



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: March 24, 2017

Title

Child Support: Midyear Funding Reallocation for Fiscal Year 2016–2017 and Base Funding Allocation for Fiscal Year 2017–2018 for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

March 24, 2017

Date of Report

March 3, 2017

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected

None

Contact

Anna L. Maves, Supervising Attorney
916-263-8624
anna.maves@jud.ca.gov

Recommended by

Family and Juvenile Law Advisory
Committee
Hon. Jerilyn L. Borack, Cochair
Hon. Mark A. Juhas, Cochair

Executive Summary

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends approving the reallocation of funding for the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program for the remainder of fiscal year (FY) 2016–2017 and the allocation of funding for this same program for FY 2017–2018, as required by Assembly Bill 1058 (Stats. 1996, ch. 957). The funds are provided through a cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) and the Judicial Council. At midyear, under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, the Judicial Council redistributes to courts with a documented need for additional funds any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants that year, up to the amount of funds available through the contract with DCSS. The courts are also offered an option to use local court funds up to an approved amount to draw down, or qualify for, federal matching funds.

Recommendation

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council, effective March 23, 2017:

1. Approve the reallocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2016–2017, subject to the state Budget Act;
2. Approve the reallocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2016–2017, subject to the state Budget Act;
3. Approve allocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2017–2018, subject to the state Budget Act; and
4. Approve the allocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2017–2018, subject to the state Budget Act.

Attachments A through D contain tables detailing the recommended reallocations and allocations of funding.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council is required annually to allocate nontrial court funding to the Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program and has done so since 1997.¹ A cooperative agreement between the California Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council provides the funds for this program and requires the council to annually approve the funding allocation. Two-thirds of the funds are federal, and one-third comes from the state General Fund (nontrial court funding). Any funds left unspent during the fiscal year revert to the state General Fund and cannot be used in subsequent years.

Historically, the Judicial Council at midyear redistributes to courts—with a documented need for additional funds—any available funds from courts that are projected not to spend their full grants. In addition, in FY 2007–2008, DCSS and the Judicial Council provided a mechanism for the courts to recover two-thirds of additional program costs beyond the contract maximum covered by local trial court funds. This federal drawdown option continues to be available for FY 2017–2018.

On April 17, 2015, the Judicial Council approved the formation of a joint subcommittee—comprising representatives from the Family and Juvenile Law, Trial Court Budget, and Workload Assessment Advisory Committees and the California Department of Child Support

¹ AB 1058 added article 4 to chapter 2 of part 2 of division 9 of the Family Code, which at section 4252(b)(6) requires the Judicial Council to “[e]stablish procedures for the distribution of funding to the courts for child support commissioners, family law facilitators pursuant to [Family Code] Division 14 (commencing with Section 10000), and related allowable costs.”

Services—to reconsider the AB 1058 Child Support Commissioner and Family Law Facilitator Program funding allocation methodology. The joint subcommittee was charged with examining the myriad factors that must be considered when allocating funding to both optimize program success and provide for mechanisms for all funds to be spent by the end of each fiscal year. The joint subcommittee was asked to report back to the Family and Juvenile Law, Trial Court Budget, and Workload Assessment Advisory Committees by December 31, 2015. The recommendation of the joint subcommittee and the individual advisory committees was on the Judicial Council’s February 2016 agenda for council consideration. At the February 26, 2016 meeting, the Judicial Council determined that the funds should continue to be allocated using the historical funding allocation model for FY 2016–2017. The council instructed the joint subcommittee to continue to (1) develop a framework for a workload-based funding methodology for implementation no later than FY 2018–2019, and (2) coordinate with DCSS on its current review of funding allocations for the local child support agencies.

Rationale for Recommendation

Midyear reallocation, FY 2016–2017

The midyear reallocation process is a review of each court’s program funding in the current fiscal year, conducted through a questionnaire distributed to each court to allow courts to indicate whether they anticipate having additional funds that can be reallocated to courts that have demonstrated a need for additional funds. Historically, the midyear reallocation is to meet one-time, nonrecurring special needs, such as equipment purchases or temporary help to clear work backlogs. However, since AB 1058 program funding has been flat since 2008, a number of courts indicated a need for additional funds just to maintain current service levels resulting from increased costs of doing business.

In FY 2007–2008, an additional procedure—the federal drawdown option—was put in place to assist in covering the cost of maintaining current program service levels through the use of local trial courts used as a match to obtain additional federal funds for the program. Federal drawdown funds voluntarily returned by some courts are also available to be redistributed to courts that have requested additional federal drawdown funds. Therefore, the committee recommends reallocation of the limited amount of funds available based on a proportional formula to all courts that have indicated a need.

Base funds and funds under the federal drawdown option, allocated at the beginning of the fiscal year but returned by courts unable to use all of the funds, are proposed for reallocation during this midyear process consistent with the funding made available under the contract between the Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council. As a result of the midyear reallocation process for the Child Support Commissioner Program, a total of \$1,071,482 is available because seven courts have volunteered to return \$397,169 in base funds and 10 courts have volunteered to return a combined \$674,313 in federal drawdown option funds. For the Family Law Facilitator Program, a total of \$338,445 is available because two courts have volunteered to return \$16,701 in base funds and five courts have volunteered to return a combined \$321,744 in federal drawdown option funds.

Under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, a questionnaire is sent to each court requesting the information needed to evaluate appropriate funding levels. In addition to compiling questionnaire responses, Judicial Council staff gathers information on each court's historical spending patterns and calculates projected spending based on invoices received to date for the current fiscal year. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee then recommends proposed funding changes. The criteria for consideration of court requests are caseload, funds available for redistribution, historical spending patterns, special needs, and staffing levels. Funds returned by courts with a historical pattern of underspending, funds voluntarily returned, and any previously unallocated funds are redistributed to courts with documented needs.

This midyear reallocation process ensures that the highest proportion of total funds allocated to the courts is spent where funding is needed. This process also minimizes the amount of unspent funds that revert to the state General Fund.

A total of \$1,071,482 from the Child Support Commissioner Program grant sources was available for reallocation to the child support commissioner component of the program. A total of 31 courts requested no change to their child support commissioner base allocations, 30 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, 7 courts offered to return base funds, 10 courts offered to return federal drawdown option funds, 17 courts requested additional base funds for their child support commissioner program, and 13 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

A total of \$338,445 from the Family Law Facilitator Program grant source was available for reallocation to the family law facilitator component of the program. A total of 33 courts requested no change to their family law facilitator base allocations, 32 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, 2 courts offered to return base funds, 5 courts offered to return federal drawdown funds, 20 courts requested additional base funds for their family law facilitator program, and 17 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

All allocations to courts requesting additional funding have been based on proportionately allocating the available base and federal drawdown funds among the courts requesting additional funds proportionate to their share of the total base funding. Under the established allocation procedures for this program, the request was reviewed by the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee. The committee recommends that the Judicial Council adopt the allocations for the Child Support Commissioner Program detailed in Attachment A and the allocations for the Family Law Facilitator Program detailed in Attachment B.

Base funding, FY 2017–2018

The Judicial Council is also responsible for the allocation of base program funding at the beginning of each fiscal year. In 1997, the Judicial Council established staffing standards for child support commissioners under Family Code section 4252(b)(3). Staffing standards are based on the number of local child support agency cases that have established child support

orders. In addition, under an established procedure described in the standard agreement with each superior court, questionnaires are sent annually to each court requesting the information needed to evaluate appropriate funding levels in case of any exceptional needs.

Although the Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council have not entered into a new contract for funding for FY 2017–2018, it is anticipated that there will be no additional funding available for the program. The allocations for the Child Support Commissioner Program and Family Law Facilitator Program are based on the anticipated funds available for allocation for FY 2017–2018 and based on the questionnaires submitted by each superior court, specifically courts indicating their ability to provide the matching funds from local trial court funds to drawdown two-thirds federal funds. If additional funds are made available through the contract between the Department of Child Support Services and the Judicial Council, those funds can be allocated during the FY 2017–2018 midyear reallocation process.

The committee recommends that courts be allocated base funding, less any amount a court indicated that it wishes to relinquish, for both the Child Support Commissioner Program and the Family Law Facilitator Program as in FY 2016–2017. The committee also recommends that courts be allocated federal drawdown funding, less any amount a court indicated that it wishes to relinquish, for both the Child Support Commissioner Program and the Family Law Facilitator Program as in FY 2016–2017, but that each court requesting increased federal drawdown funding be allocated additional funding in proportion to overall funding available for program funding. The committee recommends that the Judicial Council adopt the allocations for the Child Support Commissioner Program detailed in Attachment C and the allocations for the Family Law Facilitator Program detailed in Attachment D.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

This proposal was not circulated for public comment; however, a detailed funding questionnaire was completed by all 58 courts and used to develop the allocation recommendations.

The committee considered taking no action but rejected this option as inconsistent with Judicial Council goals because it would result in the reversion of unspent funds to the General Fund. Taking no action would also deprive courts of the option of using federal financial participation to cover two-thirds of some of the existing court contributions to the program. A number of courts commented in their questionnaires about continued shortfalls in program funding, and these concerns have been forwarded to DCSS.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

To draw down federal funds, federal provisions require payment of a state share of one-third of total expenditures. Therefore, each participating court will need to provide the one-third share of the court's total cost to draw down two-thirds of total expenditures from federal participation.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: *Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2016–2017*
2. Attachment B: *Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2016–2017*
3. Attachment C: *Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2017–2018*
4. Attachment D: *Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2017–2018*

Attachment A
Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2016–2017

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation	Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	Recommended Base Funding Allocation (A + C)	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (B + D)	Federal Share 66% (Column F * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column F * .34)	Total Allocation (E + F)	Contract Amount (E + G)
1 Alameda	1,038,898	597,577	27,543	145,159	1,066,441	742,736	490,206	252,530	1,809,177	1,556,646
2 Alpine/El Dorado										
3 Amador	140,250	45,736	-	(45,736)	140,250	-	-	-	140,250	140,250
4 Butte	357,922	-	(32,922)	-	325,000	-	-	-	325,000	325,000
5 Calaveras	131,410	39,992	-	-	131,410	39,992	26,395	13,597	171,402	157,805
6 Colusa	45,258	21,910	1,200	6,167	46,458	28,077	18,531	9,546	74,535	64,989
7 Contra Costa	998,000	48,695	-	(48,695)	998,000	-	-	-	998,000	998,000
8 Del Norte	47,549	23,494	-	-	47,549	23,494	15,506	7,988	71,043	63,055
9 El Dorado/Alpine	203,169	100,382	-	-	203,169	100,382	66,252	34,130	303,551	269,421
10 Fresno	1,576,437	881,712	-	(165,385)	1,576,437	716,327	472,776	243,551	2,292,764	2,049,213
11 Glenn	120,030	63,012	-	-	120,030	63,012	41,588	21,424	183,042	161,618
12 Humboldt	121,036	59,801	(38,522)	(59,801)	82,514	-	-	-	82,514	82,514
13 Imperial	161,151	79,624	4,272	22,413	165,423	102,037	67,344	34,692	267,460	232,767
14 Inyo	79,264	23,229	-	(16,229)	79,264	7,000	4,620	2,380	86,264	83,884
15 Kern	653,418	365,460	17,323	34,540	670,741	400,000	264,000	136,000	1,070,741	934,741
16 Kings	297,722	166,518	-	-	297,722	166,518	109,902	56,616	464,240	407,624
17 Lake	155,126	30,770	-	-	155,126	30,770	20,308	10,462	185,896	175,434
18 Lassen	93,371	-	(33,371)	-	60,000	-	-	-	60,000	60,000
19 Los Angeles	5,155,222	2,330,865	136,672	60,000	5,291,894	2,390,864	1,577,970	812,894	7,682,758	6,869,864
20 Madera	211,814	73,590	-	-	211,814	73,590	48,569	25,021	285,404	260,383
21 Marin	126,208	5,620	-	-	126,208	5,620	3,709	1,911	131,828	129,917
22 Mariposa	75,216	37,162	(21,155)	(37,162)	54,061	-	-	-	54,061	54,061
23 Mendocino	170,269	40,079	-	-	170,269	40,079	26,452	13,627	210,348	196,721
24 Merced	539,732	266,673	-	-	539,732	266,673	176,004	90,669	806,405	715,736
25 Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26 Mono	45,232	2,014	-	-	45,232	2,014	1,329	685	47,246	46,561
27 Monterey	375,757	180,525	9,962	50,814	385,719	231,339	152,684	78,655	617,058	538,403
28 Napa	182,148	101,878	(17,148)	(101,878)	165,000	-	-	-	165,000	165,000
29 Nevada/Sierra	327,593	161,860	-	(43,259)	327,593	118,601	78,277	40,324	446,194	405,870
30 Orange	2,299,118	189,538	(211,692)	(189,538)	2,087,426	-	-	-	2,087,426	2,087,426
31 Placer	371,600	75,374	(42,359)	(75,374)	329,241	-	-	-	329,241	329,241
32 Plumas	94,869	18,163	2,515	-	97,384	18,163	11,988	6,175	115,547	109,372
33 Riverside	979,746	514,330	25,974	48,583	1,005,720	562,913	371,523	191,390	1,568,633	1,377,243
34 Sacramento	1,044,502	584,196	-	-	1,044,502	584,196	385,569	198,627	1,628,698	1,430,071
35 San Benito	134,101	23,490	-	-	134,101	23,490	15,503	7,987	157,591	149,604
36 San Bernardino	2,504,371	1,237,374	66,394	18,759	2,570,765	1,256,133	829,048	427,085	3,826,898	3,399,813
37 San Diego	1,791,621	1,002,066	-	-	1,791,621	1,002,066	661,364	340,702	2,793,687	2,452,985
38 San Francisco	902,452	556,042	-	-	902,452	556,042	366,988	189,054	1,458,494	1,269,440
39 San Joaquin	678,511	113,663	-	-	678,511	113,663	75,018	38,645	792,174	753,529
40 San Luis Obispo	228,502	130,697	6,058	-	234,560	130,697	86,260	44,437	365,257	320,820
41 San Mateo	389,666	224,138	-	-	389,666	224,138	147,931	76,207	613,804	537,597
42 Santa Barbara	466,495	224,119	12,367	-	478,862	224,119	147,919	76,200	702,981	626,781
43 Santa Clara	1,728,517	660,761	45,825	185,991	1,774,342	846,752	558,857	287,896	2,621,095	2,333,199
44 Santa Cruz	190,087	90,935	5,039	-	195,126	90,935	60,017	30,918	286,061	255,144
45 Shasta/Trinity	416,675	205,874	-	-	416,675	205,874	135,877	69,997	622,549	552,552
46 Sierra/Nevada										
47 Siskiyou	236,093	132,050	-	-	236,093	132,050	87,153	44,897	368,143	323,246
48 Solano	515,817	109,258	-	-	515,817	109,258	72,110	37,148	625,075	587,927
49 Sonoma	494,070	276,335	13,098	17,491	507,168	293,826	193,925	99,901	800,994	701,094
50 Stanislaus	771,110	209,665	-	-	771,110	209,665	138,379	71,286	980,775	909,489
51 Sutter	192,235	63,487	-	-	192,235	63,487	41,901	21,586	255,722	234,136
52 Tehama	93,356	52,215	2,475	14,698	95,831	66,913	44,162	22,750	162,744	139,993
53 Trinity/Shasta										
54 Tulare	544,089	134,382	-	-	544,089	134,382	88,692	45,690	678,471	632,781
55 Tuolumne	158,566	78,346	-	-	158,566	78,346	51,708	26,638	236,912	210,274
56 Ventura	570,148	318,889	15,115	62,803	585,263	381,692	251,917	129,775	966,955	837,180
57 Yolo	190,192	93,972	-	-	190,192	93,972	62,022	31,950	284,164	252,214
58 Yuba	201,223	80,161	5,335	6,895	206,558	87,056	57,457	29,599	293,614	264,015
TOTAL	31,616,934	13,147,698			31,616,932	13,038,953	8,605,710	4,433,242	44,655,886	40,222,643

CSC Base Funds 31,616,932
 CSC Federal Drawdown 13,038,953
 Total Funding Allocated 44,655,885

Attachment B

Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2016–2017

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Court	Beginning Base Funding Allocation	Beginning Federal Drawdown Option	Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation	Mid-Year Changes to Federal Drawdown Option	Recommended Base Funding Allocation (A + C)	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (B + D)	Federal Share 66% (Column F * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column F * .34)	Total Allocation (E + F)	Contract Amount (E + G)
1 Alameda	362,285	176,319	1,356	31,892	363,641	208,211	137,419	70,792	571,853	501,061
2 Alpine/El Dorado			-							
3 Amador	46,885	4,701	-	-	46,885	4,701	3,103	1,598	51,586	49,988
4 Butte	101,754	47,433	-	-	101,754	47,433	31,306	16,127	149,187	133,060
5 Calaveras	70,326	7,051	-	-	70,326	7,051	4,654	2,397	77,377	74,980
6 Colusa	52,619	24,522	-	(13,272)	52,619	11,250	7,425	3,825	63,869	60,044
7 Contra Costa	344,896	3,138	1,291	568	346,187	3,706	2,446	1,260	349,893	348,633
8 Del Norte	50,002	5,971	-	-	50,002	5,971	3,941	2,030	55,973	53,943
9 El Dorado/Alpine	106,037	50,384	-	-	106,037	50,384	33,253	17,131	156,421	139,290
10 Fresno	392,722	186,596	-	-	392,722	186,596	123,153	63,443	579,318	515,875
11 Glenn	75,808	35,172	-	-	75,808	35,172	23,214	11,958	110,980	99,022
12 Humboldt	89,185	40,588	-	(30,814)	89,185	9,774	6,451	3,323	98,959	95,636
13 Imperial	52,619	25,001	197	4,522	52,816	29,523	19,485	10,038	82,339	72,301
14 Inyo	57,185	27,171	-	-	57,185	27,171	17,933	9,238	84,356	75,118
15 Kern	353,489	167,954	1,323	30,379	354,812	198,333	130,900	67,433	553,146	485,712
16 Kings	58,326	26,904	-	-	58,326	26,904	17,757	9,147	85,230	76,083
17 Lake	57,569	26,836	-	-	57,569	26,836	17,712	9,124	84,405	75,281
18 Lassen	77,686	-	(12,686)	-	65,000	-	-	-	65,000	65,000
19 Los Angeles	1,881,243	803,435	-	-	1,881,239	803,433	530,266	273,167	2,684,672	2,411,505
20 Madera	80,563	25,383	-	-	80,563	25,383	16,753	8,630	105,946	97,316
21 Marin	136,581	-	-	-	136,581	-	-	-	136,581	136,581
22 Mariposa	45,390	-	(4,015)	-	41,375	-	-	-	41,375	41,375
23 Mendocino	60,180	29,290	-	-	60,180	29,290	19,331	9,959	89,470	79,511
24 Merced	98,387	45,863	368	8,296	98,755	54,159	35,745	18,414	152,914	134,500
25 Modoc	70,813	1,341	-	-	70,813	1,341	885	456	72,154	71,698
26 Mono	48,159	1,350	180	244	48,339	1,594	1,052	542	49,933	49,391
27 Monterey	120,343	57,179	451	10,342	120,794	67,521	44,564	22,957	188,315	165,358
28 Napa	61,643	29,290	-	-	61,643	29,290	19,331	9,959	90,933	80,974
29 Nevada/Sierra	116,010	39,094	-	-	116,010	39,094	25,802	13,292	155,104	141,812
30 Orange	537,209	255,246	-	(203,825)	537,209	51,421	33,938	17,483	588,630	571,147
31 Placer	89,626	41,583	-	(34,271)	89,626	7,312	4,826	2,486	96,938	94,452
32 Plumas	55,827	7,803	-	-	55,827	7,803	5,150	2,653	63,630	60,977
33 Riverside	662,346	314,705	2,480	56,923	664,826	371,628	245,275	126,354	1,036,454	910,100
34 Sacramento	308,157	146,417	1,154	26,484	309,311	172,901	114,114	58,786	482,211	423,425
35 San Benito	60,180	28,729	225	5,196	60,405	33,925	22,391	11,535	94,331	82,796
36 San Bernardino	457,205	217,234	1,712	39,293	458,917	256,527	169,308	87,219	715,444	628,224
37 San Diego	605,937	253,614	-	-	605,937	253,614	167,385	86,229	859,551	773,322
38 San Francisco	245,257	113,795	-	-	245,257	113,795	75,105	38,690	359,052	320,362
39 San Joaquin	213,768	75,607	-	-	213,768	75,607	49,901	25,706	289,375	263,669
40 San Luis Obispo	66,889	31,780	250	-	67,139	31,780	20,975	10,805	98,919	88,114
41 San Mateo	126,800	61,711	-	-	126,800	61,711	40,729	20,982	188,511	167,529
42 Santa Barbara	169,911	77,323	636	-	170,547	77,323	51,033	26,290	247,870	221,580
43 Santa Clara	443,473	210,712	1,660	38,113	445,133	248,825	164,225	84,601	693,958	609,358
44 Santa Cruz	73,989	35,154	277	-	74,266	35,154	23,202	11,952	109,420	97,468
45 Shasta/Trinity	185,447	111,913	-	(86,913)	185,447	25,000	16,500	8,500	210,447	201,947
46 Sierra/Nevada			-							
47 Siskiyou	74,437	34,700	-	-	74,437	34,700	22,902	11,798	109,137	97,339
48 Solano	129,070	39,710	-	-	129,070	39,710	26,209	13,501	168,780	155,279
49 Sonoma	137,892	65,519	516	11,851	138,408	77,370	51,064	26,306	215,778	189,472
50 Stanislaus	219,062	102,115	-	-	219,062	102,115	67,396	34,719	321,177	286,458
51 Sutter	66,103	31,409	-	-	66,103	31,409	20,730	10,679	97,512	86,833
52 Tehama	27,294	3,535	-	-	27,294	3,535	2,333	1,202	30,829	29,627
53 Trinity/Shasta			-	-						
54 Tulare	306,450	132,293	1,147	23,929	307,597	156,222	103,106	53,115	463,819	410,704
55 Tuolumne	64,534	30,084	-	-	64,534	30,084	19,855	10,229	94,618	84,389
56 Ventura	252,263	119,859	944	21,680	253,207	141,539	93,416	48,123	394,746	346,623
57 Yolo	76,248	35,377	285	6,399	76,533	41,776	27,572	14,204	118,309	104,106
58 Yuba	65,550	31,146	245	5,634	65,795	36,780	24,275	12,505	102,575	90,070
TOTAL	10,789,629	4,497,039			10,789,625	4,449,686	2,936,793	1,512,893	15,239,311	13,726,418

FLF Base Funds	10,789,625
FLF Federal Drawdown	4,449,686
Total Funding Allocated	15,239,311

Attachment C
Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2017–2018

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Court	Recommended Base Funding Allocation	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option	Total Allocation (A + B)	Federal Share 66% (Column C * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column C * .34) (A + C)	Contract Amount (A + D)
1 Alameda	1,048,839	597,577	1,646,416	394,401	203,176	1,443,240
2 Alpine/El Dorado						
3 Amador	140,250	45,736	185,986	30,186	15,550	170,436
4 Butte	325,000	-	325,000	-	-	325,000
5 Calaveras	132,667	39,992	172,659	26,395	13,597	159,062
6 Colusa	45,691	21,910	67,601	14,461	7,449	60,152
7 Contra Costa	998,000	-	998,000	-	-	998,000
8 Del Norte	48,004	32,298	80,302	21,317	10,981	69,321
9 El Dorado/Alpine	203,169	100,382	303,551	66,252	34,130	269,421
10 Fresno	1,591,522	716,327	2,307,849	472,776	243,551	2,064,297
11 Glenn	120,030	63,012	183,042	41,588	21,424	161,618
12 Humboldt	121,036	59,801	180,837	39,469	20,332	160,505
13 Imperial	162,693	79,624	242,317	52,552	27,072	215,245
14 Inyo	79,264	23,229	102,493	15,331	7,898	94,595
15 Kern	659,670	400,000	1,059,670	264,000	136,000	923,670
16 Kings	297,722	166,518	464,240	109,902	56,616	407,624
17 Lake	155,126	30,770	185,896	20,308	10,462	175,434
18 Lassen	60,000	-	60,000	-	-	60,000
19 Los Angeles	5,204,551	2,330,865	7,535,416	1,538,371	792,494	6,742,922
20 Madera	211,814	73,590	285,404	48,569	25,021	260,383
21 Marin	126,208	5,620	131,828	3,709	1,911	129,917
22 Mariposa	75,216	-	75,216	-	-	75,216
23 Mendocino	170,269	40,079	210,348	26,452	13,627	196,721
24 Merced	539,732	266,673	806,405	176,004	90,669	715,736
25 Modoc	-	-	-	-	-	-
26 Mono	45,232	2,014	47,246	1,329	685	46,561
27 Monterey	375,757	180,525	556,282	119,147	61,379	494,904
28 Napa	115,000	-	115,000	-	-	115,000
29 Nevada	327,593	118,601	446,194	78,277	40,324	405,870
30 Orange	2,299,118	159,338	2,458,456	105,163	54,175	2,404,281
31 Placer	371,600	-	371,600	-	-	371,600
32 Plumas	95,777	18,163	113,940	11,988	6,175	107,764
33 Riverside	989,121	514,330	1,503,451	339,458	174,872	1,328,579
34 Sacramento	1,044,502	584,196	1,628,698	385,569	198,627	1,430,071
35 San Benito	135,384	30,000	165,384	19,800	10,200	155,184
36 San Bernardino	2,528,335	1,237,375	3,765,710	816,668	420,708	3,345,002
37 San Diego	1,791,621	1,002,066	2,793,687	661,364	340,702	2,452,985
38 San Francisco	902,452	556,042	1,458,494	366,988	189,054	1,269,440
39 San Joaquin	685,004	100,094	785,098	66,062	34,032	751,066
40 San Luis Obispo	230,689	145,000	375,689	95,700	49,300	326,389
41 San Mateo	389,666	230,496	620,162	152,127	78,369	541,793
42 Santa Barbara	470,959	224,119	695,078	147,919	76,201	618,877
43 Santa Clara	1,745,057	660,761	2,405,818	436,102	224,659	2,181,159
44 Santa Cruz	191,906	90,935	282,841	60,017	30,918	251,923
45 Shasta	416,675	205,874	622,549	135,877	69,997	552,552
46 Sierra/Nevada						
47 Siskiyou	200,000	40,000	240,000	26,400	13,600	226,400
48 Solano	515,817	109,258	625,075	72,110	37,148	587,927
49 Sonoma	498,798	276,335	775,133	182,381	93,954	681,179
50 Stanislaus	771,110	209,665	980,775	138,379	71,286	909,489
51 Sutter	192,235	63,487	255,722	41,901	21,586	234,136
52 Tehama	94,249	132,000	226,249	87,120	44,880	181,369
53 Trinity/Shasta						
54 Tulare	549,295	134,382	683,677	88,692	45,690	637,987
55 Tuolumne	158,566	78,346	236,912	51,708	26,638	210,274
56 Ventura	575,604	338,463	914,067	223,386	115,077	798,989
57 Yolo	190,192	93,972	284,164	62,022	31,951	252,214
58 Yuba	203,149	80,161	283,310	52,906	27,255	256,055
TOTAL	31,616,936	12,710,001	44,326,937	8,388,603	4,321,402	40,005,534

CSC Base Funds	31,616,936
CSC Federal Drawdown	12,710,001
Total Funding Available	44,326,937

Attachment D
Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2017–2018

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Court	Recommended Base Funding Allocation	Recommended Federal Drawdown Option	Total Allocation (A + B)	Federal Share 66% (Column C * .66)	Court Share 34% (Column C * .34)	Contract Amount (A + D)
1 Alameda	362,939	176,319	539,258	116,371	59,948	479,309
2 Alpine/El Dorado						
3 Amador	46,885	4,701	51,586	3,103	1,598	49,988
4 Butte	101,754	47,433	149,187	31,306	16,127	133,060
5 Calaveras	70,453	7,051	77,504	4,654	2,397	75,107
6 Colusa	52,619	11,250	63,869	7,425	3,825	60,044
7 Contra Costa	345,518	-	345,518	-	-	345,518
8 Del Norte	50,002	5,971	55,973	3,941	2,030	53,943
9 El Dorado/Alpine	106,037	50,384	156,421	33,253	17,131	139,290
10 Fresno	393,431	186,596	580,027	123,153	63,443	516,584
11 Glenn	75,808	35,172	110,980	23,214	11,958	99,022
12 Humboldt	89,185	40,588	129,773	26,788	13,800	115,973
13 Imperial	52,714	25,001	77,715	16,501	8,500	69,215
14 Inyo	57,185	27,171	84,356	17,933	9,238	75,118
15 Kern	354,127	170,420	524,547	112,477	57,943	466,604
16 Kings	58,326	26,904	85,230	17,757	9,147	76,083
17 Lake	57,569	26,836	84,405	17,712	9,124	75,281
18 Lassen	65,000	-	65,000	-	-	65,000
19 Los Angeles	1,884,633	803,431	2,688,064	530,264	273,167	2,414,897
20 Madera	80,563	25,383	105,946	16,753	8,630	97,316
21 Marin	136,581	-	136,581	-	-	136,581
22 Mariposa	45,390	-	45,390	-	-	45,390
23 Mendocino	60,289	29,290	89,579	19,331	9,959	79,620
24 Merced	98,565	46,536	145,101	30,714	15,822	129,279
25 Modoc	70,941	1,247	72,188	823	424	71,764
26 Mono	48,246	1,350	49,596	891	459	49,137
27 Monterey	120,343	57,179	177,522	37,738	19,441	158,081
28 Napa	61,643	29,290	90,933	19,331	9,959	80,974
29 Nevada/Sierra	116,010	39,094	155,104	25,802	13,292	141,812
30 Orange	537,209	255,246	792,455	168,462	86,784	705,671
31 Placer	89,626	-	89,626	-	-	89,626
32 Plumas	55,827	7,803	63,630	5,150	2,653	60,977
33 Riverside	663,541	319,325	982,866	210,754	108,570	874,296
34 Sacramento	308,713	146,417	455,130	96,635	49,782	405,348
35 San Benito	60,289	29,151	89,440	19,239	9,911	79,528
36 San Bernardino	458,030	220,423	678,453	145,479	74,944	603,509
37 San Diego	605,937	253,614	859,551	167,385	86,229	773,322
38 San Francisco	245,257	113,795	359,052	75,105	38,690	320,362
39 San Joaquin	214,154	71,332	285,486	47,079	24,253	261,233
40 San Luis Obispo	67,010	32,247	99,257	21,283	10,964	88,292
41 San Mateo	126,800	62,617	189,417	41,327	21,290	168,127
42 Santa Barbara	170,218	77,323	247,541	51,033	26,290	221,251
43 Santa Clara	444,273	210,712	654,985	139,070	71,642	583,343
44 Santa Cruz	74,123	35,154	109,277	23,202	11,952	97,324
45 Shasta/Trinity	185,447	111,913	297,360	73,863	38,050	259,310
46 Sierra/Nevada			-			
47 Siskiyou	74,437	35,209	109,646	23,238	11,971	97,675
48 Solano	129,070	39,710	168,780	26,209	13,501	155,279
49 Sonoma	138,141	65,519	203,660	43,243	22,276	181,383
50 Stanislaus	219,062	102,115	321,177	67,396	34,719	286,458
51 Sutter	66,103	31,409	97,512	20,730	10,679	86,833
52 Tehama	27,294	3,535	30,829	2,333	1,202	29,627
53 Trinity/Shasta			-			
54 Tulare	307,003	132,293	439,296	87,313	44,980	394,316
55 Tuolumne	64,534	30,084	94,618	19,855	10,229	84,389
56 Ventura	252,718	121,619	374,337	80,268	41,350	332,987
57 Yolo	76,386	35,377	111,763	23,349	12,028	99,734
58 Yuba	65,668	31,146	96,814	20,556	10,590	86,225
TOTAL	10,789,626	4,449,685	15,239,311	2,936,791	1,512,891	13,726,415

FLF Base Funds 10,789,626
 FLF Federal Drawdown 4,449,685
 Total Funding Allocated 15,239,311