



**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**  
**Inter-Departmental Correspondence**

County Manager's Office

**DATE:** July 28, 2009  
**BOARD MEETING DATE:** August 4, 2009  
**SPECIAL NOTICE/HEARING:** None  
**VOTE REQUIRED:** Majority

**TO:** Honorable Board of Supervisors  
**FROM:** David S. Boesch, County Manager  
**SUBJECT:** County Manager's Report #9

**A. Assembly Bill 217 (Beall), Medi-Cal: alcohol and drug screening and brief intervention**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a resolution in support of Assembly Bill 217 (Beall), Medi-Cal: alcohol and drug screening.

**BACKGROUND:**

Federal Medicaid program funds basic health care coverage for low-income individuals and their families, pregnant women, elderly, and disabled persons offering specific benefits to all and providing special benefits as a state option, such as substance abuse programs. States that offer substance abuse screening and brief intervention (SBI) services can obtain Medicaid reimbursement.

**DISCUSSION:**

Assembly Bill 217 (Beall) would create the Medi-Cal Alcohol and Drug Screening and Brief Intervention Services Matching Fund in the State Treasury. This fund would be administered by the Department of Alcohol and Drugs in collaboration with Department of Health Care Services for the purpose of increasing the counties' ability to make available alcohol and drug screening and brief intervention services to pregnant women or women of childbearing age. The program enables counties to provide the required fifty percent share of cost in order to draw down a federal match.



A recent evaluation of twenty California counties that have initiated county-funded prenatal SBI programs—in the absence of state funding—has found a sharp decline in rates of substance use during pregnancy, and in low birth-weight newborns.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Cost savings to the County as currently services not covered by Medical are passed off onto the County's general fund for payment.

**B. Assembly Bill 754 (Chesbro), Medi-Cal: mental health plans**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a resolution in support of Assembly Bill 754 (Chesbro), Medi-Cal: mental health plans.

**BACKGROUND:**

California's Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) and Department of Mental Health (DMH) administer numerous federal, state and county partnership programs, including the Early Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) program, which provides physical and mental health services to Medicaid beneficiaries under the age of 21.

**DISCUSSION:**

Assembly Bill 754 (Chesbro) would clarify the obligations and timeframes for DMH and DHCS to reimburse county mental health plans for Medi-Cal claims. It would require DMH to follow the same federally established timeframes to reimburse MPHs for underpayment of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) funds or state General Funds. The proposal would also require DMH and DHCS to submit claims for FFP funding to the federal government throughout the fiscal year, and to pay the MPHs claims when the state receives the federal match.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Unknown; potentially a 38 percent increase in reimbursements from the state to the County at the end of the fiscal year.

**C. Assembly Bill 320 (Solorio), County jails: reentry facilities**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a resolution in support of Assembly Bill 320 (Solorio), County jails, reentry facilities.

**BACKGROUND:**

In 2007 the Legislature enacted the Public Safety and Offender Rehabilitation Act, (Assembly Bill 900, Chapter 7, Statutes of 2007) authorizing \$7.4 billion in lease-revenue bond financing for the construction of reentry facilities and county jails. The legislation extends a funding preference to counties that assist the state in siting reentry facilities.

**DISCUSSION:**

Senate Bill 320 (Solorio) would modify the conditions for the funding of reentry facilities under Assembly Bill 900 to give coequal funding preference to counties that assist the state in either siting reentry facilities or providing beds in county jails for reentry. The measure would require counties interested in providing reentry services to state inmates enter into an agreement with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to provide reentry services. The proposed changes to existing law are prospective and are not intended to impact any existing awards for county jail construction bond financing.

As of January 2009, only eleven counties San Bernardino, San Joaquin, Kern, Santa Barbara, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Yolo, Madera, Calaveras, Amador, and San Benito, have been awarded bond money for jail construction. There is still more than \$164 million in bond money that is available to be awarded during Phase 1 and another \$470 million during Phase 2.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Potential increase in county jail construction funds.

**D. Assembly Bill 680 (Hall), Local government: fees and judgments**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a resolution in support of Assembly Bill 680 (Hall), Local government: fees and judgments.

**BACKGROUND:**

Under existing law, the county sheriff is required to perform certain duties, such as service process, evictions, and the keeping and maintaining seized property. By statute the sheriff is allowed to collect fees to offset the service costs. Existing law specifies the amount of the fees and requires a portion of the fees be deposited in a special fund in the county treasury to fund the sheriff's civil division, while the remainder of the fee goes to the county general fund.

**DISCUSSION:**

Assembly Bill 680 (Hall) would increase by amounts ranging from \$5 to \$20, various fees for services provided by county sheriffs and marshals. The increases would apply to serving, executing, and processing required court notices, writs, orders, and other processes. The proposed fee increases would not take effect until January 1, 2011. Persons who are unable to pay the increased fees will be able to continue to petition the court for a fee waiver.

Many of the proposed fees have not been increased since the passage of Assembly Bill 1768 (Steinberg, Chapter 629, Statutes of 2000). According to the Consumer Price Index, a \$30 fee in 2000 would equal \$37.06 at present, adjusting for inflation.

**Performance Measure(s):**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>FY 2007-08 Actual</b>	<b>FY 2008-09 Projected</b>
<b>Federal/State Measures analyzed and acted on</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>35</b>

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Savings to the County General Fund.