

REPORT TO THE
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

July 1982

LOCAL GOVERNMENT CLAIMS BILL
Revenue and Taxation Code, Section 2255

1 -

STATE BOARD OF CONTROL

David E. Janssen, Chairman

Edwin W. Beach, Member

Kenneth Cory, Member

Theresa Cook, Member

Zev Yaroslavsky, Member

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
• Preface	1
• Statement of Reasons Supporting Reimbursement of State Mandated Costs Incurred Under Statutes and Regulations	3
Included in this report are statutes and regulations that were:	
• Adjudicated prior to January 1, 1981:	
- Chapter 276, Statutes of 1976--Energy Forecasting	3
- Chapter 357, Statutes of 1978--Zoning Consistency	4
- Chapter 718, Statutes of 1978--Limitation of Juror Days	5
- Chapter 1046, Statutes of 1976--Property Appraisals	5
- Chapter 1363, Statutes of 1978--Mentally Incompetent Voter Disqualification	6
- Title 20, CAC, Chapter 2--SIC Codes	6
- P.U.C. Decision 90144 & 91091--Uniformed Safety Attendants	7
• Adjudicated Pursuant to Chapter 1256, Statutes of 1980 (SB 90 Russell)	
- Chapter 946, Statutes of 1973 (and implementing regulations, Title 19, CAC, 17.33 and 18.07)--Standards for High Rise Structures	8
- Chapter 282, 1035, and 1039; Statutes of 1979--School Crossing Guards	9
- Chapter 1060, Statutes of 1980--Detention of Stray Cats	10
- Chapter 1399, Statutes of 1976--Custody of Minors	10
- Chapter 1435, Statutes of 1974--Vocational Rehabilitation	11
• Summary of Recommended Expenditures	13

Preface

This report was prepared to fulfill the requirements of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255. This statutory provision was recently amended by Chapter 327, Statutes of 1982.

As amended, the Section requires that:

2255. (a) At least twice each calendar year the Board of Control shall report to the Legislature on the number of mandates it has found and the estimated statewide costs of such mandates. This report shall identify the statewide costs estimated for each mandate and the reasons for recommending reimbursement. The report may be included in the report required by Section 13928 of the Government Code. Immediately upon receipt of the report, a local government claims bill shall be introduced in the Legislature. The local government claims bill, at the time of its introduction, shall provide for an appropriation sufficient to pay the estimated costs of these mandates pursuant to the provisions of this article.

The section further requires that, in the event the Legislature deletes funding for a mandate recommended in this report, one of six findings may be included in the local government claims bill. In those cases where the Legislature determines that the statute or regulation contains a mandate, the Legislature must further conclude that either: 1) the mandate is not reimbursable; 2) the mandate (if it is a regulation) should be repealed by the Office of Administrative Law; or 3) the mandate shall not be enforced until other funds become available. In those cases where the Legislature determines that no mandate has really been imposed, such a finding may be amended into the bill. Lastly, the Legislature, when it cannot determine whether a mandate exists, shall either: 1) declare that the legislation shall be suspended until a court makes a mandate determination; or 2) declare the law or regulation to remain in effect unless a court determines that a reimbursable mandate exists. In this last instance, the law or regulation would be suspended upon issuance of a court order determining a reimbursable mandate, and it could not be restored until funding became available.

This report covers estimates prepared for mandated costs incurred under 12 laws and regulations for which estimates were approved on May 27, 1982. Of these 12, two have previously been reviewed by the Legislature under the unfunded mandate process that existed prior to January 1, 1981. The total cost of these unfunded mandates is more than \$67.9 million.

This report was prepared by Ray Banion, Program Manager of the Board of Control's Local Mandate Unit, under the direction of Gary Longholm, Executive Officer.

Statement of Reasons Supporting
Reimbursement of State Mandated Costs
Incurred Under Statutes and Regulations

This report recommends that the Legislature fund costs associated with ten unfunded statutes, one regulation, and one executive order. The following discussion sets forth the reasons for recommending these appropriations.

The unfunded mandates are divided into two categories: 1) mandates determined prior to January 1, 1981; and 2) mandates determined after Chapter 1256, Statutes of 1980 (SB 90-Russell) became effective on January 1, 1981. Under the Pre-SB 90 (Russell) process, the Board of Control received a single "test" claim against a particular statute or executive order which allegedly mandated that a new program or higher level of service be provided by local agencies or school districts, and that, consequently, increased "costs mandated by the state" were being incurred. If the Board concurred with the claimant's allegations, then parameters and guidelines for reimbursement of costs associated with the newly identified unfunded mandates were developed.

Next, all eligible local governments filed "reimbursement" claims with the Board of Control, which were audited by the State Controller and approved for payment by the Board of Control. Such claims were included in the local government claims bill and, pending approval by the Legislature and the Governor, were paid from the General Fund. Pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2231(b), the Department of Finance then began including appropriations for the newly funded mandates in the State Budget and the Budget Bill. Such appropriations covered costs to be incurred in the fiscal year addressed by the particular Budget. Consequently, the Board would still receive claims for costs incurred from the earliest reimbursable fiscal year to the first fiscal year for which an appropriation was included in the Budget Act.

Pursuant to Chapter 1256, Statutes of 1980 this old process was officially ended. This statute provided for the same process up to the date that parameters and guidelines were adopted. However, at this point, rather than approving individual claims by local entities, the Board is now required to recommend a statewide estimate sufficient to fund all claims under a given mandate. If approved by the Legislature, the monies are appropriated to the Controller who then audits and pays specific claims.

Estimates have been submitted for all of the mandates presented in this report. However, it should be pointed out that the Legislature has reviewed individual claims under three mandates: Chapter 1046, Statutes of 1976--Property Appraisals; Title 20, CAC, Chapter 2--Standard Industrial Code (SIC) classification; and P.U.C. Decisions 90144 and 91091--Uniformed Safety Attendants. The specific actions on these claims is included in the following statements, which list the amounts of the estimates, eligible claimants, fiscal effects, and specific findings supporting reimbursement.

ESTIMATES FOR MANDATES ADJUDICATED PRIOR TO ENACTMENT OF CHAPTER 1256, STATUTES OF 1980 (SB 90-Russell)

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. <u>Mandate:</u> Chapter 276, Statutes of 1974 | <u>Amount:</u> \$772,000 |
| <u>ENERGY FORECASTING</u> | <u>Fiscal Years:</u> 1978-79 |
| <u>Eligible Claimants:</u> Cities, Special Districts 1982-83 | through 1982-83 |

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. This legislation requires utilities to submit forecasts of their electricity demand, supply, and prices to the California Energy Commission (CEC). These forecasts, which must be prepared biennially, make 5-, 12-, and 20-year projections in accordance with the Common Forecasting Methodology adopted by the CEC.
- B. Since the forecasting requirements had never existed under prior law, publicly owned utilities were compelled to provide a "new program" resulting in "costs mandated by the state".
- C. Although publicly owned utilities could recoup costs through an increase in user's fees, the Board found that this was not a valid reason for denying the claim pursuant to the provisions of the Revenue and Taxation Code. At the time the test claim was heard, Section 2253.2(b)(4) directed the Board to deny such claims only when "the chaptered bill provided for self-financing authority". Chapter 276, Statutes of 1978 provided no self-financing authority. Section 2253.2(b)(4) now requires the Board to deny a claim whenever a "local agency or school district has the authority to levy service charges, fees or assessments sufficient to pay for the mandated program". However, the Board has generally applied the law in effect at the time a claim is filed, unless otherwise directed to do so by the Legislature.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$772,000 has been incurred by publicly owned utilities in order to comply with this mandate during the 1978-79 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate, and, pursuant to the provisions of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.

2. Mandate: Chapter 357, Statutes of 1978
ZONING CONSISTENCY

Amount: \$628,208
Fiscal Years: 1978-79
through
1981-82

Eligible Claimants: City of Los Angeles

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. This legislation requires that any charter city with a population of two million or more make its zoning ordinances consistent with its General Plan.
- B. With concurrence of the Department of Finance, the Board determined that this statute imposed "costs mandated by the state" upon the city of Los Angeles.
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, reimbursement was approved for costs related to the inventorying, reviewing, and, where necessary, the updating of base maps; the field surveying of "inconsistent" areas; and the preparation and presentation, in public hearings, of amended zoning ordinances.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$628,208 has been incurred by the City of Los Angeles in order to comply with this mandate during the 1978-79 through 1981-82 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate and, pursuant to the provisions of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.

3. Mandate: Chapter 718, Statutes of 1978
LIMITATION OF JUROR DAYS

Amount: \$1,676,000
Fiscal Years: 1978-79
through
1982-83

Eligible Claimants: Counties

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. This statute provides that a trial juror is obligated to serve only ten court days in a year unless more days must be served in order to complete a specific trial.
- B. Under prior law, such limitations were established by local court rule. Consequently, some local governments would have been able to call fewer jurors who could serve for longer periods of time. Therefore, the Board, in concurrence with the Department of Finance, determined that the statute imposed "an increased level of service" upon counties.
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for the increased costs related to contacting, summoning, and processing warrants for additional jurors. Counties are only reimbursed for those contacts that exceed the total number of contacts made in 1978, the most recent year prior to the effective date of the mandate.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$1,676,000 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1978-79 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate, and, pursuant to the provisions of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.

4. Mandate: Chapter 1046, Statutes of 1976
PROPERTY APPRAISALS

Amount: \$280,000
Fiscal Year: 1977-78
through
1981-82

Eligible Claimants: Counties

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. This statute required that county assessors reappraise all properties at least once every five years. With the passage of Proposition 13, this requirement was removed from all but five types of real property (timberland, historical properties, nonprofit golf courses, California Land Conservation Act Lands, and land owned by other local governments that is located outside of their respective jurisdictions). The statute self-repealed on January 1, 1982.
- B. Under prior law, counties were free to establish their own reappraisal cycles. Consequently, the Board determined, with the concurrence of the Department of Finance, that the statute imposed an "increased level of service" upon counties that reappraised properties less than quintennially.
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for the overall increase in reappraisal workload occurring after the statute became effective.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$280,000 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1977-78 through 1981-82 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.

E. The Legislature has previously considered and deleted ten claims totaling \$390,260 under this mandate. This action, taken in Chapter 1090, Statutes of 1981, represented a reversal of recommendations made by both the Legislative Analyst's Office and the Department of Finance. At that time, it was suggested that any increased costs incurred by counties would be offset by corresponding increases in revenue derived from higher reappraisals. The Board is resubmitting this mandate to the legislature for two reasons: 1) no specific finding or prohibition concerning this statute was enacted in Chapter 1090, Statutes of 1981; and 2) the Board continues to support the assertion by counties that the five eligible property types were reassessed less than quintennially because they had relatively stable, unique values and were difficult to assess.

5. Mandate: Chapter 1363, Statutes of 1978 Amount: \$3,991
MENTALLY INCOMPETENT VOTER DISQUALIFICATION Fiscal Years: 1979-80
through
Eligible Claimants: Counties 1982-83

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. This statute requires that county superior courts conduct a separate proceeding in order to disqualify a voter who has been declared mentally incompetent. This proceeding is mandated when the court grants a petition seeking the establishment of a conservatorship.
- B. Under prior law, counties were authorized to remove the names of voters from the roll automatically, once a person's mental incompetence was legally established. Therefore, the Board determined, with the concurrence of the Department of Finance, that counties were required to provide an "increased level of service" when disqualifying mentally incompetent persons from voting.
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for costs associated with modifying forms and notices; determining whether the alleged ward or conservatee can complete an affidavit of voter registration; and resubmitting the affidavit to disqualified voters at least every two years.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$3,991 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1979-80 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the Controller.

6. Mandate: Title 20, CAC, Chapter 2 Amount: \$675,992
SIC CODES Fiscal Years: 1976-77
through
Eligible Claimants: Publicly owned utilities 1982-83

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. These regulations, promulgated under the authority of Chapter 1195, Statutes of 1974, require utilities to submit Quarterly Fuel and Energy reports to the California Energy Commission. These reports must categorize energy sales to nonresidential customers according to the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code established by the Federal Government.

- B. Under prior law, no such reporting requirement existed for publicly owned utilities. Since such reports were not required, many public utilities were forced to reprogram their computerized billing systems in order to disaggregate the sales as directed. Consequently, the Board determined that the regulations required local agencies owning utilities to provide an "increased level of service".
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for the one-time costs associated with establishing an SIC encoded billing system as well as the ongoing cost of preparing the Quarterly Reports.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$675,992 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1976-77 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the controller.
- E. The Legislature has considered and deleted funds for claims under this mandate which were submitted in three previous local government claims bills; the Governor deleted legislatively approved funds from a fourth local government claims bill. In those cases, the Department of Finance and Legislative Analyst gained support for two arguments against reimbursement: 1) the publicly owned utilities have the ability to recover the costs by increasing their rates; and 2) providing reimbursement would provide a subsidy to customers of the publicly owned utility at the expense of tax payers who are customers of private utilities. The Board is resubmitting this mandate to the Legislature for two reasons: 1) No specific finding or prohibition has ever been made by the Legislature concerning these regulations; 2) at the time the mandate was determined, there existed no statutory basis for denying the test claim because of the existence of alternative methods for paying the mandated costs.

7. <u>Mandate:</u> P.U.C. Decisions 90144 and 91091 UNIFORMED SAFETY ATTENDANTS	<u>Amount:</u> \$498,817 <u>Fiscal Years:</u> 1980-81 through 1982-83
<u>Eligible Claimants:</u> Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. Following the Transbay Tube Fire in January 1979, the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) issued these decisions, which required BART to station uniformed safety attendants on trains traveling specified routes. These decisions were enforced under the authority of Public Utilities Code Section 29047, which empowers the P.U.C. to issue "regulations...for the purpose of safety to employees (of BART) and the general public."
- B. BART alleged that it was entitled to reimbursement for costs mandated by the state because the decisions are executive orders that, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2207(c), "implemented...a state statute and...by such implementation...increases program levels above the levels required prior to January 1, 1973; therefore, the Board concluded that an "increased level of service" had been imposed.

- C. The Board further determined that it lacked authority to deny the test claim because the claimant had the authority to collect fees to cover the increased costs. At the time the test claim was filed, (March 12, 1980), there existed no statutory provision directing the Board to deny test claims under executive orders on the basis that self-financing authority existed. Such a provision now exists in Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2253.2(b)(4). Unless otherwise directed by statute, the Board of Control does not retroactively apply such changes in the Revenue and Taxation Code, when the retroactive application would harm the claimant's interests.
- D. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for costs associated with the hiring of additional safety personnel (called "emergency procedures advisors") on designated trains.
- E. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$498,817 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1980-81 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate, and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.
- F. The Legislature has previously reviewed and deleted claims under this mandate which were submitted in Chapter 1090, Statutes of 1981. These claims covered costs incurred during the 1978-79 and 1979-80 fiscal years; consequently, no estimates for those fiscal years are being submitted. At the time the claims were deleted on the Assembly side (they had been approved in the Senate), the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst opined that 1) the new self-financing provisions of the Revenue and Taxation Code should be applied; and 2) the new safety requirement did not increase the level of services required because it merely affirmed what the "duty" of BART in the area of public safety had always been. The Board is resubmitting this mandate to the Legislature because no specific finding or prohibition has ever been made by the Legislature concerning these executive orders.

ESTIMATES FOR MANDATES ADJUDICATED UNDER CHAPTER 1256, STATUTES OF 1980 (SB 90-Russell)

8. <u>Mandate:</u> Chapter 946, Statutes of 1973 and implementing regulations (Title 19, CAC, Sections 17.11 and 18.07)	<u>Amount:</u> 1,880,740 <u>Fiscal Years:</u> 1977-78 through 1982-83
STANDARDS FOR HIGH RISE STRUCTURES	

Eligible Claimants: Local Agencies (including fire departments and fire districts)

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. Among numerous other provisions, this statute authorized the State Fire Marshal to promulgate regulations effecting fire safety and requiring local agencies to ensure compliance with such regulations. Title 19, CAC, Section 17.33 and 18.07 set standards for the prevention of fire and the protection of life and property against fire in existing and new high rise structures.

- B. The Board determined that, to the extent that local agencies incurred costs as a result of ensuring compliance with the standards, that the "crimes and infractions" disclaimer contained in Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2253.2(c)(2) was inapplicable. That section requires that the Board "shall not consider" a claim when the "chaptered bill created...or...eliminated a crime or infraction, or changed the penalty for a crime or infraction;" however, it also limits this restriction to "that portion of chaptered bill relating directly to the enforcement of the crime or infraction." The Board determined that a reimbursable mandate existed because: (1) the regulations in question did not create, change or eliminate a crime or infraction; 2) the regulations established minimum safety standards; and 3) local agencies were required to inspect facilities in order to make the standards applicable to individual high rise facilities.
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for costs related to inspecting high rise structures and reviewing relevant reports, correspondence, and plans.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$1,880,740 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1977-78 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the Controller.

9. Mandate: Chapter 282, 1035, and 1039; Statutes of 1979 Amount: \$6,131
SCHOOL CROSSING GUARDS Fiscal Years: 1980-81
Eligible Claimants: County of Santa Cruz through 1982-83

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. These statutes allowed either the county board of supervisors or individual school districts to establish school crossing guard programs. Under prior law, no such option was necessary because the California Highway Patrol administered the program. The statutes further provided that any school districts that chose to implement the school crossing guard program would be entitled to reimbursement from the county road fund.
- B. The claimant alleged that, although school districts had an option to provide the program, counties were mandated to provide reimbursement. Moreover, the claimant alleged that, in adopting a school crossing guard program, for use by participating schools in the county, it was ensuring the minimum reimbursement and providing a more cost-effective method of providing the services than would have been possible if each school district developed its own program. Consequently, the Board determined that, 1) pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2207(h), a "new requirement" (for counties) had been added to an "existing optional program or service"; 2) increased costs resulted; and 3) "no reasonable alternatives" to providing the services existed.
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for costs associated with the employment of school crossing guards, including salaries and employee benefits, necessary travel-related expenses, specialized clothing and equipment, and allowable overhead costs. Santa Cruz County is the only county eligible for reimbursement of these costs because it was the only county without such a program at the time the legislation became effective (thereby allowing school districts to exercise their option).

D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$6,131 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1980-81 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate, and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.

10. Mandate: Chapter 1060, Statutes of 1980 Amount: \$8,675,000
DETENTION OF STRAY CATS Fiscal Years: 1980-81
through
Eligible Claimants: Counties (except Los Angeles) and Cities 1982-83

Specific Findings Supporting Payment:

- A. This statute requires that stray cats be detained in animal control facilities for at least 72 hours before being destroyed. Prior to enactment of Chapter 1060/80, there was no statutory requirement to hold cats for a specified period of time prior to euthanasia.
- B. Pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2207(f), which defines "costs mandated by the state" as resulting when "any statute...removes an option previously available", the Board determined that a reimbursable mandate existed under Chapter 1060/80. In public testimony, the Department of Finance supported the Board's determination.
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for costs related to the necessary expansion of animal detention services, including personnel, cages, food, litter and cleaning supplies.
- D. The Department of Finance estimated that \$8,675,000 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1980-81 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate, and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.

11. Mandate: Chapter 1399, Statutes of 1976 Amount: \$3,691,000
CUSTODY OF MINORS Fiscal Years: 1977-78
through
Eligible Claimants: Counties 1982-83

Specific Activities Supporting Reimbursement:

- A. This statute requires counties to undertake specified activities in order to assist resolution of child custody disputes and enforce child custody decrees. Specifically, the law requires the District Attorney's Office to represent persons having custody of a child and assist them in gaining enforcement of custody decrees, in locating their children when they are unlawfully taken away, in defraying expenses related to the return of an illegally detained or concealed child, in proceeding with civil court action, and in guaranteeing appearance of offenders in court actions. Under prior law, the District Attorney was under no statutory obligation to assist or represent a parent or other person having custody of a child.
- B. With the concurrence of the Department of Finance, the Board determined that Chapter 1399, Statutes of 1980 imposed an "increased level of service" upon counties.

- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for activities necessary to assisting a child's custodian, including investigation, mediation, legal representation, service of warrants, preparation of reports, foster care, etc, provided that reimbursements be reduced by any costs assessed against an offender.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$3,691,000 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1977-78 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.

12. Mandate: Chapter 1435, Statutes of 1974
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Amount: \$49,122,000
Fiscal Years: 1978-79
 through
 1982-83

Eligible Claimants: Local agencies and school districts

Specific Findings Supporting Reimbursement:

- A. This statute seeks to ensure that any public (or private) employee would be guaranteed vocational rehabilitation in the event of a serious injury suffered while on the job. In order to accomplish this goal, all local agencies and school districts must establish an administrative system to ensure that Qualified Injured Workers receive the vocational rehabilitation necessary to help them regain employment. Under prior law, employers were only required to provide disability payments to injured employees.
- B. After the Legislature enacted this statute, the Attorney General issued an opinion declaring that the law did not apply to local agencies and school districts. However, the California Supreme Court, in refusing to hear the Slotten case, upheld an Appeals Court ruling that local agencies and school districts must comply with this statute. Consequently, the Board determined, with the support of the Department of Finance, that "an increased level of service" was imposed.
- C. In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Board approved reimbursement for either 1) increased insurance premiums or 2) increased costs (of self-insured entities) resulting from the establishment of "rehabilitation units" responsible for administering the program and providing various benefits directly to the QIW's.
- D. The Department of Finance has estimated that \$49,122,000 has been incurred in order to comply with this mandate during the 1978-79 through 1982-83 fiscal years. The Board approved this estimate, and, pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255, recommends that the Legislature appropriate the approved amount to the State Controller.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED EXPENDITURES

Reflecting Actions taken by the State Board of
Control May 27 through June 30, 1982

I. Appropriations to the Controller based on estimated statewide costs of unfunded mandates, submitted pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 2255.

A. Statutes - Estimates for Mandates Adjudicated prior to Enactment of Chapter 1256, Statutes of 1980 (SB 90-Russell)

1. Chapter 276, Statutes of 1974--Energy Forecasting \$772,000 (Rounded)

Eligible: Cities, Special Districts

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1978-79	\$ 476
1979-80	87,809
1980-81	203,106
1981-82	230,000
1982-83	250,000

2. Chapter 357, Statutes of 1978--Zoning Consistency \$628,208

Eligible: City of Los Angeles

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1978-79	\$ 82,054
1979-80	151,777
1980-81	102,645
1981-82	291,732

3. Chapter 718, Statutes of 1978--Limitation of Juror Days \$1,676,000 (Rounded)

Eligible: Counties

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1978-79	\$ 134,415
1979-80	229,303
1980-81	223,041
1981-82	522,285
1982-83	566,680

4. Chapter 1046, Statutes of 1976--Property Appraisals¹ \$280,000 (Rounded)

Eligible: Counties

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1977-78	\$ 23,471
1978-79	-0-
1979-80	187,047
1980-81	44,623
1981-82	23,673

5. Chapter 1363, Statutes of 1978--Mentally Incompetent 3,991

Eligible: Counties

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1979-80	\$ 626
1980-81	957
1981-82	1,155
1982-83	1,253

B. Executive Orders--Estimates for Mandates Adjudicated Prior to Enactment of Chapter 1256, Statutes of 1980 (SB 90-Russell)

1. Title 20, CAC, Chapter 2--SIC Codes¹ \$675,992

Eligible: Cities, Special Districts

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1976-77	\$ 81,029
1977-78	81,759
1978-79	60,780
1979-80	59,666
1980-81	94,758
1981-82	143,000
1982-83	155,000

¹ Individual reimbursement claims previously submitted to the Legislature and deleted.

2. P.U.C. Decision 90144 & 91091--Uniformed Safety Attendants \$498,817

Eligible: BART

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1980-81	\$ 157,531
1981-82	163,686
1982-83	177,600

C. Statutes - Estimates for Mandates Adjudicated Pursuant to Chapter 1256, Statutes of 1980 (SB 90-Russell)

- Chapter 946, Statutes of 1973 (and implementing regulations, Title 19, CAC, 17.33 and 18.07)--Standards for High Rise Structures \$ 1,880,740
Eligible: Local Agencies (fire departments and fire districts) \$1,880,740

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1977-78 (Six months City & County of San Francisco only)	\$ 67,581
1978-79 (City and County of San Francisco only)	147,186
1979-80	634,922
1980-81	327,007
1981-82	330,281
1982-83	373,763

- Chapter 282, 1035, and 1039; Statutes of 1979--School Crossing Guards \$6,131

Eligible: County of Santa Cruz

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1980-81	\$ 1,878
1981-82	2,040
1982-83	2,213

¹ Individual reimbursement claims previously submitted to the Legislature and deleted.

3. Chapter 1060, Statutes of 1980--Detention of Stray Cats \$ 8,675,000

Eligible: Counties and Cities

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1980-81	\$1,705,000
1981-82	3,285,000
1982-83	3,565,000
One-time start up	120,000

4. Chapter 1399, Statutes of 1976--Custody of Minors \$ 3,691,000
(Rounded)

Eligible: Counties

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1977-78	\$ 48,000 (San Bernardino only)
1978-79	598,000
1979-80	653,000
1980-81	714,000
1981-82	781,000
1982-83	847,000
1978-83	50,000 (Los Angeles County)

5. Chapter 1435, Statutes of 1974--Vocational Rehabilitation \$ 49,122,000

Eligible: All local agencies and school districts

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1978-79	\$1,530,000
1979-80	4,822,000
1980-81	11,585,000
1981-82	14,958,000
1982-83	16,227,000

GRAND TOTAL \$ 67,909,879.00