



**Chair**  
Supervisor Kelly Long

**Vice Chair**  
Supervisor Susan Ellenberg

1100 "K" Street, Suite 101/Sacramento, CA 95814 / (916) 327-7531 / email: [UCC@urbancounties.com](mailto:UCC@urbancounties.com)

## UCC Board of Directors' Meeting Summary August 5, 2020

Alameda:	Supervisor Keith Carson
Contra Costa:	Supervisor Federal Glover
Fresno:	Supervisor Buddy Mendes, Jeannie Figueroa
Los Angeles:	Samara Ashley
Orange:	Supervisor Lisa Bartlett, Peter DeMarco
Riverside:	Supervisor Chuck Washington
Sacramento:	Supervisor Susan Peters, Steve Cruz, Audrey Ratajczak
San Bernardino:	Supervisor Curt Hagman
San Diego:	Supervisor Greg Cox
San Francisco:	
San Joaquin:	Jolena Voorhis
San Mateo:	Connie Juarez-Diroll (Alternate), Steve Cruz, Audrey Ratajczak
Santa Clara:	Supervisor Susan Ellenberg, Michael Rattigan
Ventura:	Supervisor Kelly Long, Sue Hughes

**I. Call to Order**

UCC Chair Supervisor Kelly Long convened the meeting and called the members to order.

**II. Roll Call of Counties**

There were 10 supervisors, 1 alternate and 13 counties represented at this meeting.

**III. Approval of June 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes – Action Item – APPROVED**

A motion was made to approve the June 24<sup>th</sup> minutes and below is the vote count:

Member	County	Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Long, Chair	Ventura	X			
Supervisor Ellenberg, Vice-Chair	Santa Clara	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda	X			
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa	X			
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange	X			

Supervisor Washington	Riverside	X			
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento				X
Supervisor Hagman	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Cox	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Patti	San Joaquin			X	
Supervisor Groom (Alternate)	San Mateo	X			
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>10</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

#### IV. UCC Advocacy

##### IV-A: The Bob Report

Bob Giroux with LHOM reviewed key points regarding local and state elements of the 2020 California General Election. An election slide deck with district-by-district race details (congressional and state legislative) as well as other information on ballot measures was circulated following the Board meeting.

##### IV-B: 2020-21 State Budget

The UCC Advocacy Team reviewed a list provided in the agenda packet of the items the Legislature is expected to focus on in the closing weeks of session. Elizabeth Espinosa with HBE provided an update on the DJJ Realignment proposal, including the status of negotiations with counties and a counter-proposal the Legislature recently released. UCC has been an active participant at the table during negotiations. The framework, funding, and flexibility associated with the DJJ Realignment proposal are a top priority for UCC, and staff is committed to ensuring that urban counties have the tools and resources needed to carry out any new responsibilities successfully.

##### IV-C: UCC Hot Bills Report

Jean Hurst with HBE informed the Board about SB 1159 (Hill), which codifies the Governor’s Executive Order on the COVID-19 Workers’ Compensation Presumption. This bill is intended to address worker health and safety as it is related to COVID-19 workers’ compensation claims, including presumptions that are essentially for all categories of employees and places of employment. Employers that have 6-100 employees would qualify for the workers’ compensation presumption if more than 5 employees test positive for COVID. For employers with 100 or more employees, and 5 percent positive for COVID would trigger the presumption provisions. UCC joined a large coalition of public and private employers opposing that provision of the bill due to the fiscal concerns associated with managing workers’ compensation claims. Staff will continue to keep the Board informed as more conversations continue about the specifics of the bill.

#### V. Consideration of UCC Positions on November 2020 Ballot Measures

Twelve measures will be on the November 2020 ballot for voters’ consideration. Staff met with the UCC Chair and Vice-Chair to identify which initiatives have the most direct county impacts and should therefore be presented to the UCC Board of Directors for a possible position; four initiatives were selected. The UCC By-Laws require a majority vote of the entire membership (8 votes) to take a position on a measure. Staff prepared written analyses on each of the four initiatives, including a summary of the proposed policy changes, the process for reaching the ballot, principal proponents and opponents, and any relevant UCC policy.

**V-A: Proposition 15 – Split Roll: ACTION ITEM**

**Recommended Staff Position: Support– FAILED**

This measure would establish a new process for assessing commercial and industrial properties that is different from residential properties, hence a “split roll.” According to the fiscal analysis from the LAO, Proposition 15 is expected to generate \$8-\$12 billion in new property tax revenues annually. These increased revenues are to be allocated to schools, cities, counties, and special districts. The schools’ share will be sent to the state, and the state will allocate those funds to schools based on the existing local control funding formula. The allocation of funds would happen after county administrative costs are paid and after the General Fund is reimbursed for any losses associated with increased corporate and personal tax deductions. Staff noted that county administrative costs will increase significantly and would impact assessors, county counsels, tax collectors, and assessment appeals boards. For small/rural counties where there are few commercial properties, there is a potential for those counties to be net losers.

UCC has a general legislative policy to support new revenues to fund county services. Proposition 15 will likely generate considerable new revenues and most of those revenues will land in urban counties. Staff recommended a Support position on Proposition 15 based on UCC’s existing policies, however noted that there are some real challenges to consider.

Proposition 15 is supported by labor and non-profit interests, along with good government organizations such as the League of Women Voters. Opponents include the CA Chamber of Commerce, county assessors and taxpayer groups.

The Board engaged in a healthy dialogue noting valid points of both pros and cons of the measure.

**Pros:**

- This bill would bring California in line with the majority of other states that reassess commercial properties every year. Corporations have enjoyed a well-protected windfall for many years, and the urgency right now directly impacts many of our health and human services, not just for the income that counties would receive directly, but for additional income that schools and other local taxing entities will receive.
- It is a critical time to be looking for additional revenue to meet the greatly expanded needs that exist in our counties.
- Data has not shown that this change will have a devastating impact to businesses.

**Cons:**

- Could have a devastating impact to small businesses, individuals, and property owners as well as create a ripple effect of impacts that could include urban counties.
- Concerns about the change and impacts to real estate and commercial property tax.
- Facing a high unemployment rate and do not know what the full impacts will be and who will be impacted.
- Could be devastating to rural counties.
- Counties are putting a considerable amount of funding into homelessness, looking at a possible recession, and dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic, so timing is questionable.

A motion was made to Support Proposition 15 and failed. Below is the vote count:

Member	County	Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Long, Chair	Ventura		X		
Supervisor Ellenberg, Vice-Chair	Santa Clara	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda	X			
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa				X
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno		X		
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange		X		
Supervisor Washington	Riverside		X		
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento		X		
Supervisor Hagman	San Bernardino		X		
Supervisor Cox	San Diego		X		
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Patti	San Joaquin			X	
Supervisor Groom (Alternate)	San Mateo	X			
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

A second motion was made to Oppose Proposition 15 and failed. Below is the vote count:

Member	County	Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Long, Chair	Ventura		X		
Supervisor Ellenberg, Vice-Chair	Santa Clara		X		
Supervisor Carson	Alameda		X		
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa		X		
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange	X			
Supervisor Washington	Riverside		X		
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Hagman	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Cox	San Diego		X		
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Patti	San Joaquin			X	
Supervisor Groom (Alternate)	San Mateo		X		
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	

Given the failure of motions to support and oppose Prop 15, UCC therefore has “no position” this ballot measure.

**V-B: Proposition 19 – Property Tax Transfer Changes: ACTION ITEM**

**Recommended Staff Position: Oppose – APPROVED**

This measure expands the ability for seniors, persons with disabilities, and victims of wildfires/natural disasters to transfer their property of sale from one county to another county regardless of the value. A similar effort was attempted in 2018 and failed, so the CA Association of Realtors came back in 2020 and qualified a measure that would do the same, but included new provisions to limit the transfer of lowered assessed valuation from a parent to a child when the property is inherited.

The Legislature considered a compromise measure which essentially expands the ability for seniors, persons with disabilities, and victims of wildfires/natural disasters to transfer properties to another replacement property in another county regardless of value. The state is also required to calculate any net benefit to the General Fund and specify how the benefit must be allocated. Local governments could potentially gain tens of millions of dollars, depending on the home value in the communities. The fiscal effect is uncertain for counties, which will be dependent on homebuyer behavior. There also will likely be considerable administrative costs associated with this measure. UCC did not take a position on previously qualified measure (Proposition 5 in 2018). Staff had recommended an Oppose position on that measure in 2018, however, the Board vote did not reach the required vote threshold.

Proposition 19 is supported by the CA Association of Realtors, CA Professional Firefighters, the League of California Cities and other statewide organizations. The opponents thus far include the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.

A motion was made to Oppose Proposition 19 and approved. Below is the vote count:

Member	County	Yes	No	Absent	Not Voting
Supervisor Long, Chair	Ventura	X			
Supervisor Ellenberg, Vice-Chair	Santa Clara	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda				X
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa	X			
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange	X			
Supervisor Washington	Riverside				X
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Hagman	San Bernardino		X		
Supervisor Cox	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Patti	San Joaquin			X	
Supervisor Groom (Alternate)	San Mateo	X			
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

**V-C: Proposition 20 - Reducing Crime and Keeping California Safe Act: ACTION ITEM**

**Recommended Staff Position: No position – FAILED**

This measure seeks to modify provisions of previous criminal justice reforms enacted via legislative action or voter initiative in four specific areas:

- Changes to AB 109 (2011) – would eliminate existing discretion and authority of probation departments to offer intermediate sanctions to persons on post-release community supervision.
- Change provisions to Prop 47 (2014) – would create two new theft-related crimes: serial theft and organized retail theft, both defined as “wobblers” (punishable as either a felony or misdemeanor); would also specify circumstances under which theft-related crimes could be prosecuted as felonies, resulting in punishment up to and including time in state prison.
- Changes to Prop 57 (2016) – would expand the list of crimes that would make a person ineligible for the Prop 57 parole consideration process, modify the factors the Board of Parole Hearings (BPH) must consider during the parole consideration process, and extend the period

of time a person must wait for reconsideration from one year to two after being denied release by BPH, among other changes.

- DNA Collection Expansion – would expand required DNA collection from adults convicted of specified misdemeanors.

For historic context, UCC took no position on either Proposition 47 in 2014 or Proposition 57 in 2016. Additionally, the association did not engage on previous legislative efforts that sought to make similar changes.

Proponents of Prop 20 are seeking to refine previously enacted criminal justice reforms that they would argue have gone too far and that they resorted to going to the voters because their legislative efforts to make modifications have been thwarted. Primary supporters include various law enforcement organizations, the California Correctional Peace Officers Association (CCPOA), and individual state and locally elected officials. Among other supporters are several county boards of supervisors (including Fresno and Riverside), dozens of cities, as well as numerous individual district attorneys, police chiefs, and sheriffs.

Notable among the opponents are former Governor Jerry Brown, the main proponent of Prop 57 and a key driver of policy reforms that have allowed the state to comply with the prison population cap, as well as criminal justice reform and civil rights groups.

Given that UCC has no policy relevant to this measure and that the association took no position on most if not all preceding initiatives and legislative efforts, staff recommended “no position.” Additionally, recognizing a likely diversity of opinion among urban counties on the policy changes offered in the measure, a “no position” seemed most appropriate.

A motion was made to take a No Position on Proposition 20 and failed. Below is the vote count:

<b>Member</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>
Supervisor Long, Chair	Ventura	X			
Supervisor Ellenberg, Vice-Chair	Santa Clara	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda		X		
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa				X
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno		X		
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange	X			
Supervisor Washington	Riverside	X			
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento		X		
Supervisor Hagman	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Cox	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Patti	San Joaquin			X	
Supervisor Groom (Alternate)	San Mateo	X			
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

A motion was made to Oppose Proposition 20 and failed. Below is the vote count:

<b>Member</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>
Supervisor Long, Chair	Ventura		X		
Supervisor Ellenberg, Vice-Chair	Santa Clara	X			

Supervisor Carson	Alameda	X			
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa	X			
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno		X		
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange		X		
Supervisor Washington	Riverside	X			
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento		X		
Supervisor Hagman	San Bernardino		X		
Supervisor Cox	San Diego		X		
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Patti	San Joaquin			X	
Supervisor Groom (Alternate)	San Mateo				X
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

Although the recommended staff position of “no position” failed in the first round of voting, the lack of any other successful motion resulted in UCC having no position on Proposition 20.

**V-D: Proposition 25 - Bail Reform (SB 10, 2018) Referendum: ACTION ITEM**

**Recommended Staff Position: No Position – APPROVED**

This measure would fundamentally change pre-trial detention release decisions. The current cash bail system would be replaced by a risk-based assessment. Concerns about the inherent inequities in the cash bail system – which permits relatively wealthier people to be granted pretrial freedom for much more serious crimes and individuals with lesser means being detailed for lower-level crimes – have driven national conversations about pre-trial detention reform. In California, the Chief Justice has led significant efforts to assess and recommend changes to the bail system. Staff provided a summary of the provisions in SB 10 and presented on the specific county impacts. UCC has relevant bail reform policy that supports:

- Use of risk-based release decisions with adequate funding and local decision-making authority.
- Local flexibility in implementing bail reform including adequate time to address local needs and priorities.
- Risk assessment tools and processes that mitigate racial and economic disparities while maintaining public safety.

Staff noted that SB 10 meets some of UCC policy statements, although concerns exist particularly about the sufficiency of time to prepare for implementation given the pause required by the referendum having qualified. Given that UCC had no position on the final version of SB 10, the association cannot substitute action on that measure for a position on the referendum before the voters. Staff recommends a “no position” on Prop 25.

Proponents (a YES supports implementing SB 10) include several members of Congress, state elected officials (including Senate President pro Tem Toni Atkins and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon), dozens of criminal justice reform and civil rights groups, as well as many locally elected officials.

Opponents (a NO vote supports a permanent stay on bail reform as outlined in SB 10) include the bail industry, including the insurance (surety) companies that underwrite bail bonds; various current and retired congressional, state, and locally elected officials; dozens of individual county sheriffs and

district attorneys; various small business associations and chambers of commerce; and various crime victims' advocacy groups.

Supervisor Hagman from San Bernardino County expressed concern about SB 10 and referenced his previous role as Vice Chair of the Assembly Public Safety Committee where various efforts to advance bail reform failed. He raised considerable public safety concerns with the outright elimination of bail and requested that UCC consider an oppose position on Prop 25.

A motion was made to Oppose Proposition 25 and failed. Below is the vote count:

<b>Member</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>
Supervisor Long, Chair	Ventura		X		
Supervisor Ellenberg, Vice-Chair	Santa Clara		X		
Supervisor Carson	Alameda		X		
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa		X		
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno				X
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange		X		
Supervisor Washington	Riverside		X		
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Hagman	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Cox	San Diego		X		
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Patti	San Joaquin			X	
Supervisor Groom (Alternate)	San Mateo		X		
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

A second motion was made to take a No Position on Proposition 25 and passed. Below is the vote count:

<b>Member</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Not Voting</b>
Supervisor Long, Chair	Ventura	X			
Supervisor Ellenberg, Vice-Chair	Santa Clara	X			
Supervisor Carson	Alameda		X		
Supervisor Glover	Contra Costa				X
Supervisor Mendes	Fresno	X			
Supervisor Ridley-Thomas	Los Angeles			X	
Supervisor Bartlett	Orange	X			
Supervisor Washington	Riverside		X		
Supervisor Peters	Sacramento	X			
Supervisor Hagman	San Bernardino	X			
Supervisor Cox	San Diego	X			
Vacant	San Francisco			X	
Supervisor Patti	San Joaquin			X	
Supervisor Groom (Alternate)	San Mateo	X			
<b>Vote Total</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

UCC therefore has no position on Proposition 25.

#### **VI. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.



**VII. Topics for Next Meeting**

There were no specific topics suggested for the October meeting.

**VIII. Adjournment**

Our next UCC Board of Directors' meeting will be held on ***Wednesday, October 28, 2020 at 4:00 p.m.*** via conference call.