



Chair
Supervisor John J. Benoit
Executive Director
Jolena L. Voorhis

1100 "K" Street, Suite 101/Sacramento, CA 95814/ (916) 327-7531 FAX (916) 491-4182/UCC@UrbanCounties.com

UCC Summary Final Budget 2015-16 June 19, 2015

Both houses of the Legislature passed the main Budget bill and a couple of trailer bills on June 15, 2015 and the remainder of the trailer bills were passed on June 19, 2015. Attached is the list of all the bills acted upon and their current status.

Some of the major proposals in the final Budget include:

- Paying local governments \$765 million in mandate repayments which is the total amount owed for pre-2004 debt (outside of Budget Act and part of the 2014-15 Budget).
- Creates an Earned Income Tax credit for the poor.
- Additional funding to address the drought.
- An additional investment in Medi-Cal of \$245 million to help counties with the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.
- Additional \$1.1 million for the implementation of SB 678 for county probation and changes to the probation formula.
- Additional funding for CalWORKs Housing Supports and Foster Care.

A few proposals that did not make it as part of the package:

- Redevelopment dissolution changes.
- MCO tax.
- Repeal of the CalWORKs Maximum Family Grant.

To address some issues that are not part of the budget package, Governor Brown called for two special sessions:

- **Fixing California Roads, Highways and other Infrastructure.** The Governor proposes that the Legislature enact permanent and sustainable funding to maintain and repair the state's transportation and critical infrastructure, improve the state's key trade corridors and complement local infrastructure efforts.
- **Shoring Up Health Care Financing.** The Governor proposes that that the Legislature enact permanent and sustainable funding to provide at least \$1.1 billion annually to stabilize the General Fund costs for Medi-Cal, sufficient funding to continue the restoration of the 7 percent of IHSS hours and funding for additional rate increases for providers of Medi-Cal and developmental disability services. The funding could come from the proposed MCO tax and/or alternative sources.

Poverty (AB 93, SB 80, SB 85)

The final Budget package includes some of the Governor's proposals to address poverty:

- **Earned Income Tax Credit.** SB 80 creates the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to help the poorest working families in California. Specifically, this bill and the main budget bill (AB 93) provide that this targeted credit will provide a refundable tax credit for wages for households with incomes less than \$6,580 if there are no dependents or \$13,870 if there are three or more dependents. This credit would match 85% of the federal credit at the lowest income levels, providing an average estimated household benefit of \$460 annually for 825,000 families with a maximum benefit of \$2,653. SB 80 also provides that the Franchise Tax Board provide an annual written report on the EITC.
- **Amnesty Program.** The final package includes the Governor's May Revise proposal for a delinquent court ordered debt amnesty program for those Californians with past due court-ordered debt from traffic infractions. Participating individuals can reduce their debts by 50 percent, reduce the administrative fees they pay from \$300 to \$50, and have their drivers' licenses reinstated. Please see the Public Safety section for more details on this program.

Program Cuts and Changes

Drought (SB 88)

Consolidation of Water Districts

SB 88 would provide that where a public water system, or a state small water system within a disadvantaged community, consistently fails to provide an adequate supply of safe drinking water, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) may order consolidation with a receiving water system. The consolidation may be physical or operational. The SWRCB may also order the extension of service to an area that does not have access to an adequate supply of safe drinking water so long as the extension of service is an interim extension of service in preparation for consolidation. The SWRCB may set timelines and performance measures to facilitate completion of consolidation.

SB 88 also provides that prior to ordering consolidation or extension of service, the SWRCB shall do all of the following:

- Encourage voluntary consolidation or extension of service.
- Consider other enforcement remedies specified in this article.
- Consult with, and fully consider input from, the relevant local agency formation commission regarding the provision of water service in the affected area, the recommendations for improving service in a municipal service review, and any other relevant information.
- Consult with, and fully consider input from, the Public Utilities Commission when the consolidation would involve a water corporation subject to the commission's jurisdiction.
- Consult with, and fully consider input from, the local government with land use planning authority over the affected area, particularly regarding any information in the general plan,

- Notify the potentially receiving water system and the potentially subsumed water system, if any, and establish a reasonable deadline of no less than six months for the potentially receiving water system and the potentially subsumed water system.

The SWRCB must also obtain written consent from any domestic well owner for consolidation or extension of service. Any affected resident within the consolidation or extended service area who does not provide written consent shall be ineligible, until the consent is provided, for any future water-related grant funding from the state other than funding to mitigate a well failure, disaster, or other emergency.

SB 88 also provides that the SWRCB must hold at least one public meeting in the affected area. Prior to ordering consolidation or extension of service, the SWRCB must find all of the following:

- The potentially subsumed water system has consistently failed to provide an adequate supply of safe drinking water.
- All reasonable efforts to negotiate consolidation or extension of service were made.
- Consolidation of the receiving water system and subsumed water system or extension of service is appropriate and technically and economically feasible.
- There is no pending local agency formation commission process that is likely to resolve the problem in a reasonable amount of time.
- Concerns regarding water rights and water contracts of the subsumed and receiving water systems have been adequately addressed.
- Consolidation or extension of service is the most effective and cost-effective means to provide an adequate supply of safe drinking water.
- The capacity of the proposed interconnection needed to accomplish the consolidation is limited to serving the current customers of the subsumed water system.

Local Government Enforcement

SB 88 also provides intent language for local government enforcement during the drought. Specifically, SB 88 provides that the Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

- That the California Constitution authorizes a county or city to make and enforce within its limits all local police, sanitary, and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws.
- The California Supreme Court has held that local regulations affecting economic interests in property are within local governments' police power.
- Counties may reasonably regulate land use under their police powers.
- Counties may regulate groundwater, including well permitting, under their police powers and numerous counties have exercised this authority through ordinances.
- The Legislature enacted the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act to ensure that local agencies manage their high and medium priority groundwater basins sustainably. That act does not require the adoption of local groundwater sustainability plans until 2020 or 2022. Under the act, counties retain their authority to issue well permits.
- As local agencies are transitioning to the implementation of the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, unregulated well permitting in stressed high and medium priority groundwater basins during the ongoing drought emergency is causing risks to the health, safety, and well-being of citizens.

Health and Human Services

Adult Protective Services (SB 79)

SB 79 provides that DHCS shall, to the extent funding for this purpose remains with the department, established one full-time position that reports to the director to assist counties with the following functions in their operation of the adult protective services system:

- Facilitating the review and update of state policies and procedures to promote best casework practices throughout the state, and providing technical assistance to local programs to promote consistent statewide adherence to these policies.
- Developing recommended program goals, performance measures, and outcomes for the adult protective services system, and a strategic plan to accomplish these recommended goals, performance measures and outcomes.
- Collaborating with other state departments and local communities that provide or oversee elder justice services to address the needs of elders and adults with disabilities and improve coordination and effectiveness of adult protective services.
- Exploring the development of a state data collection system that builds on existing statewide data and additionally tracks outcomes that will align with national data collection efforts.
- Participating in national, statewide, and regional discussions on adult protective services and elder justice issues and providing information on California's adult protective services programs.
- Participating in the development of federal and state policy that responds to new and emerged needs and develops suggested quality assurance measures to be implemented at the local level.
- Facilitating the development of a regionally based, ongoing, comprehensive and consistent statewide adult protective services training program that responds to new and emerging trends.
- In collaboration with experts in the field, developing guidelines for local adult protective services programs that will make recommendations for local practice in the following areas:
 - Caseload levels for adult protective services workers.
 - Availability of tangible services for local programs.
 - Educational and professional development of adult protective services workers.
 - Structure for 24 hours adult protective services response.

Approved Relative Caregiver Funding Option Program (AB 123, SB 79)

The final Budget provides an additional \$15 million for the Foster, Parent and Relative Recruitment, Retention and Support program. Specifically, SB 79 provides that on or after January 1, 2015, a child eligible for the Approved Relative Caregiver Funding Option Program in accordance is not subject to the provisions of this chapter relating to CalWORKs, including, but not limited to, the provisions that relate to CalWORKs eligibility, welfare-to-work, time limits, or grant computation.

SB 79 also provides technical changes to the funding provisions to provide that each participating county's base caseload will be fully funded and provides a process for how the annual state funding would be calculated.

Specifically, SB 79 provides that participating counties shall recoup an overpayment in the Approved Relative Caregiver Funding Option Program received by an approved relative caregiver using the standards and processes for overpayment recoupment that are applicable to overpayments to an approved home of a relative. Recouped overpayments shall not be subject to remittance to the federal government. Any overpaid funds that are collected by the participating counties shall be remitted to the state after subcontracting both of the following:

- An amount not to exceed the county share of the CalWORKs portion of the Approved Relative Caregiver Funding Option Program Payment, if any.
- Any other county funds that were included in the Approved Relative Caregiver Funding Option Program Payment.

Cal Fresh (SB 79)

SB 79 provides that it is the intent of the Legislature that due to the establishment of a semiannual reporting cycle, change reporting no longer be imposed on certain households that were exempt from quarterly reporting pursuant to federal law. In addition, DSS must work with county human services agencies, client advocates, and the Statewide Automated Welfare System to eliminate change reporting for all households no later than January 1, 2017.

CalWORKs (AB 123, SB 79)

Housing Supports Program

AB 123 provides an additional \$15million to the CalWORKs Housing Supports Program which provides that families receiving CalWORKs benefits when homelessness or housing instability is a barrier to self-sufficiency are eligible for specific housing supports including financial assistance and housing stabilization funding.

SB 79 clarifies that counties may continue to provide housing supports under this section to a recipient who is discontinued because he or she no longer meets the income eligibility requirements.

In-Home Supportive Services (AB 93)

Overtime

The Governor's Budget included \$184 million General Fund in the Department of Social Services' budget for implementation in 2014-15 and \$316 million in 2015-16. SB 855 (2014) includes a provision requiring any unspent FLSA-related funding in the current year resulting from delayed federal implementation of the rule be used for other purposes within the IHSS program. The May Revision continues to assume full-year funding in 2015-16 for implementation of the federal rule.

AB 93 approves the implementation of overtime for IHSS, as currently prescribed in state law and funded by the Governor's Budget and the May Revision.

7 Percent Reduction in Service Hours

The Governor's January Budget proposed a restoration of the 7 percent to be funded through a new Managed Care Organization Tax. AB 93 approved the restoration of the 7 percent reduction in IHSS hours effective July 1, 2015. The restoration will be funded by General Fund in 2015-16 and with the MCO tax in 2016-17.

Medi-Cal (AB 93, SB 75)

AB 93 provides \$91.3 billion for the Medi-Cal budget for costs associated with the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

Coordinated Care Initiative

SB 75 provides that Multipurpose Senior Services Program (MSSP) services under the Coordinated Care Initiative (CCI) which is currently operated in seven counties would become effective no later than December 31, 2017, or on the date the managed care health plans and MSSP providers jointly satisfy the readiness criteria developed under this bill. Under existing law, the MSSP services were to begin 19 months after the commencement of beneficiary enrollment into managed care.

The readiness criteria shall be developed by the California Department of Aging in consultation with MSSP providers, managed health care plans and stakeholders. The readiness criteria shall include the mutual agreement of the affected managed health care plans and MSSP providers to the transition date. The department must also evaluate the readiness of the managed health care plans and MSSP providers to commence the transition of MSSP services to managed care health plans.

This bill also provides that at least 30 days before the MSSP services transition to a benefit administered and allocated by managed care health plans in CCI counties, DHCS shall notify the appropriate policy and fiscal committees of the Legislature of the intent to transition the MSSP services to managed care health plans.

Cost of Doing Business COLA

SB 75 provides that the cost-of-doing-business COLA is suspended for the 2015-16 fiscal year.

County Administration Funds (AB 93, AB 123)

AB 123 provides an additional \$245 million to county workers due to the continuing workload associated with implementing eligibility changes at the county eligibility offices for ACA-related eligibility determination workload. The ACA implementation has necessitated manual system workarounds that require additional resources.

Immigrant Health Care (SB 75)

AB 94 provides that after the Director of DHCS determines and communicates in writing to the Department of Finance that systems have been programmed for the implementation of the expansion of Medi-Cal to immigrants, an individual who is under 19 years of age and who does not have satisfactory immigration status or is unable to establish satisfactory immigration status shall be eligible for the full scope of Medi-Cal benefits.

Provider Rates

AB 97 (2011) reduced most Medi-Cal provider rates by up to 10 percent. This budget package (SB 75) exempts dental providers from the rate cut effective July 1, 2015.

Department of State Hospitals

The Department of State Hospitals administers the state mental health hospital system, the Forensic Conditional Release Program, the Sex Offender Commitment Program, and the evaluation and treatment of judicially and civilly committed and voluntary patients.

Incompetent to Stand Trial Expansion

AB 93 provides \$8.7 million to activate 50 new IST beds at Coalinga State Hospital.

Restoration of Competency (ROC) Expansion

AB 123 provides \$4 million to expand the ROC program. For more details please see the public safety section.

Local Government (AB 93, SB 84)

Local Government Repayment - \$765 million

Currently, the state owes counties, cities and special districts \$765 million in mandate reimbursements for costs incurred prior to 2004 that must be repaid by 2020-21 under current law. The 2014 Budget Act included a trigger mechanism that makes additional payments for the remaining pre-2004 mandate debt if the estimated General Fund revenues for 2013-14 and 2014-15 fiscal years at the 2015 May Revision exceed the 2014 Budget Act's estimate for those same revenues.

The 2015 May Revision estimates that the trigger mechanism will result in a total of \$765 to local governments for the remaining pre-2004 mandate debt. Of the \$765 million, approximately 77 percent will go to counties. The \$765 million is scheduled to be appropriated to local governments beginning in late June 2015. This does not require any budget action since this was part of the trigger adopted in the 2014-15 Budget Act.

Mandate Suspensions

AB 93 includes the mandate suspension as proposed by the Governor in his January and May Revisions. Specifically, this would suspend previous mandates including election mandates and the Interagency Child Abuse and Neglect reporting mandate.

SB 84 provides that the Department of Finance (DOF), in collaboration with the Secretary of State, and the LAO shall convene a working group to evaluate alternatives for funding election-related state mandates. The working group shall commence no later than September 1, 2015. By September 1, 2016 DOF must submit a report to the Legislature that summarizes the finding of the report.

In addition, SB 84 requires DOF to conduct a survey of county election officials during years in which a statewide general election is held to determine whether or not counties are carrying out the requirements set forth in the following mandates:

- Absentee ballots
- Absentee ballots tabulation by precinct
- Modified primary election
- Permanent absentee voters II
- Voter identification procedures
- Voter registration procedures

Pension Reform (SB 84, SB 98)

Pension – Elected Officials

SB 84 would provide that on or after January 1, 2013, a retired person may serve without reinstatement from retirement or loss of interruption of benefits provided by this system as an elective officer.

This bill also provides that if a retired person serves without reinstatement from retirement in an elective office and part or all of his or her retirement allowance is based on service in that elective office, the portion of the allowance based on service in that elective office shall be suspended during incumbency in that elective office. The entire retirement allowance must be paid for time on and after the person vacates the elective office in the monthly amount payable, had the allowance not been suspended. The governing body of every employer other than the state shall cause immediate notice to be given to this system of the election of any retired person to an office of the employer.

Pension – Health Care Changes

SB 98 would make the following changes to the Public Employees Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMHCA):

- Clarify the definition of family to exclude former spouses and former domestic partners.
- Require a state employee's or state annuitant's employer to possess and maintain documentation verifying eligibility of an employee's family members and to verify this information for three years.
- Prohibit the Board of Administration from granting further exceptions to the rule against enrolling employees, annuitants and their family members who are eligible for Medicare, in a basic health care plan.

Public Safety (AB 123, SB 85)

City Law Enforcement Grants (AB 123)

AB 123 provides the following allocation for law enforcement grants:

- Use of Force - \$20 million. AB 123 provides \$20 million for law enforcement grants who agree to provide data on use of force incidents.
- Strengthening Relationships - \$6 million. AB 123 provides \$6 million for grants to local law enforcement for programs and initiatives intended to strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve. This includes providing training for front-line peace officers on issues such as implicit bias; funding for research to examine how local policing services currently are being delivered; assessing the state of law enforcement-community relations; comparing the status quo with the best practices in the policing profession; receiving recommendations for moving forward, including the identification of policing models and operational options to improve policing; problem-oriented policing initiatives such as Operation Ceasefire; restorative justice programs that address the needs of victims, offenders and the community, behavioral health training and any one-time costs associated with implementing, expanding and maintaining program designed to capture peace officer interactions with individuals in the community.

- \$5 million for infrastructure projects. AB 123 provides \$5 million to various cities: Avenal, Corcoran and Lemoore for infrastructure.
- \$10 million for human trafficking. AB 123 provides \$10 million to support grants for community groups providing services to human trafficking victims through the Office of Emergency Services.

Debt Amnesty Program (SB 85)

SB 85 would provide that it is the intent of the Legislature that a one-time infraction amnesty program would do all of the following:

- Provide relief to individuals who have found themselves in violation of a court-ordered obligation because they have unpaid traffic bail or fines.
- Provide relief to individuals who have found themselves in violation of a court-ordered obligation or who have had their driving privileges suspended pursuant to Section 13365.
- Provide increased revenue at a time when revenue is scarce by encouraging payment of old fines that have remained unpaid.
- Allow courts and counties to resolve older delinquent cases and focus limited resources on collections for more recent cases.

SB 85 would provide that a one-time amnesty program for fines and bail meeting certain eligibility requirements shall be established in each county. Unless agreed otherwise by the court and the county in writing, the government entities that are responsible for the collection of delinquent court-ordered debt shall be responsible for implementation of the amnesty program as to that debt, maintaining the same division of responsibility in place with respect to the collection of court-ordered debt. SB 85 also provides that the amnesty program shall not apply to parking violations.

SB 85 would provide that a violation is only eligible for amnesty under the following conditions:

- The violation is an infraction violation filed with the court.
- The violation is a misdemeanor violation filed with the court.
- The initial due date for payment of the fine or bail was on or before January 1, 2013.
- There are no outstanding misdemeanor or felony warrants for the defendant within the county, except for misdemeanor warrants for misdemeanor violations subject to this section.
- The person does not owe victim restitution on any case within the county.
- The person is not currently making payments to a comprehensive collection program.

SB 85 provides that each amnesty program shall accept, in full satisfaction of any eligible fine or bail, 50 percent of the fine or bail amount.

If the participant certifies under penalty of perjury that he or she receives any of the public benefits the amnesty program shall accept, in full satisfaction of any eligible fine or bail, 20 percent of the fine or bail amount.

SB 85 provides that the Judicial Council, in consultation with CSAC, shall adopt guidelines for the amnesty program no later than October 1, 2015, and each program shall be conducted in accordance with the Judicial Council's guidelines.

As part of its guidelines, the Judicial Council shall include all of the following:

- Each court or county responsible for implementation of the amnesty program shall recover costs and may charge an amnesty program fee of fifty dollars (\$50) that may be collected with the receipt of the first payment of a participant.
- A payment plan option created pursuant to Judicial Council guidelines in which a monthly payment is equal to the amount that an eligible participant can afford to pay per month. If a participant chooses the payment plan option, the county or court shall collect all relevant information to allow for collection by the Franchise Tax Board (FTB) pursuant to existing protocols.
- If a participant does not comply with the terms of his or her payment plan under the amnesty program, including failing to make one or more payments, the appropriate agency shall send a notice to the participant that he or she has failed to make one or more payments and that the participant has 30 days to either resume making payments or to request that the agency change the payment amount. If the participant fails to respond to the notice within 30 days, the appropriate agency may refer the participant to the FTB for collection of any remaining balance owed, including an amount equal to the reasonable administrative costs incurred by the FTB.
- A plan for outreach that will, at a minimum, make available via Internet Web site relevant information regarding the amnesty program, including how an individual may participate in the amnesty program.

Probation Funding (AB 93, SB 85)

In 2009, SB 678 (Leno) created the Community Corrections Performance Incentive Grant to provide incentives for counties to reduce the number of felony probationers sent to state prison. This performance-based funding has been provided to county probation departments based on a percentage of state General Fund savings when county probation departments successfully reduce the number of adult felony probationers going to state prison.

AB 93 approves of the Governor's May Revision proposal to augment the grant program by \$1.1 million.

SB 85 recasts some of the provisions related to the formula for SB 678 program as follows:

- For a county identified as having a return to prison rate less than 1.5 percent, the incentive payment shall be equal to 100 percent of the highest year of funding that a county received for the Community Corrections Incentive Grant Program from 2011-12 fiscal year to 2014-15 fiscal year, inclusive.
- For a county identified as having a return to prison rate of 1.5 percent or greater, but not exceeding 3.2 percent, the incentive payment shall be equal to 70 percent of the highest year of funding that a county received for the CCIGP from the 2011-12 fiscal year to the 2014-15 fiscal year, inclusive.
- For a county identified as having a return to prison rate of more than 3.2 percent, not exceeding 5.5 percent, the incentive payment shall be equal to 60 percent of the highest year

of funding that a county received for the CCIGP from the 2011-12 fiscal year to the 2014-15 fiscal year, inclusive.

- For a county identified as having a return to prison rate of more than 5.5 percent, not exceeding 6.1 percent the incentive payment shall be equal to 50 percent of the highest year of funding that a county received the CCIGP from the 2011-12 fiscal year to the 2014-15 fiscal year, inclusive.
- For a county identified as having a return to prison rate of more than 6.1 percent, not exceeding 7.9 percent, the incentive payment shall be equal to 40 percent of the highest year of funding that a county received for the CCIGP from the 2011-12 fiscal year to the 2014-15 fiscal year, inclusive.

SB 85 also provides changes to the provisions in SB 678 which provided for the calculation of the various probation failure rates and adds the following:

- Calculate an estimate of the number of felons on PCRS each county successfully prevented from being incarcerated in state prison. For each county this shall be calculated based on the reduction in the county's PCRS failure to prison rate for that year and the previous year.
- The statewide return to prison rate shall be calculated as the total number of offenders supervised by probation departments as felony probationers who were sent to prison, as a percentage of the average statewide adult felony probation, mandatory supervision, and PCRS population.
- The county return to prison rate. The combined individual county return to prison rate shall be calculated as the total number of offenders supervised by a county probation department as felony probationers, or subject to mandatory supervision, or subject to PCRS, who were sent to prison, as a percentage of the average statewide adult felony probation, mandatory supervision, and PCRS population for that county.

Public Safety Realignment 2011 (SB 85)

SB 85 provides the following clarifying changes to the 2011 Public Safety Realignment:

- Removes the August 15 annual date on which funds are allocated to the Enhancing Law Enforcement Activities Growth Subaccount and instead provides that the Controller shall allocate these funds pursuant to the base allocation schedule provided by the Department of Finance.
- Provides that the county auditor shall redirect unspent funds that were remitted after July 1, 2012, by a local agency to the County Enhancing Law Enforcement Activities Subaccount to the local agency that remitted the unspent funds in an amount equal to the amount remitted.

Restoration of Competency (AB 123, SB 85)

AB 123 provides \$4 million for the Restoration of Competency Program (ROC) in county jails.

SB 85 provides the specific provisions regarding the county ROC program. Specifically, this bill would provide that if a county jail treatment facility is selected by the court, the Department of State Hospitals (DSH) shall provide restoration of competency treatment at the county jail treatment facility and shall provide payment to the county jail treatment facility for the reasonable costs of the bed during the restoration of competency treatment as well as for the reasonable costs of any necessary medical treatment not provided within the county jail treatment facility, unless otherwise agreed to by the DSH and the facility.

SB 85 would provide that if the county jail treatment facility is able to provide restoration of competency services, upon approval by DSH, and subject to funding appropriated in the annual Budget Act, the county jail treatment facility may provide those services and DSH may provide payment to the county jail treatment facility for the reasonable costs of the bed during the restoration of competency treatment, as well as the reasonable costs of providing restoration of competency services and for any necessary medical treatment not provided within the county jail treatment facility, unless otherwise agreed to by the DSH and the facility.

SB 85 also provides that transportation to a county jail treatment facility for admission and from the facility upon the filing of a certificate of restoration of competency, or for transfer of a person to another county jail treatment facility or to a state hospital, shall be provided by the committing county unless otherwise agreed to by DSH and the facility.

In the event DSH and a county jail treatment facility are determined to be comparatively at fault for any claim, action, loss or damage which results from their respective obligations under such a contract, each shall indemnify the other to the extent of its comparative fault.

Recidivism Reduction Funding (AB 123)

Last year, the Governor and the Legislature adopted the Recidivism Reduction Funding to provide resources to address the 3-Judge Panel order related to reducing the prison population.

This year the Legislature has approved the following amounts for the Recidivism Reduction Fund:

Collaborative Courts - \$1.3 million

This would provide \$1.3 million to the Judicial Council for collaborative courts.

Community Recidivism Reduction Grants - \$4 million

This would provide one-time funding for each county to provide small grants to nongovernmental entities engaged in a broad-scope of recidivism reduction efforts in the community. In order to be eligible, boards of supervisors, in collaboration with the local Community Corrections Partnership will be required to administer a competitive grant program for local nongovernmental entities that provide community recidivism and crime reduction services.

Drug Treatment in CDCR - \$6.9 million

This would provide funding for drug treatment in state prisons.

Mentally Ill Offenders Crime Reduction Grants (MIOCR) - \$1.7 million

This would provide funding in one-time competitive grant program which was established through the 2014-15 Budget Act with funding allocated to counties.

Innovative Programming - \$4 million

Provides \$4 million for grants to community based organizations currently providing innovative programming in California's Communities.

Workforce Investment Boards - \$1.5 million

This would provide funding to local workforce investment boards.