



2015 STATE LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

Contra Costa County

Adopted January 20, 2015



Table of Contents

COUNTY-SPONSORED LEGISLATION.....	2
LEGISLATIVE/REGULATORY ADVOCACY PRIORITIES.....	2
STATE PLATFORM POLICY POSITIONS	6
Agricultural Issues	6
Animal Services Issues	7
Child Support Services Issues.....	8
Climate Change Issues	9
Delta Water Platform	9
Elections Issues.....	9
Emergency Preparedness, Emergency Response	10
Eminent Domain Issues	10
Flood Control and Clean Water Issues.....	11
General Revenues/Finance Issues	12
Health Care Issues.....	14
Human Services Issues.....	17
Indian Gaming Issues.....	20
Land Use/Community Development Issues.....	21
Law and Justice System Issues	23
Library Issues.....	25
Telecommunications Issues	26
Transportation Issues	26
Veterans Issues.....	28
Waste Management.....	29



2015 STATE LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Each year, the Board of Supervisors adopts a State Legislative Platform that establishes priorities and policy positions with regard to potential State legislation and regulation. The State Legislative Platform includes County-sponsored bill proposals, legislative or regulatory advocacy priorities for the year, and policies that provide direction and guidance for identification of and advocacy on bills which would affect the services, programs or finances of Contra Costa County.

COUNTY-SPONSORED LEGISLATION

Pursue legislation to improve traffic safety around schools in an effort to increase the walk/bike rate to school. Specifically the bill would do three things:

1. increase the prescriptive size of the school zone to 1320 feet (a quarter mile);
2. authorize performance methods for further expanding the zone - essentially an agency could perform a traffic study to establish the need to further expand the zone to be reflective of actual pedestrian/bicycle access patterns around schools; and
3. enhance penalties for speeding violations in those newly defined zones.

LEGISLATIVE/REGULATORY ADVOCACY PRIORITIES

Each year, issues emerge through the legislative process that are of importance to the County and require advocacy efforts. For 2015, it is anticipated that critical issues requiring legislative advocacy will include the following:

Priority 1: State Budget – The state’s continuing economic recovery, prior budget cuts, and the additional, temporary taxes provided by Proposition 30 have combined to bring the State Budget to a much improved financial condition. California’s budget outlook for 2015-16 continues to show the promise begun in 2014-15. Our economy is expected to see continued improvement over the next several years and revenue growth is exceeding last year’s projections. General Fund revenues are projected to be \$109.7 billion in 2014-15 and \$114.6 billion in 2015-16, a 4.5 percent increase over the updated 2014-15 revenues. Compared to revenues adopted for the budget last June, revenues are forecast to be \$4.1 billion higher over 2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16. About half of these additional revenues are required to satisfy Proposition 98, the K-14 funding guarantee. The other half would be placed in the Rainy Day Fund and used to pay down debt per the terms of Proposition 2, the ballot measure passed in November 2014 that strengthens the reserve requirements and pays down debt in years of strong capital gains tax revenue growth.

The Governor’s Budget proposes total GF expenditures of \$113.2 billion and a regular reserve for liquidation and economic uncertainties of \$1.5 billion. The Prop. 2 Rainy Day Fund is

proposed to contain \$2.8 billion, of which \$1.6 billion was placed in the account in 2014-15 and \$1.2 billion is added in 2015-16.

While the Governor's Budget identifies cost pressures and budget risks in health and human services programs, of particular concern to counties is the inadequate reimbursement for our ever-increasing cost of operating several human services programs: the "Human Services Funding Deficit," formerly referred to as the "Cost of Doing Business." The annual shortfall between actual county expenses and state reimbursement has grown to over \$1 billion since 2001, creating a de facto cost shift to counties. The funding gap forces counties to reduce services to vulnerable populations and/or divert scarce county resources from other critical local services. It also increases the risk of state and federal penalties.

Priority 2: Health Care – Counties play a critical role in California's health reform efforts. Counties serve as employers, payers, and providers of care to vulnerable populations. Consequently, counties stand ready to actively participate in discussions of how to best reform the health care system in California and implement the national health care reform legislation passed in 2010, The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA).

The optional Medi-Cal Expansion, in effect on Jan. 1, 2014, was a significant part of the State Budget process in 2013. (The mandatory expansion includes changes to eligibility and enrollment for populations *currently eligible* for Medicaid and is estimated to cost the state General Fund \$350 million.) The ACA had required states to expand Medicaid programs to allow childless adults at or below 138 percent of poverty to be eligible for Medicaid (known as Medi-Cal in California). The Supreme Court struck down that mandate but allowed it to be an option for states, which California has exercised.

The Governor's proposed Budget provided two options for that optional expansion: a "state option" and a "county option." Governor Brown announced in his proposed budget that he intended to either realign the county responsibility to provide medical care to indigent adults to include providing care to Medicaid eligible adults or recoup as much of the 1991 health realignment funding from counties as possible. CSAC successfully redirected the realignment effort and instead negotiated a fiscal transaction that reflects the shift of indigent adults to the state's Medi-Cal program.

However, significant unknowns remain including questions about the actual impact of the ACA coverage expansions on counties and the number of uninsured individuals to whom counties will still need to provide services. Counties will retain the Section 17000 responsibility, and there will be significant variations in the impacts of both the ACA and AB 85 for the different types of counties: county hospital (12 counties including Contra Costa County), payor/clinic and County Medical Services Program (CMSP) counties.

In the coming year, the County will continue to work on the implementation of required health care reform measures to maximize federal revenue. The County will support efforts to provide counties with the necessary tools to implement health care reform which may include performing eligibility and enrollment, preserving existing county resources from 1991 Realignment, providing for a smooth transition in 2014 for the various operational systems, and supporting

legislation to ensure that low-income families are covered under the Affordable Care Act while opposing legislation which would reduce Medi-Cal eligibility. In addition, the County will continue to work to reduce uncompensated health care costs and on the adequacy of rates under the new health care system.

Priority 3: Water and Levees /The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta – The enactment of the Delta Reform Act (2009), a bill that established the co-equal goals for reliable water supply and ecosystem restoration for the Delta, created the Delta Stewardship Council as the state entity overseeing the Delta through the proposed Delta Plan, and supported the proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)--an effort to construct a pair of massive tunnels under the Delta--will bring significant, large-scale change to the Delta as we know it. The scope and content of these changes, as well as enduring political battles between northern and southern California over water, will continue to guide legislative and administrative agendas in the coming year. Enabling legislation was also passed in 2009 for a state water bond, which was delayed from the 2010 and 2012 ballots but successfully passed on the 2014 state ballot, as Proposition 1.

Significant future impacts upon the County in the areas of water quality and supply, levee stability, ecosystem health, local land use authority and flood control are anticipated. Consideration should be given to the potential for the County to sponsor Delta-related legislation through our legislative delegation. The County may also work with the Delta Counties Coalition (DCC) to sponsor Delta-related legislation.

Particular areas of concern for 2015 include, but are not limited to: (1) the ongoing development of the BDCP project and whether the state water bond appropriates funds specific to the BDCP; (2) the impacts of the Delta Plan on local land use authority, efforts to expedite state bond funding for levee improvement projects, and the development of flow standards that will impact water quality and ecosystem health in the Delta. The County's adopted Delta Water Platform, as well as the Strategic and Action Plans, are incorporated in this Platform by reference.

Priority 4: Realignment Implementation – The battle for constitutional protections for 2011 Realignment concluded successfully on November 6, 2012 when Proposition 30 was passed by the voters. Proposition 30 provides constitutional guarantees to the funding that supports Realignment and safeguards against future program expansion without accompanying funding. With these provisions in place, Contra Costa County can continue to implement the array of programs transferred under 2011 Realignment, confident that funding is secure and programmatic responsibilities are defined. However, the County remains concerned that the funding is not sufficient and is also concerned about liability issues arising from the new responsibilities.

Any future proposals to realign programs to counties must have constitutionally guaranteed ongoing funding and protections. The County will oppose any proposals that will transfer additional program responsibility to counties without funding, constitutional protections, county participation and approval. The County will also oppose efforts that limit county flexibility in implementing programs and services realigned in 2011 or infringe upon our ability to innovate locally.

The County resolves to remain accountable to our local constituents in delivering high-quality programs that efficiently and effectively respond to local needs. Further, we support counties' development of appropriate measures of local outcomes and dissemination of best practices.

With regard to Public Safety realignment, counties have received parolees whose latest crime fits the specified "non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offender" (N3) definition but who have a criminal background that includes violent, serious and/or sexual crimes. Under the current legislation, the person's latest offense/crime determines if they meet the N3 criteria. Specifically, a change would be requested to prevent those whose total criminal background does not meet the N3 criteria. These individuals should stay under the responsibility of the state.

The County will also support efforts to provide additional funding/grants to those counties that have a commitment to lowering the crime rate and reducing recidivism through the provision of innovative, comprehensive, evidence-based programs for offender populations and their families. The County will also continue to support efforts to ensure that the receipt of Local Community Corrections Funds matches the amounts anticipated from the state, without undue delay. Finally, the County also supports more funding for mental health and behavioral health programs and facilities in order to meet the requirements of Realignment and the goal of reducing recidivism.

STATE PLATFORM POLICY POSITIONS

A brief background statement accompanies policy positions that are not self-evident. Explanatory notes are included either as the preface to an issue area or following a specific policy position. Please note that new and revised policy positions are highlighted. The rationale for the policy position is italicized.

Agricultural Issues

1. SUPPORT efforts to ensure sufficient State funding for pest and disease control and eradication efforts to protect both agriculture and the native environment, including glassy-winged sharpshooter, light brown apple moth, and Japanese dodder activities; high risk pest exclusion activities; pesticide regulatory and law enforcement activities; and noxious weed pest management. *Agriculture is an important industry in Contra Costa County. Protection of this industry from pests and diseases is important for its continued viability.*
2. SUPPORT continued appropriations for regulation and research on sudden oak death, a fungal disease affecting many species of trees and shrubs in native oak woodlands. *The County's natural environment is being threatened by this disease.*
3. SUPPORT funding for agricultural land conservation programs and agricultural enterprise programs, **and support revisions to State school siting policies**, to protect and enhance the viability of local agriculture. *The growth in East County and elsewhere has put significant pressure on agricultural lands, yet agriculture is important not only for its production of fresh fruits, vegetables and livestock, but also as a source of open space.*
4. SUPPORT legislation to establish legal authority where needed to facilitate the efforts by the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the Department of Boating and Waterways to survey and treat all infestations of the South American spongeplant and to rid the Delta of this and other invasive aquatic species through integrated pest management methods. *Invasive aquatic species are a threat to agriculture, the environment and recreation in the Delta. This position includes support for efforts by the Department of Boating and Waterways to secure multi-year permits for eradication of multiple invasive aquatic plant species in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, its tributaries, and its marshes.*
5. SUPPORT the CSAC policy statement regarding revisions to the California Conservation Act of 1965 (the Williamson Act) to support legislative changes that preserve the integrity of the Williamson Act, eliminate abuses resulting in unjustified and premature conversions of contracted land for development, and to fully restore Williamson Act subventions. The state subventions to counties also must be revised to recognize all local tax losses.

Animal Services Issues

6. SUPPORT efforts to protect local revenue sources designated for use by the Animal Services Department; i.e., animal licensing, fines and fees. *Fines, fees, and licensing are major sources of revenue for the Animal Services Department. The demand for animal services is increasing each year as does the demand on the General Fund. It is important to protect these revenue sources to continue to provide quality animal service and to meet local needs.*
7. SUPPORT efforts to protect or increase local control and flexibility over the scope and level of animal services. *Local control over the scope of animal services is necessary to efficiently address public safety and other community concerns. Local control affords jurisdictions the ability to tailor animal service programs to fit their communities. Animal related issues in dense urban areas vary from those in small, affluent communities.*
8. SUPPORT efforts to protect against unfunded mandates in animal services or mandates that are not accompanied by specific revenue sources which completely offset the costs of the new mandates, both when adopted and in future years. *Unfunded mandates drain our limited fiscal resources and, at the same time, chip away at local control over the scope and level of services.*
9. SUPPORT efforts to ensure full funding of State animal services mandates, including defense of the Department of Finance's lawsuit against the State Commission on Mandates regarding the State obligations for reimbursement of local costs for animal services incurred in compliance with SB 1785. *The County invested large sums of money to comply with SB 1785, with the assurance that our cost would be offset by reimbursements from the State. Failure by the State to honor the reimbursements negatively impacts the County General Fund and Animal Services' budget.*
10. SUPPORT efforts to protect and/or increase County flexibility to provide animal services consistent with local needs and priorities. *The demand for quality animal service programming continues to increase each year. The County is experiencing population growth and changing demographics. It is incumbent upon the Animal Services Department to be flexible enough to adjust to the changing needs and priorities.*
11. SUPPORT efforts to preserve the integrity of existing County policy relating to Animal Services (e.g., the Animal Control Ordinance and land use requirements). *Contra Costa is looked upon as one of the model Animal Services Departments in the state. Its policies, procedures, and ordinances are the yardstick against which other Animal Control organizations are measured. The local control exercised by the Board of Supervisors is key to that hallmark.*

Child Support Services Issues

12. SUPPORT the establishment of a statewide electronic registry for the creation and release/satisfaction of liens placed on property of a non-custodial parent as necessary to collect delinquent child support payments. *California law currently provides that recording an abstract or notice of support judgment with a County Recorder creates a lien on real property. This requires recording the judgment in each of the 58 counties in order not to miss a property transaction. An electronic registry would simplify not only the creation of liens but also the release/satisfaction of liens because there would be a single statewide point of contact, and the entire process would be handled electronically through automated means.*
13. SUPPORT amendment of current law that states that documents completed and recorded by a local child support agency may be recorded without acknowledgement (notarization) to clarify that the exception is for documents completed or recorded by a local child support agency. *This amendment clarifies that documents that are prepared by the local child support agency and then sent for recording either by the local child support agency or by the obligor (non-custodial parent) or by a title insurance company are covered by the exemption, a technical point not acknowledged by all county recorder offices.*
14. SUPPORT efforts to simplify the court process for modifying child support orders by the court by requiring court appearances only when one of the parties objects to the modification. *Currently, establishment of parentage and support by the court is permitted without court appearance if both parties are in agreement. A similar process for modification would reduce court time, the workload of all involved agencies and parties, and streamline the process.*
15. SUPPORT efforts to ensure that the reduction to the California Department of Child Support Services is not passed down as a reduction to the local program.
16. SUPPORT efforts that would require the Department of Child Support Services to provide any notice form, information, or document that is required or authorized to be given, distributed, or provided to an individual, a customer, or a member of the public to be given, distributed, or provided in a digitized form, and by any means the Department determines is feasible, including, but not limited to, e-mail or by means of a website.

Climate Change Issues

17. SUPPORT the *CSAC Climate Change Policy Statements and Principles* which address a broad range of issues affected by climate change, including water, air quality, agriculture, forestry, land use, solid waste, energy and health. *The document is largely based on existing CSAC policy and adapted to climate change. Additionally, the document contains a set of general principles which establish local government as a vital partner in the climate change issue and maintain that counties should be an active participant in the discussions in the development of greenhouse gas reduction strategies underway at the state and regional level.*
18. SUPPORT efforts to ensure that the implementation of AB 32 results in harmony between the greenhouse gas reduction target created by the Air Resources Board for each regional/local agency, the housing needs numbers provided by the state Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to housing element law, and the Sustainable Communities Strategy developed through the Regional Transportation Plan processes.
19. SUPPORT legislative or administrative efforts that favor allocation of funding from the California Greenhouse Gas Cap and Trade Program to jurisdictions that are the largest emitters of greenhouse gas, have disadvantaged communities that are disproportionately affected by environmental pollution, and have demonstrated a local commitment to climate protection (e.g. established emissions reduction targets, prepared Climate Action Plans, etc.).

Delta Water Platform

To protect the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta from various detrimental forces that are affecting its health and resources, it is the policy of Contra Costa County to support implementation of projects and actions that will help improve the Delta ecosystem and the economic conditions of the Delta. Contra Costa County has developed a *Delta Water Platform* to identify and promote activities and policy positions that support the creation of a healthy Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Contra Costa County will use this Platform to guide its own actions and advocacy in other public venues regarding the future of the Delta.

The Delta Water Platform is comprised of twenty subject areas. Each of these subject categories contains relevant policies and background explanatory language. The policies and background information can be found in the Delta Water Platform, which is included in this document by reference.

Elections Issues

20. SUPPORT legislation to adjust precinct sizing from 1,000 voters per precinct to 1,250 voters per precinct. *With the option of being able to have up to 1,250 voters per precinct, the best polling locations in a neighborhood can be selected, and that same site is more*

likely to be used for several elections, thus avoiding the need to change poll sites for voters.

21. SUPPORT full state reimbursement for state mandates imposed upon local registrars by the Secretary of State, including special state elections. *The state has committed to reimburse Counties for the cost of certain state mandates. That reimbursement process, SB 90, can be lengthy and contentious. The SB 90 process is also subject to uncertainties including partial payments, delayed payments, and now, suspended or no payments. In lieu of the SB 90 process for Elections, there is merit in the examination of having the state pay its pro-rata share of costs when state candidates/measures are on the ballot.*
22. SUPPORT legislation that would add provisions to the state Elections Code that would allow special elections to fill a vacancy in a congressional or legislative district to be conducted by all mailed ballots at the county's discretion.

Emergency Preparedness, Emergency Response

23. SUPPORT legislation that would give local agencies more authority to train volunteers, provide funding for Community Emergency Response Training (CERT), and help clean-up oil spills without taking on additional legal liability.
24. SUPPORT legislation that would require the state's Oil Spill Prevention and Response Agency to improve communication and clean-up technology, increase safety standards for ships and establish special protections for ecologically sensitive areas.
25. SUPPORT legislation that would require responses to future oil spills in a shorter timeframe, with a more regional approach.
26. SUPPORT measures that enable counties and other local agencies to better exercise their responsibilities to plan for and respond to emergencies and disasters without taking on additional legal liability and oppose those that do not recognize or support the county and local agency role in the State's Standardized Emergency Management System.
27. SUPPORT legislation or other measures requiring the creation or utilization of emergency rock stockpiles suitable for levee repair throughout the Delta, enabling increasingly efficient and less costly prevention of levee breaks and enhancement of initial response capabilities.
28. SUPPORT legislation that expands school safety improvement programs such as education regarding and placement of automated external defibrillator(s) (AED(s)) in schools.

Eminent Domain Issues

29. SUPPORT legislation that maintains the distinction in the California Constitution between Section 19, Article I, which establishes the law for eminent domain, and Section

7, Article XI, which establishes the law for legislative and administrative action to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

30. SUPPORT legislation that would provide a comprehensive and exclusive basis in the California Constitution to compensate property owners when property is taken or damaged by state or local governments, without affecting legislative and administrative actions taken to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

Flood Control and Clean Water Issues

31. SUPPORT authorization for regional approaches to comply with aquatic pesticide permit issues under the purview of the State Water Resources Control Board. *Contra Costa County entered into an agreement with a neighboring county and several cities to share the costs of monitoring. While it makes sense for local government to pool resources to save money, State Board regulations make regional monitoring infeasible.*
32. SUPPORT efforts to provide local agencies with more flexibility and options to fund stormwater programs. *Stormwater permit requirements issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards are becoming more and more expensive, yet there is no funding. Stormwater services, encompassing both water quality and drainage/flood control, could be structured like a utility with the ability to set rates similar to the other two key water services: drinking water and wastewater.*
33. SUPPORT efforts to provide immunity to local public agencies for any liability for their clean-up of contaminations on private lands. *This will be more critical as the Regional Water Quality Control Boards institute Total Maximum Daily Loads, which establish a maximum allowable amount of a pollutant (like mercury) in the stormwater from a watershed.*
34. SUPPORT efforts to require the Department of Water Resources (DWR) to provide 200 year flood plain mapping for all areas in the legal Delta. SB 5 requires the County and cities in the Delta to insure certain development projects must have 200 year level of protection and to make certain related findings. *DWR has revisited developing zoning flood plain mapping, and if they do, only working in areas protected by project levees which does not include any areas within Contra Costa County.*
35. SUPPORT legislation to enable Zone 7 Water Agency to become a new public agency, separate and apart from the Alameda County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, with territory in both Alameda and Contra Costa counties and the power to provide specific services, insofar as the legislation is guided by adopted Principles of Understanding.

General Revenues/Finance Issues

As a political subdivision of the State, many of Contra Costa County's services and programs are the result of state statute and regulation. The State also provides a substantial portion of the County's revenues. However, the State has often used its authority to shift costs to counties and to generally put counties in the difficult position of trying to meet local service needs with inadequate resources. While Proposition 1A provided some protections for counties, vigilance is necessary to protect the fiscal integrity of the County.

36. SUPPORT the State's effort to balance its budget through actions that do not adversely affect County revenues, services or ability to carry out its governmental responsibilities.
37. OPPOSE any state-imposed redistribution, reduction or use restriction on general purpose revenue, sales taxes or property taxes unless financially beneficial to the County. *(Note that a redistribution of sales and property tax may be beneficial to Contra Costa County in the event that sales tax growth lags behind property tax growth.)*
38. OPPOSE efforts to limit local authority over transient occupancy taxes (TOT).
39. OPPOSE any efforts to increase the County's share-of-cost, maintenance-of-effort requirements or other financing responsibility for State mandated programs absent new revenues sufficient to meet current and future program needs.
40. SUPPORT efforts to ensure that Contra Costa County receives its fair share of State allocations, including mental health funding under Proposition 63 and pass-through of federal funds for anti-terrorism and homeland security measures. *The State utilizes a variety of methods to allocate funds among counties, at times detrimental to Contra Costa County.*
41. SUPPORT efforts to receive reimbursement for local tax revenues lost pursuant to sales and property tax exemptions approved by the Legislature and the State Board of Equalization.
42. SUPPORT continued efforts to reform the state/local relationship in a way that makes both fiscal and programmatic sense for local government and conforms to the adopted 2010 CSAC Realignment Principles, with an emphasis on maximum flexibility for counties to manage the existing and realigned discretionary programs.
43. SUPPORT efforts to relieve California of the federal Child Support penalties without shifting the cost of the penalties to the counties.
44. SUPPORT a reduction in the 2/3rd vote requirement to 55% voter approval for locally-approved special taxes that fund health, education, economic, stormwater services, library, transportation and/or public safety programs and services.
45. SUPPORT efforts to authorize counties to impose forfeitures for violations of ordinances, as currently authorized for cities. *This would provide the County with the opportunity to*

require deposits to assure compliance with specific ordinance requirements as well as retain the deposit if the ordinance requirements are not met. Currently, the County is limited to imposing fines which are limited to only \$100 - \$200 for the first violation, which has proven to be an ineffective deterrent in some cases.

46. SUPPORT efforts to redefine the circumstances under which commercial and industrial property is reassessed to reduce the growing imbalance between the share of overall property tax paid by residential property owners versus commercial/industrial owners.
47. SUPPORT efforts to reduce County costs for Workers' Compensation, including the ability to control excessive medical utilization and litigation. *Workers' Compensation costs are significant, diverting funds that could be utilized for County services. Workers' Compensation should provide a safety net for injured employees, for a reasonable period of time, and not provide an incentive for employees to claim more time than medically necessary.*
48. SUPPORT state actions that maximize Federal and State revenues for county-run services and programs.
49. SUPPORT legislative compliance with both the intent and language of Proposition 1A.
50. SUPPORT the provisions of Proposition 22 that would protect County revenues, particularly as related to transportation revenues and excluding those provisions related to redevelopment funds.
51. SUPPORT full State funding of all statewide special elections, including recall elections.
52. OPPOSE efforts of the State to avoid state mandate claims through the practice of repealing the statutes, then re-enacting them. *In 2005, the State Legislature repealed sections of the Brown Act that were subject to mandate claims, then re-enacted the same language pursuant to a voter-approval initiative, and therefore, not subject to mandate claims.*
53. SUPPORT strong Public Utilities Commission (PUC) oversight of state-franchised providers of cable and telecommunications services, including rigorous review of financial reports and protection of consumer interests. *AB 2987 (Núñez), Chapter 700, statutes of 2006 transferred regulatory oversight authority from local government to the PUC.*
54. SUPPORT timely, full payments to counties by the State for programs operated on their behalf or by mandate. *The State currently owes counties over \$1 billion in State General Funds for social services program costs dating back to FY 2002-03.*
55. SUPPORT full State participation in funding the County's retiree and retiree health care unfunded liability. *Counties perform most of their services on behalf of the State and*

Federal governments. Funding of retiree costs should be the responsibility of the State, to the same extent that the State is responsible for operational costs.

56. SUPPORT legislation that provides constitutional protections and guaranteed funding to counties under Realignment.

Health Care Issues

The County remains concerned about the implementation of any health care reform measures that could transfer responsibility to counties, without commensurate financing structures or in a manner not compatible with the County's system. The County supports a concept of universal health coverage for all Californians. Toward that end, the County urges the state to enact a system of health coverage and care delivery that builds upon the strengths of the current systems in our state, including county-operated systems serving vulnerable populations.

Currently, California has a complex array of existing coverage and delivery systems that serve many, but not all, Californians. Moving this array of systems into a universal coverage framework is a complex undertaking that requires sound analysis, thoughtful and deliberative planning, and a multi-year implementation process. As California moves forward with health care reform, the County urges the state to prevent reform efforts from exacerbating problems with existing service and funding. The state must also consider the differences across California counties and the impacts of reform efforts on the network of safety-net providers, including county providers. The end result of health reform must provide a strengthened health care delivery system for all Californians, including those served by the safety net.

57. SUPPORT state action to increase health care access and affordability. *Access to care and affordability of care are critical components of any health reform plan. Expanding eligibility for existing programs will not provide access to care in significant areas of the state. Important improvements to our current programs, including Medi-Cal, must be made either prior to, or in concert with, a coverage expansion in order to ensure access. Coverage must be affordable for all Californians to access care.*
58. SUPPORT Medi-Cal reimbursement rate increases to incentivize providers to participate in the program.
59. SUPPORT actions that address provider shortages (including physicians, particularly specialists, and nurses). Innovative programs, such as loan forgiveness programs, should be expanded. In an effort to recruit physicians from other states, the licensing and reciprocity requirements should be re-examined. Steps should be taken to reduce the amount of time it takes to obtain a Medi-Cal provider number (currently six to nine months).
60. SUPPORT efforts that implement comprehensive systems of care, including case management, for frequent users of emergency care and those with chronic diseases and/or dual (or multiple) diagnoses. *Approaches could be modeled after current programs in place in safety net systems.*
61. SUPPORT efforts that provide sufficient time for detailed data gathering of current safety funding in the system and the impact of any redirection of funds on remaining county responsibilities. *The interconnectedness of county indigent health funding to public health, correctional health, mental health, alcohol and drug services and social services*

must be fully understood and accounted for in order to protect, and enhance as appropriate, funding for these related services.

62. OPPOSE safety net funding transfers until an analysis of who would remain uninsured (e.g. medically indigent adults, including citizens, who cannot document citizenship under current Medicaid eligibility rules) is completed in order to adequately fund services for these populations.
63. SUPPORT efforts to clearly define and adequately fund remaining county responsibilities.
64. SUPPORT state action to provide an analysis of current health care infrastructure (facilities and providers), including current safety net facilities across the state, to ensure that there are adequate providers and health care facilities (including recovery facilities), and that they can remain viable after health reform.
65. SUPPORT efforts to provide adequate financing for health care reforms to succeed.
66. SUPPORT measures that maximize federal reimbursement from Medicaid and S-CHIP.
67. SUPPORT state action to complete actuarial studies on the costs of transferring indigent populations, who currently receive mostly episodic care, to a coverage model to ensure that there is adequate funding in the model.
68. SUPPORT efforts that ensure that safety net health care facilities remain viable during the transition period and be supported afterwards based on analyses of the changing health market and of the remaining safety net population.
69. SUPPORT state action to implement a Medi-Cal waiver in a manner that maximizes the drawdown of federal funds for services and facilities, provides flexibility, and ensures that counties receive their fair share of funding.
70. SUPPORT efforts to increase revenues and to contain mandated costs in the County's hospital and clinics system.
71. SUPPORT efforts to obtain a fair-share of any state funds in a distribution of funding for the integration of IHSS and managed care.
72. SUPPORT efforts to increase the availability of health care (including alcohol and other drugs recovery) to the uninsured in California, whether employed or not.
73. SUPPORT legislation that improves the quality of health care, whether through the use of technology, innovative delivery models or combining and better accessing various streams of revenue, including but not limited to acute and long term care integration.

74. SUPPORT legislation to protect safety net providers, both public and private. Legislation should focus on stabilizing Medi-Cal rates and delivery modes and should advocate that these actions are essential to the success of any effort to improve access and make health care more affordable.
75. SUPPORT efforts that allow counties to draw down federal Medicaid funds for providing confidential alcohol and drug screening and brief intervention services to pregnant women and women of childbearing age who also qualify for Medi-Cal benefits.
76. SUPPORT state efforts to increase the scope of benefits and reimbursement rates contained in Minor Consent Medi-Cal to give youth suffering from substance abuse disorders access to a continuum of care, including residential and one-on-one outpatient treatment.
77. SUPPORT efforts to give incentives to providers to establish more youth-driven treatment facilities within the community.
78. SUPPORT efforts to extend Minor Consent Medi-Cal Coverage to incarcerated youths, many of whom are in custody due to drug related crimes. *This could greatly decrease recidivism in the juvenile justice system.*
79. SUPPORT county efforts in the promotion of partnerships that provide integrated responses to the needs of alcohol and other drugs populations, including criminal justice, perinatal and youth as well as those populations with co-occurring disorders.
80. SUPPORT and encourage the development of strategies that include alcohol and other drugs services in the provision of all culturally appropriate health care services.
81. SUPPORT efforts to require coverage of medically necessary alcohol and substance abuse related disorder treatment on the same levels as other medical conditions in health care service plans and disability insurance policies. *Alcohol and other drugs treatment services are the most under-funded of all health services. Neither the state nor the federal allocations to the County covers medical treatment for AOD services, and so are a cost borne by the County.*
82. SUPPORT legislation that extends the restrictions and prohibitions against the smoking of tobacco products to include restrictions or prohibitions against electronic cigarettes (e-cigarettes) in various places, including, but not limited to, places of employment, school campuses, public buildings, day care facilities, retail food facilities, multi-family housing, and health facilities.
83. SUPPORT and encourage state, federal and/or private funding for pharmaceutical research for the development of new cannabis products which would meet Federal Drug Administration (FDA) standards of known strengths and attributes (and without unnecessary side effects) which would be dispensable through pharmacies and medical facilities consistent with State and Federal law.

Human Services Issues

84. SUPPORT efforts to increase County flexibility in the use of CalWORKs funds and in program requirements in order to better support the transition of welfare dependent families from welfare-to-work to self-sufficiency, including, but not limited to: extending supportive services beyond the current limit; enhancing supportive services; increasing diversion and early intervention to obviate the need for aid.

Legislative changes to support these initiatives could include the following:

- a. **Supportive Services.** Extending the length of time CalWORKs recipients can receive supportive service such as help with transportation, child care, work uniforms, etc.
- b. **Welfare to Work.** Extending the length of time families can receive Welfare to Work services (job training and search and other employment related services) including job retention services. Currently CalWORKs recipients are eligible to receive supportive services and Welfare to Work services for up to 48 months if they are in compliance with CalWORKs rules. After 48 months these services or for CalWORKs cash aid. Helping people move from poverty and significant education gaps to full time employment in jobs that pay a high enough wage to be self-sufficient is difficult. It can take longer than 48 months and allowing for the flexibility to extend supportive services and training past the 48 month time limit would help.
- c. **Diversion:** Removing the criteria that someone has to be apparently eligible to CalWORKs in order to qualify for diversion and base the criteria on the client's circumstance and ability to maintain the situation on their own without the need of continued assistance.
 - When applying income and resource requirements for diversion, use only half of their income and/or resource value or increase the limits for income and resources for diversion only.
 - Increasing the amount of the diversion payment. If the applicant doesn't "use" all of the amount, they have 12 months to come back into the office and apply for the remaining amount of their diversion payments
 - Allowing families to reapply for CalWORKs during their diversion period without a repayment penalty or CalWORKs ineligibility.
- d. Expanding job retention services;
- e. Exempting the hard-to-serve from Welfare to Work activities and the 20% exemption or providing flexibility in the time limit (dependent upon terms and conditions of TANF authorization). Developing an eligibility definition to 250% of the federal poverty level (FPL). Currently, the CalWORKs poverty level is 130% of the FPL for each Assistance Unit (AU). An increase to 250% would ensure more families meet income eligibility requirements.

All of these measures would make it easier for CalWORKs families to enter employment services, become employed, and continue with the support they need in order to maintain their jobs.

85. SUPPORT efforts to revise the definition of “homelessness” in the Welfare & Institutions Codes to include families who have received eviction notices due to a verified financial hardship, thus allowing early intervention assistance for CalWORKs families. *Current law prevents CalWORKs from providing homeless assistance until the CalWORKs family is actually “on the street.” This rule change would enable the County to work with CalWORKs families who are being threatened with homelessness to prevent the eviction and, presumably, better maintain the family members’ employment status.*
86. SUPPORT efforts to establish an “umbrella code” for the reporting of incidents of elder abuse to the Department of Justice, thus more accurately recording the incidence of abuse. Current reporting policies within California’s law enforcement community and social services departments are uncoordinated in regards to the reporting of adult abuse. Under an “umbrella code,” law enforcement agencies and social services departments would uniformly report incidents of elder abuse and California would have much better data for policy and budget development purposes.
87. SUPPORT efforts to ensure funding of child care for CalWORKs and former CalWORKs families at levels sufficient to meet demand. The State of California has not fully funded the cost of child care for the “working poor.” *Additional funding would allow more CalWORKs and post-CalWORKs families to become and/or stay employed.*
88. SUPPORT efforts that seek to identify and eliminate elder financial abuse and elder exposure to crime that may be committed through conservatorships, powers of attorney, notaries and others who have the right to control elder assets.
89. SUPPORT efforts to allow the CalFresh redetermination process to be done by mail without interview and permit the mail in process for CalFresh aged and/or disabled households. *This would increase the efficiency of CalFresh redetermination and help people who are receiving the benefit who would have difficulty coming into a benefits office.*
90. SUPPORT efforts to expand the number of counties in the Federal IV-E waiver funding for pre-placement, prevention activities; development of caretaker recruitment and retention campaigns; and, funding to implement Children’s Child Welfare Workload Study Results, SB 2030. *Changes in these areas would enable counties to better meet their performance accountability goals, as required under federal and state statutes.*
91. SUPPORT efforts to allow Medi-Cal clients transportation access to medical care via the most efficient transportation mode possible instead of the very costly ambulance transportation that is currently prevalent. *California is currently limited to the types of non-emergency medical transportation for reimbursement by Medi-Cal. However, the*

federal Medicaid program allows other much less costly forms of transportation to be used. Other states use this more permissive definition of approved non-emergency medical transportation to encourage Medicaid clients to receive preventative care and reduce the incidence of last-resort ambulance transportation to hospital emergency rooms for primary care.

92. OPPOSE any legislation that increases tobacco taxes but does not contain language to replace any funds consequently lost to The California Children and Families Act/Trust Fund for local services as currently funded by tobacco taxes, Proposition 10 in 1998 and Proposition 99 in 1988.
93. OPPOSE legislation, rules, regulations or policies that restrict or affect the amount of funds available to, or the local autonomy of, First 5 Commissions to allocate their funds in accordance with local needs.
94. SUPPORT efforts by the Contra Costa County's executive directors and program administrators of all Child Care and Development Programs to restore state budget allocations to the FY 2009-10 levels *if verified that this is an increase by fiscal analysts for the California State Preschool Program (CSPP), California Center-Based General Child Care Program (CCTR), CalWORKs Stage 2 (C2AP), CalWORKs Stage 3 (C3AP), Alternate Payment Program (CAPP), Child Care and Development Grant and the Child Care Retention Program (AB 212). Budgets in these programs have been flat or cut and an increase would greatly help low-income people find work and stay in jobs.*
95. SUPPORT efforts to increase the number of subsidized child care slots to address the shortage of over 20,000 slots serving children 0-12 years of age in Contra Costa County; and SUPPORT efforts to enhance the quality of early learning programs and maintain local Quality Rating and Improvement Systems (QRIS) for early learning providers. *Affordable child care is key to low-income workers remaining employed and there is a significant dearth of subsidized child care slots. Increasing quality of early learning is important to developing skills in the next generation.*
96. SUPPORT the restoration of funding for Facility Restoration and Repair (FRR) grants by California Department of Education. *Increasing the funding amounts for facility restoration of early childhood education would allow for improved facilities at Head Start sites.*
97. SUPPORT continued and improved funding for substance abuse treatment and mental health services including those that provide alternatives to incarceration and Laura's Law.
98. SUPPORT alignment of verification requirements for CalWORKS, CalFRESH and Medi-Cal programs to simplify the customer experience and reduce the potential for error. Consider letting all programs access the Federal Hub used through CalHEERS. *Currently these programs have different requirements for client verification, though they are all benefit programs. Alignment of verifications would make program administration more efficient and improve the client experience.*

99. SUPPORT legislation to expand early child care and education and increase funding for preschool and early learning.
100. SUPPORT ending the student restrictions that disallow CalFresh for poor students. *Students should not be penalized for getting an education.*
101. SUPPORT allowing all individuals in receipt of Unemployment Benefits (UIB) to be automatically eligible for CalFresh. *Applying for UI and CalFresh is duplicative because requirements of both programs are so similar. This would increase CalFresh uptake in an efficient way.*
102. SUPPORT a State Earned Income Tax Credit. Developing a state earned income tax credit would incentivize work and reduce poverty. *The Federal EITC program is the most effective government antipoverty program and 22 other states have a state EITC.*
103. SUPPORT establishing a State funded and administered General Assistance Program. *The General Assistance Program is 100% County funded. Moving it to the State would relieve pressure on the County budget and appropriately direct costs to the State.*

Indian Gaming Issues

Contra Costa County is currently home to the Lytton Band of the Pomo Indians' Casino in San Pablo, a Class II gaming facility. There is also a proposal for an additional casino in North Richmond. Local governments have limited authority in determining whether or not such facilities should be sited in their jurisdiction; the terms and conditions under which the facilities will operate; and what, if any, mitigation will be paid to offset the cost of increased services and lost revenues. Contra Costa County has been active in working with CSAC and others to address these issues, as well as the need for funding for participation in the federal and state review processes and for mitigation for the existing Class II casino.

104. SUPPORT efforts to ensure that counties who have existing or proposed Class II Indian gaming facilities receive the Special Distribution Funds.
105. CONSIDER, on a case by case basis, whether or not to SUPPORT or OPPOSE Indian gaming facilities in Contra Costa County, and only SUPPORT facilities that are unique in nature and can demonstrate significant community benefits above and beyond the costs associated with mitigating community impacts.
106. OPPOSE the expansion or approval of Class III gaming machines at the existing gaming facility in Contra Costa County unless it can be demonstrated that there would be significant community benefits above and beyond the costs associated with mitigating community impacts.
107. SUPPORT State authority to tighten up the definition of a Class II machine.

108. SUPPORT State legislative and administration actions consistent with the CSAC policy documents on development on Indian Lands and Compact negotiations for Indian gaming.

Land Use/Community Development Issues

109. SUPPORT efforts to promote economic incentives for "smart growth," in Priority Development Areas including in-fill and transit-oriented development. *Balancing the need for housing and economic growth with the urban limit line requirements of Measure J (2004) will rely on maximum utilization of "smart growth" and Sustainable Community Strategy principles.*
110. SUPPORT efforts to increase the supply of affordable housing, including, but not limited to, state issuance of private activity bonds, affordable and low income housing bond measures, low-income housing tax credits and state infrastructure financing. *This position supports Goals 2, 3 and 4 of the County General Plan Housing Element.*
111. SUPPORT establishment of a CEQA exemption for affordable housing financing. Current law provides a statutory exemption from CEQA to state agencies for financing of affordable housing (Section 21080.10(b) of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15267 of the CEQA Guidelines)—but not to local agencies. *The current exemption for state agencies is only operational if a CEQA review process has been completed by another agency (e.g., by the land use permitting agency). Since the act of financing does not change the environmental setting, the net effect of the exemption is streamlining the process for providing financial assistance for already approved projects. AB 2518 (Houston) in 2006 was a Contra Costa County-sponsored bill to accomplish this, but it was not successful in the Legislature.*
112. SUPPORT efforts to obtain a CEQA exemption or to utilize CEQA streamlining provisions for infill development or Priority Development Areas, including in unincorporated areas. Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines is a Categorical Exemption for infill development projects but only within cities or unincorporated areas of a certain size surrounded by cities. *Without the exemption, housing projects in the unincorporated areas that are not surrounded by cities (e.g. North Richmond, Montalvin Manor and Rodeo) are subject to a more time-consuming and costly process in order to comply with the CEQA guidelines than that which is required of cities, despite having similar housing obligations. The CEQA exemption bill signed by the Governor in 2013 (SB 741) only applies to mixed-use or non-residential projects in the unincorporated areas that are both within ½ mile of a BART station and within the boundaries of an adopted Specific Plan.*
113. SUPPORT efforts to reform State housing element law to promote the actual production and preservation of affordable housing and to focus less on process and paper compliance.
114. OPPOSE efforts to limit the County's ability to exercise local land use authority.

115. SUPPORT efforts to reduce the fiscalization of land use decision-making by local government, which favors retail uses over other job-creating uses and housing. *Reducing incentives for inappropriate land use decisions, particularly those that negatively affect neighboring jurisdictions, could result in more rational and harmonious land use.*
116. SUPPORT allocations, appropriations, and policies that support and leverage the benefits of approved Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs), such as the East Contra Costa County NCCP. Support the granting of approximately \$20 million to the East Contra Costa County NCCP from the \$90 million allocation for NCCPs in Proposition 84. Support the position that NCCPs are an effective strategy for addressing the impacts of climate change and encourage appropriate recognition of the NCCP tool in implementation of climate change legislation such as SB 375 and AB 32. Promote effective implementation of NCCPs as a top priority for the Department of Fish and Wildlife. Support efforts to streamline implementation of NCCPs including exemptions from unnecessary regulatory oversight such as the Delta Plan Covered Actions process administered by the Delta Stewardship Council.
117. SUPPORT legislation that would give local agencies specific tools for economic development purposes in order to enhance job opportunities, with emphasis on attracting and retaining businesses, blight removal and promoting smart growth and affordable housing development, while balancing the impacts on revenues for health and safety programs and healthy communities.
118. OPPOSE legislation that would create substantial uncertainty over the tax allocation bonds issued by redevelopment agencies and possible negative credit impact.
119. SUPPORT legislation that would resolve the administrative funding gap for agencies serving as the Successor Housing Agency. Such legislation should not have a negative impact on the localities' general fund. The Redevelopment Dissolution Act allows Successor Agencies a modest allowance of tax increment funds to support Successor Agency administrative costs. There is no such carve out for Housing Successors. However, unlike Successor Agencies, Housing Successors have an ongoing obligation to monitor existing affordable housing developments. These obligations will continue for up to 55 years.
120. SUPPORT legislation that would clarify the ability of successor agencies to former redevelopment agencies to enter into contracts with its sponsoring jurisdiction and third parties to fulfill enforceable obligations. *The existing redevelopment dissolution statute limits the contracting powers of successor agencies which is causing delays in their ability to expeditiously retire certain enforceable obligations of the former redevelopment agencies.*
121. SUPPORT legislative and regulatory efforts that streamline compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by integrating it with other environmental protection laws and regulations, modifying the tiering of environmental reviews,

expanding the application of prior environmental reviews, focusing areas of potential CEQA litigation, and enhancing public disclosure and accountability.

122. OPPOSE CEQA reform efforts that reduce environmental protections for projects that cross county or city boundaries.
123. SUPPORT efforts to improve or streamline CEQA for efficiency without losing sight of its ultimate goal to thoroughly identify environmental impacts and mitigations.
124. OPPOSE efforts to change CEQA solely to accommodate one particular infrastructure project or set of projects.
125. SUPPORT legislation that amends Section 20133 of the Public Contract Code to 1) delete the existing sunset date of July 1, 2014 for design-build authority granted to counties, and 2) eliminate the current project cost threshold of \$2.5 million required for the use of the design-build method.

Law and Justice System Issues

126. SUPPORT legislation that seeks to curb metal theft by making it easier for law enforcement agencies to track stolen metals sold to scrap dealers through such means as requiring identification from customers selling commonly stolen metals, banning cash transactions over a certain amount, and requiring scrap dealers to hold materials they buy for a certain period of time before melting them down or reselling them.
127. SUPPORT legislation that provides a practical and efficient solution to addressing the problem of abandoned and trespassing vessels and ground tackle in an administrative process that allows the California State Lands Commission to both remove and dispose of such vessels and unpermitted ground tackle. *Boat owners in increasing numbers are abandoning both recreational and commercial vessels in areas within the Commission's jurisdiction. Our state waterways are becoming clogged with hulks that break up, leak, sink and add pollutants to our waterways and marine habitat.*
128. OPPOSE legislative proposals to realign additional program responsibility to counties without adequate funding and protections.
129. OPPOSE legislation that would shift the responsibility of parolees from the state to the counties without adequate notification, documentation and funding.
130. SUPPORT legislation that will help counties implement the 2011 Public Safety Realignment as long as the proposal would: provide for county flexibility, eliminate redundant or unnecessary reporting, and would not transfer more responsibility without funding.
131. SUPPORT legislation that will combat the negative impact that human trafficking has on victims in our communities, including the impact that this activity has on a range of

County services and supports, and support efforts to provide additional tools, resources and funding to help counties address this growing problem.

132. ADVOCATE for State legislation banning the sale of alcopop products by businesses that sell alcoholic beverages. The California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control is responsible for regulating the type of alcohol products that a business may sell. *A type of flavored malt alcoholic beverage product known as “alcopops” has been identified as a contributor to under-age drinking in the County. The term alcopops usually refers to sweetened malt or alcoholic beverages that are typically sold in single-serving bottles or cans.*

Levee Issues

133. ADVOCATE for administrative and legislative action to provide significant funding for rehabilitation of levees in the western and central Delta. *Proposition 1E, passed in November 2006, provides for over \$3 billion for levees, primarily those in the Central Valley Flood Control Program. Language is included in the bond for other Delta levees but funding is not specifically directed. The County will work on a coalition basis to actively advocate for \$1 billion in funding through this bond.*
134. SUPPORT legislation that requires the levee repair funds generated by Proposition 1E be spent within one year or legislative hearings conducted on expediting the expenditure of bond proceeds through the Department of Water Resources Delta Levees Section. Many public agencies, including reclamation districts charged with maintaining levees, have complained about the state’s inaction in allocating and distributing the levee funds that were raised by the bond sales authorized by Proposition 1E in 2008. Legislation could require the immediate distribution of these funds to local levee projects. The Delta Reform Act of 2009 authorized over \$202 million for levee repairs. Legislative hearings may produce explanations from the state as to why these funds are not being distributed or identify methods to streamline administration of these funds.
135. SUPPORT legislation to amend California Water Code Section 12986, to maintain the state/local funding ratio of 75/25 for the state’s Delta Levees Subventions Program, which provides funds for local levee repair and maintenance projects. The code provisions that have the state paying 75% of project costs will expire on July 1, 2013. At that time the matching ratio will change to 50/50. This means local reclamation districts will have to pay a larger portion of project costs (50%, compared to their current 25% requirement). Many districts do not have the funding to do so. The Delta Levees Subventions Program should continue to use funds from bonds or other dedicated sources, rather than the state’s General Fund. For the past several years the program has been funded from bonds. When these bond funds run out, the program will have to be funded from the General Fund, unless some other new dedicated funding source is established.

136. ADVOCATE for legislation dealing with the Delta, including levees and levee programs, level and type of flood protection, beneficiary-pays programs, flood insurance, liability and other levee/land use issues.
137. SUPPORT legislation/regulation requiring Reclamation Districts to develop, publish, and maintain hazard emergency plans for their districts. *Emergency response plans are critical to emergency management, particularly in an area or situation like the Delta where a levee break could trigger other emergencies. This legislation/regulation should also include the requirement for plan review and annual distribution of the plan to the residents of the district, County Office of Emergency Services and other government agencies that have emergency response interests within the district.*
138. SUPPORT legislation to amend California Water Code Section 85057.5 to bring the Delta Stewardship Council's "covered actions" land-use review process into consistency with CEQA. This section of state code defines a "covered action," which refers to local permit decisions that are subject to potential revocation by the Council, as adopted in the Council's Delta Plan. The proposed process works as follows: (1) if a local permit application meets the definition of a "covered action," the jurisdiction must evaluate it for consistency with all of the policies in the Council's Delta Plan. (2) If the jurisdiction finds the project is consistent with the Delta Plan, they notify the Council of this finding. (3) Anyone who objects to the project may appeal the consistency finding, and it will be up to the Council to make the final decision. Should the Council decide against the local jurisdiction, there is no appeal process available to the jurisdiction or project applicant other than legal action.

"Covered actions" are defined in Section 85057.5 of the California Water Code. It defines them as plans, projects or programs as defined by CEQA, and then goes on to grant several exemptions to certain types of projects. It does not, however, provide exemptions for all the project types that CEQA itself exempts. CEQA provides a lengthy list of categorical exemptions for plans, projects and programs that generally do not have significant environmental impacts, and projects that have compelling reasons to move forward quickly (such as public safety projects). The entire list of categorical exemptions from CEQA also should be exempt from the Delta Stewardship Council's "covered actions" process.

Library Issues

139. SUPPORT State financial assistance in the operation of public libraries, including full funding of the Public Library Fund (PLF) and the Direct/Interlibrary Loan (Transaction Based Reimbursement) program.
140. SUPPORT State bonds for public library construction. The 2000 library construction bond provided funding for two libraries in Contra Costa County. There is currently a need of approximately \$289,000,000 for public library construction, expansion and renovation in Contra Costa County.

141. SUPPORT continued funding for the California Library Literacy and English Acquisition Services Program, which provides matching funds for public library adult literacy programs that offer free, confidential, one-on-one basic literacy instruction to English-speaking adults who want to improve their reading, writing, and spelling skills.

Telecommunications Issues

142. SUPPORT clean-up legislation on AB 2987 that provides for local emergency notifications similar to provisions in cable franchises for the last 20 years. *Currently our franchises require the cable systems to carry emergency messages in the event of local emergencies. With the occurrence of several local refinery incidents, this service is critical for Contra Costa. Under federal law, Emergency Alert System requirements leave broad discretion to broadcasters to decide when and what information to broadcast, emergency management offices to communicate with the public in times of emergencies.*
143. SUPPORT preservation of local government ownership and control of the local public rights-of-way. *Currently, local government has authority over the time, place, and manner in which infrastructure is placed in their rights-of-way. The California Public Utilities Commission is considering rulemaking that would give them jurisdiction to decide issues between local government and telecommunication providers.*

Transportation Issues

144. SUPPORT increased flexibility in the use of transportation funds.
145. SUPPORT regional coordination that provides for local input in addressing transportation needs. *Coordinated planning and delivery of public transit, paratransit, and rail services will help ensure the best possible service delivery to the public. Regional coordination also will be needed to effectively deal with the traffic impacts of Indian gaming casinos such as those in West County. Regional coordination also will be essential to complete planning and development of important regional transportation projects that benefit the state and local road system such as State Route 239, improvements to Vasco Road, completion of remaining segments of the Bay Trail, improvements to the Delta DeAnza Regional Trail, and the proposed California Delta Trail. There may be interest in seeking enhanced local input requirements for developing the Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Bay Area mandated by SB 375 for greenhouse gas reduction. It is important that the regional coordination efforts are based on input gathered from the local level, to ensure the regional approach does not negatively impact local communities. "Top-down" regional planning efforts would be inconsistent with this goal.*
146. SUPPORT efforts to improve safety throughout the transportation system. *The County supports new and expanded projects and programs to improve safety for bicyclists, pedestrians and wheelchair users, as well as projects to improve safety on high-accident transportation facilities such as Vasco Road. Data on transportation safety would be improved by including global positioning system (GPS) location data for every reported*

accident to assist in safety analysis and planning. The County also supports the expansion of school safety improvement programs such as crossing guards, revised school zone references in the vehicle code, Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) grants, efforts to improve the safety, expansion and security of freight transportation system including public and private maritime ports, airports, rail yards, railroad lines, rail bridges and sidings. The County also supports limits or elimination of public liability for installing traffic-calming devices on residential neighborhood streets.

147. SUPPORT funding or incentives for the use of renewable resources in transportation construction projects. *The County seeks and supports grant programs, tax credits for manufacturers, state purchasing programs, and other incentives for local jurisdictions to use environmentally friendly materials such as the rubberized asphalt (made from recycled tires) that the County has used as paving material on San Pablo Dam Road and Pacheco Boulevard.*
148. SUPPORT streamlining the delivery of transportation safety projects. *The length of time and amount of paperwork should be reduced to bring a transportation safety project more quickly through the planning, engineering and design, environmental review, funding application, and construction phases, such as for Vasco Road. This could include streamlining the environmental review process and also streamlining all state permitting requirements that pertain to transportation projects. Realistic deadlines for use of federal transportation funds would help local jurisdictions deliver complex projects without running afoul of federal time limits which are unrealistically tight for complex projects.*
149. SUPPORT efforts to coordinate development of state-funded or regulated facilities such as courts, schools, jails, roads and state offices with local planning. The County supports preserving the authority of Public Works over County roads by way of ensuring the Board of Supervisors' control over County roads as established in the Streets & Highways Code (Ch2 §940) is not undermined. This includes strongly opposing any action by a non-local entity that would ultimately dilute current Board of Supervisors discretion relative to road design and land use.
150. SUPPORT efforts to coordinate planning between school districts, the state, and local jurisdictions for the purposes of: (1) locating and planning new schools, (2) funding programs that foster collaboration and joint use of facilities, and (3) financing off-site transportation improvements for improved access to existing schools. The County supports the California Department of Education's current effort to better leverage school facilities in developing sustainable communities. Related to this effort, the County supports reform of school siting practices by way of legislative changes related to any new statewide school construction bond authorization. The County takes the position that reform components should include bringing school siting practices and school zone references in the vehicle code into alignment with local growth management policies, safe routes to school best practices, State SB 375 principles, and the State Strategic Growth Council's "Health in All Policies Initiative."

151. SUPPORT regional aviation transportation planning efforts for coordinated aviation network planning to improve service delivery. Regional aviation coordination could also improve the surrounding surface transportation system by providing expanded local options for people and goods movement.
152. SUPPORT efforts to increase waterborne transport of goods and obtaining funds to support this effort. *The San Francisco to Stockton Ship Channel is a major transportation route for the region, providing water access to a large number of industries and the Ports of Sacramento and Stockton. A project is underway to deepen the channel, providing additional capacity to accommodate increasing commerce needs of the Ports and providing better operational flexibility for the other industries. Increased goods movement via waterways has clear benefits to congestion management on highways and railroads (with resultant air quality benefits).*
153. SUPPORT legislative and administrative measures to enhance rail safety, increase state oversight of railroad bridges, provide funding for the training of first responders, and implement regulations that increase tank car safety standards for cars transporting crude oil and other hazardous materials, and regulations that require railroads to share data with state emergency managers and local responders.

Veterans Issues

154. SUPPORT legislation and budget actions that will continue the state's annual local assistance for County Veterans Service Offices at a minimum of the \$5.6 million level. The eventual goal is to fully fund CVSOs by appropriating the full \$11 million in local assistance funding as reflected in Military and Veterans Code Section 972.1(d). *County Veterans Service Offices (CVSOs) play a vital role in the local veteran community, not only within the Veterans Affairs claims process, but in other aspects as well. This includes providing information about all veterans' benefits (Federal, State and local), as well as providing claims assistance for all veteran-related benefits, referring veterans to ancillary community resources, providing hands-on development and case management services for claims and appeals and transporting local veterans to VA facilities.*
155. SUPPORT legislation and budget actions that will provide veterans organizations with resources to make necessary repairs to, or replacement of, their meeting halls and facilities. *Across California, the meeting halls and posts of Veterans Service Organizations such as the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars serve as unofficial community centers. Many of these facilities are not compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility standards, are not earthquake retrofitted, or have deteriorated in recent years due to declining membership and reduced rental revenues as a result of the economic downturn. The County will support legislation that would create a competitive grant program for veterans' organizations, classified by the IRS as 501c19 non-profit organizations and comprised primarily of past or present members of the United States Armed Forces and their family members, to use for repairs and improvements to their existing facilities.*

156. SUPPORT legislation that will improve the timeliness and quality of both VA benefits claim decisions and VA healthcare services. Specifically, legislation that works toward improving on the expedited processing of claims, providing VA healthcare, and administering of benefits to populations with unique needs, such as homeless Veterans, Women Veterans, and Veterans experiencing service related Posttraumatic Stress Disorder or service related Traumatic Brain Injury.

Waste Management Issues

157. SUPPORT legislation that establishes producer responsibility for management at the end of their useful life of products, including pharmaceuticals, batteries, sharps and veterinary medicine.
158. SUPPORT efforts to increase the development of markets for recycled materials.
159. SUPPORT legislative and regulatory efforts to allow third parties, under specific circumstances and conditions, to collect and transport household hazardous waste to collection facilities.
160. SUPPORT legislation that seeks to remedy the environmental degradation and solid waste management problems on a State-wide basis of polystyrene containers and single-use plastic bags typically given away for free at grocery, retail and other establishments.
161. SUPPORT legislation that does not require increased diversion from landfills without out an adequate funding mechanism.
162. SUPPORT legislation that would make changes to the used tire redemption program. *Instead of collecting a disposal fee from the consumer when new tires are purchased, a disposal fee would be collected at the wholesale level and redeemed by the disposal site when the used tires are brought to the site. The party bringing the tires to the disposal site would also receive a portion of the fee.*
163. SUPPORT legislation that relieves counties with privately-operated landfills from the state requirement for maintaining a 15-year supply of disposal capacity for waste generated within each county. *In 1989, Contra Costa County amended its general plan to accommodate construction of Keller Canyon Landfill. Due to the difficulty in siting landfills and the requirements of Public Resources Code 47100 – Countywide Siting Element, the County maintained authority to control the amount of waste disposed at this facility from outside the county. Despite Contra Costa County’s opposition, AB 845 became law on January 1, 2013 and prohibits any jurisdiction from regulating the amount of waste disposed at a privately-operated landfill based on its place of origin.*

Because local jurisdictions can no longer control importation of waste to privately-operated landfills, a host County that receives a significant amount of waste from outside

the county will have a greater need to undertake the difficult task of identifying new disposal capacity pursuant to the Countywide Siting Element requirement. Since the state believes there is no need for local jurisdictions to regulate disposal of solid waste by place of origin, the state should remove existing statutes that require each County with privately-operated landfills to identify sufficient disposal capacity for the waste generated by the jurisdictions within that County.

164. SUPPORT legislation that can reduce the amount of harmful pharmaceuticals (including veterinary medicine) that ultimately enter waste water treatment facilities, bodies of water, and landfills.
165. SUPPORT legislative and regulatory efforts to restrict payments from the Beverage Container Recycling Program Fund for redemption of beverage containers sold out of state. *Fraudulent redemption of these beverage containers is costing the Fund from \$40 million to \$200 million annually. This fraud combined with loans to the General Fund to reduce the State budget deficit has significantly reduced the availability of funds for increasing recycling as intended under the law.*
166. SUPPORT legislative and regulatory efforts that correct the imbalance between the County's regulatory authority to control the collection and disposal of solid waste generated within the unincorporated areas and our exposure to state penalties for failing to meet state mandates for diverting solid waste generated within these areas as a result of Appellate Court decisions. *In litigation where the County sought to protect its solid waste franchise authority for unincorporated areas the court awarded franchise authority to the Rodeo Sanitary District and Mountain View Sanitary District while the County remains exposed to state penalties for failing to meet state mandates for reducing disposal of solid waste generated in these areas.*