

The background of the slide features a large, faint, circular seal of the Judicial Council of California. The seal contains a central figure holding a scale and a sword, surrounded by the text "JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA" and the year "1926".

Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Reallocation

Recommendations of the Trial
Court Budget Advisory
Committee

April 17, 2015

Background

- Included in trial court funding
1997
- Court allocations based on
historical funding



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

Background

- In 2007 Judicial Council approved a workload model based on caseload standard of 188 cases per 1 attorney & .5 investigator
 - Court historical base funding is not based on the workload model
 - \$103.7 million allocation statewide
 - \$137.1 million required to fund caseload standard



Dependency Counsel Funding

Statewide Implementation Costs			
Court	Workload Model	FY 2014-2015 Historical Base Funding Level	Base/Model
Alameda	\$3,450,970.68	\$4,171,032.46	120.9%
Alpine*	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Amador	\$85,336.77	\$120,146.93	140.8%
Butte	\$833,636.96	\$664,759.00	79.7%
Calaveras	\$226,026.98	\$76,519.00	33.9%
Colusa†	\$50,569.89	\$0.00	0.0%
Contra Costa	\$2,716,647.74	\$3,120,151.00	114.9%
Del Norte	\$168,566.70	\$223,089.81	132.3%
El Dorado	\$614,078.75	\$819,764.99	133.5%
Fresno	\$2,937,650.85	\$2,958,296.00	100.7%
Glenn	\$166,060.64	\$55,250.00	33.3%
Humboldt	\$458,193.85	\$562,460.00	122.8%
Imperial	\$545,032.34	\$607,371.00	111.4%
Inyo	\$34,019.37	\$76,990.00	226.3%
Kern	\$3,108,447.52	\$2,023,943.00	65.1%
Kings	\$686,524.56	\$199,672.35	29.1%
Lake	\$239,288.90	\$307,076.27	128.3%
Lassen	\$115,953.18	\$108,374.00	93.5%
Los Angeles	\$57,151,311.87	\$32,782,704.00	57.4%
Madera	\$586,978.22	\$53,030.50	9.0%
Marin	\$247,454.02	\$408,418.72	165.0%
Mariposa	\$51,591.50	\$32,243.00	62.5%
Mendocino	\$518,939.79	\$742,022.00	143.0%
Merced	\$1,064,521.71	\$593,861.37	55.8%
Modoc	\$20,432.28	\$16,064.00	78.6%



TCBAC

- Formed work group in 2014 to examine court-appointed counsel funding allocation methodology
- Work group did not review the underlying workload model



TCBAC recommendations

1. Approve a process to allocate court-appointed counsel funding based on workload model



JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF CALIFORNIA

TCBAC recommendations

2. Phase-in new allocation with increases/decreases over 4 years:

-- FY 15-16: 10% workload-based and 90% historical base

-- FY 16-17: 40% workload/60% base

-- FY 17-18: 80% workload/20% base

-- FY 18-19: 100% workload



TCBAC recommendations

3. Continue to reallocate unspent funding based on workload model
4. Allocate any NEW funding based on workload model to courts below statewide funding average (e.g., 76% in FY 15-16)



TCBAC recommendations

5. Develop process to allow courts to seek reimbursement for unexpected costs of complex trials
6. Provide allocation to Colusa Superior Court



TCBAC recommendations

7. Form subcommittee with Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and TCBAC to examine and if necessary recommend revisions to the workload model; in time for changes to be considered by the Judicial Council in April, 2016 for FY 2016-2017 implementation

