



Judicial Council of California

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 24-123

For business meeting on July 12, 2024

Title

Collaborative Justice: Fiscal Year 2024–25
Substance Abuse Focus Grant and
Dependency Drug Court Augmentation
Grant Funding

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

July 12, 2024

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

June 18, 2024

Recommended by

Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory
Committee
Hon. Lawrence G. Brown, Chair

Contact

Carrie Zoller, 415-865-8829,
carrie.zoller@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council allocate the Substance Abuse Focus Grant Program’s fiscal year (FY) 2024–25 funds to the trial courts using the population-based methodology approved in September 2023. The Budget Act of 2024 allocated \$1.16 million for the Substance Abuse Focus Grant 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 FY 2024–25 to fund dependency drug courts.

Recommendation

The Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 12, 2024, approve the distribution of grants from the Collaborative Justice Courts Substance Abuse Focus Grant Program and the Dependency Drug Court Augmentation for fiscal year 2024–25 to courts as allocated by the population-based methodology approved at the Judicial Council meeting on September 19, 2023.

The proposed distribution is detailed in Attachment A, *Substance Abuse Focus Grant Allocation Summary: Fiscal Years 2023–24 and 2024–25*.

Relevant Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council has approved the annual funding allocation for the Substance Abuse Focus Grant Program since fiscal year (FY) 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 Substance Abuse Focus Grant (SAFG) funds as an augmentation for that type of collaborative court.

Analysis/Rationale

This year’s funding authorization for the annual grant comes from a legislative mandate under California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects in the Budget Act of 2024 (Stats. 2024, ch. 12), as referenced in item 0250-101-0001.

This recommendation allocates the funding for FY 2024–25 using the formula approved in 2023 by the Judicial Council. The 2024–25 State Budget allocates \$1,160,000 for these programs.

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).

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

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), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12245946&GUID=FA7EBFBD-2A0D-4C7F-80CA-DD469942784B>.

on the population of 18-to-24-year-olds in their county² and augments each court's base figure based on the county's proportion of the 18-to-24-year-old population.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 2023 Judicial Council meeting. 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 their calculated allocation. Funds waived during the application process will be proportionally reallocated to courts indicating that they are able to utilize additional funding.

For the 2023–24 fiscal year, the \$1.16 million allocation supported 258 court programs in 45 superior courts. The programs funded were adult domestic violence courts (4), adult drug courts (47), adult mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (31), community courts (3), dependency drug courts (29), DUI (driving under the influence) courts (13), DUI Court in School programs (6), elder courts (1), girls' courts (3), homeless courts (4), juvenile delinquency drug courts (7), juvenile mental health/dual-diagnosis courts (6), peer/youth courts (37), Proposition 36 (4), reentry courts (11), truancy courts (5), veterans courts (23), veterans stand down (3), and other collaborative justice court programs (21).

Dependency Drug Court Augmentation Grant

Federal Court Improvement Program funds totaling \$75,000 are available to support dependency drug courts in courts also funded by the SAFG Program. In past years, the Judicial Council has made these grants available through a formula distribution available to all eligible courts requesting funding through the SAFG Program for the purpose of implementing, maintaining, enhancing, or expanding their dependency drug courts. These funds augment the SAFG awards and are awarded in proportion to the allocations of the courts applying for dependency drug court funding, as described 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 30, 2024. Forty-five courts

² The population data is extracted from U.S. Census Bureau, 2019 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates, Table S0101, Age and Sex, <https://data.census.gov/table/ACSST1Y2021.S0101?q=S0101:+AGE+AND+SEX>.

³ Population size is calculated by summing up 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.

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

No alternatives were considered because the recommended allocations were calculated using the funding methodology approved by the Judicial Council.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This year, continuous process improvements include transitioning the grant allocation to a set amount of predetermined funding utilizing 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: Fiscal Years 2023–24 and 2024–25*
2. Attachment B: *Guiding Principles of Collaborative Justice Courts*

**Substance Abuse Focus Grant Allocation Summary:
Fiscal Years 2023–24 and 2024–25**

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

	County	FY 23–24 Allocation Based on Formula	FY 23–24 Final SAFG Funding Allocation	FY 23–24 DDC Augmentation Allocation	FY 23–24 Total Allocation (SAFG + DDC)	FY 24–25 Allocation Based on Formula	FY 24–25 Final SAFG Funding Allocation	FY 24–25 DDC Augmentation Allocation	FY 24–25 Total Allocation (SAFG + DDC)
1	Alameda	\$30,619.19	\$37,390.20	\$4,803.75	\$42,193.95	\$30,619.19	\$35,732.57	\$5,094.14	\$40,826.71
2	Amador	\$20,000.00	\$21,863.40	-	\$21,863.40	\$20,000.00	\$20,770.23	-	\$20,770.23
3	Butte	\$22,467.17	\$19,665.57	-	\$19,665.57	\$22,467.17	\$20,555.21	-	\$20,555.21
4	Del Norte	\$20,000.00	\$17,790.55	-	\$17,790.55	\$20,000.00	\$18,536.94	-	\$18,536.94
5	El Dorado	\$21,025.61	\$21,752.15	-	\$21,752.15	\$21,025.61	\$21,237.49	-	\$21,237.49
6	Fresno	\$27,656.18	\$39,978.95	-	\$39,978.95	\$27,656.18	\$38,191.88	-	\$38,191.88
7	Glenn	\$20,000.00	\$28,652.95	-	\$28,652.95	\$20,000.00	\$27,432.18	-	\$27,432.18
8	Humboldt	\$21,331.90	\$23,588.60	\$3,030.58	\$26,619.17	\$21,331.90	\$22,621.05	-	\$22,621.05
9	Inyo	\$20,000.00	\$16,139.15	-	\$16,139.15	\$20,000.00	\$17,285.04	-	\$17,285.04
10	Kings	\$21,278.87	\$16,255.06	-	\$16,255.06	\$21,278.87	\$17,682.29	-	\$17,682.29
11	Lassen	\$20,000.00	\$16,139.15	-	\$16,139.15	\$20,000.00	\$17,285.04	-	\$17,285.04
12	Los Angeles	\$92,937.37	\$26,722.03	\$3,433.15	\$30,155.18	\$92,937.37	\$42,952.62	\$6,123.45	\$49,076.07
13	Madera	\$21,142.42	\$17,894.09	-	\$17,894.09	\$21,142.42	\$18,891.80	-	\$18,891.80
14	Marin	\$21,353.73	\$16,261.84	-	\$16,261.84	\$21,353.73	\$17,705.54	-	\$17,705.54
15	Mendocino	\$20,000.00	\$20,111.25	\$2,583.82	\$22,695.06	\$20,000.00	\$20,211.88	\$2,881.46	\$23,093.34
16	Merced	\$22,443.92	\$13,057.84	\$1,677.62	\$14,735.47	\$22,443.92	\$15,540.38	\$2,215.48	\$17,755.86
17	Modoc	\$20,000.00	\$20,111.25	\$2,583.82	\$22,695.06	\$20,000.00	\$20,211.88	\$2,881.46	\$23,093.34
18	Monterey	\$23,377.46	\$28,764.20	-	\$28,764.20	\$23,377.46	\$27,537.87	-	\$27,537.87
19	Nevada	\$20,000.00	\$21,752.15	-	\$21,752.15	\$20,000.00	\$20,876.42	-	\$20,876.42
20	Orange	\$42,469.95	\$39,644.91	-	\$39,644.91	\$42,469.95	\$40,540.22	-	\$40,540.22
21	Plumas	\$20,000.00	\$16,139.15	-	\$16,139.15	\$20,000.00	\$17,285.04	-	\$17,285.04
22	Riverside	\$38,067.43	\$10,025.00	-	\$10,025.00	\$38,067.43	\$17,020.86	-	\$17,020.86
23	Sacramento	\$30,313.53	\$37,390.20	\$4,803.75	\$42,193.95	\$30,313.53	\$35,732.57	\$5,094.14	\$40,826.71
24	San Benito	-	-	-	-	\$20,000.00	\$20,211.88	-	\$20,211.88
25	San Bernardino	\$37,236.56	\$39,978.95	-	\$39,978.95	\$37,236.56	\$38,191.88	-	\$38,191.88
26	San Diego	\$46,014.03	\$39,966.00	\$5,134.70	\$45,100.70	\$46,014.03	\$41,641.01	\$5,936.46	\$47,577.47
27	San Francisco	\$24,616.66	\$39,978.95	\$5,136.35	\$45,115.29	\$24,616.66	\$38,191.88	\$5,444.74	\$43,636.62
28	San Joaquin	\$25,773.62	\$39,978.95	\$5,136.35	\$45,115.29	\$25,773.62	\$38,191.88	\$5,444.74	\$43,636.62
29	San Luis Obispo	\$23,317.60	\$31,352.00	\$4,027.99	\$35,379.98	\$23,317.60	\$29,996.28	\$4,276.35	\$34,272.63
30	San Mateo	\$24,320.20	\$28,764.20	-	\$28,764.20	\$24,320.20	\$27,537.87	-	\$27,537.87
31	Santa Barbara	\$25,440.94	\$27,039.00	-	\$27,039.00	\$25,440.94	\$25,898.93	-	\$25,898.93
32	Santa Clara	\$32,614.87	\$39,978.95	\$5,136.35	\$45,115.29	\$32,614.87	\$38,191.88	\$5,444.74	\$43,636.62
33	Santa Cruz	\$23,155.39	\$37,390.20	\$4,803.75	\$42,193.95	\$23,155.39	\$35,732.57	\$5,094.14	\$40,826.71
34	Shasta	\$21,076.44	\$27,039.00	-	\$27,039.00	\$21,076.44	\$25,898.93	-	\$25,898.93

Attachment A

	County	FY 23–24 Allocation Based on Formula	FY 23–24 Final SAFG Funding Allocation	FY 23–24 DDC Augmentation Allocation	FY 23–24 Total Allocation (SAFG + DDC)	FY 24–25 Allocation Based on Formula	FY 24–25 Final SAFG Funding Allocation	FY 24–25 DDC Augmentation Allocation	FY 24–25 Total Allocation (SAFG + DDC)
35	Sierra	\$20,000.00	\$16,139.15	-	\$16,139.15	\$20,000.00	\$17,285.04	-	\$17,285.04
36	Siskiyou	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$2,569.53	\$22,569.53	\$20,000.00	\$17,000.00	\$2,423.57	\$19,423.57
37	Solano	\$23,022.55	\$31,352.00	\$4,027.99	\$35,379.98	\$23,022.55	\$29,996.28	\$4,276.35	\$34,272.63
38	Sonoma	\$23,083.82	\$32,214.60	\$4,138.81	\$36,353.41	\$23,083.82	\$30,815.75	\$4,393.18	\$35,208.93
39	Stanislaus	\$24,050.99	\$15,680.61	\$2,014.59	\$17,695.20	\$24,050.99	\$17,917.44	-	\$17,917.44
40	Sutter	\$20,000.00	\$17,790.55	-	\$17,790.55	\$20,000.00	\$18,536.94	-	\$18,536.94
41	Tehama	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	\$2,569.53	\$22,569.53	\$20,000.00	\$20,000.00	-	\$20,000.00
41	Tulare	\$23,725.62	\$27,039.00	-	\$27,039.00	\$23,725.62	\$20,000.00	-	\$20,000.00
42	Tuolumne	\$20,000.00	\$20,111.25	\$2,583.82	\$22,695.06	\$20,000.00	\$20,211.88	\$2,881.46	\$23,093.34
43	Ventura	\$26,066.00	\$37,390.20	\$4,803.75	\$42,193.95	\$26,066.00	\$35,732.57	\$5,094.14	\$40,826.71
44	Yuba	\$20,000.00	\$21,863.40	-	\$21,863.40	\$20,000.00	\$20,982.11	-	\$20,982.11
45	Total	\$1,160,000	\$1,160,000	\$75,000	\$1,235,000	\$1,160,000	\$1,160,000	\$75,000	\$1,235,000

Note: FY = fiscal year. San Benito did not apply for SAFG/DDC funding in FY 23–24.

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.