



CLOSING THE \$60 BILLION BUDGET GAP

The amendments to the 2009-10 Budget are the culmination of California's effort to restore balance to a state budget that has been decimated by the worst budget crisis in the state's history.

In February, the state enacted \$36 billion in solutions to what was then estimated to be a \$42 billion General Fund budget gap (the additional \$6 billion in solutions failed to pass at the special election in May). The amendments to the 2009-10 budget include another \$24 billion in solutions to address the further deterioration of the state's fiscal situation identified in the May Revision. The \$60 billion in budget solutions adopted this year addresses the largest budget gap the state has ever faced, both in dollar amount and in the percent of General Fund revenues it represents.

COMPONENTS OF THE \$60 BILLION BUDGET GAP

Figure INT-01 displays the components of the \$60 billion budget gap the state has faced in developing the budget for 2009-10. As the figure shows, the largest contributor to the budget gap is the reduction in the baseline revenue forecast for 2008-09 and 2009-10. This reduction is due almost entirely to the economic recession. In May 2008, the Department of Finance forecast the output of the state's economy (as measured by personal income) to be \$1.589 trillion in 2008, \$1.655 trillion in 2009 and \$1.739 trillion


CLOSING THE \$60 BILLION BUDGET GAP

in 2010. In the May 2009 forecast, the equivalent values were \$1.559 trillion, \$1.543 trillion and \$1.564 trillion, reflecting reductions of 1.9 percent, 6.8 percent and 10.1 percent, respectively. General Fund revenues are very sensitive to changes in the economy, so these reductions in economic output translated into massive reductions in the baseline revenue forecasts between May of 2008 and May of 2009 of 20.4 percent for 2008-09 and 22.7 percent in 2009-10. Figure INT-02 shows General Fund revenues over the last decade and demonstrates how severely the recession has affected revenues in the last two years.

Figure INT-01
Development of the \$60 Billion Budget Gap
 (Dollars in Billions)


June 30, 2010 Reserve forecast in September 2008	-\$1.0
Changes to Reserve:	
Two-year Reduction in Baseline Revenues	-47.3
Two-year Change in Workload Spending	-10.8
Target Reserve at Budget Agreement	-0.9
	<hr/>
Budget Gap	<u><u>-\$60.0</u></u>

Figure INT-02



Spending growth also contributed to the budget gap. For much of the last decade, state spending grew faster than population and inflation. As Figure INT-03 shows the budget reduces spending below the population and inflation trends. While the figure shows that spending grew sharply in 2004-05 and 2006-07, it is important to note that about half of the increase was due to repayment of debts incurred during the last state budget crisis and to the loss of one-time solutions adopted during that crisis.

Figure INT-03



SOLUTIONS TO CLOSE THE \$60 BILLION BUDGET GAP

Figure INT-04 displays the \$60 billion in budget solutions enacted this year. The solutions are wide-ranging, touching all three of the state’s major revenue sources and cutting spending in virtually every state program that receives General Fund support.

Figure INT-04
How the \$60 Billion Budget Gap Was Closed
 (Dollars in Millions)

	2009 Budget Act - enacted in February	Amendments to the Budget Act of 2009	Total Solutions
Cuts	\$14,893	\$16,125	\$31,018
Taxes	12,513	-	12,513
Federal Stimulus	8,016	-	8,016
Other	402	8,034	8,436
Total	\$35,824	\$24,159	\$59,983

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

California’s budget situation is likely to remain challenging for some time for two reasons. First, while the economic forecast projects a recovery from the recession will begin next year, the recovery is not expected to be as robust as in past years. Second, some of the solutions to the budget crisis are one-time, or of limited duration. This is to be expected in the face of such a severe fiscal crisis. It would simply not have been possible to have balanced the budget entirely with permanent tax increases and ongoing spending cuts, given federal, constitutional and other limitations. Further, as much of the current budget shortfall is associated with a temporary economic downturn, the inclusion of some temporary solutions is appropriate. Preliminary projections for the coming fiscal year suggest that the state will face a significant budget shortfall; perhaps in the \$7 to 8 billion range, with even larger shortfalls projected in out-years. However, the state’s ability to manage its way through the nadir of this economic cycle demonstrates a determination and ability to overcome future budget challenges. Moreover, the budget contains a wide range of reforms that will significantly reduce spending growth in the future.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET ACT OF 2009

The Budget Act of 2009 was enacted in February, four months ahead of the constitutional deadline. As the recession deepened throughout the spring, it eroded revenues and put additional pressure on spending, especially in those areas most sensitive to economic downturns like Health and Human Services. The amendments to the Budget Act of 2009 address the additional budget gap of \$24 billion that resulted from the deepening recession.

Figure SWI-01 displays the solutions incorporated in the amendments to the Budget Act of 2009.

Figure SWI-01
Solutions Adopted in the Budget Amendments
(Dollars in Millions)

	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>	<u>Total</u>	
Expenditure Reductions	\$3,708	\$12,417	\$16,125	67%
Fund Shifts	6	999	1,005	4%
Revenue Increases	-	3,492	3,492	14%
Borrowing	-	2,182	2,182	9%
Other	-	1,355	1,355	6%
Total	<u><u>\$3,714</u></u>	<u><u>\$20,445</u></u>	<u><u>\$24,159</u></u>	100%

EXPENDITURE SOLUTIONS


Figure SWI-02 displays the General Fund spending reductions included in the amendments to the Budget Act of 2009.

Figure SWI-02
Amendments to the Budget Act of 2009
Expenditure Solutions
 (Dollars in Millions)

Major General Fund Programs	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Proposition 98	\$2,056.0	\$4,463.1	\$6,519.1
Higher Education (excluding Comm Colleges)	1,431.0	568.8	1,999.8
RDA Shift	-	1,700.0	1,700.0
Corrections and Rehabilitation	-	785.5	785.5
Medi-Cal	-	1,381.8	1,381.8
SSI/SSP	-	108.2	108.2
CalWORKs	-	509.6	509.6
IHSS	-	263.5	263.5
Developmental Services	-	284.0	284.0
Mental Health	-	163.9	163.9
Healthy Families	-	178.6	178.6
CWS and Foster Care	-	120.6	120.6
Other HHS	-	361.6	361.6
Courts	-	168.6	168.6
Employee Compensation	62.5	783.6	846.1
Others	158.0	575.7	733.7
Totals	\$3,707.5	\$12,417.1	\$16,124.6

PROPOSITION 98

Figure SWI-03 displays General Fund expenditures in Proposition 98 funding since 1998-99.



The Proposition 98 minimum guarantee is tied to General Fund revenues. There has been a steep and continued decline in General Fund revenues since the Budget Act was adopted. Therefore, total Proposition 98 funding is reduced by \$2.1 billion in 2008-09 and \$4.5 billion in 2009-10 compared to the levels appropriated in the February Budget Act. However, Proposition 98 General Fund savings are \$5.3 billion in 2009-10 because of a property tax shift of \$850 million from redevelopment agencies to schools.

Federal stimulus funding. The reductions are offset significantly by \$6 billion in federal stimulus funds in 2008-09 and 2009-10—\$3.2 billion from the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) and \$2.8 billion from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). With these reductions described above the state will still maintain the minimum spending level required for receipt of the ARRA State Fiscal Stabilization Fund allocations for K-12 programs.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET ACT OF 2009

Maintenance Factor. The Proposition 98 funding level is certified through legislation at \$49.1 billion for the 2008-09 fiscal year. The legislation also specifies the outstanding maintenance factor, or future funding obligation, at \$11.2 billion. Based on current estimates of General Fund and property tax revenue, the Proposition 98 minimum guarantee for 2008-09 is determined by the "Test 3" calculation, which lowers funding for education programs but also creates the maintenance factor to restore this funding over time as the state's economy and revenues improve. As a result, this maintenance factor would have been created in 2008-09 in the absence of the legislation.

The Proposition 98 minimum guarantee for 2009-10 is estimated at \$50.4 billion. The amount of maintenance factor repaid in 2009-10 is estimated at \$1.17 billion, leaving a remaining balance of \$10.1 billion.

Local flexibility. The \$2.1 billion in 2008-09 savings were achieved by reverting \$1.6 billion in unallocated funds for categorical programs to the General Fund, and by delaying for one year the \$450 million Proposition 98 settle-up payment from prior-year obligations for the Quality Education and Investment Act (QEIA). The Proposition 98 revenue limit funding is redirected in 2009-10 to backfill the reduction in categorical funding and to continue the QEIA program.

The budget continues the Administration's commitment to help school districts better manage their budgets during these tough economic times by providing relief from a variety of requirements attached to 42 categorical programs through fiscal year 2012-13, allowing school districts to transfer funds for any purpose to meet their highest priority needs. In addition, the reduced penalties associated with K-3 Class Size Reduction, allowing districts to retain up to 70 percent of funding if pupil-to-teacher ratios increase more than 25 to 1, continue through 2011-12, providing greater local flexibility.

Classroom funding is protected to the maximum extent possible in 2009-10 by achieving savings through the following actions:

- \$1.8 billion in payments are deferred from the 2009-10 fiscal year to August of the 2010-11 fiscal year from school district revenue limits and community college apportionments.
- \$850 million in General Fund savings are achieved by transferring additional property tax funding to schools. (See Redevelopment Shift.)

The Budget also contains the following reductions and changes in the way the total Proposition 98 funding is allocated to various programs:

- School district and county office of education revenue limit apportionments are reduced by \$2.1 billion. Schools are provided flexibility to reduce instruction by up to five days, if necessary, to accommodate this reduction without losing any incentive funding they receive to maintain a 180-day school year. Schools are also provided additional flexibility to reduce the amount of money they must set aside for facility maintenance and to use funds from the sale of surplus property for non-facility related purposes.
- Basic aid school district categorical programs are reduced by \$80 million to ensure that these schools take a fair share of the reductions and that no schools receive a disproportionate share of the reductions.
- Ongoing Community College funding is reduced by \$580.2 million. (See the “California Community Colleges” heading below for further information.)
- Funding for the charter school facilities is changed from a reimbursement program to an annual grant program—providing budgetary cash relief to charter schools that currently receive these funds.
- Newly established schools that did not have access to certain categorical programs that were block granted will be allowed to apply for funding for programs such as supplemental instruction and regional occupational programs.

Cash Deferrals. Due to state cash flow shortfalls, approximately \$2 billion in K-12 payments for 2009-10 will be moved from scheduled payment dates in the first few months of the 2009-10 fiscal year to December of 2009 and January of 2010. In addition, the payment schedule for K-12 apportionment funding and categorical funding will be revised to distribute five percent of total payments in each of July and August and nine percent in each of the remaining months. This will allow for an even distribution of funding to schools and more predictable outflows from the state General Fund.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES (CCC)

Included as part of the Proposition 98 General Fund solutions, the budget amendments reflect Proposition 98 General Fund savings of \$695.2 million from the February Budget Act for the CCCs in 2009-10, of which \$115 million is one-time in nature.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET ACT OF 2009

For 2009-10, ongoing savings of \$580.2 million include the following: (a) a \$140 million base reduction to apportionments, (b) a net savings of \$116.9 million by eliminating the \$175.2 million growth adjustment for apportionments and shifting \$58.3 million of this amount to base apportionments to partially offset an estimated \$116.7 million property tax shortfall, (c) \$10.2 million by eliminating the growth adjustment for categorical programs, and (d) a \$313.1 million reduction to categorical programs, including elimination of funding for physical plant and equipment. The one-time savings of \$115 million is the net savings achieved through: (a) implementing ongoing apportionment payment deferrals of \$81.5 million in both April and May of 2010 to be paid in July of 2010, which effectively reduces spending on a one-time basis, and (b) partially offsetting this reduction by shifting \$48 million for Career Technical Education funding from Quality Education and Investment Act settle-up appropriations to 2009-10 Proposition 98 funding. Deferrals for CCCs in 2009-10 now total \$703 million.


To minimize the impact of these funding reductions, the budget amendments authorize a \$6 fee increase (from \$20 per credit unit to \$26) for 2009-10, which is anticipated to generate at least \$80 million in local revenue to help mitigate base apportionment reductions. Even with this increase, California will still have the lowest per-unit fee of any community college system in the country. The budget also reappropriates \$5 million in prior year savings to apportionments; and authorizes community college districts limited flexibility to utilize funds from 12 specified categorical programs to augment any categorical program through 2012-13.

Finally, the budget amendments anticipate receipt in 2009-10 of \$130 million in ARRA State Fiscal Stabilization Fund allocations for higher education to partially backfill the categorical reduction. However, similar to anticipated funds for the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU), the specific amounts will not be known until subsequent applications are made to and approved by the federal Department of Education.

HIGHER EDUCATION (EXCLUDING COMMUNITY COLLEGES)

Figure SWI-04 displays General Fund expenditures for higher education programs since 1998-99.

Figure SWI-04



The budget amendments reflect two-year solutions totaling \$2 billion compared to the levels appropriated in the February Budget Act. Specific savings are as follows:

For 2008-09, the budget amendments include one-time unallocated savings totaling \$1.431 billion, consisting of \$715.5 million each from the UC and the CSU systems.

For 2009-10, the budget amendments include savings totaling \$568.8 million that includes: (a) ongoing unallocated reductions of \$266.7 million and \$266.1 million to UC and CSU, respectively, (b) a \$2 million unallocated reduction to Hastings College of the Law, including a \$1 million veto to bring the reduction in state support for Hastings more in line with the General Fund reductions to UC and CSU since the 2008-09 budget was first enacted, (c) \$32 million in one-time savings in the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) budget by shifting a portion of Cal Grant costs to the Student Loan Operating Fund, and (d) a \$2 million reduction to CSAC’s state operations budget. The additional reductions to UC, CSU, and Hastings are necessary to help balance the budget, but provide the segments with the maximum flexibility to balance quality and access objectives. The \$2 million reduction to CSAC’s state operations budget reflects

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET ACT OF 2009

the net change, after a veto, associated with savings that can be achieved through the decentralization of the CalGrant and other financial aid programs to the higher education segments. Decentralization of financial aid programs makes colleges and universities the single point of contact for most student's financial aid needs, thereby better serving students. Further, this change results in ongoing state operations savings and creates greater efficiency at campuses by eliminating the double handling of awards.

With these reductions, the state will still maintain the minimum spending level required for receipt of the ARRA State Fiscal Stabilization Fund allocations for higher education. Thus, it is anticipated that the reductions for UC and CSU will be partially offset with additional State Fiscal Stabilization Fund allocations, based on the formulas prescribed under federal law. It is noted that \$537 million (\$268.5 million each for UC and CSU) was previously allocated to these segments in April to compensate for reductions that were included in the February Budget Act. The budget amendments anticipate an additional \$600 million for each segment from this source; however, the specific amounts will not be known until subsequent applications are made to and approved by the federal Department of Education.

In response to the reductions, both systems are implementing cost containment measures, including employee furloughs, and the CSU has recently acted to further raise systemwide fees by \$672 effective with the fall term. This is on top of the 10-percent increase approved previously which brings the fee level to \$4,026 for undergraduates in 2009-10. Compared to the \$3,048 systemwide fee charged in 2008-09, these actions reflect a 32-percent increase from year to year. The UC is also considering further increases for implementation in the spring term, but to date has not yet acted to do so. Systemwide fees for UC undergraduates in 2009-10 are currently \$7,788, reflecting a 9.3-percent increase from the \$7,126 level charged in 2008-09. Despite the CSU fee increases, CSU fees remain among the lowest of any comparable four-year college in the nation. UC fees, at their current level, also remain below the average of comparable research universities nationwide.

For purposes of assisting the state's cash crisis, the budget package implements one-time delays in payments to UC totaling \$750 million in the months of July through September, \$250 million of which will be paid in October and the remainder between April 10 and June 30 of 2010 as specified in trailer bill legislation. For CSU, the budget package delays on a one-time basis \$290 million from July to be paid in October, 2009.

REDEVELOPMENT SHIFT


The budget amendments include a total of \$1.7 billion shifted from redevelopment agency revenues and fund balances to K-12 schools that serve the redevelopment areas and the housing built by redevelopment agencies. This shift may be made from reserves or current income, including tax increment, proceeds of land sale or bonds, interest or other earned income, or borrowing the 20 percent of the tax increment that is normally dedicated to the low and moderate income housing fund. A redevelopment agency may also have its parent agency pay in its stead.

The same amount of base school property tax is shifted to the county-level Supplemental Revenue Augmentation Funds (SRAF). From these funds, \$850 million will be used to fund courts, prisons, and Medi-Cal, hospital, and K-12 school bond expenses that would otherwise be funded from the state General Fund. The other \$850 million is used to fund K-12 school costs offsetting Proposition 98 General Fund costs.

CORRECTIONS

Figure SWI-05 displays General Fund expenditures for Corrections since 1998-99. As a result of federal stimulus funding and an offset with Proposition 1A/redevelopment shift, General Fund expenditures for Corrections have been reduced by \$1 billion in 2009-10.

Figure SWI-05



The \$785.5 million in reductions to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) is a combination of operational savings, program reductions, and policy reforms. While there is agreement on significant portions of the package, the legislation to establish significant policy reforms in the areas of parole, custody, program credits and other areas has not been enacted. We anticipate that the Legislature will enact the policy legislation upon its return in August. The following reductions can be implemented with the enactment of the Budget Act:

Selective Commutation and Deportation of Undocumented Persons in State Prison. \$182.1 million due to the selective commutation and deportation of undocumented persons held in state prison. The CDCR will ensure that those offenders with the most serious convictions remain incarcerated while the remaining undocumented inmate population is referred to the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement for deportation. Only those offenders who have been identified by the federal government for deportation will be released.

Program Reductions. \$175 million associated with a decrease in the number of programs for inmates and parolees. Programs that have been demonstrated to effectively reduce recidivism will be retained. The CDCR will also attempt to achieve this savings through more efficient delivery of programs.


Operational Savings. \$147.6 million associated with a one-time reduction for facility repairs, headquarters savings, additional efficiencies within the operations of the juvenile programs, and other operational savings.

Contract Medical Rates. \$50 million associated with the establishment of limits on contract reimbursement rates for medical services.

The remaining \$230.8 million in budgeted savings, plus the \$400 million that the Governor reduced by veto from the February Budget Act, will be achieved through various reforms intended to reduce prison and parole populations. The reforms include alternative custody options for certain offenders within the last 12 months of their sentence, inmate credit earning opportunities, various parole reforms related to who is on parole and how parolees are supervised, community corrections strategies, and sentencing changes for property crimes.

MEDI-CAL

Figure SWI-06 displays General Fund expenditures for the Medi-Cal program since 1998-99. As the chart shows, General Fund costs would be much higher in 2008-09 and 2009-10 without the federal stimulus funding and an offset with Proposition 1A/ redevelopment shift. Enacted budget reforms and budget solutions will help control Medi-Cal’s previous path of unsustainable growth, in the out-years.



The \$1.4 billion reduction in Medi-Cal primarily reflects the following:

Federal Medi-Cal Flexibility and Stabilization. \$1 billion is attributable to the receipt of federal funds within the Medicaid (Medi-Cal) Program which are past due or authorized through waivers from the federal government. Examples include, but are not limited to Social Security Disability Insurance benefits that inappropriately resulted in state rather than federal Medicare expenditures, retroactive payment of duplicative but federally required Part B (medical insurance) premium payments due to systemic errors, needed adjustments to formulas that penalize California, such as the Medicare Part D “clawback” (formula driven drug coverage costs that do not appropriately account for California efficiencies such as drug rebate collections), and receipt of federal funds under various existing waivers.

Medi-Cal Skilled Nursing Facilities. \$96.4 million in budget solutions result by expanding the amount of revenue on which the AB 1629 fee (fees paid by the industry that match federal funds and are used for provider rate increases and General Fund relief to a lesser degree) is assessed to include Medicare revenues (\$6.4 million), and suspending an estimated five percent statutory rate adjustment (individualized for each facility primarily based on their staffing) for AB 1629 skilled nursing facilities and non-AB 1629 intermediate care providers (\$90 million including the impact of the related AB 1629 fee revenue loss).

Medi-Cal Pharmacy Reforms. \$66 million in savings results by implementing new federal and state drug pricing policies aimed at lowering costs and retaining quality care. These reforms require federal Drug Pricing providers to dispense only drugs purchased through the program, compel manufacturers of HIV/AIDS/cancer drugs to pay particular rebates subject to a penalty for non-compliance, establish upper billing limits for drugs, and direct the state to perform a therapeutic category review of antipsychotic drugs.

Medi-Cal County Administration. \$60.5 million in reductions is necessary to generate a prudent budget and to reduce the structural deficit.

Reduce Funding for Private Hospitals. \$47.9 million in budget solutions result by shifting \$23.9 million from unobligated distressed hospital and supplemental funds rather than General Fund to support replacement Disproportionate Share Hospital costs, and reducing General Fund support by \$23.9 million for private hospitals by ten percent, a commensurate reduction as public hospitals received in the February Budget Act.

Medi-Cal Anti Fraud Expansion. \$46.8 million in savings is due to expanding efforts to combat fraud, waste and abuse within the Medi-Cal program. Specific efforts will focus on the areas of adult day health care, physician services, and pharmacy.

Adult Day Health Care Reform. \$28.1 million in savings results by limiting services to no more than three days per week, freezing program rates as of August 1, 2009, and performing on-site treatment authorization request reviews. Reforms also authorize the establishment of a definition of medical acuity (necessity), and direct a stakeholder workgroup process to proceed with implementation aspects of the definition.

Other Medi-Cal Solutions. \$35.8 million in budget solutions result by reducing rates by 10 percent for small and rural hospitals (authorized by Chapter 758, Statutes of 2008, and excluding rural reference centers and critical access hospitals) for savings of \$7 million, eliminating state only ancillary services (physician, pharmacy, laboratory, physical therapy, etc.) for individuals residing in institutions for mental diseases for savings of \$14.2 million, and reflecting the federal stimulus impact on caseload and solutions for savings of \$14.6 million.

Centralizing Eligibility and Enrollment for Public Assistance. The budget establishes a framework for transforming enrollment and eligibility for the Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, and Food Stamp programs from an inefficient, labor-intensive, and decentralized system to a modern and online process. This modernization effort will help improve access to health and human services while reducing costs by an estimated \$1 billion (\$500 million General Fund) by 2012-13.


Improving Health Care Coordination and Controlling Long-Term Medi-Cal Costs.

The budget includes reform that gives the Department of Health Care Services (in partnership with the federal government and stakeholders) broad authority under a demonstration project or waiver, to utilize managed care or other specialized delivery systems of care for vulnerable populations including seniors, people with disabilities, children with significant medical needs, and individuals with behavioral health problems. By providing earlier and appropriate care, this program restructuring will keep Californians healthier and avoid unnecessary emergency room visits. Savings of \$800 million (\$400 million General Fund) are estimated to be achieved through this effort by 2012-13.

WELFARE PROGRAMS

Figure SWI-07 displays General Fund expenditures for the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) and California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) programs since 1998-99. As the chart shows, CalWORKs General Fund costs would be much higher in 2008-09 and 2009-10 without the federal stimulus funding.

Figure SWI-07



SSI/SSP. The \$108.2 million reduction reflects reducing SSI/SSP grants for individuals by \$5 per month, while reducing SSI/SSP grants for couples to the federal minimum (a reduction of approximately \$82 per month for couples currently receiving the maximum monthly grant). With this reduction, the maximum monthly SSI/SSP grant for aged and disabled individuals will be \$845 per month, approximately 94 percent of the federal poverty level (FPL), while the maximum monthly SSI/SSP grant for aged and disabled couples will be \$1,407 per month, approximately 116 percent of the FPL. Even with this reduction, California’s SSI/SSP grants remain among the highest in the nation.

CalWORKs. The \$509.6 million reduction reflects: (1) prioritizing resources for employment services and child care to recipients who are working (\$370.3 million), (2) utilizing federal stimulus funds to create subsidized employment slots (\$60.1 million), (3) rejecting mid-year increases to the county single allocation in 2008-09 to enable this funding to offset General Fund costs in 2009-10 (\$42.6 million), (4) offsetting General Fund costs with Employment Training funding on a one-time basis (\$20 million), and (5) reflecting a reduced caseload projection (\$16.6 million).

In addition to addressing the need for short-term savings, the Budget includes significant long-term reform efforts for the CalWORKs program, including:


- Restructuring time limits by requiring the adults in families that have received aid for a cumulative 48 months within a 60-month period to "sit out" and not receive aid for 12 months. After 12 months has passed, the adults can receive another 12 months of aid – for a total lifetime maximum of 60 months. Any month in which the adult is in sanction status for not meeting work requirements will now count toward the 60-month cumulative time on aid.
- Requiring all non-exempt recipients who are not meeting work requirements to meet face-to-face twice a year for a review with county workers. If a recipient does not attend the review without good cause, the family's monthly grant will be reduced by 50 percent.
- Strengthening the sanction process for adults who do not comply with program requirements by removing the adult-portion of the grant if the adult refuses to comply within a cumulative total of three months. If, after another three cumulative months, the adult does not comply, the child-only portion of the grant will be reduced by 25 percent. If, after another three cumulative months, the adult does not comply, another 25 percent will be removed from the child-only portion, for a total reduction of 50 percent to the child-only grant. These sanctions also will apply to families that have reached their 60-month cumulative time on aid and are not complying with work participation requirements, provided counties make available to these families necessary child care services.
- Reducing by 25 percent the child-only grant for non-work-eligible adults, unless they meet work participation requirements. Counties may, at their own expense, provide services to enable these adults to meet program participation requirements. If they are successful in meeting program requirements, the child-only grant will continue to be provided at its full value.

Cost-of-Living Adjustments (COLAs). The budget also eliminates automatic statutory COLAs for the state's two major welfare programs. These statutory COLAs were placed in law in the early 1970's. The COLAs have been suspended or delayed during many of the years in which the state faced budget deficits.

Figure SWI-08 displays General Fund expenditures for the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) and Department of Developmental Services (DDS) programs since 1998-99. As reflected in the chart, General Fund expenditures in both the IHSS and DDS programs

have grown substantially faster than the growth in population/inflation. In addition, General Fund expenditures in both programs would be significantly higher in 2008-09 and 2009-10 if not for federal stimulus funding.

Figure SWI-08



IHSS

The \$263.5 million reduction reflects: (1) reforms to significantly strengthen efforts to reduce and prevent fraud in this fast-growing program (\$130 million) and limit the provision of IHSS services to the neediest consumers (\$79.2 million), (2) eliminating the state’s share-of-cost contribution for IHSS cases (\$41.1 million), and (3) reducing funding for Public Authority administration rates (\$13.3 million). Specific reform measures include:

- Implementing rigorous anti-fraud efforts that require: (1) all providers (current and new applicants) to attend an orientation and be fingerprinted during 2009-10, (2) IHSS recipients to be fingerprinted, (3) timesheets to be signed under a statement acknowledging that false timesheets are subject to civil penalties, and (4) fingerprints of both the recipient and provider on timecards. In addition, this reform component would generally disallow provider checks from being sent to post office box addresses, and would authorize case reviews, targeted mailings, and unannounced home visits.

- Targeting services to neediest consumers by: (1) limiting domestic and related services (housework, shopping and errands, and meal preparation and clean-up) only to individuals assessed to have the greatest need for those services, and (2) limiting all services to individuals with greater needs based on an assessment of their ability to function within 11 Activities of Daily Living.

DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES

The budget imposes a \$234 million cost containment target for the statewide developmental services system. Working with various stakeholder groups and the Legislature, the DDS developed a variety of proposals that are expected to generate savings in 2009-10. These savings are in addition to the \$100 million in regional center cost containment measures also included in the early 2009 Budget Act.

In addition, the Governor vetoed \$50 million from the DDS, Regional Centers Purchase of Services for services provided to eligible children up to age 5. These services are due to program growth and thus eligible for funding from the California Children and Families Commission.

MENTAL HEALTH

The \$163.9 million reduction reflects: (1) eliminating state support in the Mental Health Managed Care program for services other than federally required inpatient hospitalization and medication services (\$64 million), (2) reducing Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT) program funding related to county programs developed in 2007-08 and 2008-09, and funded by counties using Mental Health Services Act funds (\$28 million), (3) deferring payments for mandated mental health services to students with serious emotional disturbances enrolled in special education (AB 3632)(\$52 million), (4) reducing Caregiver Resource Center funding for services and supports to families and caregivers of cognitively impaired individuals (\$4.1 million), and (5) reducing EPSDT for prior-year claims (\$15.8 million).

HEALTHY FAMILIES

Reduces General Fund support for the program by \$178.6 million, including \$4.6 million from the elimination of Certified Application Assistance. The Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board, which oversees the program, froze new enrollment and established a waiting list effective July 17 because of the budget situation. Efforts are underway to solicit funding for the program from private and other sources. The Board will disenroll current beneficiaries from the program at their annual eligibility redetermination

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET ACT OF 2009

as necessary. Any eligible individuals would subsequently go on the waiting list until they are able to be reinstated in the future as the economy and budget permits.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES AND FOSTER CARE

The \$120.6 million reduction reflects the following:

- Reducing General Fund support for county Child Welfare Services by \$80 million.
- Reducing by 10 percent the rates paid to group homes, foster family agencies, and on behalf of seriously emotionally disturbed children (\$26.6 million).
- Reducing the funding available to provide transitional housing services to emancipating foster youth (\$5 million).
- Reducing funding available to maintain the case management and reporting information technology system used by county social workers (\$4 million).
- Reducing funding for health oversight, case planning, and relative search and engagement activities (\$4.2 million).
- Eliminating automatic increases in financial support available to families adopting a child with special needs (\$900,000). Prior to this, monthly Adoption Assistance Program grants automatically increased with the age of the child.

OTHER HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES


The \$361.6 million reduction primarily reflects the following:

- Eliminating funding for the Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000 (Proposition 36) (\$90 million General Fund) and a 10-percent reduction in Drug Medi-Cal provider reimbursement rates (\$8.8 million General Fund) for total savings of \$98.9 million General Fund. The budget includes a one-time augmentation for the Offender Treatment Program (OTP), which serves drug court clients. The \$50 million augmentation is supported by a one-time increase in federal Byrne JAG grants, bringing total funding for the OTP in 2009-10 to \$68 million (includes \$18 million General Fund).
- Eliminating \$59.1 million General Fund for various programs administered by the Office of AIDS: Education and Prevention, Therapeutic Monitoring, Counseling and Testing, Early Intervention, Home and Community Based Care, and Housing.

- A shift of \$25 million from the General Fund to the AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) Rebate Fund for support of the ADAP.
- Eliminating General Fund for various programs administered by the Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health (MCAH) Division within the Department of Public Health, including the Domestic Violence Program (\$20.4 million), Adolescent Family Life Program (\$10.8 million), Black Infant Health Program (\$3.9 million), other local MCAH services (\$2.1 million), and related state administration (\$1.7 million).
- Eliminating \$35.1 million General Fund for various Community Clinic Grants (Rural Health Services, American Indian Health, Seasonal Migratory Worker, and Expanded Access to Primary Care clinics). Many, if not all of these clinics, will continue to receive funding from Medi-Cal and other state programs, federal funds, local grants, and private funds. In addition, many of these clinics are also receiving increased federal stimulus funds, which will help soften the impact of this necessary reduction.

COURTS

Figure SWI-09 displays General Fund expenditures for Judiciary funding as compared to population and inflation since 1998-99. The costs would be higher if not for an offset with Proposition 1A/redevelopment shift.



AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET ACT OF 2009


The \$168.6 million reduction for the state trial courts, in conjunction with the February Budget Act reductions, brings the total reduction for the trial courts to \$393 million. The \$393 million reduction consists of the following: a one-day per month court closure statewide (\$102 million), the use of trial court reserves (\$71 million), transfers from special funds (\$130 million), forego statutory growth (\$32 million), and new fee increases (\$58 million). Of the \$393 million reduction, \$100 million General Fund is a one-time reduction, to be restored as part of the 2010-11 Budget.

STATE OPERATIONS

While the bulk of state General Fund spending is allocated to programs operated by school districts, counties, other local governments, the judiciary, the University of California and California State Universities, or directly to recipients and providers of services, 8 percent is used to operate the various departments and agencies. State operations' General Fund spending grew at close to the combined rate of growth of the state's population and inflation over the past decade, with most of the increase occurring in the corrections system. State operations' General Fund costs have been reduced substantially in the last two years. The budget amendments contain a variety of cuts to state operations.

Figure SWI-10 displays General Fund expenditures for state operations since 1998-99. (Amounts also include the one-time savings in 2009-10 from shifting the June payroll and health care premiums to July (see Other Solutions) and exclude debt service, health and dental benefits for annuitants, higher education, and judiciary.)

Figure SWI-10



Furloughs. In response to the fiscal emergency, the Governor issued Executive Order S-16-08 imposing a two-day furlough on most state workers, effective February 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010. As the crisis deepened, the Governor issued Executive Order S-13-09 mandating a third furlough day, effective July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010. The combined savings from both executive orders amounts to \$2,217.5 million (\$1,278.5 million General Fund).

All state civil service employees with the exception of those in Bargaining Unit 5 (Highway Patrol Officers), the Bureau of State Audits, the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (excluded for five months for fire seasons) are subject to the three-day per month furlough. While the furloughs reduce employee pay by 13.8 percent, they do not affect the pay used to calculate retirement benefits.

Rural Health Care Equity Program. The \$14.6 million General Fund reduction reflects the elimination of the Rural Health Care Equity Program effective August 1, 2009. This program provided a payment to employees who live in rural areas to cover higher health care cost due to the lack of managed care providers in many rural areas of the state. The payments averaged \$125 per employee per month.

Unallocated Reductions. State agencies will be required to achieve savings of \$125 million General Fund associated with employee health care costs and reducing costs of information technology as directed by the state Chief Information Officer (CIO).

Reorganizations and Consolidations. Savings of \$50 million will be achieved based on legislative proposals implemented to eliminate, reorganize, and consolidate various government functions to achieve operational efficiencies. Control Section 13.25 provides the mechanism to make necessary budget adjustments.

Figure SWI-11 provides a summary of reorganizations and consolidations.

Figure SWI-11
Reorganizations and Consolidations

Adopted Reorganizations and Consolidations	Referred to Policy Committee
Eliminates the Integrated Waste Management Board, consolidates recycling functions of the Department of Conservation into a new Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.	Streamline and realign energy functions by consolidating and reorganizing functions of various entities into a single Department of Energy. In addition, eliminate the Department of Community Services and Development and transfer its functions to the Department of Social Services and to the new Department of Energy.
Eliminates Bureau of Naturopathic Medicine, creates a 9-member Committee under the Osteopathic Medical Board which will provide oversight.	Consolidate the Department of Corporations, Department of Financial Institutions, Department of Real Estate and Department of Real Estate Appraisers.
Eliminates the Board of Geologists and Geophysicists and transfer responsibility of functions to the Board for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors.	Eliminate duplication and improve tax collections by merging tax collection operations currently split between the Franchise Tax Board, the Board of Equalization, and the Employment Development Department.
Moves the Structural Pest Control Board from the Department of Consumers Affairs to the Department of Pesticide Regulation.	Consolidate the Hearing Aid Dispensers Bureau under the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Bureau.
Consolidates the Bureau of Home Furnishings and Thermal Insulation with the Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair under the Department of Consumer Affairs.	
Establishes a sunset date for the Inspection and Maintenance Review Committee.	
Consolidates state information technology programs previously administered by the Department of Technology Services, the Telecommunication Division in the Department of General Services, and the Office of Information Security under the Chief Information Officer and grants the Officer authority to supervise departmental information technology projects and ongoing operations.	

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

A reduction of \$40.1 million reflects the shift of General Fund costs of the Labor Standards Enforcement and Occupational Safety and Health programs to revenue from increased employer fees. The increased assessments for the Occupational Safety and Health fee and the proposed new Labor Enforcement and Compliance fee would be assessed based on the size of the employer.

LOCAL CONSERVATION CORPS

The Legislature included an augmentation of \$16.5 million in the budget amendments of the California Conservation Corps, with language directing that the funds be allocated to local conservation corps. One-half of this augmentation is being retained. However, because of the state's fiscal constraints, the \$8.25 million augmentation from the General Fund is being eliminated.

CAL FIRE SAVINGS

The \$27 million reduction to the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) reflects: (a) a delay in CAL FIRE vehicle and equipment replacements for one year (\$17 million), (b) a cancelation of an existing DC-10 aircraft contract (\$7 million), and (c) an unallocated reduction to the Resource Management program (\$3 million).

STATE PARKS

The \$14.2 million reduction to the Department of Parks and Recreation reflects an expenditure reduction to the state park system. This reduction will achieve \$22.2 million in savings when fully implemented. It will result in the closure of probably more than 100 parks which will be identified once the Department has been able to complete a full assessment of its remaining resources and be in a position to determine where it will need to shut facilities down.

CASH MANAGEMENT SAVINGS

A projected decreased need for external borrowing due to the adoption of budget and cash solutions in the 2009-10 fiscal year will result in \$210 million savings for cash flow financing costs.

Savings of \$92 million in interest costs for the Revenue Anticipation Notes (RANs) issued to cover cash-flow in 2008-09 fiscal year was achieved by reducing the size of the RANs issued.

FUNDING FOR GENERAL FUND DEFICIENCIES

The Budget provides a reserve for funding certain contingencies and emergencies. However, the use of this funding over the years has been lower than previously anticipated. Therefore, the amount for the 2009-10 fiscal year has been reduced by \$24 million, leaving a balance of \$20 million.

For 2008-09, \$18 million was allocated to departments for contingencies or emergencies, resulting in savings of \$26 million.

SUSPEND SMALL BUSINESS LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

The Small Business Loan Guarantee Program provides loan guarantees to eligible small businesses that otherwise would not be able to obtain a loan through commercial lenders. The budget amendments suspend any new guarantees and transfers not needed to guarantee existing loans, for a savings of \$10 million.

SUSPEND METAL PLATING FACILITY LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

The Metal Plating Facility Loan Guarantee program provides loan guarantees to eligible small businesses to purchase equipment that meets or exceeds environmental requirements. The budget amendments suspend any new loan guarantees and transfers \$3.5 million to the General Fund.

SUSPEND WILLIAMSON ACT PROGRAM

The budget amendments reflect only \$1,000 for the Williamson Act Open Space program, effectively suspending the program. These monies partially backfill property tax revenues that local governments forego when they enter into voluntary contracts with property owners who agree to use their land for agricultural or open space purposes in exchange for a lower property tax assessment.

FUND SHIFTS

Figure SWI-12 displays the fund shifts included in amendments to the Budget Act of 2009.

Figure SWI-12
Amendments to the Budget Act of 2009
Fund Shifts
(Dollars in Millions)

Major General Fund Programs	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Various Fund Shifts	-	\$88.3	\$88.3
Fish and Game Preservation Fund	-	(30.0)	(30.0)
Eliminate GF Support to Marine Lift Protection Act	-	(4.4)	(4.4)
Shift Flood Protection Activities to Proposition 1E	-	(7.0)	(7.0)
Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment	-	(4.1)	(4.1)
Shift Department of Industrial Relations Major Programs to Fees	-	(40.1)	(40.1)
Revise Veteran Homes Member Fees	-	(2.7)	(2.7)
Various HHS Fund Shifts	-	4.4	4.4
California Children's Services Program	-	(3.0)	(3.0)
Child Welfare Services	-	(1.4)	(1.4)
Transportation	-	876.0	876.0
CAL FIRE Interagency Agreement with the Legislature	6.6	26.1	32.7
Local Airport Grant from Aeronautics Account	-	4.0	4.0
Totals	\$6.6	\$998.8	\$1,005.4

The fund shifts are described in greater detail below.

TRANSPORTATION

A total of \$876.6 million in General Fund relief will be provided by using fuel sales tax spillover revenues to offset General Fund costs for transit, debt service, and regional center transportation.

AERONAUTICS

Local airport grants will be suspended in 2009-10 and \$4 million will be transferred from the Aeronautics Account to the General Fund.

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCOUNT

The budget amendments transfer \$70 million in non-Article XIX miscellaneous revenues from the Motor Vehicle Account to the General Fund.

CAL FIRE SAVINGS

The budget amendments include a \$26.1 million savings to CAL FIRE to reflect a one-time transfer of spending authority from the Legislature.

REVENUE SOLUTIONS

Figure SWI-13 displays the revenue solutions included in the amendments to the Budget Act of 2009.

Figure SWI-13
Amendments to the Budget Act of 2009
Revenue Solutions
 (Dollars in Millions)

Major General Fund Programs	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Various Tax Enforcement Changes	-	\$26.0	\$26.0
Estimated Payments	-	610.0	610.0
Withholding	-	1,732.0	1,732.0
SCIF Sale	-	1,000.0	1,000.0
Special Fund Transfers	-	81.0	81.0
Teacher Credentialing - Transfer from Special Fund to Cover Partial 2005-06 Deficiency	-	(2.7)	(2.7)
Transfer from Motor Vehicle Account	-	(70.0)	(70.0)
Transfer Balance of LWDF	-	(5.5)	(5.5)
Delay Opening of Science Center Phase II by One Year (transfer from special fund)	-	(2.8)	(2.8)
State Lands Royalties	-	42.9	42.9
Totals	-	\$3,491.9	\$3,491.9

The revenue solutions are described in greater detail below.

NON-RETAILER REGISTRATION FOR USE TAX

Under current law, non-retailers – those who do not have a sales tax liability – are not required to register with the Board of Equalization (BOE). This law change will require qualified purchasers to register with the BOE and submit a return that details purchases made during the year that were subject to the use tax yet for which no use tax was paid. In general, a qualified purchaser would be a person required to hold a business license but not a seller’s permit and who receives at least \$100,000 in annual gross receipts.

This law change is expected to increase General Fund sales and use tax revenue by \$26 million. The increased revenue does not come from increasing taxes. Instead, it will result from reducing tax evasion.

ACCELERATE ESTIMATED PAYMENTS

Under current law, individuals and corporations are required to pay 30 percent each with the first two estimated payments, and 20 percent each for the last two estimated payments. Under this law change, which will begin with the 2010 tax year, the first quarterly estimated payment percentage will remain at 30 percent, the second quarter will increase from 30 percent to 40 percent, the third estimated payment will be eliminated, and the fourth quarter will increase from 20 percent to 30 percent. This law change, which was proposed in the 2009 May Revision, is expected to accelerate \$610 million into 2009-10—\$250 million in personal income tax receipts and \$360 million in corporate tax receipts.

ACCELERATE WAGE WITHHOLDING

The Employment Development Department administers the state's wage withholding program whereby employers are required to withhold personal income tax from wages paid to employees. This tax law change, which was proposed in the 2009 May Revision, will increase current wage withholding by 10 percent and is expected to accelerate \$1.7 billion of personal income tax receipts into 2009-10.

REQUIRE BACKUP WITHHOLDING

Under current federal law, gambling winnings reported on Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Form W2G and payments made by banks and businesses reported on various IRS Forms 1099 may be required to backup withholding on those payments. Payments reported on IRS Forms 1099 include payments to independent contractors, rents, commissions, and royalty payments. This law change will conform to federal law by requiring a withholding rate of 7 percent for state purposes whenever it is required for federal purposes and it is expected to increase personal income tax revenues by \$32 million in 2009-10.

STATE COMPENSATION INSURANCE FUND

The sale of a portion of the State Compensation Insurance Fund's Book of Business to a private entity is estimated to achieve \$1 billion in revenue.

BORROWING SOLUTIONS

Figure SWI-14 displays the borrowing solutions included in the amendments to the Budget Act of 2009.

Figure SWI-14
Amendments to the Budget Act of 2009
Borrowing Solutions
 (Dollars in Millions)

Major General Fund Programs	2008-09	2009-10	Total
Loan of Fund Balance from the State Highway Account	-	\$135.0	\$135.0
Loans from the Harbors and Watercraft Fund, Off Highway Vehicle Trust Fund, and the Renewable Resources Trust Fund	-	112.0	112.0
Suspend Proposition 1A	-	1,935.0	1,935.0
Totals	-	\$2,182.0	\$2,182.0

The borrowing solutions are described in greater detail below.

SUSPEND PROPOSITION 1A

The budget amendments include \$1.9 billion in property tax monies borrowed from cities, counties, and special districts pursuant to Proposition 1A (2004). The borrowed sums will be shifted to county-level Supplemental Revenue Augmentation Funds where they will be used to fund K-12 schools, courts, prisons, and Medi-Cal, hospital and K-12 school bond expenses that would otherwise be funded from the state General Fund. The enabling legislation requires the borrowed sums to be repaid with interest by June 30, 2013. To alleviate any budget impacts the borrowing may have on local government, the legislation also authorizes a local government-created joint powers authority to issue bonds against the state’s repayment obligation.

STATE HIGHWAY ACCOUNT LOAN

A loan of \$135 million will be made from the fund balance in the State Highway Account to the General Fund. This loan will be repaid by June 30, 2013.

OTHER SOLUTIONS


PAYMENT SHIFTS

One-time savings of \$1.618 billion (\$937.6 million General Fund) from shifting the June payments for employee payroll and active and retiree health to July each year beginning with the pay period ending June 30, 2010. This payment shift excludes the University of California, California State University, Community Colleges, the Legislature, the California Exposition and State Fair, and local trial courts.

STRATEGIC GROWTH PLAN

Figure SWI-15 displays General Fund spending for debt service since 1998-99. With the ability to use funds from gas sales tax spillover proceeds, the General Fund expenditures have been reduced by \$427 million in 2008-09 and \$254 million in 2009-10.

Figure SWI-15



AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET ACT OF 2009

Despite the recession and budget crisis, California has continued to invest in critical infrastructure through the state's Strategic Growth plan. In addition to capturing federal ARRA funds for shovel-ready projects, the state has continued and even accelerated spending from the \$42.7 billion of bonds approved on the November 2006 ballot. While these investments are critical to California's future, the costs of debt service will continue to put pressure on state General Fund spending.

In order to better utilize and leverage the state's existing real property assets, legislation was enacted that will authorize the Department of General Services (DGS) to lease out properties that may not be needed for many years. Also, the DGS will be authorized to sell and lease back some of the currently used high-value state properties in order to capture valuable equity. State agencies will be required to improve the justification of keeping state properties that are not fully utilized so that they may be disposed of if no long-term need can be proven. Finally, the legislative package authorizes the DGS to sell all or a portion of the Orange County Fairgrounds, an underutilized state property, and deposit those proceeds into the General Fund when sold.

SUMMARY CHARTS

This section provides various statewide budget charts and tables.

Figure SUM-01
**General Fund Budget Summary
 Workload Budget**
 (Dollars in Millions)

	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Prior Year Balance	\$3,620	-\$7,109
Revenues and Transfers	<u>\$84,098</u>	<u>\$85,775</u>
Total Resources Available	\$87,718	\$78,666
Non-Proposition 98 Expenditures	\$59,169	\$60,482
Proposition 98 Expenditures	<u>\$35,658</u>	<u>\$40,346</u>
Total Expenditures	\$94,827	\$100,828
Fund Balance	-7,109	-22,162
Budget Reserves:		
Reserve for Liquidation of Encumbrances	\$1,079	\$1,079
Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties	-\$8,188	-\$23,241

Figure SUM-02
**General Fund Budget Summary
 With All Budget Solutions**
 (Dollars in Millions)

	<u>2008-09</u>	<u>2009-10</u>
Prior Year Balance	\$4,071	-\$3,379
Revenues and Transfers	<u>\$84,097</u>	<u>\$89,541</u>
Total Resources Available	\$88,168	\$86,162
Non-Proposition 98 Expenditures	\$57,495	\$49,551
Proposition 98 Expenditures	<u>\$34,052</u>	<u>\$35,032</u>
Total Expenditures	\$91,547	\$84,583
Fund Balance	-3,379	1,579
Budget Reserves:		
Reserve for Liquidation of Encumbrances	\$1,079	\$1,079
Special Fund for Economic Uncertainties	-\$4,458	\$500

Figure-SUM-03
2009-10 Revenue Sources
(Dollars in Millions)

	General Fund	Special Funds	Total	Change From 2008-09
Personal Income Tax	\$48,868	\$706	\$49,574	\$3,387
Sales Tax	27,609	4,519	32,128	2,258
Corporation Tax	8,799	-	8,799	-984
Highway Users Taxes	-	3,145	3,145	-69
Motor Vehicle Fees	1,682	5,593	7,275	1,558
Insurance Tax	1,913	-	1,913	-128
Liquor Tax	332	-	332	6
Tobacco Taxes	102	835	937	-27
Other	236	8,625	8,861	-289
Total	\$89,541	\$23,423	\$112,964	\$5,712

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Figure-SUM-04
2009-10 Total Expenditures by Agency
(Dollars in Millions)

	General Fund	Special Funds	Bond Funds	Totals
Legislative, Judicial, Executive	\$1,884	\$2,529	\$187	\$4,600
State and Consumer Services	569	708	19	1,296
Business, Transportation & Housing Resources	2,585	5,755	4,206	12,546
Environmental Protection	1,842	2,061	1,584	5,487
Health and Human Services	73	1,197	514	1,784
Corrections and Rehabilitation	24,953	7,665	208	32,826
K-12 Education	8,210	22	2	8,234
Higher Education	35,042	106	505	35,653
Labor and Workforce Development	10,547	47	1,612	12,206
General Government	64	369	-	433
Non-Agency Departments				
Non-Agency Departments	535	1,544	2	2,081
Tax Relief/Local Government	463	2,290	700	3,453
Statewide Expenditures	-2,184	830	-	-1,354
Total	\$84,583	\$25,123	\$9,539	\$119,245

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Figure SUM-05
General Fund Expenditures by Agency
 (Dollars in Millions)

	2008-09	2009-10	Change from 2008-09	
			Dollar Change	Percent Change
Legislative, Judicial, Executive	\$3,765	\$1,884	-\$1,881	-50.0%
State and Consumer Services	567	569	2	0.4%
Business, Transportation & Housing Resources	1,547	2,585	1,038	67.1%
Environmental Protection	83	73	-10	-12.0%
Health and Human Services	28,803	24,953	-3,850	-13.4%
Corrections and Rehabilitation	10,008	8,210	-1,798	-18.0%
K-12 Education	33,890	35,042	1,152	3.4%
Higher Education	10,181	10,547	366	3.6%
Labor and Workforce Development	102	64	-38	-37.3%
General Government:				
Non-Agency Departments	411	535	124	30.2%
Tax Relief/Local Government	682	463	-219	-32.1%
Statewide Expenditures	-513	-2,184	-1,671	325.7%
Total	\$91,547	\$84,583	-\$6,964	-7.6%

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Figure SUM-06
Vetoes by Agency
General, Special, and Bond Funds
(Dollars in Millions)

	Legislative Spending Plan	General Fund Veto	Special Fund and Bond Fund Vetoes	Totals
Legislative, Judicial, Executive	\$4,600	-	-	\$4,600
State and Consumer Services	1,295	-	-	1,295
Business, Transportation & Housing Resources	12,546	-	-	12,546
Resources	5,501	-14	-	5,487
Environmental Protection	1,785	-	-	1,785
Health and Human Services	33,227	-394	-7	32,826
Corrections and Rehabilitation	8,234	-	-	8,234
K-12 Education	35,658	-5 ^{1/}	-	35,653
Higher Education	12,209	-3 ^{2/}	-	12,206
Labor and Workforce Development	433	-	-	433
General Government				
Non-Agency Departments	2,081	-	-	2,081
Tax Relief/Local Government	3,481	-28	-	3,453
Statewide Expenditures	-1,289	-45	-20	-1,354
Total	\$119,761	-\$489	-\$27	\$119,245

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

^{1/} Excludes \$3.9 million of Proposition 98 set asides.

^{2/} Excludes \$4.3 million of veto set aside for the Student Aid Commission.

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Michael C. Genest
Director of Finance
(916) 445-4141

Ana J. Matosantos
Chief Deputy Director, Budget
(916) 445-9862

Thomas L. Sheehy
Chief Deputy Director, Policy
(916) 445-8610

Fred Klass
Chief Operating Officer
(916) 445-4923

Jennifer K. Rockwell
Chief Counsel
(916) 324-4856

Miriam B. Ingenito
Deputy Director, Legislation
(916) 445-8610

H.D. Palmer
Deputy Director, External Affairs
(916) 323-0648

BUDGET PROGRAM AREAS

Revenue Forecasting; Economic Projections;
Demographic Data; Business, Transportation,
and Housing; Local Government

Mark Hill, PBM*(916) 322-2263

Education

Jeannie Oropeza, PBM(916) 445-0328

Health and Human Services

Lisa Mangat, PBM(916) 445-6423

Corrections and Rehabilitation, Judicial,
Justice, General Government, State and
Consumer Services

Todd Jerue, PBM(916) 445-8913

Resources, Energy, Environment,
Capital Outlay

Karen Finn, PBM.(916) 324-0043

Employee Relations, Retirement Systems,
Departmental Administration, Local Mandates,
Audits and Evaluations, Information
Technology Consulting

Diana L. Ducay, PBM(916) 445-3274

Budget Planning and Preparation,
Cash Management, Statewide Issues,
CALSTARS, FSCU

Veronica Chung-Ng, PBM(916) 445-5332

Financial Information System for California

Titus Toyama, PE**(916) 445-8918

*Program Budget Manager
**Project Executive

This page intentionally blank to facilitate double-sided printing.

State of California
Governor's Office

I object to the following appropriations contained in Assembly Bill 1, Fourth Extraordinary Session.

Item 3340-101-0001—For local assistance, California Conservation Corps. I delete this item.

In order to create a reasonable reserve, I am making additional reductions so we have resources to address emergencies or additional revenue shortfalls. In addition, the Legislature did not make changes to improve the cost-effectiveness of the Beverage Container Recycling Program and address the shortfall in the Fund in a manner that supports recycling objectives. I look forward to working with the Legislature to enact comprehensive reform to the Beverage Container Recycling Program.

Item 3360-001-3117—For support of Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission. I delete Provision 2.

I am deleting Provision 2, which would prohibit the Energy Commission from making any expenditure from this appropriation for hydrogen refueling stations. The goal of the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology program is to develop and deploy innovative technologies that transform California's fuel and vehicle types to help attain the state's climate change policies. This provision would limit the program's technology options, and would discourage continued development of hydrogen fuels and related vehicles and technology.

Item 3790-001-0001—For support of Department of Parks and Recreation. I reduce this item from \$133,988,000 to \$127,788,000 by reducing:

(1) For support of the Department of Parks and Recreation from \$428,717,000 to \$422,517,000.

In order to create a reasonable reserve, I am making additional reductions so we have resources to address emergencies or additional revenue shortfalls. I know this reduction will likely lead to closure of additional parks but we are facing unprecedented budget challenges and we have limited choices. I am directing the Department to do everything it can to work with local governments, the federal government, community based organizations, and other interested parties who can partner with the state to help mitigate any state park closures.

Item 4170-001-0001—For support of California Department of Aging. I reduce this item from \$4,227,000 to \$4,121,000 by reducing:

(4) 40-Special Projects from \$8,680,000 to \$8,574,000.

I am reducing this item by \$106,000 and 0.5 personnel years for the following programs:

- \$79,000 for the Linkages Program, and
- \$27,000 for Community Based Services Programs.

This action conforms to my action in Control Section 17.50.

Item 4260-101-0890—For local assistance, Department of Health Care Services. I am reducing this item from \$26,592,825,000 to \$26,532,256,000 to conform to the action I have taken in Control Section 18.00.

Item 4265-111-0231—For local assistance, Department of Public Health. I reduce this item from \$54,154,000 to \$47,354,000.

I am deleting the \$6,800,000 one-time augmentation of Proposition 99 funds for the Tobacco Control Program for anti-tobacco media campaigns and competitive grants to local entities. While I proposed this augmentation, tobacco tax revenues have since declined to levels insufficient to support these efforts.

Item 5180-151-0001—For local assistance, Department of Social Services. I reduce this item from \$763,375,000 to \$702,494,000 by reducing:

(1) 25.30-Children and Adult Services and Licensing from \$2,159,705,000 to \$2,098,824,000.

I am reducing this item by \$60,881,000 to increase the reserve for economic uncertainties and to reduce the state's structural deficit, consistent with my May Revision proposal to achieve an unallocated reduction in the Child Welfare Services Program. I am reducing a total of \$79,956,000 for this purpose: \$60,881,000 from this Item and \$19,075,000 from subdivision (f) of Control Section 18.50.

Item 5225-001-0001—For support of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. I revise this item by deleting Provisions 7 and 9.

I am deleting Provision 7, which would require the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to report 2008-09 and 2009-10 overtime expenditures for custody staff. This reporting requirement would result in additional workload without regard to the availability of resources. Consequently, I am vetoing this language. Nevertheless, in recognition of the Legislature's desire to obtain this information, I am instructing the CDCR to comply with the legislative request for this report to the extent that compliance can be achieved using existing resources and without impairing the CDCR's ability to perform its essential functions.

I am deleting Provision 9, which would restrict certain expenditures within the CDCR's budget for specified purposes, require the CDCR to report on the expenditure of these funds, allow for the redirection of funds as specified, and provide that any funds not spent revert to the General Fund. While my Administration is committed to ensuring that funds are spent for the purposes for which they are appropriated, this language is too restrictive for CDCR in 2009-10 as they implement major population reforms and other reductions, including a significant unallocated reduction.

Item 5225-002-0001—For support of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. I revise this item by deleting Provision 6.

I am deleting Provision 6, which would restrict certain expenditures within the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation's (CDCR) budget for specified purposes, require the CDCR to report on the expenditure of these funds, allow for the redirection of

funds as specified, and provide that any funds not spent revert to the General Fund. While my Administration is committed to ensuring that funds are spent for the purposes for which they are appropriated, this language is too restrictive for CDCR in 2009-10 as they implement major population reforms and other reductions, including significant unallocated reductions.

Item 5225-301-0660—For capital outlay, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. I revise this item by deleting Provision 5.

I am deleting Provision 5, which prohibits the Department from making any further encumbrances or expenditures of funding appropriated for the San Quentin State Prison: Condemned Inmate Complex until three specified conditions are met. This project is needed to remedy significant operational deficiencies associated with the existing condemned inmate housing and address issues cited in the *Plata* and *Coleman* lawsuits regarding sufficient health care access and accessibility for aging and disabled inmates. This project is ready to begin construction. Having to delay the construction start to comply with these conditions will cause unnecessary increased costs. In addition, this appropriation provides no increased expenditure authority for those costs. This increases the likelihood that the Public Works Board would be required to augment earlier appropriations as provided for by law. I therefore veto this provision so as to control the expenditures of the state.

Item 6110-001-0001—For support of the Department of Education. I reduce this item from \$38,210,000 to \$37,505,000 by reducing:

(2) 20-Instructional Support from \$158,747,000 to \$158,042,000,

and by deleting Provision 7.

I am reducing this item by \$705,000 to capture the maximum amount of savings from the instructional materials flexibility provided in the Education trailer bill to school districts, which suspends the adoption of instructional materials by the State Board of Education (Board) and the subsequent purchasing requirements for school districts until 2013-14. As a result, it is unnecessary for the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission to continue to advise the Board on content frameworks and instructional materials adoptions for the next five years or until an agreed-upon process is reestablished. This reduction removes funding for unnecessary Commission per diem and travel as well as funding for Department staff.

Item 6110-008-0001—For support of Department of Education, as allocated by the Department of Education to the State Special Schools for student transportation allowances. I delete this item.

This item would provide \$3,894,000 Proposition 98 General Fund for student transportation at the State Special Schools. However, the Legislature subsequently provided special education federal funds (Provision 11 of Item 6110-161-0890) for the same purpose with the understanding that this Proposition 98 appropriation is no longer necessary. Therefore, on a technical basis, I delete this item to remove duplicative funding for student transportation at the State Special Schools.

I am also deleting Provisions 1 and 2 to conform to this action.

Item 6600-001-0001—For support of Hastings College of the Law. I am reducing this item from \$9,270,000 to \$8,270,000.

I am reducing this item by an additional \$1,000,000 to achieve General Fund savings. Combined with the 10-percent reduction approved by the Legislature, this unallocated reduction will reduce Hastings' state support to be more in line with the General Fund reductions made to the University of California and the California State University since the 2008-09 Budget was first enacted. Because Hastings has increased its student fees by almost 38 percent since 2007-08, including a 13-percent increase for 2009-10, funding for the instructional program still increases by 5 percent in 2009-10 which should be sufficient in this fiscal climate.

Item 7980-001-0001—For support of California Student Aid Commission. I reduce this item from \$12,623,000 to \$6,323,000 by reducing:

(1) 15-Financial Aid Grants Program from \$13,049,000 to \$6,749,000

I am vetoing \$6,300,000 from the California Student Aid Commission, of which \$4,300,000 is set aside to be restored contingent upon enactment of legislation that authorizes the decentralization of the Cal Grant Program and other financial aid programs as warranted. The \$2,000,000 difference represents savings that would be achieved through efficiencies resulting from the decentralization and other over-budgeting that currently exists.

Under my January proposal, a proposal that was broadly supported by the higher education segments, the Student Aid Commission's intermediary role in approving awards will be largely eliminated. The proposal would establish colleges and universities as the single point of contact for most students' financial aid needs. This change would significantly reduce the Student Aid Commission's General Fund operating costs on an ongoing basis and save money at the postsecondary segments by reducing double-handling of awards between the colleges and the Commission. This action illustrates my commitment to put the students first and to improve the efficiency of state government. I look forward to working with the Legislature on legislation that will better serve our students and the higher education segments.

Item 9100-101-0001—For local assistance, Tax Relief. I reduce this item from \$472,370,000 to \$444,579,000 by reducing:

(5) 60-Subventions for Open Space from \$27,792,000 to \$1,000.

I am reducing this item by \$27,791,000 to suspend funding for this program, which backfills a portion of property taxes foregone when local governments voluntarily enter into contracts with property owners who agree to use their land for agricultural or open space purposes in exchange for a lower property tax assessment. This is necessary to provide a prudent reserve in the General Fund.

Item 9620-001-0001—For payment of interest on General Fund loans, upon order of the Director of Finance, for any General Fund loan. I delete Provision 4.

I have reviewed the Legislature's action on my proposal for deficiency funding in the event that the Controller must implement a payment delay plan to manage emergency cash needs. My proposal would have appropriated any amount necessary to pay the interest expenses, late payment penalties, and other costs incurred by the Controller in implementing such a

plan, and it would have accelerated the review and approval process that currently exists for funding such deficiencies.

Provision 4 serves as an appropriation for specific costs incurred by the Controller. The use of this appropriation is contingent upon the occurrence of various actions and events. The legislative action on this appropriation would, in effect, exempt the Controller from obtaining approval from Finance before incurring a deficiency. It might also have the unintended effect of relieving the Controller of the personal responsibility requirements contained in Control Section 32.00. In light of this, I have determined that the provisions of Item 9840-001-0001 are adequate for the review and approval of Controller costs related to a payment delay plan and I hereby veto Provision 4.

Item 9800-001-0001—For Augmentation for Employee Compensation. I reduce this item from \$40,742,000 to \$15,742,000.

I am reducing funding by \$25,000,000 for employee compensation and am instructing my administration to absorb this reduction to build a prudent reserve. To effect this reduction, I am directing the Director of Finance to reduce the amount that would have been allocated to each department for increases in employee compensation costs, including health care. This reduced amount available for allocation to departments will not affect pay or benefits for employees in any way. Employees will receive full pay, and the funding for pay and benefits not available from Item 9800 will be funded by a redirection within existing resources by individual departments. All previously negotiated employee compensation increases, and all employee compensation increases for medical, mental, and dental health positions arising from the *Coleman*, *Plata*, and *Perez* court cases will be unaffected by my action to reduce this appropriation.

Item 9800-001-0494—For Augmentation for Employee Compensation. I reduce this item from \$51,589,000 to \$31,589,000.

I am reducing funding by \$20,000,000 for employee compensation and am instructing my administration to absorb this reduction to build a prudent reserve. To effect this reduction, I am directing the Director of Finance to reduce the amount that would have been allocated to each department for increases in employee compensation costs, including health care. This reduced amount available for allocation to departments will not affect pay or benefits for employees in any way. Employees will receive full pay, and the funding for pay and benefits not available from Item 9800 will be funded by a redirection within existing resources by individual departments. All previously negotiated employee compensation increases, and all employee compensation increases for medical, mental, and dental health positions arising from the *Coleman*, *Plata*, and *Perez* court cases will be unaffected by my action to reduce this appropriation.

Item 9800-001-0988—For Augmentation for Employee Compensation. I reduce this item from \$25,410,000 to \$15,410,000.

I am reducing funding by \$10,000,000 for employee compensation and am instructing my administration to absorb this reduction to build a prudent reserve. To effect this reduction, I am directing the Director of Finance to reduce the amount that would have been allocated to each department for increases in employee compensation costs, including health care. This reduced amount available for allocation to departments will not affect pay or benefits for employees in any way. Employees will receive full pay, and the funding for pay and benefits not available from Item 9800 will be funded by a redirection within existing resources by

individual departments. All previously negotiated employee compensation increases, and all employee compensation increases for medical, mental, and dental health positions arising from the *Coleman*, *Plata*, and *Perez* court cases will be unaffected by my action to reduce this appropriation.

Item 9840-001-0001—Augmentation for Contingencies or Emergencies. I reduce this item from \$44,100,000 to \$20,100,000.

In order to create a reasonable reserve, I am making additional reductions so we have resources to address additional revenue shortfalls. Therefore, I am reducing this item by \$24,000,000 to fund higher competing priorities. I have determined that this reduced level of funding, which is consistent with the amount of unanticipated expenses funded by this Item in the previous fiscal year, is adequate for the purposes of this Item.

SEC. 17.50—I am reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in this section by \$6,160,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. Thus, I am increasing the General Fund reduction from \$9,483,000 to \$15,643,000.

The effect of my action reflects a reduction of \$6,160,000 to Special Projects (Program 40) to increase the reserve for economic uncertainties and to reduce the state's structural deficit. This reduction is consistent with my May Revision proposal to eliminate the Linkages Program and Community Based Services Programs. Specifically, I am reducing \$3,879,000 from the Linkages Program and \$2,281,000 from Community Based Services Programs. Funding of these non-mandated programs cannot be continued due to the state's severe budget constraints.

“Sec. 17.50. The amount appropriated in Item 4170-101-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$9,483,000~~ \$15,643,000.”

SEC. 18.00—I am reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (a) of the section by \$60,569,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. I am also reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (e) of this section by \$25,000,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. Thus, I am revising subdivision (e) of this Section by increasing the General Fund reduction from \$4,303,000 to \$29,303,000, and County Administration by \$60,569,000.

The effect of my action reflects a reduction of \$25,000,000 (from \$39,909,000 to \$14,909,000) to Primary and Rural Health (Program 20.35) to increase the reserve and to reduce the state's structural deficit. This reduction is consistent with my May Revision proposal to eliminate General Fund grants for Community Clinic Programs. Many, if not all of these clinics, will continue to receive funding through remaining state programs, federal programs, local programs, and private funds. Increased federal stimulus funds are available to many of these clinics and will help to minimize the overall impact of this reduction.

I am also reducing County Administration by \$60,569,000 (from \$2,893,363,000 to \$2,832,794,000) to increase the reserve and to reduce the state's structural deficit.

“SEC. 18.00. (a) The amount appropriated in Item 4260-101-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$2,789,402,000~~ \$2,849,971,000.

(b) Schedule (7) of Item 4260-101-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby deleted.

(c) Provision 13 is added to Item 4260-101-0001 of Section 2.00, to read:

13. It is the intent of the Legislature to actively pursue the receipt of federal funds within the Medicaid (Medi-Cal) Program which are past due from the federal government, including, but not limited to: (a) disability insurance benefits that resulted in state expenditures instead of federal Medicare expenditures, (b) the retroactive payment of Part B premiums due to systemic errors by the federal Social Security Administration, (c) needed adjustments to formulas that penalize California, such as the Medicare Part D “clawback,” and (d) receipt of federal funds due to California under various existing Medi-Cal waiver programs.

(d) Schedule (4) of Item 4260-101-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby revised to be ~~-\$284,246,000.~~

(e) The amount appropriated in Item 4260-111-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$4,303,000~~ \$29,303,000.

(f) Provision 3 is added to Item 4260-111-0001 of Section 2.00, to read:

3. The State Department of Health Care Services shall convene a diverse workgroup as applicable that, at a minimum, represents families enrolled in the California Children’s Services (CCS) Program, counties, specialty care providers, children’s hospitals, and medical suppliers to discuss the administrative structure of the CCS Program, including eligibility determination processes, the use and content of needs assessment tools in case management, and the processes used for treatment authorizations. The purpose of this workgroup will be to identify methods for streamlining, administrative cost-efficiencies, and better utilization of both state and county staff, as applicable, in meeting the needs of children and families accessing the CCS Program. The department may provide the policy and fiscal committees of each house of the Legislature with periodic updates of outcomes as appropriate.

(g) Schedule (3) of Item 4260-111-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby revised to be ~~-\$58,188,000.~~

(h) The amount appropriated in Item 4260-113-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$47,265,000.”~~

SEC. 18.10—I am reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (c) of this section by \$80,473,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. Thus, I am increasing the General Fund reduction from \$62,967,000 to \$143,440,000.

The effect of my action reflects the deletion of various legislative restorations for public health local assistance programs to increase the reserve and to reduce the state’s structural deficit, consistent with my May Revision proposals. When making these difficult reductions to important program services, I have sought to protect the continued delivery of drug therapies to low-income individuals living with HIV and thus retained funding for the AIDS Drug Assistance Program.

Specifically, I am eliminating:

- \$52,133,000 General Fund for various programs administered by the Office of AIDS: Education and Prevention, Therapeutic Monitoring, Counseling and Testing, Early Intervention, Home and Community Based Care, and Housing,
- \$16,337,000 General Fund for the Domestic Violence Program,
- \$9,000,000 General Fund for the Adolescent Family Life Program, and
- \$3,003,000 General Fund for the Black Infant Health Program.

I am deleting subdivision (d) of this section to conform to this action.

“SEC. 18.10. (a) The amount appropriated in Item 4265-001-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by \$6,981,000.

(b) Schedule (6) of Item 4265-001-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby revised to be -\$38,739,000.

(c) The amount appropriated in Item 4265-111-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$62,967,000~~ \$143,440,000.

(d) ~~Provision 2 is added to Item 4265-111-0001 of Section 2.00, to read:~~

~~2. It is the intent of the Legislature that the funds appropriated in this item be used to maintain core active surveillance activities to meet federal reporting requirements and to continue HIV/AIDS prevention and education efforts for which federal funds are not available.~~

(e) Provision 3 is added to Item 4265-111-0001 of Section 2.00, to read:

3. The appropriation in this item for the Alzheimer's Research Centers shall be used for direct services, including, but not limited to, diagnostic screening, case management, disease management, support for caregivers, and related services necessary for positive client outcomes."

SEC. 18.20—I am reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (a) of this section by \$47,050,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. I am also reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (c) of this section by \$2,950,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. Thus, I am increasing the General Fund reduction in Item 4280-101-0001 from \$125,581,000 to \$172,631,000, and in Item 4280-102-0001 from \$3,046,000 to \$5,996,000.

The effect of my action reflects a reduction of \$50,000,000 (from \$275,251,000 to \$225,251,000 in total General Fund program funding) to increase the reserve and to reduce the state's structural deficit. While this is a very difficult reduction, the Healthy Families program is not an entitlement and is a program that can be reduced during this difficult economic period. I hereby direct the Health and Human Services Agency to continue to work with the California Children and Families Commission, with local commissions, foundations, and other interested parties to provide additional resources to supplement General Fund appropriations and provide health care coverage for as many children as possible.

"Section 18.20. (a) The amount appropriated in Item 4280-101-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$125,581,000~~ \$172,631,000.

(b) Provision 2 is added to 4280-101-0001 of section 2.00, to read:

2. It is the intent of the Legislature, during these unprecedented fiscal times, to maintain the integrity of the Healthy Families Program to continue to provide health, dental, and vision coverage to low-income children. However, assistance from philanthropic organizations and other sources will be necessary in order for California to obtain its full allotment of federal funds to support this program. In the event funds are not available, it is the intent of the Legislature for the Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board to utilize its existing authority to establish a waiting list of children for enrollment in the program.

(c) The amount appropriated in Item 4280-102-0001 of Section 2.0 is hereby reduced by ~~\$3,046,000~~ \$5,996,000."

SEC. 18.30—I am reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (a) of this section by \$50,000,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. Thus, I am increasing the reduction in subdivision (a) from \$214,828,000 to \$264,828,000.

I am reducing Regional Center Purchase of Services by \$50,000,000 for services to children up to age five, as these services are due to program growth and thus eligible for funding from the California Children and Families Commission. I am directing the Secretary for the Health and Human Services Agency, the Department of Developmental Services, and the Department of Finance to immediately request funds from the Commission for this purpose.

I do not intend to pursue separate legislation changing eligibility or services for these children for purposes of achieving these savings. I urge the Commission to provide supplemental funding for the growth in these services.

“SEC. 18.30. (a) The amount appropriated in Item 4300-101-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$214,828,000~~ \$264,828,000.

(b) Schedule (4) of Item 4300-101-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby revised to be ~~-\$1,663,363,000.~~”

SEC. 18.40—I am reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (e) of this section by \$4,082,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. Thus, I am increasing the General Fund reduction from \$3,547,000 to \$7,629,000. I am vetoing \$4,082,000 to increase the reserve and to reduce the state's structural deficit, consistent with my May Revision proposal to eliminate this program.

The effect of my action reflects a partial veto of the legislative restoration for the Caregiver Resource Centers.

“SEC. 18.40. (a) The amount appropriated in Item 4440-001-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by \$8,447,000.

(b) The amount appropriated in Item 4440-103-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by \$113,380,000.

(c) The amount appropriated in Item 4440-104-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by \$52,000,000.

(d) (1) Provision 1 of Item 4440-104-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby deleted.

(2) Provision 3 is added to Item 4440-104-0001 of Section 2.00, to read:

3. These funds are for costs incurred in the 2006–07, 2007–08, 2008–09, and 2009–10 fiscal years. The first priority of funds appropriated in this item shall be used to offset the mandate reimbursement claims for the 2006–07 fiscal year. Remaining funds may be used to offset the mandate reimbursement claims for the 2007–08, 2008–09, and 2009–10 fiscal years.

(e) The amount appropriated in Item 4440-111-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$3,547,000~~ \$7,629,000.”

SEC. 18.50—I am reducing the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (d) of this section by \$37,555,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. Additionally, I reduce the item of General Fund appropriation in subdivision (f) of this section by \$19,075,000 as opposed to approving the item as presented without reduction. Thus, I am increasing the General Fund reduction from \$1,167,507,000 to \$1,224,137,000.

The effect of my action reflects a reduction of \$37,555,000 to In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS, Program 25.15) to reflect the following reductions:

- \$28,900,000 due to the determination that it is necessary to waive exemptions included in paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) of Section 29 of X4 AB 4 to maintain federal financial participation. Due to this determination, more IHSS recipients will be impacted by the reduction in services authorized in X4 AB 4.
- \$8,655,000 from reducing funding for IHSS Public Authority administration. This leaves \$10,000,000 General Fund available for the Public Authorities to provide assistance to recipients in finding IHSS providers, investigate qualifications of potential IHSS providers, and offer training to IHSS providers.

These reductions total \$37,555,000, which I am reducing from subdivision (d) of this Control Section. I am making these reductions so we have a prudent reserve and resources to address emergencies or additional revenue shortfalls.

My action also reflects a reduction of \$19,075,000 to Title IV-E Waiver (Program 26) to increase the reserve for economic uncertainties and to reduce the state's structural deficit, consistent with my May Revision proposal to achieve an unallocated reduction in the Child Welfare Services Program. I am reducing a total of \$79,956,000 for this purpose: \$19,075,000 from subdivision (f) of this Control Section and \$60,881,000 from Item 5180-151-0001.

“Sec. 18.50. (a) The amount appropriated in Item 5180-001-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by \$7,337,000.

(b) Provision 9 of Item 5180-001-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby deleted.

(c) The amount appropriated in Item 5180-101-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by \$500,501,000.

(d) The amount appropriated in Item 5180-111-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$643,248,000~~ \$680,803,000.

(e) Schedule (5) of Item 5180-111-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby deleted.

(f) The amount appropriated in Item 5180-153-0001 of Section 2.00 is hereby reduced by ~~\$16,421,000~~ \$35,496,000.”

With the above deletions, revisions, and reductions, I hereby approve Assembly Bill 1, Fourth Extraordinary Session.

/s/ Arnold Schwarzenegger

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER