



COUNTY OF YOLO

Board of Supervisors

District 1, **Michael H. McGowan**
District 2, **Don Saylor**
District 3, **Matt Rexroad**
District 4, **Jim Provenza**
District 5, **Duane Chamberlain**

625 Court Street, Room 204 • Woodland, CA 95695
(530) 666-8195 • FAX (530) 666-8193
www.yolocounty.org

County Administrator, **Patrick S. Blacklock**
Deputy Clerk of the Board, **Julie Dachtler**

2012 State Legislative and Agency Priorities Amended March 13, 2012

LEGISLATIVE

#1: Advocate for partial forgiveness and repayment plan for mental health audit liabilities. Yolo County has current projected liabilities of \$2.14 million for retroactively denied claims to the state Department of Mental Health for local mental health services. The state intends to offset a significant amount of this amount in the 2011-12 fiscal year. The Yolo County Alcohol, Drug and Mental Health Department has made significant strides to improve its billing process, but costly settlements to resolve past billing discrepancies could undermine these improvements. In addition, the state's audits of Yolo County claims have routinely take place five or more years after the audit year, therefore making it extremely difficult for the County to quickly correct billing errors. The County will advocate for a solution to this issue, as well as legislation or budget language to encourage the state to complete audits more quickly.

#2: Ensure adequate funding for Yolo County's implementation of AB 109 programs. Assembly Bill 109 provided one year of funding for realigned criminal justice programs. Yolo County supports maintaining this level of funding for three fiscal years, the allotted time for ramp up of AB 109 implementation. Yolo County also supports increasing the amount allocated to Yolo County and other counties as necessary to fully fund the services counties now provide. Any growth in the sales tax revenue dedicated to AB 109 implementation should be allocated to counties based on performance outcomes and should consider existing fiscal inequities among counties. Counties should have maximum flexibility to manage this funding.

#3: Support efforts to secure constitutional protections for realignment funding. The County supports efforts to ensure that local governments have a secure revenue stream to support realigned services.

#4: Pursue legislation or budget legislation to property tax inequity as opportunities arise. Yolo County has one of the lowest allocations of property in the state, yet is required to provide the same mandated services as other counties. Yolo County receives 8.7 cents of every property tax dollar, while counties on average receive 17 cents. When the City of West Sacramento incorporated, all of the sales tax and most of the property tax revenues were transferred to the city. When the state calculated the Education Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF), an error in the base year used to determine shift amounts included West Sacramento's

property tax in Yolo County's shift amount (new cities were exempt from ERAF shifts). Yolo County seeks to fix this error, or otherwise make up the property tax revenue difference.

#5: Support legislation sponsored by the California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association to extend or eliminate the sunset date for weights and measures device registration fees and adjust fees to fully cover local costs. The state law allowing the Board of Supervisors to charge annual registration fees to cover the County's cost of inspecting and testing weights and measures devices as required by state law expires on January 1, 2013. The County will support legislation sponsored by the Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association to extend or eliminate the sunset date of this provision and adjust fees to ensure that they fully cover the County's costs.

#6: Support legislation by the California Assessors Association to improve efficiency by shifting administrative responsibility for property tax assessments for watercraft to the State. The California Assessor's Association may pursue legislation to realign responsibility for the watercraft property tax assessment from county assessors to the state Department of Motor Vehicles. The County will support legislative efforts to realign program responsibilities where appropriate.

STATE AGENCIES

#1: Oppose widening the Fremont Weir and Yolo Bypass, especially in the absence of state outreach and public engagement in Yolo County. The public draft of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) proposes studying flood system capacity enhancement projects, including the widening of the Fremont Weir and setback of Yolo Bypass and Sacramento Bypass levees in unincorporated Yolo County. The proposed project, which was included in the administrative and public drafts of the CVFPP without significant coordination with the County of Yolo, could increase flood flows through the Yolo Bypass by up to 40,000 cubic feet per second. The County opposes the widening of the weir and setback of bypass levees, especially without substantial public outreach to Yolo County constituents, elected officials, and stakeholders.

#2: Support funding to provide a reliable water supply and adequate wastewater treatment in the cities of Woodland and Davis. The County supports funding to defray the cost to ratepayers of constructing facilities and implementing programs necessary to provide a reliable water supply and adequate wastewater treatment in the two cities.

#3: Support funding for the Woodland-Davis Water Supply Project. The Woodland-Davis Water Supply project is an estimated \$337 million project to build the necessary facilities to divert, treat and transport surface water to the communities of Woodland and Davis. The Woodland-Davis Clean Water Agency is pursuing funding to construct a \$40 million joint intake facility in collaboration with Reclamation District 2035 and to build a \$270 million regional water treatment facility and associated pipelines. The County supports funding to defray the cost to ratepayers of constructing these facilities.

#4: Advocate for cost-effective stormwater runoff regulations as State Water Resources Control Board re-drafts the statewide small municipal separate storm sewer system general permit and the statewide industrial general permit. The County will continue to participate in a statewide coalition of local governments and other stakeholders advocating for cost-effective stormwater runoff regulations that focus on improvements to water quality rather than expensive reporting and administrative tasks. The coalition is also coordinating with businesses and municipalities affected by the industrial general permit. Transportation and drainage facilities owned by Yolo County are affected by the small municipal separate storm sewer system, while the Yolo County landfill comes under the jurisdiction of the industrial general permit.

#5: Oppose unsubstantiated regulatory fee increases on landfill operations, including fees from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board and CalRecycle. Cuts in other funding sources for state regulatory bodies have resulted in substantial increases in regulatory fees charged or proposed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and CalRecycle. The County will oppose unsubstantiated administrative fee increases and advocate for fees that take into account the unique qualities of the Yolo County landfill.

#6: Advocate for a more efficient process for approval of Indirect Cost Rate Plans by the California Department of Transportation. Delays in approving the County's indirect costs for federal-aid transportation projects have resulted in delayed reimbursements of approximately \$400,000 in transportation funds to Yolo County. The County will advocate for a streamlined approach that will reduce processing time. This action may also require advocacy at the federal level.

#7: Ensure landfill post-closure regulations require deposits that are consistent with closure needs in Yolo County. If the formula applied to the current post-closure liability fee is altered slightly, the county could use a substantial amount of money sitting in the endowment fund. It appears that the methodology currently applied by the state does not recognize some of the more cutting edge processes currently underway at the county's landfill (i.e., bio-reactor, possible re-mining of older cells etc.), so the County may be paying more to the endowment fund than necessary.