

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

999



**FROM:** Executive Office

**SUBMITTAL DATE:**  
January 27, 2009

**SUBJECT:** 2009 State Legislative Platform

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That the Board approve the 2009 State Legislative Platform and direct the Executive Office and the County's Sacramento representatives to advance the legislative proposals contained here.

**BACKGROUND:** Each year the Board adopts a State Legislative Platform to guide the legislative advocacy efforts at the State level. This year the State Legislative Platform is divided into three sections: general legislative guidelines on major priorities, new proposals that have not been included in previous Board approved platforms, and continuing concerns of high interest. Previously approved Board positions from earlier state platforms and Board actions are still in effect. Due to the dynamic nature of the legislative process, additional State legislative issues of concern to the County will be brought forward to the Board for appropriate action throughout the year as the need arises.

Departmental Concurrence

Attachment

*Gary M. Christmas*  
Gary M. Christmas  
Chief Deputy County Executive Officer

<b>FINANCIAL DATA</b>	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ 0	In Current Year Budget:	N/A
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 0	Budget Adjustment:	N/A
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 0	For Fiscal Year:	N/A

<b>SOURCE OF FUNDS:</b>	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

**C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:**

APPROVE

BY: *Jay E. Orr*  
Jay E. Orr

County Executive Office Signature

- Policy
- Policy
- Consent
- Consent

Dep't Recomm.:  
Per Exec. Ofc.:

**RIVERSIDE COUNTY  
2009**

**STATE LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM**



**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**Jeff Stone**  
*Chairman*

**Bob Buster**  
*First District*

**John Tavaglione**  
*Second District*

**Roy Wilson**  
*Fourth District*

**Marion Ashley**  
*Fifth District*

**Bill Luna**  
*County Executive Officer*

*January 27, 2009*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

State Legislative Priorities. . . . .	1
New State Legislative Policy Items. . . . .	4
Selected Existing State Legislative Policy Positions. . . . .	24

## **State Legislative Priorities**

### **State Budget**

The Governor's 2009-10 proposed budget was released on December 31, 2008. Due to the continuing budget crisis, the Governor directed the Department of Finance (DOF) to prepare and release the proposal early, indicating that the state could not wait for the customary January 10 deadline. The state's General Fund deficit through the end of the 2009-10 fiscal year is projected to be \$41.6 billion.

As portrayed in the Governor's proposed budget, the budget deficit is a result of two factors. First, the massive and unsustainable new spending commitments the state made in the midst of a state revenue surge that were based on short-term capital gains revenues from the dot-com boom. This structural deficit was never fixed, since each year the state relied instead upon one-time measures — such as borrowing — rather than long-term, permanent solutions. Second, is the dramatic decline in state revenues due to the current recession. DOF now estimates a revenue decrease of \$15.1 billion, or 14.7 percent, for the current fiscal year.

According to the Governor, the state will run out of cash in March, even if the Legislature were to enact all of his proposed budget solutions before then. Therefore, the state will have to defer some payments, or else begin issuing registered warrants. Details on this process will be forthcoming from State Controller John Chiang and the Governor's office. The effect on the county may be quite severe, although actual impacts are uncertain at this time. No quick resolution to the state budget quandary is expected.

- Oppose reductions in state programs that require increased local funding to maintain the same level of service.
- Oppose reduced state funding for county-administered state programs unless there is a commensurate reduction in the county's responsibility to provide for the program.
- Oppose any state efforts to shift costs or federal penalties from the state to local government.
- Protect Proposition 1A and other measures that require the state to fulfill its requirement to support local government.
- Support measures that enhance or maintain the county's revenue base.
- Oppose any measures that limit the county's ability to operate in a reasonable and cost effective manner.

## **Corrections**

Preserving public safety is a key priority for both state and local governments. Essential components of the public safety system are the interconnected state and local corrections systems.

- Support state funding to improve, expand and renovate local correction facilities.
- Support state correctional programs that recognize and promote innovation at the local level and permit maximum flexibility so that state funds can target local community needs.
- Oppose state-mandated correctional programs that do not have dedicated, sustained funding sources.

## **Human Services Funding Deficit**

Counties operate a number of human services programs for the state. Statewide the annual shortfall between actual county expenses to operate these programs and state reimbursement has grown to over \$1 billion. This increased cost of doing business has created a funding gap that forces counties to either reduce services to vulnerable populations or divert county resources from other critical local services.

- Support legislation that requires the state to fully reimburse the county for the increasing costs of providing state-mandated human services programs.
- Oppose measures that would freeze, delay, defer or suspend state payments to the county for programs, including human services.
- Support efforts to reform the state budgeting of human services programs so that funding is based on the reasonable cost to deliver services instead of out-dated formulas.

**New State Legislative Policy Items**



**Issue:** Infrastructure funding.

**Proposal:** Support alternative ways to approach infrastructure funding.

**Background:** With the deepening housing crisis, the cash flow to fund Riverside County's long term infrastructure needs is beginning to evaporate. In 2005, the county saw 29,994 single family home permits pulled. In 2008, the number was just 3,809, an 87.3 percent decline. It is likely 2009 will be worse since the collapse of housing prices to early 2003 levels has shut down the residential construction sector. Prices will have to return to 2005 or 2006 levels before they can start building again. That could be years away. Given that fact, the county needs to find a way to fund infrastructure that is not dependent on this sector. One suggestion is to move from a fee system based on new home construction to one based on transition fees when all homes are sold. With the shifts occurring in population demographics, as well as the tendency for baby boomers to retire and be replaced by younger active families, homes sales of all kinds, not just new home sales are putting pressure on our infrastructure.

**Issue:** CalWORKs 100-hour application rule.

**Position:** Support legislation to eliminate the rule that denies eligibility for CalWORKs assistance if the principal wage earner in the family works 100 hours or more a month.

**Background:** Under current guidelines, a family is ineligible for CalWORKs assistance if the main wage-earner works for 100 hours or more a month. For example, take a family of four that seeks assistance with a father who works 100 hours at an \$8 an hour job and a mother with no work history. This family would be denied assistance under the 100-hour rule despite their financial eligibility with gross earnings of \$800 a month.

Parents in these situations may choose to live separately to ensure some economic and medical security for their children under the CalWORKs program. The primary goal in CalWORKs is to temporarily assist customers by providing services that will lead to financial independence. By changing the 100-hour rule, it could help maintain and strengthen the family by discouraging fathers to leave the home to meet eligibility. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program has placed a high priority on stabilizing families through marriage.

The number of persons denied due to the 100-hour rule is small. Most applicants for CalWORKs/TANF are single parents whose eligibility is based on deprivation due to the absence of a parent. It is anticipated that a change to the 100-hour rule would only result in a small caseload increase.

**Issue:** Annual application and re-determination Medi-Cal requirements for foster care youth.

**Proposal:** Support legislation to remove the application and annual re-determination requirements for emancipating foster care youth until the age of 21. This will allow these former foster children to continue to receive Medi-Cal benefits to which they were entitled while in foster care. The intent is to allow continuous and simplified access to address the medical needs of this vulnerable population during the critical transition out of foster care.

**Background:** California has adopted the state option available under federal Medicaid law to allow emancipated foster care children to continue their Medi-Cal coverage under the Former Foster Care Children (FFCC) program. To be eligible, a child must be in foster care under the responsibility of the state on his or her 18th birthday. Coverage continues until age 21 when they "age out" of the FFCC program. There are no income or asset eligibility requirements for this program.

Currently, emancipated former foster youth are required to fill out Medi-Cal eligibility forms to continue receiving the health care services to which they are already entitled to by law. Foster care youth have increased rates of homelessness and may have unstable addresses. The current practice has led to address and application errors, which can result in case termination. This diminishes access to preventative medical services, including badly needed mental health.

The Assembly Appropriations Committee analyzed SB 1132 to determine the financial impacts of a similar proposal. The report estimated annual costs of \$350,000 (50% GF) to \$500,000 (50% GF) to the extent the bill increased the number of Medi-Cal beneficiaries. This estimate assumes 500 to 700 youth retain eligibility each year as a result of eliminating the eligibility paperwork. However, increased access to preventative services is likely to reduce the need for expensive emergency room visits, which may partially offset the increased expenditures.

**Issue:** Exemption of vehicles from household property limits for CalWORKs eligibility.

**Position:** Align CalWORKs vehicle regulations with the Food Stamp program, which allow for the exemption of vehicles from property limits.

**Background:** The Food Stamp program recognizes that participants need reliable transportation to get to work and keep their jobs. Current property/resource regulations recognize this need by exempting vehicles in property limits. However, participants in the CalWORKs program do not receive that same exemption, despite mandatory participation in the Welfare to Work program.

CalWORKs recipients are expected to look for, obtain, and maintain employment. CalWORKs recipients would be better able to meet these requirements if the vehicle regulations were aligned with Food Stamp rules that exempt vehicles from property limits. In addition, aligning CalWORKs and Food Stamp rules may provide for ease of administering the programs.

Caseload impacts are expected to be minimal, as there are few CalWORKs applicants that are denied for excess property. This proposal is supported by the New America Foundation, which sponsored a similar bill in the 2008 session.

**Issue:** Food Stamp Eligibility for Emancipated Foster Youth.

**Proposal:** Support legislation to create a separate Food Stamp program that would provide emancipating foster youth with food stamps as they transition from foster care. This program would eliminate the 20-hour Able Bodied Adult Without Dependents (ABAWD) work requirements for emancipated foster youth if they choose to pursue a college education. Foster youth would automatically be eligible to a 12 month food stamp certification period upon emancipation. However, those receiving or eligible to receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and those eligible to CalWORKs would not be eligible for this Transitional Food Stamp benefit.

There would be standard benefit amount for all foster youth Transitional Food Stamp (TSF) cases and an initial 12 month certification period. Once the initial certification period has ended the individual would be required to complete an application for food stamps. Time on the foster youth TFS case would not count on the ABAWD calendar for the individual.

**Background:** Under current California law emancipated foster youth fall under either the Food Stamp Program's student eligibility or the Able Bodied Adult Without Dependents (ABAWD) regulations. Under current regulations emancipated foster youth are ineligible to the Food Stamp program if they choose to pursue a college education and are: 1) not exempt from the student eligibility regulations; or, 2) are not meeting the ABAWD work requirement of a minimum 20 hours per week. Studies have shown that children who emancipate from foster care face disproportionately higher rates of unemployment. The number of foster youth who are now moving on to pursue a college education is increasing due to statewide and national efforts to improve the lives of emancipated foster youth.

Eligibility to the Food Stamp program would allow some level of stability for these youth, and allow them to transition to self-sufficiency with some semblance of the assistance that other minors receive from their birth parents.

The monthly benefits are 100 percent federally funded. There would be some additional administrative costs associated with the increased number of cases and with training regarding the newly established program. These costs would be nominal as there is a relatively small population that would qualify for this program. Additionally, the flat-rate benefit amount and the fact that quarterly reporting would not be required during the initial certification period would reduce the costs associated with these cases.

**Issue:** Outdated Medi-Cal income child care deductions.

**Position:** Support an increase to the child care income-deduction amounts in the Medi-Cal program to at least the level of the least expensive child care regional market rates.

Medi-Cal income child care deductions are \$200 a month for a child under one year of age and \$175 for a child one year and older. These deductions do not reflect current child care rates. Increasing the child care deductions to correspond to current market rates will enable more families to obtain the medical coverage they need and will reduce the share of cost for some families already eligible for Medi-Cal. A lower share of cost would increase net income to working families.

**Background:** Child care is often a necessity for working parents. Current regional market rates for child care in Riverside County for the least expensive services range from \$500 - \$600 a month. The current \$200 deduction often is the sole reason why families do not qualify for the Medi-Cal program. Those families already in the program are left with a burdensome share of cost that does not accurately reflect their financial situation. Additionally, it can have the effect of discouraging employment in two-parent households. The increased income can impact a family's eligibility or share of cost when child care deductions do not reflect market prices.

An increase to child care income deductions may initially increase in Medi-Cal cases as individual applicants or recipients are determined to be financially eligible. Families would benefit as realistic child care deductions would allow for a more appropriate share of cost where applicable. Child care deductions that reflect actual child care costs may encourage both parents to work, which increases the family's likelihood of obtaining employer-provided medical insurance.

**Issue:** Provide Independent Living Program (ILP) services to former foster youth placed with non-related legal guardians.

**Proposal:** Support legislation to permit otherwise eligible former dependent foster youths placed with non-related legal guardians to participate in ILP services.

**Background:** Federal and California statute require counties to actively pursue permanency for foster youth who cannot be returned to their parental homes. Current foster parents and Non-Relative Extended Family Members (NREFM) are the most frequent and appropriate permanency resource for youths in long-term foster care.

California created state-funded programs for guardians. Non-related legal guardians (foster parents and NREFM's) are eligible for state case management. These Non Related Legal Guardians (NLRG) cases remain open child welfare services cases. Recently, CDSS re-interpreted eligibility for federal ILP services to exclude NLRG cases. These former foster youths are in acute need of ILP services to find housing, develop job skills, qualify for scholarships, etc. The denial of access to ILP services for the NLRG youths creates a serious disincentive for any foster parent or NREFM to consider guardianship. In order to retain ILP services, it is to the youth's benefit to remain in long-term foster care. As a court dependent, the youth can maintain ILP services, aftercare services and extended Medi-Cal for former foster youths.

Denial of ILP services to the NLRG youth has resulted in fewer guardianship cases, negative state and federal permanency outcomes, and increased court costs. Foster parents are returning to court to have dependency resumed in order to access services.

Any bill that permits NLRG cases to retain foster-care services would be cost neutral. The State General Fund savings to IV-E court and social worker case management can be re-invested into the ILP services delivery.

**Issue:** Regional Center services for out-of-state foster youth.

**Proposal:** Clarify that a juvenile court dependent retains California residency for the purposes of continued use of Regional Center services. Returning foster youth to California should be entitled to transitional services to Regional Center Adult Services when placed out-of-state.

**Background:** Occasionally foster children with serious developmental delays are placed in out-of-state group homes in order to secure specialized residential services that are not available in state. When these disabled youth become 18 or 19, they usually need to be returned to California and transitioned to the local Regional Center for the adult system. Currently, Regional Centers do not offer services to out-of-state foster youth.

Regional Centers do not recognize foster-care children who were placed out of state as a California resident eligible for services. Until the young adult returns to the county, an assessment for adult services is not started. Since Regional Centers have several months to process a new assessment, this means the disabled adult would have a gap in services at the same time as experiencing a transition in residence and treatment programs.

A clarification in state residency is expected to be cost neutral. Costs to assist foster youths to transition, now borne by the county CWS, would transfer to Regional Centers. This is a very small population, less than 100 youths per year.

**Issue:** Disproportionate share-of-cost increases for Medi-Cal recipients resulting from cost-of-living increases in Social Security income.

**Position:** Support legislation to modify the Aged and Disabled Federal Poverty Level (A & D FPL) program to establish a more proportionate share of cost for Medi-Cal. The goal is to assist California's citizens who qualify for the A & D FPL program to overcome the negative impacts of disproportionate Medi-Cal cost increases from annual living increases in Social Security benefits.

**Background:** The State of California established the Medi-Cal A & D FPL program to provide medical coverage for its low income aged and disabled population. Most people who qualify for this program receive their income from Social Security. The federal government, in response to inflation, establishes a small annual Cost of Living Adjustments (COLAs) for Social Security benefits. The Federal Poverty Level also experiences small increases. Over time, the interplay between minor increases in Social Security income and unequal raises to the federal poverty level results in increases to the individual's Medi-Cal share of cost.

For example, in order to qualify for the A & D FPL program, an individual could not make more than \$1,048 a month in 2005. The 2006 COLA was 4.1 percent, which means a person who just met the limit would now receive \$1,090 in income. Yet that same year, the federal poverty rate was increased by only 2.4 percent, bumping it up to \$1,073. This individual is no longer eligible for the A & D FPL program under these guidelines. As a result, this individual's Medi-Cal share of cost would increase from zero to \$470, despite the fact the income only went up \$42.

Riverside County conducted an analysis of persons terminated from the A & D FPL program due to increases in Social Security COLAs. The number of persons terminated in a given year was small - 349 persons. Fiscally, the impact of establishing a proportionate share of cost or disregarding the Social Security COLAs should be minor. Use of expensive nursing facilities by our aged and disabled citizens could be reduced by providing early affordable access to less costly medical alternatives.

**Issue:** County/EMS Agency Authority for Ambulance Transportation Services.

**Position:** Preserve County/EMS Agency authority to control EMS system. Support laws and regulations that would enhance county authority, increase funding for such oversight and oppose laws which would decrease county authority.

**Background:** The 1980 Emergency Medical Services Act provided for counties to establish, plan, implement and evaluate local emergency medical services systems. Cities that operated emergency services prior to June 1980 were grandfathered into law. For well over a decade, cities have gone before the Legislature to overturn SB 125 and obtain authority to establish city managed ambulance service. In a lawsuit that went to the California Supreme Court, it was determined that cities and districts could continue services already provided, but could not expand the scope of services without county approval.

Although a 1997 court decision in the County of San Bernardino v. City of San Bernardino clarified the role of the counties in providing emergency medical services, the League of California Cities and others are still planning to sponsor new law(s), which would cede the counties authority, especially in respect to revising "governance" structures.

Counties maintain that ambulance service must be provided on a countywide basis to ensure that providing services even in remote areas of the county remains financially viable. Changing the system to jurisdiction by jurisdiction would mean that certain affluent areas would be cherry-picked by cities leaving the less affluent areas to the county to provide coverage.

If cities were allowed to control ambulance services, those cities that have the fiscal capability to do so will. That would leave all the other areas in the county as a county responsibility. The county would lose the economy of scale and potentially need to subsidize the ambulance provider.

**Issue:** Protect funding and services for women's health.

**Proposal:**

- Continue to support policy for women's health services that encourage early and continuous prenatal care; support substance abuse screening, access, referral and treatment during pregnancy; screening and treatment for STD; screening and treatment for cancer; reducing teen pregnancy and preventing unintended pregnancy.
- Continue support of the Family PACT (Planning, Access, Care and Treatment) funding for California which provides access to health care for low income women so they can receive the services including STD screening and treatment, cancer screening for cervical, breast and birth control.
- Continue to support education targeting teen pregnancy prevention.

**Background:** It is essential for good public health that women's health issues are addressed early on. The consequences of inadequate prenatal care, lack of early screening and treatment for STD and cancer, teen pregnancy and unintended pregnancy contributes to a host of preventable health and social problems for women and families.

In the area of prenatal care, there are a number of federal, state and local programs focusing on the need for early and continuous prenatal care. Early prenatal care reduces maternal mortality and morbidity (i.e. gestational diabetes and STDs) by identifying complications earlier and identifying fetal abnormalities before birth so interventions can be anticipated and parents can prepare for special needs. In addition the Community Health Agency is working on a community collaborative to address screening, assessment, referral and treatment of substance abuse during pregnancy which is anticipated to improve both the health of the mother and the infant as well as the family. Providing these services and continuing outreach in these areas will lower costs for preventive illness in infants and children.

Preventive health services for low income women are limited at best. The major source of funded health care is through the Family PACT program which provides screening for cervical and breast cancer, screening and treatment for STD, which stresses the importance of early prenatal care, and provides birth control. In addition, the availability of these services and outreach is needed to address teen pregnancy and unintended pregnancy. California overall has made great strides in reducing teen pregnancy. It is predicted that the number of teens will increase significantly over the next several years.

**Issue:** Design-Build Authority for Redevelopment Agencies.

**Proposal:** Amend Section 43.1 of the Public Contract Code to expressly permit County Redevelopment Agencies to utilize the provisions of Section 20133 of the Public Contract Code, thus authorizing the County Redevelopment Agency to undertake the same type of projects as the county itself.

**Background:** Recent legislation enacted Section 20133 of the Public Contract Code to allow counties to utilize the design-build method of contracting for buildings which exceed \$2.5 million. However, no similar authority exists for County Redevelopment Agencies.

Under current law, the County Redevelopment Agency could still pay for a design-build project constructed under the county's authority. However, by extending this authority to the County Redevelopment Agency this process will be less cumbersome and more efficient. This will save staff costs for administration and legal review. Riverside County has the largest County Redevelopment Agency in the state, so this change will have a significant impact in Riverside County.

**Issue:** The critical shortage of skilled nurses at the California Veterans Homes.

**Proposal:** Sponsor legislation to provide educational assistance to nursing students who commit to serve a specified number of years in one of the California Veterans Homes. The concept would be similar to a GI bill for nurses. Nursing students will commit to work at one of the nursing homes for four to five years after completing their education. In return, the student would be given education grants or the state would pay off their existing student loans.

**Background:** The California Department of Veterans Affairs currently runs three State Veterans' Homes in Chula Vista, Barstow and Yountville. Three more Veterans' Homes are currently under construction and more are planned for the future. All of the current homes particularly Barstow (because of its rural location) suffer from a critical shortage of qualified nurses.

This proposal would require substantial initial investment of funds by the state but should help ease the nursing shortage. The state should recoup some of the initial investment by lessening the high turnover rate for its nurses.

The intent of the proposal is to help ease the critical shortage of nurses at the State Veterans' Homes and to make the homes more competitive in hiring nurses.

**Issue:** The lack of the sufficient capability by the California Department of Veterans Affairs (CDVA) to care for veterans suffering from brain-related diseases such as Alzheimers, organic brain disease, and other dementia-related diseases at the Veterans' Homes of California.

**Proposal:** Sponsor legislation to instruct the CDVA to provide increased access to veterans' homes for veterans suffering from Alzheimer's disease, Organic brain Syndrome and other dementia related diseases.

**Background:** The California Department of Veterans Affairs (CDVA) argues the homes are not equipped for the special needs of these seriously disabled veterans.

Eligible veterans with Alzheimers, organic brain disease, and other dementia-related diseases are denied access to California's Veterans' Homes. Current homes should be modified and future homes built to accommodate this segment of the veteran population.

The intent of the proposal is the require CDVA to appropriate the funds needed to give the above category of veterans the acute care they deserve. The CDVA would have to seek appropriations to be able to house and treat veterans with brain diseases.

**Issue:** Grant college education benefits to members of the California National Guard who are veterans of the current conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

**Proposal:** Extend the fee waiver program for eligible veterans to members of the California National Guard who have deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan as well as their children.

**Background:** Currently members of the California National Guard do not receive any education benefits from the State of California in spite of some units having three and four deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. California is the only state in the union that does not have any education benefits for its guard members.

California grants education benefits under the provisions of the California Educational Code Section 66025.3, to the children of disabled veterans under the California fee waiver program. Eligible children are not required to pay any mandatory system wide enrollment or registration fees, while attending either: (1) a California Community College, (2) a campus of the California State University system; or, (3) a campus of the University of California (UC) system. This proposal would be to extend the fee waiver program California National Guard members who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as to their children.

The intent of the proposal is the bring California in line with every other state in the union in recognizing the valuable contribution of these citizen soldiers and granting them well-deserved educational benefits from their own state.

Although no actual transfer of funds will be involved, it would mean a loss of revenue for the UC, CSU and Community College System.

**Issue:** Information Security legislation.

**Proposal:**

- Support legislation that protects the privacy/confidentiality and security of personal and critical infrastructure information. Personal information must be protected from identity theft. Critical infrastructure information must be protected from unauthorized access and misuse.
- Support legislation that promotes data exchange between government entities and/or their contractors provided the confidentiality and security of personal information is protected.

**Background:** The State of California has and will continue to pass legislation concerning information security and information sharing between government entities. Riverside County cannot go on record supporting legislation unless our county has first adopted a legislative policy covering these topics.

The intent of these policy positions is to provide Riverside County the ability to influence state legislation for the benefit of Riverside County constituents and government.

While the specific fiscal impact is unknown, the ability to influence future legislation should reduce both security and information technology costs. These policy positions are supported by the California Counties Information Services Directors Association (CCISDA).

**Issue:** Health Realignment Program not keeping up with county population growth.

**Proposal:** Support or sponsor legislation that takes population growth into account for health realignment funding formulas.

**Background:** Realignment of health funding in 1991 aimed to provide a steady stream of growth by funding it through sales tax and vehicle license fees, two revenue sources that grow. However, growth in health and mental health realignment is, in fact, not occurring to any significant degree, and is not keeping up with either inflation or population. Riverside County is receiving almost the same amount of funding now as in 2003, despite significant increases in population, and in sales tax and VLF. The system is not working as intended. Annual growth for funding is very small and Riverside County is estimated to be losing several million dollars as a result. This is a cost shift to counties from the state.

**Issue:** Equity in Health Realignment.

**Proposal:** Support or sponsor legislation to provide for equitable distribution of health realignment funding to account for population size.

**Background:** Riverside County receives a disproportionate amount of funding relative to its population size. Funding formulas have not been adjusted since 1991 to ensure equity in population size and demand for services. Health realignment funding should adjust for changes in demographics. Counties experiencing population growth should receive an equitable share of the health realignment fund. This issue is different than the proposal to provide increased funding to account for growth in that it asks that the pot of money also be distributed to equitably reflect county populations.

**Issue:** Renewal of California Hospital Medicaid Waiver.

**Proposal:** Support negotiations over the successor to the California Hospital Medicaid Waiver reflect Riverside County needs.

**Background:** The Federal Government agreed with the state to waive certain requirements for Medicaid. The five-year waiver expires in June 2010. Any successor waiver program should reflect Riverside County's needs for the In-Patient Medi-Cal Reimbursement program.

## **Selected Existing State Legislative Policy Positions**

### **Public Library:**

Support measures that fully restore the Transaction Based Reimbursement to the county for lending library materials to other jurisdictions. Fully fund the Public Library Fund, which provides general state support to public libraries.

### **Sex Offenders:**

Support measures to restrict the residence of sex offenders who are 290 registrants as permitted by Jessica's Law.

### **Water:**

Continue to support measures to mitigate the impacts of the water shortage as effectively as possible. Advocate for state water delivery projects and funding mechanisms that will improve water related infrastructure and delivery methods without causing delivery delays or jeopardizing existing water supplies.

### **Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA):**

Support efforts to reform the RHNA process to more fairly and accurately distribute low and ultra-low income housing opportunities throughout Southern California. Support measures to create consistency regarding the allocation of tax credits to the forecast in the RHNA to provide for more additional development of affordable housing in Riverside County.