CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Thursday, August 7, 2008
10:00am - 1:30pm
CSAC Conference Center, Sacramento

AGENDA

Presiding: Richard Gordon, President

10:00am	PROCEDURAL ITEMS	
1.	Roll Call	Page 1
2.	Approval of Minutes from April 10, 2008 Meeting and May 15, 2008 Conference Call	Page 2
10:10am	ACTION ITEMS	
3.	Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Committee Report ➢ Draft Policy on State Water Proposals ➢ Proposition 7: Solar and Clean Energy Act of 2008 ➢ Proposition 10: California Alternative Fuels Initiative ▪ *Supervisor Mike Nelson, Policy Committee Chair* ▪ *Karen Keene, CSAC staff*	Page 8
4.	Administration of Justice and Health and Human Services Joint Policy Committee Report ➢ Proposition 5: Nonviolent Offender Rehabilitation Act of 2008 ➢ Proposition 6: Safe Neighborhoods Act ➢ Proposition 9: Victims' Rights Act of 2008 ▪ *Elizabeth Howard & Kelly Brooks, CSAC staff*	Page 16
5.	Consideration of CSAC Regulatory Proposals ▪ *Jim Wiltshire, CSAC staff*	Page 23
12:00pm	LUNCH	
12:45pm	INFORMATION ITEMS	
6.	CSAC PAC Task Force Report ▪ *Supervisor Gary Wyatt, Task Force Chair*	Page 26
7.	State Budget/Legislative Update ▪ *Jim Wiltshire*	
8.	CSAC Finance Corporation Update ▪ *Supervisor Joni Gray, Finance Corp. Board Member* ▪ *Tom Sweet, Finance Corp. Executive Director*	Page 28
9.	CSAC Corporate Associates Program Update ▪ *Paul McIntosh, CSAC Executive Director*	Page 29
10.	Compensation Analysis Update ▪ *Paul McIntosh*	Page 30
11.	Other Items	
1:30pm	ADJOURN	

ROSTER

California State Association of Counties
Executive Committee
2008

President:	Richard Gordon, San Mateo
1st Vice President:	Gary Wyatt, Imperial
2nd Vice President:	Michael Delbar, Mendocino
Immed. Past President:	Frank Bigelow, Madera

Urban Section
Federal Glover, Contra Costa
Don Knabe, Los Angeles
John Tavaglione, Riverside
Roger Dickinson, Sacramento
Paul Biane, San Bernardino
Kathy Long, Ventura
Liz Kniss, Santa Clara (alternate)

Suburban Section
Susan Adams, Marin
Mike Nelson, Merced
Joni Gray, Santa Barbara
Mike McGowan, Yolo (alternate)

Rural Section
Terry Woodrow, Alpine
Jeff Morris, Trinity
Tony Oliveira, Kings (alternate)

Ex-Officio Members
Valerie Brown, Sonoma, NACo 1st Vice President
Brian Dahle, Lassen, WIR 1st Vice President

Advisors
Demitrios Tatum, Merced County Executive Officer
Robert Ryan, Sacramento County Counsel

MINUTES OF APRIL 10 & MAY 15, 2008

CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

April 10, 2008
Le Merigot Hotel, Santa Monica, CA

MINUTES

Presiding: Richard Gordon, President

1. ROLL CALL

Richard Gordon, President
Gary Wyatt, 1st Vice President
Michael Delbar, 2nd Vice President
Frank Bigelow, Immed. Past President
Federal Glover, Contra Costa (via audio)
Don Knabe, Los Angeles
John Tavaglione, Riverside
Paul Biane, San Bernardino
Kathy Long, Ventura
Susan Adams, Marin
Mike Nelson, Merced
Joni Gray, Santa Barbara
Terry Woodrow, Alpine
Valerie Brown, Sonoma, alternate
Demitrios Tatum, CAOAC advisor

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of January 31, 2008 were corrected to reflect that Supervisor Terry Woodrow was in attendance.

Motion and second to approve the minutes of January 31, 2008 as corrected. Motion carried unanimously.

3. REQUEST FOR SUPPORT OF STATEWIDE 2-1-1 SYSTEM

Supervisor Greg Cox provided a report on the Southern California 2-1-1 system which was instrumental in assisting residents during the Southern California wildfires of 2007. The system was able to provide up-to-date information about mandatory evacuation orders, shelter locations, road closures, relief and recovery resources and donation and volunteering opportunities.

Joining Supervisor Cox in the presentation were: Dave Smith, President & CEO of United Way of Ventura County, John Ohanion, Chief Executive Officer of 211 San Diego and Maribel Marin of 211 California. They discussed the need for a statewide 2-1-1 system. Currently 37 counties in California either have or are in the planning phases of a system. Many rural areas do not have systems in place primarily due to funding issues. Ventura County was the first county to implement a 2-1-1 system.

A discussion ensued regarding the difficulty in financially supporting a statewide system and the need for a stable source of funding.

Motion and second to recommend that the CSAC Board of Directors consider this issue, move toward endorsing a statewide 2-1-1 system and

identify funding resources. In addition, efforts should be made to advocate for federal matching funds. Motion carried unanimously.

4. PROPOSED CSAC BUDGET FOR FY 2008-09

Supervisor Joni Gray, CSAC Treasurer, presented the draft CSAC Budget for FY 2008-09 as contained in the briefing materials.

Motion and second to approve the proposed CSAC Budget for FY 2008-09 as presented and recommend adoption by the Board of Directors. Motion carried unanimously.

Staff was directed to reformat next year's budget to reflect the difference between public and non-public funds.

5. PROPOSED LITIGATION COORDINATION PROGRAM BUDGET FOR FY 2008-09

Jennifer Henning, Executive Director of the County Counsel's Association, presented the proposed budget for the CSAC Litigation Coordination Program as contained in the briefing materials. She indicated that the proposed budget contains a 5% increase in order to offset additional salary, health and retirement costs.

Motion and second to approve the Litigation Coordination Program Budget for FY 2008-09 as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Staff was directed to work with the CAOAC to develop a system where the Litigation Coordination program fees are paid through individual county risk management departments instead of county counsel departments.

President Gordon announced that the Executive Committee will have a detailed discussion on the Litigation Coordination program during their October retreat.

6. FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF INSTITUTE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ILG) CLIMATE CHANGE PROJECT

The Institute for Local Government (ILG) launched its California Climate Action Network (CCAN) in 2006. The program provides resources and fosters information sharing to support local government action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and energy use in their communities. As part of that effort, ILG is developing an award program to recognize local leadership and achievement in two key areas: actual reductions in greenhouse has emissions; and actual reductions in energy use. ILG is requesting that the CSAC Executive Committee approve $100,000 to support the efforts of this program.

No action was taken on this item. Discussion will be continued at a future meeting.

7. CSAC MEMBERSHIP SURVEY RESULTS

Paul McIntosh presented the results of a membership survey that CSAC recently conducted. The survey addressed the importance and effectiveness of several

CSAC publications and programs. It also included interviews with a cross section of CSAC members, State agency representatives, county affiliate organizations and other statewide associations. A task force will be analyzing survey results and make recommendations to CSAC on how to implement changes.

8. EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM UPDATE

Recent polling indicates that Proposition 98 will fail (41% in favor). Proposition 99 is polling a bit higher at about 50%. So far, a total of $3.3 million has been raised by the coalition that CSAC is involved in. CSAC has contributed $650,000 in non-public funds.

Paul McIntosh appeared before the Orange County Board of Supervisors earlier this week to discuss CSAC's participation in the coalition to defeat Proposition 98 and support Proposition 99. He provided background on the various eminent domain reform efforts that have taken place during the past few years and CSAC's participation in those efforts. He also outlined the sources of non-public funds that CSAC used to contribute to those efforts.

Staff reported that legislation was introduced this year relating to campaign financing – AB 1992, which would preclude any association that receives funding from dues from participating in financing campaign activities. The bill failed in committee.

9. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

On March 28, the CSAC Administration of Justice Policy committee held a meeting. Representatives from the Legislative Analyst's Office presented their parole realignment concept. Also, a representative from the Corrections Standards Authority discussed the county requests for Phase I jail construction funding through lease-revenue bond proceeds authorized by AB 900. The Authority received 24 proposals, requesting $1.2 billion. Funding recommendations for Phase I are expected in May. The committee also heard a report from the CSAC Sex Offender Working Group. They are finalizing a set of policy guidelines which will be brought before the full Board of Directors in May. AB 1491, the court facilities reauthorization measure, was heard in Assembly Appropriations Committee on April 9 and is expected to be on the Gover4nor's Desk for signature by mid-April.

Staff was directed to send additional information on the triggers associated with the court facilities transfers to Executive Committee members.

The Parole Reform Task Force is holding their first meeting on April 10. Supervisor John Tavaglione will be chairing the task force.

10. AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

The CSAC Agriculture & natural Resources Policy Committee held a special meeting regarding Bay-Delta water issues on March 28. Approximately 40 people attended in person and by phone. During the meeting, Delta Vision Executive Director John Kirlin presented an overview of Delta Vision's

recommendations and strategic planning process. California Resources Agency undersecretary Karen Scarborough discussed the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan and a roundtable discussion on county perspectives took place. CSAC has existing policy regarding water issues. The policy committee is in the process of revising the water policy which will be brought the Board of Directors at a future meeting.

A workshop on water issues will take place during this year's CSAC annual meeting in November.

11. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Paul McIntosh testified at a Senate Budget Committee hearing last week regarding the state and local fiscal relationship. The Committee is looking for opportunities to realign some services and programs and is asking for CSAC's recommendations. Santa Clara County Executive Peter Kutras and retired County Administrator John Sweeten also testified. The committee's next hearing is scheduled for April 24.

On March 20, the CSAC Board of Directors took action to request that staff work with Senator Steinberg's office to seek amendments to SB 375, Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Regional Transportation Plans. Senator Steinberg has now agreed to accept ten of the twelve amendments that CSAC requested.

Senator Kuehl has introduced SB 1221, which would allow only the State Controller to issue health-related bonds.

12. OTHER ITEMS

The Cities, Counties, Schools (CCS) Partnership will be holding a two-day summit on June 12 & 13 in Burlingame. The first day will focus on the State Budget crisis and the second day will be a joint board meeting of CSAC, the league of California Cities and the California School Boards Association to discuss emancipating foster youth. Registration information will soon be sent to all Executive Committee members.

Lindsay Hall has been appointed CSAC Corporate Relations Manager. She previously served as a communications analyst. The CSAC Finance Corporation is in the process of recruiting for a program manager.

President Gordon reminded members of some upcoming important dates: CSAC Legislative Conference is May 21 – 22, CSAC Board of Directors meeting is May 22, and the NACo Annual Conference in Kansas City, Missouri will be July 11 – 13.

Meeting adjourned.

CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CONFERENCE CALL
2:00pm
Thursday, May 15, 2008

MINUTES

Presiding: Richard Gordon, President

1. ROLL CALL

Richard Gordon, President
Gary Wyatt, 1st Vice President
John Tavaglione, Riverside
Roger Dickinson, Sacramento
Mike Nelson, Merced
Joni Gray. Santa Barbara
Mike McGowan, Yolo (alternate)
Terry Woodrow, Alpine
Jeff Morris, Trinity

2. NOMINATION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVE TO SERVE ON CSAC FINANCE CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The CSAC Finance Corporation has requested that the Executive Committee nominate a representative to serve on their Board of Directors. Supervisor Cox originally served as the Executive Committee appointee, but has now been appointed by the Finance Corporation Board to fill the seat previously held by Supervisor Helen Thomson who resigned for personal reasons.

The Officers recommended that Supervisor Joni Gray be nominated to fill the vacancy left by Greg Cox.

Motion and second to nominate Supervisor Joni Gray to serve on the CSAC Finance Corporation Board of Directors. Motion carried unanimously.

3. AUTO ALLOWANCE ADJUSTMENT FOR CSAC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The CSAC officers recommended that the auto allowance for the CSAC Executive Director be increased from $600 per month to $850 per month. It was noted that the allowance has not been increased in at least eight years.

Motion and second to increase the Executive Director's auto allowance to $850. per month effective immediately. Motion carried unanimously.

4. CSAC CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM

CSAC is in the process of contracting with William Chiat of the Alta Mesa Group, to manage the newly-created CSAC Continuing Education program. The program will be designed to provide elected officials with the tools to effectively lead their community and advocate for positions important to counties. For senior county staff, the program will provide executive-level professional development opportunities that emphasize contemporary issues and best management practices. A complete program description was included in the agenda materials.

An advisory group has been created to provide input on the program. Members are: Supervisor John Gioia, chair, Supervisors Paul Biane, Michael Delbar Diane Dillon, and Terry Woodrow, CAOs David Edge and Rick Robinson, Personnel Director Nancy Nittler, CAOAC Executive Director Brent Wallace and ILG Director JoAnne Speers. The Continuing Education Advisory Group will hold its first meeting during the CSAC Legislative Conference next week. The program will be launched during the 2008 CSAC Annual Meeting and sessions will begin in 2009.

5. OTHER ITEMS

President Gordon encouraged all Executive Committee members to attend the CCS Partnership Summit on June 12-13, in Burlingame.

Meeting adjourned.

AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

July 23, 2008

TO: CSAC Executive Committee

FROM: Supervisor Mike Nelson, Chair
CSAC Agriculture & Natural Resources Policy Committee
Supervisor Jon Vasquez, Vice-Chair
Agriculture & Natural Resources Policy Committee
Karen Keene, CSAC Legislative Representative
Cara Martinson, CSAC Legislative Analyst

RE: CSAC Policy Direction on State Water Proposals

The Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR) Policy Committee met via conference call on July 2, 2008. The committee approved the attached CSAC Policy Direction on State Water Proposals with a few suggested changes.

The ANR committee is recommending that the CSAC Executive Committee approve the attached document. These policy statements will supplement existing CSAC policy regarding water, and will assist staff in developing recommendations regarding the State Water Plan, the Delta Vision Task Force Strategic Plan, and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

CSAC Policy Direction on State Water Proposals
(As approved by the CSAC Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Committee on Wednesday, July 2, 2008. Pending final approval by the CSAC Executive Committee on August 7, 2008)

As the nation's most populous state, California faces many complicated and compelling water resource issues. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) recognizes the complexities of water use and distribution throughout the state and has reiterated its position on this issue over the years through various policy statements, including, but not limited to support for statutory protection of counties of origin and watershed areas, support for existing water rights, the need for new and expanded water resources, and the need for local water conservation efforts. CSAC also acknowledges the reliance of counties on the Delta as a water delivery system, and recognizes the urgency with which all of the Delta partners, including the State must act to resolve and fund infrastructure, environmental and supply issues.

Recent discussions and impending decisions regarding the Delta necessitate the inclusion of policy direction in CSAC's platform to ensure consideration of county interests. The proposed policies will be relied upon by CSAC staff in conjunction with existing CSAC policy in developing recommendations regarding the State Water Plan, the Delta Vision Task Force Strategic Plan, and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

The proposed policies are consistent with existing CSAC policy direction concerning water, land use, agriculture, forestry, climate change and flood protection to name a few. The proposed policies also build upon CSAC's existing policy that recognizes the Delta as a critical region of statewide importance encompassing vital water, transportation, energy, agriculture and economic interests.

CSAC believes that any proposed Delta solutions be implemented in a manner that:

- Respects the affected counties' land use authority, revenues, public health and safety, economic development, water rights, and agricultural viability.
- Promotes recreation and environmental protection.
- Ensures Delta counties' status as voting members of any proposed Delta governance structure.
- Improves flood protection for delta residents, property, and infrastructure.
- Improves and protects the Delta ecosystem, water quality, flows and supply.
- Ensures consistency with affected counties adopted policies and plans.

- Secures financial support for flood management, improved emergency response, preservation of agriculture, protection of water resources, and enhancement and restoration of habitat.

- Accords special recognition, and advances the economic vitality of "heritage" or "legacy" communities in the Delta.

- Demonstrates a clearly evidenced public benefit to any proposed changes to the boundaries of the Delta.

- Support development of adequate water supply for the south, utilizing the concept of "Regional Self Sufficiency" whereby each region maximizes conservation and recycled water use, implements storage (surface and groundwater) and considers desalination, as necessary.

Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy Committee

Wednesday, July 23, 2008 · 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
VIA Conference Call

AGENDA

Supervisor Mike Nelson, Merced County, Chair
Supervisor Jon Vasquez, Solano County, Vice- Chair

10:00- 10:05	I.	**Welcome and Introductions** *Supervisor Mike Nelson, Merced County* *Supervisor Jon Vasquez, Solano County*
	II.	**Proposition 7: The Solar and Clean Energy Act of 2008**
10:05-10:20		*Proponent: Jim Gonzalez, Californians for Solar and Clean Energy*
10:20- 10:35		*Opponent: Ralph Cavanagh, Natural Resources Defense Council*
	III.	**Proposition 10: California Alternative Fuels Initiative**
10:35-10:50		*Proponent: Allison Hart, Executive Director, Clean and Renewable Energy Association* *Opponent: None on File*
10:50-11:20	IV.	**Closed Committee Discussion**
11:20-11:30	V.	**Closing Comments and Adjournment**

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

July 21, 2008

To: CSAC ANR Policy Committee
From: Karen Keene, CSAC Legislative Representative
Cara Martinson, CSAC Legislative Analyst

Re: Proposition 7: The Solar and Clean Energy Act of 2008

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends an "oppose" position. CSAC has existing policy to support and encourage the development of alternative energy sources. However, several concerns have been raised that the measure would hurt efforts to expand transmission by creating an overlapping jurisdictional regime with two state agencies, the Public Utilities Commission and the Energy Commission. Additionally, concerns have been raised with the preemption of local land use authority. The Initiative reassigns permitting authority from locals to the Energy Commission for approval of solar and clean energy plants and related facilities within their jurisdictions. Local agencies would have 100 days after a project application is filed with the Commission to provide final comments, determinations, or opinions to the Commission.

Existing CSAC Policy:

- Counties support establishing incentives that will encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as wind, solar, biomass, hydropower, and geothermal resources. Counties also support promoting the timely development of new infrastructure, such as new electric transmission, needed to facilitate renewable energy development.
- Counties support bills that enhance local government's ability to become community aggregators of electricity.
- Counties support efforts to allow local agencies to retain regulatory oversight over generators by statutorily changing the threshold from 50 megawatts to 100 megawatts.

Initiative Summary: Legal Title and Summary given on 12/14/2007

The initiative includes a "Purpose and Intent" section which would specify the following:

- Require ALL utilities to provide 20% of power from renewable sources by 2010, 40% by 2020, and 50% by 2025. (Current law requires that 20 percent of electricity sold to customers by renewable by 2010; state agencies and the Governor have established a 33 percent target by 2020).
- The initiative would change the definition of 'retail seller' and would include publicly-owned utilities in the new definition.
- Would fast-track approvals for development of solar and clean energy plants and related transmission facilities.
- Would create production incentives; create new assessment of penalties for utilities that don't comply; require 20-year long term contracts for solar and clean energy (current length is 10 years for contracts).
- Caps impacts on consumer electricity bills at 3 percent, (specifies no pass-through of rate increase to consumers).

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

- Gives the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) the power to enforce compliance of RPS upon privately-owned utilities, assess penalties, and prohibit utilities from passing on penalties to consumers.
- Grants power to California State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (Energy Commission) to oversee compliance and penalty assessment for government-owned utilities.
- Grants power to the Energy Commission to allocate funds to purchase, sell, or lease property, personal property or rights of way for the development and use of the property and rights of way for the generation/transmission of solar and clean energy, and to upgrade existing transmission lines.
- Makes a number of "Findings and Declarations" regarding climate change and other environmental factors in California, including California's reliance on dirty energy. Makes reference to "government-owned utilities like those in Los Angeles and Sacramento [who] lobbied successfully to exempt themselves from the law."

Fiscal Impact: The Attorney General's Title and Summary identifies "potential state administrative costs of up to $3.4 million annually for the regulatory activities of the Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission and the California Public Utilities Commission, paid for by fee revenues. Potential, unknown increased costs and reduced revenues, particularly in the short term, to state and local governments resulting from the measure's potential to increase retail electricity rates, with possible offsetting cost savings and revenue increases, to an unknown degree, over the long term to the extent the measure hastens renewable energy development."

Support/Sponsors of Initiative: Jim Gonzalez is the Campaign Chair of "Californians for Solar and Clean Energy" and the filer of the initiative. You can view the campaign website at www.solarandcleanenergy.org. There are a number of endorsers including former Senators Martha Escutia and John Vasconcellos.

Opposition: Opposition to the measure ranges from renewable energy groups, labor, utilities to environmental groups. Below are a few of the notables:

League of California Cities
Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies (CEERT)
California League of Conservation Voters
Natural Resources Defense Council
Environmental Defense
Union of Concerned Scientists
Vote Solar Initiative
Some renewable energy companies
Chapters of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
California Solar Energy Industries Association
American Wind Energy Association

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

July 21, 2008

To: CSAC ANR Policy Committee
From: Karen Keene, CSAC Legislative Representative
Cara Martinson, CSAC Legislative Analyst

Re: Proposition 10: The California Alternative Fuels Initiative

Staff Recommendation: CSAC staff recommends a "support" position. CSAC has existing policy to support and encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources. This measure would authorize the State to sell $5 billion in general obligation bonds to fund projects, consumer incentives and education to increase the supply and use of renewable and clean energy. This measure would also provide funds to local governments to create renewable energy demonstration projects and educational projects in their communities.

Existing CSAC Policy:

- Counties support establishing incentives that will encourage the development and use of alternative energy sources, such as wind, solar, biomass, hydropower, and geothermal resources. Counties also support promoting the timely development of new infrastructure, such as new electric transmission, needed to facilitate renewable energy development.
- Counties support bills that enhance local government's ability to become community aggregators of electricity.
- Counties support efforts to allow local agencies to retain regulatory oversight over generators by statutorily changing the threshold from 50 megawatts to 100 megawatts.

Initiative Summary: The initiative includes a "Purpose and Intent" section which would specify the following:

- Invest $5 billion in projects and programs designed to enhance California's energy independence and to reduce California's dependence on foreign oil, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, implement the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and improve air quality.
- Provide incentives for the engineering, design and construction of facilities and related infrastructure for the large-scale production of electricity using renewable energy technologies, such as solar, wind, geothermal, and tidal power.
- Provide incentives for individuals and businesses to purchase or lease and install equipment in California for the production of electrical energy utilizing renewable energy technologies.
- Provide rebates for individuals and businesses to purchase clean alternative energy vehicles, including hybrid, plug-in hybrid and natural gas powered vehicles. Funds will also be provided for testing and certification of alternative fuel vehicles and research and development of low-carbon fuels.
- Provide funds for local governments to create renewable energy demonstration projects and educational projects in their communities. Provide grants to California public universities, colleges and community colleges for the purpose of training students to work with clean and renewable energy technologies.
- Provide consumer education on the availability and use of clean and renewable energy products and services.

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

- Make full use of California's resources and its capability for innovation to develop new ways to meet the state's important long-term goals: the Renewable Portfolio Standard, Control of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Criteria Air Pollutants from Motor Vehicles and the state's petroleum reduction goals se t forth in this Act.
- Ensure that the revenues from this measure are invested wisely in commercially viable technology achieving short-term and longer-term measurable results while supporting research and new technologies, and require mandatory independent audits and annual progress reports so that project administrators are accountable to the people of California.

Fiscal Impact: According to the Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance, "the fiscal impact on state and local government is a State cost of about $9.8 billion over 30 years to pay both the principal ($5 billion) and interest ($4.8 billion) costs on the bond, equaling payments of about $325 million per year. Increase in state sales tax revenues of an unknown amount, potentially totaling in the tens of millions of dollars, over the period from 2009 to beyond 2018. Increase in local sales tax and VLF revenues of an unknown amount, potentially totaling in the tens of millions of dollars, over the period from 2009 to about 2018-19. Potential state costs of up to about $10 million annually, through about 2018 -19, for state agency administrative costs not funded by the measure."

Support/Sponsors of Initiative: Proponents: Allison Hart, Mitzi Dudley and Thomas Daly c/o Daniel K. Abramson (213) 624-6200

Opposition: None on File

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE/HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

Administration of Justice Policy Committee

Thursday, July 31, 2008 ▪ 1 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.
First Floor CSAC Conference Room (limited seating available)
1110 K St., Ste. 101 ▪ Sacramento, California
Conference Call-in Number: (800)867-2581 ▪ Passcode: 7500513#

Supervisor Ronn Dominici, Madera County, Chair
Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County, Vice-Chair

NOTE: Agenda Items II & III will be considered in joint session with the CSAC Health and Human Services Policy Committee

1:00 p.m. **I. Welcome and Introductions**
Supervisor Ronn Dominici, Madera County

1:05 **II. Fair Alcohol Taxes**
Michele Simon, Research and Policy Director and Simon Rosen, Research Analyst, The Marin Institute

1:20 **III. Proposition 5: The Nonviolent Offender Rehabilitation Act of 2008 – ACTION ITEM**
- *Proponents: Curtis Notsinneh, Drug Policy Alliance Network and Dave Fratello, NORA Campaign*
- *Opponent: District Attorney Jan Scully, Sacramento County*

1:40 **IV. Proposition 6: The Safe Neighborhoods Act: Protect Victims, Stop Gang, Gun, and Street Crime – ACTION ITEM**
- *Proponents: Sheriff Mike McGuiness, Sacramento County and Chief Probation Officer Don Meyer, Yolo County*
- *Opponent: TBD, California Professional Firefighters*

2:00 **V. Proposition 9: The Victims' Rights Act of 2008 (Marsy's Law) – ACTION ITEM**
- *Proponent: Mitch Zak, Campaign Strategist, Yes on Proposition 9 Campaign*
- *Opponent: TBD, California Professional Firefighters*

2:20 **VI. 2008-09 State Budget Update**
Elizabeth Howard, CSAC Legislative Representative; Rosemary Lamb, CSAC Legislative Analyst

2:25 p.m. **VII. Closing Remarks and Adjournment**
Supervisor Ronn Dominici, Madera County

Health and Human Services Policy Committee

Thursday, July 31, 2008 ▪ 1 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.
First Floor CSAC Conference Room (limited seating available)
1110 K St., Ste. 101 ▪ Sacramento, California
Conference Call-in Number: (800) 867-2581 ▪ Pass code: 7500513#

Supervisor Helen Thomson, Yolo County, Chair
Supervisor Liz Kniss, Santa Clara County, Vice-Chair

NOTE: Agenda Items II & III will be considered in joint session with the CSAC Administration of Justice Policy Committee

1:00 p.m. **I. Welcome and Introductions**
Supervisor Ronn Dominici, Madera County, Chair of the CSAC Administration of Justice Policy Committee

1:05 **II. Presentation on "Fair Alcohol Taxes"**
Michele Simon, Research and Policy Director and Simon Rosen, Research Analyst, The Marin Institute

1:20 **III. Proposition 5: The Nonviolent Offender Rehabilitation Act of 2008 – ACTION ITEM**

- *Proponents: Curtis Notsinneh, Drug Policy Alliance Network and Dave Fratello, NORA Campaign*
- *Opponent: Jan Scully, District Attorney, Sacramento County*

END OF THE HHS POLICY COMMITTEE PORTION OF THE MEETING

The AOJ Policy Committee Will Continue To Meet On The Following Items:

- **Proposition 6: The Safe Neighborhoods Act: Protect Victims, Stop Gang, Gun, and Street Crime**
- **Proposition 9: The Victims' Rights Act of 2008 (Marsy's Law)**
- **2008-09 State Budget Update**

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

July 21, 2008

TO: CSAC Executive Committee

FROM: Elizabeth Howard and Rosemary Lamb, CSAC Administration of Justice Staff
Kelly Brooks and Farrah McDaid Ting, CSAC Health and Human Services Staff

RE: Analysis of November 2008 General Election Ballot Initiatives: Propositions 5, 6, and 9 – ACTION ITEM

Recommended Action. At its August 7 meeting, the Executive Committee will be asked to consider recommendations advanced by the Administration of Justice (AOJ) and Health and Human Services (HHS) policy committees on three November 2008 ballot initiatives. One of the initiatives will be considered in a joint session of the AOJ and HHS committees, given cross-cutting issues; the other two will be considered by the AOJ committee. Staff is in the process of finalizing the three analyses and will bring forth the policy committee recommendation and more in-depth analysis at the August 7 meeting.

Background. To date, a total of 12 ballot initiatives have qualified for the November 2008 general election. CSAC leadership reviewed the initiatives and assigned those deemed necessary for CSAC review and action to the appropriate policy committees. This memo gives a brief summary of three initiatives to be considered by the AOJ and HHS policy committees during their July 31 meetings. Proposition 5, the Nonviolent Offender Rehabilitation Act (NORA), was referred to both the AOJ and HHS Policy Committees, given that it deals with both treatment and justice system issues. Those two committees will meet in joint session to consider that initiative and another informational item of joint interest.

Two other initiatives, Proposition 6 (The Safe Neighborhoods Act) and Proposition 9 (The Victims' Rights Act) will also be considered on July 31 by the AOJ Policy Committee, immediately following its joint session with the HHS Committee. Speakers representing both the proponent and opponent perspectives will make presentations. Below is a short summary of each proposition to be considered. As indicated above, a more detailed analysis, including staff recommendations for each proposition, will be presented to the policy committees; specific action taken by the policy committees will come before the Executive Committee for consideration and action at the August 7 meeting.

Proposition 5: The Nonviolent Offender Rehabilitation Act of 2008 (NORA)

NORA is sponsored by the Drug Policy Alliance, the advocacy group that sponsored Proposition 36, the initiative that promoted substance abuse treatment over incarceration for certain low-level offenders, which was approved by the voters in November 2000. Proposition 5 expands and replaces the Proposition 36 program, as set forth in Penal Code Section 1000 ("deferred entry of judgment" drug diversion program for first-time nonviolent drug offenders), and existing drug courts with a tiered, three-track drug treatment diversion program. The three tracks are described very briefly below:

1. *Track I (6-18 months in duration):* This is a state-funded program and allows offenders with one prior offense to participate. It allows for a deferred entry of judgment similar to the PC 1000 program and would not require that offenders be

supervised by probation. Prosecutors would have the burden of proof to show that an offender was ineligible for Track 1.

2. *Track II (1 year, with a 1 year extension):* This track is a modification of the Proposition 36 program. It would divert offenders to treatment and probation for up to one year. This program differs from the current Proposition 36 program in that it permits participation by offenders who, along with committing a drug offense, concurrently committed a non-drug related offense. However, offenders with five or more offenses in the previous 30 months would be excluded from participating in Track II and automatically referred for consideration in Track III.
3. *Track III (18 months, with an additional 6 month extension):* Track III is similar to California's current drug court programs for adult felons. Drug court programs would be combined with the Track III program. Track III would provide treatment and probation supervision in lieu of incarceration in prison or jail for 18 months (24 months if a 6 month extension is granted). Offenders who 1) committed a drug offense or other types of crimes but appear to have a drug problem or 2) were excluded from participating in Track II due to the number of crimes committed in the last 30 months would participate in Track III.

Funding Mechanism. The funding source for Proposition 5 is the state General Fund (GF). Funds to support the provisions of Proposition 5 would be diverted from the GF into the Substance Abuse Treatment Trust Fund (SATTF) created under Proposition 36 and distributed to the state and counties under a formula delineated within the proposition. In addition, the proposition contains a non-supplantation clause.

Parole System Changes. In addition to revamping the PC 1000, Proposition 36 and drug court programs Proposition 5 makes other substantial changes to the state's current parole system. Specifically, it would reduce parole terms for certain offenses and extend parole terms for other specified offenses. Nonviolent, non-serious, non-sex offenders and drug offenders would be placed on parole for six months with an additional six month parole term if they failed to complete an appropriate rehabilitation program that was offered to them. Parole terms for all other offenders would remain at three years with longer terms (up to five years) for offenders whose most recent prison sentence was for a violent, serious felony. This proposition also establishes that parole violations are to be divided into three categories – technical violations, misdemeanors and felonies – and for the most part prohibits certain parolees from being returned to state prison for technical or misdemeanor parole violations. Furthermore, this proposition creates a 21-member Parole Reform Oversight and Accountability Board, which will have the authority to review, direct, and approve the rehabilitation programs and to set parole practices. It does not replace the current Board of Parole Hearings.

Other Provisions. This proposition creates a juvenile treatment program for juvenile drug offenders. It would also require county jails to provide materials and strategies on drug overdose awareness and prevention to all inmates prior to their release. In addition, it expands the number of rehabilitative programs available to offenders both inside and outside of prison. Offenders are to be offered rehabilitative services for up to one year after discharge from parole. These offenders would receive these services from county probation departments; however, all operational costs would be reimbursed by CDCR. The proposition contains other changes to the parole and prison systems including: the credit earning system for inmates, parole revocation hearings (to be in

compliance with existing law), and creates five, five-year pilot programs similar to drug courts to divert certain parolees which is to be administered by CDCR. It also requires certain reports and studies on inmate and parole programs as well as on the effectiveness of rehabilitative programs for these offenders. Moreover, the proposition reorganizes CDCR and establishes a second secretary of the department. Lastly, contained within the proposition is funding from Proposition 63 (the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) of 2004) for adults (who are not on parole) in drug treatment programs who need receive mental health services. Under current law, parolees are expressly excluded from receiving treatment funded through Proposition 63.

Possible County Impacts. This proposition contemplates an increased role for counties in the provision of rehabilitative programs with funding coming from the state general fund. This proposition would require county probation departments to provide rehabilitative services to discharged parolees for up to one year for those parolees who opt into the program. While counties are to be reimbursed for such services, sustainability and certainty of funding is a concern. In its analysis, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) points out that some of the funding distributed through the SATTF would require matching funds from counties, resulting in increased costs to counties. Furthermore, the ability to staff and train an adequate workforce to deliver the expanded services contemplated by this proposition — especially at a time when workforce pressures from other corrections reform efforts — is also unclear. How this initiative will interact with the parole reforms currently being debated in this year's budget deliberations is uncertain. Lastly, Proposition 63 sets forth strict guidelines as to how funding is to be distributed at the local level. Counties are to undergo strict community input processes to set up programming funded by Proposition 63, and it is not clear whether this proposition can allocate MHSA funds in this manner.

Proposition 6: The Safe Neighborhoods Act: Protect Victims, Stop Gang, Gun, and Street Crime

Proposition 6, known as "The Safe Neighborhoods Act: Protect Victims, Stop Gang, Gun, and Street Crime," amends existing laws relating to criminal offenders and the programs that provide funding to local law enforcement to supervise, apprehend and detain offenders. The proposition creates new state-funded criminal justice programs and requires that funding for certain existing programs be continued at current levels and adjusted (in some cases) for inflation in future years. Programs that would be funded through Proposition 6 include many that counties rely upon today for significant prevention, intervention, front-line, and other operational supports, such as Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) Programs; Citizens' Option for Public Safety; Small and Rural Sheriffs Grant Program; and local detention funds to replace revenues previously derived from booking fees. A number of new crime prevention and intervention programs would be funded as well. The initiative was authored by Senator George and Assembly Member Sharon Runner and has gained broad support among law enforcement and victims' organizations.

Further, Proposition 6 makes other changes to state law in the following areas:

1. *Parole:* Reduces parole agent caseloads and requires the state to fund GPS monitoring for sex offenders after their discharge from parole.

2. *Gang Abatement:* Requires the development of two databases related to gang information and makes it easier for local law enforcement to issue injunctions against gangs.
3. *Temporary Jail Housing:* Allows counties to address overcrowded jails with the construction of temporary facilities.
4. *Undocumented Individuals Charged with a Crime:* Prohibits bail from being granted to undocumented individuals charged with a violent or gang-related felony as well as prohibits them from being granted release on their own recognizance pending trial.

County Impacts. As with Proposition 5, this proposition is funded through the state general fund. While it would offer certainty in funding for a number of programs broadly supported and relied upon by counties for critical programming and services in the public safety area, it likely would have an impact in other areas. Specifically, the sustainability of the state's general fund and the possible consequences in funding for other county-administered programs funded by the state is a concern. The proposition does specify that the state is responsible for funding GPS monitoring for sex offenders post-parole, but it does not address funding for GPS monitoring of sex offenders post-probation. Lastly, this initiative also recasts how funding for the Youthful Offender Block Grant — the fiscal support the state provides to counties associated with the 2007 realignment of the juvenile justice population — is to be distributed at the local level, which may have impacts at the local level among and between the various county entities that have service responsibility associated with keeping juvenile offenders at the local level.

Proposition 9: "The Victims' Rights Act of 2008: Marsy's Law"

Counties will recall that in June 1982 voters passed Proposition 8, known as the Victims' Bill of Rights. Proposition 8 amended the state Constitution and various statutes to grant crime victims the inalienable right to be notified of and attend sentencing and parole hearings for purposes of offering a victims' statement. It also established the right of crime victims to obtain restitution from any person who committed the crime that caused them to suffer a loss. In addition, Proposition 8 established a right to safe schools for students in a grade levels up to high school. The 2008 Victims' Right Act seeks to make adjustments to existing law, in an effort to address concerns advanced by certain victims' advocates who believe Proposition 8 has not been implemented as was intended.

Proposition 9 of 2008 would amend Section 28 of Article 1 of California's Constitution. It contains three main components:

1. *Victim Notification and Restitution:* The proposition allows for victims, upon request, to be notified of all public proceedings, including delinquency proceedings and allows the victim to be present at all parole and post-conviction release proceedings. Furthermore, it allows for the victim, upon request, to be heard at any proceeding, including any delinquency proceeding, involving a post-arrest release decision, plea, sentencing, post-conviction release decision or any proceeding in which a right of the victim is at issue. In addition, it sets in statute that victims' have the right to restitution and that they are to have funds distributed to them prior to any other restitution allocations being distributed to

other funds. (The distribution priority is already established in the Penal Code, and this proposition will restate this distribution methodology in the Constitution.)

2. *Restricts Early Release of Inmates.* Under this proposition, state and local governments will be prohibited from releasing inmates early due to overcrowding. According to the following language in Proposition 9:

> "Sentences...shall be carried out in compliance with the courts' sentencing orders, and shall not be substantially diminished by early release policies intended to alleviate overcrowding in custodial facilities. The legislative branch shall ensure sufficient funding to adequately house inmates for the full terms of their sentences, except for statutorily authorized credits which reduce those sentences."

3. *Modifies Existing Parole Practices.* Proposition 9 provides victims with the right to be present and speak at parole hearings and prevents the offender or his or her counsel from questioning the victim. In addition, it reduces the number of parole hearings available to an inmate who has been denied parole while incarcerated. Currently, an inmate can have their parole hearing rescheduled two years after his or her last denial; this proposition sets certain time frames for reconsideration at 15, 10, 7, 5, or 3 years after a denial pending certain factors including "the consideration of whether the public and victim's safety does not require a more lengthy period of incarceration for the prisoner" prior to their next parole hearing.

County Impacts. The provision with the most significant potential impact for counties is the limitation on counties' ability to address jail overcrowding by releasing inmates who pose the least risk to public safety early. Thirty-two counties are under either federally-imposed or state-imposed jail population caps, and this restriction would exacerbate overcrowding at the local level and raise the costs of operating jails due to increased capacity.

Staff Contacts. For more information on these propositions, please contact either the AOJ staff — Elizabeth Howard (ehoward@counties.org or 916.327.7500 ext. 537) or Rosemary Lamb (rlamb@counties.org or 916.327.7500 ext. 503) — or the HSS staff — Kelly Brooks (kbrooks@counties.org or 916.327.7500 ext. 531), Farrah McDaid Ting (fmcdaid@counties.org or 916.327.7500 ext. 559).

CSAC REGULATORY PROPOSALS

July 25, 2008

TO: CSAC Executive Committee

FROM: Jim Wiltshire, Deputy Director

SUBJECT: CSAC Regulatory Proposals

At the May 22, 2008 Board of Directors meeting there was a discussion on the approach to advocacy efforts based on feedback provided by the urban, suburban and rural caucus meetings. As a result the Board took the following actions:

1) *Direct all CSAC policy committees to convene as soon as possible to identify those regulations that could be suspended and report to the Executive Committee to consider the negotiations of the budget process within 45 days.*

2) *The recommendations from each caucus will be forwarded to the CSAC Executive Committee for consideration.*

3) *In addition, staff requested that the Board of Directors authorize the CSAC Officers and Executive Committee to address state budget issues that are outside of current CSAC policy.*

All CSAC policy committees met by July 2, 2008 in compliance with Board direction. The Committees reviewed items related to efficiencies and statutory changes that would create more local flexibility and potential cost savings. The Committees' discussions generated mixed results. Below are the Committees' reports.

Health and Human Services Policy Committee
The CSAC Health and Human Policy Committee met on Wednesday, July 2, to discuss regulatory relief. Below is a list of proposals endorsed by the Committee.

Program Responsibility v. State Funding: Work to align local government accountability with state funding levels in the Medi-Cal, IHSS, and Food Stamps programs to reduce state and federal penalties related to the chronic lack of adequate state funding.

Recording Fees: Give counties the authority to set vital record document fees at the actual cost of producing them with hardship exceptions and multiple-copy discounts.

Public Health Categorical Funding: Promote consolidation of public health categorical funding based on the Placer County model and work to simplify process and contractual terms.

Medi-Cal: Simplify Medi-Cal programs to consolidate eligibility and services delivery at the county level for children who qualify; the Committee suggested making all children under 250% FPL eligible for no cost Medi-Cal.

Medi-Cal Mental Health Plan Contracts: Renegotiate county Mental Health Plan Medi-Cal contracts with the Department of Mental Health to provide program and administrative relief related to inadequate funding levels. CSAC, the CAOAC, and CMHDA are currently collaborating via a working group to address this issue, with CMHDA taking the lead.

Furthermore, the Committee endorsed several strategies for attempting to streamline the claims payment process in Medi-Cal Mental Health Plan contracts.

Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63): Work to simplify outcome data and reporting requirements, and simplify regulatory requirements. Duplication and confusion stems from poor communication within the state Department of Mental Health. Work with CMHDA in pushing state department.

Food Stamps: Lengthen the certification period for homeless recipients from every three months to annually, and delete the state requirement to process immediate need applications within 3 days (no such requirement exists in federal law).

In-Home Supportive Services: Endorse and promote LAO proposal to lengthen IHSS eligibility renewals from annually to every 18 months.

E-pedigree: The proposed e-pedigree system, which is supposed to be operational by 2011, seeks to create an auditable paper or electronic record of every step taken by a retail package of prescription drugs as it moves from the factory to the final point of sale. Distributing pharmaceutical products are a key component of county clinics, county hospitals, county mental health and jail systems, and any e-pedigree proposal to regulate and track the movement of prescription drugs would disproportionally impact these systems with increased costs. There are several e-pedigree proposals in circulation currently. The Schwarzenegger Administration has proposed language to require e-pedigree only in cases where drugs are NOT distributed within the normal and accredited supply chain. Staff is working with affiliates on researching. The Governor's proposal appears to alleviate county concerns and may be supportable.

Government, Finance and Operations

The Government, Finance and Operations committee convened on July 2, to discuss regulatory relief. The following bills are examples of those that put an increased fiscal burden on employers, including counties.

AB 2716 (Ma): Mandates sick leave for all employees, including temporary, seasonal, and IHSS providers.

SB 1717 (Perata): Increases the permanent disability awards under workers' compensation. This bill only affects public safety members and will result in increased workers' compensation costs to the state, counties, and cities.

AB 2754 (Bass): Adds a workers' compensation presumption for MRSA/staph infections.

Housing, Land Use and Transportation

The CSAC Housing, Land Use, and Transportation Policy Committee held a conference call June 25th to discuss regulatory processes under the committee's purview and to identify cost-saving measures that could be of mutual benefit to both counties and the state during the current fiscal crisis. Staff solicited input and suggestions from the committee members a couple of weeks in advance of the conference call but did not receive any suggestions. Staff also solicited suggestions on the call however, the committee did not identify any ideas for discussion and therefore, the committee took no action on any potential regulatory or statutory relief proposals.

Administration of Justice

The Administration of Justice Policy Committee met on June 26 to discuss the motion made on May 22 at the CSAC Board of Directors Meeting. In preparation for this meeting staff attempted to identify any potential issue areas that might be candidates for suspension in the public safety arena. CSAC staff was not unable to identify any regulations that seemed appropriate for suspension nor did staff receive any specific suggestions from committee members leading up to the policy committee meeting. Committee members may recall that counties are subject to Title 15 and Title 24 regulations through the Corrections Standards Authority, which govern adult and juvenile detention facility standards. Given the significance of these regulations — which cover facility programs and procedures; medical, mental health, nutrition and sanitation standards; as well as regulations specific to detaining minors in adult facilities — and accompanying life and safety protections as well substantial liability considerations, staff and the committee agreed that these particular regulations were not appropriate for suspension. During the course of the AOJ policy meeting discussion, committee members were unable to identify any relevant regulations for suspension.

Agriculture and Natural Resources

Staff also solicited suggestions on the call however, the committee did not identify any ideas for discussion and therefore, the committee took no action on any potential regulatory or statutory relief proposals.

CSAC PAC TASK FORCE REPORT

CSAC PAC Task Force

Monday, July 28, 2008 · 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
CSAC Third Floor Conference Room
Call in number: 800.867.2581
Access code: 7500508

Supervisor Gary Wyatt, CSAC First Vice President, Chair

1:30 p.m.	I.	**Welcome and Introductions** *Supervisor Gary Wyatt, CSAC First Vice President*
1:35 – 1:45	II.	**Purpose of Task Force** *Paul McIntosh, CSAC Executive Director*
1:45 – 2:15	III.	**The Basics of Setting Up a Political Action Committee (PAC)** *Steve Lucas, Nielsen, Merksamer, Parinello, Mueller, and Naylor, LLP*
2:15 – 3:00	IV.	**CSAC's Involvement in Issue Campaigns (Discussion)** *All*
3:15 – 3:30	V.	**Next Steps** *Paul McIntosh, CSAC Executive Director*
3:30 p.m.	VI.	**Closing Comments and Adjournment** *Supervisor Gary Wyatt, CSAC First Vice President*

CSAC PAC Task Force

Name	County	Address	Phone number	Email
Gary Wyatt, Chair	Imperial	940 W Main St., Ste. 209 El Centro, CA 92243	(760) 482-4613	garywyatt@co.imperial.ca.us
Judy Case	Fresno	2281 Tulare St., Rm. 300 Fresno, CA 93721	(559) 488-3664	dbeigi@co.fresno.ca.us
Kathy Long	Ventura	800 S. Victoria Ave. Ventura, CA 93009	(805) 654-2276	kathy.long@ventura.org
Mike McGowan	Yolo	625 Court Street, Room 204 Woodland, CA 95695	(916) 375-6441	mike.mcgowan@yolocounty.org
Ted Novelli	Amador	810 Court Street Jackson, CA 95642	(209) 223-6470	tnovelli@co.amador.ca.us
John Tavaglione	Riverside	P.O. Box 1646 Riverside, CA 92502	(951) 955-1020	jtavagli@rcbos.org

Staff

Jean Hurst	CSAC	1100 K Street, Ste. 101 Sacramento, CA 95814	(916) 327-7500 ext. 515	jhurst@counties.org

CSAC FINANCE CORPORATION UPDATE

CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
FINANCE CORPORATION

To: CSAC Executive Committee

From: Tom Sweet, Executive Director, CSAC Finance Corporation

RE: Program Update

Date: July 18, 2008

The following are highlights of the numerous programs that the CSAC Finance Corporation offers to your counties:

- Santa Barbara County Supervisor Joni Gray was appointed to the CSAC Finance Corporation Board of Directors in June as recommended by the CSAC Executive Committee.

- The CSAC Finance Corporation's new Program Manager, Laura Labanieh, started June 2nd.

- CalTRUST, a public agency investment pool, currently has 60 active participants and current assets exceed $648 million. The next CalTRUST trustees meeting will be held September 17th in San Diego County.

- The 2008 Tax and Revenue Anticipation Note financing successfully closed on July 1, 2008. There were 29 participants in this transaction for a total of $854,070,000. Counties accounted for 12 of the 29 participants.

- A Statewide Community Infrastructure Program (SCIP) financing successfully closed in June 2008 for a total exceeding $21 million. There were 9 participants in this issuance including El Dorado County.

- On July 16th CSAC Finance Corporation and US Communities hosted our 9th Green Purchasing seminar in Sacramento County. An additional seminar is scheduled in Santa Cruz County on September 26th.

- A new comprehensive marketing strategy for all CSAC Finance Corporation programs is in process of being created. A reference guide of CSAC Finance Corporation programs has already been created as part of the overall marketing strategy.

- The next CSAC Finance Corporation Board of Directors Meeting will be September 18-19th in San Diego County.

If you have any questions regarding these programs or any other CSAC Finance Corporation programs please do not hesitate to contact me via phone, 916.327.7500 x556, or via email, tsweet@counties.org, or contact Laura Labanieh at 916.327.7500 x536 or llabanieh@counties.org.

CSAC CORPORATE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM UPDATE

CALIFORNIA Counties CORPORATE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM

Memorandum

July 18, 2008

To: CSAC Executive Committee

From: Tom Sweet, Executive Director, CSAC Finance Corporation
Lindsay Hall, Corporate Relations Manager, CSAC

Re: Corporate Associates Program Updates
INFORMATION ITEM

- With the appointment of Lindsay Hall as CSAC's Corporate Relations Manager, in late March, the Corporate Associates Program now has a full-time dedicated staff person.
- The latest membership reports show there are 82 corporate members.
- Sponsorship solicitation continues with efforts geared towards the CSAC Annual Meeting in San Diego.
- Plans are in place for a major session presentation dealing with energy issues in California, with three of our key corporate members participating in the panel discussion.
- To date, the Annual Meeting exhibit hall is approximately half committed for this year.
- Upcoming events:
    1. Bocce Ball Tournament – September 10th, CSAC Conference Center, Sacramento
    2. Annual Meeting Golf Tournament – December 4th, Riverwalk Golf Club, San Diego

COMPENSATION ANALYSIS UPDATE

1100 K Street
Suite 101
Sacramento
California
95814

Telephone
916.327-7500
Facsimile
916.441.5507

MEMORANDUM

July 28, 2008

To: CSAC Executive Committee

From: Paul McIntosh
Executive Director

Re: **Compensation Analysis for CSAC Staff**

Recall that a comprehensive analysis of the duties, responsibilities and compensation of CSAC staff was authorized last year with an overall goal of ensuring that CSAC remained competitive and was able to attract and retain a highly qualified and skilled workforce. In January of this year, after review of proposals, the firm of Fox Lawson and Associates was retained. Progress of the study to date includes:

- Completion of Position Description Questionnaires by each member of the CSAC staff
- Identification of comparable agencies to survey regarding compensation policies and levels
- Preparation of a classification structure wherein all job classes are ranked according to key characteristics
- Preparation of draft job descriptions (currently under review)
- Survey of comparable agencies

By the end of July, it is expected that the survey process will be complete and analysis of the results may begin. In addition, review of the draft job descriptions will be completed and those descriptions placed into final form. We expect to receive preliminary compensation reports by the middle of August and to have final recommendations prepared for implementation by your October Retreat.

2008 CSAC CALENDAR OF EVENTS

January

23-25 CSAC Corporate Associates Meeting, La Jolla, San Diego County

31 CSAC Executive Committee Meeting, Sacramento, Sacramento County

March

1-5 NACo Legislative Conference, Washington D.C.

5-7 2008 Public Works Officers Institute & CEAC Spring Conference, Hilton Torrey Pines in La Jolla, San Diego County

20 CSAC Board of Directors Meeting, Sacramento, Sacramento County

April

10 CSAC Executive Committee Meeting, Santa Monica, Los Angeles County

16 CalTRUST Annual Meeting, Carmel, Monterey County

17-18 CSAC Finance Corp. Annual Meeting, Carmel, Monterey County

17-18 San Joaquin Valley Regional Association Conference, Bass Lake, Madera County

May

21-22 CSAC Legislative Conference, Sacramento, Sacramento County

22 CSAC Board of Directors Meeting, Sacramento, Sacramento County

21-23 NACo Western Interstate Region (WIR) Conference, St. George Utah

June

12-13 CCS Partnership Summit and Joint Board Meeting, Burlingame, San Mateo County

July

11-15 NACo Annual Conference, Kansas City, MO

August

7 CSAC Executive Committee Meeting, Sacramento, Sacramento County

September

11 CSAC Board of Directors Meeting, Sacramento, Sacramento County

17 CalTRUST Fall Meeting, La Jolla, San Diego County

18-19 CSAC Finance Corp. Fall Meeting, La Jolla, San Diego County

24-26 RCRC Annual Meeting, El Dorado County

October

8-10 CSAC Executive Committee Retreat, San Mateo County

15-17 CAOAC Annual Meeting, Morro Bay, San Luis Obispo County

22-24 San Joaquin Valley Regional Association Conference, *Location TBD*

December

1-4 CSAC 114th Annual Meeting, San Diego County

3 CSAC Board of Directors Meeting, San Diego, San Diego County

4-5 New Supervisors Institute, Session I, San Diego, San Diego County