

STATEWIDE COST ESTIMATE

\$11,218,184 - \$22,758,309

Initial Claim Period

(Second Half Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and Fiscal Year 2020-2021)

**\$7,513,209- \$10,763,822, Plus the Implicit Price Deflator
2021-2022 and Following**

Penal Code Section 680 as Amended by Statutes 2019, Chapter 588 (SB 22)

Sexual Assault Evidence Kits: Testing

20-TC-01

The Commission on State Mandates (Commission) adopted this Statewide Cost Estimate on consent by a vote of 7-0 during a regularly scheduled hearing on September 23, 2022 as follows:

Member	Vote
Lee Adams, County Supervisor	Yes
Jeannie Lee, Representative of the Director of the Office of Planning and Research	Yes
Gayle Miller, Representative of the Director of the Department of Finance, Chairperson	Yes
Renee Nash, School District Board Member	Yes
Sarah Olsen, Public Member	Yes
Shawn Silva, Representative of the State Controller	Yes
Spencer Walker, Representative of the State Treasurer, Vice Chairperson	Yes

STAFF ANALYSIS

Summary of the Mandate, Eligible Claimants, and Period of Reimbursement

Penal Code section 680, as amended by Statutes 2019, chapter 588 (SB 22), requires city and county law enforcement agencies to perform activities relating to DNA testing of sexual assault forensic evidence within specified time periods.

The Commission adopted the Test Claim Decision on July 23, 2021 and the Decision and Parameters and Guidelines on September 24, 2021, approving reimbursement for any city, county, or city and county that incurs increased costs as a result of this mandate.

The initial reimbursement period is January 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021 (second half of fiscal year 2019-2020 and all of fiscal year 2020-2021). Eligible claimants were required to file initial claims with the State Controller’s Office (Controller) by April 27, 2022. Late initial

reimbursement claims may be filed until April 27, 2023, but will incur a 10 percent late filing penalty of the total amount of the initial claim without limitation.¹

Reimbursable Activities

The Commission approved the following reimbursable activities for this program:

1. A law enforcement agency in whose jurisdiction a sex offense specified in Penal Code sections 261, 261.5, 262, 286, 287, or 289 or former section 288a occurred shall do one of the following for any sexual assault forensic evidence received by the law enforcement agency on or after January 1, 2016:
 - a. Submit sexual assault forensic evidence to the crime lab within 20 days after booked into evidence; *or*
 - b. Ensure that a rapid turnaround DNA program is in place (with a written agreement between the law enforcement agency, the crime lab, and the medical facility pursuant to Penal Code section 680(c)(5)) to submit sexual assault forensic evidence directly from the medical facility examining the victim to the crime lab within five days. (Penal Code 680(c)(1), Stats. 2019, ch. 588.)
2. For any sexual assault forensic evidence received on or after January 1, 2016, the law enforcement's crime lab shall do one of the following:
 - a. Process sexual assault forensic evidence, creating DNA profiles when able, and upload qualifying DNA profiles into CODIS as soon as practically possible, but no later than 120 days after initial receipt; *or*
 - b. Transmit sexual assault forensic evidence to another crime lab for DNA processing as soon as practically possible, but no later than 30 days after initial receipt. The transmitting crime lab shall upload into CODIS any qualifying DNA profiles from sexual assault forensic evidence as soon as practically possible, but no longer than 30 days after being notified about the presence of DNA and no later than 120 days after the transmitting crime lab initially receives the evidence. (Penal Code 680(c)(2), Stats. 2019, ch. 588.)

The Commission further concluded that the test claim statute does not mandate city and county law enforcement agencies to conduct follow-up investigations on evidence tested pursuant to the test claim statute.² Therefore, such follow-up investigations are excluded from the reimbursable activities.

Offsetting Revenues and Reimbursements

The Parameters and Guidelines specify that any offsetting revenue the claimant experiences in the same program as a result of the same statutes or executive orders found to contain the mandate shall be deducted from the costs claimed. In addition, reimbursement for this mandate from any source, including but not limited to, service fees collected, federal funds, other state funds, and other funds that are not the claimant's proceeds of taxes shall be identified and

¹ Government Code section 17561(d)(3).

² Exhibit A, Decision and Parameters and Guidelines, adopted September 24, 2021, pages 5-6.

deducted from this claim. This includes, but is not limited to, the following state and federal grant programs that may be used by a claimant to pay for the mandated activities in this program and which constitute offsetting revenues when used for this purpose:

- Citizens Option for Public Safety Grant (COPS) (state)
- DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Program (federal)
- DNA Identification Fund (state)
- Sexual Assault Evidence Submission Grant Program (state)³

Offsetting revenues identified in the initial reimbursement claims totaled \$1,022,578.

Statewide Cost Estimate

Staff reviewed 83 unaudited initial reimbursement claims submitted by 49 city and county claimants and compiled by the Controller, and developed the Statewide Cost Estimate based on the assumptions and methodology discussed herein. Table 1 and Table 2, below, summarize the cost estimates for the initial reimbursement period and the year following, respectively.

Table 1. Initial Reimbursement Period Cost Estimate

Activity 1.a. (Submit sexual assault forensic evidence to the crime lab within 20 days after booked into evidence)	\$271,541 - \$2,299,913
Activity 1.b. (Ensure that a rapid turnaround DNA program is in place)	\$0 - \$0
Activity 2.a. (Process sexual assault forensic evidence, creating DNA profiles when able, and upload qualifying DNA profiles into CODIS as soon as practically possible, but no later than 120 days after initial receipt)	\$7,310,867 - \$14,003,080
Activity 2.b. (Transmit sexual assault forensic evidence to another crime lab for DNA processing as soon as practically possible, but no later than 30 days after initial receipt.)	\$694,483 - \$1,384,920
Indirect Costs	\$3,963,871 - \$8,490,198
Offsetting Revenues	(\$1,022,578 - \$2,137,566)
Late Filing Penalty	(\$0 - \$1,282,236)
Total Costs	\$11,218,184 - \$22,758,309

Table 2. Estimated Annual Costs for Fiscal Year 2021-2022 and Following

Direct Costs for All Activities	\$5,517,927- \$7,905,275
Indirect Costs	\$2,648,605 - \$3,794,532
Offsetting Revenues	(\$653,323 - \$935,985)
Total Costs	\$7,513,209- \$10,763,822

³ Exhibit A, Decision and Parameters and Guidelines, adopted September 24, 2021, page 10.

Assumptions

1. The amount claimed for the initial reimbursement period may increase if late or amended claims are filed. Only 49 of 415 eligible claimants (12 percent) filed claims for the initial reimbursement period.⁴ The remaining 366 eligible claimants may still file late claims, and the 49 claimants that timely filed may file amended initial claims for additional costs. Disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic may contribute to a higher number of late or amended claims for the initial reimbursement period.
2. Costs are likely to be higher during the initial years of reimbursement because law enforcement agencies have to process a backlog of existing sexual assault forensic evidence received on or after January 1, 2016. Based on a one-time Department of Justice (DOJ) audit of untested sexual assault evidence kits in the possession of California law enforcement agencies, crime laboratories, medical facilities and others, the known backlog of untested sexual assault evidence kits in 2020 totaled 13,929.⁵ Of the 2,005 untested kits reported in the audit from 2016 or later, 1,995 are subject to the test claim statute.⁶ Assuming all eligible claimants have untested kits at the same average rate as the audit participants, there would be approximately 5,830 untested sexual assault evidence kits subject to the test claim statute at the beginning of the reimbursement period.⁷ While it is assumed that material and labor

⁴ This Statewide Cost Estimate assumes there are 415 eligible claimants. There are 58 counties and 481 cities in California, including one city and county (the City and County of San Francisco). Exhibit C (10), Senate Government and Finance Committee, County Fact Sheet (April 2016), https://sgf.senate.ca.gov/sites/sgf.senate.ca.gov/files/county_facts_2016.pdf (accessed on August 18, 2022), page 1. All 58 counties have law enforcement agencies (see Cal. Const., art. XI, § 1(b)) and it is assumed, extrapolating from POST data, that approximately 357 of 481 cities either have their own law enforcement agencies or contract with another city or county to provide law enforcement services in their jurisdiction.

⁵ Exhibit C (5), California Department of Justice, Statewide Audit of Untested Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Kits, 2020 Report to the Legislature, <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/publications/ag-rpt-audit-usasfe-kits-2020.pdf> (accessed on April 8, 2022), pages 3, 9. Penal Code section 680.4 (Stats. 2018, ch. 950) required DOJ to conduct the one-time audit. Data was primarily collected between November 6, 2018 and July 1, 2019, but the DOJ continued to accept late submission until the release of the audit report.

⁶ Exhibit C (5), California Department of Justice, Statewide Audit of Untested Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Kits, 2020 Report to the Legislature, <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/publications/ag-rpt-audit-usasfe-kits-2020.pdf> (accessed on April 8, 2022), page 9. 142 of the 149 of the audit participants are eligible claimants (the omitted seven are university police departments and are not eligible claimants) and reported a total of 1,995 untested kits from 2016 or later.

⁷ Exhibit C (5), California Department of Justice, Statewide Audit of Untested Sexual Assault Forensic Evidence Kits, 2020 Report to the Legislature, <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/publications/ag-rpt-audit-usasfe-kits-2020.pdf> (accessed on April 8, 2022), pages 14-23.

costs will increase over time, as reflected in the implicit price deflator, once the backlog has been eliminated and sexual assault forensic evidence is timely tested on a flow basis, total costs will likely trend downward, being limited to the number of test kits collected annually, and for some claimants, may not exceed the \$1,000 minimum filing threshold.

3. The average cost to process a sexual assault evidence kit is approximately \$1,000 per kit. According to the National Center for Victims of Crime, DNA processing costs average \$500 to \$1,200 per kit.⁸ The available claims data supports this estimate, with direct costs for DNA processing (Activities 2.a. and 2.b.) averaging \$1,088 per kit. There may also be backlogged crime scene evidence that requires DNA processing, although that number is not tracked at the statewide level.⁹
4. The number of reimbursement claims filed will vary from year to year, depending on the number of sex offenses that occur within each eligible claimant's jurisdiction and whether those crimes are reported and qualifying forensic evidence is collected and processed.
5. Claimants may elect not to seek reimbursement for one or more reimbursable activities. Under the test claim statute, eligible claimants may seek reimbursement for performing each of the two mandated activities in one of two ways. Some eligible claimants may decide not to claim costs for one or more of the mandated activities because the costs imposed may be de minimis. For example, none of the 83 unaudited claims seek reimbursement for ensuring a rapid turnaround program is in place (Activity 1.b.) and only 20 claims (less than 25%) seek reimbursement for both submitting sexual assault forensic evidence to the crime lab (Activity 1.a.) and processing the evidence for DNA, creating DNA profiles, and uploading qualifying DNA profiles into CODIS (Activity 2.a. or 2.b.).

Number of untested sexual assault evidence kits from 2016 or later in the possession of eligible claimants [1,995] / eligible claimants participating in the audit [142] = average of 14 kits per eligible claimant.

Average untested kits per eligible claimant [14] x total eligible claimants [415] = Potential backlog of untested kits at beginning of initial reimbursement period [5,830].

⁸ Exhibit C (9), National Center for Victims of Crime, Frequently Asked Questions, <https://victimsofcrime.org/frequently-asked-questions/> (accessed on April 8, 2022), Question 6 (estimating the cost to test one kit at \$500-\$1,200); see also Exhibit C (8), End the Backlog, Testing All Rape Kits Provides Returns of Up to 65,000%, <https://www.endthebacklog.org/blog/testing-all-rape-kits-provides-returns-65000> (accessed on April 8, 2022) (estimating the cost at \$500-\$1,500 to test one kit).

⁹ The submission and testing requirements imposed by the test claim statute are not limited to sexual assault evidence kits; they include crime scene evidence as well. If a sexual assault evidence kit is not collected in a case, representative and probative samples of any other types of sexual assault evidence (e.g., the victim's clothing, bedding from the assault scene, etc.) must be sent to the crime lab. Exhibit C (4), California Department of Justice, Sexual Assault Kits and Evidence FAQs, <https://oag.ca.gov/bfs/prop69/faqs-sake> (accessed on February 26, 2021), pages 1-2.

6. Estimated future annual costs will be lower if the claimants receive and apply offsetting revenues. While the Parameters and Guidelines identify several state and federal grant programs as potential offsetting revenue sources, not all claimants receive those funds, nor are those claimants that do required to apply them to this program. Of the 49 initial claimants, only five (10 percent) used offsetting revenues. Additionally, those offsets varied greatly, ranging from less than \$5,000 to more than \$500,000. While known available offsetting revenues for the initial reimbursement period exceed \$194 million, three out of five of those funding sources are grant-based, meaning that there is no guarantee that the claimants will receive or apply those funds in the future.

The majority of known available offsetting revenues come from the Citizens Option for Public Safety Grant (COPS) program (totaling \$170,074,800 for fiscal years 2019-2020 and 2020-2021) and are intended to generally fund front-line law enforcement services at the county and city level, and without a specific requirement that the funds be used for DNA testing of sexual assault forensic evidence.¹⁰ Only, \$7,491,383 awarded in fiscal year 2019-2020; \$8,184,159 in fiscal year 2020-2021; and \$8,510,042 in fiscal year 2021-2022 in U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Awards for DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Program; \$8,575,184.39 awarded in calendar year 2019 in state DNA Identification Fund (Proposition 69) revenues; \$2 million in California Department of Justice, Sexual Assault Evidence Submission Grant Program funds awarded in 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 were allocated to county and city law enforcement agencies, as specified. Additionally, the California Department of Justice, Untested Sexual Assault Evidence Grant – Backlog Reduction Program has available \$1.814 million in grant funds for fiscal years 2021-2022 and 2022-2023, specifically for the “California Department of Justice, Untested Sexual Assault Evidence Grant – Backlog Reduction Program.”¹¹ Thus, this Statewide Cost Estimate assumes that all potential eligible claimants will file claims and

¹⁰ Exhibit C (7), California State Controller, Citizens' Option for Public Safety (COPS) Program Funds, Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Year-to-Date Allocation Spreadsheet, https://www.sco.ca.gov/ard_payments_cops_fy1920.html (accessed on June 24, 2022); Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Allocation Letter from the Department of Finance, https://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Payments/copsdofletter_2021.pdf (accessed on June 24, 2022).

¹¹ Exhibit C (11), U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Awards for DNA Capacity Enhancement and Backlog Reduction Program, https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/awards/list?field_award_status_value=All&state=CA&field_funding_type_value=All&fiscal_year=2019+2020+2021&combine_awards=DNA+Capacity+Enhancement&awardee=&city=#kq5n09 (accessed on June 24, 2022); Exhibit C (1), California Department of Justice, Annual Statewide DNA Fund Report, <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/bfs/2019-dna-fund-report.pdf> (accessed on June 24, 2022), page 2; Exhibit C (2), California Department of Justice, Sexual Assault Evidence Submission Grant Program, <https://oag.ca.gov/saesg> (accessed on June 24, 2022); Exhibit C (6), California Department of Justice, Untested Sexual Assault Evidence Grant – Backlog Reduction Program, <https://oag.ca.gov/usaeg-br> (accessed on June 24, 2022).

identify offsetting revenues at the same rate as that identified in the initial claims, which is eight percent.¹²

7. Actual costs may be lower if the Controller reduces any reimbursement claim for this program following an audit deeming the claim to be excessive or unreasonable, or not eligible for reimbursement.

Methodology

A. Initial Reimbursement Period Cost Estimate:

The low end statewide cost estimate for the initial reimbursement period (second half of fiscal year 2019-2020 and all of fiscal year 2020-2021) is based on 83 unaudited, actual reimbursement claims (35 claims filed for fiscal year 2019-2020 and 48 for fiscal year 2020-2021) totaling **\$11,218,184**. The high end of the estimated potential costs is up to **\$22,758,309** if all eligible claimants file claims for the initial reimbursement period.

Activity 1.a.: Activity 1.a. consists of submitting sexual assault forensic evidence to the crime lab. The low end of the range for Activity 1.a. is costs actually claimed for that activity. The high end assumes that all eligible claimants will file claims for Activity 1.a. and the costs are calculated using the average costs claimed in the initial period of reimbursement and multiplying the average cost by the number of eligible claimants who have not yet filed claims as follows:

Activity 1.a. actual costs claimed [\$271,541] / number of 1.a. filers [49] = average activity 1.a. cost per claimant [\$5,542]

Average activity 1.a. cost per claimant [\$5,542] x number of non-filers [366] = total estimated non-filer activity 1.a. costs [\$2,028,372]

Activity 1.a. actual costs claimed [\$271,541] + estimated non-filer activity 1.a. costs that could be claimed in late claims [\$2,028,372] = Total Potential Activity 1.a. Costs [\$2,299,913]

Activity 1.b.: Activity 1.b. consists of ensuring that a rapid turnaround DNA program is in place so that the sexual assault forensic evidence is submitted directly from the medical examination facility to the crime lab. While some of the initial claims contain supporting documentation showing that a rapid turnaround agreement is in place, none of the initial claims include claimed costs for Activity 1.b., likely because the mandate is to either perform 1.a. *or* 1.b. Therefore, both the low and high ends of the range for Activity 1.b. are \$0.

Activities 2.a. and 2.b.: Activity 2.a. consists of processing sexual assault forensic evidence for DNA, creating DNA profiles, and uploading qualifying DNA profiles into CODIS. Activity 2.b. consists of transmitting the sexual assault forensic evidence to another crime lab for DNA processing and uploading qualifying DNA profiles into CODIS. Both of these activities require the law enforcement agency to pay for the sexual assault forensic evidence to be processed for

¹² The offsetting revenue rate is calculated as follows: Actual Offsetting Revenues [\$1,022,578] / Actual Direct and Indirect Costs [\$12,240,772] = Offsetting Rate (offsetting revenues as a percentage of total costs claimed) [0.08].

DNA, either by the agency itself, or by a contracted public or private crime lab, and to upload qualifying DNA profiles into CODIS.

The low end of the range for Activities 2.a. and 2.b. is costs actually claimed for that activity. The high end assumes that all eligible claimants will file claims for Activities 2.a. and 2.b.

The estimate of the high end of potential Activity 2.a and 2.b. costs for the initial reimbursement period uses the number of kits collected statewide in calendar year 2020 (two-thirds of the initial reimbursement period), as reported in DOJ's SAFE-T database,¹³ the statewide backlog of approximately 5,830 untested kits subject to the test claim statute, and an average processing cost per kit of \$1,000, to result in \$13,957,580 for 2.a. and \$1,380,420 for 2.b., calculated as follows:

1. Number of sexual assault evidence kits collected statewide in calendar year 2020 [6,372] x average cost of processing a sexual assault evidence kit for DNA [\$1,000] = Activity 2.a. and Activity 2.b. Costs for calendar year 2020 [\$6,372,000].
2. Costs for Activities 2.a. and 2.b. for the second half of fiscal year 2020-2021 are calculated by dividing the costs for calendar year 2020 by two (6,372,000 / 2 = \$3,186,000).
3. Statewide backlog of sexual assault evidence kits subject to the test claim statute [5,830] x average cost of processing a sexual assault evidence kit for DNA [\$1,000] = Activity 2.a. and 2.b. Backlog Costs for the initial reimbursement period [\$5,830,000].
4. Activity 2.a. and 2.b. Costs for calendar year 2020 [\$6,372,000] + Activity 2.a and Activity 2.b. Costs for second half of fiscal year 2020-2021 [\$3,186,000] + Activity 2.a. and 2.b. Backlog Costs for the initial reimbursement period [\$5,830,000] = High End of Estimated Activity 2.a. and Activity 2.b. Costs for the initial claim period [\$15,388,000].
5. Assuming the same proportionality of 2.a. and 2.b. costs (2.a. actual costs claimed account for 91 percent and 2.b. for nine percent of their combined total), Total Estimated Activity 2.a. Costs for the initial claim period = \$15,388,000 x 0.91 [\$14,003,080] and High End of Estimated Activity 2.b. Costs for the initial claim period = \$15,388,000 x 0.09 [\$1,384,920].

Indirect Costs: The low end of the range for indirect costs is those indirect costs actually claimed. The high end, in addition to indirect costs actually claimed, assumes that all eligible claimants who have not yet filed claims will file claims for indirect costs at the same average rate actually claimed during the initial period of reimbursement, which is calculated as follows:

1. Indirect Costs Actually Claimed [\$3,963,871] / Direct Costs Actually Claimed [\$8,276,891] = Average Indirect Cost Rate [48%].

¹³ DOJ reported 6,372 sexual assault evidence kits collected statewide in calendar year 2020. Exhibit C (3), California Department of Justice, 2020 SAFE-T Annual Report to the Legislature, <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/ag-report-safe-t-database-2020.pdf> (accessed on April 8, 2022), page 6.

2. Indirect Cost Rate [48%] x Estimated Direct Costs (sum of all estimated activity costs for the initial claim period) [\$17,687,913] = High End of the Estimated Indirect Costs [\$8,490,198].

Offsetting Revenues: The low end of the range is total offsetting revenues actually claimed. The high end assumes that all eligible claimants will file claims, with offsetting revenues reported by all eligible claimants at the same average rate, and is calculated as follows:

1. Actual Offsetting Revenues [\$1,022,578] / Actual Direct and Indirect Costs [\$12,240,762] = Offsetting Rate (offsetting revenues as a percentage of total costs claimed) [8%].
2. Estimated Non-filer Direct and Indirect Costs [\$13,937,349] x Offsetting Rate [8%] = Non-filer Offsetting Revenues [\$1,114,988].
3. Actual Offsetting Revenues [\$1,022,578] + Non-filer Offsetting Revenues [\$1,114,988] = High End of Estimated Offsetting Revenues [\$2,137,566].

Late Filing Penalties: The low end is \$0 because none of the initial claims compiled by the Controller were assessed a late filing penalty. The high end assumes that all eligible claimants will file claims for the initial period of reimbursement, which will be subject to a late filing penalty, and that penalty is calculated as follows:

1. Estimated Non-filer Direct and Indirect Costs [\$13,937,349] – Estimated Non-filer Offsets [\$1,114,988] = Estimated Non-filer Net Costs [\$12,822,361].
2. Estimated Non-filer Net Costs [\$12,822,361] x (10% late filing penalty) = Estimated Non-filer Late Filing Penalties [\$1,282,236].
3. Actual Late Filing Penalties [\$0] + Estimated Non-filer Late Filing Penalties [\$1,282,236] = High End of Estimated Late Filing Penalties [\$1,282,236].

B. Projected Annual Costs for Fiscal Year 2021-2022 and Following:

Beginning in fiscal year 2021-2022, future statewide costs are estimated to range from **\$7,513,209** to **\$10,763,822** annually.

The low end of the range assumes that the same claimants that filed reimbursement claims for the initial period of reimbursement will continue to file annual reimbursement claims, that the backlog of 5,830 untested kits is completed, and that the number of sexual assault evidence kits to be tested annually remains unchanged from 2020, as follows:

1. Initial Activity 1.a. Costs [\$271,541] / 1.5 (to account for the initial reimbursement period length of one and one-half years) = Annual Activity 1.a. Costs [\$181,027].
2. Initial Activity 2.a. and 2.b. Costs [\$8,005,350] / 1.5 years = Annual Activity 2. Costs [\$5,336,900].
3. Annual Activity 1.a. Costs [\$181,027] + Annual Activity 2. Costs [\$5,336,900] = Annual Direct Costs [\$5,517,927].
4. Indirect Cost Rate [0.48] x Annual Direct Costs [\$5,517,927] = Annual Indirect Costs [\$2,648,605].

5. Annual Direct and Indirect Costs [\$8,166,532] x Offsetting Rate [8%] = Annual Offsetting Revenues [\$653,323].
6. Annual Direct and Indirect Costs [\$8,166,532] – Annual Offsetting Revenues [\$653,323] = Low End Projected Future Annual Costs [\$7,513,209, plus the implicit price deflator].

The high end of the range assumes that all eligible claimants will file annual claims, that the backlog of 5,830 untested kits is completed during the initial reimbursement period, and that the number of sexual assault evidence kits remains unchanged from 2020:

1. Estimated Initial Activity 1.a. Costs [\$2,299,913] + (Activity 2. Costs for calendar year 2020 [\$6,372,000] x 1.5-year initial reimbursement period) = Direct Costs [\$11,857,913].
2. Direct Costs [\$11,857,913] / 1.5 (to account for the initial reimbursement period length of one and one-half years) = Annual Direct Costs [\$7,905,275].
3. Indirect Cost Rate [48%] x Annual Direct Costs [\$7,905,275] = Annual Indirect Costs [\$3,794,532].
4. Annual Direct and Indirect Costs [\$11,699,807] x Offsetting Rate [8%] = Annual Offsetting Revenues [\$935,985].
5. Annual Direct and Indirect Costs [\$11,699,807] – Annual Offsetting Revenues [\$935,985] = High End Estimated Annual Costs for 2021-2022 and Following [\$10,763,822, plus the implicit price deflator].

Draft Proposed Statewide Cost Estimate

On August 19, 2022, Commission staff issued the Draft Proposed Statewide Cost Estimate.¹⁴ No comments were filed on the Draft Proposed Statewide Cost Estimate.

Conclusion

On September 23, 2022, the Commission adopted this Statewide Cost Estimate of \$11,218,184 - \$22,758,009 for the Initial Claim Period (Second Half Fiscal Year 2019-2020 and Fiscal Year 2020-2021) and \$7,513,209- \$10,763,822, plus the implicit price deflator for fiscal year 2021-2022 and following.

¹⁴ Exhibit B, Draft Proposed Statewide Cost Estimate, issued August 19, 2022.

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY EMAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

I am a resident of the County of Sacramento and I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My place of employment is 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 95814.

On September 27, 2022, I served the:

- **Statewide Cost Estimate adopted September 23, 2022**

Sexual Assault Evidence Kits: Testing, 20-TC-01

Penal Code Section 680 as Amended by Statutes 2019, Chapter 588 (SB 22)

City of San Diego, Claimant

by making it available on the Commission's website and providing notice of how to locate it to the email addresses provided on the attached mailing list.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on September 27, 2022 at Sacramento, California.



Jill L. Magee

Commission on State Mandates

980 Ninth Street, Suite 300

Sacramento, CA 95814

(916) 323-3562

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Mailing List

Last Updated: 8/19/22

Claim Number: 20-TC-01

Matter: Sexual Assault Evidence Kits: Testing

Claimant: City of San Diego

TO ALL PARTIES, INTERESTED PARTIES, AND INTERESTED PERSONS:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.3.)

Manny Alvarez Jr., Executive Director, *Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training*
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100, West Sacramento, CA 95605
Phone: (916) 227-3909
Manny.Alvarez@post.ca.gov

Lili Apgar, Specialist, *State Controller's Office*
Local Reimbursements Section, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-0254
lapgar@sco.ca.gov

Socorro Aquino, *State Controller's Office*
Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 322-7522
SAquino@sco.ca.gov

Aaron Avery, Legislative Representative, *California Special Districts Association*
1112 I Street Bridge, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 442-7887
Aarona@cnda.net

Cindy Black, City Clerk, *City of St. Helena*
1480 Main Street, St. Helena, CA 94574
Phone: (707) 968-2742
ctzafoopoulos@cityofsthenela.org

Guy Burdick, Consultant, *MGT Consulting*
2251 Harvard Street, Suite 134, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 833-7775
gburdick@mgtconsulting.com

Allan Burdick,

7525 Myrtle Vista Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95831
Phone: (916) 203-3608
allanburdick@gmail.com

Evelyn Calderon-Yee, Bureau Chief, *State Controller's Office*
Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 740,
Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 324-5919
ECalderonYee@sco.ca.gov

Annette Chinn, *Cost Recovery Systems, Inc.*
705-2 East Bidwell Street, #294, Folsom, CA 95630
Phone: (916) 939-7901
achinnrcs@aol.com

Carolyn Chu, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*
925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 319-8326
Carolyn.Chu@lao.ca.gov

Michael Coleman, *Coleman Advisory Services*
2217 Isle Royale Lane, Davis, CA 95616
Phone: (530) 758-3952
coleman@munil.com

Kris Cook, Assistant Program Budget Manager, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, 10th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
Kris.Cook@dof.ca.gov

Donna Ferebee, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, Suite 1280, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-8918
donna.ferebee@dof.ca.gov

Jim Grottkau, Bureau Chief, *Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training*
Basic Training, 860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100, West Sacramento, CA 95605
Phone: (916) 227-3909
Jim.Grottkau@post.ca.gov

Heather Halsey, Executive Director, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
heather.halsey@csm.ca.gov

Sunny Han, Project Manager, *City of Huntington Beach*
2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, CA 92648
Phone: (714) 536-5907
Sunny.han@surfcity-hb.org

Chris Hill, Principal Program Budget Analyst, *Department of Finance*
Local Government Unit, 915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
Chris.Hill@dof.ca.gov

Tiffany Hoang, Associate Accounting Analyst, *State Controller's Office*
Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 740,
Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 323-1127
THoang@sco.ca.gov

Jason Jennings, Director, *Maximus Consulting*
Financial Services, 808 Moorefield Park Drive, Suite 205, Richmond, VA 23236
Phone: (804) 323-3535
SB90@maximus.com

Jeffrey Jordon, Captain, *City of San Diego*
Claimant Representative
San Diego Police Department, 1401 Broadway, San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 756-5264
jjordon@pd.sandiego.gov

Angelo Joseph, Supervisor, *State Controller's Office*
Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 740,
Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-0706
AJoseph@sco.ca.gov

Anita Kerezsi, *AK & Company*
2425 Golden Hill Road, Suite 106, Paso Robles, CA 93446
Phone: (805) 239-7994
akcompanysb90@gmail.com

Joanne Kessler, Fiscal Specialist, *City of Newport Beach*
Revenue Division, 100 Civic Center Drive , Newport Beach, CA 90266
Phone: (949) 644-3199
jkessler@newportbeachca.gov

Lisa Kurokawa, Bureau Chief for Audits, *State Controller's Office*
Compliance Audits Bureau, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 327-3138
lkurokawa@sco.ca.gov

Alison Leary, Deputy General Counsel, *League of California Cities*
1400 K Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 658-8200
aleary@cacities.org

Fernando Lemus, Principal Accountant - Auditor, *County of Los Angeles*
Auditor-Controller's Office, 500 West Temple Street, Room 603, Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 974-0324
flemus@auditor.lacounty.gov

Erika Li, Chief Deputy Director, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, 10th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
erika.li@dof.ca.gov

Amber Lozano, *Department of Justice*
Child Protection Program, Room H122, 4949 Broadway, Sacramento, CA 95820
Phone: (916) 227-3263
amber.lozano@doj.ca.gov

Everett Luc, Accounting Administrator I, Specialist, *State Controller's Office*
3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 323-0766
ELuc@sco.ca.gov

Jill Magee, Program Analyst, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
Jill.Magee@csm.ca.gov

Corrie Manning, Assistant General Counsel, *League of California Cities*
1400 K Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 658-8200
cmanning@cacities.org

Darryl Mar, Manager, *State Controller's Office*
3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: (916) 323-0706
DMar@sco.ca.gov

Brian Marvel, President, *Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)*
4010 Truxel Road, Sacramento, CA 95834
Phone: (916) 928-3777
president@porac.org

Elizabeth McGinnis, *Commission on State Mandates*
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
Elizabeth.McGinnis@csm.ca.gov

Jane McPherson, Financial Services Director, *City of Oceanside*
300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside, CA 92054
Phone: (760) 435-3055
JmcPherson@oceansideca.org

Michelle Mendoza, *MAXIMUS*
17310 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 340, Irvine, CA 95403
Phone: (949) 440-0845
michellemendoza@maximus.com

Lourdes Morales, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*
925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 319-8320
Lourdes.Morales@LAO.CA.GOV

Marilyn Munoz, Senior Staff Counsel, *Department of Finance*
915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-8918
Marilyn.Munoz@dof.ca.gov

Andy Nichols, *Nichols Consulting*
1857 44th Street, Sacramento, CA 95819
Phone: (916) 455-3939
andy@nichols-consulting.com

Arthur Palkowitz, *Artiano Shinoff*
2488 Historic Decatur Road, Suite 200, San Diego, CA 92106
Phone: (619) 232-3122
apalkowitz@as7law.com

Johnnie Pina, Legislative Policy Analyst, *League of Cities*

1400 K Street, Suite 400, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 658-8214
jpina@cacities.org

Jai Prasad, *County of San Bernardino*

Office of Auditor-Controller, 222 West Hospitality Lane, 4th Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0018
Phone: (909) 386-8854
jai.prasad@sbcountyatc.gov

Cindy Sconce, Director, *MGT*

Performance Solutions Group, 3600 American River Drive, Suite 150, Sacramento, CA 95864
Phone: (916) 276-8807
csconce@mgtconsulting.com

Carla Shelton, *Commission on State Mandates*

980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
carla.shelton@csm.ca.gov

Camille Shelton, Chief Legal Counsel, *Commission on State Mandates*

980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 323-3562
camille.shelton@csm.ca.gov

Natalie Sidarous, Chief, *State Controller's Office*

Local Government Programs and Services Division, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816
Phone: 916-445-8717
NSidarous@sco.ca.gov

Michelle Skaggs Lawrence, City Manager, *City of Oceanside*

300 North Coast Highway, Oceanside, CA 92054
Phone: (760) 435-3055
citymanager@oceansideca.org

Brittany Thompson, Budget Analyst, *Department of Finance*

Local Government Unit, 915 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-3274
Brittany.Thompson@dof.ca.gov

Jolene Tollenaar, *MGT Consulting Group*

2251 Harvard Street, Suite 134, Sacramento, CA 95815
Phone: (916) 243-8913
jolenetollenaar@gmail.com

Evelyn Tseng, *City of Newport Beach*

100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660
Phone: (949) 644-3127
etseng@newportbeachca.gov

Brian Uhler, Principal Fiscal & Policy Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*

925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 319-8328
Brian.Uhler@LAO.CA.GOV

Antonio Velasco, Revenue Auditor, *City of Newport Beach*

100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach, CA 92660

Phone: (949) 644-3143
avelasco@newportbeachca.gov

Matthew Vespi, Chief Financial Officer, *City of San Diego*

Claimant Contact

202 C Street, 9th Floor, San Diego, CA 92101

Phone: (619) 236-6218

mvespi@sandiego.gov

Renee Wellhouse, *David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc.*

3609 Bradshaw Road, H-382, Sacramento, CA 95927

Phone: (916) 797-4883

dwa-renee@surewest.net

Jeannine Willie, *California Department of Justice (D-01)*

Missing Persons DNA Program, 4949 Broadway, Room A132, Sacramento, CA 95820

Phone: (916) 227-5997

jeannine.willie@doj.ca.gov

Jacqueline Wong-Hernandez, Deputy Executive Director for Legislative Affairs, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*

1100 K Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 650-8104

jwong-hernandez@counties.org

Elisa Wynne, Staff Director, *Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee*

California State Senate, State Capitol Room 5019, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 651-4103

elisa.wynne@sen.ca.gov