

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688 www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No. 20-087 For business meeting on May 15, 2020

Title

Juvenile Law: 2019–20 Allocations for Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program and Court-Appointed Counsel Expected Unspent Funding

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected None

Recommended by

Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Jonathan B. Conklin, Chair Agenda Item Type Action Required

Effective Date May 15, 2020

Date of Report April 22, 2020

Contact

Penny Davis, 415-865-8815 <u>penny.davis@jud.ca.gov</u> Michele Allan, 916-263-1374 <u>michele.allan@jud.ca.gov</u>

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends two redistributions of funding for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel for fiscal year 2019–20. 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 fiscal year 2018–19 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 May 15, 2020:

- 1. Allocate fiscal year 2018–19 Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program funds of \$455,346 (Attachment A); and
- 2. Allocate fiscal year 2019–20 trial court allocations of \$1,081,225 in estimated unspent funding (Attachment B).

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) guidelines¹ that 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 Judicial 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 Judicial 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 reallocation process to bring all courts to an equivalent percentage of workload met by available statewide funding.

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

² Judicial Council of Cal., Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program (Oct. 26, 2012), <u>www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-itemA20.pdf</u>.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., Juvenile Dependency: Counsel Collections Program Guidelines (Aug. 23, 2013), <u>www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemF.pdf</u>.

⁴ Judicial Council of Cal., *Trial Court Allocations: Criminal Justice Realignment, Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel, and Workers' Compensation Liabilities* (Feb. 20, 2014), <u>www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-itemJ.pdf</u>.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Reallocation (Apr. 17, 2015), <u>www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150417-itemI.pdf</u>.

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 2016.⁶ The current base allocation for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$156.7 million—less than the estimated need.

In fiscal year (FY) 2018–19, the trial courts remitted a total of \$455,346, 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 2019–20 and beyond. The statute requires the Judicial 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.⁷ 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 2019–20 allocations were identified and contacted. Of those courts, six confirmed that they would not expend the full allocation and provided an estimate of unspent funding. Attachment B shows the total estimate—\$1,081,225—and reallocation. Under the reallocation methodology adopted at the April 17, 2015, Judicial Council meeting, funds are reallocated proportionally by workload to courts that both did not remit unspent funds and had unmet need.

To ensure use of the reallocation funds, an additional survey to trial courts was necessary to confirm the court's ability to completely expend during the fiscal year. Of the fifteen non-DRAFT courts eligible for additional funds, five declined the additional funding. 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 DRAFT courts. This practice of an additional survey on the use of funds began in FY 2018–19. In the review of courts receiving reallocation funds in FY 2018–19, 19 percent of the courts did not use the funds. On an annual basis approximately 2 percent of court-appointed counsel funds

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology (Apr. 15, 2016), <u>https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF</u>.

⁷ 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.

are unspent at the end of the fiscal year. Many courts declined reallocation because they would be unable to amend contracts with dependency attorneys so late in the fiscal year.

Policy implications

The reallocation process was established to support courts in need of additional dependency counsel funds, when available. Failure to reallocate funds designated as surplus would result in an inappropriate use of funds.

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.

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, 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, meeting, 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 2019–20 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

Attachments and Links

- 1. Attachment A: Recommended FY 2019–20 trial court allocations of \$455,346 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program funds
- 2. Attachment B: Recommended FY 2019–20 trial court allocations of \$1,081,225 in estimated unspent funding

Recommended FY 2018-2019 Trial Court Allocations of \$455,346 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

	Estimated Funding	Estimated Funding	Allocation of Court	Allocation as a	Eligible for	Funding Need of	Need as a %	Recommended	Trial Court	Trial Court	Undistributed
	Need (JC Report - September 2019)	Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2019-20		JDCCP Funding ¹	Eligible Courts	of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Allocation of 2018-19 JDCCP Collections	Allocations Through 2018-19	Distributions Through December 2019	Trial Court Allocations Through December 2019
		(Col. A Total)		(Col. C Total)		(Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	(Col. F Total)	(Col. G x \$701,593)		2013	
Court	Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. H	Col. I	Col. J	Col. K
Alameda	\$4,723,737.46	2.33%	\$3,629,342.41	2.32%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Alpine*	7,123.85	0.00%	7,225.82	0.00%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Amador	186,175.82	0.09%	145,652.86	0.09%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Butte	1,206,465.13	0.60%	926,951.40	0.59%	Y	1,206,465.13	0.99%	4,509.92	43,563.97	-	43,563.97
Calaveras	221,948.76	0.11%	203,567.35	0.13%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	5,737.02	-	5,737.02
Colusa ⁺	98,882.66	0.05%	103,517.14	0.07%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	293.14	-	293.14
Contra Costa	3,407,137.85	1.68%	2,617,772.47	1.67%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	164,513.50	0.08%	214,730.47	0.14%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	753,181.08	0.37%	582,745.73	0.37%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Fresno	4,177,783.81	2.06%	3,209,875.25	2.05%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Glenn	117,004.81	0.06%	140,011.25	0.09%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	5,261.47	5,261.00	0.47
Humboldt	794,956.57	0.39%	615,067.96	0.39%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Imperial	840,690.14	0.42%	645,919.13	0.41%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Inyo	39,521.25	0.02%	48,006.37	0.03%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Kern	3,727,882.17	1.84%	2,864,206.78	1.83%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	142,792.33	142,792.00	0.33
Kings	899,955.86	0.44%	696,307.24	0.44%	Y	899,955.86	0.74%	3,364.15	47,113.60	47,114.00	(0.40)
Lake	217,934.42	0.11%	285,152.76	0.18%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Lassen	129,763.71	0.06%	128,824.94	0.08%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	96,137,541.83	47.50%	73,864,405.11	47.14%	Y	96,137,541.83	78.92%	359,374.40	3,963,346.96	3,963,346.96	0.00
Madera	821,380.92	0.41%	674,047.00	0.43%	N	-	0.00%	-	16,068.83	16,069.00	(0.17)
Marin	270,557.01	0.13%	270,557.01	0.17%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	60,472.27	0.03%	54,019.00	0.03%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	1,817.86	-	1,817.86
Mendocino	551,549.65	0.27%	527,624.10	0.34%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Merced	1,074,140.55	0.53%	825,283.77	0.53%	N	-	0.00%	-	32,783.77	-	32,783.77
Modoc	35,026.47	0.02%	49,493.36	0.03%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mono	17,145.29	0.01%	14,550.05	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-	103.62	104.00	(0.38)
Monterey	1,079,432.15	0.53%	829,349.41	0.53%	N	-	0.00%	-	19,795.72	19,796.00	(0.28)
Napa	496,359.14	0.25%	384,039.35	0.25%	N	-	0.00%	-	9,391.29	-	9,391.29
Nevada	173,215.04	0.09%	173,215.04	0.11%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Orange	8,529,971.27	4.21%	6,553,748.32	4.18%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Placer	918,746.79	0.45%	710,846.02	0.45%	Y	918,746.79	0.75%	3,434.39	52,695.18	38,816.00	13,879.18
Plumas	113,941.95	0.06%	154,059.11	0.10%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Riverside	10,338,746.53	5.11%	7,999,218.98	5.10%	Y	10,338,746.53	8.49%	38,647.55	659,308.73	577,855.00	81,453.73
Sacramento	7,270,448.89	3.59%	5,586,031.97	3.56%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Benito	137,534.81	0.07%	107,039.53	0.07%	N	-	0.00%	-	10,297.56	4,345.00	5,952.56
San Bernardino	15,563,540.38	7.69%	11,957,780.80	7.63%	N	-	0.00%	-	242,055.83	2,641.00	239,414.83
San Diego	7,191,561.97	3.55%	5,525,421.56	3.53%	Y	7,191,561.97	5.90%	26,882.98	-	-	-
San Francisco	3,809,061.67	1.88%	2,926,578.62	1.87%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	3,565,588.53	1.76%	2,739,513.32	1.75%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	1,035,781.71	0.51%	795,811.90	0.51%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	1,281,340.04	0.63%	984,479.30	0.63%	Y	1,281,340.04	1.05%	4,789.81	66,673.49	29,275.00	37,398.49
Santa Barbara	1,126,402.76	0.56%	865,437.88	0.55%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	4,282,961.97	2.12%	3,290,685.74	2.10%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-

Recommended FY 2018-2019 Trial Court Allocations of \$455,346 in Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program Funds

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - September 2019)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2019-20	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in 2019-20	Eligible for JDCCP Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended Allocation of 2018-19 JDCCP Collections	Trial Court Allocations Through 2018-19	Trial Court Distributions Through December 2019	Undistributed Trial Court Allocations Through December 2019
		(Col. A Total)		(Col. C Total)		(Col. A when Col. E equals "Y")	(Col. F Total)	(Col. G x \$701,593)			
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	800,365.36	0.40%	619,252.81	0.40%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Shasta	899,178.55	0.44%	690,856.95	0.44%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	38,437.50	38,437.00	0.50
Sierra	-	0.00%	5,045.27	0.00%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	- 1
Siskiyou	182,532.54	0.09%	245,373.43	0.16%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	- 1
Solano	1,145,682.88	0.57%	880,251.18	0.56%	Y	1,145,682.88	0.94%	4,282.71	-	-	
Sonoma	1,643,005.07	0.81%	1,262,353.81	0.81%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	
Stanislaus	1,853,850.25	0.92%	1,424,350.40	0.91%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	-	-	
Sutter	449,761.68	0.22%	353,444.35	0.23%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	15,457.03	-	15,457.03
Tehama	399,797.45	0.20%	392,840.24	0.25%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	16,222.19	-	16,222.19
Trinity	80,412.97	0.04%	93,829.12	0.06%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	1,996.54	-	1,996.54
Tulare	2,691,210.97	1.33%	2,067,711.47	1.32%	Y	2,691,210.97	2.21%	10,060.09	108,515.68	79,682.00	28,833.68
Tuolumne	198,550.82	0.10%	187,463.22	0.12%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	7,054.13	-	7,054.13
Ventura	2,625,232.42	1.30%	2,017,018.82	1.29%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	110,204.12	110,204.00	0.12
Yolo	1,330,162.53	0.66%	1,021,990.60	0.65%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	17,813.12	17,813.00	0.12
Yuba	503,871.27	0.25%	410,104.78	0.26%	Ν	-	0.00%	-	16,197.74	-	16,197.74
Unallocated	\$0.00		100,000.00			-		-			l
Total	\$202,400,723.26		\$156,700,000.00			\$121,811,252.01	100.00%	\$455,346.00	5,650,998.43	\$5,093,550.96	\$557,447.47
Reserved for admin								246,247.00			
Distribution amount	available to courts							455,346.00			
Total collected								701,593.00			
1. A court is eligible	for an allocation if the c d criteria. Courts that me							,	a court's eligibili	ty to receive an a	llocatic

Attachment B Second Run

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - Sept. 2019)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2019-20	Percentage of Total CAC Base	Est. Unspent Funding 2019- 20	Eligible for Reallocated Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	S Recommended 2019-20 Reallocation
		(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
Alameda	\$4,723,737	2.33%	\$3,629,342	2.32%	0	Y	4,723,737.46	2.64%	28,594.25
Alpine*	\$7,124	0.00%	\$7,226	0.00%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Amador	\$186,176	0.09%	\$145,653	0.09%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Butte	\$1,206,465	0.60%	\$926,951	0.59%		N	-	0.00%	-
Calaveras	\$221,949	0.11%	\$203,567	0.13%	15,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Colusa†	\$98,883	0.05%	\$103,517	0.07%	50,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Contra Costa	\$3,407,138	1.68%	\$2,617,772	1.67%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Del Norte	\$164,514	0.08%	\$214,730	0.14%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
El Dorado	\$753,181	0.37%	\$582,746	0.37%	0	Y	753,181.08	0.42%	4,559.24
Fresno	\$4,177,784	2.06%	\$3,209,875	2.05%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Glenn	\$117,005	0.06%	\$140,011	0.09%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Humboldt	\$794,957	0.39%	\$615,068	0.39%	<u>^</u>	Y	794,956.57	0.45%	4,812.12
Imperial	\$840,690	0.42%	\$645,919	0.41%	0	Y	840,690.14	0.47%	5,088.96
Inyo	\$39,521	0.02%	\$48,006	0.03%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Kern	\$3,727,882	1.84%	\$2,864,207	1.83%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Kings	\$899,956	0.44%	\$696,307	0.44%	130,000	N	-	0.00%	-
Lake	\$217,934	0.11%	\$285,153	0.18%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Lassen	\$129,764	0.06%	\$128,825	0.08%	0	N Y	-	0.00%	581,950,42
Los Angeles	\$96,137,542	47.50%	\$73,864,405	47.14%	0		96,137,541.83	53.82% 0.00%	581,950.42
Madera	\$821,381	0.41%	\$674,047 \$270,557	0.43%	0	N N	-	0.00%	-
Marin Mariposa	\$270,557 \$60,472	0.13%	\$270,557 \$54,019	0.17%	0	N N	-	0.00%	-
Mariposa Mendocino	\$551,550	0.03%	\$54,019	0.03%	0	N N	-	0.00%	
Merced	\$1,074,141	0.27%	\$327,624	0.53%	0	Y	1,074,140.55	0.60%	6,502.11
Modoc	\$1,074,141	0.02%	\$49,493	0.03%	0	N	1,074,140.33	0.00%	0,502.11
Mono	\$17,145	0.02%	\$14,550	0.03%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Monterey	\$1,079,432	0.53%	\$829,349	0.53%	280,000	N	-	0.00%	
Napa	\$496,359	0.25%	\$384,039	0.25%	100,000	N		0.00%	
Nevada	\$173,215	0.09%	\$173,215	0.11%	0	N		0.00%	
Orange	\$8,529,971	4.21%	\$6,553,748	4.18%	0	Y	8,529,971.27	4.78%	51,634.57
Placer	\$918,747	0.45%	\$710.846	0.45%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Plumas	\$113,942	0.06%	\$154,059	0.10%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
Riverside	\$10,338,747	5.11%	\$7,999,219	5.10%	0	Y	10,338,746.53	5.79%	62,583.65
Sacramento	\$7,270,449	3.59%	\$5,586,032	3.56%	0	Y	7,270,448.89	4.07%	44,010.29
San Benito	\$137,535	0.07%	\$107.040	0.07%	0	N	-	0.00%	-
San Bernardino	\$15,563,540	7.69%	\$11,957,781	7.63%	0	Y	15,563,540.38	8.71%	94,210.95
San Diego	\$7,191,562	3.55%	\$5,525,422	3.53%	0	Y	7,191,561.97	4.03%	43,532.76
San Francisco	\$3,809,062	1.88%	\$2,926,579	1.87%	0	Y	3,809,061.67	2.13%	23,057.43
San Joaquin	\$3,565,589	1.76%	\$2,739,513	1.75%	0	Y	3,565,588.53	2.00%	21,583.62
San Luis Obispo	\$1,035,782	0.51%	\$795,812	0.51%	0	Y	1,035,781.71	0.58%	6,269.91
San Mateo	\$1,281,340	0.63%	\$984,479	0.63%	0	Y	1,281,340.04	0.72%	7,756.35
Santa Barbara	\$1,126,403	0.56%	\$865,438	0.55%	0	Y	1,126,402.76	0.63%	6,818.47
Santa Clara	\$4,282,962	2.12%	\$3,290,686	2.10%	0	Y	4,282,961.97	2.40%	25,926.10

Recommended FY 2019-2020 Trial Court Allocations of \$1,081,225 in Unspent Funding

Attachment B Second Run

	Estimated Funding Need (JC Report - Sept. 2019)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need	Allocation of Court Appointed Counsel (CAC) Base Funding in 2019-20	Percentage of Total CAC Base	Est. Unspent Funding 2019- 20	Eligible for Reallocated Funding ¹	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts	Recommended 2019-20 Reallocation
		(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
Santa Cruz	\$800,365	0.40%	\$619,253	0.40%	0	Y	800,365.36	0.45%	4,844.86
Shasta	\$899,179	0.44%	\$690,857	0.44%	0	Y	899,178.55	0.50%	5,443.01
Sierra	\$0	0.00%	\$5,045	0.00%	0	Ν	-	0.00%	-
Siskiyou	\$182,533		\$245,373	0.16%	0	Ν	-	0.00%	-
Solano	\$1,145,683	0.57%	\$880,251	0.56%	0	Y	1,145,682.88	0.64%	6,935.17
Sonoma	\$1,643,005	0.81%	\$1,262,354	0.81%	0	Y	1,643,005.07	0.92%	9,945.62
Stanislaus	\$1,853,850	0.92%	\$1,424,350	0.91%	0	Y	1,853,850.25	1.04%	11,221.93
Sutter	\$449,762	0.22%	\$353,444	0.23%	0	Ν	-	0.00%	-
Tehama	\$399,797	0.20%	\$392,840	0.25%	0	Ν	-	0.00%	-
Trinity	\$80,413	0.04%	\$93,829	0.06%	0	Ν	-	0.00%	-
Tulare	\$2,691,211	1.33%	\$2,067,711	1.32%	506,225	Ν	-	0.00%	-
Tuolumne	\$198,551	0.10%	\$187,463	0.12%	0	Ν	-	0.00%	-
Ventura	\$2,625,232	1.30%	\$2,017,019	1.29%	0	Y	2,625,232.42	1.47%	15,891.35
Yolo	\$1,330,163	0.66%	\$1,021,991	0.65%	0	Y	1,330,162.53	0.74%	8,051.89
Yuba	\$503,871	0.25%	\$410,105	0.26%	0	Ν	-	0.00%	-
Unallocated	\$0		\$100,000				-		-
Total	\$202,400,723		\$156,700,000		\$1,081,225.00		\$178,617,130.44	100.00%	\$1,081,225.00
Total Returned									
									\$1,081,225.00