



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688
www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on March 15, 2019

Title

Juvenile Law: 2018-19 Allocations for
Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections
Program and Court-Appointed Counsel
Expected Unspent Funding

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

March 15, 2019

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

February 6, 2019

Recommended by

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

Contact

Penny Davis, 415-865-8815
penny.davis@jud.ca.gov
Michele Allan, 916-263-1374
michele.allan@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 2018–19. (1) Under the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program, and as directed in Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.1, 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 (1) allocate the 2017–18 statutorily restricted funds—remitted in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs—to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the council at its August 23, 2013 business meeting. (2) under council recommendations adopted in April 2015, reallocate unspent dependency counsel funding from courts that have identified funds they do not intend to spend to courts funded at below the average statewide funding level; (3) allow staff to further survey eligible courts to determine their ability to use funding during the remainder of the fiscal year. Any funds not utilized will be prorated to other eligible courts, and staff will be directed to report the final allocation at the July 2019 council meeting.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends the Judicial Council:

1. Allocate \$766,198, the 2017-18 Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) funds remitted in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its August 23, 2013 business meeting. Attachment A shows projected allocations based on information received at the time of this report.
2. Allocate \$659,744, the 2018-19 court appointed counsel expected unspent funding, to the trial courts calculated according to the methodology adopted by the Judicial Council at its January 22, 2015 business meeting. Attachment B (column I) shows projected allocations based on information obtained from trial courts at the time of this report.
3. Direct staff to further survey courts regarding their ability to utilize funds during the remainder of the fiscal year, reallocate unspent funds to those courts demonstrating an ability to expend funds by the end of the fiscal year, and report on the final allocation to the Judicial Council at its July 18–19, 2019 business meeting.

Relevant Previous Council Action

Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program

At its October 26, 2012 meeting, the Judicial Council adopted the JDCCP guidelines¹ which fulfilled the council's legislative mandate to establish a program to collect reimbursement from parents or minors demonstrating an ability to pay.² Additional amendments were adopted by the council at its August 23, 2013 meeting regarding the issue of equitable allocation of funds remitted through JDCCP.³ The Judicial Council then allocated funds remitted through the JDCCP for the first time since the JDCCP's inception at its February 20, 2014 council meeting.⁴ In subsequent years, the council has allocated available funds to eligible trial courts annually.

¹ The guidelines took effect January 1, 2013, and are published as Appendix F of the California Rules of Court. See www.courts.ca.gov/documents/appendix_f.pdf.

² Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program* (Oct. 26, 2012), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-itemA20.pdf.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program Guidelines* (Aug. 23, 2013), <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemF.pdf>.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., *Trial Court Allocations: Criminal Justice Realignment, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel and Workers' Compensation Liabilities* (Feb. 20, 2014), <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-itemJ.pdf>.

Juvenile Dependency: Court Appointed Counsel Funding Reallocation

At its April 17, 2015 business meeting, the Judicial Council approved a methodology for reallocating funds unspent by courts for court-appointed counsel in dependency cases.⁵ The approved methodology provided a four-year reallocation process to bring all courts to an equivalent percentage of workload met by available statewide funding.

Analysis/Rationale

Recommendation 1

The estimates of courts' funding needs are computed using the dependency workload model approved by the council in April 2016 and updated in July 2016.⁶ The current base allocation for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$136.7 million—less than the estimated need.

In 2017–18, the trial courts remitted a total of \$766,198, excluding monies recovered to offset their cost of collections and dependency counsel program administrative costs, under the JDCCP and as directed in statute to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). These monies are part of the restricted TCTF fund balance available for use in 2018–19 and beyond. Statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council's approved standard.

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.⁷ Every court that has satisfied those requirements receives an allocation. Each eligible court's allocated share of the JDCCP funds is equivalent to its share of the aggregate funding need of all the eligible courts. Attachment A displays the recommended allocation amount for each court.

Recommendation 2

Trial courts whose spending patterns at midyear indicated they may not spend their full 2018–19 allocation were identified and contacted. Of those courts, six confirmed that they would not spend the full allocation and provided an estimate of unspent funding. Attachment B shows the total estimate and reallocation. Under the reallocation methodology adopted at the April 17, 2015 Judicial Council meeting, funds are reallocated proportionally by workload to courts that both did not remit unspent funds and had unmet need. With the four-year reallocation concluded, all large courts have an equal proportion of unmet need of 66%. Of the 30 small courts participating

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed-Counsel Funding Reallocation* (April 17, 2015), <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150417-item1.pdf>.

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (April 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF>.

⁷ As described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines, a court demonstrates its participation in the program by submitting an annual report required by section 13 of the program guidelines and adopting a rule or policy to inquire regarding a responsible person's ability to reimburse the cost of appointed counsel at each dispositional hearing.

in the small court adjustment, 16 courts are eligible for reallocation. In total, 41 courts are eligible for reallocation funds.

Recommendation 3

To ensure use of the reallocation funds, an additional survey to trial courts is necessary to confirm the court's ability to completely expend during the fiscal year. In the review of courts receiving reallocation funds in 2017–18, 46% of the courts did not use the funds. On an annual basis approximately 2% of court-appointed counsel funds are unspent at the end of the fiscal year. Many courts cited that receiving the funds so late in the fiscal year left them unable to amend contracts with dependency attorneys.

Policy implications

The reallocation process was established to support courts in need of additional dependency counsel funds, when available. Failure to reallocate funds designated as surplus would result in an inappropriate use of funds.

Comments

TCBAC recommendations to apply existing methodologies to allocate these funds were not circulated through the invitation-to-comment process.

Alternatives considered

Recommendation 1

Because the recommended allocation outlined in Attachment A was determined using the methodology approved by the council at its August 23, 2013 meeting, 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 April 17, 2015 meeting, no alternatives to this proposal were considered.

Recommendation 3

The alternative of reallocating funding to all eligible courts without confirming the court's ability to use the funds was considered. However, if the confirmation process is not delegated to staff, the results could be awarding funds to courts with no ability to utilize the funds by the end of the fiscal year.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This proposal is for the allocation of funds that have already been collected or included in the 2018–19 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Recommended 2018–19 Trial Court Allocations of \$766,198 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds
2. Attachment B: Recommended 2018-19 Trial Court Allocations of \$659,744 in Estimated Unspent Funding

Court	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2018)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2018-19	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2018-19 (Col. C Total)	Court participates in program 16-17	Court is under funded	Court participates in program 17-18	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total)	Recommended Allocation of 2017-18 JDCCP Collections (Col. G x \$766,198)	Trial Court Allocations Through 2017-18	Trial Court Distributions Through October 2018	Undistributed Trial Court Allocations Through October 2018
Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M	Col. N	Col. O
Alameda	\$5,151,396.77	2.49%	\$3,399,619.75	2.49%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Alpine*	3,303.26	0.00%	2,627.69	0.00%			N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Amador	217,828.04	0.11%	144,677.98	0.11%			N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Butte	1,228,458.39	0.59%	799,814.35	0.59%	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,228,458.39	1.05%	8,079.43	35,484.54	-	35,484.54
Calaveras	251,831.42	0.12%	191,355.32	0.14%	N		N	N	-	0.00%	-	5,737.02	-	5,737.02
Colusa†	81,587.95	0.04%	72,637.25	0.05%	N			N	-	0.00%	-	293.14	-	293.14
Contra Costa	3,476,688.20	1.68%	2,294,410.31	1.68%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	193,047.01	0.09%	214,730.47	0.16%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	765,443.35	0.37%	505,147.72	0.37%		Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Fresno	4,244,285.46	2.05%	2,800,979.49	2.05%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Glenn	121,233.03	0.06%	122,690.02	0.09%	N			N	-	0.00%	-	5,261.46	5,261.00	0.46
Humboldt	753,198.48	0.36%	657,658.45	0.48%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Imperial	851,763.74	0.41%	562,114.12	0.41%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Inyo	43,187.47	0.02%	51,625.77	0.04%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Kern	3,981,075.43	1.92%	2,627,276.30	1.92%	Y	Y		N	-	0.00%	-	142,792.33	142,792.00	0.33
Kings	1,095,657.83	0.53%	713,351.68	0.52%	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,095,657.83	0.94%	7,206.01	39,907.67	34,744.00	5,163.67
Lake	210,345.45	0.10%	276,158.33	0.20%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Lassen	128,658.79	0.06%	108,966.70	0.08%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	95,894,287.76	46.33%	62,434,045.75	45.67%	Y	Y	Y	Y	95,894,287.76	82.31%	630,685.37	3,332,661.17	3,332,661.17	-
Madera	836,263.17	0.40%	589,945.83	0.43%	N		N	N	-	0.00%	-	16,068.83	-	16,068.83
Marin	304,984.43	0.15%	304,984.43	0.22%			Y	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	53,773.28	0.03%	41,896.84	0.03%			Y	N	-	0.00%	-	1,817.86	-	1,817.86
Mendocino	568,332.17	0.27%	458,910.77	0.34%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Merced	1,175,434.02	0.57%	775,717.52	0.57%	N	Y		N	-	0.00%	-	32,783.77	-	32,783.77
Modoc	30,457.87	0.01%	37,160.50	0.03%	N			N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mono	20,994.66	0.01%	14,615.18	0.01%				N	-	0.00%	-	103.62	104.00	(0.38)
Monterey	1,099,267.14	0.53%	715,701.60	0.52%	N	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	19,795.72	19,796.00	(0.28)
Napa	471,864.45	0.23%	311,402.86	0.23%	N	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	9,391.29	-	9,391.29
Nevada	174,057.77	0.08%	174,057.77	0.13%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Orange	8,225,501.68	3.97%	5,355,390.40	3.92%		Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Placer	1,132,087.04	0.55%	747,111.05	0.55%	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,132,087.04	0.97%	7,445.60	45,249.23	38,816.00	6,433.23
Plumas	115,681.63	0.06%	154,059.11	0.11%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Riverside	12,384,924.68	5.98%	8,173,323.94	5.98%	Y	Y	Y	Y	12,384,924.68	10.63%	81,454.18	577,854.52	577,854.52	-
Sacramento	7,821,287.79	3.78%	5,161,591.24	3.78%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Benito	154,563.71	0.07%	104,920.19	0.08%	Y		Y	N	-	0.00%	-	10,297.79	4,345.00	5,952.79
San Bernardino	14,978,346.99	7.24%	9,751,976.09	7.13%	N	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	242,055.83	2,641.00	239,414.83
San Diego	8,090,890.49	3.91%	5,339,513.21	3.91%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Francisco	4,173,251.32	2.02%	2,754,101.12	2.01%		Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	3,636,390.65	1.76%	2,399,804.56	1.76%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	1,018,341.46	0.49%	672,045.64	0.49%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	1,416,340.88	0.68%	934,701.91	0.68%	Y	Y	Y	Y	1,416,340.88	1.22%	9,315.11	57,358.49	29,275.00	28,083.49
Santa Barbara	1,252,777.92	0.61%	826,759.95	0.60%		Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	4,466,509.51	2.16%	2,947,634.32	2.16%		Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-

Court	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2018)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2018-19	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2018-19 (Col. C Total)	Court participates in program 16-17	Court is under funded	Court participates in program 17-18	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total)	Recommended Allocation of 2017-18 JDCCP Collections (Col. G x \$766,198)	Trial Court Allocations Through 2017-18	Trial Court Distributions Through October 2018	Undistributed Trial Court Allocations Through October 2018
Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D					Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
Santa Cruz	824,613.73	0.40%	544,196.70	0.40%		Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Shasta	931,413.40	0.45%	614,678.22	0.45%	Y	Y		N	-	0.00%	-	38,437.49	38,437.00	0.49
Sierra	5,176.70	0.00%	8,323.21	0.01%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	202,252.79	0.10%	245,373.43	0.18%				N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Solano	1,220,545.94	0.59%	805,488.74	0.59%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	1,452,636.04	0.70%	945,770.04	0.69%		Y		N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Stanislaus	1,676,803.14	0.81%	1,091,718.88	0.80%		Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sutter	386,638.40	0.19%	260,937.07	0.19%	Y		Y	N	-	0.00%	-	15,457.13	-	15,457.13
Tehama	434,299.64	0.21%	362,975.46	0.27%	Y		N	N	-	0.00%	-	16,222.20	-	16,222.20
Trinity	92,143.70	0.04%	93,829.12	0.07%	Y		Y	N	-	0.00%	-	1,996.54	-	1,996.54
Tulare	2,632,922.36	1.27%	1,714,220.93	1.25%	Y	Y	Y	Y	2,632,922.36	2.26%	17,316.42	91,199.35	79,682.00	11,517.35
Tuolumne	223,997.10	0.11%	168,547.98	0.12%	N			N	-	0.00%	-	7,054.13	-	7,054.13
Ventura	2,815,443.23	1.36%	1,833,055.08	1.34%	Y	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	110,204.58	110,204.00	0.58
Yolo	1,079,532.01	0.52%	712,427.81	0.52%	N	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	17,813.11	17,813.00	0.11
Yuba	714,069.26	0.34%	471,243.83	0.34%	Y	Y	Y	Y	714,069.26	0.61%	4,696.35	11,501.16	-	11,501.16
Unallocated	\$0.00		100,000.00						-		-			
Total	\$206,988,089.98		\$136,700,000.00						\$116,498,748.20	100.00%	\$766,198.47	\$4,884,799.99	\$4,434,425.69	\$450,374.30
Reserved for admin.											232,203.53	1,273,923.67		
Distribution amount available to courts											766,198.47	6,158,723.66		
Total collected											998,402.00			

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.

Court	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2018) Col. A	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total) Col. B	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2018-19 Col. C	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2018-19 (Col. C Total) Col. D	Est. Unspent Funding 2018-19 Col. E	Eligible for Reallocated Funding ¹ Col. F	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. F equals "Y") Col. G	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. G Total) Col. H	Recommended 2018-19 Reallocation (Col. H x \$409,744) Col. I
Alameda	\$5,151,396.77	2.49%	\$3,399,619.75	2.49%	0	Y	5,151,396.77	2.62%	17,263.54
Alpine*	3,303.26	0.00%	2,627.69	0.00%	0	Y	3,303.26	0.00%	11.07
Amador	217,828.04	0.11%	144,677.98	0.11%	0	Y	217,828.04	0.11%	729.99
Butte	1,228,458.39	0.59%	799,814.35	0.59%	15,814	N	-	0.00%	-
Calaveras	251,831.42	0.12%	191,355.32	0.14%	0	Y	251,831.42	0.13%	843.95
Colusa†	81,587.95	0.04%	72,637.25	0.05%	0	Y	81,587.95	0.04%	273.42
Contra Costa	3,476,688.20	1.68%	2,294,410.31	1.68%	0	Y	3,476,688.20	1.77%	11,651.20
Del Norte	193,047.01	0.09%	214,730.47	0.16%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
El Dorado	765,443.35	0.37%	505,147.72	0.37%	0	Y	765,443.35	0.39%	2,565.18
Fresno	4,244,285.46	2.05%	2,800,979.49	2.05%	0	Y	4,244,285.46	2.16%	14,223.59
Glenn	121,233.03	0.06%	122,690.02	0.09%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Humboldt	753,198.48	0.36%	657,658.45	0.48%	22,930	N	-	0.00%	-
Imperial	851,763.74	0.41%	562,114.12	0.41%	0	Y	851,763.74	0.43%	2,854.46
Inyo	43,187.47	0.02%	51,625.77	0.04%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Kern	3,981,075.43	1.92%	2,627,276.30	1.92%	250,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Kings	1,095,657.83	0.53%	713,351.68	0.52%	125,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Lake	210,345.45	0.10%	276,158.33	0.20%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Lassen	128,658.79	0.06%	108,966.70	0.08%	0	Y	128,658.79	0.07%	431.17
Los Angeles	95,894,287.76	46.33%	62,434,045.75	45.67%	0	Y	95,894,287.76	48.71%	321,364.18
Madera	836,263.17	0.40%	589,945.83	0.43%	0	Y	836,263.17	0.42%	2,802.51
Marin	304,984.43	0.15%	304,984.43	0.22%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Mariposa	53,773.28	0.03%	41,896.84	0.03%	0	Y	53,773.28	0.03%	180.21
Mendocino	568,332.17	0.27%	458,910.77	0.34%	0	Y	568,332.17	0.29%	1,904.61
Merced	1,175,434.02	0.57%	775,717.52	0.57%	0	Y	1,175,434.02	0.60%	3,939.15
Modoc	30,457.87	0.01%	37,160.50	0.03%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Mono	20,994.66	0.01%	14,615.18	0.01%	0	Y	20,994.66	0.01%	70.36
Monterey	1,099,267.14	0.53%	715,701.60	0.52%	176,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Napa	471,864.45	0.23%	311,402.86	0.23%	70,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Nevada	174,057.77	0.08%	174,057.77	0.13%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Orange	8,225,501.68	3.97%	5,355,390.40	3.92%	0	Y	8,225,501.68	4.18%	27,565.58
Placer	1,132,087.04	0.55%	747,111.05	0.55%	0	Y	1,132,087.04	0.58%	3,793.89
Plumas	115,681.63	0.06%	154,059.11	0.11%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Riverside	12,384,924.68	5.98%	8,173,323.94	5.98%	0	Y	12,384,924.68	6.29%	41,504.78
Sacramento	7,821,287.79	3.78%	5,161,591.24	3.78%	0	Y	7,821,287.79	3.97%	26,210.96
San Benito	154,563.71	0.07%	104,920.19	0.08%	0	Y	154,563.71	0.08%	517.98
San Bernardino	14,978,346.99	7.24%	9,751,976.09	7.13%	0	Y	14,978,346.99	7.61%	50,195.94
San Diego	8,090,890.49	3.91%	5,339,513.21	3.91%	0	Y	8,090,890.49	4.11%	27,114.47
San Francisco	4,173,251.32	2.02%	2,754,101.12	2.01%	0	Y	4,173,251.32	2.12%	13,985.54
San Joaquin	3,636,390.65	1.76%	2,399,804.56	1.76%	0	Y	3,636,390.65	1.85%	12,186.40
San Luis Obispo	1,018,341.46	0.49%	672,045.64	0.49%	0	Y	1,018,341.46	0.52%	3,412.70
San Mateo	1,416,340.88	0.68%	934,701.91	0.68%	0	Y	1,416,340.88	0.72%	4,746.49
Santa Barbara	1,252,777.92	0.61%	826,759.95	0.60%	0	Y	1,252,777.92	0.64%	4,198.35
Santa Clara	4,466,509.51	2.16%	2,947,634.32	2.16%	0	Y	4,466,509.51	2.27%	14,968.32

Court	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2018) Col. A	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total) Col. B	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2018-19 Col. C	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2018-19 (Col. C Total) Col. D	Est. Unspent Funding 2018-19 Col. E	Eligible for Reallocated Funding ¹ Col. F	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. F equals "Y") Col. G	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. G Total) Col. H	Recommended 2018-19 Reallocation (Col. H x \$409,744) Col. I
Santa Cruz	824,613.73	0.40%	544,196.70	0.40%	0	Y	824,613.73	0.42%	2,763.47
Shasta	931,413.40	0.45%	614,678.22	0.45%	0	Y	931,413.40	0.47%	3,121.38
Sierra	5,176.70	0.00%	8,323.21	0.01%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	202,252.79	0.10%	245,373.43	0.18%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Solano	1,220,545.94	0.59%	805,488.74	0.59%	0	Y	1,220,545.94	0.62%	4,090.33
Sonoma	1,452,636.04	0.70%	945,770.04	0.69%	0	Y	1,452,636.04	0.74%	4,868.12
Stanislaus	1,676,803.14	0.81%	1,091,718.88	0.80%	0	Y	1,676,803.14	0.85%	5,619.36
Sutter	386,638.40	0.19%	260,937.07	0.19%	0	Y	386,638.40	0.20%	1,295.72
Tehama	434,299.64	0.21%	362,975.46	0.27%	0	Y	434,299.64	0.22%	1,455.44
Trinity	92,143.70	0.04%	93,829.12	0.07%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Tulare	2,632,922.36	1.27%	1,714,220.93	1.25%	0	Y	2,632,922.36	1.34%	8,823.54
Tuolumne	223,997.10	0.11%	168,547.98	0.12%	0	Y	223,997.10	0.11%	750.67
Ventura	2,815,443.23	1.36%	1,833,055.08	1.34%	0	Y	2,815,443.23	1.43%	9,435.21
Yolo	1,079,532.01	0.52%	712,427.81	0.52%	0	Y	1,079,532.01	0.55%	3,617.76
Yuba	714,069.26	0.34%	471,243.83	0.34%	0	Y	714,069.26	0.36%	2,393.01
Unallocated	\$0.00		100,000.00				-		-
Total	\$206,988,089.98		\$136,700,000.00		\$659,744.00		\$196,866,000.40	100.00%	\$659,744.00
Total Returned									\$659,744.00