

**CALENDAR FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
AND FOR SPECIAL DISTRICTS, AGENCIES, AND AUTHORITIES GOVERNED BY THE BOARD
BOARD CHAMBERS ROOM 107, ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, 651 PINE STREET
MARTINEZ, CALIFORNIA 94553-1229**

GAYLE B. UILKEMA, CHAIR, 2nd DISTRICT
JOHN GIOIA, 1st DISTRICT
MARY N. PIEPHO, 3rd DISTRICT
KAREN MITCHOFF, 4th DISTRICT
FEDERAL D. GLOVER, 5th DISTRICT

DAVID J. TWA, CLERK OF THE BOARD AND COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR, (925) 335-1900

The Board of Supervisors respects your time, and every attempt is made to accurately estimate when an item may be heard by the Board. All times specified for items on the Board of Supervisors agenda are approximate. Items may be heard later than indicated depending on the business of the day. Your patience is appreciated.

**AGENDA
February 15, 2011**

9:00 A.M. Convene and announcement adjournment to Closed Session in Room 101.

Present: District I Supervisor John Gioia; District II Supervisor Gayle B. Uilkema; District IV Supervisor Karen Mitchoff; District V Supervisor Federal D. Glover

Absent: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho

Attendees: David J. Twa

Closed Session Agenda:

A. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

1. Agency Negotiators: David Twa and Ted Cwiek.

Employee Organizations: Contra Costa County Employees' Assn., Local No. 1; Am. Fed., State, County, & Mun. Empl., Locals 512 and 2700; Calif. Nurses Assn.; Service Empl. Int'l Union, Local 1021; District Attorney's Investigators Assn.; Deputy Sheriffs Assn.; United Prof. Firefighters, Local 1230; Physicians' & Dentists' Org. of Contra Costa; Western Council of Engineers; United Chief Officers Assn.; Service Empl. Int'l Union United Health Care Workers West; East County Firefighters' Assn.; Contra Costa County Defenders Assn.; Probation Peace Officers Assn. of Contra Costa County; Contra Costa County Deputy District Attorneys' Assn.; and Prof. & Tech. Engineers, Local 21, AFL-CIO.

2. Agency Negotiators: David Twa and Ted Cwiek.

Unrepresented Employees: All unrepresented employees.

B. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL--EXISTING LITIGATION (Gov. Code, § 54956.9(a))

1. In the Matter of an Arbitration between Michael Gressett, Grievant and Contra Costa County, Respondent. Case No. NB 3204

By unanimous vote of the Supervisors present, the Board of Supervisors directed Counsel not to seek appellant review in the matter of an arbitration between Michael Gressett and Contra Costa County.

9:30 A.M. Call to order and opening ceremonies.

Inspirational Thought - "*Keep feeling the need for being first. But I want you to be the first in love. I want you to be the first in moral excellence. I want you to be the first in generosity.*" ~ Martin Luther King, Jr.

CONSIDER CONSENT ITEMS (Items listed as C.1 through C.53 on the following agenda) – Items are subject to removal from Consent Calendar by request of any Supervisor or on request for discussion by a member of the public. Items removed from this section will be considered with the Short Discussion Items.

PRESENTATIONS

PR. 1 PRESENTATION to recognize Doctor Patricia Stroh, Employment and Human Services Department, on the occasion of her retirement from Contra Costa County. (Joe Valentine, Employment and Human Services Director) (See C.9)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

SHORT DISCUSSION ITEMS

SD. 1 PUBLIC COMMENT (3 Minutes/Speaker)

Ralph Hoffman, Mind Freedom International, spoke on the importance of speech and participation of the populace in role of government.

SD. 2 CONSIDER Consent Items previously removed.

10:00 A.M.

SD. 3 HEARING on the itemized costs of abatement for property located at Golden Isle, Byron, CA (Golden Gate Water Ski Club, Owner), (Jason Crapo, Department of Conservation and Development) ***CONTINUED TO MARCH 1, 2011***

Continued to March 1, 2011 at 10:00 a.m.

1. **SD.4** HEARING on the itemized costs of abatement for property located at 516 Verde Ave., Richmond, CA (Gideon & Cheryl Sorokin, Owners), (Jason Crapo, Department of Conservation & Development). (No fiscal impact)

REMOVED from consideration as recommended by the County Building Official, who reports the property has changed ownership.

2. **SD.5** HEARING to consider adoption of the 2010 California Building Code, the 2010 California Residential Code, the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, the 2010 Electrical Code, the 2010 California Plumbing Code, and 2010 California Mechanical Code, with changes, additions and deletions; and on the adoption of related California Environmental Quality Act and other findings. (Jason Crapo, County Building Official) (no fiscal impact)

CLOSED the public hearing; ADOPTED Ordinance No. 2011-03, adopting the 2010 California Building Code, the 2010 California Residential Code, the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, the 2010 Electrical Code, the 2010 California Plumbing Code, and 2010 California Mechanical Code, with changes, additions and deletions; ADOPTED findings in support of the County's changes, additions, and deletions to the statewide codes; DIRECTED the Building Inspection Division of the Conservation and Development Department, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 17958.7, to send a certified copy of Ordinance No. 2011-03, the attached findings, and this Board Order to the California Department of Housing and Community Development and to the California Buildings Standards Commission; and FOUND that adoption of the ordinance is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3).

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

3. **SD.6** HEARING to rezone a 33.0-acre property located at 129 Rancho de la Rosa Road in the Martinez/Alhambra Valley area from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District. (100% applicant fees) (Catherine Kutsuris, Conservation & Development Director)

CLOSED the public hearing; FOUND, for purposes of compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State and County CEQA Guidelines, that the Initial Study prepared for the project adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts; ADOPTED the proposed Negative Declaration; ADOPTED Ordinance No. 2011-02 to rezone the subject property, Parcel B of County File #MS33-86, from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District; and DIRECTED Department of Conservation & Development staff to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

4. **SD.7** CONSIDER accepting actuarial valuation of future annual costs of negotiated and proposed changes to Other Post-Employment Benefits as provided by Buck Consultants in letter of February 9, 2011. (Lisa Driscoll, County Administrator's Office)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

5. **SD.8** CONSIDER approving the 2011 State Legislative Platform and the recommendations with regard to the on-going operations of the Contra Costa Redevelopment Agency, as recommended by the Legislation Committee. (Supervisor Mitchoff)

Speakers: Ralph Hoffman, resident of Contra Costa County; Vince Wells, President, Firefighters' Local 1230; Rollie Katz, Public Employees' Union, Local One.

ADOPTED the Contra Costa County 2011 State Legislative Platform as recommended by the Legislation Committee, with Supervisor Uilkema registering a "No" vote on Line item 39 in regard to supporting the repeal of the 2/3 vote requirement to increase taxes for certain areas linked to provision of services.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

DELIBERATION ITEMS

6. **D.1** CONSIDER accepting report regarding the mid-year status of the 2010/11 County Budget. (David Twa, County Administrator)

Speakers: Ralph Hoffman, resident of Contra Costa County.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

D. 2 CONSIDER reports of Board members.

Supervisor Uilkema noted an excellent turnout at the State of the County Luncheon at the Contra Costa Council on February 10; also attending were Supervisors Mitchoff and Glover

Closed Session

*Adjourn in memory of
Kathy Radke*

CONSENT ITEMS

Road and Transportation

7. **C.1** APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Auditor's Office to issue a warrant in the amount of \$12,000 to Metropolitan Transportation Commission for Pavement Technical Assistance Program matching funds, as recommended by the Public Works Director, Countywide. (100% Local Road Funds)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

8. **C.2** APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the grant of access rights to Erica M. Stafford to Vasco Road for driveway purposes pursuant to Streets and Highways Code section 960, and AUTHORIZE the execution of related documents by the Chair, Board of Supervisors, and the Public Works Director, as recommended by the Public Works Director, Brentwood area. (No fiscal impact)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Special Districts & County Airports

9. **C.3** AUTHORIZE the Public Works director, or designee, to advertise the Buchanan Field Airport Security Upgrades project, including new vehicular and pedestrian gates and fencing to improve access control to the airport, Concord area. (100% Federal Aviation Administration airport Improvement Program Grant No. 3-06-0050-12 funds)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

10. **C.4** ADOPT Resolution No. 2011/56 approving the application for grant funds from the Flood Corridor Program under the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 84) and the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1E), as recommended by the Chief Engineer, Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Brentwood and Martinez areas. (90% California Department of Water Resources Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E Funds and 10% Flood Control District Funds)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Claims, Collections & Litigation

C.5 DENY claims filed by Sosnowski & Associates, Inc.; Veronica Morgan-Moore; Juliet Lederle; Brenda J. Wilson and Bennie Wilson; Alan Dadafarin and Farran Dadafarin; Ambrocio Arellano, Jr.; Ana Campos; and Rosanna Archimede.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

- 11.** **C.6** RECEIVE report on settlements of litigation during the period of October 1, 2010 - December 31, 2010, as recommended by the County Counsel.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Statutory Actions

C.7 ACCEPT Board member meeting reports for January 2011.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Honors & Proclamations

- 12.** **C.8** ADOPT Resolution No. 2011/60 honoring Grant Stubblefield as the Moraga Business Person of the Year, as recommended by Supervisor Uilkema.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

- 13.** **C.9** ADOPT Resolution No. 2011/40 recognizing Doctor Patricia Stroh for her years of services to the Community Services Bureau, Employment and Human Services Department, as recommended by the Employment and Human Services Director. (See PR.1)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

- 14.** **C.10** ADOPT Resolution No. 2011/57 honoring Barbara Center, RN, for her years of service to Emergency Medical Services and Contra Costa County, as recommended by the Health Services Director.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

- 15.** **C.11** ADOPT Resolution No. 2011/61 honoring the 30th Anniversary of the California State University, East Bay Concord Campus, as recommended by Supervisor Mitchoff.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Ordinances

16. **C.12** INTRODUCE Ordinance No. 2011-01, which dissolves the Advisory Housing Commission for the Housing Authority of the County of Contra Costa, WAIVE reading, and FIX March 1, 2011 for adoption, as recommended by the County Administrator.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Appointments & Resignations

17. **C.13** REAPPOINT Daniel Pellegrini to the District II seat on the Fish and Wildlife Committee, as recommended by Supervisor Uilkema.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

18. **C.14** Appoint Kim Zvik to the Alternate 1 Seat on the Kensington Municipal Advisory Committee (KMAC), as recommended by Supervisor Gioia.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

19. **C.15** REAPPOINT Brian Amador, Lynette Busby, and Larry McEwen to seats 4, 5, and 7 respectively, on the Contra Costa Centre Municipal Advisory Council, as recommended by Supervisor Mitchoff.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

20. **C.16** APPROVE new medical staff members, requests for additional privileges, primary department changes, membership extensions, advancements to permanent staff, biennial reappointments, renewal of privileges, and resignations, as recommended by the Medical Executive Committee at their January 24, 2011 Meeting, and by the Health Services Director.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

21. **C.17** REAPPOINT Robert Mason to the District III Owner seat on the Contra Costa Mobile Home Advisory Committee, as recommended by Supervisor Piepho.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Intergovernmental Relations

22. **C.18** APPROVE an amendment to the 2011 Federal Legislative Platform to include a policy position in support of legislation that would modify the Internal Revenue Code and corresponding regulations to permit public employees to make an irrevocable election between their current pension formula and a less rich pension formula, as recommended by the Legislation Committee.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Personnel Actions

23. **C.19** APPROVE the appointment of Barbara Flynn to the position of County Librarian, Contra Costa County; and AUTHORIZE the Auditor-Controller to reimburse the new County Librarian for reasonable moving expenses incurred in relocating to the Bay Area from the San Diego area in a total amount not to exceed \$5,000, as recommended by the Human Resources Director.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

24. **C.20** ADOPT Position Adjustment Resolution No. 20898 to cancel one Treasurer's Accounting Officer (represented) position and add one Tax Compliance Officer (represented) position, in the Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office. (Cost savings)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

25. **C.21** ADOPT Position Adjustment Resolution No. 20899 to add two Social Worker (represented) positions in the Employment and Human Services Department -In-Home Supportive Services. (85% State/Federal, 15% County)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

26. **C.22** CORRECT action taken January 18, Item C.17, on Personnel Adjustment Resolution No. 20880, to increase the hours of three permanent part-time Exempt Medical Staff Physicians (represented) positions; increase one permanent part-time Exempt Medical Staff Dentist (represented) position in the Health Services Department to reflect the correct positions numbers. (100 % Federally Qualified Health Center revenue)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

27. **C.23** ACKNOWLEDGE receipt of report of suspension of competition and direct appointment in the Health Services Department to facilitate the return to work of a County employee through the County Rehabilitation Program, as provided for in the Personnel Management Regulations, Section 502, as part of the County Disability Program, as recommended by the Assistant County Administrator - Director of Human Resources. (Budgeted)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Grants & Contracts

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE execution of agreements between the County and the following agencies for receipt of fund and/or services:

28. C.24 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Agricultural Commissioner, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with the California Department of Food and Agriculture to increase the reimbursement to the County by \$263,377 to a new reimbursement limit of \$795,905, for the placing and servicing of additional traps for exotic pest detection. (No County match)

29. C.25 ADOPT a Substantial Amendment to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program FY 2010/11 Annual Action Plan; AUTHORIZE the Conservation and Development Director, or designee, to execute Neighborhood Stabilization Program Agreements; and FIND that the Action Plan Substantial Amendment is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act. (no fiscal impact to general fund)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

30. C.26 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to accept a Grant Award from Kaiser Permanente, Community Benefit Diablo Area, to pay the County an amount not to exceed \$40,000 for the Health benefit, Outreach, Prevention usage and Enrollment (HOPE) Project, for the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. (No County match)

31. C.27 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute and transmit a funding application to the California Emergency Management Agency in an amount not to exceed \$525,000, for the 2010 Comprehensive Drug Courts Implementation Program, for the period from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011. (100% Federal ARRA funds, no County match required)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

32. C.28 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with the California Department of Public Health, Tuberculosis Control Branch, effective December 1, 2010, to increase the amount payable to the County by \$23,967 to a new payment limit of \$353,850, for continuation of the Tuberculosis Control Program, with no change in the original term of July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. (No County match)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

33. C.29 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to submit a joint application with SHELTER, Inc along with all the required certifications and assurances to the Department of Veteran Affairs Supportive Services for Veteran Families Program to pay the County in an amount up to \$1,000,000, to provide supportive services to low-income veteran families that are homeless and looking for housing or those at-risk of homelessness, through fiscal years 2011-2012. (No County match required)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE execution of agreement between the County and the following parties as noted for the purchase of equipment and/or services:

34. C.30 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Public Works Director, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with LSA Associates, Inc. effective February 1, 2011, to increase the payment limit by \$75,000 from \$400,000 to a new payment limit of \$475,000, with no change to the contract term, to continue to provide environmental services, Countywide. (48% Flood Control & Water Conservation District Funds, 48% Local Road Funds, 4% Airport Project Funds)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

35. C.31 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to execute a contract in an amount not to exceed \$188,814 with Floortec Commercial Floor Covering Solutions as part of the remodel of 2530 Arnold Drive, Martinez for the Sheriff-Coroner's Office, Forensic Division. (100% General Fund)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

36. C.32 AMEND Board action of September 28, 2010 (Item C.55), which approved and authorized the Purchasing Agent or designee to execute, on behalf of the Chief Information Officer, a purchase order with Sirius Computer Solutions, in an amount not to exceed \$751,000 for purchase and replacement of mainframe components, to APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent or designee to execute a third party lease agreement with PNC Equipment Financing, Inc., for the period March 1, 2011 through September 1, 2015, increase the lease purchase amount by \$48,000 to an amount not to exceed \$799,000, as recommended by the Deputy General Services Director. (100% Department of Information Technology User fees)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

37. C.33 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Chief Information Officer, or designee, to execute a contract with Keven J. Ormiston, in an amount not to exceed \$140,000 to provide Accela Automation, GIS Database and Application Support for the period of April 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012. (100% Department User fees)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

38. C.34 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to execute a purchase order with S&C Fuels in the amount of \$1,100,000 for the purchase of bulk diesel and unleaded fuels. (budgeted, charged back to user departments)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

39. C.35 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to execute a purchase order with Ramos Petroleum in the amount of \$250,000 for the purchase of bulk diesel and unleaded fuels. (budgeted, charged back to user departments)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

40. C.36 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute a novation contract with Oakgrove School, Inc., dba Waterfall Canyon Academy, Inc., in an amount not to exceed \$154,760, to provide residential treatment services for county-referred youth for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011, with a six-month automatic extension through December 31, 2011, in an amount not to exceed \$78,016. (100% County)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

41. C.37 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with ACS Consultant Company, Inc. (dba ACS Healthcare Solutions), including modified indemnification language, effective March 1, 2011, to extend the term from September 30, 2011 through June 30, 2013 and increase the payment limit by \$6,250,000 to a new payment limit of \$6,500,000 to provide additional consultation and technical support for the Department's Health Services Information System. (100% American Recovery & Reinvestment Act and Mental Health Services Act)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

42. C.38 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the County Administrator, or designee, to execute an agreement with the City of Walnut Creek Leshner Center for the Arts, including modified indemnification language changes, in an amount not to exceed \$5,162 effective June 16, 2011, to provide a venue for the 2011 Summer Reading Festival. (budgeted)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

43. C.39 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with Greater Richmond Inter-Faith Program, effective January 1, 2011, to increase the payment limit by \$100,000, to a new payment limit of \$187,000 to provide additional consultation and technical assistance with regard to the Department's clinic services school-based health centers program, and extend the term from February 28, 2011 through August 31, 2011. (100% Federally Qualified Health Centers and US Department of Health and Human Services Teenage Pregnancy Prevention grant)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

44. C.40 AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent on behalf of the Health Services Department to renew a 2-year Blanket Purchase Order effective February 1, 2011 with Pharmedium Services LLC, in the amount of \$150,000, for purchase of pain management/ pre-mix medications at Contra Costa Regional Medical Center and Contra Costa Health Centers. (100% Enterprise Fund I)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

45. C.41 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with V. Arek Keledjian, M.D., effective May 1, 2010 to modify the payment provisions with no change in the original payment limit of \$115,200 and no change in the original term of June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2012. (100% Enterprise Fund I)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

46. C.42 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute a contract with the Mount Diablo Unified School District to pay the County an amount not to exceed \$983,111 to provide professional school-based mental health services, crisis intervention, and day treatment services for certain special education and regular students for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. (No County match)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

47. C.43 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with Thomson Reuters (Healthcare), Inc., effective February 1, 2011, including modified indemnification language, to increase the payment limit by \$38,000, to a new payment limit of \$74,000, to provide additional compliance audit services, with no change in the original term of October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2012. (100% Member Premiums)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

48. C.44 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Health Services Director, or designee, to execute a novation contract with Charis Youth Center in an amount not to exceed \$150,000, to provide a day treatment program for seriously emotionally disturbed adolescents for the period July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011, with a six-month automatic extension through December 31, 2011 in an amount not to exceed \$75,000. (49% Federal FFP Medi-Cal, 28% State Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment, 20% County, 3% Mental Health Realignment.)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

Other Actions

49. C.45 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the transfer of funds from the Contra Costa County Water Agency to the Port of Stockton, in an amount not to exceed \$84,380, representing a reimbursement from the U.S. Corps of Engineers of local share of costs from prior year(s) related to the San Francisco-Stockton Ship Channel Deepening Project. (no fiscal impact)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

50. C.46 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to execute a purchase order with Golden Gate Petroleum in the amount of \$250,000 for the purchase of bulk diesel and unleaded fuels. (budgeted, charged back to user departments)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

51. C.47 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Employment & Human Services Director, or designee, to seek reimbursement from California Department of Education, in an amount not to exceed \$3,000, to maintain Child Days of Enrollment during four days of emergency site closures at Richmond College Prep Preschool and First Baptist Head Start. (100% State funding)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

52. C.48 DECLARE as surplus and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to dispose of vehicles no longer needed for public use as recommended by the Deputy Director of General Services. (No fiscal impact)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

53. C.49 APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Employment and Human Services Director, or designee, to issue Request for Proposal #1122 for Promoting Safe and Stable Families services in an amount not to exceed \$490,000 for the period July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012. (100% Federal)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

54. C.50 REFER to the Family and Human Services Committee a review of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as Food Stamps) and the SNAP California Restaurant Meals Program as recommended by Supervisor Glover.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

55. C.51 ADOPT Resolution No. 2011/59 authorizing the issuance of Multi-Family Housing Revenue Bonds in the amount of \$12.5 million, as recommended by the Conservation and Development Director, Concord. (No impact to the County General Fund)

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

56. C.52 ACCEPT the Workforce Development Board's recommendation to eliminate the mandated partner seat for Job Corps on the Workforce Development Board, as recommended by the Employment and Human Services Department.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

57. C.53 CONTINUE the emergency action originally taken by the Board of Supervisors on November 16, 1999 regarding the issue of homelessness in Contra Costa County, as recommended by the Health Services Director.

Vote: 4 - 0 Passed

Other: District III Supervisor Mary N. Piepho (ABSENT)

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Board meets in all its capacities pursuant to Ordinance Code Section 24-2.402, including as the Housing Authority and the Redevelopment Agency. Persons who wish to address the Board should complete the form provided for that purpose and furnish a copy of any written statement to the Clerk.

Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the Clerk of the Board to a majority of the members of the Board of Supervisors less than 72 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at 651 Pine Street, First Floor, Room 106, Martinez, CA 94553, during normal business hours.

All matters listed under CONSENT ITEMS are considered by the Board to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless requested by a member of the Board or a member of the public prior to the time the Board votes on the motion to adopt.

Persons who wish to speak on matters set for PUBLIC HEARINGS will be heard when the Chair calls for comments from those persons who are in support thereof or in opposition thereto. After persons have spoken, the hearing is closed and the matter is subject to discussion and action by the Board. Comments on matters listed on the agenda or

otherwise within the purview of the Board of Supervisors can be submitted to the office of the Clerk of the Board via mail: Board of Supervisors, 651 Pine Street Room 106, Martinez, CA 94553; by fax: 925-335-1913.

The County will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend Board meetings who contact the Clerk of the Board at least 24 hours before the meeting, at (925) 335-1900; TDD (925) 335-1915. An assistive listening device is available from the Clerk, Room 106.

Copies of taped recordings of all or portions of a Board meeting may be purchased from the Clerk of the Board. Please telephone the Office of the Clerk of the Board, (925) 335-1900, to make the necessary arrangements.

Forms are available to anyone desiring to submit an inspirational thought nomination for inclusion on the Board Agenda. Forms may be obtained at the Office of the County Administrator or Office of the Clerk of the Board, 651 Pine Street, Martinez, California.

Applications for personal subscriptions to the weekly Board Agenda may be obtained by calling the Office of the Clerk of the Board, (925) 335-1900. The weekly agenda may also be viewed on the County's Internet Web Page:
www.co.contra-costa.ca.us

STANDING COMMITTEES

The Airport Committee (Supervisors Karen Mitchoff and Mary N. Piepho) meets on the fourth Thursday of the month at 10:00 a.m. at Director of Airports Office, 550 Sally Ride Drive, Concord.

The **Family and Human Services Committee** (Supervisors Gayle B. Uilkema and Federal D. Glover) meets on the second Monday of the month at 11:00 a.m. in Room 101, County Administration Building, 651 Pine Street, Martinez.

The **Finance Committee** (Supervisors John Gioia and Federal D. Glover) meets on the first Monday of the month at 1:30 p.m. in Room 101, County Administration Building, 651 Pine Street, Martinez.

The **Internal Operations Committee** (Supervisors Mary N. Piepho and John Gioia) meets on the third Monday of the month at 9:30 a.m. in Room 101, County Administration Building, 651 Pine Street, Martinez.

The **Legislation Committee** (Supervisors Karen Mitchoff and John Gioia) meets on the third Monday of the month at 11:00 a.m. in Room 101, County Administration Building, 651 Pine Street, Martinez.

The **Public Protection Committee** (Supervisors Federal D. Glover and Gayle B. Uilkema) meets on the first Monday of the month at 11:00 a.m. in Room 101, County Administration Building, 651 Pine Street, Martinez.

The **Transportation, Water & Infrastructure Committee** (Supervisors Mary N. Piepho and Karen Mitchoff) meets on the second Wednesday of the month at 9:30 a.m. in Room 101, County Administration Building, 651 Pine Street, Martinez.

Airports Committee			See above
Family & Human Services Committee	March 14, 2011	Room 101	11:00 a.m.
Finance Committee			See above
Internal Operations Committee	February 28, 2011	Room 101	9:30 a.m.
Legislation Committee	March 21, 2011	Room 101	11:00 a.m.
Public Protection Committee	March 7, 2011	Room 101	11:00 a.m.
Transportation, Water & Infrastructure Committee	February 28, 2011 - Special	Room 101	2:30 p.m.

<p>PERSONS WHO WISH TO ADDRESS THE BOARD MAY BE LIMITED TO THREE (3) MINUTES</p>

AGENDA DEADLINE: Thursday, 12 noon, 12 days before the Tuesday Board meetings.

Glossary of Acronyms, Abbreviations, and other Terms (in alphabetical order):

Contra Costa County has a policy of making limited use of acronyms, abbreviations, and industry-specific language in its Board of Supervisors meetings and written materials. Following is a list of commonly used language that may appear in oral presentations and written materials associated with Board meetings:

AB Assembly Bill
ABAG Association of Bay Area Governments
ACA Assembly Constitutional Amendment
ADA Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
AFSCME American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees
AICP American Institute of Certified Planners
AIDS Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ALUC Airport Land Use Commission
AOD Alcohol and Other Drugs
ARRA American Recovery & Reinvestment Act of 2009
BAAQMD Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BART Bay Area Rapid Transit District
BCDC Bay Conservation & Development Commission
BGO Better Government Ordinance
BOS Board of Supervisors
CALTRANS California Department of Transportation
CalWIN California Works Information Network
CalWORKS California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids
CAER Community Awareness Emergency Response
CAO County Administrative Officer or Office
CCCPCD (ConFire) Contra Costa County Fire Protection District
CCHP Contra Costa Health Plan
CCTA Contra Costa Transportation Authority
CCRMC Contra Costa Regional Medical Center
CCWD Contra Costa Water District
CDBG Community Development Block Grant
CFDA Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance
CEQA California Environmental Quality Act
CIO Chief Information Officer
COLA Cost of living adjustment
ConFire (CCCPCD) Contra Costa County Fire Protection District
CPA Certified Public Accountant
CPI Consumer Price Index
CSA County Service Area
CSAC California State Association of Counties
CTC California Transportation Commission
dba doing business as
EBMUD East Bay Municipal Utility District
ECCPCD East Contra Costa Fire Protection District
EIR Environmental Impact Report
EIS Environmental Impact Statement

EMCC Emergency Medical Care Committee
EMS Emergency Medical Services
EPSDT Early State Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Program (Mental Health)
et al. et alii (and others)
FAA Federal Aviation Administration
FEMA Federal Emergency Management Agency
F&HS Family and Human Services Committee
First 5 First Five Children and Families Commission (Proposition 10)
FTE Full Time Equivalent
FY Fiscal Year
GHAD Geologic Hazard Abatement District
GIS Geographic Information System
HCD (State Dept of) Housing & Community Development
HHS (State Dept of) Health and Human Services
HIPAA Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act
HIV Human Immunodeficiency Syndrome
HOV High Occupancy Vehicle
HR Human Resources
HUD United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
IHSS In-Home Supportive Services
Inc. Incorporated
IOC Internal Operations Committee
ISO Industrial Safety Ordinance
JPA Joint (exercise of) Powers Authority or Agreement
Lamorinda Lafayette-Moraga-Orinda Area
LAFCo Local Agency Formation Commission
LLC Limited Liability Company
LLP Limited Liability Partnership
Local 1 Public Employees Union Local 1
LVN Licensed Vocational Nurse
MAC Municipal Advisory Council
MBE Minority Business Enterprise
M.D. Medical Doctor
M.F.T. Marriage and Family Therapist
MIS Management Information System
MOE Maintenance of Effort
MOU Memorandum of Understanding
MTC Metropolitan Transportation Commission
NACo National Association of Counties
NEPA National Environmental Policy Act
OB-GYN Obstetrics and Gynecology
O.D. Doctor of Optometry
OES-EOC Office of Emergency Services-Emergency Operations Center
OPEB Other Post Employment Benefits
OSHA Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Psy.D. Doctor of Psychology
RDA Redevelopment Agency
RFI Request For Information
RFP Request For Proposal
RFQ Request For Qualifications
RN Registered Nurse
SB Senate Bill
SBE Small Business Enterprise
SEIU Service Employees International Union
SWAT Southwest Area Transportation Committee

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership & Cooperation (Central)

TRANSPLAN Transportation Planning Committee (East County)

TRE or **TTE** Trustee

TWIC Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee

VA Department of Veterans Affairs

vs. versus (against)

WAN Wide Area Network

WBE Women Business Enterprise

WCCTAC West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Jason Crapo, County Building Official
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Cost Confirmation Hearing for real property located at 516 Verde Ave., Richmond, CA

RECOMMENDATION(S):

OPEN the hearing on the attached itemized report on the costs of abating a public nuisance on the real property located at 516 Verde Ave., Richmond, CA, Contra Costa County; APN 409-271-024 RECEIVE the staff report and public testimony; and CLOSE the hearing.

DETERMINE the costs of all abatement work and all administrative costs to be \$1,462.44.

ORDER the itemized report confirmed and DIRECT that it be filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

ORDER the costs to be specially assessed against the above-referenced property and AUTHORIZE the recordation of a Notice Of Abatement Lien.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No net fiscal impact. The costs of abatement totalling \$1,462.44 will be added to the tax roll as a special assessment and will be collected at the same time and in the same manner as ordinary County property taxes are collected.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 02/15/2011 ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

Contact: Jason Crapo
335-1108

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: , Deputy

cc:

BACKGROUND:

Contra Costa County Ordinance Code Article 14-6.4 and Government Code Section 25845 authorize the recovery of abatement costs in public nuisance cases, the recordation of a Notice of Abatement Lien, and inclusion of abatement costs on the tax roll as a special assessment upon approval of the Board of Supervisors.

The Notice and Order to Abate was posted on the above-referenced property for a vacant structure whose premises contain waste, rubbish, debris and excessive vegetation, and was also served on the property owner and all persons known to be in possession of the property by certified mail on January 11, 2010.

The property owner did not file an appeal. The County Abatement Officer abated the nuisance on March 11, 2010.

The property owner was billed for the actual cost of the abatement and all administrative costs. The bill was sent by first-class mail and certified mail to the property owner on April 7, 2010. The property owner did not pay the bill within 45 days of the date of mailing. The property was subsequently sold and a second bill was sent by first-class mail and certified mail to the new property owner on September 22, 2010. The new property owner did not pay the bill within 45 days of the date of mailing.

Notice of this Cost Hearing was sent to the property owner by certified mail by the Clerk of the Board. For proof of service, see Clerk of the Board at 651 Pine Street, Room 106, Martinez, CA.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If not approved, the County will not be able to recover costs totalling \$1,462.44 for abatement of code violations for this property.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable

CLERK'S ADDENDUM

REMOVED from consideration as recommended by the County Building Official, who reports the property has changed ownership.

ATTACHMENTS

Photos

Itemized costs



Before



After

Address: 516 Verde Ave., Richmond

RF #: RV09-00421

Notes: Debris removed from property

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

DATE: February 15, 2011

TO: Clerk of the Board

FROM: Department of Conservation & Development
By: Joe Losado, Sr. Building Inspector for
Eduardo Franco, Building Inspector I

RE: Itemized Report of Abatement Costs

The following is an itemized report of the costs of abatement for the below described property pursuant to C.C.C. Ord. Code ' 14-6.428.

OWNER: Gideon & Cheryl Sorokin, Tre

POSSESSOR: N/A

MORTGAGE HOLDER: N/A

ABATEMENT ORDERED DATE: January 11, 2010

ABATEMENT COMPLETED DATE: March 11, 2010

SITE ADDRESS: 516 Verde Ave., Richmond, CA
APN #:409-271-024

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION: Single Family Dwelling

AMOUNT OF ABATEMENT COSTS (CCC ORDINANCE CODE 14-6.428)

ITEM	EXPLANATION	COST
Notice to Comply		\$ 100.00
Site Inspections (2 @ \$50 ea)		\$ 100.00
PIRT (Title Search)and updated pirt (\$35)		\$ 185.00
Certified Letter & Regular Mailings		\$ 17.94
Photos		\$ 10.50
Lock		\$ 25.00
Contractor hired for abatement		\$ 624.00
Final Site Inspection to Confirm Compliance		\$ 200.00
Compliance Report and Board Hearing		\$ 200.00
	Total	\$ <u>1462.44</u>

Abatement costs can be paid at or mailed to Building Inspection Division, Property Conservation Division, 651 Pine Street, 4th Floor, Martinez, CA 94553.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Jason Crapo, County Building Official
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: California Building, Mechanical, Plumbing, Electrical, Residential, and Green Building Standards Codes

RECOMMENDATION(S):

OPEN the public hearing on Ordinance No. 2011-03, RECEIVE testimony, and CLOSE the public hearing.

ADOPT Ordinance No. 2011-03, adopting the 2010 California Building Code, the 2010 California Residential Code, the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, the 2010 Electrical Code, the 2010 California Plumbing Code, and 2010 California Mechanical Code, with changes, additions and deletions.

ADOPT the attached findings in support of the County's changes, additions, and deletions to the statewide codes.

DIRECT the Building Inspection Division of the Conservation and Development Department, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 17958.7, to send a certified copy of Ordinance No. 2011-03, the attached findings, and this Board Order to the California Department of Housing and Community Development and to the California Buildings Standards Commission.

FIND that adoption of the ordinance is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3).

DIRECT staff to file a Notice of Exemption with the County

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I
Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II
Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV
Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V
Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Jason Crapo,
925-335-1108

cc:

RECOMMENDATION(S): (CONT'D)

Clerk.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Not applicable

BACKGROUND:

On February 8, 2011, the Board of Supervisors introduced Ordinance No. 2011-03, adopting the 2010 California Building Code (Volumes 1 and 2), the 2010 California Electrical Code, the 2010 California Plumbing Code, the 2010 California Mechanical Code, the 2010 California Residential Code and the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, with changes, additions, and deletions. The Board waived the reading and fixed February 15, 2011 for a public hearing to adopt the attached findings in support of the County's changes, additions, and deletions to the statewide codes.

The California Building Standards Commission has adopted and published the 2007 Building Standards Code, which is comprised of the 2010 California Building, Mechanical, Plumbing, Electrical, Residential and Green Building Codes. These statewide codes become effective January 1, 2011. These codes are enforced in Contra Costa County by the Department of Conservation and Development Building Inspection Division.

Although these codes apply statewide, Health and Safety Code sections 17958.5 and 18941.5 authorize a local jurisdiction to modify or change these codes and establish more restrictive building standards if the local jurisdiction finds that the changes and modifications are reasonably necessary because of local climatic, geological or topographical conditions. The attached ordinance adopts the statewide codes and amends them to address local conditions.

Staff has reviewed the statewide codes and recommends their adoption with a minimum of technical changes in order to retain as much statewide uniformity as possible. The State did not adopt the new International Housing Codes, and therefore the 1997 Uniform Housing Code (UHC), with local amendments, continues as the adopted housing code for the County.

However, Ordinance No. 2011-03 does amend the statewide codes in some respects to address certain local climatic, geological or topographical conditions. These conditions are described in the attached findings. All of the recommended amendments continue existing amendments to the State Building Code and do not create any new requirements. The recommended local amendments are predominately designed to address the risk of seismic activity within the County.

The ordinance amends the statewide codes by increasing the minimum base shear in certain buildings to a level consistent with previous building codes. The ordinance eliminates the use of unreinforced plain concrete where allowed by the statewide codes. The ordinance further amends the statewide codes by requiring the installation of a smoke detector in existing flat roof buildings when a pitch roof is added on top of the existing flat roof and the solid sheathing of the flat roof is not removed.

Staff has determined that the adoption of this ordinance is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15061(b)(3). It can be seen with certainty that the adoption of the California building standards codes with local amendments will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Notice of this public hearing was published pursuant to Government Code section 6066. A summary of this ordinance was prepared by County Counsel and published at least five days before this hearing pursuant to Government Code section 25124(b). The summary of this ordinance will be published again within 15 days of adoption pursuant to Government Code section 25124.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If the proposed ordinance is not approved, the County will not be able to adopt the 2010 California Building Code, the 2010 California Residential Code, the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, the 2010 Electrical Code, the 2010 California Plumbing Code, and 2010 California Mechanical Code, as amended.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable

CLERK'S ADDENDUM

CLOSED the public hearing; ADOPTED Ordinance No. 2011-03, adopting the 2010 California Building Code, the 2010 California Residential Code, the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, the 2010 Electrical Code, the 2010 California Plumbing Code, and 2010 California Mechanical Code, with changes, additions and deletions; ADOPTED findings in support of the County's changes, additions, and deletions to the statewide codes; DIRECTED the Building Inspection Division of the Conservation and Development Department, pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 17958.7, to send a certified copy of Ordinance No. 2011-03, the attached findings, and this Board Order to the California Department of Housing and Community Development and to the California Buildings Standards Commission; and FOUND that adoption of the ordinance is exempt from CEQA pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3).

ATTACHMENTS

Ordinance

Findings

ORDINANCE NO. 2011-03

(Adoption of California Building Standards Codes)

The Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors ordains as follows (omitting the parenthetical footnotes from the official text of the enacted or amended provisions of the County Ordinance Code):

SECTION I. SUMMARY. This ordinance adopts the 2010 California Building Code, the 2010 California Residential Code, the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, the 2010 California Electrical Code, the 2010 California Plumbing Code, and the 2010 California Mechanical Code, with changes, additions, and deletions.

SECTION II. Chapter 74-2 of the County Ordinance Code is amended to read:

**Chapter 74-2
ADOPTION**

74-2.002 Adoption.

- (a) The building code of this county is the 2010 California Building Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2, Volumes 1 and 2), the 2010 California Residential Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2.5), and the 2010 California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), as amended by the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this ordinance and Division 72.
- (b) The 2010 California Building Code, with the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this chapter and Division 72, is adopted by this reference as though fully set forth in this ordinance.
- (c) The 2010 California Residential Code, with the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this chapter and Division 72, is adopted by this reference as though fully set forth in this ordinance.
- (d) The 2010 California Green Building Standards Code, with the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in Division 72, is adopted by this reference as though fully set forth in this ordinance.
- (e) At least one copy of this building code is now on file with the building inspection division, and the other requirements of Government Code section 50022.6 have been and shall be complied with.
- (f) As of the effective date of this ordinance, the provisions of the building code are controlling

and enforceable within the county. (Ords. 2011-03 § 2, 2007-54 § 3, 2002-31 § 3, 99-17 § 5, 99-1, 90-100 § 5, 87-55 § 4, 80-14 § 5, 74-30.)

SECTION III. Chapter 74-4 of the County Ordinance Code is amended to read:

**Chapter 74-4
MODIFICATIONS**

74-4.002 Amendments to CBC. The 2010 California Building Code ("CBC") is amended by the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this chapter and Division 72. Section numbers used below are those of the 2010 California Building Code.

(a) CBC Chapter 1 is amended by the provisions of Division 72 of this code and as follows:

- (1) Sections 103, 109, 112, 113, 114, and 116 of CBC Chapter 1 are deleted.
- (2) Section 105.2 (Work Exempt from Permit) of CBC Chapter 1 is amended to provide that a building permit is not required for the following work:

Retaining walls that are not more than three feet in height, measured from the top of the footing to the top of the wall, unless supporting a surcharge or ground slope exceeding 1:2 or impounding class I, II, or III-a liquids.

All other work listed in Section 105.2 of CBC Chapter 1 is also exempt from a permit.

- (3) Section 107.1 (Submittal Documents) of CBC Chapter 1 is amended by deleting the exception.
- (4) Section 107.2.1 (Information on Construction Documents) of CBC Chapter 1 is amended to read:

107.2.1. Plans and specifications shall be drawn to scale on substantial paper or cloth and shall be sufficient clarity to indicate the location, nature and extent of the work proposed and to show in detail that it will conform to this code and all relevant laws, ordinances, rules and regulations. The first sheet of each set of plans shall give the house and street address of the work and the name and address of the owner and of the person who prepared the plans. Plans shall include a plot plan showing the location of the lot corners as established on the ground, the elevation of the top and toe of cuts and fills, and the location of the proposed building and of every existing building on the property. Instead of detailed specifications, the county building official may approve references on the plans to a specific section or part of this code or other ordinances or laws.

ORDINANCE NO. 2011-03

Sections 107.2.2, 107.2.5, and 107.3 are not amended and remain in effect.

- (5) Section 110.1 (Inspections – General) is amended by adding the following to the end of the section:

At the time of first inspection by the county building official, property corners (including angle points) shall be identified with monuments in accordance with the legal description furnished with the application to build, sufficient to locate the proposed structure in relation to the lot lines, except that this requirement shall not apply to minor alterations or repairs to existing structures not affecting the exterior limits thereof, and construction of accessory buildings or structures of a building permit value of less than \$500. The plot plan required by Section 107.2.1 shall indicate the locations and identification of all property corner monuments. Property corner monuments shall consist of one of the following:

- (A) Redwood hub not less than two inches square and twelve inches long;
- (B) Galvanized iron pipe not less than one inch in diameter and thirty inches long filled with concrete; or
- (C) Other material of sufficient durability, placed as not to be readily disturbed, acceptable to the county building official.

Monuments shall be driven flush with the ground and tagged as required by the Land Surveyor Act (Business and Professions Code section 8772).

- (b) Section 907.2.11.5.1 is added to Section 907.2.11.5 (Existing Group R-3 Occupancies) of CBC Chapter 9 (Fire Protection Systems), to read:

907.2.11.5.1 In existing flat roof buildings, the installation of a smoke detector that complies with Section 907.2.10 shall be required when a pitch roof is added on top of the existing flat roof and the solid seating of the flat roof is not removed.

- (c) Section 1406.5 is added to Section 1406 (Combustible Materials on the Exterior Side of Exterior Walls) of CBC Chapter 14 (Exterior Walls), to read:

1406.5 Wood shakes or shingles. Wood shakes or shingles used for exterior wall covering shall be fire treated unless there is a minimum of 10 feet from the exterior wall (including shakes or shingles) to the property line of all sides, except for any sides of exterior walls facing the street.

- (d) Section 1615A.1.7 ASCE 7, Section 12.8.1.1 of CBC Chapter 1614A (Structural Design) is amended to read:

Section 1614A.1.7 ASCE 7, Section 12.8.1.1. Modify ASCE 7 Section 12.8.1.1 by amending Equation 12.8-5 as follows:

$$C_s = 0.044 S_{DS} I \geq 0.01 \quad (12.8-5)$$

where S_{DS} is the 5 percent damped design spectral response acceleration parameter at short periods as defined in Section 11.4.4 and I is the importance factor in Section 11.5.1.

- (e) Section 1809.8 (Plain Concrete Footings) of CBC Chapter 18 (Soils and Foundations) is deleted.
- (f) Section 1810.3.9.3 (Placement of reinforcement) of CBC Chapter 18 (Soils and Foundations) is amended by deleting Exception No. 3.
- (g) Section 1908.1 of CBC Chapter 19 (Concrete) is amended to read:
- 1908.1 General.** The text of ACI 318 shall be modified as indicated in Sections 1908.1.1 through 1908.11.
- (h) Section 1909 (Structural Plain Concrete) of CBC Chapter 19 (Concrete) is deleted.
- (i) Section 1910.1 of CBC Chapter 19 (Concrete) is amended by adding the following sentence to Section 1910.1:
- Slabs shall have six inches by six inches by ten gauge wire mesh or equal at midheight.
- (j) Appendix C, Appendix F, and Appendix I of the CBC are incorporated into the County building code. Appendix A, Appendix B, Appendix D, Appendix E, Appendix G, Appendix H, Appendix J, and Appendix K of the CBC are excluded from the County building code. (Ords. 2011-03 § 3, 2007-54 § 4, 2002-31 § 3, 99-17 § 6, 99-1, 90-100 § 6, 87-55 § 5, 80-14 § 6, 74-30 § 1.)

74-4.004 Amendments to CRC. The 2010 California Residential Code (“CRC”) is amended by the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this chapter and Division 72. Section numbers used below are those of the 2010 California Residential Code.

- (a) Sections R103, R108, R111, R112, R113, and R114 of CRC Chapter 1 are deleted.

- (b) In Section R105.2 of CRC Chapter 1, subsection 3 of the paragraph exempting certain building work from the requirement to obtain a permit is amended to exempt the following retaining walls from the requirement to obtain a permit:

3. Retaining walls that are not more than three feet in height, measured from the top of the footing to the top of the wall, unless supporting a surcharge or ground slope exceeding 1:2 or impounding class I, II, or III-a liquids.

- (c) Section R403.1.3 of CRC Chapter 4 is amended to delete the exception.

- (d) Section R404.1.4.1 of CRC Chapter 4 is amended to read:

R404.1.4.1 Masonry foundation walls. In addition to the requirements of Table R404.1.1(1), plain masonry walls in buildings assigned to Seismic Design Category D₀, D₁, or D₂ shall comply with the seismic requirements of Section 1.17.4.4 of TMS 402, ACI 530, or ASCE 5.

- (e) Section R404.1.4.2 of CRC Chapter 4 is amended to read:

Section R404.1.4.2 Concrete foundation walls. Concrete foundation walls in buildings assigned to Seismic Design Category D₀, D₁, or D₂ shall comply with ACI 318, ACI 332, or PCA 100.

(Ord. 2011-03 § 3.)

SECTION IV. Division 76 of the County Ordinance Code is amended to read:

**Division 76
ELECTRICAL CODE**

**Chapter 76-2
ADOPTION**

76-2.002 Adoption.

- (a) The electrical code of this county is the 2010 California Electrical Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 3), as amended by the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this ordinance.
- (b) The 2010 California Electrical Code, with the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this division and Division 72, is adopted by this reference as though fully set forth in this ordinance.
- (c) At least one copy of this electrical code is now on file with the building inspection division, and the other requirements of Government Code section 50022.6 have been and shall be

ORDINANCE NO. 2011-03

complied with.

- (d) As of the effective date of this ordinance, the provisions of the electrical code are controlling and enforceable within the county. (Ords. 2011-03 § 4, 2007-54 § 5, 2002-31 § 4, 99-17 § 11, 89-60 § 2, 82-23 § 2, 79-67, 76-24.)

Chapter 76-4 MODIFICATIONS

76-4.002 Unlawful wiring, electric fences, warning.

- (a) **Prohibition.** Except as provided in subsection (b), a person may not construct or maintain any spring gun, or any electric wiring device, designated or intended to injure and/or shock animals or persons, or any contrivance or apparatus for that purpose.
- (b) **Livestock Exception.** Persons principally engaged in the business of handling livestock as a primary means of production or income may electrify fences to control or confine livestock upon complying with all the following requirements:
 - (1) Any contrivance or mechanism to control electrical current in such fences shall be listed by an approved testing laboratory, and shall include a suitable interrupting device and such other safety devices to prevent dangerous currents getting on the fence at any time.
 - (2) Any electrical fence to which the public may have access, except cross fences to confine and control livestock, shall be posted with a warning notice containing the following or similar wording: "DANGER. ELECTRIC FENCE," or "DANGER. HIGH VOLTAGE." This notice shall be posted along any such main fence at intervals of not more than 200 feet and in letters at least two inches high. (Ords. 2011-03 § 4, 2007-54 § 5, 2002-31 § 4, 99-17 § 11, 89-60 § 2, 82-23 § 2, 79-57, 76-24.)

76-4.004 Boat docks. Whether open or roofed, lighting shall be provided to insure sufficient protective lighting at least two foot candles at all points for pedestrians on the docks, within covered berths, and on all walkways or ramps to shore and to the nearest access road within or adjacent to the harbor property. (Ords. 2011-03 § 4, 2007-54 § 5, 2002-31 § 4, 99-17 § 11, 89-60 § 2, 82-23 § 2, 79-67, 76-24.)

76-4.006 Power from generators.

- (a) All occupancies that have commercially supplied electricity shall connect to the commercial supplier.
- (b) Any occupancy that has commercially supplied electricity shall not use a permanent or temporary generator(s), provided that a generator(s) may be used for commercial purposes

when authorized by the county building official. (Ords. 2011-03 § 4, 2007-54 §5, 2005-32 § 2.)

76-4.008 Public nuisance lighting. Lighting fixtures shall be installed, controlled or directed so that the light will not glare or be blinding to pedestrians or vehicular traffic or on adjoining property. (Ords. 2011-03 § 4, 2007-54 § 5, 2002-31 § 4, 99-17 § 11, 89-60 § 2, 82-23 § 2, 79-67, 76-24.)

SECTION V. Division 78 of the County Ordinance Code is amended to read:

**Division 78
PLUMBING CODE**

**Chapter 78-2
ADOPTION**

78-2.002 Adoption.

- (a) The plumbing code of this county is the 2010 California Plumbing Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 5), as amended by the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this ordinance.
- (b) The 2010 California Plumbing Code, with the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in Division 72, is adopted by this reference as though fully set forth in this ordinance.
- (c) At least one copy of this plumbing code is now on file with the building inspection division, and the other requirements of Government Code section 50022.6 have been and shall be complied with.
- (d) As of the effective date of this ordinance, the provisions of the plumbing code are controlling and enforceable within the county. (Ords. 2011-03 § 5, 2007-54 § 6, 2002-31 § 5, 99-17 § 12, 74-29.)

SECTION VI. Division 710 of the County Ordinance Code is amended to read:

**Division 710
MECHANICAL CODE**

**Chapter 710-2
ADOPTION**

710-2.002 Adoption.

- (a) The mechanical code of this county is the 2010 California Mechanical Code (California

ORDINANCE NO. 2011-03

Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 4), as amended by the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in this ordinance.

- (b) The 2010 California Mechanical Code, with the changes, additions, and deletions set forth in Division 72, is adopted by this reference as though fully set forth in this ordinance.
- (c) At least one copy of this mechanical code is now on file with the building inspection division, and the other requirements of Government Code section 50022.6 have been and shall be complied with.
- (d) As of the effective date of this ordinance, the provisions of the mechanical code are controlling and enforceable within the county. (Ords. 2011-03 § 6, 2007-54 § 7, 2002-31 § 6, 99-17 § 13, 88-91 § 5, 74-31.)

SECTION VII. Chapter 74-8 of the County Ordinance Code is deleted.

SECTION VIII. Chapter 78-4 of the County Ordinance Code is deleted.

SECTION IX. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance becomes effective 30 days after passage, and within 15 days after passage shall be published once with the names of supervisors voting for and against it in the Contra Costa Times, a newspaper published in this County.

PASSED on _____, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST: DAVID TWA,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
and County Administrator

Board Chair

By: _____
Deputy

[SEAL]

TLG:
H:\2011\Building Inspection\2011 building code revisions -- final2.wpd

ORDINANCE NO. 2011-03

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF CHANGES, ADDITIONS, AND DELETIONS TO
STATEWIDE BUILDING STANDARDS CODE

The California Building Standards Commission has adopted and published the 2010 Building Standards Code, which is comprised of the 2010 California Building, Residential, Green Building Standards, Electrical, Plumbing, and Mechanical codes. These codes are enforced in Contra Costa County by the Building Inspection Division of the Department of Conservation and Development.

Although these codes apply statewide, Health and Safety Code sections 17958.5 and 18941.5 authorize a local jurisdiction to modify or change these codes and establish more restrictive building standards if the jurisdiction finds that the modifications and changes are reasonably necessary because of local climatic, geological or topographical conditions.

Ordinance No. 2011-03 adopts the statewide codes and amends them to address local conditions. Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 17958.7, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors finds that the more restrictive standards contained in Ordinance No. 2011-03 are reasonably necessary because of the local climatic, geological, and topographic conditions that are described below.

I. Local Conditions

A. Geological and Topographic

1. Seismicity

(a) Conditions

Contra Costa County is located in Seismic Risk Zone 4, which is the worst earthquake area in the United States. Buildings and other structures in Zone 4 can experience major seismic damage. Contra Costa County is in close proximity to numerous earthquake faults including the San Andreas Fault and contains all or portions of the Hayward, Calaveras, Concord, Antioch, Mt. Diablo, and other lesser faults. A 4.1 earthquake with its epicenter in Concord occurred in 1958, and a 5.4 earthquake with its epicenter also in Concord occurred in 1955. The Concord and Antioch faults have a potential for a Richter 6 earthquake and the Hayward and Calaveras faults have the potential for a Richter 7 earthquake. Minor tremblers from seismic activity are not uncommon in the area.

A study released in 1990 by the United States Geological Survey says that there is a 67% chance of another earthquake the size of Loma Prieta during the next 30 years, and that the quake could strike at any time, including today. Scientists, therefore, believe that an earthquake of a magnitude 7 or larger is now twice as likely to happen as to not happen.

Interstates 680, 80, 580 and State Route 4 run the length throughout Contra Costa County. These interstates and state routes divide the County into a west, south, north and east. An overpass or undercrossing collapse would significantly alter the response route and time for responding emergency equipment. This is due to limited crossings of the interstate and that in some areas there is only one surface street, which runs parallel to the interstate, which would be congested during a significant emergency.

Earthquakes of the magnitude experienced locally can cause major damage to electrical transmission facilities and to gas and electrical lines in buildings, which in turn start fires throughout the County. The occurrence of multiple fires will quickly deplete existing fire department resources; thereby reducing and/or delaying their response to any given fire.

(b) Impact

A major earthquake could severely restrict the response of all Contra Costa County Fire Districts and their capability to control fires involving buildings of wood frame construction, with ordinary roofing materials and flammable exteriors, or with large interior areas not provided with automatic smoke and fire control systems. Also, when buildings not equipped with earthquake structural support move off their foundations, gas pipes may rupture. Fires develop from line ruptures and spread from house to house, causing an extreme demand for fire protection resources. The proximity of large areas within the County to fault traces, necessitates adopting stricter structural construction standards.

2. Soils

(a) Conditions

The area is replete with various soils, which are unstable, clay loam and alluvial fans being predominant. These soil conditions are

moderately to severely prone to swelling and shrinking, are plastic, and tend to liquefy.

Throughout Contra Costa County, the topography and development growth has created a network of older, narrow roads. These roads vary from gravel to asphalt surface and vary in percent of slope, many exceeding twenty (20) percent. Several of these roads extend up through the winding passageways in the hills providing access to remote, affluent housing subdivisions. The majority of these roads are private with no established maintenance program. During inclement weather, these roads are subject to rock and mudslides, as well as down trees, obstructing all vehicle traffic. It is anticipated that during an earthquake, several of these roads would be unpassable so as to prevent fire protection resources from reaching fires caused by gas line ruptures or other sources.

3. Topographic

(a) Conditions

i. Vegetation

Highly combustible dry grass, weeds, and brush are common in the hilly and open space areas adjacent to built-up locations six (6) to eight (8) months of each year. Many of these areas frequently experience wildland fires, which threaten nearby buildings, particularly those with wood roofs, or sidings. This condition can be found throughout Contra Costa County, especially in those developed and developing areas of the County. Earthquake gas fires due to gas line ruptures can ignite grasslands and stress fire district resources.

ii. Surface Features

The arrangement and location of natural and manmade surface features, including hills, creeks, canals, freeways, housing tracts, commercial development, fire stations, streets and roads, combine to limit feasible response routes for Fire District resources in and to District areas.

iii. Buildings, Landscaping and Terrain

Many of the newer large buildings and building complexes

have building access and landscaping features and designs, which preclude or greatly limit any approach or operational access to them by Fire District vehicles. In addition, the presence of security gates and roads of inadequate width and grades that are too steep for Fire District vehicles adversely affect fire suppression efforts.

When Fire District vehicles cannot gain access to buildings involved with fire, the potential for complete loss is realized. Difficulty reaching a fire site often requires that fire personnel both in numbers and in stamina. Access problems often result in severely delaying, misdirecting or making impossible fire and smoke control efforts. In existing structures where pitch roofs have been built over an existing roof, smoke detectors should be required to warn residents of smoke and fire before the arrival of fire personnel.

(b) Impact

The above local geological and topographical conditions increase the magnitude, exposure, accessibility problems, and fire hazards presented to the County fire resources. Fire following an earthquake has the potential of causing greater loss of life and damage than the earthquake itself. Most earthquake fires are created by natural gas developed from gas line ruptures. Hazardous materials, particularly toxic gases, could pose the greatest threat to the largest number, should a significant seismic event occur. Public safety resources would have to be prioritized to mitigate the greatest threat, and may likely be unavailable for smaller single dwellings that were caused by broken gas lines.

Other variables may tend to intensify the situation:

1. The extent of damage to the water system
2. The extent of isolation due to bridge and/or freeway overpass collapse.
3. The extent of roadway damage and/or amount of debris blocking the roadways.
4. Climatic condition (hot, dry weather with high winds).
5. Time of day will influence the amount of traffic on roadways and could intensify the risk to life during normal business hours.
6. The availability of timely mutual aid or military assistance.
7. The large portion of dwellings with wood shake or shingle

coverings (both on the roof diaphragm and sides of the dwellings) could result in conflagrations.

8. The large number of dwellings that slip off their foundations and rupture gas lines and electrical systems resulting in further conflagrations.

B. Climatic

1. Precipitation and Relative Humidity

(a) Conditions

Precipitation ranges from 15 to 24 inches per year with an average of approximately 20 inches per year. Ninety-six (96) percent falls during the months of October through April and four (4) percent from May through September. This is a dry period of at least five (5) months each year. Additionally, the area is subject to occasional drought. Relative humidity remains in the middle range most of the time. It ranges from forty-five (45) to sixty-five (65) percent during spring, summer, fall, and from sixty (60) to ninety (90) percent in the winter. It occasionally falls as low as fifteen (15) percent.

(b) Impact

Locally experienced dry periods cause extreme dryness of untreated wood shakes and shingles on buildings and non-irrigated grass, brush and weeds, which are often near buildings with wood roofs and sidings. Such dryness causes these materials to ignite very readily and burn rapidly and intensely. Gas fires due to gas line ruptures can also spark and engulf a single family residence during these dry periods.

Because of dryness, a rapidly burning gas fire or exterior building fire can quickly transfer to other buildings by means of radiation or flying brands, sparks or embers. A small fire can rapidly grow to a magnitude beyond the control capabilities of the Fire District resulting in an excessive fire loss.

2. Temperature

(a) Conditions

Temperatures have been recorded as high as 114° F. Average summer

highs are in the 75° - 90° range, with average maximums of 105° F in some areas of unincorporated Contra Costa County.

(b) Impact

High temperatures cause rapid fatigue and heat exhaustion of firefighters, thereby reducing their effectiveness and ability to control large building, wildland fires, and fires caused by gas line ruptures.

Another impact from high temperatures is that combustible building material and non-irrigated weeds, grass and brush are preheated, thus causing these materials to ignite more readily and burn more rapidly and intensely. Additionally, the resultant higher temperature of the atmosphere surrounding the materials reduces the effectiveness of the water being applied to the burning materials. This requires that more water be applied, which in turn requires more fire resources in order to control a fire on a hot day. High temperatures directly contribute to the rapid growth of fires to an intensity and magnitude beyond the control capabilities of the Fire Districts in Contra Costa County. The change of temperatures throughout the County between very low and extreme highs contributes to a voltage drop in conductors used for power pole lines. This necessitates that voltage drops be considered.

3. Winds

(a) Conditions

Prevailing winds in many parts of Contra Costa County are from the north or northwest in the afternoons. However, winds are experienced from virtually every direction at one time or another. Velocities can reach fourteen (14) mph to twenty-three (23) mph ranges, gusting to twenty-five (25) to thirty-five (35) mph. Forty (40) mph winds are experienced occasionally and winds up to fifty-five (55) mph have been registered locally. During the winter half of the year, strong, dry, gusty winds from the north move through the area for several days, creating extremely dry conditions.

(b) Impact

Winds such as those experienced locally can and do exacerbate fires, both interior and exterior, to burn and spread rapidly. Fires involving non-irrigated weeds, grass, brush, and fires caused by gas line ruptures can grow to a magnitude and be fanned to an intensity

beyond the control capabilities of the fire services very quickly even by relatively moderate winds. When such fires are not controlled; they can extend to nearby buildings, particularly those with untreated wood shakes or shingles.

Winds of the type experienced locally also reduce the effectiveness of exterior water streams used by all Contra Costa County Fire Districts on fires involving large interior areas of buildings, fires which have vented through windows and roofs due to inadequate built-in fire protection and fires involving wood shake and shingle building exteriors. Local winds will continue to be a definite factor toward causing major fire losses to buildings not provided with fire resistive roof and siding materials and buildings with inadequately separated interior areas, or lacking automatic fire protection systems, or lacking proper gas shut-off devices to shut off gas when pipes are ruptured, or lacking proper electrical systems. National statistics frequently cite wind conditions, such as those experienced locally, as a major factor where conflagrations have occurred.

II. Necessity of More Restrictive Standards

Because of the conditions described above, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors finds that there are building and fire hazards unique to Contra Costa County that require the increased fire protection and structural and design load requirements set forth in Ordinance No. 2011-03. The ordinance amends the statewide codes by requiring the installation of a smoke detector in existing flat roof buildings when a pitch roof is added on top of the existing flat roof and the solid seating of the flat roof is not removed. (§ 74-4.002(b).) The ordinance amends the statewide codes by requiring most wood shakes or shingles used for exterior wall covering to be fire treated. (§ 74-4.002(c).) The ordinance amends the statewide codes by increasing the minimum base shear in certain buildings to a level consistent with previous building codes. (§ 74-4.002(d).) The ordinance modifies the statewide codes by requiring masonry foundation walls and concrete foundation walls of residential structures to comply with more restrictive seismic requirements. (§§ 74-4.004(d), 74-4.004(e).)



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Catherine Kutsuris, Conservation & Development Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Fasanaro Property Rezone

RECOMMENDATION(S):

A. OPEN the public hearing; RECEIVE testimony, and CLOSE the public hearing.

B. FIND, for purposes of compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State and County CEQA Guidelines, that the Initial Study prepared for the project adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts.

C. ADOPT the proposed Negative Declaration.

D. APPROVE a motion to REZONE the subject property, Parcel B of County File #MS33-86, from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District.

E. DIRECT Department of Conservation & Development staff to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Contact: Will Nelson, (925)
335-1208

By: June McHuen, Deputy

cc:

FISCAL IMPACT:

None. All County costs are recovered through payment of application processing fees by the project applicant.

BACKGROUND:

Proposed Project

The applicant requests approval of a rezone of a 33-acre property from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District. The applicant has indicated no immediate plans for development of the property.

Site/Area Description

The subject property is located in the rural Martinez/Briones Hills area, with the Martinez city boundary approximately 2 miles east and the Richmond city boundary approximately 4 miles west. Most land in the area is zoned A-2 or A-4, including all the land abutting the property. The nearest non-agricultural zone is a planned unit district approximately 0.7 miles (3,700 feet) east of the property on Alhambra Valley Road. Surrounding land uses are agricultural, residential or a combination thereof.

The subject property is vacant and contains rolling hills, large groves of trees, and rocky terrain. Access is limited to an unpaved private easement (Rancho de la Rosa Road). A small portion of the site straddling the access easement is relatively flat and appears to be the only suitable building location.

Appropriateness of Proposed Rezone

Existing Zoning Conditions

County File #RZ72-1707 was approved to rezone the approximately 121-acre original parcel of the subject property from A-2 to A-4 prior to the property entering into a Williamson Act contract. A Williamson Act contract is a contract entered into between a property owner and the County wherein the owner agrees to utilize the land for those uses specified in the contract and in return the County taxes the property at a lower rate. The A-4 zone is compatible with lands that are under a Williamson Act contract because it specifies that all uses agreed to in the contract are permitted uses. The property came out of its Williamson Act contract in 1995. With the property out of contract, the A-4 zoning designation is unnecessary and inappropriate.

Background on Rezoning in the Briones Hills Area

It is typical for properties to rezone from A-2 to A-4 before entering into a Williamson Act contract. A significant amount of acreage in the Briones Hills area was zoned A-4 for this reason. Though several of the contracts have either expired or were never executed, a significant amount of acreage remains zoned A-4.

The following three rezone applications have been approved in the Briones Hills area in the last five years: RZ08-3204, which rezoned 34.17 acres from A-4 to A-2; RZ05-3169, which rezoned 20.89 acres from A-4 to A-20; and RZ00-3096, which rezoned 10.4 acres from A-4 to A-2. All of these properties are located within 2.5 miles of the subject property. County File #RZ08-3204, approved by the Board on February 3, 2009, is most relevant because it is adjacent to the subject property and the policies and practices in place at the time it was processed are the same as they are today.

County File #RZ08-3204 was a request to rezone the property immediately south of the subject property from A-4 to A-2. That property is similar to the subject property in every respect. The request was considered by the County Planning Commission on December 2, 2008, and in making its recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors, the Commission stressed that its action was not to be construed as an endorsement of a future subdivision.

Comparison of Existing and Proposed Zoning Designations

The uses allowed both by right and with a land use permit in the A-2 and A-4 zones are similar. The A-2 District does allow for establishment of some more-intense agricultural uses, such as granaries, dehydration plants, fruit and vegetable packing plants, and the like. However, physical limitations such as steep slopes, limited access, lack of utility connections, and scarcity of suitable building locations make the property an unlikely candidate for establishment of these types of land uses. It should be noted that these physical limitations also make the property a poor candidate for subdivision.

Under the A-4 zoning the 33.0-acre property is required to be at least 40 acres due to the non-prime soil types that are present (the minimum area requirement was 20 acres when the property was rezoned to A-4). The A-2 District requires a minimum parcel size of five acres. Therefore, approval of the rezone would correct the property's existing inconsistency with zoning standards.

General Plan Consistency

Land Use Element - Land Use Designation

The Land Use Element of the General Plan designates the subject property as Agricultural Lands (AL). The AL designation allows for a wide range of agricultural uses and limits density to a maximum of 1 unit per 5 acres. The A-2 zoning designation is consistent with the AL designation in terms of density as well as general uses allowed.

Land Use Element - Briones Hills Agricultural Preservation Area

The subject property is within the Briones Hills Agricultural Preservation Area. In the 1980s a voluntary agreement was formed between several adjacent cities and the County for the purpose of protecting the area's open space and agricultural value. The participating cities agreed not to annex any of the lands within the 64-square mile area for the purposes of allowing urban development.

While the A-2 zone allows for smaller lots than the A-4 zone, the density would not increase because density is determined by the underlying AL land use designation, which would remain unchanged.

Land Use Element - Urban Limit Line

The purpose of the ULL is twofold: (1) to ensure preservation of identified non-urban agricultural, open space and other areas by establishing a line beyond which no urban land uses may be established; and (2) facilitate the enforcement of the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard (Land Use Element page 3-8). To this end, the General Plan does not allow properties outside the ULL to obtain General Plan Amendments that would re-designate them for an urban land use. In addition, properties outside the ULL may be subject to various agricultural and open space preservation measures. These measures could include, but would not necessarily be limited to:

1. Permitting owners of large acre parcels to subdivide and allow only a one-acre building envelope (building site).
2. Encouraging the dedication of open space and agricultural conservation easements.
3. Implementing a transfer of development rights (TDR) program.

The subject property is located outside the ULL and the proposed zoning designation is consistent with the intent and purpose of the ULL because it is agricultural (non-urban).

Land Use Element - 65/35 Land Preservation Standard

The 65/35 Land Preservation Standard limits urban development to no more than 35 percent of the land in the County, and requires the remaining 65 percent of all land be preserved for agriculture, open space, wetlands, parks and other non-urban uses (Land Use Element page 3-11). The proposed zoning designation is consistent with the intent and purpose of the 65/35 Standard because it is agricultural.

Conservation Element - Agricultural Resources

The Conservation Element of the General Plan includes goals and policies related to protection of agricultural resources and encouragement of agricultural production. The subject property is located in an agriculturally important area (Conservation Element Figure 8-2). The Conservation Element does not specifically favor one agricultural zoning district over another. Rezoning the property from A-4 to A-2 would in no way threaten agricultural resources or hinder agricultural production.

Conclusion

The subject property was at one time zoned A-2 but was rezoned to A-4 when it entered into a Williamson Act contract. With the Williamson Act contract expired, the current zoning is unnecessary and inappropriately limits development. Therefore, staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Negative Declaration for the project and adopt a motion to rezone the subject property from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If the Board of Supervisors denies the application, then the zoning designation of the subject property will remain A-4 Agricultural Preserve District.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

No impact.


CLERK'S ADDENDUM

CLOSED the public hearing; FOUND, for purposes of compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State and County CEQA Guidelines, that the Initial Study prepared for the project adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts; ADOPTED the proposed Negative Declaration; ADOPTED Ordinance No. 2011-02 to rezone the subject property, Parcel B of County File #MS33-86, from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District; and DIRECTED Department of Conservation & Development staff to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk.

ATTACHMENTS

General Plan Land Use Map
Existing Zoning Map
Rezoning Ordinance
County Planning Commission Resolution No. 6-2011
Conditions of Approval
Staff Report
CEQA Negative Declaration
Agency and Public Comments
Aerial Photograph
Notification Materials



RZ09-3209 General Plan Land Use Designation Map



0 0.125 0.25 0.5 Miles

Legend

General Plan Land Use Designation

-  AL (Agricultural Lands)
-  PR (Parks and Recreation)




Map created 06/20/2010
by Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development, GIS Group
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor North Wing, Martinez, CA 94553-0095
37° 59' 45.00"N 122° 05' 35.00"W

This map or dataset was created by the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development with data from the Contra Costa County GIS Program. The County assumes no responsibility for its accuracy. This map contains copyrighted information and may not be altered. It may be reproduced in its current state if the source is cited. Users of this map agree to read and accept the County of Contra Costa disclaimer of liability for geographic information.







RZ09-3209 Existing Zoning Map



Legend

ZONING

-  A-2 (General Agriculture)
-  A-4 (Agricultural Preserve)
-  A-20 (Exclusive Agriculture)



Map created 04/19/2010
by Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development, GIS Group
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor North Wing, Martinez, CA 94553-0095
37.5948 459N 122.0635 384W

This map or dataset was created by the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development with data from the Contra Costa County GIS Program. The County assumes no responsibility for its accuracy. This map contains copyrighted information and may not be altered. It may be reproduced in its current state if the source is cited. Users of this map agree to read and accept the County of Contra Costa disclaimer of liability for geographic information.




Briones Area)

The Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors ordains as follows:

SECTION I: Page J-10, J-11 of the County's 2005 Zoning Map (Ord. No. 2005-03) is amended by re-zoning the land in the above area shown shaded on the map(s) attached hereto and incorporated herein (see also Department of Conservation and Development File No. RZ09-3209 .)

FROM: Land Use District A-4 (Agricultural Preserve)

TO: Land Use District A-2 (General Agricultural)
and the Department of Conservation and Development Director shall change the Zoning Map accordingly, pursuant to Ordinance Code Sec. 84.2.002.



SECTION II. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance becomes effective 30 days after passage, and within 15 days of passage shall be published once with the names of supervisors voting for and against it in the _____, a newspaper published in this County.

PASSED on _____ by the following vote:

<u>Supervisor</u>	<u>Aye</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
1. J. Gioia	()	()	()	()
2. G.B. Uilkema	()	()	()	()
3. M.N. Piepho	()	()	()	()
4. K. Mitchoff	()	()	()	()
5. F.D. Glover	()	()	()	()

ATTEST: David Twa, County Administrator
and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors _____

By _____, Dep. _____
Chairman of the Board
(SEAL)

RESOLUTION NO. 6-2011

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, INCORPORATING A RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS FOR A REQUESTED REZONE AT 129 RANCHO DE LA ROSA ROAD IN THE MARTINEZ/ALHAMBRA VALLEY AREA OF SAID COUNTY.

WHEREAS, on February 5, 2009, Thomas Fasanaro (Applicant & Owner) submitted an application (County File #RZ09-3209) requesting approval of a rezoning of a 33.0-acre parcel (Assessor Parcel Number 365-040-016) located at 129 Rancho de la Rosa Road in the Martinez/Alhambra Valley area from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District; and

WHEREAS, for purposes of compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State and County CEQA Guidelines, an Initial Study/Negative Declaration ("Initial Study") was prepared by the Department of Conservation & Development to determine the scope of the project's environmental impacts and whether or not an environmental impact report should be prepared; and

WHEREAS, the Initial Study identified no potentially significant environmental impacts related to the project; and

WHEREAS, on March 17, 2010, the Department of Conservation & Development published a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration, which recited the foregoing facts, indicated that the project would not result in potentially significant impacts to the environment, and began the period for public review and comments on the adequacy of the environmental documentation that ended on April 7, 2010; and

WHEREAS, after notice having been lawfully given, a public hearing was scheduled before the County Planning Commission on Tuesday, April 27, 2010, whereat all persons interested in the matter might appear and be heard; and

WHEREAS, on April 27, 2010, the County Planning Commission fully reviewed, considered, and evaluated all testimony and evidence submitted in this matter;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the County Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

1. FIND, for purposes of compliance with the provisions of CEQA and the State and County CEQA Guidelines, that the Initial Study prepared for the project adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts and ADOPT the proposed Negative Declaration.

In making this recommendation the County Planning Commission certifies that it has been presented with the Initial Study, and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Initial Study and the other pertinent information in the administrative record. The County Planning Commission further certifies that the Initial Study reflects the County's independent judgment and analysis, and that the Initial Study has been completed in compliance with CEQA regulations.

2. ADOPT a motion to rezone the subject property, Parcel B of County File #MS33-86, from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the County Planning Commission finds that sufficient evidence has been provided to determine that the proposed project conforms with the County *Growth Management Performance Standards* (County General Plan 2005-2020, Growth Management Element, Section 4.4) and makes all of the findings required by County Code § 26-2.1806 to allow approval of the proposed rezone as follows:

A. Growth Management Performance Standards

1. Traffic: The site is accessed via private easement. The project would allow for the establishment of up to one single-family residence and one residential second unit. Thus, there would be no significant impact to area streets or intersections and no traffic report is required.
2. Water: The subject site currently does not have water service and the County would not support extending service to the site because it is outside the Urban Limit Line. Rezoning the site does not change the fact that any proposal for future development must comply with Health Services Department, Environmental Health Division standards for establishment of wells.
3. Sewage: The subject site currently does not have sewer service and the County would not support extending service to the site because it is outside the Urban Limit Line. Rezoning the site does not change the fact that any proposal for future development must comply with Health Services Department, Environmental Health Division standards for establishment of septic systems.
4. Fire Protection: The subject site receives fire protection services from the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District. Simply rezoning the site would not impact fire protection services because adequate fire protection improvements and fees are typically required when physical development occurs.
5. Public Protection: The subject site receives public protection services from the Contra Costa County Sheriff. Simply rezoning the site would not impact public protection services because impacts to such services are mitigated at the time building permits are issued on lots created through a minor subdivision, as was the subject property.
6. Parks and Recreation: Approval of the proposed project would not substantially increase the population and therefore would not increase the demand for neighborhood parks and recreation facilities.
7. Flood Control and Drainage: The site is not located in a Special Flood Hazard Area and no drainage improvements are required because no development is proposed. If drainage improvements were ever necessary, they would be required to comply with the requirements of the County Building/Grading Division.

B. Rezone Findings

1. Required Finding: The change proposed will substantially comply with the General Plan.

Project Finding: The Agricultural Lands (AL) General Plan land use designation is consistent with all agricultural zoning districts. Rezoning the subject site from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Urban Limit Line and the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard because the subject property would continue to be zoned for agricultural, non-urban uses. The General Plan contains area-specific policies for the Briones Hills area. Rezoning the site from A-4 to A-2 is consistent with the overall intent of the Briones Hills Agricultural Preservation Area, as well as goals and policies contained in the various elements of the General Plan related to preservation of agricultural lands and protection of open space. For these reasons, approval of the rezoning would substantially comply with the General Plan.

2. Required Finding: The use authorized or proposed in this land use district is compatible within the district and with uses authorized in adjacent districts.

Project Finding: The subject property is bordered on the north, east, and west sides by land zoned A-4, and on the south side by land zoned A-2. Most of the uses allowed in the A-2 and A-4 districts are the same or similar. Thus, the uses allowed in the A-2 zone are found to be compatible with uses authorized in adjacent agricultural districts.

3. Required Finding: Community need has been demonstrated for the use proposed, but this does not require demonstration of future financial success.


Project Finding: Approval of County File #RZ72-1707 rezoned the subject property from A-2 to A-4 prior to the site entering into a Williamson Act contract. The contract expired in 1995 and thus there is no need for the property to be zoned A-4. The property is bordered on all sides by properties zoned A-2 and A-4 and these zones are prevalent in the surrounding area. Rezoning the site to A-2 is therefore justified.

The instructions by the County Planning Commission to prepare this resolution were given by motion of the County Planning Commission on Tuesday, April 27, 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:	Commissioners -	Clark, Sloan, Steele, Snyder
NOES:	Commissioners -	None
ABSENT:	Commissioners -	Gaddis, Terrell
ABSTAIN:	Commissioners -	None

Don Snyder,
Chair of the Planning Commission,
County of Contra Costa, State of California

I, Aruna Bhat, Secretary of the County Planning Commission, certify that the foregoing was duly called and approved on April 27, 2010.

ATTEST: 
Aruna Bhat,
Secretary of the Planning Commission
County of Contra Costa, State of California

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR COUNTY FILE #RZ09-3209

1. _____ This application is subject to an initial application deposit of \$2,500.00, which was paid with the application submittal, plus time, and material costs if the application review expenses exceed 100% of the initial deposit. **Any additional costs due must be paid within 60 days of the permit effective date or prior to use of the permit, whichever occurs first.** The applicant may obtain current costs by contacting the project planner. If you owe additional fees, a bill will be sent to you shortly after permit issuance.
2. _____ **Within four (4) business days of the final action on this project,** the applicant is required to pay the California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG) filing fee of \$2,044.00. Payment of this fee is mandated by Assembly Bill 3158, which became effective on January 1, 1991. Pursuant to Fish & Game Code Section 711.4(c)(3), the project will not be operative, vested, or final, and any local permits issued for the project will be invalid until either the fee is paid or a signed *No Effect Determination Form* is submitted indicating that the fee is not required. Also, if the fee is not paid by the date specified, then the 30-day statutory time limit to file a legal challenge against the approval will automatically extend to 180 days.

ADVISORY NOTES

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. ADVISORY NOTES ARE PROVIDED TO ALERT THE APPLICANT TO LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE COUNTY AND OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES TO WHICH THIS PROJECT MAY BE SUBJECT.

- **Notice of 90-day opportunity to protest fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions pertaining to the approval of this permit.**

This notice is intended to advise the applicant that pursuant to Government Code Section 66000, et seq., the applicant has the opportunity to protest fees, dedications, reservations, and/or exactions required as part of this project approval. The opportunity to protest is limited to a 90-day period after the project is approved.

The 90-day period in which you may protest the amount of any fee or imposition of any dedication, reservation or other exaction required by the approved permit begins on the date this permit was approved. To be valid, a protest must be in writing pursuant to Government Code Section 66020 and delivered to the Department of Conservation & Development, Community Development Division within the 90 days of the approval date of this permit.

COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2010

I. INTRODUCTION

TOM FASANARO (Applicant & Owner), County File #RZ09-3209: A request to rezone a 33.0-acre parcel from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District. The subject property is addressed 129 Rancho de la Rosa Road in the Martinez Area. (Zoning: A-4) (ZA: J-10, J-11) (CT: 3560.02) (GP: Agricultural Lands) (APN: 365-040-016)

II. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the County Planning Commission adopt a motion recommending that the Board of Supervisors do the following:

- A. FIND, for purposes of compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State and County CEQA Guidelines, that the Initial Study prepared for the project adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts and ADOPT the proposed Negative Declaration.
- B. ADOPT a motion to rezone the subject property, Parcel B of County File #MS33-86, from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District.

III. GENERAL INFORMATION

- A. General Plan: Agricultural Lands (AL)
- B. Zoning: A-4 Agricultural Preserve District
- C. CEQA Status: A Negative Declaration was posted on March 17, 2010. The comment period expired on April 7, 2010. Notices were mailed to adjacent property owners, the City of Martinez, the Alhambra Valley Improvement Association (AVIA) and the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). Comments were received from the AVIA via email on March 26, 2010, and in letter form from LAFCO on April 6, 2010. The AVIA indicated that it has no objections provided there are no neighbor complaints; no specific comments were made regarding the adequacy of the environmental document. No neighbor complaints have been received. LAFCO's comments are addressed under Section VI.C below.
- E. Previously Approved Applications
 - RZ72-1707: Rezone of 120 acres, including the subject property, from A-2 to A-4.
 - MS33-86: Four-lot minor subdivision; the subject property is Parcel B.
- F. Regulatory Programs: None

IV. SITE/AREA DESCRIPTION

The subject property is located in the rural Martinez/Briones Hills area, with the City of Martinez boundary approximately 2 miles east and the City of Richmond boundary

approximately 4 miles west. Most land in the area is zoned A-2 or A-4, including the all land abutting the property. The nearest non-agricultural zone is a planned unit district approximately 0.7 miles (3,700 feet) east of the property on Alhambra Valley Road. Surrounding land uses are agricultural, residential or a combination thereof.

The property is 33 acres, vacant, and contains rolling hills, large groves of trees, and rocky terrain. Access is limited to an unpaved private easement (Rancho de la Rosa Road). A small portion of the site straddling the access easement is relatively flat and appears to be the only location suitable building.

V. PROPOSED PROJECT

The applicant requests approval of a rezone of the property from A-4 to A-2. The applicant has indicated no immediate plans for development of the property.

VI. STAFF ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION

A. Appropriateness of Rezone

Existing Zoning Conditions

County File #RZ72-1707 was approved to rezone the approximately 121-acre mother parcel of the subject property from A-2 to A-4 prior to the property entering into a Williamson Act contract. A Williamson Act contract is a contract entered into between a property owner and the County wherein the owner agrees to utilize the land for those uses specified in the contract and in return the County taxes the property at a lower rate. The A-4 zone is compatible with lands that are under a Williamson Act contract because it specifies that all uses agreed to in the contract are permitted uses. The property came out of its Williamson Act contract in 1995. With the property out of contract, the A-4 zoning designation is unnecessary and inappropriate.

Background on Rezoning in the Briones Hills Area

It is typical for properties to rezone from A-2 to A-4 before entering into a Williamson Act contract. A significant amount of acreage in the Briones Hills area was zoned A-4 for this reason. Though several of the contracts have either expired or were never executed, a significant amount of acreage remains zoned A-4.

As shown in Table 1, three rezone applications have been approved in the Briones Hills area in the last four years. All of these were approved within 2.5 miles of the subject property. County File #RZ08-3204, approved on February 3, 2009, is most relevant to the proposed rezone because it is adjacent to the subject property and the policies and practices in place at the time it was processed are the same as they are today.

Table 1: Recent Rezones in the Briones Hills Area

County File	Request	Final Action
RZ08-3204	Rezone 34.17 acres from A-4 to A-2	Approved 2/3/2009
RZ05-3169	Rezone 20.89 acres from A-4 to A-20	Approved 4/11/2006
RZ00-3096	Rezone 10.4 acres from A-4 to A-2	Approved 12/19/2006

County File #RZ08-3204 was a request to rezone the property immediately south of the subject property from A-4 to A-2. That property is similar to the subject property in every respect. The request was considered by the County Planning Commission on December 2, 2008, and in making its recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors, the Commission stressed that its action was not to be construed as an endorsement of a future subdivision.

Comparison of Existing and Proposed Zoning Designations

The uses allowed both by right and with a land use permit in the A-2 and A-4 zones are similar. The A-2 District does allow for establishment of some more-intense agricultural uses, such as granaries, dehydration plants, fruit and vegetable packing plants, and the like. However, physical limitations such as steep slopes, limited access, lack of utility connections, and scarcity of suitable building locations make the property an unlikely candidate for establishment of these types of land uses. It should be noted that these physical limitations also make the property a poor candidate for subdivision.

Under the A-4 zoning the 33.0-acre property is required to be at least 40 acres due to the non-prime soil types that are present (the minimum area requirement was 20 acres when the property was rezoned to A-4). The A-2 District requires a minimum parcel size of five acres. Therefore, approval of the rezone would correct the property's existing inconsistency with zoning standards.

B. General Plan Consistency

Land Use Element - Land Use Designation

The Land Use Element of the General Plan designates the subject property as Agricultural Lands (AL). The AL designation allows for a wide range of agricultural uses and limits density to a maximum of 1 unit per 5 acres. The A-2 zoning designation is consistent with the AL designation in terms of density as well as general uses allowed.

Land Use Element - Briones Hills Agricultural Preservation Area

The subject property is within the Briones Hills Agricultural Preservation Area. In the 1980s a voluntary agreement was formed between several adjacent cities and the County for the purpose of protecting the area's open space and agricultural value. The participating cities agreed not to annex any of the lands within the 64-square mile area for the purposes of allowing urban development.

While the A-2 zone allows for smaller lots than the A-4 zone, the density would not increase because density is determined by the underlying AL land use designation, which would remain unchanged.

Land Use Element - Urban Limit Line

The purpose of the ULL is twofold: (1) to ensure preservation of identified non-urban agricultural, open space and other areas by establishing a line beyond which no urban land uses may be established; and (2) facilitate the enforcement of the 65/35 Land Preservation Standard (Land Use Element page 3-8). To this end, the General Plan does not allow properties outside the ULL to obtain General Plan Amendments that would re-designate them for an urban land use. In addition, properties outside the ULL may be

subject to various agricultural and open space preservation measures. These measures could include, but would not necessarily be limited to:

1. Permitting owners of large acre parcels to subdivide and allow only a one-acre building envelope (building site).
2. Encouraging the dedication of open space and agricultural conservation easements.
3. Implementing a transfer of development rights (TDR) program.

The subject property is located outside the ULL and the proposed zoning designation is consistent with the intent and purpose of the ULL because it is agricultural (non-urban).

Land Use Element - 65/35 Land Preservation Standard

The 65/35 Land Preservation Standard limits urban development to no more than 35 percent of the land in the County, and requires the remaining 65 percent of all land be preserved for agriculture, open space, wetlands, parks and other non-urban uses (Land Use Element page 3-11). The proposed zoning designation is consistent with the intent and purpose of the 65/35 Standard because it is agricultural.

Conservation Element - Agricultural Resources

The Conservation Element of the General Plan includes goals and policies related to protection of agricultural resources and encouragement of agricultural production. The subject property is located in an agriculturally important area (Conservation Element Figure 8-2). The Conservation Element does not specifically favor one agricultural zoning district over another. Rezoning the property from A-4 to A-2 would in no way threaten agricultural resources or hinder agricultural production.

C. LAFCO Comments on CEQA Initial Study

LAFCO's letter provides general comments regarding its role in the planning process as well as project-specific comments. The letter states that the Initial Study in its present form is inadequate for LAFCO's purposes. However, LAFCO will not be asked to take future action on this project for the following reasons:

- The property was legally subdivided in 1986 and it was acknowledged then that a well and septic system would be required for development. There are no plans to extend municipal utilities or services to the property.
- The property is outside the Sphere of Influence (SOI) of the City of Martinez and there are no plans to extend the SOI to this area or annex the property.
- The project does not involve a subdivision or any proposal for physical development. Therefore, annexation County Service Area L-100 is not required.

Since LAFCO will not take future action on the project, it need not rely on the Initial Study.

VII. CONCLUSION

The subject property was at one time zoned A-2 but was rezoned to A-4 when it entered into a Williamson Act contract. With the Williamson Act contract expired, the current zoning is

unnecessary and inappropriately limits development. Therefore, Staff recommends that the County Planning Commission adopt a motion recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Negative Declaration for the project and approve County File #RZ09-3209 to rezone the subject property from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District.

Exhibits

- A. Findings & Conditions of Approval
- B. Negative Declaration & Initial Study
- C. Agency Comments
- D. Maps

W 4/21/16

Department of Conservation & Development

Contra Costa County

Catherine O. Kutsuris
Director

Aruna Bhat
Deputy Director
Community Development Division

Community Development Division

County Administration Building
651 Pine Street
North Wing, Fourth Floor
Martinez, CA 94553-1229



Phone: (925) 335-1208

DATE: March 17, 2010

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the "Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970" as amended to date, this is to advise you that the Department of Conservation & Development of Contra Costa County has prepared an Initial Study to assess the potential environmental impacts of the following project:


TOM FASANARO (Applicant & Owner), County File #RZ09-3209: A request to rezone a 33.0-acre parcel from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District. The subject property is addressed #129 Rancho de la Rosa Road, in the Martinez/Alhambra Valley area. (Zoning: A-4) (Zoning Atlas: J-10, J-11) (Census Tract: 3560.02) (General Plan: Agricultural Lands) (Assessor Parcel Number: 365-040-016)

The County has determined that the proposed project will not result in significant environmental impacts and has therefore prepared a Negative Declaration pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 15070.

A copy of the Negative Declaration, Initial Study, and all documents referenced therein may be reviewed in the offices of the Department of Conservation & Development located at the McBrien Administration Building, 651 Pine Street, 2nd Floor – North Wing, Martinez, during normal business hours.

Public Comment Period – The period for accepting comments on the adequacy of the environmental document extends to **5:00 P.M., Wednesday, April 7, 2010**. It is preferable that comments be in writing. Written comments must be submitted to the following address:

Department of Conservation & Development
Community Development Division
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor – North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553
Attn: William Nelson




(over)

It is anticipated that the proposed Negative Declaration will be considered for adoption at a meeting of the County Planning Commission on Tuesday, April 27, 2010. The anticipated site of the hearing is Room 107 of the McBrien Administration Building, 651 Pine Street (intersection of Pine and Escobar Streets), Martinez, California. It is expected that that the Planning Commission will conduct a hearing on the proposed project at the same meeting.

If you have any questions regarding this notice or the proposed project, please do not hesitate to contact me at (925) 335-1208 or william.nelson@dcd.cccounty.us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William R. Nelson', with a stylized flourish at the end.

William R. Nelson
Senior Planner

cc: County Clerk's Office (3 copies)

**California Environmental Quality Act
Environmental Checklist Form**

1. Project Title: Fasanaro Rezone
County File #RZ09-3209
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: Contra Costa County
Department of Conservation & Development
Community Development Division
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor – North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: William R. Nelson, Senior Planner, (925) 335-1208
4. Project Location: 129 Rancho de la Rosa Road
Martinez, CA 94553
APN: 365-040-016
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Tom Fasanaro (Applicant & Owner)
149 Pioneer Avenue
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
6. General Plan Land Use Designation: Agricultural Lands (AL). This land use designation allows a density of 0.2 units per net acre and includes most of the privately owned rural lands in the County, excluding private lands that are composed of prime soils or lands that are located in or near the Delta. Most of the land designated AL is in hilly portions of the County and is used for grazing livestock or dry grain farming.
7. Zoning: A-4 Agricultural Preserve District. This zoning district requires a 40-acre minimum parcel size for non-prime agricultural land and a 10-acre minimum parcel size for prime agricultural land. This district is intended to provide areas primarily for the commercial production of food and fiber and other compatible uses consistent with the intent and purpose of the Land Conservation Act of 1965, also known as the Williamson Act.
8. Setting, Site Description & Surrounding Land Uses: The subject site is a 33.0-acre rectangular parcel located in a rural area west/southwest of the City of Martinez, within the Briones Hills Agricultural Preservation Area. Parcels in the vicinity range in size from less than 1-acre to over 100-acres and tend to be vacant or developed with agricultural and/or residential uses. The site is surrounded by properties zoned A-4 and A-2 General Agricultural District. Other agricultural zoning districts in the area include A-20 Exclusive Agricultural District and A-80 Exclusive Agricultural District. The nearest non-agricultural development is a single-family subdivision located approximately 0.7-miles due east. The area is characterized by steep terrain and large groupings of mature trees. These features combine with limited access to restrict much of the site's development potential and suitable building locations are few.
9. Project Description: The A-4 District is a unique zoning district that applies to properties covered by a Williamson Act contract. In 1980 the subject site was rezoned from A-2 to A-4 because it was under a Williamson Act contract. The applicant proposes to rezone the site from A-4 back to A-2 because of the contract's termination. No physical development or site modifications are proposed, and the project applicant has not indicated that the proposed rezoning is a precursor to future development.

The A-4 zone requires a minimum parcel size of 40 acres for non-prime agricultural land like the subject property, while the A-2 District requires a 5-acre minimum parcel size. As the subject site is 33 acres, rezoning to A-2 would rectify the current non-compliance with zoning requirements.

The primary land uses in the A-2 District are general farming, horticulture, floriculture, nurseries and greenhouses, dairying, livestock production and other compatible uses. The A-2 zoning also allows some uses by right, such as granaries, fruit and vegetable packing plants, and cold storage plants that are somewhat industrial in nature and more intensive than the uses allowed by right in the A-4 District. However, the subject property's unfavorable location (it is not in the vicinity of large-scale crop production), varied topography, limited building sites, lack of water and sewer connections, and limited access (one rural road accesses the property and it is not proximate to a major road, highway, or rail line) make it an unrealistic candidate for development of those types of land uses. Additional uses might be established in the A-2 District upon approval of land use permits, but each land use permit would be subject to its own California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. For that reason, establishment of uses requiring issuance of a land use permit is not considered in this Initial Study. Ultimately, it is most reasonable to expect for the property to be developed with the low-intensity agricultural uses permitted in both the A-2 and A-4 districts, along with a single-family residence and its appurtenant uses.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g. permits, financing, approval or participation agreement): None; rezoning is a legislative act under the sole purview of the County Board of Supervisors.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise
<input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems	
<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance		

☒ None of the above

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this Initial Study:


☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.



Signature

William R. Nelson

Senior Planner

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development

3/17/10

Date

SOURCES

In the process of preparing the Initial Study Checklist and conducting the evaluation, the following references, which are available for review either online or at the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development, 651 Pine Street 2nd Floor-North Wing, Martinez, were consulted:

1. Application to rezone the subject site from A-4 to A-2, received by Contra Costa County on February 5, 2009.
2. Contra Costa County General Plan 2005-2020
3. Contra Costa County Code – Title 8 Zoning Ordinance
4. Contra Costa County Geographic Information System
5. Contra Costa County Land Information System
6. *Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map 2008* prepared by the California Department of Conservation
7. Public Resources Code section 12220(g)
8. Public Resources Code section 4526
9. Government Code section 51104(g)
10. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as amended January 1, 2010, and CEQA Guidelines amended as of December 15, 2009
11. Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines dated December 1999.
12. Bay Area Air Quality Management District proposed Thresholds of Significance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions dated December 7, 2009
13. California Department of Toxic Substances Control website
14. Association of Bay Area Governments Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Maps – Wildland Urban Interface Fire Threat
15. Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map – Panel 0275
16. Association of Bay Area Governments Geographic Information Systems, Hazard Maps – Dam Failure Inundation Areas
17. Minor subdivision application, County File #MS86-33
18. Contra Costa County Code – Title 4 Health and Safety

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	✓
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	✓

Summary a-d: The subject site is located within a County-designated scenic ridge. The applicant proposes to rezone the site and has not proposed physical development. As explained in the project description above, the physical characteristics of the site all but preclude development of anything other than low-intensity agricultural uses along with a single-family residence and its appurtenant uses. Without a proposal for a specific land use, any assumption of significant visual impact would be purely speculative. The act of rezoning by itself would not impact trees, rock outcroppings, or other scenic resources, and would not introduce substantial light or glare to the area.

Impact: None

II. AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Source: 6)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? (Sources: 3, 5)	_____	_____	_____	✓

- | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, 8, 9) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____✓ |
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, 8) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____✓ |
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 3) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____✓ |

Summary a: The 2008 Contra Costa County Important Farmland Map designates the subject property as Grazing Land. Thus, there would be no impact to farmland designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

Summary b: The property's Williamson Act contract has been terminated. Therefore, no conflict with a Williamson Act contract would occur. The proposed project is to rezone from one agricultural zone to another, which clearly would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use.

Summary c-d: The site may qualify as forest land under Public Resources Code section 12220(g) and timberland under Public Resources Code 4526. The site is not zoned Timberland Production.

No physical changes are proposed that would directly impact the forest/timber resources onsite. Rezoning the site from A-4 to A-2 would not increase the likelihood of conversion of forest land to non-forest use because the uses that could realistically be established in the two zones are substantially similar.

Summary e: No physical development is proposed and the proposed A-2 District allows for a wide range of agricultural uses. No changes to the existing environment would occur that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Impact: None

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | Potentially
Significant
Impact | Less Than
Significant
With
Mitigation
Incorporated | Less Than
Significant
Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 1, 11) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____✓ |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 11) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____✓ |

- c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 1, 11)

- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 1, 4, 11)

- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 1, 11)

		✓	
			✓
			✓

Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines

Management of air quality in the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin is the responsibility of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The BAAQMD is responsible for bringing and/or maintaining air quality in the Basin within federal and state air quality standards. Specifically, the BAAQMD has the responsibility to monitor ambient air pollutant levels throughout the Basin and to develop and implement attainment strategies to ensure that future emissions would be within federal and state standards.

In April 1996 the BAAQMD prepared its *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* as a guidance document to provide lead government agencies, consultants, and project proponents with uniform procedures for assessing air quality impacts and preparing the air quality sections of environmental documents for projects subject to CEQA. The *Guidelines* were revised by the BAAQMD in December 1999 and another revision is currently under review. This document describes the criteria that the BAAQMD uses when reviewing and commenting on the adequacy of environmental documents. The *Guidelines* recommend thresholds for use in determining whether projects would have significant adverse environmental impacts, identify methodologies for predicting project emissions and impacts, and identify measures that can be used to avoid or reduce air quality impacts. This Initial Study section was prepared in accordance with the principles outlined in the *Guidelines*.

Criteria Pollutants

Both the USEPA and CARB have established ambient air quality standards for what are called "criteria pollutants." Major criteria pollutants are carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_x), particulate matter (PM_{2.5} / PM₁₀), ozone (O₃), and sulfur dioxide (SO_x). The federal and state ambient standards were developed independently with differing purposes and methods, although both processes attempt to avoid health-related effects of pollution. As a result, the federal and state standards differ in some cases. In general, the California state standards are more stringent.

The federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act of 1988 require that CARB, based on air quality monitoring data, designate as "non-attainment areas" those portions of the state where the federal or state ambient air quality standards are not met. Because there are differences between the national and state standards, the designation of non-attainment areas is different under the federal and state legislation. The USEPA has classified the San Francisco Bay Area as a non-attainment area for the federal 8-hour ozone standard. The Bay Area was designated as unclassifiable/attainment for the federal particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) standards. Under the California Clean Air Act, Contra Costa County is a non-attainment area for ozone/ozone precursors

and particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀). The County is either in attainment or is unclassified for other pollutants.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) are a group of pollutants of concern in addition to the criteria pollutants discussed above. There are many different types of TACs, with varying degrees of toxicity. Sources of TACs include industrial processes such as petroleum refining and chrome plating operations, commercial operations such as gasoline stations and dry cleaners, and motor vehicle exhaust. Cars and trucks release at least 40 different TACs. The most important, in terms of health risk, are diesel particulate, benzene, formaldehyde, 1,3-butadiene, and acetaldehyde. Public exposure to TACs can result from emissions from normal operations, as well as accidental releases. Adverse health effects of TACs include cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, and death.

Summary a-c: The Bay Area 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan is currently the applicable federal air quality plan for the region. The Plan was prepared by the BAAQMD, with cooperation from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). This plan was a revision to the Bay Area portion of California's plan (the State Implementation Plan) to achieve the national ozone standard. The Plan was approved by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and on November 30, 2001, CARB submitted the Plan to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). The USEPA is currently reviewing the Plan.

The BAAQMD, in cooperation with the MTC and ABAG, has also prepared the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy. The Ozone Strategy is a roadmap showing how the San Francisco Bay Area will achieve compliance with the State one-hour air quality standard for ozone as expeditiously as practicable and how the region will reduce transport of ozone and ozone precursors to neighboring air basins.

The proposed project is a rezone from one agricultural zoning district to another. As explained in Section I above, while the A-2 District allows certain land uses that are more intense than the uses allowed in the A-4 District, the likelihood of those uses being developed is extremely low because of the subject property's unfavorable location, varied topography, limited building sites, and limited access. It is far more reasonable to expect that the property will be developed with the low-intensity residential and agricultural land uses permitted by both zoning districts.

Even if the property were eventually developed with some of the more intense uses allowed in the A-2 District, it is extremely unlikely that emissions would result in significant impacts. Table 6 of the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* lists projects likely to generate potentially significant emissions of NO_x. Such projects include single-family residential developments of 320 units, supermarkets of 24,000 square feet, office parks of 210,000 square feet, and hotels containing 460 rooms. While Table 6 addresses only one of the criteria pollutants, the *Guidelines* state that Table 6 may be used to screen projects to determine the likelihood that the significance thresholds might be exceeded. Table 6 lists development types that would be expected to generate hundreds of trips per day. As nothing of that scale could reasonably be expected to be developed at the subject property, the County has determined that even in the worst-case scenario, the proposed rezone would not lead to production of significant amounts of criteria pollutants or TACs, and thus the individual impact on air quality would be less-than-significant.

The *Guidelines* state that if a project will not have a significant individual impact and it is consistent with the local land use agency's general plan (i.e., does not require a general plan amendment), and the general plan is consistent with the applicable Clean Air Plan, then the project

will not have a significant cumulative impact. All of these criteria are met for the proposed project, and thus the project would have a less-than-significant cumulative impact on air quality.

Summary d: Residences on nearby properties are the only sensitive receptors in the area. Agricultural land uses can generate pollutants, such as airborne pesticides. However, since the proposal is to change the zoning from one agricultural zoning district to another, the potential for a substantial increase in pollutant concentrations is negligible.

Summary e: Agricultural land uses routinely generate objectionable odors. However, since the proposal is to change the zoning from one agricultural zoning district to another, the potential for a substantial increase in objectionable odors is negligible.

Impact: Less than significant

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local,				

regional or state habitat conservation plan?
(Sources: 1, 4)

✓

Summary a-e: As explained in the project description above, no development or other physical changes to the site are proposed and the uses that could realistically be established under the proposed A-2 zoning are substantially similar to the uses that can be established under the existing A-4 zoning. Therefore, rezoning the site poses no realistic additional threat to biological resources.

Summary f: No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan has been approved or adopted for the project site or its vicinity.

Impact: None

V. **CULTURAL RESOURCES** – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? (Sources: 1, 10)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? (Sources: 1, 10)	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	✓
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	✓

Summary a: CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 defines historical resources as follows:

"a) For purposes of this section, the term "historical resources" shall include the following:

- (1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.).*
- (2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.*
- (3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence in light*

of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code, § 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) including the following:

- (A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- (B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- (C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- (D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history."

No historical resources are apparent onsite and no physical changes are proposed. Therefore, there would be no impact to historical resources as a result of the proposed rezoning.

Summary b-d: As no physical changes are proposed, there is no possibility of impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources, unique geologic features, or human remains.

Impact: None

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓
2. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓
4. Landslides? (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in				

onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 2, 17)

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1998), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 2, 17)

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (1, 17)

_____	_____	_____	✓
_____	_____	_____	✓
_____	_____	_____	✓

Summary a 1-4: The subject site is not located on or near a known earthquake fault. According to the Estimated Seismic Ground Response map (Figure 10-4, County General Plan), the site has the lowest damage susceptibility. In addition, Figure 10-5 in the County General Plan shows that the site has generally low liquefaction potential. Changing the zoning from one agricultural district to another that is substantially similar in terms of the uses that could realistically be established would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides.

Summary b: No physical changes to the site are proposed. Therefore, no erosion or loss of topsoil would occur.

Summary c-d: Figure 10-4 in the *Safety Element* of the General Plan indicates that the site is underlain by bedrock. Unstable geologic units or soils are unlikely to be present.

Expansive soils shrink and swell as a result of moisture changes that can cause heaving and cracking of slabs-on-grade, pavements, and structures founded on shallow foundations. Expansive soils are an engineering issue, not a land use or feasibility issue. If expansive soils are present, damage resulting from volume changes can be reduced by placing slabs on select, granular fill and by use of rigid mat or post-tensioned slabs on specially prepared and moisture conditioned soils.

Condition of approval #2 of the subdivision that created the subject parcel (County File# MS86-33) requires submittal of a geotechnical report prior to issuance of any building permits at the site. Any adverse geologic conditions would be addressed at that time and would not be exacerbated by approval of the proposed rezone.

Summary e: As the subject parcel was created through the subdivision process, it is believed that the site is capable of supporting a septic system.

Impact: None

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Sources: 1, 3, 12)	_____	_____	✓	_____

- b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Sources: 1, 3, 12)

_____ ✓ _____

Summary a-b: The BAAQMD has developed significance thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions as well as screening criteria to assist local agencies in determining whether a project could potentially exceed those thresholds. The screening criteria do not include agricultural uses, but indicate that single-family residential development of 56 units or more, general light industrial development of 72 acres or more, and general office development of 53,000 square feet or more would be expected to generate significant greenhouse gas emissions. A-2 zoning is more intensive than A-4 zoning, but the site, because of its physical constraints, could not be developed at a level approaching the intensity of the aforementioned development types. Therefore, at worst, the impact of the proposed rezone would be less than significant.

Impact: Less than significant

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____ ✓ _____
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____ ✓ _____
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	_____	_____	_____	_____ ✓ _____
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65862.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Source: 13)	_____	_____	_____	_____ ✓ _____
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 4)	_____	_____	_____	_____ ✓ _____
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety	_____	_____	_____	_____ ✓ _____

hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source: 4)	_____	_____	_____	✓
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands? (Sources: 1, 2, 14)	_____	_____	✓	_____

Summary a-b: No new land uses are proposed that would routinely handle hazardous materials. Therefore, rezoning the site would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Summary c: The subject site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Summary d: The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) provides an annually updated list of hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. This list, known as the "Cortese List," identifies thirty-eight hazardous materials sites within Contra Costa County. According to the list, the subject site is not on or located near any such site.

Summary e-f: The subject site is not located within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The site is not located within an area covered by an airport land use plan.

Summary g: The proposed project calls for a change from one agricultural zone to another that is substantially similar in terms of the uses that could realistically be established. As no physical development or substantial change in use is proposed, there would be no interference with implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan.

Summary h: Figure 10-10 in the Safety Element of the County General Plan indicates that the subject site is within a "moderate fire hazard area." Approval of the proposed rezone would not change the site's physical characteristics as they pertain to fire hazards, and would not result in substantial intensification of land use. Any future development must meet the requirements of the local fire district.

Impact: Less than significant

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level	_____	_____	_____	_____

which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Sources: 1, 3, 18)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface run-off in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓
e. Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____✓	_____
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____✓	_____
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Source: 15)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? (Source: 15)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Source: 16)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓
j. Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow? (Sources: 1, 3, 4)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓

Summary a: Approval of the proposed project would change the subject site's zoning from one agricultural district to another. As the uses allowed in the two districts are substantially similar, no element of this action would have the potential for violating water quality standards or discharge requirements. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Summary b: Establishment of the proposed zoning would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. The existence of sufficient groundwater supplies must be determined prior to development. Groundwater supplies would be verified and appropriately monitored by the County Health Services Department, Environmental Health Division.

Summary c-f: As no physical changes to the site are proposed, no alterations would occur to existing drainage patterns in the area and no additional runoff would be generated. As the land uses permitted

by the existing and proposed zoning districts are substantially similar, the project's potential to generate additional sources of polluted runoff or otherwise substantially degrade water quality would be negligible.

Summary g-h: The subject site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.

Summary i: No impact would occur because the subject site is not protected by levees or dams.

Summary j: Seiche and tsunami occur in larger bodies of water such as lakes and oceans. There is no threat to the subject site from seiche or tsunami because the types of water bodies where they occur do not exist in the vicinity. Any current threat to the site from mudflow would not be exacerbated by changing the zoning district from A-4 to A-2 because substantially similar uses could be established.

Impact: Less than significant

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or the regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 18)	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Source: 4)	_____	_____	_____	✓

Summary a: The subject site in an area that is comprised mostly agricultural and residential uses. Rezoning the site from one agricultural district to another one that is similar clearly would not compromise the character of the area or lead to a physical division of the established community.

Summary b: Nothing in the record suggests that the proposed project would conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of mitigating environmental impacts. As explained throughout this Initial Study, implementation of the project would result only in a change from one agricultural zone to another that is similar in terms of the uses that could realistically be established. The proposed zoning is consistent with the General Plan land use designation.

Summary c: No Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan has been approved or adopted for the subject site or its vicinity.

Impact: None

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Result in the loss or availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Source: 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓

Summary a-b: According to the General plan, there are no mineral resources in the vicinity of the project site.

Impact: None

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: 4)	_____	_____	_____	✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source: 4)	_____	_____	_____	✓

Summary a: The General Plan specifies the same noise standards for all agricultural uses. Therefore,

rezoning from one agricultural zone to another would not cause the standards to be exceeded.

Summary b-d: The existing noise environment would not change because no development is proposed and the uses allowed by the A-2 and A-4 zoning districts are substantially similar.

Summary e-f: The subject site is not located within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The site is not located within an area covered by an airport land use plan.

Impact: None

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	✓	_____
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 4)	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Source: 4)	_____	_____	_____	✓

Summary a: The proposed A-2 zoning permits construction of one single-family residence by right, whereas the existing A-4 zoning requires approval of a land use permit in order to establish a residence. A residential second unit could potentially be constructed in either zone through a separate ministerial process. Clearly, establishment of one residence and possibly one residential second unit on a legally created parcel would neither directly nor indirectly induce substantial population growth. Other uses permitted by the proposed zoning are agricultural in nature and clearly would not induce substantial population growth.

Summary b-c: The site is vacant and therefore rezoning it clearly would not result in displacement of existing housing or people.

Impact: Less than significant

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response				

times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

1. Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 2)	_____	_____	_____	✓
2. Police protection? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	_____	_____	✓	_____
3. Schools? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	_____	_____	✓	_____
4. Parks? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	_____	_____	✓	_____
5. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	✓	_____

Summary a.1: The service standard for fire protection is based on distance. The General Plan states that new development must be located within 1.5 miles driving distance of a fire station or must be equipped with improvements, such as automatic sprinklers and in some cases water storage tanks, to enhance fire fighting capabilities. Rezoning the site would neither alter its distance to a fire station nor lessen the requirements for installation of fire suppression equipment.

Summary a.2-4: The service ratios for police protection, schools, and parks are based on population. As no substantial population growth would occur, there would be negligible, if any, impacts to these services.

Summary a.5: As the proposed rezoning would not result in substantial population growth, impacts to other public facilities such as hospitals and libraries would be insignificant.

Impact: Less than significant

XV. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	✓

Summary a: As explained in Section XIII above, implementation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth. Therefore, use of parks and recreational facilities would not increase, and their deterioration would not be accelerated.

Summary b: The proposed project does not include a proposal for new recreational facilities, and because it would not induce population growth, would not necessitate the expansion of existing facilities.

Impact: No impact

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
e. Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1, 17)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____

Summary a-b: As explained above, the project would not result in substantial population growth, no physical changes are proposed, and the uses allowed in the existing and proposed zoning districts are substantially similar. Therefore, there is no possibility that rezoning the site as proposed would impact the circulation system's performance or conflict with the county's congestion management programs and standards.

Summary c: The subject site is not in the vicinity of an airstrip or airport and changing the zoning designation as proposed clearly would not impact air traffic.

Summary d: Since no physical development is proposed, hazards would not increase due to a design feature. Because the uses that could realistically be established under the A-4 and A-2 zoning are

substantially similar, rezoning the site as proposed would not result in introduction of incompatible uses.

Summary e: Access to the site is gained via Rancho de la Rosa Road and this has been the planned access since the subject parcel was created by subdivision approval in the 1980s. Rezoning the site would not alter the planned access. If and when the site is developed, the access must be improved to comply with the fire district's standards for emergency access.

Summary g: The subject site is located in a rural area that is not served by public transit. Because of the area's rural character and low density, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, such as bike lanes and sidewalks, are not widely developed. As no physical changes are proposed and the proposed rezone would not result in a substantial change in uses at the subject site, there is no realistic possibility of the project conflicting with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise degrading the performance of such facilities.

Impact: No impact

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	_____	✓
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 5)	_____	_____	_____	✓
c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Source: 1)	_____	_____	_____	✓
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 17, 18)	_____	_____	_____	✓
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Sources: 1, 17, 18)	_____	_____	_____	✓
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1, 3)	_____	_____	✓	_____
g. Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Source: 3)	_____	_____	✓	_____

Summary a: No physical development is proposed and the uses allowed in the existing and proposed zoning districts are substantially similar. Additionally, the site does not and will not discharge into a facility regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Therefore, there is no possibility that changing the zoning from A-4 to A-2 would cause an exceedance of the Board's wastewater treatment requirements. Also see discussion in Section IX.a above.

Summary b: See Sections XVI.d and XVI.e below regarding water and wastewater facilities, respectively.

Summary c: The types of stormwater drainage facilities required at any site are dependent on the characteristics if the development proposed, not on the underlying zoning designation. Therefore, rezoning the site from A-4 to A-2 has effect on construction of stormwater drainage facilities. Also see discussion in Section IX.e above.

Summary d: There is no local supplier of potable water; a well would be required upon development of the site. Changing the site's zoning designation has no impact on the requirement for a well.

Summary e: There is no local wastewater treatment provider serving the site; a septic system would be required upon development of the site. Changing the site's zoning designation has no impact on the requirement for a septic system.

Summary f-g: Because the uses allowed by the existing and proposed zoning districts are substantially similar, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially alter the quantity or type of solid waste produced at the subject site. Landfills serving the County have sufficient permitted capacity to accept any waste generated at the site.

Impact: Less than significant

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	_____	_____	_____✓_____	_____
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but are cumulatively considerable? (Cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	_____	_____	_____	_____✓_____

- c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

_____ ✓

Summary a: As explained throughout this Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project would not result in serious degradation of the quality of the environment because no physical changes to the site are proposed and the uses that could realistically be established under the proposed A-2 agricultural zoning are substantially similar to the uses that could be established under the existing A-4 agricultural zoning. Based on the evidence in the record, the County finds that the project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

Summary b: No cumulative environmental impacts would result from implementation of the proposed project. As explained throughout this Initial Study, no physical changes to the site are proposed, and because of the site's physical characteristics, the uses that could realistically be established under the proposed A-2 agricultural zoning are substantially similar to the uses that could be established under the existing A-4 agricultural zoning. Additionally, it is a normal practice to rezone property from A-4 to another agricultural zoning district upon expiration of a Williamson Act contract. There is no evidence in the record suggesting that cumulatively considerable environmental effects would result from approval of the proposed rezone.


Summary c: As explained throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would result in very few potential impacts and all of the impacts that were identified would be less than significant. Nothing in the record indicates that project has the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly.

Impact: Less than significant



CONTRA COSTA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
651 Pine Street, Sixth Floor • Martinez, CA 94553-1229
e-mail: LTExe@lafco.cccounty.us
(925) 335-1094 • (925) 646-1228 FAX

April 6, 2010



William Nelson
Department of Conservation and Development
Community Development Division
651 Pine Street, 2nd Floor – North Wing
Martinez, CA 94553

SUBJECT: Fasanaro Rezone (RZ09-3209)

Dear William:

Thank you for including the Contra Costa Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) on the distribution list for the above project. In response, we offer general and specific comments below.

General Comments

As a Responsible Agency pursuant to the CEQA, LAFCO may need to rely on the County's environmental document in consideration of any boundary change [e.g., annexation, sphere of influence (SOI) amendment] applications relating to this project.

LAFCO is an independent, regulatory agency with discretion to approve or disapprove, with or without amendment, wholly, partially or conditionally, changes of organization or reorganization. In accordance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act), LAFCO is required to consider a variety of factors when evaluating a proposal, including, but not limited to the proposal's potential impacts on agricultural land and open space, provision of municipal services and infrastructure to the project site, timely and available supply of water, fair share of regional housing, etc..

The factors relating to boundary changes are contained in Government Code §56668. We encourage the County to reference these factors, as appropriate, in its environmental documents. LAFCO is also subject to SB 375. We encourage local agencies to utilize the most current standards and thresholds of significance with respect to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions analyses. Addressing these factors will help facilitate the LAFCO application process. Failure to do so may result in additional CEQA compliance work.

If LAFCO will be asked to rely on the County's environmental document for a future boundary change, the document should specifically 1) reference the LAFCO action(s) in the Project Description, 2) list LAFCO as Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required, and 3) most importantly, the LAFCO action(s) and relevant factors on which the LAFCO decisions would be based (e.g., population, land use, topography, proximity to populated areas, the likelihood of growth, the need for services, the conformity of the proposal and its effects on LAFCO policies regarding planned, orderly efficient patterns of urban development and on the policies set forth in Government Code §56377, and other factors set forth in Government Code §56668) should be adequately evaluated in the environmental document. For example, if the project will require

annexation to a sewer district, this action and the relevant analysis indicating the effect of the annexation on the sewer agency's ability to meet the increased demand for service without adversely affecting existing customers should be specifically addressed in the environmental document.

Specific Comments

Agricultural Resources – We note that the project site includes lands designated for agricultural use. The CKH Act contains its own definitions of *agricultural lands* (Gov. Code §56016) and *prime agricultural land* (Gov. Code §56064). In addition, the CKH Act contains various provisions relating to the annexation of Williamson Act lands (e.g., 56426.5, 56856.5). If LAFCO will be asked to rely on the County's environmental document for a future boundary change, the County's document should specifically reference and analyze impacts to agricultural lands in accordance with the criteria set forth in the CKH Act.

Municipal Services and Boundary Issues - We note that the project involves rezoning a 33± acre parcel from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District, which could potentially result in the development of two residential dwelling units.

The project site is not currently being assessed for water, sewer or street lighting services. The Negative Declaration ("ND") notes that there is no local supplier of potable water to the property. The site is not currently within any water service provider's sphere of influence and/or service boundary. The site, unlike some properties in the Alhambra Valley, is not currently receiving water service through the City of Martinez. The potential for water service through the City is unlikely because the property is outside the City's water service boundary; and such out of agency service would be contrary to LAFCO policy. The ND indicates that a well would be required to serve any permanent human use of the site (e.g., single-family residential). We understand from County Environmental Health (EH) that certain areas in the Alhambra Valley have challenges with respect to ground water. Some areas are known to be ground water short. Another challenge is that shallow water drawn from zones less than 50 feet deep is not acceptable due to the County's 50 foot minimum seal requirement that is intended to protect the public from surface water and the potential health risks associated with consumption. The potential to access adequate and acceptable ground water to serve residential dwelling units is presently unknown, and would be critical to any future residential use of the site.


With regard to wastewater services, the ND indicates that there is no local wastewater treatment provider to serve the property. We note that the site is not currently within any wastewater service provider's sphere of influence and/or service boundary. Further, we understand that any development of the property would be subject to obtaining clearance from EH for an on-site septic system.

We also note that the property is not currently being assessed for street lighting services (CSA L-100). The County typically requires annexation to CSA L-100 as a condition of approval of all new subdivisions and parcel maps.

As indicated above, the County's environmental document must specifically reference and analyze service issues and boundary issues (e.g., SOI amendment, annexation) to facilitate any future LAFCO action. The document, in its present form, is not adequate for LAFCO purposes; and therefore, could not be used to support any future annexations to municipal water and/or wastewater service providers.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to receiving copies of any future environmental notices and documents relating to this project. Please contact the LAFCO office if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Lou Ann Texeira
Executive Officer


c: LAFCO Planner



Marie Olson
<marieolson@earthlink.net>
03/26/2010 10:44 AM

To "William R. Nelson" <william.nelson@dcd.cccounty.us>
cc
bcc

Subject Fasanaro File #RZ09-3209

History:  This message has been replied to.

ALHAMBRA VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION
President: Hal Olson, 22 Wanda Way, Martinez, CA 94553

RE: Fasanaro File #RZ09-3209

Dear Mr. Nelson:

AVIA has no objection to the change in zoning as long as there are no neighbor complaints. Once a neighbor complains we are obligated to represent that neighbor.

Thank you for advising us of the above application.

Sincerely,

Hal Olson

RZ09-3209 Aerial Photo



Map created 08/20/2010
by Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development, GIS Group
601 Pine Street, 4th Floor, North Wing, Martinez, CA 94553-3095
37° 59' 48" N 122° 06' 35" W

This map or data set was created by the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation & Development with data from the Contra Costa County GIS Program. The County assumes no responsibility for its accuracy. This map contains copyrighted information and may not be altered. It may be reproduced in its current state if the source is cited. Users of this map agree to read and accept the County of Contra Costa disclaimer of liability for geographic information.



NOTICE OF A PUBLIC HEARING

You are hereby notified that on TUESDAY, APRIL 27, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. in Room 107, McBrien Administration Building, 651 Pine Street, Martinez, California, the County Planning Commission will consider a REZONING application as described as follows:

TOM FASANARO (Applicant & Owner), County File #RZ09-3209: A request to rezone a 33.0-acre parcel from A-4 Agricultural Preserve District to A-2 General Agricultural District. The subject property is addressed 129 Rancho de la Rosa Road in the Martinez area. (A-4) (GP: AL) (CT: 3560.02) (Parcel #365-040-016)

For purposes of compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance (no Environmental Impact Report required) has been issued for this project.

If you challenge the project in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the County at, or prior to, the public hearing.

For further details, contact the Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development, Community Development Division, 651 Pine Street, Martinez, California, or Will Nelson at 925-335-1208.

Catherine Kutsuris, Director
Department of Conservation & Development

300 ft. 365-040-016
04/15/10
4/15/10

Parcel ID	Owner Full Name	Owner Mail	Owner Mail	Owner Mail	City	Site Street #	Site Street	Site Zip
362150003	CLARK DOROTHY M TRE	5745 ALHAI MARTINEZ	CA	94553-9761	MARTINEZ	5745	ALHAMBRA	94553-9761
362150004	VANTIL DOUGLAS J & JENNIFER A	PO BOX 23	MARTINEZ	CA	94553-0237	MARTINEZ	5675	ALHAMBRA 94553-9706
362150005	TRENERY BRUCE KENNEY TRE	5433 ALHAI MARTINEZ	CA	94553-9606	MARTINEZ	5601	ALHAMBRA	94553-9706
365040016	FASANARO TOM S & JUDITH K TRE	149 PIONEER WALNUT C	CA	94597-2718	MARTINEZ	0	ALHAMBRA	94553
365040017	THEDE JAMES S TRE	1600 HOPK BERKELEY	CA	94707-2713	MARTINEZ	0	RANCHO D	94553
365040021	DUARTE HENRY F TRE	5889 ALHAI MARTINEZ	CA	94553-9760	MARTINEZ	5765	ALHAMBRA	94553-9761
365050014	MINK TODD & KAY TRE	50 ALHAMB MARTINEZ	CA	94553-9727	MARTINEZ	50	ALHAMBRA	94553-9727
365050015	REMMINGTON RANCH PROPERTIES	PO BOX 35	CARSON C	NV	89702-3679	MARTINEZ	0	ALHAMBRA 94553

362150003
CLARK DOROTHY M TRE
5745 ALHAMBRA VALLEY RD
MARTINEZ CA94553-9761

362150004
VANTIL DOUGLAS J & JENNIFER A
PO BOX 2373
MARTINEZ CA94553-0237

362150005
TRENERY BRUCE KENNEY TRE
5433 ALHAMBRA VALLEY RD
MARTINEZ CA94553-9606

365040016
FASANARO TOM S & JUDITH K TRE
149 PIONEER AVE
WALNUT CREEK CA94597-2718

365040017
THEDE JAMES S TRE
1600 HOPKINS ST
BERKELEY CA94707-2713

365040021
DUARTE HENRY F TRE
5889 ALHAMBRA VALLEY RD
MARTINEZ CA94553-9760

365050014
MINK TODD & KAY TRE
50 ALHAMBRA CREEK RD
MARTINEZ CA94553-9727

365050015
REMINGTON RANCH PROPERTIES
PO BOX 3579
CARSON CITY NV89702-3679

ALHAMBRA VALLEY IMPROVEMENT
ASSOCIATION
22 WANDA WAY
MARTINEZ, CA 94553

CITY OF MARTINEZ
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
525 HENRIETTA STREET
MARTINEZ, CA 94553

**LAFCO
INTEROFFICE**

^{SR}
FASANARO TOM S & JUDITH K TRE
149 PIONEER AVE
WALNUT CREEK CA94597-2718



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: David Twa, County Administrator
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Government Code 7507 Compliance - Other Post Employment Benefits - Public Defenders

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ACCEPT actuarial valuation of future annual costs of negotiated and proposed changes to Other Post Employment Benefits as provided by Buck Consultants in letter of February 9, 2011.

FISCAL IMPACT:

As shown in the valuation, the result of the health plan changes described herein, if implemented, will create a \$5.3 million or 0.51% decrease in the Actuarial Accrued Liability and a \$341,000 or 0.55% decrease in the calculated Annual Required Contribution.

BACKGROUND:

Government Code, Section 7507 requires with regard to local legislative boards, that the future costs of changes in retirement benefits or other postemployment benefits as determined by the actuary, shall be made public at a public meeting at least two weeks prior to the adoption of any changes in public retirement plan benefits or other postemployment benefits. The February 9, 2011 report from Buck Consultants is attached.

On March 1, 2011, the Board of Supervisors may consider and may take formal action with respect to proposed changes in health care benefits affecting employees represented by the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association and persons who retired from classifications that were represented at the time of retirement by the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association and who are eligible for health care coverage.

Recommended changes to health care benefits for these groups are:

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Contact: Lisa Driscoll, County Finance Director, 335-1023

By: June McHuen, Deputy

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

Active Employees

- Employees represented by the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association hired on or after the date the Board approves the new Memorandum of Understanding will not receive a County subsidized retiree health/dental care benefit.
- Dual Coverage. Provide as of 03/01/11, that employees and retirees and dependents of employees and retirees can no longer have dual coverage in two County/District health or dental plans. This provision will apply to County and District employees and retirees who have spouses or partners who are either County or District employees or retirees.
- Premium Cost Sharing 2010-2011.
 - Contra Costa Health Plan and Coordinated Dental Plans – Currently shared 98% County, 2% Participant for Plan A and 90% County, 10% Participant for Plan B.
 - Effective 03/01/11, County will pay a premium subsidy equal to 93% of the 2010 premium for Plan A and Participant will pay an amount equal to 7% of the 2010 premium for Plan A. County will pay an amount equal to 87% of the 2010 premium for Plan B and Participant will pay an amount equal to 13 % of the 2010 premium for Plan B. Any premium increases for 2011 in Plan A and Plan B to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant, up to a maximum of 11%; portion of increase above 11% to be paid by the County.
 - Kaiser and Health Net HMO and dental plans – Increases 01/01/10 and 01/01/11 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant, up to a maximum of 11%; portion of increase above 11% to be paid by the County.
 - Health Net PPO- Increases 01/01/10 and 01/01/11 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant.
- Fixed Premium. Effective 06/29/11, fix the County monthly premium subsidy for all of these plans at the June 2011 amount.
- Dental Plan Benefit. Increase to \$1,800, from \$1,600, the annual maximum benefit available in the Delta Dental Insurance plan effective 03/01/11.

Retired Employees

- Dual Coverage. Provide as of 06/01/11, that employees and retirees and dependents of employees and retirees can no longer have dual coverage in two County/District health or dental plans. This provision will apply to County and District employees and retirees who have spouses or partners who are either County or District employees or retirees.
- Premium Cost Sharing January 1, 2010 - June 1, 2011.
 - Contra Costa Health Plan and Coordinated Dental Plans – Currently shared 98% County, 2% Participant for Plan A and 90% County, 10% Participant for Plan B.
 - Kaiser and Health Net HMO and dental plans – Increases 01/01/10 and 01/01/11 to be shared 80% by the County and 20% by the Participant.
 - Health Net PPO- Increases 01/01/10 and 01/01/11 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant.
- Premium Cost Sharing June 1, 2011.
 - Contra Costa Health Plan and Coordinated Dental Plans – Effective 06/01/11, County will pay a premium subsidy equal to 93% of the 2010 premium for Plan A and Participant will pay an amount equal to 7% of the 2010 premium for Plan A. County will pay an amount equal to 87% of the 2010 premium for Plan B and Participant will pay an amount equal to 13 % of the 2010 premium for Plan B. Any premium increases for 2011 in Plan A and Plan B to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant, up to a maximum of 11%; portion of increase above 11% to be paid by the County.
 - Kaiser and Health Net HMO and dental plans – Increases 01/01/10 and 01/01/11 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant, up to a maximum of 11%; portion of increase above 11% to be paid by the County.
 - Health Net PPO- Increases 01/01/10 and 01/01/11 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant.
- Fixed Premium. Effective 06/29/11, fix the County monthly premium subsidy for all of these plans at the June 2011 amount.

- Dental Plan Benefit. Increase to \$1,800, from \$1,600, the annual maximum benefit available in the Delta Dental Insurance plan effective 06/01/11.
- Effective 06/1/11 all persons who become Medicare eligible must enroll in Medicare Parts A and B.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Delayed implementation of health care rate revisions.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS

Gov Section 7507 Report

February 9, 2011

Ms. Lisa Driscoll
County Finance Director
Contra Costa County Administrator's Office
651 Pine Street, 10th Floor
Martinez, CA 94553

**RE: Complying with California Government Code Section 7507 Regarding
Changes to the Postretirement Medical Plan Effective as of 3/1/2011**

Dear Ms. Driscoll:

This letter documents the changes in future annual costs including actuarial accrued liability, normal cost, and future cash flows based on collectively bargained changes to be effective as early as March 1, 2011 for the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association and other assumed changes to the post retirement medical plan. Throughout this document medical refers to both health and dental costs. All costs presented herein tie to the County's GASB 45 liability that was developed using census data as of January 1, 2010 and beginning of year valuation results updated in a prior 7507 report dated November 17, 2010 reflecting the Deputy District Attorneys' Association changes as of January 1, 2011. This was the most recently updated valuation result for the County and serves as the baseline for actuarial comparison of the current plan change costs/savings.

**General Description of the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association
Postretirement Medical Benefits Prior to Currently Negotiated Benefit Changes**

For Employees Represented by the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association:

Future County premium contributions are assumed to increase with trend as specified in Appendix A. All other rates and assumptions are as detailed in the most recent valuation report as of January 1, 2010.

This analysis includes all actives and retirees of County entities included in the County's CAFR and utilizing Contra Costa County (CCC) health benefits. All results rely on census and health plan data provided by the County. A listing of 8,013 active employees with an average age of 46.5 years and average service of 11.4 years was used for this study. A separate file containing 5,251 retirees and survivors was provided for this study as well.

Baseline Valuation Results Before Plan Changes

Table 1 summarizes the Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) as of January 1, 2010 as calculated for all participants under the current benefit schedule (incorporating the changes to the Deputy District Attorneys' Association as per the November 17, 2010 valuation update). The AAL is defined as the actuarial present value of benefits attributed to employee service rendered to a particular date.

The table also shows the normal cost (NC), which is the amount of benefit to be earned by the active employees for service in calendar year 2010. A discount rate of 6.32% is used throughout this analysis based on the County's decision to partially prefund the plan to a dedicated irrevocable trust.

Table 1
CCC Postemployment Health Benefits Plan
Actuarial Accrued Liability and Normal Cost as of January 1, 2010

Before Plan Changes	Actuarial Accrued Liability at a 6.32% <u>Discount Rate</u>	Normal Cost at a 6.32% <u>Discount Rate</u>
Active Employees	\$469,168,000	\$28,521,000
Retirees	<u>562,717,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	\$1,031,885,000	\$28,521,000

GASB Statement 45 requires the calculation of an Annual Required Contribution (ARC) consisting of the Normal Cost and a not greater than 30 year amortization of the Unfunded Actuarial Accrued Liability (UAAL). There is no requirement for CCC to actually fund the full ARC. The UAAL is the Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) less any assets held for the plan.

Table 2 on the following page shows the calculated ARC for the fiscal year ending in 2010 under the current health benefit plan using the 6.32% discount rate assumption.

Table 2
CCC Postemployment Health Benefits Plan
Annual Required Contribution for Fiscal Year Ending 2010

Before Plan Changes	6.32% Discount Rate
Total AAL	\$1,031,885,000
Assets	<u>25,048,000</u>
UAAL	\$1,006,837,000
Annual Required Contribution	
Normal Cost	\$28,521,000
30 Year Amortization of UAAL	<u>33,561,000</u>
ARC	\$62,082,000

The amounts above include the liability associated with the subsidization of retiree premiums by active employees as required by GASB 45. This subsidization occurs because the under age 65 retiree medical costs are much higher than active employee costs but the retiree premium rates are the same as the active rates due to the pooling of the costs in the underwriting process. Approximately \$117 million of the liability is caused by this rate subsidy, or 11.4% of the total liability under the 6.32% discount rate assumption.

Table 3 on page 5 shows the updated ARC for the fiscal year ending in 2010 under the new health benefit provisions negotiated to begin as early as March 1, 2011 for employees represented by the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association and proposed for persons who retired from classifications that were represented at the time of retirement by the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association using the same 6.32% discount rate assumption.

Here is a brief summary of the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association changes:

Active Employees

- Employees represented by the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association hired on or after the date the Board approves the new Memorandum of Understanding will not receive a County subsidized retiree health/dental care benefit.
- Dual Coverage. Provide as of 03/01/2011, that employees and retirees and dependents of employees and retirees can no longer have dual coverage in two County/District health or dental plans. This provision will apply to County and District employees and retirees who have spouses or partners who are either County or District employees or retirees.

- Premium Cost Sharing 2010-2011.
 - Contra Costa Health Plan and Coordinated Dental Plans – Currently shared 98% County, 2% Participant for Plan A and 90% County, 10% Participant for Plan B.
 - Effective 03/01/2011, County will pay a premium subsidy equal to 93% of the 2010 premium for Plan A and Participant will pay an amount equal to 7% of the 2010 premium for Plan A. County will pay an amount equal to 87% of the 2010 premium for Plan B and Participant will pay an amount equal to 13 % of the 2010 premium for Plan B. Any premium increases for 2011 in Plan A and Plan B to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant, up to a maximum of 11%; portion of increase above 11% to be paid by the County.
 - Kaiser and Health Net HMO and dental plans – Increases 01/01/2010 and 01/01/2011 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant, up to a maximum of 11%; portion of increase above 11% to be paid by the County.
 - Health Net PPO- Increases 01/01/2010 and 01/01/2011 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant.
- Fixed Premium. Effective 06/29/2011, fix the County monthly premium subsidy for all of these plans at the June 2011 amount.
- Dental Plan Benefit. Increase to \$1,800, from \$1,600, the annual maximum benefit available in the Delta Dental Insurance plan effective 03/01/2011.

Retired Employees

- Dual Coverage. Provide as of 06/01/2011, that employees and retirees and dependents of employees and retirees can no longer have dual coverage in two County/District health or dental plans. This provision will apply to County and District employees and retirees who have spouses or partners who are either County or District employees or retirees.
- Premium Cost Sharing January 1, 2010 - June 1, 2011.
 - Contra Costa Health Plan and Coordinated Dental Plans – Currently shared 98% County, 2% Participant for Plan A and 90% County, 10% Participant for Plan B.

- Kaiser and Health Net HMO and dental plans – Increases 01/01/2010 and 01/01/2011 to be shared 80% by the County and 20% by the Participant.
- Health Net PPO- Increases 01/01/2010 and 01/01/2011 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant.
- Premium Cost Sharing June 1, 2011.
 - Contra Costa Health Plan and Coordinated Dental Plans-Effective 06/01/2011, County will pay a premium subsidy equal to 93% of the 2010 premium for Plan A and Participant will pay an amount equal to 7% of the 2010 premium for Plan A. County will pay an amount equal to 87% of the 2010 premium for Plan B and Participant will pay an amount equal to 13 % of the 2010 premium for Plan B. Any premium increases for 2011 in Plan A and Plan B to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant, up to a maximum of 11%; portion of increase above 11% to be paid by the County.
 - Kaiser and Health Net HMO and dental plans – Increases 01/01/2010 and 01/01/2011 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant, up to a maximum of 11%; portion of increase above 11% to be paid by the County.
 - Health Net PPO- Increases 01/01/2010 and 01/01/2011 to be shared 50% by the County and 50% by the Participant.
- Fixed Premium. Effective 06/29/2011, fix the County monthly premium subsidy for all of these plans at the June 2011 amount.
- Dental Plan Benefit. Increase to \$1,800, from \$1,600, the annual maximum benefit available in the Delta Dental Insurance plan effective 06/01/2011.
- Effective 06/01/2011 all persons who become Medicare eligible must enroll in Medicare Parts A and B.

Table 3
CCC Postemployment Health Benefits Plan
Annual Required Contribution for Fiscal Year Ending 2010

After Plan Changes	6.32% Discount Rate
Total AAL	\$1,026,579,000
Assets	<u>25,048,000</u>
UAAL	\$1,001,531,000
Annual Required Contribution	
Normal Cost	\$28,357,000
30 Year Amortization of UAAL	<u>33,384,000</u>
ARC	\$61,741,000

The plan changes for the Contra Costa County Defenders' Association created a **\$5.3** million or **0.51%** decrease in the Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) and a **\$341,000** or **0.55%** decrease in the calculated Annual Required Contribution. Future valuation results will change with demographic and cost updates but these changes to the most recent valuation as of January 1, 2010 do accurately measure the magnitude and direction of the plan change costs.

In undiscounted cash flow terms there will be decreased cash costs for the County as early as the June 1, 2011 calendar year for the postretirement medical plan based on these plan changes. The first 2-year total cash decrease from the plan change beginning in calendar 2011 is about \$9,000, while the 25-year total cash decrease beginning in calendar 2011 is about \$8.0 million. These are conservative estimates based on current plan participation and are subject to change upon open enrollment as the plan changes impact future retiree plan selections.

Appendix A provides the assumptions used for this actuarial analysis. This list includes items such as expected turnover rates, retirement rates, future trend rates, and mortality rates. The rates that we used are consistent with those used by CCCERA in its pension actuarial valuations. Appendix B provides a glossary of commonly used terms for postretirement medical valuations.

All valuation results reflect the use of the Entry Age Normal (EAN) actuarial cost method. This assumption also matches the cost method used by CCCERA for the pension valuation.

The current assumption is that annual actuarial valuations will be conducted although GASB 45 does allow for biennial valuations.

Ms. Lisa Driscoll
February 9, 2011
Page 7

Please contact us at (619) 725-1769 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Michael W. Schionning, FSA, MAAA
Principal & Consulting Actuary



James A. Summers, FSA, MAAA
Director & Consulting Actuary

cc: Jacqueline Farren, Buck Consultants

APPENDIX A

Valuation Assumptions

Mortality Rates—RP-2000 Combined Healthy Mortality Tables set back two years.

Withdrawal Rates—Representative values are shown below

Year	<u>General</u> Withdrawals per 1,000 Lives for employees with less than 5 years of Service	<u>Safety</u> Withdrawals per 1,000 Lives for employees with less than 5 years of Service
1	140.00	110.00
2	90.00	70.00
3	80.00	50.00
4	60.00	40.00
5	50.00	30.00
Age	<u>General</u> Withdrawals per 1,000 Lives for employees with more than 5 years of Service	<u>Safety</u> Withdrawals per 1,000 Lives for employees with more than 5 years of Service
30	50.00	30.00
35	49.20	22.00
40	42.30	16.10
45	35.40	10.50
50	16.80	0.00
55	3.70	0.00
60	0.00	0.00

New Entrants—None Assumed.

APPENDIX A

Dependent Assumptions—For active employees, 80% of males and 55% of females are assumed married at retirement. Female spouses are assumed to be three (3) years younger than their husbands.

Discount Rate—6.32%.

Participation Assumption—98% active participation assumed upon retirement.

Medical Demographic Information—8,013 active employees and 5,251 retirees as of January 1, 2010.

Retirement Rates

Probability of Eligible Retirements During the Year		
Age	General	Safety
50	3.0%	25.0%
51	3.0%	20.0%
52	3.0%	20.0%
53	3.0%	20.0%
54	5.0%	25.0%
55	10.0%	30.0%
56	10.0%	30.0%
57	10.0%	40.0%
58	10.0%	40.0%
59	10.0%	40.0%
60	15.0%	100.0%
61	20.0%	100.0%
62	25.0%	100.0%
63	25.0%	100.0%
64	30.0%	100.0%
65	35.0%	100.0%
66	35.0%	100.0%
67	35.0%	100.0%
68	35.0%	100.0%
69	35.0%	100.0%

Probability of retiring at age 70 equals 100% for both General and Safety.

APPENDIX A

Health Care Cost and Expense Trend—Annual trend rates are shown below.

Medical Trend Rates by Calendar Year	
CY10	10%
CY11	9%
CY12	8%
CY13	7%
CY14	6%
CY15+	5%

Contra Costa County 2010 Rates and Contributions

The following Premium Rates and Increases vary by bargaining unit. For illustrative purposes the following R-1A rates for 2010 cover over 75% of the current retiree population including the newly negotiated Contra Costa County Defenders' Association benefits.

		<u>Total Monthly Premium</u>	<u>County Monthly Premium</u>
Early Retirees (under 65)			
Kaiser	EE	\$572.41	\$444.39
	EF	\$1,333.72	\$1,035.42
Health Net			
HMO	EE	\$781.71	\$611.22
	EF	\$1,917.59	\$1,499.36
Health Net PPO			
	EE	\$946.32	\$544.25
	EF	\$2,248.05	\$1,292.88
CCHP - A			
	EE	\$536.75	\$499.18
	EF	\$1,278.84	\$1,189.32
CCHP - B			
	EE	\$592.15	\$515.17
	EF	\$1,407.05	\$1,224.13

APPENDIX A

Contra Costa County 2010 Rates and Contributions (continued)

		Total Monthly	County Monthly
Retirees (over65)		<u>Premium</u>	<u>Premium</u>
Kaiser Cost	EE	\$662.20	\$618.26
Retiree	EF	\$1,505.64	\$1,379.35
Kaiser Senior	EE	\$274.12	\$261.26
Advantage	EE+1	\$740.29	\$705.57
Health Net Cost	EE	\$436.65	\$430.28
Retiree	EF	\$873.30	\$860.58
Health Net	EE	\$408.88	\$390.88
Seniority Plus	EE+1	\$817.76	\$781.76
Health Net Flex	EE	\$730.55	\$516.58
Net PPO	EE+1	\$1,461.11	\$1,033.06
CCHP - A	EE	\$440.35	\$409.53
Retiree	EE+1	\$1,086.04	\$1,010.02
CCHP - B	EE	\$495.75	\$431.30
Retiree	EE+1	\$1,214.25	\$1,056.40

Glossary of Terminology

Actuarial Accrued Liability (AAL) - The actuarial present value of benefits attributed to employee service rendered to a particular date.

Active Plan Participant - Any active employee who has rendered service during the credited service period and is expected to receive benefits, including benefits to or for any beneficiaries and covered dependents, under the postretirement benefit plan.

Actuarial Present Value - The value, as of a specified date, of a future benefit cost or a series of benefit costs, with each amount adjusted to reflect (a) the time value of money (through discounts for interest and (b) the probability of payment (for example, by means of decrements for events such as death, disability, withdrawal or retirement) between the specified date and the expected date of payment.

Amortization - Systematic reduction of the principal portion (only) of an asset or liability.

Annual Required Contribution – Consists of the normal cost and a portion of the total unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL). The normal cost and UAAL are derived from the actuarial present value of benefits, the actuarial cost method and the plan assets.

Attribution Period - The period of an employee's service to which the expected postretirement benefit obligation for that employee is assigned.

Discount Rate - The interest rate used in developing present values to reflect the time value of money.

APPENDIX B

Health Care Cost Trend Rate - An assumption about the annual rate(s) of change in the cost of health care benefits currently provided by the postretirement benefit plan, due to factors other than changes in the composition of the plan population by age and dependency status, for each year from the measurement date until the end of the period in which benefits are expected to be paid. The Health Care Cost Trend Rate implicitly considers estimates of health care inflation, changes in health care utilization or delivery patterns, technological advances, and changes in the health status of plan participants. Differing types of service, such as hospital care and dental care, may have different trends.

Normal Cost - The portion of the Actuarial Present Value of Future Benefits attributed to employee service during a period.

Substantive Plan - The terms of a postretirement benefit plan as understood by an employer that provides postretirement benefits and the employees who render services in exchange for those benefits. The substantive plan is the basis for the accounting for that exchange transaction. In some situations an employer's cost-sharing policy, as evidenced by past practice or by communication of intended changes to a plan's cost-sharing provisions, or a past practice of regular increases in certain monetary benefits may indicate that the substantive plan differs from the extant written plan.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Legislation Committee
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Adoption of 2011 State Legislative Platform and Recommendations Related to Redevelopment Contracts

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ADOPT the Contra Costa County 2011 State Legislative Platform as recommended by the Legislation Committee.
(Attachment A)

CONSIDER the recommendations from the Legislation Committee with regard to the on-going operations of the Contra Costa County Redevelopment Agency (RDA):

- A. The Board of Supervisors, acting as the RDA, should continue to consider and approve contracts involving bond proceeds;
- B. The Board of Supervisors, acting as the RDA, should continue to consider and approve contracts involving tax increment subject to business agreements and legal obligations; and
- C. The Board of Supervisors, acting as the RDA, should continue to consider and approve contracts set forth on Attachment B—Contract Status Report.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes: See Addendum

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I
Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II
Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV
Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V
Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: L. DeLaney,
925-335-1097

cc:

FISCAL IMPACT:

No impact to the County from the adoption of the 2011 State Legislative Platform.

BACKGROUND:

At its January 18, 2011 meeting, the Board of Supervisors considered adoption of the proposed 2011 State and Federal Platforms. The Board adopted the 2011 Federal Platform with referral of two matters to the Legislation Committee for further consideration. However, the Board did not adopt the proposed 2011 State Platform, as there were several issues the Board referred to the Legislation Committee for review and recommendation. Subsequent to the January 18, 2011 Board meeting, County Administrator staff received information about additional legislative issues that were requested to be included in the 2011 State Platform.

At its February 7, 2011 meeting, the Legislation Committee reviewed and approved recommendations to the Board of Supervisors with respect to the following policy positions:

- 1) Realignment Principles
- 2) Redevelopment Agency Revenue
- 3) Vehicle License Fee (VLF) Extension for Public Safety
- 4) AB 3632 Mental health services for special education students
- 5) Funding for the Local Planning Council for Child Care and Development (LPC) and the AB 212 Child Care Salary and Retention Incentive Program
- 6) Vasco Road Double Fine Zone (DFZ) Extension

In addition, at the February 7, 2011 meeting, the Legislation Committee reviewed a recommendation from staff to include an Agricultural policy position with respect to the invasive South American Spongeplant. However, due to the fact that the item was not included on its agenda, the Committee was unable to act on that item. Staff recommends its inclusion in the 2011 State Legislative Platform.

The Legislation Committee also considered and approved recommendations with regard to the on-going operations of the Contra Costa County Redevelopment Agency.

1) Realignment Principles

At the January 18 Board meeting, Supervisor Gioia noted that there were "General Revenue/Finance Issues" policy positions in the proposed 2011 Platform that touched on the reforms of the state/local relationship that are under discussion by the Legislature and the Governor. However, these positions do not sufficiently address the Realignment proposals that are currently under consideration.

The current State Platform positions are:

36. SUPPORT continued efforts to reform the state/local relationship in a way that makes both fiscal and programmatic sense for local government.

37. OPPOSE reductions in county-run State programs that shift responsibility or costs to the County.

The Legislation Committee recommended that the following policy position instead be adopted by the Board of Supervisors:

37. SUPPORT continued efforts to reform the state/local relationship in a way that makes both fiscal and programmatic sense for local government and conforms to the adopted 2010 CSAC Realignment Principles, with an emphasis on maximum flexibility for counties to manage the existing and realigned discretionary programs.

The Legislation Committee recommended that the previous policy #37 to oppose reductions in county-run State programs be removed. They also recommended that the following policy position be amended:

39. SUPPORT reduction in the 2/3 vote requirement for special taxes that fund high priority local services.

The recommended amended policy is as follows:

39. SUPPORT a reduction in the 2/3 vote requirement for special taxes that fund a comprehensive community plan developed by the county, cities and school districts that improve health, education and economic outcomes and reduce crime and poverty.

(See page 9 of Attachment A.)

2) Redevelopment Agency Revenue

The Legislation Committee reviewed the proposed language changes to the Redevelopment Agency Revenue priority of the Platform and made adjustments, as proposed on page 3 of Attachment A.

In addition, the Legislation Committee reviewed recommendations from staff with respect to the on-going operations of the Contra Costa County Redevelopment Agency, which they approved. The Legislation Committee also recommended that the Board of Supervisors receive financial information about redevelopment revenue, which is *Attachment C*.

The recommendations to the Board of Supervisors are as follows:

A. The Board of Supervisors, acting as the RDA, should continue to consider and approve contracts involving bond proceeds;

B. The Board of Supervisors, acting as the RDA, should continue to consider and approve contracts involving tax increment subject to business agreements and legal obligations; and

C. The Board of Supervisors, acting as the RDA, should continue to consider and approve contracts set forth on Exhibit B—Contract Status Report.

3) Vehicle License Fee (VLF) Extension for Public Safety

The VLF rate is currently 1.15 percent, but, absent legislative action to extend it, will drop to 0.65 percent on July 1, 2011. The Vehicle License Fee (VLF) increase was enacted as a component of the temporary taxes under Governor Schwarzenegger and is dedicated to local public safety programs.

Specifically, 0.15 percent of the VLF is dedicated to the Local Safety and Protection Account (LSPA). Revenue in the LSPA is statutorily dedicated to a range of local programs, including the Citizens' Option for Public Safety (COPS), the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), the rural and small county sheriffs' local assistance programs, booking fee "replacement" revenue, and a range of other local assistance programs.

Governor Brown's proposed budget includes maintaining the Vehicle License Fee at 1.15 percent (\$1.4 billion in 2011-12 related to extension of 0.5% of VLF). However, the Governor proposes ongoing support for local public safety by dedicating GF (backfilled dollar-for-dollar with realignment funds) to programs now funded out of the Local Safety and Protection Account (0.15 percent of the VLF). Under this proposal, funding levels would effectively be restored to the levels enacted in the 2008-09 budget (prior to February 2009 budget revision).

The VLF extension would certainly be our first choice. It would provide the best chance to maintain a formula that would not only be sustainable but with the revenue basically predictable. That is why staff recommends supporting

a bill that legislatively removes the sunset clause. The Legislation Committee supported this recommendation; it is #109 on page 19 of Attachment A.

4) AB 3632 Mental health services for special education students

Last fall, the Legislature rejected Governor Schwarzenegger's proposal to suspend the AB 3632 mandate and voted to continue the mandate on county mental health. This included \$133 million in outstanding county mandate claims and funding of \$ 3million for a best practices study. The conference committee, however, did not adopt the LAO alternative which would have shifted the mandate from counties to schools.

Subsequently, the Governor line item vetoed all \$132.9 million of funding to reimburse counties for their unreimbursed costs from 2004-05 through 2008-09 for complying with the AB 3632 mandate (Handicapped and Disable Students I and II, and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Pupils: Out of State Mental Health Services). In doing so, he also declared that the mandate on counties for the 2010-11 fiscal year was suspended.

The Governor's action three months into the current fiscal year left many unanswered questions for counties, schools, community-based providers, parents and students related to this special education program. The big question is whether the Governor's unilateral action to de-fund the program actually suspends the mandate. Moreover, does the mandate suspension remove the financial obligations on counties? CSAC is working with the County Counsels Association and the California Mental Health Directors Association (CMHDA) to examine the policy and legal issues created by this action and will provide additional information to counties.

At this time, Governor Brown's budget proposal would fund the AB 3632 mandate on counties using Proposition 63 funds, for a General Fund savings of \$98.6 million.

The Legislation Committee supported staff's recommendation that the County support the LAO proposal that would shift the mandate from counties to schools. Alternatively, there could be a legislative requirement that the private insurance companies that insure the parents of these children be required to provide funding for the necessary services. (*See policy position #88, pages 15-16 on Attachment A.*)

5) Funding for the Local Planning Council for Child Care and Development (LPC) and the AB 212 Child Care Salary and Retention Incentive Program

At the December 6, 2010 Family and Human Services (FHS) Committee Meeting, a recommendation was made by the Committee that a report be given to the Legislation Committee so that language in support of the restoration of funding for the Local Planning Council for Child Care and Development (LPC) and the AB 212 Child Care Salary and Retention Incentive Program would be added the County's state legislative platform. A report was provided to the Legislation Committee. The Legislation Committee recommends policy position #89 on page 16 of Attachment A.

6) Vasco Road Double Fine Zone (DFZ) Extension

SB 3 (Torlakson, 2006) established a Double Fine Zone (DFZ) for Vasco road. Additionally, in the wake of a number of similar legislative requests, SB 3 became the focus of specific legislative direction to provide a standard set of criteria and terms governing DFZ's, while approving the extension of the Vasco Road DFZ through 2010.

In 2007, the Legislature again addressed the general standards and criteria for DFZ's in AB 112 (Wolk) setting out general parameters for state highway segments to qualify for DFZ's, but excluded their application to Vasco road, under previously-approved SB 3.

Following in 2008, SB 1419 added changes to the DFZ criteria and continued the focus on state highways as being eligible for DFZ. Additionally, two segments in San Francisco were authorized to be DFZ's and were not required to meet the now specific criteria applicable to state highway designations as DFZ's due to the unique, pedestrian oriented issues on those segments.

At present there is no authority for the Caltrans or the CHP to authorize DFZ on non-state highway segments. To re-authorize the Vasco Road as a DFZ, legislation will be required. It will be vital to demonstrate that the elements in place during the DFZ on Vasco Road served their purpose and reduced traffic incidents, injuries and fatalities during the period of operation.

The Legislation Committee recommends a policy be added to the 2011 State Platform that supports legislative efforts to re-authorize Vasco Road as a Double Fine Zone. (*See policy #126, page 24, Attachment A.*)

7. South American Spongeplant

South American spongeplant, *Limnobium laevigatum*, was found in the central portion of the Delta (southern Sacramento County - Brannan Island and Isleton) in July 2010. A cursory on-the-water survey performed by the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), assisted by the County Agriculture Department staff, found incipient spot infestations in the waterways around Webb Tract and Frank's Tract. CDFA is the lead agency. CDFA had been treating it in a pond in Redding and doing their best in with an infestation in the San Joaquin River in Fresno County.

In the last couple of years, the occurrence of the South American spongeplant has greatly increased and has also been found in some agricultural irrigation canals in Fresno and Stanislaus counties. Through pressure from the Sacramento and Contra Costa County Agricultural Commissioners, the experts at CDFA developed a Pest Profile. The potential adverse impact of this new invasive species to agriculture, boating, marinas, fishing and recreation in the Delta and other waterways in the state is great. The South American spongeplant has the potential to become a worse pest than water hyacinth and *Egeria densa* were before the Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) started their control program. _

The Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) does not have legal authority to treat any species other than water hyacinth and *Egeria*. Their authority, which is very specific, is found in the California Harbors and Navigation Code, section 64. DBW is in the Delta all summer long treating hyacinth and *Egeria*. Spongeplant looks very similar to hyacinth and is easily controlled by the same materials that DBW uses on hyacinth, but they cannot currently treat it.

CDFA was able to procure \$92K from an emergency fund to do an extensive survey and to treat "hot spot" areas as they go. The potential of this pest is to spread very rapidly and it is strongly felt by our Agricultural Commissioner and others that a concerted effort is needed to have a chance at eradication or control, if eradication is not possible.

Due to the threat to agriculture, the environment and recreation in the California Delta from a newly discovered invasive aquatic species, *Limnobium laevigatum* (South American spongeplant), staff supports a cooperative and concerted effort by CDFA and DBW to survey and treat all incipient infestations of this species. Staff recommends that the Board support legislation to establish legal authority where needed to facilitate this effort, as well as a continued long term effort to rid the Delta of this invasive species. (*See policy #4, page 4 of Attachment A.*)

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If the Board does not adopt the 2011 State Legislative Platform, there will be no direction from the Board of Supervisors on legislative priorities or policy positions for the year. If the Board does not consider the recommendations with regard to the on-going operations of the Contra Costa County Redevelopment Agency, certain programs and projects will not proceed.

CLERK'S ADDENDUM

Speakers: Ralph Hoffman, resident of Contra Costa County; Vince Wells, President, Firefighters' Local 1230; Rollie Katz, Public Employees' Union, Local One. ADOPTED the Contra Costa County 2011 State Legislative Platform as recommended by the Legislation Committee, with Supervisor Uilkema registering a "No" vote on Line item 39 in regard to supporting the repeal of the 2/3 vote requirement to increase taxes for certain areas linked to provision of services.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A--Recommended 2011 State Legislative Platform

Attachment B--Redevelopment Agency Program/Project Status

Attachment C--Redevelopment Revenue Information

2011 STATE LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM CONTRA COSTA COUNTY



Each year, the Board of Supervisors adopts a State Legislative Platform that establishes priorities and policy positions with regard to potential State legislation and regulation. The State Legislative Platform includes County-sponsored bill proposals; policy issues that provide direction and guidance for identification of bills which would affect the services, programs or finances of Contra Costa County; and issues regarding the State budget and state-local relationship.

COUNTY-SPONSORED BILLS

1. Subdivision Map Act Amendment for Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit and Traffic Calming Facilities – For some time the County has wanted to update its transportation fees for new development to fund off-site pedestrian, bicycle, transit and traffic calming facilities. However, the State statute authorizing local agencies to adopt ordinances to require the payment of fees for transportation facilities, section 66484 of the Subdivision Map Act, is limited to bridges and major thoroughfares.

Rationale: The public's concern over greenhouse gas emissions and the impact of auto-oriented development on public health has spurred the County's efforts to secure additional funding for transportation facilities that can encourage more walking, bicycling and transit use. In addition, the County's successful efforts to reduce sprawl through infill development has increased the need for traffic calming devices to help minimize the traffic impacts from new development on existing roads. Revising the Subdivision Map Act to allow fees for these transportation facilities would support the County's public policy goals, consistent with its General Plan circulation element. Senator DeSaulnier introduced a bill to accomplish this in 2008. The County will request the bill be reintroduced in the 2011 session, as it would provide more flexibility for an existing transportation funding source.

2. Tier C (Safety Retirement) Legislation Amendment: In 2006, the Contra Costa County Deputy Sheriffs' Association (DSA) and the County successfully worked together with then-Senator Torlakson on SB 524, legislation that allows the provision of different safety retirement benefits to members of the Association and permits a process whereby employees can negotiate different safety retirement benefits. SB 524 (Chapter 633, Statutes of 2006) was signed by the Governor on September 29, 2006, enacting Government Code section 31484.9 on January 1, 2007 with a sunset date of December 31, 2011. Legislation is required to remove the sunset date in order to keep the provisions of Government Code section 31484.9 in effect.

Rationale: This provision of the County Employees Retirement Law of 1937 allows the County to agree, pursuant to a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Contra Costa County DSA that the provisions of section 31484.9 shall apply to safety employees represented by the Association and further requires that the terms of any agreement reached with the Association pursuant to section 31484.9 also be made

applicable to unrepresented Sheriff's personnel who are safety employees.

In the MOU between the County and the rank and file and management units of the Association approved by the Board of Supervisors on December 5, 2006, the parties agreed that Government Code section 31484.9 would be applicable to safety employees represented by the Association. In the MOU, the DSA and the County also agreed that retirement benefits would be modified for peace officers hired after December 31, 2006. These new officers would receive the 3% at 50 retirement benefit as do previously hired safety employees. However, the Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) to their retirement benefit is a two percent COLA rather than the three percent COLA. In addition, the final average compensation used to calculate the new hires' retirement allowances is based on a thirty-six month period instead of the twelve month period applicable to previously hired employees. By Resolution No. 2006/743, section 66.11, the Board of Supervisors made these same modifications applicable to unrepresented Sheriff's personnel. These changes resulted in a new safety retirement tier, Tier C, for those Sheriff's employees hired after December 31, 2006.

This legislation helped the County to negotiate an MOU that lowered the County's long-term structural costs for retirement benefits. This is good for the financial stability of the County and good for taxpayers. In addition, this legislation gave the employees flexibility to negotiate a less expensive retirement benefit that resulted in a larger amount of take-home pay for new deputies. It is in the interest of both the County and the Association to preserve flexibility to negotiate different safety retirement benefit formulas particular to the Association.

LEGISLATIVE/REGULATORY ADVOCACY PRIORITIES

Each year, issues emerge through the legislative process that are of importance to the County and require advocacy efforts. For 2011, it is anticipated that critical issues requiring legislative advocacy will include the following:

1. State Budget – According to the most recent estimates, the State is running a deficit of approximately \$8.2 billion for FY 2010-11. In addition, the State Budget faces a projected deficit of up to \$25.4 billion by FY 2011-12. The long-standing practice of state government has been to look to counties as a means of balancing its budget. While opportunities to do so are more limited with the passage of Proposition 1A, the magnitude of the deficit makes it certain the State will be creative in their efforts to include counties as part of its budget balancing solution, likely through additional program re-alignment and revenue reductions.

Of particular concern to counties is the inadequate reimbursement for our increasing cost of operating several human services programs: the Human Services Funding Deficit, formerly referred to as the "Cost of Doing Business." The annual shortfall between actual county expenses and State reimbursement has grown to over \$1 billion since 2001, creating a de facto cost shift to counties. The funding gap forces counties

to reduce services to vulnerable populations and/or divert scarce county resources from other critical local services. It also increases the risk of State and Federal penalties.

2. Health Care – Counties have a high stake in California’s health reform efforts. Counties serve as employers, payers, and providers of care to vulnerable populations. Consequently, counties stand ready to actively participate in discussions of how to best reform the health care system in California and implement the national health care reform legislation passed in 2010.

3. Water and Levees /The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta – The Legislature’s passing of the Delta Reform Act (2009), a package of bills which establish among other things, co-equal goals for reliable water supply and ecosystem restoration for the Delta, as well as the proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)--an effort to construct a massive peripheral canal/tunnel-- will require significant, large-scale change to the Delta as we know it today. The scope and content of these changes and continuing political battles between north and south over water will continue to dominate legislative and administrative agendas in the coming year. Significant future impacts upon the County in the areas of water quality and supply, levees, ecosystem, governance and flood control are anticipated. Additionally, a water bond is proposed for the November 2012 ballot. Consideration should be given to the potential for the County to sponsor Delta-related legislation through our legislative delegation. The County’s Delta Water Platform, as well as the Strategic and Action Plans, are incorporated in this Platform by reference.

4. Redevelopment– Past State budgets have shifted billions of dollars in property tax revenues from redevelopment agencies to the Supplemental Educational Revenue Augmentation Funds (SERAF). The FY 2009-10 revenue take from redevelopment agencies was intended to support schools and programs that service residents of the redevelopment areas or that live in redevelopment-financed housing. In the FY 2011 State Budget, the SERAF funds were directed to court funding.

The Governor’s FY 2011-12 Budget proposes legislation to eliminate existing redevelopment agencies. Existing agencies would be required to cease creation of new obligations, and “successor agencies” would be required to retire RDA debts.

Reform of the existing redevelopment process is appropriate to consider as part of a budget solution that represents compromise among all stakeholders with an interest in the State and local agency budgets. Furthermore, all stakeholders should be at the table discussing the State and local budget solutions.

STATE PLATFORM POLICY POSITIONS

A brief background statement accompanies policy positions that are not self-evident. Explanatory notes are included either as the preface to an issue area or following a specific policy position. Please note that new and revised policy positions are highlighted and in italics. The rationale for the policy position is italicized.

Agricultural Issues

1. SUPPORT efforts to ensure sufficient State funding for pest and disease control and eradication efforts to protect both agriculture and the native environment, including glassy-winged sharpshooter, light brown apple moth, and Japanese dodder activities; high risk pest exclusion activities; pesticide regulatory and law enforcement activities; and noxious weed pest management. *Agriculture is an important industry in Contra Costa County. Protection of this industry from pests and diseases is important for its continued viability.*
2. SUPPORT continued appropriations for regulation and research on sudden oak death, a fungal disease affecting many species of trees and shrubs in native oak woodlands. *The County's natural environment is being threatened by this disease.*
3. SUPPORT funding for agricultural land conservation programs and agricultural enterprise programs to protect and enhance the viability of local agriculture. *The growth in East County and elsewhere has put significant pressure on agricultural lands, yet agriculture is important not only for its production of fresh fruits, vegetables and livestock, but also as a source of open space.*
4. *SUPPORT legislation to establish legal authority where needed to facilitate the effort by the California Department of Food and Agriculture and the Department of Boating and Waterways to survey and treat all incipient infestations of the South American spongeplant and a continued long-term effort to rid the Delta of this invasive species. This invasive aquatic species is a threat to agriculture, the environment and recreation in the Delta.*

Animal Services Issues

5. SUPPORT efforts to protect local revenue sources designated for use by the Animal Services Department; i.e., animal licensing, fines and fees. *Fines, fees, and licensing are major sources of revenue for the Animal Services Department. The demand for animal services is increasing each year as does the demand on the General Fund. It is important to protect these revenue sources to continue to provide quality animal service and to meet local needs.*
6. SUPPORT efforts to protect or increase local control and flexibility over the scope and level of animal services. *Local control over the scope of animal services is necessary to efficiently address public safety and other community concerns. Local control affords jurisdictions the ability to tailor animal service programs to fit their communities. Animal related issues in dense urban areas vary from those in small, affluent communities.*
7. SUPPORT efforts to protect against unfunded mandates in animal services or mandates that are not accompanied by specific revenue sources which

completely offset the costs of the new mandates, both when adopted and in future years. *Unfunded mandates drain our limited fiscal resources and, at the same time, chip away at local control over the scope and level of services.*

8. SUPPORT efforts to ensure full funding of State animal services mandates, including defense of the Department of Finance's lawsuit against the State Commission on Mandates regarding the State obligations for reimbursement of local costs for animal services incurred in compliance with SB 1785. *The County invested large sums of money to comply with SB 1785, with the assurance that our cost would be offset by reimbursements from the State. Failure by the State to honor the reimbursements negatively impacts the County General Fund and Animal Services' budget.*
9. SUPPORT efforts to protect and/or increase County flexibility to provide animal services consistent with local needs and priorities. *The demand for quality animal service programming continues to increase each year. The County is experiencing population growth and changing demographics. It is incumbent upon the Animal Services Department to be flexible enough to adjust to the changing needs and priorities.*
10. SUPPORT efforts to preserve the integrity of existing County policy relating to Animal Services (e.g., the Animal Control Ordinance and land use requirements). *Contra Costa is looked upon as one of the model Animal Services Departments in the state. Its policies, procedures, and ordinances are the yardstick against which other Animal Control organizations are measured. The local control exercised by the Board of Supervisors is key to that hallmark.*

Child Support Services Issues

11. SUPPORT the establishment of a statewide electronic registry for the creation and release/satisfaction of liens placed on property of a non-custodial parent as necessary to collect delinquent child support payments. *California law currently provides that recording an abstract or notice of support judgment with a County Recorder creates a lien on real property. This requires recording the judgment in each of the 58 counties in order not to miss a property transaction. An electronic registry would simplify not only the creation of liens but also the release/satisfaction of liens because there would be a single statewide point of contact, and the entire process would be handled electronically through automated means.*
12. SUPPORT amendment of current law that states that documents completed and recorded by a local child support agency may be recorded without acknowledgement (notarization) to clarify that the exception is for documents completed or recorded by a local child support agency. *This amendment clarifies that documents that are prepared by the local child support agency and then sent for recording either by the local child support agency or by the obligor (non-*

custodial parent) or by a title insurance company are covered by the exemption, a technical point not acknowledged by all county recorder offices.

13. SUPPORT efforts to simplify the court process for modifying child support orders by the court by requiring court appearances only when one of the parties objects to the modification. *Currently, establishment of parentage and support by the court is permitted without court appearance if both parties are in agreement. A similar process for modification would reduce court time, the workload of all involved agencies and parties, and streamline the process.*
14. SUPPORT efforts to ensure that the reduction caused by the federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 to the California Department of Child Support Services is not passed down as a reduction to the local program. *The Act places a restriction on the ability of states to use incentive funds as the state match to draw additional federal funds. In previous years, California used its \$30 million in federal funds in child support programs.*
15. SUPPORT efforts that would require the Department of Child Support Services to provide any notice form, information, or document that is required or authorized to be given, distributed, or provided to an individual, a customer, or a member of the public to be given, distributed, or provided in a digitized form, and by any means the Department determines is feasible, including, but not limited to, e-mail or by means of a web site.

Climate Change Issues

16. SUPPORT the CSAC Climate Change Policy Statements and Principles which address a broad range of issues affected by climate change, including water, air quality, agriculture, forestry, land use, solid waste, energy and health. *The document is largely based on existing CSAC policy and adapted to climate change. Additionally, the document contains a set of general principles which establish local government as a vital partner in the climate change issue and maintain that counties should be an active participant in the discussions in the development of greenhouse gas reduction strategies underway at the state and regional level.*
17. SUPPORT efforts to ensure that the implementation of AB 32 results in harmony among the greenhouse gas reduction target created by the Air Resources Board for each regional/local agency, the housing needs numbers provided by the state Department of Housing and Community Development pursuant to housing element law, the Sustainable Communities Strategy, and the Regional Transportation Plan processes.

Elections Issues

18. SUPPORT legislation to adjust precinct sizing from 1,000 voters per precinct to 1,250 voters per precinct. *With the option of being able to have up to 1,250 voters per precinct, the best polling locations in a neighborhood can be selected, and that same site is more likely to be used for several elections, thus avoiding the need to change poll sites for voters.*
19. SUPPORT full state reimbursement for state mandates imposed upon local registrars by the Secretary of State, including special state elections.
20. *SUPPORT legislation that would add provisions to the state Elections Code that would allow special elections to fill a vacancy in a congressional or legislative district to be conducted by all mailed ballots at the county's discretion.*

Emergency Preparedness, Emergency Response

21. SUPPORT legislation that would give local agencies more authority to train volunteers and help clean-up oil spills without taking on additional legal liability.
22. SUPPORT legislation that would require the state's Oil Spill Prevention and Response Agency to improve communication and clean-up technology, increase safety standards for ships and establish special protections for ecologically sensitive areas.
23. SUPPORT legislation that would require responses to future oil spills in a shorter timeframe, with a more regional approach.
24. SUPPORT measures that enable counties and other local agencies to better exercise their responsibilities to plan for and respond to emergencies and disasters without taking on additional legal liability and oppose those that do not recognize or support the county and local agency role in the State's Standardized Emergency Management System.
25. *SUPPORT legislation or other measures requiring the creation of emergency rock stockpiles suitable for levee repair throughout the Delta, enabling increasingly efficient and less costly prevention of levee breaks and enhancement of initial response capabilities.*

Eminent Domain Issues

26. SUPPORT legislation that maintains the distinction in the California Constitution between Section 19, Article I, which establishes the law for eminent domain, and Section 7, Article XI, which establishes the law for legislative and administrative action to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

27. SUPPORT legislation that would provide a comprehensive and exclusive basis in the California Constitution to compensate property owners when property is taken or damaged by state or local governments, without affecting legislative and administrative actions taken to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.

Flood Control and Clean Water Issues

28. SUPPORT authorization for regional approaches to comply with aquatic pesticide permit issues under the purview of the State Water Resources Control Board. *Contra Costa County entered into an agreement with a neighboring county and several cities to share the costs of monitoring. While it makes sense for local government to pool resources to save money, State Board regulations make regional monitoring infeasible.*
29. SUPPORT efforts to provide local agencies with more flexibility and options to fund clean water programs. *Stormwater requirements issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Boards are becoming more and more expensive, yet there is no funding. Stormwater should be structured like a utility with the ability to set rates similar to the other two key water services: drinking water and wastewater.*
30. SUPPORT efforts to provide immunity to local public agencies for any liability for their clean-up of contaminations on private lands. *This will be more critical as the Regional Water Quality Control Boards institute Total Maximum Daily Loads, which establish a maximum allowable amount of a pollutant (like mercury) in the stormwater from a watershed.*

General Revenues/Finance Issues

As a political subdivision of the State, many of Contra Costa County's services and programs are the result of state statute and regulation. The State also provides a substantial portion of the County's revenues. However, the State has often used its authority to shift costs to counties and to generally put counties in the difficult position of trying to meet local service needs with inadequate resources. While Proposition 1A provided some protections for counties, vigilance is necessary to protect the fiscal integrity of the County.

31. SUPPORT the State's effort to balance its budget through actions that do not adversely affect County revenues, services or ability to carry out its governmental responsibilities.
32. OPPOSE any state-imposed redistribution, reduction or use restriction on general purpose revenue, sales taxes or property taxes unless financially beneficial to the County. *(Note that a redistribution of sales and property tax may be beneficial to Contra Costa County in the event that sales tax growth continues to lag behind property tax growth.)* This policy includes opposition to the shift of redevelopment property tax increment revenues to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF).

33. OPPOSE efforts to limit local authority over transient occupancy taxes (TOT).
34. OPPOSE any efforts to increase the County's share-of-cost, maintenance-of-effort requirements or other financing responsibility for State mandated programs absent new revenues sufficient to meet current and future program needs.
35. SUPPORT efforts to ensure that Contra Costa County receives its fair share of State allocations, including mental health funding under Proposition 63 and pass-through of federal funds for anti-terrorism and homeland security measures. *The State utilizes a variety of methods to allocate funds among counties, at times detrimental to Contra Costa County.*
36. SUPPORT efforts to receive reimbursement for local tax revenues lost pursuant to sales and property tax exemptions approved by the Legislature and the State Board of Equalization.
37. SUPPORT continued efforts to reform the state/local relationship in a way that makes both fiscal and programmatic sense for local government *and conforms to the adopted 2010 CSAC Realignment Principles, with an emphasis on maximum flexibility for counties to manage the existing and realigned discretionary programs.*
38. SUPPORT efforts to relieve California of the federal Child Support penalties without shifting the cost of the penalties to the counties.
39. SUPPORT reduction in the 2/3 vote requirement for special taxes that fund *a comprehensive community plan developed by the county, cities and school districts that improve health, education and economic outcomes and reduce crime and poverty.*
40. SUPPORT efforts to authorize counties to impose forfeitures for violations of ordinances, as currently authorized for cities. *This would provide the County with the opportunity to require deposits to assure compliance with specific ordinance requirements as well as retain the deposit if the ordinance requirements are not met. Currently, the County is limited to imposing fines which are limited to only \$100 - \$200 for the first violation, which has proven to be an ineffective deterrent in some cases.*
41. SUPPORT efforts to redefine the circumstances under which commercial and industrial property is reassessed to reduce the growing imbalance between the share of overall property tax paid by residential property owners versus commercial/industrial owners.
42. SUPPORT efforts to reduce County costs for Workers' Compensation, including the ability to control excessive medical utilization and litigation. *Workers' Compensation costs are significant, diverting funds that could be utilized for*

County services. Workers' Compensation should provide a safety net for injured employees, for a reasonable period of time, and not provide an incentive for employees to claim more time than medically necessary.

43. SUPPORT state actions that maximize Federal and State revenues for county-run services and programs.
44. SUPPORT legislative compliance with both the intent and language of Proposition 1A.
45. SUPPORT full State funding of all statewide special elections, including recall elections.
46. OPPOSE efforts of the State to avoid state mandate claims through the practice of repealing the statutes, then re-enacting them. *In 2005, the State Legislature repealed sections of the Brown Act that were subject to mandate claims, then re-enacted the same language pursuant to a voter-approval initiative, and therefore, not subject to mandate claims.*
47. SUPPORT strong Public Utilities Commission (PUC) oversight of state-franchised providers of cable and telecommunications services, including rigorous review of financial reports and protection of consumer interests. *AB 2987 (Núñez), Chapter 700, statutes of 2006 transferred regulatory oversight authority from local government to the PUC.*
48. SUPPORT timely, full payments to counties by the State for programs operated on their behalf or by mandate. *The State currently owes counties over \$1 billion in State General Funds for social services program costs dating back to FY 2002-03.*
49. SUPPORT full State participation in funding the County's retiree and retiree health care unfunded liability. *Counties perform most of their services on behalf of the State and Federal governments. Funding of retiree costs should be the responsibility of the State, to the same extent that the State is responsible for operational costs.*

Health Care Issues

Counties remain concerned about any health care reform that could transfer responsibility to counties, without commensurate financing structures or in a manner not compatible with the County's system. Counties support a concept of universal health coverage for all Californians. Toward that end, counties urge the state to enact a system of health coverage and care delivery that builds upon the strengths of the current systems in our state, including county-operated systems serving vulnerable populations.

Currently, California has a complex array of existing coverage and delivery systems that serve many, but not all, Californians. Moving this array of systems into a universal coverage

framework is a complex undertaking that requires sound analysis, thoughtful and deliberative planning, and a multi-year implementation process. As California moves forward with health care reform, counties urge the State to prevent reform efforts from exacerbating problems with existing service and funding. The State must also consider the differences across California counties and the impacts of reform efforts on the network of safety-net providers, including county providers. The end result of health reform must provide a strengthened health care delivery system for all Californians, including those served by the safety net.

50. SUPPORT State action to increase access and affordability. *Access to care and affordability of care are critical components of any health reform plan. Expanding eligibility for existing programs will not provide access to care in significant areas of the state. Important improvements to our current programs, including Medi-Cal, must be made either prior to, or in concert with, a coverage expansion in order to ensure access. Coverage must be affordable for all Californians to access care.*
51. SUPPORT Medi-Cal reimbursement rate increases to incentivize providers to participate in the program.
52. SUPPORT administrative streamlining of Medi-Cal, including elimination of the asset test and semi-annual reporting and changes to income verification. *California should look to other states for ideas to reduce administrative costs, such as allowing all children born into Medi-Cal to remain on the program until age 21.*
53. SUPPORT actions that address provider shortages (including physicians, particularly specialists, and nurses). Innovative programs, such as loan forgiveness programs, should be expanded. In an effort to recruit physicians from other states, the licensing and reciprocity requirements should be re-examined. Steps should be taken to reduce the amount of time it takes to obtain a Medi-Cal provider number (currently six to nine months).
54. SUPPORT efforts that implement comprehensive systems of care, including case management, for frequent users of emergency care and those with chronic diseases and/or dual diagnoses. *Approaches could be modeled after current programs in place in safety net systems.*
55. SUPPORT efforts that provide sufficient time for detailed data gathering of current safety funding in the system and the impact of any redirection of funds on remaining county responsibilities. *The interconnectedness of county indigent health funding to public health, correctional health, mental health, alcohol and drug services and social services must be fully understood and accounted for in order to protect, and enhance as appropriate, funding for these related services.*
56. OPPOSE safety net funding transfers until an analysis of who would remain uninsured (e.g. medically indigent adults, including citizens, who cannot

- document citizenship under current Medicaid eligibility rules) is completed in order to adequately fund services for these populations.
57. SUPPORT efforts to clearly define and adequately fund remaining county responsibilities.
 58. SUPPORT State action to provide an analysis of current health care infrastructure (facilities and providers), including current safety net facilities across the state, to ensure that there are adequate providers and health care facilities, and that they can remain viable after health reform.
 59. SUPPORT efforts to provide adequate financing for reforms to succeed.
 60. SUPPORT measures that maximize Federal reimbursement from Medicaid and S-CHIP.
 61. SUPPORT State action to complete actuarial studies on the costs of transferring indigent populations, who currently receive mostly episodic care, to a coverage model to ensure that there is adequate funding in the model.
 62. SUPPORT efforts that ensure that safety net health care facilities remain viable during the transition period and be supported afterwards based on analyses of the changing health market and of the remaining safety net population.
 63. SUPPORT State action to implement *the 2010 Medi-Cal waiver in a manner that maximizes the drawdown of federal funds for services and facilities, provides flexibility, and ensures that counties receive their fair share of funding*
 64. SUPPORT efforts to increase revenues and to contain mandated costs in the County's hospital and clinics system.
 65. SUPPORT efforts to increase the availability of health care to the uninsured in California, whether employed or not.
 66. SUPPORT legislation that improves the quality of health care, whether through the use of technology, innovative delivery models or combining and better accessing various streams of revenue, including but not limited to acute and long term care integration.
 67. SUPPORT legislation to protect safety net providers, both public and private. Legislation should focus on stabilizing Medi-Cal rates and delivery modes and should advocate that these actions are essential to the success of any effort to improve access and make health care more affordable.

Currently there is no planned or organized system of care for young people and their families in need of alcohol and drug treatment services. Moreover there is a vast disparity between

treatment need and treatment capacity for adolescents. Relative to the need and demand for this service, this is an area of the State's health care system that has been largely ignored.

68. SUPPORT State efforts to increase the scope of benefits and reimbursement rates contained in Minor Consent Medi-Cal to give youth suffering from substance abuse disorders access to a continuum of care, including residential and one-on-one outpatient treatment.
69. SUPPORT efforts to give incentives to providers to establish more youth-driven treatment facilities within the community.
70. SUPPORT efforts to extend Minor Consent Medi-Cal Coverage to incarcerated youths, many of whom are in custody due to drug related crimes. *This could greatly decrease recidivism in the juvenile justice system.*
71. SUPPORT county efforts in the promotion of partnerships that provide integrated responses to the needs of alcohol and drug populations, including criminal justice, perinatal and youth as well as those populations with co-occurring disorders.
72. SUPPORT and encourage the development of strategies that include alcohol and drug services in the provision of all culturally appropriate health care services.
73. SUPPORT the development and institutionalization of a tracking system for use on utilization and notification of Healthy Family substance abuse benefits for youths enrolled under California's Health Family program. *Like other youth in California, youth in Contra Costa County, are the most underserved population in the County's Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Services' caseloads. The Healthy Family initiative holds great potential as a funding source to address this major deficit in our AOD treatment services.*
74. SUPPORT efforts to require coverage of medically necessary alcohol and substance abuse related disorder treatment on the same levels as other medical conditions in health care service plans and disability insurance policies. *Alcohol and drug treatment services are the most under-funded of all health services. Neither the state nor the federal allocations to the County covers medical treatment for AOD services, and so are a cost borne by the County.*

Human Services Issues

75. SUPPORT efforts to increase County flexibility in use of CalWORKs funds and in program requirements in order to better support the transition of welfare dependent families from welfare-to-work and self-sufficiency, including, but not limited to: extending supportive services beyond the current limit; enhancing supportive services; increasing diversion and early intervention to obviate the need for aid; developing a state earned income tax credit; expanding job retention services; developing an eligibility definition to 250% of the poverty level;

and exempting the hard-to-serve from welfare-to-work activities and the 20% exemption or providing flexibility in the time limit (dependent upon terms and conditions of TANF reauthorization). Support efforts to align CalWORKs property and asset limitations with those of Food Stamps. *All of these measures would make it easier for CalWORKs families to enter employment services, become employed, and continue with the support they need in order to maintain their jobs.*

76. SUPPORT efforts to revise the definition of “homelessness” in the Welfare & Institutions Codes to include families who have received eviction notices due to a verified financial hardship, thus allowing early intervention assistance for CalWORKs families. *Current law prevents CalWORKs from providing homeless assistance until the CalWORKs family is actually “on the street.” This rule change would enable the County to work with CalWORKs families who are being threatened with homelessness to prevent the eviction and, presumably, better maintain the parents’ employment status.*
77. SUPPORT efforts to ensure funding of child care for CalWORKs and former CalWORKs families at levels sufficient to meet demand. The State of California has not fully funded the cost of child care for the “working poor.” *Additional funding would allow more CalWORKs and post-CalWORKs families to become and/or stay employed.*
78. SUPPORT efforts to establish an “umbrella code” for the reporting of incidents of elder abuse to the Department of Justice, thus more accurately recording the incidence of abuse. *Current reporting policies within California’s law enforcement community and social services departments are uncoordinated in regards to the reporting of adult abuse. Under an “umbrella code,” law enforcement agencies and social services departments would uniformly report incidents of elder abuse and California would have much better data for policy and budget development purposes.*
79. SUPPORT efforts that seek to identify and eliminate elder financial abuse and elder exposure to crime that may be committed through conservatorships.
80. SUPPORT efforts to reduce County costs for In-Home Supportive Services, including but not limited to extending the required reassessment period. *There are many administrative tasks required in regulation for counties to follow in managing the In-Home Supportive Services program. Options for many of these tasks would lower administrative costs while maintaining program integrity.*
81. SUPPORT efforts to eliminate the finger-imaging requirement for adult food stamp applicants, recognizing the fraud deterrent aspects of the Electronic Benefits Transfer System. *Elimination of the finger-imaging requirement, which was originally implemented as a fraud control measure in the old welfare programs, is viewed by many as an unnecessary or duplicate process. The*

current electronic benefits transfer system combined with program eligibility processes provides more fraud prevention/detection than does finger-imaging.

82. SUPPORT efforts to allow phone-in Food Stamp Eligibility Redeterminations as a more cost effective benefit reassessment process. *As counties such as Contra Costa change their business models to utilize centralized service centers, some of the antiquated process rules and requirements also need to be changed, to allow cost efficient practices. Changing the rules to allow phone-ins for Eligibility Redeterminations is one example.*
83. SUPPORT efforts to continue expansion of Child Welfare Redesign Program Improvements including: use of Federal IV-E funding for pre-placement, prevention activities; development of caretaker recruitment and retention campaigns; extension of Independent Living Skill services to age 21; and, funding to implement Children's Child Welfare Workload Study Results, SB 2030. *Changes in these areas would enable counties to better meet their performance accountability goals, as required under Federal and State statutes.*
84. SUPPORT efforts to allow Medi-Cal clients transportation access to medical care via the most efficient transportation mode possible instead of the very costly ambulance transportation that is currently prevalent. *California is currently limited to the types of non-emergency medical transportation for reimbursement by Medi-Cal. However, the federal Medicaid program allows other much less costly forms of transportation to be used. Other states use this more permissive definition of approved non-emergency medical transportation to encourage Medicaid clients to receive preventative care and reduce the incidence of last-resort ambulance transportation to hospital emergency rooms for primary care.*
85. OPPOSE any legislation that increases tobacco taxes but does not contain language to replace any funds lost to The California Children and Families Act/Trust Fund for local services as currently funded by tobacco taxes, Prop 10 in 1998 and Prop 99.
86. OPPOSE legislation, rules, regulations or policies that restrict or affect the amount of funds available to, or the local autonomy of, First 5 Commissions to allocate their funds in accordance with local needs.
87. *SUPPORT efforts to restore funding in the amount of \$80 Million for the Child Welfare Services Program that was line-item vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger in the State's FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11 budgets, as these reductions have a direct impact on local child protective services and the lives of children.*
88. *SUPPORT the LAO's proposal to shift the mandate for AB 3632, mental health services for special education students, from counties to schools, and support a legislative requirement that the private insurance companies that ensure the*

parents of these children be required to provide funding for the necessary services.

89. *SUPPORT efforts by the Contra Costa Local Planning Council for Child Care and Development and others to restore the FY 2010-11 state budget allocation to the FY 2009-10 levels for both the Local Planning Council for Child Care and Development Grant and the Child Care Retention Program (AB 212). The main mandates of the local planning councils (LPCs) include the following: providing a forum for local input into child care planning and services that includes parents, providers, and other community members; conducting assessments of child care need for all families at least every five years; and creating a county-wide child care plan. In addition, local planning councils are responsible for administering the AB 212 retention program for teachers in state-funded programs, and for facilitating the transfer of funds between contractors to maximize services to children all over the state.*

Indian Gaming Issues

Contra Costa County is currently home to the Lytton Band of the Pomo Indians' Casino in San Pablo, a Class II gaming facility. There are also proposals for two additional casinos in West County: one in North Richmond and the other in Point Molate. Local governments have limited authority in determining whether or not such facilities should be sited in their jurisdiction; the terms and conditions under which the facilities will operate; and what, if any, mitigation will be paid to offset the cost of increased services and lost revenues. Contra Costa County has been active in working with CSAC and others to address these issues, as well as the need for funding for participation in the Federal and State review processes and for mitigation for the existing Class II casino.

90. SUPPORT efforts to ensure that counties who have existing or proposed Class II Indian gaming facilities receive the Special Distribution Funds.
91. CONSIDER, on a case by case basis, whether or not to SUPPORT or OPPOSE Indian gaming facilities in Contra Costa County, and only SUPPORT facilities that are unique in nature and can demonstrate significant community benefits above and beyond the costs associated with mitigating community impacts.
92. OPPOSE the expansion or approval of Class III gaming machines at the existing gaming facility in Contra Costa County unless it can be demonstrated that there would be significant community benefits above and beyond the costs associated with mitigating community impacts.
93. SUPPORT State authority to tighten up the definition of a Class II machine.
94. SUPPORT State legislative and administration actions consistent with the CSAC policy documents on development on Indian Lands and Compact negotiations for Indian gaming.

Land Use/Community Issues

95. SUPPORT efforts to promote economic incentives for "smart growth," including in-fill and transit-oriented development. *Balancing the need for housing and economic growth with the urban limit line requirements of Measure J (2004) will rely on maximum utilization of "smart growth" principles.*
96. SUPPORT efforts to increase the supply of affordable housing, including, but not limited to, state issuance of private activity bonds, affordable and low income housing bond measures, low-income housing tax credits and state infrastructure financing. *This position supports Goals 2, 3 and 4 of the County General Plan Housing Element.*
97. SUPPORT efforts to obtain a CEQA exemption for affordable housing lending undertaken by a city or county housing and community development or housing finance agency to provide financial assistance or insurance for the development and construction of affordable housing. CEQA exempts specified projects from its requirements, including an action taken by the State agencies to provide financial assistance or insurance for the development and construction of affordable housing if the project for financial assistance or insurance will be reviewed pursuant to CEQA by another public agency (Section 21080.10(b) of the California Public Resources Code). *The exemption for State agencies engaged in affordable housing lending was adopted in 1980, before localities had a significant role in affordable housing lending. Today, localities are a major provider of affordable housing assistance, whereas the State role has diminished. Local agencies should not be treated differently from State agencies with respect to CEQA requirements and exemptions. Moreover, without this exemption, affordable housing projects not otherwise exempt by virtue of "by right" provisions in State law could be subject to "double jeopardy," whereby they would be subject to CEQA during entitlements and subject to CEQA during financing. AB 2518 (Houston) in 2006 was a Contra Costa County-sponsored bill to accomplish this, but it was not successful in the Legislature.*
98. SUPPORT efforts to obtain a CEQA exemption for infill development in unincorporated areas. Section 15332 of the CEQA Guidelines is a Categorical Exemption for infill development projects but only within cities. The exemption should also include urbanized unincorporated areas. The proposal would affect the County's affordable housing, revitalization, and redevelopment programs in all unincorporated urbanized areas of the County. *Without the exemption, housing projects in the unincorporated areas are subject to a more time-consuming and costly process in order to comply with the CEQA guidelines than that which is required of cities, despite having similar housing obligations.*
99. SUPPORT efforts to amend Section 65915 of the Government Code (amended in 2004 by SB 1818 - Hollingsworth) so that State law enhances rather than

inhibits local efforts to increase the supply of affordable housing. *The provisions of law regarding density bonuses and inducements to them should be clarified and simplified in order to encourage this avenue for affordable housing production.*

100. SUPPORT efforts to reform State housing element law to promote the actual production and preservation of affordable housing and to focus less on process and paper compliance.
101. OPPOSE efforts to limit the County's ability to exercise local land use authority.
102. SUPPORT increased flexibility in the use of Redevelopment set-aside funds for low and moderate income housing. *Such flexibility would encourage creative use of these funds, resulting in higher overall production of units.*
103. SUPPORT efforts to reduce the fiscalization of land use decision-making by local government, which favors retail uses over other job-creating uses and housing. *Reducing incentives for inappropriate land use decisions, particularly those that negatively affect neighboring jurisdictions, could result in more rational and harmonious land use.*
104. SUPPORT allocations, appropriations, and *policies that support and leverage the benefits of approved Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCPs), such as the East Contra Costa County NCCP. Support the granting of approximately \$20 million to the East Contra Costa County NCCP from the \$90 million allocation for NCCPs in Proposition 84. Support the position that NCCPs are an effective strategy for addressing the impacts of climate change and encourage appropriate recognition of the NCCP tool in implementation of climate change legislation such as SB 375 and AB 32. Promote effective implementation of NCCPs as a top priority for the Department of Fish and Game.*

Law and Justice System Issues

105. SUPPORT legislation that seeks to curb metal theft by making it easier for law enforcement agencies to track stolen metals sold to scrap dealers through such means as requiring identification from customers selling commonly stolen metals, banning cash transactions over a certain amount, and requiring scrap dealers to hold materials they buy for a certain period of time before melting them down or reselling them.
106. SUPPORT full funding of the state Juvenile Probation and Camps Funding (JPCF). *In FY 2004-05, the State eliminated Probation's allocation of federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) funds and backfilled them with state *Vehicle License Fees that are due to sunset on June 30, 2011.* At risk is approximately \$6 million of revenue that supports the Orin Allen Youth Rehabilitation Facility, Juvenile Electronic Monitoring Program, and Juvenile*

Supervision Services. The potential loss of additional juvenile probation officers would also cause a reduction of approximately \$1.75 million dollars in Federal Title IV-E revenue for a total negative impact of almost \$8 million.

107. SUPPORT Adult Probation Funding that would provide State funding for adult probation services to enhance public safety and provide realistic opportunities for the rehabilitation of probationers. *Implementing evidence-based practices can potentially reduce the prison-bound probation population by between 10 and 30 percent. Intervening with this population of prison-bound probationers to increase supervision and treatment services can have a significant impact on prison admissions and help to reduce prison overcrowding in California.*
108. SUPPORT legislation that provides a practical and efficient solution to addressing the problem of abandoned and trespassing vessels and ground tackle in an administrative process that allows the California State Lands Commission to both remove and dispose of such vessels and unpermitted ground tackle. *Boat owners in increasing numbers are abandoning both recreational and commercial vessels in areas within the Commission's jurisdiction. Our state waterways are becoming clogged with hulks that break up, leak, sink and add pollutants to our waterways and marine habitat.*
109. SUPPORT legislation that removes the sunset of Vehicle License Fees designated for law enforcement agencies that are currently set to expire on June 30, 2011. *The financial impact for the Sheriff's Office, Probation Department, District Attorney, and other police departments would be well over \$12 million.*

Levee Issues, Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Issues

The County's Delta Water Platform was developed in mid-2008 to consolidate and organize the many County policies and positions into one document that could be utilized to guide actions and advocacy to promote a healthy Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

The Delta Water Platform is comprised of fourteen subject areas. Each of these subject categories contains relevant policies and background explanatory language. Each subject category is summarized below; the first five are considered priorities. The policies and background information can be found in the Delta Water Platform, which is included in this document by reference:

Short Term Actions to be implemented immediately: *Includes a broad range of specific, relatively non-controversial actions to quickly improve the state of the Delta, such as improvements to levees, the fishery, habitat and emergency response.*

Conveyance: Through-Delta and Isolated Conveyance: *Consideration of isolated conveyance must protect and improve the Delta and the entire Bay-Delta ecosystem, include the broadest range of non-biased scientific analysis of impacts, include levee repair and all costs of a facility must be paid by beneficiaries.*

The Delta Ecosystem: Protection and restoration of an ailing Delta ecosystem has long been a priority of the Board of Supervisors, including need for additional scientific research to address fundamental questions, fishery and habitat restoration projects.

Governance: A new or improved system of oversight related to ecosystem and water management is necessary. The existing Delta Protection Commission land use governance structure has been successful, requiring no further action. Local Government representation in any governance structure is paramount.

Levee Restoration: Advocacy for immediate and significant (multi-year) funding and levee repair is a priority, including upgrades to minimum (PL 84 99) standards for all levees, and a higher, 200-year level of protection for communities protected by levees. Stockpiling rock in the Delta specifically for levee repair and continuance of the Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) are highly recommended.

Water Quality, Water Quantity and Delta Outflow: Protection and improvement of water quality, quantity and outflow, determination and assurance of adequate water for the delta ecosystem and examination of the State and Federal project operations (including potential for reduced exports) are recommended here.

Flood Protection/Floodplain Management: Comprehensive flood management planning throughout the Delta and its watersheds, as well as funding to bring flood facilities to 200-year levels and revenue generation for flood control districts continue to be of import.

Water Rights and Legislative Protections: Existing area-of-origin and other water rights protections established for the Delta should be preserved.

Regional Self-Sufficiency: All export regions should be implementing all water supply options available to them to reduce stress on the Delta as a limited resource.

Emergency Response: Collaborative efforts among the Delta counties to improve emergency response in the region have been productive and are continuing.

Water Conservation: Landscape and household conservation, maximizing use of reclaimed wastewater, use of meters, and agricultural water conservation are recommended.

Water Storage: Multi-purpose storage facilities are recommended and groundwater storage preferred to surface storage options. Detailed groundwater studies are recommended.

San Luis Drain/Grasslands Bypass: Long-standing opposition to selenium discharges from this project entering the Delta and support of in-valley treatment solutions are

ongoing. Continued reduction in drainage from the Grasslands Bypass project is also monitored.

Climate Change: Impacts of climate change must be considered in planning, engineering and construction activities.

110. ADVOCATE for administrative and legislative action to provide significant funding for rehabilitation of levees in the western and central Delta. *Proposition 1E, passed in November 2006, provides for over \$3 billion for levees, primarily those in the Central Valley Flood Control Program. Language is included in the bond for other Delta levees but funding is not specifically directed. The County will work on a coalition basis to actively advocate for \$1 billion in funding through this bond.*
111. ADVOCATE for legislation dealing with the Delta, including levees and levee programs, level and type of flood protection, beneficiary-pays programs, flood insurance, liability and other levee/land use issues.
112. SUPPORT legislation/regulation requiring Reclamation Districts to develop, publish, and maintain hazard emergency plans for their districts. *Emergency response plans are critical to emergency management, particularly in an area or situation like the Delta where a levee break could trigger other emergencies. This legislation/regulation should also include the requirement for plan review and annual distribution of the plan to the residents of the district, County Office of Emergency Services and other government agencies that have emergency response interests within the district.*

Library Issues

113. SUPPORT State financial assistance in the operation of public libraries, including full funding of the Public Library Fund (PLF) and the Direct/Interlibrary Loan (Transaction Based Reimbursement) program.
114. SUPPORT State bonds for public library construction. The 2000 library construction bond provided funding for two libraries in Contra Costa County. There is currently a need of approximately \$289,000,000 for public library construction, expansion and renovation in Contra Costa County.
115. SUPPORT continued funding for the California Library Literacy and English Acquisition Services Program, which provides matching funds for public library adult literacy programs that offer free, confidential, one-on-one basic literacy instruction to English-speaking adults who want to improve their reading, writing, and spelling skills.

Telecommunications Issues

116. SUPPORT clean-up legislation on AB 2987 that provides for local emergency notifications similar to provisions in cable franchises for the last 20 years. *Currently our franchises require the cable systems to carry emergency messages in the event of local emergencies. With the occurrence of several local refinery incidents, this service is critical for Contra Costa. Under federal law, Emergency Alert System requirements leave broad discretion to broadcasters to decide when and what information to broadcast, emergency management offices to communicate with the public in times of emergencies.*
117. SUPPORT preservation of local government ownership and control of the local public rights-of-way. *Currently, local government has authority over the time, place, and manner in which infrastructure is placed in their rights-of-way. The California Public Utilities Commission is considering rulemaking that would give them jurisdiction to decide issues between local government and telecommunication providers.*

Transportation Issues

118. *SUPPORT increased flexibility in the use of transportation funds. The County supports an amendment to the Subdivision Map Act to allow the use of off-site transportation impact fees to fund pedestrian, bicycle transit and traffic calming facilities necessitated by new development. The Act currently limits the use of these funds to improvements to bridges and "major thoroughfares." Senator DeSaulnier introduced such a bill in 2008. The County's proposal was adopted by CSAC for its legislative platform in the 2011 session. The proposal would provide more flexibility in how we can use an existing transportation funding source.*
119. SUPPORT regional coordination that provides for local input in addressing transportation needs. *Coordinated planning and delivery of public transit, paratransit, and rail services will help ensure the best possible service delivery to the public. Regional coordination also will be needed to effectively deal with the traffic impacts of Indian gaming casinos such as those in West County. Regional coordination also will be essential to complete planning and development of important regional transportation projects such as State Route 239, improvements to Vasco Road, completion of remaining segments of the Bay Trail, improvements to the Delta DeAnza Regional Trail, and the proposed California Delta Trail. There may be interest in seeking enhanced local input requirements for developing the Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Bay Area mandated by SB 375 for greenhouse gas reduction. It is important that the regional coordination efforts are based on input gathered from the local level, to*

ensure the regional approach does not negatively impact local communities. "Top-down" regional planning efforts would be inconsistent with this goal.

120. SUPPORT efforts to improve safety throughout the transportation system. *The County supports new and expanded projects and programs to improve safety for bicyclists, pedestrians and wheelchair users, as well as projects to improve safety on high-accident transportation facilities such as Vasco Road. Data on transportation safety would be improved by including global positioning system (GPS) location data for every reported accident to assist in safety analysis and planning. The County also supports school safety improvement programs such as crossing guards, Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) grants, efforts to improve the safety and security of freight transportation system including public and private maritime ports, airports, rail yards, railroad lines and sidings. The County also supports limits or elimination of public liability for installing traffic-calming devices on residential neighborhood streets.*
121. SUPPORT funding or incentives for the use of renewable resources in transportation construction projects. *The County seeks and supports grant programs, tax credits for manufacturers, state purchasing programs, and other incentives for local jurisdictions to use environmentally friendly materials such as the rubberized asphalt (made from recycled tires) that the County has used as paving material on San Pablo Dam Road and Pacheco Boulevard.*
122. SUPPORT streamlining the delivery of transportation safety projects. *The length of time and amount of paperwork should be reduced to bring a transportation safety project more quickly through the planning, engineering and design, environmental review, funding application, and construction phases, such as for Vasco Road. This could include streamlining the environmental review process and also streamlining all state permitting requirements that pertain to transportation projects. Realistic deadlines for use of federal transportation funds would help local jurisdictions deliver complex projects without running afoul of federal time limits which are unrealistically tight for complex projects.*
123. SUPPORT efforts to coordinate development of state-funded facilities such as courts, schools, jails and state offices with local planning. *The County supports coordinating planning between school districts and local jurisdictions in locating and planning new schools and funding programs that foster collaboration to help finance off-site transportation improvements for access to schools.*
124. SUPPORT regional aviation transportation planning efforts for coordinated aviation network planning to improve service delivery. *Regional aviation coordination could also improve the surrounding surface transportation system by providing expanded local options for people and goods movement.*
125. SUPPORT efforts to increase waterborne transport of goods and obtaining funds to support this effort. *The San Francisco to Stockton Ship Channel is a major*

transportation route for the region, providing water access to a large number of industries and the Ports of Sacramento and Stockton. A project is underway to deepen the channel, providing additional capacity to accommodate increasing commerce needs of the Ports and providing better operational flexibility for the other industries. Increased goods movement via waterways has clear benefits to congestion management on highways and railroads (with resultant air quality benefits).

126. *SUPPORT legislative efforts to re-authorize Vasco Road as a Double-Fine Zone and to add the Double-Fine Zone designation to the State Route 4 Bypass. SB 3 (Torlakson, 2006) established a Double Fine Zone (DFZ) for Vasco Road. Additionally, in the wake of a number of similar legislative requests, SB 3 became the focus of specific legislative direction to provide a standard set of criteria and terms governing DFZ's, while approving the extension of the Vasco Road DFZ through 2010.*

Waste Management

127. *SUPPORT legislation that establishes producer responsibility for management of their products at the end of their useful life.*
128. *SUPPORT legislation that would make changes to the used tire redemption program. Instead of collecting a disposal fee from the consumer when new tires are purchased, a disposal fee would be collected at the wholesale level and redeemed by the disposal site when the used tires are brought to the site. The party bringing the tires to the disposal site would also receive a portion of the fee.*
129. *SUPPORT efforts to increase the development of markets for recycled materials.*

EXHIBIT A -- Redevelopment Agency Project/Program Status Report

			Commitment Driver			Source	
			Budget	Business Agreement	Legal	Tax Increment	Bonds
Contra Costa Centre							
Hookston Relocation		\$600,000			x	x	
Placemaking - Civic Use/Bike Station		\$1,750,000		x		x	
Station Enhancement		\$725,000	x	x		x	
Areawide Infrastructure		\$1,000,000	x			x	
Hookston HazMat		\$500,000			x	x	
Wayfinding	\$645,000		x			x	
Hookston Landscaping	\$50,000		x			x	
Iron Horse Overcrossing		\$75,000		x		x	
Transit Village Technical Consultants		\$50,000	x	x		x	
North Richmond							
Specific Plan Implementation		\$1,900,000	x				x
Third Street Enhancements		\$311,677	x	x			x
CHDC Office Expansion		\$150,000	x			x	
Industrial Area Infrastructure		\$3,000,000	x				x
Truck Route Implementation		\$6,000,000	x				x
Heritage Point Predevelopment		\$210,000	x			x	
Heritage Point Land Assemblage		\$833,000	x	x		x	x
Enterprise Zone Application		\$50,000	x			x	
Los Deltas Reuse		\$40,000	x			x	
Industrial Area General Plan Amend		\$150,000	x			x	
Parkway Tot Lot	\$50,000		x			x	
Abatement Revolving Loan Fund	\$25,000		x			x	
Blight Removal Activities	\$10,000		x			x	
Community Preservation		\$265,000	x			x	
Homebuyer Resale Revolving Loan		\$209,000	x			x	
Bay Point							
Orbisonia Heights Land Assembly		\$2,473,000	x	x		x	x
BART Specific Plan Infrastructure		\$420,000	x				x
Enterprise Zone Marketing		\$15,000	x	x		x	
Youth homes		\$310,000	x		x	x	
Homebuyer Resale Transaction costs		\$219,000	x			x	
Community Preservation		\$25,000	x			x	
Rodeo							
Parker Ave Capitalized Maintenance	\$60,000		x	x		x	
Rodeo Creek Improvements		\$200,000	x	x			x
Downtown Infrastructure		\$4,700,000	x				x
Waterfront HazMat Remediation		\$40,000	x	x		x	
Waterfront Infrastructure	\$1,200,000		x	x			x
Community Preservation		\$470,183	x			x	x
Town Plaza Mixed-Use Project		\$1,741,000	x			x	x
Montalvin Manor							
San Pablo Ave./Kay Road Ped Impvts		\$776,751	x	x			x
Totals			\$2,040,000	\$29,208,611			

2010-11 AB8 Apportionment Factors FY 2009-10 Pass-Through Revenues

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Gross Revenue</u>	<u>RDA Increment</u>	<u>Net Revenue</u>	<u>FY 2009-10 Pass-Through Est</u>	<u>Contra Costa County</u>
100300	County General	187,956,276.13	(20,542,788.47)	167,413,487.66	5,040,448.00	(15,502,340.47)
120600	County Library	20,948,038.25	(2,217,284.60)	18,730,753.65	539,690.00	(1,677,594.60)
202000	CCC Fire Protection	92,741,023.52	(15,085,377.81)	77,655,645.71	3,126,813.00	(11,958,564.81)
202800	Crockett Carquinez Fire	401,960.23	0.00	401,960.23		0.00
240100	Service Area L-100	841,520.44	(104,362.89)	737,157.55	65.00	(104,297.89)
247000	Service Area M-1	29,248.60	0.00	29,248.60		0.00
247500	Service Area M-29	51,983.64	0.00	51,983.64		0.00
248800	Service Area M-16 Clyde	20,512.38	0.00	20,512.38		0.00
248900	Service Area M-17 Montalvin	137,221.15	(3,796.34)	133,424.81		(3,796.34)
249200	Service Area M-20 Rodeo	9,205.30	0.00	9,205.30		0.00
249400	Svc Area RD4Bethel Isle	6,498.44	0.00	6,498.44		0.00
249600	Svc Area M23 Blackhawk	1,711,299.94	0.00	1,711,299.94		0.00
250500	Flood Control CCC Water	2,626,132.56	(284,110.52)	2,342,022.04	93,625.00	(190,485.52)
252000	Flood Control Zone 3B	4,277,692.32	(333,924.59)	3,943,767.73	6,310.00	(327,614.59)
252100	Flood Cont Z1 Marsh Crk	1,324,660.63	(111,368.80)	1,213,291.83		(111,368.80)
252700	Flood Control Zone 7	97,722.02	(49,570.33)	48,151.69	2,843.00	(46,727.33)
253000	Flood Control Zone 8	20,931.93	(5,684.91)	15,247.02		(5,684.91)
253100	Flood Control Zone 8A	28,726.18	(9,196.19)	19,529.99		(9,196.19)
255000	Flood Cont Drainage 290	1,361.17	0.00	1,361.17		0.00
255100	Flood Cont Drainage 300	3,217.07	0.00	3,217.07		0.00
255200	Flood Cont Drainage A13	237,647.29	0.00	237,647.29		0.00
255400	Flood Cont Drainage 10	280,043.69	(36,343.84)	243,699.85	11,624.00	(24,719.84)
256300	Flood Cont Drainage 127	16,784.93	(6,729.96)	10,054.97	420.00	(6,309.96)
258300	Flood Cont Drainage 16	59,477.71	0.00	59,477.71		0.00
265200	S/A Pl 2 Danville	7,018.39	0.00	7,018.39		0.00
265300	S/A Pl-2 Zone A	114,843.08	0.00	114,843.08		0.00
265500	S/A Pl 5 Round Hill	196,609.55	0.00	196,609.55		0.00
265600	S/A Pl 6	3,297,103.17	(169,472.88)	3,127,630.29	2,012.00	(167,460.88)
265700	S/A Pl-2 Zone B	137,305.82	0.00	137,305.82		0.00
270200	S/A Lib-2 El Sobrante	81,654.50	(0.33)	81,654.17		(0.33)
271000	S/A Lib-10 Pinole	936.17	0.00	936.17		0.00
271200	S/A Lib-12 Moraga	8,794.61	0.00	8,794.61		0.00
271300	S/A Lib-13 Ygnacio	108,487.03	0.00	108,487.03		0.00
275100	Svc Area R-4 Moraga	25,684.04	0.00	25,684.04		0.00
275800	Svc Area R-7 Zone A	815,506.55	0.00	815,506.55		0.00
282500	Co Co Co Water Agency	502,481.50	(55,761.50)	446,720.00	255.00	(55,506.50)
			(39,015,773.96)	280,109,835.97	8,824,105.00	(30,191,668.96)
300500	San Ramon Valley Fire	49,858,569.17	(1,609,392.26)	48,249,176.91		(1,609,392.26)
300700	Kensington Fire	2,788,828.85	0.00	2,788,828.85		0.00
301100	Rodeo-Hercules Fire	3,712,602.97	(1,013,496.22)	2,699,106.75		(1,013,496.22)
306000	East Contra Costa Fire	8,765,376.29	(520,652.70)	8,244,723.59		(520,652.70)
307400	Moraga-Orinda Fire	16,682,175.77	0.00	16,682,175.77		0.00
310200	Co Co Resource Cons	206,481.68	(18,407.54)	188,074.14		(18,407.54)
324000	Crockett Community Svcs	253,074.79	0.00	253,074.79		0.00
325500	Kensington Community Svc	1,255,706.66	0.00	1,255,706.66		0.00
326000	Diablo Community Svc	314,197.01	0.00	314,197.01		0.00
330100	CCC Mosquito Abate Dst1	3,811,018.06	(368,287.55)	3,442,730.51		(368,287.55)
340600	Central CC Sanitary	12,559,304.84	(626,461.98)	11,932,842.86		(626,461.98)
340900	Mt View Sanitary	278,521.68	0.00	278,521.68		0.00
341100	Ironhouse Sanitary	210,146.77	(25,309.91)	184,836.86		(25,309.91)
341400	Rodeo Sanitary	304,255.82	(96,298.66)	207,957.16		(96,298.66)
341600	West Sanitary	1,117,756.40	(261,337.53)	856,418.87		(261,337.53)
341800	Steger Sanitary	361,493.58	(43,824.83)	317,668.75		(43,824.83)
342200	Byron Sanitary	23,809.43	0.00	23,809.43		0.00
343000	Twn of Discovery Bay (Comm Svc Dis	460,842.65	0.00	460,842.65		0.00

2010-11 AB8 Apportionment Factors FY 2009-10 Pass-Through Revenues

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Gross Revenue</u>	<u>RDA Increment</u>	<u>Net Revenue</u>	<u>FY 2009-10 Pass-Through Est</u>	<u>Contra Costa County</u>
348000	Delta Diablo Z1 W Pittsburg	540,244.03	(230,875.79)	309,368.24		(230,875.79)
348100	Delta Diablo Z2 Pittsburg	1,235,438.48	(835,097.32)	400,341.16		(835,097.32)
348200	Delta Diablo Z3 Antioch	973,311.67	(159,116.61)	814,195.06		(159,116.61)
351500	Los Medanos Healthcare	1,307,440.65	(719,181.53)	588,259.12		(719,181.53)
352000	Mt Diablo Healthcare	284,742.02	(41,659.26)	243,082.76		(41,659.26)
352500	West CCC Healthcare	3,543,932.35	(764,893.26)	2,779,039.09		(764,893.26)
360100	Alamo-Lafayette Cemetery	229,772.72	(7,040.46)	222,732.26		(7,040.46)
360300	B B K Union Cemetery	394,998.22	(23,769.61)	371,228.61		(23,769.61)
370000	Ambrose Rec & Park	611,371.39	(248,095.65)	363,275.74		(248,095.65)
371500	Green Valley Rec & Park	39,580.59	0.00	39,580.59		0.00
373500	Pleasant Hill Rec & Park	3,023,259.82	(520,625.09)	2,502,634.73		(520,625.09)
374000	Rolling-Willart Rec&Park	19,469.85	0.00	19,469.85		0.00
377000	Bethel Isle Muni Imp	396,247.94	0.00	396,247.94		0.00
380300	Co Co Co Water	2,430,432.61	(385,806.52)	2,044,626.09		(385,806.52)
383000	Castle Rock Co Water	11,069.70	0.00	11,069.70		0.00
400100	East Bay Muni Utility	11,700,912.65	(1,046,758.65)	10,654,154.00		(1,046,758.65)
400200	EBMUD Special District 1	337,714.16	(40,754.09)	296,960.07		(40,754.09)
400700	A-C Transit Spec Dist 1	8,155,442.75	(1,553,465.33)	6,601,977.42		(1,553,465.33)
400900	BART	9,463,645.39	(1,022,442.70)	8,441,202.69		(1,022,442.70)
401000	Bay Area Air Poll Cont	2,758,562.28	(298,077.40)	2,460,484.88		(298,077.40)
401600	Ed Phys Handic'd Elem	4,469.61	0.00	4,469.61		0.00
401800	Livermore Jt Unified	213,983.18	0.00	213,983.18		0.00
402000	Chabot-Las Positas Comm College	232,302.74	0.00	232,302.74		0.00
402200	Dev Ctr Handi'd Minor	800.12	0.00	800.12		0.00
402500	Dublin San Ramon Svc	419,139.79	0.00	419,139.79		0.00
402600	East Bay Regional Park	41,138,286.51	(4,614,939.11)	36,523,347.40		(4,614,939.11)
402900	Trainable M.R. Alameda	2,016.16	0.00	2,016.16		0.00
411000	Reclamation Dist 800 Exp	640,787.11	0.00	640,787.11		0.00
411100	Discovery Bay Recl/Drng	35,035.06	0.00	35,035.06		0.00
418000	East Co Co Irrigation	2,255,922.93	(209,363.01)	2,046,559.92		(209,363.01)
418100	Byron-Bethany Irrigation	801,556.09	0.00	801,556.09		0.00
420100	City of Clayton	1,090,245.73	(346,266.97)	743,978.76		(346,266.97)
420200	City of Concord	12,585,844.39	(1,693,266.20)	10,892,578.19		(1,693,266.20)
420300	City of Brentwood	7,184,078.60	(776,472.61)	6,407,605.99		(776,472.61)
420400	City of San Pablo	1,241,824.98	(919,943.40)	321,881.58		(919,943.40)
420500	City of El Cerrito	6,710,562.36	(1,082,596.39)	5,627,965.97		(1,082,596.39)
420600	City of Walnut Creek	11,376,064.91	(347,946.29)	11,028,118.62		(347,946.29)
420700	City of Pleasant Hill	2,532,400.01	(243,544.10)	2,288,855.91		(243,544.10)
420800	City of Martinez	6,439,837.14	0.00	6,439,837.14		0.00
420900	City of Antioch	7,951,209.62	(862,227.82)	7,088,981.80		(862,227.82)
421000	City of Pittsburg	8,837,007.51	(6,201,527.91)	2,635,479.60		(6,201,527.91)
421100	City of Hercules	1,452,126.58	(532,707.45)	919,419.13		(532,707.45)
421200	City of Pinole	3,424,976.73	(1,683,693.13)	1,741,283.60		(1,683,693.13)
421300	Richmond Tax District 1	23,445,268.75	(4,262,129.03)	19,183,139.72		(4,262,129.03)
421400	City of Lafayette	3,660,121.91	(239,595.58)	3,420,526.33		(239,595.58)
421500	Town of Moraga	1,556,174.19	0.00	1,556,174.19		0.00
421600	Town of Danville	7,121,588.84	(196,554.00)	6,925,034.84		(196,554.00)
421700	City of San Ramon	11,963,889.01	(622,345.84)	11,341,543.17		(622,345.84)
421800	City of Orinda	3,535,147.51	0.00	3,535,147.51		0.00
421900	City of Oakley	1,777,766.85	(207,826.28)	1,569,940.57		(207,826.28)
422700	Richmond Tax District 3	7,181,586.09	(245,980.88)	6,935,605.21		(245,980.88)
423000	Richmond Sewer 1	211,310.62	(40,906.91)	170,403.71		(40,906.91)
423100	Brentwood Rec & Park	1,488,404.23	(178,881.06)	1,309,523.17		(178,881.06)
423200	San Ramon M-29	1,908,360.89	0.00	1,908,360.89		0.00
424000	Pleasant Hill Lgt Dist 1	409,168.74	(37,170.13)	371,998.61		(37,170.13)
424100	Walnut Creek/Svc Area R-8	468,057.18	(14,541.15)	453,516.03		(14,541.15)

2010-11 AB8 Apportionment Factors FY 2009-10 Pass-Through Revenues

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Gross Revenue</u>	<u>RDA Increment</u>	<u>Net Revenue</u>	<u>FY 2009-10 Pass-Through Est</u>	<u>Contra Costa County</u>
424800	Clayton Light Mtce 1	32,739.45	(5,413.60)	27,325.85		(5,413.60)
425200	Martinez Pine Ridge Mtce	5,577.80	0.00	5,577.80		0.00
425300	Martinez Parking Dist 1	55,239.63	0.00	55,239.63		0.00
426300	Lafayette Core Area Mtc	125,384.73	(63,299.51)	62,085.22		(63,299.51)
426400	Lafayette St Lt Mtce Z1	7,777.35	(621.47)	7,155.88		(621.47)
427100	Concord Vly Terr StLtMtc	2,753.69	0.00	2,753.69		0.00
427200	Concord Kirkwood Mtce 1	40,818.50	0.00	40,818.50		0.00
427400	Concord Blhn Terr St Lt	736.10	0.00	736.10		0.00
427500	Pl Hill-Diablo Vista Wtr	139,080.04	0.00	139,080.04		0.00
428000	Antioch Parking Mtce 1A	22,541.37	(562.27)	21,979.10		(562.27)
428500	Moraga St Lt Mtce 1	115,685.48	0.00	115,685.48		0.00
429400	Oakley Police Services	307,502.90	(32,857.18)	274,645.72		(32,857.18)
470100	Antioch	0.00	4,309,336.85	4,309,336.85		4,309,336.85
470200	Antioch Project 2	0.00	1,029,319.59	1,029,319.59		1,029,319.59
470300	Antioch Project 3	0.00	43,263.46	43,263.46		43,263.46
470400	Antioch Project 4	0.00	1,187,153.49	1,187,153.49		1,187,153.49
470500	Antioch Project 4 Amd 1	0.00	625,570.57	625,570.57		625,570.57
470600	Brentwood Project	0.00	1,783,619.77	1,783,619.77		1,783,619.77
470700	Brentwood Amendment 1	0.00	693,390.55	693,390.55		693,390.55
470800	North Brentwood	0.00	2,984,476.79	2,984,476.79		2,984,476.79
470900	North Brentwood Amd 2	0.00	306,503.64	306,503.64		306,503.64
471000	Central Concord	0.00	14,765,102.04	14,765,102.04		14,765,102.04
471100	Concord Commerce	0.00	540,637.87	540,637.87		540,637.87
471200	Cent Concord RDA Amnd	0.00	494,048.94	494,048.94		494,048.94
471400	Clayton	0.00	5,063,460.42	5,063,460.42		5,063,460.42
471600	Hercules Dynamite	0.00	5,750,131.36	5,750,131.36		5,750,131.36
471700	Hercules Project 2	0.00	3,854,302.92	3,854,302.92		3,854,302.92
471800	Hercules Merged Dyn & Proj2	0.00	144,785.89	144,785.89		144,785.89
472000	El Cerrito	0.00	4,868,049.28	4,868,049.28		4,868,049.28
472100	El Cerrito Area II	0.00	1,599.25	1,599.25		1,599.25
472500	Pinole Vista	0.00	5,496,674.97	5,496,674.97		5,496,674.97
472600	Pinole Vista 81	0.00	3,493,540.59	3,493,540.59		3,493,540.59
472800	Oakley Project 2	0.00	100,996.72	100,996.72		100,996.72
473000	Pittsburg Marina	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
473100	Pittsburg Riverside	0.00	262,387.79	262,387.79		262,387.79
473200	Pittsburg Neighborhood I	0.00	948,091.27	948,091.27		948,091.27
473300	Pittsburg Neighborhood II	0.00	418,753.84	418,753.84		418,753.84
473400	Pittsburg/Los Medanos I	0.00	22,167,860.36	22,167,860.36		22,167,860.36
473500	Pittsburg/Los Medanos II	0.00	3,175,079.83	3,175,079.83		3,175,079.83
473600	Pittsburg/Los Medanos III	0.00	9,890,619.88	9,890,619.88		9,890,619.88
473700	Richmond 8A - 2000 Amd	0.00	784,759.31	784,759.31		784,759.31
473800	Richmond 10A - 2000 Amd	0.00	668,256.09	668,256.09		668,256.09
473900	Richmond 1A - 2000 Amd	0.00	114,826.82	114,826.82		114,826.82
474000	Richmond 1A	0.00	333,147.58	333,147.58		333,147.58
474100	Richmond 8A	0.00	699,220.88	699,220.88		699,220.88
474200	Richmond 10A	0.00	690,815.41	690,815.41		690,815.41
474300	Richmond 10B	0.00	53,312.99	53,312.99		53,312.99
474400	Richmond 11A	0.00	9,723,055.38	9,723,055.38		9,723,055.38
474500	Richmond 12A	0.00	56,801.33	56,801.33		56,801.33
474600	Richmond 8A Henley	0.00	50,913.64	50,913.64		50,913.64
474700	Richmond 1B	0.00	89,683.45	89,683.45		89,683.45
474800	Richmond 1C	0.00	870,821.56	870,821.56		870,821.56
474900	Richmond 3A	0.00	806,898.26	806,898.26		806,898.26
475000	Walnut Creek-So Broadway	0.00	912,161.55	912,161.55		912,161.55
475100	Walnut Creek-Mt Diablo	0.00	2,713,830.23	2,713,830.23		2,713,830.23

2010-11 AB8 Apportionment Factors FY 2009-10 Pass-Through Revenues

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Gross Revenue</u>	<u>RDA Increment</u>	<u>Net Revenue</u>	<u>FY 2009-10 Pass-Through Est</u>	<u>Contra Costa County</u>
475200	Richmond 6A - 2000 Amd	0.00	21,145.81	21,145.81		21,145.81
475300	Richmond 10B - 2000 Amd	0.00	12,804.34	12,804.34		12,804.34
475400	Richmond 6A AMND 1	0.00	387,573.68	387,573.68		387,573.68
475500	Richmond 6A	0.00	542,096.67	542,096.67		542,096.67
475600	Danville Downtown	0.00	2,514,218.64	2,514,218.64		2,514,218.64
475700	Richmond 11A - 2000 Amd	0.00	9,734.97	9,734.97		9,734.97
475800	Richmond 10B - 2006 Amd	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
476000	San Pablo-So Entrance	0.00	346,911.75	346,911.75		346,911.75
476100	San Pablo-El Portal	0.00	1,994,578.61	1,994,578.61		1,994,578.61
476200	San Pablo-El Portal 79	0.00	2,390,816.16	2,390,816.16		2,390,816.16
476300	San Pablo-Oak Park	0.00	795,978.23	795,978.23		795,978.23
476400	San Pablo-Sheffield	0.00	281,938.39	281,938.39		281,938.39
476500	San Pablo-Bayview	0.00	1,405,636.34	1,405,636.34		1,405,636.34
476600	San Pablo-El Portal 80	0.00	1,152,695.99	1,152,695.99		1,152,695.99
476700	San Pablo-Oak Park 79	0.00	51,235.08	51,235.08		51,235.08
476800	San Pablo-Bayview 80	0.00	122,049.67	122,049.67		122,049.67
476900	San Pablo-Legacy	0.00	826,975.84	826,975.84		826,975.84
477000	Pleasant Hill Commons	0.00	2,767,749.59	2,767,749.59		2,767,749.59
477100	Pleasant Hill Commons 1A	0.00	90,972.81	90,972.81		90,972.81
477200	Plsnt Hill Schoolyard Anx	0.00	882,659.23	882,659.23		882,659.23
477300	Pleasant Hill Commons 2001	0.00	743,866.85	743,866.85		743,866.85
477400	Pleasant Hill Commons 2009 Amd	0.00	18,970.67	18,970.67		18,970.67
477500	Lafayette	0.00	3,895,955.34	3,895,955.34		3,895,955.34
477700	San Ramon	0.00	8,682,977.01	8,682,977.01		8,682,977.01
478000	CoCoCo Pleasnt Hill BART	0.00	7,253,120.62	7,253,120.62		7,253,120.62
478100	CoCoCo West Pittsburg	0.00	2,191,507.25	2,191,507.25		2,191,507.25
478200	CoCoCo North Richmond	0.00	1,940,528.18	1,940,528.18		1,940,528.18
478300	CoCoCo Pl H/BART Amnd 1	0.00	874,402.60	874,402.60		874,402.60
478400	Oakley RDA	0.00	2,624,095.60	2,624,095.60		2,624,095.60
478500	CoCoCo Rodeo	0.00	1,711,301.19	1,711,301.19		1,711,301.19
478600	CoCoCo Montalvin	0.00	126,833.66	126,833.66		126,833.66
500100	Acalanes Union Hi Gen	32,442,414.05	(1,535,258.17)	30,907,155.88		(1,535,258.17)
510100	Canyon Elementary Gen	64,878.35	(1,438.32)	63,440.03		(1,438.32)
520100	Lafayette Elementary Gen	12,642,411.96	(723,557.05)	11,918,854.91		(723,557.05)
530100	Moraga Elementary Gen	6,013,533.20	(110,697.65)	5,902,835.55		(110,697.65)
540100	Orinda Elementary Gen	7,743,467.78	(134,161.76)	7,609,306.02		(134,161.76)
550100	Walnut Creek Elem Gen	15,838,853.99	(976,217.15)	14,862,636.84		(976,217.15)
600100	Liberty Union Hi Gen	18,859,655.46	(1,176,359.74)	17,683,295.72		(1,176,359.74)
610100	Brentwood Elem Gen	10,267,888.20	(745,568.47)	9,522,319.73		(745,568.47)
620100	Byron Elementary Gen	3,083,430.71	(56,469.00)	3,026,961.71		(56,469.00)
630100	Knighten Elementary Gen	1,098,587.15	(120,894.59)	977,692.56		(120,894.59)
640100	Oakley Elementary Gen	7,879,422.14	(542,427.69)	7,336,994.45		(542,427.69)
690100	County Schools Gen	23,544,134.56	(2,382,018.06)	21,162,116.50		(2,382,018.06)
699900	K-12 ERAF	192,714,171.39	(21,296,846.17)	171,417,325.22		(21,296,846.17)
710100	Antioch Unified Gen	23,407,796.07	(2,956,330.84)	20,451,465.23		(2,956,330.84)
720100	John Swett Unified Gen	6,281,453.05	(346,366.00)	5,935,087.05		(346,366.00)
740100	Martinez Unified Gen	14,500,852.56	0.00	14,500,852.56		0.00
750100	Mt Diablo Unified Gen	96,261,107.16	(11,516,523.13)	84,744,584.03		(11,516,523.13)
760100	Pittsburg Unified Gen	12,065,923.95	(7,924,039.30)	4,141,884.65		(7,924,039.30)
770100	West Contra Costa Unified Gen	66,940,495.80	(15,659,215.43)	51,281,280.37		(15,659,215.43)
780100	San Ramon Valley Unified Gen	111,243,808.32	(3,620,167.66)	107,623,640.66		(3,620,167.66)
790100	Co Co Comm College Gen	69,318,572.71	(7,472,588.49)	61,845,984.22		(7,472,588.49)
799900	Community College ERAF	<u>28,693,544.50</u>	<u>(3,171,366.82)</u>	<u>25,522,177.68</u>		<u>(3,171,366.82)</u>
		<u>1,412,606,924.39</u>	0.00	<u>1,412,606,924.39</u>	8,824,105.00	8,824,105.00



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: David Twa, County Administrator
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: 2010/11 FY MID-YEAR BUDGET STATUS REPORT

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ACCEPT report regarding the mid-year status of the 2010/11 County Budget.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This report is informational and will be used for planning purposes and budget development. Additional recommendations will be presented to the Board during Budget Hearings on April 12, 2011.

BACKGROUND:

The Administrator's Office annually reports the status of the Budget as of December 31 to determine whether departmental expenses and revenues to date are consistent with the spending plan adopted, and amended from time to time, by the Board of Supervisors. Mid-year reviews provide an opportunity to identify variances from anticipated expenditures and revenue receipts, and permit budget staff to confer with departments regarding the potential need for budgetary adjustments. The following report is a status of the current year – a FY 2011/12 update on potential State Budget impacts will be presented in early March.

The mid-year budget status report is important in that it is based on a sufficient amount of experience during the budget year to permit a reasonably accurate assessment of how closely actual expenses and revenues are likely to track with the approved budget.

Our review of departmental budgets at this mid-year juncture suggests that departmental expenditures and revenues are performing substantially in accord with expectations and are projected to exceed the FY 2010/11 Adjusted Budget only in those areas noted below. However, as noted later in this report, there are several large variables which are affecting this projection. The Board is not being asked to take any corrective action at this time. Recommendations will be made as part of the Budget Hearings on April 12. This assessment could change based on intervening factors – e.g., revenue curtailments or program shifts by the State – that could affect current year costs and revenues and further substantially impact in a negative way our outlook for the ensuing fiscal year.

This report provides an overview of the status of the County's FY 2010/2011 Budget as of December 31, 2010. Included in this report are tables that summarize the County's General Fund mid-year fiscal condition (Attachments A, B, and C).

As of December 31, 2010, with 50% of the fiscal year having passed, actual expenditures for all County funds totaled 42.9% of planned spending, while actual revenues totaled 42.8% of amounts anticipated for the year. These figures compare favorably to 45.3% and 44.5% respectively for the same period last year. Comparison data for the same period in prior years are 45.6% and 43.6% in fiscal year 2008/09, 44.5% and 47.9% in fiscal year 2007/08, 43.8% and 45.5% in fiscal year 2006/07, and 42.6% and 44.2% in fiscal year 2005/06.

For the General Fund alone, actual expenditures totaled 47.0% of planned spending, and actual revenues totaled 36.3% of amounts anticipated for the year. As with all funds, these figures compare favorably to 47.7% and 36.9% respectively for the same period last year. Comparison data for the same period in prior years are 50.1% and 37.7% in fiscal year 2008/09, 47.5% and 39.0% in fiscal year 2007/08, 47.0% and 39.7% in fiscal year 2006/07, and 46.4% and 38.6% in fiscal year

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Contact: Lisa Driscoll, County Finance
Director 925-335-1023

By: June McHuen, Deputy

2006/07. Mid-year actual figures over time reflect continued tightening budgets. The specific dollar amounts were as follows:

ALL FUNDS			
Second Quarter Summary			
	Budget	Actual	Percent
Expenditures	\$ 2,346,988,007	\$ 1,006,323,371	42.9%
Revenues	\$ 2,165,183,077	\$ 925,926,046	42.8%
GENERAL FUND			
Second Quarter Summary			
	Budget	Actual	Percent
Expenditures	\$ 1,241,609,635	\$ 583,925,946	47.0%
Revenues	\$ 1,216,186,884	\$ 440,906,538	36.3%
GENERAL FUND			
Second Quarter Expenditure Summary			
	Budget	Actual	Percent
Wages & Benefits	668,060,954	314,832,711	47.1%
Services & Supplies	395,581,280	178,219,754	45.1%
Other Charges	251,414,692	127,653,223	50.8%
Fixed Assets	11,545,258	2,369,626	20.5%
Inter-departmental Charges	(84,992,549)	(39,149,829)	46.1%
Contingencies	0	461	0.0%
Total Expenses	\$ 1,241,609,635	\$ 583,925,946	47.0%
GENERAL FUND			
Second Quarter Revenue Summary			
	Budget	Actual	Percent
Taxes	\$ 272,861,239	\$ 170,247,923	62.4%
Licenses, Permits, Franchises	13,847,023	2,944,590	21.3%
Fines, Forfeitures, Penalties	17,483,518	2,070,532	11.8%
Use of Money & Property	3,808,981	1,227,875	32.2%
Federal/State Assistance	575,115,586	159,466,969	27.7%
Charges for Current Services	224,832,372	72,910,132	32.4%
Other Revenue	108,238,165	32,038,517	29.6%
Total Revenues	\$ 1,216,186,884	\$ 440,906,538	36.3%

As noted above, County expenditures and revenues at mid-year were within acceptable parameters given the Board approved budget. The difference between budgeted expenditures and revenues are due to prior year encumbrances, restricted reserves, and other carry forwards. The variances in anticipated expenses and revenue receipts are noted at the mid-year; the majority of this variance was anticipated due to the Board's decision to fund certain programs temporarily using reserves.

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

Revenues

- Revenue from State and federal sources are typically late in being realized because much of it is based on expenditure claims paid in arrears. Normally departments that rely on State and federal revenue experience a two to three-month lag in revenues. State actions continue to significantly increase these delays.
- As was the case during the last several fiscal years, cash-flow and interest income have been impacted due to the State's delay in payments. The direct impact on revenue for fiscal year 2010/11 thus far has been the posting of negative interest to the General Fund due to lack of cash. This was exacerbated by the County not selling tax revenue anticipation notes (TRANS) again this year due to unfavorable market conditions.

Expenditures

- Normally salary costs are understated at mid-year. Unanticipated vacant positions lessen salary costs, though vacancy savings continue to lag behind prior years. Some reduction in permanent salary costs is anticipated in the second half of the fiscal year due to retirements, which tend to occur in March, however, the majority of this savings will be spent in retiree pay-outs. The most significant savings are from negotiated furlough days.
- Employee benefit costs are understated at mid-year because the budget includes appropriations for health insurance cost increases that did not become effective until the end of the second quarter, December 31, 2010. Actual expenses for employee health insurance will increase the second half of the year.
- Service and supplies costs are generally understated throughout most of the fiscal year because of the time required to process payments to vendors and contractors. This payment cycle averages one month in arrears. Additionally, in very tight fiscal years – as this one is – departments tend to wait later in the year to make purchases to ensure that resources are not needed elsewhere.

General Purpose Revenue

General Purpose budgeted revenues total \$310 million (down from \$349 million two years ago) spread over approximately 50 accounts. It consists primarily of \$255.1 million in taxes for current property. Of the taxes for current property, \$153.0 million is current secured, \$1 million is supplemental, \$5.8 million is unitary, \$88.9 million is Property Tax in Lieu of Vehicle License Fees (from non-realignment vehicle license fees) and \$6.5 million is current unsecured. Other significant budgeted revenue is real property transfer tax (\$5.0 million), sales tax (\$11.2 million), and interest income (\$1 million). Based on six months of experience, General Purpose Revenues are not expected to meet budgeted levels. This projection is contingent upon several factors. All of these factors are affected by the economy and housing market.

In summary, the over-all County General Fund budget is balanced due to the appropriation and use of reserves. However, the following departments are currently projected to exceed their General Fund allocations:

Employment and Human Services Department

The Employment and Human Services Department is anticipated to end the current fiscal year within its budget allocations. However, the General Assistance program is anticipated to be overspent by approximately \$3.2 million. This over expenditure is the result of increased caseloads and payments required under the Lugo, et.al vs. Contra Costa County settlement agreement. The Department is able to cover this increased expense in the current year due to a significant number of unanticipated vacancies. However, the Department is anticipating a \$3.7 million deficit in this program during the 2011-12 fiscal year for which there are no identified funding sources. Due to increased costs in this entitlement program which are not funded, the Department will eliminate or reduce services to other essential programs.

EHSD provides funding for board and care costs of children in out-of-home placements under AB3632. Due to

the Governor's line item veto of funding for AB3632 services in the State budget, the Department is working with school districts to cover the cost of board and care in the current year. However, the County may be responsible for these costs depending on the outcome of pending litigation. Reimbursement for portions of these costs is claimed through the SB90 process. The elimination of SB90 funding in the 2010/11 State budget will delay the receipt of \$3.2 million for fiscal years 2006/07 through 2009/10.

Health Services (\$750,000)

The Mental Health Division of the Health Services Department is anticipated to end the current fiscal year with a General Fund budget shortfall of approximately \$750,000. This shortfall is due to the elimination of funding in the 2010/11 State budget for the AB3632 program. The AB3632 program provides mental health services to school age children. On October 8, 2010 Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger vetoed the funding for these services and lifted the mandate on California counties to provide those services. However, it is questionable whether the Governor had the authority to relieve counties from providing the mandated services. Contra Costa County, along with 39 other counties, has filed for relief from the mandate since it is unfunded as a result of the Governor's veto. This legal action is under consideration and review by the Sacramento Superior Court. In addition, it is possible that the State Legislature could provide a remedy to counties through separate legislation. Depending upon the outcome of these legal or legislative remedies, the total amount of the shortfall could be less.

In addition, reimbursement for a portion of the cost of AB3632 services to non-Medi-Cal children is claimed through the SB90 Mandated Services process. The elimination of funding in the 2010/11 State budget will delay the receipt of \$9.5 million in claims for fiscal years 2007/08 through 2009/10.

Probation Department (\$1.1 million)

The Probation Department continues to be impacted by projected shortfalls in estimated revenue in the amount of \$1.2 million. This is primarily composed of \$850K in Vehicle License Fee revenue (\$450K in Juvenile Probation and \$400K in Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act), \$225K in sales tax realignment revenue and a reduction of \$150K in an Office of Traffic Safety Felony DUI grant. This revenue shortfall is largely mitigated by projected cost savings of \$1.1 million in salaries and benefits due to prudent personnel management by the County Probation Officer and favorable concessions made by our labor partners. The remaining departmental shortfall is increased by approximately \$1.0 million; \$400K from placing Wards out of county, \$200K from increased juvenile medical costs, \$200K from elimination of the Service Integration Team and \$200K from county foster care aid (not eligible for State or Federal reimbursement). The Probation Department will attempt to achieve current year cost savings through early implementation of fiscal year 2011/12 service reductions.

Public Defender (\$700,000)

The Public Defender continues to experience operational difficulties from reduced attorney staff and retirement of senior attorneys resulting in the department referring certain caseloads to the Contra Costa County Bar Association. Though the caseload of the Bar Association has increased, the current composition of those cases has not resulted in a need to augment the County's current service contract. To date, the Public Defender has experienced \$180K in one-time, Tier III retirement conversion costs, which has partially contributed to the projected shortfall. The Contra Costa County Defender's Association and the county have reached a tentative agreement that is estimated to result in cost savings of \$332,000 for fiscal year 2010/11. The Public Defender will continue to work with the County Administrator's Office to explore operational efficiencies during the 2011/12 budget development process.

Special Districts

Contra Costa County Fire Protection District

The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District's general operating fund is projected to have a net fund cost this fiscal year, primarily due to a loss in property tax revenue, the "Chevron" payment, and an increase in services

and supplies, which they will offset through the utilization of \$8.1 million from fund balance. The District began the year with \$17.6 million in reserves and will end the year with \$9.5 million. The District is diligently working to minimize expenditures in this fiscal year, including the elimination of a crew. Local 1230 members and fire management raises have been deferred and other programs continue to be evaluated. In addition, the workers compensation increase has also been deferred. To increase revenue, the District is considering proposing a parcel tax or benefit assessment.

Conclusion

As noted, the overall General Fund budget is balanced given limited/planned use of reserves. A hiring freeze will be implemented to fix seniority lists in anticipation of lay-offs scheduled for May 31. Again, the County Administrator has recommended that fiscal year 2011/12 reductions be made immediately after adoption of the local budget and no later than June 1. These actions will help improve fund balance this fiscal year.

In the next few months, the County will again face massive fiscal challenges both locally and from the State. The development of the State budget is being closely followed by fiscal staff throughout the County. More detailed information will be presented to the Board in early March.

County department heads have been provided 2011/12 budget direction that includes significant County cost reductions necessary to address declines in local County revenue and replace one-time adjustments from the current year including furloughs. Due to timing of the County and State budgets, the fiscal year 2011/12 budget will likely be presented in two phases again. Phase one will address the local problem and phase two will address State budget impacts.

The County Administrator will return to the Board of Supervisors on April 12 with the Recommended Budget for FY 2011/12 (phase one) and the Planning Budget for FY 2012/13. Phase two will be scheduled once State Budget details/impacts are known. It is anticipated that the Board will adopt a Final Budget on May 3.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

None.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.

CLERK'S ADDENDUM

Speakers: Ralph Hoffman, resident of Contra Costa County.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A

Attachment B

Attachment C

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Second Quarter
General Fund**

Attachment A

Department	Budgeted Revenue	Actual Revenue	Actual as % of Budget	Budgeted Expenses	Actual Expenses	Actual as % of Budget
PUBLIC DEFENDER	\$ 44,689	\$ 15,567	34.8%	\$ 16,766,823	\$ 8,893,354	53.0%
COUNTY CLERK-RECORDER	8,164,147	5,646,812	69.2%	12,282,340	6,440,935	52.4%
EMPLMNT & HUMAN SVCS	374,533,623	117,488,693	31.4%	392,606,849	197,285,235	50.3%
PROBATION	20,994,198	5,835,059	27.8%	57,492,979	28,881,114	50.2%
SHERIFF-CORONER	115,897,896	32,430,954	28.0%	179,816,323	90,013,219	50.1%
DISTRICT ATTORNEY	14,609,221	4,081,913	27.9%	27,997,800	13,976,345	49.9%
MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES	175,000	65,895	37.7%	735,062	366,712	49.9%
TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR	3,556,822	1,903,445	53.5%	5,054,997	2,500,923	49.5%
GENERAL COUNTY SERVICES	6,340,374	2,051,562	32.4%	18,512,187	8,875,598	47.9%
HEALTH SERVICES	199,506,077	38,981,644	19.5%	289,364,866	136,673,787	47.2%
AGRICULTURE-WEIGHTS/MEAS	3,763,141	1,150,021	30.6%	5,686,119	2,614,892	46.0%
ANIMAL SERVICES	7,051,310	3,279,789	46.5%	10,300,956	4,699,672	45.6%
PERSONNEL	5,865,925	1,987,253	33.9%	8,295,788	3,743,044	45.1%
AUDITOR-CONTROLLER	5,080,256	1,694,848	33.4%	8,069,586	3,640,585	45.1%
SUPERIOR COURT-JURY COMM	7,795,333	3,566,915	45.8%	17,642,508	7,947,909	45.0%
ASSESSOR	1,532,500	50,152	3.3%	16,418,080	7,271,747	44.3%
GENERAL SERVICES	39,654,044	18,312,867	46.2%	51,732,395	20,821,657	40.2%
COUNTY COUNSEL	3,889,153	1,245,005	32.0%	5,492,975	2,098,919	38.2%
PUBLIC WORKS	50,551,734	18,008,955	35.6%	50,551,734	19,258,583	38.1%
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR	11,666,980	4,039,298	34.6%	19,665,506	7,044,696	35.8%
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	2,083,577	601,212	28.9%	8,919,813	2,783,826	31.2%
JUSTICE SYSTEM PLANNING	893,747	319,718	35.8%	5,072,300	1,542,334	30.4%
CONSERVATION & DEVELOPMENT	22,540,137	4,468,063	19.8%	22,593,921	5,359,449	23.7%
PLANT ACQUISITION	0	75,612	0.0%	10,537,728	1,191,411	11.3%
GENERAL COUNTY REVENUES	309,997,000	173,605,286	56.0%			
TOTAL	\$ 1,216,186,884	\$ 440,906,538	36.3%	\$ 1,241,609,635	\$ 583,925,946	47.0%

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
100300	0001	DEPARTMENT OF SUPERVISORS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	3,276,001	1,631,733
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,575,590	736,337
	E3000	Other Charges	200	596
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	114,506	(5,347)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	4,851,792	2,368,666
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	4,966,298	2,363,319
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	168,800	77,250
	R9600	Charges for Services	283,579	27,423
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		1,749
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	452,379	106,422
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	4,513,919	2,256,897
100300	0007	BOARD MITIGATION PROGRAMS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	3,408,723	269,022
	E3000	Other Charges	457,942	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers		134,281
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	3,866,665	269,022
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,866,665	403,302
	R9100	Taxes Other Than Cur Prop	513,239	148,360
	R9600	Charges for Services	1,087,000	346,431
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,600,239	494,791
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,266,426	(91,489)
100300	0036	PERSONNEL MERIT BOARD		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	49,810	4,460
	E2000	Services and Supplies	37,040	12,745
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	86,850	17,205
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	86,850	17,205
	R9600	Charges for Services	30,959	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	30,959	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	55,891	17,205
100300	0025	MANAGEMENT INFO SYSTEMS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,050,713	353,846
	E3000	Other Charges	19,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(50,000)	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,069,713	353,846
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,019,713	353,846
	R9600	Charges for Services	100,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	100,000	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	919,713	353,846
100300	0135	ECONOMIC PROMOTION		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	33,800	15,980
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	33,800	15,980
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	33,800	15,980
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	18,800	17,969
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	18,800	17,969
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	15,000	(1,989)
100300	0145	EMPLOYEE/RETIREE BENEFITS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	1,318,713	642,034
	E2000	Services and Supplies	5,225,593	527,327
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	6,544,306	1,169,361
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	6,544,306	1,169,361
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	6,544,306	1,169,361

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
100300	0150	INSURANCE AND RISK MGMT		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	3,748,680	1,699,750
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,911,983	466,028
	E3000	Other Charges	5,164,024	5,160,794
	E4000	Fixed Assets	73,393	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	16,288	9,840
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	10,898,080	7,326,572
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	10,914,368	7,336,412
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	468,000	215,437
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	5,753,574	1,818,156
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	6,221,574	2,033,593
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	4,692,794	5,302,819
135000	0791	RETIREMENT UAAL BOND FUND		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	(256,922)	4,500
	E3000	Other Charges	59,549,809	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	59,292,887	4,500
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	59,292,887	4,500
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	300,000	426
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	59,259,809	27,902,365
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	59,559,809	27,902,792
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(266,922)	(27,898,292)
115000	0792	NOTES & WARRANTS INTEREST		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,000	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,000	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,000	0
135200	0793	RET LITGTN STLMNT DBT SVC		
	E3000	Other Charges	2,759,911	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,759,911	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,759,911	
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	2,759,911	1,379,956
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	2,759,911	1,379,956
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(1,379,956)
135400	0794	FAMILY LAW CTR-DEBT SVC		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	3,764,817	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	3,764,817	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,764,817	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	3,764,817	0
100300	0002	CLERK OF THE BOARD		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	549,213	235,134
	E2000	Services and Supplies	84,766	32,287
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers		(2,512)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	633,979	267,421
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	633,979	264,909
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	58,000	26,699
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	400	546
	R9600	Charges for Services	42,600	5,744
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	101,000	32,990
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	532,979	231,919
100300	0003	COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	3,671,444	1,733,678
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,308,362	480,618
	E3000	Other Charges		195

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	E4000	Fixed Assets	170,463	0
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(1,186,394)	(53,208)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	5,150,269	2,214,491
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,963,875	2,161,284
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	103,317	6,905
	R9600	Charges for Services	317,476	24,035
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		3,087
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	420,793	34,027
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	3,543,082	2,127,257
100300	0004	CROCKETT-RODEO REVENUES		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	272,425	194,003
	E3000	Other Charges	270,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	542,425	194,003
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	542,425	194,003
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	542,425	194,003
100300	0018	COUNTY-STATE-WCCHCD IGT		
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	1,885,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,885,000	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(1,885,000)	0
100300	0026	REVENUE COLLECTIONS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	1,193,222	616,193
	E2000	Services and Supplies	442,271	259,635
	E3000	Other Charges	5,000	8,350
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(87,500)	(2,436)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,640,493	884,178
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,552,993	881,742
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	100,000	37,264
	R9600	Charges for Services	949,058	177,164
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,049,058	214,428
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	503,935	667,314
100300	0059	COMMUNITY ACCESS TV		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	3,251,296	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	3,251,296	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,251,296	
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	795,000	379,000
	R9600	Charges for Services		36,426
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		135,522
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	795,000	550,949
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,456,296	(550,949)
100300	0147	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	8,311,454	3,658,050
	E2000	Services and Supplies	4,301,713	1,734,144
	E3000	Other Charges	657,839	88,289
	E4000	Fixed Assets	15,000	5,000
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(9,143,823)	(4,125,905)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	13,286,006	5,485,483
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	4,142,183	1,359,578
	R9600	Charges for Services	3,974,162	1,544,923
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,974,162	1,544,923
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	168,021	(185,345)
100300	0060	TELECOMMUNICATIONS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	2,413,288	1,165,512
	E2000	Services and Supplies	4,204,956	1,692,193

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund		Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	E3000 Other Charges	686,935	411,451
	E4000 Fixed Assets	70,529	38,838
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(3,896,484)	(2,101,356)
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	7,375,708	3,307,993
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	3,479,224	1,206,637
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	544,089	297,862
	R9600 Charges for Services	2,722,363	1,388,851
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	3,266,452	1,686,713
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	212,772	(480,076)
100300	0235 LAW & JUSTICE SYSTEMS DEV		
	E1000 Salaries and Benefits	245,102	107,764
	E2000 Services and Supplies	1,708,033	108,214
	E3000 Other Charges		575,371
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(43,192)	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	1,953,135	791,349
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	1,909,943	791,349
	R9600 Charges for Services	146,044	(24,731)
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	29,472	
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	175,516	(24,731)
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	1,734,427	816,080
100300	0356 LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION		
	E3000 Other Charges	189,587	185,192
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	189,587	185,192
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	189,587	185,192
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	189,587	185,192
100300	0005 REVENUE - GENERAL COUNTY		
	R9000 Taxes Current Property	255,170,000	166,249,051
	R9100 Taxes Other Than Cur Prop	17,088,000	3,850,513
	R9200 License/Permit/Franchises	8,950,000	1,192,313
	R9300 Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	12,100,000	114,498
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	2,520,000	466,046
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	5,380,000	985,368
	R9600 Charges for Services	7,850,000	429,841
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	939,000	317,656
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	309,997,000	173,605,285
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	(309,997,000)	(173,605,285)
100300	0035 HUMAN RESOURCES		
	E1000 Salaries and Benefits	4,836,364	2,177,669
	E2000 Services and Supplies	3,818,871	1,520,553
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(730,599)	(189,481)
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	8,655,235	3,698,223
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	7,924,636	3,508,742
	R9200 License/Permit/Franchises	210,420	96,864
	R9600 Charges for Services	1,416,594	352,078
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	4,227,317	1,530,804
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	5,854,331	1,979,746
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	2,070,305	1,528,996
100300	0038 CHILD CARE		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	402,315	250,000
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(31,163)	(15,698)
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	402,315	250,000
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	371,152	234,302
	R9600 Charges for Services	11,594	7,507
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	11,594	7,507

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	359,558	226,795
115000	0009	REVENUE-AUTOMATED SYS DEV		
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	200,000	4,258
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	200,000	4,258
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(200,000)	(4,258)
100300	0010	AUDITOR - CONTROLLER		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	6,553,747	2,927,271
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,893,300	816,030
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(377,461)	(102,717)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	8,447,047	3,743,302
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	8,069,586	3,640,585
	R9600	Charges for Services	4,910,256	1,691,433
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	170,000	3,415
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	5,080,256	1,694,848
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,989,330	1,945,737
115000	0011	AUTOMATED SYSTEMS DVLPMNT		
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	170,000	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	170,000	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	170,000	0
100300	0080	MINOR CAP IMPROVEMENTS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	188,575	1
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	188,575	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	188,575	1
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	188,575	1
100300	0111	PLANT ACQUIS-GENERAL FUND		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	3,229,633	163
	E3000	Other Charges		0
	E4000	Fixed Assets	7,119,520	1,191,247
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	10,349,153	1,191,410
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	10,349,153	1,191,410
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties		200
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		75,412
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		75,612
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	10,349,153	1,115,798
110600	0119	CRIM JUST FACILITY CNSTRN		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	180,788	
	E3000	Other Charges	1,220,000	550,000
	E4000	Fixed Assets	(30,589)	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,370,199	550,000
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,370,199	550,000
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	1,285,000	485,185
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		25
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,285,000	485,210
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	85,199	64,790
110700	0122	COURTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION		
	E3000	Other Charges	1,370,500	523,292
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,370,500	523,292
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,370,500	523,292
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	1,063,000	399,726
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	(20,000)	(107)
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	327,500	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,370,500	399,618

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	123,674
100300	0015	TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	3,544,898	1,552,258
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,351,212	817,384
	E3000	Other Charges	10,000	10,596
	E4000	Fixed Assets	148,887	120,686
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	5,054,997	2,500,923
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	5,054,997	2,500,923
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	778,322	183,320
	R9600	Charges for Services	2,479,500	1,412,060
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	299,000	308,065
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,556,822	1,903,445
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,498,175	597,478
100300	0016	ASSESSOR		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	14,549,226	6,113,916
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,111,721	1,150,317
	E3000	Other Charges	4,900	
	E4000	Fixed Assets	10,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(257,767)	7,514
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	16,675,847	7,264,232
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	16,418,080	7,271,747
	R9600	Charges for Services	1,154,500	47,976
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	378,000	2,176
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,532,500	50,152
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	14,885,580	7,221,595
115100	0017	PROPERTY TAX ADMIN		
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	3,005,853	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,005,853	
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		2,770
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		2,770
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	3,005,853	(2,770)
100300	0030	COUNTY COUNSEL		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	8,511,127	3,694,427
	E2000	Services and Supplies	870,014	325,981
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(3,888,167)	(1,921,489)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	9,381,141	4,020,408
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	5,492,975	2,098,919
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	108,436	
	R9600	Charges for Services	3,780,717	1,245,005
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,889,153	1,245,005
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,603,822	853,914
100300	0301	HLTH SVCS-DETENTION INMATES		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	11,814,979	5,643,107
	E2000	Services and Supplies	7,741,853	3,464,256
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(2,196,809)	(1,061,099)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	19,556,832	9,107,363
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	17,360,023	8,046,264
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	189,819	26,729
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	29,546	236
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	219,365	26,965
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	17,140,658	8,019,299
100300	0450	HEALTH SVCS-PUBLIC HEALTH		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	31,003,734	15,299,030

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	E2000	Services and Supplies	10,169,781	5,941,222
	E4000	Fixed Assets	115,554	14,343
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(3,738,213)	(1,862,198)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	41,289,069	21,254,594
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	37,550,856	19,392,396
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	29,446	24,498
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	7,332	3,153
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	18,000	9,434
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	20,732,745	8,260,964
	R9600	Charges for Services	4,386,747	2,032,661
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	1,143,955	1,148,065
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	26,318,225	11,478,775
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	11,232,631	7,913,621
100300	0451	CONSERVATOR/GUARDIANSHIP		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	2,270,982	1,143,090
	E2000	Services and Supplies	616,790	330,270
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	19,700	9,973
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,887,772	1,473,361
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,907,472	1,483,334
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	344,227	250,337
	R9600	Charges for Services	57,295	40,025
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	100	175
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	401,622	290,537
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,505,850	1,192,797
100300	0452	HEALTH SVCS-ENVIRON HLTH		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	14,358,742	6,897,248
	E2000	Services and Supplies	4,247,450	1,449,674
	E3000	Other Charges		186
	E4000	Fixed Assets	95,489	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	185,104	69,071
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	18,701,681	8,347,108
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	18,886,785	8,416,179
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	75,000	43,245
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	250,000	70,485
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	400,000	86,302
	R9600	Charges for Services	18,226,232	(7,599,644)
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	50,000	55,678
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	19,001,232	(7,343,934)
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(114,447)	15,760,113
100300	0460	HLTH SVC-CALIF CHILD SVCS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	6,155,864	3,165,179
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,568,689	725,199
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	7,724,553	3,890,378
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	7,724,553	3,890,378
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	5,017,134	1,575,814
	R9600	Charges for Services	576,940	396,065
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	5,594,074	1,971,879
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,130,479	1,918,499
100300	0463	HSD HOMELESS PROGRAM		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	564,249	286,668
	E2000	Services and Supplies	5,200,719	2,195,511
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(2,219,034)	(192,123)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	5,764,968	2,482,179
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,545,934	2,290,056
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	5,000	

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	7,200	5,200
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	3,019,664	469,285
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	274,597	199,150
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,306,461	673,635
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	239,473	1,616,421
100300	0465	HLTH SVS-HOSPITAL SUBSIDY		
	E3000	Other Charges	45,006,091	22,503,048
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	45,006,091	22,503,048
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	45,006,091	22,503,048
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	45,006,091	22,503,048
100300	0466	ALCOHOL & OTHER DRUGS SVC		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	3,285,119	1,531,905
	E2000	Services and Supplies	11,829,646	5,368,416
	E3000	Other Charges	19,491	3,942
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(383,026)	(143,989)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	15,134,256	6,904,263
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	14,751,230	6,760,274
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	356,640	157,302
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	162,996	95,081
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	10,562,691	4,447,402
	R9600	Charges for Services	3,546,158	2,321,593
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		16
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	14,628,485	7,021,394
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	122,745	(261,120)
100300	0467	HLTH SERVICES-MNTL HLTH		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	43,316,577	19,691,658
	E2000	Services and Supplies	98,365,338	43,001,183
	E3000	Other Charges	1,919,157	1,106,368
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(1,969,150)	92,650
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	143,601,072	63,799,209
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	141,631,922	63,891,859
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	70,000	24,573
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	292,612	172,008
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	47,873,597	844,182
	R9600	Charges for Services	55,356,014	23,785,561
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	26,444,390	36,069
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	130,036,613	24,862,394
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	11,595,309	39,029,465
113700	0468	HLTH SVCS-CHIP AB75 TOBACCO		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	309	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	309	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	309	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	309	0
113700	0469	HLTH-CHIP/AB75 TOBACCO		
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		0
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		0
113500	0471	EMERGENCY MEDICAL SVCS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,060,373	655,270
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,060,373	655,270
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,060,373	655,270
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	1,969,812	947,426
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	620	261
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		150,000

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,970,432	1,097,686
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	89,941	(442,416)
113600	0470	PROP 36-SUB ABUSE CP ACT		
	E3000	Other Charges	100,584	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	100,584	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	100,584	
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		117
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		117
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	100,584	(117)
114600	0475	PROP 63 MH SVCS ACCT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	62,652,646	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	62,652,646	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	62,652,646	
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		51,491
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	24,122,994	21,408,675
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	24,122,994	21,460,166
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	38,529,652	(21,460,166)
145000	0540	HLTH SVS-HOSPITAL ENTRPSE		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	267,190,844	131,990,459
	E2000	Services and Supplies	118,601,464	44,608,676
	E4000	Fixed Assets		18,487
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	385,792,308	176,617,621
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	385,792,308	176,617,621
	R8110	MEDICARE PATIENT SERVICES	30,893,939	19,996,172
	R8120	MEDI-CAL PATIENT SERVICES	169,991,818	96,363,327
	R8130	HLTH PLAN PATIENT SVCS	98,166,298	70,515,052
	R8140	PRIVATE PAY PATIENT SVCS	8,618,001	4,978,969
	R8160	INTERDEPT PATIENT SVCS	4,237,279	1,985,127
	R8180	OTHER PATIENT SVCS		445,984
	R8200	OTHER HOSPITAL REVENUES	5,384,950	2,260,655
	R8270	CHARGES TO GEN FUND UNITS	22,017,876	10,762,719
	R8300	EXTERNAL HEALTH PLAN REVENUE	4,902,318	6,316,341
	R8380	ENTERPRISE FUND SUBSIDY	41,319,095	20,659,548
	R8800	SCHOOLS FUNDS REVENUE	260,734	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	385,792,308	234,283,894
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(57,666,273)
145000	0853	HOSPITAL FIXED ASSETS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies		0
	E3000	Other Charges	7,135,964	2,969,094
	E4000	Fixed Assets	39,074,084	5,287,195
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	46,210,048	8,256,290
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	46,210,048	8,256,290
	R8200	OTHER HOSPITAL REVENUES	45,353,068	4,854,310
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	45,353,068	4,854,310
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	856,980	3,401,980
146000	0860	CONTRA COSTA HEALTH PLAN		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	12,284,289	5,842,099
	E2000	Services and Supplies	95,708,340	47,251,646
	E3000	Other Charges	5,453,635	18,647,048
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	113,446,264	71,740,793
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	113,446,264	71,740,793
	R8200	OTHER HOSPITAL REVENUES		12
	R8300	EXTERNAL HEALTH PLAN REVENUE	113,446,264	46,594,534
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	113,446,264	46,594,546

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	25,146,247
146100	0861	CCHP-COMMUNITY PLAN		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	106,451,265	68,931,141
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	106,451,265	68,931,141
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	106,451,265	68,931,141
	R8200	OTHER HOSPITAL REVENUES	1,413,528	(10,771)
	R8300	EXTERNAL HEALTH PLAN REVENUE	101,350,741	38,373,765
	R8380	ENTERPRISE FUND SUBSIDY	3,686,996	1,843,500
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	106,451,265	40,206,494
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	28,724,647
146200	0862	MAJOR RISK MED INS BD PRGM		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,233,645	341,160
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,233,645	341,160
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,233,645	341,160
	R8400	MAJOR RISK MED INS REVENUE	1,233,645	223,935
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,233,645	223,935
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	117,225
146000	0863	HEALTH PLAN FIXED ASSETS		
	E3000	Other Charges	25,000	
	E4000	Fixed Assets	50,000	0
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	75,000	0
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	75,000	0
	R8200	OTHER HOSPITAL REVENUES	75,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	75,000	
112700	0586	ZERO TOLRNCE-DOM VIOLENCE		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	227,089	107,453
	E2000	Services and Supplies	266,332	52,229
	E3000	Other Charges	4,883	28,283
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	498,304	187,964
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	498,304	187,964
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	1,000	179
	R9600	Charges for Services	250,000	131,183
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	52,000	28,587
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	303,000	159,950
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	195,304	28,014
112500	0585	DOM VIOLENCE VICTIM ASIST		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	130,000	19,261
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	9,456	31,095
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	130,000	19,261
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	139,456	50,356
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	95,000	48,990
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	35,000	13,272
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	130,000	62,262
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	9,456	(11,906)
100300	0581	ZERO TLRNCE DOM VIOL INIT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,646,191	584,963
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers		28,087
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,646,191	584,963
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,646,191	613,051
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	1,317,944	121,523
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		31,095
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,317,944	152,618
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,328,247	460,433

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
100300	0501	EHSD ADMINISTRATIVE SVCS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	19,188,377	12,438,537
	E2000	Services and Supplies	(16,553,125)	5,938,666
	E3000	Other Charges	570,913	221,483
	E4000	Fixed Assets	114,000	99,616
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	167,274	(8,415,473)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	3,320,165	18,698,302
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,487,439	10,282,828
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	3,433,183	1,030,580
	R9600	Charges for Services	51,234	52,389
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,484,417	1,082,969
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	3,022	9,199,859
100300	0502	EHSD CHILDREN & FAMILY SVCS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	34,338,298	15,201,391
	E2000	Services and Supplies	17,244,175	7,917,644
	E3000	Other Charges	41,301,289	23,401,824
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(180,092)	(574,413)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	92,883,762	46,520,859
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	92,703,670	45,946,446
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	159,000	73,193
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	24,000	12,000
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	87,268,080	28,118,465
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	482,000	426,833
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	87,933,080	28,630,491
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	4,770,590	17,315,955
100300	0503	EHSD AGING & ADULT SVCS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	38,445,590	17,786,277
	E2000	Services and Supplies	54,284,389	8,370,461
	E3000	Other Charges	13,676,486	8,227,820
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	376,162	8,327,401
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	106,406,465	34,384,559
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	106,782,627	42,711,960
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		9,163
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	100,498,371	21,874,830
	R9600	Charges for Services	280,171	
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	340,560	310,654
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	101,119,102	22,194,648
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	5,663,525	20,517,312
100300	0504	EHSD WORKFORCE SVCS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	49,424,119	21,182,619
	E2000	Services and Supplies	6,044,003	9,919,247
	E3000	Other Charges	80,721,469	45,728,765
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	82,488	(1,005,460)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	136,189,591	76,830,631
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	136,272,079	75,825,170
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		92,394
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	130,279,624	44,522,034
	R9600	Charges for Services		8,254
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		(128,757)
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	130,279,624	44,493,925
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	5,992,455	31,331,245
132800	0505	COUNTY CHILDRENS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	219,690	59,814
	E3000	Other Charges		9,223

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	219,690	69,037
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	219,690	69,037
	R9600	Charges for Services	195,000	93,259
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	195,000	93,259
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	24,690	(24,222)
100300	0507	EHS - ANN ADLER CHILD & FMLY		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	92,461	30,107
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	92,461	30,107
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	92,461	30,107
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	92,461	80,247
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	92,461	80,247
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(50,140)
115500	0508	IHSS PUBLIC AUTHORITY		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	766,623	454,698
	E2000	Services and Supplies	364,435	75,521
	E3000	Other Charges	564,245	211,432
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	332,390	69,743
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,695,303	741,650
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,027,693	811,393
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	1,340,427	11,543
	R9600	Charges for Services	100,855	
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	504,574	69,525
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,945,856	81,069
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	81,837	730,324
100300	0535	EHS SERVICE INTEGRATION		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	729,800	21,278
	E4000	Fixed Assets	5,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers		(4,041)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	734,800	21,278
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	734,800	17,238
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	21,200	
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	557,000	211,107
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	578,200	211,107
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	156,600	(193,869)
142500	0578	EHSD-COMMUNITY SERVICES		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,500	
	E3000	Other Charges	1,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	47,186	49,944
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,500	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	49,686	49,944
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	49,686	25,811
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	49,686	25,811
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	24,133
100300	0583	EHSD WFRC INVESTMENT BRD		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	2,396,871	1,512,859
	E2000	Services and Supplies	4,391,542	1,725,012
	E3000	Other Charges	92,153	50,367
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	3,791,286	703,169
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	6,880,566	3,288,238
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	10,671,852	3,991,407
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	10,521,852	2,393,574
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	150,000	61,936
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	10,671,852	2,455,510
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	1,535,897

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
114800	0584	COMM COLL CHILD DEV-DEPT		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	189,934	256,700
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,946	72
	E3000	Other Charges	2,007	76
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	2,168,329	857,423
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	193,887	256,847
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,362,216	1,114,271
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	1,468,406	711,429
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	847,882	312,218
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	2,316,288	1,023,647
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	45,928	90,624
100300	0588	COMMUNITY SERVICES		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	18,224,855	8,049,565
	E2000	Services and Supplies	10,883,732	6,559,779
	E3000	Other Charges	68,272	39,131
	E4000	Fixed Assets	120,000	111,122
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	9,918,872	3,106,969
	E6000	Provisions for Contingencies		462
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	29,296,859	14,760,058
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	39,215,731	17,867,027
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	98,001	45,038
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	27,279,957	9,929,214
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	11,678,985	8,212,926
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	39,056,943	18,187,177
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	158,788	(320,150)
111600	0589	CHILD DEV-DEPT		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	8,841,178	3,861,430
	E2000	Services and Supplies	3,037,964	1,454,651
	E3000	Other Charges	5,636,199	1,427,740
	E4000	Fixed Assets	50,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	9,224,872	4,357,902
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	17,565,341	6,743,821
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	26,790,213	11,101,723
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		(1,381)
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	19,005,582	8,802,754
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	7,600,000	2,768,848
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	26,605,582	11,570,221
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	184,631	(468,498)
100300	0202	TRIAL COURT PROGRAMS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits		101,895
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,834,000	126,997
	E3000	Other Charges	15,610,943	7,627,410
	E4000	Fixed Assets	855	0
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers		12,879
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	17,445,798	7,856,302
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	17,445,798	7,869,181
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	25,000	10,760
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	3,062,724	1,192,345
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	80,000	35,745
	R9600	Charges for Services	4,627,609	2,327,732
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		333
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	7,795,333	3,566,915
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	9,650,465	4,302,266
100300	0238	CIVIL GRAND JURY		

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	E2000	Services and Supplies	146,210	63,500
	E3000	Other Charges	500	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	146,710	63,500
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	146,710	63,500
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	146,710	63,500
100300	0239	CRIMINAL GRAND JURY		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	50,000	15,228
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	50,000	15,228
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	50,000	15,228
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	50,000	15,228
112600	0246	DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROGRAM		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	630,508	90,796
	E3000	Other Charges	10,000	1,925
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	640,508	92,721
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	640,508	92,721
	R9600	Charges for Services	290,000	98,806
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	290,000	98,806
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	350,508	(6,085)
100300	0248	CONFLICT DEFENSE SERVICES		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	3,647,398	1,313,378
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	3,647,398	1,313,378
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,647,398	1,313,378
	R9600	Charges for Services		88,486
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		88,486
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	3,647,398	1,224,892
114000	0260	AUTOMATED ID & WARRANT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,032,838	1,237
	E3000	Other Charges	222,034	159,578
	E4000	Fixed Assets	250,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	29,472	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,504,872	160,815
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,534,344	160,815
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	400,000	151,913
	R9600	Charges for Services	225,000	489,250
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	1	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	625,001	641,163
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,909,343	(480,348)
114300	0264	SLESF-FRONT LINE ENF-CITY		
	E3000	Other Charges	2,228,164	533,090
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,228,164	533,090
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,228,164	533,090
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	2,228,164	627,165
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	2,228,164	627,165
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(94,075)
100300	0265	VEHICLE THEFT PROGRAM		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,424,902	228,956
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,424,902	228,956
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,424,902	228,956
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	893,747	231,232
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	893,747	231,232
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	531,155	(2,276)
115600	0275	DNA IDENTIFICATION FUND		

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	E2000	Services and Supplies	492,298	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	275,000	72,587
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	492,298	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	767,298	72,587
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	275,000	199,214
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	275,000	199,214
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	492,298	(126,627)
100300	0043	ELECTIONS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	3,382,757	1,715,797
	E2000	Services and Supplies	4,703,418	3,198,341
	E4000	Fixed Assets		16,147
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	14,253	(6,365)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	8,086,175	4,930,285
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	8,100,428	4,923,920
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	562,000	1,924,965
	R9600	Charges for Services	2,323,172	630,443
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	15,000	14,081
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	2,900,172	2,569,489
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	5,200,256	2,354,431
110100	0237	CLERK RECORDS AUTOMATION		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	36	
	E3000	Other Charges	42	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	78	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	78	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	78	0
110000	0353	RECORDER MICRO/MOD		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	1,550,355	493,642
	E2000	Services and Supplies	7,651,017	218,399
	E3000	Other Charges	509,637	140,202
	E4000	Fixed Assets	250,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	9,961,009	852,242
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	9,961,009	852,242
	R9600	Charges for Services	1,718,000	1,195,825
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,718,000	1,195,825
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	8,243,009	(343,583)
100300	0355	RECORDER		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	3,426,665	1,281,010
	E2000	Services and Supplies	772,544	239,082
	E3000	Other Charges	1,200	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(18,497)	(3,078)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	4,200,409	1,520,092
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	4,181,912	1,517,015
	R9100	Taxes Other Than Cur Prop	90,000	
	R9600	Charges for Services	5,159,975	3,077,323
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	14,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	5,263,975	3,077,323
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(1,082,063)	(1,560,308)
105600	0126	CO LAW ENF COMPTR CAP-PRJ		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	79,960	
	E3000	Other Charges		23
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	2,800,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	79,960	23
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,879,960	23
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		4,325

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue		548,490
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		552,815
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,879,960	(552,792)
105600	0129	CO LAW ENF COMM CAP-PROJ		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,160,660	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	3,190,074	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,160,660	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	4,350,734	
	R9600	Charges for Services	190,800	90,132
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	120,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	310,800	90,132
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	4,039,934	(90,132)
105600	0131	CO LAW ENF HLCPTR CAP PRJ		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	(286,681)	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	700,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	(286,681)	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	413,319	
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	103,000	8,493
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	103,000	8,493
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	310,319	(8,493)
114200	0252	SHER FORFEIT-FED-DOJ		
	E3000	Other Charges	559,950	21
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	30,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	559,950	21
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	589,950	21
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	8,000	816
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	100,000	36,709
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	108,000	37,524
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	481,950	(37,503)
114100	0253	SHER NARC FRFEIT-ST/LOCAL		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	547,079	2
	E3000	Other Charges	500	177
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	85,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	547,579	180
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	632,579	180
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	5,000	524
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	60,000	41,155
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	65,000	41,679
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	567,579	(41,499)
100300	0255	SHERIFF		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	68,382,483	32,114,559
	E2000	Services and Supplies	8,781,297	4,401,936
	E3000	Other Charges	201,360	89,110
	E4000	Fixed Assets	1,452,788	102,910
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	634,279	986,712
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	78,817,928	36,708,514
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	79,452,207	37,695,226
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	52,000	22,310
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	255,000	86,287
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	30,328,617	7,558,392
	R9600	Charges for Services	11,050,612	3,477,356
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	10,476,886	522,805
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	52,163,115	11,667,150
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	27,289,092	26,028,076

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
110400	0256	CRIMINALISTIC LAB FUND		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	92,905	
	E3000	Other Charges	500	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	2,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	93,405	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	95,405	1
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	17,000	3,912
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	500	110
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	17,500	4,022
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	77,905	(4,021)
142000	0258	SHERIFF LAW ENF TRNG CNTR		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	968,424	538,463
	E2000	Services and Supplies	113,157	50,869
	E3000	Other Charges	134,301	69,168
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	118,919	19,902
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,215,882	658,500
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,334,801	678,402
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	226,000	67,560
	R9600	Charges for Services	821,000	187,622
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	288,000	32,216
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,335,000	287,398
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(199)	391,004
114300	0262	SLESF-JAIL CONSTR & OPS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	445,191	
	E3000	Other Charges	1,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	303,901	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	446,191	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	750,092	
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	304,901	61,216
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	304,901	61,216
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	445,191	(61,216)
114300	0263	SLESF-FRONT LINE ENF-CO		
	E3000	Other Charges	2,000	22
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(234,772)	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,000	22
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	(232,772)	22
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	276,762	31,358
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	276,762	31,358
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(509,534)	(31,336)
114500	0268	SHER FORFEIT-FED TREASURY		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	159,419	146
	E3000	Other Charges	500	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	3,500	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	159,919	147
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	163,419	147
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	3,500	129
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,500	129
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	159,919	18
136000	0270	CENTRAL IDENTIFY BUREAU		
	E3000	Other Charges	164,661	25
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	1,600,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	164,661	25
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,764,661	25

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	45,000	5,721
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	900,000	833,545
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		153,938
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	945,000	993,204
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	819,661	(993,179)
133400	0271	CO-WIDE GANG AND DRUG		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,165,068	
	E3000	Other Charges	500	22
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,165,568	22
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,165,568	22
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	2,000	979
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	100,000	47,347
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	102,000	48,326
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,063,568	(48,304)
114700	0273	PRISONERS WELFARE		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	747,847	314,125
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,790,414	393,627
	E3000	Other Charges	10,512	1,236
	E4000	Fixed Assets	5,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	3,000	(449)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,553,773	708,989
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,556,773	708,539
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	6,000	747
	R9600	Charges for Services	64,000	12,185
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	1,393,220	644,471
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,463,220	657,403
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,093,553	51,136
136000	0274	AB 879		
	E3000	Other Charges	500	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	2,500,000	129,211
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	500	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,500,500	129,211
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	2,000	
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	950,000	466,381
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	952,000	466,381
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,548,500	(337,170)
100300	0277	SHERIFF CONTRACT SVCS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	35,608,523	17,224,182
	E2000	Services and Supplies	411,809	169,440
	E3000	Other Charges	8,200	77
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(2,952,566)	(92,560)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	36,028,532	17,393,699
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	33,075,966	17,301,139
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties		103
	R9600	Charges for Services	33,053,966	11,004,049
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	33,053,966	11,004,152
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	22,000	6,296,987
100300	0300	CUSTODY SERVICES BUREAU		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	51,004,513	25,974,419
	E2000	Services and Supplies	5,218,819	2,723,509
	E3000	Other Charges	12,100	7,833
	E4000	Fixed Assets	175,000	128,748
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	439,500	130,747
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	56,410,432	28,834,510

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	56,849,932	28,965,257
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	22,188,959	8,568,066
	R9600	Charges for Services	4,300,500	1,175,131
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	310,901	7,625
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	26,800,360	9,750,823
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	30,049,572	19,214,434
1003000	0359	CORONER		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	1,457,904	845,430
	E2000	Services and Supplies	823,305	350,264
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	40,000	19,448
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,281,209	1,195,693
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,321,209	1,215,141
	R9600	Charges for Services	154,500	69,620
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	28,000	13,551
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	182,500	83,171
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,138,709	1,131,970
100300	0362	EMERGENCY SERVICES		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	5,021,535	2,387,030
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,425,264	1,799,504
	E3000	Other Charges	2,500	27,602
	E4000	Fixed Assets	1,800,000	534,189
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(132,290)	88,131
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	8,249,299	4,748,325
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	8,117,009	4,836,456
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	2,409,762	(152,710)
	R9600	Charges for Services	1,278,193	66,082
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	10,000	12,286
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,697,955	(74,342)
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	4,419,054	4,910,798
113900	0368	TRAFFIC SAFETY		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	236,613	1,650
	E3000	Other Charges	350	846
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	120,000	186
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	236,963	2,496
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	356,963	2,682
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	19,200	5,298
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	4,600	129
	R9600	Charges for Services	9,500	3,150
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	33,300	8,577
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	323,663	(5,895)
100300	0308	PROBATION PROGRAMS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	26,170,504	12,115,970
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,495,748	683,810
	E3000	Other Charges	2,000	18,631
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(1,272,054)	(415)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	27,668,252	12,818,411
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	26,396,198	12,817,996
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	6,148,201	1,117,784
	R9600	Charges for Services	858,826	429,255
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	2,476,587	754
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	9,483,614	1,547,793
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	16,912,584	11,270,203
100300	0309	PROBATION FACILITIES		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	21,686,706	11,131,749

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,377,819	1,154,038
	E3000	Other Charges	12,100	49
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	53,315	29,403
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	24,076,625	12,285,835
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	24,129,940	12,315,238
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	8,165,437	2,919,051
	R9600	Charges for Services	143,531	2,120
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	184,713	478
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	8,493,681	2,921,649
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	15,636,259	9,393,589
100300	0310	PROB CARE OF COURT WARDS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,457,399	1,066,794
	E3000	Other Charges	5,509,442	2,681,087
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	6,966,841	3,747,881
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	6,966,841	3,747,881
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	3,016,903	1,365,617
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,016,903	1,365,617
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	3,949,938	2,382,264
114300	0311	SLESF-PROBATION		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	151,703	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	2,408,221	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	151,703	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,559,924	
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	20,000	
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	2,388,221	586,690
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	2,408,221	586,690
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	151,703	(586,690)
114900	0313	PROBATION OFFICERS SPECIAL FUND		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	286,573	22,591
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	286,573	22,591
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	286,573	22,591
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	33,000	41,885
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	33,000	41,885
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	253,573	(19,294)
100300	0335	AGRICULTURE-WEIGHTS/MEAS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	4,541,553	2,086,472
	E2000	Services and Supplies	718,117	301,546
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	426,449	226,874
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	5,259,670	2,388,018
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	5,686,119	2,614,892
	R9300	Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	22,000	16,809
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	2,820,662	1,031,933
	R9600	Charges for Services	906,255	80,854
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	14,224	20,425
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,763,141	1,150,021
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,922,978	1,464,871
100300	0366	ANIMAL SERVICES		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	7,759,218	3,521,845
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,086,754	991,850
	E3000	Other Charges		10,360
	E4000	Fixed Assets	8,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	446,984	175,619
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	9,853,972	4,524,054
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	10,300,956	4,699,672

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	1,829,058	646,544
	R9600	Charges for Services	5,191,627	2,602,613
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	30,625	30,632
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	7,051,310	3,279,789
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	3,249,646	1,419,883
133200	0369	ANIMAL BENEFIT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	927,980	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	927,980	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	927,980	
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		428
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	469,950	29,304
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	469,950	29,732
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	458,030	(29,732)
134000	0272	AVA SERVICE AUTHORITY		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	890,392	403,527
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	116,184	57,911
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	890,392	403,527
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,006,576	461,438
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	885,000	
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		472,312
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	885,000	472,312
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	121,576	(10,874)
112000	0280	CONSERVATION & DEVELOPMENT		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	22,498,291	10,349,765
	E2000	Services and Supplies	4,583,615	1,935,428
	E3000	Other Charges	2,575,365	1,033,570
	E4000	Fixed Assets	50,000	0
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(595,626)	132,618
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	29,707,271	13,318,762
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	29,111,645	13,451,380
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	9,701,650	4,757,104
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	200,000	41,402
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue		32,504
	R9600	Charges for Services	6,440,379	3,676,284
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	7,909,649	2,133,963
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	24,251,678	10,641,257
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	4,859,967	2,810,123
112000	0114	PLANT ACQ CONSERV & DEV		
	E3000	Other Charges	1,000	89
	E4000	Fixed Assets	20,114,487	613,860
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	20,115,487	613,949
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	20,115,487	613,949
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		14,500
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		14,500
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	20,115,487	599,449
100300	0115	ARRA EECBG PROJECTS		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,251,000	478,076
	E3000	Other Charges	1,556,000	233,937
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,807,000	712,013
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	2,807,000	712,013
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	2,807,000	262,699
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	2,807,000	262,699
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	449,314

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
100300	0580	KELLER CNYN MTIGATN FUND		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	173,300	73,752
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,010,041	585,933
	E3000	Other Charges		84,788
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	136,000	17,219
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,183,341	744,474
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,319,341	761,693
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	475,000	
	R9600	Charges for Services	833,300	534,812
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,308,300	534,812
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	11,041	226,881
100300	0591	HOUSING REHABILITATION		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	858,367	331,549
	E2000	Services and Supplies	29,826	4,748
	E3000	Other Charges	2,000	280
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	11,000	6,947
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	890,193	336,577
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	901,193	343,524
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	5,000	2,303
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	289,100	
	R9600	Charges for Services	294,954	
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	312,139	83,214
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	901,193	85,517
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	258,007
100300	0590	HOPWA GRANT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	850,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	30,000	3,794
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	850,000	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	880,000	3,794
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	880,000	218,567
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	880,000	218,567
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(214,773)
100300	0592	HUD BLOCK GRANT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	5,938,000	2,212,418
	E3000	Other Charges	120,000	4,030
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	1,470,000	348,012
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	6,058,000	2,216,448
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	7,528,000	2,564,461
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	7,524,000	2,521,100
	R9600	Charges for Services		440
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	4,000	15,139
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	7,528,000	2,536,679
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	27,782
100300	0593	HUD EMERGENCY SHELTER GRT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	147,000	30,098
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	8,000	2,919
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	147,000	30,098
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	155,000	33,017
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	155,000	26,452
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	155,000	26,452
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	6,565
100300	0594	HUD HOME BLOCK GRANT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	7,300,000	84,250
	E3000	Other Charges		1,529

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund		Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	270,000	110,375
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	7,300,000	85,779
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	7,570,000	196,153
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	7,570,000	145,370
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	7,570,000	145,370
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	0	50,783
111900	0351 USED OIL RECYCLING GRANT		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	37,058	10,085
	E3000 Other Charges	1,000	
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	12,000	9,401
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	38,058	10,085
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	50,058	19,486
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	50,000	15,154
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	50,000	15,154
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	58	4,332
110200	0367 GAME PROTECTION		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	108,342	1,574
	E3000 Other Charges	500	66
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	3,000	3,000
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	108,842	1,640
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	111,842	4,640
	R9300 Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	7,387	4,260
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue		12,000
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	7,387	16,260
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	104,455	(11,620)
133700	0370 LIVABLE COMMUNITIES		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	1,091,503	
	E3000 Other Charges	2,122,680	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	3,214,183	
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	3,214,183	
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	52,000	2,993
	R9600 Charges for Services		1,948,000
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	52,000	1,950,993
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	3,162,183	(1,950,993)
111800	0380 HUD NSP		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	5,031,952	1,620,299
	E3000 Other Charges		102,909
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	263,000	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	5,031,952	1,723,209
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	5,294,952	1,723,209
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	5,073,000	1,521,509
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue		393,698
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	5,073,000	1,915,207
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	221,952	(191,998)
134700	0582 CDBG SM BUS&MICROENT LOAN		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	127,858	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	127,858	
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	127,858	
	R9400 Use of Money & Property		167
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	60,000	42,079
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	60,000	42,246
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	67,858	(42,246)
111100	0595 PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND		

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund		Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	E2000 Services and Supplies	3,737,055	64,020
	E3000 Other Charges	2,814,600	7,650
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	500,000	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	6,551,655	71,670
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	7,051,655	71,670
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	140,000	17,093
	R9600 Charges for Services	465,000	330,141
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	1,000	35,041
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	606,000	382,275
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	6,445,655	(310,605)
111300	0596 AFFORDABLE HOUSING		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	2,659,438	
	E3000 Other Charges	2,500,350	22
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	5,159,788	22
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	5,159,788	22
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	192,700	11,620
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	192,700	11,620
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	4,967,088	(11,598)
134900	0597 ARRA HUD BLDG INSP NPP		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	953,475	220,273
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	180,000	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	953,475	220,273
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	1,133,475	220,273
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	2,000	3,388
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	480,000	7,306,866
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	700,000	33,071
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	1,182,000	7,343,325
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	(48,525)	(7,123,052)
134800	0598 CDBG 1ST-TIME HMBHR LOAN		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	53,520	
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers		139
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	53,520	
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	53,520	139
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	2,000	47
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	2,000	47
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	51,520	92
100300	0599 ARRA-HPRP/CDBG-R GRANTS		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	1,365,644	649,374
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	25,000	10,253
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	1,365,644	649,374
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	1,390,644	659,628
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	1,390,644	657,967
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	1,390,644	657,967
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	0	1,661
110900	0663 TRANSPRTATN IMPV MEASURE C		
	E3000 Other Charges	2,100,000	1,246,244
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers		128,207
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	2,100,000	1,246,244
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	2,100,000	1,374,452
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	25,000	3,796
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	2,075,000	5,169,077
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	2,100,000	5,172,873
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(3,798,421)

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
113200	0664	PH BART GREENSPACE MTCE		
	E3000	Other Charges	35,372	21
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	39,692	18,704
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	35,372	21
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	75,064	18,725
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	5,000	209
	R9600	Charges for Services		50,000
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	10,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	15,000	50,209
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	60,064	(31,484)
100300	0472	GENERAL SEWER PLANNING		
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers		42,423
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures		42,423
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	42,423
100300	0701	PARKS ADMINISTRATION		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	42,743	25,646
	E3000	Other Charges		17,097
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	42,743	42,743
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	42,743	42,743
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	42,743	42,743
113400	0249	CCC DEPT CHILD SPRT SVCS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	16,865,973	7,872,363
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,310,607	585,773
	E3000	Other Charges	779,490	364,657
	E4000	Fixed Assets		12,295
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	218,960	4,345
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	19,956,070	8,835,088
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	20,175,030	8,839,433
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		(1,019)
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	18,902,523	2,074,344
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue		1,180
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	18,902,523	2,074,505
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,272,507	6,764,928
113300	0233	R/ESTATE FRAUD PROSECUTE		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	997,762	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	256,076	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	997,762	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,253,838	
	R9600	Charges for Services	395,000	317,363
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	395,000	317,363
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	858,838	(317,363)
113100	0234	DA FORFEITURE-FED-DOJ		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	200,530	11,310
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	200,530	11,310
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	200,530	11,310
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		186
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue		14,886
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		15,073
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	200,530	(3,763)
114300	0241	SLESF-CRIM PROSECUTION		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	153,083	138,259
	E3000	Other Charges	101	51
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	153,184	138,310

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund		Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	153,184	138,310
	R9400 Use of Money & Property		329
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	220,515	61,216
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	220,515	61,544
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	(67,331)	76,766
100300	0242 DISTRICT ATTORNEY		
	E1000 Salaries and Benefits	25,872,109	12,634,908
	E2000 Services and Supplies	2,072,037	1,153,191
	E3000 Other Charges	30,878	33,631
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(425,224)	(108,284)
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	27,975,024	13,821,730
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	27,549,800	13,713,446
	R9300 Fines/Forfeits/Penalties	551,500	208,767
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	12,730,177	3,780,248
	R9600 Charges for Services		18,901
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	879,544	66,756
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	14,161,221	4,074,671
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	13,388,579	9,638,775
112900	0244 D A REVENUE NARCOTICS		
	E1000 Salaries and Benefits	82,585	39,456
	E2000 Services and Supplies	54,188	7,117
	E3000 Other Charges		25
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	136,773	46,598
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	136,773	46,598
	R9600 Charges for Services	14,170	9,140
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	133,394	79,048
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	147,564	88,188
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	(10,791)	(41,590)
100300	0245 D A WELFARE FRAUD		
	E1000 Salaries and Benefits	381,530	177,511
	E2000 Services and Supplies	24,470	5,903
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(406,000)	(76,974)
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	406,000	183,414
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	0	106,441
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	0	106,441
112400	0247 DA CONSUMER PROTECTION		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	355,466	6,250
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	355,466	6,250
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	355,466	6,250
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	355,466	6,250
112800	0250 D A REVENUE SEIF		
	E2000 Services and Supplies		3,058
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures		3,058
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures		3,058
	R9400 Use of Money & Property		(2)
	TOTREV Gross Revenue		(2)
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	0	3,060
100300	0364 PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR		
	E1000 Salaries and Benefits	281,737	143,904
	E2000 Services and Supplies	166,263	12,555
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	448,000	156,459
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	448,000	156,459
	R9600 Charges for Services	448,000	7,241

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	448,000	7,241
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	149,218
113000	0251	DA ENVIRON/OSHA		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	543,764	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	300,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	543,764	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	843,764	
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	30,878	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	30,878	
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	812,886	0
100300	0243	PUBLIC DEFENDER		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	14,975,129	7,972,396
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,955,322	865,302
	E3000	Other Charges	5,000	
	E4000	Fixed Assets	10,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(178,628)	55,656
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	16,945,451	8,837,698
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	16,766,823	8,893,354
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	44,689	15,567
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	44,689	15,567
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	16,722,134	8,877,787
110800	0006	GENERAL ROAD FUND REVENUE		
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	50,000	6,443
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	26,924,622	5,192,416
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	26,974,622	5,198,859
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(26,974,622)	(5,198,859)
111000	0120	PLANT ACQ-SNS CRNT DRN FD		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	263,158	
	E3000	Other Charges	150	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	1,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	263,308	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	264,308	
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	7,000	1,436
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	6,000	
	R9600	Charges for Services		152
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	13,000	1,587
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	251,308	(1,587)
110500	0161	SURVEY MONUMENT PRESERVTN		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	612,481	
	E3000	Other Charges	156	42
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	61,500	4,693
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	612,637	42
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	674,137	4,735
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	15,000	782
	R9600	Charges for Services	62,000	35,520
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	77,000	36,302
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	597,137	(31,567)
100300	0330	CO DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,112,000	485,617
	E3000	Other Charges		32
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	50,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	1,112,000	485,649
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,162,000	485,649

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	R9600	Charges for Services		8,026
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	1,162,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,162,000	8,026
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	477,623
112100	0350	CDD/PWD JOINT REVIEW FEE		
	E3000	Other Charges	5,150	222
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	635,216	227,105
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	5,150	222
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	640,366	227,327
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	30,000	914
	R9600	Charges for Services	610,000	1,056,034
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	640,000	1,056,948
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	366	(829,621)
123100	0631	HERCUL/RODEO/CROCK A OF B		
	E3000	Other Charges	100	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	83,548	1,648
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	100	
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	83,648	1,648
	R9600	Charges for Services	37,000	2,653
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	37,000	2,653
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	46,648	(1,005)
123200	0632	WEST COUNTY AREA OF BENEF		
	E3000	Other Charges	100	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	26,100	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	100	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	26,200	1
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	100	6
	R9600	Charges for Services	8,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	8,100	6
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	18,100	(5)
123400	0634	NORTH RICHMOND AOB		
	E3000	Other Charges	500	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	144,500	11,766
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	500	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	145,000	11,767
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	1,000	780
	R9600	Charges for Services	55,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	56,000	780
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	89,000	10,987
124000	0635	MARTINEZ AREA OF BENEFIT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	28,500	
	E3000	Other Charges	500	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	240,000	6,492
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	29,000	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	269,000	6,493
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	7,000	1,300
	R9600	Charges for Services	150,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	157,000	1,300
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	112,000	5,193
124100	0636	BRIONES AREA OF BENEFIT		
	E3000	Other Charges	250	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	71,500	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	250	1

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund		Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	71,750	1
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	1,000	129
	R9600 Charges for Services		2,300
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	1,000	2,429
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	70,750	(2,428)
124200	0637 CENTRAL CO AREA/BENEFIT		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	25,000	
	E3000 Other Charges	1,000	1
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	328,000	28,839
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	26,000	1
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	354,000	28,840
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	20,000	2,730
	R9600 Charges for Services	30,000	4,501
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	50,000	7,231
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	304,000	21,609
124300	0638 SO WAL CRK AREA OF BENEFIT		
	E3000 Other Charges	50	1
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	3,645	5,888
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	50	1
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	3,695	5,889
	R9400 Use of Money & Property		3
	R9600 Charges for Services	1,000	(5,827)
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	1,000	(5,824)
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	2,695	11,713
126000	0641 ALAMO AREA OF BENEFIT		
	E3000 Other Charges	400	1
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	81,599	5,819
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	400	1
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	81,999	5,820
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	10,000	1,261
	R9600 Charges for Services	57,000	75,236
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	67,000	76,497
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	14,999	(70,677)
127000	0642 SOUTH CO AREA OF BENEFIT		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	39,500	
	E3000 Other Charges	500	1
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	1,080,001	7,712
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	40,000	1
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	1,120,001	7,713
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	10,000	2,015
	R9600 Charges for Services	171,000	102,854
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	181,000	104,869
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	939,001	(97,156)
128000	0643 PITTS/ANTIOCH AREA/BENEFIT		
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	1,480	
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	1,480	
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	1,480	0
128100	0644 MARSH CRK AREA OF BENEFIT		
	E3000 Other Charges		1
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	42,725	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures		1
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	42,725	1
	R9400 Use of Money & Property		53

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	R9600	Charges for Services		530
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue		583
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	42,725	(582)
128200	0645	EAST COUNTY AREA OF BENEF		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	20,000	
	E3000	Other Charges	1,000	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	1,480,000	50,273
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	21,000	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,501,000	50,274
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	15,000	3,127
	R9600	Charges for Services	78,000	4,402
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	44,230	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	137,230	7,529
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,363,770	42,745
112200	0648	DRAINAGE DEFICIENCY		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	3,972,293	
	E3000	Other Charges	1,501,600	56
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	1,207,900	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	5,473,893	56
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	6,681,793	56
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	500,000	62,300
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	160,000	4,402
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	660,000	66,702
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	6,021,793	(66,646)
112300	0649	PUBLIC WORKS		
	E3000	Other Charges	452,300	78,749
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	5,572,860	772,164
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	452,300	78,749
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	6,025,160	850,913
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	165,000	6,382
	R9600	Charges for Services	4,661,860	5,940,399
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	4,826,860	5,946,781
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,198,300	(5,095,868)
100300	0650	PUBLIC WORKS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	34,489,728	14,442,032
	E2000	Services and Supplies	8,230,212	3,146,562
	E3000	Other Charges	75,000	3,158
	E4000	Fixed Assets	34,000	
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(6,569,106)	(2,781,185)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	42,828,940	17,591,752
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	36,259,834	14,810,567
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue		4,351
	R9600	Charges for Services	1,072,036	306,944
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	35,187,798	15,196,148
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	36,259,834	15,507,443
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(696,876)
110300	0651	PUB WKS-LAND DEVELOPMENT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	109,575	33,623
	E3000	Other Charges	47,000	14,125
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	3,300,000	1,454,843
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	156,575	47,748
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	3,456,575	1,502,591
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	630,000	135,768
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		(122)

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	R9600	Charges for Services	1,550,000	442,850
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	1,248,200	781,996
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	3,428,200	1,360,492
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	28,375	142,099
129000	0653	BETHEL ISLAND AREA OF BENEFIT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,000	
	E3000	Other Charges	500	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	10,000	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	2,500	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	12,500	1
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	1,000	283
	R9600	Charges for Services	10,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	11,000	283
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	1,500	(282)
100300	0661	ROAD CONSTRUCTION		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	8,519,400	3,685,098
	E3000	Other Charges	4,510,500	297,765
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	100,000	(20,496)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	13,029,900	3,982,863
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	13,129,900	3,962,367
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	60,000	(7,475)
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	10,851,400	2,213,559
	R9600	Charges for Services	1,260,500	42,765
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	958,000	244,638
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	13,129,900	2,493,487
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	1,468,880
110800	0662	ROAD CONSTRUCTION-RD FUND		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	30,662,811	15,038,072
	E3000	Other Charges	2,770,500	57,238
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	7,000,000	2,664,999
	E6000	Provisions for Contingencies		6,717
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	33,433,311	15,102,026
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	40,433,311	17,767,026
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	100,000	8,672
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	13,948,941	7,977,686
	R9600	Charges for Services	3,488,600	1,268,467
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	5,717,069	882,595
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	23,254,610	10,137,420
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	17,178,701	7,629,606
110800	0672	ROAD MAINTENANCE-RD FUND		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	4,179,894	2,819,489
	E3000	Other Charges	1,626,100	452,033
	E4000	Fixed Assets	450,000	0
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	13,238,990	5,347,146
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	6,255,994	3,271,523
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	19,494,984	8,618,668
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue		924
	R9600	Charges for Services	170,000	26,642
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	1,798,190	666,366
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,968,190	693,933
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	17,526,794	7,924,735
110800	0674	MISCEL PROPERTY-ROAD FUND		
	E3000	Other Charges	2,000	97
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	12,500	233

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund		Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	2,000	97
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	14,500	330
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	7,000	3,500
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	7,000	3,500
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	7,500	(3,170)
110800	0676 GEN ROAD PLAN/ADM-RD FUND		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	1,138,742	115,709
	E3000 Other Charges	695,000	163,358
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	4,000,000	1,575,549
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	1,833,742	279,067
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	5,833,742	1,854,616
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	1,000	
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	1,245,000	2,411
	R9600 Charges for Services	188,000	43,077
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	478,000	175,215
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	1,912,000	220,703
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	3,921,742	1,633,913
138800	0678 SPRW FUND		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	4,062,120	17,340
	E3000 Other Charges	300,000	70,020
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	20,000	92,846
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	4,362,120	87,360
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	4,382,120	180,206
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	275,381	43,870
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue		2,000
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	275,381	45,870
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	4,106,739	134,336
138900	0679 EAST/CENT TRAVEL CORRIDOR		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	1,146	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	1,146	
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	1,146	
	R9400 Use of Money & Property		(1,146)
	TOTREV Gross Revenue		(1,146)
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	1,146	1,146
139000	0680 RD DVLPMT DISCOVERY BAY		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	700	
	E3000 Other Charges	300	1
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	9,000	
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	1,000	1
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	10,000	1
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	1,000	129
	R9600 Charges for Services	5,000	
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	6,000	129
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	4,000	(128)
139200	0682 ROAD IMPRVMNT FEE		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	600,000	67,914
	E3000 Other Charges	5,000	360,584
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	2,501,158	862,829
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	605,000	428,498
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	3,106,158	1,291,328
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	100,000	26,279
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue		300,000
	R9600 Charges for Services	525,000	2,375,805
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	150,000	2,485

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	775,000	2,704,569
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	2,331,158	(1,413,241)
139400	0684	RD DEVLPMNT RICH/EL SOBRT		
	E3000	Other Charges	500	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	34,000	294
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	500	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	34,500	295
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	1,500	128
	R9600	Charges for Services	33,000	5,110
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	34,500	5,238
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(4,943)
139500	0685	RD DEVLPMNT BAY POINT AREA		
	E3000	Other Charges	400	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	84,600	6,374
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	400	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	85,000	6,375
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	2,000	662
	R9600	Charges for Services	10,000	28,071
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	12,000	28,733
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	73,000	(22,358)
139900	0687	RD DEVLPMNT PACHECO AREA		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	5,700	
	E3000	Other Charges	400	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	24,900	4,903
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	6,100	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	31,000	4,904
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	2,500	276
	R9600	Charges for Services	17,000	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	19,500	276
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	11,500	4,628
111400	0697	NAVY TRANS MITIGATION		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	6,487,848	
	E3000	Other Charges	200,000	66,614
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	1,083,000	268,389
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	6,687,848	66,614
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	7,770,848	335,003
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	50,000	17,753
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	50,000	17,753
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	7,720,848	317,250
111500	0699	TOSCO/SOLANO TRANS MTGTN		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	79,000	
	E3000	Other Charges	1,000	1
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	700,000	6,425
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	80,000	1
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	780,000	6,426
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	25,000	3,446
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	25,000	3,446
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	755,000	2,980
140100	0841	AIRPORT OPERATIONS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	1,811,672	961,851
	E2000	Services and Supplies	955,369	444,193
	E3000	Other Charges	673,711	252,759
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	198,500	132,129

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund		Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	3,440,752	1,658,803
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	3,639,252	1,790,932
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	3,542,492	1,962,275
	R9600 Charges for Services		7,942
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	151,947	116,389
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	3,694,439	2,086,605
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	(55,187)	(295,673)
140100	0843 AIRPORT FIXED ASSETS		
	E4000 Fixed Assets	282,000	39,581
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	282,000	39,581
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	282,000	39,581
	R9500 Inergovernmental Revenue	226,813	431,762
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	226,813	431,762
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	55,187	(392,181)
100300	0020 PURCHASING		
	E1000 Salaries and Benefits	814,928	341,227
	E2000 Services and Supplies	290,371	99,169
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(131,004)	(40,135)
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	1,105,299	440,396
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	974,295	400,261
	R9600 Charges for Services	177,331	64,685
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	20,000	3,579
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	197,331	68,264
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	776,964	331,997
150100	0064 ISF FLEET SERVICES		
	E1000 Salaries and Benefits	1,868,670	613,179
	E2000 Services and Supplies	6,111,071	2,899,663
	E3000 Other Charges	2,835,264	548,498
	E4000 Fixed Assets	2,108,499	908,742
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(1,478,967)	(132,645)
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	12,923,504	4,970,082
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	11,444,537	4,837,437
	R9600 Charges for Services	85,000	71,360
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue	11,173,307	4,993,970
	TOTREV Gross Revenue	11,258,307	5,065,331
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	186,230	(227,894)
100300	0063 FLEET SERVICES		
	E2000 Services and Supplies		429
	E3000 Other Charges	349,351	208,262
	E4000 Fixed Assets	6,780	6,780
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers	(349,351)	0
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	356,131	215,471
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	6,780	215,471
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue		208,262
	TOTREV Gross Revenue		208,262
	NETCOST Net County Cost (NCC)	6,780	7,209
100300	0077 GEN CO BLG OCCUPANCY COST		
	E2000 Services and Supplies	11,402,144	6,439,435
	E5000 Expenditure Transfers		(31,029)
	GRSCST Gross Expenditures	11,402,144	6,439,435
	TOTEXP Total Expenditures	11,402,144	6,408,406
	R9400 Use of Money & Property	74,344	28,922
	R9600 Charges for Services	68,193	48,257
	R9800 Miscellaneous Revenue		(68,374)

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	142,537	8,805
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	11,259,607	6,399,601
100300	0078	GSD OUTSIDE AGENCY SVC		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	775,631	1,136,351
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	317,022	161,404
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	775,631	1,136,351
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	1,092,653	1,297,755
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	7,739	2,202
	R9600	Charges for Services	317,022	98,918
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	767,892	555,654
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,092,653	656,774
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	640,981
100300	0079	BUILDING MAINTENANCE		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	17,706,530	7,593,934
	E2000	Services and Supplies	39,947,459	21,319,178
	E3000	Other Charges	32,522,504	8,559,130
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(53,536,073)	(25,640,567)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	90,176,493	37,472,241
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	36,640,420	11,831,675
	R9600	Charges for Services	36,204,920	16,444,279
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	410,500	223,112
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	36,615,420	16,667,390
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	25,000	(4,835,715)
100300	0148	PRINT & MAIL SERVICES		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	1,659,858	752,027
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,745,473	1,281,146
	E3000	Other Charges	40,366	23,365
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(3,846,222)	(1,916,901)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	4,445,697	2,056,537
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	599,475	139,637
	R9600	Charges for Services	599,075	238,151
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	400	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	599,475	238,151
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	(98,514)
100300	0149	GENERAL SERVICES ADMIN		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	4,178,917	1,745,821
	E2000	Services and Supplies	435,307	175,252
	E3000	Other Charges	2,000	294
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(3,910,142)	(1,570,669)
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	4,616,224	1,921,367
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	706,082	350,698
	R9600	Charges for Services	696,082	316,579
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	696,082	316,579
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	10,000	34,119
100300	0473	KELLER SRCHRGE/MITGN PROG		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	340,546	177,755
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	(30,000)	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	340,546	177,755
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	310,546	177,755
	R9200	License/Permit/Franchises	260,546	102,695
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	50,000	45,946
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	310,546	148,641
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	0	29,114

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund			Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
120600	0008	REVENUE CO LIBRARY TAXES		
	R9000	Taxes Current Property	18,592,640	18,796,516
	R9100	Taxes Other Than Cur Prop	(79,972)	(136,245)
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	705,958	
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	19,218,626	18,660,270
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	(19,218,626)	(18,660,270)
120600	0113	PLANT ACQUIS-LIBRARY FUND		
	E4000	Fixed Assets	712,385	785
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers		13
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	712,385	785
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	712,385	798
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	712,385	798
120600	0620	LIBRARY-ADMIN & SUPPORT SVCS		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	7,440,861	3,405,997
	E2000	Services and Supplies	2,472,749	1,315,168
	E3000	Other Charges	1,225,954	459,795
	E4000	Fixed Assets	368,050	77,915
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	34,828	21,929
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	11,507,614	5,258,876
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	11,542,442	5,280,805
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	60,000	30,605
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	427,636	94,717
	R9600	Charges for Services	96,200	86,749
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	871,455	29,250
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,455,291	241,320
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	10,087,151	5,039,485
120600	0621	LIBRARY-COMMUNITY SERVICES		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	12,089,784	5,152,414
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,698,584	571,081
	E3000	Other Charges	1,242,260	655,364
	E4000	Fixed Assets	231,480	37,297
	E5000	Expenditure Transfers	8,841	
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	15,262,108	6,416,157
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	15,270,949	6,416,157
	R9400	Use of Money & Property		920
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	3,114,796	945,257
	R9600	Charges for Services	934,440	313,520
	R9800	Miscellaneous Revenue	20,816	341,273
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	4,070,052	1,600,970
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	11,200,897	4,815,187
120700	0622	CASEY LIBRARY GIFT		
	E2000	Services and Supplies	1,200	
	E3000	Other Charges	254,576	45
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	255,776	45
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	255,776	45
	R9400	Use of Money & Property	1,300	761
	TOTREV	Gross Revenue	1,300	761
	NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	254,476	(716)
100300	0579	VETERANS SERVICE OFFICE		
	E1000	Salaries and Benefits	665,814	334,312
	E2000	Services and Supplies	69,248	32,398
	GRSCST	Gross Expenditures	735,062	366,709
	TOTEXP	Total Expenditures	735,062	366,709
	R9500	Inergovernmental Revenue	100,000	65,895

**Fiscal Year 2010-11
Mid-Year Budget Status Report**

Attachment B

Fund		Current Year Adjusted Budget	Total Year-to-Date
R9600	Charges for Services	75,000	
TOTREV	Gross Revenue	175,000	65,895
NETCOST	Net County Cost (NCC)	560,062	300,814

List of Funds

100300 GENERAL FUND	123100 HERCUL/RODEO CROCK A OF B
105600 COUNTY LAW ENFRMNT-CAP PROJ	123200 WEST COUNTY AREA OF BENEF
110000 RECORDER MODERNIZATION	123400 NORTH RICHMOND AOB
110100 COURT / CLERK AUTOMATION	124000 MARTINEZ AREA OF BENEFIT
110200 FISH AND GAME	124100 BRIONES AREA OF BENEFIT
110300 LAND DEVELOPMENT FUND	124200 CENTRAL CO AREA/BENEFIT
110400 CRIMINALISTICS LABORATORY	124300 SO WAL CRK AREA OF BENEFIT
110500 SURVEY MONUMENT PRESERVTN	126000 ALAMO AREA OF BENEFIT
110600 CRIM JUSTICE FACILITY CONSTR	127000 SOUTH CO AREA OF BENEFIT
110700 COURTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION	128000 PITTS/ANTIOCH AREA/BENEFIT
110800 ROAD	128100 MARSH CRK AREA OF BENEFIT
110900 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT	128200 EAST COUNTY AREA OF BENEF
111000 SANS CRAINTE DRAINAGE	129000 BETHEL ISL AREA OF BENEFIT
111100 PRIVATE ACTIVITY BOND	132800 COUNTY CHILDRENS
111300 AFFORDABLE HOUSING SPEC REV	133200 ANIMAL BENEFIT
111400 NAVY TRANS MITIGATION	133400 CO-WIDE GANG AND DRUG
111500 TOSCO/SOLANO TRNS MITIGATION	133700 LIVABLE COMMUNITIES FUND
111600 CHILD DEVELOPMENT FUND	134000 AVA SERVICE AUTHORITY
111800 HUD NSP	134700 CDBG SM BUS&MICROENT LOAN
111900 USED OIL RECYCLING GRANT	134800 CDB 1ST-TIME HMEBYR LOAN
112000 CONSERVATION & DEVELOPMENT	134900 ARRA HUD BLDG INSP NPP
112100 CDD/PWD JOINT REVIEW FEE	135000 RETIREMENT UAAL BOND FUND
112200 DRAINAGE DEFICIENCY	135200 RET LITGTN STLMNT DBT SVC
112300 PUBLIC WORKS	135400 FAMILY LAW CTR-DEBT SVC
112400 D A CONSUMER PROTECTION	136000 CENTRAL IDENTIFY BUREAU
112500 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIM ASST	138800 SPRW FUND
112700 ZERO TOLRNCE-DOM VIOLENCE	139000 RD DVLPMNT DISCOVERY BAY
112900 D A REVENUE NARCOTICS	139200 ROAD IMPRVMNT FEE
113000 D A ENVIRONMENT/OSHA	139400 RD DEVLPMNT RICH/EL SOBRT
113100 DA FORFEITRE-FED-DOJ	139500 ROAD DEVELOPMENT BAY POINT
113200 PH BART GREENSPACE MTCE	139900 RD DEVLPMNT PACHECO AREA
113300 R/ESTATE FRAUD PROSECUTE	140100 AIRPORT ENTERPRISE
113400 CCC DEPT CHILD SPPRT SVCS	142000 SHERIFF LAW ENF TRNG CNTR
113500 EMERGENCY MED SVCS FUND	142500 CHILDCARE ENTERPRISE
113600 PROP 36-SUB ABUSE CP ACT	145000 HOSPITAL ENTERPRISE
113700 AB75 TOBACCO TAX FUND	146000 HMO ENTERPRISE
113900 TRAFFIC SAFETY FUND	146100 HMO ENTERPRISE-COMM PLAN
114000 PUB PROTECT-SPEC REV FUND	146200 MAJOR RISK MED INSUR ENT
114100 SHERIFF NARC FORFEIT-ST/LOCAL	150100 FLEET ISF
114200 SHERIFF FORFEIT-FED-DOJ	
114300 SUP LAW ENFORCEMENT SVCS	
114500 SHERIFF FORFEIT-FED TREASURY	
114600 PROP 63 MH SVCS ACCT	
114700 PRISONERS WELFARE FUND	
114800 COMM COLL CHILD DEV-FUND	
114900 PROBATION OFFICERS SPECIAL FUND	
115000 AUTOMATED SYS DVLPMNT	
115100 PROPERTY TAX ADMIN	
115500 IHSS PUBLIC AUTHORITY	
115600 DNA IDENTIFICATION FUND	
120600 COUNTY LIBRARY	
120700 CASEY LIBRARY GIFT	



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Julia R. Bueren, Public Works Director/Chief Engineer
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Issue a warrant to Metropolitan Transportation Commission for Pavement Technical Assistance Program Matching Funds

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Auditor's Office to issue a warrant, in the amount of \$12,000, to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for Pavement Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) matching funds (Road Funds) (Countywide) Project No.: 0672-6U2000.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Road funds in the amount of \$12,000 are available for this purchase.

BACKGROUND:

The Contra Costa County Public Works Department's Maintenance Division has been selected by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to receive Pavement Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) funding for the pavement distress inspections of unincorporated County arterial and collector roads. Funding for the project will be \$60,000. The Department is required to provide 20% matching funds (\$12,000).

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Unincorporated County arterial and collector roads will not receive pavement distress inspection in 2011.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes: Supervisor Mary Piepho was absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Henry Finch, 313-7004

cc:

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Julia R. Bueren, Public Works Director/Chief Engineer
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Grant of Access Rights to Erica M. Stafford, Brentwood area. (Streets & Highways Code § 960) Project No. 0662-6R4255-10 (District V)

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE the conveyance of interest in real property to Erica M. Stafford, in accordance with the Grant of Access Rights Agreement and pursuant to Streets & Highways Code § 960.

DETERMINE that the conveyance of Access Rights are in the public interest and will not substantially conflict or interfere with the County's use of the property.

AUTHORIZE the Chair, Board of Supervisors, to execute the Grant of Access Rights on behalf of Contra Costa County.

AUTHORIZE the Public Works Director, to execute the Grant of Access Right Agreement on behalf of Contra Costa County.

DIRECT the Real Property Division of the Public Works Department to cause said Grant of Access Rights to be delivered to Erica M. Stafford.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes: Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: David Kramer (925)
313-2227

FISCAL IMPACT:

No fiscal impact.

BACKGROUND:

The County is planning to construct safety improvements along Vasco Road which will include a concrete median barrier. Erica Stafford (Owner) currently has access to her property, Assessor's Parcel No. 001-011-046 (Property) from Vasco Road through an easement across a neighboring parcel owned by Leo and Maria Master (Master's Property).

The Owner has requested that access to Vasco Road be granted directly to the Property. Public Works staff has reviewed the Owner's request and has determined that the proposed Grant of Access Rights would be beneficial to the Vasco Road Safety Improvements Project.

The Owner has entered into a Grant of Access Rights Agreement in which Owner agrees to quitclaim her existing rights over the Master's Property if granted direct access to the Property.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Property Owners will not obtain new rights to access their property.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

Grant of Access Rights Agreement

Grant of Access Rights

Assessor's Parcel Number: 001-011-046
Project Name: Vasco Road Safety Improvements
Project Number: 0662-6R4255-10

GRANT OF ACCESS RIGHTS AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this 23rd day of December, 2010, by and between Contra Costa County, a political subdivision of the State of California, hereinafter called "County", and Erica M. Stafford, a Married Woman as Sole and Separate Property (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Property Owner").

RECITALS

- A. The County is constructing safety improvements, including a concrete median barrier, approximately four miles north of the Contra Costa County line, hereinafter "Project."

The Property Owner owns APN 001-011-046 (hereinafter referred to as the "Property"), and is in the process of the building a single family residence and has applied for an Encroachment Permit for the construction of a new driveway. Currently the Property Owner has a 60 foot wide easement through the adjacent property owned by Leo and Maria Master identified as APN 001-011-042 (hereinafter referred to as the Master Property) per Document Number 96-67158 recorded October 16, 1996 official records of Contra Costa County for access to the Property contained herin as Exhibit "A".

- B. The Property Owner has requested access rights for a driveway along Vasco Road located on the Property, as shown on the attached Exhibit "B".
- C. The Property Owner has agreed to Quitclaim her current access rights described in Exhibit "A" to Leo and Maria Master and the County has agreed to convey access rights as shown on Exhibit "B" to the Property Owner.

In consideration of the covenants and conditions hereinafter contained, it is mutually agreed as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. Effective Date. This Agreement is subject to approval by the governing body of the County. This Agreement is effective on the date approved by the governing body of the County.
2. Quitclaim of Access Rights. Within Ninety (90) days of obtaining access rights from the County as discussed in Paragraph 3, Property Owner shall execute said Quitclaim Deed, thereby quitclaiming Property Owner's access rights described in the attached Exhibit "A".

3. Access Rights. County shall convey access rights as shown on the attached Exhibit "B" to Property Owner.

4. No Admission of Liability. Execution of this agreement and compliance with its terms do not constitute and shall never be considered to constitute an admission of any fault, error, wrongdoing, or liability by County.

5. Representations. The parties hereto have entered into this Agreement based solely upon the representations, covenants and warranties contained and referred to herein. No party has placed any reliance on any representation not expressed or referred to in this Agreement.

6. Voluntary Execution of Agreement. The parties hereto have freely and voluntarily executed this Agreement and are not acting under coercion, duress, menace, economic compulsion, or because of any supposed disparity of bargaining power; rather, the parties hereto are freely and voluntarily signing this Agreement for their own benefit.

7. Construction. The parties hereto each acknowledge that they are fully aware of and understand the contents of this agreement and its legal effect. Accordingly, this Agreement shall not be construed against any party, and the usual rule of construction that an agreement is construed against the party which drafted it shall not apply.

8. Successors and Assigns. This Agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of each of the parties hereto and their respective successors, assigns and related agencies and entities.

9. Amendment. This Agreement shall not be amended or modified except by a writing executed by all of the parties hereto.

10. California Law. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California. The venue for any legal action pertaining to this Agreement shall be Contra Costa County, California.

11. Entire Agreement. This Agreement and any exhibits attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference contain the entire agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement except as set forth herein. It is expressly understood by each of the parties that this Agreement may not be altered, amended, modified or otherwise changed in any respect whatsoever, except by a writing executed by all parties hereto.

12. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in as many counterparts as may be necessary or convenient, and by the different parties hereto on separate counterparts, each of which, when so executed, shall be deemed an original, and all such counterparts shall constitute one and the same instrument.

15. Severability. If any term, condition or provision of this Agreement is declared illegal or invalid for any reason by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining terms, conditions and provisions shall nevertheless remain in full force and effect.

16. Cooperation. The parties hereto shall reasonably cooperate with each other to fulfill the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

[Remainder of Page Left Intentionally Blank]

17. Notices. All notices, requests, demands and other communications required or permitted to be given pursuant to this Agreement shall be in writing, and shall be delivered personally or mailed, postage prepaid, by first class mail to the undersigned persons at their respective addresses as set forth below.

c/o Contra Costa County Public Works Department
255 Glacier Drive
Martinez, CA 94553
Telephone: (925) 313-2220


BY AFFIXING HIS/HER SIGNATURE BELOW, EACH OF THE PERSONS SIGNING
THIS
AGREEMENT REPRESENTS THAT HE/SHE HAS READ AND UNDERSTANDS THIS
AGREEMENT, THAT HE/SHE IS AUTHORIZED TO SIGN THIS AGREEMENT, AND
THAT THE PARTY ON BEHALF OF WHOM HE/SHE SIGNS THIS AGREEMENT
AGREES TO BE BOUND BY ITS TERMS.

The parties herein have set forth the whole of their agreement and the performance of this agreement shall relieve the Authority of all further obligations or claims on this account.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

PROPERTY OWNER

APPROVED


By 
Erica M. Stafford

By _____

Date: _____
(Date of Board Approval)

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

By _____
Karen A. Laws
Principal Real Property Agent

By 
David Kramer
Associate Real Property Agent

DK:

G:\realprop\David\Vasco Safety Improvements Phase 2\Driveway Agreement Stafford.doc

Exhibit "A"

RECORDING REQUESTED BY:
CONTRA COSTA WATER DISTRICT

WHEN RECORDED MAIL TO:
BOLD, POLISNER, MADDOW, et al.
500 Ygnacio Valley Road #325
Walnut Creek, Ca. 94596

APR 12 1996

96 67158

96-67158

RECORDED AT REQUEST OF

CCWB
APR 12 1996

AT
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY REC'D
STEPHEN W. W. R.
COMM. CLERK

FEE:
THIS SPACE FOR RECORDER'S USE ONLY

offt.

FINAL ORDER OF CONDEMNATION


TITLE OF DOCUMENT

THIS PAGE ADDED TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SPACE FOR RECORDING INFORMATION
(Govt. Code 26361.5)
(Additional recording fee applies)

95129 - 96

1 JEFFREY D. POLISNER
2 BOLD, POLISNER, MADDOW, NLLSON & JUDSON
3 A Professional Corporation
4 500 Ygnacio Valley Road, Ste. 325
5 Walnut Creek, CA 94596
6 (510) 933-7777

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff APR 9 1996
8 Contra Costa Water District



9 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

10	CONTRA COSTA WATER DISTRICT,)	No. C94-00958
11	an agency of the State of)	
12	California,)	
13	Plaintiff,)	
14	v.)	AMENDED FINAL ORDER
15	LEO MASTER, et al.,)	OF CONDEMNATION
16	Defendants.)	

17 It appearing to the Court that Plaintiff has deposited
18 into Court for Defendants entitled thereto the sum of money
19 assessed by the Judgement in Condemnation entered in this
20 proceeding;

21 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED
22 that the real property situated in the County of Contra Costa,
23 State of California, and more particularly described in Exhibits
24 "A" and "B", attached hereto and made a part hereof, be
25 condemned to Plaintiff in fee simple, permanent easement and as

BOLD, POLISNER, MADDOW, NLLSON & JUDSON
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
500 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, STE. 325
WALNUT CREEK, CALIF. 94596
(510) 933-7777

96 * 07158

1 a temporary construction easement, all as are more particularly
2 described in said Exhibits "A" and "B".

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that a
4 certified copy of this Order be recorded in the office of the
5 Recorder of Contra Costa County, State of California, and
6 thereupon title to said property described in Exhibits "A" and
7 "B" shall vest in Plaintiff.

8
9 Dated: APR 2 1996

JAMES R. TREMBATH

Judge of the Superior Court

96 07105

Mar. 1, 1996
Leo M. Mader, L.L.M.
A.P. No. 001 011 001

EXHIBIT A

All that real property situate in the County of Contra Costa, State of California, described as:

Portions of the Northwest Quarter of Section 28, Township 1 South Range 3 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, said portions being particularly described as follows:

PARCEL 1

BEGINNING at the quarter-section corner on the western line of said Section 28; thence N 00° 25' 56" E along said western line, 80.21 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT; thence continuing along said western line of Section 28, N 00° 25' 56" E, 381.87 feet; thence leaving said western line of Section 28, N 87° 34' 42" E, 128.10 feet; thence N 61° 00' 48" E, 65.00 feet; thence N 46° 58' 37" E, 61.85 feet; thence N 28° 59' 12" W, 27.00 feet; thence N 50° 58' 48" E, 132.02 feet; thence N 61° 00' 48" E, 447.35 feet; thence N 79° 37' 10" E, 209.61 feet; thence Northeastly and Northerly on a curve to the left from a tangent which bears N 42° 59' 28" E, said curve having a radius of 1,410.00 feet, through a central angle of 44° 53' 39" an arc distance of 1,104.81 feet; thence N 00° 16' 48" W, 529.59 feet; thence N 1° 54' 11" W, 176.68 feet to a point on the section line common to Sections 21 and 28 of Township 1 South Range 3 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian; thence S 89° 19' 56" E along said section line, 140.14 feet; thence leaving said section line, S 1° 54' 11" E, 699.77 feet; thence Southorly on a tangent curve to the right having a radius of 1,565.00 feet, through a central angle of 11° 53' 25" an arc distance of 324.78 feet; thence S 1° 41' 53" W, 176.47 feet; thence S 21° 41' 02" W, 274.39 feet; thence S 10° 05' 05" W, 311.72 feet; thence S 42° 03' 46" W, 461.60 feet; thence S 59° 41' 51" W, 397.90 feet; thence S 88° 05' 39" W, 376.20 feet; thence S 47° 43' 35" W, 324.19 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT.

Containing 17.292 acres of land, more or less.

This conveyance is made for the purpose of a controlled access highway, and the grantor hereby releases and relinquishes to the grantee any and all abutter's rights including access rights, appurtenant to grantor's remaining property, in and to said controlled access highway.

Reserving however, unto grantor, his successors or assigns, the right of access to said highway over and across the following described lines:

1.) BEGINNING on the western boundary line of PARCEL 1 hereinabove described, at the eastern terminus of the course designated as "N 79° 37' 10" E, 209.61 feet" in the above description of said PARCEL 1; thence Northeastly and Northerly on a curve to the left from a tangent which bears N 42° 59' 28" E, said curve having a radius of 1,410.00 feet, through a central angle of 24° 45' 18" an arc distance of 609.20 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT of the line described herein; thence continuing along said western line of PARCEL 1, along said curve Northeastly through a central angle of 2° 26' 10" an arc distance of 60.00 feet to the POINT OF TERMINUS of the line described herein.

2.) BEGINNING on the eastern boundary line of PARCEL 1 hereinabove described, at the southern terminus of the course designated as "S 21° 41' 02" W, 274.39 feet" in the above description of said PARCEL 1; thence N 21° 41' 02" E along said course, 274.39 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT of the line described herein, thence continuing along said course, N 21° 41' 02" E, 50.00 feet to the northern terminus thereof, said point being on angle no. 1 of said eastern boundary line of PARCEL 1; thence N 1° 41' 53" E along said boundary line, 10.64 feet to the POINT OF TERMINUS of the line described herein.

96-07158

May 1, 1996
Lee Master 11 A
A.P. No. 001 011 004

EXHIBIT A

PARCEL 2

AN EASEMENT for drainage purposes and incidents thereto, over, upon and across a portion of the remaining lands of grantor, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the quarter-section corner on the western line of Section 28 referred to hereinabove, in the description of PARCEL 1; thence N 00° 25' 56" E along said western line of Section 28, a distance of 462.08 feet; thence leaving said section line along the western line of PARCEL 1 as described hereinabove, N 87° 34' 42" E, 128.10 feet; thence N 61° 00' 48" E, 65.00 feet; thence N 46° 58' 37" E, 61.85 feet; thence N 28° 59' 12" W, 27.00 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT of the parcel of land described herein; thence leaving said western line, N 25° 26' 10" E, 49.72 feet; thence N 41° 28' 14" E, 40.00 feet; thence S 48° 31' 46" E, 55.69 feet to a point on said western line of PARCEL 1; thence S 60° 58' 48" W along said line, 60.35 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT.

Containing 2,672 square feet, more or less.

PARCEL 3

AN EASEMENT for drainage purposes and incidents thereto, over, upon and across a portion of the remaining lands of grantor, described as follows:

BEGINNING at the intersection of the western line of PARCEL 1 described hereinabove with the section line common to Sections 21 and 28 of Township 1 South Range 3 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian as said point is described in the description of said PARCEL 1; thence from said point of Beginning S 1° 54' 11" E along the western line of said PARCEL 1, a distance of 153.88 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT of the parcel of land described herein; thence continuing along said western line, S 1° 54' 11" E, 22.80 feet to an angle point therein; thence continuing along said western line, S 00° 16' 48" E, 32.21 feet; thence leaving said line, S 88° 05' 49" W, 15.01 feet; thence N 00° 56' 47" W, 55.01 feet; thence N 88° 05' 49" E, 15.00 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT.

Containing 936 square feet, more or less.

PARCEL 4

A TEMPORARY EASEMENT to terminate on Dec. 31, 1996, for purposes of construction and incidents thereto over, upon and across a portion of the remaining lands of grantor, described as follows:

BEGINNING on the western boundary line of PARCEL 1 hereinabove described, at the eastern terminus of the course designated as "N 79° 37' 10" E, 709.61 feet" in the above description of said PARCEL 1; thence Northeasterly and Northerly on a curve to the left from a tangent which bears N 42° 59' 28" E, said curve having a radius of 1,410.00 feet, through a central angle of 23° 56' 31" an arc distance of 589.19 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT of the parcel of land described herein; thence leaving said western line of PARCEL 1, N 72° 58' 59" W, 100.00 feet; thence N 17° 01' 01" E, 100.00 feet; thence S 72° 58' 59" E, 100.00 feet to a point on said western line of PARCEL 1, said point being on said curve of radius 1,410.00 feet, a radial line of said curve at said

May 1, 1995
Leo R. Eide Lt. Al
A.P. No. 001 011 003

EXHIBIT A

point bearing S 75° 00' 55" E; thence Southwesterly along said curve through a central angle of 4° 03' 52" an arc distance of 100.02 feet to the TRUE POINT OF COMMENCEMENT.

Containing 10,059 square feet, more or less.

Bearings used in the above descriptions are based on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone III, and distances are grid distances. Multiply distances shown by 1.000078 to obtain ground distances.

This real property description has been prepared by me, or under my direction, in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Signature Raymond R. Eide
Licensed Land Surveyor

Date May 1, 1995



EXHIBIT A

PARCEL A

A non-exclusive right-of-way and easement 60 feet wide for roadway, utility, ingress and egress, including unlimited, unobstructed vehicular access purposes, to relocated Vasco Road across the land described below, from the remaining lands of Vaquero Farms across the lands of Thelma Souza and across the lands of Leo Master to relocated Vasco Road. Said non-exclusive right-of-way and easement shall be appurtenant to the remaining lands of Vaquero Farms and Thelma Souza to provide access to relocated Vasco Road.

The area subject to said right-of-way and easement is a strip of land 60 feet wide the centerline of which is more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING AT a point at Station 348+80.01 on the centerline of Segment A of the proposed Vasco Road Relocation as shown on the drawings prepared by Tudor Engineering and dated January 10, 1994, said point being on a 1500 foot radius curve to the left;

Thence running on a radial bearing N 72° 58' 59" W, 90.00 feet to a point on the most westerly right of way of the above said Vasco Road Relocation, and said point being centered in that temporary construction easement (TCE) shown as parcel number 001-011-004-4 on Sheet 5 of said drawings, said point also being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING;

Thence continuing N 72° 58' 59" W, 130.16 feet to the point of curvature of a 175 foot radius curve to the right;

Thence along said curve, through a central angle of 45° 50' 59" for an arc distance of 140.04 feet to a point of tangency;

Thence tangent to said curve N 22° 09' 00", 858.46 feet to the point of curvature of a 1200 foot radius curve to the left;

Thence along said curve through a central angle of 13° 53' 00" for an arc distance of 290.77 feet to a point of tangency;

Thence tangent to said curve N 41° 01' 00", 95.69 feet, more or less, to the North line of said Northwest Quarter of Section 20, and the point of terminus of this description.

The intent of this description is to provide an uninterrupted access from the Vasco Road realignment to the North line of Section 20.



LS 6670

March 28, 1995
Leo Master, et al

EXHIBIT 'B'

A portion of the Northwest Quarter of Section 28, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the County Contra Costa, State of California, being described as follow:

PARCEL 1

Beginning at the west Quarter Corner of said Section 28, Thence N00° 25' 56"E, along the west line of said Section 28, 80.21 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING, thence continuing along said west line of Section 28, N00° 25' 56"E, 481.87 feet, thence leaving said west line of Section 28, N87° 34' 42"E, 128.10 feet, thence N61° 09' 48"E, 65.00 feet; thence N46° 58' 37"E, 61.85 feet; thence N28° 59' 12"W, 27.00 feet, thence S50° 58' 48"W, 62.00 feet, thence S71° 59' 40"W, 177.43 feet to an intersection with the westerly line of said Section 28, thence S00° 25' 46"W along said westerly line of Section 28 a distance of 8.85 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 0.164 Acres of land (7146.08 sq ft) more or less.

This Conveyance is made for the purpose of a controlled access highway, and the Grantor hereby releases and relinquishes to the grantee any and all abutter's right including access rights, appurtenant to Grantor's remaining property, in and to said controlled access highway.

PARCEL 2

A CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT for the purpose of relocating Brushy Creek and incidents thereto, over, along, under and across a portion of the Grantor's remaining lands, described as follows:

Beginning at the West Quarter Corner of said Section 28, referred to in the heretofore described Parcel 1; thence N00° 25' 56"E along the west line of said Section 28, a distance of 470.93 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING, thence leaving said west line of Section 28, N71° 59' 40"E, 177.43 feet, thence N50° 58' 48"E, 65.00 feet, thence N25° 24' 18"W, 49.72 feet, thence S41° 28' 14"W, 35.00 feet, thence S71° 59' 40"W, 179.81 feet to an intersection with the Westerly line of said Section 28, thence S00° 25' 46"W along the west line of said Section 28 a distance of 8.85 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 0.276 acres of land (11,975.31 sq ft) more or less.

Said easement is a TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT to terminate on December 31, 1996, for the purpose of construction and incidents thereto.

Bearings used in the above descriptions are based on the California Coordinate System of 1983, Zone III, and distances are grid distances. Multiply distance shown by 1.000078 to obtain ground distances.

This real property description has been prepared by me, in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Signature

[Handwritten Signature]
Licensed Land Surveyor # 4586

Date _____

96-67456



RECORDED IN MAPS 22
JUN 16 1995
AT OROVILLE
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY RECORDS
STEPHEN L. WILK
COUNTY RECORDER
FEE \$ *[Handwritten]*

END OF DOCUMENT

Road No. 7711B
Vasco Road Access Rights
Appurtenant to APN 001-011-046
Contra Costa County to
Stafford

EXHIBIT "B"

Real property in an unincorporated area of the County of Contra Costa, State of California, being a portion of Section 21, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, and being a portion of Parcel One as described in Exhibit U-2 in the grant deed to Contra Costa County, recorded October 8, 2008 in Series Number 2008-0220593, Contra Costa County records, and also shown on sheet 9 of that certain map entitled "Record of Survey, R/S No. 2223, Vasco Road", filed October 3, 1997 in Book 112 of Licensed Surveyors Maps at Page 22, described as follows:

Access Rights

Grantor is the owner of Vasco Road, a controlled access highway, and the Grantor has acquired abutter's rights, including access rights, from properties adjacent to said Road. Grantor hereby conveys to Grantee the right of access to said highway, over and across the following described line:

Commencing on the westerly line of said Parcel One (99-032418) at the southerly terminus of the course designated in said description as "North 1°54' 11" West, 50.56 feet"; thence along said westerly line, north 7°30'59" west, 20.00 feet to the Point of Beginning of the line described herein; thence continuing along said westerly line, north 7°30'59" west, 30.00 feet to the Point of Terminus of the line described herein.

Bearings are based on the California Coordinate System of 1983 (CCS83), 1992 Epoch, Zone III. Distances given are grid distances. To obtain ground distance, multiply distance given by 1.00008631.

A plat entitled **Exhibit "B"** showing the above described lines is attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof.


This real property description has been prepared by me or under my direction, in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Signature: _____

Licensed Land Surveyor
Contra Costa County Public Works

Date: _____

12/16/2010



1" = 100'

Contra Costa
Water District

Stafford
2006-230329

Martin
2006-100862

Vasco Road

N2° 17' 38" W

N7° 30' 59" W

358.93

408.93 (T)

30.00'
Abutters
Access
Allowed

P.O.B.

20.00

N7° 30' 59" W

50.56

N1° 54' 11" W

P.O.C.

N1° 54' 11" W

Master
18970 O.R. 527

Master
18970 O.R. 527

Vasco Road Access to Stafford

Instrument : Grant Deed of Access Rights		Scale 1"=100'	Date September 2009
Series No.	Recorded	Drawn By KT	File No. A-77118-2009
		Checked By JS	Cad File VascoRoad30ftAccess Stafford.dgn

Recorded at the request of:
Erica M. Stafford

Return to:
Erica M. Stafford
P.O. Box 3818
Hayward, CA 94540

Portion of Assessor's Parcel No. 001-011-046

GRANT OF ACCESS RIGHTS

For valuable consideration, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged,

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State of California,

Grants Erica M. Stafford, a Married Woman as Sole and separate Property, the right to access Vasco Road, which is owned by CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, over and across the real property in the unincorporated area of the County of Contra Costa, State of California, described in the Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Dated _____

By _____
Chair, Board of Supervisors

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA)

On _____ before me, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Contra Costa County, personally appeared _____, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature: _____
Deputy Clerk

Road No. 7711B
Vasco Road Access Rights
Appurtenant to APN 001-011-046
Contra Costa County to
Stafford

EXHIBIT "A"

Real property in an unincorporated area of the County of Contra Costa, State of California, being a portion of Section 21, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, and being a portion of Parcel One as described in Exhibit U-2 in the grant deed to Contra Costa County, recorded October 8, 2008 in Series Number 2008-0220593, Contra Costa County records, and also shown on sheet 9 of that certain map entitled "Record of Survey, R/S No. 2223, Vasco Road", filed October 3, 1997 in Book 112 of Licensed Surveyors Maps at Page 22, described as follows:

Access Rights

Grantor is the owner of Vasco Road, a controlled access highway, and the Grantor has acquired abutter's rights, including access rights, from properties adjacent to said Road. Grantor hereby conveys to Grantee the right of access to said highway, over and across the following described line:

Commencing on the westerly line of said Parcel One (99-032418) at the southerly terminus of the course designated in said description as "North 1°54' 11" West, 50.56 feet"; thence along said westerly line, north 7°30'59" west, 20.00 feet to the Point of Beginning of the line described herein; thence continuing along said westerly line, north 7°30'59" west, 30.00 feet to the Point of Terminus of the line described herein.

Bearings are based on the California Coordinate System of 1983 (CCS83), 1992 Epoch, Zone III. Distances given are grid distances. To obtain ground distance, multiply distance given by 1.00008631.

A plat entitled **Exhibit "B"** showing the above described lines is attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof.

This real property description has been prepared by me or under my direction, in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Signature: 

Licensed Land Surveyor
Contra Costa County Public Works

Date: 12/16/2010




EXHIBIT "B"

PLAT TO ACCOMPANY EXHIBIT "A"

1" = 100'

Contra Costa
Water District

Stafford
2006-230329

Vasco Road

Martin
2006-100862

30.00'
Abutters
Access
Allowed

Master
18970 O.R. 527

N2°17'38"W

N7°30'59"W

358.93

408.93(T)

P.O.B.

20.00

N7°30'59"W

50.56

N1°54'11"W

P.O.C.

N1°54'11"W

Master
18970 O.R. 527

Vasco Road Access to Stafford

Instrument : Grant Deed of Access Rights

Series No.

Recorded

Scale

1" = 100'

Date September 2009

Drawn By

KT

File No. A-771B-2009

Checked By

JS

Cad File VascoRoad30ftAccess
Stafford.doc

Recorded at the request of:
Erica M. Stafford

Return to:
Erica M. Stafford
P.O. Box 3818
Hayward, CA 94540

SIGNED ATTACHMENT

ITEM NO. C. 2

DATE: Feb. 15, 2011

Portion of Assessor's Parcel No. 001-011-046

GRANT OF ACCESS RIGHTS

For valuable consideration, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged,

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State of California,

Grants Erica M. Stafford, a Married Woman as Sole and separate Property, the right to access Vasco Road, which is owned by CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, over and across the real property in the unincorporated area of the County of Contra Costa, State of California, described in the Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof.

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Dated FEBRUARY 15, 2011

By *Gayle B. Uilkema*
Chair, Board of Supervisors

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA)


On FEBRUARY 15, 2011 before me EMY L. SHARP
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Contra Costa County, personally appeared
SUP. GAYLE UILKEMA, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory
evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and
acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized
capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the
entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the
foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature: *Gayle Uilkema*
Deputy Clerk

G:\realprop\David\Vasco Safety Improvements Phase 2\AP.12_Stafford.doc



Road No. 7711B
Vasco Road Access Rights
Appurtenant to APN 001-011-046
Contra Costa County to
Stafford

EXHIBIT "A"

Real property in an unincorporated area of the County of Contra Costa, State of California, being a portion of Section 21, Township 1 South, Range 3 East, Mount Diablo Meridian, and being a portion of Parcel One as described in Exhibit U-2 in the grant deed to Contra Costa County, recorded October 8, 2008 in Series Number 2008-0220593, Contra Costa County records, and also shown on sheet 9 of that certain map entitled "Record of Survey, R/S No. 2223, Vasco Road", filed October 3, 1997 in Book 112 of Licensed Surveyors Maps at Page 22, described as follows:

Access Rights

Grantor is the owner of Vasco Road, a controlled access highway, and the Grantor has acquired abutter's rights, including access rights, from properties adjacent to said Road. Grantor hereby conveys to Grantee the right of access to said highway, over and across the following described line:

Commencing on the westerly line of said Parcel One (99-032418) at the southerly terminus of the course designated in said description as "North 1°54' 11" West, 50.56 feet"; thence along said westerly line, north 7°30'59" west, 20.00 feet to the Point of Beginning of the line described herein; thence continuing along said westerly line, north 7°30'59" west, 30.00 feet to the Point of Terminus of the line described herein.

Bearings are based on the California Coordinate System of 1983 (CCS83), 1992 Epoch, Zone III. Distances given are grid distances. To obtain ground distance, multiply distance given by 1.00008631.

A plat entitled **Exhibit "B"** showing the above described lines is attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof.

This real property description has been prepared by me or under my direction, in conformance with the Professional Land Surveyors Act.

Signature: _____

Licensed Land Surveyor
Contra Costa County Public Works

Date: _____

12/16/2010




EXHIBIT "B"

PLAT TO ACCOMPANY EXHIBIT "A"



1" = 100'

Contra Costa
Water District

Stafford
2006-230329

Martin
2006-100862

Vasco Road

N2° 17' 38" W

N7° 30' 59" W

358.93

408.93 (T)

30.00'
Abutters
Access
Allowed

P.O.B.

20.00

N7° 30' 59" W

50.56

N1° 54' 11" W

P.O.C.

N1° 54' 11" W

Master
18970 O.R. 527

Master
18970 O.R. 527

Vasco Road Access to Stafford

Instrument : Grant Deed of Access Rights

Series No.

Recorded

Scale

1" = 100'

Date September 2009

Drawn By

KT

File No. A-771B-2009

Checked By

JS

Ord. File VascoRoad30ftAccess



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Julia R. Bueren, Public Works Director/Chief Engineer
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Authorize the Public Works Director, or designee, to advertise Buchanan Field Airport Security Upgrade project, Concord area.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

AUTHORIZE the Public Works director, or designee, to advertise the Buchanan Field Airport Security Upgrades project [DCD-CP #08-91] County Project No.: 4855-4690-SAS-6X5382

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact to the County General Fund. The estimated construction cost is \$480,000 and is funded by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Improvement Program Grant (AIP) No. 3-06-0050-12.

BACKGROUND:

The Contra Costa County Public Works Department is in the process of constructing security upgrade improvements at the Buchanan Field Airport located near the City of Concord. The project will upgrade physical security and barrier provisions by installing new vehicular and pedestrian gates and fencing to improve access control to the airport. The airport security upgrade project is based on the Buchanan Field Airport Security Assessment and Master Plan, dated November 1, 2007, and the requirements of the Federal Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes: Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Larry Theis, 925-313-2166

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

The Department of Conservation & Development previously determined that this project is Categorical Exemption, under Section 15302 (Class II) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The Notice of Exemption (County file: CP#08-91) was administratively approved on November 7, 2008 and filed with the County Clerk to be posted to the public on November 12, 2008. Even though a Categorical Exemption has already been determined, our department still requires the Board of Supervisors to authorize the Public Works Director, or designee, to advertise the project for bids.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Delay in approving the project advertisement will result in a delay of the construction and may jeopardize Federal funding.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

CEQA Exemption



Contra
Costa
County

To: Contra Costa County Flood Control District Board of Supervisors

From: Julia R. Bueren, Public Works Director/Chief Engineer

Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Adopt Resolution Approving the Application for California Department of Water Resources Grant. Project No. 7521-6D8467

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ADOPT Resolution No. 2011/56 approving the application for grant funds from the Flood Corridor Program under the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 84) and the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1E), Brentwood and Martinez areas. (90% California Department of Water Resources Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E Funds and 10% Flood Control District Funds)

FISCAL IMPACT:

No impact to the General Fund. The Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (FC District) will be required to provide 10% matching funding for the project. As grant awards are limited to \$5,000,000, the FC District's contribution will not exceed \$500,000.

BACKGROUND:

The purpose of the proposed grant application is to obtain funding from the California Department of Water Resources for the acquisition of floodway properties located next



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE:

John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT:

Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Carl J. Roner (925)
313-2213

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

to creeks. The FC District proposes applying for acquisition funding for two unrelated properties. The grant requires that the properties be acquired from willing sellers. Both properties are currently for sale on the real estate market. This grant, if received, will pay the majority (90%) of the cost associated with the acquisition of the property.

The first property is located at 760 Minnesota Avenue, Brentwood, at the confluence of three FC District-owned creeks. Acquisition of portions of the property is already in the Zone 1 Marsh Creek Watershed Plan. The acquisition is supported by many local stakeholders, including the City of Brentwood and the Friends of Marsh Creek Watershed.

The second property is known as the Pacheco Marsh parcel and is located at the mouth of Walnut Creek / Pacheco Slough in the Martinez area. The adjacent marshland parcels were purchased in 2001 in partnership with the Muir Heritage Land Trust and the East Bay Regional Park District. The 2001 acquisition omitted one parcel because it was not for sale at that time. That parcel has subsequently become available for sale and is well timed with this grant opportunity.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this resolution is not approved, the properties, which are currently for sale, may be purchased by other parties, thus preventing their acquisition by the FC District.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

Resolution No. 2011/56

Adopted this Resolution on 02/15/2011 by the following vote:

RECUSE:



cc: R. M. Avalon, Deputy Public Works Director, C. Roner, Flood Control, C. Windham, Flood Control

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

and for Special Districts, Agencies and Authorities Governed by the Board

Adopted this Resolution on 02/15/2011 by the following vote:

AYES: ☒ 4 **John Gioia**
Gayle B. Uilkema
Karen Mitchoff
Federal D. Glover

NOES: ☐ABSENT: ☒ 1 **Mary N. Piepho**ABSTAIN: ☐RECUSE: ☐**Resolution No. 2011/56**

Adopt Resolution Approving the Application for Grant Funds from the Flood Corridor Program Under the Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control, River and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 84) and the Disaster Preparedness and Flood Prevention Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1E), Brentwood and Martinez areas. (90% California Department of Water Resources Proposition 84 and Proposition 1E Funds and 10% Flood Control District Funds)

WHEREAS, the Legislature and Governor of the State of California have provided funds for the program shown above; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Water Resources has been delegated the responsibility for the administration of this grant program, establishing necessary procedures; and

WHEREAS, said procedures established by the Department of Water Resources require a resolution certifying the approval of application(s) by the Applicant's governing board before submission of application(s) to the State; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant, if selected, will enter into an agreement with the State of California to carry out the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Governing Board of the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District:

1. Approves the filing of an application for the 760 Minnesota Avenue Acquisition Project; 2. Approves the filing of an application for the Pacheco Marsh Acquisition Project;
3. Certifies that Applicant understands the assurances and certification in the application; and,
4. Certifies that Applicant or title holder will have sufficient funds to operate and maintain the project(s) consistent with the land tenure requirements; or will secure the resources to do so; and,
5. Certifies that it will comply with all provisions of Section 1771.5 of the California Labor Code; and,
6. Certifies that the project will comply with any laws and regulations including, but not limited to, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), legal requirements for building codes, health and safety codes, disabled access laws, and, that prior to commencement of construction all applicable permits will have been obtained; and,
7. Appoints the Chief Engineer, Flood Control and Water Conservation District, or designee, as agent to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents including, but not limited to applications, agreements, payment requests and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned project(s).

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

Contact: Carl J. Roner (925) 313-2213

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Two County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: *EMY L. SHARP*
 EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

cc: R. M. Avalon, Deputy Public Works Director, C. Roner, Flood Control, C. Windham, Flood Control



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Clerk of the Board
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: CLAIMS FOR FEBRUARY 15, 2011

RECOMMENDATION(S):

DENY claims filed by Sosnowski & Associates, Inc.; Veronica Morgan-Moore; Juliet Lederle; Brenda J. Wilson and Bennie Wilson; Alan Dadafarin and Farran Dadafarin; Ambrocio Arellano, Jr.; Ana Campos; and Rosanna Archimede.

FISCAL IMPACT:

BACKGROUND:

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 02/15/2011

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: EMELDA SHARP (925)
335-1900

cc:



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Sharon L. Anderson, County Counsel
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Report on Settlements of Litigation During the Period of October 1, 2010 - December 31, 2010

RECOMMENDATION(S):

RECEIVE report on settlements of litigation during the period of October 1, 2010 - December 31, 2010, as recommended by the County Counsel.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Settlement amounts were paid from the sources specified below.

BACKGROUND:

Settlements were finalized in the following cases during the period of October 1, 2010 - December 31, 2010.

Lance Johnson, et al., v. County of Contra Costa, et al., USDC Case No. C09-1241.

This case arose out of a search and seizure conducted at the plaintiffs' home on March 14, 2008. As part of a settlement and release agreement, the Board of Supervisors authorized payment of \$250,000, inclusive of attorney fees. The Board authorized settlement on October 12,

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes: Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Sharon Anderson (925)
335-1800

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

2010, in closed session, by a 4-0 vote (Uilkema absent). The settlement amount was paid through the Risk Management Internal Service Fund.

Gregory Clouthier v. County of Contra Costa, USDC Case No. C06-03893.

This case arose out of the suicide of the plaintiffs' son while in custody at the Martinez Detention Facility in August 2005. As part of a settlement and release agreement, the Board of Supervisors authorized payment of \$150,000, inclusive of attorney fees. The Board authorized settlement on December 7, 2010, in closed session, by a 3-0 vote (Gioia absent, District IV seat vacant). The settlement amount was paid through the Risk Management Internal Service Fund.

Maliha Barez v. Contra Costa County, CCC Sup. Ct. Case No. C10-00078.

This case arose out of the plaintiff's May 19, 2009, slip and fall at the Contra Costa Regional Medical Center. As part of a settlement and release agreement, the Board of Supervisors authorized payment of \$45,000, inclusive of attorney fees. The Board authorized settlement on December 14, 2010 in closed session, by a 4-0 vote (District IV seat vacant). The settlement amount was paid through the Risk Management Internal Service Fund.

Mahasti Minoui v. Minh Vu, Contra Costa County, et al., CCC Sup. Ct. Case No. C09-03382.

This case arose out of the plaintiff's allegation that a Sheriff vehicle backed into her as she walked across a parking lot. As part of a settlement and release agreement, the Board of Supervisors authorized payment of \$45,000, inclusive of attorney fees. The Board authorized settlement on December 14, 2010, in closed session, by a 4-0 vote (District IV seat vacant). The settlement amount was paid through the Risk Management Internal Service Fund.

Contra Costa County v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., CCC Sup. Ct. Case No. C10-00289

This was an action to acquire certain property by eminent domain in the Antioch area as part of the State Route 4 East – Somersville Road to Route 160 widening project. It was agreed that the defendant would convey all necessary property interests to the County for \$320,000, inclusive of interest and costs. The Board of Supervisors authorized settlement on September 21, 2010, in closed session, by a 5-0 vote. Judgment pursuant to the parties' stipulation was entered on December 3, 2010. The settlement amount was paid through Contra Costa Transportation Authority funds.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The Board of Supervisors would not have a complete listing of all the settlements made during the above referenced time period.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Clerk of the Board
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Board Member Meeting Reports for January 2011

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ACCEPT Board member meeting reports for January 2011.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

Government Code Section 53232.3(d) requires that members of legislative bodies report on meetings attended for which there has been expense reimbursement (mileage, meals, lodging, etc). The attached reports were submitted by Board of Supervisors members in satisfaction of this requirement.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 02/15/2011

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: JULIE ENEA (925)
335-1077

cc:

ATTACHMENTS

Gioia - January 2011

Uilkema - January 2011

Piepho - January 2011

Mitchoff - January
2011

Glover - January 2011

Supervisor John Gioia
January – 2011 Monthly Meeting Report

<u>Date</u>	<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Location</u>
3	Tom Torlakson Swearing in	Concord
11	Board of Supervisors Reorg Meeting	Martinez
12	2011 CA Working Families Policy Summit	Sacramento
12	El Sobrante Municipal Advisory Council	El Sobrante
14	ABAG/MTC Special Joint Policy Committee	Oakland
18	Board of Supervisors	Martinez
20	BCDC	Oakland
20	ABAG Finance & Personnel Committee	Oakland
21	ABAG Joint Policy Meeting	Oakland
21	Remarks/MLK Celebration	San Pablo
21	ABAG 50 Yr. Service Celebration	Berkeley
22	El Sobrante Chamber of Commerce Installation	Richmond
23	Abundant Grace Fellowship Ministries Anniversary	El Sobrante
24	BOS/Public Protection Committee	Martinez
25	Board of Supervisors Meeting	Martinez
26	Speaker/Richmond Chamber Meeting	Richmond
26	S.F. Bay Restoration Authority	Oakland
26	Doctors Hospital Meeting	San Pablo
27	Contra Costa Council Annual Event	Concord
27	Remarks/PTA Community Group Meeting	Kensington
28	RAPC Meeting	Oakland
28	Environmental Health Director Interview	Martinez
31	Board of Supervisors Retreat	Lafayette

Voice: 925-335-1046
Fax: 925-335-1076
Email: gayle@bos.cccounty.us

[illegible]

Supervisor Mary Nejedly Piepho - January 2011 AB1234 Report
(Government Code Section 53232.3(d) requires that members of legislative bodies report on meetings attended for which there has been expense reimbursement (mileage, meals, lodging, etc)).

Date	Meeting Name	Location	Purpose
3-Jan	Sheriff Livingston Swearing In Event	Martinez	Community Outreach
4-Jan	Delta Water Meeting	Sacramento	Business Meeting
4-Jan	Alamo MAC Meeting	Alamo	Business Meeting
6-Jan	Welcome Home US Navy Officer Event	Discovery Bay	Community Outreach
7-Jan	East Bay EDA Vision Awards and Reception	Hayward	Community Outreach
10-Jan	Meeting with Tam Doduc, State Water Board	Discovery Bay	Business Meeting
10-Jan	Meeting with Discovery Bay CSD Vice-Chair	Discovery Bay	Business Meeting
11-Jan	Board of Supervisors Meeting	Martinez	Business Meeting
12-Jan	LAFCO Meeting	Martinez	Business Meeting
12-Jan	Karen Mitchoff Reception	Walnut Creek	Community Outreach
13-Jan	Mark Peterson Swearing In Event	Martinez	Community Outreach
13-Jan	Discovery Bay Yacht Club Event	Discovery Bay	Community Outreach
15-Jan	35th Annual Shellie Awards Event	Walnut Creek	Community Outreach
17-Jan	Shell Community Advisory Panel 20th Anniverary Event	Martinez	Community Outreach
18-Jan	Board of Supervisors Meeting	Martinez	Business Meeting
19-Jan	* Delta Conservancy Meeting	Sacramento	Business Meeting
20-Jan	Meeting with Deputy Sheriff's Association	Martinez	Business Meeting
20-Jan	Constituent Meeting	Pleasant Hill	Community Outreach
21-Jan	Delta Association of Realtors Event	Antioch	Community Outreach
24-Jan	Meeting with Conservation and Development	Brentwood	Business Meeting
24-Jan	Constituent Meeting	Brentwood	Community Outreach
24-Jan	Meeting with California Restaurant Assoc.	Brentwood	Community Outreach
24-Jan	Meeting with Liberty Union High School Dist.	Brentwood	Business Meeting
25-Jan	Board of Supervisors Meeting	Martinez	Business Meeting
27-Jan	Contra Costa Solid Waste Authority Meeting	Walnut Creek	Business Meeting
27-Jan	2011 CC USA Event	Concord	Community Outreach
28-Jan	Environmental Health Interviews Meeting	Martinez	Business Meeting

28-Jan	Alamo Chamber, Board of Directors Swearing In Event	Alamo	Community Outreach
29-Jan	Brentwood Chamber Citizen of the Year Event	Brentwood	Community Outreach
29-Jan	Susan McNulty Rainey Retirement Event	Walnut Creek	Community Outreach
31-Jan	Board of Supervisors Retreat Meeting	Lafayette	Business Meeting

* Reimbursement may come from an agency other than Contra Costa County

Supervisor Karen Mitchoff
January 2011

DATE	MEETING NAME	LOCATION	PURPOSE
1/3/2011	Sheriff's Swearing In Ceremony	Martinez	Community outreach
1/4/2011	Animal Services	Martinez	Meet with Department Head
1/5/2011	Police Chief Swearing in Ceremony	Concord	Community outreach
1/6/2011	Community Development	Martinez	Meet with Department Head
1/6/2011	Veterans' Services	Martinez	Meet with Department Head
1/6/2011	Dept. of Information Technology	Martinez	Meet with Department Head
1/7/2011	Economic Development Alliance	Hayward	Community outreach
1/11/2011	Board of Supervisors	Martinez	Decisions on agenda items
1/13/2011	Elections Department	Martinez	Meet with Department Head
1/13/2011	District Attorney Swearing in	Martinez	Community outreach
1/18/2011	Board of Supervisors	Martinez	Decisions on agenda items
1/18/2011	Municipal Advisory Council	Walnut Creek	County advisory body meeting
1/19/2011	Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Walnut Creek	Regional transportation issues
1/24/2011	Tour of Tesoro Refinery	Martinez	Community outreach
1/25/2011	Board of Supervisors	Martinez	Decisions on agenda items
1/26/2011	Sheriff's Department	Martinez	Meet with Department Head
1/27/2011	Mayor's Breakfast	Pleasant Hill	Community outreach
1/27/2011	Contra Costa USA	Concord	Community outreach
1/31/2011	Board of Supervisors	Lafayette	Decisions on agenda items

Contra
Costa
County

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND:

The following report on meetings attended by Supervisor Federal D. Glover during the month of January, 2011 is submitted in compliance with the requirement.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Meeting Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
01/03/11	Ministers Mtg	Antioch	As Needed
01/03/11	Livingston Swearing In	Martinez	As Needed
01/04/11	Bay Point MAC Meeting	Bay Point	As Needed
01/11/11	Board of Supervisors	Martinez	Weekly
01/11/11	Board Reorg Lunch	Lafayette	Yearly
01/15/11	NAACP Installation	Antioch	As Needed
01/16/11	Bay Point Temple Event	Bay Point	As Needed
01/17/11	MLK Rally Event	Pittsburg	Yearly
01/17/11	MLK Event	Antioch	Yearly
01/18/11	Board of Supervisors	Martinez	Weekly
01/18/11	Delta Diablo Sant Dist	Antioch	Monthly
01/19/11	Gang Task Force Mtg	Antioch	As Needed
01/20/11	Delta 6 Mtg	Pittsburg	Quarterly
01/20/11	Louann Texeria	Martinez	As Needed
01/21/11	Pastor Kirkland Smith	Antioch	As Needed
01/21/11	Asseblywoman Bonilla/Pitts	Pittsburg	As Needed
01/24/11	Public Protection Mtg	Martinez	Monthly
01/25/11	Board of Supervisors	Martinez	Weekly
01/27/11	CCUSA 2011	Concord	Yearly
01/27/11	Station 84 Opening	Pittsburg	As Needed
01/27/11	Pittsburg Chamber	Pittsburg	Yearly
01/29/11	Antioch Library Opening	Antioch	As Needed
01/31/11	Board Retreat	Lafayette	Yearly

SIGNATURE :

 RECOMMENDATION OF COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE
APPROVE OTHER

ACTION OF BOARD ON	APPROVE AS RECOMMENDED	OTHER
--------------------	------------------------	-------

UNANIMOUS (ABSENT _____)

AYES:_____ NOES:_____
ABSENT:_____ ABSTAIN:_____

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE
AND CORRECT COPY OF AN ACTION TAKEN
AND ENTERED ON THE MINUTES OF THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE DATE
SHOWN.

TTESTED _____
DAVID TWA, CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AND COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
BY _____, DEPUTY



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Moraga Business Person of the Year

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: KATHERINE SINCLAIR, Deputy

Contact: Carol Yates, 925-335-1046

cc:

ATTACHMENTS

Resolution No.
2011/60

*The Board of Supervisors of
Contra Costa County, California*

In the matter of:

Resolution No. 2011/60

Grant William Stubblefield as 2011 Moraga Business Person of the Year.

Whereas, Grant Stubblefield is a solid member of the Moraga community as a lifelong resident who chose a St. Mary's College education as preparation for local business ownership and community leadership; and
Whereas, Grant is a founding member of the Shop Moraga First campaign and Founder of ShopMoragaFirst.com; and

Whereas, Grant is an organizer of the Moraga Community Faire; and

Whereas, Grant is an Officer and Member of the Moraga Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors; and

Whereas, Grant supports the New Rheem Theatre by using his skills to insure the success of the California Film Festival held at that venue; and

Whereas, Grant co-sponsors free monthly electronic recycling programs as the new owner of Neighborhood Computers; and

Whereas, Grant is a self-motivated entrepreneur with a passion for his community which he demonstrates with his involvement and active volunteering for the betterment of Moraga.

Now, therefore be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County does hereby honor and congratulate Grant Stubblefield 2011 Moraga Business Person of the Year.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa,

By: _____, Deputy

Board of Supervisors C.8

Contra Costa County, State of California

RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING GRANT WILLIAM STUBBLEFIELD AS 2011 MORAGA BUSINESS PERSON OF THE YEAR

RESOLUTION NO. 2011/60

WHEREAS, Grant Stubblefield is a solid member of the Moraga community as a lifelong resident who chose a St. Mary's College education as preparation for local business ownership and community leadership; and

WHEREAS, Grant is a founding member of the Shop Moraga First campaign and Founder of ShopMoragaFirst.com; and

WHEREAS, Grant is an organizer of the Moraga Community Faire; and

WHEREAS, Grant is an Officer and Member of the Moraga Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, Grant supports the New Rheem Theatre by using his skills to insure the success of the California Film Festival held at that venue; and

WHEREAS, Grant co-sponsors free monthly electronic recycling programs as the new owner of Neighborhood Computers; and


WHEREAS, Grant serves as an Advisory Board Member of the Moraga Education Foundation—on the Business & Community Partners Committee; and

WHEREAS, Grant is a self-motivated entrepreneur with a passion for his community which he demonstrates with his involvement and active volunteering for the betterment of Moraga.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT resolved that the Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County does hereby honor and congratulate

Grant Stubblefield
2011 Moraga Business Person of the Year


PASSED by a vote of the Board of Supervisors this 15th day of February, 2011.



JOHN GIOIA
District I Supervisor

Absent

MARY N. PIEPHO
District III Supervisor



KAREN MITCHOFF
District IV Supervisor


FEDERAL D. GLOVER
District V Supervisor


GAYLE B. UHLKEMA, Chair
District II Supervisor

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of an Order entered into the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date aforesaid.

David Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

By 

Deputy Clerk





**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Joe Valentine, Employment & Human Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: In the Matter of Honoring Doctor Patricia Stroh for Her Years of Service to Contra Costa County

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ADOPT Resolution No. 2011/ 40 recognizing Doctor Patricia Stroh for her years of services to the Community Services Bureau, Employment and Human Services Department, as recommended by the Employment and Human Services Director. (See PR.)

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

BACKGROUND:

Doctor Patricia Stroh came to the County in 1998 as the Head Start Director and quickly advanced to Community Services Director. After thirteen years of service and numerous awards, Doctor Stroh will be retiring from her position Mid-February.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The Ceremonial Resolution honoring Dr. Stroh for her years of services cannot be awarded.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS



OTHER

RECOMMENDED

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: KATHERINE SINCLAIR, Deputy

Contact: Earl Maciel 3-1648

cc: Earl Maciel

ATTACHMENTS

Resolution No.
2011/40

*The Board of Supervisors of
Contra Costa County, California*

In the matter of:

Resolution No. 2011/40

**Honoring Doctor Patricia Stroh for her Years of Services to Contra Costa County, Community Services Bureau,
Employment and Human Services Department.**

WHEREAS Doctor Stroh came to the County in 1998 as the Head Start Director and soon became Family and Children Services Director and subsequently the Employment and Human Services Department, Community Services Bureau Director; and

WHEREAS Doctor Stroh oversaw the collaborated Head Start and State Child Development Programs, and led the Community Services Department's successful integration into the Employment and Human Services Department, and

WHEREAS Doctor Stroh had more than doubled the Head Start Child Development budget and number of children served and at the same time, led the program from one of part-day part-year to eighty five percent full-day full-year services to better serve families; and

WHEREAS under Doctor Stroh's leadership the program became a Program of Excellence, seventy-five percent National Association for the Education of Young Children Accredited, and received Community Action Recognition; and

WHEREAS Doctor Stroh has been recognized as 2008 California Head Start Association Administrator of the year, and

WHEREAS Doctor Stroh has received U.S. Congressional Recognition for Invaluable Services to the Community; and

WHEREAS Doctor Patricia Stroh, Director of Community Services Bureau, Employment and Human Services Department has announced here retirement effective Mid-February.

NOW THEREFORE Be It Resolved that the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors hereby grants its unwavering gratitude to Doctor Patricia Stroh for her thirteen years of outstanding County service and wish Dr. Stroh every success for the future.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa,

By: _____, Deputy

The Board of Supervisors of C.9 Contra Costa County, California PR.1

In the matter of honoring Doctor Patricia Stroh
for her years of service to Contra Costa County,
Community Services Bureau, Employment and
Human Services Department.

RESOLUTION NO. 2011/40

WHEREAS, Doctor Stroh came to the County in 1998 as the Head Start Director and soon became Family and Children Services Director and subsequently the Employment and Human Services Department, Community Services Bureau Director; and

WHEREAS, Doctor Stroh oversaw the collaborated Head Start and State Child Development Programs, and led the Community Services Department's successful integration into the Employment and Human Services Department; and

WHEREAS, Doctor Stroh had more than doubled the Head Start Child Development budget and number of children served and at the same time, led the program from one of part-day part-year to eighty five percent full-day full-year services to better serve families; and

WHEREAS, under Doctor Stroh's leadership the program became a Program of Excellence, seventy-five percent National Association for the Education of Young Children Accredited, and received Community Action Recognition; and

WHEREAS, Doctor Stroh has been recognized as 2008 California Head Start Association Administrator of the year, and

WHEREAS, Doctor Stroh has received U.S. Congressional Recognition for Invaluable Services to the Community; and

WHEREAS, Doctor Patricia Stroh, Director of Community Services Bureau, Employment and Human Services Department has announced her retirement effective Mid-February.


NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors hereby grants its unwavering gratitude to Doctor Patricia Stroh for her thirteen years of outstanding County service and wish Dr. Stroh every success for the future.

PASSED by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors members present this 15th day of February, 2011.


GAYLE B. ULKEMA


Chair
District II Supervisor

Absent


JOHN GIOIA
District I Supervisor

MARY N. PIEPHO
District III Supervisor


KAREN MITCHOFF
District IV Supervisor


FEDERAL D. GLOVER
District V Supervisor



I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown:

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

DAVID TWA, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and County Administrator

By , Deputy



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Honoring Barbara Center, RN, for her years of service to Emergency Medical Services and to Contra Costa County

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Adopt Resolution honoring Barbara Center, RN, for her years of service to Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and Contra Costa County.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

Barbara's career with Contra Costa County Emergency Services has spanned 26 years. On February 25, 2011 Barbara will be retiring from her position as Regional Disaster Medical/Health Specialist, which she has held since 1991. Barbara has been instrumental in developing the county's trauma program, medical and disaster planning, medical mutual aid response to disasters, and the formation of the Contra Costa Medical Reserve Corps.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Not applicable.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: KATHERINE SINCLAIR, Deputy

Contact: Art Lathrop, 646-4403

cc: Tasha Scott, Barbara Borbon, Juliene Latteri

ATTACHMENTS

Resolution No.
2011/57

*The Board of Supervisors of
Contra Costa County, California*

In the matter of:

Resolution No. 2011/57

Honoring Barbara Center, RN for her years of service to Emergency Medical Services and to Contra Costa County.

WHEREAS, Barbara Center began her nursing career at Children's Hospital Oakland after graduating in 1967 from Providence College of Nursing; she developed an interest in labor and delivery, leading to her obtaining certification as a Lamaze instructor; while working at Broadway Hospital in Vallejo; Barbara moved into emergency nursing, eventually becoming a paramedic base hospital coordinator at then Brookside Hospital in San Pablo; and

WHEREAS, Barbara Center joined the Contra Costa Health Services' Emergency Medical Services (EMS) staff in February 1985 as the Prehospital Care Coordinator; and

WHEREAS, in 1986, Barbara Center became the EMS Agency's first Trauma Coordinator helping to shape the County's trauma program following the designation of John Muir Medical Center as the County's Level II Trauma Center; and

WHEREAS, in 1991 under a grant from the California EMS Authority, Barbara Center became the first Regional Disaster Medical/Health Specialist for the Northern California Coastal Region supporting Dr. William Walker in his role as the Regional Disaster Medical/Health Coordinator, developing medical mutual aid plans and assisting the 16 Northern California Coastal counties in medical disaster planning and in medical mutual aid response to disasters and emergency incidents, as well as assisting in statewide medical mutual aid planning; and

WHEREAS, beginning in 1997, Barbara Center was responsible for the organization and development of the Bay Area Disaster Medical Assistance Team (DMAT CA-6), which was to become one of the premier DMATs available to respond under federal authority to disasters anywhere in the nation; and

WHEREAS, in 2001, Barbara Center was responsible for developing Contra Costa's first EMS for Children program; and

WHEREAS, beginning in 2008, together with Dr. Neil Jayasekera, Barbara Center organized and supports the Contra Costa Medical Reserve Corps, a group of highly dedicated medical volunteers available to assist within the county in disaster medical response and community events such as health fairs and vaccination clinics;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Barbara Center be recognized on the occasion of her retirement after 26 years of Contra Costa County service for her lifetime contributions to emergency medical service and for the legacy she leaves for the people of Contra Costa County and the State of California.

GAYLE B. UILKEMA

Chair,
District II Supervisor

JOHN GIOIA

District I Supervisor

MARY N. PIEPHO

District III Supervisor

KAREN MITCHOFF

District IV Supervisor

FEDERAL D. GLOVER

District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa,

By: _____, Deputy

The Board of Supervisors of C.10 Contra Costa County, California

In the matter of honoring Barbara Center, RN
for her years of service to Emergency Medical
Services and to Contra Costa County.

RESOLUTION NO. 2011/57

WHEREAS, Barbara Center began her nursing career at Children's Hospital Oakland after graduating in 1967 from Providence College of Nursing; she developed an interest in labor and delivery, leading to her obtaining certification as a Lamaze instructor; while working at Broadway Hospital in Vallejo; Barbara moved into emergency nursing, eventually becoming a paramedic base hospital coordinator at then Brookside Hospital in San Pablo; and

WHEREAS, Barbara Center joined the Contra Costa Health Services' Emergency Medical Services (EMS) staff in February 1985 as the Pre-hospital Care Coordinator; and

WHEREAS, in 1986, Barbara Center became the EMS Agency's first Trauma Coordinator helping to shape the County's trauma program following the designation of John Muir Medical Center as the County's Level II Trauma Center; and

WHEREAS, in 1991 under a grant from the California EMS Authority, Barbara Center became the first Regional Disaster Medical/Health Specialist for the Northern California Coastal Region supporting Dr. William Walker in his role as the Regional Disaster Medical/Health Coordinator, developing medical mutual aid plans and assisting the 16 Northern California Coastal counties in medical disaster planning and in medical mutual aid response to disasters and emergency incidents, as well as assisting in statewide medical mutual aid planning; and


WHEREAS, beginning in 1997, Barbara Center was responsible for the organization and development of the Bay Area Disaster Medical Assistance Team (DMAT CA-6), which was to become one of the premier DMATs available to respond under federal authority to disasters anywhere in the nation; and


WHEREAS, in 2001, Barbara Center was responsible for developing Contra Costa's first EMS for Children program; and

WHEREAS, beginning in 2008, together with Dr. Neil Jayasekera, Barbara Center organized and supports the Contra Costa Medical Reserve Corps, a group of highly dedicated medical volunteers available to assist within the county in disaster medical response and community events such as health fairs and vaccination clinics

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Barbara Center be recognized on the occasion of her retirement after 26 years of Contra Costa County service for her lifetime contributions to emergency medical service and for the legacy she leaves for the people of Contra Costa County and the State of California.

PASSED by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors members present this 15th day of February, 2011.



JOHN GIOIA
District I Supervisor



GAYLE B. UILKEMA
Chair
District II Supervisor

Absent

MARY N. PIEPHO
District III Supervisor


KAREN MITCHOFF
District IV Supervisor


FEDERAL D. GLOVER
District V Supervisor



I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an
action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of
Supervisors on the date shown:

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

DAVID TWA, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and
County Administrator

By  Deputy



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Adopt Resolution Honoring the 30th Anniversary of the Cal. State University, East Bay Concord Campus

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II
Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV
Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V
Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III
Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: KATHERINE SINCLAIR, Deputy

Contact: Carolina Salazar, (925)
521-7100

cc:

ATTACHMENTS

Resolution No.
2011/61

*The Board of Supervisors of
Contra Costa County, California*

In the matter of:

Resolution No. 2011/61

HONORING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY CONCORD CAMPUS

Whereas, Concord Campus of California State University, East Bay started with a modest beginning in the fall of 1981 at a site vacated by Pleasant Hill High School. This public institution of higher learning was eagerly greeted by an ever expanding, population living in Central and East Contra Costa County and Southern Solano County.

Whereas, The Trustees of the CSU system approved building a permanent campus in Concord in 1986 on land purchased by the state in the 1970's. The former Cowell Ranch, which included 386 acres of rolling farmland near Lime Ridge Open Space, was to be the site for the new Contra Costa Campus.

Whereas, 1991 was a pivotal year in the campus's evolution: the 10th anniversary of the Contra Costa Campus and the year in which construction began on what would be the first permanent branch campus in the CSU.

Whereas, The campus in Concord opened in fall of 1992 with 90,000 square feet of classrooms, offices, laboratories, a library, computer lab, student center, and art studio, providing twice the space found at the old high school site.

Whereas, The Concord Campus currently serves over 1400 students. Academic offerings currently include eight bachelors and five masters degrees, teaching credentials, and certificate programs. Bachelors degrees include Business Administration, Criminal Justice Administration, English, Human Development, Liberal Studies, Nursing, Psychology, Recreation and Sociology. Masters degrees include Counseling, Education, Educational Leadership, Public Administration, and Social Work.

Whereas, The future for the Concord Campus includes offering programs that continue to meet the workforce needs of the county by providing quality degrees and programming that meet the needs of busy working professionals and freshman students interested in health care. The campus is eager to move forward, working with a cross sector of community, business and educational leaders to meet the needs of Contra Costa County for the 21st Century economy.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that Supervisor Karen Mitchoff hereby honors California State University, East Bay Concord Campus for 30 years of service in the community.

GAYLE B. UILKEMA

Chair,
District II Supervisor

JOHN GIOIA

District I Supervisor

MARY N. PIEPHO

District III Supervisor

KAREN MITCHOFF

District IV Supervisor

FEDERAL D. GLOVER

District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa,

By: _____, Deputy

C.11

The Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County, California

In the matter of honoring the 30th anniversary of
the California State University, East Bay
Concord Campus

RESOLUTION NO. 2011/61

WHEREAS, the Concord Campus of California State University, East Bay started with a modest beginning in the fall of 1981 at a site vacated by Pleasant Hill High School; this public institution of higher learning was eagerly greeted by an ever expanding, population living in Central and East Contra Costa County, Southern Solano County; and

WHEREAS, the Trustees of the CSU system approved building a permanent campus in Concord in 1986 on land purchased by the state in the 1970s the former Cowell Ranch, which included 386 acres of rolling farmland near Lime Ridge Open Space, was to be the site for the new Contra Costa Campus; and

WHEREAS, 1991 was a pivotal year in the campus' evolution: the 10th anniversary of the Contra Costa Campus and the year in which construction began on what would be the first permanent branch campus in the CSU; and

WHEREAS, the campus in Concord opened in fall of 1992 with 90,000 square feet of classrooms, offices, laboratories, a library, computer lab, student center, and art studio, providing twice the space found at the old high school site; and

WHEREAS, the Concord Campus currently serves over 1400 students; academic offerings currently include eight baccalaureate and five masters degrees, teaching credentials, and certificate programs; baccalaureate degrees include Business Administration, Criminal Justice Administration, English, Human Development, Liberal Studies, Nursing, Psychology, Recreation and Sociology; masters degrees include Counseling, Education, Educational Leadership, Public Administration, and Social Work; and

WHEREAS, the future for the Concord Campus includes offering programs that continue to meet the workforce needs of the County by providing quality degrees and programming that meet the needs of busy working professionals and freshman students interested in health care; the campus is eager to move forward, working with a cross sector of community, business and educational leaders to meet the needs of Contra Costa County for the 21st Century economy.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors hereby honors California State University, East Bay Concord Campus for 30 years of service in the community.


PASSED by a unanimous vote of the Board of Supervisors members present this 15th day of February, 2011.


GAYLE B. ULKEMA

Chair


District II Supervisor


Absent


JOHN GIOIA
District I Supervisor

MARY N. PIEPHO
District III Supervisor


KAREN MITCHOFF
District IV Supervisor


FEDERAL D. GLOVER
District V Supervisor




Introduced by Supervisor Karen Mitchoff

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown:

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

DAVID TWA, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and County Administrator

By  Deputy



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: David Twa, County Administrator
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Dissolution of the Advisory Housing Commission for the Housing Authority of the County of Contra Costa

RECOMMENDATION(S):

INTRODUCE Ordinance No. 2011-01, which dissolves the Advisory Housing Commission for the Housing Authority of the County of Contra Costa, WAIVE reading, and FIX March 1, 2011 for adoption, as requested by the Housing Authority Executive Director.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No impact on the County General Fund.

BACKGROUND:

On April 27, 2010, the Contra Costa County Housing Authority Board of Commissioners directed staff to take steps to dissolve the Housing Authority's Advisory Housing Commission and increase the size of the Board of Commissioners to eight members.

The first step in the process is for the Board of Supervisors to dissolve the Advisory Housing Commission by repealing the ordinance that established



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE:

John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT:

Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: JULIE ENEA (925)
335-1077

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

the commission. The commission was established on November 24, 1981 by Ordinance No. 3359, which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in its capacity as the Board of Commissioners.

The attached ordinance, Ordinance No. 2011-01, repeals Ordinance No. 3359. The attached ordinance is recommended for adoption by the Board of Supervisors in accordance with Health and Safety Code section 34291, which provides that a board of supervisors may establish a housing advisory commission by ordinance. Because Ordinance No. 3359 was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in its capacity as the Board of Commissioners, the Board of Commissioners will consider ratifying Ordinance No. 2011-01 following its adoption by the Board of Supervisors.

Following adoption of the attached ordinance by the Board, staff will present the following items to the Board of Supervisors, as the governing body of the Housing Authority:

1. A resolution to increase the size of the Board of Commissioners to eight commissioners. The eight commissioners will be the five members of the Board of Supervisors, two tenant commissioners, and a commissioner who is a homeless or formerly homeless person.
2. A board order appointing new members to the Board of Commissioners.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

ATTACHMENTS

Ordinance Dissolving Advisory Housing Commission

ORDINANCE NO. 2011-01

(uncodified)

(Advisory Housing Commission - Dissolution)

The Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors ordains as follows:

SECTION I. SUMMARY. This ordinance dissolves the Advisory Housing Commission for the Housing Authority of the County of Contra Costa, established by Housing Authority Ordinance No. 3359 on November 24, 1981.

SECTION II. The Advisory Housing Commission of the Housing Authority of the County of Contra Costa is hereby dissolved.

SECTION III. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance becomes effective 30 days after passage, and within 15 days of passage shall be published once with the names of supervisors voting for and against it in the Contra Costa Times, a newspaper published in the County.

PASSED on _____, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST: DAVID TWA,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
and County Administrator

Board Chair

By: _____
Deputy

[SEAL]

JKK:

H:\Ordinance\Advisory Housing Commission.Ordinance.wpd



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: REAPPOINTMENT TO THE FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION(S):

REAPPOINT the following person to the District II Seat of the Fish and Wildlife Committee for a two-year term with an expiration date of February 28, 2013, as recommended by Supervisor Uilkema:

Mr. Daniel Pellegrini
2207 Boulder Creek Court
Martinez, CA 94553

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

Established on December 13, 1994 the purpose of the Fish and Wildlife Committee is to:

- Advise the Board of Supervisors on fish and wildlife issues in Contra Costa County.
- Make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for the expenditure of funds from the Fish and Wildlife Propagation Fund pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 13103.
-



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: KATHERINE SINCLAIR, Deputy

Contact: Jill Ray, 925-335-1046

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

Address issues surrounding the enforcement of fish and game laws and regulations in the County.

- Consider other issues which may from time to time be referred to the Committee by the Board of Supervisors

The committee is comprised of ten members:

- One appointed by each Supervisor
- Four appointed by the Internal Operations Committee
- One alternate

Mr. Pellegrini has served as the District II member on the Fish and Wildlife Committee since the committees inception. He has done an excellent job representing District II and Supervisor Uilkema would to reappoint him for another term.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The current term will expire and the seat will be unfilled.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Appoint Kim Zvik to the Alternate Seat 1 on the Kensington Municipal Advisory Committee (KMAC)

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Appoint the following person to the Alternate Seat 1 on the Kensington Municipal Advisory Committee (KMAC) to a term ending on 12/31/2014, as recommended by Supervisor Gioia:

Kim Zvik
223 Willamette Avenue
Kensington, CA 94708

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

The KMAC shall advise the Board of Supervisors on land-use planning matters affecting the Kensington community, such as land-use designations, master-plan amendments, environmental-impact reports, negative declarations, and zoning-variance applications. The KMAC shall also



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: KATHERINE SINCLAIR, Deputy

Contact: Kate Rauch 510-374-3231

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

represent the community before the County Planning Commission, the Zoning Administrator, and the County Board of Supervisors on such land use, planning and zoning matters. It is understood that the Board of Supervisors is the final decision making authority with respect to issues concerning the Kensington community and that the KMAC shall serve solely in an advisory capacity. In addition, the KMAC may: Advise the Board of Supervisors on local government services as requested by the Board; provide input and reports to the Board, County staff or any County hearing body on issues of concern to the community; serve as liaison between the community and the County Supervisor representing Kensington.

Supervisor Gioia recruits for his advisory body seats in numerous ways including through advertisements or notifications in news publications, his website, and his office newsletters and eblasts. All eligible candidates are interviewed.

Kim Zvik, a 11 year Kensington resident, is involved in several community organizations and activities, including the Kensington Hilltop School PTA Garden Party and El Cerrito youth baseball. She is an IT Project Manager with a degree from UC-Berkeley.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The seat will remain unfilled.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.



AIR-7019

Consent 28.

BOS Agenda

Appointments & Resignations

Meeting Date: 02/15/2011

Time (Duration):

Appointments to the Contra Costa Centre Municipal Advisory Board

Submitted For: Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor

Department: Board of Supervisors District IV

Noticed Public Hearing: No **Official Body:** Board of Supervisors

Presenter/Phone, if applicable: **Audio-Visual Needs:**

Handling Instructions: **District:** District IV

Contact, Phone: Carolina
Salazar, (925)
521-7100

Recommendation(s):

REAPPOINT the following individuals to the Appointed Seats 4, 5, and 7 of the Contra Costa Centre Municipal Advisory Council to serve terms coterminous to the term of the District Four Supervisor, ending January 4, 2015 as recommended by Supervisor Mitchoff:

Appointed Seat 4
Brian Amador
697 Glasgow Circle
Lafayette, CA 94526

Appointed Seat 5
Lynette Busby
3740 Brookside Drive
Martinez, CA 94553

Appointed Seat 7
Larry McEwen
1175 Elmwood Drive
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Background:

The Contra Costa Centre Municipal Advisory Council advises the Board of Supervisors on local government services for the community, and provides input and reports to the Board, county staff, or any county hearing body on issues of concern to the community.

The Council also advises the Board of Supervisors on land-use planning matters affecting the Contra Costa Centre community, such as land-use designations, General Plan amendments, environmental-impact reports, negative declarations, rezonings, land use permits, preliminary and final development plans, and variances.

Supervisor Mitchoff is very pleased with the service that the above individuals have provided the County by sitting on the Contra Costa Centre Municipal Advisory Council and wishes to reappoint them to an additional term.

Consequence of Negative Action:

The Contra Costa Centre Municipal Advisory Council will not be adequately staffed and will be unable to conduct business.

Children's Impact Statement:

None.

Budget Information

Information about available funds

Budgeted: ☐

Funds Available: ☐

Adjustment: ☐

Amount Available:

Unbudgeted: ☐

Funds NOT Available: ☐

Amendment: ☐

Account Code(s) for Available Funds

1:

Fund Transfers

Attachments

No file(s) attached.

Minutes Attachments

No file(s) attached.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Medical Staff Appointments and Reappointments – January 2011

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve new medical staff members, requests for additional privileges, primary department changes, membership extensions, advancements to permanent staff, biennial reappointments, renewal of privileges, and resignations, as recommended by the Medical Executive Committee at their January 24, 2011 Meeting, and by the Health Services Director.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations has requested that evidence of Board of Supervisors approval for each Medical Staff member will be placed in his or her Credentials File. The above recommendations for appointment/reappointment were reviewed by the Credentials Committee and approved by the Medical Executive Committee.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this action is not approved, Contra Costa Regional Medical and Contra

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: KATHERINE SINCLAIR, Deputy

Contact: Anna Roth, 370-5101

cc: Joanna Fon, Tasha Scott, Barbara Borbon

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION: (CONT'D)

Costa Health Centers' medical staff would not be appropriately credentialed and not be in compliance with the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not Applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

G:\C&G DIRECTORY\NON CONTRACTS\BO Jan. page 1.doc

G:\C&G DIRECTORY\NON CONTRACTS\Attachment 1.doc

A. Request to add Psychiatric NP to the Psychiatry Privileges forms

Attachment 1

B. New Medical Staff Members

Katharine Ballinger, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology
Omri Berger, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology
Ryan Estevez, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology
Bradley Glenn, MD	Diagnostic Imaging
Rebecca Render, DO	Family Medicine
Anita Wang, MD	Emergency Medicine

C. Request for Additional Privileges

Thomas McCoy, MD	Emergency Medicine
Chiu Tung, MD	Anesthesia
Michelle Wong, MD	Family Medicine

D. Request to Change Primary Department (FM) to Emergency Medicine

Maya Shaw, MD

E. 12-Month Provisional Status - Request to extend for an additional 3-12 Months

Jenya Dvorkin, NP	Ob/Gyn
Dayna Parish, MD	Pediatrics
Christina Seed, DO	Family Medicine
George Vandermark, MD	Pathology

F. Advance to Non-Provisional

Madeline Andrew, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology
Hiya Asrani, MD	Pediatrics
Leslie Gillis, NP	Family Medicine
Richard Makman, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology
Natasha Pinto, MD	Family Medicine
Annie Thomas, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology

G. Biennial Reappointments

Philipp Banwart, MD	Family Medicine	A
Peter Broderick, MD	Family Medicine	C
James Carpenter, MD	Pediatrics	A
Grace Cavallaro, MD	Ob/Gyn	A
Daniel Forkin, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology	P/C
Susan Feierabend, MD	Ob/Gyn	A
Imtiaz Ghorri, MD	Pediatrics	A
Estela Hernandez, MD	Emergency Medicine	A
Anthony Jones, MD	Internal Medicine	C
Varujan Keledjian, MD	Internal Medicine	C
Paul Kwok, DO	Anesthesia	A
T. Rich McNabb, MD	Family Medicine	A
William Peterson, MD	Emergency Medicine	A

Michael Price, MD	Diagnostic Imaging	C
David Reedy, MD	Emergency Medicine	A
Paul Reif, MD	Internal Medicine	A
Vinod Sharma, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology	A
Lisa Wang, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology	A
Gila Wildfire, MD	Family Medicine	A
Peter Won, MD	Diagnostic Imaging	A

H. Biennial Renewal of Privileges

Christine Costa, NP	Ob/Gyn	Aff
Jenya Dvorkin, NP	Ob/Gyn	Aff
Patricia Hill, NP	Family Medicine	Aff
Phyllis Howard, NP	Family Medicine	Aff
Anthony Longoria, NP	Family Medicine	Aff
Paul Manaut, NP	Family Medicine	Aff

I. Voluntary Resignations

Christopher Benitez, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology
Nazia Choudhury, MD	Anesthesia
David Jablons, MD	Surgery
Jacob Meyer, MD	Family Medicine
Richard Schwarz, MD	Psychiatry/Psychology

**Contra Costa Regional Medical Center
Privileges Request Form**

Practitioner: _____

Department(s)	Number	Privilege Description D=With Direct Supervision C=With Consultation U=Unrestricted	D/C/U	Training/ Education	Experience	Current Competence	✓ Requested	✓ Granted	D=Denied P=Pending CNM=Criteria Not Meet
		PSYCHIATRY							
		Psychiatry - Expanded Outpatient							
	PSI 2	<i>Complex outpatient psychiatric care as above...</i> 14 - 17 years	C	Psyi or Psychiatric NP	1 yr.	N/A			
			U	Psyi	2 yrs.	1 yr. in last 4 yrs.			
	PSI 3	<i>Complex outpatient psychiatric care as above...</i> 18 - 59 years	C	Psyi or Psychiatric NP	1 yr.	N/A			
			U	Psyi	2 yrs.	1 yr. in last 4 yrs.			
GER	PSI 4	<i>Complex outpatient psychiatric care as above...</i> ≥ 50 years	C	FP or IM or Ger or Psyi or Psychiatric NP	1 yr.	N/A			
			U	Ger or Psyi	2 yrs.	1 yr. in last 4 yrs.			



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: REAPPOINTMENT TO THE MOBILE HOME ADVISORY COMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION(S):

REAPPOINT the following individual to the District III Owner seat on the Contra Costa Mobile Home Advisory Committee to a term expiring January 1, 2015 as recommended by Supervisor Mary Nejedly Piepho:

Robert Mason
1336 Blvd. Way #206
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

The Mobile Home Advisory Committee (MHAC) was established by the Board of Supervisors in 1978. The Committee's role and responsibilities are as follows:

- To advise the Board of Supervisors on policies and issues relating to mobile home parks in the unincorporated area of the County.
-

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III
Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: KATHERINE SINCLAIR, Deputy

Contact: LEA CASTLEBERRY,
925-820-8683

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

To work with mobile home park owners and residents to improve resident/owner communications, and resolve problems and conflicts in mobile home parks.

- To provide a forum for resident/owner discussion of perceived problems in mobile home parks when other means of communication have broken down.
- To discuss problems of park maintenance and work with residents, park owners, and County staff to resolve identified problems.

There are currently thirteen seats on the Committee and they are appointed as follows:

- Five Members, one from each Supervisorial District, shall represent the mobile home park owners/managers.
- Five Members, one from each Supervisorial District, shall represent the homeowners/ residents.
- Three At-Large Members who are to be neither mobile home park residents or mobile home park owners/managers and shall represent the public at large.

Ms. Mason's term expired. Applications were accepted and the recommendation to reappoint the above individual was then determined.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The seat will remain unfilled.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.



Contra Costa County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Legislation Committee
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Amendment to 2011 Federal Legislative Platform

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE an amendment to the 2011 Federal Legislative Platform to include a policy position in support of legislation that would modify the Internal Revenue Code and corresponding regulations to permit public employees to make an irrevocable election between their current pension formula and a less rich pension formula, as recommended by the Legislation Committee.

AUTHORIZE Board members, the County's federal and state legislative representatives and the County Administrator, or designee, to prepare and present information, position papers and testimony in support of this policy position for consideration by CSAC, NACo, etc.

ACCEPT the report on the Carquinez Scenic Drive SF Bay Trail Improvement Project and concur with its removal from the 2011 Federal Legislative Platform appropriations requests.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Contact: Lara DeLaney,
925-335-1097

By: June McHuen, Deputy

cc:

FISCAL IMPACT:

Like many local government entities nationwide, the County's fiscal position would benefit greatly from reduced pension costs. Allowing local government entities to implement collective bargaining agreements and state legislation that permits employees to elect less rich pension formulas would be a significant step in reducing pension costs.

BACKGROUND:

At its January 18, 2011 meeting, the Board of Supervisors adopted the 2011 Federal Legislative Platform. At the meeting, the Board requested that a matter relating to the implementation of Public Safety retirement provisions contained in SB 524 (Chapter 633, Statutes of 2006) be referred to the Legislation Committee. The Board also requested that the matter of the Carquinez Scenic Drive SF Bay Trail Improvement Project and its recommended removal from the Federal Legislative Platform be discussed by the Legislation Committee.

In 2006, Contra Costa County and the Deputy Sheriff's Association jointly obtained state legislation that would allow members of the Association to make a one-time irrevocable election between their current pension formula and a less rich pension formula, called Tier C. Orange County and its labor organizations obtained similar legislation in 2009. However, neither County has been able to implement this state legislation because such elections currently have negative tax consequences for employees and for retirement plans under federal tax law as interpreted by the Internal Revenue Service.

Like many local government entities nationwide, the County's fiscal position would benefit greatly from reduced pension costs. Allowing local government entities to implement collective bargaining agreements and state legislation that permits employees to elect less rich pension formulas would be a significant step in reducing pension costs.

Therefore, the Legislation Committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors support including the following policy position as an amendment to the 2011 Federal Platform:

The County will support legislation that would modify the Internal Revenue Code and corresponding regulations to permit public employees to make an irrevocable election between their current pension formula and a less rich pension formula.

The Legislation Committee also recommends that this matter be brought forward to CSAC and to NACo, as well as to the National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors for consideration of support.

With regard to the Carquinez Scenic Drive SF Bay Trail Improvement Project, the Legislation Committee received the following report and concurred with the project removal from the appropriations requests in the 2011 Federal Platform:

In 2005, Contra Costa County received a federal earmark for \$1.0 million for the Carquinez Scenic Drive SF Bay Trail Improvement Project. The project was estimated to cost \$6.0 million. In October 2010, East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) was awarded a TIGER II federal grant to construct a trail on Carquinez Scenic Drive. The TIGER II funds and EBRPD's Measure WW funds will fill the funding gap for the proposed trail project. Hereafter, EBRPD will be the lead agency for the remaining preliminary engineering, design, and construction of the Carquinez Scenic Drive SF Bay Trail Improvements. EBRPD will assume ownership and maintenance of the trail once constructed.

The trail will be constructed along the closed portion of Carquinez Scenic Drive. EBRPD has requested the assignment of easement for a trail on Carquinez Scenic Drive. Once the easement is accepted by EBRPD, Contra Costa County will be vacating the roadway right-of-way within this closed segment. The Contra Costa County Real Property Division is currently processing these requests and is expected to complete the assignment and vacation sometime in April 2011.

A draft MOU between the County and EBRPD has been reviewed by our County Counsel, and staff hopes to bring the agreement to the full Board for approval in the near future. In conclusion, it appears the project is now fully funded and, therefore, no additional appropriations/earmarks are required.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Unless this amendment to the 2011 Federal Legislative Platform is adopted, there will be no authority for the Board, the County's federal advocate, or staff to pursue legislation that would achieve the modifications to the Internal Revenue Code and corresponding regulations to permit public employees to make an irrevocable election between their current pension formula and a less rich pension formula.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS

2011 Federal Legislative Platform - FINAL

2011 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM CONTRA COSTA COUNTY



Each year, the Board of Supervisors adopts a Federal Legislative Platform that establishes project priorities and policy positions with regard to potential federal legislation and regulation. The 2011 Federal Legislative Platform includes 11 requests for FFY 2012 appropriations; 3 requests for the reauthorization of the federal transportation act; and 4 requests for the reauthorization of the Water Resources Development Act.

FFY 2012 FEDERAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS

The following list is a preliminary ranking in priority order. Adjustments to the priority order may be appropriate once the President releases his budget. The current priority ranking gives preference to those projects that we know will not be included in the President's budget, with lower priority to Army Corps of Engineers projects which may be in the budget. Also, Army Corps project requests will be adjusted to be consistent with Corps capability.

1. Delta LTMS-Pinole Shoal Management, CA – **\$2,500,000** appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers to continue a Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) for levee rehabilitation, dredging and sediment reuse in the Delta, similar to the effort completed in the Bay area. Levee work, reuse of dredged sediments, dredging and other activities have been difficult to accomplish due to permitting problems and a divergence of priorities related to water quality. Significant levee rehabilitation is critical to the long term stability of these levees and to water quality and supply for the 23 million Californians who depend upon this water. Stakeholders from the Department of Water Resources, Ports, Army Corps, levee reclamation districts, local governments and other interested parties are participating in the LTMS. A Sediment or Dredged Material Management Office will be established, and in the longer term, preparation of a Sediment Management Plan will consider beneficial reuse of dredged materials as one potential source of sediment for levees. *(Note: \$500,000 appropriated for FFY 2005; \$225,000 for FFY 2006; \$500,000 for FFY 2007; \$462,000 for FFY 2008; \$235,000 for FFY 2009; \$100,000 for FFY 2010.)*

2. Safe and Bright Futures for Children Exposed to Domestic Violence – **\$400,000** appropriation to implement the federally funded plan to diminish the damaging effects of domestic violence on children and adolescents and to stop the cycle of intentional injury and abuse. A three year assessment and planning process resulted in a program plan that will align and create a system responsive to the needs of children exposed to domestic violence through identification, intervention, and treatment; raising awareness; training professionals; utilizing and disseminating data; establishing consultation teams to support providers in intervening and using best practices; and developing targeted services. The local domestic violence hotline received over 3,100 calls involving children last year (60% of all calls). Exposure to trauma like domestic violence reshapes the human brain, influences personality, shapes personal skills and behaviors, impacts academic performance, and substantially contributes to the high

cost of law enforcement, civil/criminal justice and social services. (Note: \$428,000 appropriated for FFY 2009; \$550,000 for FFY 2010.)

3. Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine Clean-up – **\$483,000** appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers to complete phase 3 and 4 of the Technical Planning Process for the Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine Demonstration Project. The project will clean up the mine in a cost effective, environmentally-sound manner with minimal liability exposure for the County and involving all stakeholders through an open community-based process. The Corps initiated a Technical Planning Process in June 2008 to develop a preliminary remediation plan, identify applicable permit and environmental data requirements and complete a data collection and documentation program for the clean-up of the Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine. Phase 1 and 2 of the planning process has been completed and this appropriation will allow the Corps to continue the planning process and complete phase 3 and 4. The planning process will include looking at watershed issues downstream of the mercury mine. The Corps will be focusing on the mine site and the local Contra Costa County Flood Control District will be focusing on the broader watershed issues. The mine site is located on private property on the northeast slope of Mt. Diablo at the upper end of the Marsh Creek watershed. (Note: \$517,000 appropriated in FFY 2008.)

4. Lower Walnut Creek, California – **\$600,000** appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers continue their general reevaluation of the lower five miles of the Walnut Creek Channel to restore flood capacity, provide environmental enhancement and ecosystem restoration. The project is designed to help improve flood protection in a densely populated area, while leaving the creek in a natural state, thus providing habitat for migratory birds, fish and other wildlife; increasing neighborhood livability; and allowing for linkages with recreational and park land. (Note: \$188,000 appropriated for FFY 2006; no FFY 2007 appropriation; \$562,000 for FFY 2008; \$287,000 for FFY 2009; \$0 for FFY 2010.)

5. Grayson and Murderer's Creeks (Walnut Creek Basin), California – **\$600,000** appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers to analyze Grayson and Murderer's Creeks to determine the feasibility of providing improved flood protection for a community that regularly experiences flood damages. The project is designed to help improve flood protection in a densely populated area, while leaving the creeks in a natural state, thus providing habitat for migratory birds, fish and other wildlife; increasing neighborhood livability; and allowing for linkages with recreational and park land. (Note: \$100,000 appropriated for FFY 2006; no FFY 2007 appropriation; \$98,000 for FFY 2008.; \$478,000 for FFY 2009; \$90,000 for FFY 2010.)

6. CALFED Bay Delta Reauthorization Act Levee Stability Improvement Program (LSIP) – **\$20,000,000** appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers for levee rehabilitation planning and project implementation. The CALFED Reauthorization Act, passed in January 2004, authorized \$90 million, which may be appropriated for levee rehabilitation work. The Corps has prepared a "180-Day Report" which identifies projects and determines how these funds would be spent. Since that time, the breakdown of CALFED, coupled with the Army Corps' attempts to define an appropriate

and streamlined process, has delayed funding and resultant levee work. (Note: \$500,000 appropriated for FFY 2006; \$400,000 for FFY 2007; \$4.92 million for FFY 2008; \$4.844 million for FFY 2010.)

7. Suisun Bay Channel/New York Slough Maintenance Dredging – \$5,275,000 appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers for maintenance dredging of this channel to the authorized depth of minus 35 feet. Continued maintenance is essential for safe transport of crude oil and other bulk materials through the San Francisco Bay, along the Carquinez Straits and into the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta. Dredging for this channel section is particularly costly due to requirements on placement of dredged materials in upland environments. An oil tanker ran aground in early 2001 due to severe shoaling in a section of this channel, which creates a greater potential for oil spills (Note: \$4.559 million appropriated for FFY 2005; \$4.619 million for FFY 2006; \$2.82 million for FFY 2007; \$2.856 million for FFY 2008; \$2.768 million for FFY 2009; \$3.819 million for FFY 2010.)

8. San Pablo/Mare Island Strait/Pinole Shoal Channel Maintenance Dredging – \$5,400,000 appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers (\$2.65 million for Mare Island) for maintenance dredging of the channel to the authorized depth of minus 35 feet. The Pinole Shoal channel is a major arterial for vessel transport through the San Francisco Bay region, serving oil refineries and bulk cargo which is transported as far east as Sacramento and Stockton. (Note: \$1 million appropriated for FFY 2005; \$2.988 million for FFY 2006; \$896,000 for FFY 2007; \$1.696 million for FFY 2008; \$1.058 million for FFY 2009; \$2.518 million for FFY 2010.)

9. San Francisco to Stockton (J. F. Baldwin and Stockton Channels) Ship Channel Deepening – \$1,800,000 appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers to continue the Deepening Project. Deepening and minor realignment of this channel will allow for operational efficiencies for many different industries, an increase in waterborne goods movement, reduced congestion on roadways, and air quality benefits. Phase one work focused on establishing economic benefit to the nation and initial salinity modeling in the channel sections. The second and final phase includes detailed channel design, environmental documentation, cost analysis, additional modeling, and dredged material disposal options. (Note: \$500,000 appropriated for FFY 2005; \$200,000 for FFY 2006; \$200,000 for FFY 2007; \$403,000 for FFY 2008; \$1.34 million for FFY 2009; \$0 for FFY 2010.)

10. Contra Costa County's VHF Public Safety Radio System – \$1,063,200 appropriation for Contra Costa County operation of a VHF Public Safety Radio System serving several governmental agencies (including emergency medical services) within the county. This system will soon become a backup (VHF overlay) to the East Bay Regional Communication System (EBRCS) once that system is completed and actuated. To comply with upcoming Federal Communications Commission (FCC) narrow band requirements, the VHF system must be upgraded to ensure seamless compatibility with certain aspects of the EBRCS, should that system fail. To prevent the VHF system from being compromised, several significant security enhancements are necessary at various site locations. This includes camera monitoring and alert systems.

11. State Route 4 / Old River Bridge Study – **\$1,000,000** appropriation to work with San Joaquin County and the State of California on a study of improving or replacing the Old River Bridge along State Route 4 on the Contra Costa / San Joaquin County line. The study would determine a preferred alternative for expanding or replacing the existing bridge, which is part of State Route 4. The existing bridge is narrow, barely allowing two vehicles to pass each other, and is aligned on a difficult angle relative to the highway on either side, requiring motorists to make sharp turns onto and off of the bridge. The project would improve safety and traffic flow over the bridge. (Note: no appropriations for this project as yet.)

2011 REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

The current federal transportation policy and spending act, a five-year act known as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users, or SAFETEA-LU, expired in 2009. Its reauthorization will likely be crafted during the year. The following are priority projects for inclusion in the next multi-year transportation bill.

1. Vasco Road Safety Improvement Project -- **\$30 million** (reduced from \$40 million in 2009 platform, due to receipt of \$10 million in ARRA funds) for improvements to a 2.5-mile accident-prone section of Vasco Road. Project components include widening the roadway to accommodate a concrete median barrier and shoulders on either side of the barrier, construction of the barrier, and extension of an existing passing lane. The project will eliminate cross-median accidents which have caused numerous fatalities in recent years, and will provide increased opportunities for vehicles to safely pass (unsafe passing is a major cause of accidents and fatalities on this segment of the increasingly busy two-lane undivided road). The project will include provisions for wildlife undercrossings to preserve migration patterns. The funds will complement \$10 million programmed for the project in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. (10th/11th Districts, Garamendi/ McNerney)

2. North Richmond Truck Route -- **\$25 million** (increased from \$15.5 million in the 2009 platform due to engineering issues pertaining to levees and railroad right of way) to construct a new road that will provide truck access between businesses and the Richmond Parkway, moving the truck traffic away from a residential neighborhood and elementary school. This project will increase safety, improve public health around the school and residential area by reducing diesel particulate emissions from those areas, increase livability of the neighborhood, improve local access to the Wildcat Creek Regional Trail, stimulate economic development in the industrial area of the community and provide a better route for trucks traveling to and from the Richmond Parkway. The alignment was developed through a community planning process funded through an Environmental Justice planning grant from Caltrans. (7th District, Miller)

3. Eastern Contra Costa Trail Network -- **\$5 million** for a joint planning, environmental review, right-of-way acquisition and constructions of a coordinated network of trails for walking, bicycling and equestrian uses in eastern Contra Costa

County. Eligible trails include, but are not limited to, (1) the Mokelumne Trail overcrossing of the State Route 4 Bypass; (2) Contra Costa segments of the Great California Delta Trail; (3) a supportive network of East Contra Costa trails in unincorporated County areas and the cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley and Pittsburg (All districts)

Following are priority programs for inclusion in the next multi-year transportation bill:

- **Rural Road Funding Program** – The County supports the creation of a new funding program that will provide funds for converting or upgrading rural roads into more modern roads that can handle increasing commuter traffic in growing areas, such as East County. These roads do not often compete well in current grant programs because they do not carry as many vehicles as roads in more congested urban or suburban areas. As a result, improvements such as widening, realignment, drainage improvements and intersection modifications often go unfunded, leaving such roads with operational and safety problems as well as insufficient capacity. *(All districts)*
- **Transportation Funding for Disabled, Low-income, and Elderly Persons** – The County supports continuation and increased funding levels for the three federal funding programs dedicated to transit services for these population groups -- the New Freedom Program for senior transit services, the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program which funds transit services to job locations for low-income persons, and the Section 5310 transit funding program for the elderly and individuals with disabilities. SAFETEA-LU provided a total of \$1.7 billion nationwide for these programs. By comparison, \$200 billion was provided for highway projects; even transportation research got more funding (\$2.3 billion) than transit for elderly, disabled and low-income persons. All of the demographic trends point to a growing need for such services in the future. For example, the 65-and-older population in the Bay Area is projected to more than double by the year 2030.

Transit services for elderly, disabled, and low-income persons are provided by the County, by some cities, by all of the bus transit operators, and by many community organizations and non-profits that provide social services. Increased funding is needed to provide and maintain more service vehicles, operate them longer throughout the day, upgrade the vehicle fleet and dispatching systems, improve coordination between public providers and community groups that also provide such services to their clients, and expand outreach programs to inform potential riders of the available services, among other needs. *(All districts)*

REAUTHORIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT (WRDA)

The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 became law in November, more than seven years after the last authorization bill. The House and Senate Committees may propose a WRDA bill in 2011. The following are projects the County would submit for inclusion.

1. Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine Clean-up - Authorize the Army Corps of Engineers, through their Remediation of Abandoned Mine Site program (RAMS), to perform and complete the Technical Planning Process and site characterization of the Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine in Contra Costa County as a demonstration project with no local match, and authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to construct the clean-up project at the Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine. This mine remediation project is the first to combine the Corps' RAMS program and partnering agreements with local government to resolve liability issues associated with a clean-up project on private property and address mercury pollution on a watershed basis. Since this is a demonstration project, the Corps would fund the full Technical Planning Process Remedial Investigation, design and project construction.

A 1995 study of Marsh Creek indicated the Mt. Diablo Mercury Mine tailings are responsible for 88% of the mercury in Marsh Creek. In addition, mercury levels in fish in Marsh Creek Reservoir downstream of the mine exceed the health standard concentration of 0.5 ppm.

2. Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Infrastructure Improvements –Contra Costa County, together with the four other Delta counties of Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano and Yolo, is requesting authorization for the Army Corps of Engineers to repair infrastructure in the Delta. This includes levees rehabilitation projects in the Delta as part of an overall system, rather than on a county-by-county or island-by-island basis. As the Administration has recognized, this ecosystem is among the most important in the nation, providing a source of drinking water for more than 25 million people, supporting a \$28 billion agricultural industry, and fostering a thriving commercial and recreational fishing industry that contributes millions to the California and national economies. The project is a request for an authorization of \$2.5 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers to upgrade the levee system, including stockpiling rock to rebuild collapsed levees for emergency response purposes at selected areas of the Delta. Because of the importance of the Delta to the nation's agriculture and economy, the request includes a modification of the Federal/local cost share to 90% federal and 10% local.

3. Rodeo Creek, Section 1135 Project – The Contra Costa Flood Control and Water Conservation District is seeking an 1135 project authorization for the Army Corps of Engineers to prepare a study of the feasibility of restoring and enhancing wildlife resources in Rodeo Creek between San Pablo Bay and Highway 80. The channel was designed and constructed to provide adequate flood protection for the community of Rodeo and to control erosion of the creek. The channel currently does this, but requires extensive, environmentally insensitive maintenance to keep the channel functioning properly. In addition, the current channel design includes barriers to migration of anadromous fish. The Contra Costa Flood Control and Water Conservation District would like to partner again with the Corps of Engineers under the Corps' 1135 program to transform this outdated design into a sustainable, environmentally sensitive facility that better serves the community and the environment.

4. Rheem Creek, Section 1135 Project – The Contra Costa Flood Control and Water Conservation District is seeking an 1135 project authorization for Rheem Creek between the mouth at San Pablo Bay and Giant Road. The Army Corps of Engineers' existing flood protection project on Rheem Creek protects a number of commercial, industrial, residential and open space areas in the Richmond / San Pablo area of Contra Costa County. Surrounding the mouth of the creek is a large undeveloped parcel (Brunner Marsh) which has been acquired by the East Bay Regional Park District for a future public park. Development of the adjacent lands as a regional park provides a unique opportunity for an enhanced creek environment in an area that will be very visible to the public.

APPROPRIATIONS AND GRANTS – SUPPORT POSITIONS

*The following support positions are listed in alphabetic order and do not reflect priority order. Please note that new and revised positions are **highlighted and in italics**.*

Buchanan Field Airport – The County approved a Master Plan for the Buchanan Field Airport in October 2008, which includes a Federal Aviation Regulation Part 150 Noise Study and a Business Plan for project implementation. The comprehensive planning effort has ideally positioned Buchanan Field Airport for future aviation (general aviation, corporate aviation and commercial airline service) and aviation-related opportunities. To facilitate the economic development potential, the Business Plan prioritizes necessary infrastructure improvements for Buchanan Field Airport. Further, as the Airport is surrounded by urban residential uses, enhancing the noise program infrastructure is deemed essential for balancing the aviation needs with those of the surrounding communities. The Federal government, primarily through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), provides funding for planning, analysis, and infrastructure improvements. The County will support funding in all these areas for protection and enhancement of our aviation facility and network.

Byron Airport – The Byron Airport is poised for future general and corporate aviation and aviation-related development, but that future growth is dependent upon infrastructure improvements both on and around the Airport. The Byron Airport Business Plan prioritizes infrastructure and possible additional land acquisition to assist the Byron Airport in fulfilling its aviation and economic development potential. The Federal government, primarily through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), provides funding for planning, analysis, infrastructure improvements and aviation land acquisition. The County will support funding in all these areas for protection and enhancement of our aviation facility and network.

East Bay Regional Communication System (EBRCS) – \$3 million appropriation to build the East Bay Regional Communication System (EBRCS), a P25 Radio System infrastructure for Contra Costa and Alameda County. This system will provide interoperable voice communication in both the 800 MHz and 700 MHz frequencies to all public safety and public services agencies within Contra Costa County and Alameda County.

EBRCS will allow for interoperable voice communication within the region that can be integrated with other P25 radio systems outside the geographical area of the EBRCS, for example, with San Francisco. This project will provide Level 5 communications which is the highest level of interoperable communications. This project will allow for everyday interoperable communications, not just various levels of interoperability during big events or disasters in which radio caches are deployed or gateway devices used.

Energy Efficiency & Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) Program – Advocate/support appropriation of funding up to the authorized amount of \$2 billion for the EECBG Program established and authorized under the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007. The County's ability to continue offering programs/services improving energy efficiency and conservation while also creating jobs is contingent upon additional federal funding being appropriated to the EECBG Program in 2012 and beyond. Contra Costa and other local governments have identified and designed many successful programs and financial incentives targeting both the private and public sector which are now being implemented using EECBG funding authorized through the ARRA of 2009. Appropriation of funding for the EECBG program 2012 is necessary to ensure the nation's local governments can continue their leadership in creating clean energy jobs, reducing energy consumption and curbing greenhouse gas emissions.

Kirker Pass Road Truck Climbing Lane – \$10 million appropriation (reduced from \$31 million due to availability of other funding and focusing initially on the northbound direction) for constructing northbound and southbound truck climbing lanes on Kirker Pass Road, a heavily used arterial linking residential areas in eastern Contra Costa with job centers and the freeway system in central Contra Costa. The truck climbing lanes are needed to improve traffic flow and will also have safety benefits. The \$31 million would augment \$3 million in State Infrastructure Proposition 1B funds which the County has allocated for the project.

Regional Habitat Planning and Conservation – \$100 million appropriation to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's "Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund" to keep pace with land costs and the increasing number of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) throughout the country. In partnership with approximately a dozen counties in northern and southern California, the County will support a request that funding for the Fund increase from the \$85 million 2010 level to \$100 million in FY2012. This will provide much needed support to regional HCPs in California and nationally, including the East Contra Costa County HCP. Given the prolific growth in the number of regional HCPs, the Fund needs to be increased even more substantially in subsequent years. The East Contra Costa County HCP has received \$28 million from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund in the past five years and continuing this grant support is of vital importance to the successful implementation of that Plan. The County will also request that the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) include this Fund increase as a priority on CSAC's federal platform.

San Francisco Bay, Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS), Environmental Windows, Science Projects – \$3.45 million appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers’ “Environmental Windows Science Projects” as part of the Bay Area Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS). Environmental Windows are limited timeframes when dredging and, to some extent, disposal can occur within San Francisco Bay and environs. However, the existing windows are based on old and, in some cases, little or no scientific basis. This project would identify where additional science is necessary, prioritize science projects, obtain funding and oversee these scientific studies. The broad-based coalition includes the Bay LTMS Agencies (EPA, BCDC, Corps, Regional Water Board), resource agencies (USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, State Fish and Game) and a number of other agencies, organizations and individuals.

San Francisco Bay Improvement Act– \$1 billion restoration bill authored by Congresswoman Jackie Speier in 2010 but not passed. The bill, if passed, will help finance restoration of more than 100,000 acres of the Bay's tidal wetlands. Funds from the bill would implement a restoration plan that was adopted in 1993. In addition to benefits for fish and wildlife, wetlands restoration will create new jobs and provide regional economic infusions, as well as protect against the effects of sea level rise on the Bay's shores.

Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area– \$10 million bill authored by Senator Dianne Feinstein in 2010 but not passed. The bill, if passed, will authorize and fund a National Heritage Area (NHA) for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The NHA designation would be a first step in providing federal resources to agencies in the Delta for economic development and environmental protection.

Vasco Road-Byron Highway Connector – \$30 million appropriation (increased from \$10 million in 2009 platform due to costs of state and federal environmental review, and anticipated cost increases) for design, engineering and construction of an east-west connector road between two major arterials that link Contra Costa County with Alameda and San Joaquin Counties. The Vasco Road-Byron Highway Connector will improve traffic circulation and linkages in the southeastern portion of the County and will provide a new route for truck traffic that will remove a significant portion of truck trips which currently pass through the rural community of Byron. Vasco Road is designated as State Route 84, and Byron Highway is under study as the potential alignment for future State Route 239.

2011 FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM POLICY POSITIONS

The following support positions are listed in alphabetic order and do not reflect priority order. Please note that new and revised policy positions are **highlighted and in italics**.

Affordable Housing and Homeless Programs –For Housing and Urban Development (HUD)’s Homeless Assistance Grants, the County will support funding that does not include set-asides or other requirements that limit local communities’ ability to respond to the particular needs in their areas. For the Housing Assistance for People with AIDS

(HOPWA) program, the County will support legislation to update the formula used to allocate HOPWA grants to reflect local housing costs as well as the number of AIDS cases.

The County supports full funding for HUD homeless assistance programs. As Congress considers McKinney-Vento reauthorization legislation, the County will advocate for greater local flexibility, including an expanded definition of homelessness that will allow agencies to better respond to locally-determined needs.

Congress should include a formula-driven affordable housing production program in the final version of Government Sponsored Enterprise reform legislation. The County also supports the National Affordable Housing Trust Fund Act.

Resources made available through any new affordable housing production program should be accessible to local housing and community development agencies, including public housing authorities. As the present home mortgage crisis demonstrates, homeownership is not for everyone. While we value and support the role that homeownership plays in meeting affordable housing needs, any new production program should prioritize efforts to address our nation's acute shortage of affordable rental housing.

Agricultural Pest and Disease Control – Agriculture and native environments in Contra Costa County continue to be threatened by a variety of invasive/exotic pests, diseases and non-native weeds. The Federal government provides funding for research, regulation, pest exclusion activities, survey and detection, pest management, weed control, public education and outreach. The County will support funding in all these areas for protection of our agricultural industry and open space. Consistent with the policy position, the County will also support legislation which would authorize and direct the USDA to provide state and local funding for High Risk Prevention programs (also called Pest Detection Funding).

Beneficial Use of Dredged Materials – As the beneficial reuse of dredged materials has a clear public benefit, particularly in the Delta, the County will continue to support beneficial reuse in general and also continue to advocate for funding for a federal study to determine the feasibility of beneficial reuse, considering the benefits and impacts to water quality and water supply in the Delta, navigation, flood control damage, ecosystem restoration, and recreation. The study would include the feasibility of using Sherman Island as a rehandling site for the dredged material, for levee maintenance and/or ecosystem restoration. Language to authorize the study was included in the Water Resources and Development Act (WRDA) which was passed into law on November 8, 2007.

Child Care – The vulnerable children and families we serve face some of the most difficult circumstances of their lifetimes, as unemployment and loss of health insurance increase rapidly, more families are face foreclosure, and food assistance use hits record highs. Our agencies confront sharply rising caseloads and service demands as state

and local budget deficits grow. With respect to issues of child care, the County will advocate for the following federal actions:

Increase funding to support employment of low-income families through greater access to child care subsidies, and increase the access of children from eligible families to high-quality care that supports positive child development outcomes. [*Legislative*]

Provide flexibility at the state and local levels so that quality care can be balanced with access and parental choice.

Require coordination at the federal level among the various early child care and education funding streams.

Child Support –The County will advocate for the following federal actions:

- Eliminate the \$25 fee for non-IV-A families.
- Restore the incentive match payments that were prohibited in the Deficit Reduction Act.
- Allow the automatic use of cash medical support to reimburse Medicaid expenditures.
- Allow IV-D agencies to access Health Insurance records for the purposes of Medical Support.

Child Welfare and Well-being –The County will advocate for the following federal actions:

- Provide states with financial incentives, as opposed to monetary penalties, under the Child and Family Services Reviews and minimize the significant administrative burden associated with the review process.
- End Title IV-E disallowances from federal audits that take away funds from an already resource-strapped child welfare system. Allow states to reinvest these funds in preventing child abuse and neglect.
- Increase prevention dollars to help maintain children safely in their own homes. Federal funding currently gives disproportional support to out-of-home care rather than to preventing children from coming into care.
- Any increase in Federal Medical Assistance Percentage should include an associated increase in the Title IV-E matching rate to help support children in foster care.

Community Development Block Grant and HOME Programs – The County's ability to continue to provide funding to a variety of nonprofit agencies that provide critical services to lower income residents, including financing the development of affordable housing, is threatened by the Administration's proposal to cut the CDBG and program as part of the FY 2012 federal budget. The County will oppose proposed cuts in these vital community development programs.

In addition, the County will oppose any proposed changes in the CDBG allocation formula. CDBG formula funding has declined by 17 percent since FY 2004 while the HOME program's funding has declined by 12 percent during the same period. Both programs need to have funding restored.

At present, the HOME program is the only federal source of affordable housing production funding. The County supports increased funding for HOME, particularly formula grants.

Cost Shifts to Local and State Government – Contra Costa County performs many of its services and programs pursuant to federal direction and funding. Other services and programs are performed at the behest of the state, which receives funding through the federal government. In the past, the Administration's budget has contained significant cuts to entitlement programs and/or caps on entitlements. Such actions could shift cost of services from the federal government to the state and/or local governments (and to the extent that costs would shift to the state, it is highly likely that these would be passed on to the County). The County will oppose any actions that would result in cost shifts on federal entitlement programs or which would result on greater dependency on county funded programs. In addition, the County will support federal and state financial assistance to aid county and local government efforts to meet unfunded federal mandates, such as those contained in the National Response Plan (NRP), the National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP), and the National Incident Management System.

Criminal Debt Collection – Nonpayment of court-ordered victim restitution, fines and fees is a problem of epidemic proportions for all jurisdictions. Literally billions of dollars go uncollected each year across the country, resulting not only in financial suffering of victims, but also the loss of public revenue. Many states already allow for the offset of State Tax Refunds, and these programs are successful in achieving revenue recovery. Federal Tax Refunds are already being successfully offset to pay for delinquent child support. The County will support amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an offset against income tax refunds to pay for court-ordered debts that are past-due.

Designation of Indian Tribal Lands and Indian Gaming – The Board of Supervisors has endorsed the California State Association of Counties' (CSAC) policy documents regarding development on tribal land and prerequisites to Indian gaming. These policy statements address local government concerns for such issues as the federal government's ability to take lands into trust and thus remove them from local land use jurisdiction, absent the consent of the state and the affected county; the need for tribes

to be responsible for all off-reservation impacts of their actions; and assurance that local government will be able to continue to meet its governmental responsibilities for the health, safety, environment, infrastructure and general welfare of all members of its communities. The County will continue to advocate for federal legislation and regulation that supports the CSAC policy documents.

The County will also advocate for limitations on reservation shopping; tightening the definition of Class II gaming machines; assuring protection of the environment and public health and safety; and full mitigation of the off-reservation impacts of the trust land and its operations, including the increased cost of services and lost revenues to the County.

The County will also advocate for greater transparency, accountability and appeal opportunities for local government in the decision-making processes that permit the establishment of Indian gaming facilities. This includes sequencing the processes so that the Indian Lands Determination comes first, prior to initiation of a trust land request and associated environmental review.

The County will also *consider* support for federal action and/or legislation that allows Class III gaming at the existing gaming facility only if it can be shown that any change would result in a facility that would be unique in nature and the facility can demonstrate significant community benefits above and beyond the costs associated with mitigating community impacts.

Economic Development Programs – Congress should fund all the complementary programs within HUD’s community and economic development toolkit, ensuring that HUD does not lose sight of the development component of its mission. To that end, the County will support continued funding for the Section 108 loan guarantee program, the Brownfields Economic Development Initiative and the Rural Housing and Economic Development program. Each of these programs plays a unique role in building stronger, more economically viable communities, while enabling communities to leverage external financing in a way the CDBG program alone cannot do.

Federal “Statewideness” Requirements – For many federally funded programs, there is a “statewideness” requirement; i.e., all counties must operate the specific program under the same rules and regulations. This can hamper the County’s ability to meet local needs, to be cost effective and to leverage the funding of one program to reduce costs in another program. Contra Costa County cannot negotiate for federal waivers or do things differently because it is not a state, yet its population is greater than seven states. Recognizing this is a very long-term effort, the County will advocate for relaxation of the “statewideness” rule to allow individual counties or a consortium of counties to receive direct waivers from the federal government and/or adopt the rules and regulations currently in use in another state for specific programs.

Habitat Conservation Planning – *The County will advocate for elevating the profile of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) such as the East Contra Costa County HCP within*

Congress and Administration so that these critical federal/state/local partnerships can receive necessary attention and support. HCPs are flagship programs for the federal government and supporting effective implementation of approved HCPs should be a top priority for the U.S. Department of the Interior and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and HCPs should be a key tool in any federal climate change or economic stimulus legislation.

Health – The County will advocate for the following actions by the federal government: provide enhanced Medicaid FMAP ("FMAP" is the "Federal Medical Assistance Percentage") for Medicaid. It is the federal matching rate for state Medicaid expenditures. Increasing the federal matching rate for states would free up state general fund money for other purposes and would help counties as well.); suspend the Medicare "clawback" rule; suspend the "60-day rule" that requires states to repay the federal government overpayments identified by the state prior to collection, and even in instances where the state can never collect; ease the ability to cover those eligible for Medicaid by making documentation requirements less stringent; and prevent the implementation of the following seven federal regulations:

- Outpatient hospital
- Case Management
- School Based Administration & Transportation
- Public Provider Cost Limit
- Graduate Medical Education
- Rehabilitation Services Option
- Provider Tax

Pension– *The County will support legislation that would modify the Internal Revenue Code and corresponding regulations to permit public employees to make an irrevocable election between their current pension formula and a less rich pension formula.*

In 2006, Contra Costa County and the Deputy Sheriff's Association jointly obtained state legislation that would allow members of the Association to make a one-time irrevocable election between their current pension formula and a less rich pension formula, called Tier C. Orange County and its labor organizations obtained similar legislation in 2009. However, neither County has been able to implement this state legislation because such elections currently have negative tax consequences for employees and for retirement plans under federal tax law as interpreted by the Internal Revenue Service.

Like many local government entities nationwide, the County's fiscal position would benefit greatly from reduced pension costs. Allowing local government entities to implement collective bargaining agreements and state legislation that permits employees to elect less rich pension formulas would be a significant step in reducing pension costs.

Public Housing Programs –Years of disinvestment threaten the viability of public housing and the well-being of millions of our neediest citizens. Preservation of the existing inventory of public housing units is critical not just to families currently residing in public housing, but also to the millions of families waiting for assistance. The Public Housing program is now in critical condition. The County will support full funding for public housing operations; sufficient funding to help preserve the existing inventory of public housing; funding for unforeseen emergencies or disasters at the former annual levels; and reauthorizing legislation for the HOPE VI program and funding HOPE VI at least at its original level of \$600 million.

The County will support funding of at least \$72 million for Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) coordinators. FSS is a mandatory program for any housing agency that received new vouchers many years ago, but only about 22 percent of agencies receive funding to operate the program, due to recent changes in the program's competitive funding process. Every agency that needs assistance to operate this mandatory program should receive it.

The County will support the enactment of federal legislation to preserve existing public housing stock by addressing the huge unfunded capital needs of public housing through the use of federal income tax credits, tax credit supported bonds and other means.

The County will support putting to use public housing assets valued in excess of \$100 billion by fully enabling public housing authorities to finance the rehabilitation and preservation of public housing by encumbering public housing properties as contemplated by the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA).

The County will support the enactment of a Public Housing Conversion Pilot in which up to 100 asset management projects are converted to project-based Section 8 assistance with oversight transferred to HUD's Office of Housing.

The County will support the development of legislation to reauthorize the HOPE VI program that is workable and accessible to public housing authorities of varying sizes.

The County will support enactment of permanent authorization for the Moving to Work Demonstration Program.

The County will support reform of the contractual relationship between public housing authorities and the federal government, so that federal administrative and regulatory demands fairly reflect resources provided, and federal subsidies for public housing are predictable, adequate and stable.

The County will support a reasonable transition to asset management of public housing with an optional exemption for agencies operating fewer than 500 public housing units.

The County will support the Administrative Reform Initiative (ARI) process begun at HUD in 2007 for regulatory and administrative reform and seek meaningful, practicable

reform of federal oversight activities pertaining to LHAs and the federal programs they administer.

The County will support the development of alternatives to existing methods of evaluating the performance of LHAs and their programs and properties.

The Section 8 HCV program has a demonstrated track record of success. Nonetheless, the HCV program can be further improved to provide public housing authorities with additional tools to help maximize the number of families served in their communities. Legislative and regulatory reform should include enhancements to current voucher subsidy and administrative fee funding distribution formulas; benchmarking important program goals and appropriations; rent simplification; increased self-sufficiency; improved housing affordability burdens and deconcentration of poverty for voucher assisted households; and improving the use of tenant-based vouchers for project-based assistance.

The County will support funding of \$14.9 billion, at a minimum, for the renewal of housing assistance vouchers. Congress should build upon the funding formula revision found in the FY 2007 appropriations bill in order to restore effective funding policies in authorizing language.

The County will also support funding of at least \$1.5 billion for administrative fees and reestablishing the administrative fee structure in place from 1998–2004. The County will support vouchers being renewed at full levels and public housing authorities being provided 100% of administrative funding.

Retiree and Retiree Health Care Costs – The County operates many programs on behalf of the federal government. While federal funding is available for on-going program operations, including employee salaries, the allocation is usually capped, regardless of actual costs. For retiree and retiree health care, the County's ability to contain costs is extremely limited. The County will advocate for full federal financial participation in funding the County's retiree and retiree health obligations.

San Luis Drain – The U. S. Bureau of Reclamation is under a court injunction to evaluate and implement options for providing drainage services for the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. Drainage water from this area contains toxic concentrations of selenium and other hazardous substances. The San Luis Drain is one of the options that was studied. The Drain would pass through Contra Costa County to discharge in the Delta. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has determined to address the problem without building the Drain, but Congress would need to appropriate the funds before this alternative could be implemented and the injunction requiring provision of drainage service still looms. The County will continue to oppose the San Luis Drain option and support, instead, drainage solutions in the valley, such as reducing the volume of problem water drainage; managing/reusing drainage waters within the affected irrigation districts; retiring lands with severe drainage impairment (purchased from willing sellers);

and reclaiming/removing solid salts through treatment, bird safe/bird free solar ponds and farm-based methods.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) – The County will advocate for the following federal actions:

- Increase SNAP benefits as a major and immediately available element of economic stimulus.
- Increase administrative matching funds to a true 75/25 rate (with no cost allocation reductions) so that states can deliver benefits in a timely and effective manner.
- Suspend the restrictions applying to ABAWDs. ("ABAWDs" stands for "Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents" and pertains to adults receiving food stamps who are considered employable.) They are subject to strict time limits on how long they can receive food stamps. It is difficult administratively to track this, and when unemployment is high, it can result in more adults going hungry.
- Remove the current federal barriers that prevent some nutrition programs from employing EBT technology.

Streamlining Permitting for Critical Infrastructure, Economic Stimulus, and Alternative Energy Projects –“Green” Job Creation – Request that Congress and the Administration recognize the value of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) as a reliable way of streamlining critical infrastructure, economic stimulus, and alternative energy project permitting in a manner that is consistent with federal environmental regulations. HCPs not only facilitate such projects through permit streamlining, but the planning, implementation, management, and monitoring needs associated with regional HCPs plans also create many quality “green” jobs.

Telecommunications Act of 1996 Revisions – The Telecommunications Act of 1996 governs local government’s role in telecommunications, primarily broadband cable that uses the County’s right-of-way as well as consumer protections. As Congress works to update the Act, the County will continue to advocate for strengthening consumer protections and local government oversight of critical communications technologies; local access to affordable and reliable high speed broadband infrastructures to support the local economy; the right of local municipalities and communities to offer high-speed broadband access; coordination and integration of private communication resources for governmental emergency communication systems; preservation of local government’s franchise fees; preservation of the local community benefits, including but not limited to public, education and governmental (PEG) access channels; authority for provision of municipal telecommunication services; preservation of local police powers essential for health, safety and welfare of the citizenry; preservation of local government ownership and control of the local public rights-of-way; and support for ensuring that communication policy promotes affordable services for all Americans.

Currently, the Community Broadband Act of 2007, S.1853, encourages the deployment of high speed networks by preserving the authority of local governments to offer community broadband infrastructure and services. The County will oppose all bills that do not address the County's concerns unless appropriately amended. In addition, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has proposed rule-making (FCC Second Report and Order Docket 05-311 "Franchising Rules for Incumbents") that, in the opinion of local government, goes beyond the scope of their authority in this area. The County will oppose all such rule making efforts.

Telecommunications Issues – Support the Community Access Preservation (CAP) Act introduced in 2009 by Wisconsin Congresswoman Tammy Baldwin. The CAP Act addresses the challenges faced by public, educational and government (PEG) TV channels and community access television stations. The CAP Act addresses four immediate issues facing PEG channels. The CAP Act would: Allow PEG fees to be used for any PEG-related purpose; require PEG channels to be carried in the same manner as local broadcast channels; require the FCC to study the effect state video franchise laws have had on PEG; require operators in states that adopted statewide franchising to provide support equal to the greater of the support required under the state law or the support historically provided for PEG; and make cable television-related laws and regulations applicable to all landline video providers.

In addition, the County should support the widespread deployment and adoption of broadband, especially as it serves to connect the educational community and libraries.

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families – The County will advocate for the following federal actions:

- Relieve states of work participation rate and work verification plan penalties for fiscal years 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 in recognition of the serious downturn in the national economy and the succession of more "process-based" regulations issued in the last few years.
- Permanently withdraw the August 8, 2008, proposal that would have repealed the regulation that enables states to claim caseload reduction credit for excess MOE expenditures.
- Rescind the May 22, 2008, HHS guidance that effectively eliminated the ability of states to offer pre-assistance programs to new TANF applicants for up to four months.
- Rescind the final Deficit Reduction Act regulation restricting allowable state maintenance-of-effort expenditures under TANF purposes 3 and 4.
- End federal efforts to impose a national TANF error rate.

Volume Pricing – The National Association of Counties supports greater access for local governments to General Services Administration (GSA) contract schedules. These schedules provide volume pricing for state and local governments and make public sector procurement more cost effective. However, current law does not provide full access to state and local governments for GSA schedules. The County will support legislation that gives local governments access to these schedules and provides the option of purchasing law enforcement, security, and other related items at favorable GSA reduced pricing.

Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Reauthorization – Congress may again consider reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act in 2011. The County will support reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act at current funding levels or higher; keeping the program at the federal level rather than block granting it; maximizing local control, so that we can meet local needs; and establishing reasonable performance measures. In addition, any reauthorization or new workforce legislation should: retain private sector led state and local Workforce Investment Boards (local boards) as governing bodies; expand, enhance and simplify the WIA Youth Program; redesign the Dislocated Worker program to reflect the new economy; and redesign how the funding of One-Stop facilities is structured.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Ted Cwiek, Human Resources Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Authorize Relocation Assistance for new County Librarian

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE the appointment of Barbara Flynn to the position of County Librarian, Contra Costa County; and AUTHORIZE the Auditor-Controller to reimburse the new County Librarian for reasonable moving expenses incurred in relocating to the Bay Area from the San Diego area, in a total amount not to exceed \$5,000.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The cost of these expenses are within the FY 2010/11 budget of the County Library.

BACKGROUND:

The County conducted an external recruitment from August - December 2010. As the result of this recruitment, a candidate has accepted the position and officially will begin employment on March 7, 2011.

In order to accept this position, it is necessary for the candidate to relocate to the Bay Area from the San Diego area. A one-time reimbursement payment in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 is necessary to help defray moving expenses.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Ted Cwiek, 925-335-1766

cc:

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The recruitment may not be successfully completed.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

No impact.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Russell Watts

Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: P300 #20898 Cancel one Treasurer's Accounting Officer and Add one Tax Compliance Officer

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ADOPT Position Adjustment Resolution #20898 to cancel one (1) Treasurer's Accounting Officer (S5SG) (represented) position #314 and add one (1) Tax Compliance Officer (S5WB) (represented) at salary level QV5 1194 (\$3,484-\$4,235) position, in the Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The cost associated with this request is approximately \$29,891 for FY 2010-11 (March through June). The cost will be completely offset by the cancellation of the Treasurer's Accounting Officer position (#314) and flexibly downgrading a vacant Accountant III position (#6623) to an Accountant I position. The result will be a cost savings of approximately \$976.

BACKGROUND:

The Tax Compliance Officer position will be a significant addition to the collection of delinquent property taxes. An Account Clerk has been temporarily assisting the Tax Compliance Division and it will allow that Account Clerk to be utilized in the Cashier Division which has been struggling to meet staffing requirements relating to internal controls and separation of duties.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Russell Watts, 957-2806

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Not having a Tax Compliance Officer will limit the office's ability to keep up with the statute of limitations for collection of delinquent property taxes. It will also hinder staffing requirements in the Cashier Division relating to separation of duties and internal controls.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS

P300 #20898 Add and Cancel

POSITION ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

NO. 20898
DATE 2/3/2011

Department Treasurer-Tax Collector

Department No./

Budget Unit No. 0015 Org No. 0015 Agency No. 15

Action Requested: CANCEL one part-time (18/40) Treasurer's Accounting Officer (S5SG), position #314 and ADD one full-time (40/40) Tax Compliance Officer (S5WB).

Proposed Effective Date: 3/1/2011

Classification Questionnaire attached: Yes ☐ No ☒ / Cost is within Department's budget: Yes ☒ No ☐

Total One-Time Costs (non-salary) associated with request: \$0.00

Estimated total cost adjustment (salary / benefits / one time):

Total annual cost (\$2,927.00)

Net County Cost (\$2,927.00)

Total this FY (\$976.00)

N.C.C. this FY (\$976.00)

SOURCE OF FUNDING TO OFFSET ADJUSTMENT Cancelled position and flex Accountant III to Accountant I

Department must initiate necessary adjustment and submit to CAO.
Use additional sheet for further explanations or comments.

Russell Watts

(for) Department Head

REVIEWED BY CAO AND RELEASED TO HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Deputy County Administrator

Date

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

DATE _____

Cancel one (1) Treasurer's Accounting Officer (S5SG) (represented) position #314 and add one (1) Tax Compliance Officer (S5WB) (represented) at salary level QV5 1194 (\$3,484-\$4,235) position

Amend Resolution 71/17 establishing positions and resolutions allocating classes to the Basic / Exempt salary schedule.

Effective: ☒ Day following Board Action.
☐ _____(Date)

(for) Director of Human Resources

Date

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR RECOMMENDATION:

DATE _____

- ☐ Approve Recommendation of Director of Human Resources
☐ Disapprove Recommendation of Director of Human Resources
☐ Other: _____

(for) County Administrator

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION:

Adjustment is APPROVED ☐ DISAPPROVED ☐

David J. Twa, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
and County Administrator

DATE _____

BY _____

APPROVAL OF THIS ADJUSTMENT CONSTITUTES A PERSONNEL / SALARY RESOLUTION AMENDMENT

POSITION ADJUSTMENT ACTION TO BE COMPLETED BY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT FOLLOWING BOARD ACTION
Adjust class(es) / position(s) as follows:

REQUEST FOR PROJECT POSITIONS

Department _____

Date 3/19/2015

No. xxxxxx

1. Project Positions Requested:
2. Explain Specific Duties of Position(s)
3. Name / Purpose of Project and Funding Source (do not use acronyms i.e. SB40 Project or SDSS Funds)
4. Duration of the Project: Start Date _____ End Date _____
Is funding for a specified period of time (i.e. 2 years) or on a year-to-year basis? Please explain.
5. Project Annual Cost
 - a. Salary & Benefits Costs: _____
 - b. Support Costs: _____
(services, supplies, equipment, etc.)
 - c. Less revenue or expenditure: _____
 - d. Net cost to General or other fund: _____
6. Briefly explain the consequences of not filling the project position(s) in terms of:
 - a. potential future costs
 - b. legal implications
 - c. financial implications
 - d. political implications
 - e. organizational implications
7. Briefly describe the alternative approaches to delivering the services which you have considered. Indicate why these alternatives were not chosen.
8. Departments requesting new project positions must submit an updated cost benefit analysis of each project position at the halfway point of the project duration. This report is to be submitted to the Human Resources Department, which will forward the report to the Board of Supervisors. Indicate the date that your cost / benefit analysis will be submitted
9. How will the project position(s) be filled?
 - ☐ a. Competitive examination(s)
 - ☐ b. Existing employment list(s) Which one(s)? _____
 - ☐ c. Direct appointment of:
 - ☐ 1. Merit System employee who will be placed on leave from current job
 - ☐ 2. Non-County employee

Provide a justification if filling position(s) by C1 or C2

USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

POSITION ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

SIGNED PERSONNEL ACTION
ITEM NO. C. 20
DATE: Feb. 15, 2011
NO. 20898
DATE 2/3/2011

Department Treasurer-Tax Collector

Department No./

Budget Unit No. 0015 Org No. 0015 Agency No. 15

Action Requested: CANCEL one part-time (18/40) Treasurer's Accounting Officer (S5SG), position #314 and ADD one full-time (40/40) Tax Compliance Officer (S5WB).

Proposed Effective Date: 3/1/2011

Classification Questionnaire attached: Yes ☐ No ☒ / Cost is within Department's budget: Yes ☒ No ☐

Total One-Time Costs (non-salary) associated with request: \$0.00

Estimated total cost adjustment (salary / benefits / one time):

Total annual cost (\$2,927.00)

Net County Cost (\$2,927.00)

Total this FY (\$976.00)

N.C.C. this FY (\$976.00)

SOURCE OF FUNDING TO OFFSET ADJUSTMENT Cancelled position and flex Accountant III to Accountant I

Department must initiate necessary adjustment and submit to CAO.
Use additional sheet for further explanations or comments.

Russell Watts

(for) Department Head

REVIEWED BY CAO AND RELEASED TO HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Deputy County Administrator

Date

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

DATE _____

Cancel one (1) Treasurer's Accounting Officer (S5SG) (represented) position #314 and add one (1) Tax Compliance Officer (S5WB) (represented) at salary level QV5 1194 (\$3,484-\$4,235) position

Amend Resolution 71/17 establishing positions and resolutions allocating classes to the Basic / Exempt salary schedule.

Effective: ☒ Day following Board Action.

☐ _____(Date)

(for) Director of Human Resources

Date

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR RECOMMENDATION:

DATE _____

- ☐ Approve Recommendation of Director of Human Resources
☐ Disapprove Recommendation of Director of Human Resources
☐ Other: _____

(for) County Administrator

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION:

Adjustment is APPROVED ☒ DISAPPROVED ☐


David J. Twa, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
and County Administrator

DATE February 15, 2011

BY [Signature]

APPROVAL OF THIS ADJUSTMENT CONSTITUTES A PERSONNEL / SALARY RESOLUTION AMENDMENT

POSITION ADJUSTMENT ACTION TO BE COMPLETED BY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT FOLLOWING BOARD ACTION
Adjust class(es) / position(s) as follows:





**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Joe Valentine, Employment & Human Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: P300 #20899 Add Two (2) Social Work Positions

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ADOPT Position Adjustment Resolution No. 20899 to add two (2) Social Worker (XOVC) (represented) positions at salary level 255 1434 (\$4,419 - \$5,372) in Employment and Human Services Department, In-home Supportive Services Fraud Investigation and Program Integrity Unit.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This position is funded by the renewed specialized funding for IHSS Fraud. At a minimum it will be funded 85% State/Federal, and 15% County depending on the type of case. The monthly salary for one Social Worker is \$4,419.76-\$5,372.24; retirement 32.18% \$1,422.27-1,728.78. Other Employee Benefits \$1,450.56-1,763.16. Annual Cost \$87,511.20-\$106,370.28 for a total cost of approximately \$212.740 per year.

BACKGROUND:

The Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors order dated 09/21/2010 (c.42) regarding the "In-Home Supportive Services Fraud Investigations and Program Integrity Plus" allows the Employment and Human Services Department to accept funding from the California Department



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS



OTHER

RECOMMENDED

Clerks Notes:

Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE:

John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT:

Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Patricia Perez
(925)313-1543

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

of Social Services (CDSS) in an amount not to exceed \$538,191.00 for fraud investigation and program integrity efforts related to the IHSS Program. As part of this plan \$225,000 was allocated for two FTE Social Worker positions. The request for these two Social Worker positions has been approved by the BOS on 09/21/2010. The California Department of Social Services will be monitoring reports that EHSD will send notifying the CDSS of our implementation of this plan and ensuing results. CDSS expects the money to be used as EHSD has outlined in the plan submitted to CDSS. One critical component to managing the IHSS Program is to prevent, combat and investigate IHSS fraud. This BOS approved plan calls for the hiring of additional IHSS Quality Assurance Positions w/ the funding allocation from the State approved plan.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Should this request be denied, the department will lose the funding that is available to staff an In-Home Supportive Services Fraud Investigations and Program Integrity Unit. This is vital as it is a critical component to effectively manage, prevent, combat and investigate IHSS fraud.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

The In-Home Supportive Services program exclusively serves Seniors. The Department anticipates no impact on Children's Services.

ATTACHMENTS

P-300 #20899

POSITION ADJUSTMENT REQUESTNO. 20899DATE 02/04/11

COPERS

Agency No. A19

Department:

Employment & Human Services

Department No./

Budget Unit No. 0503Org. No. 5311Action Requested: The department requests to add two (2) Social Workers (XOVC) at a salary level of (\$4,419.76-\$5,372.24).Proposed Effective Date: Day after Board actionClassification Questionnaire attached: Yes ☐ No ☒

Cost is within Department's budget:

Yes ☒ No ☐

Total One-Time Costs (non-salary) associated with request:

\$ 00

Estimated total cost adjustment (salary/benefits/one time):

Total annual cost \$ 212,740.80

Net County Cost

\$ 31,911.12Total this FY \$ 88,642.00

N.C.C. this FY

\$ 13,296.30SOURCE OF FUNDING TO OFFSET ADJUSTMENT 85% State and Federal, 15% County General Fund

Department must initiate necessary adjustment and submit to CAO.

Use additional sheet for further explanations or comments.

Joe Valentine, Director

(for) Department Head

REVIEWED BY CAO AND RELEASED TO HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Dorothy Sansoe2/8/11

Deputy County Administrator

Date

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: _____

Add two (2) Social Worker (XOVC) (represented) positions at salary level 255 1434 (\$4,419-\$5,372)

Resolution 71/17 establishing positions and resolutions allocating classes to the Basic/Exempt salary schedule.

Effective: ☒ **Day following Board Action.**☐ _____ (Date)_____
(for) Director of Human Resources

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR RECOMMENDATION

DATE: 2/8/11☒ Approve Recommendation of Director of Human Resources☐ Disapprove Recommendation of Director of Human Resources☐ Other: _____Dorothy Sansoe

(for) County Administrator

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION:

David Twa, County Administrator and
Clerk of the Board of SupervisorsAdjustment APPROVED ☐ DISAPPROVED ☐

DATE: _____

BY: _____

APPROVAL OF THIS ADJUSTMENT CONSTITUTES A PERSONNEL/SALARY RESOLUTION AMENDMENT

POSITION ADJUSTMENT ACTION TO BE COMPLETED BY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT FOLLOWING BOARD ACTION

Adjust class(es)/position(s) as follows:

If Request is to Add Project Positions/Classes, please complete other side

P300 Form Master

POSITION ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

Department: Employment & Human Services Department No./
Budget Unit No. 0503 Org. No. 5311 COPERS
Agency No. A19
Action Requested: The department requests to add two (2) Social Workers (XOVC) at a salary level of
(\$4,419.76-\$5,372.24).

Proposed Effective Date: Day after Board action

Classification Questionnaire attached: Yes ☐ No ☒ Cost is within Department's budget: Yes ☒ No ☐

Total One-Time Costs (non-salary) associated with request: \$ 00

Estimated total cost adjustment (salary/benefits/one time):

Total annual cost \$ 212,740.80

Net County Cost \$ 31,911.12

Total this FY \$ 88,642.00

N.C.C. this FY \$ 13,296.30

SOURCE OF FUNDING TO OFFSET ADJUSTMENT 85% State and Federal, 15% County General Fund

Department must initiate necessary adjustment and submit to CAO.

Use additional sheet for further explanations or comments.

Joe Valentine, Director
(for) Department Head

REVIEWED BY CAO AND RELEASED TO HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Dorothy Sansoe

2/8/11

Deputy County Administrator

Date

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION

DATE: _____

Add two (2) Social Worker (XOVC) (represented) positions at salary level 255 1434 (\$4,419-\$5,372)

Resolution 71/17 establishing positions and resolutions allocating classes to the Basic/Exempt salary schedule.

Effective: ☒ Day following Board Action.

☐ _____ (Date)

(for) Director of Human Resources

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR RECOMMENDATION

DATE: 2/8/11

☒ Approve Recommendation of Director of Human Resources

☐ Disapprove Recommendation of Director of Human Resources

☐ Other: _____

Dorothy Sansoe

(for) County Administrator

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION:

David Twa, County Administrator and
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Adjustment APPROVED ☒ DISAPPROVED ☐

DATE: February 15, 2011

BY: [Signature]

APPROVAL OF THIS ADJUSTMENT CONSTITUTES A PERSONNEL/SALARY RESOLUTION AMENDMENT

POSITION ADJUSTMENT ACTION TO BE COMPLETED BY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT FOLLOWING BOARD

Adjust class(es)/position(s) as follows:





Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Ted Cwiek, Human Resources Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: P300 #20880 Increase Hours of Three Exempt Medical Staff Physicians & One Exempt Medical Staff Dentist

RECOMMENDATION(S):

CORRECT action taken January 18, Item C.17, on Personnel Adjustment Resolution No. 20880, to increase the hours of three permanent part-time Exempt Medical Staff Physicians (represented) positions; increase one permanent part-time Exempt Medical Staff Dentist (represented) position in the Health Services Department to reflect the correct positions numbers.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Upon approval, this action will not result in any additional costs. The original action resulted in an annual cost of \$176,576.46 which will be offset by Federally Qualified Health Center Funds.

BACKGROUND:

The Department is requesting this action to correct errors made in the effected position numbers. The original request was intended to secure additional hours required from medical staff to meet the needs of CCRMC's Labor and Delivery Unit, Obstetrics, and the Richmond and Bay Point Health Center Dental Clinics.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes: Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Terrina C. Manor, 957-5248

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

<i>Title</i>	<i>Original Request</i>	<i>Correction needed</i>
Exempt Medical Staff Physician	increase position #9987 from 22/40 to 40/40	increase position #9977 from 22/40 to 40/40
Exempt Medical Staff Physician	increase position #8614 from 24/40 to 28/40	none
Exempt Medical Staff Physician	increase position #9313 from 24/40 to 32/40	correct position number to read #9038
Exempt Medical Staff Dentist	increase position #9038 from 32/40 to 34/40	correct position number to read #9313

Note that January 19, 2011 is the effective date requested for these adjustments to reflect the effective date had the errors not been made. **CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:** If this action is not approved, the Health Services Department will not be able to maintain the level of care for its labor and delivery patients, and the Dental Clinics will not be able to adequately provide emergency dental services to residents in West and East County. Positions will not be allocated the correct number of hours to accomplish to workload. **CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:** None.
ATTACHMENTS AIR 7009 P300 20880A Addendum to P-300 #20880

POSITION ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

SIGNED PERSONNEL ACTION
ITEM NO. C. 22
DATE: Feb. 15, 2011

NO. 20880A
DATE 12/1/2010

Department Health Services/Hospital
Action Requested: See Attached Addendum

Department No./
Budget Unit No. 0540 Org No. Var Agency No. A18

Proposed Effective Date: 1/10/2011

Classification Questionnaire attached: Yes ☐ No ☒ / Cost is within Department's budget: Yes ☒ No ☐

Total One-Time Costs (non-salary) associated with request: _____

Estimated total cost adjustment (salary / benefits / one time):

Total annual cost \$176,576.40

Net County Cost _____

Total this FY \$88,288.23

N.C.C. this FY _____

SOURCE OF FUNDING TO OFFSET ADJUSTMENT Federally Qualified Health Center Funds

Department must initiate necessary adjustment and submit to CAO.
Use additional sheet for further explanations or comments.

Dorette McCollum

(for) Department Head

REVIEWED BY CAO AND RELEASED TO HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Dorothy Sansoe

12/8/10/1

Deputy County Administrator

Date

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

DATE 1/26/2011

INCREASE the hours of three Permanent Part-time Exempt Medical Staff Physicians (VPW9) (Represented) positions #9977 22/40 to 40/40; position #8614 from 24/40 to 28/40; and position #9038 24/40 to 32/40 (represented) AND one Permanent Part-time Exempt Medical Staff Dentist (VPW0) (Represented) position #9313 32/40 to 34/40 (represented) in the Health Services Department.

Amend Resolution 71/17 establishing positions and resolutions allocating classes to the Basic / Exempt salary schedule.

Effective: ☐ Day following Board Action.

☒ 1/19/2011(Date)

(for) Director of Human Resources

Date

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR RECOMMENDATION:

DATE 1/28/2011

- ☒ Approve Recommendation of Director of Human Resources
☐ Disapprove Recommendation of Director of Human Resources
☐ Other: _____

Dorothy Sansoe

(for) County Administrator

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION:

Adjustment is APPROVED ☒ DISAPPROVED ☐


David J. Twa, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
and County Administrator

DATE February 15, 2011

BY [Signature]

APPROVAL OF THIS ADJUSTMENT CONSTITUTES A PERSONNEL / SALARY RESOLUTION AMENDMENT

POSITION ADJUSTMENT ACTION TO BE COMPLETED BY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT FOLLOWING BOARD ACTION
Adjust class(es) / position(s) as follows:



POSITION ADJUSTMENT REQUEST

NO. 20880A
DATE 12/1/2010

Department Health Services/Hospital
Action Requested: See Attached Addendum

Department No./
Budget Unit No. 0540 Org No. Var Agency No. A18

Proposed Effective Date: 1/10/2011

Classification Questionnaire attached: Yes ☐ No ☒ / Cost is within Department's budget: Yes ☒ No ☐

Total One-Time Costs (non-salary) associated with request: _____

Estimated total cost adjustment (salary / benefits / one time):

Total annual cost \$176,576.40

Net County Cost _____

Total this FY \$88,288.23

N.C.C. this FY _____

SOURCE OF FUNDING TO OFFSET ADJUSTMENT Federally Qualified Health Center Funds

Department must initiate necessary adjustment and submit to CAO.
Use additional sheet for further explanations or comments.

Dorette McCollum

(for) Department Head

REVIEWED BY CAO AND RELEASED TO HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Dorothy Sansoe

12/8/10/1

Deputy County Administrator

Date

HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

DATE 1/26/2011

INCREASE the hours of three Permanent Part-time Exempt Medical Staff Physicians (VPW9) (Represented) positions #9977 22/40 to 40/40; position #8614 from 24/40 to 28/40; and position #9038 24/40 to 32/40 (represented) AND one Permanent Part-time Exempt Medical Staff Dentist (VPW0) (Represented) position #9313 32/40 to 34/40 (represented) in the Health Services Department.

Amend Resolution 71/17 establishing positions and resolutions allocating classes to the Basic / Exempt salary schedule.

Effective: ☐ Day following Board Action.

☒ 1/19/2011(Date)

(for) Director of Human Resources

Date

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR RECOMMENDATION:

DATE 1/28/2011

☒ Approve Recommendation of Director of Human Resources

☐ Disapprove Recommendation of Director of Human Resources

☐ Other: _____

Dorothy Sansoe

(for) County Administrator

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION:

Adjustment is APPROVED ☐ DISAPPROVED ☐

David J. Twa, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
and County Administrator

DATE _____

BY _____

APPROVAL OF THIS ADJUSTMENT CONSTITUTES A PERSONNEL / SALARY RESOLUTION AMENDMENT

POSITION ADJUSTMENT ACTION TO BE COMPLETED BY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT FOLLOWING BOARD ACTION

Adjust class(es) / position(s) as follows:

REQUEST FOR PROJECT POSITIONS

Department _____

Date 3/19/2015

No. xxxxxx

1. Project Positions Requested:
2. Explain Specific Duties of Position(s)
3. Name / Purpose of Project and Funding Source (do not use acronyms i.e. SB40 Project or SDSS Funds)
4. Duration of the Project: Start Date _____ End Date _____
Is funding for a specified period of time (i.e. 2 years) or on a year-to-year basis? Please explain.
5. Project Annual Cost
 - a. Salary & Benefits Costs: _____
 - b. Support Costs: _____
(services, supplies, equipment, etc.)
 - c. Less revenue or expenditure: _____
 - d. Net cost to General or other fund: _____
6. Briefly explain the consequences of not filling the project position(s) in terms of:
 - a. potential future costs
 - b. legal implications
 - c. financial implications
 - d. political implications
 - e. organizational implications
7. Briefly describe the alternative approaches to delivering the services which you have considered. Indicate why these alternatives were not chosen.
8. Departments requesting new project positions must submit an updated cost benefit analysis of each project position at the halfway point of the project duration. This report is to be submitted to the Human Resources Department, which will forward the report to the Board of Supervisors. Indicate the date that your cost / benefit analysis will be submitted
9. How will the project position(s) be filled?
 - ☐ a. Competitive examination(s)
 - ☐ b. Existing employment list(s) Which one(s)? _____
 - ☐ c. Direct appointment of:
 - ☐ 1. Merit System employee who will be placed on leave from current job
 - ☐ 2. Non-County employee

Provide a justification if filling position(s) by C1 or C2

USE ADDITIONAL PAPER IF NECESSARY

William B. Walker, M.D.
Health Services Director
Shelley Pighin
Personnel Officer



PERSONNEL SERVICES

1320 Arnold Drive, Suite 261
Martinez, California
94553-4359
Ph (925) 957-5240
Fax (925) 957-5260

ADDENDUM TO P-300 #20880

TO: Dorothy Sansoe, Senior Deputy County Administrator

FROM: Dorette McCollumn, Personnel Services Assistant

DATE: December 6, 2010

SUBJECT: P-300 Request to increase hours per agreement between Contra Costa County and PDOCC

The attached P-300 is a request to increase the position hours for the following Physicians per the agreement between Contra Costa County and PDOCC Exhibit C "Increase in Hours."

- Dr. Nishant Shah, Increase Position #9977 from 22/40 to 40/40; Org. #6384
- Dr. Kristine Moeller, Increase Position #8614 from 24/40 to 28/40; Org. #6307
- Dr. Tina Sarvi, Increase Position #9313 from 24/40 to 32/40; Org. #6373
- Dr. Deborah Simon-Weisberg, Increase Position #9038 from 32/40 to 34/40; Org. # 6388



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Ted Cwiek, Human Resources Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Suspension of Competition and Direct Appointment in the Health Services Dept.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ACKNOWLEDGE receipt of report of suspension of competition and direct appointment in the Health Services Department to facilitate the return to work of a County employee through the County Rehabilitation Program, as provided for in the Personnel Management Regulations, Section 502, as part of the County Disability Program, as recommended by the Assistant County Administrator- Director of Human Resources.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There are no additional costs associated with this direct appointment. Costs associated with filling the position are included in the Department's budget.

BACKGROUND:

Personnel Management Regulations, Section 502, Suspension of Competition, provides that the Director of Human Resources may suspend competition and authorize a direct appointment to merit system positions where use of competitive examination procedures are impractical. It also requires that a report of the suspension of competition be reported to the Board of Supervisors.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 02/15/2011

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

Supervisor Mary Piepho absent all day.

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: EMY L. SHARP, Deputy

Contact: Cheri Branson, (925)
335-1768

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

In accordance with the above regulations, the Director of Human Resources is authorizing the following direct appointment:

Employee #51602 as Clerk - Experienced Level (position #12098) in the Health Services Department/Hospital. Date effective: 1/3/11. Reason: to facilitate return to work of County employee through the County Rehabilitation Program.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Department would not be able to benefit from the employee's prompt return to work.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

No impact.

ATTACHMENTS

AK9 Voc.Rehab Agreement

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY PERSONNEL REQUEST

Department Hlth Svcs/Hosp/Pittsb	Location Clerk - Exp Level	Classification JWXB	Shift Days	No. to be Empl. 1	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPT. 2011 JAN 18 AM 10:20
Permanent Position Nos. 12098		<input type="checkbox"/> New Position <input type="checkbox"/> Promotion <input type="checkbox"/> Reassignment <input type="checkbox"/> Separation <input type="checkbox"/> Leave of Absence			
COPERS Agency No. A-18		Date Vacated _____ By _____			
Finance System Budget Unit No. 0540 Org. No. 6388					
<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary Help Necessary Because _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flexible Staffing Classification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Action Required Please flex position down.					CONTRA COSTA COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES DEPT. 2011 JAN 26 PM 3:38
Employment Duration: From _____ To _____			Employment Type:		
<input type="checkbox"/> Request Eligibles to Contact us for Appointment.			<input type="checkbox"/> Temporary <input type="checkbox"/> Perm Full Time <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Perm Part Time 32/40 <input type="checkbox"/> Perm Intermittent		
Call _____ Phone _____			Signature of Appointing Authority Shelley Pighin, HSD Personnel Officer Date 1/14/11		

Special Certification Requested: (Type) Suspension of competition and Direct Appointment approved by the Director of Personnel, Section 502 of PMR's for Vocational Rehab of [REDACTED]		
Approved for Director of Human Resources By: _____		
CERTIFICATION: Do not write in this section - Human Resources Department use only.		
Name, Address and Phone Number	Type List	Remarks
<input type="checkbox"/> Classified <input type="checkbox"/> Rule of 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Rule of 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Rule of List <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete Certification <input type="checkbox"/> Exempt <input type="checkbox"/> Rule of 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Rule of 10 <input type="checkbox"/> No Eligibles to Refer <input type="checkbox"/> See Attached Printout		
The above persons are certified eligible for appointment and have been so notified. It is advisable to interview all eligibles. Date _____ Approved for Human Resources Department _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Authority to Nominate for Provisional Appointment <input type="checkbox"/> Authority to Make Temporary Appointment Because insufficient eligibles are immediately available or no employment list exists for the class described in your request, authority is given to nominate/select any individual meeting the requirements for the class as stated on the specifications. A completed application must be submitted for review and determination as to whether the individual meets the minimum qualifications prior to commitments for employment.		
Date _____ Approved for Human Resources Department _____		

APPOINTMENT From the above certified eligibles, the following person or persons are being appointed:									
Social Security No.	Emp. No.	Name	Pos. No.	Pay Series	Pay Level	Pay Step	Pay Rate	Date Effective	Type Appointment
1. [REDACTED]	51602	[REDACTED]	12098	3RH 0750	4		\$2485.67	1/3/11	PPT 32/40
2.									
3.		(REHAB AGREEMENT)							ATA Schedule 2.
4.									
5.									
Date 1/14/11		Signature of Appointing Authority Shelley Pighin, HSD Personnel Officer Title _____							

CONFIRMATION		COPERS Referral Appt.		COPERS Pos/E.H. Appt.		Approved for Human Resources Department Rafaela Mendez		Date 2-1-11	
---------------------	--	-----------------------	--	-----------------------	--	---	--	--------------------	--



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Vincent L. Guise, Director of Agriculture/Weights & Measures
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Agricultural Commissioner, or his designee, to sign an Amendment to Agreement #10-0220-1 with CDFA

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Agricultural Commissioner, or his designee, to sign an amendment to Agreement #10-0220 "Exotic Pest Detection" with the Department of Food and Agriculture. This amendment will increase reimbursement to the County by \$263,377.00 for a new total amount not to exceed \$795,905.00. The amendment is necessary for placing and servicing of additional traps.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This contract provides reimbursement for County expense incurred during this period for pest detection work performed on behalf of the California Department of Food and Agriculture in Contra Costa County.

BACKGROUND:

The County Department of Agriculture deploys traps countywide to detect incipient infestations of exotic pests such as Medfly, Gypsy Moth, Japanese Beetle, etc. The State reimburses the county for all costs that exceed our historic level of trapping.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

**VOTE OF
SUPERVISORS**

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

Contact: 646-5250

By: , Deputy

cc:

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Catherine Kutsuris, Conservation & Development Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: FY 2010/11 Community Development Block Grant Action Plan Substantial Amendment for \$1,871,294 in
Neighborhood Stabilization Program Funds

RECOMMENDATION(S):

- (1) ADOPT the FY 2010/11 Action Plan Neighborhood Stabilization Program Substantial Amendment;
- (2) AUTHORIZE the Conservation & Development Director, or designee, to execute the appropriate documents for transmittal to the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD); and
- (3) AUTHORIZE the Conservation & Development Director, or designee, to execute the NSP program Agreements with the HUD;
- (4) FIND that the Substantial Amendment is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act [Section 15061(b)(3)];
- (5) DIRECT the Director of Conservation and Development, or designee, to file a Notice of Exemption for the Action Plan with the County Clerk;
- (6) DIRECT the Director of Conservation and Development, or designee, to arrange for payment of the \$50 handling fee to the County Clerk for filing such Notice of Exemption.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I
Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II
Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV
Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V
Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Kara Douglas,
335-7223

cc:

FISCAL IMPACT:

The proposed Substantial Amendment to the Action Plan will have no General Fund impact. Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) funds are provided to the County on a formula allocation basis through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Neighborhood Stabilization Program uses the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program CFDA number – 14.218

BACKGROUND:

On April 28, 2010, the Board approved the County's FY 2010/11 Annual Action Plan of the Five Year (2010 – 2015) Consolidated Plan for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. In 2010, Congress appropriated a third round of neighborhood stabilization funds (NSP3) under Section 1497 of the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111-202, approved July 21, 2010) (Dodd-Frank Act).

NSP3 provides targeted emergency assistance to state and local governments to acquire and redevelop vacant or foreclosed residential properties that might otherwise become sources of abandonment and blight within our communities. Contra Costa County, as the County lead agency, has been allocated \$1,871,294 in NSP3 funds.

The purpose of the Substantial Amendment to the Annual Action Plan is to set forth the target areas and programs for Contra Costa County NSP3 activities.

The County has 24 months from the date it executes a contract with HUD to spend 50 percent of the funds, and three years to expend all funds and complete all projects. Twenty-five percent of the funds must be spent on projects that will be affordable to households with incomes that are less than 50 percent of the area median income (i.e. \$45,150 for a household of four).

Determination of Target Areas

HUD requires NSP3 funds be targeted to the areas with a high need as determined by HUD and in a manner that will have the greatest impact to the neighborhood.

HUD requires NSP3 grantees use the HUD Foreclosure Need website. On the website, HUD provides estimates of foreclosure need and a foreclosure related needs score at the census tract level. The scores range from 1 to 20, with a score of 20 indicating census tracts with the HUD-estimated greatest need. In California, a minimum score of 17 is needed to be eligible for NSP3 funds. In Contra Costa County, there are 7 cities or communities that have at least one census tract with a score of 17 or higher. They are Antioch, Bay Point, Concord, Pittsburg, North Richmond, Richmond, and San Pablo.

HUD requires that grantees use HUD data to determine how many units in a given area must be rehabilitated to affect a positive impact on an area. The areas must be very small in order to make an impact with an allocation of only \$1.8 million. The Governor's budget proposal to disestablish redevelopment agencies may mean there will not be any redevelopment agency funds to assist in NSP3 activities.

HUD requires grantees also evaluate market conditions in order to select areas of need where market conditions will support the program and where there is a reasonable likelihood that the program will have a stabilizing impact on the community.

County staff consulted with city and County housing and redevelopment agency staff to discuss NSP3. The County was provided with additional neighborhood and market information as a result. The County was also provided information on potential projects in those neighborhoods that would qualify for NSP3 funds.

Determination of NSP3 Activities

The County analyzed the data from HUD, the cities and County redevelopment areas, and other sources to evaluate need and market conditions. Staff then developed three tiers of projects:

Tier 1 includes a portion of the Monument Corridor in Concord, downtown Pittsburg, and the south end of Tabora Road in Antioch. Tier 1 activities are multi-family rental projects that will serve low- and moderate-income families.

Tier 2 includes the cities and communities of Bay Point, North Richmond (City and County) and San Pablo. Tier 2 activities are multi-family rental projects that will serve low- and moderate-income families.

Tier 3 will initially be limited to a single Tier 1 or Tier 2 area. The Tier 3 activities are acquisition and rehabilitation of single family homes and home buyer downpayment assistance/shared appreciation loans.

Due to the highly constrained time frame in which HUD and local jurisdictions are working, this amendment contains flexibility to allow the County to reallocate funds between tiers without requiring additional substantial amendments.

The following table summarizes the program recommendations and amount of funds allocated to each program.

NSP3 Activities

Activity #	Program	Area	NSP3 Allocation	Number of Units/Homes
1	Multi-family foreclosure or vacant property acquisition, rehabilitation or construction for low-income households (LH25)	Tier 1 and Tier 2	At least \$467,824	6 units, more with additional funds for this activity
2	Multi-family foreclosure or vacant property acquisition, rehabilitation or construction for low-income households (LMMH)	Tier 1 and Tier 2	Up to \$1,216,341	12 units, fewer if more funds are used to support Activity 1
3	Revolving Fund for Purchase and Rehabilitation for Low Income Households (LH25)	Tier 3	None at this time. This project may be funded with at least \$467,824 if the Tier 1 and Tier 2 activities are not feasible.	To be determined
4	Revolving Fund for Purchase and Rehabilitation (LMMH)	Tier 3	None at this time. This project may be funded with up to \$1,216,341 if the Tier 1 and Tier 2 activities are not feasible.	To be determined
5	Downpayment Assistance/Shared Appreciation Loans (LMMH)	Tier 3	None at this time. This project may be funded if the Tier 1 and Tier 2 activities are not feasible.	To be determined
6	NSP Program Planning and Administration	N/A	\$187,129	N/A

NSP3 Implementation

The County will issue a Request for Proposals in early spring seeking projects or developers in all tiers. County staff will initially pursue projects in the Tier 1 Areas. If there are no feasible projects in Tier 1, then the County will move to Tier 2. Finally, if there is no viable multi-family Tier 1 or Tier 2 project, the County will move forward with scattered site single family acquisition and rehabilitation activities in the Tier 3 areas.

The County will strive to coordinate activities with the Economic Development Board and local job training programs to meet the NSP3 “vicinity hire” requirement.

CEQA Exemption

This amendment to the Action Plan is exempt from CEQA pursuant to 14 CCR 15061(b)(5). If any of the individually funded projects are subject to CEQA, the CEQA review will be undertaken by the lead agency.

ATTACHMENTS

A: NSP3 Substantial Amendment

B: Notice of Exemption

C: County map with NSP3 scores of 17 and higher

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If the County does not submit the proposed Substantial Amendment to HUD by March 1, 2011, it will not receive \$1,871,294 in NSP3 funds.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

This program will stabilize neighborhoods and provide affordable housing for low income families. It will support Outcome #2 in the Children's Report Card: Families are Economically Self Sufficient.

ATTACHMENTS

NSP3 Application

NSP3 County map of areas with a NSP3 score of 17 or greater

NSP3 Tier 1 - Antioch Tabora

NSP3 Tier 1 Concord Monument

NSP3 Tier 1 Pittsburg Los Medanos

NSP3 Tier 1 Pittsburg West 10th, Siena

NSP3 Tier 2 and Tier 3 Bay Point Bella Monte

NSP3 Tier 2 and Tier 3 Bay Point Shore Acres

NSP3 Tier 2 North Richmond City and County

NSP3 Tier 2 and Tier 3 San Pablo Old Town

CEQA Notice of Exemption

1. NSP3 Grantee Information

NSP3 Program Administrator Contact Information	
Name (Last, First)	Douglas, Kara
Email Address	Kara.Douglas@dcd.cccounty.us
Phone Number	925-335-7223
Mailing Address	Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez, CA 94553

2. Areas of Greatest Need

Map Submission

A Countywide map showing all areas that are potentially eligible for NSP3 funds is included as Attachment A. The maps generated at the HUD NSP3 Mapping Tool for Preparing Action Plan website are included as Attachment B.

Data Sources Used to Determine Areas of Greatest Need

Describe the data sources used to determine the areas of greatest need.
<p>Response:</p> <p>The County first used the HUD data from HUD's mapping tool and mapped all areas with a HUD-determined score of 17 and above (see Attachment A). Seventeen is the minimum score needed in California for an area to be eligible for NSP3 funded activities.</p> <p>In addition, the following sources were used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Policy Map was used for additional NSP 3 information, such as income eligibility, foreclosure starts, and mortgage delinquency.- Foreclosure Radar was used for additional foreclosure information (i.e. number of foreclosure filings) and the foreclosure trends for an area.- American Community Survey 2005-2009 (U.S. Census Bureau) information was used for estimated number of housing units in an area, overall vacancy, and median gross rents, and household income.- California (CA) Employment Development Department – Labor Market Information was used for current unemployment information for the overall County and the Cities within the County.- RealData, Inc. Apartment Insights information was used for a snapshot of rental vacancy rates within target areas. <p>In addition to the sources above, the following studies or plans for a local jurisdiction were utilized providing additional information described above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Contra Costa County Consortium, 2010-15 Consolidated Plan- Contra Cost County Consortium, Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice- City of Pittsburg, Affordable Housing Market Study (December 2009), prepared by AECOM Economics

- City Of Pittsburg, Market Study for Affordable Senior Housing (March 2010), prepared by Laurin Associates/Raney Planning & Management, Inc.
- City of Antioch, Summary Appraisal Report/Market Study (June 2010), prepared by Joseph J. Blake and Associates, Inc.

Determination of Areas of Greatest Need and Applicable Tiers

Describe how the areas of greatest need were established and whether a tiered approach is being utilized to determine the distribution of funding.

Response:

County staff first considered the amount of the NSP3 grant (\$1.8 million) and how to best meet the HUD-identified goals. It determined that it would pursue a multifamily rental project for the following reasons:

1. HUD requires grantees create a preference for rental housing. Multi-family housing is the most cost effective way to provide rental housing.
2. Multi-family rental is an effective way to meet the requirement to expend 25 percent of the NSP3 grant on low income households.
3. HUD is seeking a significant impact in a community from NSP3 activities. With the limited resources available, rental housing can be a more cost effective use of the funds and will concentrate the impact in a small area.
4. HUD has determined that a grantee must improve 20 percent of the foreclosed units in an area to show an impact. Some of the Contra Costa areas would have to be so small to reach the 20 percent threshold that it would be extremely difficult to find appropriate units to purchase and rehabilitate.

Next, the County used the HUD data from its mapping tool and mapped all areas with a HUD-determined score of 17 and above. (See Attachment A.) Seventeen is the minimum score needed in California for an area to be eligible for NSP3 funded activities. The cities and communities highlighted on the map have scores of at least 17 and are the following: Antioch, Bay Point, Concord, Pittsburg, North Richmond, Richmond, and San Pablo.

County staff met with representatives of all of these jurisdictions to determine which specific neighborhoods would be best served with NSP3 activities. County staff requested information, about projects or activities that the city and community representatives desired in their communities.

County staff reviewed that information together with its additional research on rents, incomes, vacancy rates, and neighborhood assets.

Potential Projects: Of the seven NSP3 qualifying areas, Antioch, Pittsburg, and Concord have various potential sites for multi-family rental housing that would meet the NSP3 community impact and funding expenditure requirements. Research on rental market information was done for all seven NSP3 qualifying areas with priority given to Antioch, Pittsburg, and Concord due to the likelihood of potential sites that would meet NSP3 requirements.

Vacancy Rate Information: According to 2005-2009 American Community Survey information, the overall vacancy rate for Contra Costa County is 6.9 percent. The overall vacancy rates of the

areas that meet the HUD determined score of 17 or above are as follows: **Antioch - 8.9 percent; Pittsburg – 9.1 percent; Concord – 5.8 percent; Bay Point – 7.1 percent; San Pablo – 9.1 percent; Richmond/North Richmond – 12.5 percent.** The overall vacancy rate includes owner-occupied units; however, a snapshot of multi-family apartment complexes (100 units or over) within the six areas shows a lower vacancy rate for each area: **Antioch – 4.8 percent; Pittsburg – 4.3 percent; Concord – 4.7 percent; Bay Point 5.0 percent; San Pablo – 6.8 percent; Richmond/North Richmond – 5.3 percent.** The differences between the overall vacancy rates and the rental vacancy rates are a reflection of the impact that the housing foreclosure crisis has on owner-occupied single-family properties within these areas. Furthermore, the lower vacancy rates for rental properties indicate that the rental market is still strong in these areas.

Median Gross Rent Information: The median gross rent for Contra Costa County as a whole is \$1,239. All NSP 3 qualifying areas are below the County median: Antioch - \$1,192; Pittsburg - \$1,197; Concord - \$1,171; Bay Point - \$1,076; San Pablo - \$999; Richmond/North Richmond - \$1,110.

Income and Unemployment Information: Contra Costa County is considered a high-income area; however, the communities in the County have a significant disparity of household income between them. According to Census information, the median household income for Contra Costa County is \$63,675. The annual median household incomes of each of the six NSP3 qualifying areas in the County are below the County's overall median household income. Antioch's median household income (\$60,360) is the highest of the County's six qualifying NSP3 areas, but still lower than the County's overall median household income. Pittsburg, Bay Point, San Pablo, and Richmond each have median household incomes near or below \$50,000. Concord is located in central Contra Costa County and although higher income communities tend to be located in central Contra Costa County, Concord's annual median household income (\$55,600) is closer to those of lower-income communities.

Unemployment is also particularly high in the six NSP3 qualifying areas. According to California Employment Development Department information, the unemployment rate for Contra Costa County dropped from 11.2 percent in November 2010 to 10.9 in December 2010. However, all six NSP3 qualifying areas still exceed the overall County unemployment rate. Pittsburg, San Pablo, Richmond, and Bay Point each have unemployment rates near or above 17 percent. The unemployment rates for both Antioch and Concord are approximately 12 percent. These six areas appear to be ideal for rentals given that most residents would not be able to afford to purchase a home due to the lower incomes and high unemployment rates found in these areas.

Neighborhood Asset Information: A review of neighborhood assets was done for each target area to see how attractive each area may be to potential renters. Each of the priority target areas (Antioch, Pittsburg, and Concord) has various amenities that most renters and families desire in a neighborhood (i.e. parks, commercial/retail, access to public transportation, schools, etc.). Each target area/city has an active redevelopment agency and these agencies completed various projects to improve the overall infrastructure and economic vitality of each area.

Foreclosures (for Tier 3 priority areas): Both Bay Point and San Pablo were selected areas because of the high number of foreclosures and they have been successful areas for NSP1 activities. Based on Policy Map (policymap.com) and Foreclosure Radar (foreclosureradar.com) information, Bay Point and San Pablo have high numbers of delinquent mortgages, foreclosure

starts, and overall number of foreclosure filings. Over the last year, San Pablo had over 280 foreclosure starts while Bay had over 180 foreclosure starts.

Based on the above conversations and information, County staff determined that a portion of west Antioch, Monument Corridor in Concord, and downtown Pittsburg showed the greatest potential benefit from NSP3 funds. These areas are called “Tier 1” in this application. The remaining areas are Bay Point, North Richmond (both City and County portions), and San Pablo. They are the “Tier 2” areas. Tier 2 areas are included in this application so if there are no feasible projects in any Tier 1 area, the County can quickly move onto other areas. Finally, if there are not any viable multi-family projects in either Tier 1 or Tier 2, the County will move to Tier 3.

Tier 3 will be one or more of above areas and will consist of scattered site single-family home acquisition and rehabilitation, and homebuyer downpayment assistance/shared appreciation loans. The priority Tier 3 areas will be Bay Point and San Pablo. These two areas have had successful NSP1 activities.

3. Definitions and Descriptions

Definitions

Term	Definition
Blighted Structure	“Blighted Structure” shall mean buildings or conditions causing blight as defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 33031(a)(1) and (2).
Affordable Rents	<p>A. For low income households, the product of one-twelfth of 30 percent times 50 percent of the area median income adjusted for family size appropriate for the unit, less an allowance for tenant paid utilities.</p> <p>B. For moderate income households whose gross incomes exceed the maximum income for low income households, the product of one-twelfth of 30 percent times 65 percent of the area median income adjusted for family size appropriate for the unit, less an allowance for tenant paid utilities.</p> <p>C. For middle income households, the product of one-twelfth of 30 percent times 110 percent of the area median income adjusted for family size appropriate for the unit, less an allowance for tenant paid utilities.</p>

Descriptions

Term	Definition
Long-Term Affordability	<p><u>Rental housing</u> developers will be required to enter into a Regulatory Agreement with a term of not less than 30 years.</p> <p><u>Shared Appreciation Loans</u>: Homebuyers who receive a shared appreciation loan will be required to enter into a Promissory Note</p>

	<p>which requires the home remains owner-occupied for the 30 year term of the loan.</p> <p><u>Presumed Affordability:</u> Homebuyers in North Richmond and Bay Point who purchase homes without financial assistance from the County will be required to enter into a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants. The Declaration of Restrictive Covenants requires homes to be owner occupied for the entire 20 year term of affordability.</p>
Housing Rehabilitation Standards	<p>“Rehabilitation Standards” shall mean the applicable residential standards in the California Building Code as amended by the California Building Standards Commission.</p> <p>In addition, as applicable, the following standards shall be met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All gut rehabilitation (i.e. general replacement of the interior of a building that may or may not include changes to structural elements such as flooring systems, columns or load bearing interior or exterior walls) or new construction of residential buildings up to three stories shall be designed to meet the standard for Energy Star Qualified New Homes. - All gut rehabilitation or new construction or mid- or high-rise multifamily housing shall be designed to meet the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 90.1-2004, Appendix G plus 20 percent (which is the Energy Star standard for multifamily buildings piloted by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy). - Other rehabilitation shall meet these standards to the extent applicable to the rehabilitation work undertaken, e.g. replace older obsolete products and appliances (such as windows, doors, lighting, hot water heaters, furnaces, boilers, air conditioning units refrigerators, clothes washers and dishwashers) with Energy Star-46 labeled products. - Water efficient toilets, showers, and faucets, such as those with the WaterSense label, shall be installed. - Where relevant, the housing will be improved to mitigate the impact of disasters such as earthquakes, fires, and flooding.
Vicinity Hire	<p>Contra Costa will encourage vicinity hiring to the extent practicable. The County will modify its Section 3 advertising and bidding policies to accommodate the vicinity hiring requirements.</p>

4. Low-Income Targeting

Low-Income Set-Aside Amount

Enter the low-income set-aside percentage in the first field. The field for total funds set aside will populate based on the percentage entered in the first field and the total NSP3 grant.

Identify the estimated amount of funds appropriated or otherwise made available under the NSP3 to be used to provide housing for individuals or families whose incomes do not exceed 50 percent of area median income.

Response:

Total low-income set-aside **percentage** (must be no less than 25 percent): 25.00%
The minimum amount of funds set aside for low-income individuals will be 25 percent of the grant amount which is \$467,824. Up to \$1,685,000 may be used for low income housing if the selected Tier 1 activity requires that amount.

Meeting Low-Income Target

Provide a summary that describes the manner in which the low-income targeting goals will be met.

Response:

The County will issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a developer to meet the low income target. The RFP will allow developers to respond with either a proposal for rental housing or for homeownership. Proposals in the Tier 1 areas will be evaluated first. If there are no feasible Tier 1 proposals, then Tier 2 proposals will be evaluated. If there are no feasible Tier 1 or Tier 2 proposals, then Tier 3 proposals will be evaluated.

Rental Housing: Tier 1 proposals will be for a rental housing project in the Tier 1 areas. The projects may be either new construction on a vacant or abandoned site, or rehabilitation of an existing foreclosed development. Low and moderate units will be required based on a proportional share of the NSP3 investment into the project. For example, if the NSP3 funds are 10 percent of the total project cost, at least 10 percent of the units must be compliant with NSP3 income and rent requirements. Once 25 percent of the County's NSP3 funds have been used to support low income households, additional NSP3 funds may be allocated to the same project to support additional units that will be affordable to moderate income households.

Homeownership: A successful proposal for homeownership will demonstrate how a low-income household will be able to finance the purchase and maintain successful homeownership (i.e. cover future maintenance and repair costs, and not become cost burdened or at risk of foreclosure). The County successfully worked with Habitat for Humanity East Bay on NSP1 and expects the same type of approach will also work for NSP3.

5. Acquisition and Relocation

Demolition or Conversion of LMI Units

Does the grantee intend to demolish or convert any low- and moderate-income dwelling units (i.e., $\leq 80\%$ of area median income)?

No

If yes, fill in the table below.

Question	Number of Units
The number of low- and moderate-income dwelling units—i.e., ≤ 80% of area median income—reasonably expected to be demolished or converted as a direct result of NSP-assisted activities.	
The number of NSP affordable housing units made available to low-, moderate-, and middle-income households—i.e., ≤ 120% of area median income—reasonably expected to be produced by activity and income level as provided for in DRGR, by each NSP activity providing such housing (including a proposed time schedule for commencement and completion).	
The number of dwelling units reasonably expected to be made available for households whose income does not exceed 50 percent of area median income.	

6. Public Comment

Citizen Participation Plan

Briefly describe how the grantee followed its citizen participation plan regarding this proposed substantial amendment or abbreviated plan.

Response:

County staff met with representatives of all of the potential target areas. The group discussed the funding available and the HUD requirements and preferences. The County offered to provide a written report to the representatives, which summarized NSP3. Some representatives plan on taking a report to their City Council or Municipal Advisory Committees.

A memorandum that outlined the County approach to the NSP3 application was posted on the County website in late January. The NPS3 application was posted on the website on January 27, 2011. An email was sent to over 500 recipients notifying them of the memorandum and draft NSP3 application.

The application is scheduled for the County Board of Supervisors for approval on February 15, 2011.

Summary of Public Comments Received.

The summary of public comments received is included as an attachment.

7. NSP Information by Activity

Enter each activity name and fill in the corresponding information. If you have fewer than seven activities, please delete any extra activity fields. (For example, if you have three activities, you should delete the tables labeled “Activity Number 4,” “Activity Number 5,” “Activity Number 6,” and “Activity Number 7.” If you are unsure how to delete a table, see the instructions [above](#).

The field labeled “Total Budget for Activity” will populate based on the figures entered in the fields above it.

Consult the [NSP3 Program Design Guidebook](#) for guidance on completing the “Performance Measures” component of the activity tables below.

Activity Number 1		
Activity Name	Multi-family Low Income Rental Housing	
Uses	Select all that apply:	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use A: Financing Mechanisms
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use B: Acquisition and Rehabilitation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use C: Land Banking
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use D: Demolition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use E: Redevelopment
CDBG Activity or Activities	24 CFR 570.201(a) – Acquisition (i) – Relocation. New construction is eligible as part of the redevelopment of demolished or vacant properties. 24 CFR 570.202 – Eligible rehabilitation and preservation activities	
National Objective	Low and Moderate Income Housing (LMMH) (LH25)	
Activity Description	<p>This activity will consist of one or more of the eligible uses noted above. Financing mechanism will be a low (i.e. between 1 and 3 percent) interest deferred loan to the developer of a multi-family rental project. The term will be for either 30, 40, or 55 years depending on requirements of other funding sources. A regulatory agreement with income, rent, and term of affordability will be record against the property.</p> <p>The Request for Proposals (see the responses to Question 4 above) will include existing foreclosed multi-family properties as well as demolished or vacant properties as eligible property types. Therefore, this activity may result in the acquisition and rehabilitation of an existing apartment building with occupants. The occupants may be temporarily or permanently displaced. The acquisition of a vacant site would support the new construction of affordable rental housing. Depending on the site cost, project size, timing, and budget, NSP3 funds may also be used for predevelopment and/or construction costs.</p>	
Location Description	<p>Tier 1 priority areas: These areas include neighborhoods within the cities of Antioch, Concord, and Pittsburg. NSP3 will focus on these areas for the first nine months of implementation. If a viable project is not identified within the first nine months, NSP3 activities will focus on Tier 2 priority areas (Bay Point, San Pablo, and North Richmond [City and County]).</p> <p>The purpose of this approach is to enable the County to move quickly and adapt to changing market conditions.</p>	
Budget	Source of Funding	Dollar Amount
	NSP3	at least \$467,824
	To Be Determined	To be determined
Total Budget for Activity	To be determined	
Performance Measures	A minimum of 5 Low- income rental units.	
Projected Start Date	Tier 1 start date is April 1, 2011, or as close to that date as practicable.	

	If after 9 months of the actual Tier 1 start date there is not a feasible Tier 1 proposals, then the County will move on and consider the Tier 2 proposals.	
Projected End Date	3/31/14	
Responsible Organization	Name	Contra Costa County
	Location	Department of Conservation and Development 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez, CA 94553
	Administrator Contact Info	Kara Douglas Kara.Douglas@dcd.cccounty.us (925) 335-7223

Activity Number 2		
Activity Name	Multi-family Moderate Income Rental Housing	
Uses	Select all that apply:	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use A: Financing Mechanisms
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use B: Acquisition and Rehabilitation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use C: Land Banking
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use D: Demolition
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use E: Redevelopment
CDBG Activity or Activities	24 CFR 570.201(a) – Acquisition (i) – Relocation. New construction is eligible as part of the redevelopment of demolished or vacant properties.	
National Objective	Moderate Income Housing (LMMH)	
Activity Description	<p>This activity will consist of one or more of the eligible uses noted above. Financing mechanism will be a low (i.e. between 1 and 3 percent) interest deferred loan to the developer of a multi-family rental project. The term will be for either 30, 40, or 55 years depending on requirements of other funding sources. A regulatory agreement with income, rent, and term of affordability will be record against the property.</p> <p>The Request for Proposals (see the responses to Question 4 above) will include existing foreclosed multi-family properties as well as demolished or vacant properties as eligible property types. Therefore, this activity may result in the acquisition and rehabilitation of an existing apartment building with occupants. The occupants may be temporarily or permanently displaced. The acquisition of a vacant site would support the new construction of affordable rental housing. Depending on the site cost, project size, timing, and budget, NSP3 funds may also be used for predevelopment and/or construction costs.</p>	
Location Description	<p>Tier 1 priority areas: These areas include neighborhoods within the cities of Antioch, Concord, and Pittsburg. NSP3 will focus on these areas for the first nine months of implementation. If a viable project is not identified within the first nine months, NSP3 activities will focus on Tier 2 priority areas (Bay Point, San Pablo, and North Richmond [City and County]).</p> <p>The purpose of this approach is to enable the County to move quickly and adapt to changing market conditions.</p>	
Budget	Source of Funding	Dollar Amount
	NSP3	Up to \$1,216,341

	To be determined	To be determined
Total Budget for Activity		To be determined
Performance Measures	Approximately 12 rental units affordable to Low and Moderate Income households.	
Projected Start Date	Tier 1 start date is April 1, 2011, or as close to that date as practicable. If after 9 months of the actual Tier 1 start date there is not a feasible Tier 1 proposals, then the County will move on and consider the Tier 2 proposals.	
Projected End Date	3/31/14	
Responsible Organization	Name	Contra Costa County
	Location	Department of Conservation and Development 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez, CA 94553
	Administrator Contact Info	Kara Douglas Kara.Douglas@dcd.cccounty.us (925) 335-7223

Activity Number 3	
Activity Name	Single Family Low Income Housing
Use	Select all that apply:
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eligible Use A: Financing Mechanisms
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eligible Use B: Acquisition and Rehabilitation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligible Use C: Land Banking
	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligible Use D: Demolition
	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligible Use E: Redevelopment
CDBG Activity or Activities	24 CFR 570.201(a) Acquisition, (b) Disposition, (i) Relocation, (n) Direct Homeownership Assistance, 24 CFR 570.202 Eligible rehabilitation and preservation activities for homes and other residential properties, housing counseling for those seeking to take part in the activity.
National Objective	Low Moderate Middle Income Housing (LMMH)
Activity Description	<p>This activity is intended to meet the low income housing requirement. It is expected that this activity will be carried out by a non profit that specializes in self help housing.</p> <p>NSP funds will be loaned to the agency carrying out this activity. It will purchase vacant and foreclosed homes. The non-profit will select homebuyers who will assist in the rehabilitation of their future home. The selection process includes extensive outreach and marketing in the community. Marketing materials are translated into Spanish and other languages. Materials are provided to community organizations and churches. The non-profit screens the applicants for income eligibility and ability to pay the mortgage. They strive to work with families with the greatest need for decent housing. The work done by the future owner not only provides a "sweat equity" stake in the home, but also teaches the homebuyer valuable home maintenance skills. The non-profit will be the mortgage lender and will structure the loan to be affordable to the specific household. The typical structure provides a 30 year, zero interest, amortizing loan with a forgivable</p>

	<p>appreciation share provision. NSP3 funds will leverage volunteer labor, foundation grants, and donations of materials. Unless private sources of funds can be identified to supplement NSP3 funds, the full cost of the acquisition and rehabilitation will be funded with NSP3. In this case, the loans will transfer to the homeowner as amortizing loans with interest rates set so that the mortgage payments are affordable to the buyer (i.e. to keep housing costs equal to or less than 30% of the owner's income).</p> <p>The homes will be sold for an amount equal to or less than the total amount of funds used to acquire and rehabilitate the home. Homebuyers will be required to sign a 20 to 30 year resale restriction with the non profit entity operating the selfhelp program. The County will have a right of first refusal to purchase the home should the non-profit entity not be in a position to exercise its right in a future transaction. If redevelopment housing set-aside funds are used to supplement NSP3 funds, the buyer will be required to enter into a 45 year resale restriction. All properties will be purchased at a minimum of one percent less than the appraised value. Appraisals shall be consistent with the appraisal requirements of the Uniform Relocation Act.</p>	
Location Description	Tier 3 - Bay Point	
Budget	Source of Funding	Dollar Amount
	NSP3	None at this time
Total Budget for Activity	\$0.00	
Performance Measures	One home will be rehabilitated for every \$250,000 budgeted to this activity	
Projected Start Date	1/1/12 if Tier 3 activities are needed	
Projected End Date	3/31/14	
Responsible Organization	Name	Contra Costa County
	Location	Department of Conservation and Development 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez, CA 94553
	Administrator Contact Info	Kara Douglas Kara.Douglas@dcd.cccounty.us (925) 335-7223

Activity Number 4											
Activity Name	Single Family Moderate and Middle Income Housing										
Use	<p>Select all that apply:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Eligible Use A: Financing Mechanisms</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Eligible Use B: Acquisition and Rehabilitation</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Eligible Use C: Land Banking</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Eligible Use D: Demolition</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Eligible Use E: Redevelopment</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use A: Financing Mechanisms	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use B: Acquisition and Rehabilitation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use C: Land Banking	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use D: Demolition	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use E: Redevelopment
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use A: Financing Mechanisms										
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use B: Acquisition and Rehabilitation										
<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use C: Land Banking										
<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use D: Demolition										
<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use E: Redevelopment										
CDBG Activity or Activities	24 CFR 570.201(a) Acquisition, (b) Disposition, (i) Relocation, (n) Direct Homeownership Assistance, 24 CFR 570.202 Eligible rehabilitation and preservation activities for homes and other residential properties, housing counseling for those seeking to take part in the activity.										
National Objective	Low Moderate Middle Income Housing (LMMH)										

Activity Description	<p>NSP funds will be used to purchase and rehabilitate vacant and foreclosed homes. Unless private sources of funds can be identified to supplement NSP funds, it is likely that the full cost of the acquisition and rehabilitation will be funded with NSP. This activity will also fund down payment assistance for the homebuyer if needed. This approach is based on the County's NSP1 Activity One. The County funded non-profit developers to acquire and rehabilitate homes for low, moderate, and middle income homebuyers. The funds are initially loaned to the developer. At the completion of construction, the developer repays the NSP loan (less any amount loaned in excess of the sales price). The County makes a new loan to the homebuyers as deferred shared appreciation loans.</p> <p>The homes will be sold for an amount equal to or less than the total amount of funds used to acquire and rehabilitate the home. Homebuyers will be required to sign a 30 year shared appreciation promissory note. If redevelopment housing set-aside funds are used to supplement NSP funds, the buyer will be required to enter into a 45 year resale restriction. If no financial assistance is provided to the homebuyer, and the area qualifies under the presumed affordability provisions, then the buyer will sign a covenant to occupy the home.</p> <p>Resale restrictions are a deterrent to buyers when similar homes at the same price are available for purchase without restrictions.</p> <p>This activity will target properties that can be purchased and rehabilitated for under \$300,000. All properties will be purchased for at least one percent less than the appraised value. Appraisals shall be consistent with the appraisal requirements of the Uniform Relocation Act.</p>		
	Location Description		
	(Area or possible areas of greatest need where activity is being undertaken)		
	Budget	Source of Funding	Dollar Amount
		NSP3	None at this time. This activity will be funded if Activity 1 is not viable.
Total Budget for Activity		None at this time.	
Performance Measures	One home will be rehabilitated for every \$250,000 budgeted to this project.		
Projected Start Date	1/1/12 if Tier 3 activities are needed		
Projected End Date	3/31/14		
Responsible Organization	Name	Contra Costa County	
	Location	Department of Conservation and Development 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez, CA 94553	
	Administrator Contact Info	Kara Douglas Kara.Douglas@dcd.cccounty.us (925) 335-7223	

Activity Number 5	
Activity Name	Homeownership financial assistance
Use	Select all that apply: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eligible Use A: Financing Mechanisms

	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use B: Acquisition and Rehabilitation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use C: Land Banking
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use D: Demolition
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use E: Redevelopment
CDBG Activity or Activities	24 CFR 570.201(n) Direct homeownership assistance	
National Objective	Low Moderate Middle Income Housing (LMMH)	
Activity Description	<p>This activity will provide downpayment and/or silent second shared appreciation mortgage assistance. Buyers will be required to contribute at least 3 percent of the purchase price from their own funds. NSP3 loans will be provided with fully amortizing, fixed interest rate loans. NSP3 loans will be provided as 30 year deferred payment, shared appreciation loans. The loans will be limited to 15 percent of the purchase price. Purchase prices are limited to \$300,000. Payments on the loans will be deferred until sale of the home or if the owner no longer occupies the home. When the loan is paid, the borrower will pay the original principal plus a share of the appreciation equal to the percentage of the NSP3 loan to the original purchase price. Adjustments will be made for capital improvements and deferred maintenance. All properties will be purchased at a minimum of 1 percent less than the appraised value. Appraisals shall be consistent with the appraisal requirements of the Uniform Relocation Act.</p>	
Location Description	Tier 3 Areas	
Budget	Source of Funding	Dollar Amount
	NSP3	None at this time. This activity will be funded if Tier 3 activities are needed.
Total Budget for Activity		
Performance Measures	One loan will be provided for every \$25,000 budgeted for this activity.	
Projected Start Date	1/1/12 if Tier 3 activities are needed	
Projected End Date	3/31/14	
Responsible Organization	Name	Contra Costa County
	Location	Department of Conservation and Development 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez, CA 94553
	Administrator Contact Info	Kara Douglas Kara.Douglas@dcd.cccounty.us (925) 335-7223

Activity Number 6		
Activity Name	Program Administration	
Use	Select all that apply:	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use A: Financing Mechanisms
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use B: Acquisition and Rehabilitation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Eligible Use C: Land Banking

	<input type="checkbox"/> Eligible Use D: Demolition <input type="checkbox"/> Eligible Use E: Redevelopment	
CDBG Activity or Activities	An amount of up to 10 percent of an NSP grant provided to a jurisdiction and up to 10 percent of program income earned may be used for general administration and planning activities as defined at 24 CFR 570.205 and 206. Activity delivery costs may be charged to the specific activity.	
National Objective	N/A	
Activity Description	Planning and administrative work will include all tasks associated with the development and publication of the NSP Substantial Amendment. Activity development and related legal documents will also be covered by the planning and administration budget.	
Location Description	N/A	
Budget	Source of Funding	Dollar Amount
	NSP3	\$187,124.00
Total Budget for Activity	\$187,124.00	
Performance Measures	N/A	
Projected Start Date	4/1/11	
Projected End Date	3/31/14	
Responsible Organization	Name	Contra Costa County
	Location	Department of Conservation and Development 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez, CA 94553
	Administrator Contact Info	Kara Douglas Kara.Douglas@dcd.cccounty.us (925) 335-7223

8. Certifications

Certifications for State and Entitlement Communities

(1) **Affirmatively furthering fair housing.** The jurisdiction certifies that it will affirmatively further fair housing, which means that it will conduct an analysis to identify impediments to fair housing choice within the jurisdiction, take appropriate actions to overcome the effects of any impediments identified through that analysis, and maintain records reflecting the analysis and actions in this regard.

(2) **Anti-displacement and relocation plan.** The applicant certifies that it has in effect and is following a residential anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan.

(3) **Anti-lobbying.** The jurisdiction must submit a certification with regard to compliance with restrictions on lobbying required by 24 CFR part 87, together with disclosure forms, if required by that part.

(4) **Authority of jurisdiction.** The jurisdiction certifies that the consolidated plan or abbreviated plan, as applicable, is authorized under state and local law (as applicable) and that the

jurisdiction possesses the legal authority to carry out the programs for which it is seeking funding, in accordance with applicable HUD regulations and other program requirements.

(5) **Consistency with plan.** The jurisdiction certifies that the housing activities to be undertaken with NSP funds are consistent with its consolidated plan or abbreviated plan, as applicable.

(6) **Acquisition and relocation.** The jurisdiction certifies that it will comply with the acquisition and relocation requirements of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4601), and implementing regulations at 49 CFR part 24, except as those provisions are modified by the notice for the NSP program published by HUD.

(7) **Section 3.** The jurisdiction certifies that it will comply with section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (12 U.S.C. 1701u), and implementing regulations at 24 CFR part 135.

(8) **Citizen participation.** The jurisdiction certifies that it is in full compliance and following a detailed citizen participation plan that satisfies the requirements of Sections 24 CFR 91.105 or 91.115, as modified by NSP requirements.

(9) **Following a plan.** The jurisdiction certifies it is following a current consolidated plan (or Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy) that has been approved by HUD. [Only States and entitlement jurisdictions use this certification.]

(10) **Use of funds.** The jurisdiction certifies that it will comply with the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act and Title XII of Division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 by spending 50 percent of its grant funds within 2 years, and spending 100 percent within 3 years, of receipt of the grant.

(11) **The jurisdiction certifies:**

- a. that all of the NSP funds made available to it will be used with respect to individuals and families whose incomes do not exceed 120 percent of area median income; and
- b. The jurisdiction will not attempt to recover any capital costs of public improvements assisted with CDBG funds, including Section 108 loan guaranteed funds, by assessing any amount against properties owned and occupied by persons of low- and moderate-income, including any fee charged or assessment made as a condition of obtaining access to such public improvements. However, if NSP funds are used to pay the proportion of a fee or assessment attributable to the capital costs of public improvements (assisted in part with NSP funds) financed from other revenue sources, an assessment or charge may be made against the property with respect to the public improvements financed by a source other than CDBG funds. In addition, with respect to properties owned and occupied by moderate-income (but not low-income) families, an assessment or charge may be made against the property with respect to the public improvements financed by a source other than NSP funds if the jurisdiction certifies that it lacks NSP or CDBG funds to cover the assessment.

(12) **Excessive force.** The jurisdiction certifies that it has adopted and is enforcing:

- a. A policy prohibiting the use of excessive force by law enforcement agencies within its jurisdiction against any individuals engaged in nonviolent civil rights demonstrations; and
- b. A policy of enforcing applicable state and local laws against physically barring entrance to, or exit from, a facility or location that is the subject of such nonviolent civil rights demonstrations within its jurisdiction.

(13) **Compliance with anti-discrimination laws.** The jurisdiction certifies that the NSP grant will be conducted and administered in conformity with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d), the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601-3619), and implementing regulations.

(14) **Compliance with lead-based paint procedures.** The jurisdiction certifies that its activities concerning lead-based paint will comply with the requirements of part 35, subparts A, B, J, K, and R of this title.

(15) **Compliance with laws.** The jurisdiction certifies that it will comply with applicable laws.

(16) **Vicinity hiring.** The jurisdiction certifies that it will, to the maximum extent feasible, provide for hiring of employees that reside in the vicinity of NSP3 funded projects or contract with small businesses that are owned and operated by persons residing in the vicinity of NSP3 projects.

(17) **Development of affordable rental housing.** The jurisdiction certifies that it will abide by the procedures described in its NSP3 Abbreviated Plan to create preferences for the development of affordable rental housing for properties assisted with NSP3 funds.


Signature/Authorized Official

Date

Title



Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) Three Qualifying Census Block Groups in Contra Costa County




NSP Need Score



17 18 19 20

Congress created the Neighborhood stabilization Program to help cities, counties and states deal with community problems that are the result of the mortgage foreclosure crisis in the nation. HUD provides money to about 250 local governments (cities and counties) in all 50 states. Generally, the money must be used to buy, fix up, and resell foreclosed and abandoned homes. As long as the funds are used for this redevelopment, the units of government that receive HUD funds decide how to use the funds and what specific redevelopment activities to undertake.

NSP3 funds were allocated by a formula based on the number of foreclosures and vacancies in the 20 percent of U.S. neighborhoods (Census Tracts) with the highest rates of homes financed by a subprime mortgage, are delinquent, or are in foreclosure. In California, the minimum NSP Need score is 17.



Map created 12/10/2010
by Contra Costa County Community Development, GIS Group
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor - North Wing, Martinez, CA 94553-0095
37:59:48.455N 122:06:35.384W



Antioch - Tabora

HUD USER GIS Maps - Microsoft Internet Explorer provided by DCD CD DIVISION IT

http://www.huduser.org/NSP/NSP3.html

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

HUD USER GIS Maps

Neighborhood Stabilization Program Grants

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) provides grants to address the problems associated with homes that have been foreclosed upon and are creating economic problems for their communities.

Enter an Address, city or state: Select a County: Go

Map Options: Clear | Reset

Click Mode: Zoom | Info

NSP3 Options

15 Current Zoom Level

☐ Show Tracts Outline (Zoom In)

DRAW FINISH

VIEW DATA

VIEW PROJECTS

METHODOLOGY INSTRUCTIONS

The NSP3 mapping tool now provides a summary NSP3 score for all projects drawn. Click on "View Projects", which will list all of the projects (target areas) that have data calculated. It shows the NSP3 score for each target area along with the total estimated housing units in that area. At the bottom of the list is a sum of all housing units in all target areas and the NSP3 score for all target areas drawn. Grantees are advised to know their state minimum and if the summary score is less than the state minimum the grantee should delete, add, or revise target areas. Note that if you delete or add, the tool only recalculates after you close the "View Projects" box and reopen it. HUD also advises grantees to think carefully about the size of their target areas in total. If those target areas have a very large number of total housing units relative to the dollars available, HUD will likely ask that the grantee reduce the number and/or size of their target areas.

Project Name: Tabora

Block Group	Neighborhood Housing Units	Block Group Housing Units	Block Group Score	State Min	USPS HMDA
060139008002252307205U4	239	711	17	17	714 378

Total Neighborhood Housing Units: 239
Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 17.00
State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17

Map Terrain

Map data ©2010 Google - Terms of Use

start Kara Douglas - In... Agenda_011111... SIGNIN - Microsof... Target Areas_ma... HUD USER GIS Ma... 10:21

Neighborhood ID: 4751281

NSP3 Planning Data

Grantee ID: 0601300C
Grantee State: CA
Grantee Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Grantee Address: 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez CA 94553
Grantee Email: kara.douglas@dcd.cccounty.us

Neighborhood Name: Antioch - Tabora
Date: 2011-01-05 00:00:00

NSP3 Score

The neighborhoods identified by the NSP3 grantee as being the areas of greatest need must have an individual or average combined index score for the grantee's identified target geography that is not less than the lesser of 17 or the twentieth percentile most needy score in an individual state. For example, if a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 18, the requirement will be a minimum need of 17. If, however, a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 15, the requirement will be a minimum need of 15. If more than one neighborhood is identified in the Action Plan, HUD will average the Neighborhood Scores, weighting the scores by the estimated number of housing units in each identified neighborhood.

Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 17

State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17

Total Housing Units in Neighborhood: 239

Area Benefit Eligibility

Percent Persons Less than 120% AML: 69.5

Percent Persons Less than 80% AML: 28.6

Neighborhood Attributes (Estimates)

Vacancy Estimate

USPS data on addresses not receiving mail in the last 90 days or "NoStat" can be a useful measure of whether or not a target area has a serious vacancy problem. For urban neighborhoods, HUD has found that neighborhoods with a very high number vacant addresses relative to the total addresses in an area to be a very good indicator of a current for potentially serious blight problem.

The USPS "NoStat" indicator can mean different things. In rural areas, it is an indicator of vacancy. However, it can also be an address that has been issued but not ever used, it can indicate units under development, and it can be a very distressed property (most of the still flood damaged properties in New Orleans are NoStat). When using this variable, users need to understand the target area identified.

In addition, the housing unit counts HUD gets from the US Census indicated above are usually close to the residential address counts from the USPS below. However, if the Census and USPS counts are substantially different for your identified target area, users are advised to use the information below with caution. For example if there are many NoStats in an area for units never built, the USPS residential address count may be larger than the Census number; if the area is a rural area largely served by PO boxes it may have fewer addresses than housing units.

USPS Residential Addresses in Neighborhood: 240

Residential Addresses Vacant 90 or more days (USPS, March 2010): 7

Residential Addresses NoStat (USPS, March 2010): 1

Foreclosure Estimates

HUD has developed a model for predicting where foreclosures are likely. That model estimates serious delinquency rates using data on the leading causes of foreclosures - subprime loans (HMDA Census Tract data on high cost and highly leveraged loans), increasing unemployment (BLS data on unemployment rate change), and fall in home values (FHFA data on house price change). The predicted serious delinquency rate is then used to apportion the state total counts

of foreclosure starts (from the Mortgage Bankers Association) and REOs (from RealtyTrac) to individual block groups.

Total Housing Units to receive a mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 127

Percent of Housing Units with a high cost mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 24.5

Percent of Housing Units 90 or more days delinquent or in foreclosure: 14.7

Number of Foreclosure Starts in past year: 9

Number of Housing Units Real Estate Owned July 2009 to June 2010: 5

HUD is encouraging grantees to have small enough target areas for NSP 3 such that their dollars will have a visible impact on the neighborhood. Nationwide there have been over 1.9 million foreclosure completions in the past two years. NSP 1, 2, and 3 combined are estimated to only be able to address 100,000 to 120,000 foreclosures. To stabilize a neighborhood requires focused investment.

Estimated number of properties needed to make an impact in identified target area (20% of REO in past year): 2

Supporting Data

Metropolitan Area (or non-metropolitan area balance) percent fall in home value since peak value (Federal Housing Finance Agency Home Price Index through June 2010): -31.1 Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2005: 5.3

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2010: 12.4

·Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics

Market Analysis:

HUD is providing the data above as a tool for both neighborhood targeting and to help inform the strategy development. Some things to consider:

1. Persistent Unemployment. Is this an area with persistently high unemployment? Serious consideration should be given to a rental strategy rather than a homeownership strategy.
2. Home Value Change and Vacancy. Is this an area where foreclosures are largely due to a combination of falling home values, a recent spike in unemployment, and a relatively low vacancy rate? A down payment assistance program may be an effective strategy.
3. Persistently High Vacancy. Are there a high number of substandard vacant addresses in the target area of a community with persistently high unemployment? A demolition/land bank strategy with selected acquisition rehab for rental or lease-purchase might be considered.
4. Historically low vacancy that is now rising. A targeted strategy of acquisition for homeownership and rental to retain or regain neighborhood stability might be considered.
5. Historically high cost rental market. Does this market historically have very high rents with low vacancies?

A strategy of acquiring properties and developing them as long-term affordable rental might be considered.

Latitude and Longitude of corner points

-121.820784 37.979995 -121.825891 37.980300 -121.826749 37.981653 -121.828594
37.981856

-121.829324 37.983040 -121.827221 37.982972 -121.825290 37.982363

Blocks Comprising Target Neighborhood

060133072054014,

HUD USER GIS Maps - Microsoft Internet Explorer provided by DCD CD DIVISION IT

http://www.huduser.org/NSP/NSP3.html

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

HUD USER GIS Maps

Neighborhood Stabilization Program Grants

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) provides grants to address the problems associated with homes that have been foreclosed upon and are creating economic problems for their communities.

Enter an Address, city or state Go

Select a State Select a County Go

Map Options : Clear | Reset

Click NSP3

Project Name : Concord Monument

Block Group	Neighborhood Housing Units	Block Group Housing Units	Block Group Score	State Min	USPS HMDA
060139044016000336101U2	667	980	18	17	940 221
060139044016000336102U1	513	746	18	17	758 203
060139044016000336200U2	224	324	16	17	326 126
060139044016000336200U4	20	282	16	17	283 109
060139044016000336200U5	685	685	16	17	689 266

Total Neighborhood Housing Units: 2109
Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 17.12
State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17

The summary NSP3 score for all projects drawn. Click on "View Projects", which will list all of the projects (target areas) that have data calculated. It shows the NSP3 score for each target area along with the total estimated housing units in that area. At the bottom of the list is a sum of all housing units in all target areas and the NSP3 score for all target areas drawn. Grantees are advised to know their state minimum and if the summary score is less than the state minimum the grantee should delete, add, or revise target areas. Note that if you delete or add, the tool only recalculates after you close the "View Projects" box and reopen it. HUD also advises grantees to think carefully about the size of their target areas in total. If those target areas have a very large number of total housing units relative to the dollars available, HUD will likely ask that the grantee reduce the number and/or size of their target areas.

Map data ©2011 Google - Terms of Use

LOG OUT

Map Terrain

Overview

Map data ©2011 Google - Terms of Use

Done

start

IMAND8_925462...

2 Microsoft Excel

Target Areas_map...

Kara Douglas - Inb...

HUD USER GIS Ma...

Internet

100%

12:24 PM

Neighborhood ID: 4957000

NSP3 Planning Data

Grantee ID: 0601300C

Grantee State: CA

Grantee Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Grantee Address: 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez CA 94553

Grantee Email: kara.douglas@dcd.cccounty.us

Neighborhood Name: Concord Monument

Date: 2011-01-28 00:00:00

NSP3 Score

The neighborhoods identified by the NSP3 grantee as being the areas of greatest need must have an individual or average combined index score for the grantee's identified target geography that is not less than the lesser of 17 or the twentieth percentile most needy score in an individual state. For example, if a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 18, the requirement will be a minimum need of 17. If, however, a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 15, the requirement will be a minimum need of 15. If more than one neighborhood is identified in the Action Plan, HUD will average the Neighborhood Scores, weighting the scores by the estimated number of housing units in each identified neighborhood.

Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 17.12

State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17

Total Housing Units in Neighborhood: 2109

Area Benefit Eligibility

Percent Persons Less than 120% AMI: 93.46

Percent Persons Less than 80% AMI: 74.16

Neighborhood Attributes (Estimates)

Vacancy Estimate

USPS data on addresses not receiving mail in the last 90 days or "NoStat" can be a useful measure of whether or not a target area has a serious vacancy problem. For urban neighborhoods, HUD has found that neighborhoods with a very high number vacant addresses relative to the total addresses in an area to be a very good indicator of a current for potentially serious blight problem.

The USPS "NoStat" indicator can mean different things. In rural areas, it is an indicator of vacancy. However, it can also be an address that has been issued but not ever used, it can indicate units under development, and it can be a very distressed property (most of the still flood damaged properties in New Orleans are NoStat). When using this variable, users need to understand the target area identified.

In addition, the housing unit counts HUD gets from the US Census indicated above are usually close to the residential address counts from the USPS below. However, if the Census and USPS counts are substantially different for your identified target area, users are advised to use the information below with caution. For example if there are many NoStats in an area for units never built, the USPS residential address count may be larger than the Census number; if the area is a rural area largely served by PO boxes it may have fewer addresses than housing units.

USPS Residential Addresses in Neighborhood: 2095

Residential Addresses Vacant 90 or more days (USPS, March 2010): 21

Residential Addresses NoStat (USPS, March 2010): 15

Foreclosure Estimates

HUD has developed a model for predicting where foreclosures are likely. That model estimates serious delinquency rates using data on the leading causes of foreclosures - subprime loans (HMDA Census Tract data on high cost and highly leveraged loans), increasing unemployment (BLS data on unemployment rate change), and fall in home values (FHFA data on house price change). The predicted serious delinquency rate is then used to apportion the state total counts

of foreclosure starts (from the Mortgage Bankers Association) and REOs (from RealtyTrac) to individual block groups.

Total Housing Units to receive a mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 651

Percent of Housing Units with a high cost mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 24.56

Percent of Housing Units 90 or more days delinquent or in foreclosure: 14.65

Number of Foreclosure Starts in past year: 45

Number of Housing Units Real Estate Owned July 2009 to June 2010: 25

HUD is encouraging grantees to have small enough target areas for NSP 3 such that their dollars will have a visible impact on the neighborhood. Nationwide there have been over 1.9 million foreclosure completions in the past two years. NSP 1, 2, and 3 combined are estimated to only be able to address 100,000 to 120,000 foreclosures. To stabilize a neighborhood requires focused investment.

Estimated number of properties needed to make an impact in identified target area (20% of REO in past year): 9

Supporting Data

Metropolitan Area (or non-metropolitan area balance) percent fall in home value since peak value (Federal Housing Finance Agency Home Price Index through June 2010): -31.1

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2005: 5.1

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2010: 11.8

·Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics

Market Analysis:

HUD is providing the data above as a tool for both neighborhood targeting and to help inform the strategy development. Some things to consider:

1. Persistent Unemployment. Is this an area with persistently high unemployment? Serious consideration should be given to a rental strategy rather than a homeownership strategy.
2. Home Value Change and Vacancy. Is this an area where foreclosures are largely due to a combination of falling home values, a recent spike in unemployment, and a relatively low vacancy rate? A down payment assistance program may be an effective strategy.
3. Persistently High Vacancy. Are there a high number of substandard vacant addresses in the target area of a community with persistently high unemployment? A demolition/land bank strategy with selected acquisition rehab for rental or lease-purchase might be considered.
4. Historically low vacancy that is now rising. A targeted strategy of acquisition for homeownership and rental to retain or regain neighborhood stability might be considered.
5. Historically high cost rental market. Does this market historically have very high rents with low vacancies? A strategy of acquiring properties and developing them as long-term affordable rental might be considered.

Latitude and Longitude of corner points

-122.044415 37.952489 -122.047505 37.955467 -122.044115 37.957666 -122.043815 37.957463

-122.041454 37.959019 -122.039609 37.960305 -122.041497 37.962166 -122.039094
37.963756
-122.038708 37.964467 -122.038021 37.965008 -122.035017 37.966700 -122.034545
37.966903
-122.033601 37.965956 -122.032743 37.966395 -122.031670 37.964332 -122.031755
37.962741
-122.032571 37.960813 -122.033644 37.960068 -122.039223 37.956312

Blocks Comprising Target Neighborhood

060133361012006, 060133361012008, 060133361012012, 060133361012007,
060133361012005, 060133361012003, 060133361021000, 060133361021004,
060133361021003, 060133361021002, 060133362002000, 060133362002001,
060133362002002, 060133362004002, 060133362005000, 060133362005001,

Pittsburg – Los Medanos

HUD USER GIS Maps - Microsoft Internet Explorer provided by DCD CD DIVISION IT

http://www.huduser.org/NSP/NSP3.html

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

HUD USER GIS Maps

Neighborhood Stabilization Program Grants

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) provides grants to address the problems associated with homes that have been foreclosed upon and are creating economic problems for their communities.

Enter an Address, city or state Go

Select a State Select a County Go

Map Options : Clear | Reset

Click Mode: Zoom | Info

NSP Legend (%): ☒ Tract Outline

Click here for an Overview

NSP3 Options

15 Current Zoom Level

☐ Show Tracts Outline (Zoom 11+)

The NSP3 mapping tool now provides a summary NSP3 score for all projects drawn. Click on "View Projects", which will list all of the projects (target areas) that have data calculated. It shows the NSP3 score for each target area along with the total estimated housing units in that area. At the bottom of the list is a sum of all housing units in all target areas and the NSP3 score for all target areas drawn. Grantees are advised to know their state minimum and if the summary score is less than the state minimum the grantee should delete, add, or revise target areas. Note that if you delete or add, the tool only recalculates after you close the "View Projects" box and reopen it. HUD also advises grantees to think carefully about the size of their target areas in total. If those target areas have a very large number of total housing units relative to the dollars available, HUD will likely ask that the grantee reduce the number and/or size of their target areas.

NSP3

Project Name : Greater dwntwn Pittsburg

Block Group	Neighborhood Housing Units	Block Group Housing Units	Block Group Score	State Min	USPS HMDA
060139008057456309000U2	111	251	17	17	260 205
060139008057456309000U3	133	257	17	17	266 210
060139008057456310000U2	142	291	19	17	383 271
060139008057456310000U3	251	670	19	17	882 625

Total Neighborhood Housing Units: 637
Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 18.23
State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17

Done

start Kara Douglas - In... NSP3 Application ... Agenda_011111 ... Target Areas_ma... HUD USER GIS Ma... 3:22 PM

Neighborhood ID: 5687866

NSP3 Planning Data

Grantee ID: 0601300C

Grantee State: CA

Grantee Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Grantee Address: 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez CA 94553

Grantee Email: kara.douglas@dcd.cccounty.us

Neighborhood Name: Pittsburg - Los Medanos

Date: 2011-01-19 00:00:00

NSP3 Score

The neighborhoods identified by the NSP3 grantee as being the areas of greatest need must have an individual or average combined index score for the grantee's identified target geography that is not less than the lesser of 17 or the twentieth percentile most needy score in an individual state. For example, if a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 18, the requirement will be a minimum need of 17. If, however, a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 15, the requirement will be a minimum need of 15. If more than one neighborhood is identified in the Action Plan, HUD will average the Neighborhood Scores, weighting the scores by the estimated number of housing units in each identified neighborhood.

Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 19

State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17

Total Housing Units in Neighborhood: 187

Area Benefit Eligibility

Percent Persons Less than 120% AML: 95

Percent Persons Less than 80% AML: 81.8

Neighborhood Attributes (Estimates)

Vacancy Estimate

USPS data on addresses not receiving mail in the last 90 days or "NoStat" can be a useful measure of whether or not a target area has a serious vacancy problem. For urban neighborhoods, HUD has found that neighborhoods with a very high number vacant addresses relative to the total addresses in an area to be a very good indicator of a current for potentially serious blight problem.

The USPS "NoStat" indicator can mean different things. In rural areas, it is an indicator of vacancy. However, it can also be an address that has been issued but not ever used, it can indicate units under development, and it can be a very distressed property (most of the still flood damaged properties in New Orleans are NoStat). When using this variable, users need to understand the target area identified.

In addition, the housing unit counts HUD gets from the US Census indicated above are usually close to the residential address counts from the USPS below. However, if the Census and USPS counts are substantially different for your identified target area, users are advised to use the information below with caution. For example if there are many NoStats in an area for units never built, the USPS residential address count may be larger than the Census number; if the area is a rural area largely served by PO boxes it may have fewer addresses than housing units.

USPS Residential Addresses in Neighborhood: 246

Residential Addresses Vacant 90 or more days (USPS, March 2010): 10

Residential Addresses NoStat (USPS, March 2010): 4

Foreclosure Estimates

HUD has developed a model for predicting where foreclosures are likely. That model estimates serious delinquency rates using data on the leading causes of foreclosures - subprime loans (HMDA Census Tract data on high cost and highly leveraged loans), increasing unemployment (BLS data on unemployment rate change), and fall in home values (FHFA data on house price change). The predicted serious delinquency rate is then used to apportion the state total counts

of foreclosure starts (from the Mortgage Bankers Association) and REOs (from RealtyTrac) to individual block groups.

Total Housing Units to receive a mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 174

Percent of Housing Units with a high cost mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 28.1

Percent of Housing Units 90 or more days delinquent or in foreclosure: 17.4

Number of Foreclosure Starts in past year: 15

Number of Housing Units Real Estate Owned July 2009 to June 2010: 8

HUD is encouraging grantees to have small enough target areas for NSP 3 such that their dollars will have a visible impact on the neighborhood. Nationwide there have been over 1.9 million foreclosure completions in the past two years. NSP 1, 2, and 3 combined are estimated to only be able to address 100,000 to 120,000 foreclosures. To stabilize a neighborhood requires focused investment.

Estimated number of properties needed to make an impact in identified target area (20% of REO in past year): 3

Supporting Data

Metropolitan Area (or non-metropolitan area balance) percent fall in home value since peak value (Federal Housing Finance Agency Home Price Index through June 2010): -31.1

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2005: 7.6

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2010: 17.1

-Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics

Market Analysis:

HUD is providing the data above as a tool for both neighborhood targeting and to help inform the strategy development. Some things to consider:

1. Persistent Unemployment. Is this an area with persistently high unemployment? Serious consideration should be given to a rental strategy rather than a homeownership strategy.
2. Home Value Change and Vacancy. Is this an area where foreclosures are largely due to a combination of falling home values, a recent spike in unemployment, and a relatively low vacancy rate? A down payment assistance program may be an effective strategy.
3. Persistently High Vacancy. Are there a high number of substandard vacant addresses in the target area of a community with persistently high unemployment? A demolition/land bank strategy with selected acquisition rehab for rental or lease-purchase might be considered.
4. Historically low vacancy that is now rising. A targeted strategy of acquisition for homeownership and rental to retain or regain neighborhood stability might be considered.
5. Historically high cost rental market. Does this market historically have very high rents with low vacancies? A strategy of acquiring properties and developing them as long-term affordable rental might be considered.

Latitude and Longitude of corner points


-121.881680 38.024971 -121.879106 38.024228 -121.878548 38.026323 -121.878376
38.027879

-121.883912 38.029129 -121.884298 38.027743 -121.880951 38.026932

Blocks Comprising Target Neighborhood

060133100002000, 060133100002007, 060133100002015, 060133100002014,
060133100002013, 060133100002008, 060133100002019,

Bay Point Bella Monte



Neighborhood ID: 8858520

NSP3 Planning Data

Grantee ID: 0601300C

Grantee State: CA

Grantee Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Grantee Address: 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez CA 94553

Grantee Email: kara.douglas@dcd.cccounty.us

Neighborhood Name: Bay Point - Bella Monte

Date: 2011-01-28 00:00:00

NSP3 Score

The neighborhoods identified by the NSP3 grantee as being the areas of greatest need must have an individual or average combined index score for the grantee's identified target geography that is not less than the lesser of 17 or the twentieth percentile most needy score in an individual state. For example, if a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 18,

the requirement will be a minimum need of 17. If, however, a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 15, the requirement will be a minimum need of 15. If more than one neighborhood is identified in the Action Plan, HUD will average the Neighborhood Scores, weighting the scores by the estimated number of housing units in each identified neighborhood.

Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 18
State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17
Total Housing Units in Neighborhood: 1792

Area Benefit Eligibility

Percent Persons Less than 120% AMI: 87.1
Percent Persons Less than 80% AMI: 68.06
Neighborhood Attributes (Estimates)

Vacancy Estimate

USPS data on addresses not receiving mail in the last 90 days or "NoStat" can be a useful measure of whether or not a target area has a serious vacancy problem. For urban neighborhoods, HUD has found that neighborhoods with a very high number vacant addresses relative to the total addresses in an area to be a very good indicator of a current for potentially serious blight problem.

The USPS "NoStat" indicator can mean different things. In rural areas, it is an indicator of vacancy. However, it can also be an address that has been issued but not ever used, it can indicate units under development, and it can be a very distressed property (most of the still flood damaged properties in New Orleans are NoStat). When using this variable, users need to understand the target area identified.

In addition, the housing unit counts HUD gets from the US Census indicated above are usually close to the residential address counts from the USPS below. However, if the Census and USPS counts are substantially different for your identified target area, users are advised to use the information below with caution. For example if there are many NoStats in an area for units never built, the USPS residential address count may be larger than the Census number; if the area is a rural area largely served by PO boxes it may have fewer addresses than housing units.

USPS Residential Addresses in Neighborhood: 1957
Residential Addresses Vacant 90 or more days (USPS, March 2010): 49
Residential Addresses NoStat (USPS, March 2010): 104

Foreclosure Estimates

HUD has developed a model for predicting where foreclosures are likely. That model estimates serious delinquency rates using data on the leading causes of foreclosures - subprime loans (HMDA Census Tract data on high cost and highly leveraged loans), increasing unemployment (BLS data on unemployment rate change), and fall in home values (FHFA data on house price change). The predicted serious delinquency rate is then used to apportion the state total counts of foreclosure starts (from the Mortgage Bankers Association) and REOs (from RealtyTrac) to individual block groups.

Total Housing Units to receive a mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 1025
Percent of Housing Units with a high cost mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 29.8
Percent of Housing Units 90 or more days delinquent or in foreclosure: 16.3

Number of Foreclosure Starts in past year: 81

Number of Housing Units Real Estate Owned July 2009 to June 2010: 45

HUD is encouraging grantees to have small enough target areas for NSP 3 such that their dollars will have a visible impact on the neighborhood. Nationwide there have been over 1.9 million foreclosure completions in the past two years. NSP 1, 2, and 3 combined are estimated to only be able to address 100,000 to 120,000 foreclosures. To stabilize a neighborhood requires focused investment.

Estimated number of properties needed to make an impact in identified target area (20% of REO in past year): 17

Supporting Data

Metropolitan Area (or non-metropolitan area balance) percent fall in home value since peak value (Federal Housing Finance Agency Home Price Index through June 2010): -31.1

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2005: 4.7

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2010: 10.9

·Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics

Market Analysis:

HUD is providing the data above as a tool for both neighborhood targeting and to help inform the strategy development. Some things to consider:

1. Persistent Unemployment. Is this an area with persistently high unemployment? Serious consideration should be given to a rental strategy rather than a homeownership strategy.
2. Home Value Change and Vacancy. Is this an area where foreclosures are largely due to a combination of falling home values, a recent spike in unemployment, and a relatively low vacancy rate? A down payment assistance program may be an effective strategy.
3. Persistently High Vacancy. Are there a high number of substandard vacant addresses in the target area of a community with persistently high unemployment? A demolition/land bank strategy with selected acquisition rehab for rental or lease-purchase might be considered.
4. Historically low vacancy that is now rising. A targeted strategy of acquisition for homeownership and rental to retain or regain neighborhood stability might be considered.
5. Historically high cost rental market. Does this market historically have very high rents with low vacancies? A strategy of acquiring properties and developing them as long-term affordable rental might be considered.

Latitude and Longitude of corner points

-121.961718 38.025512 -121.957941 38.022875 -121.954937 38.022064 -121.951675 38.020644

-121.948242 38.019156 -121.944551 38.019156 -121.942492 38.020103 -121.941719 38.019224

-121.937513 38.019292 -121.932964 38.019359 -121.933050 38.023213 -121.928158 38.023146


-121.928501 38.026729 -121.937513 38.026797 -121.937771 38.021050 -121.942062 38.022334

-121.942062 38.026797 -121.960430 38.026932

Blocks Comprising Target Neighborhood

060133141041006, 060133141041021, 060133141041020, 060133141041019,
060133141041018, 060133141041017, 060133141041016, 060133141041015,
060133141041014, 060133141041013, 060133141041012, 060133141041011,
060133141041010, 060133141041009, 060133141041008, 060133141041007,
060133141041005, 060133141042000, 060133141042003, 060133141042005,
060133141042007, 060133141042019, 060133141042018, 060133141042017,
060133141042016, 060133141042015, 060133141042014, 060133141042013,
060133141042012, 060133141042011, 060133141042010, 060133141042009,
060133141042008, 060133141042006, 060133141042004, 060133141042002,
060133141042001, 060133141043002, 060133141043005, 060133141043014,
060133141043013, 060133141043012, 060133141043025, 060133141043024,
060133141043023, 060133141043022, 060133141043004, 060133141043003,

Bay Point – Shore Acres



Neighborhood ID: 9556427

NSP3 Planning Data

Grantee ID: 0630000E,0601300C

Grantee State: CA

Grantee Name: RICHMOND,CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Grantee Address: 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez CA 94553

Grantee Email: kara.douglas@dcd.cccounty.us

Neighborhood Name: N Richmond-Cnty/City

Date:2011-01-26 00:00:00

NSP3 Score

The neighborhoods identified by the NSP3 grantee as being the areas of greatest need must have an individual or average combined index score for the grantee's identified target geography that is not less than the lesser of 17 or the twentieth percentile most needy score in an individual state. For example, if a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 18,

the requirement will be a minimum need of 17. If, however, a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 15, the requirement will be a minimum need of 15. If more than one neighborhood is identified in the Action Plan, HUD will average the Neighborhood Scores, weighting the scores by the estimated number of housing units in each identified neighborhood.

Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 18.75
State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17
Total Housing Units in Neighborhood: 1040

Area Benefit Eligibility

Percent Persons Less than 120% AMI: 93.3
Percent Persons Less than 80% AMI: 82.18

Neighborhood Attributes (Estimates)

Vacancy Estimate

USPS data on addresses not receiving mail in the last 90 days or "NoStat" can be a useful measure of whether or not a target area has a serious vacancy problem. For urban neighborhoods, HUD has found that neighborhoods with a very high number vacant addresses relative to the total addresses in an area to be a very good indicator of a current for potentially serious blight problem.

The USPS "NoStat" indicator can mean different things. In rural areas, it is an indicator of vacancy. However, it can also be an address that has been issued but not ever used, it can indicate units under development, and it can be a very distressed property (most of the still flood damaged properties in New Orleans are NoStat). When using this variable, users need to understand the target area identified.

In addition, the housing unit counts HUD gets from the US Census indicated above are usually close to the residential address counts from the USPS below. However, if the Census and USPS counts are substantially different for your identified target area, users are advised to use the information below with caution. For example if there are many NoStats in an area for units never built, the USPS residential address count may be larger than the Census number; if the area is a rural area largely served by PO boxes it may have fewer addresses than housing units.

USPS Residential Addresses in Neighborhood: 1193
Residential Addresses Vacant 90 or more days (USPS, March 2010): 135
Residential Addresses NoStat (USPS, March 2010): 58

Foreclosure Estimates

HUD has developed a model for predicting where foreclosures are likely. That model estimates serious delinquency rates using data on the leading causes of foreclosures - subprime loans (HMDA Census Tract data on high cost and highly leveraged loans), increasing unemployment (BLS data on unemployment rate change), and fall in home values (FHFA data on house price change). The predicted serious delinquency rate is then used to apportion the state total counts of foreclosure starts (from the Mortgage Bankers Association) and REOs (from RealtyTrac) to individual block groups.

Total Housing Units to receive a mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 673
Percent of Housing Units with a high cost mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 34.64

Percent of Housing Units 90 or more days delinquent or in foreclosure: 19.35
Number of Foreclosure Starts in past year: 63

Number of Housing Units Real Estate Owned July 2009 to June 2010: 34
HUD is encouraging grantees to have small enough target areas for NSP 3 such that their dollars will have a visible impact on the neighborhood. Nationwide there have been over 1.9 million foreclosure completions in the past two years. NSP 1, 2, and 3 combined are estimated to only be able to address 100,000 to 120,000 foreclosures. To stabilize a neighborhood requires focused investment.

Estimated number of properties needed to make an impact in identified target area (20% of REO in past year): 13

Supporting Data

Metropolitan Area (or non-metropolitan area balance) percent fall in home value since peak value (Federal Housing Finance Agency Home Price Index through June 2010): -31.1
Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2005: 5.81
Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2010: 13.27
-Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics

Market Analysis:

HUD is providing the data above as a tool for both neighborhood targeting and to help inform the strategy development. Some things to consider:

1. Persistent Unemployment. Is this an area with persistently high unemployment? Serious consideration should be given to a rental strategy rather than a homeownership strategy.
2. Home Value Change and Vacancy. Is this an area where foreclosures are largely due to a combination of falling home values, a recent spike in unemployment, and a relatively low vacancy rate? A down payment assistance program may be an effective strategy.
3. Persistently High Vacancy. Are there a high number of substandard vacant addresses in the target area of a community with persistently high unemployment? A demolition/land bank strategy with selected acquisition rehab for rental or lease-purchase might be considered.
4. Historically low vacancy that is now rising. A targeted strategy of acquisition for homeownership and rental to retain or regain neighborhood stability might be considered.
5. Historically high cost rental market. Does this market historically have very high rents with low vacancies? A strategy of acquiring properties and developing them as long-term affordable rental might be considered.


Latitude and Longitude of corner points

-122.368855 37.960035 -122.368770 37.954621 -122.368984 37.954722 -122.368898
37.950695
-122.365766 37.950661 -122.363834 37.951473 -122.362504 37.952116 -122.362375
37.954790
-122.362461 37.960745 -122.364779 37.960474 -122.366538 37.960271 -122.367868
37.960204

Blocks Comprising Target Neighborhood

060133650022020, 060133650023016, 060133650023021, 060133650023023,
060133650023020, 060133650024000, 060133650024005, 060133650024007,
060133650024009, 060133650024013, 060133650024014, 060133650024012,
060133650024008, 060133650024006, 060133650024002, 060133650024001,
060133780002002, 060133780002003, 060133780002004, 060133650021000,
060133650021001, 060133650021002, 060133650021010, 060133650021011,
060133650021012, 060133650021013, 060133650021014, 060133650021015,
060133650021018, 060133650021019, 060133650021020, 060133650022017,
060133650022026, 060133650022025, 060133650022024, 060133650022023,
060133650022022, 060133650022018, 060133650022019, 060133650023003,
060133650023004, 060133650023005, 060133650023006, 060133650023007,
060133650023019, 060133650023018, 060133650023017, 060133650023008,
060133650023009, 060133650023010, 060133650023011,

North Richmond – City and County



Neighborhood ID: 9556427

NSP3 Planning Data

Grantee ID: 0630000E,0601300C

Grantee State: CA

Grantee Name: RICHMOND,CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Grantee Address: 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez CA 94553

Grantee Email: kara.douglas@dcd.cccounty.us

Neighborhood Name: N Richmond-Cnty/City

Date:2011-01-26 00:00:00

NSP3 Score

The neighborhoods identified by the NSP3 grantee as being the areas of greatest need must have an individual or average combined index score for the grantee's identified target geography that is not less than the lesser of 17 or the twentieth percentile most needy score in an individual state. For example, if a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 18,

the requirement will be a minimum need of 17. If, however, a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 15, the requirement will be a minimum need of 15. If more than one neighborhood is identified in the Action Plan, HUD will average the Neighborhood Scores, weighting the scores by the estimated number of housing units in each identified neighborhood.

Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 18.75
State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17
Total Housing Units in Neighborhood: 1040

Area Benefit Eligibility

Percent Persons Less than 120% AMI: 93.3
Percent Persons Less than 80% AMI: 82.18

Neighborhood Attributes (Estimates)

Vacancy Estimate

USPS data on addresses not receiving mail in the last 90 days or "NoStat" can be a useful measure of whether or not a target area has a serious vacancy problem. For urban neighborhoods, HUD has found that neighborhoods with a very high number vacant addresses relative to the total addresses in an area to be a very good indicator of a current for potentially serious blight problem.

The USPS "NoStat" indicator can mean different things. In rural areas, it is an indicator of vacancy. However, it can also be an address that has been issued but not ever used, it can indicate units under development, and it can be a very distressed property (most of the still flood damaged properties in New Orleans are NoStat). When using this variable, users need to understand the target area identified.

In addition, the housing unit counts HUD gets from the US Census indicated above are usually close to the residential address counts from the USPS below. However, if the Census and USPS counts are substantially different for your identified target area, users are advised to use the information below with caution. For example if there are many NoStats in an area for units never built, the USPS residential address count may be larger than the Census number; if the area is a rural area largely served by PO boxes it may have fewer addresses than housing units.

USPS Residential Addresses in Neighborhood: 1193
Residential Addresses Vacant 90 or more days (USPS, March 2010): 135
Residential Addresses NoStat (USPS, March 2010): 58

Foreclosure Estimates

HUD has developed a model for predicting where foreclosures are likely. That model estimates serious delinquency rates using data on the leading causes of foreclosures - subprime loans (HMDA Census Tract data on high cost and highly leveraged loans), increasing unemployment (BLS data on unemployment rate change), and fall in home values (FHFA data on house price change). The predicted serious delinquency rate is then used to apportion the state total counts of foreclosure starts (from the Mortgage Bankers Association) and REOs (from RealtyTrac) to individual block groups.

Total Housing Units to receive a mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 673
Percent of Housing Units with a high cost mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 34.64

Percent of Housing Units 90 or more days delinquent or in foreclosure: 19.35

Number of Foreclosure Starts in past year: 63

Number of Housing Units Real Estate Owned July 2009 to June 2010: 34

HUD is encouraging grantees to have small enough target areas for NSP 3 such that their dollars will have a visible impact on the neighborhood. Nationwide there have been over 1.9 million foreclosure completions in the past two years. NSP 1, 2, and 3 combined are estimated to only be able to address 100,000 to 120,000 foreclosures. To stabilize a neighborhood requires focused investment.

Estimated number of properties needed to make an impact in identified target area (20% of REO in past year): 13

Supporting Data

Metropolitan Area (or non-metropolitan area balance) percent fall in home value since peak value (Federal Housing Finance Agency Home Price Index through June 2010): -31.1

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2005: 5.81

Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2010: 13.27

·Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics

Market Analysis:

HUD is providing the data above as a tool for both neighborhood targeting and to help inform the strategy development. Some things to consider:

1. Persistent Unemployment. Is this an area with persistently high unemployment? Serious consideration should be given to a rental strategy rather than a homeownership strategy.
2. Home Value Change and Vacancy. Is this an area where foreclosures are largely due to a combination of falling home values, a recent spike in unemployment, and a relatively low vacancy rate? A down payment assistance program may be an effective strategy.
3. Persistently High Vacancy. Are there a high number of substandard vacant addresses in the target area of a community with persistently high unemployment? A demolition/land bank strategy with selected acquisition rehab for rental or lease-purchase might be considered.
4. Historically low vacancy that is now rising. A targeted strategy of acquisition for homeownership and rental to retain or regain neighborhood stability might be considered.
5. Historically high cost rental market. Does this market historically have very high rents with low vacancies? A strategy of acquiring properties and developing them as long-term affordable rental might be considered.


Latitude and Longitude of corner points

-122.368855 37.960035 -122.368770 37.954621 -122.368984 37.954722 -122.368898
37.950695
-122.365766 37.950661 -122.363834 37.951473 -122.362504 37.952116 -122.362375
37.954790
-122.362461 37.960745 -122.364779 37.960474 -122.366538 37.960271 -122.367868
37.960204

Blocks Comprising Target Neighborhood

060133650022020, 060133650023016, 060133650023021, 060133650023023,
060133650023020, 060133650024000, 060133650024005, 060133650024007,
060133650024009, 060133650024013, 060133650024014, 060133650024012,
060133650024008, 060133650024006, 060133650024002, 060133650024001,
060133780002002, 060133780002003, 060133780002004, 060133650021000,
060133650021001, 060133650021002, 060133650021010, 060133650021011,
060133650021012, 060133650021013, 060133650021014, 060133650021015,
060133650021018, 060133650021019, 060133650021020, 060133650022017,
060133650022026, 060133650022025, 060133650022024, 060133650022023,
060133650022022, 060133650022018, 060133650022019, 060133650023003,
060133650023004, 060133650023005, 060133650023006, 060133650023007,
060133650023019, 060133650023018, 060133650023017, 060133650023008,
060133650023009, 060133650023010, 060133650023011,

San Pablo – Old Town



Neighborhood ID: 2304901

NSP3 Planning Data

Grantee ID: 0601300C
Grantee State: CA
Grantee Name: CONTRA COSTA COUNTY
Grantee Address: 2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190 Martinez CA 94553
Grantee Email: kara.douglas@dcd.cccounty.us

Neighborhood Name: San Pablo - Old Town
Date: 2011-01-26 00:00:00

NSP3 Score

The neighborhoods identified by the NSP3 grantee as being the areas of greatest need must have an individual or average combined index score for the grantee's identified target geography that is not less than the lesser of 17 or the twentieth percentile most needy score in an individual state. For example, if a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 18,

the requirement will be a minimum need of 17. If, however, a state's twentieth percentile most needy census tract is 15, the requirement will be a minimum need of 15. If more than one neighborhood is identified in the Action Plan, HUD will average the Neighborhood Scores, weighting the scores by the estimated number of housing units in each identified neighborhood.

Neighborhood NSP3 Score: 18
State Minimum Threshold NSP3 Score: 17
Total Housing Units in Neighborhood: 1724

Area Benefit Eligibility

Percent Persons Less than 120% AMI: 90.48
Percent Persons Less than 80% AMI: 67.28

Neighborhood Attributes (Estimates)

Vacancy Estimate

USPS data on addresses not receiving mail in the last 90 days or "NoStat" can be a useful measure of whether or not a target area has a serious vacancy problem. For urban neighborhoods, HUD has found that neighborhoods with a very high number vacant addresses relative to the total addresses in an area to be a very good indicator of a current for potentially serious blight problem.

The USPS "NoStat" indicator can mean different things. In rural areas, it is an indicator of vacancy. However, it can also be an address that has been issued but not ever used, it can indicate units under development, and it can be a very distressed property (most of the still flood damaged properties in New Orleans are NoStat). When using this variable, users need to understand the target area identified.

In addition, the housing unit counts HUD gets from the US Census indicated above are usually close to the residential address counts from the USPS below. However, if the Census and USPS counts are substantially different for your identified target area, users are advised to use the information below with caution. For example if there are many NoStats in an area for units never built, the USPS residential address count may be larger than the Census number; if the area is a rural area largely served by PO boxes it may have fewer addresses than housing units.

USPS Residential Addresses in Neighborhood: 1794
Residential Addresses Vacant 90 or more days (USPS, March 2010): 69
Residential Addresses NoStat (USPS, March 2010): 14

Foreclosure Estimates

HUD has developed a model for predicting where foreclosures are likely. That model estimates serious delinquency rates using data on the leading causes of foreclosures - subprime loans (HMDA Census Tract data on high cost and highly leveraged loans), increasing unemployment (BLS data on unemployment rate change), and fall in home values (FHFA data on house price change). The predicted serious delinquency rate is then used to apportion the state total counts of foreclosure starts (from the Mortgage Bankers Association) and REOs (from RealtyTrac) to individual block groups.

Total Housing Units to receive a mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 1011
Percent of Housing Units with a high cost mortgage between 2004 and 2007: 25.3

Percent of Housing Units 90 or more days delinquent or in foreclosure: 16.2
Number of Foreclosure Starts in past year: 80
Number of Housing Units Real Estate Owned July 2009 to June 2010: 45

HUD is encouraging grantees to have small enough target areas for NSP 3 such that their dollars will have a visible impact on the neighborhood. Nationwide there have been over 1.9 million foreclosure completions in the past two years. NSP 1, 2, and 3 combined are estimated to only be able to address 100,000 to 120,000 foreclosures. To stabilize a neighborhood requires focused investment.

Estimated number of properties needed to make an impact in identified target area (20% of REO in past year): 16

Supporting Data

Metropolitan Area (or non-metropolitan area balance) percent fall in home value since peak value (Federal Housing Finance Agency Home Price Index through June 2010): -31.1
Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2005: 9.8
Place (if place over 20,000) or county unemployment rate June 2010: 21.4
-Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Unemployment Statistics

Market Analysis:

HUD is providing the data above as a tool for both neighborhood targeting and to help inform the strategy development. Some things to consider:

1. Persistent Unemployment. Is this an area with persistently high unemployment? Serious consideration should be given to a rental strategy rather than a homeownership strategy.
2. Home Value Change and Vacancy. Is this an area where foreclosures are largely due to a combination of falling home values, a recent spike in unemployment, and a relatively low vacancy rate? A down payment assistance program may be an effective strategy.
3. Persistently High Vacancy. Are there a high number of substandard vacant addresses in the target area of a community with persistently high unemployment? A demolition/land bank strategy with selected acquisition rehab for rental or lease-purchase might be considered.
4. Historically low vacancy that is now rising. A targeted strategy of acquisition for homeownership and rental to retain or regain neighborhood stability might be considered.
5. Historically high cost rental market. Does this market historically have very high rents with low vacancies? A strategy of acquiring properties and developing them as long-term affordable rental might be considered.

Latitude and Longitude of corner points

-122.347355 37.953402 -122.357054 37.953335 -122.356882 37.958986 -122.356539
37.960677
-122.354822 37.963892 -122.350745 37.962809 -122.347827 37.962234 -122.345724
37.962065
-122.346754 37.959595 -122.347183 37.958004 -122.347355 37.956786

Blocks Comprising Target Neighborhood

060133680001016, 060133680001015, 060133680001014, 060133680001013,
060133680001012, 060133680001011, 060133680001010, 060133680001002,
060133680002000, 060133680002001, 060133680002002, 060133680002003,
060133680002005, 060133680002007, 060133680002019, 060133680002018,
060133680002017, 060133680002016, 060133680002015, 060133680002014,
060133680002013, 060133680002012, 060133680002009, 060133680002008,
060133680002006, 060133680002004, 060133680003001, 060133680003002,
060133680003003, 060133680003007, 060133680003013, 060133680003012,
060133680003009, 060133680003008, 060133680003006, 060133680003004,
060133680005000, 060133680005002, 060133680005004, 060133680005013,
060133680005012, 060133680005011, 060133680005010, 060133680005009,
060133680005008, 060133680005007, 060133680005006, 060133680005005,
060133680005003, 060133680005001, 060133680006000, 060133680006001,
060133680006004, 060133680006006, 060133680006008, 060133680006009,
060133680006007, 060133680006005,

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

Notice of Exemption

Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development
651 Pine Street, 4th Floor - North Wing, McBrien Administration Building
Martinez, CA 94553-0095

Telephone: (925) 335-7223

Contact Person: Kara Douglas

Project Description: Neighborhood Stabilization Program 3 (NSP3)/CDBG Action Plan Substantial Amendment, The activity consists of the amendment of the FY 2010/11 CDBG Annual Action Plan to include \$1,871,294 in NSP3 funds. NSP3 provides targeted emergency assistance to state and local governments to acquire and redevelop vacant and foreclosed residential properties that might otherwise become sources of abandonment and blight within our communities. The purpose of the Substantial Amendment to the Annual Action Plan is to set forth the target areas and programs for the Contra Costa NSP3 activities.

Project Location: Target areas include: Portions of the following cities and communities: Antioch, Bay Point, Concord, Pittsburg, North Richmond, Richmond and San Pablo.

This project is exempt from **CEQA** as a:

<input type="checkbox"/> Ministerial Project (Sec. 15268)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Statutory Exemption, Section
<input type="checkbox"/> Declared Emergency (Sec. 15269(a))	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Rule of Applicability (Section 15061(b)(3))
<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Project (Sec. 15269(b) or (c))	
<input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exemption,	

for the following reason(s): This activity is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Article 5, Section 15061 (b) (3) of the CEQA Guidelines. It can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Date: February 15, 2011

By: _____
Department of Development Conservation and Development
Representative

AFFIDAVIT OF FILING AND POSTING

I declare that on _____ I received and posted this notice as required by California Public Resources Code Section 21152(c). Said notice will remain posted for 30 days from the filing date.

Signature

Title

Applicant:

Kara Douglas
DCD, Redevelopment Division
2530 Arnold Drive, Suite 190
Martinez, CA 94553

County Clerk Fee \$50 Due



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Grant Award #28-326 from Kaiser Permanente Community Benefit Diablo Area

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director or his designee (Wendel Brunner, M.D.), to accept on behalf of the County Grant Award #28-326, from Kaiser Permanente, Community Benefit Diablo Area, to pay the County an amount not to exceed \$40,000, for the Health benefit, Outreach, Prevention usage and Enrollment (HOPE) Project, for the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Approval of this Grant Award will result in an amount not to exceed \$40,000 from Kaiser Permanente Community Benefit Diablo Area, for the HOPE Project, for the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. (No County funds are required)

BACKGROUND:

Both Latinos and African Americans suffer from disparate health outcomes in Contra Costa County. Health coverage and prevention usage of health coverage are key factors for improving health. When members of these populations enter late into the healthcare system, or fail to appropriately utilize health coverage benefits for prevention care, the likelihood of premature

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

Contact: Wendel Brunner M.D.
313-6712

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: , Deputy

cc: J Pigg, B Borbon

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

death or poor health outcomes increases. Therefore health benefit coverage and preventive utilization are crucial assets for these populations. The Promotora and health conductor programs will work closely with Ambulatory Care Centers and Contra Costa Health Centers (CCHS) appointment and financial counseling units as well as community health partners. The goal of the HOPE Project is to significantly increase the number of Latino and African American families who have and who know how to utilize health coverage benefits programs through the use of culturally and linguistically appropriate Promotora and African American health conductor assistance.

Approval of Grant Award #28-326 will allow funding to support this HOPE project, through June 30, 2011.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this contract is not approved, County will not receive funding to support the Health benefit, Outreach, Prevention usage and Enrollment (HOPE) Project.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Submission of Federal Funding Application #29-531 with the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA)

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director, or his designee (Haven Fearn), to execute and transmit an application to the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) for funding in an amount not to exceed \$525,000, for the 2010 Comprehensive Drug Courts Implementation (CDCI) Program, for the period from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Approval of this Funding Application will result in an amount not to exceed \$525,000 in Federal Funds American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), of which funding is administered by the California Emergency Management Agency (CAL EMA), through December 31, 2011. No County match required.

BACKGROUND:

The Comprehensive Drug Court Implementation (CDCI) Act created a funding stream for state drug courts (Assembly Bill 1111, Chapter 147, 1999 Statutes, Health and Safety Code Section 11970.1-11970.4). CDCI was originally designed to serve adult pre-plea and post-plea offenders



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Haven Fearn 335-3340

cc: J Pigg, B Borbon

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

and misdemeanants; any juveniles and parents of children who are detained by, or are dependents of, the juvenile court. In the year of 2003, CDCI was amended to focus exclusively on convicted felons placed on formal probation.

At present, there is inadequate capacity to provide treatment for persons eligible under our existing Adult Felony Drug Court. Non-Violent Offenders who can be helped through substance treatment to achieve sobriety and recovery and break the cycle of recidivism are not able to find that help.

The Health Services Department Alcohol and Other Drugs Services Division's application to Cal EMA would allow Alcohol and Other Drugs Services (AODS) to expand treatment capacity for our existing Adult Felony Drug Court and to strengthen the existing countywide drug collaborative structure. Through this project, AODS expects to divert non-violent offenders and probationers charged with non-violent offenses, drug possessions, low level possessions for sales, sales, or transportation and other possible offenses from incarceration into community-based treatment including case management and sober living. Approval of this funding application will allow the Alcohol and Drugs Services to: 1) Expand residential treatment; 2) Provide case management and coordination of support services necessary to achieve recovery; and 3) Provide sober living housing combined with outpatient treatment for after care support.

The goal of the program will be to enhance treatment services; increase proportion of offenders who enter, remain in, and complete treatment; reduce delays in the availability of appropriate services based on our existing drug court model, including a dedicated court calendars with regularly scheduled reviews of individual's performance in treatment, and strong collaboration by the courts, probation and treatment, through December 31, 2011.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this contract is not approved, the County's Alcohol and Other Drugs Services will not receive funding to be able to: 1) Expand residential treatment; 2) Provide case management and coordination of support services necessary to achieve recovery; and 3) Provide sober living housing combined with outpatient treatment for after care support.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Grant Award (Amendment) #29-393-14 from the California Department of Public Health, Tuberculosis Control Branch

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and Authorize the Health Services Director or his Designee, to execute, on behalf of the County, Grant Award (Amendment) #29-393-14 with the California Department of Public Health, Tuberculosis Control Branch, effective December 1, 2010 to increase the amount payable to the County by \$23,967, from \$329,883 to a new total amount not to exceed \$353,850, for continuation of the Tuberculosis (TB) Control Program, with no change in the original term of July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The amendment will result in an additional amount of \$23,967 of allocated funds for fiscal year 2010-2011 shall not exceed a total of \$353,850 from the California Department of Public Health, Tuberculosis Control Branch. No County funds required.

BACKGROUND:

The Contra Costa County, Public Health Department maintains a TB Control

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Wendel Brunner, M.D.
313-6712

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

Program, which serves all reported TB patients and their contacts in Contra Costa County. Outreach services are provided to reach the "Hard-to Reach" people with TB and those at high risk. The TB control staff work within the Communicable Disease Section in collaboration with the HIV/AIDS Program, Substance Abuse Programs, Contra Costa Regional Medical Center and Health Centers, and providers throughout the County.

Approval of this Grant Award Amendment #29-393-14 will provide the Department with additional funds to continue to expand prevention occurrence and transmission of TB and control activities, improve completion of appropriate therapy which is essential to decrease TB transmission, prevent the development of drug resistance, and cure TB patients, through June 30, 2011.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this contract is not approved, the County will not receive funds to continue identifying and treating Contra Costa County residents who have active TB and ensure that they complete appropriate therapy.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Submit a joint application #28-826 along with SHELTER, Inc. to the Department of Veteran Affairs

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director or his designee (Wendel Brunner, M.D.), to submit on behalf of the County a joint application with SHELTER, Inc with all the required certifications and assurances to the Department of Veteran Affairs Supportive Services for Veteran Families Program. The SSVF program would provide up to \$1,000,000 for one year to provide supportive services to low-income veteran families that are homeless and looking for housing or those at-risk of homelessness. The County Homeless Program would use a portion of these funds to provide housing placement and support services to homeless veteran individuals and families accessing the Adult Interim Housing Program and the Philip Dorn Respite Center. Additionally, as the lead agency for data collection into the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), a portion of funds will be used to provide technical assistance and software required to provide required reports, through fiscal years 2011-2012.

FISCAL IMPACT:

A successful application would result in an award amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 and a sub-contract from SHELTER, Inc. through the Department of Veteran Affairs for fiscal

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Wendel Brunner, M.D.
313-6712

FISCAL IMPACT: (CONT'D)

year 2011-2012. The County Homeless Program would use a portion of these funds to provide housing placement and support services to homeless veteran individuals and families accessing the Adult Interim Housing Program and the Philip Dorn Respite Center. Additionally, as the lead agency for data collection into the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), a portion of funds will be used to provide technical assistance and software required to provide required reports. (No County funds are required)

BACKGROUND:

The Supportive Services for Veteran Families funding is not intended to provide long-term support but focuses on housing stabilization, linking veterans to community resources and mainstream benefits and helping them develop a plan for preventing future housing instability. It will provide temporary financial assistance and housing relocation and stabilization services to veterans and their families who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this contract is not approved, supportive services will not be provided to low-income veteran families that are homeless and looking for housing or those at-risk of homelessness.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Julia R. Bueren, Public Works Director/Chief Engineer

Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Public Works Director, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with LSA Associates Inc., Countywide

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Public Works Director, or designee, to execute a contract amendment with LSA Associates, Inc. effective February 1, 2011, to increase the payment limit by \$75,000 from \$400,000 to a new payment limit of \$475,000, with no change to the contract term, to continue to provide environmental services, Countywide.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no impact to the County General Fund. This project is funded by 48% Flood Control & Water Conservation District Funds, 48% Local Road Funds, 4% Airport Project Funds. Project No.: Various

BACKGROUND:

The amendment is needed to increase the contract payment limit by \$75,000 from \$400,000 to a new contract limit of \$475,000 to continue to provide on-call environmental services for Contra Costa County Public Works Department, Countywide.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Without Board approval, necessary on-call environmental assessments may not be completed in a timely manner. Therefore, necessary environmental clearances may not be obtained, which may jeopardize funding and delay the design and construction of various projects.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: T. Torres, 313-2176

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not Applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

LSA (On Call) Contract

CONTRACT AMENDMENT AGREEMENT
(Purchase of Services - Long Form)

Number
Fund/Org#
Account #
Other #

1. Identification of Contract to be Amended.

Number: 4520200

Effective Date: March 15, 2009

Department: Contra Costa County Public Works Department

Subject: On-Call Environmental Assessments (various specialties)

2. Parties. The County of Contra Costa, California (County), for its Department named above, and the following named Contractor mutually agree and promise as follows:

Contractor: LSA Associates, Inc
Capacity: Corporation
Address: 157 Park Place Pt. Richmond, CA 94801

3. Amendment Date. The effective date of this Contract Amendment Agreement is February 1, 2011 .



4. Amendment Specifications. The Contract identified above is hereby amended as set forth in the "Amendment Specifications" attached hereto which are incorporated herein by reference.

5. Signatures. These signatures attest the parties' agreement hereto:

COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, CALIFORNIA

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	ATTEST: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
By _____ Chairman/Designee	By _____ Deputy

CONTRACTOR

Name of business entity: LSA Associates, Inc.	Name of business entity: LSA Associates, Inc.
By  (Signature of individual or officer)	By  (Signature of individual or officer)
LES CARD, CEO/Chairman (Print name and title A, if applicable)	JAMES BAUM CEO (Print name and title B, if applicable)

Note to Contractor: For Corporations (profit or nonprofit), the contract must be signed by two officers. Signature A must be that of the president or vice-president and Signature B must be that of the secretary or assistant secretary (Civil Code Section 1190 and Corporations Code Section 313). All signatures must be acknowledged as set forth on Form L-2.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA)


On January 11, 2011, before me, Teresita De la Cruz
(insert name and title of the officer), personally appeared Les Card and James Baum

who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) ~~is~~ are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that ~~he/she~~ they executed the same in ~~his/her~~ their authorized capacity(ies), and that by ~~his/her~~ their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL.

Teresita De la Cruz
Signature



ACKNOWLEDGMENT (by Corporation, Partnership, or Individual)
(Civil Code §1189)

APPROVALS

RECOMMENDED BY DEPARTMENT

By: [Signature]
Designee

FORM APPROVED
COUNTY COUNSEL

By: [Signature]
Deputy County Counsel

APPROVED: COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

By: _____
Designee

Contra Costa County

Amendment Specifications

-Amendment (No. 1)-

LSA Associates, Inc. On Call

Number: 4520200

Fund/Org#: Various / On Call

This Agreement is amended as follows;

Contract Payment Limit Increase: Increase the contract payment limit by **\$75,000** from **\$400,000** to a new payment limit of **\$475,000**.

All other terms and conditions in the Contract entered into on March 15, 2009 between the Dept. and the Contractor shall remain in full force and effect.

Initials: fc JB JB
Contractor County Dept.

(Page 1 of 1)



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Steve Silveira, Deputy General Svcs Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Approve and Authorize the Purchasing Agent, or Designee, to Execute a Purchase Order for the Sheriff-Coroner's Office, Forensic Division

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to execute a contract with Floortec Commercial Floor Covering Solutions in an amount not to exceed \$188,814 for the replacement of flooring as part of the remodeling project for the Sheriff-Coroner's Office, Forensic Division at 2530 Arnold Drive, Martinez.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The cost of the replacement flooring will be paid from funds appropriated in the Plant Acquisition (General Fund) budget.

BACKGROUND:

The Sheriff-Coroner's Forensic Division (Crime Lab) is relocating from 1122 Escobar Street in Martinez to the Summit Centre located at 2530 Arnold Drive in Martinez. The cost of the specialized flooring for the remodeling project is \$188,814. The flooring will be purchased using the California Multiple Award Schedules Agreement (CMAS), and includes all labor and materials costs. The CMAS agreement allows public agencies to contract directly with a CMAS contractor when the material is CMAS approved. There is no need for the public agency to go out to bid,



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Mike Lango (925)
313-7120

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

as the State has already performed this function and the price has been established. Floortec is an authorized contractor under the CMAS agreement.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The new flooring is a necessary element of the remodel project as this highly resilient flooring provides the required protection for work completed in a lab environment. Without the flooring the project will not be able to proceed.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

FloorTec Invoice



BENICIA BRANCH
 538 Stone Rd, Suite F
 Benicia, CA 94510
 Tel: (707) 747-0770
 Fax: (707) 747-0700
 CA Contractor Lic. #805618

PROPOSAL

CMAS CONTRACT # 4-09-00-0078D



CUSTOMER: Bill Perry
 COMPANY: Contra Costa County
 ADDRESS: 2467 Waterbird Way
 Martinez, CA 94553-1457

DATE: October 14, 2010
 PROJECT: **2nd Floor New Flooring**
 LOCATION: 2530 Arnold Dr.
 Martinez, CA

TELEPHONE:

FAX: (925) 313-7088

MEASURED DATE:

QUANTITY	UNIT	DESCRIPTION	UNIT PRICE	EXTENSION
MONDO FLOOR COVERING PROPOSAL				
Pricing based on CMAS Contract				
25,335	sq ft	Removal of existing carpet:	\$ 0.60	\$ 15,201.00
3,800	lin ft	Removal of existing base:	\$ 0.35	\$ 1,330.00
19,621	sq ft	Furnish and install rubber tile: Terranova - #413 Deep Blue	\$ 7.52	\$ 147,549.92
19,621	sq ft	Floor prep - Sanding:	\$ 0.70	\$ 13,734.70
19,621	sq ft	Floor prep material: Mapei Planipatch	\$ 0.14	\$ 2,746.94
3,800	lin ft	Furnish 4" rubber base: Burke 4.5" - Color TBD	\$ 0.86	\$ 3,268.00
3,800	lin ft	Install 4" rubber base:	\$ 1.49	\$ 5,662.00
Non Specified Pricing				
120	lin ft	Furnish & Install rubber transition:	\$ 3.85	\$ 462.00
21	each	Calcium Chloride Tests:	\$ 150.00	\$ 3,150.00
		Discount to match previous proposal		\$ (4,291.27)
Note: Sales tax included in unit pricing.				
EXCLUSIONS:				
Furniture and equipment moving, borders and inlays, non-standard working hours, moisture treatment, temporary heat or power, and asbestos removal.				

SUBTOTAL \$ 188,813.29

TAXABLE SUBTOTAL

SALES TAX RATE 9.250%

SALES TAX Included

TOTAL PRICE \$ 188,813.29

1. Freight charges are included in price unless specifically noted above.
2. Terms are net 30 days. Deposit or progress payment may required for materials.
3. The prices listed on this proposal are valid for a period of 3 months.
4. If this proposal is accepted, please submit a signed purchase order.
5. Payment or performance bonds are not included in price unless specifically noted above.
6. Unless itemized on this proposal, FloorTec, Inc. is not responsible for moisture testing or treatment of concrete vapor emissions and alkalinity.
7. FloorTec, Inc. is not responsible for substrate failures (such as alkalinity and moisture) after the flooring installation is complete.
8. If existing flooring is to be removed, our price would include standard prep (scraping excess material, skim coat uneven areas, and primer if needed). Any floor patch required from removal of existing floor is not included in price. Our price does not include removal of asbestos tiles below existing carpet.

SUBMITTED BY


 Carl Hancock

TEL: (707) 747-0770

FAX: (707) 747-0700



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Michael J. Lango, General Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Lease-Purchase Agreement with PNC Equipment Financing, Inc. for Purchase of Mainframe Computer System Components

RECOMMENDATION(S):

AMEND Board action of September 28, 2010 (Item C.55), which approved and authorized the Purchasing Agent or designee to execute, on behalf of the Chief Information Officer, a purchase order with Sirius Computer Solutions, in an amount not to exceed \$751,000 for purchase and replacement of mainframe components, to APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent or designee to execute a third party lease agreement with PNC Equipment Financing, Inc., for the period March 1, 2011 through September 1, 2015, increase the lease purchase amount by \$48,000 to an amount not to exceed \$799,000, as recommended by the Deputy General Services Director.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The increase in the total lease purchase price is due to the cost of borrowing money. The lease purchase cost not to exceed \$799,000 is budgeted in the FY 2010/2011 Department of Information Technology (DoIT) budget and charged back to user departments through the DoIT billing process.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Steve Silveira
925-313-7120

BACKGROUND:

On September 28, 2010, the Board of Supervisors approved execution of a purchase order on behalf of the Chief Information Officer, with Sirius Computer Solutions in an amount not to exceed \$751,000, for the purchase and replacement of mainframe computer system components for DoIT.

To finance the purchase, the Purchasing Agent negotiated a lease-purchase agreement with PNC Equipment Financing, Inc., which amends the September 28, 2010 Board Order (C.55) in accordance with the following terms:

- \$750,910.27 Principal
- 2.625% annual percentage rate compounded semi-annually
- 10 semi-annual payments of \$79,829.68 with first payment due at funding.

In order to finance the purchase of the equipment and pay for subsequent implementation, service, and support costs, PNC will place funds in escrow with U.S. Bank's Corporate Trust Services Escrow Group. The U.S. Bank Money Market account is a U.S. Bank National Association ("U.S. Bank") interest-bearing time deposit account. Execution of this agreement includes authorization to place funds on deposit with U.S. Bank.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If the PNC financing agreement is not approved, replacement and implementation of the mainframe computer system components will require payment from operating funds or cancellation of the project. Full payment from operating funds will create a hardship for the department and negatively impact support of County information technology systems. The mainframe computer system is vital to the continued operation of the County's financial software systems.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not Applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

PO PNC

PNC Lease Purchase Schedule

C.55 Sept 28 2010

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROVAL FORM FOR ITEMS OVER \$25,000

Department: General Services – Print & Mail

Date: 1/12/2011

Authorized Requestor: David Gould _____ Telephone: 313-7326

Authorized Requestor Signature: David Gould

1. **Item:** Lease-Purchase Agreement with PNC Equipment Financing Inc., for the Purchase of Mainframe Computer Systems Components on behalf of the Department of Information Technology.
2. **Description:** General Services Department has negotiated a third-party leasing arrangement with PNC, for the replacement of the County's mainframe. The project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisor's on September 28, 2010 (item C.55). The financing was requested by the CIO as a means for funding a project for which operational funds were limited.
3. **Estimated cost of equipment:** The Principal amount of this Lease is \$750,910. Total cost of this lease is \$798,296. This consists of 10 (ten) semi-annual payments of \$79,829.68. The annual percentage rate is 2.625%. The cost for equipment is approximately \$350,000. The remaining funds are for implementation, software development, and ongoing maintenance and support. An escrow account has been established to pay for ongoing costs. Once the project has been completed, a refund of the unused balance will be refunded. The project is expected to be completed within 12 months.
4. **Single Item:** X **Integrated System** _____
5. **How does this purchase meet the Departments operational needs?** The 3rd-party lease allows the Department of Information Technology to implement necessary changes for which operational funds are not available. Use of a new financing partner allows General Services to obtain competitive funding without the high costs of fees associated with the previous financing vendor.
6. **Fiscal Impact:** The cost of equipment and financing is budgeted in the FY 2010/2011 Department of Information Technology budget and charged back to user departments through the DOIT billing process.
7. **County Administrator Approval**

Signature: _____ Date: _____

SCHEDULE A-1

Attached to and made a part of that certain Lease Schedule No. 142146000 dated as of December 7, 2010 by and between PNCEF, LLC, dba PNC Equipment Finance, as lessor, and County of Contra Costa, as lessee.

Commencement Date: _____

1. EQUIPMENT LOCATION & DESCRIPTION:

30 Douglas Drive
Department of Information Technology
Martinez, CA 94553
Contra Costa County

Quantity	Description	Serial No
1	IBM System z 10 Business Class with H01 Processor	
1	IBM Option HW Maintenance	
1	12 Months EGO z/OS Operating System Software	
1	Implementation and Installation	

2. LEASE PAYMENT SCHEDULE:

- (a) Total Amount Financed: \$750,910.27
(b) Payment Schedule: Payments Semi-Annually

Payment No,	Date	Payment	Interest	Principal	Termination
1	3-1-11	79,829.68	1,662.43	78,167.25	\$686,197.88
2	9-1-11	79,829.68	8,985.88	70,843.80	\$613,937.20
3	3-1-12	79,829.68	8,039.62	71,790.06	\$540,711.34
4	9-1-12	79,829.68	7,080.71	72,748.97	\$466,507.39
5	3-1-13	79,829.68	6,109.00	73,720.68	\$391,312.30
6	9-1-13	79,829.68	5,124.30	74,705.38	\$315,112.81
7	3-1-14	79,829.68	4,126.46	75,703.22	\$237,895.53
8	9-1-14	79,829.68	3,115.28	76,714.40	\$159,646.84

9	3-1-15	79,829.68	2,090.60	77,739.08	\$80,352.98
10	9-1-15	79,829.68	1,052.25	78,777.43	\$0.00

County of Contra Costa, as Lessee

*PNCEF, LLC, dba PNC Equipment
Finance, as Lessor*

Authorized Signature

Authorized Signature


Printed Name

Printed Name

Title

Title

C.55

To: Board of Supervisors**From: Ed Woo, Chief Information Officer****Date: September 17, 2010****Contra
Costa
County****Subject: Upgrade to Mainframe Operating System****RECOMMENDATION(S):**

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to execute a purchase order, on behalf of the Chief Information Officer, with Sirius Computer Solutions an amount not to exceed \$751,000 for purchase and replacement of mainframe components.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The cost of \$751,000 is budgeted under Org #1060 FY 2010/2011 and charged back to user departments via the DoIT billing process.

BACKGROUND:

Our Current Mainframe, which runs the Property Tax system and Law and Justice System, will be out of IBM support on November 1, 2010. This purchase will provide us with a Mainframe system upgrade to maintain a current operating system and hardware set.

☒ APPROVE☐ OTHER☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEEAction of Board On: **09/28/2010**☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORSAYES NOES ABSENT ABSTAIN RECUSE

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: September 28, 2010


David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Ed Woo (925) 957-7771

cc:

C.55

To: Board of Supervisors**From: Ed Woo, Chief Information Officer****Date: September 17, 2010****Contra
Costa
County****Subject: Upgrade to Mainframe Operating System**☒ APPROVE☐ OTHER☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEEAction of Board On: **09/28/2010**☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORSAYES NOES ABSENT ABSTAIN RECUSE

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: September 28, 2010

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Ed Woo (925) 957-7771

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

In accordance with Administrative Bulletin No 611.0, County Departments are required to get Board approval for single item purchases over \$100,000. The County Administrator's Office has reviewed this request and recommends approval.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Ed Woo, Chief Information Officer
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: GIS Professional Services Contract

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Chief Information Officer, or designee, to execute a contract with Keven J. Ormiston, in an amount not to exceed \$140,000 to provide Accella Automation, GIS Database and Application Support for the period of April 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The cost of \$140,000 is budgeted under Org# 1065, FY 11/12 and recovered from the user departments through DoIT's billing process.

BACKGROUND:

The skills required to perform this work are varied and complex. Performance factors include knowledge of GIS data management and server technology, network administration skills, knowledge of new Accella permitting system and an understanding of County work processes. DOIT has requirements to provide technical assistance to all departments of the County. However, the support services covered under this contract will

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Ed Woo (925) 383-2688

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

mostly be utilized by the Department of Conservation and Development, Animal Services Department and Law and Justice. As directed by the CAO, this contract is part of the collaborative efforts to effectively utilize IT staff and streamline IT operations.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The Department of Conservation and Development will not be able to assure effective transition into the Accela Automation System and reduce the savings and efficiencies gained by optimizing services across departments.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

No Impact.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Michael J. Lango, General Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Approve and Authorize the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to Execute a Purchase Order with S&C Fuels for the Purchase of Bulk Fuel

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to execute a purchase order with S&C Fuels in the amount of \$1,100,000 for the purchase of bulk diesel and unleaded fuels.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Fuel costs are budgeted in the County Department Budgets.

BACKGROUND:

The Waterbird fueling site has been in place since 1993. It services County and other agency vehicles as a self serve fueling station. Available fuel is stored in underground 12,000 gallon fuel tanks. General Services solicits and accepts daily fuel bids from several vendors. S&C Fuels has been one of three fuel vendors that has received orders from the County for bulk fuel.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this agreement is not approved, customer departments may have to fuel their vehicles at commercial gas stations at higher prices.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Beth C. Balita, (925)
313-7161



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Michael J. Lango, General Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Approve and Authorize the Purchasing Agent or Designee to Execute a Purchase Order with Ramos Petroleum for the Purchase of Bulk Fuel

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to EXECUTE a purchase order with Ramos Petroleum in the amount of \$250,000 for the purchase of bulk diesel and unleaded fuels.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Fuel costs are budgeted in the County Department Budgets.

BACKGROUND:

The Waterbird fueling site has been in place since 1993. It services County and other agency vehicles as a self serve fueling station. Available fuel is stored in underground 12,000 gallon fuel tanks. General Services solicits and accepts daily fuel bids from several vendors. Ramos Petroleum has been one of three fuel vendors that has received orders from the County for bulk fuel.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this agreement is not approved, customer departments may have to fuel their vehicles at commercial gas stations at higher prices.



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 02/15/2011



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE:

John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT:

Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Beth C. Balita, (925)
313-7161



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Novation Contract #74-352-3 with Oakgrove School, Inc, dba Waterfall Canyon Academy, Inc.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director, or his designee, to execute, on behalf of the County, Novation Contract #74-352-3 with Oakgrove School, Inc., dba Waterfall Canyon Academy, Inc., a non-profit corporation, in an amount not to exceed \$154,760, to provide residential treatment services for County-referred youth for the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. This Contract includes a six-month automatic extension through December 31, 2011, in an amount not to exceed \$78,016.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This Contract is funded 100% County General Fund. (No rate increase)

BACKGROUND:

In December 2010, the County Administrator approved and Purchasing Services Manager executed Novation Contract #74-352-1 (as amended by Contract Amendment 74-352-2) with Oakgrove School, Inc. dba Waterfall Canyon Academy, Inc., for the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010, which included a six-month automatic extension through December 31, 2010, for the provision

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Donna Wigand, 957-5111

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

of mental health services in a residential treatment program.

Approval of Novation Contract #74-352-3 replaces the automatic extension under the prior Contract and allows the Contractor to continue providing services through June 30, 2011.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this contract is not approved, residential treatment services for county-referred youth students will not be implemented.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

This program supports the following Board of Supervisors' community outcomes: "Children Ready For and Succeeding in School"; "Families that are Safe, Stable, and Nurturing"; and "Communities that are Safe and Provide a High Quality of Life for Children and Families". Expected program outcomes include an increase in positive social and emotional development as measured by the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS).



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Amendment/Extension #23-455-2 with ACS Consultant Company, Inc.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director, or his designee, to execute, on behalf of the County, Contract Amendment/Extension Agreement #23-455-2 with ACS Consultant Company, Inc. (dba ACS Healthcare Solutions), a corporation, effective March 1, 2011, to amend Contract #23-455 (as amended by Contract Amendment/Extension Agreement #23-455-1), to increase the payment limit by \$6,250,000, from \$250,000, to a new payment limit of \$6,500,000, and extend the term from September 30, 2011 through June 30, 2013.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funding for this Amendment is from the Medicare & Medicaid Electronic Health Records (EHR) Incentive Program of the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA). (No rate increase)

BACKGROUND:

On November 3, 2009, the Board of Supervisors approved Contract #23-455 (as amended by Contract Amendment/Extension Agreement #23-455-1), with ACS Consultant Company, Inc. (dba ACS Healthcare Solutions), for the period from October 1, 2009 through September

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Patrick Godley 957-5410

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

30, 2011, for the provision of professional consultation and technical support for the Department's Health Services Information System.

Health Services is implementing the Electronic Medical Record ("EMR") process within the Contra Costa Regional Medical Center and its Health Centers (Epic®), the Contra Costa Health Plan (Epic®), and the Mental Health Division (NetSMART®). The Department has selected ACS Consulting, Inc. to provide project management assistance for this significant implementation. Services include detailed project scope planning, management, and governance of the inpatient, ambulatory, revenue, and managed care components of the application; management of legacy applications; coordination and scheduling of all project activities to include application configuration; development and management of the communication and marketing plans; development of a resource plan to include staff and organizational change management and analysis; hardware planning, device selection, and placement recommendations; data center planning; activity scheduling and benchmark management; unit, modular, and integration testing; build team and end user education and training specific to the application modules being implemented; issues tracking and oversight; change management and control; risk management identification, analysis, and response planning; go-live planning, readiness evaluation and support; contingency planning; and post go-live support.

Approval of Contract Amendment/Extension Agreement #23-455-2 will allow the Contractor to provide additional services through September 30, 2013, including mutual indemnification of the parties.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this contract is not approved, County will not have the use of Contractor's expertise required to implement the EMR process which will delay EMR implementation and will result in the loss of Federal funding.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not Applicable



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: David Twa, County Administrator
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: City of Walnut Creek Leshar Center for the Arts Library Agreement

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the County Administrator, or designee, to execute an agreement with the City of Walnut Creek Leshar Center for the Arts in an amount not to exceed \$5,162 effective June 16, 2011 to provide a venue for the 2011 Summer Reading Festival.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Costs for the City of Walnut Creek Leshar Center for the Arts not to exceed \$5,162 and will be offset by admission costs not to exceed \$7,650. The balance of \$2,488 will be used to offset speaker's costs which are included in the Library's 2010-11 budget.

BACKGROUND:

On June 16, 2011, the Contra Costa County Library's annual Reading Festival will kick off its ever-popular Summer Reading program. The festival will feature authors, events, music and more, while encouraging people throughout the county to sign up for the 2011 Summer Reading program. The Library will feature an author talk at the City of Walnut Creek Leshar Center



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 02/15/2011



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Gail McPartland,
925-927-3204

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

for the Arts - Hofmann Theatre at 7pm on Thursday, June 16, 2011.

The Library will charge \$10 admission for each seat. Cost of admission will be used to offset expenses related to the event, including: \$3 per ticket facility cost, \$1,232 theater rental, \$850 projector, \$350 publicity, \$250 ticket, \$100 table, and \$85 microphone. Tickets will be sold through the Leshar Center for the Arts and the event will be widely publicized throughout the County. The City of Walnut Creek Leshar Center for the Arts Agreement contains the following modified indemnification language: "COPYRIGHTS: USER shall assume all cost and liability arising from the use of patented, trademarked, franchised or copyrighted material used in or incorporated in its performance, as well as all cost and liability for material which violates the right of privacy or right of publicity or any other statutory or common law right or any person. USER also shall assume any liability for defamation based on the material used in or incorporated in the performance. USER agrees to indemnify, defend and hold harmless the CITY, its officers, agents, employees and contractors from any liabilities, expenses, damages, claims or costs, including legal fees, which might arise from such matters."

Furthermore:

"USER agrees to indemnify, hold harmless and defend the CITY, its officers, officials, agents, employees, contractors and volunteers, against any and all claims for damages, including claims for liability or judgment for any injury to or death of any person or damage to property whatsoever, caused by, created by, or in any way connected with the performance of the Event by USER, other than claims arising from the sole negligence or willful misconduct of CITY."

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If the contract is not approved then the Library will not have a sufficiently large enough venue to hold the author event. The event will have to be canceled.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

The annual Summer Reading Festival encourages reading as family activity. Research shows that family involvement in reading encourages children to read and prepares them for success in school. This meets the community outcome of families that are safe, stable and nurturing and the outcome of communities that are safe and provide a high quality of life for children and families.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Amendment/Extension #22-852-8 with Greater Richmond Inter-Faith Program

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director, or his designee, to execute, on behalf of the County, Contract Amendment/Extension Agreement #22-852-8 with Greater Richmond Inter-Faith Program, a non-profit corporation, effective January 1, 2011, to amend Contract #22-852-7, to increase the payment limit by \$100,000, from \$87,000, to a new payment limit of \$187,000, and extend the term from February 28, 2011 through August 31, 2011.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This Contract is funded 100% by Federally Qualified Health Centers and US Department of Health and Human Services Teenage Pregnancy Prevention (TPP) grant. (No rate increase)

BACKGROUND:

In March 2010, the County Administrator Approved, and the Purchasing Services Manager executed Contract #22-852-7, with Greater Richmond Inter-Faith Program, for the period from March 1, 2010 through February 28, 2011, for the provision of consultation and technical

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Wendel Brunner, MD
313-6712

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

assistance to the Health Services Department's Clinic Services School-Based Health Centers program. Approval of Contract Amendment/Extension Agreement #22-852-8 will allow the Contractor to provide additional services and continue providing services through August 31, 2011.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this amendment is not approved, Contractor will not provide direct consultation to school-based health center program staff to coordinate health education activities at various high schools throughout Contra Costa County.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

This TPP program supports the following Board of Supervisors' community outcomes: "Children Ready For and Succeeding in School"; "Children and Youth Healthy and Preparing for Healthy Adulthood"; and "Communities that are Safe and Provide a High Quality of Life for Children and Families". Expected program outcomes include a decrease in the number of teenage pregnancies in Contra Costa County.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Approval of Blanket Purchase Order with Pharmedium Services, LLC

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Authorize the Purchasing Agent on behalf of the Health Services Department to renew a 2-year Blanket Purchase Order effective February 1, 2011 with Pharmedium Services LLC, in the amount of \$150,000, for the purchase of pain management/ pre-mix medications at Contra Costa Regional Medical Center and Contra Costa Health Centers (CCRMC).

FISCAL IMPACT:

100% Enterprise I Fund. The total payments on the previous Blanket Purchase Order, effective date 2/01/2009-1/31/2011, is estimated to be \$6,100 per month. The total estimated dollar value for the new Blanket Purchase Order is \$150,000 within a 2-year period.

BACKGROUND:

Recalls and back orders of medications have prompted the Pharmacy Department to directly purchase medications through manufacturers such as Pharmedium. Pharmedium strictly adheres to FDA compounding guidelines through exclusive use of commercially available FDA approved sterile drugs, additives, solutions and containers. These medications are in short supply or not commercially available through wholesaler Cardinal.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Anna Roth, 370-5101

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Without these medications, the Pharmacy Department will not be consistent with patient safety and quality assurance, which will negatively affect the patient population at CCRMC.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Amendment #26-964-9 with V. Arek Keledjian, M.D.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director or his designee, to execute, on behalf of the County, Contract Amendment Agreement #26-964-9 with V. Arek Keledjian, M.D., a self-employed individual, effective May 1, 2010, to amend Contract #26-964-8, to modify the payment provisions with no change in the original Payment Limit of \$115,200 and no change in the original term of June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2012.

FISCAL IMPACT:

100% Enterprise Fund I. Cost to the County depends upon utilization. As appropriate, patients and/or third party payors will be billed for services. Adding a rate for provision of additional medical procedures.

BACKGROUND:

On June 2, 2009, the Board of Supervisors approved Contract #26-964-8 with V. Arek Keledjian, M.D., for the period from June 1, 2009 through May 31, 2012, for the provision of endoscopy and internal medicine services including therapeutic endoscopic procedures at Contra Costa Regional Medical Center and Contra Costa Health Centers.



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE:

John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT:

Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: David Goldstein,
M.D., 370-5525

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

Upon request of the County, Contractor agreed to provide additional medical services. Approval of Contract Amendment Agreement #26-964-9 will modify the payment provisions to allow the Contractor to provide additional medical services including capsule endoscopy procedures, through May 31, 2012.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this amendment is not approved, Contractor would not be paid for services rendered at Contra Costa Regional Medical and Contra Costa Health Centers.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Interagency Agreement #29-513-12 with Mount Diablo Unified School District

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director, or his designee, to execute on behalf of the County, Interagency Agreement #29 513 12 with Mount Diablo Unified School District, a government agency, to pay County an amount not to exceed \$983,111, to provide professional school-based mental health services, crisis intervention, and day treatment services for certain Special Education and regular students, for the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Approval of this Interagency Agreement will result in an amount not to exceed \$983,111 from Mount Diablo Unified School District. No County funds are required.

BACKGROUND:

Fred Finch Youth Center, Families First, and Seneca Residential & Day Treatment Center for Children work collaborative with the County and school district personnel in developing program services and policies. The Primary goal of their Early and Periodic Screening,

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Donna Wigand 957-5111

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) Program and non-Medi-Cal mental health programs are to continue to provide seriously disturbed children with the services and the support they need to function effectively in school, at home, and in the community.

On November 3, 2009, the Board of Supervisors approved Interagency Agreement #29 513 11 with Mount Diablo Unified School District, for the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010, for the provision of professional mental health intervention and day treatment services to designated students at Sunrise Elementary School, Belaire Elementary School, Riverview Middle School, Glenbrook Middle School, Pleasant Hill Middle School, Delta View Middle School, Mount Diablo High School, and Olympic/Alliance High School, and their families.

Approval of Interagency Agreement #29 513 12 will allow Mount Diablo Unified School District to continue to pay County for the provision of professional mental health services through June 30, 2011.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this agreement is not approved, special education and regular students will not receive school based mental health services crisis intervention and day treatment services.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

This program supports the following Board of Supervisors' community outcomes: "Children Ready For and Succeeding in School"; "Families that are Safe, Stable, and Nurturing"; and "Communities that are Safe and Provide a High Quality of Life for Children and Families". Expected program outcomes include an increase in positive social and emotional development as measured by the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS).



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Amendment #27-571-11 with Thomson Reuters (Healthcare), Inc.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director, or his designee, to execute, on behalf of the County, Contract Amendment Agreement #27-571-11 with Thomson Reuters (Healthcare), Inc., a corporation, effective February 1, 2011, to amend Contract #27-571-10, to increase the payment limit by \$38,000, from \$36,000 to a new payment limit of \$74,000, with no change in the original term of October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2012.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This Contract is funded 100% by Health Plan Member Premiums. (No rate increase)

BACKGROUND:

On October 19, 2010, the Board of Supervisors approved Contract #27-571-10 with Thomson Reuters (Healthcare), Inc., for the period from October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2012, for the provision of National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) Health Plan Employer Data Information Set (HEDIS) annual audits for 2011 and 2012.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Patricia Tanquary 313-6008

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

Approval of Contract Amendment Agreement #27-571-11 will allow the Contractor to provide additional HEDIS compliance audits through September 30, 2012, including mutual indemnification of the parties.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this amendment is not approved, Contra Costa Health Plan will not obtain their NCQA HEDIS compliance audits, and the Health Plan will be out of compliance with Federal Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) regulations and the State requirements for operating a Health Plan.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not Applicable



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: William Walker, M.D., Health Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Novation Contract #74-128-12 with Charis Youth Center

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Approve and authorize the Health Services Director, or his designee, to execute, on behalf of the County, Novation Contract #74-128-12 with Charis Youth Center, a non-profit corporation, in an amount not to exceed \$150,000, to provide a day treatment program for Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) adolescents, for the period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011. This Contract includes a six-month automatic extension through December 31, 2011, in an amount not to exceed \$75,000.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This Contract is funded 49% Federal FFP Medi Cal, 28% State Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT), 20% by County, and 3% Mental Health Realignment. (No rate increase)

BACKGROUND:

This Contract meets the social needs of County's population in that it provides intensive and rehabilitative day treatment programs, including medication support and mental health services for wards of the court to reduce the need for hospitalization.



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS



OTHER

RECOMMENDED

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Donna Wigand 957-5111

cc: D Morgan, B Borbon

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

On November 12, 2009, County Administrator approved and Purchasing Services Manager executed Novation Contract #74-128-10 (as amended by Contract Amendment Agreement #74-128-11) with Charis Youth Center, for the period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010, with a six-month automatic extension through December 31, 2010, for the provision of a day treatment program for SED adolescents.

Approval of Novation Contract #74-128-12 replaces the automatic extension under the prior Contract and allows the Contractor to continue providing services through June 30, 2011.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this contract is not approved, the services for residential program to out-of-county EPSDT clients and clients whose costs are funded through EPSDT will be reduced.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

This program supports the following Board of Supervisors' community outcomes: "Children Ready For and Succeeding in School"; "Families that are Safe, Stable, and Nurturing"; and "Communities that are Safe and Provide a High Quality of Life for Children and Families". Expected program outcomes include an increase in positive social and emotional development as measured by the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS).



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Catherine Kutsuris, Conservation & Development Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Transfer of Funds from Contra Costa Water Agency to Port of Stockton

RECOMMENDATION(S):

AUTHORIZE a transfer of funds from the Contra Costa County Water Agency to the Port of Stockton in the amount of \$84,379.41 for the local share of the San Francisco-Stockton Ship Channel Deepening Project.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no net fiscal impact to the County. The funds being transferred to the Port were reimbursed to the Contra Costa County Water Agency by the U.S. Corps of Engineers as part of the local share of the San Francisco-Stockton Ship Channel Deepening Project in prior years, and cannot be used for any other purpose. The Water Agency is transferring these funds to the Port because the Port is the current non-Federal sponsor for this project.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Roberta Goulart,
925-335-1226

cc:

BACKGROUND:

The Contra Costa County Water Agency was the local sponsor for portions of the San Francisco-Stockton Ship Channel Deepening Project (Project) from the late 1980's through the 1990's. In 1999, the Phase 3 project was put on hold until additional computer models could be developed to better determine and understand the effects of salinity intrusion into the Delta with deepening. The project was restarted in the mid 2000s with the Port of Stockton (Port) as local sponsor for the project, with assistance from the Water Agency. The Water Agency and the Port have a long history of working together on various phases of this project, and have a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) for operations and maintenance of the Suisun Bay Channel section, and the Port provides assistance on funding advocacy for the Pinole Shoal Channel section of the project.

In August 2009, the Corps of Engineers, in closing out the books on the early phase of the Project, refunded to Contra Costa County \$84,379.41 in unused funds which had been contributed in prior years for the non-federal share of the Project. Although the Port of Stockton is the current local sponsor for the project, the County was obligated to receive the reimbursement from the Corps of Engineers because it was the local sponsor in prior years when these funds were dedicated for the project. Industry beneficiaries and the Port had provided this initial funding.

After the County has transferred the reimbursed local funds to the Port of Stockton (pursuant to the proposed Board order), the Port is expected to use the funds to provide the local share necessary to meet Project needs today. The Port had requested that the County hold the funds until they were needed to meet the current local share of the Project, and has recently requested these funds for that purpose.

The Board's authorization will allow the Auditor's office to provide \$84,379.41 of reimbursed local share of funds, currently held in the Water Agency account, to the Port as the current local sponsor.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The Port of Stockton, as the current non-federal sponsor, would not receive certain funds which were reimbursed to Contra Costa County Water Agency by the U.S. Corps of Engineers for the local cost-share of the San Francisco-Stockton Ship Channel Deepening Project; the Project will be delayed without these funds.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Michael J. Lango, General Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Approve a Purchase Order with Golden Gate Petroleum for Bulk Fuel

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to EXECUTE a purchase order with Golden Gate Petroleum in the amount of \$250,000 for the purchase of bulk diesel and unleaded fuels.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Fuel costs are budgeted in County Customer Department Budgets.

BACKGROUND:

The Waterbird fueling site has been in place since 1993. It services County and other agency vehicles as a self serve fueling station. Available fuel is stored in underground 12,000 gallon fuel tanks. General Services solicits and accepts daily fuel bids from several vendors. Golden Gate Petroleum has been one of three fuel vendors that has received orders from the County for bulk fuel.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

If this agreement is not approved, customer departments may have to fuel their vehicles at commercial gas stations at higher prices.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 02/15/2011

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Beth Balita (925) 313-7161



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Joe Valentine, Employment & Human Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Acknowledgement of emergency closures of two childcare sites

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Employment & Human Services Director, or designee, to seek reimbursement from California Department of Education, in an amount not to exceed \$3,000, to maintain Child Days of Enrollment during four days of emergency site closures at Richmond College Prep Preschool and First Baptist Head Start.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Approval of this board order will allow the County to maintain Child Days of Enrollment for the period in question. This will preserve revenue of \$2,438.66 for fiscal year 2010-11 from California Department of Education.

BACKGROUND:

Two childcare site closures occurred on November 19, 2010 and December 14 - 16, 2010 which were beyond the control of the Community Services Bureau and its childcare partners.

Richmond Elementary School, Inc. (Richmond College Prep Preschool) was closed

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: C. Youngblood, 313-1712

cc: Cassandra Youngblood, Katharine Mason

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

for three days (December 14, 15 and 16, 2010) due to vandalism of the main water line which resulted in no water access for the childcare site during this period. Vandals were attempting to obtain copper from the lines, which disrupted water service. The site was unable to safely operate without a water source.

First Baptist Head Start, East Leland Court Center was closed for one day (November 19, 2010) due to water damage incurred by an apartment unit fire located immediately above the childcare center. First Baptist had less than 24 hours notice of the water damage; the site could not safely operate due to the overly saturated walls and flooring.

The two site closures were beyond the control of the Department, as the events were unforeseen. The State requires an executed board order from the County Board of Supervisors, acknowledging that the closures were beyond the control of the Department. Meeting this requirement will assist the Department to avoid loss of funding for the days of non-attendance by the affected children. The closure affected 48 part-day State-funded preschool children at the Richmond College Prep. School and 16 full-day State-funded infants and toddlers at the First Baptist Head Start, East Leland Court Center.

The Department seeks authorization to request from the State credited funds, in the amount of \$2,438.66, for the days of closure, as permissible by the State Department of Education, Child Development Division Management Advisory, dated February 1994.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The County will lose \$2,438.66 in potential revenue.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

The Employment & Human Services Department Community Services Bureau supports three of Contra Costa County's community outcomes - Outcome 1: "Children Ready for and Succeeding in School," Outcome 3: "Families that are Economically Self-sufficient," and, Outcome 4: "Families that are Safe, Stable, and Nurturing." These outcomes are achieved by offering comprehensive services, including high quality early childhood education, nutrition, and health services to low-income children throughout Contra Costa County.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Michael J. Lango, General Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Dispose of Surplus Property

RECOMMENDATION(S):

DECLARE as surplus and **AUTHORIZE** the Purchasing Agent, or designee, to dispose of vehicles no longer needed for public use as recommended by the Deputy Director of General Services.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact associated with approval of recommended action.

BACKGROUND:

Section 1108-2.212 of the County Ordinance code authorizes the Purchasing Agent to dispose of any personal property belonging to Contra Costa County and found by the Board of Supervisors not to be required for public use. The property for disposal is either obsolete, worn out, beyond economical repair, or damaged beyond repair.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

General Services would not be able to dispose of surplus vehicles.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not applicable.



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE:

John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT:

Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Steve Silveira
925-313-7120

ATTACHMENTS

Surplus
Attachment

ATTACHMENT TO BOARD ORDER

Department	Description/Unit/Make/Model	Serial No.	Condition A. Obsolete B. Worn Out C. Beyond economical repair D. Damaged beyond repair
SHERIFF	2006 FORD #4645 (91384 Miles)	1FTSS34L86HA09189	B
SHERIFF	2003 FORD #2322 (53973 Miles)	2FAHP71W53X185099	C
SHERIFF	2006 FORD #2633 (97045 Miles)	2FAFP71W56X107515	B
GENERAL SERVICES	1997 FORD #4460 (109938 Miles)	1FTJE34S6VHB09137	B
GENERAL SERVICES	1996 FORD #4446 (107120 Miles)	1FTFE24H5THB05274	B
GENERAL SERVICES	2002 FORD #5551 (105186 Miles)	1FTNF20LX2EC81627	B
GENERAL SERVICES	2001 FORD #5211 (107748 Miles)	1FTPF17L61NB31845	B
HEALTH SERVICES	1999 FORD #0563 (93512 Miles)	1FAFP52U1XG242502	C
HEALTH SERVICES	1997 CHEV. #5100 (98856 Miles)	1GCCS14X6V8105218	B
HEALTH SERVICES	2002 FORD #0366 (95830 Miles)	1FAFP52U42G268326	C
EHSD	1995 CHEV. #1422 (58083 Miles)	1G1LD55M7SY253260	C
DISTRICT ATTORNEY	2002 FORD #0319 (41895 Miles)	1FAFP52U92A151117	D
SHERIFF	2007 FORD #0782 (96057 Miles)	1FAFP53U77A172165	B
AGRICULTURE	2002 FORD #5039 (106590 Miles)	1FTYR45EX2PA96881	B



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Joe Valentine, Employment & Human Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Issuance of Request for Proposal #1122 for Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) Services

RECOMMENDATION(S):

APPROVE and AUTHORIZE the Employment and Human Services Director, or designee, to issue Request for Proposal #1122 for Promoting Safe and Stable Families services in an amount not to exceed \$490,000 for the period of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

FISCAL IMPACT:

\$490,000: 100% Federal, Promoting Safe and Stable Families funding. No County match.

BACKGROUND:

The Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 established the Family Preservation and Support Service Program, geared toward community-based family preservation and support under Title IV-B of the Social Security Act and according to the United States Code, Title 42, Chapter 7, Subchapter IV, Part B, subpart 2, commencing with section 629a. In 1997, the program was reauthorized under the Adoption and Safe Families Act, and renamed the Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program (PSSF) with two additional services put in place: time-limited reunification and supportive adoption

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Elaine Burres, 313-1717

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

services. The PSSF Amendment of 2001, extended the program through 2006.

Recently, the PSSF Program was reauthorized through federal fiscal year 2011 by the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006. The PSSF funding is used to support services to strengthen parental relationships and promote healthy marriages, to improve parenting skills and increase relationship skills within the family to prevent child abuse and neglect, while also promoting timely family reunification when children must be separated from their parents for the safety of the child. The PSSF funds are also to be used to remove barriers which impede the process of adoption when children cannot be safely reunited with their families and to address the unique issues adoptive families and children may face.

The period of for the resulting contracts will be July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012 with an option for a one-year renewal pending availability of funds and the provision of quality services with successful outcomes as determined by the Employment and Human Services, Children and Family Services Bureau ongoing monitoring and evaluation of programs.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Without the release of this funding, Promoting Safe and Stable Families services would not be contracted with agencies and delivered to the children and families in Contra Costa County.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

The contracts resulting from Request for Proposal #1122 will support all of the community outcomes established on the Children's Report Card: 1) "Children Ready for and Succeeding in School"; 2) "Children and Youth Healthy and Preparing for Productive Adulthood"; 3) "Families that are Economically Self Sufficient"; 4) "Families that are Safe, Stable and Nurturing"; and, 5) "Communities that are Safe and Provide a High Quality of Life for Children nd Families" by reducing the occurrence of child abuse and neglect, and providing support services to strengthen the family unit.



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Family and Human Services Committee
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Referral to Family and Human Services Committee on the SNAP (Food Stamp) Program

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Refer to the Family and Human Services Committee a review of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as Food Stamps) and the SNAP California Restaurant Meals Program as recommended by Supervisor Glover.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No fiscal impact from this referral.

BACKGROUND:

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance program (SNAP), formerly known as Food Stamps, provides food assistance to more than 42 million low-income individuals and families annually. The U.S. Department of Agriculture funds SNAP. State and county agencies administer the program locally by enrolling recipients and verifying benefit levels.

The Restaurant Meals program helps expand food access to those who do not have a place to store and cook food, who may not be able to prepare food or who don't have access to a grocery store. The Restaurant Meals Program currently operates in Arizona and Michigan and in a handful of California counties. Contra Costa County does not participate.



APPROVE



OTHER



RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY



RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD

ADMINISTRATOR

COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**



APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED



OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE:

John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT:

Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Dorothy Sansoe,
925-335-1009

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

None

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None



**Contra
Costa
County**

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Catherine Kutsuris, Conservation & Development Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Multi-Family Housing Revenue Bonds – Riley Court Apartments, Concord

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ADOPT Resolution 2011/59,

- (1) authorizing the issuance of Multi-Family Housing Revenue Bonds in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$12.5 million to finance the costs of acquisition and rehabilitation of the Riley Court Apartments located at 2050, 2051 and 2061 Riley Court in Concord;
- (2) finding and declaring that certain findings, statements and declarations contained in the proposed Resolution are true and correct;
- (3) declaring that the Resolution will not relieve the borrower of Bond funds from obtaining other required permits or approvals required by law nor obligate the County to incur any obligation or provide financial assistance with respect to the Bonds or the Project concerned;
- (4) approving, ratifying, and confirming all actions heretofore taken by officers and agents of the County with respect to the financing of the Project and the sale and issuance of Bonds; and,
- (5) authorizing and directing any authorized officer of the County to do any and all things, take any and all actions, and execute and deliver any

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011** ☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Jim Kennedy, 335-7225

cc:

RECOMMENDATION(S): (CONT'D)

and all certificates, agreements, and other documents which the officer may deem necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purposes of the Resolution.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No General Fund obligation is involved. In the event that the bonds are issued, the County will be reimbursed for costs associated with the issuance of bonds. The bonds to be issued will be solely secured by revenues (rents, reserves, etc.) pledged under the bond documents. No County funds are pledged to secure the bonds.

BACKGROUND:

The recommended action is the adoption of a Resolution by the Board, as the legislative body of the County, authorizing the issuance of Multi-Family Housing Revenue Bonds which will be used to finance the costs of acquisition and rehabilitation of the Riley Court Apartments, a 48-unit multifamily rental housing development located at 2050, 2051 and 2061 Riley Court (APNs 128-200-062 and 128-200-063) in Concord.

The bonds, when issued, will be used to finance the acquisition and rehabilitation of the Riley Court Apartments by the ownership entity. The ownership entity will be a California Limited Partnership, the Managing General Partner of which will be Resources for Community Development (a local non-profit housing developer) or a related entity.

The proposed financing would implement City of Concord and County policies to preserve the supply of affordable housing. The City of Concord is supportive of the acquisition and renovation of Riley Court Apartments.

The main purpose of the proposed Resolution is to acknowledge that a public hearing has been held by the Deputy Director – Redevelopment and to meet other bond issuance requirements which are specified in Section 147(f) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The recommended action of the Board is not the Bond Sale Resolution. The proposed bonds could not be issued until a separate resolution is adopted by the Board of Supervisors specifically authorizing the sale of bonds. Such a separate proposed resolution to authorize the sale of bonds would come back to the Board after receipt of an allocation from the State of California for Private Activity Bond Authority. An application for Private Activity Bond Authority will be submitted to the California Debt Limit Allocation Committee in the summer of 2011. The expected timing for a Bond Sale Resolution would be in the fourth quarter of calendar year 2011.

The proposed resolution would not relieve the borrower of bond funds from obtaining other required permits or approvals required by law, nor obligate the County to incur any obligation or provide financial assistance with respect to the bonds or the project concerned.

Annual expenses related to the monitoring of the Regulatory Agreement are accommodated in the bond issue.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Negative action would prevent the County from meeting the public approval requirement of the Internal Revenue Code for issuing Multi-family Housing Revenue Bonds, and prior actions of officers and agents of the County would not be confirmed and ratified. As a result, the Multi-family Housing Revenue Bonds could not be issued and funds would not be available to refinance the Riley Court Apartments located at 2050, 2051 and 2061 Riley Court in Concord.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not Applicable.

ATTACHMENTS

Resolution No. 2011/59

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

and for Special Districts, Agencies and Authorities Governed by the Board

Adopted this Resolution on 02/15/2011 by the following vote:

AYES: ☒ 4 **John Gioia**
Gayle B. Uilkema
Karen Mitchoff
Federal D. Glover

NOES: ☐

ABSENT: ☐ 1 **Mary N. Piepho**

ABSTAIN: ☐

RECUSE: ☐



Resolution No. 2011/59

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF MULTIFAMILY HOUSING REVENUE BONDS IN AN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$12,500,000 FOR THE FINANCING OF A MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL RENTAL PROJECT GENERALLY KNOWN AS RILEY COURT APARTMENTS, CONCORD.

WHEREAS, the County of Contra Costa (the "County") is authorized to issue multifamily housing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 52075 and following of the California Health and Safety Code;

WHEREAS, the County desires to participate in financing the development of a 48-unit multifamily residential rental development generally known as Riley Court Apartments and located at 2050, 2051 and 2061 Riley Court, Concord, California (the "Project"), which will be owned and operated by a California Limited Partnership between Resources for Community Development, or an entity related thereto, as managing general partner, and a tax credit investor as limited partner (collectively, the "Borrower");

WHEREAS, to assist in financing the Project, the County intends to sell and issue not to exceed \$12,500,000 aggregate principal amount of its multifamily housing revenue bonds (the "Bonds") and to loan the proceeds thereof to the Borrower, thereby reducing the cost of the Project and assisting in providing housing for low income persons;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 147(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the "Code"), the financing of the Project and the issuance of the Bonds by the County must be approved by the "applicable representative of the County" (as defined in the Code);

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Contra Costa (the "Board"), is the elected legislative body of the County and is one of the applicable elected representatives required to approve the financing of the Project and the Bonds under Section 147(f) of the Code;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 147(f) of the Code, the Deputy Director – Redevelopment has, following notice duly given, held a public hearing regarding the financing of the Project and the issuance of the Bonds at which no public comments were made; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to approve the financing and the issuance of the Bonds;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Contra Costa, as follows:

Section 1. The Board hereby specifically finds and declares that the statements, findings and determinations of the County set forth above are true and correct.

Section 2. For purposes of Section 147(f) of the Code, the Board hereby authorizes the issuance of Bonds by the County to finance the Project.

Section 3. The adoption of this Resolution does not (1) relieve or exempt the Borrower from obtaining any other permits or approvals that are required by, or determined to be necessary from, the County in connection with the Project, nor (2) obligate the County to incur any obligation or provide financial assistance with respect to the Bonds or the Project.

Section 4. All actions heretofore taken by the officers and agents of the County with respect to the financing of the Project and the sale and issuance of Bonds are hereby approved, ratified and confirmed, and any authorized officer of the County is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the County, to do any and all things and take any and all actions and

execute and deliver any an all certificates, agreements and other documents, which any such officer may deem necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purposes of this Resolution.

Section 5. This Resolution shall take effect upon its adoption.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

Contact: Jim Kennedy, 335-7225

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: , Deputy

cc:

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

and for Special Districts, Agencies and Authorities Governed by the Board

Adopted this Resolution on 02/15/2011 by the following vote:


AYES: ☒ 4 **John Gioia**
Gayle B. Uilkema
Karen Mitchoff
Federal D. Glover

NOES: ☐

ABSENT: ☒ 1 **Mary N. Piepho**

ABSTAIN: ☐

RECUSE: ☐



Resolution No. 2011/59

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF MULTIFAMILY HOUSING REVENUE BONDS IN AN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$12,500,000 FOR THE FINANCING OF A MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL RENTAL PROJECT GENERALLY KNOWN AS RILEY COURT APARTMENTS, CONCORD.

WHEREAS, the County of Contra Costa (the "County") is authorized to issue multifamily housing revenue bonds pursuant to Section 52075 and following of the California Health and Safety Code;

WHEREAS, the County desires to participate in financing the development of a 48-unit multifamily residential rental development generally known as Riley Court Apartments and located at 2050, 2051 and 2061 Riley Court, Concord, California (the "Project"), which will be owned and operated by a California Limited Partnership between Resources for Community Development, or an entity related thereto, as managing general partner, and a tax credit investor as limited partner (collectively, the "Borrower");

WHEREAS, to assist in financing the Project, the County intends to sell and issue not to exceed \$12,500,000 aggregate principal amount of its multifamily housing revenue bonds (the "Bonds") and to loan the proceeds thereof to the Borrower, thereby reducing the cost of the Project and assisting in providing housing for low income persons;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 147(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the "Code"), the financing of the Project and the issuance of the Bonds by the County must be approved by the "applicable representative of the County" (as defined in the Code);

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the County of Contra Costa (the "Board"), is the elected legislative body of the County and is one of the applicable elected representatives required to approve the financing of the Project and the Bonds under Section 147(f) of the Code;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 147(f) of the Code, the Deputy Director – Redevelopment has, following notice duly given, held a public hearing regarding the financing of the Project and the issuance of the Bonds at which no public comments were made; and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to approve the financing and the issuance of the Bonds;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Contra Costa, as follows:

Section 1. The Board hereby specifically finds and declares that the statements, findings and determinations of the County set forth above are true and correct.

Section 2. For purposes of Section 147(f) of the Code, the Board hereby authorizes the issuance of Bonds by the County to finance the Project.

Section 3. The adoption of this Resolution does not (1) relieve or exempt the Borrower from obtaining any other permits or approvals that are required by, or determined to be necessary from, the County in connection with the Project, nor (2) obligate the County to incur any obligation or provide financial assistance with respect to the Bonds or the Project.

Section 4. All actions heretofore taken by the officers and agents of the County with respect to the financing of the Project and the sale and issuance of Bonds are hereby approved, ratified and confirmed, and any authorized officer of the County is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the County, to do any and all things and take any and all actions and

execute and deliver any and all certificates, agreements and other documents, which any such officer may deem necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purposes of this Resolution.

Section 5. This Resolution shall take effect upon its adoption.

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

Contact: Jim Kennedy, 335-7225

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: , Deputy

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David J. Twa", written over the text "By: , Deputy".

cc:



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Joe Valentine, Employment & Human Services Director
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Eliminate Mandated Partner Seat - Job Corps from Workforce Development Board

RECOMMENDATION(S):

ACCEPT the Workforce Development Board's recommendation to eliminate the mandated partner seat for Job Corps on the Workforce Development Board, as recommended by the Employment and Human Services Department.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

BACKGROUND:

The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 sought to streamline service delivery by moving toward a system of collaboration among all entities receiving funding for employment and training that fall under the purview of the Department of Labor (DOL). Public agencies in local jurisdictions were required under the law to partner in delivery of services at the operational level and in development of policy on the leadership level. The August 11, 2000 Final Rule states that "responsibilities of a required partner apply in those local areas where the required partner provides services." This comment references CFR Section 662.220 (b)(3) which states that national programs under title I of WIA (are) required partners

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/15/2011**

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Earl Maciel 3-1648

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

if such programs are present in the local area...”

When WIA was implemented in Contra Costa County in 2000, the Board was inclusive in their outreach to all entities receiving the funds under the Act. At that time, and sporadically thereafter, the Job Corps seat has been filled by a staff based at Treasure Island Job Corps site.

In a renewed effort to support Goal 1 of the “Board” section of the 2010-2013 WDB Strategic Plan, “Strengthen a diverse, active, and full board”, staff has reviewed this seat. Treasure Island Job Corps recruits youth from the greater Bay Area, and both youth contractors and One-Stop staff are familiar with the opportunities afforded youth through this program. However, there is no organizational representation through Job Corps within the LWIA. Staff therefore recommends elimination of this mandated partner seat at this time.

This action will result in a reduction of the size of the Board from forty five (45) members to forty four (44) and does not statistically shift the required business or labor composition of the Board.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Seat will remain filled periodically by staff based at Treasure Island and, thus, will not effectively contribute to the business of the Workforce Development Board.


CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

This position is filled on a sporadic basis by Treasure Island Job Corps. The elimination of this position will not have an immediate impact on children or children services.

ATTACHMENTS

Staff Report

Board Minutes



A1

DATE: October 5, 2010
TO: Executive Committee
FROM: Workforce Development Board Staff
RE: **Review Mandated Partner Seat- Job Corps**

This memo brings forth a proposed elimination of the mandated partner seat for Job Corps from the Contra Costa Local Workforce Investment Area (LWIA).

A. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 sought to streamline service delivery by moving toward a system of collaboration among all entities receiving funding for employment and training that fall under the purview of the Department of Labor (DOL). Public agencies in local jurisdictions were required under the law to partner in delivery of services at the operational level and in development of policy on the leadership level. The August 11, 2000 Final Rule states that “responsibilities of a required partner apply in those local areas where the required partner provides services.” This comment references CFR Section 662.220 (b)(3) which states that national programs under title I of WIA (are) required partners if such programs are present in the local area...”

When WIA was implemented in Contra Costa County in 2000, the Board was inclusive in their outreach to all entities receiving the funds under the Act. At that time, and sporadically thereafter, the Job Corps seat has been filled by a staff based at Treasure Island Job Corps site.

B. CURRENT SITUATION

In a renewed effort to support Goal 1 of the “Board” section of the 2010-2013 WDB Strategic Plan, “Strengthen a diverse, active, and full board”, staff has reviewed this seat. Treasure Island Job Corps recruits youth from the greater Bay Area, and both youth contractors and One-Stop staff are familiar with the opportunities afforded youth through this program. However, there is no organizational representation through Job Corps within the LWIA. Staff therefore recommends elimination of this mandated partner seat at this time.

This action will result in a reduction of the size of the Board from forty five (45) members to forty four (44) and does not statistically shift the required business or labor composition of the Board.

C. SCHEDULE

Following discussion and potential action on this item, it will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for final approval and reflected in the Maddy Book listings as the official documentation of board membership.



Contra
Costa
County

To: Board of Supervisors
From: Dorothy Sansoe, County Administrator
Date: February 15, 2011

Subject: Extension of Emergency Declaration Regarding Homelessness

RECOMMENDATION(S):

CONTINUE the emergency action originally taken by the Board of Supervisors on November 16, 1999 regarding the issue of homelessness in Contra Costa County.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

Government Code Section 8630 required that, for a body that meets weekly, the need to continue the emergency declaration be reviewed at least every 14 days until the local emergency is terminated. In no event is the review to take place more than 21 days after the previous review.

On November 16, 1999, the Board of Supervisors declared a local emergency, pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 8630 on homelessness in Contra Costa County.

With the continuing high number of homeless individuals and insufficient funding available to assist in sheltering all homeless individuals and families, it is appropriate for the

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY
ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD
COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: 02/15/2011

☒ APPROVED AS
RECOMMENDED

☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

VOTE OF SUPERVISORS

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor
Gayle B. Uilkema, District II Supervisor
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 15, 2011

David J. Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: June McHuen, Deputy

Contact: Cynthia Belon,
925-313-6736

cc:

BACKGROUND: (CONT'D)

Board to continue the declaration of a local emergency regarding homelessness.

CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The Board of Supervisors would not be in compliance with Government Code Section 8630.

CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

None.