



JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

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

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Item No.: 22-121

For business meeting on: July 15, 2022

Title

Trial Court Budget: Fiscal Year 2022–23
Allocation of Court-Appointed Juvenile
Dependency Counsel 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

July 1, 2022

Date of Report

June 24, 2022

Contact

Audrey Fancy, 415-865-7706
audrey.fancy@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee recommends allocation of \$186.7 million for fiscal year 2022–23 from the ongoing Trial Court Trust Fund to the trial courts for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel, and two adjustments to the dependency counsel funding allocation methodology. The allocation may change based on final appropriations included in the signed 2022 Budget Act.

Recommendation

The Trial Court Budget Advisory Committee (TCBAC) recommends that the Judicial Council, effective July 1, 2022:

1. Amend the court-appointed dependency counsel funding allocation methodology as it relates to small court funding adjustments;
2. Clarify the court-appointed dependency counsel funding allocation methodology as it relates to the survey of entry-level county counsel; and

3. Allocate \$186.7¹ million for fiscal year 2022–23 to the trial courts for court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel costs based on the recommended amended methodology.

Relevant Previous Council Action

Court-appointed dependency counsel became a state fiscal responsibility in 1989 through the Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act (Sen. Bill 612/Assem. Bill 1197; Stats. 1988, ch. 945). The act added section 77003 to the Government Code, defined “court operations” in that section as including court-appointed dependency counsel, and made an appropriation to fund trial court operations. In 1997, the Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act (Assem. Bill 233; Stats. 1997, ch. 850) provided the funding for, and delineated the parameters of, the transition to state trial court funding that had been outlined in the earlier legislation.

In 2015, the council approved recommendations of the TCBCAC to reallocate funding for court-appointed dependency counsel among the trial courts based on a caseload funding model in an effort to provide a more equitable allocation of funding among the courts. Rather than using historical funding levels dating back to the adoption of state trial court funding, the new funding methodology is based on the caseload-based calculation of funding for each court provided by the workload model previously approved by the council in October 2007.²

Another recommendation approved by the council at this time was that a joint subcommittee of the TCBCAC and the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee be formed to review that workload model for possible updates and revisions. After a year of research and analysis, the methodology recommended by this joint subcommittee was approved by the council.³ The key factors used in this methodology are (for each court):

- A three-year rolling average of original dependency filings;
- A three-year rolling average of number of children in foster care⁴; and

¹ The Budget Act of 2022 augmented the annual court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel \$156.7 million budget in the amount of \$30 million, bringing the Court-Appointed Counsel allocation to \$186.7 million. The allocation may change based on final appropriations included in the signed 2022 Budget Act. In addition, adjustments to allocations netting less than \$200,000 were made since the TCBCAC review to adjust the methodology to the proposed median salary change. Senate Bill 154 (Skinner) *Budget Act of 2022*
https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220SB154&firstNav=tracking

² Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Counsel Funding Reallocation* (Apr. 17, 2015), www.courts.ca.gov/documents/jc-20150417-item1.pdf.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (Apr. 15, 2016), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4382676&GUID=E8BCCA8A-5DED-48C3-B946-6E21EBB0BEAF>.

⁴ On February 27, 2020, the California Child Welfare Indicators Project site was updated to improve navigation and offer new features. With these changes, some previously available views of the data were removed. Cases opened and not identified to a specific court are assigned to the service component “Missing.” Statewide, these cases total 199 and are not reported as service component data on the site.

- Current county counsel salaries at the median of the first two salary ranges reported by counties, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics current index.

Based on discussion at the April and June 2016 council meetings, in July 2016, the council directed the Executive and Planning Committee to form a working group to consider changes to the court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel funding methodology as it relates to small courts.

The working group determined that changes were justified in light of the unique costs faced by small courts. It recommended that the funding methodology be modified for 2017–18 and 2018–19 to (1) suspend reallocation-related budget reductions for the smallest courts with caseloads under 200, (2) adjust the local economic index for the small courts with dependency caseloads under 400, and (3) slightly reduce the funding allocations of the larger courts receiving increases related to the reallocation to compensate for these increases to the small court budget.⁵

The council adopted the modified funding methodology for small courts in May 2017 for 2017–18 and 2018–19, and as ongoing effective July 1, 2019.⁶ Based on current workload and filing information, 31 courts remain in the small court category; however, caseload changes have resulted in only 24 courts meeting the “smallest” court criteria.

Analysis/Rationale

Proposed small court funding offset methodology

The council’s allocation methodology for dependency counsel includes several adjustments to ensure that small courts have adequate allocations to meet their needs. The cost of these adjustments requires a transfer of approximately \$1 million from the larger courts to the small court allocations. The current methodology specifies that this offset be provided by reducing the budgets of larger courts receiving increases. In 2021–22, the council received a one-time funding augmentation of \$10 million for COVID-related expenses in dependency counsel.⁷ As a result, in 2022–23, almost all large courts would have received allocation decreases at the historical

To comply with CDSS data de-identification guidelines, “masking” is performed to protect the privacy of individuals served by CDSS. In reporting the number of children served, any service component with a value between 1 and 10 are masked. Three courts, Alpine, Mono, and Sierra, had total values between 1 and 10; therefore, the number of children served were masked and identified with (M). With the aim of maintaining confidentiality and allocating funds to each of these courts, each were allotted a value of 10 as of reporting period July 1, 2021.

⁵ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Small Court Dependency Workload Working Group Final Recommendations* (May 19, 2017), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=5150554&GUID=7D8E5F4F-6D83-4C73-A246-4F11E877A411>.

⁶ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Law: Court-Appointed Juvenile Dependency Counsel Funding Methodology for Small Courts* (Jan. 15, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=6913216&GUID=4DEB6A82-B007-46D8-9885-8D11D907DBF5>.

⁷ The 2021 Budget Act augmented the annual court-appointed juvenile dependency counsel \$156.7 million budget to include \$10 million in additional funding for court-appointed counsel to address COVID-19 pandemic-related operational and caseload increase costs, bringing the court-appointed counsel allocation to \$166.7 million, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=20210220SB129.

\$156.7 million funding level, and those few courts receiving an increase would have been heavily impacted by the small court adjustments.

Given that the “reallocation” referenced in the January 2019 report is completed, and all courts are currently funded at the same percentage of need, the TCBAC recommends that the current methodology be revised so that funding for all large courts be adjusted to offset the costs for small court funding. The TCBAC recommends that the council make this change even though additional funding has been provided in the enacted 2022 Budget Act, since the current methodology is based on offsetting the impact of a statewide reallocation that is now completed.

Proposed clarification to county counsel survey updates used in methodology

The council’s allocation methodology includes this element used for calculating local and statewide funding need:

That attorney salaries used in the model be updated for each county using the statewide median county counsel salary and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Category 92 index. [Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Dependency: Court-Appointed Dependency Counsel Workload and Funding Methodology* (Apr. 15, 2016) Recommendation 2, p. 2.)]

The method used for the county counsel survey is described in the rationale section as:

The subcommittee determined that two data sources should be used: current county counsel salaries at the median of the first two salary ranges reported by counties, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics current index. County counsel represent the child welfare department in dependency proceedings and are roughly parallel in skills and experience to court-appointed dependency counsel. County counsel salary information is publicly available and can be used to update the workload model on a regular basis. (page 8).

However, the update cycle was not specified in the report and the salary survey has not been updated since the 2016 report. Updating the survey will result in a county counsel median statewide salary figure that will increase the total funding need reported to the council each year. It will not increase the amount allocated to courts, which is dependent on the funding provided in the Budget Act every year. The median salary is used in conjunction with the Bureau of Labor Statistics index to estimate a statewide need for dependency counsel funding.

The TCBAC recommends that the methodology be clarified to specify that the county counsel median salary be updated on an annual basis.

Update on court-appointed dependency counsel funding for 2021–22 (informational)

In March 2022, the council approved the allocation of \$1,543,180 in Family First Prevention Services Act augmentation funding to eligible courts, contingent upon actual receipt of the

funding,⁸ to support legal activities by attorneys representing children and their parents at a new juvenile court hearing. At this hearing, the court will approve or disapprove any new placement of a child or nonminor dependent in a short-term residential therapeutic program held under AB 153.⁹

In consultation with the California Department of Social Services, council staff have determined that this grant will need to be administered as a federal title IV-E match program. Similar to the existing Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program¹⁰ (FFDRP), program implementation requires a lengthy sequence of steps and approvals before this funding can be made available to the courts. The funding will be incorporated into the council's interbranch agreement with the California Department of Social Services for 2022–23, and courts and dependency counsel providers will have access to these funds in 2022–23 and ongoing.

While the new funding is being implemented, courts and dependency providers can recover costs for the new hearing under the court-appointed counsel general fund allocation to the courts and the FFDRP program. In 2022–23, the new funds will add additional funds to the title IV-E reimbursement program to defray the costs of these hearings.

Policy implications

There are no policy implications to consider for the recommended allocation and methodology revision.

Comments

Circulation for public comment was not required for this report.

Alternatives considered

Two alternatives were considered to recommendation 1:

1. *Utilize the current methodology, using 2021–22 allocations at the historical \$156.7 million funding level.*

This alternative requires a calculation that nets out the 2021–22 one-time allocation of \$10 million. This alternative does not address the issue that the current methodology refers to increases based on the statewide reallocation of funds. Now that the reallocation is complete, all large courts are funded at the same percentage of need, and a prorated share of the small court transfer of funding has the same relative impact on all large courts.

⁸ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Law: 2021–22 Allocations for Dependency Counsel Program, Expected Unspent Program Funding, and Family First Prevention Services Act Funding* (Feb. 22, 2022), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=10544371&GUID=5B28EB35-9464-4A92-8B00-6D5DE8EF2578>.

⁹ Assem. Bill 153 (Committee on Budget; Stats. 2021, ch. 86), accessible at, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=20210220AB153.

¹⁰ Judicial Council of Cal., *Juvenile Law: Federally Funded Dependency Representation Program* (Sept. 3, 2020), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=8766467&GUID=17E19209-5AA7-4382-B7A7-257AAEE206F2>.

2. *Utilize the current methodology.*

In 2021–22, the council received a one-time funding augmentation of \$10 million for COVID-related expenses for dependency counsel. Utilizing the current methodology at the historical \$156.7 million funding level would result in almost all large courts receiving allocation decreases—and the few courts receiving an increase carrying disproportionate reductions to fund the small court transfer.

Fiscal and Operational Impacts

This recommendation is for the allocation of funds that are included in the FY 2022-23 budget. Hence, no additional costs or impacts are anticipated.

Attachments

Attachment A: 2022-23 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Attachment B: 2022-23 Impact of Recommendation on Court Allocations at \$186.7M Funding Level

2022-23 Allocation of Dependency Counsel Funding

Court	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Prior Year 21-22	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Current Year 22-23 Median County Counsel \$78,150	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Current Year 22-23 Median County Counsel \$98,030	2018-19 Allocation	2019-20 Allocation	2020-21 Allocation	2021-22 Allocation	2022-23 Allocation Current Methodology \$186.7M	2022-23 Allocation Revised Methodology Offset with All Lrg Courts \$186.7M Recommended
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Alameda	\$4,075,144	\$4,165,251	\$5,224,818	\$3,399,620	\$3,629,342	\$3,422,591	\$3,348,652	\$3,844,220	\$3,840,167
Alpine	\$15,513	\$17,400	\$21,826	\$2,628	\$7,226	\$11,439	\$19,616	\$19,850	\$19,850
Amador	\$151,319	\$155,965	\$195,640	\$144,678	\$145,653	\$126,205	\$128,301	\$144,314	\$144,314
Butte	\$1,061,873	\$1,004,737	\$1,260,325	\$799,814	\$926,951	\$891,346	\$872,569	\$927,298	\$926,321
Calaveras	\$191,018	\$172,781	\$216,733	\$191,355	\$203,567	\$202,088	\$189,010	\$161,288	\$161,288
Colusa	\$100,499	\$93,171	\$116,873	\$72,637	\$103,517	\$117,871	\$112,668	\$99,064	\$99,064
Contra Costa	\$3,248,232	\$2,980,842	\$3,739,116	\$2,294,410	\$2,617,772	\$2,571,073	\$2,651,024	\$2,751,098	\$2,748,197
Del Norte	\$189,259	\$200,553	\$251,570	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$203,096	\$214,730	\$214,730	\$214,730
El Dorado	\$704,974	\$597,947	\$750,054	\$505,148	\$582,746	\$560,863	\$579,296	\$553,278	\$553,278
Fresno	\$4,576,938	\$4,840,683	\$6,072,068	\$2,800,979	\$3,209,875	\$3,302,907	\$3,735,438	\$4,467,594	\$4,462,884
Glenn	\$136,523	\$133,326	\$167,242	\$122,690	\$140,011	\$154,825	\$164,905	\$146,444	\$146,444
Humboldt	\$876,594	\$844,588	\$1,059,437	\$657,658	\$615,068	\$665,891	\$715,427	\$779,493	\$778,671
Imperial	\$814,882	\$739,360	\$927,440	\$562,114	\$645,919	\$693,729	\$669,610	\$682,375	\$681,656
Inyo	\$32,686	\$36,120	\$45,308	\$51,626	\$48,006	\$39,570	\$41,562	\$46,352	\$58,143
Kern	\$3,367,432	\$3,522,727	\$4,418,848	\$2,627,276	\$2,864,207	\$2,720,713	\$2,748,308	\$3,251,218	\$3,247,790
Kings	\$846,627	\$858,302	\$1,076,639	\$713,352	\$696,307	\$659,612	\$690,969	\$792,150	\$791,315
Lake	\$210,846	\$173,416	\$217,530	\$276,158	\$285,153	\$288,934	\$280,183	\$286,139	\$296,119
Lassen	\$128,016	\$131,299	\$164,699	\$108,967	\$128,825	\$130,683	\$135,339	\$129,091	\$129,091
Los Angeles	\$101,358,111	\$100,814,675	\$126,460,174	\$62,434,046	\$73,864,405	\$75,809,513	\$82,722,770	\$93,044,529	\$92,946,429
Madera	\$731,363	\$791,199	\$992,466	\$589,946	\$674,047	\$631,797	\$643,573	\$732,094	\$732,094
Marin	\$288,497	\$289,720	\$363,420	\$304,984	\$270,557	\$287,842	\$288,497	\$284,732	\$357,163
Mariposa	\$65,070	\$73,336	\$91,991	\$41,897	\$54,019	\$48,793	\$60,059	\$67,857	\$67,857
Mendocino	\$506,668	\$521,132	\$653,698	\$458,911	\$527,624	\$510,212	\$529,357	\$511,024	\$511,024
Merced	\$1,095,655	\$1,118,760	\$1,403,353	\$775,718	\$825,284	\$840,466	\$894,211	\$1,032,533	\$1,031,445
Modoc	\$36,516	\$37,755	\$47,359	\$37,161	\$49,493	\$59,313	\$52,855	\$51,256	\$51,256
Mono	\$20,508	\$21,416	\$26,864	\$14,615	\$14,550	\$18,114	\$18,392	\$19,817	\$19,817
Monterey	\$898,182	\$724,678	\$909,023	\$715,702	\$829,349	\$797,204	\$738,059	\$670,542	\$670,542
Napa	\$529,636	\$486,138	\$609,803	\$311,403	\$384,039	\$417,108	\$435,215	\$449,822	\$449,822
Nevada	\$185,041	\$185,860	\$233,139	\$174,058	\$173,215	\$178,805	\$185,041	\$184,256	\$226,123
Orange	\$9,325,618	\$9,499,539	\$11,916,056	\$5,355,390	\$6,553,748	\$6,915,607	\$7,611,043	\$8,767,376	\$8,758,132
Placer	\$757,007	\$704,457	\$883,659	\$747,111	\$710,846	\$600,593	\$622,053	\$651,832	\$651,832
Plumas	\$116,804	\$106,378	\$133,438	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$154,059	\$152,458	\$154,059
Riverside	\$9,094,598	\$10,048,073	\$12,604,128	\$8,173,324	\$7,999,219	\$6,877,392	\$7,422,498	\$9,273,632	\$9,263,855
Sacramento	\$5,987,569	\$5,522,714	\$6,927,596	\$5,161,591	\$5,586,032	\$5,017,201	\$4,920,141	\$5,097,059	\$5,091,685
San Benito	\$120,828	\$111,691	\$140,103	\$104,920	\$107,040	\$109,317	\$99,288	\$103,347	\$103,347
San Bernardino	\$15,984,841	\$16,076,265	\$20,165,787	\$9,751,976	\$11,957,781	\$12,446,717	\$13,045,926	\$14,837,210	\$14,821,566
San Diego	\$6,522,796	\$6,647,256	\$8,338,202	\$5,339,513	\$5,525,422	\$5,141,307	\$5,323,538	\$6,134,928	\$6,128,460
San Francisco	\$3,251,547	\$3,153,096	\$3,955,189	\$2,754,101	\$2,926,579	\$2,698,254	\$2,671,880	\$2,910,976	\$2,907,007
San Joaquin	\$3,293,435	\$3,131,249	\$3,927,784	\$2,399,805	\$2,739,513	\$2,729,427	\$2,706,301	\$2,889,913	\$2,886,866
San Luis Obispo	\$971,029	\$873,531	\$1,095,741	\$672,046	\$795,812	\$803,509	\$797,919	\$806,204	\$805,354
San Mateo	\$1,009,098	\$896,472	\$1,124,519	\$934,702	\$984,479	\$837,813	\$829,202	\$829,503	\$829,503
Santa Barbara	\$1,241,134	\$1,427,914	\$1,791,151	\$826,760	\$865,438	\$889,172	\$1,012,943	\$1,317,860	\$1,316,470
Santa Clara	\$4,171,607	\$3,977,233	\$4,988,971	\$2,947,634	\$3,290,686	\$3,262,294	\$3,404,630	\$3,670,693	\$3,666,823
Santa Cruz	\$640,179	\$544,979	\$683,612	\$544,197	\$619,253	\$557,112	\$526,052	\$504,267	\$504,267
Shasta	\$821,962	\$817,032	\$1,024,871	\$614,678	\$690,857	\$662,855	\$670,839	\$754,061	\$753,266
Sierra	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,323	\$5,045	\$10,829	\$13,759	\$22,459	\$22,459
Siskiyou	\$177,189	\$173,714	\$217,904	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373	\$245,373
Solano	\$1,172,880	\$1,241,671	\$1,557,531	\$805,489	\$880,251	\$868,262	\$957,238	\$1,145,971	\$1,144,763
Sonoma	\$1,810,820	\$1,714,938	\$2,151,188	\$945,770	\$1,262,354	\$1,405,793	\$1,477,889	\$1,582,761	\$1,581,093
Stanislaus	\$1,779,104	\$1,619,266	\$2,031,179	\$1,091,719	\$1,424,350	\$1,448,878	\$1,452,004	\$1,494,463	\$1,492,887
Sutter	\$433,392	\$373,067	\$467,969	\$260,937	\$353,444	\$374,781	\$363,107	\$345,198	\$345,198
Tehama	\$281,284	\$240,370	\$301,516	\$362,975	\$392,840	\$340,323	\$293,399	\$241,836	\$241,836
Trinity	\$77,181	\$74,230	\$93,113	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829	\$93,829
Tulare	\$2,806,090	\$2,700,364	\$3,387,290	\$1,714,221	\$2,067,711	\$2,155,983	\$2,290,172	\$2,492,237	\$2,489,610
Tuolumne	\$337,668	\$326,761	\$409,884	\$168,548	\$187,463	\$257,399	\$338,350	\$313,321	\$313,321
Ventura	\$2,119,160	\$2,055,714	\$2,578,652	\$1,833,055	\$2,017,019	\$1,802,468	\$1,741,369	\$1,897,273	\$1,895,272
Yolo	\$1,558,884	\$1,468,321	\$1,841,836	\$712,428	\$1,021,991	\$1,167,029	\$1,272,273	\$1,355,152	\$1,353,723
Yuba	\$436,672	\$405,544	\$508,707	\$471,244	\$410,105	\$363,820	\$377,291	\$375,249	\$375,249
Reserve	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Total	\$202,743,998	\$201,664,975	\$252,965,035	\$136,700,000	\$156,700,000	\$156,700,000	\$166,700,000	\$186,700,000	\$186,700,000

Note: Allocations are based on filings data obtained from the Office of Court Research and caseload data obtained from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) as of July 1, 2021.

2022-23 Impact of Recommendation on Court Allocations at \$186.7M Funding Level

Court	Caseload Funding Model Estimated Funding Need Current Year 22-23	Allocation without Small Court Adjustment Current Year 2022-23	Small Court Adjustment Current Year 2022-23	Current Methodology Courts funding adjustment	Current Methodology 2022-23 Allocation	Recommended Methodology Courts funding adjustment	Recommended Methodology 2022-23 Allocation
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Alameda	\$4,165,251	\$3,854,094	\$0	-\$9,874	\$3,844,220	-\$13,927	\$3,840,167
Alpine	\$17,400	\$16,100	\$3,750		\$19,850		\$19,850
Amador	\$155,965	\$144,314	\$0		\$144,314		\$144,314
Butte	\$1,004,737	\$929,680	\$0	-\$2,382	\$927,298	-\$3,359	\$926,321
Calaveras	\$172,781	\$159,873	\$1,415		\$161,288		\$161,288
Colusa	\$93,171	\$86,211	\$12,853		\$99,064		\$99,064
Contra Costa	\$2,980,842	\$2,758,164	\$0	-\$7,066	\$2,751,098	-\$9,967	\$2,748,197
Del Norte	\$200,553	\$185,571	\$29,159		\$214,730		\$214,730
El Dorado	\$597,947	\$553,278	\$0		\$553,278		\$553,278
Fresno	\$4,840,683	\$4,479,069	\$0	-\$11,475	\$4,467,594	-\$16,186	\$4,462,884
Glenn	\$133,326	\$123,366	\$23,077		\$146,444		\$146,444
Humboldt	\$844,588	\$781,495	\$0	-\$2,002	\$779,493	-\$2,824	\$778,671
Imperial	\$739,360	\$684,128	\$0	-\$1,753	\$682,375	-\$2,472	\$681,656
Inyo	\$36,120	\$33,422	\$12,930		\$46,352		\$58,143
Kern	\$3,522,727	\$3,259,569	\$0	-\$8,351	\$3,251,218	-\$11,779	\$3,247,790
Kings	\$858,302	\$794,185	\$0	-\$2,035	\$792,150	-\$2,870	\$791,315
Lake	\$173,416	\$160,461	\$75,678		\$236,139		\$296,119
Lassen	\$131,299	\$121,491	\$7,600		\$129,091		\$129,091
Los Angeles	\$100,814,675	\$93,283,518	\$0	-\$238,989	\$93,044,529	-\$337,089	\$92,946,429
Madera	\$791,199	\$732,094	\$0		\$732,094		\$732,094
Marin	\$289,720	\$268,077	\$16,655		\$284,732		\$357,163
Mariposa	\$73,336	\$67,857	\$0		\$67,857		\$67,857
Mendocino	\$521,132	\$482,202	\$28,822		\$511,024		\$511,024
Merced	\$1,118,760	\$1,035,185	\$0	-\$2,652	\$1,032,533	-\$3,741	\$1,031,445
Modoc	\$37,755	\$34,934	\$16,321		\$51,256		\$51,256
Mono	\$21,416	\$19,817	\$0		\$19,817		\$19,817
Monterey	\$724,678	\$670,542	\$0		\$670,542		\$670,542
Napa	\$486,138	\$449,822	\$0		\$449,822		\$449,822
Nevada	\$185,860	\$171,975	\$12,281		\$184,256		\$226,123
Orange	\$9,499,539	\$8,789,895	\$0	-\$22,519	\$8,767,376	-\$31,763	\$8,758,132
Placer	\$704,457	\$651,832	\$0		\$651,832		\$651,832
Plumas	\$106,378	\$98,431	\$54,027		\$152,458		\$154,059
Riverside	\$10,048,073	\$9,297,452	\$0	-\$23,820	\$9,273,632	-\$33,597	\$9,263,855
Sacramento	\$5,522,714	\$5,110,151	\$0	-\$13,092	\$5,097,059	-\$18,466	\$5,091,685
San Benito	\$111,691	\$103,347	\$0		\$103,347		\$103,347
San Bernardino	\$16,076,265	\$14,875,320	\$0	-\$38,110	\$14,837,210	-\$53,753	\$14,821,566
San Diego	\$6,647,256	\$6,150,686	\$0	-\$15,758	\$6,134,928	-\$22,226	\$6,128,460
San Francisco	\$3,153,096	\$2,917,550	\$0	-\$7,475	\$2,910,076	-\$10,543	\$2,907,007
San Joaquin	\$3,131,249	\$2,897,335	\$0	-\$7,423	\$2,889,913	-\$10,470	\$2,886,866
San Luis Obispo	\$873,531	\$808,275	\$0	-\$2,071	\$806,204	-\$2,921	\$805,354
San Mateo	\$896,472	\$829,503	\$0		\$829,503		\$829,503
Santa Barbara	\$1,427,914	\$1,321,245	\$0	-\$3,385	\$1,317,860	-\$4,774	\$1,316,470
Santa Clara	\$3,977,233	\$3,680,122	\$0	-\$9,428	\$3,670,693	-\$13,298	\$3,666,823
Santa Cruz	\$544,979	\$504,267	\$0		\$504,267		\$504,267
Shasta	\$817,032	\$755,998	\$0	-\$1,937	\$754,061	-\$2,732	\$753,266
Sierra	\$0	\$0	\$22,459		\$22,459		\$22,459
Siskiyou	\$173,714	\$160,737	\$84,636		\$245,373		\$245,373
Solano	\$1,241,671	\$1,148,915	\$0	-\$2,943	\$1,145,971	-\$4,152	\$1,144,763
Sonoma	\$1,714,938	\$1,586,827	\$0	-\$4,065	\$1,582,761	-\$5,734	\$1,581,093
Stanislaus	\$1,619,266	\$1,498,302	\$0	-\$3,839	\$1,494,463	-\$5,414	\$1,492,887
Sutter	\$373,067	\$345,198	\$0		\$345,198		\$345,198
Tehama	\$240,370	\$222,413	\$19,422		\$241,836		\$241,836
Trinity	\$74,230	\$68,685	\$25,144		\$93,829		\$93,829
Tulare	\$2,700,364	\$2,498,639	\$0	-\$6,401	\$2,492,237	-\$9,029	\$2,489,610
Tuolumne	\$326,761	\$302,351	\$10,969		\$313,321		\$313,321
Ventura	\$2,055,714	\$1,902,146	\$0	-\$4,873	\$1,897,273	-\$6,874	\$1,895,272
Yolo	\$1,468,321	\$1,358,633	\$0	-\$3,481	\$1,355,152	-\$4,910	\$1,353,723
Yuba	\$405,544	\$375,249	\$0		\$375,249		\$375,249
Reserve	\$0	\$100,000	\$0		\$100,000		\$100,000
Total	\$201,664,975	\$186,700,000	\$457,199	-\$457,199	\$186,700,000	-\$644,870	\$186,700,000

Note: Allocations are based on filings data obtained from the Office of Court Research and caseload data obtained from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project (CCWIP) as of July 1, 2021.