



Judicial Council of California

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

courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 26-101

For business meeting on July 17, 2026

Collaborative Justice: Fiscal Year 2026–27 Substance Abuse Focus Grant and Dependency Drug Court Augmentation Grant Funding

Judicial Council Report Details

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Effective Date

July 17, 2026

Recommended by

Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory
Committee

Hon. Charles A. Smiley III, Chair

Date of Report

June 23, 2026

Contact

Carrie Zoller, 415-865-8829

carrie.zoller@jud.ca.gov

Report Type

Action Required

Executive Summary

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council allocate the Collaborative Justice Courts Substance Abuse Focus Grant (SAFG) Program's fiscal year 2026–27 funds to the trial courts using the population-based methodology approved in September 2023. The Budget Act of 2026 allocated \$1.16 million for the SAFG Program to the superior courts to maintain, expand, or enhance collaborative courts. A total of \$75,000 in federal Court Improvement Program funds is also available in fiscal year 2026–27 to fund dependency drug courts.

Recommendation

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 17, 2026, approve the distribution of grants from the SAFG Program and the Dependency Drug Court Augmentation for fiscal year 2026–27 to courts as allocated by the

population-based methodology approved at the Judicial Council meeting on September 19, 2023, as outlined below. The proposed distribution is detailed in Attachment A, Substance Abuse Focus Grant Allocation Summary: FY 2025–26 and FY 2026–27.

Relevant Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council has approved the annual funding allocation for the Substance Abuse Focus Grant Program since fiscal year 1998–99. In September 2023, at the recommendation of the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee, the council approved a population-based funding-level formula for distributing the funds.¹ Beginning in July 2014, grant funds from the Court Improvement Program of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, have been distributed every year to dependency drug courts receiving SAFG funds as an augmentation for that type of collaborative court.

Analysis/Rationale

Any court with an existing or planned collaborative justice program is eligible for funding. All courts that meet the grant criteria receive a base funding amount of \$20,000 per county. This base figure may be adjusted upward or downward to reflect the actual amount of total funding approved by the Legislature for the year and the number of courts eligible for grants from those funds. The funding formula then determines the amount of funding a court is eligible for based on the population of 18-to-24-year-olds in their county² and augments each court's base figure according to the county's proportion of 18-to-24-year-olds.³

To ensure that courts with existing collaborative justice programs funded by the SAFG Program have adequate time to adjust their operations to the new allocation methodology, there is a 5 percent maximum threshold applied to annual decreases if the new allocation methodology results in a court receiving less funding than it has historically received. For courts whose allocation increases from the previous year, the increase will be prorated based on the remaining funding and calculated using the population-based methodology approved at the Judicial Council meeting in September 2023. Adjustments will continue annually until affected courts arrive at the new methodology baseline.

Although uncommon, occasionally a court does not want to receive the full amount of funding for which it is eligible. The grant application allows courts to elect to receive less funding than

¹ Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., [*Collaborative Justice: Revised Allocation Methodology for Fiscal Year 2023–24 Substance Abuse Focus Grants*](#) (Aug. 24, 2023).

² The population data is extracted from U.S. Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, [Table S0101, Age and Sex](#).

³ Population size is calculated by summing the 18-to-24-year-old population for courts that applied for SAFG funding. Then each court's 18-to-24-year-old population is divided by the total number of 18-to-24-year-olds across all SAFG-funded courts to calculate the percentage of the total SAFG population of 18-to-24-year-olds.

their calculated allocation. Funds waived during the application process will be proportionally reallocated to courts indicating that they are able to utilize additional funding.

As in previous years, grants are awarded to all proposed programs that meet the following criteria:

- Consistency with both the California Standards of Judicial Administration and the Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts (see Attachment B);
- Involvement of a local steering committee; and
- Fulfillment of statistical and financial reporting requirements for previous grant funding periods (if applicable).

For the 2025–26 fiscal year, the \$1.16 million allocation supported 201 court programs in 45 superior courts. The programs funded were adult domestic violence courts (5), adult drug courts (33), adult mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (27), community courts (3), dependency drug courts (21), driving under the influence (DUI) courts (10), DUI Court in School programs (3), girls' courts (3), homeless courts (4), juvenile delinquency drug courts (5), juvenile mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (5), peer/youth courts (6), Proposition 36 (13), reentry courts (8), truancy courts (4), veterans courts (21), veterans stand-downs (3), and other collaborative justice court programs (27).

Dependency Drug Court Augmentation Grant

A total of \$75,000 in Federal Court Improvement Program funds is available to support dependency drug courts that also receive SAFG Program funding. Historically, the Judicial Council has distributed these grants using a formula-based model for all eligible courts seeking to implement, maintain, or expand their dependency drug or family treatment court program. These funds supplement SAFG awards and are distributed in proportion to each court's allocation, as detailed in Attachment A.

Application process

The presiding judges and court executive officers of the superior courts were informed of this year's grant opportunity and new funding methodology on April 3, 2026. Forty-four courts submitted program action plans that staff of the Judicial Council's Center for Families, Children & the Courts reviewed for conformance with the requirements of addressing substance abuse issues and adhering to collaborative justice court principles (see Attachment B, Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts).

Policy implications

The recommended action is consistent with the current Judicial Council policy regarding allocating these funds to local courts.

Comments

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

Alternatives considered

The committee considered modifying the allocation methodology to provide larger awards to fewer counties. While this would provide a greater benefit to counties receiving the award, the grant would become a competitive grant, with fewer counties being selected as recipients, resulting in a loss of funding for several courts whose collaborative justice programs depend on this funding source for operation. Ultimately, it was decided to continue with the current allocation method because it results in serving the greatest number of collaborative justice courts.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This year, continuous process improvements include continued transitioning of the grant allocation to a set amount of predetermined funding using the population-based methodology, continuation of a paperless online process in which courts submit funding request information, and staff monitoring a detailed budget through an online system.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Substance Abuse Focus Grant Allocation Summary: FY 2025–26 and FY 2026–27
2. Attachment B: Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts

**Substance Abuse Focus Grant Allocation Summary:
FY 2025–26 and FY 2026–27**

Collaborative Justice Courts Project—Substance Abuse Focus Grant (SAFG) and
Dependency Drug Court (DDC) Augmentation Awards (by Court)

	County	FY 2025–26 Allocation Based on Formula	FY 2025–26 Final SAFG Funding Allocation	FY 2025–26 DDC Augmentation Allocation	FY 2025–26 Total Allocation (SAFG + DDC)	FY 2026–27 Allocation Based on Formula	FY 2026–27 Final SAFG Funding Allocation	FY 2026–27 DDC Augmentation Allocation	FY 2026–27 Total Allocation (SAFG + DDC)
1	Alameda	\$30,390.96	\$33,973.89	\$4,237.70	\$38,211.59	\$31,098	\$32,277	\$4,644	\$36,921
2	Amador	\$20,172.03	\$20,199.98	-	\$20,199.98	\$20,184	\$20,184	-	\$20,184
3	Butte	\$22,402.31	\$20,996.21	-	\$20,996.21	\$22,571	\$21,741	-	\$21,741
4	Contra Costa	-	-	-	-	\$27,881	\$23,726	-	\$23,726
5	Del Norte	\$20,135.78	\$18,922.43	-	\$18,922.43	\$20,139	\$19,498	-	\$19,498
6	El Dorado	\$20,995.38	\$21,023.33	-	\$21,023.33	\$21,069	\$21,069	-	\$21,069
7	Fresno	\$27,704.78	\$36,310.24	-	\$36,310.24	\$28,318	\$34,494	-	\$34,494
8	Glenn	\$20,197.97	\$26,088.52	-	\$26,088.52	\$20,212	\$24,785	-	\$24,785
9	Humboldt	\$21,287.88	\$21,517.95	\$2,684.02	\$24,201.97	\$21,376	\$21,376	\$3,076	\$24,452
10	Inyo	\$20,086.21	\$17,939.40	-	\$17,939.40	\$20,101	\$18,961	-	\$18,961
11	Kings	\$21,261.95	\$18,510.73	-	\$18,510.73	\$21,350	\$19,853	-	\$19,853
12	Lassen	\$20,180.12	\$17,960.39	-	\$17,960.39	-	-	-	-
13	Los Angeles	\$89,708.28	\$53,436.16	\$6,665.30	\$60,101.46	\$94,015	\$72,618	\$10,449	\$83,067
14	Madera	\$21,193.18	\$19,434.39	-	\$19,434.39	\$21,341	\$20,337	-	\$20,337
15	Marin	\$21,411.77	\$18,562.29	-	\$18,562.29	\$21,547	\$19,973	-	\$19,973
16	Mendocino	\$20,505.70	\$20,533.65	\$2,561.24	\$23,094.89	\$20,531	\$20,531	\$2,954	\$23,485
17	Merced	\$22,448.31	\$17,113.10	\$2,134.58	\$19,247.68	\$22,779	\$19,792	-	\$19,792
18	Modoc	\$20,043.38	\$20,071.33	\$2,503.58	\$22,574.91	\$20,046	\$20,046	\$2,884	\$22,930
19	Monterey	\$23,438.93	\$26,188.93	-	\$26,188.93	\$23,730	\$24,880	-	\$24,880
20	Nevada	\$20,452.96	\$20,000.00	-	\$20,000.00	\$20,471	\$20,471	-	\$20,471
21	Orange	\$42,533.06	\$42,561.01	-	\$42,561.01	\$44,000	\$44,000	-	\$44,000
22	Plumas	\$20,076.85	\$17,937.30	-	\$17,937.30	\$20,077	\$18,949	-	\$18,949
23	Riverside	\$38,135.95	\$21,770.62	-	\$21,770.62	\$39,639	\$30,218	-	\$30,218
24	Sacramento	\$30,412.69	\$33,973.89	\$4,237.70	\$38,211.59	\$31,210	\$32,277	\$4,644	\$36,921
25	San Benito	\$20,458.91	\$20,486.86	-	\$20,486.86	\$20,503	\$20,503	-	\$20,503
26	San Bernardino	\$37,179.04	\$37,206.99	-	\$37,206.99	\$38,262	\$38,262		\$38,262
27	San Diego	\$45,338.76	\$42,495.86	\$5,300.67	\$47,796.53	\$47,166	\$44,704	\$6,432	\$51,136
28	San Francisco	\$24,152.43	\$36,310.24	\$4,529.12	\$40,839.36	\$24,665	\$34,494	\$4,963	\$39,457
29	San Joaquin	\$25,840.69	\$36,310.24	\$4,529.12	\$40,839.36	\$26,343	\$34,495	\$4,963	\$39,458
30	San Luis Obispo	\$23,306.48	\$28,524.42	\$3,557.96	\$32,082.38	\$23,561	\$27,098	\$3,899	\$30,997
31	San Mateo	\$24,273.62	\$26,188.93	-	\$26,188.93	\$24,621	\$24,880	-	\$24,880
32	Santa Barbara	\$25,227.60	\$25,255.55	-	\$25,255.55	\$25,596	\$25,596	-	\$25,596

	County	FY 2025–26 Allocation Based on Formula	FY 2025–26 Final SAFG Funding Allocation	FY 2025–26 DDC Augmentation Allocation	FY 2025–26 Total Allocation (SAFG + DDC)	FY 2026–27 Allocation Based on Formula	FY 2026–27 Final SAFG Funding Allocation	FY 2026–27 DDC Augmentation Allocation	FY 2026–27 Total Allocation (SAFG + DDC)
33	Santa Clara	\$33,194.35	\$36,310.24	\$4,529.12	\$40,839.36	\$33,979	\$34,495	\$4,963	\$39,458
34	Santa Cruz	\$22,889.53	\$33,973.89	\$4,237.70	\$38,211.59	\$23,167	\$32,275	\$4,644	\$36,919
35	Shasta	\$21,044.00	\$24,631.93	-	\$24,631.93	\$21,137	\$23,401	-	\$23,401
36	Sierra	\$20,015.70	\$17,923.63	\$2,235.68	\$20,159.31	\$20,022	\$18,916	\$2,722	\$21,638
37	Siskiyou	\$20,223.98	\$17,000.00	\$2,120.48	\$19,120.48	\$20,222	\$18,523	-	\$18,523
38	Solano	\$22,968.69	\$28,524.42	\$3,557.96	\$32,082.38	\$23,178	\$27,097	\$3,899	\$30,996
39	Sonoma	\$23,014.13	\$29,302.91	\$3,655.07	\$32,957.98	\$23,224	\$27,839	\$4,006	\$31,845
40	Stanislaus	\$24,072.72	\$19,321.85	\$2,410.09	\$21,731.94	\$24,434	\$21,739	-	\$21,739
41	Sutter	\$20,676.94	\$19,043.44	-	\$19,043.44	\$20,746	\$19,848	-	\$19,848
42	Tehama	\$20,380.94	\$20,380.94	\$2,542.19	\$22,923.13	\$20,411	\$20,411	\$2,937	\$23,348
43	Tulare	\$23,800.28	\$20,877.78	-	\$20,877.78	\$24,123	\$22,413	-	\$22,413
44	Tuolumne	\$20,279.42	\$20,307.37	\$2,533.02	\$22,840.39	\$20,298	\$20,298	\$2,921	\$23,219
45	Ventura	\$25,890.42	\$33,973.89	\$4,237.70	\$38,211.59	-	-	-	-
46	Yuba	\$20,594.93	\$20,622.88	-	\$20,622.88	\$20,657	\$20,657	-	\$20,657
	Total	\$1,160,000	\$1,160,000	\$75,000	\$1,235,000	\$1,160,000	\$1,160,000	\$75,000	\$1,235,000

Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts

Using the National Drug Court Institute's 10 key components of drug courts as a model, the Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee identified 11 essential components as the guiding principles of collaborative justice courts:

1. Integrate services with justice system processing;
2. Achieve the desired goals without the use of the traditional adversarial process;
3. Intervene early and promptly to place participants in the collaborative justice court program;
4. Provide access to a continuum of services, including treatment and rehabilitation services;
5. Use a coordinated strategy that governs the court's response to participant compliance, using a system of sanctions and incentives to foster compliance;
6. Use ongoing judicial interaction with each collaborative justice court participant;
7. Use monitoring and evaluation to measure the achievement of program goals and gauge effectiveness;
8. Ensure continuing interdisciplinary education;
9. Forge partnerships among collaborative justice courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations to increase the availability of services;
10. Enhance the program's effectiveness and generate local support; and
11. Emphasize team and individual commitments to cultural competency.