San Bernardino	2,698,328	1,393,318	64,713	372,576	2,763,041	1,765,894	1,165,490	600,404	4,528,935	3,928,531
37	San Diego	1,755,653	1,010,906	0	0	1,755,653	1,010,906	667,198	343,708	2,766,559	2,422,851
38	San Francisco	863,471	111,854	0	-441,796	863,471	0	0	0	863,471	863,471
39	San Joaquin	719,254	50,000	10,000	25,000	729,254	75,000	49,500	25,500	804,254	778,754
40	San Luis Obispo	220,725	127,093	0	0	220,725	127,093	83,881	43,212	347,818	304,606
41	San Mateo	372,835	214,678	0	-107,591	372,835	107,087	70,677	36,410	479,922	443,512
42	Santa Barbara	458,012	149,724	10,984	109,000	468,996	258,724	170,758	87,966	727,720	639,754
43	Santa Clara	1,697,087	977,183	40,700	171,164	1,737,787	1,148,347	757,909	390,438	2,886,134	2,495,696
44	Santa Cruz	186,631	36,000	0	-6,122	186,631	29,878	19,719	10,159	216,509	206,350
45	Shasta	417,575	205,874	0	-205,874	417,575	0	0	0	417,575	417,575
46	Sierra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Siskiyou	124,720	0	-14,720	0	110,000	0	0	0	110,000	110,000
48	Solano	493,537	95,481	0	0	493,537	95,481	63,017	32,464	589,018	556,554
49	Sonoma	477,253	221,104	0	0	477,253	221,104	145,929	75,175	698,357	623,182
50	Stanislaus	737,802	260,000	0	-35,000	737,802	225,000	148,500	76,500	962,802	886,302
51	Sutter	192,235	63,487	0	0	192,235	63,487	41,901	21,586	255,722	234,136
52	Tehama	98,961	56,982	2,374	19,256	101,335	76,238	50,317	25,921	177,573	151,652
53	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	Tulare	534,195	68,348	0	-6,227	534,195	62,121	41,000	21,121	596,316	575,195
55	Tuolumne	158,566	78,346	0	0	158,566	78,346	51,708	26,638	236,912	210,274
56	Ventura	555,211	106,527	13,315	59,921	568,526	166,448	109,856	56,592	734,974	678,382
57	Yolo	199,702	33,000	0	0	199,702	33,000	21,780	11,220	232,702	221,482
58	Yuba	203,149	50,000	0	0	203,149	50,000	33,000	17,000	253,149	236,149
	TOTAL	31,579,897	12,709,012	37,039	-819,353	31,616,936	12,219,601	8,064,937	4,154,664	43,836,537	39,681,873

CSC Base Funds 31,616,936
 CSC Federal Drawdown 13,038,954
 Total Funding Allocated 44,655,890

31,616,936 Final CSC Base Funds
 12,219,601 Final CSC FDD
 43,836,537 Total Funding Allocated

Attachment B

Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2019–2020

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
#	FLF Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation	Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	Recommended Base Funding Allocation (A + C)	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (B + D)	Federal Share 66% (Column F * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column F * .34)	Total Allocation (E + F)	Contract Amount (E + G)
1	Alameda	362,939	215,080	4,119	0	367,058	215,080	141,953	73,127	582,138	509,011
2	Alpine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Amador	46,885	4,701	0	0	46,885	4,701	3,103	1,598	51,586	49,988
4	Butte	101,754	61,250	0	0	101,754	61,250	40,425	20,825	163,004	142,179
5	Calaveras	70,655	8,000	802	10,000	71,457	18,000	11,880	6,120	89,457	83,337
6	Colusa	35,600	8,900	0	0	35,600	8,900	5,874	3,026	44,500	41,474
7	Contra Costa	345,518	0	-15,000	0	330,518	0	0	0	330,518	330,518
8	Del Norte	50,002	5,971	0	0	50,002	5,971	3,941	2,030	55,973	53,943
9	El Dorado	106,037	50,384	0	0	106,037	50,384	33,253	17,131	156,421	139,290
10	Fresno	394,558	186,596	0	0	394,558	186,596	123,153	63,443	581,154	517,711
11	Glenn	75,808	0	860	0	76,668	0	0	0	76,668	76,668
12	Humboldt	89,185	9,774	0	0	89,185	9,774	6,451	3,323	98,959	95,636
13	Imperial	52,865	36,086	0	0	52,865	36,086	23,817	12,269	88,951	76,682
14	Inyo	57,185	27,171	-17,185	-27,171	40,000	0	0	0	40,000	40,000
15	Kern	355,141	200,000	4,031	150,000	359,172	350,000	231,000	119,000	709,172	590,172
16	Kings	58,493	32,000	0	0	58,493	32,000	21,120	10,880	90,493	79,613
17	Lake	57,569	26,836	0	0	57,569	26,836	17,712	9,124	84,405	75,281
18	Lassen	65,000	0	738	0	65,738	0	0	0	65,738	65,738
19	Los Angeles	1,890,029	803,431	0	0	1,890,029	803,431	530,264	273,167	2,693,460	2,420,293
20	Madera	80,794	25,383	0	0	80,794	25,383	16,753	8,630	106,177	97,547
21	Marin	136,581	0	0	0	136,581	0	0	0	136,581	136,581
22	Mariposa	45,390	0	-5,188	0	40,202	0	0	0	40,202	40,202
23	Mendocino	60,462	30,000	686	8,425	61,148	38,425	25,361	13,065	99,573	86,509
24	Merced	98,847	67,473	0	52,035	98,847	119,508	78,875	40,633	218,355	177,722
25	Modoc	70,941	1,247	0	0	70,941	1,247	823	424	72,188	71,764
26	Mono	48,246	1,350	0	0	48,246	1,350	891	459	49,596	49,137
27	Monterey	120,688	57,179	1,370	0	122,058	57,179	37,738	19,441	179,237	159,796
28	Napa	61,820	40,000	702	0	62,522	40,000	26,400	13,600	102,522	88,922
29	Nevada	116,010	0	0	0	116,010	0	0	0	116,010	116,010
30	Orange	537,209	114,738	0	-75,849	537,209	38,889	25,667	13,222	576,098	562,876
31	Placer	89,626	0	-9,626	0	80,000	0	0	0	80,000	80,000
32	Plumas	55,827	7,803	0	0	55,827	7,803	5,150	2,653	63,630	60,977
33	Riverside	665,441	218,500	0	0	665,441	218,500	144,210	74,290	883,941	809,651
34	Sacramento	309,597	211,331	3,514	0	313,111	211,331	139,478	71,853	524,442	452,589
35	San Benito	60,289	29,151	0	0	60,289	29,151	19,240	9,911	89,440	79,529
36	San Bernardino	459,342	313,548	5,213	0	464,555	313,548	206,942	106,606	778,103	671,497
37	San Diego	605,937	253,614	6,877	0	612,814	253,614	167,385	86,229	866,428	780,199
38	San Francisco	245,257	62,362	0	0	245,257	62,362	41,159	21,203	307,619	286,416
39	San Joaquin	214,154	78,238	2,431	-8,238	216,585	70,000	46,200	23,800	286,585	262,785
40	San Luis Obispo	67,010	32,246	761	0	67,771	32,246	21,282	10,964	100,017	89,053
41	San Mateo	126,800	86,554	1,439	0	128,239	86,554	57,126	29,428	214,793	185,365
42	Santa Barbara	170,705	77,323	1,937	-10,000	172,642	67,323	44,433	22,890	239,965	217,075
43	Santa Clara	445,545	210,712	5,057	0	450,602	210,712	139,070	71,642	661,314	589,672
44	Santa Cruz	74,335	43,000	0	574	74,335	43,574	28,759	14,815	117,909	103,094
45	Shasta	185,447	111,913	0	-92,913	185,447	19,000	12,540	6,460	204,447	197,987
46	Sierra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Siskiyou	74,650	35,000	847	10,000	75,497	45,000	29,700	15,300	120,497	105,197
48	Solano	129,070	39,710	0	0	129,070	39,710	26,209	13,501	168,780	155,279
49	Sonoma	138,141	65,519	1,568	0	139,709	65,519	43,243	22,276	205,228	182,952
50	Stanislaus	219,062	120,000	0	0	219,062	120,000	79,200	40,800	339,062	298,262
51	Sutter	66,292	31,409	0	0	66,292	31,409	20,730	10,679	97,701	87,022
52	Tehama	27,294	3,535	310	0	27,604	3,535	2,333	1,202	31,139	29,937
53	Trinity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	Tulare	307,882	132,293	0	67,233	307,882	199,526	131,687	67,839	507,408	439,569
55	Tuolumne	64,534	30,084	0	0	64,534	30,084	19,855	10,229	94,618	84,389
56	Ventura	252,718	77,864	2,868	0	255,586	77,864	51,390	26,474	333,450	306,976
57	Yolo	76,604	35,377	869	0	77,473	35,377	23,349	12,028	112,850	100,822
58	Yuba	65,856	44,953	0	0	65,856	44,953	29,669	15,284	110,809	95,525
	TOTAL	10,789,626	4,365,589	0	84,096	10,789,626	4,449,685	2,936,792	1,512,893	15,239,311	13,726,418

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

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

Attachment C

Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2020-2021						
	A	B	C	D	E	F
CSC Court	Beginning Base Funding 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)
Alameda	1,119,358	549,815	362,878	186,937	1,669,173	1,482,236
Alpine (see El Dorado)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amador	140,250	45,736	30,186	15,550	185,986	170,436
Butte	287,042	0	0	0	287,042	287,042
Calaveras	132,667	10,000	6,600	3,400	142,667	139,267
Colusa	45,691	20,809	13,734	7,075	66,500	59,425
Contra Costa	835,291	0	0	0	835,291	835,291
Del Norte	50,404	29,023	19,155	9,868	79,427	69,559
El Dorado	203,169	100,382	66,252	34,130	303,551	269,421
Fresno	1,547,773	843,800	556,908	286,892	2,391,573	2,104,681
Glenn	120,030	63,012	41,588	21,424	183,042	161,618
Humboldt	117,835	59,801	39,469	20,332	177,636	157,304
Imperial	173,631	99,977	65,985	33,992	273,608	239,616
Inyo	79,264	45,640	30,122	15,518	124,904	109,386
Kern	704,023	405,377	267,548	137,828	1,109,399	971,571
Kings	289,538	166,716	110,033	56,683	456,254	399,571
Lake	148,425	37,000	24,420	12,580	185,425	172,845
Lassen	60,000	0	0	0	60,000	60,000
Los Angeles	5,554,479	3,198,270	2,110,858	1,087,412	8,752,749	7,665,337
Madera	205,992	83,000	54,780	28,220	288,992	260,772
Marin	120,757	34,980	23,087	11,893	155,737	143,844
Mariposa	75,216	0	0	0	75,216	75,216
Mendocino	162,914	51,250	33,825	17,425	214,164	196,739
Merced	516,419	297,354	196,254	101,100	813,773	712,673
Modoc	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mono	45,974	5,000	3,300	1,700	50,974	49,274
Monterey	375,757	100,556	66,367	34,189	476,313	442,124
Napa	100,465	0	0	0	100,465	100,465
Nevada	327,593	0	0	0	327,593	327,593
Orange	2,199,809	326,142	215,254	110,888	2,525,951	2,415,063
Placer	328,758	51,092	33,721	17,371	379,850	362,479
Plumas	95,777	0	0	0	95,777	95,777
Riverside	1,055,625	244,375	161,288	83,088	1,300,000	1,216,913
Sacramento	1,096,727	500,000	330,000	170,000	1,596,727	1,426,727
San Benito	135,384	30,000	19,800	10,200	165,384	155,184
San Bernardino	2,698,328	1,393,318	919,590	473,728	4,091,646	3,617,918
San Diego	1,755,653	1,010,905	667,197	343,708	2,766,558	2,422,850
San Francisco	863,471	441,796	291,585	150,211	1,305,267	1,155,056
San Joaquin	719,254	50,000	33,000	17,000	769,254	752,254
San Luis Obispo	220,725	127,093	83,881	43,212	347,818	304,606
San Mateo	372,835	214,678	141,687	72,991	587,513	514,522
Santa Barbara	458,012	149,724	98,818	50,906	607,736	556,830
Santa Clara	1,697,087	977,183	644,941	332,242	2,674,270	2,342,028
Santa Cruz	186,631	36,000	23,760	12,240	222,631	210,391
Shasta	417,575	205,874	135,877	69,997	623,449	553,452
Sierra (see Nevada)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Siskiyou	124,720	0	0	0	124,720	124,720
Solano	493,537	95,481	63,017	32,464	589,018	556,554
Sonoma	477,253	221,104	145,929	75,175	698,357	623,182
Stanislaus	737,802	260,000	171,600	88,400	997,802	909,402
Sutter	192,235	63,487	41,901	21,586	255,722	234,136
Tehama	98,961	56,982	37,608	19,374	155,943	136,569
Trinity (see Shasta)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulare	534,195	68,348	45,110	23,238	602,543	579,305
Tuolumne	158,566	78,346	51,708	26,638	236,912	210,274
Ventura	555,211	106,527	70,308	36,219	661,738	625,519
Yolo	199,702	33,000	21,780	11,220	232,702	221,482
Yuba	203,149	50,000	33,000	17,000	253,149	236,149
Total	31,616,936	13,038,953	8,605,709	4,433,244	44,655,889	40,222,648

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

Attachment D

Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2020-2021						
	A	B	C	D	E	F
FLF Court	Beginning Base Funding 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)
Alameda	362,939	247,743	163,510	84,233	610,682	526,449
Alpine (see El Dorado)			0	0	0	0
Amador	46,885	4,701	3,103	1,598	51,586	49,988
Butte	101,754	61,250	40,425	20,825	163,004	142,179
Calaveras	70,655	8,000	5,280	2,720	78,655	75,935
Colusa	35,600	8,900	5,874	3,026	44,500	41,474
Contra Costa	345,518	0	0	0	345,518	345,518
Del Norte	50,002	5,971	3,941	2,030	55,973	53,943
El Dorado	106,037	50,384	33,253	17,131	156,421	139,290
Fresno	394,558	186,596	123,153	63,443	581,154	517,711
Glenn	75,808	0	0	0	75,808	75,808
Humboldt	89,185	9,774	6,451	3,323	98,959	95,636
Imperial	52,865	36,086	23,817	12,269	88,951	76,682
Inyo	57,185	27,171	17,933	9,238	84,356	75,118
Kern	355,141	200,000	132,000	68,000	555,141	487,141
Kings	58,493	32,000	21,120	10,880	90,493	79,613
Lake	57,569	26,836	17,712	9,124	84,405	75,281
Lassen	65,000	0	0	0	65,000	65,000
Los Angeles	1,890,029	803,431	530,264	273,167	2,693,460	2,420,293
Madera	80,794	25,383	16,753	8,630	106,177	97,547
Marin	136,581	0	0	0	136,581	136,581
Mariposa	45,390	0	0	0	45,390	45,390
Mendocino	60,462	30,000	19,800	10,200	90,462	80,262
Merced	98,847	67,473	44,532	22,941	166,320	143,379
Modoc	70,941	1,247	823	424	72,188	71,764
Mono	48,246	1,350	891	459	49,596	49,137
Monterey	120,688	57,179	37,738	19,441	177,867	158,426
Napa	61,820	40,000	26,400	13,600	101,820	88,220
Nevada	116,010	0	0	0	116,010	116,010
Orange	537,209	114,738	75,727	39,011	651,947	612,936
Placer	89,626	0	0	0	89,626	89,626
Plumas	55,827	7,803	5,150	2,653	63,630	60,977
Riverside	665,441	218,500	144,210	74,290	883,941	809,651
Sacramento	309,597	211,331	139,478	71,853	520,928	449,075
San Benito	60,289	29,151	19,240	9,911	89,440	79,529
San Bernardino	459,342	313,548	206,942	106,606	772,890	666,284
San Diego	605,937	253,614	167,385	86,229	859,551	773,322
San Francisco	245,257	113,795	75,105	38,690	359,052	320,362
San Joaquin	214,154	78,238	51,637	26,601	292,392	265,791
San Luis Obispo	67,010	32,246	21,282	10,964	99,256	88,292
San Mateo	126,800	86,554	57,126	29,428	213,354	183,926
Santa Barbara	170,705	77,323	51,033	26,290	248,028	221,738
Santa Clara	445,545	210,712	139,070	71,642	656,257	584,615
Santa Cruz	74,335	43,000	28,380	14,620	117,335	102,715
Shasta	185,447	111,913	73,863	38,050	297,360	259,310
Sierra (see Nevada)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Siskiyou	74,650	35,000	23,100	11,900	109,650	97,750
Solano	129,070	39,710	26,209	13,501	168,780	155,279
Sonoma	138,141	65,519	43,243	22,276	203,660	181,384
Stanislaus	219,062	120,000	79,200	40,800	339,062	298,262
Sutter	66,292	31,409	20,730	10,679	97,701	87,022
Tehama	27,294	3,535	2,333	1,202	30,829	29,627
Trinity (see Shasta)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulare	307,882	132,293	87,313	44,980	440,175	395,195
Tuolumne	64,534	30,084	19,855	10,229	94,618	84,389
Ventura	252,718	77,864	51,390	26,474	330,582	304,108
Yolo	76,604	35,377	23,349	12,028	111,981	99,953
Yuba	65,856	44,953	29,669	15,284	110,809	95,525
Total	10,789,626	4,449,685	2,936,792	1,512,893	15,239,311	13,726,418

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



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue • San Francisco, California 94102-3688
Telephone 415-865-4200 • Fax 415-865-4205 • TDD 415-865-4272

MEMORANDUM

Date

January 15, 2020

To

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee

From

Bonnie Rose Hough
Principal Managing Attorney
Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Subject

Midyear Reallocation of Model Self-Help
Pilot Funds

Action Requested

Approve Midyear Reallocation of Model
Self-Help Program Funds

Deadline

January 24, 2020

Contact

Bonnie Rose Hough
415 865 7668 phone
bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov

Recommendation:

Approve Judicial Council Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) staff recommendation regarding a midyear reallocation of \$191,400 in Model Self-Help Pilot Grant funds for 2019-20 from the Model Self-Help Technology project that is withdrawing from the grant program to the other four projects. A short application would be submitted by the other programs to set out how they would use all or a portion of the funds to expand their services to self-represented litigants using technology. An informational report on the final reallocation amounts would be provided to the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee and the Judicial Council later this fiscal year, with a recommendation for ongoing use of these funds next fiscal year.

Rationale:

The Budget Act of 2001 provided funding for the Judicial Council to establish five model self-help center pilot projects in response to a budget change proposal submitted by the agency. A

special Selection Review Committee reviewed the proposals submitted by interested courts and made recommendations about funding. Those recommendations were then reviewed by the Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants and approved by the Executive and Planning Committee of the Judicial Council on April 12, 2002 and reported to the Judicial Council meeting on April 19, 2002.

The approved programs were:

Butte - Regional Model Court
Contra Costa - Technology Model Court
Fresno - Spanish-speaking Model Court
Los Angeles - Urban Collaboration Model Court
San Francisco - Multilingual Model Court

An extensive evaluation of the project was submitted to the Legislature on March 1, 2005 demonstrating the benefits of these programs. Funding has been included as a line item for local assistance in the State Budget Act in the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF) since that time and the grants were continued with each court receiving \$191,400 per year. The projects continue to model innovative practices and report to Judicial Council staff on their activities.

On September 16, 2019, the Contra Costa Superior Court informed the Judicial Council that they will no longer be able to participate in the Model Self-Help Project. The court was modeling technological methods to provide services to self-represented litigants including the Virtual Self-Help Center website. The attorney who was lead on that project has joined the Judicial Council staff and the court has determined to end work on the grant so that they can focus on a successful implementation of its new case management system.

After continuing discussion with the court and review of options, Judicial Council CFCC staff recommends that the \$191,400 in funding that the court would have received be reallocated to the remaining four pilot projects to use for technology related services to improve services for self-represented litigants based on a short application process, in lieu of having the dollars revert to the TCTF. There is not sufficient time in this fiscal year for a full application process that would be open to all courts since the funds would have to be encumbered or spent by the end of this this fiscal year.

The remaining pilot courts could propose using all or a portion of the unused funds for the project, allowing funds to be used for the intended purpose and expand services to self-represented litigants.