



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 23-009

For business meeting on: January 20, 2023

Title

Report to the Legislature: Statewide
Collection of Court-Ordered Debt

Agenda Item Type

Information Only

Date of Report

December 14, 2022

Submitted by

Judicial Council staff
Zlatko Theodorovic,
Director, Budget Services

Contact

Maria Lira, 916 263-7320
maria.lira@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

Pursuant to Penal Code section 1463.010, the Judicial Council is required to submit a report on the information required to be collected and reported as specified in Government Code section 68514(a), to the Legislature and the Department of Finance by December 31 of each year. On or before December 31, 2022, the Judicial Council's Budget Services staff submitted the *Report on Statewide Collection of Court-Ordered Debt for 2021–22*.

Relevant Previous Council Action

This report is submitted to the Legislature annually. Reports from previous fiscal years are available on the “Legislative Reports” webpage of the California Courts website at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

Analysis/Rationale

All information related to the collection of court-ordered debt under [Government Code section 68514](#) is presented in this annual report, which is due to the Legislature and the Department of Finance by December 31.

Following are highlights of the data reported for fiscal year 2021–22:

- Just over \$1.0 billion in revenue was collected.

- \$659.2 million from nondelinquent (forthwith) accounts; and
- \$376.7 million from delinquent accounts.

This total represents nearly an 8 percent increase from the \$961.6 million collected in the prior fiscal year. The increase in revenue is attributable to the restoration of collections operations to near pre-pandemic service levels.

- Since reporting began in fiscal year 2008–09, a total of \$20.8 billion in court-ordered debt has been collected by court and county collections programs, \$12.6 billion nondelinquent and \$8.2 billion from delinquent accounts.
- A total of \$88.1 million in operating costs were recovered, as authorized under Penal Code section 1463.007.
- A total of \$699.1 million in delinquent debt was adjusted or satisfied by means other than payment, such as court-ordered waiver, dismissal, alternative sentence, ability-to-pay determination, or vacated order per statutory changes.
- A total of \$230.8 million in uncollectible court-ordered debt was discharged from accountability, as authorized by [Government Code sections 25257–25259.95](#).
- A total outstanding debt balance of \$7.7 billion was reported, representing a 2 percent decrease from the \$7.9 billion 2020–21 ending balance.
- *Judicial Council–Approved Collections Best Practices* were updated to reflect changes to statute and Judicial Council policy.
- New performance metrics developed to evaluate statewide performance were approved by the Judicial Council in May 2022.

Fiscal Impact and Policy Implications

No costs to the Judicial Council are associated with this report.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Report on Statewide Collection of Court-Ordered Debt 2021–22
2. Link A: Gov. Code, § 68514,
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=68514&lawCode=GOV
Link B: Gov. Code, §§ 25250–25265,
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&division=2.&title=3.&part=2.&chapter=3.&article=



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
*Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee*

HON. MARLA O. ANDERSON
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. CARIN T. FUJISAKI
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

*Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Botke
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Mr. David D. Fu
Hon. Brad R. Hill
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. Ann C. Moorman
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg*

ADVISORY MEMBERS

*Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Ms. Rebecca J. Fleming
Mr. Shawn C. Landry
Hon. Kimberly Merrifield
Hon. Glenn Mondo
Hon. David Rosenberg
Mr. David H. Yamasaki*

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

December 2, 2022

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Legislative Counsel
State Capitol, Room 3021
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Erika Contreras
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 3044
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Sue Parker
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3196
Sacramento, California 95814

*Re: Report on Statewide Collection of Court-Ordered Debt for 2021–22,
as required under Penal Code section 1463.010(c) and Government Code
section 68514(a).*

Dear Ms. Jenkins, Ms. Contreras, and Ms. Parker:

Pursuant to Penal Code section 1463.010(c), the Judicial Council is submitting the annual report on the information required to be collected and reported as specified in Government Code section 68514(a).

In fiscal year 2021–22, statewide collections programs collected just over \$1.0 billion in revenue, of which \$659.2 million was nondelinquent (forthwith) court-ordered debt and \$376.7 million was from delinquent accounts. This total represents nearly an 8 percent increase over the \$961.6 million collected in the prior fiscal year. The increase in revenue is attributable to the restoration of collections operations to near pre-pandemic service levels. Since reporting began in 2008–09, a total of \$20.8 billion in court-ordered debt has been collected by court and county

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Ms. Erika Contreras
Ms. Sue Parker
December 2, 2022
Page 2

collections programs, with \$12.6 billion nondelinquent and \$8.2 billion from delinquent accounts.

A total of \$699.1 million in delinquent debt was adjusted or satisfied by means other than payment, such as court-ordered waiver, dismissal, alternative sentence, ability-to-pay determination, or vacated order per statutory changes. Additionally, a total of \$230.8 million in uncollectible court-ordered debt was discharged from accountability. The total outstanding delinquent debt at the end of 2021–22 was \$7.7 billion, a 2 percent decrease from the \$7.9 billion balance reported for 2020–21.

Detailed information highlighting statewide collections data is included in the report. Each court or county collections programs' data are included in the full report in Attachment 1, *Individual Court and County Collections Program Summary Reports for 2021–22*. This report is submitted to the Legislature annually. Reports from previous fiscal years are available on the “Legislative Reports” webpage of the California Courts website at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Budget Services, at 916-263-1397 or Zlatko.theodorovic@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Martin Hoshino
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

MH/ML

Attachments

cc: Eric Dang, Counsel, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Toni G. Atkins
Alf Brandt, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon
Shaun Naidu, Policy Consultant, Office of Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon
Anita Lee, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Gabriel Petek, Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office
Jessie Romine, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance
Margarita Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Ms. Erika Contreras
Ms. Sue Parker
December 2, 2022
Page 3

Mary Kennedy, Chief Counsel, Senate Public Safety Committee
Nora Brackbill, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee
Matthew Fleming, Consultant, Senate Appropriations Committee
Hans Hemann, Principal Consultant, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
Eric Csizmar, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Matt Osterli, Consultant, Senate Republican Fiscal Office
Morgan Branch, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office
Alison Merrilees, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee
Sandy Uribe, Chief Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee
Jennifer Kim, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee
Jay Dickenson, Chief Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Kimberly Horiuchi, Principal Consultant, Assembly Appropriations Committee
Lyndsay Mitchell, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Daryl Thomas, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget
Amy Leach, Minute Clerk, Office of Assembly Chief Clerk
Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council
Fran Mueller, Deputy Director, Budget Services, Judicial Council
Jenniffer Herman, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel 415-865-4200
TDD 415-865-4272
Fax 415-865-4205
www.courts.ca.gov

HON. TANI G. CANTIL-SAKAUYE
*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

HON. MARSHA G. SLOUGH
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. DAVID M. RUBIN
*Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee*

HON. MARLA O. ANDERSON
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. CARIN T. FUJISAKI
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. KYLE S. BRODIE
Chair, Technology Committee

Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. Richard Bloom
Hon. C. Todd Bottke
Hon. Kevin C. Brazile
Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Samuel K. Feng
Mr. David D. Fu
Hon. Brad R. Hill
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Harold W. Hopp
Hon. Ann C. Moorman
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Mr. Maxwell V. Pritt
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Ms. Rebecca J. Fleming
Mr. Shawn C. Landry
Hon. Kimberly Merrifield
Hon. Glenn Mondo
Hon. David Rosenberg
Mr. David H. Yamasaki

MR. MARTIN HOSHINO
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

Report title: *Report on Statewide Collection of Court-Ordered Debt for 2021–22*

Statutory citation: Senate Bill 940 (Stats. 2003, ch. 275, § 3)

Code section: Penal Code section 1463.010(c) and Government Code section 68514(a)

Date of report: December 31, 2022


Pursuant to Penal Code section 1463.010(c), the Judicial Council is submitting this annual report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance on the information required to be collected and reported as specified in Government Code section 68514(a). The following summary of the report is provided per the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

In 2021–22, statewide collections programs collected just over \$1.0 billion in revenue, of which \$659.2 million was nondelinquent (forthwith) court-ordered debt and \$376.7 million was from delinquent accounts. This total represents nearly an 8 percent increase over the \$961.6 million collected in the prior fiscal year. The increase in revenue is attributable to the restoration of collections operations to near pre-pandemic service levels. Since reporting began in fiscal year 2008–09, a total of \$20.8 billion in court-ordered debt has been collected by court and county collections programs, \$12.6 billion nondelinquent and \$8.2 billion from delinquent accounts.

A total of \$699.1 million in delinquent debt was satisfied by means other than payment, such as court-ordered waiver, dismissal, alternative sentence, ability-to-pay determination, or vacated order per statutory changes. Additionally, a total of \$230.8 million in uncollectible court-ordered debt was discharged from accountability. The total outstanding delinquent debt at the end of 2021–22 was \$7.7 billion, a 2 percent decrease from the \$7.9 billion balance reported for 2020–21.

The full report is available on the “Legislative Reports” webpage of the California Courts website, at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm.

A printed copy may be obtained by emailing collections@jud.ca.gov.



Report on Statewide Collection of Court-Ordered Debt for 2021–22

DECEMBER 31, 2022



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION
BUDGET SERVICES

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye

*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Martin Hoshino

*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

John Wordlaw

Chief Administrative Officer

BUDGET SERVICES

Zlatko Theodorovic

Director

Fran Mueller

Deputy Director

Angela Cowan

Manager

Donna Newman

Supervisor

Maria Lira

*Senior Fiscal Analyst
Primary Author of Report*

Don Lowrie

*Fiscal Analyst
Data Analyst and Coauthor*

Executive Summary

This report complies with the requirement in Government Code section 68514(a) and Penal Code section 1463.010(c) for the Judicial Council to report annually, on or before December 31, information related to the collection of court-ordered debt. The report includes collections information as reported by 57 of the 58 individual court and/or county collections programs¹ for fiscal year 2021–22, based on available data from the case management and accounting systems.

Following are highlights of the 2021–22 statewide data:

- Just over \$1.0 billion in revenue was collected from [nondelinquent](#) (forthwith) and [delinquent](#) accounts, which is nearly an 8 percent increase from the prior fiscal year:
 - \$659.2 million from nondelinquent accounts; and
 - \$376.7 million from delinquent accounts.
- A total of \$88.1 million in [operating costs](#) were recovered, as authorized under Penal Code section 1463.007.
- A total of \$699.1 million in delinquent debt was [adjusted](#) or satisfied by means other than payment, such as court-ordered waiver, dismissal, alternative sentence, ability-to-pay determination, or vacated order per statutory changes.
- A total of \$230.8 million in uncollectible court-ordered debt was [discharged](#) from accountability, as authorized by Government Code sections 25257–25259.95.²
- A total of \$7.7 billion was reported as the balance of outstanding debt, representing a 2 percent decrease from the \$7.9 billion 2020–21 ending balance.
- The *Judicial Council–Approved [Collections Best Practices](#)* were updated to reflect changes in statute and Judicial Council policy.
- New [performance metrics](#) developed to evaluate statewide performance were approved by the Judicial Council in May 2022.³ The metrics were applied to the Collections Reporting Template (CRT) and are included in this report.
 - Performance metrics include the Collector Effective Index, First Year Resolution Rate, Spend Efficiency Score, Cost to Referral Ratio, Risk Monitor, Discharge Score, and the Adjustment Score.

¹ The statewide totals in this report do not include the Plumas Court and County collections program, because a CRT was not submitted.

² Gov. Code, § 25250–25265, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&division=2.&title=3.&part=2.&chapter=3.&article=.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Budget Com. Rep., *Collections: Updates to Performance Measures and Benchmarks for Collections Program* (May 10, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10823040&GUID=EB595029-3B24-450B-BE8C-B0BD076CF4BB>.

The statewide collections programs reported that in 2021–22 they began to restore collections operations to pre-pandemic service levels. Several programs resumed case processing and continued local policies to address pandemic-related economic hardships by prolonging installment payment plans, extending payment due dates, and/or reducing installment amounts.


The programs also implemented Assembly Bill 177, which repealed 18 administrative fees and made any unpaid balance related to those fees uncollectible.⁴

Summaries of each collections program’s performance, progress, and challenges encountered during 2021–22, as reported by the programs, are included as Attachment 1.

Reporting Requirements

In 2008–09, the Judicial Council adopted *Judicial Council–Approved Collections Best Practices* and performance measures, as required by Assembly Bill 367 (Stats. 2007, ch. 132). Before the enactment of AB 367, California had neither established best practices for the collection of court-ordered debt nor evaluated program performance.

The timeline below highlights legislative and reporting requirement changes to the statewide collections program.



In 2017, section 68514 was added to the Government Code requiring collection entities to report on new, additional data elements. This change prompted the Judicial Council to hire a consultant

⁴ Assem. Bill 177 (Stats. 2021, ch.257), https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB177.

in June 2019 to align performance metrics and benchmarks with the new reporting requirements. The new performance metrics adopted by the Judicial Council are outlined in Attachment 4.

All information related to the collection of court-ordered debt under Government Code section 68514 is presented in this annual report and reflected by period in Chart 1, as required by section 68514(b).⁵

Chart 1

Period	Nondelinquent Revenue	No. Associated Cases	Delinquent Revenue	No. Associated Cases	Adjustments	Discharged Debt
Current	\$567,251,852	1,005,549	\$120,676,467	373,006	\$54,831,933	\$378,264
Prior	\$91,913,142	359,140	\$256,048,199	1,083,057	\$644,267,670	\$230,418,119
Combined	\$659,164,994	1,364,689	\$376,724,666	1,456,063	\$699,099,603	\$230,796,383

Changes in Legislative Policy

Since enactment of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850), courts and counties have been responsible for the collection of court-ordered debt. For over a decade, the Legislature has been aware of, and responsive to, the impacts of outstanding court-ordered debt in California.

Over the past 14 years, various approaches have been implemented to address the disproportionate impacts of fees, fines, and assessments on low-income and minority communities, many focusing on an individual's ability to pay. These approaches seek to recognize the high cost of citations after add-ons, as well as the impacts of cumulative unpaid violations.

To address these issues, several mechanisms were implemented over the last decade to help individuals reduce their court-ordered debt:

- Two amnesty programs were authorized by the Legislature (in 2010 and 2015).
- Courts increase public awareness of the availability of community service in lieu of cash payments for fines.
- Courts were encouraged to develop procedures to determine an individual's ability to pay.
- Provision that required courts to place a hold or suspension on a driver's license for failure to pay traffic violations was eliminated.
- Legislative bills repealed 41 administrative fees and costs and eliminated any associated outstanding debt incurred.

⁵ Gov. Code, § 68514,
https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?sectionNum=68514&lawCode=GOV.

In response, the Judicial Council implemented several rules of the California Rules of Court that make it easier for individuals with outstanding court-ordered debt to appear in court to resolve their issues. For example, rule 4.335 requires that courts provide defendants with notice of their right to request an ability-to-pay determination.⁶ Offering financial screenings to assess ability to pay is not a new practice; it is one of the *Collections Best Practices*. Awareness of and greater access to the practice was heightened by the online ability-to-pay application process, also known as MyCitations, which allows individuals with court-ordered debt for infractions to request an ability-to-pay determination without having to appear in court. During the reporting period, this online tool was available for traffic infractions in the Superior Courts of Fresno, Humboldt, Imperial, Modoc, Mono, Monterey, Placer, San Benito, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Tulare, and Ventura Counties. Per Government Code section 68645, all courts will be required to offer online ability-to-pay determinations using MyCitations by June 30, 2024.⁷

Findings

For 2021–22, just over \$1.0 billion was collected from delinquent and nondelinquent accounts, representing an 8 percent increase from collections in 2020–21. The increase in revenue is attributed to the restoration of collections operations to pre-pandemic service levels and is likely a temporary increase that would not change the long-term trend toward declining revenues. Collections have rebounded from the pandemic low, as case processing has resumed, but are back on trend. Although revenues have increased over pandemic years, several programs have continued local policies implemented during the pandemic. These policies were intended to provide relief to low-income individuals by prolonging installment payment plans, extending payment due dates, and/or reducing installment amounts.


Another contributing factor to the long-term trend in reduced revenue is the ongoing pattern of reduced criminal filings. According to the *2022 Court Statistics Report*, criminal filings have seen a significant decline (more than 60 percent) over the past 13 years.⁸ An even more striking decline is evident in traffic-related infractions and misdemeanors, which have declined 62 percent in the same period. Chart 2 shows the decline in criminal filings—felonies, misdemeanors, and infractions, both traffic and nontraffic—from 2008–09 to 2020–21.

⁶ Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.335, www.courts.ca.gov/cms/rules/index.cfm?title=four&linkid=rule4_335.

⁷ Cal. Courts, “MyCitations: Online Ability to Pay Determinations for Infractions,” www.courts.ca.gov/abilitytopay.htm.


⁸ Judicial Council of Cal., *2022 Court Statistics Report: Statewide Caseload Trends 2011–12 Through 2020–21*, www.courts.ca.gov/documents/2022-Court-Statistics-Report.pdf.

Chart 2



The number of adjudications or dispositions (see Chart 3) are also declining, down 72 percent since 2008–09, and filings are down 62 percent.

Chart 3



The programs have reported available collections information to the extent that the data could be extracted from their case management and accounting systems. However, the pandemic delayed projects aimed at developing reports to extract collections information at the level and detail required by Government Code section 68514. The programs continue to work with their vendors on creating reports to extract the required data.


Program Overview by Collections Type

The collection of *nondelinquent* (forthwith) payments—payments that are paid on time either in full or in monthly installments at the clerk’s window, via mail, over the phone, or online—is primarily a court responsibility, whereas a variety of entities are responsible for the collection of *delinquent* court-ordered debt. Court-ordered debt is considered delinquent one day after the payment due date and remains delinquent until paid in full or satisfied by means other than payment. Delinquent accounts include those with any outstanding court-ordered debt that is past the payment due date. The various types of collections programs consist of:

- Court-operated programs in which the court collects its own court-ordered debt;
- County-operated programs that may collect court-ordered debt for the superior court in that county;
- Private vendors that contract with a county or court to perform their collections services;
- The Franchise Tax Board (FTB) Court-Ordered Debt (COD) and Interagency Intercept Collections (IIC) collection programs; and
- Intrabranh collections services offered by the Superior Courts of Shasta and Ventura Counties to other courts that wish to contract with them for that purpose.

Chart 4 depicts the total delinquent court-ordered debt collected in 2021–22 and the percentages collected by each of the collecting entities involved in the statewide collection of court-ordered debt. Amounts collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles are reported under “Other.”

Chart 4




Data Elements Required by and Listed in Government Code Section 68514

Item 1—Nondelinquent Debt Collected (Forthwith Payments)

As programs restored collection operations to near pre-pandemic levels, revenues for nondelinquent accounts increased by nearly 9 percent to \$659.2 million in 2021–22, as reported by the collecting entities. Nondelinquent debt collected for the past seven years is shown in Chart 5.


Chart 5



Item 2—Delinquent Court-Ordered Debt Collected

Since 2007, court and county collections programs have been reporting to the Legislature the amount of delinquent debt collected, per Penal Code section 1463.010. Since reporting began in 2008–09, a cumulative total of \$8.2 billion in delinquent court-ordered debt, before the recovery of operating costs, has been collected by court and county collections programs. For 2021–22, the gross amount of delinquent debt collected was \$376.7 million, an increase of approximately 6 percent over collections in the prior year. The increase in revenues is attributed to the restoration of collections services to near pre-pandemic levels, including the referral of delinquent cases to collections. Chart 6 provides delinquent debt collections for the past seven years.

Chart 6



Collections Operating Costs


As authorized under Penal Code section 1463.007, costs incurred to collect delinquent court ordered fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments imposed on infractions, misdemeanor, and felony cases may be recovered by a court or county operating a comprehensive collections program. Costs are recovered before revenues are distributed under the State Controller’s Office *Trial Court Revenue Distribution Guidelines*.⁹

Of the total \$376.7 million that was collected from delinquent accounts, \$88.1 million in operating costs were recovered. This represents an approximate 2 percent decline from the prior year. After deducting these operating costs from the gross revenue collected, \$288.6 million in net revenue was distributed to the various state and local government entities as mandated by statute.

Chart 7 shows delinquent revenue collected and administrative costs for each program involved in the collection of court-ordered debt in 2021–22. Notable variances in private agency administrative costs—as compared to the intrabranh collections and other programs—represent economies of scale and other program-specific factors.

⁹ State Controller’s Office, *Trial Court Revenue Distribution Guidelines: Revision 31* (Jan. 1, 2021), www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/guidelines_rev_31.pdf.

Chart 7



Item 3—Adjustments: Debt Satisfied by Means Other Than Payment

The Legislature has enacted, and the courts have implemented, strategies to reduce the burdens associated with the high cost of court-ordered debt. Implementation of these strategies has reduced the amount of court-ordered debt owed and increased the number of cases satisfied or resolved by means other than payment; these are called *adjustments*. An adjustment is defined as any change in the total amount of debt due after the initial determination of the outstanding delinquent debt amount. Adjustments include amnesty, suspension or dismissal of all or a portion of a bail or fine amount, ability-to-pay determinations, and alternative payments such as community service in lieu of cash payment for fines.

For 2021–22, a total of \$699.1 million in delinquent debt was adjusted, which represents a 27 percent decline from prior-year totals.

In September 2021, AB 177 eliminated 18 criminal fees and any outstanding debt incurred because of those fees, effective January 2022. This bill expanded on Assembly Bill 1869,

enacted in 2020 to provide permanent relief to low-income individuals by repealing 23 administrative fees and costs related to the processing of criminal cases. The bill also made the remaining balance related to those fees and costs uncollectible.

To the extent the value of the 41 fees and costs eliminated by statute were previously reported on the CRT (Attachment 2) as part of court-ordered debt and were vacated or dismissed by court order during the reporting period, those values are reported as adjustments. As mentioned, of the reported adjusted amount of \$699.1 million, \$414.9 million (or just over 59 percent) was identified by the programs as related to AB 1869 and AB 177.

As of 2021–22, of the 58 programs, 41 programs have reported a combined total of \$2.9 billion in dismissed or vacated criminal administrative fees eliminated by AB 1869 and AB 177. Of the 17 programs that were unable to identify any amounts vacated or dismissed by statute, 13 are adapting to or converting to new case management systems. Problems with reporting complete and accurate data are not isolated to adjustments or related only to case management systems. Thirty-seven programs reported limitations within their case management and accounting systems. Some examples of the reporting challenges reported include:


- Correlating revenue, case count, and operating costs to a specific collections component;
- Separating collections transactions/activity by period;
- Tracking and reconciling the number of accounts to account balances;
- Reporting on nondelinquent collections activity; and
- Extracting the necessary data/reports to comply with reporting requirements.

Also, various programs reported that the added workload and hours of staff time spent identifying and adjusting eliminated fees from accounts receivable diverted staff from performing other collections activities.

Based on available data, Chart 8 shows adjustments for the last seven reporting periods.¹⁰

¹⁰ Adjustments shown in Chart 8 for 2015–16 and 2016–17 include amnesty-related balance reductions. See Judicial Council of Cal., *18-Month Statewide Infraction Amnesty Program Report* (Aug. 28, 2017), www.courts.ca.gov/partners/documents/lr-2017-JC-statewide-traffic-amnesty.pdf.

Chart 8



Item 3—Uncollectible Debt: Discharge from Accountability

It is important to distinguish between delinquent court-ordered debt that is collectible and debt that is unlikely to be collected. Collectible debt is debt for which reasonable efforts and recourse may result in it being paid. Debt is unlikely to be collected for reasons such as its age or a balance too small to justify the cost of collections. Enhanced collections programs are authorized under Government Code sections 25257 through 25259.95 to discharge delinquent debt from accountability if certain statutory provisions are met.¹¹ The programs acknowledge the importance of reducing the outstanding balance to accurately reflect the amount of truly collectible debt.

It is equally important for the programs to understand that the discharge process does not release the debtor from responsibility for payment of the unpaid court-ordered debt balance. Training on discharge is provided annually by staff to remind collections staff and managers of the true purpose of discharge and the impacts of debt accumulation. When delinquent debt remains uncollected, the balance of outstanding debt increases year over year. This is referred to as the “residual effect.” To remedy this effect, the adoption of a standardized discharge practice to normalize each program’s outstanding debt balance to improve the accuracy of the related measure is recommended.


In 2021–22, court and county collections programs discharged \$230.8 million, which represents close to a 40 percent decrease from the prior year. Of the 23 programs that discharged debt, two

¹¹ Gov. Code, § 25250–25265, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displayText.xhtml?lawCode=GOV&division=2.&title=3.&part=2.&chapter=3.&article=.

used the discharge process for the first time, and they represent \$115.8 million, or just over 50 percent of the statewide totals. The overall decrease for this year may be attributed to competing priorities, such as the time allocated to reporting AB 177 and AB 1869—specific adjustments, which may have reduced staff time dedicated to the discharge process.

Chart 9 shows the value of the statewide outstanding balance discharged by 44 of the 58 programs in the past seven fiscal years—a total of \$1.8 billion. The 14 programs that have not implemented a discharge process have a combined outstanding balance of \$1.6 billion, or almost 21 percent of the \$7.7 billion statewide outstanding balance.

Chart 9




As a result of increased familiarity with and greater use of discharge provisions, the collections programs have discharged an estimated \$1.8 billion in the last seven years. The surge in 2018–19 may be attributed to an increased emphasis on training that stressed the importance of reducing the outstanding balance to accurately reflect the amount of truly collectible debt. Chart 10 shows the increase in the number of the programs that acknowledge the importance of discharge process.

Chart 10

No. of Programs Discharging Debt							
	2015–16	2016–17	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22
No. of Programs	15	17	20	19	17	23	23

This year's discharge amount of \$230.8 million, combined with the \$699.1 million in adjustments referenced above and \$376.7 million in delinquent revenue collected, decreased the amount of outstanding debt by 2 percent from the prior year. Chart 11 shows the statewide ending balance of outstanding debt and the year-over-year percentage change for the past seven years.

Chart 11



Item 4—Description of Collections Activities Used

Under Penal Code section 1463.007, and to incentivize the utilization of comprehensive strategies for collecting delinquent debt, court and county programs may recover the costs of operating a comprehensive collections program. As required by statute, to be eligible to recover their costs, the programs must use at least 10 of 16 authorized activities—or tools—designed to enhance collection efforts. Since 2012, all 58 programs have consistently met the minimum number of activities required to recover operating costs. As required by Government Code section 68514, each program describes which collections activities it uses, by checking the boxes on the Contact and Other Information worksheet of the CRT.

Items 5 to 7—Revenue, Number of Cases, and Costs per Collection Activity

Collections programs have not always been required to report the type or level of information currently required by Government Code section 68514. As a result, case management, accounting, and collections systems, in some cases, are not configured to track the amount of revenue collected, the number of cases, and the costs associated with those collections by activity. Programs continue to work on reprogramming their case management systems to comply. However, as needed, the programs have developed different methods to report this required data. For example, programs are splitting operating costs between two or more activities, or reporting lump sums under one activity.

A total of 4.7 million collections activities were used to collect \$322.3 million. Multiple collections activities—for example, a telephone call, a mailed delinquency notice, and follow-up by a private vendor—may have been used to collect a single delinquent debt. Hence, the 4.7 million collections activities used reflect far fewer actual delinquent accounts. The total reported administrative cost of \$66.6 million represents the use of all 16 activities. Details for each program’s total revenue collected, the number of cases, and the administrative costs per collections activity can be found in Attachment 1.

Item 8—Percentage of Fines or Fees That Are Defaulted On

Individuals may enter installment payment plans to pay court-ordered debt. To meet the reporting requirement, court-ordered debt is considered in default if payments are not received as promised on an installment agreement. If installment payments are not received as promised or the payment plan is not reinstated at the end of the fiscal year, the original case value and unpaid balance are used to calculate the default rate. The percentage of fines and fees in default is nearly 33 percent for the current reporting period and approximately 60 percent for prior periods.

Item 9—Collections Best Practices

Judicial Council–Approved Collections Best Practices were adopted in 2008, with subsequent revisions made in 2011, 2017, and 2022 (Attachment 3). In 2022, three were deleted to reflect changes to statute and Judicial Council policy. Two were related to administrative fees repealed by AB 177 (listed below) and the other was based on a policy that was rescinded within the reporting period.¹²

- Practice 19—Charge fees as authorized by Penal Code section 1202.4(l).
- Practice 20—Charge fees as authorized by Penal Code section 1205(e).

Collections Best Practices identifies a variety of strategies designed to improve the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt. These include, for example, permitting courts to finalize judgments when violators do not appear in court after repeated notices, using the FTB’s collections programs, and contracting for the services of third-party collections vendors.

In 2021–22, most programs met 17 or more of the 22 best practices. Collections programs are not required to meet a specified number, though courts and counties continue to implement them to improve collections. For example, two programs implemented the discharge-from-accountability process during this reporting period.

Item 9—Performance Measures and Benchmarks

In 2008–09, performance measures and benchmarks were developed to evaluate the effectiveness of collections programs statewide. The Judicial Council approved two measures—Gross

¹² Judicial Council of Cal., Budget Com. Rep., *Collections: Outdated Policy on Civil Assessments* (June 29, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=11023505&GUID=B04976F6-8E88-4D9D-B35D-3F97C2239826>.

Recovery Rate and Success Rate—to provide baselines from which to measure and compare each program’s progress from year to year, and to analyze statewide programs.

In 2017, Government Code section 68514 required the separation of data by current and prior periods, substantially affecting the performance measures and corresponding benchmarks. These changes prompted the hiring of a consultant to reevaluate and develop metrics that align with the current reporting requirements and statutory changes.

As part of the study, the consultant analyzed available collections data and collaborated with several subject-matter experts of Judicial Council partners. In May 2022, the Judicial Council approved seven new collections metrics (Attachment 4) that are based solely on the available collections-related information reported on the CRT, allowing programs to adopt them with limited systems reprogramming. The 2021–22 CRT was modified to incorporate the performance metrics. The intent of the metrics is to give the programs a deeper understanding of their performance, case resolution patterns, and costs related to collecting delinquent court-ordered debt. Four metrics are performance indicators: the Collector Effective Index, First Year Resolution Rate, Spend Efficiency Score, and the Cost to Referral Ratio. The Risk Monitor, Discharge Score, and the Adjustment Score, are three normalizing metrics that will provide additional context to each program’s performance.

In addition to developing new metrics, the consultant created a dashboard that will allow each collections program to view and measure its performance against similarly sized programs. This approach is intended to encourage collaboration and information sharing between similarly sized programs to solve issues and find ways to improve performance. The dashboard is part of each program’s report in *Individual Court and County Collections Program Summary Reports for 2021–22*.

The metrics do not have specified benchmarks. Instead, an average value for each metric will display on the program’s dashboard, based on performance within each cluster (Attachment 4). The current four-cluster model was developed in the early 2000s and was revised in 2020. It was primarily informed based on the number of authorized judicial positions (AJPs). Courts were ranked by their number of AJPs first, and then grouped into four clusters. Cluster boundaries were created based on a clear break in the number of AJPs. The smallest of the 58 trial courts, those with two AJPs, constituted cluster 1 courts. The remaining three clusters were identified based on natural breaks—or jumps—in the total number of AJPs.

The report, *Collections: Updates to Performance Measures and Benchmarks for Collections Program*, provides detail on how the metrics were developed. Additional explanation of the metrics and how to interpret them is included in two videos, both available online.¹³

¹³ California Courts, “Revenue Distribution Guidelines,” www.courts.ca.gov/revenue-distribution.htm.

Item 10—Improving Statewide Collections and Distribution of Court-Ordered Debt

The Judicial Council, in partnership with several stakeholders, is focused on continuous improvements in the collection, distribution, and reporting of court-ordered debt. The following are specific efforts and accomplishments that focused on improving statewide collections and distribution practices during this reporting period:

- Offering annual statewide training programs on the distribution of revenues in collaboration with the State Controller’s Office, the FTB, and Judicial Council’s Governmental Affairs and Legal Services offices. A session was offered in January 2022 to provide updates on new laws affecting criminal fines, fees, and penalties. In May 2022, webinars offered over four days included topics such as measuring the resolution of cases through adjustments and discharge, an overview of the online Ability-to-Pay program and backfill process, and both beginning and advanced revenue distribution. The materials and recorded presentations are available online for viewing.¹⁴
- Offering web-based training on how to complete the CRT and how to interpret the new metrics, to assist our collection partners with the reporting requirement for this report. This training was offered in June. Also, the 58 programs were provided a prefilled CRT, intended to improve data accuracy, and reduce recurring errors caused by incomplete or missing data.
- Continuing outreach to court and county staff to provide immediate notification and updates of legislation affecting collection and distribution efforts.
- Maintaining and strengthening relationships and partnerships with collections stakeholders, such as the State Controller’s Office, California State Association of Counties, California Revenue Officers Association, and the FTB.
- Maintaining peer-to-peer information sharing and problem-resolution opportunities, including a collections and a revenue-distribution listserve. These listserves are open to all court and county partners who work in court-ordered debt collections and revenue distribution. The listserves provide opportunities to collaborate and share knowledge regarding the collection of nondelinquent and delinquent court-ordered debt, as well as local and state distribution of the monies collected.
- Regularly updating materials related to court-ordered debt, as required by legislative changes. For example, *Collections Best Practices*, statewide collections master agreements, *Intercounty Probation Case Transfer Statewide Fiscal Procedures*, and

¹⁴ California Courts, “Revenue Distribution Guidelines,” www.courts.ca.gov/revenue-distribution.htm.

revenue distribution worksheets were revised to delete fees eliminated by AB 177. The latest revised documents are available online.¹⁵

Third-Party Collections Entities

Courts and counties are authorized by law to contract with third-party collections entities to assist in the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt. This option is particularly helpful to programs that have limited staff or need to focus their efforts on other court-specific, mission-critical goals and objectives. Additionally, third-party vendors tend to be better equipped to address hard-to-collect cases, allowing courts and counties to address the collection of more recently delinquent cases that tend to be easier and less costly to collect.

The options available to the programs for third-party collections entities, as listed in *Judicial Council–Approved Collections Best Practices*, include the following:

- **California FTB services.** The FTB offers two programs:
 - Court-Ordered Debt program—This program offers a variety of collections services, including wage garnishment, bank levies, and seizure of real and personal property or other assets to satisfy payment of delinquent debt.¹⁶
 - Interagency Intercept Collections program—This program intercepts California tax returns and, where applicable, lottery winnings and applies these dollars to the amounts of court-ordered debt owed.¹⁷
- **Intrabranh collections services.** Intrabranh collections services are programs that operate under a written memorandum of understanding. The Superior Courts of Shasta and Ventura Counties provided collections services to 11 other superior courts—one additional program than was reported last year. Ventura and Shasta provided collections services to 7 and 4 other courts, respectively.
- **Private, third-party vendors.** Twelve private companies provided collections services to the courts and counties. Those companies were vetted through a competitive process and awarded statewide master agreements by the Judicial Council in January 2019. Individual courts and counties were then free to select their preferred vendors and independently negotiate and contract with them. Programs with a high volume of delinquent accounts may elect to use multiple vendors. Collections commission rates vary. Forty-nine of the 58 collections programs used at least one private vendor during

¹⁵ California Courts, “Collections Resources,” www.courts.ca.gov/partners/455.htm.

¹⁶ See State of Cal., Franchise Tax Board, “Court-ordered dept collections,” www.ftb.ca.gov/pay/collections/court-ordered-debt/index.html (as of Nov. 4, 2022).

¹⁷ See State of Cal., Franchise Tax Board, “Interagency intercept,” www.ftb.ca.gov/pay/collections/interagency-intercept/index.html (as of Nov. 4, 2022).

the reporting period, which represents an increase from the 48 reported last year. For a list of statewide master agreements, refer to Collections LPA Master Agreements, at www.courts.ca.gov/procurementservices.htm.

Conclusion

In fiscal year 2021–22, just over \$1.0 billion in court-ordered debt was collected by court and county collections programs from nondelinquent and delinquent accounts, representing nearly an 8 percent increase from the previous fiscal year. Revenues are higher, despite lingering effects of the pandemic on collections operations and continued local policies to lengthen installment payment plans, extend payment due dates, and/or reduce installment amounts.

Also, in 2021–22, the programs reported \$699.1 million in adjustments, of which \$284.2 million in court-ordered debt was resolved by means other than actual payment, through ability-to-pay determinations, community service, or time served in lieu of payment. The remaining \$414.9 million reported in adjustments was either vacated or dismissed by court order per AB 177 and AB 1869. The total outstanding delinquent debt balance of \$7.7 billion represents a 2 percent decrease from the prior year—the third consecutive year that debt balance has dropped.

Over the 14 years that the state has been actively gathering data on court-ordered debt, court and county programs have reported a total of \$20.8 billion collected (\$8.2 billion from delinquent and \$12.6 billion from nondelinquent accounts). In addition, over the 10 years that adjustments and discharge have been tracked separately, a total of \$6.7 billion has been satisfied by means other than payment—such as through a court-ordered waiver, an alternative sentence, or a vacate order per statutory change—and \$2.2 billion has been discharged from accountability.

Programs continue to report challenges in tracking, reconciling, and reporting complete and accurate collections information because of limitations within case management and accounting systems. These factors may have affected collections information reported and should be considered in assessing the overall success of the program’s efforts.

The courts and counties continue to strive for improved performance by following recommended best practices, implementing new collections strategies, and streamlining their operations.

Attachments

1. *Individual Court and County Collections Program Summary Reports for 2021–22*
2. Collections Reporting Template
3. *Judicial Council–Approved Collections Best Practices*
4. *Judicial Council–Approved Collections Performance Metrics and Performance Measures Reference Guide*

ATTACHMENT 1:

Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22
by Program

Alameda: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Alameda County and the County of Alameda. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Alameda collections program, gross revenue collected may have been higher, but due to Assembly Bill 177 certain fees were no longer collectible as of January 1, 2022.

The program continued to be affected by the changes due to pandemic. The court continues to increase access to the public per safe practice guidelines and is offering alternatives to appearing in court such as video and phone appearances. The Franchise Tax Board (FTB) Interagency Intercept Collections (IIC) program implemented a temporary suspension which may have also affected collections.

Due to the lifting of pandemic restrictions, the FTB-IIC and the court reported increased gross revenue collections over last fiscal year. Meanwhile, the FTB Court-Ordered Debt program's revenue declined from the prior year as more funds were collected by other programs. The

The county engages in most collection activities authorized by Penal Code section 1463.007, but due to system limitations is unable to report all collections information requested. Administrative costs are not calculated per collection activity, they are calculated monthly, as mandated guidelines. The court reported totals by collections activity from holds placed on driver's license by the DMV for failure to appear.


Because of system limitations, the program is unable to report some of the collection information that has been requested.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Alameda	Outstanding Balance \$220,030,199	Nondelinquent Revenue \$31,669,741	Delinquent Revenue \$22,507,481	Administrative Cost \$3,568,933	Adjustments \$54,009,942	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 4	First-year Resolution Rate Score Cluster Average 10.4% 19.1%	Risk Monitor Score Cluster Average 67.1% 49.7%	Adjustment Score Score Cluster Average 182.13 101.72	Discharge Score Score Cluster Average 0.00 31.79	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average CEI Score 0.40 0.20 0.00 0.07 0.32 0.49 0.10 Current Prior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average Cost: Referral Score 30.00 20.00 10.00 0.00 5.68 27.15 6.18 5.19 Current Prior	Spend Efficiency Score Period Program Score Current Cluster Average Prior Cluster Average Combined Score Cluster Average County0.170.360.300.550.260.49 Private Agency0.170.250.170.200.170.22 FTB-COD0.150.170.150.190.150.19 FTB-IIC0.060.060.150.040.130.04			
	Population 1,651,979					
	Judges 73					
	Commissioners 10.00					
Best Practices Engaged 22/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index Period Score Cluster Average Current0.070.32 Prior0.490.10 Combined0.400.12	Cost: Referral Ratio Period Score Cluster Average Current5.6827.15 Prior6.185.19 Combined6.077.01	Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Alameda	Current	Prior	Combined				
	56%	46%	49%	184,902	113,615	587,697	233,329

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$637,967	\$1,423,038	\$106,219	\$432,595	\$580,676	\$1,194,716	-	-
Private	\$1,024,010	\$2,923,117	\$174,574	\$496,866	\$237,184	\$25,068,848	-	-
FTB-COD	\$2,349,400	\$8,004,374	\$352,410	\$1,200,656	\$235,945	\$26,644,177	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$1,237,091	\$4,908,484	\$73,804	\$731,809	\$48,396	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$5,248,468	\$17,259,013	\$707,007	\$2,861,926	\$1,102,201	\$52,907,741	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$33,975	37,493	\$0
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$35,736	24,353	\$0
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	288,910	-
4 - Skip Tracing	\$81,184	6,206	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$9,214,208	255,011	\$1,553,066
6 - FTB-IIC	\$5,481,797	61,112	\$805,613
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$1,347,656	15,886	-
8 - Private Agency	\$3,947,127	-	\$671,440
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$20,141,682	688,971	\$3,030,119

Alpine: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview



The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Alpine County and the County of Alpine. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance


According to the Alpine collections program, the "Other" category represents cases not entered in Alpine's current case management system. Delinquent cases were previously forwarded to a private collection agency from Alpine's previous case management system. Court will continue to either enter those cases in current case management system or discharge depending on age and activity.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Alpine	Outstanding Balance \$632,871	Nondelinquent Revenue \$335,606	Delinquent Revenue \$77,879	Administrative Cost \$19,951	Adjustments \$24,225	Discharge \$205,669	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 28.2%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 23.5%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 25.7531.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 218.651.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court0.270.260.540.480.330.36 Private Agency0.150.140.150.160.150.16				
	Population 1,200						
	Judges 2						
	Commissioners 0.30						
Best Practices Engaged 18/22							
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.470.16 Prior0.050.06 Combined0.160.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current36.9211.14 Prior8.634.43 Combined16.355.19	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court Alpine	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 1,090	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 1,220	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 201
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	19%	141%	94%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$37,279	\$10,033	\$10,008	\$5,389	\$2,990	\$15,834	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$15,356	\$15,211	\$2,288	\$2,266	\$918	\$4,483	-	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$205,669
Total	\$52,635	\$25,244	\$12,296	\$7,655	\$3,908	\$20,317	-	\$205,669

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	35	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$47,312	10	\$15,397
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$30,567	-	\$4,554
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$77,879	45	\$19,951

Amador: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Amador County and the County of Amador. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Amador collections program, the court went live with a new case management system (eCourt) in February 2022. From that date until the end of 2021–22, the court was unable to refer new cases to Ventura Court for collections. The interface to allow for the referral of cases is almost complete.


Ventura Superior Court was able to comply with the reporting requirements of Government Code section 68514 for collections received on behalf of Amador Superior Court.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Amador	Outstanding Balance \$11,154,649	Nondelinquent Revenue \$934,169	Delinquent Revenue \$806,741	Administrative Cost \$161,229	Adjustments \$636,196	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 14.2%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 22.7%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 50.4831.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.60 0.40 0.20 0.00 0.160.100.060.54 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 20.00 10.00 0.00 11.146.4625.924.43 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average FTB-COD0.160.150.200.150.20 Intrabranch0.200.210.200.220.200.22			
	Population 40,297	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
	Judges 2					
	Commissioners 1.00					
Best Practices Engaged 20/22						
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.540.16 Prior0.100.06 Combined0.120.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current25.9211.14 Prior6.464.43 Combined7.285.19	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Amador	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	3,294	22,149	2,577
	36%	68%	64%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	\$2,384	-	\$358	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$121,166	\$683,191	\$24,233	\$136,638	-	\$636,196	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$121,166	\$685,575	\$24,233	\$136,996	-	\$636,196	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$410,718	1,389	\$82,143
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$393,639	1,091	\$78,728
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$2,384	-	\$358
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$806,741	2,480	\$161,229

Butte: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Butte County and the County of Butte. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance



According to the Butte collections program, although the majority of Assembly Bill 1869 reductions were included in last year's report, this report includes amounts directly related to Assembly Bills 1869 and 177.

The county's collections system is unable to differentiate revenue, reductions, and cost for current reporting period cases and cases assigned in prior years; the county split the total amounts of revenue collected, cost, and reductions equally between current and prior periods. Additionally, because of collection system reporting limitations, the county cannot differentiate the number of payments received on specific cases from total payments made on all accounts in a given time period nor the value of cases on installment agreements. The county plans to upgrade to a new version of the collections system with more robust reporting capabilities. The county also intends to return to an annual discharge from accountability process in the next reporting period.

Due to case management system limitations, adjustments made to cases are not accurately reported, which could potentially offset total reported underpayments. Because of systems limitations, the program cannot provide some of the information required by Government Code section 68514, but is working with systems providers to rectify the issue.


During review of the report, it was determined that case values are reported at any time during the fiscal year, when the case is reported as delinquent, as expected. All other activities are reported for the full fiscal year, including payments and credits. Due to this discrepancy, the ending case value resulted in a negative balance. In previous years, there were a few errors with reported beginning balance due to case management system limitations, resulting in the carryover of inaccurate ending balance. These figures were removed and replaced by calculated amounts of the beginning inventory and reflect correct values moving forward.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Butte	Outstanding Balance \$89,344,598	Nondelinquent Revenue \$3,752,112	Delinquent Revenue \$4,848,296	Administrative Cost \$1,237,288	Adjustments \$9,799,124	Discharge \$0																											
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 17.8%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 72.7%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 94.2358.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69																												
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Court</td><td>0.27</td><td>0.32</td><td></td><td>0.22</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.25</td></tr><tr><td>County</td><td>0.91</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.91</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.91</td><td>0.33</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.18</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.16</td></tr></table>			Court	0.27	0.32		0.22	0.17	0.25	County	0.91	0.33	0.91	0.33	0.91	0.33	Private Agency	0.14	0.16	0.19	0.19	0.17	0.18	FTB-COD	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.16
	Court	0.27	0.32		0.22	0.17	0.25																										
	County	0.91	0.33	0.91	0.33	0.91	0.33																										
	Private Agency	0.14	0.16	0.19	0.19	0.17	0.18																										
FTB-COD	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.16																											
Population 201,608																																	
Judges 11																																	
Commissioners 2.00																																	
Best Practices Engaged 21/22				Dashboard Comments We have a high adjustment score due to crediting account balances regarding AB 1869 and AB 177 this fiscal year. Another factor towards a high adjustment score is our process in collecting current delinquent cases. They are sent a notice to act within 20 days, and if the balance is not collected, we refer them to County Collections.																													
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.71</td><td>0.23</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.07</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.11</td><td>0.09</td></tr></table>	Current	0.71	0.23	Prior	0.06	0.07	Combined	0.11	0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Current</td><td>33.44</td><td>16.73</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>2.33</td><td>3.83</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>4.80</td><td>5.20</td></tr></table>	Current	33.44	16.73	Prior	2.33	3.83	Combined	4.80	5.20	Performance Metrics Key <table><tr><td>Positive</td><td>Needs Improvement</td><td>No Data</td></tr></table>			Positive	Needs Improvement	No Data							
Current	0.71	0.23																															
Prior	0.06	0.07																															
Combined	0.11	0.09																															
Current	33.44	16.73																															
Prior	2.33	3.83																															
Combined	4.80	5.20																															
Positive	Needs Improvement	No Data																															

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Butte	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	11,334	257,842	29,328
	46%	48%	47%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$525,564	\$295,832	\$141,655	-	\$16,685	\$170,594	\$0	-
County	\$475,808	\$475,808	\$431,558	\$431,558	\$638,601	\$638,601	-	-
Private	\$40,690	\$94,725	\$5,696	\$17,729	\$222,817	\$7,490,972	-	-
FTB-COD	\$750,318	\$750,319	\$104,546	\$104,546	\$310,427	\$310,427	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$719,616	\$719,617	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$2,511,996	\$2,336,301	\$683,455	\$553,833	\$1,188,530	\$8,610,594	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-

Calaveras: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Calaveras County and the County of Calaveras. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Calaveras collections program, their case management system has a very limited ability to report the information required by Government Code section 68514. Most of the data reported comes directly from vendors and is reconciled against the data the program is able to retrieve, which consists of gross revenue collected annually and the cost of collections. They are not able to identify the number of cases that have payments applied, the activity generating payments, or the inventory that each vendor maintains. The hope is that with system upgrades, the program will be able to complete this report in full. Calaveras County Probation Department has been unable to provide collection and victim restitution information for 2021–22 due to staffing issues.


The Contact and Other Information Report is compiled by the private vendor and only applies to their collection efforts on behalf of the program. Therefore, trying to reconcile any information from that report against the Annual Financial Report will be prohibitive, as the Annual Financial Report included collection efforts made by other components as well.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Calaveras	Outstanding Balance \$9,444,607	Nondelinquent Revenue \$623,884	Delinquent Revenue \$318,861	Administrative Cost \$31,755	Adjustments \$330,413	Discharge \$0																															
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 11.3% 6.5%		Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 46.6% 50.9%		Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 32.73 31.97		Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.00 1.69																													
	Collector Effective Index CEI Score Cluster Average 0.16 0.06 0.25 0.25	Cost: Referral Ratio Cost: Referral Score Cluster Average 4.96 2.99 11.14 4.43		Spend Efficiency Score Period Program Score Current Cluster Average Prior ScoreCluster Average Combined ScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Court</td><td></td><td>0.26</td><td>0.08</td><td>0.48</td><td>0.08</td><td>0.36</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.11</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.11</td><td>0.16</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td>0.12</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.20</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.04</td><td></td><td>0.23</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.19</td></tr></table>						Court		0.26	0.08	0.48	0.08	0.36	Private Agency	0.15	0.14	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.16	FTB-COD	0.12	0.16	0.14	0.20	0.14	0.20	FTB-IIC	0.04	0.04		0.23	0.04	0.19
	Court		0.26	0.08	0.48	0.08	0.36																														
	Private Agency	0.15	0.14	0.11	0.16	0.11	0.16																														
	FTB-COD	0.12	0.16	0.14	0.20	0.14	0.20																														
FTB-IIC	0.04	0.04		0.23	0.04	0.19																															
Population 45,049																																					
Judges 2																																					
Commissioners 0.30																																					
Best Practices Engaged 20/22																																					
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.250.16 Prior0.250.06 Combined0.250.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current4.9611.14 Prior2.994.43 Combined3.425.19		Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments. Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data																																	

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Calaveras	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	3,495	9,273	2,298
	-	18%	15%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	\$3,735	-	\$300	-	-	-	-
County	\$6,219	\$22,244	-	-	\$32,865	\$112,012	-	-
Private	\$3,948	\$46,515	\$588	\$5,027	-	\$15,703	-	-
FTB-COD	\$57,396	\$115,151	\$6,911	\$16,389	\$69,933	\$99,900	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$63,653	-	\$2,540	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$131,216	\$187,645	\$10,039	\$21,716	\$102,798	\$227,615	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$11,231	42	\$2,119
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$15,902	47	\$3,572
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	\$33,801	57	\$2,540
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$60,934	146	\$8,231

Colusa: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Colusa County and the County of Colusa. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Colusa collections program, fiscal year 2021–22 was challenging. In July 2021 the court started a court collection program after Shasta Court Collections terminated their contract with Colusa. The first year resolution rate is low because the collections program is new and notices of transferred cases are consistently being sent out to defendants.

In addition, in November 2021 the court transitioned to a new case management system. This posed all sorts of obstacles as legacy system information did not convert over correctly into the new case management system. Additionally, due to system limitations, certain reports were unavailable in either case management system. The program has been actively working with the system vendor to create reports that will capture the information needed for the annual collections report. However, currently the program is unable to complete much of the Contact and Other Information tab, as well as other elements of the report.


The court successfully entered into a contract with the Franchise Tax Board (FTB). However, due to system limitations, they are currently unable to send the needed information to FTB. They are hopeful the vendor will find a solution to this soon.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Colusa	Outstanding Balance \$8,067,558	Nondelinquent Revenue \$1,764,762	Delinquent Revenue \$99,409	Administrative Cost \$23,710	Adjustments \$315	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 100.0%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0431.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.16 0.06 0.02 CEI Score Period CurrentPrior	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 11.14 4.43 2.83 Cost: Referral Score Period CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court 0.26 0.24 0.48 0.24 0.36			
	Population 21,807					
	Judges 2					
	Commissioners 0.30					
Best Practices Engaged 20/22						
Collections Activities Performed 11/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.000.16 Prior0.020.06 Combined0.020.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current11.14 Prior2.834.43 Combined2.835.19	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court Colusa	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 8,381	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 148
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	\$99,409	-	\$23,710	-	\$315	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	\$99,409	-	\$23,710	-	\$315	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-

Contra Costa: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Contra Costa County and the County of Contra Costa. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Contra Costa collections program, nondelinquent and delinquent collections revenue increased in 2021–22. The significant increase in prior period collections is most likely attributed to lifting of pandemic restrictions. For example, the Franchise Tax Board Interagency Intercept Collections program resumed tax intercepts in August 2021, resulting in an increase in tax intercept revenue in 2021–22. Additionally, the court worked down criminal and traffic case backlogs following 2020–21 public closures, which had a positive impact on collections activity.

The ending inventory balances decrease for both the FTB Court-Ordered Debt (COD) program and private agency collections program resulted from negative adjustments to court-ordered debt. The court eliminated balances owed on various administrative fees as a result of a moratorium passed by the County Board of Supervisor on various county fees, and pursuant to Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177. Also, the court's discharged amount in delinquent criminal court-ordered debt also decreased the ending case inventory balance.

The court compiled collections data from multiple systems, private collections agency, and FTB-COD. These sources were unable to provide the number of cases with payments received for nondelinquent cases and data for the court's collections program. The FTB-COD program does not report installment agreement default balances. Although the court mails delinquent notices, generates internal reports, and accepts credit card payments, the case management system does not track payment by collection activity, so all court collections activities are reported under category 2, including revenue and costs. Other delinquent court costs such as court staff and systems costs, except for commission costs, are reported under category 3. Although the private agency and FTB engaged in multiple activities (telephone calls, notices, internal reports, skip tracing, garnishments, etc.), collections information provided by private agency and FTB are reported under categories 5, 6 and 8 only.


Current period nondelinquent collections include forthwith payments collected by the court and accounts receivable and installment payments collected by private collections agencies. Delinquent revenue collected by the court are payments on cases in failure to appear, failure to pay or failure to comply status made at the counter, by mail, or online.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Contra Costa	Outstanding Balance \$218,315,180	Nondelinquent Revenue \$13,027,532	Delinquent Revenue \$17,203,331	Administrative Cost \$2,623,748	Adjustments \$25,945,172	Discharge \$4,107,117																												
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 13.4%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 97.7054.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 15.4728.98																													
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Court</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.25</td><td></td><td>0.33</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.28</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td>0.12</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.31</td><td>0.24</td><td>0.26</td><td>0.22</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.21</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.21</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.09</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.09</td></tr></table>				Court	0.18	0.25		0.33	0.18	0.28	Private Agency	0.12	0.18	0.31	0.24	0.26	0.22	FTB-COD	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.21	0.15	0.21	FTB-IIC	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.09
	Court	0.18	0.25		0.33	0.18	0.28																											
	Private Agency	0.12	0.18	0.31	0.24	0.26	0.22																											
	FTB-COD	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.21	0.15	0.21																											
FTB-IIC	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.07	0.09																												
Population 1,156,555	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																																	
Judges 38 Commissioners 4.00																																		
Best Practices Engaged 18/22	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.30</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.22</td><td>0.08</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.22</td><td>0.10</td></tr></table>	Current	0.13	0.30	Prior	0.22	0.08	Combined	0.22	0.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Current</td><td>18.73</td><td>22.21</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>8.88</td><td>4.50</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>9.58</td><td>6.33</td></tr></table>	Current	18.73	22.21	Prior	8.88	4.50	Combined	9.58	6.33	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data													
Current	0.13	0.30																																
Prior	0.22	0.08																																
Combined	0.22	0.10																																
Current	18.73	22.21																																
Prior	8.88	4.50																																
Combined	9.58	6.33																																
Collections Activities Performed 12/16																																		

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Contra Costa	Current	Prior	Combined				
	48%	58%	57%	136,137	Not Available	273,805	59,753

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$1,322,684	-	\$241,964	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$797,672	\$2,259,060	\$94,583	\$696,214	\$650,973	\$25,294,198	-	\$4,107,117
FTB-COD	\$89,625	\$8,747,739	\$13,444	\$1,312,161	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$225,093	\$3,761,457	\$14,275	\$251,107	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$2,435,074	\$14,768,257	\$364,266	\$2,259,482	\$650,973	\$25,294,198	-	\$4,107,117

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	\$0
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,322,684	-	\$38,709
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	\$203,255
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	\$0
5 - FTB-COD	\$8,837,364	16,152	\$1,325,605
6 - FTB-IIC	\$3,986,550	9,201	\$265,382
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$3,056,733	34,400	\$790,797
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$17,203,331	59,753	\$2,623,747

Del Norte: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview



The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Del Norte County and the County of Del Norte. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged are displayed on tables below.¹

Performance


According to the Del Norte collections program, the court's enhanced collection processes and program may be jeopardized by the continuing elimination of debts by the Legislature. At this time, the benefit to the court in comparison to the amount of time and expense spent to run a program is increasingly less beneficial.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Del Norte	Outstanding Balance \$23,378,094	Nondelinquent Revenue Not Available	Delinquent Revenue \$334,363	Administrative Cost \$46,785	Adjustments \$38,449	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 5.3%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 1.6231.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Private Agency0.140.140.140.160.140.16				
	Population 27,218			Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
	Judges 2						
	Commissioners 0.80						
Best Practices Engaged 15/22							
Collections Activities Performed 11/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.100.16 Prior0.020.06 Combined0.020.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current8.5711.14 Prior1.454.43 Combined1.955.19	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	20%	23%	22%				
Del Norte				Not Available	Not Available	24,003	523

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$102,260	\$232,103	\$14,293	\$32,492	\$19,904	\$18,544	\$0	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$102,260	\$232,103	\$14,293	\$32,492	\$19,904	\$18,544	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$216,415	294	\$30,316
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$117,948	229	\$16,469
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$334,363	523	\$46,785

El Dorado: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt transitioned from the County of El Dorado to the Superior Court of El Dorado County, effective June 30, 2017, terminating the written memorandum of understanding (MOU) for delinquent collections. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the El Dorado collections program, overall delinquent collections were minimally lower over 2020–21 totals, but are on a steady decline probably due to Assembly Bill 177 and Assembly Bill 1869. The pandemic continues to impact court collection activities, as well as debtor's ability to pay. Current and Prior Period non-delinquent collections had a minimal decrease. The court was unable to complete the process to discharge uncollectible debt as planned, and is planning to complete this action in 2022–23.

Due to systems limitations, the court and its private collection agency cannot provide some of the information required by Government Code section 68514. Both the court and collection agency systems cannot track the type of collections activities used on each case and each individual.


The court's private collection agency was able to provide fiscal year activities limited to the number of letters mailed to individuals, and inbound and outbound telephone calls. The private agency and the Franchise Tax Board were able to provide the court installment payment default information. The court replaced its case management system for all case types in October 2021. However, information had to be pulled in from three different systems for this report.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court El Dorado	Outstanding Balance \$36,368,907	Nondelinquent Revenue \$3,592,678	Delinquent Revenue \$2,008,133	Administrative Cost \$344,208	Adjustments \$3,268,232	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 25.8%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 36.6%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 78.4858.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 2.00 1.50 1.00 0.50 0.00 CurrentPrior Period 0.230.07 1.620.28	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 20.00 10.00 0.00 CurrentPrior Cost: Referral Score 16.733.83 26.875.97	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Private Agency0.130.160.220.190.190.18 FTB-COD0.150.150.150.160.150.16			
	Population 190,465					
	Judges 8					
	Commissioners 1.00					
Best Practices Engaged 19/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current1.620.23 Prior0.280.07 Combined0.430.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current26.8716.73 Prior5.973.83 Combined8.295.20	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court El Dorado	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 10,766	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 41,536	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 17,667
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	26%	49%	46%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$341,093	\$651,098	\$45,705	\$146,112	\$386,384	(\$386,774)	-	-
FTB-COD	\$520,162	\$495,779	\$78,024	\$74,367	-	\$3,268,622	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$861,255	\$1,146,877	\$123,729	\$220,479	\$386,384	\$2,881,848	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$724,300	3,439	\$140,027
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$267,892	1,193	\$51,791
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	39,340	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$1,015,941	19,216	\$152,391
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	\$0
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$2,008,133	63,188	\$344,208

Fresno: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Fresno County and the County of Fresno. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Fresno collections program, their contract with the private agency was terminated during the reporting period. When case inventory was returned, the program discovered that the information provided for 2020–21 was inaccurate and underreported by 95,558 cases with a value of \$51.2 million. This report reflects that correction.

The program vacated millions in fees eliminated by Assembly Bill 177 and discharged older uncollectable debt, reducing the outstanding balance. Last fiscal year, the court had the most successful year with the Franchise Tax Board Interagency Intercept Collections (FTB-IIC) program. Also, the county now uses the FTB-IIC as their primary collection program, therefore there is no collection activity reported for the prior period.


The court and county are still unable to reprogram their systems to gather all required information, but continue to work with their systems vendors to improve reporting.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Fresno	Outstanding Balance \$523,832,180	Nondelinquent Revenue \$4,477,782	Delinquent Revenue \$8,431,260	Administrative Cost \$1,690,804	Adjustments \$22,232,523	Discharge \$19,453,880	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 5.7%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 85.5%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 38.7454.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 33.8928.98		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average CEI Score 0.300.200.100.00 0.300.08 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average Cost: Referral Score 20.0010.000.00 22.214.50 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average County 0.63 0.28 0.75 0.30 0.74 0.29 Private Agency 0.25 0.18 0.16 0.24 0.21 0.22 FTB-COD 0.16 0.16 0.21 0.16 0.21 FTB-IIC 0.02 0.07 0.09 0.02 0.09				
	Population 1,011,273						
	Judges 45						
	Commissioners 6.00						
Best Practices Engaged 22/22							
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.120.30 Prior0.010.08 Combined0.020.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current9.2022.21 Prior1.034.50 Combined1.586.33	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data						

Court Fresno	Default Rate			No. of People Served 5	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 12,408	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 1,067,131	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 20,921
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	16%	28%	22%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	\$18,900,755	-	-
County	\$69,088	\$597,077	\$43,351	\$448,660	\$35,809	\$2,801,968	-	-
Private	\$2,319,754	\$2,006,473	\$584,180	\$324,340	\$61,437	\$401,194	-	\$19,453,880
FTB-COD	-	\$1,596,372	-	\$256,018	-	\$31,360	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$1,842,496	-	\$34,255	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$4,231,338	\$4,199,922	\$661,786	\$1,029,018	\$97,246	\$22,135,277	-	\$19,453,880

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$3,218,954	7,164	\$637,638
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$2,069,013	22,989	\$603,380
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$212,995	12,743	\$84,296
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	\$0
5 - FTB-COD	\$1,918,441	4,192	\$326,884
6 - FTB-IIC	\$1,010,481	2,053	\$34,255
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$465	12	\$3,990
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$911	27	\$361
Total	\$8,431,260	49,180	\$1,690,804

Glenn: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Glenn County and the County of Glenn. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Glenn collections program, collections have been significantly impacted by Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177. There are still nominal impacts from the pandemic, as well as staffing issues.


The court's collections program converted mid-year from a legacy case management system to a more modern case management system. Adjustments have been made so total amounts in this report match the deposit records reasonably understood to represent infraction, misdemeanor, and felony collections received by the collections program. Adjustments were made within the fourth quarter data on a pro-rata or program basis, as deemed appropriate. The program has already begun the process of configuring the reporting in the new case management system to minimize such adjustments for the next fiscal year. They are unable to report nondelinquent collections at this time.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Glenn	Outstanding Balance \$98,675,986	Nondelinquent Revenue Not Available	Delinquent Revenue \$664,732	Administrative Cost \$159,536	Adjustments \$931,847	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 0.2%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 9.2931.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.16 0.06 0.04 CEI Score Period CurrentPrior	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 11.14 4.43 2.04 Cost: Referral Score Period CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Private Agency FTB-COD FTB-IIC Intrabranchn 0.14 0.16 0.04 0.21 0.24 0.24 0.23 0.22 0.24 0.24 0.16 0.20 0.19 0.22				
	Population 28,750						
	Judges 2						
	Commissioners 0.30						
Best Practices Engaged 17/22							
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.000.16 Prior0.040.06 Combined0.040.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.2511.14 Prior2.044.43 Combined1.805.19	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court Glenn	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 88,624	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 3,345
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	\$6,371	-	\$1,537	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	\$326,544	-	\$78,806	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$1,559	\$154,701	\$376	\$37,334	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$11,045	\$164,512	\$2,666	\$38,816	\$14,869	\$916,978	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$12,604	\$652,127	\$3,042	\$156,494	\$14,869	\$916,978	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$175,557	1,659	\$41,482
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	6,024	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	19	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	4,980	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$326,544	1,125	\$78,806
6 - FTB-IIC	\$156,260	5,967	\$37,711
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$6,371	959	\$1,537
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$664,731	20,733	\$159,535

Humboldt: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Humboldt County and the County of Humboldt. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Humboldt collections program, the overall collections rate continues to be negatively impacted by legislative and policy changes in recent years. The impact of the pandemic continues to limit employment and available resources from individuals.

The county operating software doesn't have the ability to collect detailed collection activity data as requested on the Contact and Other Information sheet. Supplementary reports were utilized from which data was extrapolated and evaluated with methods that provided the most accurate approximations. The county is unable to track a detailed breakdown of cost of collections; amounts reported are pro-rated by period based on revenue collected. Reporting of some data on the Annual Financial Report is affected due to limitations of the data provided by the Franchise Tax Board and other third-party sources.


Revenue Recovery attempted again in 2022 to transition to new software. As in 2018, the process halted again when the company experienced obstacles to accurately transfer Revenue Recovery's data to the new system.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Humboldt	Outstanding Balance \$26,321,497	Nondelinquent Revenue \$1,728,373	Delinquent Revenue \$2,122,230	Administrative Cost \$479,300	Adjustments \$10,911,338	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 10.2%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 51.9%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 277.2558.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average CEI Score 0.300.200.100.00 Current Prior Period 0.230.07 0.290.16	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average Cost: Referral Score 20.0015.0010.005.000.00 Current Prior 16.733.83 13.4310.21	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average County Private Agency FTB-COD FTB-IIC 0.720.150.150.01 0.330.160.150.01 0.720.180.170.00 0.330.190.160.03 0.720.170.170.00 0.330.180.160.03			
	Population 135,168					
	Judges 7					
	Commissioners 1.00					
Best Practices Engaged 21/22				Dashboard Comments Cost of Collections entered as actual costs billed from each agency from the fiscal year. County collection cost include cost of county collections as well as cost for county to enter, process distribute, and maintain records for all collections.		
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current Prior Combined 0.290.160.17 0.230.070.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current Prior Combined 13.4310.2110.59 16.733.835.20	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court Humboldt	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 5,235	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 45,243	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 7,815
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	14%	29%	27%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$52,645	\$331,146	\$37,666	\$236,924	\$49,624	\$10,797,797	\$0	-
Private	\$80,373	\$174,020	\$11,976	\$30,513	\$29,304	\$34,613	-	-
FTB-COD	\$154,355	\$796,511	\$23,168	\$136,801	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$187	\$532,993	\$1	\$2,251	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$287,560	\$1,834,670	\$72,811	\$406,489	\$78,928	\$10,832,410	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$175,838	404	\$79,247
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$128,492	336	\$72,193
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$110,965	232	\$79,392
4 - Skip Tracing	\$85,534	125	\$61,196
5 - FTB-COD	\$950,866	4,966	\$159,969
6 - FTB-IIC	\$533,180	1,447	\$2,252
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$137,355	305	\$25,051
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$2,122,230	7,815	\$479,300

Imperial: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Imperial County and the County of Imperial. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Imperial collections program, the department's efficiencies continue to improve by providing staff training, incorporating new tools to the process, and better communication with external agencies. The program plans to start a process for handling the discharge of uncollectible court-ordered debt, but was unable to implement a process this period.


The court continues to experience significant challenges with transferring information to the new case management system; limited access to old software prevents the creation of specific reports. The court's priority is to keep improving their case management system (Ecourts) to generate all specific information required for this report. The program completed the reporting template to the extent possible, within the limits of the case management system and the availability of data.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Imperial	Outstanding Balance \$70,028,180	Nondelinquent Revenue \$8,048,202	Delinquent Revenue \$2,829,451	Administrative Cost \$742,517	Adjustments \$584,335	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate Score Cluster Average 19.4% 13.2%	Risk Monitor Score Cluster Average 30.6% 63.3%	Adjustment Score Score Cluster Average 7.96 58.76	Discharge Score Score Cluster Average 0.00 11.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.23 0.07 0.14 0.03 CEI Score Period Current Prior	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 16.73 3.83 28.38 5.30 Cost: Referral Score Period Current Prior	Spend Efficiency Score Period Program Score Current Cluster Average Prior Score Cluster Average Combined Score Cluster Average Court Private Agency FTB-COD 0.34 0.14 0.17 0.32 0.16 0.15 0.22 0.19 0.16 0.34 0.15 0.17 0.25 0.18 0.16			
	Population 179,329					
	Judges 10 Commissioners 1.30					
	Best Practices Engaged 21/22					
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index Period Score Cluster Average Current 0.14 0.23 Prior 0.03 0.07 Combined 0.04 0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio Period Score Cluster Average Current 28.38 16.73 Prior 5.30 3.83 Combined 7.93 5.20	Dashboard Comments We keep improving our Collection Department in order to work more efficient. Our goal is to keep improving our performance metric ratios.			
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court Imperial	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 60,251	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 93,650	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 4,169
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	9%	15%	13%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$621,145	\$929,784	\$214,154	\$320,564	\$4,570	\$9,710	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$222,818	\$238,291	\$32,193	\$35,739	\$25,845	\$544,210	-	-
FTB-COD	\$327,373	\$490,040	\$56,016	\$83,850	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$1,171,335	\$1,658,115	\$302,363	\$440,154	\$30,415	\$553,920	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$196,318	479	\$29,448
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$264,791	700	\$38,484
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$104,694	778	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$619,191	6,921	-
Total	\$1,184,994	8,878	\$67,932

Inyo: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Inyo County and the County of Inyo. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template (CRT).

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Inyo collections program, they are still experiencing an increase in the number of applicants seeking hardship relief and payment extensions. With these changes to Judge's ruling on traffic matters, more debt is being forgiven and less extensions granted. As the pandemic situation continues to improve, the program anticipates less debt forgiveness and increased debt collections. Data related to fees eliminated by Assembly Bill 199 was incomplete, and will be reported in 2022–23.


The program is currently in the process of a case management system conversion and continues to work with private collections agency and case management vendors to accurately track and report required data. The program was able to extract the necessary data to complete certain sections of the Collections Reporting Template. Also, they continue to manually track and report the necessary data from FTB-COD as they are not able to provide the requested information for the CRT. While the program can obtain all the required data, it is an extensive and time-consuming process for the limited number of staff.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Inyo	Outstanding Balance \$8,451,097	Nondelinquent Revenue \$2,542,552	Delinquent Revenue \$474,992	Administrative Cost \$154,151	Adjustments \$2,170,423	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 21.9%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 23.8%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 195.6031.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.30 0.20 0.10 0.00 0.160.060.280.05 CurrentPriorPeriod	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 20.00 10.00 0.00 11.144.4326.758.29 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court Private Agency FTB-COD 0.280.130.130.260.140.160.260.190.100.480.160.200.590.190.100.360.160.20				
	Population 18,978						
	Judges 2						
	Commissioners 0.30						
Best Practices Engaged 21/22							
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current Prior Combined 0.280.050.080.160.060.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current Prior Combined 26.758.2910.4511.144.435.19	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data				

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Inyo	Current	Prior	Combined				
	71%	93%	92%	2,505	7,347	14,748	1,200

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$162,922	\$6,507	\$45,730	\$54,747	\$22,472	\$1,788,147	\$0	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$3,478	\$256,314	\$449	\$48,605	-	\$359,630	-	-
FTB-COD	\$512	\$45,259	\$66	\$4,554	\$175	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$166,912	\$308,080	\$46,245	\$107,906	\$22,647	\$2,147,777	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$27,480	4,925	\$3,319
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$141,949	5,106	\$97,157
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$45,771	1,118	\$4,621
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$259,792	2,181	\$49,054
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$474,992	13,330	\$154,151

Kern: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Kern County and the County of Kern. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹



Performance

According to the Kern collections program, performance metrics for this fiscal year have been affected by the emergency order that was in place through April 4, 2022, collectors being diverted to assist with vacating fees related to Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177, and a higher than usual vacancy rate.

The program worked with a programmer to provide as much data as possible for the Annual Financial Report. A new method was used this year to provide more refined totals, which required updates to some prior year totals. It was not possible to provide accurate collection and cost data by collection activity on the Contact and Other Information sheet, but consolidated court and county totals were provided. The court is working to find ways to provide additional requested detail, and is in the process of moving toward a new case management system that would support more detailed reporting. The county's case management system is also limited and does not have information such as case counts available. Court available data and ratios have been used for Franchise Tax Board values to provide more accurate values when available.


The court has implemented revised collection strategies over the last two years, placing a higher focus on collection of more recent past due amounts. This focus is in preparation for discharge of accountability, which is anticipated once the court has moved to the new case management system that is currently in the works.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Kern	Outstanding Balance \$183,196,245	Nondelinquent Revenue \$15,011,675	Delinquent Revenue \$16,415,267	Administrative Cost \$3,928,287	Adjustments \$20,215,879	Discharge \$0																																	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 10.1%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 19.9%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 91.9654.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0028.98																																		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Score</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Combined Score</th><th>Combined Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Court</td><td></td><td>0.30</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.42</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.39</td><td>0.28</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.21</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.21</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td>0.01</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.01</td><td>0.09</td><td>0.01</td><td>0.09</td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Combined Cluster Average	Court		0.30	0.25	0.42	0.33	0.39	0.28	FTB-COD		0.15	0.16	0.15	0.21	0.15	0.21	FTB-IIC		0.01	0.07	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Combined Cluster Average																															
	Court		0.30	0.25	0.42	0.33	0.39	0.28																															
	FTB-COD		0.15	0.16	0.15	0.21	0.15	0.21																															
FTB-IIC		0.01	0.07	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09																																
Population 909,813																																							
Judges 38																																							
Commissioners 7.00																																							
Best Practices Engaged 16/22																																							
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.38</td><td>0.30</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.08</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.10</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.38	0.30	Prior	0.17	0.08	Combined	0.18	0.10	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>54.99</td><td>22.21</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>13.06</td><td>4.50</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>15.47</td><td>6.33</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	54.99	22.21	Prior	13.06	4.50	Combined	15.47	6.33	Dashboard Comments Performance Metrics for this fiscal year have been affected by the Emergency Order that was in place through April 4, 2022, collectors being diverted to assist with vacating fees related to AB1869/AB177, and a higher than usual vacancy rate.												
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																					
Current	0.38	0.30																																					
Prior	0.17	0.08																																					
Combined	0.18	0.10																																					
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																					
Current	54.99	22.21																																					
Prior	13.06	4.50																																					
Combined	15.47	6.33																																					
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data																																				

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Kern	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	60,908	253,961	45,297
	79%	99%	98%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$2,321,101	\$6,204,878	\$702,083	\$2,599,739	\$58,178	\$20,157,701	\$0	-
County	\$146,835	\$563,491	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$649,940	\$3,323,774	\$97,491	\$498,566	\$0	-	\$0	-
FTB-IIC	\$165,004	\$3,040,244	\$2,115	\$28,293	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$3,282,880	\$13,132,387	\$801,689	\$3,126,598	\$58,178	\$20,157,701	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$9,236,305	24,306	\$3,301,822
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$3,973,714	10,841	\$596,057
6 - FTB-IIC	\$3,205,248	10,150	\$30,408
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$16,415,267	45,297	\$3,928,287

Kings: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Kings County and the County of Kings. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Kings collections program, Kings County Probation Department's case management system does not allow for data to be extracted to meet the state Collection Report's requirements. The county does not have the information technology and financial resources to create a report or a query that would extract the needed information in the required format.

The probation department collects on accounts for people currently on probation. Once a person is no longer on probation, the probation department continues to collect on the account. Accounts that have missed payments more than three times are transferred to the private collection agency. They completed the report for the accounts transferred to them with the technology resources available.


Kings County Superior Court will look into developing a process to discharge uncollectable debt. The court is unable to determine the amount of outstanding victim restitution. The case management system does not have a report that will extract the data needed for this information.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Kings	Outstanding Balance \$75,100,527	Nondelinquent Revenue \$6,758,761	Delinquent Revenue \$1,741,194	Administrative Cost \$294,573	Adjustments \$492,811	Discharge \$2,070
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 11.9%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 6.3758.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0311.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.23 0.07 0.150.03 CurrentPrior CEI Score Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 16.73 3.83 13.532.30 CurrentPrior Cost: Referral Score Period	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Private Agency0.170.160.170.190.170.18 FTB-COD0.150.160.170.160.170.16			
	Population 152,023					
	Judges 8					
	Commissioners 1.60					
Best Practices Engaged 16/22						
Collections Activities Performed 13/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.150.23 Prior0.030.07 Combined0.040.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current13.5316.73 Prior2.303.83 Combined2.935.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Kings	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	Not Available	100,415	4,061
	17%	24%	22%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$454,724	\$1,136,175	\$76,834	\$192,728	\$181,886	\$316,314	\$2,070	-
FTB-COD	-	\$150,295	-	\$25,012	-	(\$5,389)	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$454,724	\$1,286,470	\$76,834	\$217,740	\$181,886	\$310,925	\$2,070	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$1,136,175	2,347	\$192,728
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$454,724	1,304	\$76,834
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$150,295	407	\$2,468
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$1,741,194	4,058	\$272,030

Lake: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Lake County and the County of Lake. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Lake collections program, despite the aftereffects of the pandemic, collections had a productive year. The program effectively processed many court cases that had accumulated during the pandemic and started the collection process, while dealing with the impact of changes in statute. Assembly Bill 199, which requires the removal of any unpaid civil assessment, will have an estimated \$12 million dollar impact to the program's portfolio. The large number of new case referrals and the repeal of various administrative fees, due to Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177, created some bottlenecks in the system at the outset of the year. While revenue was down again for the year, the program is well positioned with operational stability to move into the future.

Franchise Tax Board (FTB) collections declined 17 percent from prior year and a historic low in reimbursements for the last three months of the year. The county program had a 58 percent increase from prior year but is still down from pre-pandemic revenue levels. Collection rates were aided by the court catching up from the pandemic, with the referral of large number of cases at the end of 2020–21 and the beginning of 2021–22. This fact along with changes in state law, and the subsequent reduction in the value of fines sent to the Treasurer-Tax Collectors Office may result in revenue decline in the coming fiscal year. Some reported information are best estimates; going forward the county will attempt to reconcile their inventory in their system with the FTB's data. This will likely cause a revision in 2022–23 beginning balance, as the inventory gets sorted out. Also, the program continues to move toward accomplishing a discharge from accountability soon. Due to the anticipated impacts of AB 199, a more modest goal of \$2.5 to \$3 million has been set instead of the \$10 million originally planned.

Due to the new performance metrics, it is hard to compare old standards of Gross Recovery Rate and Success Rate with the new standards. The program looks forward to seeing the dashboard to assess how they compare to the other California counties.

The FTB is a huge part of the program's ability to collect unpaid court debt using tools such as wage garnishment and bank levies. The FTB's 35 percent revenue decline is attributed to the pandemic and the court's pause in referring new cases to the Treasurer-Tax Collector. The pause

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.

Lake: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

created a situation where the FTB, by the 4th quarter of 2021–22, was left collecting on the worst of cases in their possession while the large amount of catch-up debt was just starting the FTB process. The case values currently with FTB will also decrease due to recent changes in state law, but since they are now processing a huge number of cases, a huge drop in reimbursements is not expected next year. However, as case values drop, the FTB program will eventually be affected.



The county addressed the desire of the Legislature, expressed through the Judicial Council, to move away from a revenue model into a case resolution model. While the county agrees with this move, revenue numbers are a good measure of success. Going forward, all stakeholders involved need to realize that falling revenue will not be an aberration, but a feature as fine amounts fall as AB 1869, AB 177, and AB 199 adjustments take hold and the court fully implements the desire of the Legislature to focus on resolving cases over revenue.

The program is considering the FTB's Interagency Intercept Collections services and may participate in the program starting in 2023–24 to try and clear up debt that is over 15 years old. A discharge is still the best option here. Also, we need to be realistic in what we may collect from this program with an understanding that the process is ultimately about resolving these accounts whether we get paid or they end up appearing before a judge for an alternative sentencing arrangement.

The program refers the oldest and hard to collect debt to the private agency, including many accounts with missing or bad identifiers. Their collections dropped by 45 percent from the year before.


The program continues to improve its data capturing ability. Unfortunately, a lot of data must be sorted manually to meet reporting standards. The program has had a few years of relative staff stability, who can capture this data with more accuracy and efficiency. Moving into the future it will be beneficial to the program if we can move toward more automation in the acquisition of the needed data. The program was unable to report certain data required by Government Code section 68514, because of systems limitations. Information reported on revenue collected and costs by collection activity is based on an educated guess and proportioned accordingly. Case count might be the hardest pieces of data we collected. We did our best to present this data as accurately as possible.

Due to systems limitations, the program was unable to report certain data required by Government Code section 68514; the report was completed to the best of the program's ability with the current systems in place. Also, the program spent a significant amount of time removing fees eliminated by AB 1869 and AB 177.


Court Lake	Outstanding Balance \$44,276,131	Nondelinquent Revenue \$723,800	Delinquent Revenue \$746,457	Administrative Cost \$112,366	Adjustments \$246,261	Discharge \$504,921																																
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 8.3%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 55.6%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 5.3858.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 11.0311.69																																	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Score</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Score</th><th>Combined Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>County</td><td></td><td>0.15</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.33</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td></td><td>0.18</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.18</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.17</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Combined Cluster Average	County		0.15	0.33	0.16	0.33	0.16	0.33	Private Agency		0.18	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.18	FTB-COD		0.17	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.15	0.16
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Combined Cluster Average																														
	County		0.15	0.33	0.16	0.33	0.16	0.33																														
	Private Agency		0.18	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.18																														
FTB-COD		0.17	0.15	0.14	0.16	0.15	0.16																															
Population 67,407																																						
Judges 4																																						
Commissioners 0.70																																						
Best Practices Engaged 21/22																																						
Collections Activities Performed 13/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.23</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.03</td><td>0.07</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.09</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.18	0.23	Prior	0.03	0.07	Combined	0.04	0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>10.66</td><td>16.73</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>1.80</td><td>3.83</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>2.41</td><td>5.20</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	10.66	16.73	Prior	1.80	3.83	Combined	2.41	5.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.											
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																				
Current	0.18	0.23																																				
Prior	0.03	0.07																																				
Combined	0.04	0.09																																				
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																				
Current	10.66	16.73																																				
Prior	1.80	3.83																																				
Combined	2.41	5.20																																				
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Lake	Current	Prior	Combined				
	40%	40%	40%	25,572	2,547	46,686	2,083

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$201,246	\$90,169	\$31,192	\$14,012	\$40,007	\$24,115	\$6,637	\$3,318
Private	\$1,880	\$37,372	\$333	\$6,323	\$0	\$155,692	\$1,447	\$474,626
FTB-COD	\$14,447	\$401,343	\$2,419	\$58,087	\$2,880	\$23,567	\$864	\$18,029
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$217,573	\$528,884	\$33,944	\$78,422	\$42,887	\$203,374	\$8,948	\$495,973

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$4,152	25,350	\$623
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$231,415	5,150	\$35,109
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$26,500	3,250	\$3,975
4 - Skip Tracing	\$33,500	5,225	\$5,025
5 - FTB-COD	\$108,465	3,650	\$16,270
6 - FTB-IIC	\$0	0	\$0
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$0	0	\$0
8 - Private Agency	\$35,100	1,861	\$5,265
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$307,325	4,250	\$46,099
Total	\$746,457	48,736	\$112,366

Lassen: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Lassen County and the County of Lassen. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Lassen collections program, collections have been significantly impacted by Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177. There are still nominal impacts from the pandemic, as well as staffing issues.

The court's collections program converted mid-year from a legacy case management system to a more modern case management system. Adjustments have been made so total amounts in this report match the deposit records reasonably understood to represent infraction, misdemeanor, and felony collections received by the collections program. Adjustments were made within the fourth quarter data on a pro-rata or program basis, as deemed appropriate.


The court changed our case management system earlier this year. The months leading up to and following the transition greatly affected our ability to collect at times and also provide some of the information we previously were able to make available. Shasta courts who were collecting for us also had a case management system conversion which affected the data. Additionally, the court has recently moved collections back in-house, which will lead to greater ability to respond to this report next year with a fuller picture. As a result of these changes, the court is unable to report on nondelinquent collections, private agency and Franchise Tax Board collections, adjustments due to Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177, installment cases and default rates, case inventory, and victim restitution.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Lassen	Outstanding Balance \$49,421,337	Nondelinquent Revenue Not Available	Delinquent Revenue \$572,899	Administrative Cost \$137,497	Adjustments \$89,808	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 2.7%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 1.7931.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average CEI Score 0.160.06	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average Cost: Referral Score 11.144.43	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Private Agency0.140.240.160.240.16 FTB-COD0.160.240.200.240.20 FTB-IIC0.040.240.230.240.19 Intrabranchn0.240.210.240.220.240.22				
	Population 30,274			Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
	Judges 2						
	Commissioners 0.30						
Best Practices Engaged 18/22							
Collections Activities Performed 13/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.060.16 Prior0.020.06 Combined0.020.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current4.0611.14 Prior2.924.43 Combined2.955.19	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court Lassen	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 46,610	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 917
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	\$4,340	-	\$1,046	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	\$119,815	-	\$28,872	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	\$127,132	-	\$30,635	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$20,886	\$300,727	\$5,033	\$71,911	\$15,131	\$74,677	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$20,886	\$552,014	\$5,033	\$132,463	\$15,131	\$74,677	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$321,612	1,281	\$76,944
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	2,618	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	25	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	1,992	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$119,815	424	\$28,872
6 - FTB-IIC	\$127,132	3,649	\$30,635
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$4,340	338	\$1,046
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$572,899	10,327	\$137,496

Los Angeles: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Los Angeles County and the County of Los Angeles. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Los Angeles collections program, because of the pandemic, the court continued to pause referral of delinquent cases to collections and instructed the private agency and the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) to cease outbound collection activity seeking payment for existing delinquent accounts in order help lessen the financial burden many residents of Los Angeles County continued to face. Although the court did not refer any new delinquent accounts to either the private agency or FTB, the court did receive some incremental payments made on cases referred to collections in past years. In addition, the court did participate in the FTB’s Interagency Intercept Collections (IIC) program but referred a lower volume of cases than in previous years. Also, cases that were previously referred to the FTB’s Court-Ordered Debt (COD) program remained with the FTB, and some payments were collected for existing payment plan agreements.

Currently, due to case management system (CMS) limitations, the court is unable to provide the number of cases with payments received and gross revenue collected for other case types. The legacy systems do not have the capability of providing this information; therefore, until criminal cases are migrated to the court’s CMS, information provided will be incomplete. The “out of balance” error is due to a manual entry to correct the ending inventory, which is from the FTB-COD collection report. The FTB-COD is not able to provide the default balance on installments agreements. The number of cases with payments received for current period, includes criminal cases only. The court discharged from accountability 15,262 criminal cases valued at \$5,997,835 that were delinquent, since prior to June 30, 2015.

The new performance-based metrics were introduced for 2021–2022. Since the court continued to pause delinquent case referrals due to the pandemic and the inability for most individuals to pay during this time, the court’s performance is not indicative of what would be expected had collection referrals been running routinely and the collection vendors were actively pursuing payment of delinquent debt. In addition, at this time the court is unable to provide all the information used in some of the new metrics calculations. For example, the Risk Monitor score is calculated utilizing the number of non-delinquent cases with payments received in the current

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program’s case management systems.

Los Angeles: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

period, a number the court cannot currently provide due to system limitations. Therefore, the Risk Monitor score of 99 percent is inflated.

For the purposes of this report, Probation is listed as the County Collection Program (Probation). Probation has a stand-alone collection program that is not associated with the court's collection efforts. Costs reported include unpaid commission to previous private agency and FTB-IIC invoices that were not reported in 2020–2021.


Nondelinquent collections, reflects the number of cases with payments from the county. Gross revenue collected amount of \$224,625,992, reflects \$224,373,979 collected by the court and \$252,013 by Probation. At this time, the court is unable to provide the number of cases with payments for non-delinquent collections; however, available reports are being explored in the new case management systems.

The required information pursuant to Government Code section 68514 cannot be fully obtained for this reporting period; however, the court is looking into further programming efforts and exploring reports that can be generated to ensure that data elements required to complete the CRT can be provided. In addition, the court is working with its two new collection vendors to request the specific data needed.


Court Los Angeles	Outstanding Balance \$1,216,644,768	Nondelinquent Revenue \$225,154,032	Delinquent Revenue \$10,122,844	Administrative Cost \$7,359,445	Adjustments \$45,715,511	Discharge \$6,000,171
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 4	First-year Resolution Rate Score Cluster Average 0.9% 19.1%	Risk Monitor Score Cluster Average 99.2% 49.7%	Adjustment Score Score Cluster Average 35.76 101.72	Discharge Score Score Cluster Average 4.69 31.79	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.32 0.10	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 27.15 5.19	Spend Efficiency Score Period Program Score Current Cluster Average Prior Cluster Average Combined Score Cluster Average Court County Private Agency FTB-COD FTB-IIC 0.30 0.36 0.25 0.17 0.06 0.39 3.61 0.28 0.16 0.46 0.27 0.55 0.20 0.19 0.04 0.39 2.80 0.28 0.16 0.46 0.28 0.49 0.22 0.19 0.04			
	Population 9,861,224					
	Judges 510					
	Commissioners 75.30					
Best Practices Engaged 20/22				Dashboard Comments Since the Court continued to pause delinquent case referrals, the Court’s performance metrics as reported on the 2021-22 CRT are not indicative of what would be expected had the collection referrals been running routinely and the vendors were actively pursuing payment of delinquent debt. In addition, at this time the Court is unable to provide all the information used in the new metrics calculations such as the number of non-delinquent cases with payments received in the current period.		
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index Period Score Cluster Average Current 0.02 0.32 Prior 0.02 0.10 Combined 0.02 0.12	Cost: Referral Ratio Period Score Cluster Average Current 3.51 27.15 Prior 3.51 5.19 Combined 3.36 7.01	Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court Los Angeles	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 2,559	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 2,193,518	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 33,747
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	0%	0%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$997	\$7,759,566	-	\$3,006,767	\$22,268	\$40,338,690	\$0	\$5,997,835
County	\$337,426	\$1,163,856	-	\$4,202,176	\$236,997	\$817,453	-	-
Private	\$0	\$17,592	-	\$4,980	-	\$2,963	\$0	\$2,336
FTB-COD	\$0	\$798,609	-	\$125,056	\$0	\$4,297,140	\$0	-
FTB-IIC	\$0	\$44,798	-	\$20,466	-	-	\$0	-
Intrabranh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$338,423	\$9,784,421	-	\$7,359,445	\$259,265	\$45,456,246	\$0	\$6,000,171

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$798,609	9,419	\$125,056
6 - FTB-IIC	\$44,798	210	\$20,466
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$17,592	136	\$4,980
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$860,999	9,765	\$150,502

Madera: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Madera County and the County of Madera. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Madera collections program, the program had large adjustments due to Assembly Bill 177 and Assembly Bill 1869. Madera Superior Court is currently configuring its case management system to provide data on nondelinquent debt, but at the time of reporting that information was not available.

At this time, probation does not have a process to discharge debt; the court has performed its first discharge in many years. To expedite the discharge from accountability process, we are attempting to generate a report that will upload into the discharge from accountability spreadsheet directly. This will eliminate many hours of data entry which will result in more cases being discharged per year.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.

Court Madera	Outstanding Balance \$39,216,378	Nondelinquent Revenue Not Available	Delinquent Revenue \$3,208,475	Administrative Cost \$196,535	Adjustments \$17,523,684	Discharge \$1,719,268																																				
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 17.3%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 284.1658.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 27.8811.69																																					
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average CEI Score 0.400.200.00 0.230.230.070.08 CurrentPriorPeriod	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average Cost: Referral Score 20.0015.0010.005.000.00 8.2016.733.83 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Score</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Combined Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td></td><td>Private Agency</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.22</td><td>0.18</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>FTB-COD</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td>FTB-IIC</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.01</td><td>0.09</td><td>0.03</td><td>0.01</td><td>0.03</td><td></td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Cluster Average		Private Agency	0.25	0.16	0.20	0.19	0.22	0.18			FTB-COD	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.16			FTB-IIC	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.03	0.01	0.03	
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Cluster Average																																	
		Private Agency	0.25	0.16	0.20	0.19	0.22	0.18																																		
		FTB-COD	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.16																																		
	FTB-IIC	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.03	0.01	0.03																																			
Population 157,396																																										
Judges 9																																										
Commissioners 0.30																																										
Best Practices Engaged 20/22																																										
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.490.23 Prior0.080.07 Combined0.110.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current8.2016.73 Prior0.773.83 Combined1.365.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																																							
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																							

Court Madera	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments																																																																																																																																						
	Current	Prior	Combined																																																																																																																																										
	9%	28%	19%	Not Available	Not Available	144,446	15,829																																																																																																																																						
Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22 ● Revenue Net of Cost ● Administrative Cost ◆ % Administrative Cost <table><caption>Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost Data (2015-16 to 2021-22)</caption><thead><tr><th>Period</th><th>Revenue Net of Cost (\$M)</th><th>Administrative Cost (\$M)</th><th>% Administrative Cost</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2015–16</td><td>\$1.7M</td><td>\$1.8M</td><td>5.0%</td></tr><tr><td>2016–17</td><td>\$1.8M</td><td>\$1.8M</td><td>5.0%</td></tr><tr><td>2017–18</td><td>\$2.8M</td><td>\$2.9M</td><td>4.0%</td></tr><tr><td>2018–19</td><td>\$3.6M</td><td>\$3.8M</td><td>5.5%</td></tr><tr><td>2019–20</td><td>\$4.3M</td><td>\$4.4M</td><td>2.9%</td></tr><tr><td>2020–21</td><td>\$5.2M</td><td>\$5.3M</td><td>1.8%</td></tr><tr><td>2021–22</td><td>\$3.0M</td><td>\$3.2M</td><td>6.1%</td></tr></tbody></table>					Period	Revenue Net of Cost (\$M)	Administrative Cost (\$M)	% Administrative Cost	2015–16	\$1.7M	\$1.8M	5.0%	2016–17	\$1.8M	\$1.8M	5.0%	2017–18	\$2.8M	\$2.9M	4.0%	2018–19	\$3.6M	\$3.8M	5.5%	2019–20	\$4.3M	\$4.4M	2.9%	2020–21	\$5.2M	\$5.3M	1.8%	2021–22	\$3.0M	\$3.2M	6.1%	Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22 ● Nondelinquent Revenue ● Delinquent Revenue ● Adjustments ● Discharge <table><caption>Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved Data (2015-16 to 2021–22)</caption><thead><tr><th>Period</th><th>Delinquent Revenue (\$M)</th><th>Adjustments (\$M)</th><th>Discharge (\$M)</th><th>Total (\$M)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2015–16</td><td>\$1.8M</td><td>\$5.6M</td><td>\$0M</td><td>\$7.35M</td></tr><tr><td>2016–17</td><td>\$1.8M</td><td>\$0M</td><td>\$0M</td><td>\$2.24M</td></tr><tr><td>2017–18</td><td>\$2.9M</td><td>\$3.5M</td><td>\$0M</td><td>\$6.37M</td></tr><tr><td>2018–19</td><td>\$3.8M</td><td>\$0M</td><td>\$0M</td><td>\$4.52M</td></tr><tr><td>2019–20</td><td>\$4.4M</td><td>\$1.34M</td><td>\$0M</td><td>\$5.74M</td></tr><tr><td>2020–21</td><td>\$5.3M</td><td>\$26.0M</td><td>\$0M</td><td>\$31.27M</td></tr><tr><td>2021–22</td><td>\$3.2M</td><td>\$17.5M</td><td>\$1.7M</td><td>\$22.45M</td></tr></tbody></table>			Period	Delinquent Revenue (\$M)	Adjustments (\$M)	Discharge (\$M)	Total (\$M)	2015–16	\$1.8M	\$5.6M	\$0M	\$7.35M	2016–17	\$1.8M	\$0M	\$0M	\$2.24M	2017–18	\$2.9M	\$3.5M	\$0M	\$6.37M	2018–19	\$3.8M	\$0M	\$0M	\$4.52M	2019–20	\$4.4M	\$1.34M	\$0M	\$5.74M	2020–21	\$5.3M	\$26.0M	\$0M	\$31.27M	2021–22	\$3.2M	\$17.5M	\$1.7M	\$22.45M																																																														
Period	Revenue Net of Cost (\$M)	Administrative Cost (\$M)	% Administrative Cost																																																																																																																																										
2015–16	\$1.7M	\$1.8M	5.0%																																																																																																																																										
2016–17	\$1.8M	\$1.8M	5.0%																																																																																																																																										
2017–18	\$2.8M	\$2.9M	4.0%																																																																																																																																										
2018–19	\$3.6M	\$3.8M	5.5%																																																																																																																																										
2019–20	\$4.3M	\$4.4M	2.9%																																																																																																																																										
2020–21	\$5.2M	\$5.3M	1.8%																																																																																																																																										
2021–22	\$3.0M	\$3.2M	6.1%																																																																																																																																										
Period	Delinquent Revenue (\$M)	Adjustments (\$M)	Discharge (\$M)	Total (\$M)																																																																																																																																									
2015–16	\$1.8M	\$5.6M	\$0M	\$7.35M																																																																																																																																									
2016–17	\$1.8M	\$0M	\$0M	\$2.24M																																																																																																																																									
2017–18	\$2.9M	\$3.5M	\$0M	\$6.37M																																																																																																																																									
2018–19	\$3.8M	\$0M	\$0M	\$4.52M																																																																																																																																									
2019–20	\$4.4M	\$1.34M	\$0M	\$5.74M																																																																																																																																									
2020–21	\$5.3M	\$26.0M	\$0M	\$31.27M																																																																																																																																									
2021–22	\$3.2M	\$17.5M	\$1.7M	\$22.45M																																																																																																																																									
Annual Financial Report by Program and Period <table><thead><tr><th rowspan="2">Program</th><th colspan="2">Revenue</th><th colspan="2">Administrative Cost</th><th colspan="2">Adjustments</th><th colspan="2">Discharge</th></tr><tr><th>Current</th><th>Prior</th><th>Current</th><th>Prior</th><th>Current</th><th>Prior</th><th>Current</th><th>Prior</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Court</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>\$1,648</td><td>\$1,076</td><td>-</td><td>\$1,719,268</td></tr><tr><td>County</td><td>\$837,960</td><td>\$1,012,495</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>\$157,702</td><td>\$15,612,508</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>Private</td><td>\$92,539</td><td>\$111,637</td><td>\$22,834</td><td>\$21,843</td><td>\$26,990</td><td>\$689,302</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td>\$466,487</td><td>\$530,921</td><td>\$69,973</td><td>\$79,638</td><td>\$315,681</td><td>\$718,777</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td>\$139,715</td><td>\$16,721</td><td>\$696</td><td>\$1,551</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>Intrabranch</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>Other</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>\$1,536,701</td><td>\$1,671,774</td><td>\$93,503</td><td>\$103,032</td><td>\$502,021</td><td>\$17,021,663</td><td>-</td><td>\$1,719,268</td></tr></tbody></table>					Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge		Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Court	-	-	-	-	\$1,648	\$1,076	-	\$1,719,268	County	\$837,960	\$1,012,495	-	-	\$157,702	\$15,612,508	-	-	Private	\$92,539	\$111,637	\$22,834	\$21,843	\$26,990	\$689,302	-	-	FTB-COD	\$466,487	\$530,921	\$69,973	\$79,638	\$315,681	\$718,777	-	-	FTB-IIC	\$139,715	\$16,721	\$696	\$1,551	-	-	-	-	Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Total	\$1,536,701	\$1,671,774	\$93,503	\$103,032	\$502,021	\$17,021,663	-	\$1,719,268	Delinquent Collections Activity <table><thead><tr><th>Category</th><th>Revenue</th><th>No. of Cases</th><th>Cost</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>1 - Telephone</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>2 - Written Notice(s)</td><td>\$1,850,455</td><td>1,033</td><td>\$0</td></tr><tr><td>3 - Lobby/Counter</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>4 - Skip Tracing</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>5 - FTB-COD</td><td>\$997,408</td><td>13,607</td><td>\$149,611</td></tr><tr><td>6 - FTB-IIC</td><td>\$156,436</td><td>747</td><td>\$2,247</td></tr><tr><td>7 - DL Hold/Suspension</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>8 - Private Agency</td><td>\$204,176</td><td>442</td><td>\$44,677</td></tr><tr><td>9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>\$3,208,475</td><td>15,829</td><td>\$196,535</td></tr></tbody></table>				Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost	1 - Telephone	-	-	-	2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,850,455	1,033	\$0	3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-	4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-	5 - FTB-COD	\$997,408	13,607	\$149,611	6 - FTB-IIC	\$156,436	747	\$2,247	7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-	8 - Private Agency	\$204,176	442	\$44,677	9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-	Total	\$3,208,475	15,829	\$196,535
Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost			Adjustments		Discharge																																																																																																																																					
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior																																																																																																																																					
Court	-	-	-	-	\$1,648	\$1,076	-	\$1,719,268																																																																																																																																					
County	\$837,960	\$1,012,495	-	-	\$157,702	\$15,612,508	-	-																																																																																																																																					
Private	\$92,539	\$111,637	\$22,834	\$21,843	\$26,990	\$689,302	-	-																																																																																																																																					
FTB-COD	\$466,487	\$530,921	\$69,973	\$79,638	\$315,681	\$718,777	-	-																																																																																																																																					
FTB-IIC	\$139,715	\$16,721	\$696	\$1,551	-	-	-	-																																																																																																																																					
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-																																																																																																																																					
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-																																																																																																																																					
Total	\$1,536,701	\$1,671,774	\$93,503	\$103,032	\$502,021	\$17,021,663	-	\$1,719,268																																																																																																																																					
Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost																																																																																																																																										
1 - Telephone	-	-	-																																																																																																																																										
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,850,455	1,033	\$0																																																																																																																																										
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-																																																																																																																																										
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-																																																																																																																																										
5 - FTB-COD	\$997,408	13,607	\$149,611																																																																																																																																										
6 - FTB-IIC	\$156,436	747	\$2,247																																																																																																																																										
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-																																																																																																																																										
8 - Private Agency	\$204,176	442	\$44,677																																																																																																																																										
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-																																																																																																																																										
Total	\$3,208,475	15,829	\$196,535																																																																																																																																										

Marin: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Marin County and the County of Marin. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Marin collections program, much of the data on the Contact and Other Information tab is not available in the program's case management system so the data reported is based on best estimates. The system does not have the capabilities to differentiate costs of collections down to the case level so total costs were allocated to current period and prior period in proportion to the revenue collected in each period. The court is scheduled to launch a new case management system and is currently working on developing the interface between the two systems.


In 2021–22, the program worked with court staff to create a discharge of accountability process. This process is still pending approval.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Marin	Outstanding Balance \$36,140,042	Nondelinquent Revenue \$7,265,279	Delinquent Revenue \$1,923,313	Administrative Cost \$948,748	Adjustments \$321,404	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 27.4%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 8.3758.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.30 0.20 0.10 0.00 0.23 0.07 0.26 0.08 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 100.00 50.00 0.00 16.73 98.43 3.83 17.39 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average County0.540.330.540.330.540.33 Private Agency0.480.160.480.190.480.18 FTB-COD0.150.150.150.160.150.16			
	Population 257,135					
	Judges 12					
	Commissioners 0.70					
Best Practices Engaged 19/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.260.23 Prior0.080.07 Combined0.090.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current98.4316.73 Prior17.393.83 Combined22.325.20	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Marin	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	Not Available	42,508	3,791
	26%	9%	12%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$465,322	\$1,223,127	\$249,086	\$654,739	\$144,772	\$140,007	-	-
Private	\$2,210	\$24,982	\$1,051	\$11,877	\$165	\$19,509	-	-
FTB-COD	\$28,567	\$179,105	\$4,401	\$27,594	\$1,658	\$15,293	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$496,099	\$1,427,214	\$254,538	\$694,210	\$146,595	\$174,809	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$697,538	1,097	\$373,280
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$990,911	1,817	\$530,545
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$207,672	1,052	\$31,995
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$27,192	64	\$12,928
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$1,923,313	4,030	\$948,748

Mariposa: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Mariposa County and the County of Mariposa. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance



According to the Mariposa collections program, the residual effects of the pandemic may be contributing to the decrease in collections for the reporting period. The court and county dismissed or vacated an estimated one million dollars in fees eliminated by Assembly Bills 1869 and 177; many of these cases now have a zero balance. As a result of new legislation, there was also a decrease in the number of new accounts. As the report states, there were no delinquent new accounts this year for the county. The Franchise Tax Board (FTB) Interagency Intercept Collections program is once again running and collecting for the county program. The cost of collection for the county program had a small increase again this year due to salary and benefits.

The court is still unable to get an accurate number for value of cases on installment agreements on both defaulted and current due to the limitations of our case management system (CMS). The court is currently working on transferring to a new CMS and hopes to be able to provide more accurate numbers next fiscal year.

The county program is unable to get accurate numbers for default balances on all installment agreements, specifically the FTB programs, as they do not know which accounts are on an installment plan with FTB.


The court's out of balance error may come from a discrepancy in the ending balance amount reported and JALAN limitations. The court recently switched case management systems from JALAN to Tyler and anticipates providing more accurate reports.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Mariposa	Outstanding Balance \$6,864,793	Nondelinquent Revenue \$281,180	Delinquent Revenue \$530,340	Administrative Cost \$285,042	Adjustments \$1,428,020	Discharge \$205,392																																			
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 23.0%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 36.4%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 158.9431.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 22.861.69																																				
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Combined Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Court</td><td></td><td>0.66</td><td>0.26</td><td>1.24</td><td>1.02</td><td>0.36</td></tr><tr><td>County</td><td></td><td>0.70</td><td>0.48</td><td>0.46</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.31</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.16</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td>0.00</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.46</td><td>0.23</td><td>0.19</td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Cluster Average	Court		0.66	0.26	1.24	1.02	0.36	County		0.70	0.48	0.46	0.25	0.31	FTB-COD			0.16	0.19	0.20	0.20	FTB-IIC		0.00	0.04	0.46	0.23	0.19
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Cluster Average																																		
	Court		0.66	0.26	1.24	1.02	0.36																																		
	County		0.70	0.48	0.46	0.25	0.31																																		
FTB-COD			0.16	0.19	0.20	0.20																																			
FTB-IIC		0.00	0.04	0.46	0.23	0.19																																			
Population 17,045	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																																								
Judges 2																																									
Commissioners 0.30	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																								
Best Practices Engaged 22/22																																									
Collections Activities Performed 13/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.49</td><td>0.16</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.44</td><td>0.06</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.45</td><td>0.08</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.49	0.16	Prior	0.44	0.06	Combined	0.45	0.08	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>98.92</td><td>11.14</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>43.33</td><td>4.43</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>49.74</td><td>5.19</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	98.92	11.14	Prior	43.33	4.43	Combined	49.74	5.19															
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																							
Current	0.49	0.16																																							
Prior	0.44	0.06																																							
Combined	0.45	0.08																																							
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																							
Current	98.92	11.14																																							
Prior	43.33	4.43																																							
Combined	49.74	5.19																																							

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Mariposa	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	35%	34%	214	1,179	5,731	2,576

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$77,502	\$123,423	\$51,163	\$153,490	\$15,572	\$82,585	\$0	-
County	\$13,204	\$25,630	\$9,294	\$11,761	\$0	\$1,110,702	\$6,566	\$29,910
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	\$261,319	\$4,838	\$50,099	\$152,855	\$66,306	-	\$168,916
FTB-IIC	\$19,843	\$9,419	\$89	\$4,308	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$110,549	\$419,791	\$65,384	\$219,658	\$168,427	\$1,259,593	\$6,566	\$198,826

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$2,211	16	\$1,993
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$217,073	247	\$198,278
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$7,739	1,778	\$23,842
4 - Skip Tracing	\$3,317	287	\$1,684
5 - FTB-COD	\$261,319	1,647	\$54,937
6 - FTB-IIC	\$38,681	455	\$4,308
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$0	7	\$0
8 - Private Agency	\$0	0	\$0
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$0	0	\$0
Total	\$530,340	4,437	\$285,042

Mendocino: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Mendocino County and the County of Mendocino. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Mendocino collections program, all programs are reported under the county program. The county is unable to break out collection activity to the detail requested on the Contact and Other Information tab. The court will start a program in 2022–23 and intends develop process that meets reporting criteria.


Impacts to revenue include implementation of the court's case management system (CMS), and staffing shortages in the collection program. The court and county worked together on interfaces between the CMS and county accounts receivable program. After the passage of AB 177, removing all county account receivable fees, staffing shortages continued and the county determined it was cost prohibitive to continue to operate the program under the current structure and loss of fee revenue. It was recommended the county work with the court to separate the processes, whereas the county continue to collect the outstanding receivables held in their system until paid in full or discharged. The court will develop a new program for delinquent revenue keeping all new receivables except victim restitution and juvenile cases.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Mendocino	Outstanding Balance \$18,075,848	Nondelinquent Revenue \$2,119,863	Delinquent Revenue \$1,717,680	Administrative Cost \$31,956	Adjustments \$408,703	Discharge \$2,048,383
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate Score Cluster Average 14.1% 13.2%	Risk Monitor Score Cluster Average 8.3% 63.3%	Adjustment Score Score Cluster Average 18.37 58.76	Discharge Score Score Cluster Average 92.06 11.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.23 0.07	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 16.73 3.83	Spend Efficiency Score Period Program Score Current Cluster Average Prior Cluster Average Combined Score Cluster Average County0.020.330.020.330.020.33			
	Population 89,999					
	Judges 8					
	Commissioners 0.40					
Best Practices Engaged 19/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.000.23 Prior0.000.07 Combined0.000.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current1.5116.73 Prior1.513.83 Combined1.515.20	Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Mendocino	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	6,982	21,139	Not Available
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$51,598	\$1,666,082	\$960	\$30,996	\$12,277	\$396,426	\$0	\$2,048,383
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$51,598	\$1,666,082	\$960	\$30,996	\$12,277	\$396,426	\$0	\$2,048,383

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$670,045	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$541,526	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	\$458,101	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$48,008	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$1,717,680	-	-

Merced: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Merced County and the County of Merced. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Merced collections program, the decrease in delinquent collections is due to the passing of Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177, which required the court to vacate millions in eliminated fees that were no longer collectible. In addition, the court has seen an increase in TR-320 filings requesting a fine reduction and/or community service in lieu of fines.

The court will be implementing the Ability to Pay (ATP) online program in January 2023. There are no data to report on the ATP for 2021–22. The court is still working with case management systems vendor, Tyler, to develop the additional reporting requirements. Lastly, the court has been unable to refer new cases to both the private agency and to the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt program due to a case management configuration issue that has occurred. The court is working with Tyler to address this issue, expected to be corrected in 2022–23.


Also, the program is unable to provide certain collections information required by Government Code section 68514 because of case management system limitations.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Merced	Outstanding Balance \$108,025,332	Nondelinquent Revenue \$7,776,728	Delinquent Revenue \$3,811,545	Administrative Cost \$505,128	Adjustments \$13,212,885	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 15.1%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 105.6658.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average CEI Score 0.230.070.220.12 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average Cost: Referral Score 16.733.839.843.99 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average Court Private Agency FTB-COD 0.19 0.32 0.16 0.15 0.12 0.18 0.15 0.22 0.19 0.16 0.13 0.18 0.15 0.25 0.18 0.16				
	Population 284,338						
	Judges 11 Commissioners 2.00						
	Best Practices Engaged 21/22						
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.220.23 Prior0.120.07 Combined0.140.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current9.8416.73 Prior3.993.83 Combined4.745.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court Merced	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 106,619	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 14,480
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	31%	31%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$712,388	\$2,924,099	\$133,474	\$343,388	\$1,682,387	\$11,493,985	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	\$68,597	-	\$12,297	-	\$36,513	-	-
FTB-COD	-	\$106,462	-	\$15,969	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$712,388	\$3,099,158	\$133,474	\$371,654	\$1,682,387	\$11,530,498	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$35,325	66	\$6,322
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,829,558	16,640	\$234,869
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$1,840,201	-	\$247,968
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$106,462	-	\$15,969
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$3,811,546	16,706	\$505,128

Modoc: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Modoc County and the County of Modoc. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance


According to the Modoc collections program, there was a lack of payments for current period, in general. However, overall the court has done a good job in collecting past due fines. For prior period, the court was able to do a break down between both periods. Due to case management system limitations, Modoc Court cannot provide all of the information listed in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code section 68514. The collections report was completed to the best of their ability.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Modoc	Outstanding Balance \$2,566,814	Nondelinquent Revenue \$211,458	Delinquent Revenue \$127,238	Administrative Cost \$70,330	Adjustments \$222,239	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 13.0%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 26.4%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 76.2131.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.16 0.06 CEI Score CurrentPriorPeriod	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 30.00 20.00 10.00 0.00 Cost: Referral Score CurrentPrior 11.144.43 30.6925.47	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court Private Agency 0.37 0.26 0.73 0.48 0.65 0.36 0.14 0.02 0.16				
	Population 8,690						
	Judges 2						
	Commissioners 0.30						
Best Practices Engaged 21/22							
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.000.16 Prior0.000.06 Combined0.000.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current30.6911.14 Prior25.474.43 Combined26.005.19	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Modoc	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	773	2,705	Not Available
	74%	-	74%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$23,207	\$84,504	\$8,500	\$61,825	-	\$222,239	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	\$325	-	\$5	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	\$19,202	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$23,207	\$104,030	\$8,500	\$61,831	-	\$222,239	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$107,711	277	\$70,325
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	\$19,202	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$325	-	\$5
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$127,238	277	\$70,330

Mono: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Mono County and the County of Mono. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹



Performance

According to the Mono collections program, the court updated its case management system (CMS) on June 2021 and has been working to update and improve its reporting process for the collections reporting template (CRT). There were some reporting constraints this fiscal year as the CMS program is tailored specifically to the court, and the court was a little late in requesting individual reports for the CRT. However, the court is currently working on adding better reporting parameters specific to collections. It should be noted that there is the possibility for error in the CRT as a lot of the figures were established manually. At this time, there was no way to establish the cases and default balance for fine installment plans.

The court's CMS is unable to collect some of the required reporting items related to Government Code section 68514. This includes the case numbers and the amount collected for telephone contact with debtors, at this time, the court does not have a way to track that in its CMS. The court has manually tracked this fiscal year to get the numbers for the various collection activities. The court does refer cases to the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) and wages are garnished, however, the private vendor refers those cases to FTB on behalf of the court and detailed data was not provided.


This year was impacted by some of the legislation that was passed, which included Assembly Bill 199 and also halted all collections activities for a portion of time in June. With the new case management system, the court's cost of collections has decreased from previous years due to being more streamlined and not having to use multiple programs for collections activities. Unfortunately, the court was unable to discharge debt this fiscal year. This was due to several court projects that occurred in the fiscal year and limited staffing, but it is on the court's agenda to work on cases that fall under the requirements to discharge from accountability to help reflect more accurate numbers from old debt that has been uncollectable.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Mono	Outstanding Balance \$2,135,765	Nondelinquent Revenue \$2,806,399	Delinquent Revenue \$395,554	Administrative Cost \$55,482	Adjustments \$700,417	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 28.7%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 19.8%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 216.7331.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court0.130.260.130.480.130.36 Private Agency0.130.140.190.160.160.16 FTB-COD0.150.160.150.200.150.20				
	Population 13,379						
	Judges 2						
	Commissioners 0.30						
Best Practices Engaged 19/22				Dashboard Comments The high adjustment score is due Assembly Bills 1869 & 199 that were passed this year. AB199 had a bigger impact with all the outstanding \$300.00 civil assessments being dismissed.			
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.320.16 Prior0.170.06 Combined0.240.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current17.0011.14 Prior6.464.43 Combined11.335.19	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court Mono	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 9,146	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 4,898	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 1,172
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$236,350	\$27,537	\$31,809	\$3,534	\$80,984	\$195,682	\$0	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$46,189	\$31,413	\$6,140	\$5,889	\$10,427	\$290,141	-	-
FTB-COD	\$3,386	\$50,679	\$508	\$7,602	-	\$123,183	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$285,925	\$109,629	\$38,456	\$17,025	\$91,411	\$609,006	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	\$1,590
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$126,451	521	\$14,491
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	1,349	\$1,060
4 - Skip Tracing	\$11,658	151	\$1,590
5 - FTB-COD	\$54,065	801	\$9,145
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$125,778	263	\$10,603
8 - Private Agency	\$77,602	1,011	\$10,994
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$395,554	4,096	\$49,473

Monterey: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Monterey County and the County of Monterey. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Monterey collections program, the county received 13,776 delinquent accounts, a slight increase from the 12,812 accounts referred in the prior year. Discharge from accountability, adjustments, process improvements, and staff development led to an increase in delinquent gross revenue collections. Collections continue to be impacted by legislation including most recently Assembly Bills 1869 and 177.

A discharge from accountability of \$18.9 million was completed, using the annual process established. The programs prior period performance is impacted by \$63.6 million in delinquent debt held by the court that is more than 15 years old. Because of the age of the related cases, the court expects to spend roughly two years researching and collecting the necessary data to discharge the outstanding debt.

The county further refined its methodology of data on installment plans and defaults through additional analysis and was able to increase accuracy of this information. Some of the requested figures for costs and performance are difficult to calculate and assign by collections activity, as they are a product of several factors. The program did its best to research and allocate them accordingly. Due to court case management system (CMS) limitations, the program was unable to report certain data required by Government Code section 68514.

The court does not collect on delinquent debt; all delinquent cases are referred to the Monterey County Revenue Division (MCRD). However, the court recovers costs from work performed by staff on delinquent cases that are referred to the MCRD. The types of work performed by staff includes: 1) monitoring and maintaining the Traffic Collections Interface (TCI) which is responsible for electronically sending delinquent case information to the MCRD; 2) reviewing and updating previously referred cases which results in case modifications. The modifications are picked up by the TCI and corrections are updated by MCRD.


The court is unable to provide any data on collections from cases subject to ATP determination due to the limited ability in their CMS.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Monterey	Outstanding Balance \$131,065,505	Nondelinquent Revenue \$10,189,557	Delinquent Revenue \$9,809,738	Administrative Cost \$3,353,064	Adjustments \$1,332,784	Discharge \$18,905,841
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 25.6%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 52.3%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 8.2754.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 117.3428.98	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.800.600.400.200.00 0.300.080.720.09 CurrentPriorPeriod	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 60.0040.0020.000.00 22.214.5064.86 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average County0.380.280.460.300.400.29 Private Agency0.190.180.190.240.190.22 FTB-COD0.150.160.150.210.150.21 FTB-IIC0.000.070.020.090.010.09			
	Population 433,716					
	Judges 19					
	Commissioners 2.20					
Best Practices Engaged 22/22				Dashboard Comments The County prioritizes collection efforts on new referrals from the Court and has recently begun recalling groups of accounts without much result from tertiary collection vendors. The County performs annual discharges of accountability and regular adjustments required by legislation to ensure collection efforts are being spent on collectible accounts. Discharge of the Court's \$63.6 million of old uncollectible debt would increase Prior CEI to 12.5%.		
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.720.30 Prior0.090.08 Combined0.150.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current64.8622.21 Prior4.464.50 Combined10.076.33	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court Monterey	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 28,257	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 333,030	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 48,716
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	31%	79%	66%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$5,040,478	\$2,543,931	\$1,904,816	\$1,165,491	\$517,378	\$815,406	-	\$18,905,841
Private	\$25,621	\$96,374	\$4,863	\$17,835	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$645,382	\$1,057,474	\$96,807	\$158,621	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$111,121	\$289,357	\$38	\$4,593	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$5,822,602	\$3,987,136	\$2,006,524	\$1,346,540	\$517,378	\$815,406	-	\$18,905,841

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$513,806	363,984	\$302,143
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$513,735	67,277	\$44,364
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$5,311,046	7,133	\$2,512,829
4 - Skip Tracing	-	525	\$21,788
5 - FTB-COD	\$1,702,856	28,774	\$255,428
6 - FTB-IIC	\$400,478	1,106	\$4,631
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$175,577	473	\$33,045
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$1,192,240	20,285	\$178,836
Total	\$9,809,738	489,557	\$3,353,064

Napa: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Napa County and the County of Napa. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Napa collections program, overall collections were higher largely due to the following two factors: re-establishment of the Franchise Tax Board Interagency Intercept Collections program (after 2 years of program suspension) and the continued efforts of the court and county partnership with their private agency for collections services. This is the first full year that the private agency has been collecting on fines and fees on the court's behalf, and victim restitution for the county.

On delinquent data, the number of cases with payments received is the number of payments, not the number of cases. The program is currently unable to separate out cases by period, due to case management systems limitations. All forthwith payments received are shown as current period collections; unable to separate out cases from prior years. All delinquent payments are shown in the prior period section. For the number of delinquent cases, the data represents the number of payments, not the number of cases.


Also, the program is unable to provide certain collections information required by Government Code section 68514 because of system limitations of the private collections agency.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Napa	Outstanding Balance \$50,855,838	Nondelinquent Revenue \$2,472,351	Delinquent Revenue \$2,060,464	Administrative Cost \$362,072	Adjustments \$14,238,575	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate Score Cluster Average 21.9% 13.2%	Risk Monitor Score Cluster Average 30.3% 63.3%	Adjustment Score Score Cluster Average 212.03 58.76	Discharge Score Score Cluster Average 0.00 11.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.30 0.23 0.27 0.06 0.07 CEI Score Period Current Prior	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 20.00 16.73 24.38 3.45 3.83 Cost: Referral Score Period Current Prior	Spend Efficiency Score Period Program Score Current Cluster Average Prior Score Cluster Average Combined Score Cluster Average Private Agency 0.17 0.16 0.20 0.19 0.19 0.18 FTB-IIC 0.13 0.01 0.13 0.03 0.13 0.03			
	Population 136,179					
	Judges 7 Commissioners 1.00					
	Best Practices Engaged 21/22					
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index Period Score Cluster Average Current 0.27 0.23 Prior 0.06 0.07 Combined 0.07 0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio Period Score Cluster Average Current 24.38 16.73 Prior 3.45 3.83 Combined 4.98 5.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Napa	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	12,191	72,658	5,258
	14%	24%	21%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,295,063	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$779,714	\$897,339	\$128,960	\$181,809	\$325,609	\$12,617,903	\$0	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$4,015	\$379,396	\$518	\$50,786	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$783,729	\$1,276,736	\$129,477	\$232,595	\$325,609	\$13,912,966	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$1,385,777	3,244	\$259,916
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$291,277	975	\$51,370
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	\$383,411	1,039	\$51,304
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$2,060,465	5,258	\$362,590

Nevada: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Nevada County and the County of Nevada. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.



Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Nevada collections program, the court only refers cases to the private agency which in turn refers to Franchise Tax Board's Court-Ordered Debt program. The court does not have the ability to separate current and prior period non-delinquent revenue or the number of cases.


The private agency's total revenue and cost is reported on the Contact and Other Information tab. The county not provide collection amounts on this tab. The county is collecting on a small number of cases that were referred many years ago. The court does not currently refer delinquent cases to the county for collections.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Nevada	Outstanding Balance \$28,978,786	Nondelinquent Revenue \$2,006,217	Delinquent Revenue \$450,963	Administrative Cost \$34,527	Adjustments \$17,556	Discharge \$1,049																						
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 7.8%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 0.6058.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0411.69																							
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average <table><tr><td>County</td><td></td><td>0.33</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.33</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.18</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.15</td><td>0.02</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.02</td><td>0.16</td></tr></table>				County		0.33	0.25	0.33	0.25	0.33	Private Agency	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.18	FTB-COD		0.15	0.02	0.16	0.02	0.16	
	County		0.33	0.25	0.33	0.25	0.33																					
	Private Agency	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.18																					
	FTB-COD		0.15	0.02	0.16	0.02	0.16																					
Population 101,242																												
Judges 6																												
Commissioners 1.60																												
Best Practices Engaged 20/22																												
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.150.23 Prior0.020.07 Combined0.030.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current10.7616.73 Prior0.563.83 Combined0.825.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																									
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data																									

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Nevada	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	Not Available	42,116	1,068
	23%	17%	20%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	\$3,372	-	\$843	-	\$4,317	-	\$1,049
Private	\$76,497	\$121,138	\$11,361	\$17,938	\$1,046	\$4,513	\$0	-
FTB-COD	-	\$249,956	-	\$4,385	-	\$7,681	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$76,497	\$374,466	\$11,361	\$23,166	\$1,046	\$16,511	\$0	\$1,049

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$140,070	226	\$20,855
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$57,565	203	\$8,443
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$249,956	631	\$4,385
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$447,591	1,060	\$33,684

Orange: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Orange County and the County of Orange. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Orange collections program, although the court received slightly fewer new cases this fiscal year, gross collections were higher than prior year. Also, the program was able to maintain operating costs. The biggest accomplishment was the discharge of over \$114 million in delinquent cases, 10 years or older. These factors likely contributed to improvements in overall performance metrics for the year. The program is pleased to see that they are moving in the right direction for each category.



For the court, with the removal of the required breakdown of adjustments by debt type, the court has sufficient reporting capabilities to provide the information requested. Legislative changes impacting the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt (FTB-COD) program's processes, as it relates to ability to pay, has resulted in a significant drop in their collections this reporting period. The court expects that this trend will continue and that it will be compounded by the reduction in civil assessments. Therefore, they will need to reset expectations for the collections from the FTB-COD program.

Currently, County Probation's data systems are only capable of reporting limited information required by Government Code section 68514. Data systems have no way of equating a payment received to a collection activity, and as such all payments are reported in a single category.

For current period, values for gross collections and costs reflect both current and prior period inventory. For prior period, the county is only able to report ending balances from the prior year. No other data regarding only prior year inventory is available from their data systems, including reported adjustments.


The adjustment amount for fines and fees contains among other things, debt canceled by Assembly Bills 1869 and 177. In addition to these amounts, unpaid state restitution fines were transferred to the Victim Compensation Board (CalVCB) for collections, after the term of probation has expired. With recent legislative changes such as AB 1950, the county is seeing shorter terms of probation and larger amount of debt being forwarded to CalVCB for further collections.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Orange	Outstanding Balance \$178,073,226	Nondelinquent Revenue \$52,701,966	Delinquent Revenue \$33,559,323	Administrative Cost \$5,632,175	Adjustments \$105,735,126	Discharge \$114,140,961
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 4	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 40.0%19.1%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 40.3%49.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 245.04101.72	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 264.5231.79	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average Court0.240.300.090.270.180.28 Private Agency2.710.250.520.200.620.22 FTB-COD0.260.170.140.190.160.19 FTB-IIC0.010.060.010.040.010.04			
	Population 3,162,245					
	Judges 127 Commissioners 17.00					
Best Practices Engaged 21/22				Dashboard Comments COURT: First year of discharge from accountability completed. Pleased with improvement in Collector Effective Index COUNTY: Orange County Probation is unable at this time to separate prior period and current period debt activity. As such the related performance measures will not be accurate.		
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.750.32 Prior0.090.10 Combined0.170.12	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current44.6227.15 Prior2.385.19 Combined7.887.01	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court Orange	Default Rate			No. of People Served 40,024	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 168,228	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 714,333	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 123,042
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	44%	21%	30%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$16,242,711	\$10,980,041	\$3,944,246	\$986,062	\$2,670,172	\$12,566,126	-	\$114,140,961
County	\$880,118	-	-	-	-	\$77,834,135	-	-
Private	\$14,223	\$295,103	\$38,558	\$154,233	\$0	\$4,028	-	-
FTB-COD	\$666,384	\$2,396,082	\$170,842	\$326,764	\$119,776	\$12,540,889	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$364,820	\$1,719,841	\$2,294	\$9,176	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$0	-	-	-	\$0	-	-	-
Other	\$0	-	-	-	\$0	-	-	-
Total	\$18,168,256	\$15,391,067	\$4,155,940	\$1,476,235	\$2,789,948	\$102,945,178	-	\$114,140,961

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$2,167,051	8,524	\$1,061,972
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$12,617,183	43,290	\$241,961
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$11,073,309	44,081	\$3,544,951
4 - Skip Tracing	\$74,902	305	\$78,251
5 - FTB-COD	\$3,062,467	20,120	\$497,606
6 - FTB-IIC	\$2,084,662	7,017	\$11,470
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$2,170,422	3,173	\$3,173
8 - Private Agency	\$309,327	646	\$192,791
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$33,559,323	127,156	\$5,632,175

Placer: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Placer County and the County of Placer. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Placer collections program, the program's increase in 2021–22 collection totals can be attributed to multiple factors, including the reinstatement of the Franchise Tax Board's Interagency Intercept Collections program and focusing collection efforts on newly referred delinquent debt.


The court determined that their case management system lacks the reporting capabilities to fulfill the requested data requirements for nondelinquent collections on the collections report template. In March 2020, the court contracted with their vendor to build a reporting template for the necessary data. Since the date of the contract the vendor has been contacted multiple times for an update, most recently in August 2022, however no response by the vendor has been received. Therefore, nondelinquent collections information is not being provided. The county has determined that the numbers associated with installment agreements that have gone into default are not available at this time. The program has identified a software product upgrade that will provide this information in the future.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Placer	Outstanding Balance \$41,191,869	Nondelinquent Revenue Not Available	Delinquent Revenue \$6,891,151	Administrative Cost \$2,037,821	Adjustments \$11,920,393	Discharge \$15,642,345
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 36.1%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 157.5858.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 206.7811.69	
	Collector Effective Index CEI Score◆Cluster Average 0.400.300.200.100.00 0.230.07 0.360.15 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio Cost: Referral Score◆Cluster Average 80.0060.0040.0020.000.00 16.733.83 75.8814.25 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average County0.540.330.510.330.520.33 Private Agency0.150.160.150.190.150.18 FTB-COD0.180.150.180.160.180.16 FTB-IIC0.000.010.000.030.000.03			
	Population 409,025					
	Judges 10					
	Commissioners 4.50					
Best Practices Engaged 21/22						
Collections Activities Performed 13/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.360.23 Prior0.150.07 Combined0.180.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current75.8816.73 Prior14.253.83 Combined23.145.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court Placer	Default Rate			No. of People Served 51,243	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 88,081	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 15,981
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$1,641,067	\$1,701,754	\$888,857	\$864,849	\$354,853	\$9,993,879	-	\$11,259,349
Private	\$6,860	\$386,639	\$1,056	\$59,658	\$63	\$840,019	-	\$2,539,971
FTB-COD	\$418,911	\$840,948	\$73,397	\$147,344	\$35,811	\$695,768	-	\$1,843,025
FTB-IIC	\$120,348	\$1,774,624	\$160	\$2,500	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$2,187,186	\$4,703,965	\$963,470	\$1,074,351	\$390,727	\$11,529,666	-	\$15,642,345

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$1,470,885	9,410	\$765,648
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,872,036	11,929	\$974,462
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	77,601	\$13,596
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$1,259,859	4,867	\$220,741
6 - FTB-IIC	\$1,894,872	4,020	\$2,660
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$393,499	435	\$60,714
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$6,891,151	108,262	\$2,037,821

Plumas: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Plumas County and the County of Plumas.

Performance

Performance information for the Plumas Court and County collections program is not available, as a CRT was not submitted.

Riverside: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Riverside County and the County of Riverside. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Riverside collections program, collections continued to be negatively impacted by the pandemic. Collections were also impacted by the Franchise Tax Board Interagency Intercept Collections (FTB-IIC) program's suspension of collection activities between July and August 2021. The cost of collections for FTB-IIC is not reported because the court did not receive an invoice from the agency during this reporting period, such costs will be reported in 2022–23.


The court does not send first year delinquency to the FTB Court-Ordered Debt (COD) program and private agencies; therefore, there is no activity reported for FTB-COD and private agencies for current period. The elimination of Assembly Bill 77 related fees contributed to the significant number of vacated local and administrative fees. The beginning balances were reduced to reflect a correction of amounts under Assembly Bill 1869 found in this reporting period.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Riverside	Outstanding Balance \$310,345,350	Nondelinquent Revenue \$31,404,170	Delinquent Revenue \$43,220,923	Administrative Cost \$11,044,468	Adjustments \$27,958,740	Discharge \$10,764,961	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 4	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 24.5%19.1%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 29.1%49.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 71.27101.72	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 27.4431.79		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court0.420.300.430.270.420.28 Private Agency0.250.110.200.110.22 FTB-COD0.170.180.190.180.19				
	Population 2,435,525						
	Judges 71 Commissioners 14.00						
Best Practices Engaged 22/22				Dashboard Comments CEI, First Year Resolution, Risk Monitor, Cost Referral Ratio, Adjustment and Discharge score: These performance measures will be used to identify areas of improvement or successes within the program.			
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.670.32 Prior0.240.10 Combined0.280.12	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current85.9527.15 Prior16.195.19 Combined23.427.01	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Riverside	Current	Prior	Combined				
	47%	51%	50%	83,979	119,212	471,586	132,043

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$9,903,302	\$12,763,591	\$4,203,356	\$5,425,074	\$2,223,660	\$22,187,346	-	\$2,333,224
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	\$1,908,324	-	\$208,785	-	\$1,714,604	-	\$6,455,457
FTB-COD	\$31,636	\$6,734,305	-	\$1,207,253	-	\$1,833,130	-	\$1,976,280
FTB-IIC	-	\$11,879,765	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$9,934,938	\$33,285,985	\$4,203,356	\$6,841,112	\$2,223,660	\$25,735,080	-	\$10,764,961

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$8,975,033	41,917	\$5,286,440
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$2,352,714	12,632	\$228,950
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$21,072,403	46,977	\$1,503,125
4 - Skip Tracing	\$1,351,500	6,805	\$1,953,981
5 - FTB-COD	\$5,992,680	17,187	\$1,207,253
6 - FTB-IIC	\$422,973	35,923	\$0
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$1,281,162	3,334	\$208,785
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$1,772,458	2,527	\$655,934
Total	\$43,220,923	167,302	\$11,044,468

Sacramento: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Sacramento County and the County of Sacramento. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template (CRT).

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹



Performance

According to the Sacramento collections program, multiple changes to collections processes over the last several years have drastically changed the amount of collectible delinquent debt. These changes include the repeal of fees by Assembly Bills 177 and 1869, amnesty programs, and removal of drivers license suspensions. This report reflects significant adjustments to outstanding debt effectuated by AB 1869 and AB 177.

At this time, the court, county, and private collection agency are unable to provide all data components of the requested categories for collections activities performed. The county and private agency are assessing reprogramming needs that will allow the extraction of required data from their respective automated systems. The court is currently in the process of implementing a new case management system (CMS) in Traffic and Criminal. The current version of the new system does not include the ability to capture much of the required data categories, but new functionality is being explored by the vendor to address these reporting needs.


For cases and values referred to Franchise Tax Board (FTB) Interagency Intercept Collections (IIC) program in the Current Period, the referring program's line was reduced to avoid double counts. Beginning balances are different than the totals provided in the prefilled CRT as the transferring program's line was reduced to account for FTB-IIC referrals. Because of system limitations, the program is unable to report some of the collection information that has been requested.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Sacramento	Outstanding Balance \$431,316,624	Nondelinquent Revenue \$22,914,644	Delinquent Revenue \$12,645,073	Administrative Cost \$5,613,517	Adjustments \$47,904,848	Discharge \$0																																													
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 4	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 21.7%19.1%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 61.4%49.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 97.39101.72	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0031.79																																														
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Score</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Combined Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>County</td><td></td><td>0.78</td><td>0.36</td><td>0.78</td><td>0.55</td><td>0.78</td><td>0.49</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td></td><td>0.17</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.22</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.15</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.19</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td>0.00</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.04</td><td></td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Cluster Average	County		0.78	0.36	0.78	0.55	0.78	0.49		Private Agency		0.17	0.25	0.18	0.20	0.18	0.22		FTB-COD		0.15	0.17	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.19		FTB-IIC		0.00	0.06	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04	
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Cluster Average																																										
	County		0.78	0.36	0.78	0.55	0.78	0.49																																											
	Private Agency		0.17	0.25	0.18	0.20	0.18	0.22																																											
FTB-COD		0.15	0.17	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.19																																												
FTB-IIC		0.00	0.06	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04																																												
Population 1,576,618																																																			
Judges 66 Commissioners 9.50																																																			
Best Practices Engaged 21/22																																																			
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.23</td><td>0.32</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.08</td><td>0.10</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.10</td><td>0.12</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.23	0.32	Prior	0.08	0.10	Combined	0.10	0.12	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>44.46</td><td>27.15</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>5.62</td><td>5.19</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>10.21</td><td>7.01</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	44.46	27.15	Prior	5.62	5.19	Combined	10.21	7.01	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																								
	Period	Score	Cluster Average																																																
	Current	0.23	0.32																																																
Prior	0.08	0.10																																																	
Combined	0.10	0.12																																																	
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																																	
Current	44.46	27.15																																																	
Prior	5.62	5.19																																																	
Combined	10.21	7.01																																																	
Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																																			

Court Sacramento	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 55,939	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 549,732	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 53,721
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	12%	22%	18%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$3,525,493	\$2,800,607	\$2,736,048	\$2,173,482	\$7,660,559	\$29,894,212	-	-
Private	\$641,702	\$950,165	\$112,281	\$171,183	\$232,460	\$9,826,008	\$0	-
FTB-COD	\$276,657	\$2,474,519	\$41,885	\$374,634	\$71,886	\$219,723	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$394,857	\$1,581,073	\$800	\$3,204	\$0	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$4,838,709	\$7,806,364	\$2,891,014	\$2,722,503	\$7,964,905	\$39,939,943	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$1,027,111	2,381	\$182,821
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$564,756	1,800	\$100,643
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$2,751,176	14,484	\$416,519
6 - FTB-IIC	\$1,975,930	10,089	\$4,004
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$1,591,867	4,181	\$282,464
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$7,910,840	32,935	\$986,451

San Benito: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of San Benito County and the County of San Benito. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.



Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the San Benito collections program, the current court collections program consists of original and follow up notices to customer before referral to the Franchise Tax Board for collections. All victim restitution is handled by the county for collections.


The program is working with the case management system vendor to acquire the proper numbers for the number of cases that payments are received on and amounts satisfied by court orders, suspensions, dismissals or alternative sentence. The program is working with their vendor to report nondelinquent collections information that are not currently provided. It is also working on a discharge of accountability program.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court San Benito	Outstanding Balance \$1,165,819	Nondelinquent Revenue Not Available	Delinquent Revenue \$99,346	Administrative Cost \$14,901	Adjustments \$0	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 7.9% 6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0% 50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 0.00 31.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.00 1.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average FTB-COD 0.15 0.16 0.15 0.20 0.15 0.20			
	Population 65,479					
	Judges 2					
	Commissioners 0.50					
Best Practices Engaged 15/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 11/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current 0.80 0.16 Prior 0.80 0.06 Combined 0.80 0.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current 9.06 11.14 Prior 9.06 4.43 Combined 9.06 5.19	Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
San Benito	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	Not Available	1,644	1,313
	0%	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$70,763	\$28,583	\$10,614	\$4,287	\$0	-	\$0	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$70,763	\$28,583	\$10,614	\$4,287	\$0	-	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$99,346	-	\$14,901
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$99,346	-	\$14,901

San Bernardino: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of San Bernardino County and the County of San Bernardino. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the San Bernardino collections program, collections and cases with payment increased for both nondelinquent and delinquent collections program populations. The 65 percent increase in cases with payments collected reflect the court's re-instatement of failure to appear (FTA) and failure to pay (FTP) actions and referral of FTA and FTP cases to the county's collection program. While collection rates improved compared to pandemic-driven reductions, legislative changes triggered additional impacts to case inventory. Assembly Bill 177 repealed various fees that could no longer be assessed nor collected, in many instances cases instantly became paid in full and closed as a result. The program performed annual discharge from accountability on 10,484 accounts with no payment activity in 10-years, removing \$6.2 million from active inventory.

Processes for data extraction and assumptions continue to be refined. Attributing collections to phone calls versus notices remains a challenge. Since the collection process starts with a series of notices, the courts assumption for allocating collections between the two activities remains the same. All collections received within 95-days are attributed to notices and the remainder, not already identified to other collection activities, are attributed to phone calls. The court is exploring a methodology to distinguish between delinquent and non-delinquent driver's license suspensions. Once segregated, the court can identify administrative costs associated with this collection activity.


Finally, reporting the inventory number of cases is not supported by system aging reports. Multiple files are assembled to compile ending inventory, such as number of accounts paid-in-full, canceled, and discharged during the reporting period to net against beginning balances and new assignments. The Franchise Tax Board Interagency Intercept Collections program's inventory is refined to include accounts where they were the only source of payment, and accounts older than 4-years. The amounts reported as gross revenue collected include direct payments accepted at the court, but some are inconsistently reported to the county, as system issues prevent this data exchange from occurring consistently. Processes are in place now to identify and fix discrepancies as they occur, and ongoing system improvements are also in development to continue to improve data exchange through automation.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court San Bernardino	Outstanding Balance \$341,653,975	Nondelinquent Revenue \$31,564,152	Delinquent Revenue \$23,596,370	Administrative Cost \$4,884,115	Adjustments \$33,805,585	Discharge \$6,287,650
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 4	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 13.9%19.1%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 43.6%49.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 83.40101.72	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 15.5131.79	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average County0.230.360.460.550.390.49 FTB-COD0.170.190.180.19 FTB-IIC0.080.060.030.040.040.04			
	Population 2,187,665					
	Judges 79 Commissioners 15.00					
	Best Practices Engaged 19/22					
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.230.32 Prior0.090.10 Combined0.100.12	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current17.2527.15 Prior6.735.19 Combined7.617.01	Dashboard Comments CEI: Improved on current. First Year Resolution: Dropped due to assignments delayed until 2nd qtr. Spend Efficiency Score: County performed well across all programs. Cost to Referral Ratio: County is within cluster average. Adjustment Score: No comment; less legislative impact this year. Discharge Score: 2nd annual discharge far less than last year. Risk Monitor: Increased due to delayed assignments. Within cluster average.			
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court San Bernardino	Default Rate			No. of People Served 23,014	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 104,207	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 642,128	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 66,427
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$3,474,326	\$7,773,231	\$794,911	\$3,596,567	\$1,191,162	\$32,348,351	-	\$6,287,650
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	\$275,480	-	\$48,841	-	\$266,073	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$1,647,998	\$10,425,334	\$124,520	\$319,276	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$5,122,325	\$18,474,045	\$919,431	\$3,964,684	\$1,191,162	\$32,614,424	-	\$6,287,650

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$3,112,052	47,362	\$1,586,923
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$2,238,392	9,167	\$857,888
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$3,751,127	13,492	\$1,384,935
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$275,480	9,147	\$48,841
6 - FTB-IIC	\$12,073,333	36,703	\$443,796
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$427,362	1,025	\$24,480
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$1,718,624	10,985	\$537,253
Total	\$23,596,370	127,881	\$4,884,115

San Diego: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of San Diego County and the County of San Diego. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the San Diego collections program, the court has continued its debtor-friendly approach to collections sparked in part by the pandemic. The court acted immediately and efficiently regarding the implementation of Assembly Bills 1869 and 177, by promptly vacating outstanding accounts receivable (AR), temporarily halting collections efforts, granting payment plans, extending payment terms, and releasing driver's license holds upon request, without requiring immediate payment. Despite these concessions, the court collected more in delinquent revenue from the previous reporting period, while having a reduced AR balance to collect from. The court remains committed to continuing to maintain collections best practices, while working effectively with debtors using their post-pandemic approach.

County collections have been drastically impacted by AB 1869 which eliminated the ability to collect on specific court-ordered criminal administrative fees including cost of supervision, court-appointed attorney, and the criminal justice administrative fees. This resulted in the dismissal of 65 percent of the combined 2020–21 beginning case value, which would have otherwise been available for collection during the current year. Additionally, collections on these criminal administrative fees accounted for 48 percent of Combined collections in 2020–21. As a result of AB 1869, the Combined total collections for 2021–22 decreased 61 percent from last year's total collections.

Despite the continued impact of AB 1869 and AB 177, the court fared similarly to last fiscal year in terms of current and prior period debt collected. Gross revenue collections increased, notwithstanding the millions in combined (prior and current period) adjustments due to AB 1869 and AB 177 that the court was not able to collect. The county implemented several enhancements that helped improve the accuracy of the new performance measures. The county restated its beginning number of delinquent cases to reflect the number of cases referred for collections and not the number of accounts owed for each case. Also, the county restated the beginning number and value of cases for Prior Period to include cases with victim restitution administrative fees that were previously reported under victim restitution to reflect the corresponding adjustments resulting from the dismissal of fees repealed by AB 177. These changes will make the performance metrics calculation more accurate. However, these metrics


¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.

San Diego: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

still understate the collection program's success if victim restitution is outstanding or the court orders installment payments on a case, since the reported balances of fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments are not available for collections.


The program engages all collections activities required by statute. The court uses multiple case management systems, and some data submitted by the court requires special ad-hoc reporting not found in those systems. Collections vendors are limited on reporting revenue received from the FTB to avoid duplicate reporting due to vendor system limitations.

Government Code section 68514 requires reporting the total amount collected, number of cases and operating costs per collection activity. This data cannot be compiled automatically via system generated reports and will require labor intensive tracking which will deter from actual collection activities. While the FTB-COD report provides information on the value of cases on installment agreements, the balance defaulted on is currently unavailable.


Court San Diego	Outstanding Balance \$658,745,408	Nondelinquent Revenue \$35,577,991	Delinquent Revenue \$29,804,467	Administrative Cost \$6,989,452	Adjustments \$42,074,338	Discharge \$154,416																																			
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 4	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 27.2%19.1%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 55.4%49.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 57.57101.72	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.2131.79																																				
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Court</td><td>0.12</td><td>0.30</td><td>0.12</td><td>0.27</td><td>0.12</td><td>0.28</td></tr><tr><td>County</td><td>0.31</td><td>0.36</td><td>0.72</td><td>0.55</td><td>0.64</td><td>0.49</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td>0.26</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.22</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.24</td><td>0.22</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td>0.22</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.32</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.32</td><td>0.19</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.04</td></tr></table>				Court	0.12	0.30	0.12	0.27	0.12	0.28	County	0.31	0.36	0.72	0.55	0.64	0.49	Private Agency	0.26	0.25	0.22	0.20	0.24	0.22	FTB-COD	0.22	0.17	0.32	0.19	0.32	0.19	FTB-IIC	0.19	0.06	0.13	0.04	0.17	0.04
	Court	0.12	0.30	0.12	0.27	0.12	0.28																																		
	County	0.31	0.36	0.72	0.55	0.64	0.49																																		
	Private Agency	0.26	0.25	0.22	0.20	0.24	0.22																																		
FTB-COD	0.22	0.17	0.32	0.19	0.32	0.19																																			
FTB-IIC	0.19	0.06	0.13	0.04	0.17	0.04																																			
Population 3,287,306																																									
Judges 135																																									
Commissioners 19.00																																									
Best Practices Engaged 22/22																																									
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.45</td><td>0.32</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.06</td><td>0.10</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.08</td><td>0.12</td></tr></table>	Current	0.45	0.32	Prior	0.06	0.10	Combined	0.08	0.12	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Current</td><td>30.23</td><td>27.15</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>4.05</td><td>5.19</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>5.44</td><td>7.01</td></tr></table>	Current	30.23	27.15	Prior	4.05	5.19	Combined	5.44	7.01	Dashboard Comments New performance metrics for collections are highlighted by a combined (Court & County) 45.3% CEI for current period debt. Prior period CEI of 6.4% can be attributed to that segment of cases being several years old but not yet qualified for discharge. A drop in prior period success is in-line with account aging expectations. First year resolution rate is almost 1/3 of qualified cases. An adjustment score of 57.57% is impacted by AB 1869 and AB 177 fees vacates.																				
	Current	0.45	0.32																																						
	Prior	0.06	0.10																																						
Combined	0.08	0.12																																							
Current	30.23	27.15																																							
Prior	4.05	5.19																																							
Combined	5.44	7.01																																							
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																						

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
San Diego	Current	Prior	Combined				
	10%	66%	48%	35,329	55,282	1,285,102	108,969

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$1,192,194	\$1,724,125	\$141,572	\$204,738	\$284,083	\$410,835	-	-
County	\$155,594	\$671,835	\$48,306	\$483,638	\$907,897	\$10,649,238	-	\$154,416
Private	\$6,835,077	\$11,273,227	\$1,800,086	\$2,506,084	\$4,398,589	\$25,423,696	-	-
FTB-COD	\$59,411	\$5,317,474	\$13,204	\$1,722,322	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$271,276	\$132,078	\$51,773	\$17,729	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	\$2,166,496	\$5,680	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$10,680,048	\$19,124,419	\$2,054,941	\$4,934,511	\$5,590,569	\$36,483,769	-	\$154,416

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$4,244,387	8,941	\$633,102
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,452,937	32,850	\$370,784
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$3,514,489	43,673	\$691,862
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$5,376,885	43,246	\$1,735,526
6 - FTB-IIC	\$403,355	445,887	\$69,502
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$2,172,176	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$12,621,041	1,016,130	\$3,487,968
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$19,197	71	\$708
Total	\$29,804,467	1,590,798	\$6,989,452

San Francisco: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of San Francisco County and the County of San Francisco. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the San Francisco collections program, since 2018, local policies and state legislative changes have deauthorized imposition of and vacated outstanding balances on numerous fees in criminal and traffic cases. Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177 contributed to the decrease in collections values. Since June 2017, Traffic implemented the Ability to Pay (ATP) determination process, which created further decreases in outstanding debt amounts on cases. San Francisco is a pilot court in the MyCitations online ATP project, which allows reductions for fines, fees, penalties, and assessments. There has been a significant decrease in infraction citations being issued by law enforcement in San Francisco. Additionally, impacts from the pandemic have furthered the downward trend in citation filings.

Given the ongoing challenges, the court continues to adjust processes and make accommodations for alternative solutions to reduce or resolve court-ordered debt when requested by debtors, as allowed. The program has processed discharge from accountability of court-ordered debts annually since 2018, reducing outstanding debt balances.

The court refers accounts to a private agency and to the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) Court-Ordered Debt (COD) and Interagency Intercept Collections (IIC) programs, to perform collections. Referrals to and collections by FTB-COD and FTB-IIC are handled and processed through the private agency.

The program was unable to report certain data required by Government Code section 68514, because of systems limitations. The private agency provided details as to case numbers in certain identified activities but is unable to provide amounts collected by all activities, as they do not track or charge by event. Data on payment plans and defaults for FTB-COD is unavailable. Also, the court initiates driver's license suspension or hold actions when appropriate for failure to appear in criminal cases, but data for the category is not provided.

At the end of June 2022, the court converted criminal cases into the new case management, C-Track, currently used by the Traffic Division. Programming builds is ongoing for both Traffic and Criminal cases to capture more data for reporting purposes. Given the limitations of the

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.

San Francisco: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22


legacy systems and changeover to C-Track, that is still in progress, the court is only able to make a determination of reasonableness of the data provided. The private agency assured the court that they can support all values reported for the period. Current period nondelinquent collections revenue include private agency and court values, and associated case count include only private agency numbers at this time, as the court is unable to provide case counts tied to the values.

There currently is no mechanism to store information about installment payment related activity for cases subject to ability to pay in C-Track. Some raw data exists on the Judicial Council's MyCitations database. A two-way integration between systems is currently in development, and it is anticipated that this enhancement would allow more detailed reports to be generated from C-Track in the future.


Court San Francisco	Outstanding Balance \$84,724,736	Nondelinquent Revenue \$6,029,949	Delinquent Revenue \$5,313,790	Administrative Cost \$2,804,047	Adjustments \$5,627,239	Discharge \$7,785,483	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate Score Cluster Average 26.7% 15.4%	Risk Monitor Score Cluster Average 99.5% 62.7%	Adjustment Score Score Cluster Average 54.40 54.12	Discharge Score Score Cluster Average 75.26 28.98		
	Collector Effective Index CEI Score Cluster Average 0.30 0.08	Cost: Referral Ratio Cost: Referral Score Cluster Average 73.99 13.32	Spend Efficiency Score Period Program Score Current Cluster Average Prior Cluster Average Combined Score Cluster Average Court 0.69 0.25 0.33 0.69 0.28 Private Agency 0.37 0.18 0.24 0.35 0.22 FTB-COD 0.56 0.16 0.21 0.57 0.21 FTB-IIC 0.06 0.07 0.09 0.18 0.09				
	Population 842,754						
	Judges 52						
	Commissioners 3.90						
Best Practices Engaged 19/22							
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index Period Score Cluster Average Current 0.12 0.30 Prior 0.09 0.08 Combined 0.10 0.10	Cost: Referral Ratio Period Score Cluster Average Current 73.99 22.21 Prior 13.32 4.50 Combined 18.72 6.33	Dashboard Comments Given limitations with legacy systems that do not communicate with each other and with information from our collections vendor, the program is unable to report on all components impacting the values presented in these Performance Metrics. The court has recently converted criminal cases into a new case management system, C-Track, on June 27, 2022. Program continues to work on programmatic builds for both Traffic and Criminal cases with goals to be able to produce more data for reporting purposes.				
				Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court San Francisco	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 112	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 149,809	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 14,235
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	87%	55%	57%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$1,064,017	-	\$733,284	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$555,145	\$361,108	\$204,746	\$115,034	\$787,869	\$4,280,790	-	\$7,785,483
FTB-COD	\$84,231	\$2,865,917	\$47,426	\$1,635,513	\$168,053	\$390,527	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$12,661	\$370,711	\$707	\$67,337	-	-	-	-
Intrabranh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$1,716,054	\$3,597,736	\$986,164	\$1,817,884	\$955,922	\$4,671,317	-	\$7,785,483

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	27,456	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	31,269	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$2,950,148	10,070	\$1,682,939
6 - FTB-IIC	\$383,372	1,241	\$68,044
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$916,253	6,231	\$319,780
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$4,249,773	76,267	\$2,070,763

San Joaquin: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt transitioned from the County of San Joaquin to the Superior Court of San Joaquin County, effective July 1, 2014, terminating the memorandum of understanding (MOU) for delinquent collections. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the San Joaquin collections program, the overall decrease in collections is due to cases not being processed by the court throughout the pandemic, from March 2020 to December 2021. In January 2022, the court began identifying and sending delinquent cases to collections.

Costs recovered are for court staff time spent processing delinquent collections. Information by collections activity cannot be provided as it is not tracked.


Currently, the court does not have any cases placed with the Franchise Tax Board as delinquent processing was on hold from March 2020 to January 2022. Adjustments include fees and costs repealed by Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177.

¹ A dash (-) in the below tables represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court San Joaquin	Outstanding Balance \$117,295,047	Nondelinquent Revenue \$910,694	Delinquent Revenue \$1,113,450	Administrative Cost \$354,473	Adjustments \$53,331	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 1.2%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 0.4554.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0028.98	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.300.30 0.20 0.100.08 0.000.05 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 22.21 20.00 10.00 0.004.50 2.33 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgram ScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Private Agency0.230.180.200.240.210.22			
	Population 784,298					
	Judges 30 Commissioners 4.50					
	Best Practices Engaged 21/22					
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.050.30 Prior0.000.08 Combined0.010.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current2.3322.21 Prior0.944.50 Combined1.136.33	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court San Joaquin	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 312,934	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 2,873
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	45%	73%	52%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	\$121,277	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$456,515	\$656,936	\$103,398	\$129,798	\$5,264	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	\$48,067	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$456,515	\$656,936	\$103,398	\$251,075	\$5,264	\$48,067	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-

San Luis Obispo: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County and the County of San Luis Obispo. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.



Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the San Luis Obispo collections program, the program is not able to provide all of the data requested in the Contact and Other Information and Annual Financial Report tabs. In the Annual Financial Report tab, only the county's collection of nondelinquent debt is available; no data is available for the court. The court is hopeful that more complete and reliable data will be available in the future based on work being performed by the court's case management system (CMS) provider.


The county is not able to provide all the data requested in the Contact and Other Information tab. The county's vendor made changes to their report to accommodate most of the new requirements. However, some of the requested information was cost prohibitive to have the vendor reprogram the system. On the Annual Financial Report, the system is currently unable to report case counts for Franchise Tax Board's (FTB) Interagency Intercept Collections program. There are reporting issues involving several data items from FTB's Court-Ordered Debt program as well. We will resume reporting next year.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court San Luis Obispo	Outstanding Balance \$160,574,472	Nondelinquent Revenue \$10,762,902	Delinquent Revenue \$6,281,981	Administrative Cost \$1,526,555	Adjustments \$14,931,396	Discharge \$1,520,738																																																
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 56.1%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 21.3%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 81.4558.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 8.3011.69																																																	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Score</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Combined Score</th><th>Combined Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Court</td><td></td><td>0.38</td><td>0.32</td><td></td><td>0.22</td><td>0.38</td><td>0.25</td></tr><tr><td>County</td><td></td><td>0.06</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.54</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.29</td><td>0.33</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td></td><td>0.17</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.18</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td></td><td>0.16</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.16</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td>0.00</td><td>0.01</td><td></td><td>0.03</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.03</td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Combined Cluster Average	Court		0.38	0.32		0.22	0.38	0.25	County		0.06	0.33	0.54	0.33	0.29	0.33	Private Agency		0.17	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.18	FTB-COD		0.16	0.15		0.16	0.16	0.16	FTB-IIC		0.00	0.01		0.03	0.00	0.03
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Combined Cluster Average																																														
	Court		0.38	0.32		0.22	0.38	0.25																																														
	County		0.06	0.33	0.54	0.33	0.29	0.33																																														
Private Agency		0.17	0.16	0.17	0.19	0.17	0.18																																															
FTB-COD		0.16	0.15		0.16	0.16	0.16																																															
FTB-IIC		0.00	0.01		0.03	0.00	0.03																																															
Population 280,721																																																						
Judges 13																																																						
Commissioners 2.00																																																						
Best Practices Engaged 20/22																																																						
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.63</td><td>0.23</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.07</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.09</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.63	0.23	Prior	0.07	0.07	Combined	0.13	0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>67.13</td><td>16.73</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>13.11</td><td>3.83</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>19.33</td><td>5.20</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	67.13	16.73	Prior	13.11	3.83	Combined	19.33	5.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																											
	Period	Score	Cluster Average																																																			
	Current	0.63	0.23																																																			
Prior	0.07	0.07																																																				
Combined	0.13	0.09																																																				
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																																				
Current	67.13	16.73																																																				
Prior	13.11	3.83																																																				
Combined	19.33	5.20																																																				
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																																			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	15%	66%	31%				
San Luis Obispo				Not Available	33,776	78,974	10,532

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$816,321	-	\$308,965	-	\$102,988	-	-	\$22,649
County	\$1,429,567	\$1,405,825	\$83,579	\$752,214	\$7,530,112	\$6,531,403	-	\$1,498,089
Private	\$764,577	\$972,862	\$129,196	\$164,359	\$150,407	\$616,486	-	-
FTB-COD	\$551,732	-	\$86,577	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$341,096	-	\$1,665	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$3,903,293	\$2,378,688	\$609,983	\$916,573	\$7,783,507	\$7,147,889	-	\$1,520,738

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$1,210,821	2,020	\$204,634
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$526,619	929	\$88,921
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$577,182	7,042	\$86,577
6 - FTB-IIC	\$341,096	-	\$1,665
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$1,737,439	2,949	\$293,555
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$4,393,157	12,940	\$675,353

San Mateo: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of San Mateo County and the County of San Mateo. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance


According to the San Mateo collections program, the San Mateo County Revenue Services unit ceased collections activities on May 26, 2022 for the court and ceased all operations on June 30, 2022. In June the court began referring cases for collections to the intrabranh program operated by Ventura Superior Court. In addition, due to Revenue Services ceasing operations it withdrew all cases referred to Franchise Tax Board on behalf of the court prior to the end of June 30, 2022. Court-ordered debt payable to the Probation Department is not included in this report.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court San Mateo	Outstanding Balance \$94,850,835	Nondelinquent Revenue \$18,396,358	Delinquent Revenue \$8,879,684	Administrative Cost \$1,205,598	Adjustments \$2,374,540	Discharge \$12,961,063
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 24.2%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 24.7%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 19.9454.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 108.8628.98	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average CEI Score 0.300.280.100.08 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average Cost: Referral Score 22.2115.646.174.50 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average County Private Agency FTB-COD FTB-IIC Intrabran 0.11 0.35 0.36 0.10 0.25 0.28 0.18 0.16 0.07 0.20 0.11 0.24 0.21 0.09 0.25 0.29 0.22 0.21 0.09 0.20			
	Population 744,662					
	Judges 28					
	Commissioners 5.00					
Best Practices Engaged 21/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 15/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.280.30 Prior0.100.08 Combined0.120.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current15.6422.21 Prior6.174.50 Combined7.256.33	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
San Mateo	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	62,414	166,301	20,206
	77%	76%	77%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$2,617,257	\$2,739,210	\$295,333	\$309,094	\$911,404	\$1,843,027	-	\$54,845
Private	-	\$12,953	-	\$4,521	-	\$980,109	-	\$12,473,327
FTB-COD	-	\$927,959	-	\$338,234	-	(\$1,360,000)	-	\$432,891
FTB-IIC	-	\$2,552,021	-	\$250,845	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$1,148	\$29,136	\$287	\$7,284	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$2,618,405	\$6,261,279	\$295,620	\$909,978	\$911,404	\$1,463,136	-	\$12,961,063

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$123,767	6,994	\$18,754
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,222,643	69,091	\$186,186
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$2,492,110	1,694	\$240,565
4 - Skip Tracing	\$1,517,726	85,766	\$158,900
5 - FTB-COD	\$927,959	3,590	\$338,234
6 - FTB-IIC	\$2,552,021	3,554	\$250,845
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$0	0	\$0
8 - Private Agency	\$43,237	186	\$12,092
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$221	3	\$22
Total	\$8,879,684	170,878	\$1,205,598

Santa Barbara: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Santa Barbara County and the County of Santa Barbara. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template (CRT).

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Santa Barbara collections program, the county has not been able to accurately determine account balances or number of accounts due to software “balance sheet” reporting limitations. The periods in the collections system do not close resulting in data being applied retroactively, resulting in unreliable data, and there is currently no estimated time by which this problem will be resolved. However, the actual amounts collected and cost of collections ties to financial system and is periodically audited. The county’s beginning balance figures were updated to reflect more accurate figures, but do not reconcile to prior year ending balances. This is due to an error discovered in the software report used to complete the CRT. The county does not have a comprehensive collection program therefore, operating costs are not recovered.


The court was unable to extract from its case management system all the information required per Government Code section 68514, specifically with regard to the court's collection activities and ability to pay (data is either unavailable or unreliable). The court is still working with its case management system vendor and other courts to resolve these reporting limitations.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program’s case management systems.


Court Santa Barbara	Outstanding Balance \$88,602,135	Nondelinquent Revenue \$10,781,719	Delinquent Revenue \$4,985,989	Administrative Cost \$1,255,375	Adjustments \$24,636,570	Discharge \$5,111,462	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 38.3%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 48.0%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 199.7554.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 41.4428.98		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorScoreCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court0.230.250.330.230.28 Private Agency0.040.180.240.340.22 FTB-COD0.150.160.210.150.21				
	Population 445,164			Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
	Judges 21 Commissioners 3.00						
	Best Practices Engaged 21/22						
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.350.30 Prior0.060.08 Combined0.100.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current33.0322.21 Prior5.094.50 Combined8.386.33	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Santa Barbara	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	19,150	149,850	14,465
	26%	63%	61%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$2,196,928	-	\$500,384	-	-	-	-	\$100,832
County	\$179,483	-	-	-	-	\$5,145,431	-	-
Private	\$1,223,448	\$666,152	\$54,524	\$592,470	\$3,413,851	\$121,675	-	\$5,010,630
FTB-COD	\$186,161	\$533,816	\$27,924	\$80,072	-	\$15,955,613	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$3,786,021	\$1,199,968	\$582,832	\$672,542	\$3,413,851	\$21,222,719	-	\$5,111,462

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-

Santa Clara: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Santa Clara County and the County of Santa Clara. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged are displayed on tables below.¹

Performance



According to the Santa Clara collections program, the ongoing pandemic continues to affect collections. Although there was an increase in delinquent referrals, collections decreased compared to last year. The Franchise Tax Board's Court-Ordered Debt and Interagency Intercept Collections program's collections totals also dropped, as compared to last year. The report does not reflect annual discharge from accountability by the county due to competing priorities such as the implementation of Assembly Bill 177. The discharge from accountability is scheduled for August 2022 and will reflect a decrease compared to last year. In compliance with Assembly Bill 177, the county adjusted millions in vacated administrative fees; this year's non-cash adjustments increased by \$10 million over prior year.

The court purged seventy-two thousand cases with an estimated value of \$58.2 million in delinquent case balances per Standing Orders, under per Government Code section 68152. Any adjustments resulting from Assembly Bill 177 and Assembly Bill 199 will be reported by the court in the 2022–23 Collections Reporting Template.

According to the county, activities described are performed simultaneously or sequentially which makes it difficult to know what action or effort caused the amount collected or its associated cost, as such, the data requested is unavailable. The county's new collections system implementation and go-live that will enhance reporting capabilities was extended to 2023. The reconciled figures reported are extracted and compiled from the monthly operations from the system's available data.


Due to systems limitations, the program was unable to report certain data required by Government Code section 68514; the report was completed to the best of the program's ability with the current systems in place

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Santa Clara	Outstanding Balance \$189,445,292	Nondelinquent Revenue \$22,153,051	Delinquent Revenue \$22,131,714	Administrative Cost \$3,595,105	Adjustments \$82,266,116	Discharge \$0																													
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 4	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 17.8%19.1%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 21.4%49.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 279.97101.72	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0031.79																														
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average <table><tr><td>Court</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.30</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.27</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.28</td></tr><tr><td>County</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.36</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.55</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.49</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.19</td></tr><tr><td>Intrabran</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td></tr></table>				Court	0.13	0.30	0.13	0.27	0.13	0.28	County	0.17	0.36	0.17	0.55	0.17	0.49	FTB-COD	0.15	0.17	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.19	Intrabran	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	
	Court	0.13	0.30	0.13	0.27	0.13	0.28																												
	County	0.17	0.36	0.17	0.55	0.17	0.49																												
	FTB-COD	0.15	0.17	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.19																												
Intrabran	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20																													
Population 1,894,783																																			
Judges 77																																			
Commissioners 5.00																																			
Best Practices Engaged 21/22				Dashboard Comments CEI -- Counts are challenging to obtain from the current county system. Cost Ratio -- County review of prior cost for future reporting. Adjustment Score -- Legislative changes affects this score. Discharge Score -- County did not perform its annual discharge due to competing priorities such as legislative changes, such as Assembly Bill177.																															
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.48</td><td>0.32</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.11</td><td>0.10</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.12</td></tr></table>	Current	0.48	0.32	Prior	0.11	0.10	Combined	0.13	0.12	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average <table><tr><td>Current</td><td>25.15</td><td>27.15</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>6.18</td><td>5.19</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>7.20</td><td>7.01</td></tr></table>	Current	25.15	27.15	Prior	6.18	5.19	Combined	7.20	7.01	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data														
Current	0.48	0.32																																	
Prior	0.11	0.10																																	
Combined	0.13	0.12																																	
Current	25.15	27.15																																	
Prior	6.18	5.19																																	
Combined	7.20	7.01																																	

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Santa Clara	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	99,741	499,022	65,596
	1%	23%	19%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$1,094,686	\$5,323,762	\$143,821	\$702,182	-	\$4,852,133	-	-
County	\$2,407,178	\$8,328,488	\$405,872	\$1,404,257	\$2,276,329	\$16,512,239	-	-
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$292,913	\$838,027	\$43,937	\$125,704	\$13,966	\$5,286,109	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$412,758	\$3,433,902	\$82,552	\$686,780	-	\$53,325,340	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$4,207,535	\$17,924,179	\$676,182	\$2,918,923	\$2,290,295	\$79,975,821	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$2,196,724	6,470	\$439,345
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,649,936	3,921	\$329,987
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$1,130,940	21,234	\$169,641
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$4,977,600	31,625	\$938,973

Santa Cruz: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Santa Cruz County and the County of Santa Cruz. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Santa Cruz collections program, the Probation department's caseload management system does not allow them to easily track back the data to the collection activity that spurred payment (e.g., monthly invoices, skip tracing, etc.).


Due to systems limitations, the program was unable to report certain data required by Government Code section 68514; the report was completed to the best of the program's ability with the current systems in place.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Santa Cruz	Outstanding Balance \$100,990,957	Nondelinquent Revenue \$4,346,729	Delinquent Revenue \$2,701,220	Administrative Cost \$400,065	Adjustments \$623,635	Discharge \$761,914
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 12.9%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 28.7%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 5.9358.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 7.2511.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.23 0.07 0.11 0.04 CEI Score Period Current Prior	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 16.73 3.83 8.21 2.44 Cost: Referral Score Period Current Prior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorScoreCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Private Agency0.130.160.090.190.100.18 FTB-COD0.200.150.190.160.190.16			
	Population 266,564					
	Judges 12 Commissioners 1.50					
Best Practices Engaged 20/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.110.23 Prior0.040.07 Combined0.050.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current8.2116.73 Prior2.443.83 Combined2.715.20	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court Santa Cruz	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 25,187	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 147,473	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 6,917
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	46%	56%	54%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$398,901	\$840,999	\$49,947	\$74,174	\$8,499	\$570,988	\$360,680	\$401,234
FTB-COD	\$37,373	\$1,423,948	\$7,528	\$268,415	\$1,620	\$42,528	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$436,274	\$2,264,947	\$57,475	\$342,590	\$10,119	\$613,516	\$360,680	\$401,234

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$1,461,321	4,894	\$275,944
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$1,239,900	3,812	\$124,121
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$2,701,221	8,706	\$400,065

Shasta: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Shasta County and the County of Shasta. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Shasta collections program, collections have been significantly impacted by Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177. In addition, there are still nominal impacts from the pandemic, as well as staffing issues.


The court's collections program converted mid-year from a legacy case management system to a more modern case management system. Due to some legacy data issues and incomplete reporting configuration in the new system, collections data can't be accurately categorized as required. Reasoned adjustments have been made so total amounts in this report match the deposit records for the collections program. We will be working on configuring the new case management system to accurately provide this data for the next fiscal year. Additionally, those efforts are expected to allow us to correct any inaccuracies in the 2021–22 ending balances when they are entered as beginning balances for the 2022–23 report.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Shasta	Outstanding Balance \$592,213,386	Nondelinquent Revenue \$3,445,613	Delinquent Revenue \$3,510,733	Administrative Cost \$354,410	Adjustments \$6,439,516	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 1.1%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 87.2%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 10.6958.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.23 0.07 0.030.03 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 16.73 3.83 0.680.550.57 CurrentPrior Period	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average Court0.150.320.150.220.150.25 Private Agency0.200.160.200.190.200.18 FTB-COD0.150.150.150.160.150.16 FTB-IIC0.000.010.030.030.030.03			
	Population 180,531					
	Judges 11					
	Commissioners 2.00					
Best Practices Engaged 20/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.030.23 Prior0.030.07 Combined0.030.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.6816.73 Prior0.553.83 Combined0.575.20	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Shasta	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	17,594	621,998	15,931
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$402,472	\$1,473,459	\$59,923	\$219,380	\$455,530	\$5,983,986	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$19	\$4,708	\$4	\$942	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$3,810	\$490,606	\$571	\$73,591	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$35,838	\$1,099,821	\$0	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$442,139	\$3,068,595	\$60,498	\$293,912	\$455,530	\$5,983,986	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$1,875,931	12,236	\$279,303
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	18,296	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	3,837	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	5,756	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$494,416	1,433	\$74,162
6 - FTB-IIC	\$1,135,659	20,897	\$0
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$4,727	1,146	\$945
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$3,510,734	63,601	\$354,411

Sierra: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Sierra County and the County of Sierra. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Sierra collections program, this was the first full year of contracting with Ventura Superior Court Collections. Collection efforts have improved somewhat after the COVID-19 pandemic and with Ventura Collections efforts. The court has worked with the case management system vendor to identify cases more readily that can be sent to collections as the collection efforts by the court are limited due to the size of the court and staffing.


Reporting capabilities have improved greatly as we, and other courts, have worked with the case management system vendor to increase and improve the enhanced collections reports.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Sierra	Outstanding Balance \$545,193	Nondelinquent Revenue \$390,119	Delinquent Revenue \$93,858	Administrative Cost \$12,793	Adjustments \$160,446	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 19.4%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 30.4%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 200.6831.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 2.00 1.50 1.00 0.50 0.00 CEI Score CurrentPrior Period 0.160.061.42	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 30.00 20.00 10.00 0.00 Cost: Referral Score CurrentPrior Period 11.1410.784.4333.53	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average Court0.090.260.090.480.090.36 Intrabran0.250.210.250.220.250.22			
	Population 3,229					
	Judges 2					
	Commissioners 0.30					
Best Practices Engaged 17/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 11/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.150.16 Prior1.420.06 Combined0.750.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current10.7811.14 Prior33.534.43 Combined21.465.19	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data			

Court Sierra	Default Rate			No. of People Served 2	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 1,362	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 596	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 445
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	43%	38%	40%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$8,233	\$57,669	\$724	\$5,080	\$12,546	\$147,900	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$10,723	\$17,233	\$2,681	\$4,308	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$18,956	\$74,902	\$3,405	\$9,388	\$12,546	\$147,900	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$18,782	58	\$4,696
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$9,174	23	\$2,293
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$65,902	371	\$5,804
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	\$0	0	\$0
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$93,858	452	\$12,793

Siskiyou: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview



The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Siskiyou County and the County of Siskiyou. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance


Siskiyou County Superior Court continues to maintain an efficient collections program, even though the report does not show accurate information. Prior changes to the reporting template caused some issues in collecting the data needed for the report from our current case management system. However, by next year the court will have transitioned to a new case management system that will hopefully provide report queries to pull all required data elements for an accurate collections report.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Siskiyou	Outstanding Balance \$42,991,080	Nondelinquent Revenue \$1,598,754	Delinquent Revenue \$523,373	Administrative Cost \$319,465	Adjustments \$2,638,605	Discharge \$1,013,286	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 63.3%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 55.9458.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 21.4811.69		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court1.600.320.221.600.25 Private Agency0.140.160.190.140.18				
	Population 43,830						
	Judges 4						
	Commissioners 1.00						
Best Practices Engaged 20/22					Dashboard Comments Unable to confirm whether the ratios are completely true as the data from the CMS is inaccurate and unreliable at the moment.		
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.070.23 Prior0.000.07 Combined0.000.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current201.5616.73 Prior3.83 Combined7.745.20	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court Siskiyou	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 41,251	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 109
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	10%	8%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$168,365	-	\$268,552	-	\$34,958	-	-	\$649
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$355,008	-	\$50,913	-	\$762,155	\$1,841,492	-	\$953,386
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$59,251
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$523,373	-	\$319,466	-	\$797,113	\$1,841,492	-	\$1,013,286

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$168,365	-	\$268,552
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$355,008	-	\$50,913
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$523,373	-	\$319,465

Solano: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Solano County and the County of Solano. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance


According to the Solano collections program, the information provided in the Contact and Other Information sheet represent collection activities performed by the private agency only. The entire program is not able to provide all information by collection activity required by Government Code section 68514 due to functionality limitation in the case management system, except for the items described in above. The court has not completed the process of adjusting the case balances for fees eliminated by AB 1869 and AB 177. These adjustments will be reported in 2022–23 annual collection report.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Solano	Outstanding Balance \$155,007,515	Nondelinquent Revenue \$4,646,245	Delinquent Revenue \$8,056,724	Administrative Cost \$907,070	Adjustments \$4,010,639	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 22.7%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 24.0154.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0028.98		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.300.30 0.20 0.10 0.00 0.130.03 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 22.21 20.00 10.00 0.00 21.792.12 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court0.120.250.330.120.28 County0.000.280.300.000.29 Private Agency0.140.180.240.140.22 FTB-IIC0.000.070.090.000.09				
	Population 447,241						
	Judges 20						
	Commissioners 3.00						
Best Practices Engaged 21/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.130.30 Prior0.030.08 Combined0.030.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current21.7922.21 Prior2.124.50 Combined3.466.33	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court Solano	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 262,462	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 8,863
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	38%	14%	19%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$1,893,713	-	\$235,783	-	-	-	-	-
County	\$104,315	\$88,446	\$0	-	\$23,226	\$798,832	-	-
Private	\$1,068,355	\$3,862,470	\$150,732	\$519,048	\$88,863	\$3,099,718	\$0	-
FTB-COD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$1,039,425	-	\$1,507	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$4,105,808	\$3,950,916	\$388,022	\$519,048	\$112,089	\$3,898,550	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$3,787,270	6,330	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$854,101	1,938	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	\$289,454	791	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$4,930,825	9,059	-

Sonoma: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Sonoma County and the County of Sonoma. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.



Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Sonoma collections program, the court continues to suspend referring delinquent cases to collections. Cases being referred to the Franchise Tax Board or the private agency are being transferred from one collection component to the other.


The court still has issues extracting the needed information from our case management system and therefore cannot provide some of the necessary information for the reporting period and accounts for reporting differences, specifically in the Contact and Other Information tab, balances for current and prior period, and installment information.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Sonoma	Outstanding Balance \$39,875,876	Nondelinquent Revenue \$142,045	Delinquent Revenue \$1,451,897	Administrative Cost \$121,695	Adjustments \$233,865	Discharge \$0	
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 6.5%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 85.1%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 5.6354.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0028.98		
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Private Agency0.180.180.120.240.150.22 FTB-COD0.150.160.140.210.140.21 FTB-IIC0.010.070.010.090.010.09				
	Population 482,404						
	Judges 20						
	Commissioners 3.00						
Best Practices Engaged 17/22							
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.220.30 Prior0.470.08 Combined0.460.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current2.5822.21 Prior2.774.50 Combined2.766.33	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data				

Court Sonoma	Default Rate Current Prior Combined - 2% 1%	No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 407	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 44,031	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 20,272
------------------------	--	--	--	---	--

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$0	\$348,468	-	-	-	\$30,243	-	-
County	\$14,946	\$88,569	-	-	\$62	\$8,444	-	-
Private	\$9,151	\$12,191	\$1,611	\$1,519	\$3,154	(\$637)	-	-
FTB-COD	\$8,908	\$803,104	\$1,340	\$115,239	\$899	\$151,121	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$7,586	\$158,974	\$97	\$1,889	\$10,513	\$30,066	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$40,591	\$1,411,306	\$3,048	\$118,647	\$14,628	\$219,237	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$16,365	23	\$1,519
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$4,976	12	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$451,983	358	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$812,012	5,408	\$115,239
6 - FTB-IIC	\$166,560	2,790	\$1,889
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$1,451,896	8,591	\$118,647

Stanislaus: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Stanislaus County and the County of Stanislaus. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.



Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Stanislaus collections program, the collection portion of the court's case management system has not been turned on at full capacity. The traffic division was closed to the public for a few months due to the pandemic. The court also notified collection agencies to hold back on collections as staff was limited.


Due to system limitations, the program is able to report only limited information regarding collection activities, but potential system improvements may provide the data required by Government Code section 68514 in the future.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Stanislaus	Outstanding Balance \$65,933,676	Nondelinquent Revenue \$4,425,915	Delinquent Revenue \$5,844,663	Administrative Cost \$1,704,571	Adjustments \$6,769,159	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 11.6%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 97.6%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 70.6354.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0028.98	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court0.300.250.300.330.300.28 County0.340.280.340.300.340.29 Private Agency0.180.180.210.240.190.22 FTB-COD0.150.160.150.210.150.21 FTB-IIC0.340.070.340.090.340.09			
	Population 549,466					
	Judges 22					
	Commissioners 3.00					
Best Practices Engaged 22/22				Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.		
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.310.30 Prior0.090.08 Combined0.130.10	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current12.2222.21 Prior4.764.50 Combined6.116.33	Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court Stanislaus	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 18,372	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 279,187	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 36,289
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	21%	17%	19%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$37,460	\$656,316	\$11,297	\$197,923	\$1,161,282	\$3,567,486	-	-
County	\$1,400,765	\$1,428,236	\$472,532	\$481,799	\$124,258	\$1,194,381	-	-
Private	\$48,774	\$10,276	\$9,016	\$2,196	\$542,893	\$178,860	-	-
FTB-COD	\$676,700	\$570,100	\$101,505	\$85,555	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$67,016	\$949,020	\$22,607	\$320,141	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$2,230,715	\$3,613,948	\$616,957	\$1,087,615	\$1,828,433	\$4,940,727	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$2,676,728	154,941	\$914,175
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$59,050	2,372	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$693,776	73,724	\$209,220
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$1,246,800	34,437	\$187,060
6 - FTB-IIC	\$1,016,036	13,155	\$342,748
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$152,273	558	\$51,368
Total	\$5,844,663	279,187	\$1,704,571

Sutter: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Sutter County and the County of Sutter. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Sutter collections program, collection rates decreased significantly due to enactment of Assembly Bill 177, which eliminated various fees and made any outstanding balance uncollectible.

The county has not yet converted to an updated collections system. Therefore, they are still limited in providing additional information, such as installment plan data. The court continues to have a difficult time extracting information from its case management system for this report, specifically collection activity data, by period.


Cases were not referred to the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt program due to ongoing case management system interface issues. The court plans to address these issues in 2022–23. Also, the court is not yet participating in the statewide MyCitations online ability to pay determination program, but anticipates being onboarded in 2023–24.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Sutter	Outstanding Balance \$42,466,753	Nondelinquent Revenue \$2,388,893	Delinquent Revenue \$1,700,588	Administrative Cost \$353,398	Adjustments \$1,154,882	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 8.4%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 72.4%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 25.4858.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.30 0.230.07 0.230.26 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 20.00 16.733.83 13.163.07 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average Court0.290.320.170.220.210.25 County0.330.330.770.330.770.33 FTB-COD0.150.150.150.160.150.16 FTB-IIC0.010.030.000.030.000.03 Intrabran0.250.250.250.240.250.24			
	Population 99,145					
	Judges 5					
	Commissioners 0.30					
Best Practices Engaged 22/22						
Collections Activities Performed 16/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.230.23 Prior0.260.07 Combined0.260.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current13.1616.73 Prior3.073.83 Combined4.505.20	Dashboard Comments The Court plans to do a discharge of accountability in 2022-23.			
		Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data				

Court	Default Rate			No. of People Served	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments
Sutter	Current	Prior	Combined	Not Available	8,306	78,513	20,068
	31%	36%	35%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$387,993	\$758,473	\$114,374	\$131,592	\$225,942	\$449,004	\$0	-
County	\$0	\$5,084	\$0	\$3,891	\$0	\$454,713	\$0	-
Private	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-	\$0	-
FTB-COD	\$9,555	\$42,619	\$1,433	\$6,393	\$0	-	\$0	-
FTB-IIC	\$0	\$115,859	\$0	\$464	\$0	-	\$0	-
Intrabranch	\$123,814	\$257,191	\$30,953	\$64,298	\$0	\$25,223	\$0	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$521,362	\$1,179,226	\$146,760	\$206,638	\$225,942	\$928,940	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$15,183	253	\$2,499
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$759,127	12,634	\$124,928
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$379,563	6,317	\$62,464
4 - Skip Tracing	\$15,183	253	\$2,499
5 - FTB-COD	\$52,174	1,028	\$7,826
6 - FTB-IIC	\$115,859	432	\$464
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$349,198	5,812	\$57,467
8 - Private Agency	\$381,005	1,073	\$95,251
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$0	0	\$0
Total	\$2,067,291	27,802	\$353,398

Tehama: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Tehama County and the County of Tehama. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Tehama collections program, collections have been significantly impacted by Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177. There are still nominal impacts from the pandemic, as well as staffing issues.


The court's collections program converted mid-year from a legacy case management system to a more modern case management system. Adjustments have been made so total amounts in this report match the deposit records reasonably understood to represent infraction, misdemeanor, and felony collections received by the collections program. Adjustments were made within the fourth quarter data on a pro-rata or program basis, as deemed appropriate. The program has already begun the process of configuring the reporting in the new case management system to minimize such adjustments for the next fiscal year. With the existing case management system the program is unable to report on the areas that are not completed.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Tehama	Outstanding Balance \$56,633,411	Nondelinquent Revenue Not Available	Delinquent Revenue \$836,346	Administrative Cost \$200,723	Adjustments \$104,704	Discharge \$0
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 1.6%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 100.0%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 1.8258.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 0.23 0.07 0.020.03 CurrentPrior Period	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 16.73 3.83 3.083.48 CurrentPrior	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AverageScorePriorCluster AverageScoreCombinedCluster Average Private Agency 0.24 0.16 0.24 0.19 0.24 0.18 FTB-COD 0.24 0.15 0.24 0.16 0.24 0.16 FTB-IIC 0.24 0.01 0.24 0.03 0.24 0.03 Intrabranchn 0.24 0.25 0.24 0.24 0.24 0.24			
	Population 65,052					
	Judges 4					
	Commissioners 0.33					
Best Practices Engaged 17/22						
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current 0.02 0.23 Prior 0.03 0.07 Combined 0.03 0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current 3.08 16.73 Prior 3.48 3.83 Combined 3.42 5.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.			
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data			

Court Tehama	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments Not Available	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 58,624	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 1,533
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$375	\$7,139	\$90	\$1,722	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$2,585	\$154,061	\$623	\$37,164	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$3,278	\$209,583	\$791	\$50,557	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$97,180	\$362,145	\$23,443	\$86,332	\$20,215	\$84,489	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$103,417	\$732,928	\$24,947	\$175,776	\$20,215	\$84,489	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$459,325	2,511	\$109,775
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	3,130	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	77	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	1,884	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$156,646	311	\$37,787
6 - FTB-IIC	\$212,861	4,720	\$51,348
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$7,514	446	\$1,813
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$836,345	13,079	\$200,723

Trinity: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt transitioned from the County of Trinity to the Superior Court of Trinity County, effective July 1, 2021, terminating the written memorandum of understanding (MOU) for delinquent collections. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.



Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Trinity collections program, responsibility for administering the delinquent collections program was transferred from the county to the court in 2020–21. The court is still working to refine the collections program and activities. As of April 2022, the court started utilizing the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt program for collections and is working to refine that program.


The court has experienced a turnover in collections staff; the position that worked hands on with the case management system is vacant. Also, the court went live with a new case management system in June 2020. These changes had a major impact on the court's reporting capabilities, as staff learns more about the new case management system.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Trinity	Outstanding Balance \$7,014,719	Nondelinquent Revenue \$596,656	Delinquent Revenue \$469,583	Administrative Cost \$55,825	Adjustments \$1,027,744	Discharge \$0		
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 1	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 11.2%6.5%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 54.0%50.9%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 120.7431.97	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.001.69			
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score PeriodProgramScoreCurrentCluster AveragePriorCluster AverageCombinedScoreCluster Average Court0.240.260.480.120.36					
	Population 16,023			Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.				
	Judges 2							
	Commissioners 0.30							
Best Practices Engaged 18/22								
Collections Activities Performed 10/16	Collector Effective Index PeriodScoreCluster Average Current0.190.16 Prior0.160.06 Combined0.170.08	Cost: Referral Ratio PeriodScoreCluster Average Current26.2111.14 Prior4.43 Combined8.895.19	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data					

Court Trinity	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 3,027	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 6,279	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 1,070
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	14%	-	14%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$229,068	\$228,685	\$55,825	-	-	\$1,027,744	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$11,830	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$240,898	\$228,685	\$55,825	-	-	\$1,027,744	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	-	-	-
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	-	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	-	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	-	-	-
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	-	-	-
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	-	-	-

Tulare: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview



The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Tulare County and the County of Tulare. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance


According to the Tulare collections program, the program is unable to determine if Ability To Pay cases are online or in-person. This information is not indicated anywhere in the case management system. The county collects victim restitution. Collections by Franchise Tax Board's Interagency Intercept Collections program are remitted to a third party and the administrative fee is also charged by a third party.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Tulare	Outstanding Balance \$215,383,463	Nondelinquent Revenue \$19,119,704	Delinquent Revenue \$7,533,267	Administrative Cost \$1,992,287	Adjustments \$7,810,013	Discharge \$0																																																															
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 20.9%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 59.3%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 33.8554.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0028.98																																																																
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Score</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Combined Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Court</td><td></td><td>0.41</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.77</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.56</td><td>0.28</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>County</td><td></td><td>0.14</td><td>0.28</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.30</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.29</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td></td><td>0.09</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.14</td><td>0.24</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.22</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.21</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.21</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td>0.14</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.09</td><td>0.09</td><td>0.10</td><td>0.09</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Intrabran</td><td></td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td></td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Cluster Average	Court		0.41	0.25	0.77	0.33	0.56	0.28		County		0.14	0.28	0.17	0.30	0.17	0.29		Private Agency		0.09	0.18	0.14	0.24	0.13	0.22		FTB-COD		0.15	0.16	0.15	0.21	0.15	0.21		FTB-IIC		0.14	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09		Intrabran		0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Cluster Average																																																												
	Court		0.41	0.25	0.77	0.33	0.56	0.28																																																													
	County		0.14	0.28	0.17	0.30	0.17	0.29																																																													
Private Agency		0.09	0.18	0.14	0.24	0.13	0.22																																																														
FTB-COD		0.15	0.16	0.15	0.21	0.15	0.21																																																														
FTB-IIC		0.14	0.07	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.09																																																														
Intrabran		0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20																																																														
Population 475,014	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																																																																				
Judges 21																																																																					
Commissioners 3.00	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																																																				
Best Practices Engaged 22/22																																																																					
Collections Activities Performed 12/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.40</td><td>0.30</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.08</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.17</td><td>0.10</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.40	0.30	Prior	0.13	0.08	Combined	0.17	0.10	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>13.60</td><td>22.21</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>4.88</td><td>4.50</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>6.05</td><td>6.33</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	13.60	22.21	Prior	4.88	4.50	Combined	6.05	6.33																																											
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																																																			
Current	0.40	0.30																																																																			
Prior	0.13	0.08																																																																			
Combined	0.17	0.10																																																																			
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																																																			
Current	13.60	22.21																																																																			
Prior	4.88	4.50																																																																			
Combined	6.05	6.33																																																																			

Court Tulare	Default Rate			No. of People Served 16,147	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 154,354	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 329,411	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 55,841
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	37%	66%	62%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$1,106,669	\$788,889	\$452,846	\$611,041	\$7,213,190	-	-	-
County	\$24,276	\$198,757	\$3,512	\$34,088	\$0	\$596,823	\$0	-
Private	\$80,340	\$569,756	\$6,846	\$79,031	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$711,484	\$1,483,411	\$106,723	\$220,647	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$77,385	\$293,139	\$10,929	\$26,792	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$92,912	\$2,106,249	\$18,582	\$421,250	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$2,093,066	\$5,440,201	\$599,438	\$1,392,849	\$7,213,190	\$596,823	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$1,703,679	8,664	\$586,677
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,808,332	9,173	\$627,440
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$679,879	4,080	\$280,709
4 - Skip Tracing	\$40,685	169	\$11,098
5 - FTB-COD	\$2,194,895	45,274	\$327,370
6 - FTB-IIC	\$370,524	901	\$37,721
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$85,177	539	\$35,395
8 - Private Agency	\$650,096	1,082	\$85,877
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$7,533,267	69,882	\$1,992,287

Tuolumne: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Tuolumne County and the County of Tuolumne. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.



Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Tuolumne collections program, currently the program's software does not separate current and prior period cases. Currently, the program must manually enter all data from the court system into the collections system, which is a time-consuming operation, that negatively impacts the ability to collect. The program's hope had been to be able to import data directly into their system, which will greatly increase the time spent actively collecting. They are in the process of working to explore other software upgrade opportunities. The program plans to meet with the Board of Supervisors to discharge uncollectable accounts soon.


The program has been working with their collections software company, to find more accurate ways of tracking and reporting data. The program has the ability to track the number of phone calls made, letters and statements sent, but can neither tie those actions to revenue nor can they separate the data from current and prior cases. At current, the software does not have the ability to determine what action generates revenue. Current software limitations cannot separate the costs on collecting prior and current period debt. Lastly, current software limitations cannot accurately track balances that are in default or current.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Tuolumne	Outstanding Balance \$29,728,670	Nondelinquent Revenue \$48,957	Delinquent Revenue \$2,482,106	Administrative Cost \$330,510	Adjustments \$7,745,123	Discharge \$0																																
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 4.1%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 83.8%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 193.8458.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69																																	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Score</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Combined Score</th><th>Combined Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>County</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.33</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.33</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.15</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.01</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.03</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.03</td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Combined Cluster Average	County			0.33	0.16	0.33	0.16	0.33	FTB-COD		0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.16	FTB-IIC			0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Score	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Combined Cluster Average																														
	County			0.33	0.16	0.33	0.16	0.33																														
	FTB-COD		0.15	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.16																														
FTB-IIC			0.01	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03																															
Population 55,291																																						
Judges 4																																						
Commissioners 0.75																																						
Best Practices Engaged 20/22																																						
Collections Activities Performed 13/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>1.93</td><td>0.23</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.07</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.27</td><td>0.09</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	1.93	0.23	Prior	0.20	0.07	Combined	0.27	0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>9.44</td><td>16.73</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>8.34</td><td>3.83</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>8.38</td><td>5.20</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	9.44	16.73	Prior	8.34	3.83	Combined	8.38	5.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.											
	Period	Score	Cluster Average																																			
Current	1.93	0.23																																				
Prior	0.20	0.07																																				
Combined	0.27	0.09																																				
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																				
Current	9.44	16.73																																				
Prior	8.34	3.83																																				
Combined	8.38	5.20																																				
			Performance Metrics Key Positive Needs Improvement No Data																																			

Court Tuolumne	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 282	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 39,436	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 10,460
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
County	-	\$1,855,433	-	\$296,075	-	\$7,745,123	\$0	-
Private	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$92,054	\$128,699	\$13,808	\$19,305	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	-	\$405,920	-	\$1,322	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$92,054	\$2,390,052	\$13,808	\$316,702	-	\$7,745,123	\$0	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$390,007	0	\$57,409
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,560,027	0	\$229,636
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$0	0	\$8,496
4 - Skip Tracing	\$0	0	\$534
5 - FTB-COD	\$220,753	1,311	\$33,113
6 - FTB-IIC	\$405,920	558	\$1,322
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$0	0	\$0
8 - Private Agency	\$0	0	\$0
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	\$0	0	\$0
Total	\$2,576,707	1,869	\$330,510

Ventura: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Ventura County and the County of Ventura. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance



According to the Ventura Collections Program, the continued reduction in revenue is contributed to the lasting effects of the pandemic, limited staff, and the recent legislation changes that have resulted in fees which are no longer collectible. The court has also seen an increase in the number of debtors using the online Ability to Pay (ATP) tool which has resulted in additional reductions in case balances.

The program refers cases to Franchise Tax Board's Court-Ordered Debt (COD) collections program and participates annually in the Interagency Intercept Collections (IIC) program and their ID lookup program. Cases are also referred to private agency.

Fees vacated from active collections cases due to Assembly Bill (AB) 177, are reflected in the prior period adjustments column. Fees vacated due to AB 199 will be reported in 2022–23. Payments received by the Department of Motor Vehicles are reported under "Other" program.


During 2021–22, Ventura Superior Court provided collections services to Amador, Plumas, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Sierra, Sutter, and Tulare Superior Courts.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Ventura	Outstanding Balance \$112,415,849	Nondelinquent Revenue \$13,199,219	Delinquent Revenue \$19,076,278	Administrative Cost \$3,815,255	Adjustments \$6,356,168	Discharge \$0																																																
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 3	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 22.2%15.4%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 64.1%62.7%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 46.1154.12	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0028.98																																																	
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Score</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Score</th><th>Combined Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Court</td><td></td><td>0.20</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.28</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td></td><td>0.20</td><td>0.18</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.24</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.22</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.20</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.21</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.21</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td>0.20</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.09</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.09</td></tr><tr><td>Other</td><td></td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.20</td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Combined Cluster Average	Court		0.20	0.25	0.20	0.33	0.20	0.28	Private Agency		0.20	0.18	0.20	0.24	0.20	0.22	FTB-COD		0.20	0.16	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.21	FTB-IIC		0.20	0.07	0.20	0.09	0.20	0.09	Other		0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Score	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Combined Cluster Average																																														
	Court		0.20	0.25	0.20	0.33	0.20	0.28																																														
	Private Agency		0.20	0.18	0.20	0.24	0.20	0.22																																														
FTB-COD		0.20	0.16	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.21																																															
FTB-IIC		0.20	0.07	0.20	0.09	0.20	0.09																																															
Other		0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20																																															
Population 833,652	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																																																					
Judges 30 Commissioners 4.00																																																						
Best Practices Engaged 21/22																																																						
Collections Activities Performed 14/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.47</td><td>0.30</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.09</td><td>0.08</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.10</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.47	0.30	Prior	0.09	0.08	Combined	0.16	0.10	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>25.43</td><td>22.21</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>5.05</td><td>4.50</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>8.56</td><td>6.33</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	25.43	22.21	Prior	5.05	4.50	Combined	8.56	6.33	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																											
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																																				
Current	0.47	0.30																																																				
Prior	0.09	0.08																																																				
Combined	0.16	0.10																																																				
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																																				
Current	25.43	22.21																																																				
Prior	5.05	4.50																																																				
Combined	8.56	6.33																																																				

Court Ventura	Default Rate			No. of People Served 32,368	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 47,733	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 445,662	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 69,469
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	37%	84%	57%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$7,960,071	\$7,412,938	\$1,592,014	\$1,482,588	\$748,905	\$5,607,263	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	\$179,882	\$136,868	\$35,976	\$27,374	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$221,795	\$563,169	\$44,359	\$112,634	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$1,148,107	\$1,179,295	\$229,621	\$235,859	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	\$261,021	\$13,132	\$52,204	\$2,626	-	-	-	-
Total	\$9,770,876	\$9,305,402	\$1,954,174	\$1,861,081	\$748,905	\$5,607,263	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$13,691,729	30,776	\$2,738,345
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$192,282	21,996	\$38,457
3 - Lobby/Counter	\$1,488,997	1,506	\$297,799
4 - Skip Tracing	-	-	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$784,964	4,467	\$156,993
6 - FTB-IIC	\$2,327,402	8,934	\$465,480
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	\$274,154	509	\$54,831
8 - Private Agency	\$316,750	1,281	\$63,350
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$19,076,278	69,469	\$3,815,255

Yolo: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Yolo County and the County of Yolo. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.



Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹

Performance

According to the Yolo collections program, at this time the court's case management system is not configured to report the separate collections categories of current and prior period inventory. As a result, all delinquent debt whether newly established or from prior period inventory is reported as prior period inventory.


Since the transition of the new case management system, continuous efforts have been made to improve reporting. The court's prior period beginning balance was adjusted to reflect the accurate beginning balance. The court is working diligently to create, test and implement reports that will satisfy the reporting requirements. Some areas that may be affected are victim restitution balances, established case numbers and values. The court expects to have the reporting issues resolved for the next reporting period.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Yolo	Outstanding Balance \$83,876,453	Nondelinquent Revenue \$2,568,332	Delinquent Revenue \$4,753,948	Administrative Cost \$1,115,361	Adjustments \$6,421,759	Discharge \$1,498,343																																			
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 5.0%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 39.3%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 66.5158.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 15.5211.69																																				
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Score</th><th>Combined Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Court</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.32</td><td>0.22</td><td>0.50</td><td>0.25</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td></td><td>0.33</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.32</td><td>0.18</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.16</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td>0.00</td><td>0.01</td><td>0.03</td><td>0.00</td><td>0.03</td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Combined Cluster Average	Court			0.32	0.22	0.50	0.25	Private Agency		0.33	0.16	0.19	0.32	0.18	FTB-COD			0.15	0.16	0.15	0.16	FTB-IIC		0.00	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.03
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Score	Combined Cluster Average																																		
	Court			0.32	0.22	0.50	0.25																																		
	Private Agency		0.33	0.16	0.19	0.32	0.18																																		
FTB-COD			0.15	0.16	0.15	0.16																																			
FTB-IIC		0.00	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.03																																			
Population 221,165																																									
Judges 11																																									
Commissioners 1.40																																									
Best Practices Engaged 20/22																																									
Collections Activities Performed 13/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.07</td><td>0.23</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.07</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.09</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.07	0.23	Prior	0.13	0.07	Combined	0.13	0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>6.24</td><td>16.73</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>14.83</td><td>3.83</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>14.20</td><td>5.20</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	6.24	16.73	Prior	14.83	3.83	Combined	14.20	5.20	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.														
	Period	Score	Cluster Average																																						
	Current	0.07	0.23																																						
Prior	0.13	0.07																																							
Combined	0.13	0.09																																							
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																							
Current	6.24	16.73																																							
Prior	14.83	3.83																																							
Combined	14.20	5.20																																							
			Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																						

Court Yolo	Default Rate			No. of People Served 43,756	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 8,828	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 78,533	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 9,936
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	64%	64%	64%				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	-	\$1,673,415	-	\$843,848	-	\$418,551	-	\$959,794
County	\$1,800	\$120,925	-	-	-	\$517,019	-	\$538,549
Private	\$108,981	\$676,312	\$35,556	\$218,415	\$117,902	\$5,368,287	-	-
FTB-COD	-	\$103,664	-	\$15,550	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$88,231	\$1,980,620	\$80	\$1,912	\$0	-	-	-
Intrabranch	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$199,012	\$4,554,936	\$35,636	\$1,079,725	\$117,902	\$6,303,857	-	\$1,498,343

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$472,110	5,875	\$236,198
2 - Written Notice(s)	\$1,200,742	11,603	\$607,366
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	66,352	-
4 - Skip Tracing	\$563	2	\$284
5 - FTB-COD	-	-	-
6 - FTB-IIC	\$2,068,851	3,731	\$1,992
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$785,293	61,506	\$253,971
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$4,527,559	149,069	\$1,099,811

Yuba: Summary of Collection Reporting Template 2021–22

Program Overview

The collection of delinquent court-ordered debt is a cooperative effort between the Superior Court of Yuba County and the County of Yuba. This report contains collections information as reported in the Collections Reporting Template.

Detail on the number of best practices met and collection activity components engaged is displayed on tables below.¹



Performance

According to the Yuba collections program, collections have been significantly impacted by Assembly Bill 1869 and Assembly Bill 177. There are still nominal impacts from the pandemic, as well as staffing issues.

The court's collections program converted mid-year from a legacy case management system to a more modern case management system. Adjustments have been made so total amounts in this report match the deposit records reasonably understood to represent infraction, misdemeanor, and felony collections received by the collections program. Adjustments were made within the fourth quarter data on a pro-rata or program basis, as deemed appropriate. The program has already begun the process of configuring the reporting in the new case management system to minimize such adjustments for the next fiscal year.


The case management system is not capable of separating out a specific revenues collected by activity at this time. Thus, they are not confidently able provide accurate figures leaving blank cells on the Contact and Other Information Tab. The information technology department continues to work with vendors to make upgrades to the case management system where possible so that the program can report information that is more accurate. The program continues to work with other agencies to verify collected data with various reports. Blank cells are due to case management system limitations where accurate information is unable to be collected.

¹ A dash (-) in the tables below represents data that is currently unavailable or is not provided by the program. This may include collection entities not engaged or practices not used, as well as data unavailable due to reporting limitations of the program's case management systems.


Court Yuba	Outstanding Balance \$132,482,933	Nondelinquent Revenue \$3,775,524	Delinquent Revenue \$2,805,689	Administrative Cost \$523,708	Adjustments \$1,266,049	Discharge \$0																																										
2021–22 Collections Individual Program Report	Cluster 2	First-year Resolution Rate ScoreCluster Average 2.9%13.2%	Risk Monitor ScoreCluster Average 88.4%63.3%	Adjustment Score ScoreCluster Average 9.2758.76	Discharge Score ScoreCluster Average 0.0011.69																																											
	Collector Effective Index ● CEI Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Cost: Referral Ratio ● Cost: Referral Score ◆ Cluster Average 	Spend Efficiency Score <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Program</th><th>Score</th><th>Current Cluster Average</th><th>Prior Cluster Average</th><th>Combined Score</th><th>Combined Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Court</td><td></td><td>0.15</td><td>0.32</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.22</td><td>0.15</td></tr><tr><td>Private Agency</td><td></td><td>0.24</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.24</td><td>0.19</td><td>0.24</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-COD</td><td></td><td>0.24</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.24</td><td>0.16</td><td>0.24</td></tr><tr><td>FTB-IIC</td><td></td><td>0.24</td><td>0.01</td><td>0.24</td><td>0.03</td><td>0.24</td></tr><tr><td>Intrabrand</td><td></td><td>0.24</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.23</td><td>0.24</td><td>0.23</td></tr></table>				Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Combined Cluster Average	Court		0.15	0.32	0.15	0.22	0.15	Private Agency		0.24	0.16	0.24	0.19	0.24	FTB-COD		0.24	0.15	0.24	0.16	0.24	FTB-IIC		0.24	0.01	0.24	0.03	0.24	Intrabrand		0.24	0.25	0.23	0.24	0.23
	Period	Program	Score	Current Cluster Average	Prior Cluster Average	Combined Score	Combined Cluster Average																																									
	Court		0.15	0.32	0.15	0.22	0.15																																									
	Private Agency		0.24	0.16	0.24	0.19	0.24																																									
FTB-COD		0.24	0.15	0.24	0.16	0.24																																										
FTB-IIC		0.24	0.01	0.24	0.03	0.24																																										
Intrabrand		0.24	0.25	0.23	0.24	0.23																																										
Population 82,275	Dashboard Comments The program did not comment on the dashboard. Please see page 1 of the Individual Program Report for other performance comments.																																															
Judges 5																																																
Commissioners 0.33	Performance Metrics Key PositiveNeeds ImprovementNo Data																																															
Best Practices Engaged 19/22																																																
Collections Activities Performed 13/16	Collector Effective Index <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>0.11</td><td>0.23</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>0.04</td><td>0.07</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>0.05</td><td>0.09</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	0.11	0.23	Prior	0.04	0.07	Combined	0.05	0.09	Cost: Referral Ratio <table><tr><th>Period</th><th>Score</th><th>Cluster Average</th></tr><tr><td>Current</td><td>4.17</td><td>16.73</td></tr><tr><td>Prior</td><td>3.40</td><td>3.83</td></tr><tr><td>Combined</td><td>3.52</td><td>5.20</td></tr></table>	Period	Score	Cluster Average	Current	4.17	16.73	Prior	3.40	3.83	Combined	3.52	5.20																						
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																														
Current	0.11	0.23																																														
Prior	0.04	0.07																																														
Combined	0.05	0.09																																														
Period	Score	Cluster Average																																														
Current	4.17	16.73																																														
Prior	3.40	3.83																																														
Combined	3.52	5.20																																														

Court Yuba	Default Rate			No. of People Served Not Available	No. of Nondelinquent Cases With Payments 7,799	No. of Delinquent Cases Reported 148,577	No. of Delinquent Cases With Payments 7,188
	Current	Prior	Combined				
	-	-	-				

Delinquent Revenue and Administrative Cost, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Total Court-Ordered Debt Resolved, 2015–16 to 2021–22



Annual Financial Report by Program and Period

Program	Revenue		Administrative Cost		Adjustments		Discharge	
	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior	Current	Prior
Court	\$568,247	\$1,094,601	\$85,237	\$164,190	-	-	-	-
County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Private	-	\$4,671	-	\$1,132	-	-	-	-
FTB-COD	\$1,007	\$332,582	\$244	\$80,597	-	-	-	-
FTB-IIC	\$21,169	\$582,763	\$5,130	\$141,226	-	-	-	-
Intrabranch	\$29,855	\$170,794	\$7,235	\$38,718	\$60,806	\$1,205,243	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	\$620,278	\$2,185,411	\$97,846	\$425,863	\$60,806	\$1,205,243	-	-

Delinquent Collections Activity

Category	Revenue	No. of Cases	Cost
1 - Telephone	\$200,649	2,833	\$45,953
2 - Written Notice(s)	-	10,027	-
3 - Lobby/Counter	-	9	-
4 - Skip Tracing	-	4,301	-
5 - FTB-COD	\$333,590	559	\$80,841
6 - FTB-IIC	\$603,932	8,989	\$146,355
7 - DL Hold/Suspension	-	-	-
8 - Private Agency	\$4,671	877	\$1,132
9 - Wage/Bank Garnishments & Liens	-	-	-
Total	\$1,142,841	27,595	\$274,282

1	Court/County	Select court/county (see Contact Informa ▼
---	--------------	--

2	Court Contact:	
	Telephone Number:	
	E-mail Address:	

3	County Contact:	
	Telephone Number:	
	E-mail Address:	

4	List collection agencies or programs used by order in which debt is referred:	1.		▼
		2.		▼
		3.		▼
		4.		▼
		5.		▼

5		Item 4		Item 5	Item 6a	Item 6b	Item 7
	Below is a description of the collections components (activities) authorized by Penal Code section 1463.007. As required by Government Code section 68514, for Items 4 , 5 , 6a , 6b and 7 , input the requested information for <u>each</u> collection activity that the court/county program currently uses:	Check each collections activity performed by program	Category	Total amount collected per collection activity	Total number of cases by activity	Total number of individuals associated with those cases	Total administrative cost per collection activity
6	a. Attempts telephone contact with delinquent debtors for whom the program has a telephone number to inform them of their delinquent status and payment options.	☐	1			Enter data as part of Category 3, (activity c)	
7	b. Notifies delinquent debtors for whom the program has an address in writing of their outstanding obligation within 95 days of delinquency.	☐	2				
8	c. Generates internal monthly reports to track collections data, such as age of debt and delinquent amounts outstanding.	☐	3				
9	d. Uses Department of Motor Vehicles information to locate delinquent debtors.	☐	4				
10	e. Accepts payment of delinquent debt by credit card.	☐	3	Enter data as part of Category 3, (activity c), Row 8 above.			
11	a. Sends delinquent debt to the Franchise Tax Board's Court-Ordered Debt Collections Program.	☐	5				
12	b. Sends delinquent debt to the Franchise Tax Board's Interagency Intercept Collections Program.	☐	6				
13	c. Initiates driver's license suspension or hold actions when appropriate for a failure to appear in court.	☐	7				
14	d. Contracts with one or more private debt collectors to collect delinquent debt.	☐	8				
15	e. Sends monthly bills or account statements to all delinquent debtors.	☐	2	Enter data as part of Category 2 (activity b), Row 7 above.			
16	f. Contracts with local, regional, state, or national skip tracing or locator resources or services to locate delinquent debtors.	☐	4	Enter data as part of Category 4, (activity d) in Row 9 above.			
17	g. Coordinates with the probation department to locate debtors who may be on formal or informal probation.	☐	4	Enter data as part of Category 4, (activity d) in Row 9 above.			
18	h. Uses Employment Development Department employment and wage information to collect delinquent debt.	☐	4	Enter data part of Category 4, (activity d) Row 9 above.			
19	i. Establishes wage and bank account garnishments where appropriate.	☐	9				
20	j. Places liens on real property owned by delinquent debtors when appropriate.	☐	9	Enter data as part of Category 9, (activity i) Row 19 above.			
21	k. Uses an automated dialer or automatic call distribution system to manage telephone calls.	☐	1	Enter data as part of Category 1, (activity a) Row 6 above.			
22	TOTAL:			\$0	0	0	\$0

Category Key: (See Category tab for task/activities list)		
1= Telephone Contact	4= Skip tracing	7= DL Hold
2= Written Notice(s)	5= FTB-COD	8= Private agency
3= Lobby/counter	6= FTB-IIC	9= Wage/bank garnishments and Liens

Is the program qualified as a comprehensive collection program?

No

Select court/county (see Contact Information worksheet #1)
Use the space below to describe your collection program.

Describe the extent to which your collection program is meeting the Judicial Council approved Collections Best Practices and identify any obstacles or problems that prevent the collections program from meeting those objectives. Of the twenty-two (22) Best Practices listed below please check those which your collection program has implemented. Provide an explanation for the best practices currently not being met, below. Also, identify any new or additional practices that have improved your collections program.

- ☐ 1 Develop plan and put in a written MOU that implements and enhances a program in which the court/county collaborate to collect court-ordered debt and monies owed to a court under court order.
- ☐ 2 Establish and maintain a cooperative superior court and county collection committee responsible for compliance, reporting, and internal enhancements of the joint collection program.
- ☐ 3 Meet the components of a comprehensive collection program as required under Penal Code section 1463.007 in order that the costs of operating the program can be recovered.
- ☐ 4 Complete all data components in the Collections Reporting Template.
- ☐ 5 Reconcile amounts placed in collection to the supporting case management and/or accounting systems.
- ☐ 6 Retain the joint court/county collection reports and supporting documents for at least three years.
- ☐ 7 Take appropriate steps to collect court-ordered debt locally before referring it to the Franchise Tax Board for collection.
- ☐ 8 Participate in the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt (COD) collection program.
- ☐ 9 Participate in the Franchise Tax Board Interagency Intercept Collections (IIC) program.
- ☐ 10 Establish a process for handling the discharge of accountability for uncollectible court-ordered debt.
- ☐ 11 Participate in any program that authorizes the Department of Motor Vehicles to suspend or refuse to renew drive when appropriate for a failure to appear in court.
- ☐ 12 Conduct trials by written declaration under Vehicle Code section 40903 and, as appropriate in the context of such trials, impose a civil assessment.
- ☐ 13 Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of external collection agencies or companies to which court-ordered debt is referred for collection.
- ☐ 14 Accept payments via credit and debit card.
- ☐ 15 Accept payments via the Internet.
- ☐ 16 Include in a collection program all court-ordered debt and monies owed to the court under a court order.
- ☐ 17 Include financial screening to assess each individual's ability to pay prior to processing installment payment plans and account receivables.
- ☐ 18 Use restitution rebate, as authorized by Government Code section 13963(f), to further efforts for the collection of funds owed to the Restitution Fund.
- ☐ 19 Participate in the statewide master agreement for collection services or renegotiate existing contracts, where feasible, to ensure appropriate levels of services are provided at an economical cost.
- ☐ 20 Require private vendors to remit the gross amount collected as agreed and submit invoices for commission fees to the court or county on a monthly basis.
- ☐ 21 Use collection terminology (as established in the glossary, instructions, or other documents approved for use by courts and counties) for the development or enhancement of a collection program.
- ☐ 22 Require private vendors to complete the components of the Collections Reporting Template that corresponds to their collection programs.

Please identify areas in collections or distribution (check all that apply) in which program staff would like to receive training, assistance, or additional information.

- | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| ☐ Audits (Judicial Council) | ☐ Revenue Distribution | ☐ Adjustments | ☐ Cost Recovery |
| ☐ Audits (SCO) | ☐ Discharge from Accountability | ☐ Ability to Pay Program | ☐ Other Collections-Related Issues |

Comments or explanations:

The number of best practices used is: 0

Performance Report**Select court/county (see Contact Information worksheet #1)****Use the space below to discuss your collection program.**

Please provide any comments on your performance for the reporting period, by Current Period, Prior Period Inventory, and Combined, that you wish included in the Individual Program Report that will be attached in the Report to the Legislature.

Please explain the extent of your reporting capabilities in terms of providing the information required by GC § 68514. If data cannot be provided at this time or if the reported data differs from the Instructions, please describe the submitted data and any plans for providing this information in the future.

Additional operational information about your collections program for the reporting period.

Select court/county (see Contact Information worksheet #1)

REPORTING PERIOD		Col. A	
1	Beginning Date-First day of Reporting Period	01-Jul-21	
2	Ending Date-Last day of Reporting Period	30-Jun-22	

CURRENT PERIOD (NEWLY-ESTABLISHED) DELINQUENT DEBT: FINES, FEES, FORFEITURES, PENALTIES AND ASSESSMENTS												
		Number of Cases Established or Referred as Delinquent	Value of Cases Established or Referred as Delinquent	Number of Cases with Payment(s) Received (Items 1 and 2)	Gross Revenue Collected	Cost of Collections (Penal Code 1463.007) enter as negative number	Adjustment: Amount satisfied by Court-ordered Suspension, Dismissal or Alternative Sentence (Item 3)	Discharge from Accountability (Item 3)	Net Value of Newly-Established Delinquent Debt at End of Period (Col. C - E - G - H)	Value of Cases on Installment Agreement (Item 8)	Default Balance Installment Agreement (Item 8)	Percentage of Debt Defaulted On (Installment Agmt.) (Col. K / Col. J)
Row	Program	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L
3	Non-Delinquent Collections											
4	Court Collection Program								-			
5	County Collection Program								-			
6	Private Agency								-			
7	FTB Court-Ordered Debt								-			
8	FTB Interagency Intercept Collection								-			
9	Intra-Branch Program								-			
10	Other								-			
11	Sub-total Delinquent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

PRIOR PERIOD (PREVIOUSLY-ESTABLISHED) DELINQUENT DEBT: FINES, FEES, FORFEITURES, PENALTIES AND ASSESSMENTS												
		Number of Delinquent Cases at Period Beginning (Ending Balance from Transfer Worksheet)	Value of Delinquent Cases at Period Beginning (Ending Balance from Transfer Worksheet)	Number of Cases with Payment(s) Received	Gross Revenue Collected	Cost of Collections (Penal Code 1463.007) enter as negative number	Adjustment: Amount satisfied by Court-ordered Suspension, Dismissal or Alternative Sentence	Discharge from Accountability	Net Value of Previously-Established Delinquent Debt at End of Period (Col. N - P - R - S)	Value of Cases on Installment Agmt. (Ending Balance from Prior Year)	Default Balance Installment Agreement	Percentage of Debt Defaulted On (Installment Agmt.) (Col. V / Col. U)
Row	Program	Col. M	Col. N	Col. O	Col. P	Col. Q	Col. R	Col. S	Col. T	Col. U	Col. V	Col. W
12	Non-Delinquent Collections											
13	Court Collection Program								-			
14	County Collection Program								-			
15	Private Agency								-			
16	FTB Court-Ordered Debt								-			
17	FTB Interagency Intercept Collection								-			
18	Intra-Branch Program								-			
19	Other								-			
20	Sub-total Delinquent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

COMBINED: BEGINNING AND ENDING BALANCES; FINES, FEES, FORFEITURES, PENALTIES AND ASSESSMENTS											
		Number of Cases Beginning Balance	Value of Cases Beginning Balance	Gross Revenue Collected	Cost of Collections (Penal Code 1463.007)	Adjustments	Discharge from Accountability	Net Change in Value	Number of Cases - Ending Balance	Value of Cases-Ending Balance	Error Messages
Row	Program	Col. X	Col. Y	Col. Z	Col. AA	Col. AB	Col. AC	Col. AD	Col. AE	Col. AF	Col. AG
21	Non-Delinquent Collections			-							
22	Court Collection Program	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
23	County Collection Program	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
24	Private Agency	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
25	FTB Court-Ordered Debt	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
26	FTB Interagency Intercept Collection	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
27	Intra-Branch Program	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
28	Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
29	Total Delinquent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

COLLECTIONS FROM CASES SUBJECT TO ABILITY TO PAY DETERMINATION											
	Period	Online ATP Revenue: Nondelinquent	Online ATP Revenue: Delinquent	Online ATP Revenue: Combined	In-Person ATP Revenue: Nondelinquent	In-Person ATP Revenue: Delinquent	In-Person ATP Revenue: Combined	Online ATP Cases w/ Installment Payments: Nondelinquent	Online ATP Installment Costs Claimed: Nondelinquent	In-Person ATP Cases w/ Installment Payments: Nondelinquent	In-Person ATP Installment Costs Claimed: Nondelinquent
Row		Col. AH	Col. AI	Col. AJ	Col. AK	Col. AL	Col. AM	Col. AN	Col. AO	Col. AP	Col. AQ
30	Current Period			-			-				
31	Prior Period			-			-				
32	Combined Periods	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-

VICTIM RESTITUTION (PC 1202.4)											
		Number of Cases - (Ending Balance from Prior Year)	Value of Cases - (Ending Balance from Prior Year)	Number of Cases Established/ Referred/ Transferred in Period	Value of Cases Established/ Referred/ Transferred in Period	Gross Revenue Collected	Net Change in Value	Number of Cases - Ending Balance	Value of Cases - Ending Balance	Error Messages	
Row	Program	Col. AR	Col. AS	Col. AT	Col. AU	Col. AV	Col. AW	Col. AX	Col. AY	Col. AZ	
33	Non-Delinquent Collections										
34	Court Collection Program						0		-		
35	County Collection Program						0		-		
36	Private Agency						0		-		
37	FTB Court-Ordered Debt						0		-		
38	FTB Interagency Intercept Collection						0		-		
39	Intra-Branch Program						0		-		
40	Other						0		-		
41	Total Delinquent	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-		

Reviewed by Court		Reviewed by County	
Printed Name	Signature	Printed Name	Signature
Date	Title (Court Executive or Presiding Judge)	Date	Title (County Auditor-Controller or other)

Collector Effective Index	Current	Prior

First Year Resolution Rate	
----------------------------	--

Spend Efficiency Score	Current	Prior	Combined
Court Collection Program			
County Collection Program			
Private Agency			
FTB Court-Ordered Debt			
FTB Interagency Intercept Collection			
Intra-Branch Program			
Other			

Cost to Referral Ratio	Current	Prior	Combined

Adjustment Score	Adjustments	Score
	\$0	

Discharge Score	Discharges	Score
	\$0	

Risk Monitor	
--------------	--

Please provide any brief comments on your performance measures you wish included in the Dashboard for your program. (500 character maximum)

Quality Criteria Checklist

Attachment 2

Row	Quality Checklist	CURRENT PERIOD: FINES, FEES, FORFEITURES, PENALTIES AND ASSESSMENTS
1	☐	Row 3, Column D, includes revenues collected for non-delinquent infraction, misdemeanor, and felony cases that were paid in full on or before the due date, or current installment or accounts receivable (A/R) payment plan. Row 3, Column E includes the number of cases associated with non-delinquent revenue collections reported in Row 3, Column D.
2	☐	Rows 4-10 include all fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments on traffic, criminal, and juvenile delinquency case types (infraction, misdemeanors, and felony), except victim restitution (see Rows 33-41 for more information).
3	☐	Rows 4-10, include newly established/referred/transferred cases, gross revenue collected, adjustments, or discharges posted during the reporting period.
4	☐	Rows 4-10, Column B, include the total number of new cases established, referred, or transferred within the reporting period. Any cases that were previously established, but never referred or transferred to collections, are considered new cases and should be reported in this column (the corresponding value of these cases should be reported in Column C). If multiple cases were bundled into one case, only one (1) case should be reported in Column B.
5	☐	Rows 4-10, Column C, include the total value of the corresponding cases in Column B, that were established, referred, or transferred during the reporting period only.
6	☐	Rows 4-10, Column D, include the number of cases with payment(s) received during the reporting period. The number of cases reported may be equal to but not greater than the number of cases established in Column B.
7	☐	Rows 4-10, Column E, include all monies received towards the satisfaction of delinquent court-ordered debt, including installment payments.
8	☐	Rows 4-10, Column F, include the cost of collections that, pursuant to PC 1463.007, is allowable to offset revenue prior to distribution to other governmental entities. Cost of collections is entered in Column F as a negative number unless posting a reversal.
9	☐	Value reported in Column G includes the total value of court-ordered debt satisfied by court-ordered dismissal, suspension, or by means other than payment. An amount satisfied by means other than payment includes alternative sentences (e.g., community service or time served in custody in lieu of fine) or non-cash adjustment that decreases or increases the amount outstanding for individual debt items.
10	☐	Value reported in Column H includes all debt deemed uncollectible that was established and discharged in the reporting period, per Government Code section 25257-25259.95.
11	☐	Column I is the change in value of Cases Referred/Established/Transferred minus (-) Gross Collections, Adjustments, and Discharged debt. (Column C - E - G - H).
12	☐	Rows 4-10, Column J, includes the value of all cases set-up on an installment agreement (A/R or monthly installment payment plan) by the court or collecting entity.
13	☐	Rows 4-10, Column K, includes the balances from delinquent cases where the individual is non-compliant with the terms of the agreement (i.e., payments have not been received) and the plan was not reinstated at the end of the fiscal year.
14	☐	Column L is formula driven and calculates the percentage of fines and fees defaulted on by dividing the installment agreement balance (amount <i>defaulted on</i>) by the initial value of court-ordered debt set-up on payment plan (Col. K/ Col. J)
PRIOR PERIODS INVENTORY: FINES, FEES, FORFEITURES, PENALTIES AND ASSESSMENTS		
15	☐	Row 12, Column P, includes revenues collected for non-delinquent infraction, misdemeanor and felony cases that were paid in full on or before the due date, or current installment or accounts receivable (A/R) payment plan. Row 12, Column O includes the number of cases associated with non-delinquent revenue collections reported in Row 12, Column P.
16	☐	Rows 13-19 include all fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments on traffic, criminal, and juvenile delinquency case types (infraction, misdemeanors, and felonies), except victim restitution (see Row 33-41 for more information).
17	☐	Rows 13-19 include all cases in inventory referred or transferred to a collections program in a prior period, and gross revenue collected, court-ordered adjustments, or discharges that were received and posted during the current reporting period.
18	☐	Rows 13-19, Column O, include the number of cases with payments received during the reporting period. Note: any late postings from prior year should be reported in Column M, and the case value should be reported in Column N as part of the ending balance from prior year.
19	☐	Rows 13-19, Column P, include all monies received towards the satisfaction of delinquent court-ordered debt.
20	☐	Rows 13-19, Column Q, include the cost of collections that, pursuant to PC 1463.007, is allowable to offset revenue prior to distribution to other governmental entities. Cost of collections is entered in Column Q as a negative number unless posting a reversal.
21	☐	Rows 13-19, Column R, includes the total value of court-ordered debt satisfied by court-ordered dismissal, suspension, or by means other than payment. An amount satisfied by means other than payment includes alternative sentences (e.g., community service or time served in custody in lieu of fine) or non-cash adjustment that decreases or increases the amount outstanding for individual debt items.
22	☐	Value reported in Column S includes all previously established debt deemed uncollectible and discharged in the reporting period, per Government Code section 25257-25259.95.
23	☐	Value reported in Column T is the change in Value of Cases (Ending Balance from Prior Year) minus (-) Gross Collections, Adjustments, and Discharged debt. (Column N - P - R - S).
24	☐	Column U is the value of cases carried over from the prior year for all cases on an installment agreement that remained unpaid at the end of the year.
25	☐	Column V includes the balance from all cases on an installment agreement carried over where payment(s) were not received in the reporting period.
26	☐	Column W captures the percentage of delinquent fines and fees payable in installments that were defaulted on. The cell is formula driven and calculates a percentage by dividing the rolling balance by the value of cases (carried over) on installment agreements. (Column V/Column U)
COMBINED: ENDING BALANCE FINES, FEES, FORFEITURES, PENALTIES AND ASSESSMENTS		
27	☐	Row 21, Column Z, includes the combined total of non-delinquent gross revenue collected.
28	☐	Rows 22-28, Columns X, Y, Z, AA, AB, AC and AD include the combined case number and value of new and prior period inventory, change in value, gross revenues, cost of collections, and adjustments, and discharge from accountability.
29	☐	Rows 22-28, Columns X, Y, Z, AA, AB, AC and AD are formula driven, no input required. Value of Cases reported in Columns Y and AF reconcile to figures reported from underlying systems and vendors.
30	☐	Value reported in Column AE includes the total number of cases at the end of the reporting period for each program.
31	☐	Values reported in Column AF balance to value of cases at beginning of period (Col. Y), minus the change in value reported in Col. AD (which is the sum of the amounts shown in Col. Z, AB and AC.)
32	☐	An Error Message in Column AG indicates that the beginning balance in Column Y, minus the value of transactions reported in Column AD does not equal the ending balance reported in Column AF.
COLLECTIONS FROM CASES SUBJECT TO ABILITY-TO-PAY DETERMINATION		
33	☐	Row 30 includes revenues collected, number of cases, and cost of administering those cases which have been subject to an ability to pay (ATP) determination for cases newly established during the reporting period. This information should ALSO be reported as part of the revenues reported in Rows 3-10 above.
34	☐	Row 31 includes revenues collected, number of cases, and cost of administering those cases which have been subject to an ATP determination for cases in inventory at the beginning of the reporting period. This information should ALSO be reported as part of the revenues reported in Rows 12-19 above.
35	☐	Column AH includes revenue collected for nondelinquent ATP cases processed through the online tool established by Government Code section 68645.
36	☐	Column AI includes revenue collected for delinquent ATP cases processed through the online tool established by Government Code section 68645.
37	☐	Column AK includes revenue collected for nondelinquent ATP cases processed in-person, using a paper form, or other methods aside from the online ATP tool.
38	☐	Column AL includes revenue collected for delinquent ATP cases processed in-person, using a paper form, or other methods aside from the online ATP tool.
39	☐	Column AN includes the number of nondelinquent ATP cases with installment plans processed through the online tool established by Government Code section 68645.2.
40	☐	Column AO includes the administrative cost (up to \$35 per case) for nondelinquent ATP cases with installment plans processed through the online tool established by Government Code section 68645.2.
41	☐	Column AP includes the number of nondelinquent ATP cases with installment plans processed in-person, using a paper form, or other methods aside from the online ATP tool.
42	☐	Column AQ includes the administrative cost (up to \$35 per case) for nondelinquent ATP cases with installment plans processed in-person, using a paper form, or other methods aside from the online ATP tool.
VICTIM RESTITUTION		
43	☐	Row 33 includes only non-delinquent cases referred/established and revenue collected during the reporting period.
44	☐	Rows 34-40 include victim restitution not included in Rows 3-10 or 12-19
45	☐	Rows 34-40, include cases referred/established and revenue collected during the reporting period.
46	☐	Column AR includes the number of victim restitution cases in inventory at the beginning of the period. Column AS includes the value of victim restitution cases in inventory at the beginning of the period.
47	☐	Column AT represents the number of cases which reported payment of victim restitution during the reporting period. Column AU includes the total amount of restitution owed to a victim by court order under Penal Code section 1202.4(f) collected by each collections program during the reporting period. Row 29 includes non-delinquent restitution collections.
48	☐	Column AV includes the number of cases of delinquent restitution (new and inventory) not reported in rows 3-10 or 12-19.
49	☐	Column AW includes the value of Col. AS plus the Col. AU less the amount shown in column AV (this field is formula-driven, so no separate calculation or entry is required).
50	☐	Column AX is blank unless errors or potential errors are detected in the worksheet. If an out of balance message appears correct the identified error or explain in Performance Report.

Program	Number of Delinquent Cases at Period Beginning (Ending Balance from Prior Year – Col. AE)	Value of Delinquent Cases at Period Beginning (Ending Balance from Prior Year – Col. AF)	Number of Cases Transferred Between Programs	Value of Cases Transferred Between Programs	Adjusted Number of Delinquent Cases at Period Beginning (Enter in Col. M)	Adjusted Value of Delinquent Cases at Period Beginning (Enter in Col. N)
Program	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. M	Col. N
Non-Delinquent Collections						
Court Collection Program					-	-
County Collection Program					-	-
Private Agency					-	-
FTB Court-Ordered Debt					-	-
FTB Interagency Intercept Collection					-	-
Intra-Branch Program					-	-
Other					-	-
Sub-total Delinquent	-	-	-	-	-	-

PC 1463.007 Collections Activity	Category	Task/Activity
3a. Attempts telephone contact with delinquent debtors for whom the program has a telephone number k. Uses an automated dialer or automatic call distribution system to manage telephone calls.	1= Telephone Contact	Outbound Call Inbound Call Dialer blast messaging
3b. Notifies delinquent debtors for whom the program has an address in writing of their outstanding obligation within 95 days of delinquency. 4e. Sends monthly bills or account statements to all delinquent debtors.	2=Written Notice(s)	Delinquent Notice (Failure to Appear or Failure to Pay) Handle all collections-related mail correspondence E-mail received Email sent
3c. Generates internal monthly reports to track collections data, such as age of debt and delinquent amounts outstanding. 3e. Accepts payment or delinquent debt by credit card.	3= Lobby/Counter	Receive/post cash, check and credit card payments Provide case information to individuals Establish payment plan agreements including amendments to existing plan Schedule walk-in arraignment, upon individual's request to go before a judge Update DMV, if needed Enter notes on the case, etc. Work the Out of Court--Collection Queue (Judge orders case be handled in collections) Process all criminal and juvenile probation orders; update financials and establish payment plans. Process all criminal and juvenile DA forms; update financials and establish payment plans Process payments from Intra-branch, generate weekly payment report Process payments and commission credit adjustments from private agency. Assist vendor w/case info., account balances, email them any directives from Judge on case and prepare commission checks at the end of month. Process all payments and commission credit adjustments from FTB-COD. Contact FTB-COD for additional information such as account balances, levy actions, etc.
3d. Uses Department of Motor Vehicles information to locate delinquent debtors. 4f. Contracts with local, regional, state, or national skip tracing or locator resources or services to locate delinquent debtors. 4g. Coordinates with the probation department to locate debtors who may be on formal or informal probation. 4h. Uses Employment Development Department employment and wage information to collect delinquent debt.	4=Skip Tracing	Perform skip tracing (DMV, internet, third party vendors) Obtain debtor information from probation and/or EDD
4a. Sends delinquent debt to the Franchise Tax Board's Court-Ordered Debt Collections Program.	5=FTB-COD	Refer case to FTB-COD
4b. Sends delinquent debt to the Franchise Tax Board's Interagency Intercept Collections Program.	6= FTB-IIC	Refer case to FTB-IIC
4c. Initiates driver's license suspension or hold actions when appropriate for a failure to appear in court.	7=DL Hold/Suspension	Send abstract to DMV for Failure to Appear driver's license hold/suspension
4d. Contracts with one or more private debt collectors to collect delinquent debt.	8= Private Agency	Refer case to private collection agency
4i. Establishes wage and bank account garnishments where appropriate. 4k. Places liens on real property owned by delinquent debtors when appropriate.	9= Wage/bank Garnishments and Liens	Wage and/or bank accounts are garnished Place liens

Sample list of activities/tasks to be used to report activities utilized in the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt. See corresponding "Category" on the Contact and Other Information Sheet, Items 5, 6 and 7.

Instructions for Completing the Collections Reporting Template

1. About the Collections Reporting Template (CRT)

Under Government Code section 68514 and Penal Code section 1463.010, as amended by Assembly Bill 1818, (Stats. 2019, Ch. 637), each superior court and county shall jointly report each year on the collection of revenue from criminal fines and fees, including information related to specific collections activities, the use of best practices, and amount of outstanding court-ordered debt. This report shall be submitted to the Judicial Council on or before September 1, using a template provided by the Council.

The following worksheets include the data elements required by both Government Code section 68514 and Penal Code section 1463.010. The worksheets must be completed and submitted by the date indicated below to the Judicial Council as part of the CRT:

- Contact and Other Information
- Program Report
- Performance Report
- Annual Financial Report

2. Due Date

The CRT must be submitted to the Judicial Council as part of the report *due on or before September 1*, per Penal Code section 1463.010. If September 1 falls on a weekend or holiday, the report shall be due the next business day.

3. Reporting Period

The CRT should be completed for the period of July 1 of the prior calendar year through June 30 of the calendar year the report is prepared. For example, for the 2022 report, the reporting period is July 1, 2021–June 30, 2022. The reporting period may also be referred to as the current period, the current year, the fiscal year, the reporting year, the year, or similar terms.

4. What Should Be Reported

The following should be reported in the CRT:

- All delinquent court-ordered fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments, as well as victim restitution, imposed by law or court order in criminal (infraction, misdemeanor, and felony) cases, including juvenile delinquency cases, and the number of cases associated with those collections.
- All revenues generated by each collection program (e.g., court, county, private agency, Franchise Tax Board (FTB), intra-branch, or other program) from delinquent cases during the reporting period and the number of cases associated with those collections.
- All revenues generated from non-delinquent cases during the reporting period and the number of cases associated with those collections.

- The value and number of new cases established or referred during the reporting period, as well as the value and number of cases from prior period inventory which are still outstanding.

Fees collected in non-criminal cases (e.g., civil, probate, family, mental health, and juvenile dependency) **should not be** reported in the template.

5. Worksheet 1: Contact and Other Information

This worksheet captures contact information and data in response to Items 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the reporting requirements under Government Code section 68514 (highlighted in green). Required data corresponding to Items 1, 2, 3 and 8 is captured in the Annual Financial Report. Refer to sections that follow for instructions on how to complete the Contact and Other Information worksheet. See Crosswalk tool to help map each item listed in Government Code section 68514 to corresponding worksheet(s) in the CRT (page 17).

Penal Code section 1463.007 requires that each program engage 10 of 16 collections activities, including each of the first five activities listed. The collections programs may collectively meet the requirement. For purposes of this report, the collection activities were grouped into nine (9) categories. (See the Category Key).

NOTE: Based on the number of activities checked, the worksheet will indicate whether your collections program has fulfilled that component of the requirements of a comprehensive collection program.

The **Category** column identifies the number assigned to each activity. Each activity utilized in the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt should be reported by Category. See the Categories tab for a non-exhaustive list of tasks/activities.

Item 4: In this column, check each activity that is met by at least one of the collections programs (e.g., court, county, private agency, FTB, and intra-branch program). This complies with the reporting requirement for a description of the collection activities used pursuant to Penal Code section 1463.007. It is expected that if a collection activity is marked on this Worksheet that is also listed as a best practice on the Program report, it will be marked there as well.

Item 5: In this column, for each case, track and record payment(s) received per collection activity and report the total amount collected in the corresponding Category at the end of the fiscal year.

NOTE: The total in Item 5, Row 22, should reconcile with the Gross Revenue Collected, Column Z, Row 29, of the Annual Financial Report.

Item 6: For purposes of this report, item 6 is interpreted as requesting information on each case plus a unique person (one individual).

In Column Item 6a, track and record each case by activity that the program engages (utilizes) as part of the collection effort and report the total number of cases by Category at the end of the fiscal year, whether or not the activity resulted in collections.

In Column Item 6b, track and record one individual in Category 3 regardless of the number of associated case(s) in 6a and report the total number of individuals at the end of the fiscal year.

NOTE: Since a program may utilize one or more of the 16 activities during the collections process, the number of cases by activity in 6a will always be equal to or greater than the associated number of individuals reported in 6b.

Item 7: In this column, for each case, track and record total operating costs per collection activity and report total costs in the corresponding category, as a negative (–) entry, at the end of the fiscal year.

For purposes of this report, operating costs are as defined in the [Guidelines and Standards for Cost Recovery](#). Operating costs should be calculated and recovered using the *Guidelines* approved methodologies.

NOTE: The total in Row 22, Item 7, must reconcile with Cost of Collections, Column AA, Row 29, of the Annual Financial Report.

**Wondering how to report data on CRT?
See an Example of the Process on page 16**

6. Worksheet 2: Program Report

Programs should provide a description of any changes to collections during the reporting period, including a description of the extent to which Judicial Council–approved Collections Best Practices are being met and any obstacles or problems that prevent the program from meeting the best practices. In the bottom section, indicate areas (by checkmark) in which training, assistance, or additional information is necessary. If additional space is required, please submit the information as an attachment in Microsoft Word format.

If a best practice on this report matches a collection program or activity on either Worksheet 1 or Worksheet 4 which shows activity, it should be checked as being used on this report as well.

7. Worksheet 3: Performance Report

Programs should provide a summary of the collection program’s performance during the reporting year, including the extent of the program’s reporting capabilities as it relates to the information required by Government Code section 68514. If data cannot be provided at this time or if the reported data differs from these Instructions, please describe the submitted data and any plans for providing this information in the future.

If additional space is required, please submit the information as an attachment in Microsoft Word format.

8. **Worksheet 4: Annual Financial Report**

The Annual Financial Report worksheet captures the total revenue collected during the reporting period (i.e., July 1–June 30) and the number of cases associated with those collections, court-ordered adjustments, discharged debt, and cost of collections. Data in response to Items 1, 2, 3 and 8 of the reporting requirements under Government Code section 68514 are captured in this worksheet.

NOTE: This worksheet is protected, and data entry is required only in unshaded cells. Refer to sections that follow for instructions on how to complete the Annual Financial Report worksheet.

9. **Worksheet 5: Transfer Worksheet**

If accounts with previously established debt are transferred from one collection program to another during the reporting period, the transfer worksheet should be used to record those transfers, so that any collections, adjustments, or discharges which occur are correctly attributed in the Annual Financial Report. *Use of this form is optional but encouraged if needed to clearly show the net transfer of accounts between the programs.*

10. **Worksheet 6: Performance Metrics**

The new performance metrics align to reporting requirements, as required in statute, and are intended to effectively track and measure each program's performance. The worksheet is formula driven and captures information on the programs' individual performance.

The performance indicators are designed to gauge an entity's performance across a variety of metrics including collection of referrals and cost control:

- **Collector Effective Index (CEI)**— gauges an entity's effectiveness at collecting from referrals of groups defined by the age of the court-ordered debt by calculating the percentage of cases with payment for debts of those groups.
- **First Year Resolution Rate**— provides the percentage of "current" referral balance that is resolved within the first year or how effective an entity is at resolving first-year referrals.
- **Spend Efficiency Score (SES)**— measures the cost to collect \$1 in delinquent referrals for each component and age group.
- **Cost to Referral Ratio**— reflects the average dollars spent (costs) per referral.

The normalizing metrics are designed to assist entities better understand any unique conditions and will provide additional context to an entity's performance:

- **Risk Monitor**— assesses the potential of an entity's current year referrals becoming delinquent to help the entity set expectations for performance on specific referrals.

- **Adjustment Score**— represents the value of debt resolved through non-cash means.
- **Discharge Score**— represents the value of debt discharged by an entity

Any comments provided in the worksheet (500 character maximum) will be included in the program's dashboard and attached to the report to the legislature.

HOW TO COMPLETE THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT: STEP-BY-STEP

CURRENT PERIOD (NEWLY-ESTABLISHED) DEBT: Fines, Fees, Forfeitures, Penalties, and Assessments

For each collections program, (e.g., court, county, private agency, FTB, or an intra-branch program) enter all transactions on newly established and referred cases that occurred during the reporting period, also known as current period debt. "Newly established and referred cases" includes all cases for which criminal fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments became delinquent during the fiscal year. It also includes forthwith payments on cases established during the reporting year, which are reported as a single total not assigned to specific collection programs.

- In row 3, report only the number of non-delinquent cases for which payments were received (e.g., traffic bail forfeitures, forthwith payments, accounts receivable, and payment plans for non-delinquent debt), in column D, and the amount of non-delinquent gross revenue collected, in column E.
- In rows 4–10, report the number (column B) and value (column C) of cases newly established or referred as delinquent during the reporting period; detailed explanations for each column are below.
 - the number of cases for which payments were received – column D,
 - gross revenue collected – column E,
 - cost of collections – column F,
 - adjustments – column G,
 - discharges posted during the year on newly-delinquent cases only – column H. Discharge can only be performed by the court or the county (rows 4 or 5)

NOTE: As a reminder, programs which have contracted with another court or county to handle collections should report all collections activity on Row 8, for Intra-Branch Program.

- In row 10, enter amounts that cannot be broken out or attributed to a single collection program. These amounts may include revenue collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV).

NOTE: If revenue is received from FTB-IIC in a case that is also assigned to another program, the value of the inventory should be reported on row 8 and subtracted from the other program's reported value.

Column B: Number of Cases Established or Referred as Delinquent

Enter the total net number of new cases established or referred to each respective collection program within the reporting year. Cases that were previously established, but never referred to collections, are considered new cases and should be reported in Col. B. Report newly delinquent debt only.

To avoid double-counting, a case should be reported only once, under the collection program that has the case in inventory at year end (June 30th). If a case is fully resolved through payment, adjustment, or discharge, it should be reported under the program that has the case when it is resolved.

Example: If an individual has two delinquent cases: Case 1 is a DUI and Case 2 includes two Vehicle Code violations, two cases are reported in Col. B, regardless of the number of violations. For cases that are "bundled" into one case for referral to a collections program (i.e., the Franchise Tax Board), only one case should be reported in Col. B.

NOTE: Reporting an accurate case count is as important as reporting an accurate value of delinquent debt. Both are required reporting elements under Government Code section 68514.

Column C: Value of Cases Established or Referred as Delinquent

Enter the total net value of cases identified in Col. B that were newly established or referred as delinquent during the reporting period. Delinquent debt which was established or referred to a program in prior years should be reported in Col. N.

Column D: Number of Cases with Payment(s) Received

In row 3, include the number of cases associated with non-delinquent collections reported in Col. D. In rows 4 through 10, enter the number of newly delinquent cases with payment(s) received (including payment(s) on an installment agreement) during the fiscal year that are directly associated with the total delinquent revenues reported in Col. E.

NOTE: Report the number of cases with payment received, non-delinquent and delinquent, not the number of payments. The number of cases with payments received (Col. D) cannot be greater than the number of cases reported in Col. B.

Using example in Column B above: If at the end of the year six installment payments are received on Case 1 and three on Case 2, the number of cases reported in Column D is two, regardless of the number of payments received.

Column E: Gross Revenue Collected

As noted above, in row 3 include non-delinquent traffic bail forfeitures, forthwith payments, accounts receivable, and current payment plans. In rows 4 to 10, enter the total amount of delinquent revenue collected by each collections program on newly delinquent debt during the reporting year, including payment(s) from an accounts receivable or installment payment plan. If revenue cannot be separated between the current and prior periods, report all revenue, and the associated number of cases, in the prior reporting period.

Column F: Cost of Collections

Enter as a ***negative number*** the cost of collections allowable for recovery under Penal Code section 1463.007. If cost of collections cannot be distinguished by period, prorate and report costs based on the value of revenue collected in each period.

Column G: Adjustments

Enter the total dollar value of court-ordered debt satisfied by means other than payment that decreases or increases the outstanding debt amount. This includes court-ordered adjustments, such as dismissals, suspensions, and waivers of all or part of the total fine, and alternative payments such as community service or post sentence service of time in custody in lieu of fine, or other non-cash adjustments that occurred during the reporting period. It also includes changes resulting from legislation which affect outstanding court-ordered debt.

This total should be entered as a positive number if the net effect is to reduce the amount of debt outstanding or a negative (–) number if the net effect is to increase the amount of debt outstanding. For example, charges for a bad check would be entered as a negative (–) dollar amount, as this would increase the amount of debt outstanding.

Column H: Discharge from Accountability

Enter the total dollar value of accounts established as delinquent **and** discharged during the current year, per Government Code sections 25257 to 25259.95. The value should be entered as a positive number as the net effect is to reduce the amount of debt outstanding.

Column H should include *only* debt established in the current period, otherwise report the value in Column S. For example, if a \$600 debt being collected by the county is discharged, +\$600 would be entered in Col. H, row 5.

Column I: Net Value of Newly Established Delinquent Debt at End of Period

The amount in Column I is formula driven; no data entry required. The formula calculates the change in value of transactions reported in columns C, E, G, and H, as follows: (Column I= C– E– G– H), or the value of cases established, minus all collections, adjustments, and discharges.

Column J: Value of Cases on Installment Agreements

In Column J, enter the original value of all delinquent cases set-up on an installment agreement, by the court or collecting entity, for installment payment(s) on newly established delinquent court-ordered debt.

The value of cases on installments cannot be greater than the value of cases reported in Column C.

Column K: Default Balance Installment Agreements

In Column K, enter the balance of newly established delinquent cases set-up on an installment agreement where the individual did not fulfill their payment obligation, i.e., payment(s) have not been received as promised and the plan was not reinstated at the end of the fiscal year. Include only the value of installment plans where the individual failed to comply with the terms of the installment agreement.

A delinquent case that is set-up on an installment payment plan as part of the collections process is considered “*defaulted on*” if the individual fails to fulfill his/her payment obligation, per the terms of the agreement. The default balance should not include the unpaid balance of cases set-up on installment plans that are “current”, i.e., installment payment(s) have been made according to the agreement terms.

Column L: Percentage of Debt Defaulted On (Installment Agreements)

The amount in Column L is formula-driven; no data entry required. The formula calculates the percentage of court-ordered debt *defaulted on* by dividing the default balance by the original case value set-up on an installment agreement. (Col. K / Col. J)

NOTE: Court-ordered debt should be reported separately, by Current and Prior Periods. If any portion of court debt established in the Current Period cannot be accurately distinguished from debt established in a Prior Period, report the combined total in Prior Period. In the Performance Report explain when the program anticipates reporting collections information as required by statute.

PRIOR PERIOD (PREVIOUSLY-ESTABLISHED) DELINQUENT DEBT: Fines, Fees, Forfeitures, Penalties, and Assessments

In response to the reporting requirement under Government Code section 68514, the Annual Financial Report captures data by Current Period (Newly Established Delinquent Debt), Prior Period (Previously Established Delinquent Debt), and Combined total.

Data reported in the Previously Established Delinquent Debt, or Prior Period, section will be used to comply with subdivision (b) of Government Code section 68514, which requires a section that lists information on fines and fees which were established prior to the current reporting period that had outstanding balances in the current year.

For each collections program, (e.g., court, county, private agency, FTB, or an intra-branch program), enter all transactions that occurred during the current fiscal year, as follows:

- In row 12 report only the number of non-delinquent cases from which payments were received (e.g., traffic bail forfeitures, forthwith payments, accounts receivable, and payment plans for non-delinquent debt), in column O, and the amount of gross revenue collected, in column P. This includes installment payments or accounts receivable which were established prior to July 1 but received payments during the reporting period.
- In rows 13–19, like rows 4-10 in the current period, report on cases previously established as delinquent. Detailed explanations are below:
 - report the number of cases in inventory from the prior year – column M
 - value of cases in inventory from the prior year – column N
 - the number of cases for which payments were received – column O
 - gross revenue collected – column P
 - cost of collections – column Q
 - adjustments – column R
 - discharges from accountability on all cases in inventory which were established prior to the current year – column S.

- In row 18, report collections activity from contract with another court or county to handle collections through an Intra-Branch Program.
- In row 19, enter amounts that cannot be broken out or attributed to a single collection program. These amounts would include revenue collected by the DMV.

NOTE: If revenue is received from FTB-IIC in a case that is also assigned to another program, the value of the inventory should be reported on row 17 and subtracted from the other program's reported value.

Column M: Number of Delinquent Cases at Period Beginning (Ending Balance from Prior Year)

Enter the total number of cases initially referred or established in each respective collection program in prior fiscal years, which remain in inventory. This number should be the same as the ending number of cases reported in the previous year (Column AE), as modified by any transfers between collection programs reported on the Transfer Worksheet, if necessary. Any variance from the previous year's ending balance not included on the Transfer Worksheet (if used) should be reported and explained in the Performance Report worksheet.

Example: The ending number of cases for the county collection program on the previous year's report is 1,000. During the current reporting period, 300 cases are transferred to the private agency and 200 cases are transferred to Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt (FTB-COD). On the Transfer Worksheet, report a reduction of 500 cases for the county collection program, an increase of 300 cases for the private agency, and an increase of 200 cases for FTB-COD. These modified amounts are entered into Col. M.

Column N: Value of Delinquent Cases at Period Beginning (Ending Balance from Prior Year)

Enter the total net value of cases identified in Col. M that were referred or established in prior reporting periods which remain in inventory, following adjustments for transfers between collection programs. This value represents the ending balance reported at the end of the previous year (Column AF), as modified by transfers between collection programs during the reporting period as reported on the Transfer Worksheet, if necessary. Any variance between the ending balance on the previous year's report and the value reported in Column N not included on the Transfer Worksheet (if used) should be reported and explained in the Performance Report worksheet.

Example: The ending balance for the county collection program on the previous year's report is \$25,000. During the current reporting period, \$10,000 is transferred to the private agency and \$5,000 is transferred to FTB-COD. On the Transfer Worksheet, report a \$15,000 reduction in the balance of the county collection program, a \$10,000 increase in the balance of the private agency, and a \$5,000 increase in the balance of FTB-COD. These modified amounts are entered into Col. N.

NOTE: As of 2021-22 collections activity of the FTB-IIC program should be reported in Rows 8 and 17. The number and value of cases reported in 2020-21 as "Other", in Columns M and N, should be subtracted from "Other" and reported in the FTB-IIC line.

Column O: Number of Cases with Payment(s) Received

In row 12, include the number of cases associated with non-delinquent collections reported in Col. P. In rows 13–19, enter the number of cases with payments received (including cases on installment plans) during the current reporting year from previously-established cases, which are associated with the gross revenue collected in Col. P. As stated regarding Column D above, report the number of cases with payments, not the number of payments received.

Column P: Gross Revenue Collected During the Period

As noted above, in row 12, include non-delinquent traffic bail forfeitures, forthwith payments, accounts receivable, and current payment plans. In rows 13–19, enter the total amount of delinquent revenue collected during the current reporting period by each collection program from previously-established cases. If revenue cannot be separated between the current and prior periods, please report all revenue, and the associated number of cases, in the prior reporting period.

Column Q: Cost of Collections

Enter as a negative number the cost of collections (operating costs) allowable for recovery under Penal Code section 1463.007.

Column R: Adjustments

Enter the total dollar value of court-ordered debt satisfied by means other than payment that decreases or increases the amount outstanding for individual debt item. This includes court-ordered adjustments, such as suspensions and dismissals, and alternative payments such as community service or post sentence service of time in custody in lieu of fine, or other non-cash adjustments that occurred during the current reporting period. It also includes changes resulting from ability to pay determinations and legislation which affect outstanding court-ordered debt.

This total should be entered as a positive number if the net effect is to reduce the amount of debt outstanding or a negative (–) number if the net effect is to increase the amount of debt outstanding. For example, charges for a bad check would be entered as a negative (–) dollar amount, as this would increase the amount of debt outstanding.

Column S: Discharge from Accountability

Enter the total dollar value of accounts previously established, referred or transferred that were discharged during the current fiscal year, per Government Code sections 25257–25259.95. The value should be entered as a positive number as the net effect is to reduce the amount of debt outstanding.

For example, if a \$600 debt being collected by the county is discharged, +\$600 would be entered in column S, row 14.

Column T: Net Value of Previously Established Delinquent Debt at End of Period

This is formula driven, no data entry required. The formula calculates the change in value of transactions reported in columns N, P, R, and S as follows: (Column T= N– P– R– S), or beginning value minus all collections, adjustments, and discharges on previously-existing debt.

Column U: Value of Cases on Installment Agreement (Ending Balance from Prior Year)

Enter the value carried over from the prior year for all cases on an installment agreement that were defaulted on, i.e., payment(s) were not received as promised and the plan was not reinstated at the end of the fiscal year. The value carried over should not include the unpaid balance of cases set-up on installment plans that are “current”, i.e., installment payment(s) have been received according to the agreement terms.

The value of cases on installment plans cannot be greater than the value of cases reported in Column N.

Column V: Default Balance Installment Agreement

Enter the default balance from all delinquent cases on an installment agreement carried over from the prior year with no payment(s) received in the current year.

Column W: Percentage of Debt Defaulted On (Installment Agreements)

Column W is formula-driven, no separate calculation or data entry required. The formula calculates the percentage of court-ordered debt *defaulted on* by dividing the default balance by the value carried-over from prior year. (Col. V / Col. U)

NOTE: Court-ordered debt should be reported separately, by Current and Prior Periods. If any portion of court debt established in the Current Period cannot be accurately distinguished from debt established in a Prior Period, report the combined total in Prior Period. In the Performance Report explain when the program anticipates reporting collections information as required by statute.

COMBINED DELINQUENT DEBT:**Beginning and Ending Balance Fines, Fees, Forfeitures, Penalties, and Assessments**

The Combined Beginning and Ending Balances section includes the number and value of ALL cases; new and previously established. Except for Columns AE and AF, information from the Current Period (Newly Established) and Prior Period (Previously Established) Delinquent Debt sections is captured by formula for each program; no separate calculation or entry is required.

Column X: Number of Cases—Beginning Balance

Column X calculates the total number of cases on inventory at the beginning of the period plus the total number of newly delinquent cases established during the reporting period. (Col. B + Col. M)

Column Y: Value of Cases—Beginning Balance

Column Y calculates the total value of cases in inventory at the beginning of the year or newly established during the reporting year. (Col. C + Col. N)

Column Z: Gross Revenue Collected

Column Z calculates all payments received towards the satisfaction of delinquent court-ordered debt during the current fiscal year. (Col. E + P)

Column AA: Cost of Collections

Column AA calculates the combined total cost of collections which, pursuant to Penal Code section 1463.007 is allowable to offset revenue prior to distribution to other governmental entities. Cost of collections should be reported as a negative (–) number unless posting a reversal. (Col. F + Col. Q)

Columns AB: Adjustments

Column AB calculates the total amounts satisfied by means other than payment that decreased or increased the amount outstanding for individual debt items during the current fiscal year. (Col. G + Col. R)

Column AC: Discharge from Accountability

Column AC calculates the total amount of debt deemed uncollectible that was discharged during the reporting period, per Government Code sections 25257-25259.95. (Col. H + Col. S)

Column AD: Change in Value

Column AD calculates the value of transactions in columns Z, AB, and AC, or the total amount of revenue collected, adjustments, and discharges.
=SUM (Z+ AB+ AC)

Column AE: Number of Cases—Ending Balance

Enter the total number of cases at the end of the fiscal year for each program.

Column AF: Value of Cases—Ending Balance

Enter the total net value of cases at the end of the reporting year for each program. The value of cases at end of period (Col. AF) should equal the value of cases at beginning of period (Col. Y), minus the value reported in Column AD (which is the sum of Columns Z, AB and AC).

Column AG: Error Messages

This data field displays “Out of Balance” if the ending balance in Col.AF does not equal the beginning balance in Col. Y, minus the value of transactions reported in Col. AD.

- If the beginning balance for the County Collection Program in column Y, row 23 is \$10,000,000; and
- The gross revenue collected in Col. Z, row 23 is \$2,000,000; and
- The value of adjustments in Col. AB, row 23 is \$250,000, and
- The value of discharged debt in Col. AC, row 23 is \$250,000.
- Then the ending balance reported in Col. AF, row 23 should be \$7,500,000, because:

$$\$10,000,000 - \$2,000,000 - \$250,000 - \$250,000 = \$8,000,000.$$

If the ending balance in Col. AF reconciles to the program’s case management and/or accounting system but does not reconcile to the information input in columns Y, AZ, AB, and AC, explain the “Error Message” in the Performance Report worksheet.

Collections from Cases Subject to Ability to Pay (AtP) Determination

This section was added to capture supplemental AtP collections information to help estimate the level of funding needed to backfill amounts reduced by the ability-to-pay program. Such information includes the total amount collected from nondelinquent and delinquent cases which have been subject to an ability to pay (AtP) determination processed in person or through the online tool ([MyCitations](#)) established by Government Code section 68645.

Also, as authorized by Government Code section 68645.2, an administrative cost of up to \$35 per installment plan approved may be claimed on nondelinquent cases. For delinquent cases, costs associated with the collection of any reduced amounts ordered under the ability to pay program for delinquent cases may be recovered, per Penal Code section 1463.007.

NOTE: Implementation of the online tool (MyCitations) is ongoing, complete statewide expansion is expected by June 30, 2024. If your court has not been onboarded, report \$0 in this section.

Column AH: Online AtP Revenue Nondelinquent Enter gross revenue collected from the total outstanding amount due on nondelinquent AtP cases processed through the online tool (MyCitations) established by Government Code section 68645.

Column AI: Online AtP Revenue Delinquent Enter gross revenue collected from the total outstanding amount due on delinquent AtP cases processed through the online tool (MyCitations) established by Government Code section 68645.

Column AJ: Online AtP Revenue Combined This cell is self-populating, no data entry required.

Column AK: In-Person (Paper Form) AtP Revenue Nondelinquent Enter gross revenue collected from the total outstanding amount due on nondelinquent AtP cases processed in-person, using a paper form, or other methods aside from the online (MyCitations) tool.

Column AL: In-Person (Paper Form) AtP Revenue Delinquent Enter gross revenue collected from the total outstanding amount due on delinquent AtP cases processed in-person, using a paper form, or other methods aside from the online (MyCitations) tool.

Column AM: In-Person (Paper Form) AtP Revenue Combined This cell is self-populating, no data entry required.

Column AN: Online AtP Cases w/Installment Payments Nondelinquent Enter the number of nondelinquent AtP cases with approved installment plans processed through the online tool (MyCitations) established by Government Code section 68645.2.

For example, if 124 cases are reported in Column AN, then the total reported in Column AO should be \$4,340 ($124 \times \$35 = \$4,340$). If the costs claimed is less than \$35 per approved installment plan, indicate the adjusted amount in the Performance Report.

Column AO: Online AtP Installment Costs Claimed Nondelinquent Enter the administrative cost (up to \$35 per case) for nondelinquent ATP cases with approved installment plans processed through the online tool established by Government Code section 68645.2.

Column AP: In-Person (Paper Form) AtP Cases w/Installment Payments Nondelinquent Enter the number of nondelinquent AtP cases with approved installment plans processed in-person, using a paper form, or other methods aside from the online (MyCitations) tool.

Column AQ: In-Person ATP Installment Costs Claimed Nondelinquent Enter the administrative cost (up to \$35 per case) for nondelinquent ATP cases with approved installment plans processed in-person, using a paper form, or other methods aside from the online tool established by Government Code section 68645.2.

NOTE: Penal Code section 1205(e) was repealed by Assembly Bill 177, the administrative fee for installment payment plans cannot be assessed and any unpaid balance is uncollectible.

Victim Restitution

This section captures the ending balances (number and value of cases) from prior year and values for the current reporting period for victim restitution.

In rows 33–40, enter transactions that occurred during the reporting period including restitution owed to a victim by court order under Penal Code section 1202.4(f) restitution not reported in rows 3–10 and 12–19. Any administrative fees repealed by law, that were included in a program’s outstanding delinquent balance, must be dismissed, or vacated by court-order and reported under Adjustments, Columns G and R.

Column AR: Number of Cases (Ending Balance from Prior Year)

The Beginning Balance should include the number of cases of all delinquent outstanding victim restitution (case inventory) reported as the Number of Cases-Ending Balance on the previous year’s report and not reported in rows 3-9 and 12-19.

Column AS: Value of Cases (Ending Balance from Prior Year)

The Beginning Balance should include the value of cases of all delinquent outstanding victim restitution (case inventory) that were reported as Value of Cases-Ending Balance on the previous year’s report and not reported in rows 3-9 and 12-19.

Column AT: Number of Cases Established/ Referred/ Transferred in Period

Enter the total net number of newly established, referred, or transferred victim restitution cases for the reporting period. Cases that were previously established, but never referred to collections, are considered new and should be reported in column AP.

Column AU: Value of Cases Established/ Referred/ Transferred in the Reporting Period

Enter the total net value of new victim restitution cases identified in Column AT that were established, referred, or transferred during the reporting period.

Column AV: Gross Revenue Collected

Enter the total amount of restitution owed to a victim by court order under Penal Code section 1202.4(f) collected by each collections program during the reporting period. Report non-delinquent restitution collections in row 33.

Column AW: Change in Value

Column AW captures the value of column AU, less the amounts shown in column AV (this field is formula-driven, so no separate calculation or entry is required).

Column AX: Number of Cases Ending Balance

Include the number of cases of all delinquent outstanding victim restitution (new and inventory).

Column AY: Value of Cases Ending Balance

The ending balance in column AY should equal the beginning balance in column AS plus the value of newly established cases reported in Column AU, less the gross amount collected ($AY = AS + AU - AV$).

Column AZ: Error Messages

These rows are blank unless errors are detected in the worksheet. If error messages are present, please correct the identified error or explain in Performance Report.

Quality Checklist

Confirm that the data reported complies with the stated specification. (See Quality Checklist Tab.) For boxes left unchecked, please explain in the Program Report worksheet.

Signature Block

Print the names, dates, and job titles of as well as obtain the authorized signatures from the court representative *and* county representative on the Annual Financial Report worksheet.

Submitting the Collections Reporting Template

Print all completed worksheets in the Collections Reporting Template. Obtain electronic signatures from the authorized court *and* county representative and e-mail the signed PDF report and the Excel workbook to collections@jud.ca.gov

If You Have Questions If you have any questions about the Collections Reporting Template, please send them to collections@jud.ca.gov.

EXAMPLE: HOW TO FILL OUT THE CRT

Case information: A citation is filed and court mails courtesy notice. Individual fails to appear in court or make a payment on the due date and \$720 case is established as delinquent. Individual fails to respond to two delinquency notices and three attempted telephone calls. Case is referred to a private vendor for collections (15% commission). Individual is located via skip tracing, agrees to an installment agreement. As signed, the individual agrees to a \$60.00, 12-month installment plan. Individual makes two installment payments during the reporting period. No activity or other payment arrangements on the record, the plan is not reinstated by collections program at year end. **At the end of the fiscal year, report data as follows on CRT:**

Step by Step:	Worksheet:	Column/Category:	What to Input?
A citation is filed and court mails courtesy notice.			No entry needed. Case is not delinquent.
Individual fails to appear in court or make a payment on the due date and the \$720 case is established as delinquent.	Annual Financial Report	Col. B, Row 6 Col. C, Row 6	Report 1 Report \$720
Individual fails to respond to two delinquency notices and three attempted telephone calls. In Item 6a: report one (1) in <u>each</u> Category regardless of the number of notices mailed or telephone calls attempted.	Contact and Other Information Sheet Annual Financial Report	Item 6a, Category 1 Item 6a, Category 2 Item 7, Category 1, 2 Column F, Row 4	Report <u>one</u> (1) Report <u>one</u> (1) Report actual costs* Report actual costs* (Include staff salary, paper, postage, phone bill, etc.)
Case is referred to a private vendor for collections. (15% commission) In Item 6b: report <u>one</u> (1) in Category 3, regardless of the number of cases reported in 6a.	Contact and Other Information Sheet Annual Financial Report	Item 6a, Category 8 Item 6b, Category 3 Item 7, Category 8 Column F, Row 6	Report one (1) Report one (1) Report -\$18 Report -\$18
Individual is located via skip tracing, agrees to an installment agreement.	Contact and Other Information Sheet		No entry needed. Skip tracing costs included in private vendor costs.
As signed, the individual agrees to a \$60.00, 12-month installment plan. Individual makes two installment payments, in the reporting period to the private vendor.	Contact and Other Information Sheet Annual Financial Report	Item 5, Category 8 Col. D, Row 6 Col. E, Row 6 Col. J, Row 6	Report \$120 Report one (1) Report \$120 Report \$720
No activity or other payment arrangements on the record, the plan is not reinstated by collections program at year end.	Annual Financial Report	Col. K, Row 6	Report \$600

Crosswalk

GC § 68514 Item	Description	CRT Worksheet	Column
1	Non-delinquent revenue, number of cases	Annual Financial Report	D, E, O, P
2	Delinquent revenue, number of cases	Annual Financial Report	D, E, O, P
3	Fine and fees dismissed, discharged, satisfied by other means	Annual Financial Report	G, H, R, S
4	Collection activities used pursuant to PC 1463.007	Program Report	Item 4
5	Total amount collected per collection activity	Contact sheet	Item 5
6	Total number of cases by collection activity, individuals associated	Contact sheet	Item 6a, 6b
7	Total operating costs per collection activity	Contact sheet	Item 7
8	Percentage of fines and fees defaulted on	Annual Financial Report	J, K, U, V
9	Extent best practices and performance measures/benchmarks met	Program Report Annual Financial Report	AI, AJ, AK
10	Changes necessary to improve performance	NA	NA

Collections Reporting Template Glossary

Accounts Receivable (A/R): An accounts receivable is a set of account receivables if paid in installments, that are not paid forthwith.

Adjustments: An adjustment is any change in the total of debt due after the initial determination of the amount of outstanding delinquent debt. Non-cash adjustments include the suspension of all or a portion of bail, fines, fees, penalties, forfeitures, or assessments. Alternative payments may include community service in lieu of a fine and post sentence service of time in custody in lieu of fine; dismissals include dismissing all or a portion of the debt. Cash adjustments include fees added for payment by an insufficient funds check (NSF) or a correction to the initial assessment amount.

Alternative Sentence: This refers to a different option for resolving court-ordered debt, such as community service in lieu of bail or fines, designed for an individual who demonstrates an inability to pay.

Case: For the purposes of the Collections Reporting Template, a case is a set of official court documents filed in connection with an infraction, misdemeanor, or felony violation. A case may include multiple violations but is filed as one case.

Community Service: This refers to the hours of service that are converted to a monetary value and applied to the fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments and reduce the imposed amount.

Comprehensive Collection Program: A program that collects eligible delinquent court-ordered fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, and assessments on infraction, misdemeanor, and felony cases, as authorized by Penal Code section 1463.007.

Continuance: A continuance is the postponement of a hearing, trial, or other scheduled court proceeding at the request of either or both parties in a court dispute, or by the judge. For purposes of the Collections Reporting Template, a continuance is the postponement, stay, or withholding of payment under certain conditions for a temporary period.

Cost of Collections: The costs of operating a collections program that are allowed to be offset against collected delinquent revenues prior to distribution under Penal Code section 1463.007.

County Collection Program: A collection program administered by the county.

Court Collection Program: A collection program administered by the local superior court.

Default: A default occurs when an individual fails to make a payment on the date specified by a court or as agreed to under the terms and conditions of an installment payment or accounts receivable (A/R) plan set by a court or collecting entity. For purposes of complying with GC68514, Item 8, a delinquent account that is set-up on an installment payment plan as part of the collections process is considered “defaulted on” if the individual fails to fulfill their payment obligation (i.e., payment(s) are not made as promised based on agreement terms) and the plan was not reinstated, at the end of the fiscal year.

Delinquent Account: A delinquent account results when an individual has not appeared in court as promised or has not complied with a court order for payment of fines, fees, penalties, forfeitures, and assessments. For cost recovery, once the debt becomes delinquent, it continues to be delinquent and may be subject to collection by a comprehensive collection program. An account is considered delinquent the day after the payment is due.

Discharged Account: An account that has been deemed uncollectible and discharged from accountability. The actual discharge is based on established criteria by an authorized body, pursuant to Government Code sections 25257–25259.95.

Dismissal: A judgment that disposes a matter in a case. For the purposes of the Collections Reporting Template, this term refers to a criminal action dropped without settling the involved issues or based on statutory change. The initial court-ordered debt no longer exists.

Enhanced Collections: Enhanced collections are non-forthwith collection activities related to enhancing collection programs where costs are incurred and paid directly by or reimbursed by the county and are not cost recoverable. These collections are also included in the Collections Reporting Template.

Forthwith Payments: This collections category involves payment on the same day as the court order and generally involves no “extra cost” because the account is paid in full. Forthwith payments are distinguished from enhanced collections primarily by the timing of the payments. Any of these associated costs should not be reported as an enhanced or delinquent collection cost. Forthwith payments are included, together with nondelinquent installment payments, as a separate category on the Collections Reporting Template. Installment and accounts receivable plans are not forthwith payments.

Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt (FTB-COD) Program: The Franchise Tax Board collection program authorized under Revenue and Taxation Code section 19280.

Franchise Tax Board Interagency Intercept Collections (FTB-IIC) Program: A program of the Franchise Tax Board authorized by Government Code section 12419.10(a)(1) to collect court-ordered fines, fees, forfeitures, assessments, and penalties from Franchise Tax Board refunds, unclaimed property, or California State Lottery winnings. Report collections information related to the IIC program in rows 9 and 18 and not in “Other”.

Gross Revenue Collected: Monies collected toward the satisfaction of a court-ordered debt by collection programs prior to any reductions.

Installment Payment: A scheduled payment agreed upon by the defendant and the court or county collection program. Generally, cost recovery does not apply when an individual is paying a fine, fee, penalty, assessment, or forfeiture through time payments unless the account is delinquent. A delinquent account may be reinstated to installment payments, and costs associated with collection activities on this reinstated account are eligible for cost recovery. A court or county may claim costs associated with the administration of a nondelinquent installment plan processed through the online ability-to-pay tool or paper form (Govt. Code, Section 68645.2). Claimed costs shall not exceed thirty-five (\$35) dollars per approved nondelinquent installment plan.

Intra-branch Program: An Intra-branch Program is a court, or a county collection service provided under a written Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to another court or county.

Net Revenue: Gross revenue collected less any reductions (i.e., allowable cost offsets pursuant to Penal Code section 1463.007).

Nondelinquent Collections: All nondelinquent revenue collected during the reporting period, including bail forfeitures, forthwith payments, and current payments made on accounts receivables and installment payment plans; recorded on row 3, column D of the Annual Financial Report worksheet.

“Other” Program: This refers to the “Other” row, rows 10 and 19 of the Annual Financial Report worksheet and captures revenue that cannot be broken out or attributed to a single collecting entity (e.g., court, county, private agency, the FTB or an Intra-branch Program). Any amount reported on this row should be explained in the Program Report worksheet.

Penal Code section 1463.007: This statute specifies the criteria for a comprehensive collection program and allows the county and/or court to deduct, and deposit in the county treasury or trial court operations fund, the cost of operating a comprehensive collection program prior to distributing revenues to other governmental entities.

Private Agency: A private entity employed or contracted to collect court-ordered fines, fees, forfeitures, assessments, and penalties.

Referral: A referral is a newly established delinquent court-ordered debt submitted to a collection program during the reporting period.

Suspensions: Amounts that are reduced or eliminated because of a judicial order.

Value of Cases: The value of a case is the amount of court-ordered debt that is owed and is deemed collectible. For closed cases, the value is the sum of (gross) debt collected, dismissals, alternative payments, suspensions, and discharged accounts.

Victim Restitution: Victim restitution is an amount that is owed to a victim who incurs any economic loss because of a crime and that is payable directly from a defendant convicted of the crime as a condition of probation; see Penal Code section 1202.4(f). The restitution fine under Penal Code section 1202.4(b) is also court-ordered, but it is not paid directly to the victim.

Judicial Council Approved Collections Best Practices

Penal Code section 1463.010 as amended by Assembly Bill 1818 (Stats. 2019, ch.637) requires the Judicial Council to report the extent to which each court or county is following best practices for its collection program.

The collection programs are encouraged to use the following best practices. Additional information regarding best practices, including guidelines and standards, can be obtained on the external collections Web site: <http://www2.courtinfo.ca.gov/collections>; or by contacting staff of the Funds & Revenues Unit at collections@jud.ca.gov.

1. Develop a plan and put the plan in a written memorandum of understanding (MOU) that implements or enhances a program in which the court and county collaborate to collect court-ordered debt and other monies owed to a court under a court order.
2. Establish and maintain a cooperative superior court and county collection committee responsible for compliance, reporting, and internal enhancements of the joint collection program.
3. Meet the components of a comprehensive collection program as required under Penal Code section 1463.007 in order that the costs of operating the program can be recovered.
4. Complete all data components in the Collections Reporting Template.
5. Reconcile amounts placed in collection to the supporting case management and/or accounting systems.
6. Retain the joint court/county collection reports and supporting documents for at least three years.
7. Take appropriate steps to collect court-ordered debt locally before referring it to the Franchise Tax Board for collection.
8. Participate in the Franchise Tax Board Court-Ordered Debt (COD) collection program.
9. Participate in the Franchise Tax Board Interagency Intercept Collections (IIC) program.
10. Establish a process for handling the discharge of accountability for uncollectible court-ordered debt.
11. Participate in any program that authorizes the Department of Motor Vehicles to suspend or refuse to renew driver's licenses for individuals with unpaid fees, fines, or penalties.¹

¹ Assembly Bill 103 (Stats. 2017, ch. 17) limits driver's license suspension or hold actions to only failures to appear in court.

12. Conduct trials by written declaration under Vehicle Code section 40903 and, as appropriate in the context of such trials, impose a civil assessment.²
13. Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of external collection agencies or companies to which court-ordered debt is referred for collection.
14. Accept payments via credit and debit card.
15. Accept payments via the Internet.
16. Include in a collection program all court-ordered debt and monies owed to the court under a court order.
17. Include financial screening to assess each individual's ability to pay prior to processing installment payment plans and account receivables.^{3, 4}
18. Use restitution rebate, as authorized by Government Code section 13963(f), to further efforts for the collection of funds owed to the Restitution Fund.
19. Participate in the statewide master agreement for collection services or renegotiate existing contracts, where feasible, to ensure appropriate levels of services are provided at an economical cost.
20. Require private vendors to remit the gross amount collected as agreed and submit invoices for commission fees to the court or county on a monthly basis.
21. Use collection terminology (as established in the glossary, instructions, or other documents approved for use by courts and counties) for the development or enhancement of a collection program.
22. Require private vendors to complete the components of the Collections Reporting Template that corresponds to their collection programs.

² The Judicial Council repealed the *Criteria for a Successful Civil Assessment Program* (2005), effective July 1, 2022.

³ Assembly Bill 177 (Stats. 2021, ch. 257) repealed the imposition and collection of fees authorized by Penal Code sections 1205 (e) and 1202.4(l), effective January 1, 2022.

⁴ Assembly Bill 143 (Stats. 2021, ch. 79) authorized the establishment of an online tool for adjudicating infraction violations, including ability-to-pay determinations, to be available statewide on or before June 30, 2024.

Judicial Council Approved Collections Performance Metrics
(Penal Code § 1463.010)

Measure	Definition	Formula
Collector Effective Index (CEI)	Percentage of case referrals with payment received versus total referrals of that age, Current and Prior Period.	$\frac{\text{Number of cases with payment recieved (n)}}{\text{Number of cases referred (n)}}$
First-year Resolution Rate (FYR)	Percentage of “current” period referral balance resolved within the first year.	$1 - \left(\frac{\text{Change in Value(current)}}{\text{Value of Cases established,referred,transferred (current)}} \right)$
Spend Efficiency Score (SES)	Number of dollars spent to collect \$1 in delinquent referrals for the various programs.	$\frac{\text{Cost of Collections}_{pn}}{\text{Gross Revenue Collected}_{pn}}$
Cost to Referral Ratio	Average dollars spent per referral, of a specific age, Current and Prior Period.	$\frac{\text{Cost of Collections (n)}}{\text{Number of Cases Established (n)}}$
Adjustment Score	Represents the dollar value of adjustments against the total referral balance.	$\frac{\text{Adjustments (Combined)}}{\text{Value of Cases Beginning Balance (Combined)}} \times 1000$
Discharge Score	Represents the dollar value of discharges against the total referral balance.	$\frac{\text{Discharge from Accountability (Combined)}}{\text{Value of Cases Beginning Balance (Combined)}} \times 1000$
Risk Monitor	Number of cases which became delinquent as a percentage of total “current” period referrals, including non-delinquent referrals.	$\frac{\text{Number of Cases Established, Referred, Transferred(current)}}{\text{Number of Cases Established (current) + Number of Cases with Payments Recieved (non – delinquent, current)}}$

Judicial Council:

Performance Measures Reference Guide

THIS DASHBOARD IS DESIGNED TO:

Provide entities with contextual and performance-based metrics based on reported CRT data and to give entities a deeper understanding of performance, case distribution, and costs. Cluster averages are included for reference and to give entities an opportunity to share best practices and strategies. The goal is to encourage information sharing, investigation into errors or areas that may require attention and to give entities more data and information to influence collections strategy moving forward.

Key:

	Positive
	Room for Improvement

Collector Effective Index (CEI):

Definition: The Collector Effective Index (CEI) shows the *percentage of referrals with payment received versus total referrals of that age*.

WHAT IT MEANS:

- › CEI shows an entity's effectiveness at collecting referrals of a specific age by calculating the *percentage of cases with payment* for debts of specific, pre-determined ages.
- › CEI gives a numeric (percentage) and visual representation of how an entity is performing versus peers in collecting referrals of a specific age.

Entities should strive to maximize CEI for both Current and Prior referrals.

Spend Efficiency Score (SES):

Definition: The Spend Efficiency Score is the number of dollars spent to collect \$1 in delinquent referrals for the various programs.

WHAT IT MEANS:

- › SES shows the cost to collect \$1 in delinquent referrals.
- › An SES for Private Agency of 0.2 means that an entity spent 20 cents to collect each dollar of delinquent referrals when using that program.

Low SES means an entity is spending less to collect delinquent referrals, a high SES means an entity is spending more to collect delinquent referrals. An SES greater than 1 should always be investigated.

Cost to Referral Ratio:

Definition: Cost to Referral ratio show the average dollars spent (costs) per referral.

WHAT IT MEANS:

- › The Cost to Referral ratio is helpful when entities are looking to compare relative operating costs with other entities, and to the cost of resolving court-ordered debt.
- › This benchmark shows the average cost-per-referral for current, prior, and combined referrals, in addition to the cost-per-total cases resolved.

First-year Resolution rate:

Definition: First-year Resolution is the percentage of 'current' referral balance that was resolved within the first year.

WHAT IT MEANS:

- › How effective entities are at collecting and resolving first-year (current) referrals within that year
- › This shows the percentage of current referral dollars that were resolved within the first year through collections, adjustments and/or discharges. Higher percentages mean an entity was able to resolve more first-year debt.

Entities should strive to make First-year Resolution Rate as high as possible.

Adjustment Score:

Definition: Adjustment Score is a representation of the dollar value of adjustments against the total referral balance.

WHAT IT MEANS:

- › The amount of revenue that an entity adjusted through non-cash means.

The adjustment score is a *normalizing metric* and is intended to help entities understand where they stand in terms of adjustments with the other entities in their cluster.

Discharge Score:

Definition: Discharge Score is a representation of the dollar value of discharges against the total referral balance.

WHAT IT MEANS:

- › The amount of revenue that an entity discharged.

The discharge score is a *normalizing metric* and is intended to help entities understand where they stand in terms of discharges with the other entities in their cluster.

Risk Monitor:

Definition: The Risk Monitor is the percentage of referrals that went delinquent out of the total current referral pool for that year.

WHAT IT MEANS:

- › The Risk Monitor is designed to assign a 'riskiness score' to an entity's current year referrals to help the entity (and JCC) set expectations for performance on those specific referrals.
 - A high Risk Monitor means fewer referrals were paid before going delinquent and the remaining pool is riskier
 - A low Risk Monitor means more referrals were paid before going delinquent and the remaining pool is less risky

Potential Errors / Issues:

This dashboard exclusively uses reported CRT data so if one of the metrics seems off (100% or 0%) it is likely due to an error or irregularity in the CRT data. We have included the specific equations used to calculate each metric to aid in error investigation work.

In this same vein, if entities report inaccurate or incomplete data, it will impact the cluster averages.

Cluster 1	Cluster 2		Cluster 3	Cluster 4
Alpine	Butte	Shasta	Contra Costa	Alameda
Amador	El Dorado	Siskiyou	Fresno	Los Angeles
Calaveras	Humboldt	Sutter	Kern	Orange
Colusa	Imperial	Tehama	Monterey	Riverside
Del Norte	Kings	Tuolumne	San Francisco	Sacramento
Glenn	Lake	Yolo	San Joaquin	San Bernardino
Inyo	Madera	Yuba	San Mateo	San Diego
Lassen	Marin		Santa Barbara	Santa Clara
Mariposa	Mendocino		Solano	
Modoc	Merced		Sonoma	
Mono	Napa		Stanislaus	
Plumas	Nevada		Tulare	
San Benito	Placer		Ventura	
Sierra	San Luis Obispo			
Trinity	Santa Cruz			