



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO
Inter-Departmental Correspondence

County Manager's Office

DATE: January 3, 2006
BOARD MEETING DATE: January 10, 2006
SPECIAL NOTICE/HEARING: None
VOTE REQUIRED: Majority

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors
FROM: John Maltbie, County Manager
SUBJECT: County Manager's Report #1—Resolution to amend the 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution amending the 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program

VISION ALIGNMENT:

Commitment: Responsive, effective and collaborative government.

Goal(s): 20 – Effectively communicate, collaborate and develop strategic approaches to issues affecting the entire County.

BACKGROUND:

The 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program (Legislative Program) articulates San Mateo County's goals and objectives as they relate to the 2005-2006 legislative session. The proposals, priorities and policies in combination with other positions adopted by the Board of Supervisors guide the County's legislative advocacy efforts. The Legislative Committee in coordination with County staff, departments and the County's advocates developed the Legislative Program.

At the close of the first year of the session, County staff revises the Legislative Program in response to the activities of the first half of the session. Changes to the Legislative Program reflect resolution of legislative proposals and shifts in priorities and policies.

DISCUSSION:

While the Legislative Program 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. However, the mid-session amendments to the Legislative Program attempt to reflect the new and changed issues that are likely to have an impact on County services and operations. Some of the more notable changes include the elimination of seven legislative proposals. They are:

- **Change of Venue**—AB 27 (Mullin, Ruskin). 09/22/2005: Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 282, Statutes of 2005
- **San Francisco International Airport Jet Fuel Sales Tax Recovery**—AB 1282 (Mullin). 04/25/2005: Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation. Hearing canceled at the request of author.
- **Public Agency Authorization to Operate Group Homes**—SB 679 (Simitian). 09/22/2005: Chaptered by Secretary of State. Chapter 268, Statutes of 2005
- **Automated Warrant System**—AB 1742 (Asm Judiciary). 10/07/2005: Chaptered by Secretary of State - Chapter 706, Statutes of 2005.
- **San Mateo County Preschool for All Funding**—Failed to secure federal earmark funding. Currently reviewing earmark priorities for FFY 2007.
- **Public Notice Process for Locating Parole Offices**—AB 313 (Ruskin). 10/07/2005: Vetoed by Governor. Currently reviewing alternatives.
- **Legislative Authority for a 1/8th cent sales tax for parks and recreation activities and programs in San Mateo County**—SB 203 (Simitian, etal). 10/07/2005: Chaptered by Secretary of State. Chapter 682, Statutes of 2005.

Staff recommends that efforts on two proposals (Order to seek employment for non-delinquent child support obligors; and increased State Children's Health Insurance eligibility) from 2005 be continued with minor amendments. In addition, staff recommends the inclusion of a new proposal related to child support program access to telecom subscriber information.

The Legislative Committee has reviewed the proposed amendments to the Legislative Program and recommends approval by the Board of Supervisors.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Unknown

RESOLUTION NO. _____

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * * * *

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MID-SESSION AMENDMENTS TO THE SAN MATEO
COUNTY 2005-2006 LEGISLATIVE SESSION PROGRAM**

RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California, that

WHEREAS, effective legislative participation and advocacy are critical to county government and many local programs; and

WHEREAS, review of and change to the County's legislative program by the Board of Supervisors is necessary to have successful and effective legislative representation; and

WHEREAS, the County Manager's Office with County departments has coordinated mid-session amendments to the 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program; and

WHEREAS, the Legislative Committee of the Board of Supervisors has developed amendments to the 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program and recommends approval by the Board;

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED AND ORDERED that the mid-session amendments to the 2005-2006 Legislative Session Program of San Mateo County recommended to the Board of Supervisors are hereby adopted and approved.

* * * * *

1
2
3
4

County of San Mateo



5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

2005-2006 Legislative Session Program

San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

Richard S. Gordon, District 3, President
Mark Church, District 1
Jerry Hill, District, District 2, Vice President
Rose Jacobs Gibson, District 4,
Adrienne Tissier, District 5

1
2
3
4
5

AMENDED January 10, 2006
AMENDED May 3, 2005
AMENDED April 26, 2005
AMENDED January 25, 2005
January 2005

1 CONTENTS

2

3 I. INTRODUCTION

4 II. COUNTY-SPONSORED AND COSPONSORED INITIATIVES

5 III. 2005-2006 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

6 IV. LEGISLATIVE POLICIES

7 A. Administration and Finance

8 B. Human Services

9 C. Health Services and Hospitals

10 D. Public Safety and Justice

11 E. Land Use, Housing, Transportation and Environment

12 F. Miscellaneous

13

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

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.

1 COUNTY SPONSORED AND COSPONSORED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

2
3 This section details legislative proposals that San Mateo County will pursue, either through
4 sponsorship or co-sponsorship, in the upcoming session. Once approved by the Board of
5 Supervisors, County staff and legislative consultants will work to develop the proposals, identify
6 bill authors/sponsors and shepherd them through the legislative process. The Board of
7 Supervisors will receive regular updates on the status of the legislative proposals and may be
8 asked to testify before the legislature.

9
10 Due to the expected budget shortfall for the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 Budget years, legislative
11 proposals that have a state general fund cost will likely not meet a minimal level of viability.
12 Those that require funds will likely not be considered by the State Legislature.

13
14 **1. Change of Venue**

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

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

27
28 **2.1. San Mateo County Demonstration for Orders to Seek Employment for Non-**
29 **Delinquent Child Support Obligor**

30 **Proposal:** ~~Provide the Superior Court of the County San Mateo courts the flexibility to order~~
31 ~~unemployed parents to seek work at the time of the initial order for support rather than wait until~~
32 ~~an obligor has become delinquent.~~

33 **Background:** ~~Current law (FC §4505) requires delinquent child support obligors that allege they~~
34 ~~are not paying because they are unemployed to contact at least 5 employers a week and report~~
35 ~~back to the child support agency, the court or another entity. This requirement may only be~~
36 ~~imposed after the obligor has become delinquent. The seek work order cannot be imposed until~~
37 ~~an unemployed obligor defaults on their child support payments. Since orders cannot be~~
38 ~~reserved due to unemployment alone, this contributes to the creation of arrears. The proposed~~
39 ~~changes in the language would not limit the seek work requirement to delinquent obligors. The~~
40 ~~change would allow the court to order unemployed parents to seek work at the time of the initial~~
41 ~~order for support. This proposal would allow San Mateo County's Courts to order unemployed~~
42 ~~parents to seek work at the time of the initial order for support. (20056, DCSS)~~

43
44 **2. Child Support Program Access to Telecom Subscriber Information**

45 **Proposal:** Amend the Telecommunications Act to provide for access to subscriber locate
46 and financial information based on matches with child support obligors/potential obligors.

1 **Background:** The Cable Communications Privacy Act (1984) and the Telecommunications Act
2 of 1996 place restrictions on the release of cable and other telecommunications customers'
3 subscriber information, including location/address information and financial information.
4 However, this restriction impedes one of the core actions in providing child support services—
5 locating the obligor/potential obligor for service of legal documents, and in locating financial
6 information concerning an obligor/potential obligor to assist in establishing ability to pay. With
7 the ubiquitous nature of cable/satellite, cell phone, Internet and wireless services, the
8 telecommunications arena is positioned to be an excellent potential source of location
9 information. Ten years ago, Congress agreed. The Personal Responsibility and Work
10 Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA) required states to have administrative
11 procedures for accessing information from cable service providers (42 USC 666). The
12 restrictions in the above cited telecommunications laws have prevented implementation of the
13 PRWORA requirements. (2006, DCSS)

14 15 **3.San Francisco International Airport Jet Fuel Sales Tax Recovery**

16 **Proposal:**— Sponsor legislation that will ensure consistent application of the long-held “point
17 of sale” principle.

18 **Background:** For more than sixty years sales tax in California has been allocated at the “point
19 of sale.” Assembly Bill 66 (Baea) statutorily designated the point of sale or situs for sales tax on
20 jet fuel as at the “wing tip.” AB 66 also created a special exception that requires jet fuel sold in
21 the County of San Mateo (at San Francisco International Airport) is split with the City and
22 County of San Francisco. In 2002, United Airlines was able to take advantage of a Board of
23 Equalization ruling and manipulate the allocation of sales taxes by creating a “jet fuel sales
24 subsidiary” located in the City of Oakland. United Airlines was able to negotiate a generous
25 rebate and divert sales tax from local jurisdictions that in fairness should have gone to the
26 County of San Mateo and other jurisdictions with airports. Last year, Assembly Bill 2466 (Yee)
27 proposed to close the United/Oakland inequitable and unfair loop hole, but failed to close the
28 inequitable and unfair special exception created for San Francisco. The Governor vetoed AB
29 2466. (2005, CMO)

30 31 **4.Public Agency Authorization to Operate Group Homes**

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

35 **Background:** More restrictive than Federal law, current State law and regulation require that
36 group homes be operated by private not for profit agencies in order to be eligible for AFDC-FC
37 residential care rate payments. San Mateo County has received a three-year State Department of
38 Social Services (DSS) administrative demonstration waiver to operate Canyon Oaks as a public
39 agency and receive AFDC-FC group home funding. This waiver will expire in August of 2006.
40 (2005, Health)

41 42 **5.Automated Warrant System**

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

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

16 **6. San Mateo County Preschool for All Funding**

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

19 **Background:** First 5 San Mateo County recently completed a three-year Preschool for All
20 (PFA) planning process. With eleven goals, Preschool for All San Mateo County will utilize and
21 build on the existing early childhood education infrastructure to improve teacher qualification
22 standards and expanding services to more families regardless of income. PFA will begin with a
23 three-year phased-in demonstration project that is projected to serve 1,423 children per year
24 when fully implemented. The program will start year one in Ravenswood and Redwood City
25 School Districts on a voluntary basis. While funded with multi-year one-time grant funding
26 from an assortment of sources including First 5 San Mateo County and First 5 of California, the
27 three-year demonstration project is fully funded only for the first year. Years two and three will
28 require \$1.4 million and \$4 million respectively. (2005, CMO)

29 **73. State Children's Health Insurance (S-CHIP) eligibility**

30 **Proposal:** Authorize county agencies, local initiatives, and county organized health systems
31 to seek and obtain funds to provide comprehensive health insurance coverage to children in
32 families whose income does not exceed a to-be-determined percentage of the federal poverty
33 level and who do not qualify for either Medi-Cal or the Healthy Families Program.

34 **Background:** AB 495 (Diaz, 2001) authorized local governments to seek and obtain federal
35 matching funds to provide comprehensive health insurance coverage to children in families
36 whose incomes do not exceed 300 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL), and who do not
37 qualify for either Medi-Cal or the Healthy Families program. San Mateo County's Children's
38 Health Initiative provides services to children in families with incomes that does not exceed
39 400% FLP. The County serves approximately 5,100 children through its Healthy Kids insurance
40 program since they are ineligible for Medi-Cal and Healthy Families due to the income
41 restriction. As a result, San Mateo County does not receive federal or state funds to provide
42 coverage to children between 300-400% FLP who meet citizenship and immigration status
43 requirements. AB 772 (Chan, 2005) would have created a statewide Healthy Kids Insurance
44
45

1 Program providing insurance to children with family incomes up to 300% of the federal poverty
2 level. AB 772 was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger due to cost concerns. (2006, Health)
3

4 **48. Public Notice Process for Locating Parole Offices**

5 **Proposal:** Require the Department of Corrections to notify affected jurisdictions about a
6 proposed parole office location that is within 1000 feet of a school (including K-12 and childcare
7 centers/pre-schools) or a public park with playground equipment designed for young children
8 and to secure a written response from affected jurisdictions before entering into a lease or
9 beginning construction on the site.

10 **Background:** This proposal originates with a recent effort of the California Department of
11 Corrections to relocate a community parole office near the County's child care center, Our Place.
12 With the help of Senator Byron Sher and then-Assemblymember Joe Simitian, the County
13 succeeded in convincing the Department of Corrections to reconsider the location of the parole
14 office. However, the incident highlighted problems with the notification process. The current
15 process does not require an action of express approval or objection by the affected jurisdiction.
16 This proposal would require the Department of Corrections to notify affected jurisdictions about
17 a proposed parole office location that is within 100 feet of a school and to secure a written
18 response from affected jurisdictions before entering into a lease or beginning construction on the
19 site.
20

21 ~~9. Legislative authority for a 1/8th cent sales tax for parks and recreation activities~~
22 ~~and programs in San Mateo County~~

23 ~~**Proposal:** Secure legislative authority for San Mateo County to levy a transactions and use~~
24 ~~tax at a rate of 0.125 if approved by two-thirds of voters in an election on the issue, where the net~~
25 ~~revenues derived from the imposed tax shall be expended only to supplement existing~~
26 ~~expenditures for park and recreation purposes.~~

27 ~~**Background:** San Mateo County is one of only two counties in the 9 county Bay Area region~~
28 ~~not to have a dedicated source of funding for acquisition, development and/or maintenance of~~
29 ~~park facilities. Citizens of San Mateo County have been working since 1992 for tax based~~
30 ~~funding for its parks. Counties possess the authority for levying sales taxes in 1/4th increments~~
31 ~~under Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7285, the general provision for one-quarter cent sales~~
32 ~~tax increases. However, there is no general provision for counties or cities to impose a one-~~
33 ~~eight cent sales tax, other than for the purposes of funding libraries.~~
34

1 2005-2006 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

2
3 This section highlights the most important 2003-2004 Legislative Session issues that could
4 significantly affect San Mateo County. While San Mateo County will not actively pursue
5 legislation, in the following areas, the following priorities will receive heightened scrutiny and
6 may warrant significant involvement on the part of County staff or Board members. The County
7 may request amendments to legislation in these priority areas—amendments that conform to the
8 general goals and objectives of the below priorities.

9
10 **1. Protecting County Revenues and Operations**

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

- 21 • A freeze of the property tax shift to the State through the Education Revenue
22 Augmentation Fund (ERAF) and the eventual return of those funds to local
23 governments. (2001-2002)
- 24 • The development of new revenue sources dedicated exclusively to specified county-
25 provided services such as In-Home Supportive Services. New revenue sources could
26 be delivered through a mechanism similar to the Realignment programs of the early
27 1990s.

28
29 Should funding for programs not be maintained with the current budget revenue and expenditure
30 levels, the County would support increases in alcohol and cigarette taxes.

31
32 Not mutually exclusive to increases in revenues, the County supports, in concept, the reduction
33 in funding for various programs and activities only when the concomitant requirement to provide
34 such programs and activities is relieved. The Board has not considered what specific programs
35 would be acceptable for reductions in funding and expressly reserves its ability to take a position
36 on this issue should (as) it arises during the next legislative session and any pertinent special
37 sessions.

38
39 The County supports restoration of historic reductions in local government funding and increased
40 flexibility in implementing and administering services. Providing local governments with
41 greater flexibility to provide services to local communities ensures that services match local
42 needs and greater efficiencies for limited resources. While restoration of funds seems unlikely in
43 the current economic climate, future fiscal years may provide better opportunities. The County
44 also supports the preservation and increase of funding for Health and Human services
45 “realigned” to counties in the early 1990s. The County opposes any effort to alter the existing

1 Realignment funding allocation formula if it will result in a reduction of funds to San Mateo
2 County.

3
4 For programs, like trial courts, no longer operated by counties, the County supports the
5 elimination of maintenance of effort requirements and equitable transition of
6 ~~responsibilites~~responsibilities and facilities to the State.

7
8 **2. Adequate funding for the Community Care Licensing Division of the Department of**
9 **Social Services**

10 Community Care Licensing (CCL), a division of the Department of Social Services, is
11 responsible for issuing licenses to child care centers and family child care homes to ensure that
12 basic health and safety regulations under Title 22 are met and maintained. Community Care
13 Licensing was created to ensure that child care facilities were inspected for a very basic level of
14 health and safety. Families looking for child care and early education for infants, preschoolers or
15 school-aged children have long been advised to seek out programs that are licensed in order to
16 protect their children. Community Care Licensing formerly performed annual unannounced
17 monitoring visits of all child care centers, and every-three-year visits for family child care
18 homes.

19
20 In Fiscal Year 2003-2004, Community Care Licensing sustained significant budget cuts. Under
21 current funding levels, CCL now visits only a random 10% of licensed programs per year, unless
22 a specific complaint has been filed. Licensing inspectors have shifted from being proactive to
23 reactive to reported claims of unsafe conditions, neglect or abuse.

24
25 California's inspector-to-facility ratio (1:191 for centers and 1:309 for family child care) is now
26 among the highest in the nation and far higher than the ratios recommended by national experts.
27 The lack of sufficient trained and qualified licensing inspectors prevents the timely licensure of
28 badly needed new child care homes and centers. As a result, the County supports increased
29 funding for the Community Care Licensing Division of the Department of Social Services to a
30 level sufficient to provide trained, qualified staff, educated in child development. This funding
31 should be used to:

- 32 • Make unannounced annual visits for licensed centers;
- 33 • Make unannounced every-3-year for licensed family child care homes;
- 34 • Ensure timely licensure of new centers and family child care homes;
- 35 • Investigate and resolve complaints in a timely manner; and
- 36 • Communicate changes in regulations to licensed providers.

37
38 **2.3. TANF Reauthorization**

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

- 43 • Increasing child care funding proportionately related to the increase in work
44 participation hours during which time parents are not able to care for their children.
45 (2006, HSA)increased funding for child care. Existing Child Care Development
46 Block Grant (CCDBG) funds do not adequately meet current needs. In San Mateo

1 County, 25,000 children are eligible for subsidized child care, but only 5,000
2 children receive assistance funded by existing child care funds. Since child care
3 funding consists of both federal with state funding, California has used a larger
4 portion of state funds to supplement inadequate child care funding from the federal
5 government. California receives approximately 22% of federal TANF funds, but
6 only 11 % of child care funds. This amount should increase to meet the needs of
7 California. (2002, HSA)

8 Considering the current shortfall of funds needed for child care, any increase minimum
9 work requirements must include a corresponding increase in child care funding to
10 accommodate for the time parents will not be able to care for their children. (2002,
11 HSA)

12 • Regional Promoting flexibility for eligible work participation activities. San Mateo
13 County supports flexibility in work participation activities. The County supports the
14 inclusion of including rehabilitative services including such as substance abuse
15 treatment, mental health treatment, vocational rehabilitation services, adult basic
16 education, and English proficiency classes as fulfilling work requirements as full-
17 time activities for limited durations. (2002, HSA)

18 • Removal of the federal 85% income eligibility income standard and allowing state
19 flexibility in using eligibility formulas such as the U.S. Housing and Urban
20 Development (HUD) income eligibility formula, which better reflects the true need
21 of families on a regional (rather than state) level. (2005, HSA)

22 • Maintaining state flexibility in strategies and activities relating to the Marriage and
23 Family Formation Act allowing welfare families to engage in healthier relationships.
24 (2005, HSA)

25 • The Employment Achievement grant of up to 5 percent to high achieving states
26 which reach the goals of employment entry, job retention, and increased earnings
27 from employment for families receiving assistance. (2005, HSA)

28 Removal of the state matching fund requirement for CDBG funds, considering the
29 current economic downturn. (2005, HSA)

30 Revision of the child care funding formula to be calculated through the TANF formula
31 which is based on the proportion in state allotment for the state's share of child care
32 funds rather than the current CCDBG formula. (2005, HSA)

33 • General support for "super waiver" flexibility in the use of TANF funds. Any
34 proposed super waiver alternatives should allow for local demonstration
35 projects/waivers as well as statewide ones. (2005, HSA)

36 • Maintaining drug testing as a state's option. (2005, HSA)

37 38 **4. Infrastructure Needs, Investments and On-going Revenues**

39 The California State Legislature is expected to work on legislation to present voters with the
40 opportunity to authorize bond funding for infrastructure needs throughout California. While the
41 County generally supports additional, one-time funding for the County's infrastructure, such
42 funding must adequately address local streets and roads. Cities and counties are responsible for
43 82 percent of the States maintained miles, referred to as the local system and also serves as the
44 secondary highway system in California.

1 Of greater importance is the need to secure additional and/or dedicated on-going revenues for the
2 operations and maintenance of existing local infrastructure and future infrastructure
3 improvements. While capitol improvements are needed, maintaining existing infrastructure
4 first—"fix it first"—is a sound, cost effective investment of tax dollars. Unfortunately, revenues
5 have not been able to keep pace with the costs of operating and maintaining our critical
6 infrastructure. Attacks on Proposition 42 funding, increased regulatory requirements, flat or
7 shrinking revenue sources and inflation continue to attrite the County's ability to operate and
8 maintain infrastructure at appropriate levels. As a result, the County supports:

- 9 • Funding that adequately supports local infrastructure needs;
- 10 • From existing revenue sources like Proposition 42 and SAFETEA-LU, funding
11 allocations that reasonably support local needs;
- 12 • Consideration of additional and/or dedicated statewide on-going revenue sources that
13 support local operations and maintenance of existing and future infrastructure needs;
- 14 • Increasing local flexibility to create new and increased local transportation revenue
15 sources such as local transportation sales taxes, vehicle license fees and
- 16 • Updating, adjusting and/or indexing the current gas tax;
- 17 • Statewide policies that ensure rehabilitation and operation and maintenance of local
18 infrastructure are among the top funding priorities; and
- 19 • Balanced with the need for environmental protection, the streamlining of regulatory
20 requirements that reduce the costs of both initial construction of and on-going
21 operations and maintenance of local infrastructure.

23 **3.5. Mandate and Financing for Mental Health Services to Special Education Students** 24 **(AB 3632 services)**

25 The County supports full funding for the County's costs incurred providing mental health
26 services to special education students. Full funding for such services best meets the needs of
27 beneficiaries while preventing eventual reliance on other County services. The County also
28 supports the development of a plan for the timely payment for outstanding reimbursement (SB
29 90) claims related to costs related to meeting this mandate. In the absence of full funding for
30 ongoing mandated costs or timely payment for outstanding reimbursement claims, the County
31 supports the repeal of the AB 3632 mandate in recognition that permanent responsibility for
32 mental health services under the Individuals with Disabilities Enrichment Act (IDEA) best rests
33 with education—not local government. With the passage of SB 1895 (Burton) in 2004, the
34 County supports the implementation of the provisions of SB 1895, which provides, among other
35 things, that schools provide more early intervention services before referring a child to county
36 mental health and that counties, with the exception of assessments of referred youth, generally do
37 not have fiscal or legal responsibility for any costs they incur prior to approval of an
38 individualized education plan (IEP). In addition, the County supports the SB 1895 provision that
39 the Commission on State Mandates reexamine what costs are reimbursable and update AB 3632
40 Parameters and Guidelines to reflect recent legislation and allowable services under the Federal
41 "Individuals with Disabilities Education Act." The County also supports the Legislative
42 Analyst's Office recommendation permanently to assign permanent responsibility for AB 3632
43 program services to schools through Special Education Local Plan Areas. While the County is
44 prepared to consider contracting with schools to provide such services, transferring program
45 responsibility will encourage schools to provide early, effective and efficient services. (20065,
46 Health)

1
2 **4.6. Proposition 63, Mental Health Services Act—Adequate Funding**

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

17
18 **5.7. Adequate Proposition 36 Funding**

19 If funding for Proposition 36, the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) of 2000,
20 is allowed to sunset in 2006, without renewal, the mandate to provide the sentencing option of
21 treatment instead of incarceration must sunset at the same time, thus avoiding an un-funded
22 mandate. If Proposition 36 is extended, it must be adequately funded, and County allocations be
23 revised based on a formula using population size, cost of doing business, and participation rates.
24 (2005, CMOHSA)

25
26 **6.8. Medi-Cal Redesign and Intergovernmental Transfer Funding**

27 Since 2004, the Schwarzenegger Administration has been developing a redesign of the Medi-Cal
28 program. The Administration plans to release a detailed proposal in January 2005. As the local
29 public health authority and charged with the public health and safety of our communities, San
30 Mateo County with other counties is the foundation of California's safety net system. To that
31 end, the County provides needed services to the medically indigent through the San Mateo
32 Medical Center, a county system of healthcare and to Medi-Cal recipients through a managed
33 care system called the Health Plan of San Mateo (HPSM). ~~The Medical Center and HPSM rely~~
34 ~~heavily on Medicaid reimbursements and intergovernmental transfers. However, these existing~~
35 state and federal resources do not adequately fund the need in San Mateo County. In
36 addition, the percentage of uninsureds has increased and costs continue to outpace fund sources.
37 As a result, the County must supplement the Medical Center with additional revenues, which
38 reached ~~nearly approximately \$5460~~ million in FY 2005-06. The County can no longer
39 absorb these cost increases and shortfalls in revenue. ~~Medi-Cal reform that results in decreased~~
40 ~~funding to county hospitals and health systems would devastate the County's safety net~~ must
41 include significant increases in funding to the public health care safety net system. Because of
42 the unique and critical role of counties in providing safety net services, counties must be
43 involved in the development of Medi-Cal redesign. San Mateo County supports the following
44 principles as a guide for Medi-Cal redesign:

- 45 • The viability of the safety net system must be preserved through increased funding
46 for indigent care, not by shifting costs to the County.

1 ~~Intergovernmental transfers (IGT) should not be impeded by reforms, and where~~
2 ~~appropriate expanded to accommodate the coordination of public hospitals with~~
3 ~~managed care systems. Specifically, the County supports the use of IGTs to increase~~
4 ~~State funding passed to HPSM, which would thereby increase the rates paid to the~~
5 ~~Medical Center.~~

- 6 • The expansion of managed care must not destabilize the public health care safety net.
- 7 • Adequate funding levels must be developed for public hospitals and those qualified
- 8 safety net hospitals operating within a county organized health system (COHS)
- 9 managed care framework.
- 10 • Reform efforts must preserve access to medically necessary mental health care, drug
- 11 treatment services, and California Children's Services.
- 12 • The State should pursue all possible options for securing additional federal funds.
- 13 • Reform efforts must simplify (not add to the complexity of) Medi-Cal eligibility
- 14 requirements without jeopardizing eligibility.
- 15 • Reform efforts must preserve continuity of care and coverage and maintain access
- 16 and eligibility.

17
18 **7.9. Classification of Family Support Bench Warrants**

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

24
25 **8.10. Implementation of the Olmstead Decision**

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

37
38 **9.11. Child Support Enforcement Penalties and Resource Allocation**

39 The State of California expects to install a statewide automated child support system and
40 centralized payment facility by the Spring 2006. If the project is on schedule, the state will incur
41 an additional \$440 million in federal penalties due on last day of Federal FY 2005 and the first
42 day of Federal FY 2006. Currently, there is no language requiring a county contribution.
43 However, in 2003-2004, counties were required to pay 25% of the penalty with a statewide cost
44 to counties of \$52 million. The San Mateo County share was \$792,000. With the possibility ~~that~~
45 of future legislation will mandate another requirements for a county contribution or that the
46 project will fall behind schedule, the County must oppose and any transfer of responsibility to

1 pay for federal child support enforcement penalties. The state, not counties, must assume full
2 responsibility for any federal penalties for the state's failure to establish a statewide automated
3 child support system. The County also opposes any efforts to alter the allocation formula
4 without appropriate consideration of performance and efficient use of funds. The County
5 supports federal consideration of reinvestment in the child support program instead of payment
6 of the penalties and the "repayment" of any shared penalty costs. (DCSS, 2005)

7 8 **10.12. Nurse Staffing Ratio Requirements**

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

23 24 **11.13. Hospital Professional, Technical and Support Services Staffing**

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

33 34 **12.14. Housing Vouchers**

35 Housing is an important component to self-sufficiency. In San Mateo County, where housing
36 costs are well above the state and national average, housing assistance programs like Section 8
37 housing vouchers are critical. San Mateo County urges full funding for Section 8 vouchers
38 currently in use. In addition, the County seeks flexibility in the program to better serve local
39 needs. Specifically, the County seeks time-limited vouchers with relevant support services that
40 move families toward greater self-sufficiency and independence from the voucher program. The
41 County also seeks additional family unification vouchers to ensure rapid access to housing for
42 family preservation. Emancipated youth have an equally pressing need for housing. Additional
43 vouchers are needed to ensure that youth who "age out" of foster care have access to affordable
44 housing. Over 50% of all foster care youth experience homelessness within two years of aging
45 out of the system. The high cost of living in San Mateo County, also raises questions about
46 national standards for subsidized housing rental rates. Current law limits the tenant's share of

1 rent to 30% of their income. This does not reflect the realities of high-cost areas where many
2 families pay well in excess of 30% of their income to housing. As a result, the County seeks
3 flexibility to allow for 40% of income for rent and utilities. This would create parity between
4 subsidized and unsubsidized families and enable existing funds to reach more families. (2003,
5 HSA)
6

7 **13.15. Devil’s Slide Designation as an Ongoing Emergency**

8 The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) authorized the Federal surface
9 transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for the 6-year period from
10 1998-2003. It was scheduled to expire on September 30, 2003. Unable to craft a reauthorization
11 of TEA-21 before the expiration date, Congress passed a five-month extension on the existing
12 authorization through February 29, 2004. During the 108th Congress, Offices of Senator Barbara
13 Boxer and Congressman Tom Lantos worked to designate Devil’s Slide as an “ongoing
14 emergency,” which makes the project eligible for various fund sources including Federal
15 Emergency Management Agency funding until the project is completed. The project began in
16 2004.
17

18 **14.16. Use of County-specific Cost of Doing Business in State Funding Allocations**

19 While the cost of doing business varies widely by county, most state allocations of funding to the
20 counties do not account for such differences. For example the Substance Abuse and Crime
21 Prevention Act (SACPA) allocation methodology, assumes that a dollar of allocation can
22 purchase an equal amount of services in each county. In contrast, Federal funding to states
23 accounts for cost differences among states. The formula in the Federal Public Health Service
24 Act for allocating funds to the states for the Federal Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment
25 (SAPT) Block Grant utilizes a Cost of Service Index Factor whose purpose is to accurately
26 reflect the differences between California and the other states in the cost of providing substance
27 abuse services. The County supports adjustments to county human service fund allocations that
28 account for the differences among California counties in the cost of providing services.
29
30

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)

- 1 2. Increased flexibility for the administration of CalWORKs. Flexibility in the CalWORKs
2 program should include income eligibility standards for child care.
- 3 3. Performance incentives and other rewards for cooperation and collaboration among local
4 governments, including regional and sub-regional efforts to provide accessible,
5 affordable and transit oriented housing. (2001-2002)
- 6 4. Preservation of children's protective services, participation and funding for
7 foster/adoptive programs and funding for child care. (2001-2002, revised)
- 8 ~~5. Increases in Housing Assistance Payments and Administrative Fee amounts and greater
9 flexibility for use of Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program funds. The County
10 opposes efforts to reduce funding amounts in this arena and or limitations on the
11 flexibility of use of funds. (2002, HSA)~~
- 12 ~~6. Renewal of subsidies for the Supportive Housing Program as well as the Shelter Plus Care
13 Program. These programs fund San Mateo County's transitional and permanent
14 supportive housing for homeless families and homeless persons with disabilities. It also
15 is the primary funder of our homeless providers for support staff and program operations.
16 These funds also support rental assistance for disabled homeless people. (2002, HSA)~~
- 17 7.5. Maximum flexibility to institute innovative practices in child welfare and foster care such
18 as "wraparound" services and multi-discipline service approaches.
- 19 8.6. Increased funding and greater funding flexibility for foster care services, which are
20 critical to adequately protect children in need.
- 21 9.7. Protection of counties from any penalties associated with child support enforcement-
22 reporting violations associated with the state's failure to adequately implement an
23 electronic reporting system.
- 24 ~~10.8. Elimination of or reductions to federal penalties related to food stamps. California faces
25 a \$114.3 million penalty for FY 2001 and an additional \$62.5 million for FY 2002.
26 Given the State's dramatic improvement, the penalties serve no beneficial purpose and
27 would damage the program and improvements.~~
- 28 11.9. Where appropriate, aligning incongruent rules for resource limits and treatment of
29 particular types of resources in the CalWORKs, Food Stamps and Medi-Cal programs.
30 (2005, HSA)
- 31 10. Preservation of existing safety net program benefits and income eligibility threshold, e.g.,
32 Medi-Cal, Food Stamps, CalWORKs. (2005, HSA)
- 33 ~~12. A thorough and inclusive review of the California Performance Review proposals including
34 those related to realignment, privatization, reorganization and changes in funding
35 policies. Impacts on clients/customers as well as fiscal impacts on local government
36 should be assessed.~~

38 **Health Services and Hospitals**

39
40 The County supports:

- 41 1. The creation and funding for a health care system that provides access to health insurance
42 to all San Mateo County residents regardless of their ability to pay. To that end, the
43 County supports efforts to reduce or eliminate premiums and co-payments that serve to
44 deny access to care.
- 45 2. Improved access to health care and increased stability of the health care system through
46 Medi-Cal. The County supports increased reimbursement rates, full funding for

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

21 22 **Public Safety and Justice**

23 24 The County supports:

- 25 1. Preservation of funding for local public safety efforts, including inmate health, juvenile
26 probation and prevention programs, mental health and drug and alcohol programs.
27 (2001-2002)
- 28 2. Preservation of funding and, in the future, seek additional funding for Proposition 36
29 implementation. Support statutory changes that improve the operational efficiency and
30 local flexibility of the program. (2001-2002, revised)
- 31 3. Full funding and/or equity in the trial court realignment block grant. The County also
32 supports efforts to continue examination into trial court funding and maintenance
33 including the transfer of trial court facilities.
- 34 4. The maintenance of booking fees that protects the County from external costs while
35 serving a public policy benefit of reducing unnecessary bookings.
- 36 5. Increased regulation of firearms.
- 37 6. Efforts to facilitate the construction and operation of juvenile correctional facilities, such
38 as increased or reallocated funding for correctional facilities that are ready for immediate
39 construction.
- 40 7. Increased funding for substance abuse treatment, mental health services and other
41 diversionary services for inmates.
- 42 8. Continued review of the alignment of Chief Probation Officer selection, appointment and
43 retention authority with funding. The County also supports cautious review of any
44 potential separation of adult and juvenile probation activities.
- 45 9. Efforts to align law library costs, including facilities maintenance, with trial courts rather
46 than the County.

1 10. Increased federal funding for State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP).

2
3 **Land Use, Housing, Transportation and Environment**

4
5 The County supports:

- 6 1. Solutions to the region's housing crisis that address the needs of homeless, lower-income
7 residents, CalWORKs participants and at-risk populations as well as the housing needs of
8 disabled residents and the elderly.
- 9 2. Efforts to preserve affordable and accessible housing and the development of new
10 affordable and accessible housing through activities including additional funding for local
11 housing trust funds, development of a statewide and national housing trust funds, and
12 efforts to increase the amount of multi-family housing in San Mateo County.
- 13 3. Smart Growth efforts and other land use decisions that facilitate appropriate mixed use
14 developments along efficient, public transportation corridors. The County also supports
15 an examination of current rules and standards that benefit lower density development
16 (over higher density development), vehicular movement at the expense of pedestrian
17 traffic and safety. While the County supports development incentives for Smart Growth
18 related activities, the County opposes efforts to divert or restrict funding usage to specific
19 programs.
- 20 4. Increases in Housing Assistance Payments and Administrative Fee amounts and greater
21 flexibility for use of Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program funds. The County
22 opposes efforts to reduce funding amounts in this arena and or limitations on the
23 flexibility of use of funds. (2006, Housing)
- 24 5. Renewal of subsidies for the Supportive Housing Program as well as the Shelter Plus
25 Care Program. These programs fund San Mateo County's transitional and permanent
26 supportive housing for homeless families and homeless persons with disabilities. It also
27 is the primary funder of our homeless providers for support staff and program operations.
28 These funds also support rental assistance for disabled homeless people. (2006, Housing)
- 29 6. Meaningful reform related to redevelopment agencies—reform that includes an
30 examination of the definition of blight and of project area mergers. (2006, CMO)
- 31 4.7. Careful and cautious review of the implementation of Proposition 50 water bond funds.
- 32 5.8. Careful and cautious examination of state efforts to manage regional growth issues.
- 33 6.9. Maintenance of adequate open space/park lands through increased funding for
34 development easements and needed restoration and rehabilitation activities.
- 35 7.10. Efforts to protect, conserve, restore, and enhance environmental resources of the San
36 Mateo County, its coast and adjacent waters for environmentally sustainable and prudent
37 use by current and future generations. (2005, ESA)
- 38 8.11. Increased funding to address the growing Sudden Oak Death syndrome affecting several
39 California coastal counties. (2002, ESA)
- 40 9.12. The Legislative Analysts Office recommendation to require a statewide transportation
41 needs assessment every five years, if the assessment has no fiscal impact on County
42 funds or revenues.
- 43 ~~10. The Legislative Analysts Office recommendation to create high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes~~
44 ~~as a pilot program. The County also supports consideration of San Mateo County as a~~
45 ~~potential pilot project location.~~

1 ~~11.13.~~ Increased energy efficiency and conservation efforts that reduce California's per-capita
2 need for energies including electricity and fossil fuels; increased production and use of
3 renewable energies that grows the renewable energies "market share" of California's
4 energy consumption profile; and, when necessary, non-renewable energies development
5 that meets environmental reviews, that maintains or exceeds current environmental
6 and/or emission controls, and that best protects our natural environments and offshore
7 areas. ~~(2005, ESA)~~

8

9 **Miscellaneous**

10

11 The County supports:

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