

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

711



FROM: Executive Office

SUBMITTAL DATE:
January 26, 2010

SUBJECT: Urban County Caucus State Budget Education Project: Enabling County Government

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Supervisors receive and file the attached report.

BACKGROUND: The Urban County Caucus (UCC) surveyed twelve urban California counties regarding trends in funding contributions for Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, Child Welfare, In Home Supportive Services (IHSS), Proposition 36 and Proposition 42. The attached report incorporates the responses from eleven counties, including Riverside County.

The report found that the shift in responsibility for social service programs has placed a substantial burden on counties. Counties' financial support has increased by approximately 5.6% per year, compared with only a 2.8% annual increase in federal and state contributions. Federal and state funding has not kept pace when compared to socio-economic indicators such as inflation and the rate of economic growth in California.

Continued on page 2

Debra Cournoyer, Principal Management Analyst

**FINANCIAL
DATA**

Current F.Y. Total Cost: \$
Current F.Y. Net County Cost: \$
Annual Net County Cost: \$

In Current Year Budget:
Budget Adjustment:
For Fiscal Year:

SOURCE OF FUNDS:

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

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE

BY:
Gary M. Christmas

County Executive Office Signature

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion of Supervisor Tavaglione, seconded by Supervisor Buster and duly carried by unanimous vote, IT WAS ORDERED that the above matter is received and filed as recommended.

Ayes: Buster, Tavaglione, Stone, Benoit and Ashley
Nays: None
Absent: None
Date: January 26, 2010
xc: EO

Kecia Harper-Ihem
Clerk of the Board
By:
Deputy

Prev. Agn. Ref.:

ATTACHMENT FILED
WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

Agenda Number:

2.36

Dep't Recomm.: ☒ Consent ☐ Policy
Per Exec. Ofc.: ☒ Consent ☐ Policy

Departmental Concurrence

RE: Urban County Caucus State Budget Education Project: Enabling County Governments

January 26, 2010

Page 2

The decline in federal and state support for social service programs generally has meant an erosion in the real level of benefits over time for program recipients. The report further indicates that the child welfare program is an area where federal and state governments can take a larger role to help counties.

Transportation funding has experienced an annual deficit averaging \$135 million during the past six years. The report found that the transportation workload increased yet insufficient federal, state and county funding was available for projects. Federal and state governments can help counties by providing a larger and more stable level of funding.



**Urban Counties Caucus (UCC) State Budget Education Project:
Enabling County Governments**

January 21, 2010

Prepared by:

Justin L. Adams, Ph.D.

Andrew J. Chang

Chang & Adams Consulting

About *Chang & Adams Consulting*:

We are Sacramento's premier management consulting firm, operating at the intersection of the public and private sectors. We specialize in applying cutting-edge quantitative analyses to help frame and solve issues pertaining to public policy and business strategy. We advise a range of clients, including government agencies, non-profit organizations, campaigns for initiatives and candidates, and Fortune 1000 companies. We provide them with the analytical insight to shape their strategic direction, improve their operations, and develop sound policies.

About the Authors:

Justin L. Adams, Ph.D. is a Director in Chang & Adams Consulting.

With over 11 years of experience as a consultant and an executive in state government, Justin is a seasoned political economist who brings a combination of theoretical and practical expertise in public policy and fiscal and economic analysis. From 2007 to 2009, Justin was the Director of Economics at Forward Observer, a political and public policy consulting firm. He oversaw the development of all of the firm's fiscal and economic studies, and has testified in front of the Legislative Analyst's Office. Between 2001 and 2007, Justin was an associate economist at the RAND Corporation specializing in domestic and international economic development, defense economics, and the economics of public-sector organizations. From 1994 to 1997, Justin served in multiple roles in California State government. He was a Special Assistant in the California Department of Transportation, an Assistant for Policy Development in the California Department of Housing and Community Development, and a staff economist in the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Justin received his Ph.D. in Political Economics from Stanford University's Graduate School of Business in 2000. He also received his A.M. in Political Science and his A.B. in Economics and Political Science from Stanford University.

Andrew J. Chang is the Managing Director of Chang & Adams Consulting.

Andrew Chang has extensive experience working with both high-level executives and operations staff on sensitive issues under tight deadlines in both the public and private sectors. Andrew has more than 10 years of public policy development and implementation experience, and more than seven years of strategy and operations consulting experience with Fortune 500 companies. Between 2007 and 2009, Andrew was Vice President of business strategy for Forward Observer, a Sacramento-based consulting firm where he led engagements in regards to public finance and market entry for technology and energy companies. Between 2004 and 2007, Andrew served as the Chief Deputy Director of the California Department of General Services where he was responsible for the day-to-day operations of 4000 employees. Between 2000 and 2004, Andrew was a management consultant at the global management consulting firm of A. T. Kearney, where he led a number of strategy and operations engagements for global IT and telecommunications firms. Between 1995 and 1998, Andrew served as Assistant Secretary for Policy and Operations at the State and Consumer Services Agency. Andrew received his A.B. from the University of California at Berkeley, his Masters in Public Policy at Georgetown University in Washington, DC and is a graduate of the University of Michigan's Executive MBA Center.

**Urban Counties Caucus (UCC) State Budget Education Project:
Enabling County Governments
(Table of Contents)**

Section	Page
Key Findings	4
1. Introduction	5
2. County Program Descriptions	7
3. County Program Trends	9
4. Conclusion	15
Appendix A: County Survey Results	16
Appendix B: Bibliography	19

**Urban Counties Caucus (UCC) State Budget Education Project:
Enabling County Governments
(Key Findings)**

- The Urban Counties Caucus (UCC) surveyed urban California counties regarding trends in funding contributions for Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Proposition 36, and Proposition 42.
- Based on data from eleven of the counties – Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange County, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura – we found that the six major programs account for over \$10.6 billion in county spending annually.
- Over the past 6 fiscal years (FY 2004-05 to FY 2009-10), federal and state support for the six programs has steadily decreased while the counties' support has increased. Since FY 2004-05, the counties' support for these programs grew from 12.2 percent to 14.1 percent – a 15.6 percent increase in relative support.
- The shift in responsibility for the social service programs has placed a substantial (and still growing) burden on counties. The counties' financial contributions are increasing by about 5.7 percent every year, compared with only a 3.0 percent annual growth in federal and state contributions.
- The 3.0 percent growth in federal/state program support is anemic when compared against a handful of California socio-economic indicators such as inflation and the rate of economic growth in California.
- The decline in federal/state support for social service programs generally has meant an erosion in the real level of benefits over time for program recipients. Total contributions (federal/state and county) per caseload declined in real terms since FY 2004-05 for every program except Child Welfare.
- The Child Welfare Program is a particular area where the federal and state governments could take a larger role to help counties. Child Welfare is a sizable program, totaling over \$3.3 billion in FY 2009-10, and over the last six years county funding responsibility has gone from 14.4 percent to 22.1 percent.
- The federal and state governments can also help the counties with respect to transportation by taking on a larger and more stable share of responsibility. California counties have experienced an annual transportation-funding deficit averaging \$135 million during the past six years.

Urban Counties Caucus (UCC) State Budget Education Project: Enabling County Governments

1. Introduction

As California continues through the deepest recession since the Great Depression, the state's counties are facing severe challenges. The collapse of the state's housing market, for example, has reduced the amount of property tax revenue that counties receive – amazingly 2010 might be the first year since the passage of Proposition 13 in which “base year values” for real estate in California actually get adjusted downwards.¹ Taxable sales are also down. And at the same time, counties are facing higher costs in maintaining the basic services that county residents expect from them.

Because counties also provide critical services on behalf of the state and federal governments, counties are significantly impacted by state and federal funding decisions. Consequently, the dire fiscal position of state government in recent years has necessitated large spending cuts to programs in health, human services, corrections, and education. In fact, according to the Legislative Analyst's Office, the State budget for FY 2009-10 contains General Fund and special fund spending levels that are 15 percent lower than spending levels from just two years ago.²

Counties have already done much to help the state out of many of its budget crises. In prior years, for example, the counties have engaged with the state in “realignment,” in which many state programs were transferred to the county level; acquiesced to the suspension of Proposition 1A (2004), where the state was allowed to borrow \$1.9 billion from local government (cities, counties and special districts) during the 2009 Budget Revision; and weathered the \$1 billion human services funding deficit, which is the difference between the state's funding for eight human services programs (frozen at 2001 funding levels) and the actual costs incurred by counties to deliver the services.

As the state budget outlook for FY 2010-11 continues to worsen, steps must be taken to protect counties, particularly urban counties, from additional state budget cuts. The 12 urban counties represented by the Urban Counties Caucus (UCC) contain over three-quarters of California's population and experience the majority of the state's caseloads in the health, human services, and corrections areas. Legislators need to be made aware of the burden that state budget cuts have placed on California counties in recent years, especially in light of increasing caseloads, so that they can better set their budgetary priorities.

Chang & Adams Consulting has been retained to provide an independent estimation of the magnitude of the burden placed on counties in California, particularly urban counties, from state budget cuts. Specifically, we have been asked to answer the following questions:

- Over the past five years, how have State budget cuts impacted counties for six major state programs in the areas of health and human services, transportation, and corrections? The programs include Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, Child Welfare, In-Home

¹ California State Board of Equalization, “Negative Inflation Spurs First Time Property Tax Reductions,” News Release, November 30, 2009.

² Legislative Analyst's Office, *The Budget Package: 2009-10 California Spending Plan*, October, 2009.

Supportive Services (IHSS), Proposition 42 (county transportation), and Proposition 36 (substance abuse treatment).

- How have county caseload and workload increased for these six programs over the past five years?
- How much have the responsibilities for these programs been shifted to the counties over time?

The UCC surveyed the 12 urban counties as to funding histories for the six programs. The next section describes the size and purpose of these programs. Section 3 analyzes the survey results to uncover federal, state, and county program trends. And Section 4 concludes with key observations.

2. County Program Descriptions

The UCC County Survey covered six major state programs in the areas of health and human services, corrections, and transportation: Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, Child Welfare, In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), Proposition 36 (substance abuse treatment), and Proposition 42 (county transportation). We describe these programs briefly below:

Medi-Cal. The Medi-Cal Program (referred to as Medicaid at the federal level) provides health care for 6.5 million low-income individuals including members of families with children, seniors, persons with disabilities, those in foster care, pregnant women and people with specific diseases. Counties administer the Medi-Cal program for the state and federal governments. County welfare departments are responsible for determining Medi-Cal eligibility for all those except the aged, blind and disabled recipients of SSI/SSP. Counties also oversee the enrollment and recertification process and disburse benefits.

CalWORKs. The CalWORKs program provides monthly cash assistance to eligible families, and to low-income children whose parents are not able to provide basic necessities for them. CalWORKs requires parents to participate in welfare-to-work activities including training, education and other services designed to help families get back into the workforce. Counties are responsible for processing applications, interviewing candidates to verify eligibility, and conducting fingerprinting, among other requirements of the program. If the County determines that the applicants are eligible for CalWORKs, the family will receive monthly checks from the county welfare department until determined ineligible or they reach their statutory time limit.

Child Welfare. All counties are required to respond on a 24-hour basis to investigate any report of child abuse or child neglect. Counties are responsible for investigating the report of abuse, assessing the risk to the children, and taking action if necessary to protect the children from harm. County social workers may also link the family to services that may include therapy, drug treatment and domestic violence counseling. As part of this process, the courts could order the children to be removed from the home and placed in foster care.

In Home Supportive Services (IHSS). The IHSS Program is an alternative to out-of-home care and helps to pay for services so that the elderly, blind, or disabled residents can remain safely in their own home. The types of services authorized through IHSS are housecleaning, meal preparation, laundry, grocery shopping, personal care services, accompaniment to medical appointments, and protective supervision for the mentally impaired. Counties are responsible for enrolling beneficiaries and providers into the IHSS program, monitoring their timesheets, providing training and education to the enrollees as well as other administrative functions.


Proposition 36 (Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act). The Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act passed in 2000, and requires that individuals convicted of a nonviolent drug possession offense receive drug treatment in the community rather than prison or jail. These programs are operated by counties and most of the funding associated with Proposition 36 is used for treatment programs and prevention.

Proposition 42 (Transportation). In 2002, the voters passed Proposition 42, which constitutionally dedicates the state's share of the sales tax on gasoline to transportation programs, increasing transportation funding by more than \$1 billion a year. Proposition 42 was designed to provide a steady stream of transportation funding so that California would be able to better keep up with growth in population and trade. The law allows Proposition 42 funds to be

suspended and diverted during a state fiscal crisis – until the 2005-06 budget year, nearly all of Proposition 42 dollars were diverted to the General Fund. Counties are responsible for planning, designing, funding, building, operating and maintaining all roads, bridges, and transportation facilities within the unincorporated County territory.

The UCC County Survey of the six major health and human services, corrections, and transportation programs found that they currently account for over \$10.6 billion in county spending annually. Of these six programs, two health and human services programs account for nearly two-thirds of spending: CalWORKs at \$3.4 billion and Child Welfare at \$3.3 billion. Additionally, spending for Proposition 42 (transportation) and Proposition 36 (substance abuse treatment) represents only about 5.2 percent of the total. This is illustrated in Figure 2.1 below.

Figure 2.1
FY 2009-10 Projected Program Expenditures




SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

These programs are all funded by a combination of state/federal and local funding. Five of them – CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Medi-Cal, and Proposition 36 – are social service programs that are directed towards individuals and households. In that sense they are distinct from Proposition 42 funding which involves capital investment for roads. However, transportation funds have regularly been taken by the state and put to other purposes. Consequently we consider all six programs together in the analysis that follows.

3. County Program Trends

How has support for the six major programs changed over time? Looking at the last six fiscal years, federal and state support have steadily decreased while county responsibilities have increased. Figure 3.1 below shows federal/state and county burdens since FY 2004-05. In FY 2004-05, federal and state contributions supported 87.8 percent of the programs and counties were responsible for about 12.2 percent of program support. By FY 2009-10, the federal and state share was down to 85.9 percent while the county share climbed to 14.1 percent. Although 14.1 percent might seem small in absolute terms, it represents a 15.6 percent increase in the counties' relative burden over the past six years.

Figure 3.1
Federal/State and County Social Service Program Burdens




SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

These programs have placed a substantial (and still growing) burden on the counties over the past six years. Since FY 2004-05, federal and state support for the six programs has increased from \$7.6 billion annually to \$9.1 billion. This increase reflects a Compounded Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of federal/state support of 3.0 percent. By contrast, county support has gone from \$1.1 billion annually to \$1.5 billion over the same time period. This

increase represents a county CAGR of 5.7 percent – that is twice the federal/state growth rate. Should these growth rates continue unchanged, counties will be responsible for over 20 percent of the programs within another ten years. That far surpasses the 12 percent level of county support seen just in FY 2004-05. This is shown in Figure 3.2 below.

Figure 3.2
Federal/State and County Social Service Program Burdens




SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

Figure 3.3 compares the growth in federal/state support for the six programs, as well as that of county support, against the growth in California's Gross State Product (GSP), California's population, and the Consumer Price Index (CPI). These socio-economic indicators are useful benchmarks for comparison: changes in GSP reflect the growth of the state's economy, changes in California's population proxy fluctuations in the size of program caseloads, and changes in CPI, used to measure inflation, suggests changes in the value of program benefits.

Figure 3.3 shows that the growth in federal/state support for the programs has been somewhat anemic over time. The 3.0 percent Compounded Annual Growth Rate of federal/state program support translates to an increase in funding of 19 percent since FY 2004-05. This does compare favorably to the growth in California population (6 percent) over the FY 2004-05 to FY 2009-10 timeframe. However, it only tracks the growth in Gross State Product (16 percent) or the growth in inflation (17 percent), meaning that it is not enough to maintain the real level of benefits received by program recipients (combining both caseload growth and inflation growth).

Note that at the same time, the level of county spending on these programs has increased by almost 40 percent over the past 6 years.




SOURCES: (1) California Department of Finance. (2) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09. (3) Chang & Adams Consulting GSP estimates for 2007-2010 based on latest Department of Finance data.

Looking at the five social service programs in particular (all excluding Proposition 42), the decline in federal/state support generally has caused the real level of benefits to decrease or remain flat over time. That is, adjusting for inflation, the total contributions (federal/state and county) per caseload have decreased for four of the five programs over the last six years. As Figure 3.4 shows below, between FY 2004-05 and FY 2009-10 CalWORKs contributions dropped from \$7,496 to \$6,271 per caseload, Medi-Cal went from \$910 to \$892 per caseload,

IHSS declined from \$3,074 to \$2,882 per caseload, and Proposition 36 dropped from \$2,134 to \$1,330 per caseload in 2009 dollars. Only Child Welfare shows a significant increase in total contributions between FY 2004-05 and FY 2009-10. Here, per caseload funding actually increased from \$13,845 to \$16,875, while accounting for inflation.

Figure 3.4
Total Funding per Social Service Caseload (in 2009 Dollars)




SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09. Programs include CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Medi-Cal and Proposition 36.

The Child Welfare Program is a particular area where the federal and state governments could take a larger role to help counties. As shown in Figure 3.5 below, the level of county support for CalWORKs and Medi-Cal has been relatively small and stable over time. The burden of Proposition 36 on counties began small, gradually increasing to 3.0 percent by FY 2008-09. And although it spiked to 12.4 percent in FY 2009-10 because of a significant drop in state support, the overall program size is still very small. And county support for IHSS has fluctuated somewhat over time, the level of support has decreased from 21.1 percent in FY 2004-05 to 17.8 percent in FY 2009-10.

That said, Figure 3.5 shows that the program whose relative burden on the counties has steadily increased over time is Child Welfare. County responsibility has gone from 14.4 percent

in FY 2004-05 to 22.1 percent in FY 2009-10 – that is a 54 percent increase in its share. Moreover, Child Welfare is a large program, totaling \$3.3 billion in spending.


Figure 3.5
County Level of Social Service Program Support



SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

Turning to transportation, the federal and state governments can also help the counties by taking on a larger and more consistent share of responsibility. Figure 3.6 below illustrates the federal/state and county burdens for Proposition 42 since FY 2004-05. It shows that the transportation workload for counties has grown from \$432 million in FY 2004-05 to \$621 million in FY 2009-10, translating to a CAGR of 6.2 percent over the six years. At the same time, total federal/state and county funding have been insufficient to meet this transportation workload. While county contributions have grown from \$284 million to \$326 million – a CAGR of 2.3 percent – federal/state contributions have been erratic. This primarily reflects the fact that the California Legislature has occasionally withheld transportation-related appropriations or loaned itself transportation funding to help balance the state budget.

Figure 3.6
Federal/State and County Proposition 42 Burdens



SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura.

4. Conclusion

The UCC survey of urban counties on funding contributions for six social service and transportation programs found that these programs are sizable, accounting for over \$10.3 billion in county spending annually. Over the past 6 fiscal years, federal and state support for the social service programs has steadily decreased while the counties' support has increased. In fact, the counties' financial contributions are increasing by about 5.7 percent every year, compared with only a 3.0 percent annual growth in federal and state contributions. With respect to transportation, federal and state support has been erratic.

The shift in responsibility for the social service programs has placed a substantial and growing burden on counties. And generally it has meant an erosion in the real level of benefits over time for program recipients.

What can the federal and state governments do to help? Specifically, they can take a larger role in the Child Welfare Program and Proposition 42. Child Welfare is a sizable program, totaling over \$3.3 billion in FY 2009-10, and over the last six years county funding responsibility has gone from 14.4 percent to 22.1 percent. At the same time, California counties have experienced an annual transportation-funding deficit averaging over \$135 million during the past six years.

Appendix A County Survey Results

Local Contributions Among Eleven Urban Counties

	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10
CalWORKs	\$91,157,889	\$101,600,616	\$86,093,861	\$106,641,908	\$94,253,954	\$82,516,934
Child Welfare	\$406,950,271	\$516,155,995	\$549,513,232	\$584,268,279	\$685,266,542	\$722,582,215
IHSS	\$236,742,585	\$224,396,731	\$289,562,583	\$294,613,038	\$316,807,804	\$298,016,927
Medi-Cal	\$43,905,670	\$59,115,455	\$53,600,349	\$58,863,512	\$48,938,673	\$53,417,969
Proposition 36	\$200,000	\$400,000	\$1,496,213	\$1,536,182	\$2,035,570	\$3,969,572
Proposition 42	\$284,298,967	\$279,010,084	\$303,016,642	\$316,382,222	\$290,099,252	\$326,000,000
Total	\$1,038,986,583	\$1,156,414,712	\$1,252,398,913	\$1,323,587,215	\$1,391,679,743	\$1,440,109,549

SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

Federal and State Contributions Among Eleven Urban Counties

	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10
CalWORKs	\$3,000,247,288	\$2,988,973,324	\$2,948,530,400	\$3,068,059,654	\$3,218,909,901	\$3,336,321,224
Child Welfare	\$2,410,430,670	\$2,448,793,806	\$2,517,625,914	\$2,546,261,742	\$2,513,665,152	\$2,535,315,209
IHSS	\$882,746,354	\$962,315,071	\$1,045,702,740	\$1,209,113,713	\$1,306,804,554	\$1,378,638,443
Medi-Cal	\$1,228,815,673	\$1,321,710,510	\$1,404,853,829	\$1,567,524,771	\$1,619,054,619	\$1,634,729,290
Proposition 36	\$72,305,637	\$75,247,084	\$90,097,075	\$77,385,534	\$65,109,970	\$27,924,272
Proposition 42	\$24,243,005	\$79,412,911	\$125,109,818	\$18,704,936	\$164,844,091	\$159,268,132
Total	\$7,509,433,671	\$7,768,076,126	\$7,992,457,615	\$8,326,696,329	\$8,700,587,329	\$8,885,072,596

SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

Caseloads Among Eleven Urban Counties

	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10
CalWORKs	463,042	462,857	422,506	428,991	490,902	545,150
Child Welfare	237,200	241,401	234,699	224,297	204,749	193,066
IHSS	424,450	441,672	462,277	501,085	541,879	581,857
Medi-Cal	1,397,867	1,511,727	1,655,977	1,762,032	1,843,319	1,891,903
Proposition 36	39,610	40,643	39,980	37,704	35,434	23,976
Proposition 42	\$432,246,370	\$489,882,104	\$562,382,116	\$575,563,605	\$584,438,465	\$621,355,423
Total	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura.

Appendix B Bibliography

California Department of Finance, *California Statistical Abstract*, 2009.

Legislative Analyst's Office, *The Budget Package: 2009-10 California Spending Plan*, October, 2009.

Urban Counties Caucus, Program Survey, (Counties in survey include Alameda, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego and Ventura), 2009.

**Urban Counties Caucus
Compendium of County Programs
January 18, 2010**

General Government

Administration

Counties, like most government entities, operate several departments that are key to their organization including County Administrator, County Counsel, Human Resources, General Services and other basic functions that are needed to run a county.

Agricultural Commissioner

Each county is required to have an Agricultural Commissioner who is responsible for the promotion and protection of the agricultural industry and for the protection of public health, safety, and welfare. These requirements include pest exclusion, pest detection, pest eradication, pest management, nursery and seed inspections, fruit and vegetable quality control, and egg shell quality control.

The Agricultural Commissioner's Office may also be responsible for various biological and chemical weed control programs or environmental health programs. Within most counties, the Agricultural Commissioner is also responsible for weights and measures enforcement (see Weights and Measures).

These programs are funded through County General Fund, and fees charged to conduct these services.

Animal Control

Many counties also have an Animal Control Department to provide services to their community and some also contract to provide the services for cities in the county.

Responsibilities include the following:

- Providing public health protection against communicable animal diseases.
- Enforcing local, State and Federal laws.
- Providing humane euthanasia of seriously injured animals.
- Impounding stray or injured animals.
- Conducting cruelty investigations.
- Issuing dog licenses.
- Retaining lost pets for three days.

Funding is provided from County General Fund, State funds, and in some cases fees.

Assessor

Each county has an Assessor that is responsible for the creation and maintenance of all mapping activities and creation of new assessor parcels from final subdivisions, parcel maps, lot line adjustments, record of surveys, deeds and miscellaneous documents.

Compendium of County Programs

The Assessor's Office is responsible for processing all recorded documents and ownership changes, all real estate and personal property valuation activities, valuation of real property ownership changes, new construction, agricultural preserves, mines and quarries, oil and gas wells, pipeline easements, and water companies. It handles all Proposition 8 recalculations (declines in value), and annually values all personal property and trade fixtures in the county.

The Assessor is funded through the County General Fund and other fees charged to residents for various activities.

Auditor-Controller

In most counties, the Auditor-Controller is an independent, nonpartisan elected office established to provide various accounting and property tax administration services to the county government, special districts, schools, and cities. The Auditor-Controller is the chief accounting officer of the county responsible for budget control, disbursements and receipts, and financial reporting. In addition, this office is responsible for audits of certain agencies within the county.

The Auditor-Controller is responsible for budget control, issuing warrants (checks) for payments, recording receipts of revenues, payroll, accounting for assets and liabilities such as fixed assets, accounts receivable/payable, long-term debt, and preparation of the county's financial statements.

In the area of auditing, an Auditor-Controller may have an audit staff to perform audits of the functions of the county depending on the size of the county. However, this position is responsible for ensuring that certain mandatory audits are performed periodically by either internal staff or contracted certified public accountants. Mandatory audits may include: special districts, county treasury, probation, child development, tax collector, retirement systems, and food stamps.

In accordance with state law, the Auditor-Controller is also responsible for property taxation administration. The specific duties include: controlling the tax roll, calculating the tax and general obligation bond rates, accounting for property tax receipts, allocating property tax revenues to all taxing agencies, and reconciling with the tax collector.

The cities, special districts and redevelopment agencies are charged for their share of the costs associated with property tax administration.

County Clerk/Recorder

The County Clerks are sometimes appointed but can also be elected officials serving four-year terms. The following offices and responsibilities are associated with the County Clerk or Recorder:

- Clerk of the Board of Supervisors: Provides support to the Board, prepares and monitors the Board budget, and takes minutes at all sessions of the Board and its affiliated agencies.
- County Clerk: Responsible for issuing marriage licenses, filing fictitious business name statements, filing and qualifying notary public oaths and bonds, processing passport applications, posting environmental documents, registering process servers, administering and filing oaths of office, filing grand jury reports, and maintaining a variety of miscellaneous public documents.

Compendium of County Programs

- Recorder: Responsible for filing and maintaining public documents associated with land transactions, files and maintains vital statistics (including births, deaths, and marriages), and maintains a cumulative record of all official documents for the county.
- Registrar of Voters (Elections): Registers all voters in the county and maintains the voter files, verifies petitions, files campaign statements, conducts all elections in the county (i.e., federal, state, county, school, and special district elections); and contracts with some cities to conduct their elections. Cities, schools, and special districts pay for the costs of their elections; county, state, and federal elections are paid for by the county.

Most of these offices are funded by the County General Fund and various fees or charges to provide the services.

Emergency Services

All counties have an Emergency Services office which coordinates the overall county response to any disaster. This office is responsible for alerting and notifying appropriate agencies during a disaster, coordinating all agencies that respond to the disaster, ensuring resources are available and mobilized in times of disaster, developing plans and procedures for response to and recovery from disasters, and developing and providing preparedness materials for the public.

This office is funded through County General Fund as well as Federal funds for disaster response.

Land Use and Planning

Local land use authority is delegated by the state to local governments including counties. Local zoning and police powers are granted to cities and counties by the State Constitution. State law requires that each county adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development under its jurisdiction. This general plan is the foundation for community decisions that will affect the future location of housing, business, roads, parks, and other land uses.

It is important to note that for counties, planning only involves the unincorporated areas of the county.

County responsibilities in the area of planning are as follows:

- General Plan Adoption: Counties are required to adopt a general plan which includes seven required elements: Land Use, Circulation/Transportation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety. Counties can also voluntarily adopt optional elements covering subjects that are of interest to the county.
- Housing Element Updates: The Housing Element is the only element of the General Plan which is required to be updated every 5 to 7 years. The Department of Housing and Community Development reviews and certifies this element for adoption. SB 375 (Steinberg, 2008) changes the housing element revision time periods for the next updates to 8 years for most counties.
- Zoning: Counties are responsible for zoning land consistent with the adopted General Plan. Zoning ordinances regulate land uses within the community and determine whether the land will be used for residential, commercial, agriculture or other uses.
- Permits: Most development projects require permits approved by the county which are often reviewed by local planning commissions and planning departments.
- CEQA: Projects must also comply with the California Environmental Quality Act where applicable and in many cases counties can serve as the lead agency that is responsible for

Compendium of County Programs

overseeing the CEQA process. The lead agency is responsible for determining whether or not a project will impact the environment which requires the adoption of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or negative declaration. CEQA also requires mitigation to the extent a project may impact the environment.

Planning functions are generally funded by the County General Fund, fees charged to developers, and in some cases state or federal grants that are available (i.e. Proposition 84).

Libraries

While state law does not mandate library services, it does allow the County Board of Supervisors to establish and maintain a county free library, and to provide library services to unincorporated areas and to cities wishing to participate in the county free library system.

Libraries are funded through County General Fund, state funds, and in some cases fees. State funds include the Public Library Foundation which provides all public libraries with funding on a per capita basis, and the Resource Sharing and Transaction-Based Reimbursement program which provides reimbursement to local libraries for loaning books and materials to other libraries' residents.

Parks and Recreation

Some counties have Parks Departments to help maintain, and improve the parks in their jurisdiction. Their responsibilities can include the following: maintenance of the parks, construction of new parks, educating the public and responding to necessary clean-up.

Parks are funded through the County General Fund, state funds (including bond funds) and in some cases fees.

Public Works

The Public Works Department is responsible for planning, designing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the county's infrastructure which includes bridges, public roads, transportation systems, water, wastewater, and solid waste disposal systems.

The types of activities and level of involvement by the Public Works Department may vary from county to county and can include the following:

- Maintaining the county's network of bridges, roadways, underground facilities (sewer and domestic water) and other minor structures.
- Developing and delivering a countywide coordinated transportation program which includes bus and transit services.
- Constructing, operating, and maintaining flood control channels, dams, levees, retarding basins, and pump stations.
- Surveying land in the county.
- Overseeing the use of the public rights of way by private entities such as utility or cable companies.

This department is funded through County General Fund, state funds, federal funds and in some cases fees.

Compendium of County Programs

Redevelopment

Many counties have a redevelopment agency which in some cases can be operated by the County Board of Supervisors. The main purpose of redevelopment is to combat physical and economic blight in the community which is accomplished by revitalizing blighted areas in the state.

A redevelopment agency is authorized to keep the property tax increment revenues resulting from increased property values within a redevelopment project area. Property tax increment financing allows agencies to issue bonds and repay debt from the receipt of all future tax increments. As part of redevelopment law, agencies are required to set-aside at least 20% of the property tax increment into a separate Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund to address the community's affordable housing needs.

There are currently 31 counties that have redevelopment agencies. In 2008, it was noted that statewide there were close to \$4 billion in tax revenues diverted to redevelopment agencies.

Transportation (Streets and Roads)

Counties are responsible for planning, designing, funding, building, operating and maintaining all roads, bridges, and transportation facilities within the unincorporated County territory. This includes street sweeping, pavement patching, sidewalk repair and tree trimming, etc (see also Public Works).

Statewide, counties are responsible for 38% of the streets and roads. In Los Angeles County, this department maintains almost 3,200 miles of major roads and local streets and 1,600 miles in 20 cities (some cities contract with Los Angeles County to maintain their roads).

These programs are funded through state, federal, and local funds as well as bond funds:

- State Gas Tax – Counties receive approximately 18% of the 18 cent per gallon gas tax.
- Proposition 42 – Sales tax on gasoline dedicated to transportation under Proposition 42 generates approximately \$1.5 billion annually today of which the local share (cities and counties) is 40% with half of that dedicated to counties. Proposition 42 dedicates the state's share of the sales tax on gasoline to transportation programs.
- Proposition 1B – This is the transportation infrastructure bond passed by the voters in 2006 which authorized \$19.9 billion in bonds to be sold for a variety of projects to improve traffic safety, reduce congestion, repair local streets and roads, expand public transit, reduce air pollution and facilitate the movement of goods and services. Specifically, \$1 billion was dedicated to counties for local streets and roads.
- Federal Funding – This is provided through the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Funds are provided to California directly to regions through federal formulas. There is no direct allocation to counties or cities.
- Local Sales Tax – Nineteen counties have passed local measures by a two-thirds vote to increase the sales tax for specific transportation needs.

Treasurer/Tax Collector

Each county has a Treasurer/Tax Collector which is responsible for the billing, collection, and reporting of property tax revenues levied annually through the county. The Treasurer also maintains all funds belonging to the county, schools and other special districts in the county.

Compendium of County Programs

This office and the duties are funded by the County General Fund.

Waste Management and Recycling

Counties are responsible for the collection and disposal or recycling of the resident's garbage, recyclables, green waste and bulky items. This includes curbside recycling in most urban counties, operating landfills, and handling waste diversion.

Counties are required to meet solid waste diversion goals of 25 percent by 1995 and 50 percent by 2000. This means that counties are required to create an Integrated Waste Management Plan that includes elements such as recycling programs, purchasing of recycled products and waste minimization.

For example, Sacramento County services 155,000 residential customers every week, collecting and disposing of, or processing 150,000 tons of trash, 75,000 tons of green waste and 45,000 tons of recyclables each year.

These programs are funded by the County General Fund, state funds and various fees.

Weights and Measures

The Weights and Measures Department is responsible for the preservation and maintenance of standards of measurement. This office is responsible for device inspections, quantity control, petroleum inspections and weighmaster inspections.

- **Device Inspection:** The device inspection program inspects and tests various types of commercial weighing and measuring devices which include: gasoline dispensers, electric meters, taxi meters, odometers on ambulances, pharmacy scales, and livestock scales.
- **Petroleum Inspection:** This program enforces automotive fuel and product regulations to ensure that they meet the minimum standards for quality. Brake fluid, motor oil and anti-freeze are also checked.
- **Quality Control:** This program controls the accurate reproduction of quantity standards and price extension in commercial transactions and provides for informative labeling of identity, quantity, and responsibility of packaged commodities. Duties include verifying that businesses request the correct amount of payment from customers, checking packages for accuracy of net content, and enforcement of Federal Fair Packaging and Labeling Act Requirements.
- **Weighmaster:** Certifies the weight, measurement or count of any commodity. Inspections cover such businesses as wineries, cement plants, scrap yards, moving and storage companies, livestock dealers and feed mills.

These programs are funded from County General Fund, state funds, and various fees.

Health and Human Services

Each county is the main provider of health and human services for the State and Federal Government. Some counties also administer unique local programs based on community need.

Health Programs

Alcohol and Drug Treatment

The public substance abuse treatment system is administered by counties under a contract with the State Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (DADP). Counties are not statutorily required to provide alcohol and drug treatment services, however Proposition 36 provides that as a condition of probation the court shall require participation in and completion of an appropriate drug treatment program.

County alcohol and drug programs are required to meet state and federal requirements regarding the administration, licensing and use of funds. Some counties provide services directly while others contract with private treatment programs.

These programs are funded by a combination of federal, state, and in some cases local funds.

California Children's Services Program (CCS)

The CCS program provides diagnosis and treatment services, medical case management and physical and occupational therapy services to children under age 21 with CCS-eligible medical conditions, such as cystic fibrosis, hemophilia, cerebral palsy, heart disease, cancer and traumatic injuries. CCS pays only for health care services related to the CCS eligible medical condition. Children become eligible for CCS through the Medi-Cal, Healthy Families or CCS Only programs. CCS also provides medically necessary physical and occupational therapy to special education students.

Counties administer the program at the local level (according to state established standards and protocols) for all CCS eligible children. Counties also have a share of cost for diagnosis, treatment and therapy services for CCS Only (50%) and Healthy Families CCS (17.5%) children, as well as county administration for the CCS Only and Healthy Families CCS children. The remainder of the program is funded by federal dollars (both Medicaid and SCHIP) and state General Fund.

County responsibilities include:

1. CCS Program Administration at the Local Level (financial and residential eligibility determination for the CCS Only program and medical eligibility determination and case management for all three CCS programs)
2. Administration of the Medical Therapy Program (MTP), including direct provision of therapy services by county employed therapists to children enrolled in the CCS program and Special Education students.

The CCS Program is funded through sharing ratios as follows:

Diagnosis/Treatment and Therapy

- Medi-Cal/CCS: 50% Federal Medicaid funds and 50% State General Funds
- Straight CCS: 50% State General Fund and 50% County Funds.
- Healthy Families/CCS: For family incomes under \$40,000 AGI: 65% Federal SCHIP funds, 17.5% State General Funds, and 17.5% County funds. For family incomes over \$40,000 AGI: 65% Federal SCHIP funds and 35% State General Funds.

Compendium of County Programs

- Special Education Students: Billed to Medi-Cal when eligible; otherwise 50% State General Fund and 50% County Funds.

County Administration and Case Management

- Medi-Cal/CCS: 50% Federal Medicaid Funds and 50% State General Funds.
- Straight CCS: 50% State General Funds and 50% County Funds.
- Healthy Families/CCS: 65% Federal SCHIP funds, 17.5% State General Funds, and 17.5% County Funds.

California Children and Families Commission (First Five)

The California Children and Families Commission (First Five) was created by the passage of Proposition 10 in 1998 and the main purpose of the Act is to promote, support and improve the early development of children from 0-5 years of age. Proposition 10 provides funding to improve the lives of California's young children and their families through a comprehensive system of education, health services, childcare and other programs.

Statewide programs include the following:

- Comprehensive Approaches to Raising Educational Standards (CARES)
- Health Access For All Children Initiative
- California Oral Health Education and Training Project (First Smiles)
- Power of Preschool (PoP)
- School Readiness
- Tobacco Cessation
- Special Needs Project

Each county has created its own local First 5 County Commission which directs where funds will be used in that community.

Funding for these programs is provided through a 50 cents tax on the purchase of tobacco products provided under Proposition 10.

In 2008 and 2009, both the state and local First 5 commission provided funding to support the Healthy Families Program, which offers low cost health insurance to nearly 16,000 children ages 0 to 5 that come from low-income families.

Healthy Families Program

This program provides health coverage for uninsured children not eligible for Medi-Cal up to 250 percent of the Federal Poverty Level.

While the Healthy Families Program is administered at the state level by the Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board (MRMIB) county welfare departments may identify children eligible for Healthy Families as part of their responsibilities under Medi-Cal. Seriously emotionally disturbed children within the Healthy Families Program are referred to county mental health plans and CCS children are referred to county CCS programs.

Compendium of County Programs

This program is funded by the federal government (66%), while the rest of the state's share is funded by a combination of a provider tax and local First 5 Commission contributions in Fiscal Year 2009-10.

Medi-Cal

The Medi-Cal Program (referred to as Medicaid at the Federal level) provides health care for 6.5 million low-income individuals including members of families with children, seniors, persons with disabilities, those in foster care, pregnant women and people with specific diseases. Counties administer the Medi-Cal program for the State and Federal governments. County welfare departments are responsible for determining Medi-Cal eligibility for all those except the aged, blind and disabled recipients of SSI/SSP. Counties also oversee the enrollment and recertification process and disburse benefits.

Medi-Cal consists of several different programs within its purview. These include:

- Children's Programs – Income Disregard Program, 133% Program, 100% Program, Minor Consent Program.
- Pregnancy Related Programs – Income Disregard Program or Federal Poverty Level for Infants and Pregnant Women, Postpartum Program, and Presumptive Eligibility Program.
- Senior and Disabled Programs – Aged/Disabled Federal Poverty Level Program, Long-Term Care Program, 250% Working Disabled Program, Medicare Savings Program, and the In Home Support Services Program (see separate section).

A county has 45 days to determine a person's eligibility or 90 days if there is a need to determine whether a person meets the disability criteria. There is automatic enrollment for those receiving SSI or CalWORKs.

Medi-Cal is funded equally by the Federal and State governments.

Mental Health

California counties and the community agencies with which they contract provide services and supports to a target population of adults who have a serious mental illness and children with a severe emotional disorder in order to promote their recovery. Unlike adults with developmental disabilities, individuals with mental illness do not have an entitlement to services; mental health services are provided to the extent resources are available. Children who are eligible for Medi-Cal or have mental health services specified in their special education Individual Education Plan (IEP) have access to a broader array of services than those who are privately insured or indigent. There are six major sources of funding for community mental health.

Counties' Realignment (VLF and sales tax) funds provide services and supports to the target population, as does the Mental Health Services Act (1% income tax on millionaires). However, the MHSA specifies an emphasis on children, adults and older adults who are un-served, under-served, or inappropriately served (e.g., homeless, frequent users of hospitals, individuals with criminal justice history, etc.). Specialty Mental Health Medi-Cal Managed Care provides medically necessary services to adult Medi-Cal beneficiaries requiring specialty services to manage their serious mental illness. Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) is the children's services counterpart to Specialty Mental Health Medi-Cal Managed Care.

Compendium of County Programs

Under Mental Health Services for Special Education Pupils (AB 3632), county mental health departments are required by state law to serve all public special education students under age 22 determined by schools (through an IEP) who need mental health services to benefit from their federally-entitled free and appropriate public education (pursuant to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act). This program has been determined by the Commission on State Mandates to be a reimbursable mandate on counties.

The Healthy Families - Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) Benefit provides services to SED youth enrolled in the Healthy Families Program, to the extent resources are available.

Counties certify the public expenditure in order to draw down federal matching funds for Specialty Mental Health Medi-Cal Managed Care, EPSDT, and Healthy Families - SED Benefit.

Public Guardian-Conservator-Administrator

The Public Guardian provides mandated conservatorship and estate administration services as specified under state law. There are two types of conservatorship, Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) and probate, which can only be established by order of the superior court. As probate conservator, county Public Guardians are responsible for financial management, housing, medical care, placement and advocacy for their clients. As LPS conservator, county Public Conservators are responsible for directing the mental health treatment and placement of their clients.

The County Administrator is responsible for administering the estate of a county resident who dies without a will or family in California. Estate administration may include selling real or personal property, performing heir searches, and overseeing the distribution of the estate.

These functions are generally funded through the County General Fund, and some fees.

Public Health

Counties are required by law to preserve and protect the public's health. County public health departments are responsible for the control and prevention of communicable diseases. They accomplish this through epidemiologic surveillance, testing by public health laboratories and health promotion and prevention/education. Counties are also responsible for protecting the public during public health emergencies, including outbreaks of new communicable diseases, bioterrorist attacks and natural emergencies such as earthquakes.

In addition, counties administer a number of family health and other "categorical" programs on behalf of the state and federal governments, including the Adolescent Family Life Program, Black Infant Health Program, Comprehensive Perinatal Services Program, Fetal and Infant Mortality Review Program, and Perinatal Outreach and Education Program, Cancer Prevention and Detection and Tobacco Education Program.

Public health is funded by a combination of Health Realignment, County General Funds and state and federal "categorical" funding.

Public Hospitals

Since counties are the health care provider for the poor and indigent, some counties provide these services by operating public hospitals. There are 19 public hospitals in California that provide the poor

Compendium of County Programs

and indigent with health care services with nine urban counties operating their own hospitals. Under the existing Medi-Cal Waiver, nearly all of the county operated hospitals are funded primarily through county and federal funding. In 2005, the state stopped providing funding for inpatient services provided to Medi-Cal patients in these public hospitals. The public hospitals fund the non-federal share of the federal reimbursement they receive for the uninsured.

Public hospital systems provide care to more than 2.5 million Californians, operate more than half of the top-level trauma centers in the state, and deliver 10 million outpatient visits every year. They also provide one-third of the hospital care to Medi-Cal beneficiaries and almost half of the hospital care to the state's uninsured population.

Human Services

Adoption Assistance

As part of the Child Welfare Services counties are responsible for placing foster children into permanent homes through the Adoption Assistance Program.

This program provides children in foster care the security and stability of a permanent home through adoption. Counties are responsible for determining the child's special needs eligibility for participation in the program, and if approved counties are responsible for negotiating an adoption assistance agreement. Counties also conduct a reassessment of the child's needs and family's circumstances every two years. The amount of financial assistance given to the adoptive family is determined based upon the special needs of the child and circumstances of the family.

This program is funded through Foster Care Administration and the sharing ratio is Federal (50%) and State (35%) and County (15%). For nonfederal share of costs the sharing ratio is State (70%) and County (30%). For assistance the sharing ratios are Federal (50%), State (37.5%) and County (12.5%). For nonfederal share of costs the sharing ratio is State (75%) and County (25%).

Adult Protective Services

Each county is required to have an Adult Protective Service Program to respond to reports of elder abuse or neglect on a 24/7 basis. This is a state-mandated program which requires counties to investigate situations involving elderly and dependent adults who are reported to be in danger due to abuse, neglect, exploitation, or hazardous or unsafe living conditions. County staff evaluates abuse cases and arranges for services such as counseling, out-of home placement or conservatorship.

Counties are not specifically required to have separate agencies to do this (although many do), nor are they required to investigate every report of abuse or neglect.

This program is funded by the state. In 2006, there were 110,000 reported cases of elder abuse statewide.

Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI)

CAPI is funded by the state and provides monthly cash benefits to children and adults with disabilities under the SSI Program or seniors aged 65 or older who are ineligible for SSI/SSP benefits because of their immigration status. Counties are responsible for the administration of this program including enrollment and processing of applications.

Compendium of County Programs

This program was created in 1998 in conjunction with the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) to care for the elderly, blind and disabled immigrants who no longer qualified for SSI/SSP and because of changes that were made as part of welfare reform.

As of 2009, this statewide program has served approximately 12,000 immigrants.

California Food Assistance Program (CFAP)

This is a state-funded program which provides cash assistance for legal immigrants to buy food.

This program was created in 1998 in conjunction with the CAPI Program to care for the elderly, blind and disabled immigrants who no longer qualified for SSI/SSP and because of recent changes that were made as part of welfare reform.

As of 2009, this statewide program has served approximately 22,000 legal immigrants.

CalWORKs

This program provides monthly cash assistance to eligible families, and to low-income children whose parents are not able to provide basic necessities for them. CalWORKs requires parents to participate in welfare-to-work activities including training, education and other services designed to help families get back into the workforce.

The amount of a family's monthly assistance payment depends on several factors, including the number of people within the family who are eligible and the special needs of any of those family members. The income of the family is considered in calculating the amount of cash aid the family receives.

Counties are responsible for processing applications, interviewing candidates to verify eligibility, and conducting fingerprinting, among other requirements of the program. If the County determines that the applicants are eligible for CalWORKs, the family will receive monthly checks from the county welfare department until determined ineligible or they reach their statutory time limit.

CalWORKs also includes a Homeless Assistance program which provides temporary aid to shelter families for a limited number of days and one-time payments to help families retain or regain permanent housing.

CalWORKs provides temporary income support, employment services, and child care to more than 525,000 low-income California families each month. CalWORKs is funded by state, federal and local funds with counties responsible for 30% of the non-federal share for the administration portion of CalWORKs. For CalWORKs grants, counties share in 5% of the nonfederal costs, and the rest of the costs are covered by the TANF/MOE between the state and federal government which can vary from year to year.

Child Welfare

All counties are required to respond on a 24-hour basis to investigate any report of child abuse or child neglect. Counties are responsible for investigating the report of abuse, assessing the risk to the children, and taking action if necessary to protect the children from harm.

Compendium of County Programs

County social workers may also link the family to services that may include therapy, drug treatment and domestic violence counseling. As part of this process, the courts could order the children to be removed from the home and placed in foster care.

This program is funded through sharing ratios by the Federal (50%), State (35%) and County (15%) governments.

Food Stamps

Counties operate the Food Stamp Program (now named the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP) on behalf of the federal government. This is a supplemental nutrition program for families and individuals that meet certain income and asset guidelines. Food stamp benefits help supplement an individual's food budget and allow families to buy nutritious food.

Counties are responsible for determining eligibility, enrolling individuals in the program and providing the cash assistance. Eligibility for food stamps depends on household size, assets (in certain circumstances), income and certain living expenses.

Food Stamp Administration is funded by the Federal (50%), State (35%) and County (15%) governments. The benefit portion of this program is fully federally funded.

Foster Care

Counties are responsible for assessing children at risk and placing them (see Child Welfare) in a foster home or with other family members if the situation warrants. Counties recruit individuals and families that are interested in providing foster family homes, processing applications for foster homes, providing training and support for foster parents, completing annual on-site visits and investigating complaints.

In San Diego County, for example, there are 1,500 licensed family foster homes.

This program is funded through sharing ratios as follows: For Eligibility Placement activities the ratios are Federal (50%), State (35%), and County (15%). For assistance the ratios are Federal (50%), State (20%) and County (30%). For nonfederal costs on assistance the sharing ratio is State (40%) and County (60%).

General Assistance

This is a state-mandated program funded entirely by counties. State law (Welfare and Institutions Code Section 17000) requires counties to provide basic health care for low-income uninsured residents who have no other source of care. Assistance is provided to childless single adults and couples who are not eligible for state or federal cash aid. Some counties provide cash assistance and some combine cash assistance with vouchers for basic needs such as housing.

In-Home Support Services (IHSS)

The IHSS Program is an alternative to out-of-home care and helps to pay for services so that the elderly, blind, or disabled residents can remain safely in their own home. The types of services authorized

Compendium of County Programs

through IHSS are housecleaning, meal preparation, laundry, grocery shopping, personal care services, accompaniment to medical appointments, and protective supervision for the mentally impaired.

Counties are responsible for enrolling beneficiaries and providers into the IHSS program, monitoring their timesheets, providing training and education to the enrollees as well as other administrative functions.

IHSS sharing ratios as follows: For administration, Federal (50%), State (35%) and County (15%). For assistance the ratios are Federal (50%), State (32.5%) and County (17.5%). For nonfederal costs in assistance the sharing ratio is State (65%) and County (35%).

Public Safety

Child Support Services

Counties operate the Child Support Services Program and work with parents and guardians to ensure children and families receive court-ordered financial and medical support. Child support services are available to the general public through a network of 52 county and regional child support agencies (LCSAs).

The Child Support Services Program is responsible for the following duties:

- **Locating Parents:** To obtain or enforce a child support order, the LCSA must locate the non-custodial parent. Custodial parents can help the LCSA by providing any information they may have about the non-custodial parent's whereabouts, income and assets.
- **Establishing Paternity:** Paternity in the child support program means fatherhood. The child's paternity must be established prior to a court ordering child support and medical support. Genetic testing is generally accepted as proof of fatherhood, and is available through local child support agencies in California, at no cost to the participants.
- **Establishing a Child Support Order:** Child support helps to ensure that both parents share the financial responsibility for their children. The amount of a child support order results from a mathematical calculation specified in the statute that takes into consideration several factors, including the parents' incomes, childcare and visitation.
- **Enforcing Child Support Orders:** The California child support program has an array of tools and services designed to make the collection of child support efficient and effective including wage assignments, real estate property liens, income tax intercepts, passport denial, license suspension and criminal prosecution.
- **Collecting and Disbursing Child Support:** Unless the court approves a different payment method, child support payments must be withheld from a non-custodial parent's paycheck.

These programs are funded in large part by federal funds and also receive State General Fund. In 2007-08, this program received \$514.2 million in federal funding and \$225 million in State General Fund.

Coroner

The Coroner, in those counties where the Sheriff doesn't assume both roles, is responsible for inquiring into and determining the circumstance, manner, and cause of all violent, sudden, or unusual deaths.

Compendium of County Programs

Some counties have independently elected Coroners and others have appointed Coroners, or Medical Examiners who perform the duties of the Coroner.

The Coroner's Office typically has three functional operations:

- Medical: Responsible for conducting autopsies to determine cause of death in those cases which fall within its jurisdiction; transport and remove bodies, verify cause of death and sign death certificates, and appear at all unattended deaths unless the deceased has been seen by a physician within a specified period of time.
- Administrative: Required to respond to inquiries by law enforcement agencies, doctors, and others with potential cases and provide proper custody and security of valuables.
- Investigative: Required to conduct investigations to determine causes of death and/or to establish identity of deceased.

The Coroner's responsibilities are funded by the County General Fund.

In 2008, the Riverside County Coroner's office handled approximately 9,000 cases.

District Attorney

The District Attorney (DA) is a constitutionally elected county official who is responsible for the prosecution of criminal violations of state law and county ordinances occurring within a county. This includes investigation and apprehension, as well as prosecution in court. The District Attorney serves as legal advisor to the Grand Jury and, through its family support division, and enforces parental financial obligations.

Most District Attorneys have the following responsibilities:

- Presents all felony cases in Superior Court, including legal motions, writs, and appeals, extraditions, and Grand Jury matters.
- Provides initial investigation and assistance in trial preparation through the investigation of criminal acts.

District Attorneys are funded through the County General Fund, Proposition 172 funds in some cases, and in some cases fees.

Probation

County probation departments are charged with supervising individuals on probation, which includes adult and juvenile probation. Probation officer's primary function is to make contact with probationers in the community and at their homes and ensure that probationers comply with the terms of their probation. This can include community service, paying restitution, and attending counseling programs.

County probation departments make recommendations to judges on placements and sentencing of juveniles, supervise these offenders in the community, provide rehabilitation and training services to probationers, and operate juvenile halls and county ranches and camps.

Probation officers conduct investigations and prepare reports upon referral by the Court. Referrals cover, but are not limited to, pre- and post-sentence investigations and recommendations, pre-plea

Compendium of County Programs

recommendations, violations of probation, eligibility for drug diversion, credit for time served, reduction of previously entered pleas, early termination from probation, and restitution.

Probation services are generally funded through a mix of sources such as County General Fund, subventions (e.g. Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act), Proposition 172, and federal funds.

Public Defender

The Public Defender's Office is responsible for providing legal defense (at all stages of the proceedings) for any person who is not financially able to employ counsel and who is charged with any contempt or offense triable in the superior court. The Public Defender, appointed by the Board of Supervisors, carries out the office responsibilities with the assistance of deputy counsels and other support staff.

- Directs deputies' representation of defendants who are unable to employ counsel in felony trials, misdemeanor trials, and preliminary hearings; minors whose parents are unwilling or financially unable to obtain counsel in juvenile court proceedings; and persons who are unable to employ counsel in psychiatric court proceedings which may result in incarceration or detention.
- Assists the courts in obtaining reimbursement from defendants, and from parents or guardians of minors represented, for all or a portion of the Public Defender's cost of counsel.
- Directs the defense of persons unable to employ counsel in any civil litigation, if in the judgment of the Public Defender, the person is being persecuted or unjustly harassed.
- Directs field investigations to locate witnesses and obtain information for legal staff.
- Directs the appeal of those cases in which an appeal might reasonably be expected to result in a reversal or modification of the original judgment.

Conflicts defense panels operate in counties and their purpose is to provide representation where a conflict exists within the public defender's office.

The Public Defender's office is funded by the County General Fund and some fees.

Sheriff

The Sheriff has three primary duties: keep the peace, attend the courts, and operate the county jail. All 58 counties in California have a Sheriff's Department and 41 of those counties also provide for the Sheriff to assume the duties of the Coroner (See Coroner). The Sheriff is a constitutionally elected official.

The Sheriff's Department typically has six functional operations: Patrol, detention which includes the operation of the county jail and work camps, handling the receipt and serving of civil papers, providing inmate transportation and bailiff duties in the court, courthouse security, and maintaining records.

The Sheriff's Department is funded through County General Fund and in some cases federal funds. Sheriff's Departments also get some state subventions (Citizen's Option for Public Safety) and Proposition 172 funds.

Compendium of County Programs

Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (Proposition 36)

The Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act passed in 2000, and requires that individuals convicted of a nonviolent drug possession offense receive drug treatment in the community rather than prison or jail. These programs are operated by counties and most of the funding associated with Proposition 36 is used for treatment programs and prevention.

The Proposition required that in 2001, \$120 million in state funds be set aside each year through 2005-06. Funds are allocated to counties based on a formula. Since these funds were only required through 2005-06, this program is now entirely funded by the state General Fund or county funds.

By July 2006, over 150,000 people benefited from Prop 36 treatment and California taxpayers saved about \$1.3 billion in estimated avoided costs.

In Los Angeles County during 2004-05, a total of 9,026 new defendants were either convicted and sentenced by the Court or ordered by Parole to participate in Proposition 36. Of these defendants, the Community Assessment Services Centers (CASCs) provided assessment and treatment referral services to 7,687 participants. Of those new participants assessed by CASCs, 6,334 participants reported to a community-based treatment provider as instructed. At any given time, approximately 5,000 participants are receiving treatment services in Los Angeles County.

Compendium of County Programs

Sources:

Alameda County Website, Library Program
California Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems Fact Sheet, February 2009
California Children's Services Family Handbook, June 2008
California Children's Services (CCS): Program Overview, County Health Executives Association of California, January 2009
California Department of Social Services Website
California Library Association, Talking Points 2009
California Local Streets and Roads Assessment, 10/20/2009
California Planning Guide: An Introduction to Planning in California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, December 2005
California Proposition 36 Website
California Redevelopment Association Fact Sheet, 2009
California State Association of Counties Website, County Department Information
California Welfare Director's Association Website
Department of Child Support Services 2008 Annual Report
First Five California Annual Report 2007/08
Human Services in a Time of Economic Crisis, CWDA and CSAC, April 2009
Los Angeles County Annual Report on the Substance Abuse and Prevention Act, 2004-05
Realignment for Social Services Dummies, California State Association of Counties, 2004
Riverside County Website
San Diego County Website
Senate Local Government Committee Briefing Paper on Redevelopment: "Winding Down: Preparing for the End of Older Redevelopment Projects", February 20, 2008
The Crucial Role of Counties in the Health of Californians: An Overview, July 2004, California HealthCare Foundation
The Guide to Medi-Cal Programs, Third Edition 2006, California Healthcare Foundation
Transportation California Website


Compendium of County Programs

Index:

Administration, Page 1
Adoptions Assistance, Page 11
Adult Protective Services, Page 11
Agricultural Commissioner, Page 1
Alcohol and Drug Treatment, Page 7, 13
Animal Control, Page 1
Assessor, Page 1
Auditor-Controller, Page 2
CalWORKs, Pages 9, 12
California Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI), Pages 11- 12
California Children Services (CCS), Pages 7-8, 9
California Children and Families Commission (First Five), Page 8
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Pages 3-4
California Food Assistance Program, Page 12
Child Care, Page 12
Child Support Services, Page 14
Child Welfare, Pages 12-13
Conflicts Defense Panel, Page 16
Conservator, 10
Coroner, Pages 14-15, 16
County Clerk/Recorder, Pages 2-3
County Counsel, Page 1
District Attorney, Page 15
Elections, Pages 2- 3
Emergency Services, Page 3
Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT), Pages 9- 10
Food Stamps, Page 13
Foster Care, Pages 11, 13
Gas Tax, Page 5
General Assistance, Page 13
General Plan, Pages 3-4
Healthy Families, Pages 8-9, 10
Homeless Assistance, Page 12
Housing Element, Page 3
IHSS, Pages 13- 14
Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, Page 16
Landfill, Page 6
Land Use, Pages 3-4
Lanterman-Petris-Short, Page 10
Libraries, Page 4
Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board (MRMIB), Page 8
Medi-Cal, Pages 7, 9, 10, 11
Medical Examiner, Page 15
Medical Therapy Program, Page 7
Mental Health, Pages 9, 10
Mental Health Services Act (MHSA), Page 9

Compendium of County Programs

Parks and Recreation, Page 4
Permits, Page 3
Pest detection, Page 1
Planning, Pages 3-4
Probation, Pages 15-16
Property Tax Administration, Page 2
Proposition 1B, Page 5
Proposition 8, Page 2
Proposition 10, Page 8
Proposition 36, Pages 7, 17
Proposition 42, Page 5
Proposition 172, Page 16
Public Defender, Page 16
Public Guardian, Page 10
Public Health, Page 10
Public Hospitals, Pages 10-11
Public Safety, Page 14
Public Works, Page 4
Recycling, Page 6
Redevelopment, Page 5
SAFETEA-LU, Page 5
Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Benefit, Page 10
Sheriff, Page 16
Sidewalk repair, Page 5
Special Education, Pages 7, 9
SSI/SSP, Pages 9, 12
Street Sweeping, Page 5
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Page 13
Tax Collector, Pages 5-6
Transit, Page 4, 5
Transportation, Page 5
Treasurer, Pages 5- 6
Tree Trimming, Page 5
Waste Management, Page 6
Water, Page 4
Weights and Measures, Pages 1, 6
Zoning, Page 3



UCC State Budget Education Project:
Enabling County Governments

Prepared by:

Chang & Adams Consulting

January 21, 2010

The current situation

- The state's counties are facing severe challenges. These include reductions in property tax revenue stemming from the collapse of the state's housing market, decreases in taxable sales from the difficult economic environment, and increases in the costs of maintaining the basic services that county residents expect.
- Because counties also provide critical services on behalf of the state and federal governments, counties are significantly impacted by state and federal funding decisions. Consequently, the dire fiscal position of state government in recent years has necessitated large spending cuts to programs in health, human services, corrections, and education. In fact, the State budget for FY 2009-10 contains General Fund and special fund spending levels that are 15 percent lower than spending levels from just two years ago.*
- Counties have already contributed much to help the state out of its many budget crises, including:
 - Engaging in "realignment," in which many state programs were transferred to the county level;
 - Acquiescing to the suspension of Proposition 1A (2004), where the state borrowed \$1.9 billion from local governments during the 2009 Budget Revision; and
 - Weathering the \$1 billion human services funding deficit.
- As the state budget outlook for FY 2010-11 continues to worsen, steps must be taken to protect counties, particularly urban counties, from additional state budget cuts. The 12 urban counties represented by the Urban Counties Caucus (UCC) contain over three-quarters of California's population and experience the majority of the state's caseloads in the health, human services, and corrections areas. Legislators need to be made aware of the burden that state budget cuts have placed on California counties in recent years.
- Chang & Adams consulting has been retained to provide an independent estimation of the magnitude of the burden placed on counties in California, particularly urban counties, from State budget cuts. Specifically, we have been asked to answer the following questions:
 - Over the past five years, how have State budget cuts impacted counties for six major state programs in the areas of health and human services, transportation, and corrections? The programs include Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, Child Welfare, In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), Proposition 42 (county transportation), and Proposition 36 (substance abuse treatment).
 - How have county caseload and workload increased for these six programs over the past five years?
 - How much have the responsibilities for these programs been shifted to the counties over time?


*Legislative Analyst's Office, *The Budget Package: 2009-10 California Spending Plan*, October, 2009.

Findings

- The Urban Counties Caucus (UCC) surveyed the urban California counties regarding trends in funding contributions for Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Proposition 36, and Proposition 42.
- Based on data from eleven of the counties – Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange County, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura – we found that the six major programs account for over \$10.6 billion in county spending annually.
- Over the past 6 fiscal years (FY 2004-05 to FY 2009-10), federal and state support for the six programs has steadily decreased while the counties' support has increased. Since FY 2004-05, the counties' support for these programs grew from 12.2 percent to 14.1 percent – a 15.6 percent increase in relative support.
- The shift in responsibility for the six programs has placed a substantial (and still growing) burden on counties. The counties' financial contributions are increasing by about 5.7 percent every year, compared with only a 3.0 percent annual growth in federal and state contributions. In other words, the burden on local governments has grown at twice the rate of that for the federal and state governments.
- The 3.0 percent growth in federal/state program support is anemic when compared against a handful of California socio-economic indicators such as inflation and the rate of economic growth in California.
- The decline in federal/state support for social service programs generally has meant an erosion in the real level of benefits over time for program recipients. Total contributions (federal/state and county) per caseload declined in real terms since FY 2004-05 for every program except Child Welfare.
- The Child Welfare Program is a particular area where the federal and state governments could take a larger role to help counties. Child Welfare is a sizable program, totaling over \$3.3 billion in FY 2009-10, and over the last six years county funding responsibility has gone from 14.4 percent to 22.1 percent.
- The federal and state governments can also help the counties with respect to transportation by taking on a larger and more stable share of responsibility. California counties have experienced an annual transportation-funding deficit averaging \$135 million during the past six years.

Six major health and human services, transportation, and corrections programs account for over \$10.6 billion in county spending annually

FY 2009-10 Projected Expenditures⁽¹⁾



SOURCE:


(1) SOURCE: Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

Key Observations

- Of these six programs, two health and human services programs account for nearly two-thirds of spending: CalWORKs and Child Welfare.
- Proposition 42 (transportation) and Proposition 36 (substance abuse treatment) spending represents 5 percent of the total.
- These programs are all funded by a combination of state/federal and local funding.

Federal and state support for the six programs have steadily decreased over time while county responsibilities have increased

Federal/State and County Program Burdens⁽¹⁾



SOURCE:


(1) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09. Programs include CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Medi-Cal, Proposition 36 and Proposition 42.

Key Observations

- In FY 2004-05, federal and state contributions supported 87.8 percent of the programs. Counties were responsible for about 12.2 percent of program support.
- The county share of support has steadily increased each year until the present. For FY 2009-10, the level of support is 14.1 percent. By contrast, the federal/state share is now down to 85.9 percent.
- Although the current county share (14.1 percent) still seems small in absolute terms, the relative burden on counties has increased by about 15.6 percent since FY 04-05.

The burden for local governments has grown at twice the rate of that for the Federal and State governments

Federal/State and County Program Burdens⁽¹⁾



SOURCE:


(1) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09. Programs include CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Medi-Cal, Proposition 36 and Proposition 42.

Key Observations

- Since FY 2004-05, federal and state support for the six programs has increased from \$7.6 billion annually to \$9.1 billion. This increase reflects a Compounded Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) of federal/state support of 2.8 percent.
- By contrast, county support has gone from \$1.0 billion annually to \$1.5 billion over the same time period. This increase represents a much higher county CAGR of 5.7 percent.

The growth in federal/state support for the six programs is anemic when compared against a handful of California socio-economic indicators

California Socio-Economic Indicators (2004-05=100%)



SOURCES:


- (1) California Department of Finance
- (2) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09. Programs include CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Medi-Cal, Proposition 36 and Proposition 42.
- (3) Chang & Adams Consulting GSP estimates for 2007-2010 based on latest Department of Finance data

Key Observations

- The 3.0 percent Compounded Annual Growth Rate of federal/state program support translates to an increase in funding of 19 percent since FY 2004-05.
- The growth in federal/state support is favorable relative to the growth in California population (6 percent) over the FY 2004-05 to FY 2009-10 timeframe. But it only tracks the growth in Gross State Product (16 percent) or the growth in inflation (17 percent).
- At the same time, the level of county spending on these programs has increased by 40 percent over the past 6 years.

The decline in federal/state support for the social service programs generally has caused the real level of benefits to decrease or remain flat

Total Funding per Caseload (in 2009 Dollars)⁽¹⁾




SOURCE: (1) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09. Programs include CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Medi-Cal, Proposition 36 and Proposition 42.

Key Observations

- Adjusting for inflation, the total contributions (federal/state and county) per caseload has decreased for four of the programs over the last six years. Thus the real level of benefits has decreased over time.
- Between FY 2004-05 and FY 2009-10, CalWORKs contributions dropped from \$7,496 to \$6,271 per caseload, Medi-Cal went from \$910 to \$892 per caseload, IHSS declined from \$3,074 to \$2,882 per caseload, and Proposition 36 dropped from \$2,134 to \$1,330 per caseload in 2009 dollars.
- Only Child Welfare shows a significant increase in total contributions between FY 2004-05 and FY 2009-10. Per caseload funding increased from \$13,845 to \$16,875, while accounting for inflation.

The Child Welfare Program is a particular area where the federal and state governments could take a larger role to help counties

County Level of Program Support⁽¹⁾




SOURCE: (1) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09. Programs include CalWORKs, Child Welfare, IHSS, Medi-Cal, Proposition 36 and Proposition 42.

Key Observations

- County support for CalWORKs and Medi-Cal is relatively small and stable over time.
- The burden of Proposition 36 on counties began small, gradually increasing to 3.0 percent by FY 2008-09. While it spiked to 12.4 percent the following year because of a significant drop in state support, the program size is still very small.
- County support for IHSS has fluctuated somewhat over time, although the share has decreased from 21.1 percent in FY 2004-05 to 17.8 percent in FY 2009-10.
- The program whose relative burden on the counties has steadily increased over time is Child Welfare. County responsibility has gone from 14.4 percent in FY 2004-05 to 22.1 percent in FY 2009-10 – a 54 percent increase. Moreover, it is a large program, totaling over \$3.3 billion in spending.

The federal and state governments can also help the counties with respect to transportation by taking on a larger and more stable share of responsibility

Federal/State and County Proposition 42 Burdens⁽¹⁾



SOURCE: (1) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Mateo, San Diego, Santa Clara and Ventura.

Key Observations

- The transportation workload for counties has grown from \$432 million in FY 2004-05 to \$621 million in FY 2009-10. This translates to a CAGR of 6.2 percent over the six years.
- Total federal/state and county funding have been insufficient to meet transportation workload. Counties have experienced an annual transportation-funding deficit averaging \$135 million during the past six years.
- Although county contributions have grown from \$284 million to \$326 million – a CAGR of 2.3 percent – federal/state contributions have been erratic.
- This primarily reflects the fact that the California Legislature has occasionally withheld transportation-related appropriations or loaned itself transportation funding to help balance the state budget.

Appendix

- Local Contributions Among Urban Counties
- Federal & State Contributions Among Urban Counties
- Caseload Among Urban Counties

Local Contributions Among Eleven Urban Counties⁽¹⁾

	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10
CalWORKs	\$91,157,889	\$101,600,616	\$86,093,861	\$106,641,908	\$94,253,954	\$82,516,934
Child Welfare	\$406,950,271	\$516,155,995	\$549,513,232	\$584,268,279	\$685,266,542	\$722,582,215
IHSS	\$236,742,585	\$224,396,731	\$289,562,583	\$294,613,038	\$316,807,804	\$298,016,927
Medi-Cal	\$43,905,670	\$59,115,455	\$53,600,349	\$58,863,512	\$48,938,673	\$53,417,969
Proposition 36	\$200,000	\$400,000	\$1,496,213	\$1,536,182	\$2,035,570	\$3,969,572
Proposition 42	\$284,298,967	\$279,010,084	\$303,016,642	\$316,382,222	\$290,099,252	\$326,000,000
Total	\$1,038,986,583	\$1,156,414,712	\$1,252,398,913	\$1,323,587,215	\$1,391,679,743	\$1,440,109,549

SOURCE: (1) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

Federal & State Contributions Among Eleven Urban Counties⁽¹⁾

	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10
CalWORKs	\$3,000,247,288	\$2,988,973,324	\$2,948,530,400	\$3,068,059,654	\$3,218,909,901	\$3,336,321,224
Child Welfare	\$2,410,430,670	\$2,448,793,806	\$2,517,625,914	\$2,546,261,742	\$2,513,665,152	\$2,535,315,209
IHSS	\$882,746,354	\$962,315,071	\$1,045,702,740	\$1,209,113,713	\$1,306,804,554	\$1,378,638,443
Medi-Cal	\$1,228,815,673	\$1,321,710,510	\$1,404,853,829	\$1,567,524,771	\$1,619,054,619	\$1,634,729,290
Proposition 36	\$72,305,637	\$75,247,084	\$90,097,075	\$77,385,534	\$65,109,970	\$27,924,272
Proposition 42	\$24,243,005	\$79,412,911	\$125,109,818	\$18,704,936	\$164,844,091	\$159,268,132
Total	\$7,509,433,671	\$7,768,076,126	\$7,992,457,615	\$8,326,696,329	\$8,700,587,329	\$8,885,072,596

SOURCE: (1) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Ventura. For Orange County, San Bernardino and Sacramento, IHSS figures do not include funding for services; for Santa Clara, IHSS data for FY 04-05 is assumed to be that for FY 05-06, and for FY 09-10 is assumed to be that for FY 08-09.

Caseloads Among Eleven Urban Counties⁽¹⁾

	FY 04-05	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 09-10
CalWORKs	463,042	462,857	422,506	428,991	490,902	545,150
Child Welfare	237,200	241,401	234,699	224,297	204,749	193,066
IHSS	424,450	441,672	462,277	501,085	541,879	581,857
Medi-Cal	1,397,867	1,511,727	1,655,977	1,762,032	1,843,319	1,891,903
Proposition 36	39,610	40,643	39,980	37,704	35,434	23,976
Proposition 42	\$432,246,370	\$489,882,104	\$562,382,116	\$575,563,605	\$584,438,465	\$621,355,423
Total	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

SOURCE: (1) Urban Counties Caucus Survey 2009. Counties in survey include Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Mateo, San Diego, Santa Clara and Ventura.