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## 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) 2017-18 and the allocation of funding for this same program for FY 2018-19, 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 2, 2018:

1. Approve the reallocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2017-18, subject to the state Budget Act;
2. Approve the reallocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2017-18, subject to the state Budget Act;
3. Approve allocation for funding of child support commissioners for FY 2018-19, subject to the state Budget Act; and
4. Approve the allocation for funding of family law facilitators for FY 2018-19, 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 2007-08, 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 2018-19.

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

[^0]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 2016-17. 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 2018-19, and (2) coordinate with DCSS on its current review of funding allocations for the local child support agencies.

Subsequently, because the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee's (TCBAC) Funding Methodology Subcommittee (FMS) is in the process of evaluating Workload-based Funding and Allocation Methodology (WAFM) and its continued impact on trial court budgets, it was decided that any decision regarding a funding methodology for AB 1058 should be postponed for at least one additional fiscal year to allow for FMS to complete its work reviewing the WAFM funding methodology for allocating trial court funds and also to allow additional time for the AB 1058 Joint Subcommittee to gather additional information that may impact a proposed AB 1058 funding methodology.

## Rationale for Recommendation

## Midyear reallocation, FY 2017-18

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 2007-08, 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, not requested at the beginning of the fiscal year or 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 $\$ 1,725,259$ is available because seven courts have volunteered to return $\$ 340,686$ in base funds and $\$ 1,384,573$ in federal drawdown option funds from unallocated funds at the beginning of the fiscal year and because 16 courts have volunteered to return funds that they do not anticipate needing during fiscal year 2017-18. For the Family Law Facilitator Program, a total of $\$ 556,522$ is available because four courts have volunteered to return $\$ 68,930$ in base funds and 10 courts have volunteered to return a combined $\$ 487,592$ 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 $\$ 1,725,259$ from the Child Support Commissioner Program grant sources was available for reallocation to the child support commissioner component of the program. A total of 38 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, 16 courts offered to return federal drawdown option funds, 13 courts requested additional base funds for their Child Support Commissioner Program, and 12 requested additional federal drawdown option funds.

A total of \$556,522 from the Family Law Facilitator Program grant source was available for reallocation to the family law facilitator component of the program. A total of 36 courts requested no change to their family law facilitator base allocations, 34 requested no change to their federal drawdown option, 4 courts offered to return base funds, 10 courts offered to return federal drawdown funds, 18 courts requested additional base funds for their Family Law Facilitator Program, and 14 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 2018-19

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.

Funding for FY 2018-19 for the child support commissioner component of the program will be $\$ 31,616,936$ in base funding and $\$ 13,038,952$ for the federal drawdown option; funding for the family law facilitator component will be $\$ 10,789,626$ in base funding and $\$ 4,449,685$ from the federal drawdown option, for a total program base allocation of $\$ 44.6$ million and a total federal drawdown allocation of $\$ 15.2$ million.

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 2017-18. 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 2017-18, but that each court requesting increased base funding, federal drawdown funding, or both 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 programs. 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 2017-2018
2. Attachment B: Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2017-2018
3. Attachment C: Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2018-2019
4. Attachment D: Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2018-2019

## Attachment A

Child Support Commissioner Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2017-2018

|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | CSC Court | Beginning Base Funding Allocation | Beginning Federal Drawdown Option | Mid-Year Changes to Base Allocation | Mid-Year <br> Changes to <br> Federal Drawdown Option | Recommended Base Funding Allocation (A + C) | Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation (B+D) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Federal Share } \\ 66 \% \\ \text { (Column F* } \\ .66 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Court Share } \\ 34 \% \\ \text { (Column F } \\ .34 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total Allocation $(E+F)$ | Contract Amount ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{G}$ ) |
| 1 | Alameda | 1,048,839 | 597,577 | 25,286 | 409,893 | 1,074,125 | 1,007,470 | 664,930 | 342,540 | 2,081,595 | 1,739,055 |
| 2 | Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | Amador | 140,250 | 45,736 | - | - | 140,250 | 45,736 | 30,186 | 15,550 | 185,986 | 170,436 |
| 4 | Butte | 325,000 | - | $(75,000)$ | - | 250,000 | - | - | - | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| 5 | CALAVERAS | 132,667 | 39,992 | - | - | 132,667 | 39,992 | 26,395 | 13,597 | 172,659 | 159,062 |
| 6 | Colusa | 45,691 | 21,910 | - | $(1,101)$ | 45,691 | 20,809 | 13,734 | 7,075 | 66,500 | 59,425 |
| 7 | Contra Costa | 998,000 | - | $(125,000)$ |  | 873,000 | - | - | - | 873,000 | 873,000 |
| 8 | Del Norte | 48,004 | 32,298 | - | - | 48,004 | 32,298 | 21,317 | 10,981 | 80,302 | 69,321 |
| 9 | El Dorado | 203,169 | 100,382 | - | $(36,331)$ | 203,169 | 64,051 | 42,274 | 21,777 | 267,220 | 245,443 |
| 10 | Fresno | 1,591,522 | 716,327 | - |  | 1,591,522 | 716,326 | 472,775 | 243,551 | 2,307,848 | 2,064,297 |
| 11 | Glenn | 120,030 | 63,012 |  | - | 120,030 | 63,012 | 41,588 | 21,424 | 183,042 | 161,618 |
| 12 | Humboldt | 121,036 | 59,801 | $(31,036)$ | $(59,801)$ | 90,000 | - | - | - | 90,000 | 90,000 |
| 13 | Imperial | 162,693 | 79,624 | 3,922 | 144,146 | 166,615 | 223,770 | 147,688 | 76,082 | 390,385 | 314,303 |
| 14 | Inyo | 79,264 | 23,229 | - | 25,701 | 79,264 | 48,930 | 32,294 | 16,636 | 128,194 | 111,558 |
| 15 | Kern | 659,670 | 400,000 | 15,903 | 50,000 | 675,573 | 450,000 | 297,000 | 153,000 | 1,125,573 | 972,573 |
| 16 | Kings | 297,722 | 166,518 | 7,178 | 26,481 | 304,900 | 192,999 | 127,379 | 65,620 | 497,899 | 432,279 |
| 17 | Lake | 155,126 | 30,770 | - | $(5,770)$ | 155,126 | 25,000 | 16,500 | 8,500 | 180,126 | 171,626 |
| 18 | Lassen | 60,000 | - | - | - | 60,000 | - | - | - | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| 19 | Los Angeles | 5,204,551 | 2,330,865 | 125,473 | - | 5,330,024 | 2,330,865 | 1,538,371 | 792,494 | 7,660,889 | 6,868,395 |
| 20 | Madera | 211,814 | 73,590 | 5,106 | 9,000 | 216,920 | 82,590 | 54,509 | 28,081 | 299,510 | 271,429 |
| 21 | Marin | 126,208 | 5,620 | - | - | 126,208 | 5,620 | 3,709 | 1,911 | 131,828 | 129,917 |
| 22 | Mariposa | 75,216 | - | $(2,000)$ | - | 73,216 | - | - | - | 73,216 | 73,216 |
| 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 | 1,090 | - | 46,323 | 2,014 | 1,329 | 685 | 48,336 | 47,652 |
| 27 | Monterey | 375,757 | 180,525 | - | - | 375,757 | 180,525 | 119,147 | 61,379 | 556,282 | 494,904 |
| 28 | Napa | 115,000 | - | $(10,000)$ | - | 105,000 | - | - | - | 105,000 | 105,000 |
| 29 | Nevada | 327,593 | 118,601 | - | $(118,601)$ | 327,593 | - | - | - | 327,593 | 327,593 |
| 30 | Orange | 2,299,118 | 159,338 | - | $(151,948)$ | 2,299,118 | 7,390 | 4,877 | 2,513 | 2,306,508 | 2,303,995 |
| 31 | Placer | 371,600 | - | $(28,000)$ | - | 343,600 | - | - | - | 343,600 | 343,600 |
| 32 | Plumas | 95,777 | 18,163 | - | - | 95,777 | 18,163 | 11,988 | 6,175 | 113,940 | 107,765 |
| 33 | Riverside | 989,121 | 514,330 | 23,846 | 114,974 | 1,012,967 | 629,304 | 415,341 | 213,963 | 1,642,271 | 1,428,308 |
| 34 | Sacramento | 1,044,502 | 584,196 | - | $(100,010)$ | 1,044,502 | 484,186 | 319,563 | 164,623 | 1,528,688 | 1,364,065 |
| 35 | San Benito | 135,384 | 30,000 | - | - | 135,384 | 30,000 | 19,800 | 10,200 | 165,384 | 155,184 |
| 36 | San Bernardino | 2,528,335 | 1,237,375 | 60,954 | 232,211 | 2,589,289 | 1,469,586 | 969,927 | 499,659 | 4,058,875 | 3,559,216 |
| 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 | - | $(114,246)$ | 902,452 | 441,796 | 291,585 | 150,211 | 1,344,248 | 1,194,037 |
| 39 | San Joaquin | 685,004 | 100,094 | - | $(53,828)$ | 685,004 | 46,266 | 30,536 | 15,730 | 731,270 | 715,540 |
| 40 | San Luis Obispo | 230,689 | 145,000 | - | - | 230,689 | 145,000 | 95,700 | 49,300 | 375,689 | 326,389 |
| 41 | San Mateo | 389,666 | 230,496 | - | - | 389,666 | 230,496 | 152,127 | 78,369 | 620,162 | 541,793 |
| 42 | Santa Barbara | 470,959 | 224,119 | 11,354 | 36,094 | 482,313 | 260,213 | 171,741 | 88,472 | 742,526 | 654,054 |
| 43 | Santa Clara | 1,745,057 | 660,761 | 42,070 | 225,233 | 1,787,127 | 885,994 | 584,756 | 301,238 | 2,673,121 | 2,371,883 |
| 44 | Santa Cruz | 191,906 | 90,935 | 4,627 | $(90,935)$ | 196,533 | - | - | - | 196,533 | 196,533 |
| 45 | Shasta | 416,675 | 205,874 | - | - | 416,675 | 205,874 | 135,877 | 69,997 | 622,549 | 552,552 |
| 46 | Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 47 | Siskiyou | 200,000 | 40,000 | $(69,650)$ | $(40,000)$ | 130,350 | - | - | - | 130,350 | 130,350 |
| 48 | Solano | 515,817 | 109,258 | - | $(32,393)$ | 515,817 | 76,865 | 50,731 | 26,134 | 592,682 | 566,548 |
| 49 | Sonoma | 498,798 | 276,335 | - | $(76,776)$ | 498,798 | 199,559 | 131,709 | 67,850 | 698,357 | 630,507 |
| 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 | 94,249 | 132,000 | - | - | 94,249 | 132,000 | 87,120 | 44,880 | 226,249 | 181,369 |
| 53 | Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 54 | Tulare | 549,295 | 134,382 | - | $(81,746)$ | 549,295 | 52,636 | 34,740 | 17,896 | 601,931 | 584,035 |
| 55 | Tuolumne | 158,566 | 78,346 | - | - | 158,566 | 78,346 | 51,708 | 26,638 | 236,912 | 210,274 |
| 56 | Ventura | 575,604 | 338,463 | 13,877 | 110,838 | 589,480 | 449,301 | 296,539 | 152,762 | 1,038,782 | 886,019 |
| 57 | Yolo | 190,192 | 93,972 | - | $(61,972)$ | 190,192 | 32,000 | 21,120 | 10,880 | 222,192 | 211,312 |
| 58 | Yuba | 203,149 | 80,161 | - | $(30,161)$ | 203,149 | 50,000 | 33,000 | 17,000 | 253,149 | 236,149 |
|  | TOTAL | 31,616,936 | 12,710,001 |  |  | 31,616,936 | 13,038,952 | 8,605,710 | 4,433,243 | 44,655,888 | 40,222,646 |

CSC Base Funds
CSC Federal Drawdown Total Funding Allocated

31,616,936
13,038,952
44,655,888

| Attachment B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family Law Facilitator Program Midyear Reallocation, FY 2017-2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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 <br> 34\% (Column F * <br> .34) | Total Allocation ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{F}$ ) | Contract Amount ( $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{G}$ ) |
| 1 | Alameda | 362,939 | 176,319 | - | $(54,543)$ | 362,939 | 121,776 | 80,372 | 41,404 | 484,715 | 443,311 |
| 2 | Alpine | - | - | - | - | - | - |  | - | - | - |
| 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 | 70,453 | 7,051 | 1,315 | 2,258 | 71,768 | 9,309 | 6,144 | 3,165 | 81,077 | 77,912 |
| 6 | Colusa | 52,619 | 11,250 | $(8,119)$ | $(11,250)$ | 44,500 | - | - | - | 44,500 | 44,500 |
| 7 | Contra Costa | 345,518 | - | - | - | 345,518 | - | - | - | 345,518 | 345,518 |
| 8 | Del Norte | 50,002 | 5,971 | - | - | 50,002 | 5,971 | 3,941 | 2,030 | 55,973 | 53,943 |
| 9 | El Dorado | 106,037 | 50,384 | - | - | 106,037 | 50,384 | 33,253 | 17,131 | 156,421 | 139,290 |
| 10 | Fresno | 393,431 | 186,596 | - | - | 393,431 | 186,596 | 123,153 | 63,443 | 580,027 | 516,584 |
| 11 | Glenn | 75,808 | 35,172 | - | - | 75,808 | 35,172 | 23,214 | 11,958 | 110,980 | 99,022 |
| 12 | Humboldt | 89,185 | 40,588 | - | $(40,588)$ | 89,185 | - | - | - | 89,185 | 89,185 |
| 13 | Imperial | 52,714 | 25,001 | 984 | 8,006 | 53,698 | 33,007 | 21,785 | 11,222 | 86,705 | 75,483 |
| 14 | Inyo | 57,185 | 27,171 | $(42,185)$ | $(27,171)$ | 15,000 | - | - | - | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| 15 | Kern | 354,127 | 170,420 | 6,609 | 29,580 | 360,736 | 200,000 | 132,000 | 68,000 | 560,736 | 492,736 |
| 16 | Kings | 58,326 | 26,904 | 1,089 | 6,096 | 59,415 | 33,000 | 21,780 | 11,220 | 92,415 | 81,195 |
| 17 | Lake | 57,569 | 26,836 | - | $(11,836)$ | 57,569 | 15,000 | 9,900 | 5,100 | 72,569 | 67,469 |
| 18 | Lassen | 65,000 | - | - | - | 65,000 | - | - |  | 65,000 | 65,000 |
| 19 | Los Angeles | 1,884,633 | 803,431 | - | - | 1,884,633 | 803,431 | 530,264 | 273,167 | 2,688,064 | 2,414,897 |
| 20 | Madera | 80,563 | 25,383 | 1,504 | - | 82,067 | 25,383 | 16,753 | 8,630 | 107,450 | 98,820 |
| 21 | Marin | 136,581 | - | - | - | 136,581 | - | - | - | 136,581 | 136,581 |
| 22 | Mariposa | 45,390 | - | $(4,000)$ | - | 41,390 | - | - | - | 41,390 | 41,390 |
| 23 | Mendocino | 60,289 | 29,290 | - | - | 60,289 | 29,290 | 19,331 | 9,959 | 89,579 | 79,620 |
| 24 | Merced | 98,565 | 46,536 | - | - | 98,565 | 46,536 | 30,714 | 15,822 | 145,101 | 129,279 |
| 25 | Modoc | 70,941 | 1,247 | - | - | 70,941 | 1,247 | 823 | 424 | 72,188 | 71,764 |
| 26 | Mono | 48,246 | 1,350 | - | - | 48,246 | 1,350 | 891 | 459 | 49,596 | 49,137 |
| 27 | Monterey | 120,343 | 57,179 | 2,246 | 12,707 | 122,589 | 69,886 | 46,125 | 23,761 | 192,475 | 168,714 |
| 28 | Napa | 61,643 | 29,290 | 1,150 | - | 62,793 | 29,290 | 19,331 | 9,959 | 92,083 | 82,124 |
| 29 | Nevada | 116,010 | 39,094 | - | $(39,094)$ | 116,010 | - | - | - | 116,010 | 116,010 |
| 30 | Orange | 537,209 | 255,246 | - | $(255,246)$ | 537,209 | - | - | - | 537,209 | 537,209 |
| 31 | Placer | 89,626 | - | $(14,626)$ | - | 75,000 | - | - | - | 75,000 | 75,000 |
| 32 | Plumas | 55,827 | 7,803 | - | - | 55,827 | 7,803 | 5,150 | 2,653 | 63,630 | 60,977 |
| 33 | Riverside | 663,541 | 319,325 | 12,384 | 102,256 | 675,925 | 421,581 | 278,243 | 143,337 | 1,097,506 | 954,168 |
| 34 | Sacramento | 308,713 | 146,417 | 5,762 | 46,886 | 314,475 | 193,303 | 127,580 | 65,723 | 507,778 | 442,055 |
| 35 | San Benito | 60,289 | 29,151 | - | - | 60,289 | 29,151 | 19,240 | 9,911 | 89,440 | 79,529 |
| 36 | San Bernardino | 458,030 | 220,423 | 8,549 | 70,585 | 466,579 | 291,007 | 192,065 | 98,943 | 757,586 | 658,644 |
| 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 | 214,154 | 71,332 | - | - | 214,154 | 71,332 | 47,079 | 24,253 | 285,486 | 261,233 |
| 40 | San Luis Obispo | 67,010 | 32,247 | - |  | 67,010 | 32,246 | 21,282 | 10,964 | 99,256 | 88,292 |
| 41 | San Mateo | 126,800 | 62,617 | - | 20,051 | 126,800 | 82,668 | 54,561 | 28,107 | 209,468 | 181,361 |
| 42 | Santa Barbara | 170,218 | 77,323 | 3,177 | 19,082 | 173,395 | 96,405 | 63,627 | 32,778 | 269,800 | 237,022 |
| 43 | Santa Clara | 444,273 | 210,712 | 8,292 | 67,475 | 452,565 | 278,187 | 183,603 | 94,584 | 730,752 | 636,168 |
| 44 | Santa Cruz | 74,123 | 35,154 | 1,383 | $(35,154)$ | 75,506 | - | - | - | 75,506 | 75,506 |
| 45 | Shasta | 185,447 | 111,913 | - | - | 185,447 | 111,913 | 73,863 | 38,050 | 297,360 | 259,310 |
| 46 | Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 47 | Siskiyou | 74,437 | 35,209 | 1,389 | $(5,209)$ | 75,826 | 30,000 | 19,800 | 10,200 | 105,826 | 95,626 |
| 48 | Solano | 129,070 | 39,710 | - | - | 129,070 | 39,710 | 26,209 | 13,501 | 168,780 | 155,279 |
| 49 | Sonoma | 138,141 | 65,519 | - | - | 138,141 | 65,519 | 43,243 | 22,276 | 203,660 | 181,384 |
| 50 | Stanislaus | 219,062 | 102,115 | - | $(7,500)$ | 219,062 | 94,615 | 62,446 | 32,169 | 313,677 | 281,508 |
| 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 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 54 | Tulare | 307,003 | 132,293 | 5,730 | 42,363 | 312,733 | 174,656 | 115,273 | 59,383 | 487,389 | 428,006 |
| 55 | Tuolumne | 64,534 | 30,084 | - | - | 64,534 | 30,084 | 19,855 | 10,229 | 94,618 | 84,389 |
| 56 | Ventura | 252,718 | 121,619 | 4,717 | 38,945 | 257,435 | 160,564 | 105,972 | 54,592 | 417,999 | 363,407 |
| 57 | Yolo | 76,386 | 35,377 | 1,425 | 11,329 | 77,811 | 46,706 | 30,826 | 15,880 | 124,517 | 108,637 |
| 58 | Yuba | 65,668 | 31,146 | 1,225 | 9,974 | 66,893 | 41,120 | 27,139 | 13,981 | 108,013 | 94,032 |
|  | TOTAL | 10,789,626 | 4,449,685 |  |  | 10,789,626 | 4,449,685 | 2,936,792 | 1,512,893 | 15,239,312 | 13,726,418 |


| Attachment C |  | Child Support Commissioner Program Allocation, FY 2018-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F |
| \# | Court | Recommended Base Funding Allocation | Recommended <br> Federal <br> Drawdown Option <br> Allocation | Total Allocation $(A+B)$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Federal Share } \\ 66 \% \\ \text { (Column B * } \\ .66 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Court Share } \\ 34 \% \\ \text { (Column B * } \\ .34 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Contract Amount |
| 1 | Alameda | 1,066,055 | 713,526 | 1,779,581 | 470,927 | 242,599 | 1,536,982 |
| 2 | Alpine/El Dorado |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3 | Amador | 140,250 | 45,736 | 185,986 | 30,186 | 15,550 | 170,436 |
| 4 | Butte | 300,000 | - | 300,000 | - |  | 300,000 |
| 5 | Calaveras | 132,667 | 39,992 | 172,659 | 26,395 | 13,597 | 159,062 |
| 6 | Colusa | 45,691 | 20,809 | 66,500 | 13,734 | 7,075 | 59,425 |
| 7 | Contra Costa | 873,000 | - | 873,000 | - | - | 873,000 |
| 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 | 1,617,646 | 762,100 | 2,379,746 | 502,986 | 259,114 | 2,120,632 |
| 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 | 165,363 | 136,662 | 302,025 | 90,197 | 46,465 | 255,560 |
| 14 | Inyo | 79,264 | 48,930 | 128,194 | 32,294 | 16,636 | 111,558 |
| 15 | Kern | 670,498 | 438,444 | 1,108,942 | 289,373 | 149,071 | 959,871 |
| 16 | Kings | 302,609 | 171,250 | 473,859 | 113,025 | 58,225 | 415,634 |
| 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 | 5,289,980 | 2,780,860 | 8,070,840 | 1,835,367 | 945,492 | 7,125,347 |
| 20 | Madera | 215,291 | 76,056 | 291,347 | 50,197 | 25,859 | 265,488 |
| 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 | 45,974 | 2,926 | 48,900 | 1,931 | 995 | 47,905 |
| 27 | Monterey | 375,757 | 180,525 | 556,282 | 119,147 | 61,379 | 494,904 |
| 28 | Napa | 105,000 | - | 105,000 | - | - | 105,000 |
| 29 | Nevada | 327,593 | - | 327,593 | - | - | 327,593 |
| 30 | Orange | 2,299,118 | 66,155 | 2,365,273 | 43,662 | 22,493 | 2,342,780 |
| 31 | Placer | 343,600 | 5,151 | 348,751 | 3,400 | 1,751 | 347,000 |
| 32 | Plumas | 95,777 | 18,163 | 113,940 | 11,988 | 6,175 | 107,765 |
| 33 | Riverside | 1,005,357 | 569,001 | 1,574,358 | 375,541 | 193,460 | 1,380,898 |
| 34 | Sacramento | 1,044,502 | 500,000 | 1,544,502 | 330,000 | 170,000 | 1,374,502 |
| 35 | San Benito | 135,384 | 30,000 | 165,384 | 19,800 | 10,200 | 155,184 |
| 36 | San Bernardino | 2,569,836 | 1,393,318 | 3,963,154 | 919,590 | 473,728 | 3,489,426 |
| 37 | San Diego | 1,791,621 | 1,002,066 | 2,793,687 | 661,364 | 340,702 | 2,452,985 |
| 38 | San Francisco | 902,452 | 441,796 | 1,344,248 | 291,585 | 150,211 | 1,194,037 |
| 39 | San Joaquin | 685,004 | 50,000 | 735,004 | 33,000 | 17,000 | 718,004 |
| 40 | San Luis Obispo | 230,689 | 145,000 | 375,689 | 95,700 | 49,300 | 326,389 |
| 41 | San Mateo | 389,666 | 239,077 | 628,743 | 157,791 | 81,286 | 547,457 |
| 42 | Santa Barbara | 478,689 | 243,496 | 722,185 | 160,707 | 82,789 | 639,396 |
| 43 | Santa Clara | 1,773,701 | 739,480 | 2,513,181 | 488,057 | 251,423 | 2,261,758 |
| 44 | Santa Cruz | 195,056 | 18,655 | 213,711 | 12,312 | 6,343 | 207,368 |
| 45 | Shasta | 416,675 | 205,874 | 622,549 | 135,877 | 69,997 | 552,552 |
| 46 | Sierra/ Nevada |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| 47 | Siskiyou | 130,350 | - | 130,350 | - | - | 130,350 |
| 48 | Solano | 515,817 | 95,481 | 611,298 | 63,017 | 32,464 | 578,834 |
| 49 | Sonoma | 498,798 | 199,559 | 698,357 | 131,709 | 67,850 | 630,507 |
| 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 | 558,311 | 68,732 | 627,043 | 45,363 | 23,369 | 603,674 |
| 55 | Tuolumne | 158,566 | 78,346 | 236,912 | 51,708 | 26,638 | 210,274 |
| 56 | Ventura | 575,604 | 425,000 | 1,000,604 | 280,500 | 144,500 | 856,104 |
| 57 | Yolo | 190,192 | 33,000 | 223,192 | 21,780 | 11,220 | 211,972 |
| 58 | Yuba | 203,149 | 50,000 | 253,149 | 33,000 | 17,000 | 236,149 |
|  | TOTAL | 31,616,936 | 13,038,953 | 44,655,889 | 8,605,709 | 4,433,244 | 40,222,645 |

CSC Base Funds
CSC Federal Drawdown
Total Funding Available
31,616,936
13,038,953
44,655,889

| Attachment D |  | Family Law Facilitator Program Allocation, FY 2018-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | A | B | C | D | E | F |
| \# | Court | Recommended Base Funding Allocation | Recommended Federal Drawdown Option Allocation | Total Allocation ( $\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Federal Share } \\ 66 \% \\ \text { (Column B * } \\ .66 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Court Share } \\ 34 \% \\ \text { (Column B * } \\ .34 \text { ) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Contract Amount (A + D) |
| 1 | Alameda | 362,939 | $176,319$ | 539,258 | 116,370 | 59,948 | 479,309 |
| 2 | Alpine |  |  |  | 3,103 |  | - |
| 3 | Amador | 46,885 | 4,701 | 51,586 |  | 1,598 | 49,988 |
| 4 | Butte | 101,754 | 47,433 | 149,187 | 31,306 | 16,127 | 133,060 |
| 5 | Calaveras | 70,655 | 8,000 | 78,655 | 5,280 | 2,720 | 75,935 |
| 6 | Colusa | 35,600 | 8,900 | 44,500 | 5,874 | 3,026 | 41,474 |
| 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 | 106,037 | 50,384 | 156,421 | 33,253 | 17,131 | 139,290 |
| 10 | Fresno | 394,558 | 186,596 | 581,154 | 123,153 | 63,443 | 517,711 |
| 11 | Glenn | 75,808 | 35,172 | 110,980 | 23,214 | 11,958 | 99,022 |
| 12 | Humboldt | 89,185 | 9,774 | 98,959 | 6,451 | 3,323 | 95,636 |
| 13 | Imperial | 52,865 | 34,661 | 87,526 | 22,876 | 11,785 | 75,741 |
| 14 | Inyo | 57,185 | 27,171 | 84,356 | 17,933 | 9,238 | 75,118 |
| 15 | Kern | 355,141 | 200,000 | 555,141 | 132,000 | 68,000 | 487,141 |
| 16 | Kings | 58,493 | 26,904 | 85,397 | 17,757 | 9,147 | 76,250 |
| 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 | 1,890,029 | 803,431 | 2,693,461 | 530,264 | 273,167 | 2,420,293 |
| 20 | Madera | 80,794 | 25,383 | 106,177 | 16,753 | 8,630 | 97,547 |
| 21 | Marin | 136,581 | - | 136,581 |  |  | 136,581 |
| 22 | Mariposa | 45,390 | - | 45,390 |  |  | 45,390 |
| 23 | Mendocino | 60,462 | 29,290 | 89,752 | 19,331 | 9,959 | 79,793 |
| 24 | Merced | 98,847 | 46,536 | 145,383 | 30,714 | 15,822 | 129,561 |
| 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 | 120,688 | 57,179 | 177,867 | 37,738 | 19,441 | 158,426 |
| 28 | Napa | 61,820 | 29,290 | 91,110 | 19,331 | 9,959 | 81,151 |
| 29 | Nevada | 116,010 | - | 116,010 |  |  | 116,010 |
| 30 | Orange | 537,209 | 66,935 | 604,144 | 44,177 | 22,758 | 581,386 |
| 31 | Placer | 89,626 | - | 89,626 | - |  | 89,626 |
| 32 | Plumas | 55,827 | 7,803 | 63,630 | 5,150 | 2,653 | 60,977 |
| 33 | Riverside | 665,441 | 356,279 | 1,021,720 | 235,144 | 121,135 | 900,585 |
| 34 | Sacramento | 309,597 | 202,993 | 512,590 | 133,975 | 69,018 | 443,572 |
| 35 | San Benito | 60,289 | 29,151 | 89,440 | 19,240 | 9,911 | 79,529 |
| 36 | San Bernardino | 459,342 | 305,595 | 764,936 | 201,693 | 103,902 | 661,035 |
| 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 | 32,246 | 99,256 | 21,282 | 10,964 | 88,292 |
| 41 | San Mateo | 126,800 | 86,812 | 213,612 | 57,296 | 29,516 | 184,096 |
| 42 | Santa Barbara | 170,705 | 77,323 | 248,028 | 51,033 | 26,290 | 221,738 |
| 43 | Santa Clara | 445,545 | 210,712 | 656,257 | 139,070 | 71,642 | 584,615 |
| 44 | Santa Cruz | 74,335 | - | 74,335 | - | - | 74,335 |
| 45 | Shasta | 185,447 | 111,913 | 297,360 | 73,863 | 38,050 | 259,310 |
| 46 | Sierra | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 47 | Siskiyou | 74,650 | 30,000 | 104,650 | 19,800 | 10,200 | 94,450 |
| 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 | 181,384 |
| 50 | Stanislaus | 219,062 | 102,115 | 321,177 | 67,396 | 34,719 | 286,458 |
| 51 | Sutter | 66,292 | 31,409 | 97,701 | 20,730 | 10,679 | 87,022 |
| 52 | Tehama | 27,294 | 3,535 | 30,829 | 2,333 | 1,202 | 29,627 |
| 53 | Trinity | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 54 | Tulare | 307,882 | 132,293 | 440,175 | 87,313 | 44,980 | 395,195 |
| 55 | Tuolumne | 64,534 | 30,084 | 94,618 | 19,855 | 10,229 | 84,389 |
| 56 | Ventura | 252,718 | 168,612 | 421,330 | 111,284 | 57,328 | 364,002 |
| 57 | Yolo | 76,604 | 35,377 | 111,981 | 23,349 | 12,028 | 99,953 |
| 58 | Yuba | 65,856 | 42,000 | 107,856 | 27,720 | 14,280 | 93,576 |
|  | TOTAL | 10,789,626 | 4,449,685 | 15,239,311 | 2,936,792 | 1,512,892 | 13,726,418 |


| FLF Base Funds | $10,789,626$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| FLF Federal Drawdown | $4,449,685$ |
| Total Funding Available | $15,239,311$ |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ 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."

