

County of San Mateo



2005-2006 Legislative Session Program

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

Rich Gordon, District 3, President

Mark Church, District 1

Jerry Hill, District 2

Rose Jacobs Gibson, District 4,

Adrienne Tissier, District 5

January 2005

CONTENTS

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. COUNTY-SPONSORED AND COSPONSORED INITIATIVES
- III. 2005-2006 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES
- IV. LEGISLATIVE POLICIES
 - A. Administration and Finance
 - B. Human Services
 - C. Health Services and Hospitals
 - D. Public Safety and Justice
 - E. Land Use, Housing, Transportation and Environment
 - F. Miscellaneous

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the San Mateo County Legislative Program is to sponsor legislative proposals and to influence legislation that relates to the people, places, prosperity and partnerships of our community. The 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program reflects San Mateo County's commitment to our Shared Vision 2010.

The overarching goal of the San Mateo County Legislative Program is to identify legislation that could impact San Mateo County and to attempt to influence the outcome of such legislation. In this effort, the Legislative Committee with the support of County staff will assess the impact of legislation and refine and represent the Board's positions on the range of proposals, priorities and policies found in this document. The goal of the Legislative Program also includes legislative ideas that originate from County staff and Board members. This document, the 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program, is intended to provide a basic policy framework in which San Mateo County can work toward this goal. Divided into three general categories (legislative proposals, priorities, and policies), the Program asserts some of the key issues and general positions for issues of concern to San Mateo County.

While this document attempts to cover the breadth and depth of legislative issues that may have an impact on San Mateo County, it is not comprehensive, complete or final. The Legislative Committee will review policy positions related to legislation and make recommendations to the full Board. All legislation, on which the County takes a position, will be tracked through the legislative process. For each bill, County staff or consultants will prepare position letters for relevant legislators and committees, deliver testimony at hearings, conduct other advocacy roles, and provide regular status reports to the Legislative Committee and the Board. Some issues may require heightened advocacy. As a result, Board members may testify or meet with relevant legislators. Staff will utilize the approval of the 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program in lieu of an official Board position to advocate on particular legislation or issues that conform to adopted policy positions.

COUNTY SPONSORED AND COSPONSORED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

This section details legislative proposals that San Mateo County will pursue, either through sponsorship or co-sponsorship, in the upcoming session. Once approved by the Board of Supervisors, County staff and legislative consultants will work to develop the proposals, identify bill authors/sponsors and shepherd them through the legislative process. The Board of Supervisors will receive regular updates on the status of the legislative proposals and may be asked to testify before the legislature.

Due to the expected budget shortfall for the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 Budget years, legislative proposals that have a state general fund cost will likely not meet a minimal level of viability. Those that require funds will likely not be considered by the State Legislature.

1. Change of Venue

Proposal: For change of venue trials, create a mechanism that allows a county, in which a trial takes place, to recover allowable, trial-related costs from the State Controller when the county of the trial's origin does not pay for such costs.

Background: When a court orders a change of venue to a court in another county, current law requires that specified costs (including the transfer, preparation and trial of the action, the guarding, keeping and transportation of the prisoner, any appeal or other proceeding relating to the action and execution of the sentence) incurred by that court or county shall be a charge against the court or the county in which the action originated. However, when a county of origin fails to pay for such charges, the county in which the trial takes place has no recourse, save litigation. Allowing the county of the new venue to recover costs directly from the State Controller can ensure that host counties recover costs while avoiding costly litigation. (2005, CMO)

2. Order to Seek Employment for Non-Delinquent Child Support Obligor

Proposal: Provide courts the flexibility to order unemployed parents to seek work at the time of the initial order for support rather than wait until an obligor has become delinquent.

Background: Current law (FC §4505) requires delinquent child support obligors that allege they are not paying because they are unemployed to contact at least 5 employers a week and report back to the child support agency, the court or another entity. This requirement may only be imposed after the obligor has become delinquent. The seek work order cannot be imposed until an unemployed obligor defaults on their child support payments. Since orders cannot be reserved due to unemployment alone, this contributes to the creation of arrears. The proposed changes in the language would not limit the seek work requirement to delinquent obligors. The change would allow the court to order unemployed parents to seek work at the time of the initial order for support. (2005, DCSS)

3. San Francisco International Airport Jet Fuel Sales Tax Recovery

Proposal: Sponsor legislation that will ensure consistent application of the long-held "point of sale" principle.

Background: For more than sixty years sales tax in California has been allocated at the "point of sale." Assembly Bill 66 (Baca) statutorily designated the point of sale or situs for sales tax on jet fuel as at the "wing tip." AB 66 also created a special exception that requires jet fuel sold in

the County of San Mateo (at San Francisco International Airport) is split with the City and County of San Francisco. In 2002, United Airlines was able to take advantage of a Board of Equalization ruling and manipulate the allocation of sales taxes by creating a “jet fuel sales subsidiary” located in the City of Oakland. United Airlines was able to negotiate a generous rebate and divert sales tax from local jurisdictions that in fairness should have gone to the County of San Mateo and other jurisdictions with airports. Last year, Assembly Bill 2466 (Yee) proposed to close the United/Oakland inequitable and unfair loop hole, but failed to close the inequitable and unfair special exception created for San Francisco. The Governor vetoed AB 2466. (2005, CMO)

4. Public Agency Authorization to Operate Group Homes

Proposal: Amend California Welfare and Institutions Code to permit public agencies to operate group homes and receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) program funding.

Background: More restrictive than Federal law, current State law and regulation require that group homes be operated by private not for profit agencies in order to be eligible for AFDC-FC residential care rate payments. San Mateo County has received a three-year State Department of Social Services (DSS) administrative demonstration waiver to operate Canyon Oaks as a public agency and receive AFDC-FC group home funding. This waiver will expire in August of 2006. (2005, Health)

5. Automated Warrant System

Proposal: Conform the liability standards for arrests made through warrants transferred through an automated process to the County’s Automated Warrant System (AWS) with that of the traditional, paper warrant process.

Background: Approximately three years ago, the Sheriff’s Office began to convert to the AWS, which was developed and is maintained by Alameda County. As the AWS system develops, the process has recently included the automated posting of warrants onto AWS from warrants posted on the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) by Court personnel. The current process is a manual system that requires personnel to enter into AWS warrant information received from court personnel who receive the signed warrant from a judge and enter the same data into CJIS. The current system has the potential for data entry errors, delays in data entry between the time a warrant is issued, sent to AWS data entry personnel and when it is actually entered. There is also the risk that the physical transmission of a paper-copy of a warrant could be lost. The proposal would protect any peace officer who makes an arrest based on AWS information indicating a warrant of arrest that is entered by court personnel authorized to make such entries. Current state law expressly protects any peace officer that makes an arrest based on a warrant of arrest regular upon its fact. However, County Counsel is concerned that a court could interpret “a warrant of arrest regular upon its face” to exclude a warrant issued through AWS, which could expose an arresting officer to liability. (2003, CoCo).

6. San Mateo County Preschool for All Funding

Proposal: Secure funding for the implementation and operation of Preschool for All in San Mateo County.

Background: First 5 San Mateo County recently completed a three-year Preschool for All (PFA) planning process. With eleven goals, Preschool for All San Mateo County will utilize and

build on the existing early childhood education infrastructure to improve teacher qualification standards and expanding services to more families regardless of income. PFA will begin with a three-year phased-in demonstration project that is projected to serve 1,423 children per year when fully implemented. The program will start year one in Ravenswood and Redwood City School Districts on a voluntary basis. While funded with multi-year one-time grant funding from an assortment of sources including First 5 San Mateo County and First 5 of California, the three-year demonstration project is fully funded only for the first year. Years two and three will require \$1.4 million and \$4 million respectively. (2005, CMO)

2005-2006 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

This section highlights the most important 2003-2004 Legislative Session issues that could significantly affect San Mateo County. While San Mateo County will not actively pursue legislation, in the following areas, the following priorities will receive heightened scrutiny and may warrant significant involvement on the part of County staff or Board members. The County may request amendments to legislation in these priority areas—amendments that conform to the general goals and objectives of the below priorities.

1. Protecting County Revenues and Operations

San Mateo County has had a long-standing policy relating to full funding for state-mandated and partnership programs, increased flexibility and the simple elimination of programs not properly funded by state and/or federal funds (2001-2002). The County generally supports the principle and related legislation that guarantees local governments including schools, cities, special districts and counties reliable, predictable and equitable funding. This support includes the restoration of transportation funding under Proposition 42, which was approved by California voters in March 2002. The County supported the passage of Proposition 1A in November 2004. San Mateo County supports the maintenance of current funding levels to health, human services and public safety needs in San Mateo County. To that end, the County supports:

- A freeze of the property tax shift to the State through the Education Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) and the eventual return of those funds to local governments. (2001-2002)
- The development of new revenue sources dedicated exclusively to specified county-provided services such as In-Home Supportive Services. New revenue sources could be delivered through a mechanism similar to the Realignment programs of the early 1990s.

Should funding for programs not be maintained with the current budget revenue and expenditure levels, the County would support increases in alcohol and cigarette taxes.

Not mutually exclusive to increases in revenues, the County supports, in concept, the reduction in funding for various programs and activities only when the concomitant requirement to provide such programs and activities is relieved. The Board has not considered what specific programs would be acceptable for reductions in funding and expressly reserves its ability to take a position on this issue should (as) it arises during the next legislative session and any pertinent special sessions.

The County supports restoration of historic reductions in local government funding and increased flexibility in implementing and administering services. Providing local governments with greater flexibility to provide services to local communities ensures that services match local needs and greater efficiencies for limited resources. While restoration of funds seems unlikely in the current economic climate, future fiscal years may provide better opportunities. The County also supports the preservation and increase of funding for Health and Human services “realigned” to counties in the early 1990s. The County opposes any effort to alter the existing Realignment funding allocation formula if it will result in a reduction of funds to San Mateo County.

For programs, like trial courts, no longer operated by counties, the County supports the elimination of maintenance of effort requirements and equitable transition of responsibilities and facilities to the State.

2. TANF Reauthorization

During prior legislative sessions, the County sought amendments to the federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program reauthorization. The program expired in September 30, 2002. It has been maintained through Continuing Resolutions. As a result, the issue of TANF reauthorization will continue. The County supports:

- Increased funding for child care. Existing Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) funds do not adequately meet current needs. In San Mateo County, 25,000 children are eligible for subsidized child care, but only 5,000 children receive assistance funded by existing child care funds. Since child care funding consists of both federal with state funding, California has used a larger portion of state funds to supplement inadequate child care funding from the federal government. California receives approximately 22% of federal TANF funds, but only 11 % of child care funds. This amount should increase to meet the needs of California. (2002, HSA)
- Considering the current shortfall of funds needed for child care, any increase minimum work requirements must include a corresponding increase in child care funding to accommodate for the time parents will not be able to care for their children. (2002, HSA)
- Regional flexibility for eligible work participation activities San Mateo County supports flexibility in work participation activities. The County supports the inclusion of rehabilitative services including substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, vocational rehabilitation services, adult basic education, and English proficiency classes as fulfilling work requirement as full-time activities for limited durations. (2002, HSA)
- Removal of the federal 85% income eligibility income standard and allow state flexibility in using eligibility formulas such as the U.S. Housing and Urban Development (HUD) income eligibility formula, which better reflects the true need of families on a regional (rather than state) level. (2005, HSA)
- Removal of the state matching fund requirement for CDBG funds, considering the current economic downturn. (2005, HSA)
- Revision of the child care funding formula to be calculated through the TANF formula which is based on the proportion in state allotment for the state's share of child care funds rather than the current CCDBG formula. (2005, HSA)
- General support for "super waiver" flexibility in the use of TANF funds. Any proposed superwaiver alternatives should allow for local demonstration projects/waivers as well as statewide ones. (2005, HSA)

3. Mandate and Financing for Mental Health Services to Special Education Students (AB 3632 services)

With the passage of SB 1895 (Burton) in 2004, the County supports the implementation of the provisions of SB 1895, which provides, among other things, that schools provide more early intervention services before referring a child to county mental health and that counties, with the

exception of assessments of referred youth, generally do not have fiscal or legal responsibility for any costs they incur prior to approval of an individualized education plan (IEP). In addition, the County supports the SB 1895 provision that the Commission on State Mandates reexamine what costs are reimbursable and update AB 3632 Parameters and Guidelines to reflect recent legislation and allowable services under the Federal “Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.” (2005, Health)

4. Proposition 63, Mental Health Services Act—Adequate Funding

Proposition 63, the Mental Health Services Act, was approved by voters in November 2004. The Legislative Analysts Office estimates that Proposition 63 will generate approximately \$750 million in 2005-06. This revenue is generated through an additional 1% tax on individuals’ taxable income over \$1 million. The State Department of Mental Health Services (DMH) has been charged with developing many details to implement Proposition 63 including a formula to distribute among California’s counties the generated revenues. The County supports a fund allocation/distribution formula that recognizes counties’ historical support of mental health programs, geographic differences in the cost of living and cost of doing business and that includes “under-service” to individuals as well as unmet need defined as a lack of any service to eligible clients. The County also supports implementation efforts that provide counties with flexibility to best meet local needs while ensuring that funds are spent responsibly. The County advocates that the State DMH make funding for infrastructure (capital and technology) needs available as soon as is feasible. (2005, Health)

5. Adequate Proposition 36 Funding

If funding for Proposition 36, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) of 2000, is allowed to sunset in 2006, without renewal, the mandate to provide the sentencing option of treatment instead of incarceration must sunset at the same time, thus avoiding an un-funded mandate. If Proposition 36 is extended, it must be adequately funded, and County allocations be revised based on a formula using population size, cost of doing business, and participation rates. (2005, HSA)

6. Medi-Cal Redesign and Intergovernmental Transfer Funding

Since 2004, the Schwarzenegger Administration has been developing a redesign of the Medi-Cal program. The Administration plans to release a detailed proposal in January 2005. As the local public health authority and charged with the public health and safety of our communities, San Mateo County with other counties is the foundation of California’s safety net system. To that end, the County provides needed services to the medically indigent through the San Mateo Medical Center, a county system of healthcare and to Medi-Cal recipients through a managed care system called the Health Plan of San Mateo (HPSM). The Medical Center and HPSM rely heavily on Medicaid reimbursements and intergovernmental transfers. However, these sources do not adequately fund the need in San Mateo County. In addition, the percentage of uninsureds has increased and costs continue to outpace fund sources. As a result, the County must supplement the Medical Center with additional revenues, which reached nearly \$60 million in FY 2003-04. The County can no longer absorb these cost increases and shortfalls in revenue. Medi-Cal reform that results in decreased funding to county hospitals and health systems would devastate the County’s safety net. Because of the unique and critical role of counties in

providing safety net services, counties must be involved in the development of Medi-Cal redesign. San Mateo County supports the following principles as a guide for Medi-Cal redesign:

- The viability of the safety net system must be preserved through increased funding for indigent care, not by shifting costs to the County.
- Intergovernmental transfers (IGT) should not be impeded by reforms, and where appropriate expanded to accommodate the coordination of public hospitals with managed care systems. Specifically, the County supports the use of IGTs to increase State funding passed to HPSM, which would thereby increase the rates paid to the Medical Center.
- The expansion of managed care must not destabilize the public health care safety net.
- Adequate funding levels must be developed for public hospitals and those qualified safety net hospitals operating within a county organized health system (COHS) managed care framework.
- Reform efforts must preserve access to medically necessary mental health care, drug treatment services, and California Children's Services.
- The State should pursue all possible options for securing additional federal funds.
- Reform efforts must simplify (not add to the complexity of) Medi-Cal eligibility requirements without jeopardizing eligibility.
- Reform efforts must preserve continuity of care and coverage and maintain access and eligibility.

7. Classification of Family Support Bench Warrants

With the recent separation of the Family Support Division from the District Attorney's Office, the question of the criminal or civil nature of bench warrants has arisen. It is unclear whether bench warrants in family support cases should be processed as civil or criminal warrants. While there may be various methods to clarify the classification of such warrants, the County supports the increased authority a criminal warrant provides.

8. Implementation of the Olmstead Decision

Existing law establishes programs for the provision of care to eligible individuals with disabilities as determined by the United States Supreme Court, in *Olmstead v. L.C.* (1999) 527 U.S. 581. This decision prohibits public agencies from the unnecessary institutionalization of individuals with disabilities, and requires states to provide community-based treatment for persons with disabilities, when the state's treatment professionals determine that placement is appropriate. The State is responsible for developing an Olmstead Plan to implement this decision. Legislation at the State level that helps facilitate the implementation of the State's Olmstead Plan is of vital interest to San Mateo County. Such legislation that maximizes opportunities for individuals with disabilities to live independently are consistent with the County's Vision and the Goals and Objectives of the New Beginning Strategic Plan for Services for Older Adults and Adults with Disabilities. (2005, CoD)

9. Child Support Enforcement Penalties and Resource Allocation

The State of California expects to install a statewide automated child support system and centralized payment facility by the Spring 2006. If the project is on schedule, the state will incur an additional \$440 million in federal penalties due on last day of Federal FY 2005 and the first day of Federal FY 2006. Currently, there is no language requiring a county contribution.

However, in 2003-2004, counties were required to pay 25% of the penalty with a statewide cost to counties of \$52 million. The San Mateo County share was \$792,000. With the possibility that future legislation will mandate another county contribution or that the project will fall behind schedule, the County must oppose and transfer of responsibility to pay for federal child support enforcement penalties. The County also opposes any efforts to alter the allocation formula without appropriate consideration of performance and efficient use of funds. The County supports federal consideration of reinvestment in the child support program instead of payment of the penalties and the “repayment” of any shared penalty costs. (DCSS, 2005)

10. Nurse Staffing Ratio Requirements

AB 394 (1999, Kuehl) required the California Department of Health Services (DHS) to develop nurse-to-patient ratios for nurse classifications and hospital units. In 2003, DHS completed the administrative law process and established nurse-to-patient ratio standards that must be met by January 2004. In November 2004, DHS issued emergency regulations, approved by the Office of Administrative Law, that would in effect suspend much of the nurse-staff ratio requirements. The County supports a reexamination of the nurse-to-patient ratios and urges consideration for an implementation schedule that recognizes the existing and ongoing shortage of nurses and the increased cost associated with providing heightened service in public hospitals like the San Mateo Medical Center. In anticipation of these requirements and the long-term outlook for nurse supplies in San Mateo County, the County supports efforts to increase the number of qualified nurses and additional state and federal funding to meet the heightened mandate on public hospitals like the San Mateo Medical Center. This includes efforts to pilot collaboration between the state, community-based organizations, local businesses, the County’s community colleges, the San Mateo Medical Center and other hospitals.

11. Hospital Professional, Technical and Support Services Staffing

While AB 1927 (Dymally, 2004) failed to pass through the Legislature, it required hospitals, including the San Mateo Medical Center (SMMC), to review use of professional, technical and support staff and to revise staffing as needed to improve professional, technical, and support staff care. While AB 1927’s intent—to ensure improved quality of care from professional, technical and support staff—is commendable, the cost impacts on public hospitals, like the San Mateo Medical Center, could be significant and harm SMMC’s ability to provide services. The County supports recognition that efforts to improve the quality of health care through staffing standards must be accompanied by additional state for federal funding. (2005, SMMC)

12. Housing Vouchers

Housing is an important component to self-sufficiency. In San Mateo County, where housing costs are well above the state and national average, housing assistance programs like Section 8 housing vouchers are critical. San Mateo County urges full funding for Section 8 vouchers currently in use. In addition, the County seeks flexibility in the program to better serve local needs. Specifically, the County seeks time-limited vouchers with relevant support services that move families toward greater self-sufficiency and independence from the voucher program. The County also seeks additional family unification vouchers to ensure rapid access to housing for family preservation. Emancipated youth have an equally pressing need for housing. Additional vouchers are needed to ensure that youth who “age out” of foster care have access to affordable housing. Over 50% of all foster care youth experience homelessness within two years of aging

out of the system. The high cost of living in San Mateo County, also raises questions about national standards for subsidized housing rental rates. Current law limits the tenant's share of rent to 30% of their income. This does not reflect the realities of high-cost areas where many families pay well in excess of 30% of their income to housing. As a result, the County seeks flexibility to allow for 40% of income for rent and utilities. This would create parity between subsidized and unsubsidized families and enable existing funds to reach more families. (2003, HSA)

13. Devil's Slide Designation as an Ongoing Emergency

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) authorized the Federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for the 6-year period from 1998-2003. It was scheduled to expire on September 30, 2003. Unable to craft a reauthorization of TEA-21 before the expiration date, Congress passed a five-month extension on the existing authorization through February 29, 2004. During the 108th Congress, Offices of Senator Barbara Boxer and Congressman Tom Lantos worked to designate Devil's Slide as an "ongoing emergency," which makes the project eligible for various fund sources including Federal Emergency Management Agency funding until the project is completed. The project began in 2004.

14. Use of County-specific Cost of Doing Business in State Funding Allocations

While the cost of doing business varies widely by county, most state allocations of funding to the counties do not account for such differences. For example the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) allocation methodology, assumes that a dollar of allocation can purchase an equal amount of services in each county. In contrast, Federal funding to states accounts for cost differences among states. The formula in the Federal Public Health Service Act for allocating funds to the states for the Federal Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) Block Grant utilizes a Cost of Service Index Factor whose purpose is to accurately reflect the differences between California and the other states in the cost of providing substance abuse services. The County supports adjustments to county human service fund allocations that account for the differences among California counties in the cost of providing services.

LEGISLATIVE POLICIES

This section describes San Mateo County's general positions on legislative issues that are expected to appear in the next legislative session, appear regularly at the federal and state levels or are standing policies of the County. While the policies are broken down into five general categories (Administration and Finance; Human Services; Health Services and Hospitals; Public Safety and Justice; and Land Use, Housing Transportation and Environment) and a miscellaneous category, many of the policies bridge more than one category. Every effort has been made to place properly each of the policies.

Administration and Finance

The County supports:

1. Preservation of existing revenues and revenue authority, including the elimination of ERAF and maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements. The County opposes efforts to expand MOE requirements and ERAF. Maintenance of effort requirements tend to penalize more progressive counties that implement programs before the statewide program.
2. Maintenance of property tax revenues directed to local government. The County opposes efforts to direct property tax revenues away from local government.
3. Efforts to allocate funding through block grants, which allow for maximum flexibility in the use of funding within the designated program.
4. Increased funding for county infrastructure needs, should such funds be available.
5. Examination of equitable funding structures and formulas that reflect a county's responsibilities, demographics, cost of living and caseloads. The County opposes funding restructuring efforts that do not ensure adequate revenues for new responsibilities and obligations.
6. Federal funding mechanisms that allow funding to flow directly to local governments rather than through state government.
7. Efforts to create faster reimbursement processes from state and federal sources to local government.
8. Increased ability to utilize state or local matching funds to draw down additional federal funds.
9. "Revenue neutrality," that requires the transfer of adequate revenues to accompany the corresponding responsibility. Generally, the County opposes the use of local revenues to satisfy state or federally mandated activities.
10. Economic Development efforts that grow the California and local economies in an sustainable (environmental and economic) fashion.

Human Services

The County supports:

1. Preservation of the 1991 county health and human services realignment program. The County also supports a careful and cautious analysis of any efforts to alter the current system in light of California's fiscal constraints. (2001-2002, revised)

2. Increased flexibility for the administration of CalWORKs. Flexibility in the CalWORKs program should include income eligibility standards for child care.
3. Performance incentives and other rewards for cooperation and collaboration among local governments, including regional and sub-regional efforts to provide accessible, affordable and transit oriented housing. (2001-2002)
4. Preservation of children's protective services, participation and funding for foster/adoptive programs and funding for child care. (2001-2002, revised)
5. Increases in Housing Assistance Payments and Administrative Fee amounts and greater flexibility for use of Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program funds. The County opposes efforts to reduce funding amounts in this arena and or limitations on the flexibility of use of funds. (2002, HSA)
6. Renewal of subsidies for the Supportive Housing Program as well as the Shelter Plus Care Program. These programs fund San Mateo County's transitional and permanent supportive housing for homeless families and homeless persons with disabilities. It also is the primary funder of our homeless providers for support staff and program operations. These funds also support rental assistance for disabled homeless people. (2002, HSA)
7. Maximum flexibility to institute innovative practices in child welfare and foster care such as "wraparound" services and multi-discipline service approaches.
8. Increased funding and greater funding flexibility for foster care services, which are critical to adequately protect children in need.
9. Protection of counties from any penalties associated with child support enforcement-reporting violations associated with the state's failure to adequately implement an electronic reporting system.
10. Elimination of or reductions to federal penalties related to food stamps. California faces a \$114.3 million penalty for FY 2001 and an additional \$62.5 million for FY 2002. Given the State's dramatic improvement, the penalties serve no beneficial purpose and would damage the program and improvements.
11. Where appropriate, aligning incongruent rules for resource limits and treatment of particular types of resources in the CalWORKs, Food Stamps and Medi-Cal programs. (2005, HSA)
12. A thorough and inclusive review of the California Performance Review proposals including those related to realignment, privatization, reorganization and changes in funding policies. Impacts on clients/customers as well as fiscal impacts on local government should be assessed.

Health Services and Hospitals

The County supports:

1. The creation and funding for a health care system that provides access to health insurance to all San Mateo County residents regardless of their ability to pay. To that end, the County supports efforts to reduce or eliminate premiums and co-payments that serve to deny access to care.
2. Improved access to health care and increased stability of the health care system through Medi-Cal. The County supports increased reimbursement rates, full funding for emergency room services and costs, expanded dental coverage, increased funding for

- outreach and enrollment, funding and flexibility to provide increased health care and mental health services in the County's jail system.
3. Expanding the Healthy Families program (State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)) to include families of eligible children and preserving \$ federal funds to California.
 4. Full funding for Emergency Medical Service program costs.
 5. Legislation and budget actions that reduce the fiscal impact of the In-Home Supportive Services program on county revenues, including Realignment funds. The County supports examinations of the In-Home Support Services program and its impact on other programs realigned to counties, particularly its impact on mental health services and efforts to secure dedicated funding for mental health programs.
 6. Legislation that facilitates the implementation of the U.S. Supreme Court's Olmstead Decision at the State and local level. Community-based services that enable individuals with disabilities to live independently for as long as possible are the cornerstone to the implementation of Olmstead. (2005, CoD)
 7. Limited demonstration projects in several states to model MiCASSA—Medicaid community-based long-term care services that are economically feasible and effective in providing equal access to services and supports that are consumer driven and directed in the most integrated setting appropriate. (2004, CoD)

Public Safety and Justice

The County supports:

1. Preservation of funding for local public safety efforts, including inmate health, juvenile probation and prevention programs, mental health and drug and alcohol programs. (2001-2002)
2. Preservation of funding and, in the future, seek additional funding for Proposition 36 implementation. Support statutory changes that improve the operational efficiency and local flexibility of the program. (2001-2002, revised)
3. Full funding and/or equity in the trial court realignment block grant. The County also supports efforts to continue examination into trial court funding and maintenance including the transfer of trial court facilities.
4. The maintenance of booking fees that protects the County from external costs while serving a public policy benefit of reducing unnecessary bookings.
5. Increased regulation of firearms.
6. Efforts to facilitate the construction and operation of juvenile correctional facilities, such as increased or reallocated funding for correctional facilities that are ready for immediate construction.
7. Increased funding for substance abuse treatment, mental health services and other diversionary services for inmates.
8. Continued review of the alignment of Chief Probation Officer selection, appointment and retention authority with funding. The County also supports cautious review of any potential separation of adult and juvenile probation activities.
9. Efforts to align law library costs, including facilities maintenance, with trial courts rather than the County.
10. Increased federal funding for State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP).

Land Use, Housing, Transportation and Environment

The County supports:

1. Solutions to the region's housing crisis that address the needs of homeless, lower-income residents, CalWORKs participants and at-risk populations as well as the housing needs of disabled residents and the elderly.
2. Efforts to preserve affordable and accessible housing and the development of new affordable and accessible housing through activities including additional funding for local housing trust funds, development of a statewide and national housing trust funds, and efforts to increase the amount of multi-family housing in San Mateo County.
3. Smart Growth efforts and other land use decisions that facilitate appropriate mixed use developments along efficient, public transportation corridors. The County also supports an examination of current rules and standards that benefit lower density development (over higher density development), vehicular movement at the expense of pedestrian traffic and safety. While the County supports development incentives for Smart Growth related activities, the County opposes efforts to divert or restrict funding usage to specific programs.
4. Careful and cautious review of the implementation of Proposition 50 water bond funds.
5. Careful and cautious examination of state efforts to manage regional growth issues.
6. Maintenance of adequate open space/park lands through increased funding for development easements and needed restoration and rehabilitation activities.
7. Efforts to protect, conserve, restore, and enhance environmental resources of the San Mateo County, its coast and adjacent waters for environmentally sustainable and prudent use by current and future generations. (2005, ESA)
8. Increased funding to address the growing Sudden Oak Death syndrome affecting several California coastal counties. (2002, ESA)
9. The Legislative Analysts Office recommendation to require a statewide transportation needs assessment every five years, if the assessment has no fiscal impact on County funds or revenues.
10. The Legislative Analysts Office recommendation to create high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes as a pilot program. The County also supports consideration of San Mateo County as a potential pilot project location.
11. Increased energy efficiency and conservation efforts that reduce California's per-capita need for energies including electricity and fossil fuels; increased production and use of renewable energies that grows the renewable energies "market share" of California's energy consumption profile; and, when necessary, non-renewable energies development that meets environmental reviews, that maintains or exceeds current environmental and/or emission controls, and that best protects our natural environments and offshore areas. (2005, ESA)

Miscellaneous

The County supports:

1. The development of regulations and the implementation of Proposition 49, the After School Education and Safety Program Act of 2002, which will benefit the County's existing system of before and after school programs.
2. Legislation that will benefit horseracing and other subsequent horse racing related activities in and around Bay Meadows.
3. Legislation that conveys to domestic partners any and all benefits and advantages enjoyed by married couples.