



## 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

For business meeting on: October 28, 2014

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Juvenile Dependency: Proposed Allocation for Fiscal Year 2014–2015 for Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
N/A	October 28, 2014
Recommended by	Date of Report
Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee Hon. Laurie M. Earl, Judge of the Superior Court of Sacramento County, and Cochair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	October 8, 2014
	Contact
	Don Will, 415-865-7557 <a href="mailto:don.will@jud.ca.gov">don.will@jud.ca.gov</a>
	Steven Chang, 415-865-7195 <a href="mailto:steven.chang@jud.ca.gov">steven.chang@jud.ca.gov</a>
Zlatko Theodorovic, Director and Chief Financial Officer, Judicial Council Finance, and Cochair of the Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee	

---

### Executive Summary

The Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) is a program under which 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 Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends that the council allocate \$525,139 remitted through the JDCCP in fiscal year 2013–2014 to the trial courts, according to the methodology adopted by the council at its August 23, 2013 meeting.

## Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective October 27, 2014:

1. Allocate \$525,139 remitted through the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program (JDCCP) in fiscal year (FY) 2013–2014 to the trial courts as outlined in Attachment A.
2. If the recommended JDCCP funding allocation in Attachment A receives the council’s approval, the TCBAC recommends that the council direct staff to notify courts regarding the remaining balance of JDCCP funding allocated in FY 2013–2014, and the amount of any new allocations in FY 2014–2015. As is the case for funding allocated in 2013–2014, any portion of a court’s allocated funds not distributed in FY 2014–2015 should be carried forward for distribution to the court in FY 2015–2016 and subsequent years.

The recommended allocation outlined in Attachment A has been determined using the methodology approved by the council at its August 23, 2013 meeting.<sup>1</sup>

## Previous Council Action

At its October 26, 2012 meeting, the Judicial Council adopted the JDCCP Guidelines<sup>2</sup>, which fulfilled the council’s legislative mandate to “establish a program to collect reimbursements from the person liable for the costs of counsel appointed to represent parents or minors pursuant to Welfare & Institutions Code section 903.1 in dependency proceedings.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 903.47(a).)<sup>3</sup> As required by statute, the Guidelines include a statewide standard for determining an obligated person’s ability to pay reimbursement as well as policies and procedures to allow courts to recover costs associated with implementing the program.

At its August 23, 2013 meeting, the council adopted amendments to the Guidelines by adding current section 14, which addressed the outstanding issue of how the Judicial Council could equitably allocate the funds remitted through the JDCCP among the trial courts in compliance with the statutory mandate that the funds be used to reduce court-appointed attorney caseloads. Section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines describes the allocation methodology, which considers each court’s participation in the program and each court’s percentage of the statewide court-appointed counsel funding need.

The council then allocated funds remitted through the JDCCP for the first time since the JDCCP’s inception at the February 20, 2014 Judicial Council meeting.<sup>4</sup> At this meeting, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Report to the Judicial Council, August 23, 2013, <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20130823-itemF.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The Guidelines took effect January 1, 2013, and are published as Appendix F of the California Rules of Court. [http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/appendix\\_f.pdf](http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/appendix_f.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> Report to the Judicial Council. October 26, 2012, <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20121026-itemA20.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> Report to the Judicial Council, February 20, 2014, <http://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20140220-itemJ.pdf>.

council approved an allocation of \$2.3 million to eligible trial courts using the methodology in section 14 of the JDCCP guidelines. This allocation represented funds collected from January 2010 through June 30, 2013. Any portion of a court's allocated funds not spent and distributed in FY 2013–2014 has been carried forward for distribution to the court in FY 2014–2015 and subsequent years, even if a court is not eligible for an allocation in the current fiscal year.

### **Rationale for Recommendation**

The estimates of courts' funding needs are computed using the Caseload Funding Model (CFM) approved by the council in 2007 and 2008.<sup>5</sup> The CFM estimates that the total funding required to enable each full-time equivalent, appointed dependency attorney to represent no more than 188 clients at a given time—the maximum caseload permissible to ensure the adequate and competent representation required by statute—is higher than the current state allocation. The current base allocation for court-appointed dependency counsel is \$103.7 million, less than the estimated need. Multiple Budget Change Proposals to request funding for this shortfall have been submitted to the Department of Finance for consideration to be funded in FY 2014–2015, but none have proven successful.

In FY 2013–2014, the trial courts have remitted a cumulative \$525,139, excluding administrative costs and monies recovered to offset their cost of collections, through the JDCCP to the TCTF. These funds are part of the overall TCTF fund balance available for use in 2014–2015 and beyond. Statute requires the Judicial Council to allocate the monies remitted through the JDCCP 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>6</sup> 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.

### **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

None.

---

<sup>5</sup> The CFM uses data collected in the 2002 Caseload Study to calculate the amount of time a court-appointed attorney would spend working on each stage of a juvenile dependency case. Because the basic elements of a dependency case remain the same as they were in 2002, the constants in the CFM remain valid indicators of attorney workload per case. The variable inputs in the CFM—total clients and attorney salaries—are updated periodically to reflect changing conditions.

<sup>6</sup> As described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines, a court has demonstrated 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.

## **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

None.

## **Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives**

The JDCCP aligns with Goal II established by the Judicial Council. Goal II specifies that “[t]he judiciary must maintain its status as an independent, separate, and equal branch of government... The judiciary will unify in its advocacy for resources and policies that support and protect independent and impartial judicial decisionmaking in accordance with the State Constitution and the law. The branch will maintain the highest standards of accountability for its use of public resources and adherence to its statutory and constitutional mandates.” The courts’ collective efforts to implement the JDCCP—and the funds allocated from their collections efforts—demonstrate the branch’s adherence to statutory and constitutional mandates, as well as highlight the judiciary’s unity in advocating for much needed resources.

## **Attachments**

1. Attachment A: Recommended Allocation per Court of \$525,139 in Collections Generated by the Juvenile Dependency Counsel Collections Program

Funding Analysis											
Court	Estimated Funding Need per Caseload Funding Model (CFM)	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total)	Allocation of CAC Base Funding in FY 13-14	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in FY 13-14 (Col. C Total)	Eligible for JDCCP Funding <sup>1</sup>	Funding Need of Eligible Courts	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total)	Recommended Allocation of FY 14-15 JDCCP Collections \$525,139	Allocated to Courts in FY 13-14 \$2,314,999.97	FY 13-14 Allocation Spent through 9/30/14	FY 13-14 Allocation Remaining
Col. A	Col. B	Col. C	Col. D	Col. E	Col. F	Col. G	Col. K	Col. L	Col. M	Col. N	
Alameda	\$3,450,970.68	2.52%	4,171,032.46	4.02%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Alpine*	\$0.00	0.00%	-	0.00%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Amador	\$85,336.77	0.06%	120,146.93	0.12%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Butte	\$833,636.96	0.61%	664,759.00	0.64%	N	-	0.00%	-	26,476.96	-	26,476.96
Calaveras	\$226,026.98	0.16%	76,519.00	0.07%	Y	226,026.98	0.25%	1,310.23	4,426.79	-	4,426.79
Colusa†	\$50,569.89	0.04%	-	0.00%	Y	50,569.89	0.06%	293.14	-	-	-
Contra Costa	\$2,716,647.74	1.98%	3,120,151.00	3.01%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	\$168,566.70	0.12%	223,089.81	0.22%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
El Dorado	\$614,078.75	0.45%	819,764.99	0.79%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Fresno	\$2,937,650.85	2.14%	2,958,296.00	2.85%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Glenn	\$166,060.64	0.12%	55,250.00	0.05%	Y	166,060.64	0.18%	962.62	4,298.85	-	4,298.85
Humboldt	\$458,193.85	0.33%	562,460.00	0.54%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Imperial	\$545,032.34	0.40%	607,371.00	0.59%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Inyo	\$34,019.37	0.02%	76,990.00	0.07%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Kern	\$3,108,447.52	2.27%	2,023,943.00	1.95%	Y	3,108,447.52	3.43%	18,019.00	93,064.91	93,065.00	(0.09)
Kings	\$686,524.56	0.50%	199,672.35	0.19%	Y	686,524.56	0.76%	3,979.64	16,004.05	16,004.00	0.05
Lake	\$239,288.90	0.17%	307,076.27	0.30%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Lassen	\$115,953.18	0.08%	108,374.00	0.10%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Los Angeles	\$57,151,311.87	41.69%	32,782,704.00	31.61%	Y	57,151,311.87	63.09%	331,293.87	1,448,983.18	1,448,983.18	-
Madera	\$586,978.22	0.43%	53,030.50	0.05%	Y	586,978.22	0.65%	3,402.59	12,666.24	-	12,666.24
Marin	\$247,454.02	0.18%	408,418.72	0.39%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mariposa	\$51,591.50	0.04%	32,243.00	0.03%	Y	51,591.50	0.06%	299.06	1,518.80	-	1,518.80
Mendocino	\$518,939.79	0.38%	742,022.00	0.72%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Merced	\$1,064,521.71	0.78%	593,861.37	0.57%	Y	1,064,521.71	1.18%	6,170.80	26,612.97	-	26,612.97
Modoc	\$20,432.28	0.01%	16,064.00	0.02%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Mono	\$17,874.58	0.01%	12,329.00	0.01%	Y	17,874.58	0.02%	103.62	-	-	-
Monterey	\$667,373.42	0.49%	329,570.00	0.32%	Y	667,373.42	0.74%	3,868.62	15,927.10	15,927.00	0.10
Napa	\$294,546.52	0.21%	176,430.00	0.17%	Y	294,546.52	0.33%	1,707.42	7,683.87	-	7,683.87
Nevada	\$202,963.00	0.15%	232,799.00	0.22%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Orange	\$6,056,115.22	4.42%	6,583,082.00	6.35%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Placer	\$743,663.62	0.54%	418,422.00	0.40%	Y	743,663.62	0.82%	4,310.86	17,634.62	-	17,634.62
Plumas	\$82,240.12	0.06%	163,290.96	0.16%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Riverside	\$10,235,491.48	7.47%	4,171,897.50	4.02%	Y	10,235,491.48	11.30%	59,332.94	268,169.93	-	268,169.93
Sacramento	\$4,443,854.42	3.24%	5,378,189.72	5.19%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Benito	\$209,882.19	0.15%	31,884.50	0.03%	Y	209,882.19	0.23%	1,216.64	5,117.67	-	5,117.67
San Bernardino	\$7,983,595.68	5.82%	3,587,297.00	3.46%	Y	7,983,595.68	8.81%	46,279.19	195,776.64	-	195,776.64
San Diego	\$7,678,774.64	5.60%	9,749,950.36	9.40%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Francisco	\$2,951,118.03	2.15%	3,907,633.00	3.77%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	\$2,542,228.38	1.85%	3,081,900.92	2.97%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Luis Obispo	\$781,869.29	0.57%	707,000.04	0.68%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	\$1,050,915.74	0.77%	323,021.73	0.31%	Y	1,050,915.74	1.16%	6,091.93	23,183.23	23,183.00	0.23
Santa Barbara	\$1,318,162.00	0.96%	1,610,017.00	1.55%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	\$3,340,629.23	2.44%	4,700,130.81	4.53%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-

Funding Analysis											
Court	Estimated Funding Need per Caseload Funding Model (CFM) Col. A	Estimated Funding Need as Percentage of Statewide Need (Col. A Total) Col. B	Allocation of CAC Base Funding in FY 13-14 Col. C	Allocation as a Percentage of Total CAC Base Funding in FY 13-14 (Col. C Total) Col. D	Eligible for JDCCP Funding <sup>1</sup> Col. E	Funding Need of Eligible Courts Col. F	Need as a % of Total Need of Eligible Courts (Col. F Total) Col. G	Recommended Allocation of FY 14-15 JDCCP Collections \$525,139 Col. K	Allocated to Courts in FY 13-14 \$2,314,999.97 Col. L	FY 13-14 Allocation Spent through 9/30/14 Col. M	FY 13-14 Allocation Remaining Col. N
Santa Cruz	\$703,196.64	0.51%	894,764.81	0.86%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Shasta	\$940,395.62	0.69%	569,416.00	0.55%	Y	940,395.62	1.04%	5,451.27	23,190.01	-	23,190.01
Sierra	\$3,575.65	0.00%	14,898.00	0.01%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Siskiyou	\$173,163.56	0.13%	256,552.00	0.25%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Solano	\$847,816.33	0.62%	896,319.14	0.86%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	\$1,274,378.06	0.93%	1,150,195.00	1.11%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Stanislaus	\$1,100,152.36	0.80%	1,130,985.52	1.09%	N	-	0.00%	-	-	-	-
Sutter	\$272,154.93	0.20%	84,082.75	0.08%	Y	272,154.93	0.30%	1,577.62	7,830.04	-	7,830.04
Tehama	\$313,635.48	0.23%	93,909.01	0.09%	Y	313,635.48	0.35%	1,818.08	8,546.07	-	8,546.07
Trinity	\$119,528.83	0.09%	83,204.00	0.08%	Y	119,528.83	0.13%	692.88	-	-	-
Tulare	\$1,598,825.80	1.17%	658,892.25	0.64%	Y	1,598,825.80	1.76%	9,268.05	40,032.80	-	40,032.80
Tuolumne	\$210,458.79	0.15%	63,980.75	0.06%	Y	210,458.79	0.23%	1,219.98	5,834.15	-	5,834.15
Ventura	\$2,010,744.36	1.47%	755,357.00	0.73%	Y	2,010,744.36	2.22%	11,655.85	47,486.89	47,160.36	326.53
Yolo	\$565,644.04	0.41%	333,430.00	0.32%	Y	565,644.04	0.62%	3,278.92	14,534.20	-	14,534.20
Yuba	\$264,659.14	0.19%	199,732.00	0.19%	Y	264,659.14	0.29%	1,534.17	-	-	-
Unallocated			651,641.31			-					
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$137,077,862.19</b>		<b>103,725,444.48</b>			<b>90,591,423.07</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>525,139.00</b>	<b>2,314,999.97</b>	<b>1,644,322.54</b>	<b>670,677.43</b>
Reserved for admin.								<b>260,000.00</b>	<b>351,896.00</b>		
Total collected								<b>785,139.00</b>	<b>2,666,895.97</b>		
		1. A court is eligible for an allocation if the court has met both the <i>Funding Need</i> and <i>Participation</i> requirements described in section 14 of the JDCCP Guidelines. This table indicates a court's eligibility to receive an allocation based on the <i>Funding Need</i> criteria. Courts that meet the <i>Funding Need</i> criteria must also meet the <i>Participation</i> requirements in order to receive an allocation.									