



**Chair**  
 Supervisor Carole Groom  
**Executive Director**  
 Jolena L. Voorhis

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

## UCC Board of Director's Meeting Summary

Alameda: Amy Shrago (Alternate)  
 Contra Costa: Supervisor Federal Glover, Lara DeLaney,  
 Fresno: Supervisor Buddy Mendes, Supervisor Nathan Magsig  
 Los Angeles: Faith Conley, Manuel Rivas, Donna Seitz  
 Orange: Peter DeMarco, Steve Wallauch, Nicole Wordelman  
 Riverside: Supervisor Chuck Washington, Jean Hurst, Elizabeth Espinosa  
 Sacramento:  
 San Bernardino: Supervisor James Ramos, Steve Wallauch, Nicole Wordelman  
 San Diego: Geoff Patnoe (Alternate)  
 San Francisco: Karen Lange  
 San Joaquin: Supervisor Bob Elliott, Katie Patterson  
 San Mateo: Supervisor Carole Groom, Connie Juarez-Diroll  
 Santa Clara: Supervisor Ken Yeager, Michael Rattigan  
 Ventura: Supervisor Kelly Long, Jean Hurst, Elizabeth Espinosa  
 UCC: Jolena Voorhis, Grace Childs-Ferguson

### I. Call to Order

UCC Chair, Supervisor Groom convened the meeting and called the members to order.

### II. Roll Call of Counties

There were 7 Supervisors, 2 Alternates and 13 counties represented at this meeting.

### III. Approval of Minutes from the January 29, 2018 UCC Board Meeting – APPROVED with Amendment

The January 29<sup>th</sup> minutes were approved as amended and below is the vote count:

Member		Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Groom, Chair	San Mateo	X			
Supervisor Ramos V-Chair	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Carson (Alternate)	Alameda	X			
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa			X	

**Board of Directors:** **Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange			X	
Supervisor Washington	Riverside	X			
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento			X	
Supervisor Horn (Alternate)	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Elliott	San Joaquin				X
Supervisor Yeager	Santa Clara	X			
Supervisor Long	Ventura	X			
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>8</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>

**IV. Items for Consideration**  
**1) State Budget**

Staff provided a handout on Budget Issues which provided an update on some of the key issues that are being worked on in the State Budget.

**Homelessness and Housing Package**

UCC joined CSAC in requesting \$1 billion in state General Fund to provide immediate funding to various homeless and housing programs.

- Jump Start No Place Like Home (NPLH) (\$300 million). Due to the fact that NPLH is currently on hold waiting for court validation of the use of Proposition 63. By using General Fund, this program could begin immediately.
- Multi-Family Housing Program (\$700 million). This would provide funding immediately instead of waiting for SB 2 to be implemented.

Other proposals include additional funding for housing vouchers, landlord liaison program, chronically homeless and youth to name a few.

**SB 2 Homeless Funding Trailer Bill**

The Administration released a Budget Trailer Bill outlining the allocations for the homeless funding provided under SB 2 (Atkins). In the first year of the \$75 fee on transactions the funding is provided for planning and homeless. Under the Trailer Bill, the homeless funding is provided to counties based on the Point In Time count from 2017, and a couple of counties get separate allocations.

Staff testified in Senate Subcommittee #4 in support of the homeless funding being provided to counties, but that the allocations are different from other programs like NPLH and requested more information on the methodology.

At the hearing the Department of Finance (DOF), indicated that the amounts allocated to the counties were a minimum and could increase, which is not clear in the language.

### **Cap and Trade**

Under the Governor's Budget, the Transformative Climate Communities program is provided \$25 million. This program provides funding to local governments for projects that reduce GHG. In last year's budget, this program was provided \$140 million. UCC along with our local government partners have requested \$100 million.

In addition to the request for the TCC program, staff is also working with several partners to increase the funding to organic waste infrastructure. Due to the requirements under SB 1383, cities and counties will need additional infrastructure to meet the recycling goals set by the state.

### **340b Pharmacy Issue**

In the Governor's Budget, there is a proposal to eliminate the 340b Drug rebate program in Fee-for-Service and managed care. UCC is opposed to this proposal and along with a large coalition of hospitals and county affiliates due to the negative impact this would have on our public hospitals and services.

Staff noted that both the Cap and Trade and 340b Pharmacy issues were heard Budget Subcommittees, and UCC testified at those hearings. During the 340b discussion the Chair of the committee indicated that there should be another option besides just elimination.

While not mentioned in the memo, staff is also working on the Child Support issue and the IST issue. On IST, staff is working with a larger county workgroup to discuss options for the \$100 million program. Staff included various letters that have been sent on budget issues.

## **2) Other Emerging or Continuing Legislative Issues**

### **a) Conservatorship Bills**

One of the major issues that continues to dominate the Legislature is the homeless issue. This has resulted in about 10 bills being introduced, specifically on conservatorship as a possible solution as to how to treat the chronic homeless and those that need immediate assistance.

There are two bills that are sponsored by urban counties:

#### **AB 1971 – Los Angeles County Sponsored**

This bill would expand the definition of gravely disabled under the LPS act to include medical treatment.

The Los Angeles Board of Supervisors requested this change to the gravely disabled definition in order to help those homeless individuals that are mentally ill and also have a medical issue that need immediate treatment. Under the LPS Act, medical treatment is not one of the issues that can trigger a conservatorship.

Los Angeles County believes this is a just clarification and would allow them to help more individuals and get the individual into treatment.

### SB 1045 – San Francisco County Sponsored

This bill would establish a procedure for the appointment of a conservator for a person who is chronically homeless and incapable of caring for their own health and well-being due to acute and severe mental illness or a severe substance abuse disorder, as evidenced by high-frequency emergency department use, high frequency jail detention due to behavior resulting from a persons severe mental illness or substance abuse disorder, or frequent placement under a 72 hour involuntary hold because the person is a danger to others or to him or herself, or is gravely disabled, for the purpose of providing appropriate placement. This bill would also require each county to establish a working group and requires the working group to prepare a report to the Legislature. San Francisco is trying to reach those homeless individuals with mental illness and it is the intent of the county to make this program permissive.

### Background on Conservatorship/LPS Act

Under the Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) Act, a person with specified mental health disorders may be involuntarily committed or submitted for treatment if the person is a danger to themselves or others or is gravely disabled. Those allowed to conserve an individual include peace officers, member of a crisis team, certain county personnel, emergency room personnel and the courts.

The LPS Act sets up the guidelines for involuntarily committing individuals. Existing law also establishes different types of conservatorships including a Probate Conservatorship and a LPS Conservatorship.

The funding of the conservatorship program and the public conservator and public guardian is 100% funded by the county general fund. Each county is organized differently and funded differently.

Because both of these bills are requiring an expansion of the program, this bill could require more funding from the counties since both have a statewide impact.

Staff reported that previous legislation has tried to expand the definition of gravely disabled, and has been opposed by UCC and other county associations including CSAC. Because these two bills are sponsored by urban counties, and because these are trying to address the homeless issue, staff brought this to the UCC Board and suggested they may want to consider the following recommendations:

- Direct staff to work with both counties to make these bills permissive or to limit the fiscal impact of these bills.
- Take a position of Support if Amended and request specific amendments to reduce the fiscal impact on other urban counties.

**Staff provided a brief overview on both of the bills and then allowed each county to present their bills:**

Guest speaker Dr. Jonathan Sherrin, Director from the Department of Mental Health in LA County was on the call. Dr. Sherrin said that this bill is more of a clarification than an expansion. He said that the courts in LA will help determine who is gravely disabled. He does not think it's humane to having them in the streets. He noted it's not a massive number of people, roughly 5,000 and could go up to 10,000. The resources in this bill would help to identify and help the gravely disabled and mentally ill.

San Diego County asked how willing are they to make it permissive. Dr. Sherrin's response was that the opt-in is permissible, and not imposed at the counties discretion. Dr. Sherrin was also asked if this bill is similar to Chen's bill, and he said yes, and that they are trying to reconcile the differences.

**SB 1045 establishes a conservator procedure that is 100% intended as optional to counties to be used as a tool and not to drain resources. While not currently optional it is their intent to amend the bill to make it optional. This bill would create a new type of conservatorship to address the 40 homeless persons that have substance use disorder and mental health issues and need a longer time to address their issues. San Francisco has analyzed the fiscal impact and noted that one of this individuals can cost the system \$150,000 per year.**

**Riverside county asked if the \$150,000 per year is the current cost. Answer was yes but they are cataloging costs. It was also noted that this is not just for San Francisco, but for other jurisdictions with high frequency. San Diego asked if they have talked to the author and or sponsor on not mandating this, making it permissive? The answer was that they are working to make the wording abundantly clear that it's not a mandate.**

**Supervisor Elliott stated he was opposed to a support position until the amendments are taken to the bills and the rest of the Board agreed.**

**Supervisor Washington stated that he wanted to have another conversation about the bills at the next board meeting even if they were not amended and staff indicated that they would be discussed at the next Board meeting.**

**The Board decided to not take a vote on the bills until the amendments are out and directed staff to work with Los Angeles and San Francisco to work on the mandate issues.**

## **b) Legislative Update**

Staff provided a list of the bills UCC has positions on and noted that they are in the process of taking positions on several other bills. Below are some key bills:

### AB 2717 (Lackey) -- Cannabis

---

**Board of Directors:** **Chair:** Supervisor Carole Groom, San Mateo County **Vice Chair:** Supervisor James Ramos, San Bernardino County **Treasurer:** Emily Harrison, Finance Director, Santa Clara County **Members:** Supervisor Keith Carson, Alameda County; Supervisor Federal Glover, Contra Costa County; Supervisor Ernest Mendes, Fresno County; Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Los Angeles County; Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Orange County; Supervisor Chuck Washington, Riverside County; Supervisor Susan Peters, Sacramento County; Supervisor Bill Horn, San Diego County; Vacant, San Francisco County; Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin; Supervisor Ken Yeager, Santa Clara County; Supervisor Kelly Long, Ventura County

UCC is a co-sponsor of this bill which would clarify the issue related to cities contracting with counties for enforcement which is unclear due to the Trailer Bill from last year.

SB 1302 (Lara) -- Cannabis

This bill would change the way deliveries are allowed which goes back on the agreement counties made under MACRSA.

AB 3147 and SB 827 Housing Bills

UCC has concerns with these bills as they would remove counties ability to charge fees on projects and would remove local control.

**3) Informational Items**

**a) Workplan**

Staff provided an updated version of the UCC Workplan.

**V. Proposals for Next Month's Meeting Agenda**

- 1) State Budget
- 2) Homelessness
- 3) Legislative Update
- 4) Cap and Trade Update

**VI. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**VII.** Adjourn until April 23, 2018. The April meeting will be held via conference call. Please note the conference call-in number change to:

**Conference Call number: 1-515-603-3124**

**Participant Access Code - 939756#**