



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 22-078

For business meeting on: March 11, 2022

Title

Juvenile Law: 2021–22 Allocations for
Dependency Counsel Program, Expected
Unspent Program Funding, and Family First
Prevention Services Act Funding

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

March 11, 2022

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Date of Report

February 22, 2022

Recommended by

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

Contact

Kelly Meehleib, 916-263-1693
kelly.meehleib@jud.ca.gov
Michele Allan, 916-263-1374
michele.allan@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends two redistributions of funding for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel and allocation of new federal Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA) augmentation funding for fiscal year (FY) 2021–22. Under the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program, courts collect reimbursements from parents and other responsible persons liable for the cost of dependency-related legal services to the extent that those persons are able to pay. The committee recommends that the Judicial Council allocate the FY 2020–21 statutorily restricted funds remitted in excess of dependency counsel program administrative costs to the trial courts, calculated according to the methodology adopted by the council. The committee also recommends that the council reallocate unspent dependency counsel funding from courts that have identified funds they do not intend to spend to courts funded at below the average statewide funding level. Finally, beginning FY 2021–22 and annually thereafter, the judicial branch will receive new FFPSA augmentation funding. The committee recommends that the council allocate these pass-through federal Title IV-E funds to those courts receiving unspent dependency counsel reallocation funds for 2021–22, contingent upon actual receipt of the funding.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective March 11, 2022:

1. Allocate FY 2020–21 Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program funds of \$1,144,748 (Attachment A);
2. Allocate FY 2021–22 trial court allocations of estimated unspent dependency counsel funding of \$878,001 (Attachment B); and
3. Allocate FY 2021–22 Family First Prevention Services Act augmentation funding of \$1,543,180 (Attachment B) contingent upon actual receipt of the funding.

Relevant Previous Council Action

Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program

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

Court-appointed counsel funding reallocation

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

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

² Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program* (Sept. 14, 2012), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-itemA20.pdf.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program Guidelines* (Aug. 15, 2013), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemF.pdf.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., *Trial Court Allocations: Criminal Justice Realignment, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel, and Workers’ Compensation Liabilities* (Feb. 10, 2014), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-itemJ.pdf.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Reallocation* (Apr. 8, 2015), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150417-itemI.pdf.

Family First Prevention Services Act funding

In 2018, the federal Family First Prevention Services Act (FFPSA) was signed into law. Part IV of the legislation addresses steps that participating states must take to safely reduce the inappropriate use of congregate care for children. Assembly Bill 153 (Stats. 2021, ch. 86) implemented part IV of the federal FFPSA, with an effective date of October 1, 2021. The bill created a new court hearing for the juvenile court to approve or disapprove any new placement of a child or nonminor dependent in a short-term residential therapeutic program. At its October 1, 2021 business meeting, the council enacted rules and forms to effectuate the new juvenile court hearing to approve or disapprove any new placement of a child or nonminor dependent in a short-term residential therapeutic program created through AB 153.⁶

Analysis/Rationale

Recommendation 1

The estimates of courts' funding needs are computed using the dependency workload model approved by the council in April 2016 and updated in July 2016.⁷ The current base allocation for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$166.7 million—less than the estimated need.

In FY 2020–21, the trial courts remitted a total of \$1,144,748, excluding monies recovered to offset their cost of collections and dependency counsel program administrative costs, under the JDCCP and as directed in Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.1 to the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). These monies are part of the restricted TCTF fund balance available for use in FY 2021–22 and beyond. The statute requires the council to allocate the monies remitted to the trial courts for use to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads to the council's approved standard.

For a court to be eligible to receive an allocation of these funds, it must meet the participation and funding need requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines.⁸ Every court that has satisfied those requirements receives an allocation. Each eligible court's allocated share of the JDCCP funds is equivalent to its share of the aggregate funding need of all the eligible courts. Attachment A displays the recommended allocation amount for each court.

Recommendation 2

Trial courts whose spending patterns at midyear indicated they may not expend their full FY 2021–22 allocations were identified and contacted through a survey questionnaire. Of those

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Law: Short-Term Residential Therapeutic Program Placement* (Sept. 3, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9836129&GUID=8EBE3EA7-8AAE-474C-A816-B0799C581D55>.

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

⁸ As described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines, a court demonstrates its participation in the program by submitting an annual report required by section 13 of the program guidelines and adopting a rule or policy to inquire regarding a responsible person's ability to reimburse the cost of appointed counsel at each dispositional hearing.

courts, four confirmed that they would not spend the full allocation and provided an estimate of unspent funding. Attachment B shows the total \$878,001 estimate and reallocation. Under the reallocation methodology adopted at the April 17, 2015 Judicial Council business meeting, funds are reallocated proportionally by workload to courts that (1) did not remit unspent funds, and (2) had unmet need.

To ensure use of the reallocation funds, an additional survey to trial courts was conducted to confirm the court's ability to completely expend funds during the fiscal year. Declined funds were placed back in the pool and reallocated to those courts eligible and accepting additional funds. Contract augmentations will be processed for dependency representation providers in Dependency, Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) courts. In previous years, many courts declined reallocation funds because they would be unable to amend contracts with dependency attorneys so late in the fiscal year.

On an annual basis, approximately 2 percent of court-appointed counsel funds are unspent at the end of the fiscal year.

Recommendation 3

In January 2022, Judicial Council staff were notified by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) that federal funding is available annually to support legal activities by attorneys representing children and their parents at a new juvenile court hearing to approve or disapprove any new placement of a child or nonminor dependent in a short-term residential therapeutic program held under AB 153 and that FY 2021–2022 funds must be spent by the end of the fiscal year. CDSS anticipates the judicial branch will annually receive \$1,543,180 in pass-through federal Title IV-E funds to support attorney representation costs associated with the new juvenile court hearing implemented in AB 153. Due to the timing these funds became available to the branch for FY 2021–22, the committee recommends allocating the \$1,543,180 to eligible courts according to the court-appointed counsel reallocation methodology adopted at the April 17, 2015 Judicial Council business meeting, contingent upon actual receipt of the funding. Attachment B includes allocation amounts for each eligible court.

Policy implications

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

Because of the timing of the FFPSA funding augmentation the committee elected to propose allocation to those courts indicating a need for additional funds this fiscal year. The committee will consider a methodology for ongoing allocation of these funds, including utilizing the regular court appointed counsel methodology adopted at the April 15, 2016 Judicial Council business meeting.

Comments

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's recommendations to apply existing methodologies to allocate these funds were not circulated through the invitation-to-comment process. No public comments were received.

Alternatives considered

Recommendation 1

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

Recommendation 2

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

Recommendation 3

The committee considered allocating 2021–22 funds using the court-appointed counsel methodology adopted at the April 15, 2016 Judicial Council business meeting. However, because Judicial Council staff were notified late in the fiscal year by CDSS of the availability of federal funds to support legal activities by attorneys representing children and their parents in dependency proceedings, and that the funding must be spent by the end of the fiscal year, the methodology for reallocation of unspent court-appointed counsel funds adopted on April 17, 2015 was utilized.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This proposal is for the allocation of funds that have already been collected or included in the FY 2021–22 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Recommended 2021–22 Trial Court Allocations of \$1,144,748 in JDCCP Funds
2. Attachment B: Recommended 2021–22 Trial Court Allocations of \$878,001 in Unspent Funding and \$1,543,180 in FFPSA Funding

Recommended FY 2020-2021 Trial Court Allocations of Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

Attachment A

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2021)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2021-22	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2021-22 (Col. C Total)	Court is under funded	Court participates in program 20-21	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. H Total)	Recommended Allocation of 2020-21 JDCCP Collections (Col. H x \$1,394,264)	JDCCP Allocations Through 2020-21	JDCCP Distributions Through December 2021	JDCCP Allocations Through December 2021
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M
Alameda	\$4,075,144.37	2.01%	\$3,348,651.79	2.01%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Alpine*	15,512.81	0.01%	19,616.17	0.01%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Amador	151,319.25	0.07%	128,300.66	0.08%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Butte	1,061,873.27	0.52%	872,568.80	0.52%	Y	Y	Y	1,061,873.27	0.79%	8,987.84	39,994.46	-	39,994.46
Calaveras	191,017.94	0.09%	189,009.52	0.11%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	13,816.45	-	13,816.45
Colusa†	100,498.84	0.05%	112,668.35	0.07%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	293.14	-	293.14
Contra Costa	3,248,232.10	1.60%	2,651,023.73	1.59%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	189,258.89	0.09%	214,730.47	0.13%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	704,974.23	0.35%	579,295.60	0.35%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Fresno	4,576,937.87	2.26%	3,735,438.41	2.24%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Glenn	136,523.35	0.07%	164,905.00	0.10%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	5,261.47	5,261.00	0.47
Humboldt	876,593.98	0.43%	715,426.54	0.43%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Imperial	814,882.02	0.40%	669,609.68	0.40%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Inyo	32,685.93	0.02%	41,561.71	0.02%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Kern	3,367,431.72	1.66%	2,748,307.74	1.65%	Y	Y	Y	3,367,431.72	2.49%	28,502.41	142,792.33	111,084.00	31,708.33
Kings	846,627.25	0.42%	690,969.39	0.41%	Y	Y	Y	846,627.25	0.63%	7,165.97	50,477.75	47,114.00	3,363.75
Lake	210,846.11	0.10%	280,182.73	0.17%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Lassen	128,015.73	0.06%	135,339.20	0.08%	N	Y	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	101,358,110.77	49.99%	82,722,770.21	49.62%	Y	Y	Y	101,358,110.77	74.94%	857,909.15	4,322,721.36	4,322,721.36	-
Madera	731,363.07	0.36%	643,573.02	0.39%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	16,068.83	16,069.00	-
Marin	288,497.36	0.14%	288,497.36	0.17%	N	Y	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	65,070.37	0.03%	60,058.81	0.04%	Y	Y	Y	65,070.37	0.05%	550.76	1,817.86	-	1,817.86
Mendocino	506,667.64	0.25%	529,357.35	0.32%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Merced	1,095,654.64	0.54%	894,211.49	0.54%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	32,783.77	-	32,783.77
Modoc	36,516.29	0.02%	52,854.79	0.03%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mono	20,508.15	0.01%	18,391.90	0.01%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	103.62	104.00	-
Monterey	898,182.05	0.44%	738,059.48	0.44%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	19,795.72	19,796.00	-
Napa	529,635.61	0.26%	435,215.31	0.26%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	9,391.29	-	9,391.29
Nevada	185,040.57	0.09%	185,040.57	0.11%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Orange	9,325,617.62	4.60%	7,611,042.85	4.57%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Placer	757,007.27	0.37%	622,052.50	0.37%	Y	Y	Y	757,007.27	0.56%	6,407.41	56,129.57	38,816.00	17,313.57
Plumas	116,804.02	0.06%	154,059.11	0.09%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Riverside	9,094,598.21	4.49%	7,422,497.84	4.45%	Y	Y	Y	9,094,598.21	6.72%	76,977.94	697,956.28	2,445.00	695,511.28
Sacramento	5,987,569.22	2.95%	4,920,140.88	2.95%	Y	Y	Y	5,987,569.22	4.43%	50,679.62	-	-	-
San Benito	120,828.09	0.06%	99,287.57	0.06%	Y	Y	Y	120,828.09	0.09%	1,022.71	10,297.56	4,345.00	5,952.56
San Bernardino	15,984,841.42	7.88%	13,045,925.52	7.83%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	242,055.83	2,641.00	239,414.83
San Diego	6,522,795.91	3.22%	5,323,537.93	3.19%	Y	Y	Y	6,522,795.91	4.82%	55,209.85	26,882.98	26,882.98	-
San Francisco	3,251,546.90	1.60%	2,671,880.40	1.60%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	3,293,434.65	1.62%	2,706,300.65	1.62%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	971,028.66	0.48%	797,919.43	0.48%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	1,009,098.37	0.50%	829,202.30	0.50%	Y	Y	Y	1,009,098.37	0.75%	8,541.15	71,463.30	29,275.00	42,188.30
Santa Barbara	1,241,133.62	0.61%	1,012,943.22	0.61%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	4,171,606.67	2.06%	3,404,629.95	2.04%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-

Recommended FY 2020-2021 Trial Court Allocations of Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

Attachment A

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2021)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2021-22	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2021-22	Court is under funded	Court participates in program 20-21	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended Allocation of 2020-21 JDCCP Collections	JDCCP Allocations Through 2020-21	JDCCP Distributions Through December 2021	JDCCP Allocations Through December 2021
		(Col. A Total)		(Col. C Total)				(Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	(Col. H Total)	(Col. H x \$1,394,264)			
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M
Santa Cruz	640,178.81	0.32%	526,051.52	0.32%	Y	Y	Y	640,178.81	0.47%	5,418.56	-	-	-
Shasta	821,962.37	0.41%	670,839.30	0.40%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	38,437.50	38,437.00	0.50
Sierra	-	0.00%	13,758.53	0.01%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	177,189.30	0.09%	245,373.43	0.15%	N	Y	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Solano	1,172,880.03	0.58%	957,238.50	0.57%	Y	Y	Y	1,172,880.03	0.87%	9,927.42	4,282.71	4,282.71	-
Sonoma	1,810,819.57	0.89%	1,477,888.74	0.89%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Stanislaus	1,779,104.04	0.88%	1,452,004.32	0.87%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sutter	433,392.49	0.21%	363,106.52	0.22%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	15,457.03	-	15,457.03
Tehama	281,284.22	0.14%	293,399.09	0.18%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	16,222.19	-	16,222.19
Trinity	77,180.76	0.04%	93,829.12	0.06%	N	Y	N	-	0.00%	-	1,996.54	-	1,996.54
Tulare	2,806,090.05	1.38%	2,290,172.34	1.37%	Y	Y	Y	2,806,090.05	2.07%	23,751.14	118,575.77	65,870.00	52,705.77
Tuolumne	337,667.97	0.17%	338,350.13	0.20%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	7,054.13	-	7,054.13
Ventura	2,119,159.75	1.05%	1,741,368.51	1.04%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	110,204.12	110,204.00	0.12
Yolo	1,558,883.62	0.77%	1,272,272.84	0.76%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	17,813.12	17,813.00	0.12
Yuba	436,672.16	0.22%	377,291.18	0.23%	Y	Y	Y	436,672.16	0.32%	3,696.05	16,197.74	-	16,197.74
Unallocated	\$0.00		100,000.00					-		-			
Total	\$202,743,997.93		\$166,700,000.00					\$135,246,831.51	100.00%	\$1,144,748.00	\$6,106,344.43	\$4,863,161.05	\$1,243,184.20
Reserved for admin.										249,516.00			
Distribution amount available to courts										1,144,748.00			
Total collected										1,394,264.00			
1. A court is eligible for an allocation if the court has met both the Funding Need and Participation requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. This table indicates a court's eligibility to receive an allocation based on the Funding Need criteria. Courts that meet the Funding Need criteria must also meet the Participation requirements in order to receive an allocation.													

Recommended FY 2021-2022 Trial Court Allocations of CAC Unspent Funding and FFPSA Funding

Attachment B

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2021)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2021-22	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2021-22	Est. Unspent CAC Funding 2021-22	Eligible for Reallocated Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended 2021-22 CAC Reallocation	Recommended Allocation of FFPSA Augmented Funds	Total CAC Reallocation Funds and FFPSA Funds
		(Col. A Total)		(Col. C Total)			(Col. A when Col. F equals "Y")	(Col. G Total)	(Col. H x \$0.00)		
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
Alameda	\$4,075,144	2.01%	\$3,348,652	2.01%	0	Y	4,075,144.37	2.12%	18,641.52	32,764.45	51,405.98
Alpine*	\$15,513	0.01%	\$19,616	0.01%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Amador	\$151,319	0.07%	\$128,301	0.08%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Butte	\$1,061,873	0.52%	\$872,569	0.52%		Y	1,061,873.27	0.55%	4,857.48	8,537.54	13,395.02
Calaveras	\$191,018	0.09%	\$189,010	0.11%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Colusa†	\$100,499	0.05%	\$112,668	0.07%	50,000	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Contra Costa	\$3,248,232	1.60%	\$2,651,024	1.59%	0	Y	3,248,232.10	1.69%	14,858.86	26,116.02	40,974.88
Del Norte	\$189,259	0.09%	\$214,730	0.13%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
El Dorado	\$704,974	0.35%	\$579,296	0.35%	0	Y	704,974.23	0.37%	3,224.87	5,668.04	8,892.91
Fresno	\$4,576,938	2.26%	\$3,735,438	2.24%	0	Y	4,576,937.87	2.38%	20,936.95	36,798.91	57,735.86
Glenn	\$136,523	0.07%	\$164,905	0.10%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Humboldt	\$876,594	0.43%	\$715,427	0.43%		Y	876,593.98	0.46%	4,009.93	7,047.88	11,057.81
Imperial	\$814,882	0.40%	\$669,610	0.40%	0	Y	814,882.02	0.42%	3,727.63	6,551.71	10,279.34
Inyo	\$32,686	0.02%	\$41,562	0.02%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Kern	\$3,367,432	1.66%	\$2,748,308	1.65%	0	Y	3,367,431.72	1.75%	15,404.13	27,074.39	42,478.52
Kings	\$846,627	0.42%	\$690,969	0.41%	215,969	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Lake	\$210,846	0.10%	\$280,183	0.17%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Lassen	\$128,016	0.06%	\$135,339	0.08%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Los Angeles	\$101,358,111	49.99%	\$82,722,770	49.62%	0	Y	101,358,110.77	52.81%	463,657.05	814,926.50	1,278,583.54
Madera	\$731,363	0.36%	\$643,573	0.39%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Marin	\$288,497	0.14%	\$288,497	0.17%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Mariposa	\$65,070	0.03%	\$60,059	0.04%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Mendocino	\$506,668	0.25%	\$529,357	0.32%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Merced	\$1,095,655	0.54%	\$894,211	0.54%	0	Y	1,095,654.64	0.57%	5,012.01	8,809.14	13,821.15
Modoc	\$36,516	0.02%	\$52,855	0.03%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Mono	\$20,508	0.01%	\$18,392	0.01%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Monterey	\$898,182	0.44%	\$738,059	0.44%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Napa	\$529,636	0.26%	\$435,215	0.26%	99,092	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Nevada	\$185,041	0.09%	\$185,041	0.11%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Orange	\$9,325,618	4.60%	\$7,611,043	4.57%	0	Y	9,325,617.62	4.86%	42,659.52	74,978.64	117,638.16
Placer	\$757,007	0.37%	\$622,053	0.37%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Plumas	\$116,804	0.06%	\$154,059	0.09%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Riverside	\$9,094,598	4.49%	\$7,422,498	4.45%	0	Y	9,094,598.21	4.74%	41,602.73	73,121.22	114,723.96
Sacramento	\$5,987,569	2.95%	\$4,920,141	2.95%	0	Y	5,987,569.22	3.12%	27,389.80	48,140.49	75,530.29
San Benito	\$120,828	0.06%	\$99,288	0.06%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
San Bernardino	\$15,984,841	7.88%	\$13,045,926	7.83%	0	Y	15,984,841.42	8.33%	73,121.77	128,519.27	201,641.04
San Diego	\$6,522,796	3.22%	\$5,323,538	3.19%	0	Y	6,522,795.91	3.40%	29,838.17	52,443.75	82,281.92
San Francisco	\$3,251,547	1.60%	\$2,671,880	1.60%	0	Y	3,251,546.90	1.69%	14,874.02	26,142.67	41,016.69
San Joaquin	\$3,293,435	1.62%	\$2,706,301	1.62%	0	Y	3,293,434.65	1.72%	15,065.63	26,479.45	41,545.09
San Luis Obispo	\$971,029	0.48%	\$797,919	0.48%	0	Y	971,028.66	0.51%	4,441.92	7,807.14	12,249.06
San Mateo	\$1,009,098	0.50%	\$829,202	0.50%	0	Y	1,009,098.37	0.53%	4,616.06	8,113.22	12,729.29
Santa Barbara	\$1,241,134	0.61%	\$1,012,943	0.61%	0	Y	1,241,133.62	0.65%	5,677.50	9,978.80	15,656.30
Santa Clara	\$4,171,607	2.06%	\$3,404,630	2.04%	0	Y	4,171,606.67	2.17%	19,082.78	33,540.02	52,622.80

Recommended FY 2021-2022 Trial Court Allocations of CAC Unspent Funding and FFPSA Funding

Attachment B

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2021)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2021-22	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2021-22 (Col. C Total)	Est. Unspent CAC Funding 2021-22	Eligible for Reallocated Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts (Col. A when Col. F equals "Y")	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. G Total)	Recommended 2021-22 CAC Reallocation (Col. H x \$0.00)	Recommended Allocation of FFPSA Augmented Funds	Total CAC Reallocation Funds and FFPSA Funds
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
Santa Cruz	\$640,179	0.32%	\$526,052	0.32%	0	Y	640,178.81	0.33%	2,928.46	5,147.08	8,075.55
Shasta	\$821,962	0.41%	\$670,839	0.40%	0	Y	821,962.37	0.43%	3,760.02	6,608.64	10,368.66
Sierra	\$0	0.00%	\$13,759	0.01%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Siskiyou	\$177,189	0.09%	\$245,373	0.15%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Solano	\$1,172,880	0.58%	\$957,238	0.57%	0	Y	1,172,880.03	0.61%	5,365.27	9,430.04	14,795.31
Sonoma	\$1,810,820	0.89%	\$1,477,889	0.89%	0	Y	1,810,819.57	0.94%	8,283.49	14,559.12	22,842.61
Stanislaus	\$1,779,104	0.88%	\$1,452,004	0.87%	0	Y	1,779,104.04	0.93%	8,138.41	14,304.12	22,442.54
Sutter	\$433,392	0.21%	\$363,107	0.22%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Tehama	\$281,284	0.14%	\$293,399	0.18%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Trinity	\$77,181	0.04%	\$93,829	0.06%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Tulare	\$2,806,090	1.38%	\$2,290,172	1.37%	512,940	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Tuolumne	\$337,668	0.17%	\$338,350	0.20%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Ventura	\$2,119,160	1.05%	\$1,741,369	1.04%	0	Y	2,119,159.75	1.10%	9,693.98	17,038.20	26,732.18
Yolo	\$1,558,884	0.77%	\$1,272,273	0.76%	0	Y	1,558,883.62	0.81%	7,131.03	12,533.54	19,664.56
Yuba	\$436,672	0.22%	\$377,291	0.23%	0	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-
Unallocated	\$0		\$100,000	-		-	-	-	-		
Total	\$202,743,998		\$166,700,000		\$878,001.00		\$191,936,094.41	100.00%	\$878,001.00	\$1,543,180	2,421,181.00
Total Returned											
									\$878,001.00	\$1,543,180	\$2,421,181.00