



# Judicial Council of California

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

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

---

## REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

*Item No.: 23-071*

For business meeting on: March 24, 2023

---

**Title**

Juvenile Law: 2022–23 Allocations for  
Dependency Counsel Collections Program  
and Expected Unspent Program Funding

**Agenda Item Type**

Action Required

**Effective Date**

March 24, 2023

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

None

**Date of Report**

March 1, 2023

**Recommended by**

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

**Contact**

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

---

### Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends two redistributions of funding for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel for fiscal year (FY) 2022–23. 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 2021–22 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.

## Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective March 24, 2023:

1. Allocate Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program funds of \$364,976 remitted in FY 2021–22 (Attachment A); and
2. Allocate FY 2022–23 trial court allocations of estimated unspent dependency counsel funding of \$1,145,000 from courts that have identified funds they do not intend to spend to courts funded at below the average statewide funding level (Attachment B).

These recommendations were presented to the Judicial Branch Budget Committee via an action by email between meetings on February 22, 2023, and approved for consideration by the Judicial Council.

## Relevant Previous Council Action

### Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program

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

### Court-appointed counsel funding reallocation

At its business meeting on April 17, 2015, the council approved a methodology for reallocating funds unspent by courts for court-appointed counsel in dependency cases.<sup>5</sup> The approved methodology provided a four-year process to bring all courts to an equivalent percentage of

---

<sup>1</sup> 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](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/appendix_f.pdf).

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

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

<sup>4</sup> 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](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-itemJ.pdf).

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

workload met by available statewide funding and provided a methodology for reallocation of unspent funds.

## **Analysis/Rationale**

### **Recommendation 1**

Estimates of courts' funding needs are computed using the dependency workload model approved by the council in April 2016<sup>6</sup> and updated in July 2016.<sup>7</sup> The current base allocation for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$186.7 million—less than the estimated need.

In FY 2021–22, the trial courts remitted a total of \$624,655—excluding monies recovered to offset the costs of collections and dependency counsel program administration, as per section 11 of the JDCCP guidelines—and as directed in Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.1, the Judicial Council deposited that amount into the Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF). These monies are part of the restricted TCTF fund balance available for use in FY 2022–23 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.<sup>8</sup> Every court that satisfies 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 that had spending patterns at midyear that indicated that they may not expend their full FY 2022–23 allocations were identified and contacted through a survey questionnaire. Of those courts, four confirmed that they would not spend the full allocation and provided an estimate of unspent funding. Attachment B shows the total \$1,145,000 estimate and proposed reallocation. Under the reallocation methodology adopted at the Judicial Council business meeting on April 17, 2015, funds are reallocated proportionally by workload to courts that (a) did not remit unspent funds, and (b) had unmet need.

To ensure use of the reallocation funds, additional outreach to eligible trial courts was conducted to confirm the court's ability to completely expend funds during the fiscal year. Declined funds

---

<sup>6</sup> 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>.

<sup>7</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology Options* (July 18, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4572873&GUID=C33C7410-DDA2-451A-9004-024D84910504>.

<sup>8</sup> As described in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines, a court can demonstrate its participation in the program by submitting annual reports as required by section 13 and adopting a local rule or policy to inquire regarding a responsible person's ability to reimburse the cost of appointed counsel at each dispositional hearing.

were placed back in the pool and reallocated to those courts eligible for and accepting additional funds. Contract augmentations will be processed for dependency representation providers in Dependency, Representation, Administration, Funding, and Training (DRAFT) courts.

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

### **Policy implications**

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

### **Comments**

This item was not circulated for comment, and 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 business meeting on August 23, 2013, no alternatives to this proposal were considered.

#### ***Recommendation 2***

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

### **Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

This proposal is for the allocation of funds that have already been collected or included in the FY 2022–23 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

### **Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: *Recommended Fiscal Year 2022–2023 Trial Court Allocations of Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds*
2. Attachment B: *Recommended Fiscal Year 2022–2023 Trial Court Allocations of Court Appointed Counsel Unspent Funding*

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2022)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2022-23	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2022-23	Court is under funded	Court participates in program 21-22	Eligible for JDCCP Funding <sup>1</sup>	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended Allocation of 2021-22 JDCCP Collections	JDCCP Allocations Through 2021-22	JDCCP Distributions Through December 2022	JDCCP Allocations Remaining Through December 2022
Court	Col. A	(Col. A Total) Col. B	Col. C	(Col. C Total) Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	(Col. A when Col. F equals "Y") Col. H	(Col. H Total) Col. I	(Col. I x \$364,679) Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M
Alameda	\$4,165,251	2.07%	\$3,840,167	2.06%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Alpine	\$17,400	0.01%	\$19,850	0.01%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Amador	\$155,965	0.08%	\$144,314	0.08%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Butte	\$1,004,737	0.50%	\$926,321	0.50%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	51,970.93	-	51,970.93
Calaveras	\$172,781	0.09%	\$161,288	0.09%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	13,816.45	-	13,816.45
Colusa†	\$93,171	0.05%	\$99,064	0.05%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	293.14	-	293.14
Contra Costa	\$2,980,842	1.48%	\$2,748,197	1.47%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	\$200,553	0.10%	\$214,730	0.12%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	\$597,947	0.30%	\$553,278	0.30%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Fresno	\$4,840,683	2.40%	\$4,462,884	2.39%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Glenn	\$133,326	0.07%	\$146,444	0.08%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	5,261.47	5,261.00	-
Humboldt	\$844,588	0.42%	\$778,671	0.42%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Imperial	\$739,360	0.37%	\$681,656	0.37%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Inyo	\$36,120	0.02%	\$58,143	0.03%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Kern	\$3,522,727	1.75%	\$3,247,790	1.74%	Y	Y	Y	3,522,727.40	2.63%	9,588.26	314,087.07	171,295.00	142,792.07
Kings	\$858,302	0.43%	\$791,315	0.42%	Y	Y	Y	858,302.25	0.64%	2,336.15	59,855.36	47,114.00	12,741.36
Lake	\$173,416	0.09%	\$296,119	0.16%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Lassen	\$131,299	0.07%	\$129,091	0.07%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	\$100,814,675	49.99%	\$92,946,429	49.78%	Y	Y	Y	100,814,674.83	75.18%	274,400.15	5,437,044.61	5,437,044.61	-
Madera	\$791,199	0.39%	\$732,094	0.39%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	16,068.83	16,069.00	-
Marin	\$289,720	0.14%	\$357,163	0.19%	N	Y	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	\$73,336	0.04%	\$67,857	0.04%	Y	Y	Y	73,335.65	0.05%	199.61	2,368.62	-	2,368.62
Mendocino	\$521,132	0.26%	\$511,024	0.27%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Merced	\$1,118,760	0.55%	\$1,031,445	0.55%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	32,783.77	-	32,783.77
Modoc	\$37,755	0.02%	\$51,256	0.03%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mono	\$21,416	0.01%	\$19,817	0.01%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	103.62	104.00	-
Monterey	\$724,678	0.36%	\$670,542	0.36%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	19,795.72	19,796.00	-
Napa	\$486,138	0.24%	\$449,822	0.24%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	9,391.29	-	9,391.29
Nevada	\$185,860	0.09%	\$226,123	0.12%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Orange	\$9,499,539	4.71%	\$8,758,132	4.69%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Placer	\$704,457	0.35%	\$651,832	0.35%	Y	Y	Y	704,457.06	0.53%	1,917.41	64,550.73	38,816.00	25,734.73
Plumas	\$106,378	0.05%	\$154,059	0.08%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Riverside	\$10,048,073	4.98%	\$9,263,855	4.96%	Y	Y	Y	10,048,072.98	7.49%	27,349.12	797,993.69	79,423.00	718,570.69
Sacramento	\$5,522,714	2.74%	\$5,091,685	2.73%	Y	Y	Y	5,522,713.75	4.12%	15,031.87	67,501.99	67,501.89	-
San Benito	\$111,691	0.06%	\$103,347	0.06%	Y	Y	Y	111,690.75	0.08%	304.00	11,686.80	4,345.00	7,341.80
San Bernardino	\$16,076,265	7.97%	\$14,821,566	7.94%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	242,055.83	2,641.00	239,414.83
San Diego	\$6,647,256	3.30%	\$6,128,460	3.28%	Y	Y	Y	6,647,255.57	4.96%	18,092.68	99,331.31	99,331.31	-
San Francisco	\$3,153,096	1.56%	\$2,907,007	1.56%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	\$3,131,249	1.55%	\$2,886,866	1.55%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	\$873,531	0.43%	\$805,354	0.43%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	\$896,472	0.44%	\$829,503	0.44%	Y	Y	Y	896,472.31	0.67%	2,440.04	80,004.45	29,275.00	50,729.45
Santa Barbara	\$1,427,914	0.71%	\$1,316,470	0.71%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	\$3,977,233	1.97%	\$3,666,823	1.96%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2022)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2022-23	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2022-23	Court is under funded	Court participates in program 21-22	Eligible for JDCCP Funding <sup>1</sup>	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended Allocation of 2021-22 JDCCP Collections	JDCCP Allocations Through 2021-22	JDCCP Distributions Through December 2022	JDCCP Allocations Remaining Through December 2022
Court	Col. A	(Col. A Total) Col. B	Col. C	(Col. C Total) Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	(Col. A when Col. F equals "Y") Col. H	(Col. H Total) Col. I	(Col. I x \$364,679) Col. J	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M
Santa Cruz	\$544,979	0.27%	\$504,267	0.27%	Y	Y	Y	544,978.80	0.41%	1,483.34	5,418.56	5,418.56	-
Shasta	\$817,032	0.41%	\$753,266	0.40%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	40,660.01	38,437.00	2,223.01
Sierra	\$0	0.00%	\$22,459	0.01%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	\$173,714	0.09%	\$245,373	0.13%	N	Y	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Solano	\$1,241,671	0.62%	\$1,144,763	0.61%	Y	Y	Y	1,241,671.50	0.93%	3,379.62	17,121.36	17,121.36	-
Sonoma	\$1,714,938	0.85%	\$1,581,093	0.85%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Stanislaus	\$1,619,266	0.80%	\$1,492,887	0.80%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sutter	\$373,067	0.18%	\$345,198	0.18%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	15,457.03	-	15,457.03
Tehama	\$240,370	0.12%	\$241,836	0.13%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	16,222.19	-	16,222.19
Trinity	\$74,230	0.04%	\$93,829	0.05%	N	Y	N	-	0.00%	-	1,996.54	-	1,996.54
Tulare	\$2,700,364	1.34%	\$2,489,610	1.33%	Y	Y	Y	2,700,364.17	2.01%	7,349.93	149,619.19	65,870.00	83,749.19
Tuolumne	\$326,761	0.16%	\$313,321	0.17%	N	N	N	-	0.00%	-	7,054.13	-	7,054.13
Ventura	\$2,055,714	1.02%	\$1,895,272	1.02%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	110,204.12	110,204.00	-
Yolo	\$1,468,321	0.73%	\$1,353,723	0.73%	Y	N	N	-	0.00%	-	17,813.12	17,813.00	-
Yuba	\$405,544	0.20%	\$375,249	0.20%	Y	Y	Y	405,543.95	0.30%	1,103.82	19,893.79	-	19,893.79
Unallocated	\$0		\$100,000					-		-			1,454,544.89
Total	\$201,664,975		\$186,700,000					\$134,092,260.97	100.00%	\$364,976.00	\$ 7,727,425.72	\$6,272,880.73	\$1,454,545.01
Reserved for admin.										259,679.00			
Distribution amount available to courts										364,976.00			
Total collected										624,655.00			

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 2022-2023 Trial Court Allocations of Court Appointed Counsel Unspent Funding

Attachment B

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2022)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need  (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2022-23	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2022-23  (Col. C Total)	Est. Unspent CAC Funding 2022-23	Eligible for Reallocated Funding <sup>1</sup>	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 2022-23 CAC Reallocation
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Alameda	\$4,165,251	2.01%	\$3,840,167	2.01%	0	Y	4,165,251.10	2.22%	25,593.82
Alpine*	\$17,400	0.01%	\$19,850	0.01%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Amador	\$155,965	0.07%	\$144,314	0.08%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Butte	\$1,004,737	0.52%	\$926,321	0.52%	0	Y	1,004,736.96	0.54%	6,173.71
Calaveras	\$172,781	0.09%	\$161,288	0.11%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Colusa†	\$93,171	0.05%	\$99,064	0.07%	50,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Contra Costa	\$2,980,842	1.60%	\$2,748,197	1.59%	0	Y	2,980,842.08	1.59%	18,316.10
Del Norte	\$200,553	0.09%	\$214,730	0.13%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
El Dorado	\$597,947	0.35%	\$553,278	0.35%	0	Y	597,946.63	0.32%	3,674.15
Fresno	\$4,840,683	2.26%	\$4,462,884	2.24%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Glenn	\$133,326	0.07%	\$146,444	0.10%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Humboldt	\$844,588	0.43%	\$778,671	0.43%	0	Y	844,588.30	0.45%	3,976.79
Imperial	\$739,360	0.40%	\$681,656	0.40%	0	Y	739,360.09	0.39%	4,543.08
Inyo	\$36,120	0.02%	\$58,143	0.02%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Kern	\$3,522,727	1.66%	\$3,247,790	1.65%	0	Y	3,522,727.40	1.88%	16,586.97
Kings	\$858,302	0.42%	\$791,315	0.41%	0	Y	858,302.25	0.46%	5,273.93
Lake	\$173,416	0.10%	\$296,119	0.17%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Lassen	\$131,299	0.06%	\$129,091	0.08%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Los Angeles	\$100,814,675	49.99%	\$92,946,429	49.62%	0	Y	100,814,674.83	53.81%	619,466.40
Madera	\$791,199	0.36%	\$732,094	0.39%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Marin	\$289,720	0.14%	\$357,163	0.17%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Mariposa	\$73,336	0.03%	\$67,857	0.04%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Mendocino	\$521,132	0.25%	\$511,024	0.32%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Merced	\$1,118,760	0.54%	\$1,031,445	0.54%	0	Y	1,118,760.17	0.60%	6,874.34
Modoc	\$37,755	0.02%	\$51,256	0.03%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Mono	\$21,416	0.01%	\$19,817	0.01%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Monterey	\$724,678	0.44%	\$670,542	0.44%	240,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Napa	\$486,138	0.26%	\$449,822	0.26%	155,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Nevada	\$185,860	0.09%	\$226,123	0.11%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Orange	\$9,499,539	4.60%	\$8,758,132	4.57%	0	Y	9,499,539.00	5.07%	58,370.92
Placer	\$704,457	0.37%	\$651,832	0.37%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Plumas	\$106,378	0.06%	\$154,059	0.09%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Riverside	\$10,048,073	4.49%	\$9,263,855	4.45%	0	Y	10,048,072.98	5.36%	61,741.44
Sacramento	\$5,522,714	2.95%	\$5,091,685	2.95%	0	Y	5,522,713.75	2.95%	33,934.90
San Benito	\$111,691	0.06%	\$103,347	0.06%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
San Bernardino	\$16,076,265	7.88%	\$14,821,566	7.83%	0	Y	16,076,264.71	8.58%	98,782.30
San Diego	\$6,647,256	3.22%	\$6,128,460	3.19%	0	Y	6,647,255.57	3.55%	40,844.76
San Francisco	\$3,153,096	1.60%	\$2,907,007	1.60%	0	Y	3,153,096.03	1.68%	19,374.53
San Joaquin	\$3,131,249	1.62%	\$2,886,866	1.62%	0	Y	3,131,249.06	1.67%	19,240.29
San Luis Obispo	\$873,531	0.48%	\$805,354	0.48%	0	Y	873,530.52	0.47%	5,367.50
San Mateo	\$896,472	0.50%	\$829,503	0.50%	0	Y	896,472.31	0.48%	5,508.47
Santa Barbara	\$1,427,914	0.61%	\$1,316,470	0.61%	0	Y	1,427,914.32	0.76%	8,773.97
Santa Clara	\$3,977,233	2.06%	\$3,666,823	2.04%	0	Y	3,977,232.67	2.12%	24,438.53



	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - July 2022)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need  (Col. A Total)	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2022-23  Col. C	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2022-23  (Col. C Total)	Est. Unspent CAC Funding 2022-23  Col. E	Eligible for Reallocated Funding <sup>1</sup>  Col. F	Funding Need of Eligible Courts  (Col. A when Col. F equals "Y")  Col. G	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts  (Col. G Total)  Col. H	Recommended 2022-23 CAC Reallocation  Col. I
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I
Santa Cruz	\$544,979	0.32%	\$504,267	0.32%	0	Y	544,978.80	0.29%	3,352.01
Shasta	\$817,032	0.41%	\$753,266	0.40%	0	Y	817,032.25	0.44%	5,020.34
Sierra	\$0	0.00%	\$22,459	0.01%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	\$173,714	0.09%	\$245,373	0.15%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Solano	\$1,241,671	0.58%	\$1,144,763	0.57%	0	Y	1,241,671.50	0.66%	7,629.58
Sonoma	\$1,714,938	0.89%	\$1,581,093	0.89%	0	Y	1,714,937.71	0.92%	10,537.62
Stanislaus	\$1,619,266	0.88%	\$1,492,887	0.87%	0	Y	1,619,265.73	0.86%	9,949.75
Sutter	\$373,067	0.21%	\$345,198	0.22%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Tehama	\$240,370	0.14%	\$241,836	0.18%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Trinity	\$74,230	0.04%	\$93,829	0.06%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Tulare	\$2,700,364	1.38%	\$2,489,610	1.37%	700,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Tuolumne	\$326,761	0.17%	\$313,321	0.20%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Ventura	\$2,055,714	1.05%	\$1,895,272	1.04%	0	Y	2,055,713.81	1.10%	12,631.55
Yolo	\$1,468,321	0.77%	\$1,353,723	0.76%	0	Y	1,468,320.53	0.78%	9,022.25
Yuba	\$405,544	0.22%	\$375,249	0.23%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Unallocated	\$0		\$100,000				-		-
Total	\$201,664,975		\$186,700,000		\$1,145,000.00		\$187,362,451	100.00%	\$1,145,000.00
Total Returned									
									\$1,145,000.00