



The State Bar of California

DATE: August 11, 2020

TO: Members, Partnership Grants Committee

FROM: Daniel Passamaneck, Senior Program Analyst, Office of Access & Inclusion

SUBJECT: Partnership Grant Funding Recommendations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Each year the Partnership Grants Committee recommends a slate of Partnership Grants to the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission. These grants are specifically directed toward services for self-represented litigants, provided at or near courthouses, and in partnership with the court. Thirty-six applications were received from 25 organizations for 2021 funding; one applicant withdrew. The remaining 35 applications seek a total of \$2.895 million of funding. The amount available for distribution is estimated at \$2.55 million.

The Committee met on May 22, 2020 to begin developing funding recommendations for 2021 Partnership Grants, and to consider how the current public health crisis has impacted existing grantees. When the Committee next met on June 26, it identified tentative allocation recommendations for each applicant, and directed staff to offer the applicants the opportunity to revise their proposals in light of the tentative recommendation, or as necessary to reflect changes to the project as a result of court closures or other impacts of COVID-19.

The Committee will meet on August 11, 2020 to review and discuss the revisions to the proposals, and to approve a final list of allocation recommendations for the Commission's consideration at its August 14 meeting, and for the Judicial Council's consideration at its September 24 meeting.

This memo describes the funding criteria and priorities for Partnership Grants to guide the Committee as it finalizes grant award recommendations. Staff recommends that the Partnership Grants Committee approve the list of recommended Partnership Grant allocations for 2021, as finalized after review and discussion by the Partnership Grants Committee at its August 11 meeting.

BACKGROUND

The Partnership Grants program is established by the State Budget Act, which annually provides that “[t]en percent of the [Equal Access Fund] ... shall be for joint projects of courts and legal services programs to make legal assistance available to pro per litigants.” (See Attachment B.) Funding is allocated through the Budget Act to the Judicial Council, and the Judicial Council has authority for final approval of grants. The State Bar administers the grant selection and distribution process through a contract with the Judicial Council. The Commission oversees the administration of these grants, delegating primary responsibility for review and recommendations to the Committee.

This memorandum provides information on funding criteria and priorities for the Partnership Grants program, and reports on revisions to the applications to assist the Committee in developing recommendations for the allocation of 2021 Partnership Grant funds among the applicant projects.

DISCUSSION

OVERVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY, REVIEW, AND FUNDING CRITERIA

The State Bar and Judicial Council have approved criteria limiting eligibility for Partnership Grant funding and guiding the review of proposals to identify projects that best fulfill the goals and intentions of the Partnership Grants program. These are stated in the Partnership Grant RFP Requirements, Priorities, and Policies (RFP Requirements; see Attachment A).

Projects applying for Partnership Grants must meet threshold eligibility criteria that are set forth in the RFP Requirements:

- **Qualified Legal Services Projects (QLSPs):** Only QLSPs are eligible to apply for Partnership Grants.
- **Joint Court/Qualified Legal Services Projects:** Proposals must be for projects jointly developed and implemented by California State courts and QLSPs; except in rare circumstances, services must be delivered at or near the courthouse.
- **Indigent Persons:** Use of Partnership Grant funds is restricted to the provision of services to indigent persons as defined under Business and Professions Code § 6213(d).
- **Self-Represented Civil Litigants:** Under the Budget Act and State Bar policy, Partnership Grant funding is restricted to providing assistance to individuals who are or expect to be engaged in civil litigation without representation by counsel. .

The RFP Requirements also identify additional criteria to be considered when determining recommended grant allocations: whether the services provide a meaningful impact for their communities; the quality of the collaboration with the cooperating court; steps taken to preserve the court’s impartiality; the information, alternatives, and referrals provided to litigants who are not eligible for services for any reason; continuity planning; and evaluation plans and reports.

Additionally, the Commission approved policies in 2018 to provide guidance in prioritizing applications for funding. Applicants for funding are prioritized in the following order:

1. New projects and projects in their second to fifth year of funding
2. Projects requesting funding beyond their fifth year that serve rural areas, are responsive to a recent emergency or disaster, or are high-functioning and heavily-utilized projects but have been unable to secure alternate funding despite documented efforts are prioritized.
3. Projects seeking funding beyond a fifth year that are not in these priority areas are considered for funding only after proposed awards have been allocated for all prioritized projects. The State Bar retains discretion to waive this policy.

REVIEW OF 2021 PROPOSALS

The Committee is considering 35 proposals for funding, submitted by 24 different QLSPs that have requested a total of \$2.895 million in funding. Available funding is estimated to be \$2.55 million. The Committee will allocate the available funding among the eligible proposals, based on the criteria listed above and in order of their priority for funding.

Applications for Partnership Grant funds were reviewed in a multi-step process. The Partnership Grants Committee was divided into Review Teams of two committee members and one staff; each team reviewed between eight and twelve proposals. Teams met to discuss their portfolios and determine whether Partnership Grant funding was appropriate for the projects applying, and if so, to identify an initial suggested funding range for each of their assigned projects. Staff conducted follow-up on issues identified during these Review Team meetings.

The full Committee met on May 22, 2020 to consider each team's initial tentative recommendations, to begin to develop Committee funding recommendations or ranges for each project in the applicant pool, and to identify any additional issues requiring clarification before recommendations could be finalized. At this meeting, staff also reported on the results of a survey of current Partnership Grant recipients, indicating that many of them had been impacted by the court closures and consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. A majority anticipated unspent funds at the end of the year, and a majority had begun to implement remote services after shelter in place orders and court closures had precluded in-person operations. A majority also stated that they expected to return to in-court operations by the start of 2021.

The Committee met again on June 26, 2020 and tentatively identified a proposed funding recommendation for each applicant. The Committee also directed staff to contact each applicant to advise them of their project's tentative allocation recommendation for 2021. Applicants were given an opportunity to revise their applications, if the current pandemic impacted the plans for delivery of services in 2021. This will permit the Committee to ensure that it is making decisions on the program as it is currently planned, not as it was planned prior to the current situation.

REVISIONS TO 2021 PROPOSALS

Of the 35 applicant projects, 22 submitted revisions to their applications and 13 declined to do so. Review of the revised applications revealed that 13 applicants revised to indicate how they have incorporated remote services into their delivery model and will continue remote services, if needed, into 2021; three applicants revised to remove references to expungement work and one revised to shift focus from fines and fees to unlawful detainers; three applicants made adjustments in response to the tentative allocations; and two applicants made revisions related to how the pandemic has impacted their delivery of services – one to add more staff, and one to reduce the number of litigants they expect to be able to serve..

One applicant, Legal Aid of Marin (LAM), opted to revise their proposal entirely to support unlawful detainer settlement conferences, following the Committee’s discussion regarding whether those activities are properly considered civil litigation as required by the RFP. The Review Team reviewed the application and recommends this project be funded. An additional verbal update will be provided at the Committee meeting.

Another applicant, Inland Counties Legal Services (ICLS), submitted a revision that reflected significant differences from their original proposal. The revised proposal reduced the amount requested from \$294,000 to \$95,000. ICLS advised that it intends to seek other funding to support the other components of the project, and has provided a detailed letter of further support from their partner court.

FINALIZING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2021 PARTNERSHIP GRANTS AWARDS

On August 11, 2020, after review of the application revisions and staff’s report, the Committee will finalize its recommendations for allocation of 2021 Partnership Grant funding. The Commission will meet on August 14 to review and discuss the Committee’s recommendations, and to approve grant recommendations as it deems appropriate. The Judicial Council will consider the Commission’s recommendations on September 24 and has final authority to approve Partnership grants.

A list of the tentative funding recommendations developed during the Committee’s June 26 meeting is attached. The Committee will finalize funding recommendations during its August 11 meeting pursuant to funding priorities and relevant staff updates.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Partnership Grant Committee approve the list of allocation recommendations for 2021 Partnership Grants, as finalized during the Committee’s August 11 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS LIST

- A.** Partnership Grant RFP Requirements, Priorities, and Policies

B. Relevant Language from the 2019 California Budget Act

C. 2021 Partnership Grant Tentative Allocation Recommendations as of June 26, 2020



The State Bar
of California

OFFICE OF ACCESS & INCLUSION

THE PARTNERSHIP GRANT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL: REQUIREMENTS, PRIORITIES, AND POLICIES

This document provides information for organizations interested in submitting proposals for Partnership Grants.

- Section A includes background on applicant eligibility requirements.
- Section B describes the criteria used to select successful Partnership Grant proposals.
- Section C states policies regarding whether, or to what extent, certain activities would be eligible for funding through a Partnership Grant.

Organizations intending to submit proposals for Partnership Grants should review these materials to ensure that the proposed projects are eligible for this funding, and that their proposals describe those activities in a manner that best addresses the principal concerns of the funding authorities.

BACKGROUND

The State Budget Act establishes the Equal Access Fund “to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice.” The Equal Access Fund is allocated to the Judicial Council and administered by the State Bar of California, through its Legal Services Trust Fund Commission (Commission). Ten percent of the Equal Access Fund is reserved for “joint projects of courts and legal services programs to make legal assistance available to pro per litigants.”

Partnership Grants are awarded through a competitive process: The Commission reviews proposals and makes funding recommendations to the Judicial Council. Grants are awarded for a one-year period commencing January 1. Decisions of the Commission, as approved by the Judicial Council, are final; there is no appeals process.

Partnership Grants are primarily intended to support new projects or services, and to sustain services in rural or isolated areas. Consideration will also be given to ensuring that this funding

supports projects serving a diverse range of geographic areas, substantive issues, and client constituencies.

At the conclusion of each grant year, Partnership grantees must submit a comprehensive report and evaluation on the use and impact of these funds. Partnership Grant funding is typically awarded for no more than five consecutive years of support, and applicants must describe their plans for obtaining funding from other sources to support these projects after the termination of Partnership Grant support.

A. Applicant Eligibility Requirements

Applicants for Partnership Grants must meet the following eligibility requirements:

- Qualified Legal Services Projects (QLSPs): Only QLSPs are eligible to apply for Partnership Grants (Business & Professions Code 6210 et seq.).
- Joint Court/Qualified Legal Services Projects: Proposals must be for projects jointly developed and implemented by California State courts and QLSPs, and, except in rare circumstances, services must be delivered at or near the courthouse.
- Indigent Persons: Use of Partnership Grant funds is restricted to the provision of services to indigent persons as defined under Business and Professions Code §6213(d).
- Self-Represented Civil Litigants: Partnership Grant funding is restricted to providing assistance to individuals who are or expect to be engaged in civil litigation without representation by counsel. These funds cannot be used to make court appearances on behalf of litigants.

B. Selection Criteria for Partnership Grants

Partnership Grants are competitive and discretionary. The Commission will recommend grant awards with consideration for the need within the communities to be served, and the extent to which the proposals address the following issues:

- Impact of Services: The project must address the needs of the targeted population and achieve meaningful and timely outcomes.
- Collaboration with Cooperating Court: The project must be jointly undertaken with the court. The Commission will consider the extent to which the applicant and cooperating court will collaborate on this project to achieve access for self-represented litigants.

- Integration with Court-Based Services: The applicant's services, or planned services, should be integrated with other court-based services, including the Family Law Facilitator, self-help centers, and other offices of the cooperating court.
- Court's Impartiality: The proposal must ensure the court's independence and impartiality. If the project's services are to be reserved for only one litigant role, such as petitioners but not respondents, or defendants but not plaintiffs, the applicant must demonstrate that it has thoroughly explored all the implications of this decision with the court, and identified alternate legal resources that can provide meaningful if not equivalent levels of assistance to the opposing parties.
- Conflict of Interest: If the project establishes an attorney-client relationship with the self-represented litigants, it must provide meaningful referrals for individuals who are not eligible to use the services because they present a conflict of interest for the project.
- Information and Referrals: The proposal must address the methods by which the project will provide information and alternatives to litigants who are not eligible to use its services for any reason.
- Continuity Planning: In anticipation of the eventual termination of Partnership Grant support, the applicant must diligently pursue other means for supporting the continuation of the project. The Commission will consider efforts to pursue other sources of funding and support, as well as contributions actually received, such as commitments of the program's general operating revenue, recruitment of volunteers, and in-kind support.
- Evaluation: All applicants must incorporate evaluation plans into their Partnership Grant proposal and complete a year-end evaluation report.

C. Policies Regarding Administration Of Partnership Grants

The Commission has made policy determinations with regard to certain substantive issues that have arisen repeatedly, as guidance for applicants seeking to strengthen their proposals, and to help ensure the consistency of its own deliberations and recommendations regarding Partnership Grants. The following statements of Partnership Grants policies were each approved by the Commission, on the dates indicated in parentheses after their titles:

Self-Representation and Attorney-Client Relationships (July 2017)

Self-represented litigants receiving services under a Partnership Grant are not prohibited from forming a confidential relationship with a lawyer, so long as they remain unrepresented when they appear in court. While we will ultimately defer to the court's own determination as to

whether the litigant is self-represented, factors impacting this determination include where any attorney's participation takes place, and whether the attorney's name appears on pleadings or in the records of proceedings in court. So long as no appearance is made on the record and no representational activity occurs in court, formation of an attorney-client relationship in and of itself is not inconsistent with the "self-represented" status of a litigant.

Overhead, Administration, and Audit (August 2018)

Partnership Grant funds should pay for actual project expenses or directly related costs – to fund the project, but not the organization. Some programs have used individual line items to identify administrative costs. Others use an Allocated Cost Ratio, which is often based on a standardized formula; however, it is sometimes unclear how a formula-based allocation relates to the proposed activities.

- Some non-personnel costs which may be appropriately tied to the project include malpractice insurance and attorney licensing fees.
- As Partnership Grant-funded services should typically be performed primarily at or near the courthouse, which reduces the need for program space and equipment, costs allocated to these lines should be clearly justified in the budget narrative.
- Programs using formula-based allocated cost ratios must clearly explain what these comprise and how they are calculated, for purposes of Partnership grant budgeting.

Use of Partnership Funding as a Sub-grant Covering Wages of Court Staff (August 2018)

An organization receiving Partnership Grant funding is expected to be the primary service provider under that grant. However, greater efficiencies can sometimes be attained by sub-granting some of that funding to a court partner. The following considerations have been identified as relevant in determining whether to approve discretionary funding for such a request:

- The contract governing the relationship between the grant recipient organization and the court must clearly specify that grant-funded court staff will only work on project activities, not on other duties that might be assigned by the court.
- The contracted staff must follow the Guidelines for the Operation of Self-Help Centers, with particular regard to ensuring the court's neutrality as to the fact that services are being provided, the manner in which they are provided, and the persons to whom they are provided.
- The services funded would not otherwise be provided by the court, but for the Partnership Grant. The Partnership Grant shall not supplant existing funding or services.
- The project budget must include additional funding sufficient to assist litigants who do not qualify to be served with Partnership Grant funding.

- In these and all cases, the court must participate in providing feedback and in developing evaluative data. Where funding is sub-granted to the court partner for payment of court staff, this evaluative data will include information on the number of litigants using the service who do not meet the definition of “indigent” found at Business & Professions Code §6213.

Prioritization of Funding for New Projects and to Sustain Services in Rural Areas (July 2019)

Partnership Grant funding is prioritized first to support new projects, and to sustain projects serving rural areas. Other projects seeking funding beyond a 5th year will be considered for funding only after proposed awards have been identified first for all prioritized projects, and then for any proposals seeking funding for a second through fifth year. The State Bar retains discretion to waive this policy and consider proposals for funding in excess of five years under certain exceptions together with proposals seeking funding of less than six years.

Funding of Supervised Settlement Services through Partnership Grants (July 2019)

Partnership Grants may be used to support supervised settlement services to assist litigants in settling their litigation, so long as the settlement services are a component of court-based litigation and are overseen by an attorney.

Assembly Bill No. 74

CHAPTER 23

[Approved by Governor June 27, 2019. Filed with Secretary of
State June 27, 2019.]

AB 74, Ting. Budget Act of 2019.

This bill would make appropriations for the support of state government for the 2019–20 fiscal year.

This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as a Budget Bill.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1.00.

This act shall be known and may be cited as the “Budget Act of 2019.”

[.....]

0250-101-0001—For local assistance, Judicial Branch 127,603,000

Schedule:

(1)	0150010-Support for Operation of Trial Courts.....	83,551,000
(2)	0150051-Child Support Commissioner Program (AB 1058)	54,332,000
(3)	0150055-California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects	5,748,000
(4)	0150075-Grants—Other	1,586,000
(5)	0150083-Equal Access Fund	42,892,000
(6)	Reimbursements to 0150051-Child Support Commissioner Program (AB 1058)	–54,332,000
(7)	Reimbursements to 0150055-California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects	–4,588,000

(8) Reimbursements to 0150075-Grants—Other -1,586,000

Provisions:

1. In order to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice, the funds appropriated in Schedule (5), after distribution of the \$20,000,000 in Provision 6, are to be distributed by the Judicial Council through the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission to qualified legal services projects and support centers as defined in Sections 6213 to 6215, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code, to be used for legal services in civil matters for indigent persons. The Judicial Council shall approve awards made by the commission if the council determines that the awards comply with statutory and other relevant guidelines. Ten percent of the funds in Schedule (5) shall be for joint projects of courts and legal services programs to make legal assistance available to pro per litigants and 90 percent of the funds in Schedule (5) shall be distributed consistent with Sections 6216 to 6223, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code. The Judicial Council may establish additional reporting or quality control requirements consistent with Sections 6213 to 6223, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code.

[....]

5. Of the funds appropriated in Schedule (5), \$2,500,000 shall be available for the expansion and administration of pilot programs pursuant to the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (Ch. 457, Stats. 2009).
6. Of the amount appropriated in Schedule (5), \$20,000,000 shall be distributed by the Judicial Council through the State Bar of California pursuant to Provision 1 to qualified legal services projects and support centers to provide eviction defense or other tenant defense assistance in landlord-tenant rental disputes, including pre-eviction and eviction legal services, counseling, advice and consultation, mediation, training, renter education, and representation, and legal services to improve habitability, increasing affordable housing, ensuring receipt of eligible income or benefits to improve housing stability, and homelessness prevention. Of this amount, \$150,000 shall be available, upon order of the Department of Finance, for administrative costs of the Judicial Council and the State Bar. The remaining funds shall be allocated as follows:
 - (a) 75 percent shall be distributed to qualified legal services projects and support centers that currently provide eviction defense or other tenant defense assistance in landlord-tenant rental disputes, as set forth in Provision 6. To expedite the distribution of this percentage of the \$20,000,000, eligible programs shall be limited to those found eligible for 2019 IOLTA funding.

Each eligible program shall receive a percentage equal to that legal services project's 2019 IOLTA allocation divided by the total 2019 IOLTA allocation for all legal services projects eligible for this funding, except that to ensure that meaningful funding is provided, a minimum amount of \$50,000 shall be allocated to each eligible program unless the program requests a lesser amount, in which case the additional funds shall be distributed proportionally to the other qualified legal services projects. These funds shall be distributed as soon as practicable after the effective date of this act and shall not supplant existing resources.

- (b) 25 percent shall be allocated through a competitive grant process developed by the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission of the State Bar to award grants to qualified legal service projects and support centers to provide eviction defense or other tenant defense assistance in landlord-tenant rental disputes, as set forth in Provision 6, to meet the needs of tenants not addressed by the formula provided in subdivision (a). The grant process shall ensure that any qualified legal service project or support center that received funding pursuant to subdivision (a) may only receive funding pursuant to this subdivision if that qualified legal service project or support center demonstrates that funds received under this subdivision will be not be used to supplant existing resources, and will be used to provide services to tenants not otherwise served by that qualified legal service project or support center. The commission shall make the grant award determinations. In awarding these grants, preference shall be given to qualified legal aid agencies that serve rural or underserved communities and that serve clients regardless of immigration or citizenship status. Any funding not allocated pursuant to this competitive grant process shall be distributed pursuant to subdivision (a), except that there shall be no minimum funding amount for these funds.

[...]

**0250-101-0932—For local assistance, Judicial Branch, payable
from the Trial Court Trust Fund 2,705,376,000**

Schedule:

(1)	0150010-Support for Operation of Trial Courts	2,116,843,000
(2)	0150019-Compensation of Superior Court Judges	417,104,000
(3)	0150028-Assigned Judges	29,090,000
(4)	0150037-Court Interpreters	120,686,000
(5)	0150067-Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) program	2,713,000

(6)	0150071-Model Self-Help Program	957,000
(7)	0150083-Equal Access Fund	5,482,000
(8)	0150087-Family Law Information Centers	345,000
(9)	0150091-Civil Case Coordination	832,000
(10)	0150095-Expenses on Behalf of the Trial Courts	11,325,000
(11)	Reimbursements to 0150010-Support for Operation of Trial Courts	-1,000

Provisions:

[....]

8. In order to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice, the funds appropriated in Schedule (7) are available for distribution by the Judicial Council through the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission in support of the Equal Access Fund Program to qualified legal services projects and support centers as defined in Sections 6213 to 6215, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code, to be used for legal services in civil matters for indigent persons. The Judicial Council shall approve awards made by the commission if the council determines that the awards comply with statutory and other relevant guidelines. Upon approval by the Administrative Director, the Controller shall transfer up to 5 percent of the funding appropriated in Schedule (7) to Item 0250-001-0932 for administrative expenses. Ten percent of the funds remaining after administrative costs shall be for joint projects of courts and legal services programs to make legal assistance available to pro per litigants and 90 percent of the funds remaining after administrative costs shall be distributed consistent with Sections 6216 to 6223, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code. The Judicial Council may establish additional reporting or quality control requirements consistent with Sections 6213 to 6223, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code.
9. Funds available for expenditure in Schedule (7) may be augmented by order of the Director of Finance by the amount of any additional resources deposited for distribution to the Equal Access Fund Program in accordance with Sections 68085.3 and 68085.4 of the Government Code. Any augmentation under this provision shall be authorized not sooner than 30 days after notification in writing to the chairpersons of the committees in each house of the Legislature that consider appropriations, the chairpersons of the committees and appropriate subcommittees that consider the State Budget, and the Chairperson of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, or not sooner than whatever lesser time the chairperson of the joint committee, or the chairperson's designee, may determine.

[....]

2021 Partnership Grants Committee - Tentative Funding Recommendations
Estimated Available Funding: \$2,423,410

PROGRAM	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY(IES)	AMOUNT REQUESTED	JUNE 26 TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATION	AUGUST 11 FINAL RECOMMENDATION
Bet Tzedek	Self-Help Elder and Dependent Adult RO Clinic	Los Angeles	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	
Central California Legal Services	Guardianship Project	Fresno	\$ 73,000	\$ 60,000	
Central California Legal Services	Tenant/Landlord Housing Law Project	Fresno	\$ 71,000	\$ 70,000	
Central California Legal Services	Tulare County Unlawful Detainer Workshop	Tulare	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	
Community Legal Aid - SoCal	Orange County Community Court Clinic	Orange	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	
Community Legal Aid - SoCal	Orange County Consumer Debt Workshop	Orange	\$ 23,000	\$ 23,000	
Community Legal Aid - SoCal	Unlawful Detainer Workshop at Norwalk	Los Angeles	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	
Elder Law & Advocacy	Unlawful Detainer/Elder Abuse Restraining Order Self-Help Clinic	Imperial	\$ 71,000	\$ 71,000	
Family Violence Law Center	Domestic Violence Pro Per Project	Alameda	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	
Housing and Economic Rights Advocates	Probate Clinic	San Mateo	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000	
Inland Counties Legal Services	Consumer Clinic Partnership	San Bernardino	\$ 95,000	\$ 94,000	
Justice and Diversity Center / Bar Association of San Francisco	FLASH-CARE	San Francisco	\$ 60,000	\$ 40,000	
Justice and Diversity Center / Bar Association of San Francisco	Shriver-SASH Self-Help	San Francisco	\$ 74,000	\$ 74,000	

LACBA Counsel for Justice	Domestic Violence Legal Services Project	Los Angeles	\$ 97,000	\$ 91,000	
Legal Access Alameda	Family Law Day of Court Project	Alameda	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	
Legal Access Alameda	Family Law Status Conference Project	Alameda	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles	Torrance Self-Help Center	Los Angeles	\$ 100,000	\$ 90,000	
Legal Aid Foundation of Santa Barbara County	Legal Resource Center Partnership	Santa Barbara	\$ 126,000	\$ 117,000	
Legal Aid of Marin	Community Court Expansion / Mandatory Settlement Conferences for Homelessness Prevention	Marin	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	
Legal Aid Society of San Bernardino	Caregivers Accessing Justice	San Bernardino	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
Legal Aid Society of San Diego	Name/Gender Marker Change Self-Help Clinic	San Diego	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	
Legal Aid Society of San Diego	Unlawful Detainer Clinic Expansion	San Diego	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	
Legal Assistance for Seniors	Partnership to Assist Guardianship Litigants	Alameda	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	
Legal Assistance for Seniors	Partnership to Assist Limited Conservatorship Litigants	Alameda	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	
Legal Services of Northern California	Mother Lode Pro Per Project	AM, CL, ED, PL, NV, Sierra	\$ 95,000	\$ 95,000	
Legal Services of Northern California	Small Claims and Guardianship Self-Help Project	Yolo	\$ 62,000	\$ 62,000	
Neighborhood Legal Services	Consumer Technology Project	Los Angeles	\$ 126,000	\$ 90,000	
Neighborhood Legal Services	Housing Cases Continuum of Services	Los Angeles	\$ 113,000	\$ 81,000	
Neighborhood Legal Services	Stabilizing Families	Los Angeles	\$ 113,000	\$ 100,000	
Public Counsel	Guardianship Clinic	Los Angeles	\$ 60,000	\$ 30,000	

ATTACHMENT C

Public Law Center	De Facto & Adoptive Parent Assistance Project	Orange	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	
Public Law Center	Orange County Courthouse Guardianship Clinic	Orange	\$ 60,000	\$ 40,000	
Riverside Legal Aid	Small Estates Assistance Program	Riverside	\$ 105,000	\$ 100,000	
San Diego Volunteer Lawyers Program	Central Division Restraining Order Clinic	San Diego	\$ 130,000	\$ 100,000	
San Luis Obispo Legal Aid Foundation	Rental Clinic	San Luis Obispo	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	
			\$ 2,696,000	\$ 2,470,000	\$ -

Estimated Available Funding:	\$ 2,423,410
6/26 Tentative Allocation	\$ 2,470,000
Difference	\$ (46,590)