



2020 Accomplishments

A State Budget

- **CARES Act Funding** – The County’s main priority for the May Revision was to secure funding from the CARES Act. As part of the 42 counties with less than 500 thousand in population, the County did not initially receive any part of the federal funding in the CARES Act. The County took the lead in coordinating a letter with the other 41 smaller counties in an effort to receive a part of the funding to address the unprecedented demands to reduce and contain the spread of COVID-19. The Department of Finance and the Administration were not forthcoming in whether or not they would allocate any funding from the CARES Act until the May Revision officially came out, which included \$45,698 million for the County of Santa Barbara.
- **Realignment Backfill** – One of the other issues that came out of the May Revision was its failure to address the reduction of counties’ realignment funding, which would have equaled to about \$11.5 million loss for the County of Santa Barbara. Along with CSAC, the County advocated for realignment backfill to be included in the final budget. The final agreement provided \$750 million to counties to backfill for lost realignment revenues, prioritizing support for health and human services, entitlement programs, and programs that serve vulnerable populations. The additional \$250 million was not provided to counties because sufficient federal funding was not received by the October 15, 2020 deadline. The final agreement was still an improvement over the May Revision, which didn’t include any funding, and the Legislature’s version of the backfill, which had \$1 billion, but had \$600 million dependent upon federal funding.
- **340B Program** – The Governor’s May Revision proposed to withdraw the January’s proposed investment of \$52.5 million to create a supplemental payment pool for the pharmacy services for non-hospital 340B clinics. The final agreement in the State Budget restored, by rejecting the withdrawal of the January budget proposal, \$52.5 million (\$26.3 million General Fund and \$26.3 million federal funds) to provide supplemental payments to nonhospital 340B clinics. These payments are intended to replace lost revenue from implementation of Medi-Cal Rx, which DHCS intends to do on January 1, 2021. Trailer bill AB 80 also required DHCS to establish a stakeholder process to develop and implement the methodology for distribution of payments from the 340B supplemental payment pool, including the eligibility criteria for receipt of payments, the aggregate amount of pool funding, the criteria for apportioning the funding, and timing of payments. The County has been a part of the stakeholder process and has been in contact with the Administration, CA Department of Finance, our local Delegation, Legislative budget staff, the California Health and Human Services Agency and the Department of Health Care Services to insist that the County gets a correct share of the funds.
- **CaleVIP** – Successfully supported California Energy Commission’s (CEC’s) budget request for a one-time expenditure for electric vehicle charging infrastructure. The funds were included in trailer bill SB 115, which included \$51 million in funding for the electric vehicle charging infrastructure to support increased Zero-Emission Vehicle adoption and deployment in California. SB 115 was signed into law on September 9th.
- **AB 107 (Committee on Budget)** – Successfully supported trailer bill AB 107, which includes language to extend the deadline for decisions in pending assessment appeals cases beyond the Governor’s Executive Order to March 31, 2021, and provides explicit statutory authority to conduct assessment appeals hearings remotely. These important provisions will allow counties to safely conduct assessment appeals hearings and ensure that boards are able to finalize rulings on appeals that are nearing the statutory deadline. AB 107 was signed by the Governor on September 29th.

B Delegation – Worked directly with the County’s Legislators on legislation that would directly affect the County, including:

- *AB 3214 (Limon)* - Successfully supported *AB 3214 (Limon)*, which doubles specified maximum and minimum financial penalties for specified violations, including failing to notify specified state and federal agencies of the discharge of oil and the discharging of oil into waters of the state, it also authorizes the court to impose upon a person convicted of violating specified provisions of the Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act a fine of up to \$1,000 dollars per gallon spilled in excess of 1,000 gallons of oil. The Governor signed *AB 3214 (Limon)* on September 24th.

C Legislation – Reviewed and assessed all of the introduced legislation and worked with the County to determine which legislation fit in the County’s Platform. Below is legislation that the County was successful in:

- *AB 6 (Reyes)* – Successful in opposing *AB 6 (Reyes)*, which would have authorized the Attorney General to enter into a settlement agreement with opioid manufacturers on the state’s behalf and would have blocked local governments from suing the companies responsible for the opioid crisis. The County, CSAC and other local governments strongly opposed *AB 6* in the last few days of session. The Legislature adjourned without taking up *AB 6*, while *AB 6* was heard in Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee Saturday, it was not voted on and no further action was taken to move the bill from the Committee.
- *SB 217 (Portantino)* – Successful in opposing *SB 217 (Portantino)*, which would have required a person who operates an organized or recreational camp to obtain a license issued by a local health agency (LHAs). The bill had an opposed unless amended position by the County and CSAC. This bill failed deadline and died in the Assembly.
- *Worker’s Comp* - Santa Barbara opposed three worker’s comp bills in alliance with the California Coalition on Worker’s Compensation (CCWC), CSAC and a large number of other organizations. *AB 196 (Gonzalez)* was the most concerning bill, it would have established an overly-broad legal presumption that employers are liable for the COVID-19 infection of every “Essential Critical Infrastructure Worker” in California and had no sunset date. *AB 664 (Cooper)* created a presumption for COVID-19 for specifically defined categories of police officers, fire fighters, and health care workers. Both *AB 196* and *AB 664* did not move off the Senate Floor and are dead for the year. The coalition remained in substantive opposition to *SB 1159*, which codifies the Governor's Executive Order (N-62-20) that created a rebuttable presumption that "essential employees" who contracted COVID-19 were infected on the job, and establishes the scope and terms of a similar presumption for infected employees outside of the Executive Order. *SB 1159* was signed by the Governor on September 17th. The Coalition was not opposed to the contents of Sections 1-3 of *SB 1159*, which includes research on COVID claims through the Commission on Health and Safety and Workers’ Compensation, a codification of the policy contained in Governor Newsom’s Executive Order, and a temporary and rebuttable COVID-19 presumption for police, firefighters, healthcare workers, IHSS workers, and home health workers that contains necessary protections and a reasonable sunset date, but opposed the idea that a presumption is necessary for workers who are not in Section 3 of *SB 1159*. The Coalition will be looking to do clean-up legislation in 2021.