



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 20-176

For business meeting on September 25, 2020

Title

Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support
Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator
Program Funding Reduction FY 2020–21

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Recommended by

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

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

September 25, 2020

Date of Report

August 31, 2020

Contact

Cassandra McTaggart, Principal Manager
916-263-8624

cassandra.mctaggart@jud.ca.gov

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

anna.maves@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

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

Recommendation

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

1. Approve the committee's recommended reduction for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2020–21, as set forth in Attachment A1. This methodology distributes 75 percent of the \$7 million reduction to the child support commissioners based on the FY 2020–21 allocation approved by the Judicial Council in March 2020 (which allocated 75 percent of the overall funding to this side of the program). Additionally, the methodology applies the reduction based on courts' child support commissioner workload by establishing a 4 percent band around the statewide average funding level (2 percent above the average funding level and 2 percent below) and includes the following criteria:
 - a. Courts within the band take a pro rata reduction, but do not fall outside the band;
 - b. Courts above the band take up to an additional 1 percent cut from those within the band without falling into the band;
 - c. Courts below the band take up to 1 percent less of a cut than those within the band; and
 - d. Cluster 1 courts are held to a cut of 50 percent of the percentage reduction taken by courts within the band.
2. Approve the committee's recommended reduction for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2020–21, as set forth in Attachment A2. This methodology distributes 25 percent of the \$7 million reduction to the family law facilitators based on the FY 2020–21 allocation approved by the Judicial Council in March 2020. Additionally, the methodology applies the reduction pro rata, holding the cluster 1 courts to 50 percent of the pro rata reduction.
3. Approve the committee's recommendation for FY 2020–21 AB 1058 program funding for the courts for the total base funding allocations derived from recommendations 1 and 2, and the application of the additional federal drawdown funding, as displayed in Attachments B1 and B2.

Relevant Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council is required annually to allocate non-trial court funding to the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program (AB 1058 program) and has done so since 1997.¹ A cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) and the Judicial Council provides the funds for this program and requires the council to annually approve the funding allocation. Two-thirds of the funds are federal, and one-third

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

comes from the state General Fund (non-trial court funding). Program costs up to the authorized annual contract amount are reimbursed by the DCSS based on actual expenditures. Any unspent funding in the fiscal year cannot be carried forward into future years.

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

- Adopted a new funding methodology for the AB 1058 child support commissioner program base funding that is workload-based and employs the same workload and cost structures as the Workload Formula, caps increases or reductions of funding at 5 percent, maintains current funding levels for smaller courts to ensure continued operation of their programs, and reviews the workload measure on a biannual basis;
- Based on recommendations of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, allocated federal title IV-D (of the Social Security Act) drawdown funds (to be matched 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
- Maintained the historical funding methodology for the family law facilitator program until FY 2021–22.

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

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent recession, the final state budget for FY 2020–21 was revised substantially downward from the initial budget proposed in January. The budget that was enacted and signed into law seeks to close a projected \$54.3 billion shortfall for the current fiscal year. According to the Department of Finance’s final budget summary, the Budget Act of 2020 “includes an ongoing \$46.4 million General Fund reduction for child support administration,” which includes “[s]avings of \$38.1 million to revert Local Child Support Agency Funding to 2018 levels” and “[s]avings of \$8.3 million to reduce state operations and contracts cost.”² The DCSS has allocated \$2.38 million of the \$8.3 million of their state budget reduction for FY 2020–21 to the AB 1058 program. The reduction of the state funds will result in a reduction of federal matching funds of \$4.62 million for a \$7 million total reduction to the AB 1058 program for the current fiscal year.

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

The federal title IV-D (of the Social Security Act) drawdown funds (to be matched by the trial courts) will continue to be allocated to each court in accordance with the recommendations approved by the Judicial Council in March 2020 and will be allocated in proportion to the total funds, up to the amount the court requests and is prepared to match.

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

Analysis/Rationale

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

The base funding model estimates the workload-based need for child support commissioners and the staff to support those commissioners, excluding the family law facilitator, using the same principles and model parameters as the funding formula including the Resource Assessment Study model. Child support commissioner need is estimated by taking a three-year average of governmental child support filings (FY 2014–15 through FY 2016–17) and multiplying those filings by the caseweight in the Family Law–Other Petitions category (46 minutes). The product is then divided by the judicial workload year value. The result is an estimate of the full-time equivalent (FTE) positions needed for the workload. To convert the FTE estimate into dollars, the AB 1058 Funding Allocation Joint Subcommittee directed staff to use an average salary for commissioners equivalent to 85 percent of a judge’s salary. A similar approach was taken to estimate the workload-based need for support staff.³

The 2019 model calculates a funding need of \$67.696 million for child support commissioner services in the courts. The available funding of \$31.617 million is 47 percent of the funding need. The reduction of \$5.250 million will lower the available funding to \$26.367 million for child support commissioners, reducing the percentage of funding need met to 39 percent.

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

³ More details can be found in the Judicial Council report for the January 2019 meeting, Judicial Council of Cal., Adv. Com. Rep., *Child Support: AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program Funding Allocation* (Nov. 21, 2018), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6953308&GUID=A6F15A78-08B6-42DA-8826-19A6AF0B7CB1>.

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

- An increase in applications for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) program, which provides temporary financial assistance and employment services to families with minor children with income and property below the state's limits, caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. This will lead to an increase in new title IV-D actions; and
- A large increase in applications for unemployment benefits in the state caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, as many Californians have either lost their jobs or seen reduced hours or wages, which will in turn lead to more requests for modification of support orders.

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

Policy implications

The funding for the AB 1058 program is grounded in a workload-based methodology that fairly distributes funds for the program while taking into account the statutory requirement that each court provide sufficient AB 1058 commissioners to hear child support cases involving local child support agencies and maintain an office of the family law facilitator to assist parents with those cases. To ensure each court can meet that requirement within the funding for the program it is critical that each court receive a level of funding that makes it possible to employ someone in each of these positions. In addition, it is critical that the funding for the program is sufficient for California to continue to meet federal performance measures that allow federal funds to flow to the program. The economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is extensive; for this reason it is critical that the budget reduction methodology be implemented to ensure that statewide AB 1058 services can continue and to prevent any loss of performance in the program.

Comments

The Child Support Services Subcommittee of the Court Executives Advisory Committee (CEAC) met twice to discuss the budget reduction and make a recommendation to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee on reduction methodology. The CEAC subcommittee requested and reviewed a range of reduction methodologies; they noted the importance of workload-based reductions and the desirability of a reduction methodology that paralleled the recent Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommendation to the Judicial Council on reductions to trial court budget allocations. In this context the CEAC subcommittee also discussed the fact that the child support commissioner allocation is based on a workload methodology approved by the Judicial Council, while a workload methodology for family law facilitators is still under development. This means that a workload-based reduction methodology can only be considered for the child support commissioner allocation. The CEAC subcommittee also noted the importance of preserving core services in the cluster 1 courts, and made the following recommendations:

1. For both the family law facilitator and the child support commissioner allocation reduction methodologies, cluster 1 courts should receive only 50 percent of the statewide reduction percentage.
2. For family law facilitator allocations, the reductions should be applied pro rata to all courts.
3. For child support commissioners, the reductions should be applied as follows:
 - a. Courts with a FY 2020–21 budget allocation to total workload-based need ratio that is within a band of 2 percent below and above the statewide ratio receive the average statewide reduction;
 - b. Courts with a ratio above the statewide ratio receive the statewide reduction plus 1 percent;
 - c. Courts with a ratio below the statewide ratio receive the statewide reduction less 1 percent, scaled by their distance below the ratio;
 - d. Cluster 1 courts receive 50 percent of the statewide reduction.

In January 2019, the Judicial Council adopted the recommendation that the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be directed to make recommendations to the TCBAC on a new funding methodology for family law facilitators and review the impact of the new workload-based funding methodology on child support commissioners.⁴ The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee met to discuss the budget reduction, review the CEAC subcommittee's recommendation, and make a recommendation to the TCBAC on reduction methodologies. After an extensive discussion about the various options, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee agreed with the recommendation made by the CEAC subcommittee, with the amendment that the reduction to the courts below the band not be scaled but rather be uniformly 1 percent less than the pro rata reduction. The recommendation received two dissenting votes, with both committee members expressing that small courts should not receive a reduction, and that unless the Legislature explicitly directs otherwise, all judicial branch processes should be based on equity with special consideration to the underfunded courts.

In addition, the Family and Juvenile Law Committee recommended to the TCBAC that cluster 1 courts be polled as to the potential impact of the reductions and that this information be provided in the final report to the Judicial Council.

The TCBAC carefully considered the various options presented regarding how to equitably allocate the \$7 million funding reduction. The committee took into account the thoughtful comments made by the CEAC subcommittee and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. After this deliberate review, the TCBAC concluded it should recommend that the

⁴ *Id.*

council adopt the recommendations set forth above in order to best maintain the current level of court services and efficiencies and the public's access to justice.

Alternatives considered

Various alternative allocation methodologies for the reduction to AB 1058 funding were discussed for consideration. All the funding alternatives considered are contained in attachments to the report to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee (see Link A).

Below is the list of options that were considered:

Child support commissioner only alternatives

Pro rata reduction based on courts' workload calculation and establishment of a 6 percent band around the statewide funding level. (Note: Establishing a 6 percent band was not considered in either committee's discussion.)

- Pros
 - Consistent with the options presented to the TCBAC made in developing the trial court budget reduction methodology.
 - Compared to the 4 percent band model, a larger number of courts fall into the band around the statewide average and are thus protected from the larger reduction made to courts above the band.
- Cons
 - Compared to the 4 percent band model, fewer courts receive the lower reduction made to courts below the band.

Pro rata reduction based on courts' workload calculation and establishment of a 4 percent band around the statewide funding level be scaled relative to distance from statewide average met need for the courts below the band.

- Pros
 - Consistent with the methodology for trial court budget reductions.
 - Mitigates the reduction for those courts at greatest distance below statewide average need met.
- Cons
 - Deviates from strict pro rata reduction, which some commenters believed was the fairest model.

Child support commissioner and family law facilitator alternatives

For all reductions cluster 1 courts receive no reduction.

- Pros
 - Protects cluster 1 courts from having to reduce staff to the extent of ending the program.
- Cons
 - Exempting cluster 1 courts from the reduction is inconsistent with equity principles.

For all reductions cluster 1 courts receive full pro rata reduction.

- Pros
 - Including cluster 1 courts in the reduction is consistent with equity principles.
- Cons
 - Cluster 1 courts may not be able to absorb any reduction without reducing staff to the extent of ending the program.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

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

This reduction will have substantial negative impacts on trial court operations. It will make it challenging for courts to comply with provisions related to filing time frames and hearing cases that are contained in the contract between the DCSS and the Judicial Council and the agreements entered into by the Judicial Council and the local courts, as well as the plans of cooperation between the trial courts and the local child support agencies. Both the contract and the plans of cooperation will need to be renegotiated to revise these timelines.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A1: Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 4% Band (small courts held at 50% of pro rata)
2. Attachment A2: Family Law Facilitator Reduction Model (small courts held at 50% of pro rata)
3. Attachment B1: Child Support Commissioners Final FY 2020–21 Allocations (based on the committee’s recommendation of reduction model)
4. Attachment B2: Family Law Facilitator Final FY 2020–21 Allocations (based on the committee’s recommendation of reduction model)
5. Link A: All financial models considered are available in the July 30, 2020, report to the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, www.courts.ca.gov/documents/famjuv-20200730-materials.pdf

Attachment A1

Child Support Commissioner Reduction Model: 4% Band

(Small Courts Held at 50% of Pro Rata)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Cluster	Court	Total CSC and Staff Funding Need	Allocation FY 2020-21	Percentage of Need Met	Reduction: Small Court	Reduction: Above Band	Reduction: Within Band	Reduction: Below Band	Reduction One Column	Amount of Reduction
1	Mono	9,301	45,974	494.27%	8.43%				8.43%	3,873
1	Inyo	27,489	79,264	288.35%	8.43%				8.43%	6,678
1	Plumas	39,749	95,777	240.95%	8.43%				8.43%	8,069
1	Sierra	4,595	11,000	239.42%	8.43%				8.43%	927
2	Nevada	135,724	316,593	233.26%		17.85%			17.85%	56,513
1	Colusa	20,730	45,691	220.41%	8.43%				8.43%	3,850
1	Mariposa	35,342	75,216	212.82%	8.43%				8.43%	6,337
1	Amador	73,760	140,250	190.14%	8.43%				8.43%	11,816
1	San Benito	86,478	135,384	156.55%	8.43%				8.43%	11,406
2	Tuolumne	104,455	158,566	151.80%		17.85%			17.85%	28,305
1	Glenn	83,419	120,030	143.89%	8.43%				8.43%	10,113
1	Calaveras	109,761	132,667	120.87%	8.43%				8.43%	11,177
3	Sonoma	429,281	477,253	111.17%		17.85%			17.85%	85,192
2	Santa Cruz	168,509	186,631	110.75%		17.85%			17.85%	33,314
4	Santa Clara	1,551,874	1,697,087	109.36%		17.85%			17.85%	302,937
2	Siskiyou	117,625	124,720	106.03%		17.85%			17.85%	22,263
2	Shasta	399,474	398,675	99.80%		17.85%			17.85%	71,165
2	Yuba	228,887	203,149	88.76%		17.85%			17.85%	36,263
2	Marin	139,003	120,757	86.87%		17.85%			17.85%	21,556
3	Contra Costa	973,086	835,291	85.84%		17.85%			17.85%	149,103
3	Santa Barbara	554,070	458,012	82.66%		17.85%			17.85%	81,757
3	San Mateo	453,725	372,835	82.17%		17.85%			17.85%	66,553
2	Lake	185,197	148,425	80.14%		17.85%			17.85%	26,495
2	Placer	411,054	328,758	79.98%		17.85%			17.85%	58,685
4	San Francisco	1,107,735	863,471	77.95%		17.85%			17.85%	154,133
2	San Luis Obispo	293,214	220,725	75.28%		17.85%			17.85%	39,400
2	El Dorado	290,358	203,169	69.97%		17.85%			17.85%	36,267
2	Mendocino	233,717	162,914	69.71%		17.85%			17.85%	29,081
2	Kings	419,007	289,538	69.10%		17.85%			17.85%	51,684
3	Tulare	782,899	534,195	68.23%		17.85%			17.85%	95,356
2	Butte	465,533	287,042	61.66%		17.85%			17.85%	51,238
1	Lassen	98,431	60,000	60.96%	8.43%				8.43%	5,055
2	Sutter	321,148	192,235	59.86%		17.85%			17.85%	34,315
3	Stanislaus	1,263,676	737,802	58.39%		17.85%			17.85%	131,701
3	Solano	874,487	493,537	56.44%		17.85%			17.85%	88,098
2	Merced	936,592	516,419	55.14%		17.85%			17.85%	92,183
2	Napa	189,565	100,465	53.00%		17.85%			17.85%	17,933
4	Orange	4,339,981	2,199,809	50.69%		17.85%			17.85%	392,675
3	Fresno	3,143,939	1,547,773	49.23%		17.85%			17.85%	276,284
3	Monterey	788,655	375,757	47.65%			16.85%		16.85%	63,317
2	Madera	436,283	205,992	47.22%			16.85%		16.85%	34,710
3	Ventura	1,181,896	555,211	46.98%			16.85%		16.85%	93,555
2	Humboldt	251,220	117,835	46.91%			16.85%		16.85%	19,856
4	San Diego	3,746,939	1,755,653	46.86%			16.85%		16.85%	295,835
1	Trinity	41,798	18,900	45.22%	8.43%				8.43%	1,592
3	San Joaquin	1,616,992	719,254	44.48%				15.85%	15.85%	114,005
2	Tehama	224,963	98,961	43.99%				15.85%	15.85%	15,686
2	Yolo	457,344	199,702	43.67%				15.85%	15.85%	31,654
4	Alameda	2,621,376	1,119,358	42.70%				15.85%	15.85%	177,423
4	San Bernardino	7,550,076	2,698,328	35.74%				15.85%	15.85%	427,696
1	Del Norte	142,611	50,404	35.34%	8.43%				8.43%	4,247
4	Los Angeles	16,130,495	5,554,479	34.43%				15.85%	15.85%	880,408
3	Kern	2,205,847	704,023	31.92%				15.85%	15.85%	111,591
4	Sacramento	3,437,294	1,096,727	31.91%				15.85%	15.85%	173,836
2	Imperial	635,749	173,631	27.31%				15.85%	15.85%	27,521
4	Riverside	5,097,627	1,055,625	20.71%				15.85%	15.85%	167,321
1	Modoc	24,662			8.43%				8.43%	
1	Alpine	1,103			8.43%				8.43%	
	Total	67,695,798	31,616,936	46.70%						5,250,000

Attachment A2

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

Attachment B1

Child Support Commissioner Final FY 2020-21 Allocations						
	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	941,935	549,815	362,878	186,937	1,491,750	1,304,813
Alpine (see El Dorado)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amador	128,434	45,736	30,186	15,550	174,170	158,620
Butte	235,804	0	0	0	235,804	235,804
Calaveras	121,490	10,000	6,600	3,400	131,490	128,090
Colusa	41,841	20,809	13,734	7,075	62,650	55,575
Contra Costa	686,188	0	0	0	686,188	686,188
Del Norte	46,158	29,023	19,155	9,868	75,181	65,313
El Dorado	166,902	100,382	66,252	34,130	267,284	233,154
Fresno	1,271,489	843,800	556,908	286,892	2,115,289	1,828,397
Glenn	109,917	63,012	41,588	21,424	172,929	151,505
Humboldt	97,979	59,801	39,469	20,332	157,780	137,448
Imperial	146,110	99,977	65,985	33,992	246,087	212,095
Inyo	72,586	45,640	30,122	15,518	118,226	102,708
Kern	592,432	405,377	267,548	137,828	997,809	859,980
Kings	237,854	166,716	110,033	56,683	404,570	347,887
Lake	121,931	37,000	24,420	12,580	158,931	146,351
Lassen	54,945	0	0	0	54,945	54,945
Los Angeles	4,674,071	3,198,270	2,110,858	1,087,412	7,872,341	6,784,929
Madera	171,281	83,000	54,780	28,220	254,281	226,061
Marin	99,201	34,980	23,087	11,893	134,181	122,288
Mariposa	68,879	0	0	0	68,879	68,879
Mendocino	133,833	51,250	33,825	17,425	185,083	167,658
Merced	424,236	297,354	196,254	101,100	721,590	620,490
Modoc	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mono	42,101	5,000	3,300	1,700	47,101	45,401
Monterey	312,440	100,556	66,367	34,189	412,996	378,807
Napa	82,531	0	0	0	82,531	82,531
Nevada	260,080	0	0	0	260,080	260,080
Orange	1,807,134	326,142	215,254	110,888	2,133,276	2,022,388
Placer	270,074	51,092	33,721	17,371	321,166	303,795
Plumas	87,708	0	0	0	87,708	87,708
Riverside	888,304	244,375	161,288	83,088	1,132,679	1,049,592
Sacramento	922,891	500,000	330,000	170,000	1,422,891	1,252,891
San Benito	123,978	30,000	19,800	10,200	153,978	143,778
San Bernardino	2,270,632	1,393,318	919,590	473,728	3,663,950	3,190,222
San Diego	1,459,818	1,010,905	667,197	343,708	2,470,723	2,127,015
San Francisco	709,338	441,796	291,585	150,211	1,151,134	1,000,923
San Joaquin	605,249	50,000	33,000	17,000	655,249	638,249
San Luis Obispo	181,324	127,093	83,881	43,212	308,417	265,205
San Mateo	306,282	214,678	141,687	72,991	520,960	447,969
Santa Barbara	376,255	149,724	98,818	50,906	525,979	475,073
Santa Clara	1,394,150	977,183	644,941	332,242	2,371,333	2,039,091
Santa Cruz	153,316	36,000	23,760	12,240	189,316	177,076
Shasta	327,510	205,874	135,877	69,997	533,384	463,387
Sierra (see Nevada)	10,073	0	0	0	10,073	10,073
Siskiyou	102,457	0	0	0	102,457	102,457
Solano	405,438	95,481	63,017	32,464	500,919	468,455
Sonoma	392,061	221,104	145,929	75,175	613,165	537,990
Stanislaus	606,102	260,000	171,600	88,400	866,102	777,702
Sutter	157,920	63,487	41,901	21,586	221,407	199,821
Tehama	83,276	56,982	37,608	19,374	140,258	120,884
Trinity (see Shasta)	17,308	0	0	0	17,308	17,308
Tulare	438,839	68,348	45,110	23,238	507,187	483,949
Tuolumne	130,261	78,346	51,708	26,638	208,607	181,969
Ventura	461,656	106,527	70,308	36,219	568,183	531,964
Yolo	168,048	33,000	21,780	11,220	201,048	189,828
Yuba	166,886	50,000	33,000	17,000	216,886	199,886
Total	26,366,936	13,038,953	8,605,709	4,433,244	39,405,888	34,972,645

CSC Base Funds	26,366,936
CSC Federal Drawdown	13,038,953
Total Funding Allocated	39,405,889

Attachment B2

Family Law Facilitator Final FY 2020-21 Allocations						
	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	302,087	247,743	163,510	84,233	549,830	465,598
Alpine (see El Dorado)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amador	43,083	4,701	3,103	1,598	47,784	46,185
Butte	84,694	61,250	40,425	20,825	145,944	125,119
Calaveras	64,925	8,000	5,280	2,720	72,925	70,205
Colusa	32,713	8,900	5,874	3,026	41,613	38,587
Contra Costa	287,587	0	0	0	287,587	287,587
Del Norte	45,947	5,971	3,941	2,030	51,918	49,888
El Dorado	88,258	50,384	33,253	17,131	138,642	121,512
Fresno	328,405	186,596	123,153	63,443	515,001	451,558
Glenn	69,660	0	0	0	69,660	69,660
Humboldt	74,232	9,774	6,451	3,323	84,006	80,683
Imperial	44,001	36,086	23,817	12,269	80,087	67,818
Inyo	52,548	27,171	17,933	9,238	79,719	70,480
Kern	295,597	200,000	132,000	68,000	495,597	427,597
Kings	48,686	32,000	21,120	10,880	80,686	69,806
Lake	47,917	26,836	17,712	9,124	74,753	65,629
Lassen	59,729	0	0	0	59,729	59,729
Los Angeles	1,573,141	803,431	530,264	273,167	2,376,572	2,103,405
Madera	67,248	25,383	16,753	8,630	92,631	84,001
Marin	113,681	0	0	0	113,681	113,681
Mariposa	41,709	0	0	0	41,709	41,709
Mendocino	50,325	30,000	19,800	10,200	80,325	70,125
Merced	82,274	67,473	44,532	22,941	149,747	126,806
Modoc	65,188	1,247	823	424	66,435	66,011
Mono	44,333	1,350	891	459	45,683	45,224
Monterey	100,453	57,179	37,738	19,441	157,632	138,191
Napa	51,455	40,000	26,400	13,600	91,455	77,855
Nevada	96,559	0	0	0	96,559	96,559
Orange	447,139	114,738	75,727	39,011	561,877	522,866
Placer	74,599	0	0	0	74,599	74,599
Plumas	51,300	7,803	5,150	2,653	59,103	56,450
Riverside	553,871	218,500	144,210	74,290	772,371	698,081
Sacramento	257,689	211,331	139,478	71,853	469,020	397,167
San Benito	55,400	29,151	19,240	9,911	84,551	74,639
San Bernardino	382,327	313,548	206,942	106,606	695,875	589,269
San Diego	504,344	253,614	167,385	86,229	757,958	671,729
San Francisco	204,136	113,795	75,105	38,690	317,931	279,241
San Joaquin	178,248	78,238	51,637	26,601	256,486	229,885
San Luis Obispo	55,775	32,246	21,282	10,964	88,021	77,057
San Mateo	105,540	86,554	57,126	29,428	192,094	162,666
Santa Barbara	142,084	77,323	51,033	26,290	219,407	193,117
Santa Clara	370,843	210,712	139,070	71,642	581,555	509,913
Santa Cruz	61,872	43,000	28,380	14,620	104,872	90,252
Shasta	154,354	111,913	73,863	38,050	266,267	228,217
Sierra (see Nevada)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Siskiyou	62,134	35,000	23,100	11,900	97,134	85,234
Solano	107,430	39,710	26,209	13,501	147,140	133,638
Sonoma	114,980	65,519	43,243	22,276	180,499	158,222
Stanislaus	182,333	120,000	79,200	40,800	302,333	261,533
Sutter	55,177	31,409	20,730	10,679	86,586	75,907
Tehama	22,718	3,535	2,333	1,202	26,253	25,051
Trinity (see Shasta)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tulare	256,262	132,293	87,313	44,980	388,555	343,575
Tuolumne	53,714	30,084	19,855	10,229	83,798	73,569
Ventura	210,346	77,864	51,390	26,474	288,210	261,737
Yolo	63,760	35,377	23,349	12,028	99,137	87,109
Yuba	54,814	44,953	29,669	15,284	99,767	84,483
Total	9,039,626	4,449,685	2,936,792	1,512,893	13,489,311	11,976,418

FLF Base Funds	9,039,626
FLF Federal Drawdown	4,449,685
Total	13,489,311