

BUDGET REVISION: NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES/SHRIVER-L.A. SELF-HELP CENTER

Typically, State Bar staff review and approve the revisions to Partnership Grant (“PG”) budgets that bring the projects into alignment with the allocated grant funding. However, when the proposed revisions include a significant change, they are brought to the Partnership Grants committee for final approval.

The attached budget revision is submitted for your consideration because the revised budget has changed the allocation of this funding from staffing for a mix of lawyers and intake staff, to an allocation that funds intake staff only.

Funding for attorneys for this project as initially proposed, was \$158,160 of PG funding and \$240,906 of non-Trust Fund (“TF”) funding, for a total of \$399,066. The revised budget includes \$363,584 of total attorney funding, none of which is from the PG.

“Other” staff were initially funded at \$80,784 of PG funding and \$31,200 of non-TF funding, for a total of \$111,948. In the revised budget these figures are essentially unchanged: other staff are funded with \$80,328 and non-TF funding contributes another \$31,200 for these staff, for a total of \$111,528.

PG funding was not used for any other significant line items in the budget as proposed or revised.

Summarizing, the project as originally proposed:

- Had a \$2.598 million total cost
- Sought \$315,000 of PG funding
- Planned to spend \$158,000 of PG funding on lawyers and \$80,000 of PG funding on “other” staff
- Included \$2.289 million of other funding to complete the project.

The revised proposal:

- Has a \$2.449 million total cost
- Will receive \$140,000 in PG funding
- Intends to spend \$80,000 of PG funding on “other” staff
- Includes 2.309 million of other funding to complete the project.

There is no meaningful change in total funded FTEs, and the shift away from funding attorneys with the PG funding has been substantially offset by the investment of additional organizational funds to make up for the reduction in the grant that was awarded.

It does not appear to staff that the changes will impair the project’s ability to meet goals or serve litigants. Staff therefore recommend approval of this proposed revision.