

SONOMA COUNTY



2009 STATE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

SONOMA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- Valerie BrownDistrict 1
- Mike KernsDistrict 2
- Shirlee Zane.....District 3
- Paul L. Kelley (Chair).....District 4
- Efren Carrillo.....District 5

Bob Deis, County Administrative Officer
Jim Leddy, Community and Government Affairs Manager

Sonoma County
575 Administration Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
(707) 565-2241

State Advocates

Peterson Consulting, Inc. / Shaw Yoder, Inc.
1415 L Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 441-4424
Petersonconsult@earthlink.net

Sonoma County 2009 Legislative Program

Table of Contents

	Page No.
General Guidelines	1
Top Priorities*	3
General Concerns*	10
Health and Human Services	11
Criminal Justice	13
Development, Administrative, Support & Fiscal Services.....	14
Sonoma County Green Proposals.....	22

** Please note the numbers beside each item are for tracking purposes and are not to be construed as ranking or prioritization.*

General Guidelines

Sonoma County 2009 Legislative Program

General Guidelines

The primary goal of Sonoma County's Board of Supervisors and its employees is to serve and support the well being of the county's residents. Sonoma County government is dedicated to enhancing the economic, environmental, and social quality of life in the County. To this end the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors supports the general guidelines set forth below. County staff, including the County's legislative advocates, will apply these general guidelines in evaluating legislation, as well as executive and regulatory actions; it is the Board's objective to implement these guidelines:

- Encourage and seek legislation that protects the County's quality of life, its diverse natural resources, and preserves the essence and history of the County.
- Encourage and seek legislation to facilitate orderly economic expansion and growth, and increase the opportunity for discretionary revenues and programmatic and financial flexibility for the County.
- Support fiscal reform efforts which would assure Sonoma County the financial independence necessary to provide services to its residents and meet its mandated responsibilities.
- Oppose taking property tax revenues from Sonoma County.
- Oppose mandates without enough revenue to pay for the mandate including County control of the relevant programs and program expenditures.
- Support the County's authority to assure mutually acceptable tax sharing agreements for annexation, incorporation, and redevelopment that protect or enhance the County's ability to provide services to its residents.
- Support legislation that provides tax and funding formulas for the equitable distribution of state and federal monies while opposing attempts to decrease, restrict, or eliminate County revenue sources.
- Support increased appropriations to the County for mandated programs, including capital acquisition costs.
- Support the enactment of legislation to allocate infrastructure bonds based on objective criteria developed with local input.
- Advocate for timely, full state funding for state programs operated by the County which include appropriate cost of living increases, as well as costs associated with increases in population and caseload growth.
- Support legislation that furthers the goals identified in the County's Strategic Plan.

Top Priorities

Sonoma County 2009 Legislative Program

Top Priorities

Set forth below are the County's priority advocacy issues for the 2009 State Legislative Session. The process of identifying these priorities included an assessment of the relative importance of identified issues, and an evaluation of exclusivity to Sonoma County. As a result, the 2009 priority advocacy issues include two categories: (1) the County's top priorities; and (2) issues that are exclusive or semi-exclusive to Sonoma County, for which the County's advocates will take a lead role in pursuing the introduction and passage of legislation. Additionally, in order to reflect Sonoma County's commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and addressing climate change, advocacy issues related to greenhouse gas emissions reductions and climate protection efforts appearing throughout the platform are also restated at the end of this document for easy reference.

Criminal Justice

1. Domestic Violence Program Funding

Issue: AB 2010, enacted by the legislature in 2004, authorized Alameda and Solano Counties to raise fees for the issuance of marriage licenses and for certified copies of marriage certificates, birth certificates, fetal death records, and death records. The added fees are placed in a special fund to provide for oversight and coordination of domestic violence prevention, intervention and prosecution efforts in each respective county. The authorization provided by AB 2010 sunsets on January 1, 2010. In 2007, the legislature considered AB 1275, which would expand this program statewide by authorizing any county Board of Supervisors to, upon making certain findings, to increase the fees for certified copies of marriage certificates, birth certificates, fetal death records and death records, to fund governmental oversight and coordination of domestic violence programs. The potential for funds raised from this legislation could result in approximately \$300,000 per year in increased revenues to support countywide efforts in the area of domestic violence.

Legislation was introduced in 2008 (AB 2231) which, in some versions, would have authorized the County of Sonoma to collect such fees. In its final version, AB 2231 only extended a sunset for those counties that already had statutory authority to collect the additional fees. The Governor vetoed this measure.

Action: Sponsor, co-sponsor and/or support legislation to allow the County of Sonoma, upon certain findings made by the Board of Supervisors, to raise fees for the issuance of marriage licenses and certified copies of marriage certificates, fetal death records and death records, issued by the County Clerk, for the purpose of funding oversight and coordination of domestic violence prevention, intervention and prosecution efforts.

2. Jail Alternative Model Recognition

Issue: In an effort to forestall a prison population cap, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 900 in May of 2007. This legislation provides funding for "secure reentry" beds. The Governor, recognizing the wisdom in more "upstream" efforts to manage detention challenges, had earlier proposed to fund Adult Probation Services state-wide at \$100 million annually. However, his additional funding was cut from the 2007-2008 Budget by the Legislature.

The Sonoma County Strategic Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors in December of 2007, discusses the need to “more effectively address public safety issues at the lowest risk levels for all members of the community, including early detection, intervention and diversion of minor criminal activity, substance abuse and mental health issues.”

Sonoma County is exploring a number of jail alternatives including the potential development of a Community Corrections Center. This model holds offenders accountable while providing programs to help them become productive members of our community. It assists offenders in taking responsibility for their lives through law-abiding and responsible behavior. The Model includes offering programs and services such as job skills training, life skills classes, thought-restructuring programs, individual and group counseling, alcohol and drug counseling, family counseling and financial management classes. Despite evidence based success of this model in other State and Countries, it is not recognized as a reentry facility for purposes of funding under AB 900.

Action: Sponsor legislation to recognize the Sonoma County Community Corrections Center Model as a reentry facility eligible for AB 900 funding and for funding under any other current or future correctional or reentry facility state financing.

3. County Correctional Facilities and Funding

Issue: Sonoma County projects that the County jail will reach its inmate population capacity by 2010. Proposed state prison reform efforts may require county correctional facilities to house inmates longer, further reducing available capacity. The estimated cost, to consolidate and expand the County’s main adult detention facility to house the increasing inmate population, is \$300+ million.

Action: Oppose state prison reforms that would shift prisoners to county jail. Support proposals to provide state funding to maintain and expand County correctional facilities to house increasing inmate populations, and to fund viable jail alternatives. Oppose legislation or administration efforts to restrict jail funding to only those counties that agree to site a state re-entry facility or correctional skilled nursing facility within the county.

4. Prop 83 Responsibility and Funding

Issue: Proposition 83, which was approved by voters in November 2006, prohibits registered sex offenders from residing within 2,000 feet of any school or park. Prior law barred high risk parolees convicted of specified sex offenses against a child from residing with ¼ to ½ mile (1,320 to 2,640 feet) of a school. The increased residency restrictions contained in Prop 83 will ultimately force many of these offenders from urban to rural areas. This will result in an increased number of offenders, residing in the incorporated areas of the county.

Further, Prop 83 adds responsibilities for the Probation Department to assess and supervise these offenders. As written, Prop 83 requires sex offenders to be monitored by GPS for life. The California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is responsible for the offenders while on parole, but Prop 83 was silent as to who monitors and pays for monitoring offenders who complete parole, and return to the community. The Proposition does not provide any funding for the required life-time monitoring.

Action: Support efforts to change the residency requirements through the court or legislative process. Support legislation that will clarify the proposition and assure State funding of sex-offender assessment, supervision, and monitoring. Seek clarification to identify the State as the

entity financially responsibility once an offender is off parole, but still required to comply with lifetime bracelet monitoring.

Development, Administrative, Support & Fiscal

5. Conversion of Mobile Home Parks to Resident Ownership

Issue: There is a growing movement by mobile home park owners to convert their parks to resident ownership as a means to circumvent local rent control ordinances. Under current State law (GC Section 66427.5) upon conversion and the sale of a single lot, the entire park is removed from local rent control. Residents must be given the opportunity to purchase their lots, but the lot does not have to be offered at fair market value. If residents remain as tenants, the provisions of 66427.5 supersede rent control. Mobile homes are an essential source of affordable housing for seniors and others on fixed incomes. In 2007 the County sponsored legislation (AB 1542) to protect this important affordable housing resource. AB 1542, authored by Assembly member Evans was passed by the legislature, but vetoed by the Governor, based on his concern that as proposed, it extended rent control to mobile home owners in much of the state no matter what their income level.

Action: Sponsor or support legislation to amend Article 1 of Chapter 2 of the Subdivision Map Act (Division 2 of Title 7 of the Government Code) related to Mobile Home Park Conversions, to maintain mobile home parks as a viable and essential source of affordable housing.

6. Sudden Oak Death

Issue: Sudden Oak Death has killed more than a million trees in California over the last 12 years, and the prognosis is that we have seen just 1/10th of the mortality that can be expected. Sonoma County is experiencing the worst tree mortality of any county in the State. In October 2006, the Sonoma County Department of Emergency Services and the University of California Cooperative Extension began a successful education and outreach program designed to mitigate the spread of the disease, and to manage the increased fire hazard resulting from the disease.

Action: Support legislation to allocate funding to support Sudden Oak Death education, fire fuel mitigation and hazardous tree removal.

7. Self Help Counties

Issue: The passage of Proposition 1B presents an opportunity for local jurisdictions to receive State Bond funds to support congestion reduction, highway and local road improvements, public transportation, etc. Historically, funding preference has been given to counties that have taken the initiative to supplement state and federal transportation funds by enacting local voter-approved funding measures such as, the half-cent sales tax passed by Sonoma County to fund transportation projects. Counties with locally enacted transportation measures have been referred to as “self-help” counties.

Action: Advocate for regulations that reflect the historical practice of giving funding preference to “self-help” counties, who have enacted local transportation tax measures. Advocate for California Transportation Commission regulations that distribute Proposition 1B funds largely to those traditional “self-help” counties that have enacted local, voter approved, transportation funding sources, such as local sales tax measures.

8. **Locally-Funded Judicial Benefits**

Issue: Under Government Code Section 77201(c), counties in 1998 had the option of reducing MOE payments for trial court funding by the cost of local judicial benefits. Sonoma and many other counties deducted this amount from their payment. Counties therefore remain liable for the “cost of these benefits” into the future. There is no mechanism to reverse this choice. A recent California Court of Appeals 4th District opinion held that it was unconstitutional for a county to provide benefits to local judges because compensation for judges must be “prescribed” by the Legislature. If counties cannot provide benefits to judges, it is unclear what counties remain responsible for under Sec. 77201. The Fiscal impact to the sought after changes would be the relief of the County from increasing health care costs associated with judicial benefits as well as administrative clarity. The fiscal impact should be neutral because the County will increase its maintenance of effort (MOE) payment to the state, however, the County would no longer be responsible for payment of the cost of local judicial benefits whose costs has grown at a far greater rate than the states MOE. As the cost of benefits increases the County continues to incur a growing liability.

Action: Sponsor and/or support legislation which clarifies the county’s role and responsibility in implementing the Court of Appeal’s decision while meeting any ongoing funding responsibility under the Trial Court statute.

9. **Service Connected Disability**

Issue: Section 31720(a) of the Retirement Act of 1937 states that any member permanently incapacitated for the performance of duty shall be retired for disability regardless of age if, and only if, the member's incapacity is a result of injury or disease arising out of, and in the course of, the member's employment, and such employment contributes substantially to such incapacity. Two principal cases of the California Supreme Court hold that the “substantial contribution” clause contained in Section 31720(a) requires there be a “real and measurable” connection between the member’s condition and the employment in order to qualify for a service-connected disability. This judicial interpretation creates a different (lower) standard and creates administrative complexity for the retirement system and medical experts involved in determining eligibility for disability retirement. An examiner may reach the medical opinion that the contribution of the member’s employment to the disability was not “substantial.” However, when considering the same case in light of the Court’s “real and measurable” standard, the examiner may find that it meets that test. This conflict in standard exposes the Board of Retirement to criticism that it is not enforcing Section 31720(a). In 2007, Sonoma County Retirement Board considered 29 disability retirement applications, 21 of which were applications for service-connected disability retirement. All 21 applications were granted. For the period of 2003-2007, a total of 156 service-connected disability retirements were granted.

Action: Support legislation to define the meaning of “substantial contribution” as established in Section 31720(a) of the Retirement Act of 1937, to mean 50% plus one and require that “substantial contribution” be the standard applied in determining a member’s eligibility for a service related disability retirement.

10. **Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Funding**

Issue: Proposition 84 allocates \$37 million to the North Coast and \$138 million to the Bay Area for implementation of Integrated Waste Management Plans. These funds should be appropriated by the legislature over the coming years. SB 2X 1 (Perata), which was signed by the Governor on September 20, 2008, appropriates over \$181 million statewide for integrated plan programs. Funds

are disbursed through grant programs administered by the Department of Water Resources. In addition to benefitting County departments such as Regional Parks and Public Works, special districts including Agricultural Preservation and Open Space, the Water Agency and cities within the County are eligible.

Action: Advocate for grant criteria as DWR develops them so that Sonoma County and regional agencies have maximum opportunity to draw down grant funding for local projects.

11. **Funding for Sanitation Facility Upgrades**

Issue: Three rural communities in Sonoma County (Occidental, Camp Meeker, and Monte Rio) are under regulatory orders to install or upgrade sanitary sewer collection and wastewater treatment systems. The cost of required facilities has escalated over time, and now exceeds local financial resources. State financial assistance is necessary to implement projects to bring these communities into compliance with state regulatory order.

Action: Advocate for additional state funds for the Small Community Grant Program offered through the State Water Resources Control Board. Support implementation of integrated regional water management grant programs through Prop 50 and Prop 84 to support these projects.

12. **Force Account Labor Threshold**

Issue: Use of force account labor (in house staff) is restricted to projects totaling \$30,000 or less under the Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Act of the Public Contract Code. Sonoma County Facilities Operations is allowed to use in-house Building Mechanic labor construction projects under \$30,000, including detention work, and for all maintenance work. The \$30,000 limit on force account labor is restrictively low and does not adequately take into account construction project escalation. Construction projects can be delivered effectively and efficiently through in-house labor. This threshold level is constrictive, particularly with detention work which requires additional background clearance and security measures for outside contractors up to \$125,000.

Action: Support legislation to amend the Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Act of the Public Contract Code to increase the authorized amount of force account labor for construction projects to align with the same level allowed for purchasing.

13. **Sonoma County Transportation Authority Climate Protection Capacity**

Issue: The Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) is a multijurisdictional Transportation Planning Agency which serves all nine cities and the County of Sonoma. As the issue of climate protection has expanded to touch upon other policy areas and given the large role that transportation policy has to do with greenhouse gas production and climate change, the need for the SCTA to have the ability to better coordinate multijurisdictional efforts becomes evident.

Action: Sponsor or support legislation that would provide the SCTA with authority for coordination of climate protection programs and projects.

14. **Provision of Additional Services**

Issue: Current statute authorizes specific counties to contract with the public and private sectors to share their expertise within their respective areas of service. These services provide revenues that help reduce fixed costs. Sonoma County currently practices this provision of services with public entities in the areas of fleet maintenance, reprographics and County Counsel services. It would follow to allow our services be made available for private entities pending Board approval.

Currently, other counties also benefit from being able to provide maintenance and construction services to other non-government entities. Under the current statutes, Sonoma County is not a specified county for provision of services to private entities, and therefore is not allowed to generate revenue by providing optional or enhanced services.

Action: Sponsor or support legislation to add the County of Sonoma to the list of specified counties in Government Code Section 25332 to enter into contracts with private enterprise to provide services that require special experience, education and training that the County possesses. Sponsor or support legislation which allows counties to perform maintenance and construction services to other non-governmental agencies.

General Concerns

General Concerns

Following are the County's general advocacy issues for 2009. General advocacy issues differ from priority advocacy issues, in that the County's legislative advocates will primarily support the efforts of others to enact legislation to address these concerns, which are most often shared concerns of multiple counties.

Health & Human Services

15. Family PACT Program – Reductions in Funding

Issue: California's Family Planning Access Care and Treatment Program (FAM PACT) provides counseling, education and birth-control services to nearly 1.7 million low-income Californians each year, including prenatal services, annual exams and education about sexually transmitted diseases. In Sonoma County, Public Health Clinics provided FAM PACT services to 4,254 clients in FY 07-08. It is estimated the FAM PACT program saves federal and state taxpayers more than \$1.4 billion annually. The federal government pays \$315 million of California's \$432-million annual cost. Because those federal funds can be spent only on legal residents, California pays the cost for the services provided to undocumented immigrants. Since it began receiving Medicaid money in 1998, the state has used a statistical method to estimate the number of illegal immigrants in the Family PACT program, currently calculated at 14%. But the federal government, which objects to this method, informed the State it must begin vetting every participant to determine if he/she is in the country legally, or lose all federal funding.

Action: Advocate for resolution of this issue through the California Department of Health Care Services and the Health and Human Services Agency to support California's screening methodology. Coordinate with similarly-affected counties to maximize effective communication and resolution of this issue, with resolution ultimately including historical funding levels.

16. Expansion of State/Federal Health Coverage for Low Income Children

Issue: There are approximately 3,000 uninsured low-income children in Sonoma County. Two-thirds of these children are eligible for existing public programs, the remaining one-third are not eligible for any program. Without coverage, these children may be unable to obtain basic primary care, preventative screening, developmental assessment and specialty care. As a result, they are more likely to suffer from acute illness, developmental delay and chronic health problems that may impact their ability to be healthy, productive and successful members of our community. The County in partnership with the community has developed a local initiative to support health coverage to all low-income children in Sonoma County. (Healthy Kids) The County has received grant funds from both public and private sources as well as community funds to work toward the goal of health coverage for all children in Sonoma County. There are currently 10,300 children covered by federally funded Health Families (SCHIP) and 3080 children who rely on community funded health insurance in Sonoma County through Healthy Kids. Current federal SCHIP funding will not allow for Sonoma County to maintain or grow enrollment without reductions in benefits. Private funding for all 3,080 children in Healthy Kids is not projected to be sustainable over the long-term. The County seeks long-term policy and financial support for health coverage for children from the state and federal governments.

Action: Support legislative efforts that seek to provide insurance, including funding, for all uninsured children in California. Support legislation or an initiative that identifies a stable source of funding for uninsured child health care.

17. **Distribution of Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Treatment State Discretionary Funding**

Issue: Since 1994, as a result of the Sobkey v. Smoley court decision, the disparity in the distribution of AOD discretionary state general funds has grown. Some counties receive no AOD discretionary State General Funds (such as Sonoma County), some receive less than 50 cents per capita, and some receive more than 50 cents per capita. The methodology for distribution of AOD state discretionary general funds needs to be revisited and a more equitable distribution methodology developed. The County substantiated, through its recent Jail Alternatives Study, the high correlation between alcohol and other drug use and involvement with the criminal justice systems. Investing in upstream programs, like AOD treatment, could relieve pressure on the Criminal Justice System thereby resulting in savings to the County and to the State.

Action: Support legislation that provides a base level (minimum 50 cents per capita) of state discretionary funding to all counties for local alcohol and other drug treatment programs.

18. **Medi-Cal Simplification and Consolidation with Healthy Families**

Issue: Medi-Cal simplification and consolidation with Healthy Families is needed more urgently than ever. The recently enacted Deficit Reduction Act (DRA) citizenship and ID requirements will further complicate already complex Medi-Cal eligibility determinations. Counties must assist families with obtaining documentation, creating an even greater workload. Sonoma County Healthy Kids, providing health insurance options to children who are not eligible for public programs due to income or immigration status is now fully operational. Applicant children must first be screened for Medi-Cal and Healthy Families, and if ineligible can apply for Healthy Kids. Simplification and consolidation of Medi-Cal and Healthy Families would make determination of eligibility for one of these programs easier and less error-prone.

Action: Support legislation to simplify and consolidate complex and duplicative health programs such as Medi-Cal and Healthy Families programs.

19. **Health Coverage for All California Residents**

Issue: There are approximately 46 million Americans without insurance coverage – including 6.5 million residents of California. Two-thirds of the uninsured are low income, and eight in ten come from working families. Many uninsured work for employers that do not offer insurance, and those who are offered insurance often cannot afford their share of the premium. Young adults, racial and ethnic minorities, and those who are non-citizens are more likely to be uninsured. Lack of insurance has a significant impact on an individual's ability to access health care services. Uninsured adults are more likely to postpone or forego health care altogether, are less able to afford prescription drugs and less likely to follow through on treatment plans. Reduced access to quality health care results in poorer health, preventable hospitalizations, and premature death. Similar to the substantial efforts that have been made to provide insurance coverage for uninsured children, the County supports the development by policy makers and stakeholders of a long term solution that will provide health care coverage for all residents of California. Toward that end, the County urges the Governor and the State Legislature to enact a system of health care coverage and medical care delivery that builds upon and preserves the strengths of the current system, including the unique qualities of county operated systems that specialize in serving vulnerable populations. Any transfer of county responsibilities and funding to the state would be a very complex process, and must be approached

in a thoughtful, gradual manner. Any health care reform process must take into account historical, current and future county costs for treating those who are, and those who may remain, uninsured. Finally, health care reform must include mental health parity provisions that provide coverage for mental health services equal to coverages for medical and surgical benefits and ensure adequate ongoing funding for both expanded and core mental health services.

Action: Support legislative efforts to provide health insurance and a stable source of funding for all residents of California consistent with the *Health Care Reform Principles of Action* adopted by the Board on August 21, 2007.

20. Service Delivery System and Funding for Individuals With Cognitive Disorders

Issue: Individuals with cognitive disorders such as Alzheimer's, HIV dementia, and traumatic brain injuries often require extensive, costly long-term care and other mental health treatment services. Currently, there is no mental health services delivery system or funding for programs and services to address the needs of individuals with cognitive disorders. As a result, these individuals often end up in mental health crisis centers and inpatient psychiatric hospitals requiring significant mental health realignment dollars to fund needed services.

Action: Support legislation or budget language that identifies new resources to fund services, including long term care services for individuals with cognitive disorders.

Criminal Justice

21. Superior Court Reimbursement for Court Security Costs

Issue: Counties are required to pay for a number of court related costs for court security services, which are provided to the Court by the Sonoma County Sheriff's Department. These non-reimbursed costs include the salary and benefit and related costs for the Lieutenant in charge of the Unit, 4850, pagers, travel, required staff training, and indirect costs, and administrative costs. Annually, the Sheriff's department is not reimbursed for approximately \$300,000 in eligible expenditures.

Action: Support legislation to require the courts to pay all costs for Court Security as defined in the Superior Court Law Enforcement Act of 2002.

22. Domestic Violence Court

Issue: An estimated 39 California Counties have implemented domestic violence courts. Sonoma County's Domestic Violence Court costs approximately \$300,000 annually to the General Fund. In the past, several bills were introduced to provide state funding to counties for the operation of this type of program. However, none of these bills have passed.

Action: Support legislation that would provide state funding for Domestic Violence Courts.

23. Extraordinary Costs Related to Prosecution and Criminal Defense for Homicide/Capital Cases

Issue: The State's formula to reimburse counties for the cost of prosecution and criminal defense for homicide/capital cases does not provide funding for counties the size of Sonoma.

Action: Support legislation that would provide full state funding for criminal defense in all capital cases.

24. Funding Responsibility for Civil Grand Juries

Issue: The State, through trial court funding, has transferred court fiscal responsibility to the State. The fiscal responsibility of grand juries was not included in the transfer. Since the county lacks control over activities, expenditures, and investigatory activities (which include county agencies and officials as well as special districts and cities) of the grand jury, it is reasonable that the fiscal responsibility should also be transferred to the State. Grand juries report to the presiding judge and the presiding judge can order the county to increase funding for grand juries if a request is made and approved.

Action: Support legislation that would transfer fiscal responsibility of civil grand juries to the State court since Government Code Section 914 allows the presiding judge to approve expenditures in excess of budget.

25. **Defendant Release from Jail In Capital Cases**

Issue: Existing law provides that a defendant must be released from custody pursuant to Penal Code Section 1318, pending the prosecution's appeal of an adverse ruling on a suppression motion. There are two exceptions: 1) when the defendant is charged in a capital case where the proof is evident and the presumption great, and 2) in certain defined non-capital offenses where the court orders the defendant released from custody upon making bail. These narrow exceptions mean that in life-sentence cases such as attempted premeditated murder and aggravated sex offenses or crimes with gang enhancements that carry life terms, potentially dangerous defendants must be released from custody pending the outcome of the prosecution's appeal. Such an outcome creates the possibility a defendant may flee, and may place the public's safety at risk.

Action: Support legislation to add exceptions for release to any case where the punishment is a life term.

Development, Administrative, Support, & Fiscal Services

26. **Reimbursement for Special Election in 2009; County Authority to Administer All-Mail Election**

Issue: In order to address budgetary short-falls in 2008-2009, the Governor is likely to call a Special Election.

Action: Advocate for funding in the 2009-2010 State Budget to reimburse counties for the costs of any special election. Advocate for county authority to administer the election entirely through the mail.

27. **Proposition 1C and Proposition 84 – Park Funding Implementation Language**

Issue: Sonoma County has a strong interest in ensuring that Proposition 1C and 84 bond funds are allocated timely, equitably, and in a manner that supports ongoing priorities of Regional Parks and Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District needs, including specific earmarks, if applicable. The bonds total \$8.2 billion that could assist the County in protecting open space and developing its regional parks and related facilities.

Action: Advocate for legislation and/or specific implementation language to include that Sonoma County receive its fair share in funding for park facilities and programs and protection of open space within these bond acts. Ensure that the California State Parks Department is involved in developing language and implementing procedures. Incorporate language that considers the environmental

diversity of Sonoma County (e.g., riparian corridors, coastal areas, trails, etc.) and for per capita projects.

28. **Statewide Bond Initiatives To Be Placed on Future Ballots**

Issue: The Legislature as well as private organizations may develop bond initiatives that would appear on the ballot in 2010. Initiatives are expected to address land conservation and preservation, water resources, green jobs and infrastructure, as well as climate protection issues. Sonoma County seeks an equitable share of state bond funding.

Action: Advocate for State bond funding to benefit Sonoma County regional parks, open space and public access needs.

29. **Tribal Matters**

Issue: Federally recognized Indian tribes can develop lands held by the federal government in trust, without regard to local land use plans, such as the County General Plan. Further, such developments can have a number of impacts on the County, its citizenry, services, lands, and infrastructure that the County may not have the ability to mitigate. Recognizing this, the Board has adopted resolutions and provided policy direction both on specific development proposals, as well as more general matters, regarding tribal gaming and other development on tribal lands. In addition, the Board and County staff have actively participated in developing policy which deals with these issues regionally, and on state and national levels.

Action: Monitor and support efforts to enact legislation and regulations consistent with CSAC and NACO policies, prior and future Board resolutions, and policy direction with respect to tribal recognition and development proposals. Oppose legislation and regulations that are inconsistent with the above.

30. **Pension Reform**

Issue: Sonoma County supports pension reform efforts, but is opposed to recent proposals that are inconsistent with principles adopted by the California State Association of Counties (CSAC). Concerns include an ambiguous definition of “new employee,” ambiguous definition of “safety employees,” loss of local control due to the inclusion of reform in the State Constitution, loss of local control by mandating hybrid DB/DC plans, lack of recognition for those programs that are fiscally and managerially sound and for which considerable unfunded liability could be created by the loss of contributions to the DB plans, and loss of flexibility and employee choice of retirement age.

Action: Support pension reform legislation that is consistent with the CSAC principles, emphasizing sound fiscal and program practices, but allows local agencies the flexibility to design retirement programs that will protect their ability to recruit and retain a workforce for the effective delivery of local government services.

31. **Workers’ Compensation**

Issue: Since passage of SB 899 (Poochigian), Workers’ Compensation Reform, labor representatives, and the workers’ comp applicant attorney bar have sought legislative support for weakening the just-enacted reforms, pressed the Administrative Director to produce weakened guidelines, and pursued legal challenges to the reforms of SB 899. Previously, extraordinarily high Workers’ Compensation costs experienced by Sonoma County and other public employers resulted in the need to divert important discretionary general funds away from other identified needs to offset

this growing liability. Further, the claims adjudication system became unbalanced to the point that common sense often did not prevail in the determination of benefits.

Action: Resist all legislative and administrative efforts aimed at further reducing improvements made to the workers compensation system through SB 899. Continue to actively support the legislative platforms outlined by various statewide public employer organizations, including the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), the CSAC Excess Insurance Authority (CSAC-EIA), and the Public Agency Risk Managers Association (PARMA).

32. **Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Climate Change Response**

Issue: The County of Sonoma has adopted a comprehensive Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program which identifies strategies the County will pursue to reduce emissions. Substantial activity at the state and federal level is anticipated in the area of greenhouse gases and climate change. It is critical that State programs developed to implement AB 32, and new legislative initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases or to address the impacts of climate change, are structured to maximize the effectiveness and minimize economic disruption. It is also important that they recognize and address the needs of local government. Programs and strategies should be clear, feasible, and enforceable as a practical matter. They should be designed to avoid duplication, and should (to the extent reasonably practicable) build upon existing programs. Local decision-making authority should not be taken away, and local governments should be provided with the means to recover costs associated with new mandates.

Action: Support legislation and/or budget language that ensures that any new programs to reduce greenhouse gases or respond to climate change are sensible, equitable, and effective. Further, advocate that any new State mandates include full cost recovery. Support budgetary action to fund local implementation of AB 32 requirements.

33. **Funding for Implementation of AB 3018**

Issue: The emerging green economy requires a trained green workforce, and AB 3018 was passed recognizing that this will be a necessity. AB 3018 (2008) sets forth a plan to develop a green-trained work force but does not provide program funding, becoming an un-funded mandate. The training programs are available and desperately needed, but there is no funding appropriated for the program.

Action: Advocate for budget action to fund green-trained work force development.

34. **Fishery Restoration Programs**

Issue: California allocates general fund and water bond dollars to support salmon restoration programs. The state funding forms the state/local match for federal funding under the Pacific Coast Salmon Restoration Fund. In 2008, the state provided \$10 in general fund dollars and \$5.3 million in Proposition 84 funds. Within Proposition 84 there is an allocation of \$45 million available for coastal salmon restoration. Approximately \$40 million of that amount remains to be appropriated at this time.

Action: Support legislative or budget action that would appropriate \$10 million in Proposition 84 funds and \$10 million in General Fund money for salmon restoration programs managed by the Department of Fish and Game. Advocate for the Department to use the funds for projects that fulfill requirements of the States' Coho Salmon Recovery Strategy.

35. **County Early Pest Detection, Surveillance and Management Programs**

Issue: County early pest detection, surveillance and management programs are critical to Sonoma County, and the entire state, as a means of preventing the introduction and spread of exotic pests. These pests can range from Sudden Oak Death, Glassy-Winged Sharpshooter, various noxious weeds, to vine mealy bug. With an 80% reduction of funding to perform these activities, in the past year the State and counties have reduced or eliminated these programs, putting the program and entire state at risk. These programs are administered in conjunction with the California Department of Food and Agriculture and USDA.

Action: Support legislative and budget proposals that provide resources for counties to perform early pest detection, surveillance and management programs. Obtain broad support for programs and funding for these programs at federal, state, and local levels.

36. **Weights and Measure Device Registration Fees**

Issue: Mandated inspection programs to verify accuracy of weighing and measuring devices are partially funded by an annual device registration fee. The authority for this fee, found in Business and Professions Code Section 12246, sunsets January 1, 2011. This is the most significant funding mechanism for weights and measures inspection programs.

Action: Sponsor, co-sponsor or support legislation that would extend or eliminate the repeal date in the Business and Professions Code Section 12246 pertaining to weights and measures Device Registration Fees.

37. **Pesticide Regulatory Activity Funding**

Issue: The costs of operating County programs are not being adequately funded in order for counties to provide the level of pesticide enforcement activities expected by the public.

Action: Support legislative and budget proposals that provide funding to perform these programs, specifically at the county level. Obtain broad support for programs and funding for these programs at federal, state, and local level.

38. **Statewide Regulations for Onsite Wastewater Systems**

Issue: AB 885, passed in 2001, requires the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to develop statewide regulations for onsite wastewater systems (e.g., septic systems). SWRCB staff has been engaged in a multi-year process to draft the regulations with stakeholder groups, including environmental health professionals, local government officials, and real estate professionals. From a local government perspective, the draft regulations currently promoted by the SWRCB are based on questionable science and will impose onerous new regulatory and monitoring requirements on local agencies and costly new requirements on property owners who use onsite wastewater systems, including existing systems that may need repair in the future.

Action: Support the efforts of the California County Directors of Environmental Health (CCDEH), and other stakeholders, to ensure that the rules adopted to implement AB 885 are workable for local governments and practical for property owners, especially property owners with existing septic systems that may need repair in the future.

39. **Certificates of Compliance Undermine the General Plan and Agricultural Land Conservation**

Issue: Under the State Subdivision Map Act, Certificates of Compliance are used to recognize parcels created by old deeds, patents, and early subdivision maps. Certificates are also used to

recognize “fragment lots” that result from intersecting lines of old deeds and maps, one laid on top of the other. These certificate parcels are usually inconsistent with the General Plan. In addition, Certificates of Compliance have been used to recognize small lots on lands subject to an Agricultural Land Conservation (Williamson Act) Contract, resulting in parcels that are too small for viable agricultural use.

Action: Sponsor and/or support legislation that would restrict or eliminate the use of Certificates of Compliance for lots created prior to implementation of the public agency review provisions of the Subdivision Map Act in 1929, and for so-called “fragment lots” that result from intersecting lines of old deeds and maps, one laid on top of the other. In addition, sponsor and/or support legislation that would prohibit approval of Certificates of Compliance on lands subject to a Williamson Act contract, unless the resulting Certificate parcels each meet the minimum size and other requirements for inclusion in a Williamson Act contract.

40. **Endangered Species Act – Habitat Conservation Plans and Other Efforts Necessary to Comply With the ESA’s “Take” Prohibition**

Issue: The federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) prohibits “taking” any endangered species without specific authorization. Obtaining this authorization, whether through the ESA Section 7 process for projects with federal funding or a federal permit or through Section 10 for other projects, typically involves an extensive conservation planning effort. Once “take” authorization is granted, significant financial commitments are required to implement conservation programs. The cost of the comprehensive conservation planning effort can make individual projects financially infeasible. Public funding sources for conservation planning efforts under the ESA are very limited.

Action: Support legislation that would make federal and/or state funds available for comprehensive conservation planning efforts under the ESA.

41. **CEQA Process, Tiering of Environmental Documents**

Issue: Recently, the CEQA Guidelines were modified in response to a 2002 lawsuit by the Citizens for a Better Environment (CBE vs. California Resources Agency). One effect of these changes was removal of specific Guideline language (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 (f)(3)(C)), which previously allowed agencies to “tier” a Mitigated Negative Declaration for a project on a previous, Programmatic EIR, so long as no new, unmitigatable significant impacts are identified. Even if significant impacts were identified for the subsequent project, a mitigated negative declaration could still be used so long as the impacts were identified and found to be acceptable in the previous EIR (i.e., Findings were made in support of a Statement of Overriding Considerations). The County has numerous Programmatic EIRs (General Plan, Arm Plan, Airport Master Plan, etc.) upon which environmental documentation for a wide array of future projects should be able to tier, without the preparation of new EIRs. Given confusion over the new CEQA Guidelines, agencies may now need to prepare new EIRs to address subsequent project impacts, even if they were previously analyzed and, if found to be significant, overridden. This is in direct conflict with longstanding CEQA principles in support of document tiering, and is in direct conflict with CEQA process streamlining.

Action: Support amendments to streamline CEQA statute and/or guidelines to clearly provide for the tiering of mitigated negative declarations on Program EIRs, including situations where the subsequent project would have significant unavoidable impacts that were adequately identified in the Program EIR. Allow for multiple projects within a given area to share recent environmental data collected in the area

42. **Vehicle Code Prohibition on Mitigation Fees**

Issue: The Vehicle Code currently includes a provision under Section 9400.8 that prohibits the imposition of “a tax, permit fee, or other charge for the privilege of using the streets and highways, other than a permit fee for extra legal loads”. This provision has been interpreted by the courts to prevent an agency from adopting a mitigation fee under the Mitigation Fee Act for road maintenance due to excessive wear and tear regardless of any nexus study that documents excessive damage to a road. This provision harms heavy industries by limiting their ability to pay fees for mitigation measures related to cumulative road wear and maintenance impacts. Absent such a fee, CEQA would require that maintenance improvements are completed by the user, which is usually impractical, or that the road impacts are deemed “unavoidable” and approved under a statement of overriding consideration.

Action: Support legislation to amend Section 9400.8 to clarify that mitigation measures or impact fees that are required to mitigate road wear and maintenance impacts pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act or as identified through the CEQA process are allowable. Support an alternative funding mechanism which allows users to provide necessary funds for maintenance and upkeep of roads and bridges.

43. **State Fuel Tax Indexed to Consumer Price Index**

Issue: Through Prop. 111 in 1990, the state fuel tax doubled to 18 cents with a 9-cent increase phased in over four years. Since that time, the fuel tax rate has lost 25% of its value due to inflation. California is one of only 15 states below the federal gasoline tax rate of 18.4 cents per gallon, and California state gas tax is well below the national average of 20.2 cents per gallon. Eleven states index all or a portion of their gas tax rate based on either the Consumer Price Index or the price of gasoline. The gas tax revenue has not kept pace with the increasing cost of road maintenance. Since FY 04-05, County gas tax revenues being based on units sold, dropped 5% due in most part to people conserving fuel to avoid higher prices. Conversely, material and labor costs continue to rise.

Action: Support a constitutional amendment changing Prop.111 to allow for the indexing of California state gas tax (back to 1990, since the Prop.111 increase) phasing it in by 2 cents per year until it is current.

44. **Clean Generation Measures**

Issue: Counties should be permitted to retain the green credit associated with power generation used as a credit under AB 2466. Power purchase agreement installation surplus generation will be deemed eligible for this treatment. Counties should be encouraged to generate more green energy by being paid the full value of solar power generated and sold to an investor-owned utility less reasonable transmission charges.

Action: Support increased state solar subsidies, advocate for retention of the green credit for surplus generation, and require peak rate payment for solar power generation sold to investor-owned utilities. Advocate for legislation which authorizes Power Purchase Agreement surplus power to be wheeled to its own other government accounts. Support additional California Energy Commission rebates over standard rebates to reflect the loss of the Federal Tax Credit and the California Solar rebate should be raised back to its initial funding level.

45. **Managed Competition for Capital Projects**

Issue: Public bidding statutes do not contemplate allowing general law counties to bid on one of their own projects (managed competition). The apparent risk is that vendors may allege that a

county issued a “sham” request for bids and that in-house county labor is unfairly advantaged by its status as a tax-free government entity. Allowing counties to compete in a process that can be demonstrated to be fair, competitive, and transparent could prove that the county’s cost of doing business is equal to, if not more efficient, than private sector. Managed competition, or like initiatives, combine the best features of the public sector (control of valuable public funded infrastructure and retention of savings for workforce productivity gains) and private sector (competitive budgets and employee incentives) and would provide budget strapped counties new options to best utilize public resources.

Action: Support legislation to allow general law public entities to participate in managed competition for capital project work.

46. **Single Sourcing Based on Green Standards**

Issue: Sonoma County supports State action to develop “Green Standards” for single source procurement/sourcing decisions as they relate to the purchase of good and professional services. As many of the standards today are self-certifying, the appropriate criteria would need to be established so that it is fair for all parties. Developing green preference programs, for example, would allow true benefits to be realized by suppliers. Similarly, expanding existing law to include incentives for suppliers that objectively demonstrate certifications in particular areas promote expertise and an overall acceleration of green projects. Local government agencies will benefit from any legislative processes that help support and govern such green procurement policies.

Action: Support legislation that authorizes local procurement agencies to single-source green goods and professional services. Support legislation that provides incentives for suppliers to objectively demonstrate certifications, expertise and overall acceleration of green projects.

47. **Storm Drain Maintenance Assessment Districts New NPDES Water Quality Standards**

Issue: Storm drains are separated by law from sewer drains. To form a maintenance district and assess property owners requires a higher (66 2/3 %) vote.

Action: Support legislation that equates funding mechanisms for standards for storm runoff with funding standards for clean water standards for water sewer treatment as well as lower the threshold to form storm water maintenance district to 60% or less of property owners.

48. **Air Pollution Reduction:**

Issue: The air pollution control districts currently fund grants to incentivize clean up of mobile sources through a surcharge on motor vehicle registration. In 2004, the APCO helped negotiate (with business and environmental representatives) \$61 million in the Governor’s budget for additional diesel pollution clean-up, to be allocated to the air pollution control districts and released as grants, subject to state guidance. The same negotiations also resulted in the passage of AB 923 (Firebaugh) authorizing districts to raise additional incentive funds, and establishing a surcharge on the sale of new tires that will fund diesel pollution grants and the purchase of clean school buses. The negotiations also identified other potential sources of clean-up funds, and program changes that would increase fund availability for public fleets. The Governor’s office asked negotiators to continue to work towards consensus on these funding sources and program change, with a commitment from the administration to carry forward any consensus elements in the Governor’s next budget, or through independent legislation.

Action: Support state budget initiative, legislation, or regulatory changes to increase funds available for incentive programs to reduce air pollution.

49. **Manufacturer's Extended Product Stewardship for Discarded Items**

Issue: Many existing products and several new waste streams have been identified as hazardous waste when discarded, requiring the County to provide for collection and load checking to remove these wastes from the waste stream. The State has provided funding assistance for only a limited number of these items (used oil, CRT's). Collectively, these waste streams are costing the County hundreds of thousands of dollars to manage annually. These increased costs have resulted in new and increased tipping fees at County disposal sites, and have also increased the incidents of illegal dumping. Electronic waste has emerged as a major concern in waste, and requires attention and action from the Legislature.

Action: In the 2009 legislative session, the Integrated Waste Division would like the County to continue to encourage product stewardship legislation to include mercury-containing (fluorescent) lamps, electronic devices (in addition to CRT's), paint, batteries, and other hazardous items that are prohibited from landfill disposal.

50. **Public Utilities (PG&E, SBC, CABLE, ETC.) Facilities Relocation Cooperation**

Issue: Public utilities have become far less cooperative in identifying and planning for their facilities located within public works rights-of-way, causing project delays and additional costs related to design, construction, and claims.

Action: Support legislation regarding the establishment of regional centers for utility coordination information related to engineering projects.

Green Issues

Sonoma County's Green Proposals

*** Before the title of the issue below is a number in parentheses that reflects the numerical placement of the issue as it appears in the platform.**

(32) Greenhouse Gas Reduction and Climate Change Response

Issue: Local government agencies as well as California's communities are being mandated through AB 32 to calculate greenhouse gas emissions baselines and to take steps to reduce emissions. The County of Sonoma has adopted a comprehensive Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program which identifies strategies the County will pursue to reduce emissions. Substantial activity at the state and federal level is anticipated in the area of greenhouse gases and climate change. It is critical that State programs developed to implement AB 32, and new legislative initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases or to address the impacts of climate change, are structured to maximize the effectiveness and minimize economic disruption. It is also important that they recognize and address the needs of local government. Programs and strategies should be clear, feasible, and enforceable as a practical matter. They should be designed to avoid duplication, and should (to the extent reasonably practicable) build upon existing programs. Local decision making authority should not be taken away, and local governments should be provided with the means to recover costs associated with new mandates. Furthermore, AB 32 is an unfunded mandate that will likely have substantial county general fund impacts.

Action: Support legislation that ensures that any new programs to reduce greenhouse gases or respond to climate change imposed on counties include full cost recovery. Support legislative or budget language to create no/low cost fund for counties to use as a financial mechanism to implement baseline studies and to fund mitigation measures and programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions in government and communities.

Action:

(44) Clean Generation Measures

Issue: Counties should be permitted to retain the green credit associated with power generation used as a credit under AB 2466. Power purchase agreement installation surplus generation will be deemed eligible for this treatment. Counties should be encouraged to generate more green energy by being paid the full value of solar power generated and sold to an investor-owned utility less reasonable transmission charges.

Action: Support increased state solar subsidies, advocate for retention of the green credit for surplus generation, and require peak rate payment for solar power generation sold to investor-owned utilities. Advocate for legislation which authorizes Power Purchase Agreement surplus power to be wheeled to its own other government accounts.

(46) Single Sourcing Based on Green Standards

Issue: Sonoma County supports State action to develop "Green Standards" for single source procurement/sourcing decisions as they relate to the purchase of good and professional services. As many of the standards today are self-certifying, the appropriate criteria would need to be established so that it is fair for all parties. Developing green preference programs, for example, would allow true benefits to be realized by suppliers. Similarly, expanding existing law to include incentives for suppliers that objectively demonstrate certifications in particular areas promote expertise and an overall acceleration of green projects. Local government agencies will benefit from any legislative processes that help support and govern such green procurement policies.

Action: Support legislation that authorizes local procurement agencies to single-source green goods and professional services while adhering to the principles of arms-length transactions. Support legislation that provides incentives for suppliers to objectively demonstrate certifications, expertise and overall acceleration of green projects.

(48) Air Pollution Reduction:

Issue: The air pollution control districts currently fund grants to incentivize clean up of mobile sources through a surcharge on motor vehicle registration. In 2004, the APCO helped negotiate (with business and environmental representatives) \$61 million in the Governor’s budget for additional diesel pollution clean-up, to be allocated to the air pollution control districts and released as grants, subject to state guidance. The same negotiations also resulted in the passage of AB 923 (Firebaugh) authorizing districts to raise additional incentive funds, and establishing a surcharge on the sale of new tires that will fund diesel pollution grants and the purchase of clean school buses. The negotiations also identified other potential sources of clean-up funds, and program changes that would increase fund availability for public fleets. The Governor’s office asked negotiators to continue to work towards consensus on these funding sources and program change, with a commitment from the administration to carry forward any consensus elements in the Governor’s next budget, or through independent legislation.

Action: Support state budget initiative, legislation, or regulatory changes to increase funds available for incentive programs to reduce air pollution.

(49) Manufacturer’s Extended Product Stewardship for Discarded Items

Issue: Many existing products and several new waste streams have been identified as hazardous waste when discarded, requiring the County to provide for collection and load checking to remove these wastes from the waste stream. The State has provided funding assistance for only a limited number of these items (used oil, CRT’s). Collectively, these waste streams are costing the County hundreds of thousands of dollars to manage annually. These increased costs have resulted in new and increased tipping fees at County disposal sites, and have also increased the incidents of illegal dumping. Electronic waste has emerged as a major concern in waste, and requires attention and action from the Legislature.

Action: In the 2009 legislative session, the Integrated Waste Division would like the County to continue to encourage product stewardship legislation.

(40) Endangered Species Act – Habitat Conservation Plans and Other Efforts Necessary to Comply With the ESA’s “Take” Prohibition

Issue: The federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) prohibits “taking” any endangered species without specific authorization. Obtaining this authorization, whether through the ESA Section 7 process for projects with federal funding or a federal permit or through Section 10 for other projects, typically involves an extensive conservation planning effort. Once “take” authorization is granted, significant financial commitments are required to implement conservation programs. The cost of the comprehensive conservation planning effort can make individual projects financially infeasible. Public funding sources for conservation planning efforts under the ESA are very limited.

Action: Support legislation that would make federal and/or state funds available for comprehensive conservation planning efforts under the ESA.

(6) Sudden Oak Death

Issue: Sudden Oak Death has killed more than a million trees in California over the last 12 years, and the prognosis is that we have seen just 1/10th of the mortality that can be expected. Sonoma County is experiencing the worst tree mortality of any county in the State. In October 2006, the Sonoma County Department of Emergency Services and the University of California Cooperative Extension began a successful education and outreach program designed to mitigate the spread of the disease, and to manage the increased fire hazard resulting from the disease.

Action: Support legislation to allocate funding to support Sudden Oak Death education, fire fuel mitigation and hazardous tree removal.

(10) Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Funding

Issue: Proposition 84 allocates \$37 million to the North Coast and \$138 million to the Bay Area for implementation of Integrated Waste Management Plans. These funds should be appropriated by the legislature over the coming years. SB 2X 1 (Perata), which was signed by the Governor on September 20, 2008, appropriates over \$181 million statewide for integrated plan programs. Funds are disbursed through grant programs administered by the Department of Water Resources. In addition to benefitting County departments such as Regional Parks and Public Works, special districts including Agricultural Preservation and Open Space, the Water Agency and cities within the County are eligible.

Action: Advocate for grant criteria as DWR develops them so that Sonoma County and regional agencies have maximum opportunity to draw down grant funding for local projects.

(27) Proposition 1C and Proposition 84 – Park Funding Implementation Language

Issue: Sonoma County has a strong interest in ensuring that Proposition 1C and 84 bond funds are allocated timely, equitably, and in a manner that supports ongoing priorities of Regional Parks and Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District needs, including specific earmarks, if applicable. The bonds total \$8.2 billion that could assist the County in protecting open space and developing its regional parks and related facilities.

Action: Advocate for legislation and/or specific implementation language to include funding for Sonoma County park facilities and programs and protection of open space within these bond acts. Ensure that State Parks is involved in developing language and implementing procedures. Incorporate language that considers the environmental diversity of Sonoma County (e.g., riparian corridors, coastal areas, trails, etc.) and for per capita projects.

(28) Statewide Bond Initiatives To Be Placed on Future Ballots

Issue: The Legislature as well as private organizations may develop bond initiatives that would appear on the ballot in 2010. Initiatives are expected to address land conservation and preservation, water resources, green jobs and infrastructure, as well as climate protection issues. Sonoma County seeks an equitable share of state bond funding.

Action: Advocate for State bond funding to benefit Sonoma County regional parks, open space and public access needs.

(33) Funding for Implementation of AB 3018

Issue: The emerging green economy requires a trained green workforce, and AB 3018 was passed recognizing that this will be a necessity. AB 3018(2008) sets forth a plan to develop a green-trained

work force but does not provide program funding, becoming an un-funded mandate. The training programs are available and desperately needed, but there is no funding appropriated for the program.

Action: Advocate for budget action to fund green-trained work force development.