

# How Can California Improve Access to Justice For Unrepresented Litigants?

## An Informational Hearing of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary And Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 5 on Public Safety

### Background Paper

By the Staff of the Assembly Committee on Judiciary

*“The idealized picture of an adversarial system in which both parties are represented by competent attorneys who can assert all legitimate claims and defenses is an illusion.”*

-National Center for State Courts<sup>1</sup>

#### I. Introduction

The California justice system, like all court systems in the United States, relies on an adversarial system, where both parties in theory are represented by counsel who argue their cases and present legal claims and defenses, facts, and evidence, before a neutral fact finder who does not independently discover facts, nor seek to bolster either side’s legal case. But this vision of the justice system, at least for the majority of civil matters, does not comport with reality. Unfortunately, far too many litigants in California today find themselves, often for financial reasons, unable to hire an attorney to represent them in civil court; and are therefore left to either represent themselves as best they can in a system designed for attorneys. Alternatively, they neglect to seek judicial intervention for their legal problems, regardless of the strength of their cases.

It is estimated that 36 million people across the nation use non-criminal courts on an annual basis without representation, constituting approximately 23 million civil cases (including family law, probate, and housing) and 13 million traffic cases.<sup>2</sup> In California, the Judicial Council estimates that 4.3 million unrepresented litigants<sup>3</sup> annually use California’s courts.<sup>4</sup> Assuming that the trends in California are consistent with those for the rest of the nation, that would translate to 2.75 million unrepresented Californians being in civil court every year who are trying to address family law, guardianship, conservatorship, housing, and other civil matters without the legal help on which the judicial system depends, and another 1.55 million in court for traffic infractions. These figures are most stark in certain critical areas. The Judicial Council estimates that up to 90 percent of family law cases involve unrepresented litigants, including contested

---

<sup>1</sup> National Center for State Courts, *The Landscape of Civil Litigation in State Courts* (2013) p. vi.

<sup>2</sup> Self-Represented Litigation Network, SLRN Brief: How Many SLRNs (2019), available at: <https://www.srln.org/node/548/srln-brief-how-many-srls-srln-2015>.

<sup>3</sup> This paper uses the term “unrepresented litigant” to refer to litigants who do not have attorneys. The courts and the Judicial Council use the term “self-represented litigant,” instead, which appears to imply that proceeding without assistance of counsel is more of a choice and not a financial necessity.

<sup>4</sup> Budget Change Proposal 0250-083-BCP-BR-2020-GB.

custody cases and domestic violence cases.<sup>5</sup> For tenants facing the loss of their rental housing, that figure is similar, with nearly 90 percent of tenants who file an answer in their eviction proceedings appearing without attorneys.<sup>6</sup> The Judicial Council acknowledges this new reality, stating that the “caseload of most California judges now consists primarily of cases in which at least one party is self-represented.”<sup>7</sup>

The difficulties that unrepresented litigants face in trying to access the courts and to achieve justice in their cases cannot be overstated. The difficulties include the following:

[T]he technicalities of specialized legal language, applicable rules and procedures, complex requirements for notice and proof of service, and procedural rules that vary among types of cases. [Unrepresented litigants’] lack of knowledge of due dates and filing timelines can cause them to be unprepared and to incur unnecessary, time-consuming continuances or outright dismissal of their cases. Also, [unrepresented litigants] frequently do not understand court orders or how to enforce them. These barriers can inhibit informed decisions about cases or the forfeiture of meritorious claims and defenses.<sup>8</sup>

Without adequate legal support, unrepresented litigants face hurdles that translate directly to poorer outcomes in their cases. Academic research confirms what seems obvious: attorney representation leads to significantly better outcomes for low-income individuals who attempt to navigate the civil legal system for critical life needs.<sup>9</sup> Unrepresented litigants are at a significantly greater risk of losing their children, their homes, their jobs, and their financial security in a system designed for parties who are represented by attorneys.

Unrepresented litigants also require far more judicial resources than represented parties. Unrepresented litigants are far more likely to have their court filings rejected, or their hearings continued for an array of reasons, including failure to properly complete forms, failure to properly serve opposing parties, and failure to support their claims with admissible evidence and legal arguments.

The problem may be even more serious than it appears because the data on unrepresented litigants significantly understates the justice gap. Most civil legal problems never make it

---

<sup>5</sup> Budget Change Proposal 0250-114-BCP-2018-GB; Judge Mark Juhas, *A Judge’s View on the Benefits of Unbundling*, California Bar Journal (July 2015). Note that this figure is an estimate since the Judicial Council does not track cases with unrepresented litigants.

<sup>6</sup> Budget Change Proposal 0250-114-BCP-2018-GB. Note that this figure is an estimate since the Judicial Council does not track cases with unrepresented litigants.

<sup>7</sup> Judicial Council of California, *Handling Cases Involving Self-Represented Litigants: A Benchguide for Judicial Officers* (April 2019) p. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Commission on the Future of California’s Court System, *Report to the Chief Justice*, Judicial Council of California (2017) pp. 29-30.

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., D. James Greiner, Cassandra W. Pattanayak & Jonathan P. Hennessy, *The Limits of Unbundled Legal Assistance: A Randomized Study in a Massachusetts District Court and Prospects for the Future* (2013) 126 Harvard L. Rev. 903 (determining, in a randomized control trial, that attorney representation in eviction proceedings led to twice as many tenants retaining possession of their units as compared to self-represented tenants in the control group).

to court for resolution. On a national level, over 70 percent of low-income Americans had a civil legal problem, such as a family law or housing issue, in 2016; and fully 70 percent of them said the problem significantly impacted their lives.<sup>10</sup> However, most of them never sought legal help for their problems,<sup>11</sup> and those who sought help for their civil legal problem from a legal aid office only had their legal needs fully addressed about a third of the time.<sup>12</sup> Fully 86 percent of low-income Americans “receive inadequate or no professional legal help” for their civil legal problems.<sup>13</sup> Those figures are comparable in California where approximately 85 percent of Californians with civil legal problems received no or inadequate legal help.<sup>14</sup> This represents the actual justice gap, both in California and nationally. The number of unrepresented litigants in California, when considered in light of the severity of their legal needs, is nothing short of an ongoing justice crisis.

*Structure of this paper.* This paper will first examine how litigants can find legal representation, whether paid or unpaid. The paper will then explore what options are available in California, including a review of some innovative programs that exist today, for those who do not seek or obtain legal representation. Finally, the paper will conclude with options and ideas for how to better provide the 4.3 million (and growing) Californians who today go to court without an attorney with real access to justice.

## **II. Attorney Representation**

Before considering what services and support are available to unrepresented litigants, it is important to understand what options exist today for litigants who seek attorney representation. Without question, this is the best option for consumers, given that attorney representation generally leads to far better outcomes than being unrepresented.

### **A. Options for Paid Representation**

The limiting factor on obtaining paid legal representation is cost, as obtaining legal services can be quite expensive. For large corporate or governmental organizations, the high fees charged for legal services is frequently viewed as the cost of doing business; however for many average Californians the high cost of legal services can make obtaining quality legal assistance nearly impossible. Although the legal profession is driven by a fee-for-service model, this model has been adapted to fit varying circumstances and an economically diverse set of clients.

***Hourly Representation.*** The overwhelming majority of attorneys bill their clients for legal services provided on an hourly basis. Accordingly to a 2019 survey by Martindale-Avvo, 75 percent of all attorneys reported billing at least some clients on an hourly

---

<sup>10</sup> Legal Services Corporation, *The Justice Gap: Measuring the Unmet Civil Legal Needs of Low-Income Americans (The Justice Gap)* (2017) p. 7.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Legal Services Corporation, *The Justice Gap*, *supra* note 10, at 13.

<sup>13</sup> Legal Services Corporation, *The Justice Gap*, *supra* note 10, at 30.

<sup>14</sup> Rocio Avalos et al., *2019 California Justice Gap Study: Executive Report*, State Bar of California (2020) p. 7.

basis.<sup>15</sup> A separate 2019 survey determined that the average attorney in California charges clients \$323 per hour for legal services.<sup>16</sup> Beyond the most basic legal matters that may require only a few hours of work and usually do not require court involvement, legal fees can quickly reach several thousand dollars or more, which is almost certainly unattainable for most low- and middle-income Californians.

***Flat Fee Services.*** To compensate for the high cost of hourly legal services, the legal industry has developed several other models for middle-income clients. A popular billing method is charging a flat fee for a specific service. For example, an attorney may charge \$500 to \$1,000 for the preparation of a basic will or trust. Similar arrangements are frequently utilized by attorneys in simple family law matters, traffic court related issues, and basic matters involving real estate or contract law. The flat fee-for-service model does help lower costs for relatively routine legal services. However, for middle-income Californians facing complex legal issues or legal matters requiring significant courtroom representation, the fee-for-service model is rarely used and thus any cost savings benefits cannot be realized.

***Contingency Fee.*** For Californians injured at work or by the negligence of others, attorneys will frequently work on a contingency fee basis. A contingency agreement typically provides that the attorney will not collect their payment for rendering legal services until after the plaintiff has recovered payments from a defendant for the harm that occurred. Attorneys working on contingency typically charge clients a percentage of their total recovery and frequently waive their fees if the defendant prevails and the plaintiff does not recover. By deferring payment for legal services until after the plaintiff has been awarded a money judgment, contingency fee arrangements provide plaintiffs from all economic backgrounds with a means to obtain legal representation that they could not otherwise afford.

***Insurance Company Representation.*** Californians who face legal liability for alleged harm to another and who have purchased liability insurance often receive legal representation from their insurance companies. Many insurance policies (including auto, home, and umbrella liability policies) provide that the insurance company will provide counsel to their insured should they face potential liability. In such an instance, a person is entitled to legal representation so long as they have paid their insurance premiums in a timely manner.

***Pre-Paid Legal Plans.*** A pre-paid group legal insurance program, typically purchased through an employment-related group plan, permits individuals to pay a monthly fee to the pre-paid plan provider and receive free or discounted legal representation should they need it.<sup>17</sup> However, much like employer-coordinated health insurance programs, these pre-paid legal services plans frequently require the payment of deductibles before the no-cost legal services are provided. Furthermore, much like out-of-network doctors, many

---

<sup>15</sup> Martindale-Avvo, *2019 Attorney Compensation Report* (2019) p. 11.

<sup>16</sup> Clio, *Legal Trends Report* (2019) Appendix A, p. 53.

<sup>17</sup> Amy Fontinelle, *How Personal Legal Insurance Works* (2015) Investopedia, available at: <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/personal-finance/040615/how-personal-legal-insurance-works.asp>.

attorneys do not accept work through pre-paid legal plans.<sup>18</sup> Additionally, the plans tend to provide only routine legal work (such as drafting wills and trusts) and brief consultations on more complex legal matters and do not cover complex legal services.<sup>19</sup> Further, those legal services covered by a pre-paid group legal plan frequently duplicate coverages obtainable through home or auto insurance providers, thus providing little benefit to consumers who need legal assistance in complex, non-tort related matters.

**Limited-Scope Legal Services.** Unbundled or limited-scope representation allows an attorney to represent a client on only part of the client’s legal matter, rather than handling the entire case from start to finish or addressing all the issues in the client’s case. California Rules of Court specifically allow for limited scope representation, defined as “a relationship between an attorney and a person seeking legal services in which they have agreed that the scope of the legal services will be limited to specific tasks that the attorney will perform for the person,”<sup>20</sup> in both general civil and family law matters. It is designed for individuals who may not be able to afford full representation by an attorney, but may be able to pay for help on a key issue of the case. For example, a party in a divorce case may not be able to afford attorney representation for the entire divorce case, but may seek assistance on a contested custody hearing or the division of retirement benefits.

## **B. Options for Unpaid Legal Representation**

Over 100 nonprofit organizations in California, commonly known as “legal services” or “legal aid” organizations, provide free civil legal assistance to low-income individuals. These organizations all have income eligibility limitations, which generally require that clients have income below 125 percent of the federal poverty line.<sup>21</sup> The legal aid that is delivered, and the means of delivery, may vary in nature, but can include direct services to clients, impact litigation on behalf of client populations, and the provision of legal expertise in a particular area of law to other legal services organizations. Most legal aid groups also partner with, and rely heavily on, pro bono legal assistance from the private bar.

Despite recent increases in funding, legal services for low-income Californians remains woefully underfunded. In California today, there are about 8,000 Californians who qualify for legal services for every one legal aid attorney.<sup>22</sup> California also falls far behind other states in its support of legal services, providing only a fraction of the funding per low-income resident that states such as New York and Texas do. California even falls far below the national average for legal aid funding per person.<sup>23</sup> Not only does the shortage of funding mean fewer Californians have legal representation, it also

---

<sup>18</sup> Amy Fontinelle, *How Personal Legal Insurance Works*, *supra* note 18.

<sup>19</sup> Nina Kaufman, *The Pros and Cons of Pre-Paid Legal* (2013) Ask the Business Lawyer, available at: <http://askthebusinesslawyer.com/blog/2013/05/26/the-pros-and-cons-of-pre-paid-legal.html>.

<sup>20</sup> California Rules of Court, Rules 3.35 and 5.425.

<sup>21</sup> Business & Professions Code Section 6213(d).

<sup>22</sup> Letter from Salena Copeland, Legal Aid Association of California, to Assemblymember Shirley Weber, Chair, Assembly Budget Subcommittee (April 2018) p. 5.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

contributes to heavy turnover in the legal services profession. According to a just-released study, nearly one-third of the attorneys employed in the 56 legal services organizations that were surveyed on January 1, 2017 had departed those organizations by December 31, 2018.<sup>24</sup> According to the study, “Financial stress due to their low salary is the number one reason legal aid attorneys give for leaving soon.”<sup>25</sup> Such high turnover adversely impacts the quality of legal services provided, both because of the training required for new attorneys and the experience that is lost when trained attorneys leave.

***Federal Legal Services Corporation-Funded Nonprofits.*** Since 1965 as part of President Johnson’s War on Poverty, the federal government has provided funding for local legal aid nonprofits throughout the country, now through the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). The level of services available at LSC-funded programs varies greatly on a county-by-county basis. Some counties have fully-staffed offices with multiple attorneys, paralegals, and clerical personnel; other counties may have a single attorney and a secretary. Still others, particularly in rural areas, may only receive visits from an attorney on a periodic basis. LSC-funded nonprofits are also limited in what services they can provide and may not, among other restrictions, bring class action lawsuits or participate in the legislative process regardless of whether they use LSC or non-LSC funding to do so.

In 2020, LSC will provide \$46.6 million to the following eleven nonprofit organizations<sup>26</sup> that are responsible for providing legal aid in every California county:<sup>27</sup>

- Bay Area Legal Aid (Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara)
- California Indian Legal Services (Alpine, Inyo, Mono, plus Native Americans in any California county and those who live on reservations)
- California Rural Legal Assistance (Colusa, Imperial, Kern, Madera, Monterey, San Benito, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Sonoma, Stanislaus, Sutter, Ventura, Yuba, plus migrant farmworkers in any California county)
- Central California Legal Services (Fresno, Kings, Mariposa, Merced, Tulare, Tuolumne)
- Community Legal Aid SoCal (Los Angeles, Orange)
- Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance (Kern)
- Inland Counties Legal Services (Riverside, San Bernardino)
- Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles (Los Angeles)
- Legal Aid Society of San Diego, Inc. (San Diego)

---

<sup>24</sup> Legal Aid Association of California, *Justice at Risk* (Jan. 2020) pp. 1-2.

<sup>25</sup> Legal Aid Association of California, *Justice at Risk*, *supra* note 24, at ii.

<sup>26</sup> Legal Services Corporation, *LSC 2020 Grant Awards*, available at <https://www.lsc.gov/grants-grantee-resources/our-grant-programs/basic-field-grant/lsc-2019-grant-awards>. See also Legal Services Corporation, *California State Profile*, available at <https://www.lsc.gov/grants-grantee-resources/our-grantees/california-state-profile>.

<sup>27</sup> See list available at: <https://www.lsc.gov/california>.

- Legal Services of Northern California (Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Del Norte, El Dorado, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Mendocino, Modoc, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Solano, Tehama, Trinity, Yolo)
- Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles (Los Angeles)

These organizations provide the backbone of the system that provides civil access to justice for low-income Californians across the state. However, this funding source is far from secure. In his just released 2021 budget blueprint, President Trump once again proposes nearly eliminating federal LSC legal aid by reducing funding by fully 96 percent.<sup>28</sup>

Fortunately, LSC funding is not the only means by which the federal government funds legal services for persons who otherwise might go unrepresented. For example, the Older Americans Act (OAA), first signed into law in 1965, funds numerous services for seniors nationwide, including legal aid. OAA funding differs from LSC funding in several ways, including the fact that it is not income-restricted; instead, no one over the age of 60 years of age can be denied OAA-funded services. The OAA was most recently reauthorized in 2016, with funding provided through the current budget year.

***Legal Services Trust Fund.*** California’s Legal Services Trust Fund financially supports, according to a statutory formula, nonprofits throughout the state that in turn provide a range of legal services to income-eligible Californians. In 2020, 100 nonprofits in California,<sup>29</sup> including the 11 LSC-funded programs, will share \$78 million in funding from the Legal Services Trust Fund.<sup>30</sup> The funding comes from a range of public and private sources.

***IOLTA Funds.*** A significant funding source for California legal services program is the Interest on Lawyers’ Trust Account (IOLTA) program administered by the State Bar of California.<sup>31</sup> Attorneys typically receive funds, such as advances for fees and costs, or settlement funds, that they hold in trust for clients for short periods of time before forwarding them to the intended recipients. The funds are held for such short periods that it would be too time-consuming and costly, both for banks and attorneys, to set up individual bank accounts for each client’s funds; moreover, the interest generated in these short time frames is usually too little to constitute a measurable loss to clients.

Given these factors, the Legislature and the State Bar (and those of every other state) require attorneys to deposit these short-term trust funds into a separate bank account; the interest earned on those funds supports legal services programs throughout California through the Legal Services Trust Fund Program. IOLTA funds fluctuate with interest

<sup>28</sup> Office of Management & Budget, *A Budget for America’s Future: Major Savings and Reforms* (2020) p. 104.

<sup>29</sup> See the complete list of 2020 recipients, available at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/Access-to-Justice/Legal-Aid-Grants/2020-Grant-Recipients>

<sup>30</sup> State Bar of California, *State Bar Announces Record Legal Services Funding of \$78 Million to 100 Grantees*, available at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/About-Us/News-Events/News-Releases/state-bar-announces-record-legal-services-funding-of-78-million-to-100-grantees>.

<sup>31</sup> See Business and Professions Code Sections 6210-6228.

rates, but are now on the upswing. Approximately \$55.6 million in IOLTA funds will be distributed to legal services programs in California this year.<sup>32</sup>

*Equal Access Fund:* The state general fund also contributes to legal services funding. Established in 1999, the Equal Access Fund (EAF) funds legal aid organizations that provide legal services to low-income Californians throughout the state. Funding is directed to the Judicial Council, which in turn passes the funds to the Legal Services Trust Fund to distribute according to a set formula.

The state initially funded EAF at \$10 million, and funding remained level until the 2016 Budget Act,<sup>33</sup> which added \$5 million in one-time funding. Subsequent years have seen further increases. The 2017 Budget Act included an additional \$10 million each year for two years in EAF funding.<sup>34</sup> The 2019 Budget Act made this annual \$10 million annual increase to EAF permanent.<sup>35</sup> As a result, the 2020 budget includes the new baseline of \$20 million in EAF funding.

*Attorney License Fee Contribution to Legal Services Organizations.* In 2013, the Legislature enacted a \$30 fee for licensed attorneys who voluntarily choose to contribute to the support of nonprofit legal aid organizations that make free legal services available to poor Californians.<sup>36</sup> The fee, which has since been increased to \$40,<sup>37</sup> is formulated as an “opt-out” assessment so that attorneys pay the fee unless they specifically deduct the amount from their annual licensing fees. According to data from the State Bar, opt out rates have varied over the years, but have grown to 39% in 2018 and 2019. In 2019, approximately \$6.5 million was raised for California legal services through this funding source.<sup>38</sup> It is anticipated that opt-out rates will increase this year – and funding from license fees will therefore decrease – because overall State Bar licensing fees increased significantly this year and attorneys are likely motivated to take advantage of even relatively small fee reductions where possible.

*Attorney License Fee Opt-In Justice Gap Fund Campaign.* As the result of 2006 legislation, the State Bar established the Justice Gap Fund to promote charitable giving by lawyers.<sup>39</sup> This program collects contributions from individual attorneys to support legal services via an opt-in to the State Bar’s annual licensing fees and by contributions made online at the State Bar’s web site. Disappointingly, less than five percent of the state’s 275,000 attorneys choose to participate in the Justice Gap Fund. In 2019, the Justice Gap Fund raised approximately \$1.25 million for California legal services.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> State Bar of California, *State Bar Announces Record Legal Services Funding*, *supra* note 30.

<sup>33</sup> SB 826 (Leno), Chap. 23, Stats. 2016.

<sup>34</sup> AB 97 (Ting), Chap. 14, Stats. 2017.

<sup>35</sup> SB 840 (Mitchell), Chap. 27, Stats. 2018.

<sup>36</sup> SB 345 (Evans), Chap. 681, Stats. 2013.

<sup>37</sup> AB 2746 (Committee on Judiciary), Chap. 429, Stats. 2014.

<sup>38</sup> Hellen Hong, State Bar of California; State Bar of California, *2019 State Bar Final Budget* (Feb. 28, 2019) p. 18.

<sup>39</sup> AB 2301 (Judiciary), Chap. 165, Stats. 2006.

<sup>40</sup> State Bar of California, *2019 State Bar Final Budget*, *supra* note 38, at 63.



*2019-2020 Budget Eviction Defense Fund.* The 2019-20 state budget allocated an additional \$20 million to the Equal Access Fund in one-time funding for legal services for housing assistance, including tenant assistance and homelessness prevention.<sup>41</sup> Three-quarters of these funds – \$15 million – were distributed according to the EAF funding formula to legal aid organizations that provide eviction defense or other assistance to tenants in landlord-tenant disputes; \$5 million will be distributed under a competitive grant process overseen by the State Bar’s Legal Services Trust Fund Commission; and \$150,000 will be allocated for administrative costs. Any funds so granted must be spent by June 30, 2021.<sup>42</sup>

*National Mortgage Settlement.* In 2012, the federal government and the attorneys general of 49 states and the District of Columbia reached a settlement of claims with the nation’s five largest mortgage servicers for the latter’s violations of federal law that arguably helped precipitate the foreclosure crisis. As part of the settlement entered in federal court, California was to receive some \$410 million in funds to be “used for purposes intended to avoid preventable foreclosures, to ameliorate the effects of the foreclosure crisis, to enhance law enforcement efforts to prevent and prosecute financial fraud, or unfair or deceptive acts or practices and to compensate the State [] for costs resulting from the alleged unlawful conduct of [the defendants.]”<sup>43</sup> Rather than being spent solely for these purposes, however, approximately \$331 million of these funds were diverted by then-Governor Jerry Brown for general fund expenditures. Nonprofit organizations sued the state, and in 2019, the Third District Court of Appeals ordered these funds released to a National Mortgage Special Deposit Fund previously established by the Legislature to fulfill the settlement’s purposes.<sup>44</sup> After the California Supreme Court denied review, Governor Newsom announced his intention to use the funds to “create a new permanent fund that would provide legal assistance for struggling California renters and homeowners.”<sup>45</sup> It is anticipated that at least some of these funds will support legal services organizations protecting tenants from evictions.

***Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act.*** To ensure that unrepresented parties in important civil cases have meaningful access to justice, guard against the involuntary waiver of rights or disposition of cases by default, and encourage the fair and expeditious resolution of disputes in a manner consistent with principles of judicial neutrality, the Legislature created a pilot “Civil Gideon” program in 2009 that provides a right to counsel for litigants faced with life-changing civil legal matters who cannot afford counsel. The Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act (Shriver Act)<sup>46</sup> was initially created as a pilot program with \$9.5 million funding per year for ten projects in seven counties (Kern, Los Angeles,

---

<sup>41</sup> AB 74 (Ting), Chap. 23, Stats. 2019.

<sup>42</sup> Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, *Governor Newsom Proposes New Permanent Funding to Help Californians Fight Evictions & Foreclosures* (Aug. 7, 2019), available at: <https://www.gov.ca.gov/2019/08/07/governor-newsom-proposes-new-permanent-funding-to-help-californians-fight-evictions-foreclosures/>.

<sup>43</sup> *National Asian American Coalition v. Newsom* (2019) 33 Cal. App. 5th 993, 997.

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* at 1023.

<sup>45</sup> Office of Governor Gavin Newsom, *Governor Newsom Proposes New Permanent Funding*, *supra* note 42.

<sup>46</sup> AB 590 (Feuer), Chap. 457, Stats. 2009.

Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Yolo), six of which focused on housing cases, three of which focused on child custody cases, and one which focused on guardianship and conservatorship cases.<sup>47</sup> The pilot projects were operated by legal services nonprofit corporations, working in collaboration with local courts and other legal services providers in the community to provide legal representation to low-income Californians with incomes at or below-200 percent of the federal poverty level.

An initial study, mandated by the establishing legislation, found that Shriver representation made it much more likely that desperately poor Californians would find stable housing, secure child custody, and successfully navigate probate matters, all while providing numerous efficiencies to the courts which participated in the pilot projects. For example, 70 percent of the tenants with Shriver representation in eviction proceedings settled their cases and 5 percent resolved their cases via trial, versus rates of 34 percent and 14 percent, respectively, in cases involving unrepresented tenants. A year later, 71 percent of Shriver clients had obtained new rental housing, versus only 43 percent of unrepresented tenants.<sup>48</sup> Similarly, child custody orders in Shriver representation cases proved more durable than those in unrepresented cases, with only 11 percent of parties in Shriver-involved cases seeking to modify custody orders within two years of their issuance, compared to 32 percent of the parties in comparison cases.<sup>49</sup> These results were therefore positive for both represented litigants and participating courts.

As a result of these successes, the Legislature has in recent years made the Shriver pilot program permanent,<sup>50</sup> increased funding,<sup>51</sup> and expanded the services that can be offered under the Shriver Act.<sup>52</sup>

**Law School Clinics.** Each ABA-accredited law school in California offers an elective clinical legal program in which students can gain experience handling real-world legal problems under the supervision of a licensed attorney. Many of these programs focus on providing services to clients who would otherwise be unrepresented. A sampling of areas of representation include legal services for the indigent (East Bay Community Law Center at University of California Berkeley Law); business transactions (Small Business Clinic at University of Southern California Gould School of Law); environmental law (Environmental Law Clinic at University of California Los Angeles School of Law); family law (Domestic Violence Clinic at University of California Irvine School of Law); immigration law (Immigration Law Clinic at University of California Davis School of Law); and tax law (Low-Income Taxpayers Clinic at University of California Hastings

---

<sup>47</sup> See Judicial Council of California, *Fact Sheet: Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act* (Aug. 2012); Judicial Council of California, *Evaluation of the Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act* (Evaluation) (July 2017).

<sup>48</sup> See Evaluation, *supra* note 47, at II-IV.

<sup>49</sup> See Evaluation, *supra* note 47, at VII-VIII.

<sup>50</sup> SB 843 (Public Safety), Chap. 33, Stats. 2016.

<sup>51</sup> See AB 330 (Gabriel), Chap. 217, Stats. 2019, which augmented Shriver funding by increasing certain court filing fees, and also authorized donations to the program. The 2019 Budget Act also allocated an extra \$2.5 million in one-time Shriver funding. See AB 74 (Ting), Chap. 23, Stats. 2019.

<sup>52</sup> See AB 330 (Gabriel), Chap. 217, Stats. 2019, which now permits up to 20 percent of Shriver funding to be directed to family law matters; the initial pilot had restricted this funding to actions in which a parent seeks sole legal or physical custody of a child.

College of Law), although many other areas of law are also represented at various law schools. Each law school clinic has its own eligibility criteria for clients. Several law school clinics receive funding from the Legal Services Trust Fund.

***Pro Bono Legal Services.*** The State Bar of California defines pro bono legal service as “providing or enabling the direct delivery of legal services, without expectation of compensation other than reimbursement of expenses, to indigent individuals, or to not-for-profit organizations with a primary purpose of providing services to the poor or on behalf of the poor or disadvantaged, not-for-profit organizations with a purpose of improving the law and the legal system, or increasing access to justice.”<sup>53</sup> Attorneys in California are “encouraged” by the State Bar to provide 50 hours of pro bono legal service each year. However, the State Bar notes that the 50 hour total is “aspirational” and not a “requirement.”<sup>54</sup>

Although many of California’s largest law firms provide pro bono legal services, most attorneys likely do not complete the “encouraged” annual 50 hours of pro bono legal services. This is especially true for attorneys that serve in roles that may pose conflicts of interest with potential clients, including most attorneys working for government employers. Furthermore, many of the legal services organizations that provide free legal aid require pro bono attorneys to possess highly specialized legal skills, such as immigration law, that are outside the expertise of many licensed attorneys. As a result of the demands of paid clients, potential conflicts, and need for specialized legal assistance, current levels of pro bono legal service are well below what is needed to provide high-quality representation to most Californians who otherwise cannot afford legal counsel.

### **III. Existing Support for Litigants Without Legal Representation**

Too frequently the inability to hire legal counsel results in an inability to access California courts. However, as unrepresented litigants have increased in California so have support – both from the courts and from outside the courts – to help those litigants, though the increase has not kept pace with the ever-growing need.

#### **A. Court-Based Assistance**

***Family Law Facilitators.*** California law requires each superior court to have a family law facilitator, staffed by at least one experienced family law attorney, to help unrepresented family law litigants.<sup>55</sup> Family law facilitators, who were intended to help in child support cases and made eligible to receive federal child support funding to provide services in those cases, are specifically required to do the following:

- Provide educational materials to parents concerning the process of establishing parentage and establishing, modifying, and enforcing child support and spousal support in the courts;

---

<sup>53</sup> State Bar of California, *Pro Bono Resolution* (amended June 22, 2002).

<sup>54</sup> Available at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/Access-to-Justice/Pro-Bono/Pro-Bono-FAQ>.

<sup>55</sup> Family Code Section 10002.

- Distribute necessary court forms and voluntary declarations of paternity;
- Provide assistance in completing forms;
- Prepare child support schedules based upon statutory guidelines; and
- Provide referrals to the local child support agency, family court services, and other community agencies and resources that provide services for parents and children.<sup>56</sup>

Family law facilitators may also provide other family law services and assistance, including drafting stipulations (if the parties agree), reviewing filings and advising the judge about them, assisting the clerk in maintaining records, preparing formal court orders, and serving as a special master.<sup>57</sup> State law specifically provides that the facilitator does not represent any party and that no attorney-client relationship exists between the facilitator, their staff, and the family law litigant.<sup>58</sup> Statewide, family law facilitators receive \$14 million in state and federal funding.

***Self-Help Centers.*** Building on the success of the family law facilitator program, court-based self-help centers began in 2001, with five pilot projects testing best practices for providing assistance to unrepresented litigants in small rural counties, in large urban counties, and for non-English speakers. In reviewing the pilots, as well as the family law facilitator program, the Judicial Council’s Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants determined that “court-based, staffed, self-help centers, supervised by attorneys, are the optimum way for courts to facilitate the timely and cost-effective processing of cases involving self-represented litigants, to increase access to the courts and improve delivery of justice to the public.”<sup>59</sup> The evaluation, done for the Legislature in 2005, concluded that court-based self-help centers “facilitate a litigant’s ability to participate effectively in the legal process,” “improve court efficiency,” “promote public trust and confidence in the court system,” and “have the capacity to meet the needs of many non-English speakers.”<sup>60</sup> Based on that analysis, the Legislature added \$5 million for self-help assistance in the 2005-06 budget, increased that amount to \$11.2 million in the 2007-08 budget, and, most recently, significantly increased that amount again by \$19.1 million in last year’s budget for a total budget of \$31.3 million in this budget year (2019-20). At a statewide-level, this year’s budget also funded technological improvements for self-help centers, particularly intelligent chat technology. Details on the amount of funding received and the number of litigants served by each county self-help center are shown in Appendix A.

Given their increased state funding, self-help centers have expanded their assistance to litigants, generally offering services in family law, including dissolution, parentage, child custody, child support, and domestic violence; guardianships and conservatorships; probate; and general civil law (see Appendix B for information on the cases encountered

---

<sup>56</sup> Family Code Section 10004.

<sup>57</sup> Family Code Section 10005.

<sup>58</sup> Family Code Section 10013.

<sup>59</sup> Judicial Council Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants, *Statewide Action Plan for Serving Self-Represented Litigants* (2004) p. 1.

<sup>60</sup> Budget Change Proposal 0250-114-BCP-2018-GB.

by self-help centers) with no income limitations for users. The centers provide assistance to the public by providing various information and services to unrepresented litigants, which can include group workshops, such as divorce workshops, assistance completing forms, one-on-one assistance, mediation assistance, and referrals. Almost all self-help centers also provide services for non-English speakers (see Appendix C for details). The centers are staffed by at least one attorney and legal assistants working under the supervision of the attorney. While the self-help centers provide legal assistance, they do not provide legal *advice* to the parties and no attorney-client relationship exists with the litigants.

Beyond helping litigants, the self-help centers also provide significant benefits to the courts. The Judicial Council has found that for every \$0.23 spent on self-help center workshops, the court saves approximately \$1 in costs for hearings and public counter staff time; while one-on-one support saves “at least one hearing per case, 5 to 15 minutes of hearing time for every hearing held in the case, and 1 to 1.5 hours of court staff time” at the front counter.<sup>61</sup> A former Sonoma County Family Law Commissioner, Louise Fightmaster, succinctly explained the benefits to the court of providing legal assistance to unrepresented litigants:

The assistance that the self-represented litigants receive in our self-help center greatly reduces our workload in the courtroom and also in our business office. In the courtroom, our continuances have been reduced because litigants far more frequently have correct and complete paperwork the first time. And because of the help they get at the self-help center, the default and uncontested judgments submitted by the self-represented litigants is far more frequently correct the first time it is submitted. This spares the court staff from having to return the paperwork and then review it again and again as it is re-filed – until it is finally correct.<sup>62</sup>

Saving the court time and money is important, and court efficiency helps ensure that state general fund support for services to unrepresented litigants is a wise investment. More importantly, efficiency reduces the time that litigants must spend trying to access the justice system and reduces the number of days they have to miss work and find care for their children, which are significant barriers for low-income litigants, in order to address their legal issues (see Appendix D for information on the income of self-help center visitors). However, while self-help centers may increase court efficiency and assist unrepresented litigants navigate the judicial process and present their cases to the court, they are certainly not equivalent to actual representation by an attorney as data on ultimate case outcomes makes clear.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Budget Change Proposal 0250-083-BCP-BR-2020-GB.

<sup>62</sup> Judicial Council, *Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants: Implementation Task Force: Final Report* (Oct. 2014) p. 19.

<sup>63</sup> See, e.g., Evaluation, *supra* note 47; D. James Greiner, et al., *The Limits of Unbundled Legal Assistance*, *supra* note 9.

***Small Claims Advisory Services.*** A small claims advisory service is available in every county in California, administered either by the county or the superior court in that county. Small claims advisory services are funded at the county level through a portion of the fees paid for small claims filings.<sup>64</sup> The amount of funding for small claims advisory services in a given county is therefore directly proportional to the number of small claims cases filed in that county. Some counties or courts contract with third parties, such as an attorney, law firm, or nonprofit, to provide the small claims advisory services.

The small claims advisor is required to offer services including, but not limited to, “preparation of small claims court filings, procedures, including procedures related to the conduct of the hearing, and information on the collection of small claims court judgments”<sup>65</sup> and to be trained in areas of law that are commonly invoked in small claims court.<sup>66</sup> The only exception to the small claims advisor requirement is in counties where 1,000 or fewer small claims actions are filed per year; such counties are nonetheless required to offer small claims information booklets and recorded telephone messages providing general small claims-related information.<sup>67</sup>

## **B. Law Libraries**

Since 1891, every county in California has been statutorily required to maintain a public law library to provide no- or low-cost legal resources to attorneys and unrepresented litigants.<sup>68</sup> These libraries, which are funded, for the most part, from court filing fees, strive to ensure that all Californians have access to legal information (see Appendix A for more information on library funding and users).<sup>69</sup> The law libraries provide members of the public with access to legal research databases, legal practice guides, and other legal documents that may assist an attorney or a person in representing themselves in court. Details on the variety of library services offered and areas of law covered are shown in Appendices E and B, respectively. However, because support is based on filing fees, smaller counties with fewer filings are unable to maintain independent law libraries. In fact, two counties do not provide any law library services, while six counties provide law library services in conjunction with the public library system, and seven counties provide law library services through a district attorney, public defender, or county counsel’s office.<sup>70</sup>

Although the law libraries have long maintained a steady source of funding, the annual collection of filing fees is volatile and the statutory formula for collecting fees has not

---

<sup>64</sup> See Code of Civil Procedure Section 116.230(g).

<sup>65</sup> Code of Civil Procedure Section 116.940(b)(1).

<sup>66</sup> California Rules of Court, Rule 3.2120.

<sup>67</sup> Code of Civil Procedure Section 116.940(c).

<sup>68</sup> Benjamin Watson, *Origins of California’s County Law Library System*, (1989) 81 Law Libr. J. 241.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> Alpine and Sutter Counties have no active law library services. Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Mariposa, Mono, and Trinity Counties have law library services provided by the public library. Glenn, Lassen, Modoc, San Benito, Sierra, Tuolumne, and Yuba Counties have library services provided through other legal offices.

substantially changed in nearly a decade.<sup>71</sup> Accordingly, law libraries have historically faced inconsistent funding levels, resulting in significant variability in the level of service they provide to the public. To ensure that law libraries can maintain and expand the services they provide to the public, the Legislature approved a \$16.5 million supplemental, one-time funding allocation in the 2018-19 budget.<sup>72</sup> Those additional funds helped support a variety of services (see Appendix F for details). According to a survey of the law libraries conducted by the Committees, significant portions of the funds were dedicated to restoring services that the law libraries were forced to cut because their funding has not kept pace with inflation. Twenty-one libraries repurchased or renewed out-of-date resources, while 19 libraries upgraded technology hardware and expanded online resources. Some libraries expanded hours or hired additional staff. Notably, five law libraries used additional staff resources to expand their service hours; nine libraries boosted resources for non-English speakers; and six libraries expanded programming offered to the public (see Appendix C for details). However, many other law libraries utilized the one-time funds for infrastructure improvements and repairs that, while important, did not improve or expand the services provided to the public (though they may have been a reasonable use of *one-time* funds).

Many law libraries provide meaningful services to non-English speaking Californians. Nearly half of the law libraries reported providing print resources in languages other than English and an equal number of libraries provide non-English speakers with, at the very least, recommendations for how to seek information in their native language. Additionally, half of the law libraries reported that at least one staff member speaks Spanish and six libraries report a member who is able to speak a language other than English or Spanish. Several counties have also expressed interest in expanding the software and technological resources they provide to non-English speakers.

### **C. Unauthorized Practice of Law**

When litigants cannot afford legal representation, unscrupulous actors often fill the void and offer to provide assistance with legal matters. These actors commonly cause negative outcomes for all Californians, but particularly those with the fewest resources. Perhaps more troubling than Californians abandoning legal claims for want of financial resources are those Californians who fall victim to unscrupulous actors who exploit legal troubles for their own financial gains. Due to California's large Latinx population, "Notarios" pose a significant problem for the legal profession. According to the National Notary Association, in many Latin American countries, "Notarios Publicos" are highly trained legal professionals akin to attorneys in the United States.<sup>73</sup> However, in the United States notaries public, while publicly sanctioned and similarly named, provide limited services related to validating signatures and identification verification and have no formal legal training.<sup>74</sup> Too frequently, especially in matters related to immigration, deceitful actors use the confusion presented by the similar names to take advantage of

---

<sup>71</sup> Business and Professions Code Sections 6230 *et seq.*

<sup>72</sup> SB 840 (Committee on Budget & Fiscal Review), Chap. 19, Stats. 2018.

<sup>73</sup> Available at: <https://www.nationalnotary.org/knowledge-center/about-notaries/notaries-and-notarios>

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*

unwitting victims who seek legitimate legal advice and services. Frequently, victims of notarios pay significant fees while their legal issues are ignored or improperly handled and end up facing significantly greater legal jeopardy than if they had simply tried to navigate the byzantine legal system by themselves. Accordingly, the Legislature has repeatedly sought to deter such activities by deeming notarios to be engaged in the unauthorized practice of law and imposing civil penalties on those found liable for engaging in such conduct.<sup>75</sup>

#### **D. Limitations on Assistance for Unrepresented Litigants**

***Physical Access to Services and Supports.*** While every county (with some exceptions in the smallest counties that do not have law libraries, as discussed above) maintains options for unrepresented litigants to obtain limited legal assistance, many large counties with multiple branch courthouses do not provide those services at every location.<sup>76</sup> It is unclear how many Californians are unable to obtain self-help assistance because they cannot even reach the proper venue to receive help. Furthermore, in large, geographically sprawling counties, it is unclear how many Californians cannot reach the courts, self-help centers, or law libraries due to limits on transportation and hours of service. Although Californians of all income levels are frequently unrepresented in court,<sup>77</sup> transportation issues make accessing even basic legal self-help especially difficult for the poorest Californians and communities of color who may lack adequate transit options.

***Language Access to Self-Help Services.*** Further complicating access to adequate help for unrepresented litigants are the language gaps that create additional hurdles for many non-English speaking Californians. Although information about seeking court services is provided by the Judicial Council (on a statewide website) in nearly a dozen languages, self-help information on specific legal topics is only provided in four languages online.<sup>78</sup> If a non-English speaker is able to reach a court-based self-help center, two-thirds of those centers report providing substantive materials in languages other than English; 70 percent report that at least one staff member is multilingual; and half report providing at least some in-person language interpreting services. However, that assuredly does not adequately meet the legal service or self-help needs of all non-English speaking Californians in all counties and all courts in California.

### **IV. Best Practices to Help Unrepresented Litigants**

#### **A. Self-Help Centers**

As discussed above, self-help centers located within California's courts provide important assistance to unrepresented litigants by helping them to understand the court process. In recent budget years, the Legislature has invested millions of dollars in

---

<sup>75</sup> AB 1159 (Gonzalez), Chap. 574, Stats. 2013.

<sup>76</sup> Available at: <https://www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-courtresources.htm>

<sup>77</sup> Rocío Avalos et al., *2019 California Justice Gap Study*, *supra* note 14, at 8.

<sup>78</sup> Available at: <https://www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-interpretor.htm>.



funding to improve the capacity of the self-help centers, including an additional \$19 million in ongoing funding in the 2019-20 budget (see Appendix F for details on how the additional funding was spent).

*Additional staff and online resources.* The overwhelming majority of self-help centers surveyed by the Committees report that they used the additional funding to hire new staff, including attorneys with expertise in the areas of law frequently litigated by unrepresented parties, and expand hours of operation. Many self-help centers also used their increased funding to improve and to expand their online presence, which may help boost awareness of these resources so litigants will know where to seek assistance with their legal issues.

*Partnering with law libraries.* Many self-help centers work with local law libraries by, for example, advertising self-help center services in law libraries and informing court users of the resources available at local law libraries. This cross-promotion appears to assist litigants. Additionally, several self-help centers provide written materials directly to law libraries. This resource sharing helps to maximize resources, especially for smaller law libraries with very limited budgets.

*Written materials.* Interestingly, the survey data revealed that many self-help centers are developing their own resources, such as packets of court forms and other legal information for litigants. It appears that, although many of the self-help centers turn to one another for assistance, unique versions of these documents are being developed in counties across California. Although each county may have unique local rules of court, it would seem that significant portions of the documents developed by self-help centers could be standardized for all California counties and all California courts. While many self-help centers praised the Judicial Council's listserv for providing helpful and innovative suggestions for programs and services, it also may be possible for the Judicial Council to work more closely with self-help centers to standardize these documents.

*Partnerships between self-help centers.* Self-help centers in 23 counties participate in the Self-Help Assistance and Referral Program (SHARP), a multi-county self-help center that increases remote access to legal assistance through video conferencing and live-broadcast workshops, coordinates staff training, and creates self-help materials. Additionally, many self-help center managers noted that they frequently communicate with other self-help centers to answer questions or seek ideas for programming. Several self-help centers noted that such cross-county cooperation enables litigants to seek highly specific legal guidance at neighboring county facilities. The survey data did not reveal, however, the degree to which this coordination may help standardize practices across California courts to improve efficiency, particularly in the smallest counties with the fewest resources.

## **B. Law Libraries**

Similar to the self-help centers, some of the most effective law library practices include collaboration with other groups and organizations that share the goal of assisting

unrepresented litigants, including self-help centers, bar associations, and legal aid and community organizations. Regular communication, resource-sharing, and cross-promotion allows for faster and more effective referrals, increased public awareness of available resources, and more frequent programs, like topic-specific workshops or “Lawyers in the Library” clinics (see Appendix E for details on library resources and services). Several law libraries use these inter-agency communications to identify gaps in resources and avoid duplication. Most staffed law libraries rely on the Council of California County Law Librarians (CCCLL), their statewide education and advocacy organization, as a resource for distributing self-help materials; donating older books, computers, and furniture to smaller libraries; and sharing institutional knowledge on legal topics and library operations. The CCCLL also pools resources from multiple counties to provide online self-help services (“Ask a Law Librarian”), create a statewide database of forms and self-help instructions, and make group purchases of legal publications and databases at discounted prices. These types of collaboration maximize library resources and may reduce burdens for smaller law libraries with limited resources.

Many county law libraries are working to increase support for unrepresented litigants by creating new self-help materials, providing in-person assistance, or increasing the accessibility of their existing resources. While most libraries are able to provide in-person legal research assistance for unrepresented litigants, some supplement this by creating or compiling self-help information and form packets. Libraries with more resources are also able to organize and host legal clinics or workshops on common legal issues.

The 2018-19 one-time, \$16.5 million supplemental budget increase for the law libraries was used by the libraries in different ways to increase access to legal assistance (see Appendix F for details):

- Some of the law libraries used the one-time funding to expand services by increasing staffing, creating new self-help materials, or increasing in-person programming.
- While a majority of county law libraries provide some resources to non-English speakers, most often in the form of translated self-help or informational materials, as well as in-person advice through multilingual staff, interpreters, or referral to other resource organizations, many libraries want to increase these services. About one quarter of the libraries indicated that they used their supplemental funding to increase resources to non-English speakers.
- A few libraries used the funding to increase access for people with hearing or vision impairments.
- Many law libraries are working to create more resources that are accessible remotely, such as online forms, self-help materials, and online legal databases. About half of the libraries used the supplemental funding to increase the quality and quantity of these online, remote-access resources.
- Some law libraries were able to increase the accessibility of their in-person workshops, either by live-streaming them at other library locations, or recording them and making them available online.

- Many library resources still require a visit to the physical library. Increasing weekend and evening hours allows for greater accessibility for working people, while multiple library locations increase accessibility for those with limited transportation options. These are difficult to achieve with limited funding, especially for geographically large, rural counties with smaller populations (and hence smaller funding).
- A small fraction of law libraries used the increased funding to expand library hours or increase or expand secondary library locations.

### C. Court Navigators

A relatively recent addition to the arsenal of services and supports to help unrepresented litigants are court navigators. Court navigators provide *non-legal* assistance to unrepresented litigants to help them “find their way around the court; get practical information and referrals to other sources of assistance; or complete their court paperwork. Navigators also accompany [unrepresented litigants] to court to provide emotional back-up, help answer the judge’s factual questions, or resolve a matter with opposing counsel.”<sup>79</sup> It is important to note that some of these tasks, particularly the latter two (answering a judge’s factual questions, or resolving a matter with opposing counsel), likely require legal training and may in fact represent the unlawful practice of law in California if performed by a non-attorney working without attorney supervision.<sup>80</sup>

A version of the court navigator program is operating today in several large, urban California counties, including Los Angeles, San Diego, and Santa Clara. Called JusticeCorps, the program is a partnership between the California courts and AmeriCorps with AmeriCorps paying college students and recent college graduates a stipend to provide non-legal service and support to unrepresented litigants in selected trial courts. The Judicial Council is seeking to expand this program, without AmeriCorps participation, statewide. At the same time, the Governor’s January budget proposes \$8.1 million for the 2020-21 budget year and \$15.5 million annually thereafter to fund the program. The Judicial Council proposes that the navigators can do the following:

- Provide non-legal assistance in self-help centers;
- Provide referrals for language access services, disability accommodations, and other options designed to address barriers to court access;
- Assist with technology (kiosks) for intake and completion of forms; and
- Help guide litigants through the steps for completing their cases.<sup>81</sup>

The proposal seeks to allow each court to design its own program and place court navigators where each court believes they are needed most. While the idea of each court making its own decisions how to prioritize its resources has some merit, it is also true that

---

<sup>79</sup> Mary McClymont, *Nonlawyer Navigators in State Courts: An Emerging Consensus*, The Justice Lab at Georgetown Law Center (June 2019) p. 6.

<sup>80</sup> See Business & Professions Code Section 6125, which prevents a non-licensed attorney from practicing law.

<sup>81</sup> Budget Change Proposal 0250-083-BCP-BR-2020-GB.

statewide standards, based upon proven best practices, also has merit. For example, the Justice Lab at Georgetown Law notes that integrating navigators into a system that uses lawyers to help unrepresented litigants “can foster institutionalization of programs, enhance court efficiency, and provide an improved system in which to service [unrepresented litigants].”<sup>82</sup>

The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) believes that it is premature for the Legislature to fund court navigators because there has yet to be a more complete analysis of existing programs to help litigants, including expanded self-help center services and increased legal services funding, which may already provide some or all of the services that court navigators are proposed to do.<sup>83</sup> Instead, the LAO recommends waiting to review the evaluation of the self-help centers, which is due in November of this year, and to better understanding what assistance the litigants themselves actually need.

*As it considers the Governor’s proposal to expand and fund the court navigator program on a statewide and continuing basis, the Legislature may want to consider whether this proposal is premature, as LAO suggests, or, if not, whether to place requirements on the programs, including that, to the extent possible, court navigators are fully integrated with existing self-help centers and that they report to the Legislature what services they provide to the public.*

## **V. Possible Options to Improve Access to Justice for All Californians**

The following is an inexhaustive list of ideas, programs, and services that may help improve access to justice for all Californians, recognizing the reality that many Californians will continue to lack representation by licensed attorneys as they seek to address their legal needs in the courts.

### ***A. Better understand the extent of the problem by the following:***

- *Tracking data on unrepresented litigants in the courts, by case type, such as family law, unlawful detention, and conservatorship; and by county, and by courthouse within larger counties. This should help determine where support services are most needed. Track data over time, to learn if litigants, particularly in family law, begin with counsel, but lose representation during the life of their case, and, if so, when. Courts today do not track unrepresented litigants, so, at best, can only estimate their prevalence in courts across the state.*
- *Further studying the justice gap to better understand why some Californians choose not to seek legal assistance for their legal problems in order to develop approaches to help more Californians obtain needed legal help for these problems.*

### ***B. Increase access to legal representation by doing the following:***

---

<sup>82</sup> Mary McClymont, *Nonlawyer Navigators in State Courts*, *supra* note 79.

<sup>83</sup> Legislative Analyst’s Office, *The 2020-21 Budget: Criminal Justice Proposals* (Feb. 18, 2020) pp. 44-46.

- *Increasing financial support for legal service organizations* through increased state general fund support, increased support from the State Bar and from attorneys statewide, and by advocating for increased support from the federal government.
- *Strongly encouraging more law students to choose careers in legal services* by creating more paid summer internships, increasing salaries, and making school debt forgiveness more effective.
- *Improving legal services attorney retention* by increasing salaries and providing more options for career advancement.
- *Expanding funding for, and the scope of, Sargent Shriver Civil Counsel Act grants.*
- *Strongly encouraging more pro bono volunteering* by California attorneys, particularly in the areas of greatest need. Consider providing MCLE credit for pro bono volunteering.

***C. Reduce barriers to access the courts by doing the following:***

- *Expanding court services beyond traditional business hours.* In an attempt to provide opportunities for working Californians to access court services, many courts operate “night courts” to varying degrees. Existing California law permits courts to impose a \$1 fee on all traffic tickets to fund night court, basically an after-hours traffic court.<sup>84</sup> Beyond traffic matters, some courts have also expanded night court to include small claims court or unlawful detainer hearings, both services frequently used by unrepresented litigants.<sup>85</sup> It appears, according to Judicial Council staff, that many of the night courts were significantly curtailed, if not outright eliminated, during the last recession. These services remain vulnerable to future budget fluctuations. Presently, the only night court service with a statutorily directed funding stream remains traffic court, and all other night court services are at risk of potential budget cuts.
- *Consider opening more courthouses to be closer to court users.* As a result of draconian budget cuts made during the last recession, court hours were reduced and courthouses were closed across the state. As court funding has significantly increased these last few years, some of the closed courts have reopened and court hours have been expanded, expanding access to justice. However, there is certainly room for improvement, especially for those litigants who have transportation difficulties that make getting to a distant courthouse nearly impossible.

---

<sup>84</sup> Vehicle Code Section 42006.

<sup>85</sup> See, e.g., Sacramento County Night Court Services, available at: <https://www.saccourt.ca.gov/locations/cmjc.aspx>.

***D. Improve the effectiveness of self-help centers by doing the following:***

- *Requiring the Judicial Council to establish statewide trainings and annual meetings for self-help center staff to facilitate dissemination of best practices.*
- *Establishing statewide standards for self-help forms and packets to ensure that minimum standards are met and to encourage development of additional packets and forms.*
- *Establishing statewide forms and packets to be used in all self-help centers and law libraries in order to create uniformity, allow for development of additional forms through economies of scale, allow for cross-training of staff, and ensure access to all the forms and packets for litigants throughout the state.*
- *Expanding interpreter services offered by self-help centers and translating more self-help materials into more languages.*
- *Requiring better coordination between self-help centers.*
- *Requiring better coordination between self-help centers and their local law libraries.*
- *Improving online resources for litigants.*
- *Establishing statewide standards for kiosks.*
- *Having Judicial Council develop a “best practices” manual for self-help centers.*

***E. Improve the effectiveness of law libraries by doing the following:***

- *Requiring statewide coordination between the law libraries and self-help centers, possibly with a coordinator housed in the Judicial Council’s Center for Families, Children & the Courts.*
- *Requiring better coordination between the state’s law libraries so that the smaller counties with minimal financial support can still offer many of the same services offered by larger counties.*
- *Requiring self-help centers to provide no- or low-cost copies of forms and documents to law libraries for use by visitors to the libraries.*
- *Expanding interpreter services offered by law libraries and translating more self-help materials into more languages.*
- *Requiring better coordination between county law libraries and their local self-help centers.*

***F. Increase support for law libraries by doing the following:***

- *Increasing the impact of any new state general fund support by requiring a county or local match for new state funds.*
- *Requiring that law libraries receiving new general fund support provide minimum services, including access to all available forms and self-help packets, access to online legal research, and better coordination with self-help centers in terms of referrals and assistance with appointments.*
- *Providing resources to ensure that all county law libraries maintain a meaningful online presence, including offering guidance from state or judicial branch information technology experts and website hosting assistance to ensure that all law libraries maintain an accessible and user-friendly website.*

***G. If court navigators are to receive state funding, maximize the effectiveness of those funds by:***

- *Clearly defining the role of court navigators to ensure they provide needed non-legal assistance or ensure they are under the supervision of the self-help center attorneys.*
- *Requiring the court navigators to be part of the self-help centers or, at a minimum, coordinate their activities with the self-help centers to make more effective use of limited court resources.*
- *Requiring that navigators are able to provide assistance (or referrals for assistance) in multiple languages, reflecting the languages spoken in the county or near the particular courthouse.*





**APPENDIX A - Part 1**  
**Funding & Customers: Self-Help Centers**

Self-Help Centers	Population	Total Budget			# Customer Encounters*		# Customer Encounters as % of Population**	
		FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19
Alameda	1,663,190	\$888,244	\$1,692,597	\$1,739,737	66,846	38,175	4.0%	2.3%
Alpine	1,120	\$34,308	\$34,825	\$34,825	***	***	***	***
Amador	38,626	\$93,455	\$111,498	\$111,498	947	1,435	2.5%	3.7%
Butte	229,294	\$412,382	\$520,732	\$529,851	44,678	36,368	19.5%	15.9%
Calaveras	45,670	\$120,455	\$142,309	\$142,309	7,486	9,194	16.4%	20.1%
Colusa	21,805	\$99,384	\$91,273	\$91,273	3,950	3,369	18.1%	15.5%
Contra Costa	1,147,439	\$826,462	\$1,387,648	\$1,387,648	23,299	25,602	2.0%	2.2%
Del Norte	27,470	\$95,191	\$107,384	\$107,384	542	3,851	2.0%	14.0%
El Dorado	188,987	\$217,033	\$305,931	\$305,931	2,479	6,338	1.3%	3.4%
Fresno	989,255	\$1,051,539	\$1,543,212	\$1,543,212	4,382	16,768	0.4%	1.7%
Glenn	28,094	\$140,135	\$153,615	\$130,401	3,618	4,154	12.9%	14.8%
Humboldt	136,754	\$182,873	\$227,795	\$227,795	2,392	2,410	1.7%	1.8%
Imperial	182,830	\$144,570	\$244,727	\$245,668	***	1,309	***	0.7%
Inyo	18,026	\$113,714	\$122,463	\$122,463	1,781	2,131	9.9%	11.8%
Kern	893,119	\$694,207	\$1,162,700	\$1,162,700	52,325	51,504	5.9%	5.8%
Kings	150,101	\$146,757	\$217,429	\$220,792	3,059	5,488	2.0%	3.7%
Lake	64,246	\$125,195	\$155,829	\$155,829	6,287	7,589	9.8%	11.8%
Lassen	31,163	\$107,801	\$121,160	\$121,160	979	1,182	3.1%	3.8%
Los Angeles	10,163,507	\$5,356,273	\$10,158,487	\$10,158,487	121,248	98,263	1.2%	1.0%
Madera	156,890	\$167,162	\$243,710	\$243,710	22,100	12,274	14.1%	7.8%
Marin	260,955	\$233,473	\$359,516	\$359,516	6,728	5,811	2.6%	2.2%
Mariposa	17,569	\$83,912	\$92,397	\$92,397	1,332	1,507	7.6%	8.6%
Mendocino	88,018	\$136,073	\$177,679	\$178,148	4,559	6,625	5.2%	7.5%
Merced	272,673	\$224,535	\$360,423	\$374,241	8,961	12,162	3.3%	4.5%
Modoc	8,859	\$108,206	\$112,630	\$112,630	789	826	8.9%	9.3%
Mono	14,168	\$86,512	\$92,966	\$92,966	594	188	4.2%	1.3%
Monterey	437,907	\$297,549	\$509,485	\$509,485	10,664	15,939	2.4%	3.6%
Napa	140,973	\$148,350	\$217,220	\$224,289	***	7,168	***	5.1%
Nevada	99,814	\$200,654	\$220,844	\$220,844	4,660	5,333	4.7%	5.3%
Orange	3,190,400	\$1,502,382	\$2,904,658	\$2,936,208	14,324	36,853	0.4%	1.2%
Placer	386,166	\$202,200	\$398,019	\$398,019	***	9,049	***	2.3%
Plumas	18,742	\$100,301	\$109,182	\$109,182	***	6,008	***	32.1%
Riverside	2,423,266	\$1,393,213	\$2,643,845	\$2,552,911	52,669	62,562	2.2%	2.6%
Sacramento	1,530,615	\$783,327	\$1,563,262	\$1,568,765	20,497	21,090	1.3%	1.4%
San Benito	60,310	\$127,834	\$154,278	\$154,278	1,848	1,516	3.1%	2.5%
San Bernardino	2,157,404	\$1,131,983	\$2,243,368	\$2,248,617	52,470	46,489	2.4%	2.2%
San Diego	3,337,685	\$1,568,664	\$3,184,157	\$3,184,157	101,220	100,561	3.0%	3.0%
San Francisco	884,363	\$744,035	\$1,172,353	\$1,172,353	27,437	24,974	3.1%	2.8%
San Joaquin	745,424	\$461,131	\$830,540	\$835,098	17,334	21,764	2.3%	2.9%
San Luis Obispo	283,405	\$187,642	\$323,051	\$323,051	7,783	6,313	2.7%	2.2%
San Mateo	771,410	\$381,887	\$770,128	\$769,958	8,180	10,756	1.1%	1.4%
Santa Barbara	448,150	\$359,920	\$578,744	\$578,744	28,395	12,831	6.3%	2.9%
Santa Clara	1,938,153	\$1,057,557	\$2,007,779	\$2,007,779	16,268	34,041	0.8%	1.8%
Santa Cruz	275,897	\$196,453	\$306,586	\$334,966	16,582	18,489	6.0%	6.7%
Shasta	179,921	\$338,363	\$421,323	\$421,323	7,750	10,100	4.3%	5.6%
Sierra	2,999	\$34,869	\$36,299	\$36,299	***	4	***	0.1%
Siskiyou	43,853	\$143,131	\$160,480	\$163,780	4	1,098	0.0%	2.5%
Solano	445,458	\$294,252	\$501,792	\$501,792	6,293	11,187	1.4%	2.5%
Sonoma	504,217	\$334,526	\$577,422	\$577,422	11,121	10,119	2.2%	2.0%
Stanislaus	547,899	\$448,151	\$713,270	\$725,074	13,995	11,427	2.6%	2.1%
Sutter	96,648	\$229,786	\$276,764	\$276,764	8,196	8,412	8.5%	8.7%
Tehama	63,926	\$78,903	\$109,495	\$109,495	8,676	8,343	13.6%	13.1%
Trinity	12,709	\$37,481	\$43,768	\$43,768	46	994	0.4%	7.8%
Tulare	464,493	\$532,735	\$767,381	\$767,381	20,119	32,745	4.3%	7.0%
Tuolumne	54,248	\$132,845	\$157,599	\$157,599	4,539	3,485	8.4%	6.4%
Ventura	854,223	\$569,894	\$1,012,521	\$952,627	15,804	17,467	1.9%	2.0%
Yolo	219,116	\$180,987	\$290,844	\$290,844	11,086	9,749	5.1%	4.4%
Yuba	77,031	\$137,560	\$181,028	\$182,977	8,792	10,217	11.4%	13.3%
Statewide	39,536,653	\$26,228,415	\$45,328,418	\$45,328,418	888,113	931,606	2.2%	2.4%

\* Customer encounters: Total number of participants in one-on-one assistance, brief service encounters, and workshops offered by centers

\*\* Number of customer encounters as percentage of county population [(# of Encounters / Population) × 100%]

\*\*\* Not provided or unknown (not tracked)

Note: Some funding sources are shared between Alpine and El Dorado counties, Nevada and Sierra counties, and Shasta and Trinity counties

## APPENDIX A - Part 2

### Funding & Customers: *Law Libraries*

Law Libraries	Population	Total Budget * (Approx. Total Income)		% of Total Budget from Court Filing Fees (excluding one-time allocation)		# Individuals Provided Service in Calendar Year			# Individuals Provided Service as % of Population **		
		FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019
Alameda	1,663,190	\$1,273,447	\$2,101,665	92%	93%	38,000	40,000	42,000	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%
Butte	229,294	\$151,333	\$279,472	99%	81%	7,118	6,473	6,853	3.1%	2.8%	3.0%
Calaveras	45,670	\$28,000	\$40,000	100%	100%	***	***	***	***	***	***
Colusa	21,805	***	***	***	***	32	41	52	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Contra Costa	1,147,439	\$882,880	\$1,419,512	88%	96%	41,700	43,000	43,000	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%
El Dorado	188,987	\$108,759	\$186,028	94%	92%	***	1,040	1,213	***	0.6%	0.6%
Fresno	989,255	\$747,858	\$1,197,096	94%	94%	4,658	4,871	4,983	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Glenn	28,094	\$10,405	\$14,675	100%	100%	0	1	2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Humboldt	136,754	\$106,782	\$129,206	97%	98%	2,981	2,849	2,607	2.2%	2.1%	1.9%
Imperial	182,830	\$57,658	\$116,193	96%	95%	773	1,118	1,315	0.4%	0.6%	0.7%
Inyo	18,026	***	\$33,874	***	26%	***	***	***	***	***	***
Kern	893,119	\$525,117	\$749,113	100%	100%	24,784	24,785	25,506	2.8%	2.8%	2.9%
Los Angeles	10,163,507	\$9,069,659	\$12,655,410	75%	84%	***	77545 †	100,706	***	0.8%	1.0%
Marin	260,955	\$189,078	\$261,887	92%	93%	4,165	4,159	4,035	1.6%	1.6%	1.5%
Mendocino	88,018	\$57,486	\$84,879	96%	96%	***	1,300	1,500	***	1.5%	1.7%
Merced	272,673	\$133,535	\$235,960	***	***	***	***	4,761	***	***	1.7%
Monterey	437,907	\$170,000	\$326,000	94%	96%	6,400	6,600	7,000	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%
Napa	140,973	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Nevada	99,814	\$54,305	\$67,174	94%	92%	2337 ‡	2629 ‡	2921 ‡	2.3%	2.6%	2.9%
Orange	3,190,400	\$2,878,571	\$4,614,558	98%	96%	42,253	37,371	31,339	1.3%	1.2%	1.0%
Riverside	2,423,266	\$1,905,557	\$3,210,594	89%	90%	41,724	33,362	32,840	1.7%	1.4%	1.4%
Sacramento	1,530,615	\$3,751,677	\$4,042,253	93%	87%	32,198	26,973	26,327	2.1%	1.8%	1.7%
San Bernadino	2,157,404	\$1,518,465	\$2,693,532	94%	98%	12,300	12,100	12,200	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
San Diego	3,337,685	\$2,952,891	\$4,769,874	95%	95%	49,357	47,776	49,002	1.5%	1.4%	1.5%
San Francisco	884,363	\$1,203,589	\$2,216,273	85%	86%	20,831	21,068	20,510	2.4%	2.4%	2.3%
San Joaquin	745,424	\$510,907	\$872,535	97%	95%	***	2,476	3,533	***	0.3%	0.5%
San Luis Obispo	283,405	\$175,051	\$265,961	95%	98%	2,750	2,900	3,100	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%
San Mateo	771,410	\$576,000	\$920,663	92%	95%	***	6,475	7,820	***	0.8%	1.0%
Santa Barbara	448,150	\$343,620	\$526,422	98%	96%	***	14,716	17,950	***	3.3%	4.0%
Santa Clara	1,938,153	\$866,257	\$1,476,929	95%	96%	34,910	36,112	37,320	1.8%	1.9%	1.9%
Santa Cruz	275,897	\$176,900	\$307,222	79%	79%	11,806	10,448	10,258	4.3%	3.8%	3.7%
Solano	445,458	\$347,835	\$535,348	92%	103%	8,303	9,039	9,162	1.9%	2.0%	2.1%
Sonoma	504,217	\$495,907	\$638,281	69%	82%	6,391	8,614	10,054	1.3%	1.7%	2.0%
Stanislaus	547,899	\$377,697	\$618,260	68%	69%	7,776	15,129	15,314	1.4%	2.8%	2.8%
Tehama	63,926	\$24,627	\$46,061	100%	95%	***	***	291	***	***	0.5%
Tulare	464,493	\$344,159	\$484,999	90%	86%	15,340	17,324	20,020	3.3%	3.7%	4.3%
Ventura	854,223	\$573,256	\$993,986	96%	95%	9,852	13,874	***	1.2%	1.6%	***
Yolo	219,116	\$96,696	\$189,816	100%	99%	***	960	960	***	0.4%	0.4%
<b>Total Reported</b>	<b>38,093,814</b>	<b>\$32,685,964</b>	<b>\$49,321,711</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>

\* Total Budget is approximate and was reported differently by different counties; data standardized by the committee

\*\* Number of individuals served as percentage of county population [(# of Individuals / Population) × 100%]

\*\*\* Not provided or unknown (not tracked)

† Partial reporting, only reflects last three quarters of 2018

‡ Reflects 50% of total individuals served by co-located Nevada County Law Library and Self-Help Center/Family Law Facilitator.

Note: Counties not listed above either do not have staffed law libraries, or did not respond to the Committees' survey.

Budget for Fiscal Year 2019-20 is not reported since law library income is dependent on court filing fees collected in FY 2019-20 (not yet complete at time of report).

**APPENDIX B - Part 1**  
**Legal Issues Encountered: Self-Help Centers**

County	Total # Customer Encounters w/ Reported Case Type * (FY 2018-19)	% of Total Customer Encounters **													
		Total Family Law***	Child & Spousal Support	Dissolution	Child Custody & Visitation	Domestic Violence	Parentage	Other Family Law	Total Probate***	Guardianship	Conservatorship	Other Probate	General Civil	Housing	Other
Alameda	33,475	74%	14%	39%	22%	7%	1%	2%	2%	2%	0.1%	0.2%	1%	3%	16%
Alpine	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†	†
Amador	818	90%	66%	45%	44%	4%	5%	3%	6%	6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	2%
Butte	9,418	50%	16%	17%	16%	6%	0.3%	2%	5%	4%	0.0%	0.7%	0.3%	6%	9%
Calaveras	1,739	83%	93%	40%	37%	3%	2%	25%	4%	3%	0.1%	1.3%	2%	5%	6%
Colusa	1,157	83%	26%	31%	41%	8%	2%	4%	4%	4%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	10%
Contra Costa	11,642	82%	37%	28%	36%	2%	7%	4%	4%	4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	1%	11%
Del Norte	2,430	57%	27%	21%	19%	8%	0%	18%	12%	7%	2.1%	4.3%	3%	13%	22%
El Dorado	2,531	75%	20%	46%	18%	2%	0.3%	3%	2%	1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	1%
Fresno	15,738	75%	10%	28%	37%	6%	2%	6%	1%	1%	0.0%	0.3%	2%	6%	15%
Glenn	1,261	61%	31%	18%	25%	8%	0.3%	5%	6%	5%	0.0%	0.8%	0.3%	7%	10%
Humboldt	2,193	65%	72%	28%	36%	12%	10%	9%	3%	2%	0.1%	0.7%	1%	3%	10%
Imperial	1,172	77%	14%	45%	16%	1%	0.3%	2%	10%	5%	4.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0%	5%
Inyo	1,997	65%	31%	28%	39%	6%	8%	3%	9%	6%	0.2%	3.2%	2%	8%	18%
Kern	17,590	70%	15%	17%	31%	6%	3%	11%	5%	5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	22%	4%
Kings	5,480	83%	44%	34%	44%	13%	3%	11%	6%	4%	0.4%	1.6%	1%	2%	10%
Lake	1,991	62%	22%	24%	25%	7%	1%	16%	4%	4%	0.0%	1.4%	1%	18%	23%
Lassen	1,122	60%	15%	32%	20%	1%	2%	2%	11%	4%	1.4%	5.3%	9%	12%	9%
Los Angeles	60,637	88%	66%	30%	26%	8%	8%	5%	1%	1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	5%	4%
Madera	1,709	82%	17%	36%	36%	4%	1%	2%	11%	10%	0.5%	0.4%	1%	1%	6%
Marin	4,363	72%	19%	33%	23%	6%	2%	6%	2%	1%	0.2%	0.3%	2%	8%	19%
Mariposa	358	58%	32%	25%	27%	3%	0.0%	3%	9%	4%	0.8%	4.5%	2%	11%	18%
Mendocino	6,625	72%	43%	30%	37%	7%	1%	5%	6%	5%	1.0%	0.8%	3%	2%	19%
Merced	7,636	70%	14%	25%	33%	12%	3%	3%	4%	3%	0.4%	0.7%	1%	7%	15%
Modoc	265	47%	11%	19%	22%	0.0%	1%	5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1%	31%	19%
Mono	186	79%	40%	49%	51%	1%	8%	3%	2%	2%	0.0%	0.0%	2%	10%	9%
Monterey	3,208	50%	24%	21%	18%	6%	5%	3%	2%	1%	0.3%	0.1%	1%	2%	5%
Napa	3,933	32%	11%	11%	14%	4%	2%	2%	2%	1%	0.2%	0.2%	1%	3%	5%
Nevada	5,330	47%	11%	16%	19%	4%	1%	9%	10%	4%	0.5%	5.4%	5%	15%	26%
Orange	31,313	98%	12%	59%	8%	2%	24%	1%	0.2%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Placer	6,588	44%	19%	21%	16%	5%	1%	4%	4%	2%	0.9%	1.5%	3%	3%	7%
Plumas	1,653	83%	81%	20%	12%	8%	0.4%	3%	7%	7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7%
Riverside	20,692	77%	36%	32%	19%	3%	6%	14%	2%	1%	0.6%	0.7%	3%	7%	10%
Sacramento	19,642	95%	17%	52%	33%	9%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0.0%	0.1%	1%	0.0%	3%
San Benito	1,266	62%	45%	22%	32%	6%	5%	1%	5%	3%	1.5%	0.9%	4%	8%	23%
San Bernardino	26,915	60%	28%	18%	20%	0.1%	3%	3%	1%	1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	14%	13%
San Diego	50,715	86%	37%	41%	33%	5%	4%	24%	3%	3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	7%
San Francisco	8,241	76%	14%	43%	22%	8%	1%	2%	3%	1%	1.2%	0.2%	0.1%	3%	17%
San Joaquin	14,700	89%	25%	35%	34%	4%	0.3%	10%	3%	3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	1%	2%
San Luis Obispo	4,665	92%	62%	42%	47%	9%	2%	4%	4%	3%	0.2%	0.3%	1%	0.1%	5%
San Mateo	5,910	90%	35%	41%	39%	8%	0.5%	5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	8%	1%
Santa Barbara	4,591	92%	82%	28%	31%	1%	3%	5%	1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	1%
Santa Clara	12,448	90%	21%	23%	38%	18%	12%	7%	3%	1%	1.9%	0.4%	1%	2%	4%
Santa Cruz	9,292	72%	17%	29%	32%	8%	5%	4%	4%	2%	1.6%	0.4%	2%	5%	19%
Shasta	4,347	84%	36%	21%	31%	8%	3%	8%	7%	6%	0.1%	0.7%	0.1%	3%	8%
Sierra	4	25%	25%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25%	0.0%
Siskiyou	1,098	63%	11%	27%	36%	4%	2%	1%	8%	7%	0.8%	0.3%	4%	12%	16%
Solano	3,781	94%	20%	41%	29%	10%	2%	7%	3%	2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0%
Sonoma	8,238	93%	41%	40%	41%	4%	5%	20%	4%	2%	0.3%	1.3%	1%	1%	2%
Stanislaus	11,019	77%	15%	33%	31%	10%	2%	6%	3%	2%	0.0%	1.0%	1%	5%	16%
Sutter	2,436	86%	46%	44%	49%	2%	2%	0.3%	8%	8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	6%
Tehama	2,042	44%	15%	16%	20%	4%	0.2%	5%	6%	6%	0.2%	1.4%	0.2%	6%	10%
Trinity	842	57%	52%	3%	2%	2%	0.2%	1%	1%	0.4%	0.0%	1.0%	0.1%	1%	32%
Tulare	8,324	61%	12%	27%	19%	6%	1%	3%	6%	5%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	1.5%	4%
Tuolumne	700	97%	139%	68%	53%	4%	0.1%	1%	2%	2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	1%
Ventura	13,375	99%	40%	44%	39%	3%	3%	23%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Yolo	7,084	78%	28%	31%	40%	12%	3%	2%	6%	4%	1.6%	1.0%	2%	2%	14%
Yuba	2,627	89%	14%	32%	50%	6%	2%	5%	4%	4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5%
Statewide	490,552	80%	31%	34%	28%	6%	5%	8%	3%	2%	0.3%	0.4%	1%	4%	8%

\* Encounters where case type is reported (one-on-one assistance and workshops)

\*\* Adds up to more than 100% since customers can have multiple case types

\*\*\* Total number with any family/probate law issue reported

† Not provided or unknown (not tracked)

## APPENDIX B - Part 2

### Legal Issues Encountered: *Law Libraries*

Law Libraries	Total # Individuals Provided Service in 2019	Legal issues of individuals using law library by approximate % ^								Other - Specified
		Family Law	Probate	Small Claims	Housing	General Civil	Criminal	Other		
Alameda	42,000	20%	10%	5%	20%	15%	5%	25%	Estate planning, Employment, Business law, Real estate transactions, Immigration	
Butte	6,853	16%	15%	10%	21%	10%	13%	15%	Adoptions, Evidence and subpoena, Bankruptcy, Deeds and transfers, Juvenile law, Appeals	
Calaveras	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Colusa	52	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Contra Costa	43,000	15%	15%	10%	15%	20%	5%	20%	Education law, Estate planning, Business law, Immigration, Juvenile law, Tax law, Maritime law	
El Dorado	1,213	15%	5%	30%	30%	10%	5%	5%	Immigration, Bankruptcy, Real property, Government tort claims, Public entity claim, Civil rights law, Liens, Secured transactions, Civil writs, Employment law, Workers' compensation, Answers to Debt Collection law suits, Adult Name Changes, Enforcements of money judgments	
Fresno	4,983	30%	15%	5%	15%	5%	25%	5%	Business entity formation	
Glenn	2	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	33%	Case law for a specific case, Research pertaining to human/sex trafficking	
Humboldt	2,607	20%	20%	10%	15%	30%	5%	0%	N/A	
Imperial	1,315	30%	25%	15%	10%	5%	10%	5%	Estate planning	
Inyo	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Kern	25,506	5%	25%	5%	10%	25%	25%	5%	Deeds, Traffic	
Los Angeles	100,706	10%	15%	5%	25%	25%	5%	15%	Employment, Immigration, Intellectual property, Government benefits	
Marin	4,035	16%	7%	7%	19%	20%	5%	15%	Personal injury, Real estate transactional, Employment, Bankruptcy, Copyright infringement, Deferred prosecution agreements (DPA), Name change, Taxes	
Mendocino	1,500	20%	5%	5%	25%	20%	15%	10%	Estate Planning, Business Law	
Merced	4,761	16%	20%	13%	25%	5%	5%	37%	Deeds and transfers	
Monterey	7,000	40%	10%	20%	20%	5%	5%	0%	N/A	
Napa	**	65%	20%	10%	0%	5%	0%	0%	N/A	
Nevada	2921 †	50%	‡	‡	‡	‡	1%	49%‡	Probate, Small claims, Unlawful detainer, General civil, Harassment	
Orange	31,339	10%	10%	8%	40%	20%	10%	2%	Immigration	
Riverside	32,840	25%	14%	1%	21%	20%	7%	12%	Business law, Employment law, Torts	
Sacramento	26,327	7%	14%	1%	3%	42%	6%	13%	Bankruptcy, Immigration, Tax, Business law	
San Bernadino	12,200	20%	5-10 %	5-10 %	20%	20%	10-20 %	**	Tax, Immigration, Education (IEP), Property and neighbor issues	
San Diego	49,002	8%	5%	2%	7%	45%	10%	10%	Federal law (Civil procedure, Bankruptcy, Tax, Civil rights, Federal employment issues, Intellectual property)	
San Francisco	20,510	20%	12%	12%	20%	20-40 %	6%	13%	Consumer/Bankruptcy, Civil rights, Workers comp, Employment, Administrative agencies, Intellectual property, Political process and participation, General interest and research (including students)	
San Joaquin	3,533	13%	8%	20%	17%	33%	6%	3%	Personal injury/torts	
San Luis Obispo	3,100	30%	10%	5%	20%	7%	25%	3%	Business entity formation	
San Mateo	7,820	20%	20%	10%	10%	20%	20%	0%	N/A	
Santa Barbara	17,950	20%	5%	25%	20%	15%	5%	10%	Restraining orders	
Santa Clara	37,320	15%	10%	10%	15%	10%	15%	25%	Immigration, Business formation	
Santa Cruz	10,258	11%	8%	5%	13%	33%	21%	9%	Restraining orders	
Solano	9,162	25%	25%	6%	6%	6%	25%	6%	Traffic	
Sonoma	10,054	15%	10%	15%	15%	15%	20%	10%	**	
Stanislaus	15,314	10%	10%	10%	15%	20%	20%	15%	Bankruptcy, Immigration, Citizenship, Civil rights, Government tort liens, Consumer debt, Patent, repossession, Lemon law, Traffic, Animal licensing, Agricultural and mechanics liens, General legal education	
Tehama	291	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Tulare	20,020	50%	10%	10%	10%	10%	5%	5%	Real property	
Ventura	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	
Yolo	960	10%	30%	5%	20%	15%	5%	15%	Estate planning, Employment, Business law	

\* Percentages are an approximation. Percentages are as reported in response to Committees' survey and may not add up to 100%.

\*\* Not provided or unknown (not tracked)

† Reflects 50% of total individuals served by co-located Nevada County Law Library and Self-Help Center/Family Law Facilitator

‡ Probate, Small Claims, Housing (unlawful detainer), and General Civil included in "Other" percentage for Nevada County

Note: Counties not listed above either do not have staffed law libraries, or did not respond to the Committees' survey.

## APPENDIX C - Part 1

### Multilingual Services: *Self-Help Centers*

Self-Help Centers	Translated Instructions & Materials	Multilingual Staff*	Interpreters	Remote Interpretation	Other	Languages Spoken by Staff or Volunteers
Alameda	X	X	X	X		Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, Tagalog, Vietnamese
Alpine				X		
Amador				X		
Butte, Glenn, & Tehama	X	X		X	X	Spanish
Calaveras			X	X		
Colusa	X	X				Spanish
Contra Costa		X		X		Spanish, Mandarin
Del Norte				X		
El Dorado			X			
Fresno		X				Spanish, Hmong
Humboldt	X		X		X	
Imperial	X	X		X		Spanish
Inyo					X	
Kern	X	X				Spanish
Kings	X	X	X	X		Spanish, Portuguese
Lake	X			X		
Lassen	X					
Los Angeles	X	X		X	X	Spanish, Armenian, Arabic, Farsi, Tagalog, Mandarin, Punjabi, Korean
Madera	X	X	X			Spanish
Marin	X	X	X			Spanish, Vietnamese, Portuguese, Cantonese, Mandarin, Korean, Tagalog
Mariposa	X			X		
Mendocino	X	X	X	X		Spanish
Merced	X	X				**
Modoc			X	X		
Mono	X	X		X		**
Monterey	X	X	X			Spanish
Napa	X	X				Spanish
Nevada & Sierra		X				Spanish
Orange	X	X	X	X	X	Spanish, Vietnamese, Farsi, Mandarin
Placer			X	X		
Plumas		X				Spanish
Riverside	X	X	X	X		Spanish, Tagalog
Sacramento	X	X	X	X		Spanish, Russian
Sacramento Civil Self-Help Services			X	X		
San Benito & Santa Cruz	X	X			X	Spanish
San Bernardino	X	X	X	X	X	Spanish
San Diego	X	X	X	X		Spanish
San Francisco	X	X		X		**
San Joaquin	X	X				Spanish
San Luis Obispo	X	X		X		Spanish
San Mateo	X	X				Spanish, Tagalog
Santa Barbara	X	X	X	X		Spanish
Santa Clara	X	X	X			Spanish, Vietnamese, Hindi, Farsi
Shasta	X		X			
Sierra				X		
Siskiyou	X			X		
Solano		X	X			Spanish, Tagalog
Sonoma	X	X	X			**
Stanislaus	X	X	X			Spanish
Sutter		X	X		X	Spanish, Punjabi
Trinity			X			
Tulare	X	X		X		Spanish
Tuolumne		X				Spanish
Ventura	X	X	X	X		Spanish, Farsi, Portuguese
Yolo	X	X				Spanish
Yuba		X		X		**
Statewide	37	39	26	30	8	

\* Staff may also include regular volunteers or collaborating court staff

\*\* Not provided

**APPENDIX C - Part 2**  
**Multilingual Services: *Law Libraries***

Law Libraries	Translated Instructions & Materials	Multilingual Clinics or Programming	Multilingual Staff* (Spanish)	Multilingual Staff* (Other Languages)	Remote Interpretation	Other**	Languages Spoken by Staff or Volunteers
Alameda	X	X		X	X	X	Cantonese, Tagalog
Butte	X		X				Spanish
Calaveras							
Colusa							
Contra Costa	X			X†		X	† Language not specified
El Dorado	X		X				Spanish
Fresno	X	X	X				Spanish
Glenn			X				Spanish
Humboldt	X					X	
Imperial	X		X				Spanish
Inyo							
Kern	X		X				Spanish
Los Angeles	X	X	X		X		Spanish
Marin	X	X					
Mendocino	X						
Merced	X	X		X†	X		† Language not specified
Monterey							
Napa							
Nevada				X			Cantonese
Orange			X	X			Spanish, Vietnamese
Riverside	X		X				Spanish
Sacramento	X	X	X				Spanish
San Bernadino	X					X	
San Diego	X	X	X				Spanish
San Francisco	X		X			X	Spanish
San Joaquin	X		X				Spanish
San Luis Obispo	X						
San Mateo	X	X	X	X			Spanish, Italian
Santa Barbara			X				Spanish
Santa Clara	X		X	X			Spanish, Vietnamese, Cantonese, Portuguese, Korean
Santa Cruz	X		X			X	Spanish
Solano	X					X	
Sonoma	X					X	
Stanislaus	X		X		X	X	Spanish
Tehama	X						
Tulare	X		X	X		X	Spanish, Portuguese
Ventura							
Yolo	X					X	
<b>Total Reported</b>	28	8	19	8	4	11	

\* Staff may also include regular volunteers or collaborating court staff

\*\* Includes translation software, referral to other legal assistance organizations

Note: Counties not listed above either do not have staffed law libraries, or did not respond to the Committees' survey.

## APPENDIX D

### Customer Monthly Income Levels: *Self-Help Centers*

Self-Help Centers	Total # Customers Surveyed*	% of surveyed customers in each <i>monthly income</i> bracket							No response
		No Income	\$1,000 or less	\$1,001 to \$2,000	\$2,001 to \$3,000	\$3,001 to \$4,000	\$4,001 to \$5,000	More than \$5,000	
Alameda	33,668	9%	12%	14%	9%	5%	3%	4%	45%
Amador	777	16%	19%	20%	20%	10%	5%	8%	1%
Butte	2,559	15%	27%	28%	13%	6%	3%	4%	4%
Calaveras	1,903	8%	11%	17%	10%	4%	3%	3%	44%
Colusa	909	12%	13%	27%	19%	8%	4%	4%	13%
Contra Costa	4,606	14%	12%	21%	21%	15%	9%	9%	1%
Del Norte	294	25%	29%	24%	6%	3%	2%	2%	9%
El Dorado	955	17%	17%	25%	14%	8%	5%	10%	3%
Fresno	4,381	14%	31%	19%	9%	4%	2%	2%	17%
Glenn	909	17%	24%	30%	13%	6%	3%	2%	6%
Humboldt	634	8%	27%	28%	18%	6%	2%	1%	10%
Inyo	1,574	12%	17%	26%	14%	6%	3%	6%	15%
Kern	10,298	34%	21%	29%	10%	3%	1%	2%	0%
Kings	3,059	19%	28%	21%	12%	5%	3%	4%	8%
Lake	1,752	17%	26%	30%	12%	4%	2%	2%	7%
Lassen	979	14%	21%	23%	15%	7%	5%	8%	7%
Los Angeles	53,219	8%	28%	29%	15%	6%	2%	2%	10%
Madera	652	21%	26%	33%	10%	5%	1%	1%	2%
Marin	3,730	14%	15%	22%	14%	8%	7%	16%	3%
Mariposa	603	16%	24%	32%	11%	7%	4%	6%	0%
Mendocino	4,362	23%	24%	26%	11%	4%	2%	3%	7%
Merced	3,288	18%	31%	25%	12%	5%	2%	3%	4%
Modoc	187	6%	24%	33%	21%	11%	2%	2%	1%
Mono	593	7%	1%	8%	16%	13%	3%	2%	50%
Nevada	4,660	7%	1%	2%	2%	0%	0%	0%	88%
Orange	708	23%	14%	27%	15%	6%	3%	4%	8%
Riverside	6,146	18%	19%	23%	14%	6%	3%	5%	13%
Sacramento	13,204	15%	20%	25%	16%	9%	5%	6%	5%
San Benito	733	12%	19%	19%	21%	9%	5%	8%	8%
San Bernardino	11,033	20%	22%	26%	14%	6%	3%	4%	4%
San Diego	43,548	10%	11%	17%	12%	7%	4%	6%	33%
San Francisco	8,740	38%	7%	6%	6%	3%	1%	3%	37%
San Joaquin	8,132	16%	27%	23%	12%	6%	3%	4%	8%
San Luis Obispo	4,184	12%	19%	25%	15%	8%	5%	8%	8%
San Mateo	4,374	11%	15%	25%	18%	11%	6%	10%	4%
Santa Barbara	2,461	9%	14%	20%	9%	4%	3%	4%	36%
Santa Clara	11,921	6%	5%	8%	5%	3%	3%	4%	67%
Santa Cruz	9,229	14%	22%	28%	16%	8%	4%	7%	1%
Shasta	4,091	14%	27%	28%	12%	5%	2%	3%	9%
Solano	2,864	7%	4%	6%	6%	4%	3%	8%	62%
Sonoma	4,798	10%	7%	15%	11%	6%	3%	4%	44%
Stanislaus	11,999	18%	26%	25%	12%	5%	3%	4%	7%
Sutter	2,212	23%	18%	30%	13%	7%	4%	2%	3%
Trinity	46	22%	28%	13%	13%	4%	7%	0%	13%
Tulare	2,380	19%	22%	29%	11%	4%	2%	2%	10%
Tuolumne	540	17%	20%	27%	17%	6%	4%	5%	4%
Ventura	13,270	12%	17%	37%	17%	6%	4%	5%	1%
Yolo	6,105	15%	16%	21%	13%	6%	4%	5%	21%
Yuba	1,235	10%	32%	24%	11%	5%	4%	4%	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>314,504</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>21%</b>

\* Represents only customers who provided personal/demographic information, not total customers encountered

Note: Counties not listed above either did not track, or did not report customer income information.





## APPENDIX E

### Services Offered: *Law Libraries*

Law Libraries	Listed services offered by the law library *										
	Legal Databases (primary & secondary law)	Self-Help/Instructional Materials	Legal Forms or Documents	Remote Access to Primary Law Sources	Remote Access to Self-Help Materials	Remote Access to Legal Forms/Documents	One-on-One Reference Assistance	Referrals or Information about Legal Assistance	Volunteer Attorney Clinics or Consultations	Workshops or Classes on Common Topics	Other
Alameda	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Butte	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			
Calaveras		X						X			
Colusa	X										
Contra Costa	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
El Dorado	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Fresno	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X
Glenn	X	X			X						
Humboldt	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X
Imperial	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Inyo		X						X			X
Kern	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Los Angeles	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Marin	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Mendocino	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			X
Merced	X	X					X	X		X	X
Monterey	X	X					X				
Napa	X						X				X
Nevada	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X
Orange	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X
Riverside	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sacramento	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Bernadino	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X
San Diego	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Francisco	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
San Joaquin	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			
San Luis Obispo	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X
San Mateo	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Barbara	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Santa Clara	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X
Santa Cruz	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X
Solano	X	X			X		X	X			X
Sonoma	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Stanislaus	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X
Tehama	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			
Tulare	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X
Ventura	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Yolo	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X
<b>Total Reported</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>29</b>

\* This is not an exhaustive list; law libraries may offer more services than are listed here

\*\* Information not provided

Note: Counties not listed above either do not have staffed law libraries, or did not respond to the Committees' survey.



**APPENDIX F - Part 1**  
**Use of State Funding Increase: Self-Help Centers**

Self-Help Center	Additional Ongoing Allocation in FY 18-19	Hired Staff/Staffing Changes	Extended Service Hours	Expanded # or Type of Workshops	New Location/Center or Space/Tech Enhancements	Developed Materials	Added New Case Types	Added Technology Services (such as document assembly)	Added Self-Serve Online Functions	Added Remote Assistance	Added Services in Languages Other than English
Alameda	\$795,129	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Alpine	\$556										
Amador	\$18,548	X	X								
Butte	\$109,411	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Calaveras	\$21,828	X	X	X			X	X	X		
Colusa	\$10,652						X	X			
Contra Costa	\$550,676	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Del Norte	\$13,108										
El Dorado	\$89,432	X		X			X	X	X	X	X
Fresno	\$481,310	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Glenn	\$13,884	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Humboldt	\$66,183	X			X		X	X	X		
Imperial	\$91,013	X			X		X	X		X	
Inyo	\$8,998	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kern	\$432,568	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Kings	\$72,265	X	X	X		X			X	X	X
Lake	\$31,385	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Lassen	\$14,941									X	
Los Angeles	\$4,949,153	X			X	X	X	X	X		X
Madera	\$75,626	X			X	X	X	X	X		X
Marin	\$127,388	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mariposa	\$8,770	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mendocino	\$43,074	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Merced	\$132,733	X	X	X	X		X			X	
Modoc	\$4,630		X	X	X		X				
Mono	\$6,627	X					X				
Monterey	\$213,775	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Napa	\$68,819	X	X			X		X	X	X	
Nevada	\$47,759	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Orange	\$1,543,529	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Placer	\$185,008	X			X						
Plumas	\$9,578						X				
Riverside	\$1,152,459	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Sacramento	\$732,021	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
San Benito	\$27,475	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Bernardino	\$1,043,955	X			X	X		X	X	X	
San Diego	\$1,602,568	X	X	X	X	X				X	
San Francisco	\$422,475	X	X	X	X	X			X		X
San Joaquin	\$360,928	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
San Luis Obispo	\$135,360	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X
San Mateo	\$372,205	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Santa Barbara	\$217,785				X						
Santa Clara	\$936,636	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Cruz	\$133,670	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Shasta	\$86,312			X	X	X	X	X			
Sierra	\$1,550			X			X			X	
Siskiyou	\$21,596		X			X		X			
Solano	\$210,710	X			X		X				
Sonoma	\$244,102				X	X	X	X	X		X
Stanislaus	\$264,852	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Sutter	\$46,855	X		X		X					
Tehama	\$30,926	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Trinity	\$6,586	X	X		X						
Tulare	\$228,020	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Tuolumne	\$26,437						X	X			
Ventura	\$414,336	X	X		X		X	X	X		X
Yolo	\$105,783	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
Yuba	\$36,040						X	X	X		X
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,100,000</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>

**APPENDIX F - Part 2**  
**Use of State Funding Increase: Law Libraries**

Law Libraries	Additional One-Time Allocation in FY 2018-19	Use of State Funding Increase															
		Increased Staffing	Improved Building or Furniture	Updated Out-of-Date Material	Purchased Materials Previously Cut Due to Budget	Purchased New Materials	Developed Materials	Added or Updated Technology (Hardware)	Added Self-Serve Online Functions	Expanded # or Type of In-Person Programming	Extended Library Hours	Reserved Funds (for Future Projects or Contingencies)	Added Materials or Services in Languages Other than English	Added Collaborative Projects (e.g. Programming, Outreach)	Expanded Services at New Locations	Other	
Alameda	\$818,835	X	X		X				X								
Butte	\$75,222			X	X	X			X							X	
Calaveras	\$12,000				X			X	X								
Colusa	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Contra Costa	\$551,632	X				X			X								
El Dorado	\$66,771		X	X	X			X			X						
Fresno	\$423,171		X		X					X							
Glenn	\$4,675											X					
Humboldt	\$24,349		X					X								X	
Imperial	\$52,095					X			X							X	
Inyo	\$6,477								X								
Kern	\$174,969		X	X	X			X	X			X					
Los Angeles	\$3,500,000		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Marin	\$78,109			X	X	X			X			X				X	
Mendocino	\$27,351			X		X										X	
Merced	\$110,760		X	X				X					X				
Monterey	\$131,000								X		X						
Napa	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Nevada	\$36,908				X												
Orange	\$1,515,086		X		X			X									
Riverside	\$1,100,000		X					X									
Sacramento	\$537,494				X		X		X			X	X	X			
San Bernadino	\$1,193,532		X			X		X									
San Diego	\$1,649,283	X	X			X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
San Francisco	\$943,340		X		X			X	X	X			X	X			
San Joaquin	\$334,977	X	X		X			X									
San Luis Obispo	\$81,000		X		X												
San Mateo	\$336,678	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X				
Santa Barbara	\$165,309	X	X		X				X				X				
Santa Clara	\$563,591	X	X		X			X	X				X				
Santa Cruz	\$93,116		X			X		X	X							X	
Solano	\$194,517					X			X			X					
Sonoma	\$229,473	X	X	X	X		X	X				X	X	X			
Stanislaus	\$223,245	X			X		X	X	X			X	X	X			
Tehama	\$17,393			X			X	X	X	X		X					
Tulare	\$105,746		X		X	X	X	X	X						X	X	
Ventura	\$350,914	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Yolo	\$70,000	X			X			X		X				X			
<b>Total Reported</b>	<b>\$15,799,018</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	

\* Not provided

Note: Counties not listed above either do not have staffed law libraries, or did not respond to the Committees' survey.