



# Judicial Council of California

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

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

## REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

*Item No.: 25-013*

For business meeting on April 25, 2025

---

**Title**

Juvenile Law: 2024–25 Allocations for  
Dependency Counsel Collections Program  
and Expected Unspent Program Funding

**Report Type**

Action Required

**Effective Date**

April 25, 2025

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**

None

**Date of Report**

March 19, 2025

**Recommended by**

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee  
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair  
Ms. Rebecca Fleming, Vice-Chair

**Contact**

Kelly Meehleib, 916-263-1693  
[kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov](mailto:kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends two redistributions of funding for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel for fiscal year (FY) 2024–25. Under the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program, courts collect reimbursements from parents and other responsible persons liable for the cost of dependency-related legal services to the extent that those persons are able to pay. The committee recommends that the Judicial Council allocate the FY 2023–24 statutorily restricted funds to the trial courts, calculated according to the methodology adopted by the council in 2013. The committee also recommends that the council reallocate unspent dependency counsel funding from courts that have identified funds they do not intend on spending to courts that are not fully funded to their need.

### Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective April 25, 2025:

1. Allocate Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program funds of \$363,458 remitted in FY 2023–24 (Attachment A); and

2. Allocate FY 2024–25 estimated unspent dependency counsel funding of \$843,000 from courts that have identified funds they do not intend on spending to courts that are not fully funded to their need (Attachment B).

These recommendations were presented to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee at its meeting on February 20, 2025, and approved for consideration by the Judicial Council.

## **Relevant Previous Council Action**

### **Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program**

At its meeting on October 26, 2012, the Judicial Council adopted the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) guidelines,<sup>1</sup> which fulfilled the council’s legislative mandate to establish a program to collect reimbursement from parents or minors demonstrating an ability to pay.<sup>2</sup> Additional amendments were adopted by the council at its meeting on August 23, 2013, regarding the issue of equitable allocation of funds remitted through the JDCCP.<sup>3</sup> The council then allocated funds remitted through the JDCCP for the first time at its meeting on February 20, 2014.<sup>4</sup> Since then, the council has allocated available funds to eligible trial courts annually.

### **Court-appointed counsel funding reallocation**

At its business meeting on April 17, 2015, the council approved a methodology for reallocating funds unspent by courts for court-appointed counsel in dependency cases.<sup>5</sup>

## **Analysis/Rationale**

### **Recommendation 1**

In FY 2023–24, the trial courts remitted a total of \$622,982. Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.47(a)(2) requires the council to allocate the remitted monies to the trial courts for the purpose of reducing court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council’s approved standard.

---

<sup>1</sup> The guidelines took effect January 1, 2013, and are published as Appendix F of the California Rules of Court. See [https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-08/appendix\\_f.pdf](https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-08/appendix_f.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program* (Sept. 14, 2012), [www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-itemA20.pdf](https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-itemA20.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program Guidelines* (Aug. 15, 2013), <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20130823-itemf.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Allocations: Criminal Justice Realignment, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel, and Workers’ Compensation Liabilities* (Feb. 10, 2014), <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20140220-itemj.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed–Counsel Funding Reallocation* (Apr. 8, 2015), <https://courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/courts/default/2024-10/jc-20150417-itemi.pdf>.

For a court to be eligible to receive an allocation of these funds, it must meet the participation and funding need requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines.<sup>6</sup> Every court that satisfies those requirements receives an allocation. The amount of JDCCP funds each eligible court receives is determined by the court's share of the aggregate funding need of all eligible courts. Estimates of courts' funding needs are computed using the dependency workload model approved by the council in April 2016<sup>7</sup> and then updated in July 2016<sup>8</sup> and July 2022.<sup>9</sup>

Attachment A displays the recommended allocation amount for each court.

## **Recommendation 2**

Program staff contacted trial courts<sup>10</sup> to inquire whether the court anticipated any unspent court-appointed counsel funding for FY 2024–25. Of those courts, five confirmed that they would not spend the full allocation and provided an estimate of unspent funding. Attachment B shows the total \$843,000 estimate and proposed reallocation. Under the reallocation methodology adopted at the Judicial Council business meeting on April 17, 2015, funds are reallocated proportionally by workload to courts that (1) did not remit unspent funds, and (2) are not fully funded to their need.

To ensure use of the reallocation funds, additional outreach to eligible trial courts was conducted to confirm the court's ability to completely expend funds during the fiscal year. Declined funds were placed back in the pool and reallocated to those courts eligible for and accepting additional funds.<sup>11</sup>

## **Policy implications**

The reallocation process was established to support courts in need of additional dependency counsel funds, when available.

---

<sup>6</sup> As described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines, a court can demonstrate its participation in the program by submitting annual reports as required under section 13 and by adopting a local rule or policy to inquire about a responsible person's ability to reimburse the cost of appointed counsel at each dispositional hearing.

<sup>7</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (Apr. 1, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF>.

<sup>8</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology Options* (July 18, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4572873&GUID=C33C7410-DDA2-451A-9004-024D84910504>.

<sup>9</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2022–23 Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding* (June 24, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11019079&GUID=CB0A2EE1-B3CF-43AC-B92B-F4724B5D209C>.

<sup>10</sup> Program staff contacted 38 of the 58 trial courts as the Judicial Council administers the court-appointed dependency counsel budget for the remaining 20 courts through the Dependency Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training program.

<sup>11</sup> On an annual basis, a small amount of court-appointed counsel funds remain unspent at the end of the fiscal year.

**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*****Recommendation 1***

Because the recommended allocation outlined in Attachment A was determined using the methodology approved by the council at its business meeting on August 23, 2013, no alternatives to this proposal were considered.

***Recommendation 2***

Because the recommended allocation outlined in Attachment B was determined using the methodology approved by the council at its business meeting on April 17, 2015, no alternatives to this proposal were considered.

**Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

This proposal is for the allocation of funds that have already been collected or included in the FY 2024–25 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

**Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: *Recommended Fiscal Year 2024–25 Trial Court Allocations of Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds*
2. Attachment B: *Recommended Fiscal Year 2024–25 Trial Court Allocations of Court-Appointed Counsel Unspent Funding*

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2024)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2024-25	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2024-25	Eligible for JDCCP Funding <sup>1</sup>	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended Allocation of 2023-24 JDCCP Collections
		(Col. A Total)		(Col. C Total)		(Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	(Col. F Total)	(Col. G x \$363,458)
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H
Alameda	\$5,507,175	2.24%	\$4,150,739	2.22%	N	-	0.00%	-
Alpine	\$19,301	0.01%	\$18,999	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-
Amador	\$200,569	0.08%	\$155,513	0.08%	N	-	0.00%	-
Butte	\$1,276,798	0.52%	\$962,319	0.52%	N	-	0.00%	-
Calaveras	\$258,697	0.11%	\$231,546	0.12%	N	-	0.00%	-
Colusa†	\$99,107	0.04%	\$101,811	0.05%	N	-	0.00%	-
Contra Costa	\$3,343,233	1.36%	\$2,519,783	1.35%	N	-	0.00%	-
Del Norte	\$269,344	0.11%	\$269,768	0.14%	N	-	0.00%	-
El Dorado	\$601,436	0.25%	\$601,356	0.32%	N	-	0.00%	-
Fresno	\$6,778,404	2.76%	\$5,108,860	2.74%	N	-	0.00%	-
Glenn	\$142,637	0.06%	\$141,039	0.08%	N	-	0.00%	-
Humboldt	\$988,193	0.40%	\$744,798	0.40%	N	-	0.00%	-
Imperial	\$747,666	0.30%	\$809,029	0.43%	N	-	0.00%	-
Inyo	\$88,156	0.04%	\$85,907	0.05%	N	-	0.00%	-
Kern	\$5,481,045	2.23%	\$4,131,045	2.21%	Y	\$5,481,044.90	3.58%	\$13,008.49
Kings	\$1,093,705	0.45%	\$824,322	0.44%	Y	\$1,093,705.15	0.71%	\$2,595.76
Lake	\$184,195	0.08%	\$247,103	0.13%	N	-	0.00%	-
Lassen	\$184,025	0.08%	\$173,075	0.09%	N	-	0.00%	-
Los Angeles	\$115,214,556	46.96%	\$86,836,815	46.51%	Y	\$115,214,555.92	75.23%	\$273,445.51
Madera	\$998,990	0.41%	\$824,032	0.44%	N	-	0.00%	-
Marin	\$385,919	0.16%	\$386,687	0.21%	N	-	0.00%	-
Mariposa	\$86,998	0.04%	\$75,764	0.04%	N	-	0.00%	-
Mendocino	\$704,430	0.29%	\$662,845	0.36%	N	-	0.00%	-
Merced	\$1,548,128	0.63%	\$1,166,819	0.62%	N	-	0.00%	-
Modoc	\$48,248	0.02%	\$65,582	0.04%	N	-	0.00%	-
Mono	\$32,047	0.01%	\$26,958	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-
Monterey	\$694,915	0.28%	\$528,532	0.28%	N	-	0.00%	-
Napa	\$469,074	0.19%	\$356,764	0.19%	N	-	0.00%	-
Nevada	\$193,343	0.08%	\$193,301	0.10%	N	-	0.00%	-
Orange	\$12,943,647	5.28%	\$9,755,582	5.23%	N	-	0.00%	-
Placer	\$849,058	0.35%	\$645,769	0.35%	N	-	0.00%	-
Plumas	\$91,447	0.04%	\$128,921	0.07%	N	-	0.00%	-
Riverside	\$15,792,508	6.44%	\$11,902,759	6.38%	Y	\$15,792,508.06	10.31%	\$37,481.29
Sacramento	\$6,269,231	2.56%	\$4,725,098	2.53%	N	-	0.00%	-
San Benito	\$124,742	0.05%	\$94,875	0.05%	N	-	0.00%	-
San Bernardino	\$21,326,805	8.69%	\$16,073,940	8.61%	N	-	0.00%	-
San Diego	\$8,073,185	3.29%	\$6,084,732	3.26%	Y	\$8,073,185.00	5.27%	\$19,160.57
San Francisco	\$4,131,224	1.68%	\$3,113,689	1.67%	N	-	0.00%	-
San Joaquin	\$4,223,902	1.72%	\$3,183,540	1.71%	N	-	0.00%	-
San Luis Obispo	\$940,973	0.38%	\$732,191	0.39%	N	-	0.00%	-
San Mateo	\$952,983	0.39%	\$724,811	0.39%	N	-	0.00%	-
Santa Barbara	\$1,911,090	0.78%	\$1,440,382	0.77%	N	-	0.00%	-
Santa Clara	\$3,270,112	1.33%	\$2,464,672	1.32%	Y	\$3,270,112.09	2.14%	\$7,761.15
Santa Cruz	\$586,717	0.24%	\$584,471	0.31%	N	-	0.00%	-
Shasta	\$1,236,665	0.50%	\$932,070	0.50%	N	-	0.00%	-
Sierra	\$34,732	0.01%	\$36,894	0.02%	N	-	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	\$175,297	0.07%	\$255,222	0.14%	N	-	0.00%	-
Solano	\$1,520,292	0.62%	\$1,145,839	0.61%	N	-	0.00%	-
Sonoma	\$2,170,223	0.88%	\$1,635,689	0.88%	N	-	0.00%	-
Stanislaus	\$1,800,657	0.73%	\$1,357,149	0.73%	N	-	0.00%	-
Sutter	\$418,535	0.17%	\$337,171	0.18%	N	-	0.00%	-
Tehama	\$308,871	0.13%	\$313,954	0.17%	N	-	0.00%	-
Trinity	\$75,925	0.03%	\$83,204	0.04%	N	-	0.00%	-
Tulare	\$3,474,774	1.42%	\$2,618,925	1.40%	Y	\$3,474,773.59	2.27%	\$8,246.89
Tuolumne	\$325,449	0.13%	\$300,491	0.16%	N	-	0.00%	-
Ventura	\$2,249,805	0.92%	\$1,695,670	0.91%	N	-	0.00%	-
Yolo	\$1,681,966	0.69%	\$1,267,692	0.68%	N	-	0.00%	-
Yuba	\$740,872	0.30%	\$563,486	0.30%	Y	\$740,871.98	0.48%	\$1,758.36
Unallocated	\$0		\$100,000			-		-
Total	\$245,342,019		\$186,700,000			\$153,140,756.69	100.00%	\$363,458.00
Reserved for admin.								\$259,524.00
Distribution amount available to courts								\$363,458.00
Total collected								\$622,982.00
1. A court is eligible for an allocation if the court has met both the Funding Need and Participation requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. This table indicates a court's eligibility to receive an allocation based on the Funding Need criteria. Courts that meet the Funding Need criteria must also meet the Participation requirements in order to receive an allocation.								

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2024)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need  (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2024-25	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2024-25  (Col. C Total)	Est. Unspent CAC Funding 2024-25	Eligible for and Accepted Reallocated Funding	Funding Need of Eligible Courts  (Col. A when Col. F equals "Y")	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts  (Col. G Total)	Recommended 2024-25 CAC Reallocation
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Alameda	\$5,507,175	2.24%	\$4,150,739	2.22%	-	Y	\$5,507,174.93	2.60%	\$22,147.86
Alpine	\$19,301	0.01%	\$18,999	0.01%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Amador	\$200,569	0.08%	\$155,513	0.08%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Butte	\$1,276,798	0.52%	\$962,319	0.52%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Calaveras	\$258,697	0.11%	\$231,546	0.12%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Colusa	\$99,107	0.04%	\$101,811	0.05%	\$20,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Contra Costa	\$3,343,233	1.36%	\$2,519,783	1.35%	-	Y	\$3,343,233.03	1.58%	\$13,445.27
Del Norte	\$269,344	0.11%	\$269,768	0.14%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
El Dorado	\$601,436	0.25%	\$601,356	0.32%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Fresno	\$6,778,404	2.76%	\$5,108,860	2.74%	-	Y	\$6,778,404.14	3.20%	\$24,577.16
Glenn	\$142,637	0.06%	\$141,039	0.08%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Humboldt	\$988,193	0.40%	\$744,798	0.40%	-	Y	\$988,193.36	0.47%	\$3,582.99
Imperial	\$747,666	0.30%	\$809,029	0.43%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Inyo	\$88,156	0.04%	\$85,907	0.05%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Kern	\$5,481,045	2.23%	\$4,131,045	2.21%	-	Y	\$5,481,044.90	2.59%	\$22,042.78
Kings	\$1,093,705	0.45%	\$824,322	0.44%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Lake	\$184,195	0.08%	\$247,103	0.13%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Lassen	\$184,025	0.08%	\$173,075	0.09%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Los Angeles	\$115,214,556	46.96%	\$86,836,815	46.51%	-	Y	\$115,214,555.92	54.40%	\$463,351.22
Madera	\$998,990	0.41%	\$824,032	0.44%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Marin	\$385,919	0.16%	\$386,687	0.21%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Mariposa	\$86,998	0.04%	\$75,764	0.04%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Mendocino	\$704,430	0.29%	\$662,845	0.36%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Merced	\$1,548,128	0.63%	\$1,166,819	0.62%	-	Y	\$1,548,128.19	0.73%	\$5,613.21
Modoc	\$48,248	0.02%	\$65,582	0.04%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Mono	\$32,047	0.01%	\$26,958	0.01%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Monterey	\$694,915	0.28%	\$528,532	0.28%	\$100,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Napa	\$469,074	0.19%	\$356,764	0.19%	\$5,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Nevada	\$193,343	0.08%	\$193,301	0.10%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Orange	\$12,943,647	5.28%	\$9,755,582	5.23%	-	Y	\$12,943,647.11	6.11%	\$46,931.12
Placer	\$849,058	0.35%	\$645,769	0.35%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Plumas	\$91,447	0.04%	\$128,921	0.07%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Riverside	\$15,792,508	6.44%	\$11,902,759	6.38%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Sacramento	\$6,269,231	2.56%	\$4,725,098	2.53%	-	Y	\$6,269,231.30	2.96%	\$25,212.58
San Benito	\$124,742	0.05%	\$94,875	0.05%	-	Y	\$124,742.14	0.06%	\$501.67
San Bernardino	\$21,326,805	8.69%	\$16,073,940	8.61%	-	Y	\$21,326,805.32	10.07%	\$85,768.69
San Diego	\$8,073,185	3.29%	\$6,084,732	3.26%	-	Y	\$8,073,185.00	3.81%	\$32,467.43
San Francisco	\$4,131,224	1.68%	\$3,113,689	1.67%	-	Y	\$4,131,223.57	1.95%	\$16,614.29
San Joaquin	\$4,223,902	1.72%	\$3,183,540	1.71%	-	Y	\$4,223,901.99	1.99%	\$16,987.00
San Luis Obispo	\$940,973	0.38%	\$732,191	0.39%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
San Mateo	\$952,983	0.39%	\$724,811	0.39%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Santa Barbara	\$1,911,090	0.78%	\$1,440,382	0.77%	-	Y	\$1,911,090.23	0.90%	\$7,685.71
Santa Clara	\$3,270,112	1.33%	\$2,464,672	1.32%	-	Y	\$3,270,112.09	1.54%	\$13,151.21
Santa Cruz	\$586,717	0.24%	\$584,471	0.31%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Shasta	\$1,236,665	0.50%	\$932,070	0.50%	-	Y	\$1,236,664.83	0.58%	\$4,973.42
Sierra	\$34,732	0.01%	\$36,894	0.02%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	\$175,297	0.07%	\$255,222	0.14%	\$10,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Solano	\$1,520,292	0.62%	\$1,145,839	0.61%	-	Y	\$1,520,292.07	0.72%	\$6,114.06
Sonoma	\$2,170,223	0.88%	\$1,635,689	0.88%	-	Y	\$2,170,222.67	1.02%	\$8,727.85
Stanislaus	\$1,800,657	0.73%	\$1,357,149	0.73%	-	Y	\$1,800,656.70	0.85%	\$7,241.59
Sutter	\$418,535	0.17%	\$337,171	0.18%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Tehama	\$308,871	0.13%	\$313,954	0.17%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Trinity	\$75,925	0.03%	\$83,204	0.04%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Tulare	\$3,474,774	1.42%	\$2,618,925	1.40%	\$708,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Tuolumne	\$325,449	0.13%	\$300,491	0.16%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Ventura	\$2,249,805	0.92%	\$1,695,670	0.91%	-	Y	\$2,249,804.99	1.06%	\$9,047.90
Yolo	\$1,681,966	0.69%	\$1,267,692	0.68%	-	Y	\$1,681,965.51	0.79%	\$6,764.26
Yuba	\$740,872	0.30%	\$563,486	0.30%	-	N	-	0.00%	-
Unallocated	\$0		\$100,000				-		-
Total	\$253,429,531		\$186,700,000		\$843,000		\$211,794,280	100.00%	\$842,949.26
Total Returned									\$843,000.00