

2-1983

Overview of State Assistance to Local Governments Since Proposition 13

Assembly Local Government Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caldocs_assembly



Part of the [Legislation Commons](#), and the [Taxation-State and Local Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Assembly Local Government Committee, "Overview of State Assistance to Local Governments Since Proposition 13" (1983).
California Assembly. Paper 450.
http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caldocs_assembly/450

This Committee Report is brought to you for free and open access by the California Documents at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in California Assembly by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jfischer@ggu.edu.

OVERVIEW OF STATE ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SINCE PROPOSITION 13

A Report Prepared by Staff of the
ASSEMBLY LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

With the Assistance of
Assembly Office of Research
Assembly Revenue & Taxation Committee
Assembly Ways & Means Committee

DOMINIC L. CORTESE
Chairman

February 1983

KFC
914
084

LAW LIBRARY
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY

OVERVIEW OF STATE ASSISTANCE
TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SINCE PROPOSITION 13

A Report Prepared by Staff of the
ASSEMBLY LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
With the Assistance of
Assembly Office of Research
Assembly Revenue & Taxation Committee
Assembly Ways & Means Committee

DOMINIC L. CORTESE
Chairman

February 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Fiscal Relief to Local Governments After Proposition 13	1
1978-79 Senate Bill 154	1
Allocation of Property Tax	2
Block Grants to Offset Property Tax Loss	2
1979-80 Assembly Bill 8 "The Long Term Solution"	6
1979-80 Base Calculation - "The Shift"	7
1979-80 Allocation of Property Tax Growth	8
Distribution of Property Tax in 1980-81 and Thereafter	8
Special District Augmentation Fund	9
The Deflator	9
Health and Welfare	
Full Program Buyout	10
Partial Program Buyout	11
Other Miscellaneous Health and Welfare Provisions	15
1981-82 Reductions in State Assistance	16
Target Reduction in 1981-82 Local Government Assistance.	16
Three Subventions Repealed	17
Offset For No-Property Tax Cities	18
One-Time Reduction Made in VLF Subvention	19
Distribution of VLF Cuts Among Cities and Counties	20
Adjustments to VLF Reduction Formula	21
"Capture" of Unsecured Roll Interest	22
Actual Subvention Reductions Less Than Target Level	23
Business Inventory Subvention COLA Changed	24
Health and Welfare	26
Other Provisions	27

1982-83 Reductions in State Assistance 28

 One Year Reduction in VLF Subventions 28

 VLF Reduction Calculated as the Lowest of Three Formulas. . . 29

 Fiscal Effect of VLF Cut. 31

 Local Agency Reimbursement Fund Established 32

 Health and Welfare 33

 Certain Special Districts Sustain One-Year Elimination of
 Subventions 35

 Net Fiscal Effect on Local Government 36

 Other Provisions 37

 Proposed Additional Reductions in State Assistance for
 1982-83 39

 Assembly Bill 36X 39

 Assembly Bill 28X 39

1983-84 Proposed Budget - Local Government Financial Assistance. 40

 Subvention Reductions 40

 Health and Welfare. 41

 Business Inventory COLA 42

Issues For Discussion 42

 Subvention Reduction Formulas 42

 Local Revenue Sources 43

 Earmarked State Revenues 44

Appendix I Estimated Net Revenue Reductions in 1981-82,
 By County and City 45

Appendix II Comparison of Fiscal Relief Reduction
 Alternatives for 1982-83, By County and City . . 63

Appendix III Estimated Impact of Assembly Bill 28X on
 Cities and Counties in 1982-83 79

OVERVIEW OF STATE ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Fiscal Relief to Local Governments After Proposition 13

Since the passage of Proposition 13 in June of 1978, the state has become engaged in a new fiscal relationship with local governments. In order to reduce the impact of the sudden and substantial reductions in property tax revenues for cities, counties and special districts, the state provided approximately \$2 billion in state assistance to local governments in 1978-79. This increased level of state assistance was sustained during 1979-80 and 1980-81 through the shift in property tax revenues from schools to local agencies established in Assembly Bill 8. Since 1981-82, however, this new fiscal relationship has become characterized by uncertainty. As the state's financial condition has worsened the state has looked to reductions in state assistance to local governments as a partial solution to its own difficulties. For both 1981-82 and 1982-83 the state made significant reductions in various forms of state assistance to local governments, and the continuing bleak state economic picture suggested that additional reductions were necessary for the remainder of 1982-83. Moreover, economic forecasts indicate that the state will be unable to sustain the anticipated level of local assistance for 1983-84 and will once again look to reductions in state assistance to local governments as a means of achieving a balanced state budget.

1978-79 SENATE BILL 154

Immediately following the passage of Proposition 13, the Legislature enacted SB 154 (Chapter 292) an acknowledged one year "bail out" solution. Under 154, the Legislature provided for the allocation of the 1% property tax allowed under Proposition 13, provided block

grants to local governments, and made several adjustments in the shared financing of several health and welfare programs.

I. Allocation of Property Tax

For 1978-79, property taxes were allocated to each local agency on a pro rata basis. The basis for the pro rata distribution for cities, counties and special districts was the average percentage of all property tax revenues collected (exclusive of taxes levied for debt retirement) within the county which each such city, county or district collected over the prior three fiscal years.

II. Block Grants to Offset Property Tax Loss

In order to offset the significant reduction in property tax revenues, the Legislature appropriated \$878 million in the form of block grants to cities, counties and districts. It was assumed that such assistance would insure that no entity would be left with less than 90% of the total revenue it would have received in 1978-79 had Proposition 13 not passed.

A. Cities

\$250 million was appropriated for distribution to all cities which sustained a property tax loss under Proposition 13. The distribution was based on each city's property tax loss in relation to the property tax loss of all cities statewide.

In recognition of the fact that a number of local agencies had reserve funds which they could use to help offset their property tax loss, the actual allocation to be made to any city was reduced by one-third of the city's surplus revenues or reserves which were in excess of 5% of its total 1977-78 revenues.

General fund reserves did not include the following and thus, block grants were not reduced due to these items:

1. Noncash assets such as stores, inventory, property and buildings, or other investments purchased prior to June 6, 1978.
2. Any amounts for self-insurance, for contractual obligations, or for reserves established by law or a governing board policy adopted prior to June 6, 1978.
3. Any amounts restricted by law or court order.
4. Any amounts committed to a capital outlay project approved prior to June 6, 1978, by the governing body.

Cities were required to use these funds first to ensure continuation of the same level of police and fire protection as was provided in 1977-78.

B. Counties

Assistance to counties was provided in two parts: (1) state assumption of various mandated health and welfare programs; and (2) a block grant to offset lost property tax revenues. State requirements for county health service were also modified in order to provide greater flexibility and cost savings in county administration.

1. State Assumption of Mandated Health and Welfare Programs

The state relieved counties of their fiscal liability for the costs of the following programs:

	(In millions)
a. MediCal	\$418
b. SSI/SSP	168

(In millions)

c. AFDC

Grants	\$ 257*
Administration	88
BHI (State assumes 95% of the non-federal costs)	92
Food Stamp Administration	<u>21</u>
	\$1044

2. County Block Grant

\$436 million was appropriated for distribution to counties. The distribution was based on each county's net property tax loss after taking into consideration the assistance provided by the state assumption of health and welfare programs. Thus, the total amount of state assistance to counties was \$1.480 billion.

Counties, like cities, were required to use these block grant funds to ensure the same level of sheriff and fire protection as was provided in 1977-78.

Counties were subject to the same reductions due to general fund reserves as were cities.

3. Program Waivers

The required 10% county match for mental health, alcohol and drug abuse programs was waived for 1978-79.

4. Mental Health Rollover

Unexpended mental health funds from the 1977-78 budget were allocated to the Department of Mental Health to provide local services to the mentally ill.

* Exclusive of AFDC cost-of-living increase. Under prior state law an automatic increase of 7.55% would have been granted to AFDC recipients at an added cost of \$24 million, but this increase was eliminated when the final state budget for 1978-79 provided for no cost-of-living increase.

C. Special Districts

1. \$125 million

\$125 million was appropriated in SB 154 for distribution to each county board of supervisors for allocation to the special districts within the county. (Note: Each city council having subsidiary districts within their jurisdiction received the funds to be allocated to such districts and was required to following the same procedure as counties in distributing those funds).

Each county received its apportionment on the basis of that county's special districts' collective property tax loss in relation to statewide special district property tax loss. The governing bodies were given discretion in determining the amount of assistance for each district, but were required to follow the following criteria and priorities:

a. Fire and Police

In the case of any district which provided fire protection services or a district which provided police protection services only, the governing body was required to provide an amount sufficient to ensure that each district could maintain the same level of protection as was actually provided in 1977-78.

b. Other Districts

(1) Districts with unobligated reserves of five percent or less of their total 1977-78 revenues were given priority over districts with surplus funds in excess of 5%.

- (2) Districts which relied most heavily upon the property tax to finance their activities were given priority over districts which were less dependent upon the property tax because they had revenues from other sources available to them.
- (3) Districts not authorized to use non-property tax revenue sources such as fees, rate and tolls, were given priority over districts authorized to utilize non property tax revenue sources.

Special districts were subject to reduction due to general fund reserves.

2. \$37 Million "Unmet Needs" Fund

In cleanup legislation (SB 2212 - Chapter 332) this addition appropriation was made to the State Department of Finance for allocation to districts which the Department determined had "unmet needs". In distributing these funds the Department was subject to the above-discussed procedures and criteria.

3. \$30 Million Fund

Legislation enacted in early 1979 appropriated an additional \$30 to be distributed by Boards of Supervisors and city councils to specified types of special districts.

1979-80 ASSEMBLY BILL 8 "THE LONG-TERM SOLUTION"

In 1979 the Legislature enacted a long-term method for the distribution of the property tax which would eliminate the so-called "bail out" of local governments on an annual basis.

The central feature of AB 8 was the creation of a local property tax base which would allow local agencies to realize growth in property tax revenues along with growth in assessed value. In order to achieve this objective, a portion of the property tax was shifted from school districts to local agencies, with growth allocated on a situs basis. In turn, the state increased financial assistance to school districts to make up the loss in property tax revenues.

Under the AB 8 property tax allocation system, in any fiscal year, a local agency is to receive property tax revenues equal to the amount it received in the prior year plus its share of any growth in property tax within its boundaries. The agency's share of the growth is in turn based on its share of the prior year's property tax in the area experiencing growth - (Note - These allocation formulas only apply to the \$4.00 countywide tax - levies for the retirement of voter approved indebtedness all accrue to the agency levying the tax.

I. 1979-80 Base Calculation - "The Shift"

For 1979-80, a one-time adjustment, "shift", was made which created a new property tax base for each local agency. Specifically, each county's, city's and special district's share of the property tax was increased by the amount of its 1978-79 SB 154 block grant (adjusted for various factors) and each school district's property tax share was reduced by the same amount.

In order to reduce the overall state cost of AB 8, local agencies did not receive 100% of their block grant amounts in additional property tax revenues. The property tax base calculated for each city, county and district was adjusted as follows:

- Cities: Cities received added property tax equal to 82.91 percent of the city's 1978-79 block grant.
- Counties: The sum of the following (whether positive or negative) was added to the counties' share of the property tax: (1) 1978-79 block grant, plus (2) an amount specified in AB 8 representing reduction in state buyout of AFDC costs, minus (3) new state grant for county health services.
- Special Districts: Districts received added property tax revenues equal to 95.24 percent of the 1978-79 block grant.

II. 1979-80 Allocation of Property Tax Growth

One of the objectives of AB 8 was to provide local governments with a revenue source which is not only their own but reflects their changing circumstances. Allocating property tax growth on a situs basis was chosen as the method for accomplishing this objective. Any property tax resulting from new assessed value - the "increment" or increase in assessed value over the prior year, whether due to new construction, change in ownership or the 2% allowable inflation factor - will accrue only to those jurisdictions in which the increase took place.

III. Distribution of Property Tax in 1980-81 and Thereafter

For 1980-81 and each year thereafter, each city, county, special district and school district receives the amount it received in the prior year plus its share of the property tax generated by assessed value growth within its boundaries.

IV. Special District Augmentation Fund

Consistent with the approach taken in SB 154 for allocating state assistance to special districts through the board of supervisors, and city councils in the case of subsidiary districts, AB 8 created a Special District Augmentation Fund in each county.

Annually, each special district which received state assistance funds in 1978-79 is required to contribute a portion of the property tax revenue it is entitled to receive to the Augmentation Fund. The amount each district contributes to the fund is based on the amount of state assistance it received in 1978-79.

By October 31 of each year each governing body is required to allocate the fund to the districts. Since there is no statutorily prescribed criteria for the allocation of augmentation funds, each governing body has full discretion to allocate the fund according to local policies and priorities.

Multicounty special districts receive their full share of property tax and do not participate in any Augmentation Fund.

V. The Deflator

One of the overriding concerns during the development of AB 8 was whether, over the long-term, the state could afford to sustain the program. For this reason, a mechanism known as the deflator was included and provides for the total costs of the AB 8 program for any given year to be automatically reduced if insufficient state funds are available.

For any fiscal year, if state revenues do not increase by CPI and population the amount of the shortfall is made up by reductions in state assistance.

Fifty percent of the amount of the shortfall would be reflected in across-the-board percentage cuts in school assistance.

Reductions for the remaining fifty percent would be effected through reductions in state subvention payments to local governments.

VI. Health and Welfare

A. Full Program Buyout

1. Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Program (SSI/SSP)

This program is administered by the federal Social Security Administration, and provides cash grants to eligible aged, blind and disabled persons. The state and counties shared in the costs of the state supplement (SSP). The amount of county contribution was fixed according to what it had been paying prior to federalization of the programs, increased by changes in the assessed value of property. AB 8 made permanent the one-year buyout of the county share of SSP grants provided by SB 154.

2. Medi-Cal

This state program is operated pursuant to federal requirements in order to qualify for federal funding, and provides health services for low-income persons. County contribution to program costs was set at a fixed amount which

increased at the same rate as changes in the assessed value of property. Statewide, counties shared in approximately 13% of Medi-Cal program costs in 1977-78. Under AB 8, the state assumed the entire county share of Medi-Cal costs, making permanent the one-year buyout provided by SB 154.

3. Aid for the Adoption of Children (AAC)

The AAC program waives the adoption fees for certain hard-to-place children, in addition to providing a monthly payment equal to the amount that would have been paid if the child had been placed in a foster home instead of being adopted. Under AB 8, the state permanently assumes the entire cost of this program.

4. Work Incentive Program (WIN) Expenses

Welfare recipients enrolled in the WIN program as part of the work requirements for AFDC are reimbursed for work and training related expenses and child care costs associated with their participation in WIN. Prior to 1979-80, counties paid for 3.25% of these costs, with the state and federal governments paying 6.75% and 90%, respectively. AB 8 assumed the 3.25% county share of costs, to produce a total state share of 10%.

B. Partial Program Buyout

1. AFDC Payments to Families

This program provides financial assistance to broken families and to families with unemployed parents. Prior to SB 154, counties paid 32.5% of the non-federal share (16.5% of total costs including federal share). SB 154

provided a one-year buyout of the counties' share.

AB 8 provided for a permanent two-thirds buyout, thereby reducing the county share of non-federal costs from 32.5% to 10.8% (5.4% of total costs including federal share).

2. AFDC Administration

Counties administer the AFDC program under state supervision and have been required to fund 50% of the non-federal administrative costs (25% of total costs including federal share). SB 154 provided a one-year total buyout of these costs for fiscal 1978-79. AB 8 required counties to continue to fund 50% of the non-federal share of AFDC administrative costs. The state assumed 50% of the non-federal share of staff development costs, which were previously paid by the counties.

3. AFDC Special Needs

Cost of providing special items of need over and above the basic subsistence grant are provided at county expense (i.e., counties pay all the non-federal costs). SB 154 provided no buyout of these costs. Under AB 8 the state assumed 89.2% of the counties' costs.

4. AFDC Foster Care

The Boarding Homes and Institutions Program (BHI) provides cash grants for eligible children placed in foster care homes and institutions because of abuse, abandonment, neglect, or inability of parents to care for them.

Prior to SB 154, counties were paying the major share of foster care averaging approximately 65%. SB 154 bought

out 95% of the non-federal share of costs for one year. AB 8 continued this 95% buyout until December 31, 1983, at which time the law reverts back to the old sharing formula. Concomitant with the increase in state funding are requirements for tighter state supervision of the program, including development of a management information system, program definition, and a quality control system.

5. Family Protection Pilot Projects

Prior to 1979-80, two counties operated family protection pilot projects pursuant to provisions of legislation enacted in 1976 and 1977. AB 8 tied the state share of costs for these projects, which test alternatives to the AFDC-BHI program, to the state share of foster care BHI in 1979-80 and 1980-81. Costs for the two counties were thus reduced from a 33% share to 5% for the two fiscal years.

6. Aid to the Potentially Self-Supporting Blind (APSB)

Prior to 1979-80, counties paid half of the administrative costs of the APSB program, which is a special state program designed to encourage blind recipients to become self-supporting. AB 8 provided for two-thirds of the county costs of administration to be assumed by the state, thereby reducing the county share from 50% to 16%.

7. County Health Services

Counties had funded 100% of the uncompensated costs of public health services and inpatient and outpatient services to indigents (i.e., those not eligible for state medical programs).

AB 8 established a state fund for providing counties with a \$3 per capita grant plus 50% of remainder of the county's uncompensated costs for fiscal year 1977-78, both adjusted annually by CPI. Counties were required to submit an annual plan and budget and to agree with the state to expend required county matching funds in meeting net county costs.

8. Child Support Enforcement Program

Under provisions of federal and state law, county district attorney offices administer a program to collect child support payments from absent parents. Under SB 154, the state assumed the county share of 25% of administrative costs for welfare and non-welfare cases. The 12.75% state incentive payment to counties was suspended for one year.

AB 8 impacted this program in two ways:

Administration. Counties retained 25% sharing in welfare and non-welfare cases, with the federal government participating in 75% of costs. The State assumed 75% of costs of non-welfare cases if no federal participation.

Incentive payment. Increased state incentive payment from 12.75% of collections to 15.0% until December 31, 1980 with future action contingent on findings from a program study required by the bill.

9. Food Stamp Administration

The Food Stamp Program enables qualified, low-income persons to supplement their food purchases at full federal cost. County welfare departments determine eligibility of persons for the program in California.

The administrative costs of the program are shared 50% federal with counties contributing a fixed amount based on their administrative expenditures in 1973 which totals \$21.5 million and the state paying the remainder. SB 154 provided for a one-year assumption of the counties fixed contribution. AB 8 required the counties to share in the non-federal costs on a 50% county - 50% state basis. For fiscal 1979-80, the counties' 50% share was \$20.8 million statewide.

C. Other Miscellaneous Health and Welfare Provisions

1. Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Community Mental Health Programs
Counties had been required to match state funds for these programs on a 90% - 10% basis. AB 8 would waived the required 10% match for drug abuse, alcohol and mental health programs for three years.
2. State Hospitals for Developmental Disabled and Mentally Ill
Counties had provided 10% of costs of county residents in state hospitals. AB 8 waived this 10% match until December 31, 1979, at which time the 10% match was to be restored.
3. Cost Control Mechanisms
Provided fiscal sanctions and control mechanisms to assume adequate county performance in the administration of AFDC, food stamps and Medi-Cal:
 - a. Counties were required to pay for all costs of ineligibles and overpayments in AFDC above a specified error rate.
 - b. Counties were required to pay for administrative costs which exceed standards of performance and allocations

established annually in the Budget. Requirements apply to both AFDC and Medi-Cal administration.

- c. The State Department of Social Services was authorized to develop a state centralized, automated program verification and management system by which county performance will be monitored.

4. State Administrative Costs

AB 8 provided \$2.2 million appropriation to state agencies to fund the increased administrative costs related to the AFDC-BHI study, cost control mechanisms and the county health services fund.

1981 82 REDUCTIONS IN STATE ASSISTANCE

The 1981-82 Budget year was the first year in which the state began to experience significant fiscal problems. It was projected that the deflator would trigger for 1981-82 resulting in reductions in state funding to schools and local governments totalling \$2.8 billion.

It was in response to this situation that SB 102 (Marks) Chapter 101 of 1981, and AB 250 and AB 251 (Vasconcellos) Chapter 102 and 133 of 1981 dealt with reductions in state assistance to local governments.

The "deflator" was suspended for 1981-82 in favor of the following reductions:

I. Target Reduction in 1981-82 Local Government Assistance

A target level of \$275 million was set as the amount by which state assistance to cities and counties was to be reduced in 1981-82, before certain adjustments. This reduction amount was allocated one-third to counties (\$92 million) and two-thirds to cities (\$183 million).

Special districts were generally not affected by the reductions. The one exception is the changes made in business inventory subventions

The reductions were made in two ways: a permanent repeal of three local subventions and a one-time reduction in the Vehicle License Fund Subvention (VLF).

II. Three Subventions Repealed

The following three subventions were permanently repealed:

1. Liquor License Fee

Historically, 90% of liquor license fees collected by the state were returned to cities and counties in proportion to the amount collected in each city and each county.

By repealing this subvention, all revenues now accrue to the State Alcohol Beverage Control Fund and the State General Fund.

The estimated 1981-82 local government loss of liquor license subventions is as follows:

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
\$2.7 million	\$12.1 million	\$14.8 million

2. Highway Carrier's Uniform Business Tax

All persons and companies operating motor vehicles engaged in the transportation of property on the public highways is subject to a fee of one-tenth of one percent of gross operating revenues.

Historically, the proceeds of the fee were apportioned to cities and counties on the basis of population. Under the

1981 repeal of this subvention, the funds are now deposited in the State General Fund.

The estimated revenue loss for 1981-82 is estimated to be:

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
\$ 0	\$4.3 million	\$4.3 million

3. Financial Aid to Local Agencies (FALA) Fund

The FALA Fund was established by AB 66, Chapter 1150 of 1979. Taxes collected from banks and financial institutions from that portion of their rate in excess of the 9.6% general corporation tax rate accrue to the fund. Prior to the repeal in 1981-82, the revenues were distributed to cities and counties pursuant to the following formula: half to cities and counties unincorporated areas, by population, and half to counties based on AFDC benefits paid to county residents, which was to be further distributed among cities and unincorporated areas in inverse proportion to personal income.

For 1981-82 and subsequent years, revenues attributable to the higher bank tax rate accrue to the State General Fund.

The estimated revenue loss to local governments is as follows:

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
-\$7.5 million	-\$22.5 million	-\$30.0 million

Offset for No-Property Tax Cities

Thirty-one cities which existed in 1977-78 (prior to Proposition 13) never levied a property tax (other than for voter approved indebtedness). It was argued that since these cities did not sustain a property tax loss under Proposition 13, and thus did not receive any state assistance under AB 8, it was inequitable to include them in

and reductions in local government assistance which results from the state's inability to continue to finance the AB 8 program. Accordingly, an in-lieu appropriation of \$2.2 million for 1981-82 was provided for these "no-property tax cities" to offset their revenue losses from the repeal of the three subventions.

The estimated combined fiscal effect of repeal of the three subventions, with the adjustment for no-property tax cites, is summarized in the following table:

TABLE I

Fiscal Effect on Local Governments of Repeal of
Three Subventions, 1981-82
(In millions)

<u>Subvention</u>	<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
Liquor License Fees	-\$ 2.7	-\$12.1	-\$14.8
Highway Carriers			
Uniform Business Tax	- 0.0	- 4.3	- 4.3
FALA Fund	- 7.5	- 22.5	- 30.0
Subtotal	-10.2	-38.9	-49.1
No-Property-Tax			
Cities Appropriation	0	+ 2.2	+ 2.2
Total	-\$10.2	-\$36.7	-\$46.9

III. One-Time Reduction Made in VLF Subvention

The motor vehicle license fee is imposed annually on vehicles equal to two percent of market value. The revenues (except for trailer coach fees) are distributed 50% to counties based on population and 50% to cities based on population. Trailer coach fees are distributed on a situs basis.

Before the effect of the reductions, VLF subventions to cities and counties in 1981-82 were projected to be as follows:

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
\$342 million	\$317 million	\$659 million

In calculating the reduction in this subvention for 1981-82 the State Controller was required first to subtract from the target reduction levels of \$183 million for cities and \$92 million for counties, the aggregate amounts attributable to repeal of the three subventions measured in 1980-81 terms. The remaining amount was the amount of the VLF subvention reduction for 1981-82 to be spread among cities and counties. The estimated amounts are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Controller's Calculation of 1981-82
Reduction in VLF Subventions
(In Millions)

	<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
Target Total Reduction	\$ 92.0	\$183.0	\$275.0
Repealed Subventions (1980-81 Measure)			
Liquor License Fees	-\$ 2.7	-\$ 12.1	-\$ 14.8
Highway Carriers			
Uniform Business Tax	0	- 4.3	- 4.3
FALA Fund	- 5.5	- 14.5	- 20.0
Remainder: Reduction in 1981-82 VLF Subventions	\$ 82.5	\$153.5	\$ 236.0

(Source: State Controller, December 1981)

A. Distribution of VLF Cuts Among Cities and Counties

The distribution of the estimated \$153.5 million VLF reduction among cities and the estimated \$82.5 million VLF reduction among counties was based on the amount of state assistance received by such agencies under AB 8 in 1979-80. Specifically, for each city, a factor was calculated representing its share of all state assistance payments made

to determine the amount of the reduction for each county. For cities, the VLF subvention was reduced from \$317 million to \$208 million, a reduction of \$109.5 million. For counties, the VLF subvention was reduced from \$342 million to \$321 million, a net reduction of \$21.5 million after the offset for increased county health and welfare costs discussed below.

It should be noted that a small number of cities and counties received no state assistance from AB 8, and thus did not share in the VLF reduction in 1981-82. These include the "no-property-tax" cities, cities which did not exist in 1978, and counties whose county health service reductions in 1979 offset their state assistance payments.

B. Adjustments to VLF Reduction Formula

Two adjustments were included in the VLF reduction formula in order to reduce the impact of the calculated reductions.

1. "Per Capita Cap"

This adjustment insured that no city or county would sustain a per capita reduction in all subventions greater than the average per capita reductions for city residents and county residents resulting from the target reductions. The "per capita cap" for cities was \$10.87 (\$183 million divided by 17,313,150 population) and \$3.87 for counties (\$92 million divided by 23,772,610 population).

The "per capita cap" reduced the target 1981-82 reductions by \$71.2 million.

2. Offset for Counties' SB 633 Costs

SB 633, Chapter 69 of 1981, instituted a number of changes in health and welfare programs resulting in both costs and savings to counties for 1981-82. Counties were allowed to offset any net costs of SB 633 against the VLF reductions calculated under the reduction formula. This offset provision reduced the target 1981-82 reductions by \$33.5 million.

In some cases, a county's SB 633 net cost was greater than the targeted subvention reduction and thus such costs could not be fully offset. According to the Department of Finance, SB 633 costs not fully offset by subvention reductions and thus absorbed by the counties total \$8.8 million.

IV. "Capture" of Unsecured Roll Intent

For 1978-79, it was unclear what property tax rate was to be applied to the unsecured roll. While Section 12 of Article XIII of the California Constitution requires property taxes on the unsecured roll to be computed using the prior year's secured tax roll rate, Article XIII A (Proposition 13) provides that property be taxed at no more than 1% of acquisition value.

Twenty-two counties collected the 1978-79 unsecured roll property taxes using the 1977-78 (higher) secured tax rate while thirty-six counties used the (lower) 1% rate. For the most part, in the counties which used the higher rate, revenues from the portion of the rate in excess of the 1% rate were impounded pending the outcome of litigation on the issue.

In order to make up the estimated \$71 million shortfall in VLF reductions resulting from the per capita cap, the State "captured" the interest earned on the impounded unsecured roll taxes by the 22 counties according to the following procedure.

The County Auditor was directed to determine and report to the State Controller the amount of interest earned by each local agency from investment of the funds through June 30, 1981.

This amount reported was, however, required to be adjusted so that it is no less than the amount which would have been earned had the rate of interest been two percentage points below the rate earned on money deposited in the Pooled Money Investment Fund during the same period.

The state "captured" the interest by deducting an equivalent amount from the business inventory subvention made to the counties in 1981-82. If the amount of interest was greater than the BI subvention, the remainder was to be subtracted from the 1982-83 payment.

V. Actual Subvention Reductions Less Than Target Level

As shown in Table 3, the total amount of subvention reductions for 1981-82, including the unsecured roll interest capture was \$229.7 million -- \$45.3 million less than the targeted amount of \$275 million.

This shortfall is the net effect of several offsetting features: (1) the SB 633 offset and the "per capita cap" reduced the cut; (2) the state's "capture" of the unsecured roll interest partially offset the "per capita cap" effect; and (3) the fact that the 1981-82 actual losses from the repealed subventions were higher than the 1981-82 measure used in the formula increased the reduction

Appendix I contains estimates prepared by the Legislative Analyst's Office of the impact of the 1981-82 subvention reductions on all cities and counties in the State.

Business Inventory Subvention COLA Changed

Under legislation enacted in 1979 (AB 66, Chapter 1150) business inventories (BI) were fully exempted from property taxation. The state makes subventions to local agencies each year to reimburse for the loss of property tax revenues caused by the exemption. The amount of the subvention is provided in statute to be the amount subvned in the prior year, increased using a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) formula, called the State Reimbursement for Inventory Tax (SRIT) factor.

As part of the 1981-82 budget package, the SRIT factor for 1981-82 was repealed, and replaced by a specified increase of 2.92%. By contrast, use of the statutory formula in 1981-82 would have required a COLA of 11.1%. The 1981-82 savings to the state was \$40.5 million. This was done in response to a finding that the SRIT factor has overcompensated local agencies for the property tax revenue loss due to the BI exemption. The 2.92% COLA was set to reimburse a 1981-82 revenue loss estimated by the Department of Economic and Business Development based on the relationship between inventory value and Gross State Product.

TABLE 3

Difference Between "Target" Cut and
Actual Reduction in Subventions in 1981-82
(In Millions)

	<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Special Districts</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>"Target" Cut</u>	-\$92.0	-\$183.0		-\$275.0
<u>Actual Cut</u>				
Repeal of Subventions				
Liquor	- 2.7	- 12.1		- 14.8
Highway	- 0	- 4.3		- 4.3
FALA	- 7.5	- 22.5		- 30.5
No-Property-Tax Cities Appropriation	- 0	+ 2.2		+ 2.2
SUBTOTAL	<u>\$10.2</u>	<u>\$ 36.7</u>		<u>\$ 47.4</u>
VLF Adjustments Target				
Reduction	-\$82.5	-\$153.5		-\$236.0
Per Capita Cap	+ 27.5	+ 43.7		+ 71.2
SB 633 Adjustment	+ 33.5	0		+ 33.5
SUBTOTAL	<u>-\$21.5</u>	<u>-\$109.8</u>		<u>-\$131.3</u>
<u>Subtotal: Subvention Cuts</u>	<u>-\$31.7</u>	<u>-\$146.5</u>		<u>-\$178.7</u>
"Capture" of Unsecured Roll Interest	33.0	10.0	\$ 7.6	-\$ 51.0
<u>Total Actual Cut</u>	N/A	N/A		-\$229.7
<u>Difference:</u>				
Target v. Actual	N/A	N/A		\$ 45.3

N/A: Not Available.

(Source: State Controller and Department of Finance.)

The budget package also made a permanent modification to the statutory SRIT factor formula, which is in effect again for 1982-83 and thereafter. The original SRIT factor provided that BI subventions are to be adjusted annually by the change in cost-of-living plus the change in population in the county. This was enacted prior to the adoption of Proposition 4 of 1979, which established governmental appropriations limits. The SRIT factor approximated but did not duplicate the exact Proposition 4 calculation, which requires adjustment by the change in population multiplied by the lesser of the change in cost-of-living or the change in per capita personal income. The 1981 local government package adopted this latter change to conform the SRIT factor formula to the Prop. 4 formula.

For 1982-83, the Legislative Analyst estimated this change would reduce BI subventions by \$24.4 million .

VI. Health and Welfare

The following adjustments were made in county health and welfare programs for 1981-82.

A. Alcohol, Mental Health and Drug Abuse

Under AB 8, the counties' 10% match for alcohol, mental health and drug abuse was waived for three years. This 10% match requirement was reestablished, beginning in 1981-82.

B. In-Home Supportive Services

The In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program provides specified supportive services to enable eligible persons to remain in their own homes as an alternative to out of home care. The state continued to pay cost of this program up to the 1980-81 level. For any costs over that amount, counties became responsible for 10%, and counties were made

responsible for 100% of costs exceeding the total amount budgete

VII. Other Provisions

The 1981-82 budget package contained several other miscellaneous provisions affecting local government. These are:

1. Appropriation to Los Angeles County. Five million dollars was appropriated in 1981-82 to Los Angeles County for purposes of state assistance payments.

2. VLF Reduction Offset for City of Oakland. The amount of 1981-82 VLF subvention reduction to be sustained by the City of Oakland was lessened, using a formula based on a provision of AB 8 if 1979. The amount by which Oakland's reduction was offset is \$2 million.

3. Local Agency Indebtedness Fund (LAIF) Changes. Several changes were made in provisions pertaining to the Local Agency Indebtedness Fund, which was created after Prop. 13 to make loans so as to prevent actual or technical default of local bonds. Changes made in 1981 continued the loan program in fiscal years beyond 1980-81, limited eligibility for loans only to cases where default is due solely to lack of funds resulting from the passage of Prop. 13, and changed the interest rate on loans to a rate established by the Pooled Money Investment Board but not less than the interest rate on the bonds for which the agency is requesting the loan.

In addition, \$17 million from the unencumbered balance of the LAIF was transferred in July 1981 back to the General Fund. This left an unencumbered balance in the Fund of about \$10.8

million. (Section 36 of Chapter 169 of 1981.) However, subsequent unrelated legislation reduced this balance further (Chapter 998 of 1981).

The above-discussed reductions and adjustments resulted in growth in county general purpose revenues of 3.6%. This was a decrease of 2.8% of anticipated 1981-82 revenues.

For cities, such actions resulted in a general purpose revenue growth of 4.7%, for a decrease of 3.2% of anticipated 1981-82 revenues.

1982-83 REDUCTIONS IN STATE ASSISTANCE

In the development of the 1982-83 state budget, the projection of state revenues showed that the AB 8 deflator would be triggered. "Deflator" cuts were projected to be approximately \$2.4 billion, half of which would be sustained by local agencies and half by schools.

The Legislature responded as it did in 1981-82 by again suspending the deflator for the coming year and instead enacting a statutory plan for one-year only reductions in fiscal assistance to cities, counties and special districts, along with some adjustments in some health program costs.

The reductions in state assistance to local governments were enacted in the budget, AB 21 (Vasconcellos) Chapter 326 of 1982, in the budget "trailer bill", SB 132 (Alquist) Chapter 327 of 1982, and in the MediCal reform bill, AB 799 (Robinson) Chapter 328 of 1982.

The major provisions of the 1982-83 local government finance package are as follows:

I. One Year Reduction in VLF Subventions

Following the approach utilized in 1981-82 in SB 102, the 1982-83 budget package made reductions in city and county vehicle license

fee (VLF) subventions.

Before the effect of the reductions, VLF subventions to cities and counties in 1982-83 were projected to be as follows:

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
\$369 million	\$342 million	\$711 million

VLF Reduction Calculated as the Lowest of Three Formulas

Under SB 1326 three separate calculations were made for determining the VLF subvention reduction. The actual reduction was the lowest of the three calculations. The following are the three alternative calculations:

1. In Proportion to AB 8 State Assistance

This first option represents a continuation of the approach used to allocate VLF reductions for 1981-82. Computational statewide targets were established (\$345.5 million for cities, \$61 million for counties). The \$345.5 million city target was allocated among cities in proportion to each city's share of total state assistance distributed to cities in 1979 under AB 8. The same procedure was used to allocate the \$61 million target reduction among counties.

2. Based on Average Statewide Per Capita Reduction

This option is also an extension of a concept embodied in the VLF reduction formula used in 1981-82. Each city's population, as a proportion of the population of all cities in the state, was determined. Then the \$345.5 million target reduction for cities was allocated among them based on these population factors. The same procedure was followed to allocate the \$61 million target reduction among counties.

3. Measured By 1982-83 State Assistance Receipts

The third optional formula for calculating the city and county reductions was not part of the approach used in effecting subvention reductions in 1981-82. This option involves calculating the 1982-83 value of state assistance anticipated to be received by cities and counties.

For cities, 1982-83 state assistance was measured by 1979 "state assistance payments" (the property tax shift), increased by the amount of assessed value growth between 1978-79 and 1982-83. This amount was then reduced by the amount of the three subventions that were repealed by SB 102 in 1981-82.

For counties, the 1982-83 state assistance was measured by 1979 state assistance payments, increased by the amount of assessed value growth between 1978-79 and 1982-83. This amount was then increased by the 1982-83 value of local fiscal relief for health and welfare, as determined by the Department of Finance. This sum was then reduced by the amount of the three subventions repealed in 1981-82.

The resulting amount became known as the "net bailout" amount for 1982-83. Since the formula calls for the reduction to be based on the lowest of the three calculations, VLF reductions would not exceed an agency's "net bailout" for 1982-83.

SB 1326 further provided that for two cities the calculated reduction was to be further adjusted by specified amounts as follows:

For the City of Oakland, a formula was provided which had the effect of reducing the computed reduction by \$3 million.

For the City of San Jose, a formula was provided which had the effect of reducing the computed reduction by \$1.6 million.

Appropriation to No-Property Tax Cities

Continuing the approach taken in 1981-82, the thirty-one no-property tax cities were provided in-lieu appropriations in 1982-83 to offset their revenue losses attributable to the repeal in 1981-82 of the liquor license fee, highway carriers uniform business tax, and financial assistance to local agencies subventions.

This appropriation for 1982-83 was estimated by the Legislative Analyst to be \$2.2 million.

II. Fiscal Effect of VLF Cut

The "lowest of the three" approach for computing reductions in subventions to cities and counties, was designed to ensure that each city and county which received state assistance in 1979 realized some reduction in state aid in 1982-83, while also ensuring that a city or county neither took a cut larger than the statewide average per capita cut nor lost more than 100% of its current state assistance or "bailout":

The estimated 1982-83 fiscal effect of the VLF reductions for cities and counties made according to the three optional formulas, including the adjustments for Oakland and San Jose and the appropriations to no-property tax cities is as follows:

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
-\$40.2 million	-\$221.6 million	-\$261.8 million

(Source: Legislative Analyst, June 25, 1982)

The print-out reproduced in Appendix II shows, for each city and county, the three alternate calculations, and identifies the lowest of each for purposes of making the VLF reduction for 1982-83.

III. Local Agency Reimbursement Fund Established

The reductions in state assistance for 1982-83 are partially offset by a one-time distribution to cities and counties of certain revenue from the state bank tax rate.

SB 1326 establishes a Local Agency Reimbursement Fund (LARF), into which is to be transferred in 1982-83 \$10 million from the amount of revenue attributable to the excess of the bank tax rate over the general corporation tax rate for the income year ending in 1981.

(California's general tax rate on corporations is 9.6%. In 1981 the tax rate on banks and financial corporations was \$11 bill. The added rate on banks and financials is imposed to recoup revenue not collected from these corporations due to their exemption from local personal property and business license taxes. The revenue raised from this 2% differential is estimated to be in the \$30 million range, and it is from this sum that \$10 million is to be transferred to the Local Agency Reimbursement Fund in 1982-83.)

SB 1326 provides that the \$10 million balance in the Local Agency Reimbursement Fund is, by February 28, 1983, to be distributed in the following manner:

1. Half is to be distributed to cities and counties in proportion to population.
2. The other half is to be distributed to cities and counties in proportion to each's share of statewide bank and financial corporations' salaries and wages.

Calculations for counties' population and bank and financial location are for unincorporated areas only.

(The Local Agency Reimbursement concept is very similar to the Financial Aid to Local Agencies (FALA) subvention, which was one of the three small subventions repealed in 1981-82 as part of SB 102. Like the Local Agency Reimbursement, FALA also drew its funding from revenue attributable to the higher bank tax rate, and it too sent revenue back to cities on a two-part formula, one part of which was population-based. While the newly-created Local Agency Reimbursement formula uses bank and financial salaries and wages for the second part of the allocation formula, FALA used inverse proportion to personal income.)

The 1982-83 fiscal effect of the Local Agency Reimbursement provision is estimated to be as follows (in millions):

<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Total</u>
\$3.0	#7.0	\$10.0

(Source: Legislative Analyst, July 23, 1982)

IV. Health and Welfare

A. Counties: Transfer of Health and Welfare Program Responsibilities

Several provisions enacted in the budget and in AB 799, the MediCal reform bill, had the effect of shifting some health care program responsibilities to counties. Those shifts are as follows:

1. Medically Indigent Adult Transfer. The Medically Indigent Adult category, which is totally funded by the state, was eliminated as a MediCal category December 31, 1982.

Seventy percent of the dollars (calculated on the basis of the last three years) will be given to counties to deliver medical services to this population. The Legislative Analyst estimated that funding at the 70% level will be adequate revenue for counties to provide care for this population since counties are also given additional flexibility in determining eligibility and benefits. Fiscal year 1982-83 expenditures for the Medically Indigent Adult category are estimated to be \$715 million. AB 799 provides that during the last half of fiscal year 1982-83 counties will receive approximately \$250 million to care for this population.

Accommodation is provided for small counties to assume this responsibility or to contract with the state.

Counties that decided to initiate the transfer prior to January 1, 1983 benefit from having the savings allocated over a longer period. No estimate of the fiscal effect of this provision is available.

To facilitate funding the "pipeline" (claims incurred for this population between July 1, 1982 and January 1, 1983), Los Angeles County will loan the state funds in return for which counties (Los Angeles) will not be liable for MediCal audit payback claimed by the state.

2. Cuts in Eligibility and Benefits. Various changes in eligibility and benefits were made in the MediCal program in AB 799 to generate cost savings to the state. It was hypothesized that individuals and families who

were no longer eligible for services and benefits would spent their personal resources to secure health care. Others have suggested that many of these persons will simply shift from the MediCal program to county health programs because of the lack of expendable resources. No estimates on county impact may be determined from these eligibility and benefit changes until counties have experience with the program as modified.

3. Cuts in Reimbursement. AB 799 provides that physician services and hospital outpatient services reimbursement will be reduced by 10%. It is estimated that county reduction for hospital outpatient services could be from \$6 to \$9 million, and physician reimbursement reduction from \$14 to \$15 million.

In addition, provisions enacted in SB 1326 had the effect of shifting to the counties the responsibility for funding non-federally eligible AFDC-U recipients (Aid to Families With Dependent Children, where parents are unemployed). The cost to counties of this change is unknown. State savings are estimated to be approximately \$29 million for 1982-83.

V. Certain Special Districts Sustain One-Year Elimination of Subventions

Special districts identified by the State Controller as enterprise districts are also included in the 1982-83 local government aid reductions.

SB 1326 provides that in 1982-83, no enterprise districts (except those providing transit services or operating an airport) shall be paid the statutory reimbursement for the exemption of business

inventories (BI) from property taxation. The legislation specifies that the amount of BI subvention allocated by the auditor to other local jurisdictions shall equal the amount allocated to them in 1982.

Enterprise districts generally are those where operations are accounted for in a manner similar to a private enterprise, and where the acquisition, operation and maintenance of governmental facilities and services are entirely or predominantly self-supporting by user charges.

According to the Department of Finance, about 1,500 enterprise districts will sustain the BI subvention elimination, producing a 1982-83 revenue loss for those districts of \$8.0 million.

Net Fiscal Effect on Local Governments

Table 4 below portrays the net effect on local agencies of the fiscal relief provisions enacted in the 1982-83 budget and trailer bill.

Net savings to the state in local government aid in 1982-83 amount to \$260 million. The three classes of local agencies sustain the following net losses in the aggregate: counties lose \$37 million, cities lose \$215 million, and special districts lose \$8 million.

For counties, the above-discussed actions result in a 6.7% increase in general purpose revenues which is a decrease of 1% of anticipated 1982-83 revenues. This growth rate does not include any increased local cost for Medically Indigent Adults or AFDC-U (see pages 32 - 34).

For cities, the net effect is growth of 2.7% in general purpose revenues which is a decrease of 4.4% of anticipated 1982-83 revenues.

Table 4
Fiscal Effect on Local Agencies
1982-83 Local Government Finance Provisions

	<u>Counties</u>	<u>Cities</u>	<u>Special Districts</u>	<u>Total</u>
VLF Reductions*	-\$40.2	-\$221.6	n/a	-\$261.8
LARF Subvention	+ 3.0	+ 7.0	n/a	+ 10.0
Elimination of Special District BI Subvention	<u>n/a</u>	<u>n/a</u>	<u>-\$8.0</u>	<u>- 8.0</u>
Net Effect	-\$37.2**	-\$214.6	-\$8.0	-\$259.8

n/a: Not applicable.

* Includes \$2.2 million appropriation to no-property-tax cities.

** In addition, counties may absorb additional health care program costs. These costs cannot be quantified at this time.

VI. Other Provisions

SB 1326 contains a number of other miscellaneous provisions affecting local government finance in 1982-83. Among them are:

- A. Balance of Local Agency Indebtedness Fund (LAIF) Transferred.
The LAIF was created after Prop. 13 to make loans to local agencies from the state to prevent actual or technical default of local bonds. SB 1326 transfers \$2.8 million of the unencumbered balance of the LAIF to the General Fund.

- B. No Business Inventory Subvention COLA. In keeping with the 1982-83 budget policy of not giving cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) in any program areas, the statutory formula for increasing business inventory subventions to cities, counties, and special districts is waived; it would have required an 8.7% increase in subventions 1982-83. Instead, SB 1326 provides that for 1982-83 the sum of the BI reimbursements for all jurisdictions within a county shall be equal to the reimbursement computed for the prior fiscal year.

The Legislative Analyst estimates this provision results in a net state savings of \$28.0 million.

- C. Local Fee and Tax Authority Broadened. SB 1326 adds statutory language which specifies that the legislative body of any general law city may levy any tax which may be levied by a charter city, subject to the voters' approval pursuant to Article XIII A of the Constitution.

SB 1326 also allows local agencies to levy any fee or charge in connection with an aerial tramway.

- D. VLF Subventions Reduced to Help Fund Property Tax Monitoring Program.

The State Board of Equalization conducts a local property tax monitoring program and local assessment practices surveys, which help to identify local property tax revenues which may have escaped collection. The budget bill transfers the sum of \$986,000 from the Vehicle License Fee (VLF) account to the State Board of Equalization to fund 50%

of the Board's monitoring and assessment survey activities. That revenue would otherwise have been subvned to cities and counties based on a statutory formula. The \$986,000 reduction is made "off the top", meaning the reduction is shared among cities and counties in proportion to the statutory formula for distributing VLF.

VII. Proposed Additional Reductions in State Assistance for 1982-83.

As of January 1983, the state's current year deficit was \$1.6 million. In response to the severity of the current year's shortfall, the Governor has proposed to further reduce state assistance to local agencies for 1982-83 by \$108 million.

VIII. Assembly Bill 36X

AB 36X as introduced, proposed to reduce city and county remaining subvention payments by \$108 million apportioned one-half to cities and one-half to counties. Under this proposal, 362 cities which have remaining subvention payments have already lost their total net bailout under the subvention reductions enacted earlier this year. To take any remaining subventions away from such cities would result in the state taking more from these cities than they were to receive in 1982-83 under the AB 8 formula - resulting in "reverse bailout".

As approved by the Assembly, AB 36X ensured that such cities would not sustain further reductions and the total reduction for cities was reduced from \$54 million to \$21 million.

IX. Assembly Bill 28X

AB 28X makes additional reductions in subventions to cities and counties for 1982-83.

Cities will sustain an additional \$14.5 million reduction in vehicle license fee, cigarette tax, and open-space subventions. These reductions are made in proportion to reductions already made in 1982-83, with a per capita cap and a cap which ensures that reductions do not exceed remaining net bail-out. An additional reduction will be made for cities with remaining net bail-out which exceeds two times the reductions made by SB 1326 and by this bill.

If the reductions under Phase I of the Governor's proposal (see discussion on page 38) are less than the reductions in this bill for any city, then the reductions under AB 28x will be reduced by \$20,000.

Counties will also sustain an additional \$14.5 million reduction in vehicle license fee, cigarette tax and open-space subventions. Reductions will be made in proportion to reductions already made in 1982-83 with a per capita cap and a cap on remaining net bail-out.

Appendix III is a printout prepared by the Legislative Analyst which estimates these reductions.

1983-84 PROPOSED BUDGET - LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

I. Subvention Reductions

The Governor Budget for 1983-84 proposes a reduction in VLF subventions to cities and counties of \$350 million, apportioned \$255 million to cities and \$45 million to counties. The reduction for each city and county would be determined by the three alternate approaches used in 1982-83.

These proposed reductions would leave cities with \$111 million in VLF subventions. This reduction would result in a growth rate of 4.3% in general purpose revenues which would represent a decrease of 4.8% of anticipated 1983-84 revenues.

The proposed reduction for counties would leave counties with \$349 million in VLF subventions, resulting in a growth rate of 3.1% in general purpose revenues which is a decrease of 1.1% from anticipated 1983-84 revenues.

II. Health and Welfare

The budget proposes a number of cost shifts to counties in health and welfare programs. The major changes are as follows:

A. Medically Indigent Adult Program

Counties received \$261 million for the latter six months of 1982-83 to assist them in assuming responsibility for the program. While it had been anticipated that the 1983-84 budget would provide at least \$522 million - a doubling of the \$261 million--the budget instead provides \$476 million, \$47 million less than anticipated.

B. Aid to Families with Dependent Children - Foster Care

AB 8 sunsetted the 95% state and 5% county sharing rates for costs incurred for the AFDC - Foster Care Program. Counties will be picking up approximately 80% of these costs after December 1, 1983. The estimated cost is \$64 million.

C. Mental Health

The budget proposes to continue the 125% cap placed on local mental health program reimbursement in 1982-83 for a projected state savings of \$11.6 million. In addition,

local mental health funds are reduced by \$9.2 million on the assumption that counties can improve their revenue collections.

D. County Health Services Fund

AB 8 created a County Health Services Fund whereby the state assumed one-half of the counties' indigent health care costs. This fund contains \$339.996 million (includes a proposed 3% COLA). The counties match these funds dollar for dollar. However, the budget proposes to reduce the base on which the COLA is provided by \$25 million because the Department of Finance interprets Chapter 1351 (1980), which augmented the fund by \$25 million, to be a one-time only expenditure. The Legislature ignored this argument last year and included the funds in the base. The \$25 million reduction plus the 3% COLA equals a net reduction of \$9 million from funds provided in 1982-83.

III. Business Inventory COLA

The Governor's Budget proposes no cost-of-living increase for business inventory tax subventions which under statute would be increased by 6.3%. The elimination of the COLA represents an additional \$19 revenue loss to cities, counties and special districts.

ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

I. Subvention Reduction Formulas

For purposes of allocating the total amount of subvention reductions among individual cities and counties, various formulas have been utilized. Given that such formulas include several components designed to produce certain effects when applied to individual

local agencies, the final impact of any such formula has a varying effect from city to city and county to county.

As a result, these formulas have been criticized for their failure to produce equitable reductions among the affected local agencies.

What has been the effect of various formulas on individual jurisdictions?

Can a formula be developed which better reflects the current position of individual local agencies (i.e., "needs")?

Are there valid reasons for continuing to tie current reductions to the original Proposition 13 bail-out -- (SB 154)?

II. Local Revenue Sources

It has been suggested that local governments should become more responsible for funding their own programs and should generate more revenue from local sources.

- A. What legal authority or limitations do cities, counties and special districts have to raise their own revenues?
- B. Are local agencies utilizing their full capacity to raise local revenues? For example, is the authority to impose user fees being used to recover the full cost of providing the service for which it is imposed?
- C. Should the state withhold subvention payments from local agencies which have not used their capacity to increase revenues from local sources?
- D. In what ways can the authority for current local revenue sources be expanded to increase the capacity of local agencies to make use of these sources?

- E. What new revenue sources should local governments be authorized to use?

III. Earmarked State Revenues

It has been suggested that a fixed portion of specified state revenue sources be constitutionally earmarked for allocation to local governments.

- A. What are the long-term implications for the state/local relationship of such a proposal?
- B. Should such earmarked funds be made available for the funding of state-mandated costs only, or should such funds be available for funding discretionary expenditures?

APPENDIX I

Estimated Net Revenue
Reductions in 1981-82,
By County and City.

Estimated Net Revenue
Reductions in 1981-82,
By County and City

The following table, developed by the Legislative Analyst's Office, displays estimated net reductions in local government revenue in 1981-82 made by SB 102 and related 1981 legislation.

The figures reflect actual VLF subvention reductions plus estimates of the reductions caused by repeal of the liquor license, highway carriers and FALA fund subventions. They include the effects of the "per capita cap" and the SB 633 offset pertaining to the VLF reduction.

The figures do not reflect appropriations made to no-property-tax cities, nor do they reflect the "capture" of either the unsecured roll collections (described in Part II of this paper) or the unsecured roll interest (described in Part I). They also do not show the effect of business inventory COLA changes or any of the other miscellaneous features of the 1981 legislation.

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS

ALAMEDA COUNTY	1,740,782	217,124	1,957,906
ALAMEDA	560,387	156,854	717,161
ALBANY	130,849	34,645	165,494
BERKELEY	897,244	234,116	1,131,360
EMERYVILLE	26,743	17,166	43,909
FREMONT	1,072,424	264,959	1,337,383
HAYWARD	801,381	238,773	1,040,154
LIVERMORE	404,158	102,063	506,221
NEWARK	294,167	65,891	360,058
OAKLAND	914,976	847,034	1,762,010
PIEDMONT	100,424	13,189	113,613
PLEASANTON	311,667	75,266	386,933
SAN LEANDRO	550,267	159,379	709,646
UNION CITY	367,124	81,811	448,935

ALPINE COUNTY	0	6,740	6,740

AMADOR COUNTY	39,638	24,967	64,605
AMADOR	331	730	1,061
IDONE	4,718	4,404	9,122
JACKSON	10,822	9,180	20,002
PLYMOUTH	3,331	2,638	5,969
SUTTER CREEK	7,219	4,645	11,864

BUTTE COUNTY	0	126,139	126,139
BIGGS	3,888	2,913	6,801
CHICO	92,874	63,551	156,425
GRIDLEY	21,872	10,644	32,516
DROVILLE	75,685	25,100	100,785
PARADISE	0	43,689	43,689

CALAVERAS COUNTY	38,348	45,468	83,816
ANGELS CAMP	15,152	6,968	22,122

COLUSA COUNTY	16,093	16,732	32,825

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	DLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
COLUSA	21,514	11,022	32,536
WILLIAMS	10,002	5,959	15,961

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	642,571	296,363	938,934
ANTIOCH	243,861	86,970	330,831
BRENTWOOD	27,202	8,723	35,925
CLAYTON	24,413	7,583	31,996
CONCORD	520,650	208,442	729,092
EL CERRITO	205,116	43,260	248,376
HERCULES	34,753	7,451	42,204
LAFAYETTE	0	38,620	38,620
MARTINEZ	212,688	44,535	257,223
MORAGA	57,311	25,614	82,925
PINGLE	104,404	28,841	133,245
PITTSBURG	281,352	65,262	346,614
PLEASANT HILL	0	55,612	55,612
RICHMOND	682,666	156,597	839,263
SAN PABLO	70,214	46,313	116,527
WALNUT CREEK	349,456	107,433	456,889

DEL NORTE COUNTY	1,086	19,966	21,052
CRESCENT CITY	9,089	12,412	21,501

EL DORADO COUNTY	280,495	95,175	375,670
PLACERVILLE	53,820	19,847	73,667
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	179,373	55,225	234,598

FRESNO COUNTY	0	422,922	422,922
CLOVIS	175,584	62,394	237,978
COALINGA	35,966	13,516	49,482
FIREBAUGH	16,518	10,662	27,180
FOWLER	12,357	5,429	17,786
FRESNO	2,016,227	478,763	2,494,990
HURON	13,146	8,247	21,393
KERMAN	15,286	10,739	26,025
KINGSBURG	25,878	11,891	37,769
MENOTA	18,603	11,102	29,705
ORANGE COVE	9,978	10,369	20,347

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
PARLIER	8,718	6,998	15,716
REEDLEY	46,618	21,286	67,904
SANGER	94,361	27,252	121,613
SAN JOAQUIN	3,830	5,530	9,360
SELMA	51,872	22,374	74,246

GLENN COUNTY	55,437	20,163	75,600
ORLAND	33,782	10,545	44,327
WILLOWS	37,376	11,546	48,922

HUMBOLDT COUNTY	0	106,678	106,678
ARCATA	78,197	32,694	110,891
BLUE LAKE	9,245	3,407	12,652
EUREKA	192,868	73,082	265,950
FERNDALE	5,135	4,480	9,515
FORTUNA	1,874	16,550	18,424
RIO DELL	4,584	6,441	11,025
TRINIDAD	2,008	1,108	3,116

IMPERIAL COUNTY	71,241	52,997	124,238
BRAWLEY	113,120	34,057	147,177
CALEXICO	70,108	33,746	103,754
CALIPATRIA	18,295	5,670	23,965
EL CENTRO	180,523	50,839	231,362
HOLTVILLE	32,050	9,912	41,970
IMPERIAL	29,793	9,512	39,305
WESTHORLAND	6,661	4,116	10,777

INYO COUNTY	42,414	29,045	71,459
BISHOP	19,307	11,905	31,212

KERN COUNTY	0	361,936	361,936
ARVIN	1,813	9,712	11,525
BAKERSFIELD	759,856	225,130	984,986
CALIFORNIA CITY	23,747	6,460	30,207
DELANO	62,458	37,408	99,876

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
MARICOPA	2,150	2,506	4,656
MCFARLAND	9,174	9,695	18,869
RIDGECREST	66,525	29,072	95,597
SHAFTER	16,460	13,893	30,353
TAFT	20,791	12,586	33,377
TEHACHAPI	27,417	7,382	34,799
WASCO	9,570	18,945	28,515

KINGS COUNTY	228,938	58,657	287,595
AVENAL	0	6,694	6,694
CORCORAN	37,656	14,249	51,905
HANFORD	126,545	47,273	173,818
LENDORE	72,549	17,217	89,766

LAKE COUNTY	62,169	85,581	147,750
CLEAR LAKE	0	0	0
LAKEPORT	25,988	11,172	37,160

LASSEN COUNTY	0	27,510	27,510
SUSANVILLE	36,449	20,555	57,004

LOS ANGELES COUNTY	13,399,722	1,790,409	15,190,131
ALHAMBRA	475,760	128,232	603,992
ARCADIA	324,054	102,175	426,229
ARTESIA	0	36,260	36,260
AVALON	9,405	13,428	22,833
AZUSA	214,400	70,991	285,391
BALDWIN PARK	148,519	118,231	266,750
BELL	32,697	57,513	90,210
BELLFLOWER	0	120,391	120,391
BELL GARDENS	57,689	88,875	146,564
BEVERLY HILLS	275,659	76,788	352,447
BRADBURY	5,117	1,025	6,142
BURBANK	735,844	194,718	930,562
CARSON	0	180,805	180,805
CERRITOS	0	101,456	101,456
CLAREMONT	185,261	55,545	240,806
COMMERCE	0	31,780	31,780

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
COMPTON	265,187	218,247	473,434
COVINA	284,975	85,576	370,551
CUDAHY	0	44,405	44,405
CULVER CITY	289,208	97,165	386,373
DOWNEY	578,092	179,026	757,118
DUARTE	46,684	38,882	85,566
EL MONTE	305,306	192,667	497,973
EL SEGUNDO	67,969	31,426	99,395
GARRENA	273,802	115,747	389,549
GLENDALE	1,029,316	296,681	1,325,997
GLENORA	229,890	83,477	313,367
HAWAIIAN GARDENS	9,793	33,919	43,712
HAWTHORNE	304,780	130,059	434,839
HERMOSEA BEACH	158,908	37,395	196,303
HIDDEN HILLS	13,581	2,118	15,699
HUNTINGTON PARK	114,817	96,857	211,674
INDUSTRY	0	15,257	15,257
INGLEWOOD	642,641	223,683	866,324
IRVINDALE	8,511	2,840	11,351
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	0	43,710	43,710
LA HABRA HEIGHTS	46,387	6,867	53,254
LAKESWOOD	85,410	157,536	242,946
LA MIRADA	0	97,402	97,402
LANCASTER	0	109,676	109,676
LA PUENTE	0	80,989	80,989
LA VERNE	204,524	45,181	249,705
LAWDALE	0	52,288	52,288
LOMITA	0	40,151	40,151
LONG BEACH	3,160,610	828,320	3,988,930
LOS ANGELES	26,238,207	6,690,654	32,928,861
LYNWOOD	142,731	113,966	256,697
MANHATTAN BEACH	295,696	66,835	362,531
MAYWOOD	46,427	50,532	96,959
MONROVIA	273,864	65,738	339,602
MONTEBELLO	262,520	117,292	379,812
MONTEREY PARK	441,845	110,659	552,504
NORWALK	0	194,207	194,207
PALMDALE	0	29,949	29,949
PALOS VERDES ESTATES	135,331	20,841	156,172
PARAMOUNT	0	87,024	87,024
PASADENA	1,079,722	248,555	1,328,277
PICO RIVERA	0	129,543	129,543
POHONA	837,232	203,069	1,040,301
RANCHO PALOS VERDES	51,812	55,236	107,048
REDONDO BEACH	493,099	149,719	642,818
ROLLINS HILLS	3,956	2,243	6,199

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	0	16,790	16,790
ROSEMEAD	0	105,336	105,336
SAN DIMAS	100,794	44,877	145,671
SAN FERNANDO	139,233	42,162	181,395
SAN GABRIEL	144,673	69,093	213,766
SAN MARINO	126,605	17,936	144,541
SANTA FE SPRINGS	118,332	42,917	161,249
SANTA MONICA	749,040	222,738	971,778
SIERRA MADRE	97,702	19,174	116,876
SIGNAL HILL	4,105	12,516	16,621
SOUTH EL MONTE	0	43,814	43,814
SOUTH GATE	29,051	157,658	186,709
SOUTH PASADENA	207,822	41,068	248,890
TEMPLE CITY	0	57,536	57,536
TORRANCE	1,160,015	287,521	1,447,536
VERDON	0	6,615	6,615
WALNUT	31,894	18,179	50,073
WEST COVINA	507,400	166,456	673,856
WHITTIER	305,768	136,758	442,526

MADERA COUNTY	62,733	71,948	134,681
CHOCOMILLA	25,111	11,394	36,505
MADERA	79,494	47,854	127,348

MARIN COUNTY	235,198	83,391	318,589
BELVEDERE	22,867	2,911	25,778
CORTE MADERA	76,358	13,369	89,727
FAIRFAX	64,571	15,728	80,299
LARKSPUR	100,544	21,784	122,328
HILL VALLEY	116,908	22,625	139,533
NOVATO	191,730	61,963	253,693
ROSS	25,088	3,949	29,037
SAN ANSELMO	106,476	21,829	128,305
SAN RAFAEL	322,859	90,263	413,122
SAUSALITO	55,227	21,573	76,800
TIBURON	58,709	13,466	72,166

MARIPOSA COUNTY	0	23,506	23,506

MENOCINGO COUNTY	142,837	98,833	241,670

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
FORT BRAGG	16,103	17,830	33,933
POINT ARENA	1,899	3,583	4,682
UKIAH	52,814	35,022	87,036
WILLITS	31,294	12,619	43,913

MERCED COUNTY	126,410	112,699	239,109
ATWATER	82,084	35,076	117,160
DOS PALOS	21,541	6,833	28,374
GUSTINE	25,752	8,053	33,805
LIVINGSTON	38,921	12,860	51,781
LOS BANOS	70,518	25,797	96,315
MERCED	273,206	85,002	358,208

MODOC COUNTY	21,610	15,591	37,201
ALTURAS	17,426	9,303	26,729

MONO COUNTY	0	36,793	36,793

MONTEREY COUNTY	0	134,061	134,061
CARMEL	30,345	21,112	51,457
DEL REY OAKS	12,521	3,247	15,768
GONZALES	24,652	7,558	32,210
GREENFIELD	13,208	9,403	22,611
KING	41,416	12,454	53,870
MARINA	63,184	32,124	95,308
MONTEREY	212,903	78,322	291,225
PACIFIC GROVE	110,414	28,291	138,705
SALINAS	449,060	163,828	612,888
SAND CITY	1,483	307	1,790
SEASIDE	120,247	48,160	168,407
SOLEDAD	20,993	14,170	35,168

NAPA COUNTY	192,595	59,277	251,872
CALISTOGA	25,646	11,636	37,282
NAPA	436,346	101,077	537,423
ST HELENA	29,510	13,103	42,613

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
YOUNTVILLE	6,389	9,829	15,418

NEVADA COUNTY	66,649	71,290	137,939
GRASS VALLEY	46,154	19,850	66,004
NEVADA CITY	14,427	12,050	26,477

ORANGE COUNTY	0	296,644	296,644
ANAHEIM	923,472	385,175	1,308,647
BREA	188,181	47,521	235,702
BUENA PARK	345,013	106,712	451,725
COSTA MESA	625,550	155,341	780,891
CYPRESS	168,639	63,137	231,776
FOUNTAIN VALLEY	281,057	85,024	366,081
FULLERTON	745,737	164,413	910,140
GARDEN GROVE	490,279	218,044	708,323
HUNTINGTON BEACH	1,357,138	272,887	1,631,025
IRVINE	169,984	85,760	255,744
LAGUNA BEACH	159,225	35,817	195,032
LA HABRA	307,588	80,201	387,789
LA PALMA	93,815	20,829	114,644
LOS ALAMITOS	63,377	18,541	81,918
NEWPORT BEACH	548,614	156,510	705,124
ORANGE	569,096	172,345	741,441
PLACENTIA	195,083	51,190	246,273
SAN CLEMENTE	194,687	49,892	244,579
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	101,472	29,586	131,058
SANTA ANA	1,394,356	340,329	1,734,685
SEAL BEACH	226,336	37,953	264,289
STANTON	89,553	42,679	132,232
TUSTIN	163,825	58,353	222,178
VILLA PARK	42,930	8,434	51,364
WESTMINSTER	158,544	115,533	274,077
YORBA LINDA	0	34,867	34,867

PLACER COUNTY	0	139,747	139,747
AUBURN	49,327	22,627	71,954
COLFAX	5,888	4,439	10,319
LINCOLN	20,170	8,621	28,791
ROCKLIN	37,163	14,014	51,177
ROSEVILLE	113,623	53,565	167,188

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS

PLUMAS COUNTY	0	48,915	48,915
PORTOLA	7,667	7,837	15,504

RIVERSIDE COUNTY	0	458,532	458,532
BANNING	62,205	30,273	92,478
BEAUMONT	40,737	16,725	57,462
BLYTHE	44,285	18,846	63,131
CATHEDRAL CITY	0	0	0
COACHELLA	20,379	22,565	42,944
CORDONA	304,108	73,959	378,067
DESERT HOT SPRINGS	34,373	13,231	47,604
HEMET	138,263	47,213	185,476
INDIAN WELLS	2,546	4,494	7,040
INDIO	114,492	49,987	164,479
LAKE ELSINORE	26,678	17,690	44,368
NORCO	126,718	36,329	163,047
PALM DESERT	0	29,162	29,162
PALM SPRINGS	277,411	88,324	365,735
PERRIS	28,852	14,715	43,567
RANCHO MIRAGE	0	20,346	20,346
RIVERSIDE	657,723	329,445	987,168
SAN JACINTO	25,877	14,934	40,811

SACRAMENTO COUNTY	574,792	967,493	1,542,285
FOLSOM	57,031	29,381	86,412
GALT	15,666	13,959	29,625
ISLETON	5,424	4,940	11,364
SACRAMENTO	2,374,134	636,504	3,010,638

SAN BENITO COUNTY	17,367	17,501	34,868
HOLLISTER	48,748	24,257	73,005
SAN JUAN BAPTISTA	5,789	5,708	11,497

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	513,246	574,011	1,087,257
ADELANTO	8,692	6,464	15,156

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
BARSTOW	93,146	42,750	135,896
BIG BEAR LAKE	0	0	0
CHINO	270,596	79,180	349,676
COLTON	155,262	56,723	211,985
FONTANA	171,864	73,103	244,967
GRAND TERRACE	80,861	13,728	94,589
LOMA LINDA	43,234	16,140	59,374
MONTCLAIR	170,578	52,299	222,877
NEEMES	35,165	10,404	45,569
ONTARIO	619,021	174,416	793,437
RANCHO CUCAMONCA	128,810	104,154	232,964
REDLANDS	395,245	76,565	471,810
RIALTO	178,851	75,840	254,691
SAN BERNARDINO	616,969	290,158	907,127
UPLAND	417,356	85,623	502,979
VICTORVILLE	0	34,544	34,544

SAN DIEGO COUNTY	0	655,031	655,031
CARLSBAD	323,727	63,679	387,406
CHULA VISTA	468,552	158,163	626,715
CORONADO	171,092	35,495	206,587
DEL MAR	41,425	13,569	54,994
EL CAJON	363,717	150,898	514,615
ESCONDIDO	317,625	135,636	453,261
IMPERIAL BEACH	125,671	44,338	170,009
LA MESA	255,098	100,012	355,110
LEHON GROVE	62,438	42,138	104,576
NATIONAL CITY	183,581	108,522	292,103
OCEANSIDE	641,221	154,481	795,702
POWAY	0	0	0
SAN DIEGO	5,408,263	1,770,254	7,178,517
SAN MARCOS	50,368	36,889	87,257
SANTEE	0	0	0
VISTA	195,005	65,516	260,521

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY	0	2,563,713	2,563,713

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	348,202	261,668	609,870
ESCALON	19,836	8,872	28,708
LODI	297,913	87,220	385,133

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
MANTECA	135,516	57,317	192,833
RIPON	30,862	8,363	39,225
STOCKTON	1,206,506	381,332	1,587,838
TRACY	163,484	45,205	208,689

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	0	87,979	87,979
ARROYO GRANDE	53,102	18,935	72,037
ATASCADERO	0	25,015	25,015
EL PASO DE ROBLES	83,399	22,051	105,360
GROVER CITY	29,317	13,594	42,911
MORRO BAY	78,911	21,154	100,065
PISMO BEACH	28,066	16,842	44,908
SAN LUIS OBISPO	181,865	64,463	246,328

SAN MATEO COUNTY	0	107,276	107,276
ATHERTON	76,592	8,274	84,866
BELMONT	120,101	36,626	156,727
BRISBANE	25,296	6,743	32,039
BURLINGAME	219,823	58,469	278,292
COLMA	0	3,278	3,278
DALY CITY	594,179	121,543	715,722
FOSTER CITY	0	32,918	32,918
HALF MOON BAY	16,711	14,996	31,707
HILLSBOROUGH	104,377	10,647	115,024
MENLO PARK	195,822	40,419	236,241
MILLBRAE	124,711	35,202	159,913
PACIFICA	285,289	58,001	343,290
PORTOLA VALLEY	11,912	6,152	18,064
REDWOOD CITY	490,921	108,300	599,221
SAN BRUNO	160,356	58,823	219,179
SAN CARLOS	175,183	42,618	217,801
SAN MATEO	408,113	155,771	563,884
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	426,754	96,446	523,200
WOODSIDE	19,867	8,437	28,304

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	41,668	200,256	241,924
CARPINTERIA	48,341	19,570	67,911
GUADALUPE	7,678	9,695	17,373
LOPUC	102,306	46,235	148,541
SANTA BARBARA	383,065	174,701	557,766

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
SANTA MARIA	179,640	74,806	254,246

SANTA CLARA COUNTY	528,661	168,976	697,637
CAMPBELL	169,166	68,712	237,878
CUPERTINO	39,587	57,029	96,616
GILROY	100,315	45,077	145,392
LOS ALTOS	238,034	47,787	285,821
LOS ALTOS HILLS	25,926	8,615	34,541
LOS GATOS	190,540	56,032	246,572
MILPITAS	250,078	68,162	318,240
MONTE SERENO	1,389	4,060	5,369
MORGAN HILL	105,628	32,515	138,143
MOUNTAIN VIEW	526,599	123,332	649,931
PALO ALTO	490,080	114,158	604,238
SAN JOSE	3,322,521	1,188,510	4,511,031
SANTA CLARA	417,007	185,702	602,709
SARATOGA	64,499	45,758	110,257
SUNNYVALE	973,345	206,760	1,180,105

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	0	163,396	163,396
CAPITOLA	26,091	22,444	48,535
SANTA CRUZ	287,280	96,658	383,938
SCOTT'S VALLEY	19,423	12,953	32,376
WATSONVILLE	168,647	51,259	219,906

SHASTA COUNTY	0	130,806	130,806
ANDERSON	31,508	46,350	77,858
REDDING	290,054	92,603	382,657

SIERRA COUNTY	2,864	10,129	12,993
LOYALTON	2,071	2,764	4,835

SISKIYOU COUNTY	84,372	46,657	131,029
DORRIS	4,131	3,478	7,609
DUNSHUIR	17,360	6,951	24,311
ETHA	4,191	2,430	6,621

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
FORT JONES	3,116	1,849	4,965
MONTAGUE	7,589	2,992	10,581
MT SHASTA	16,828	9,152	25,980
TULELAKE	4,596	3,799	8,395
WEED	12,774	9,127	21,901
YREKA	44,032	17,049	61,081

SOLANO COUNTY	462,524	28,570	491,094
BENICIA	152,009	29,339	181,348
DIXON	64,295	14,787	79,082
FAIRFIELD	417,527	111,179	528,706
RIO VISTA	20,820	7,710	28,530
SUISUN	26,520	25,987	52,507
VACAVILLE	267,463	78,008	345,471
VALLEJO	478,161	162,742	640,903

SONOMA COUNTY	217,054	242,477	459,531
CLOVERDALE	33,814	10,941	44,755
COTATI	14,798	13,751	28,549
HEALDSBURG	61,356	18,178	79,534
PETALUMA	211,969	75,676	286,645
ROHNERT PARK	85,138	41,450	126,588
SANTA ROSA	554,891	167,079	721,970
SEBASTOPOL	42,162	14,645	56,807
SONOMA	49,821	18,099	67,920

STANISLAUS COUNTY	0	162,081	162,081
CERES	57,019	27,163	84,182
HUGHSON	6,450	5,820	12,270
MODESTO	511,534	231,498	743,032
NEWMAN	17,022	8,205	25,227
OAKDALE	74,944	20,338	95,282
PATTERSON	20,851	12,599	33,450
RIVERBANK	50,645	14,232	64,877
TURLOCK	122,914	52,700	175,614
WATERFORD	5,398	6,342	11,740

SUTTER COUNTY	98,340	46,628	144,968

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
 Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
LIVE OAK	14,957	7,353	22,310
YUBA CITY	168,448	41,622	210,070

TEHAMA COUNTY	1,888	40,147	42,035
CORNING	20,340	9,727	30,067
RED BLUFF	74,285	25,124	99,409
TEHAMA	1,143	976	2,119

TRINITY COUNTY	0	30,160	30,160

TULARE COUNTY	309,054	245,021	554,075
DINUBA	45,989	22,537	68,526
EXETER	36,376	12,646	49,022
FARMERSVILLE	10,329	14,059	24,388
LINDSAY	42,819	16,448	59,267
PORTERVILLE	92,114	50,896	143,010
TULARE	124,169	53,670	177,839
VISALIA	272,416	91,857	364,273
WOODLAKE	11,368	11,894	23,262

TUOLUMNE COUNTY	48,657	60,736	109,393
SONORA	21,795	12,337	34,132

VENTURA COUNTY	683,122	121,172	804,294
CAMARILLO	0	63,119	63,119
FILLMORE	44,245	17,549	61,794
OJAI	61,178	14,483	75,661
OXHARD	737,793	202,685	940,478
PORT HUENEME	115,544	29,948	145,492
SAN BENEVENTURA	473,195	142,629	615,824
SANTA PAULA	129,690	39,819	169,499
SIMI VALLEY	0	125,561	125,561
THOUSAND OAKS	0	130,953	130,953

YOLO COUNTY	72,039	88,066	160,105

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

CITY/COUNTY	VLF REDUCTION	SUBVENTION REDUCTION	TOTAL REDUCTIONS
DAVIS	335,949	64,341	410,290
WINTERS	21,200	6,431	27,631
WOODLAND	276,148	59,015	335,163

YUBA COUNTY	64,481	78,459	142,940
MARYSVILLE	74,442	35,611	110,043
WHEATLAND	5,291	4,787	9,998

1981-82 SB102 FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTIONS
Legislative Analyst - March 3, 1982

<u>CITY/COUNTY</u>	<u>VLF REDUCTION</u>	<u>SURVENTION REDUCTION</u>	<u>TOTAL REDUCTIONS</u>
CITY TOTALS	109,718,853	36,204,583	145,923,436
COUNTY TOTALS	21,535,297	12,554,208	34,089,505
SPECIAL DISTRICTS:	0		

APPENDIX II

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF
REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
FOR 1982-83 BY COUNTY AND CITY

APPENDIX II

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOVER OF (1), (2), OR (3)

ALAMEDA COUNTY	+3,351,596	+2,825,399	+110,052,139	-2,825,399
ALAMEDA	+2,147,686	+1,276,926	+1,751,649	-1,276,926
ALBANY	+408,547	+294,430	+268,855	-268,855
BERKELEY	+4,647,945	+2,010,763	+3,417,323	-2,010,763
DUBLIN	+0	+368,028	+0	+0
EMERYVILLE	+404,371	+76,536	+316,145	-76,536
FREMONT	+2,416,457	+2,614,996	+2,077,448	-2,077,448
HAYWARD	+2,371,182	+1,841,247	+1,697,967	-1,697,967
LIVERMORE	+910,675	+943,129	+688,675	-688,675
NEWARK	+744,200	+631,496	+622,850	-622,880
OAKLAND	+14,405,839	+6,615,816	+10,658,389	-3,615,816
PIEDMONT	+775,331	+204,291	+623,134	-204,291
PLEASANTON	+1,089,809	+684,214	+941,202	-684,214
SAN LEANRO	+1,355,060	+1,257,894	+816,365	-816,365
UNION CITY	+987,056	+787,040	+745,709	-745,709

ALPINE COUNTY	+0	+2,921	+62,096	+0

AMADOR COUNTY	+32,090	+51,029	+1,433,501	-32,090
AMADOR	+745	+2,647	+359	-359
IGONE	+10,632	+44,310	+4,627	-4,627
JACKSON	+24,306	+45,595	+13,083	-13,083
PLYMOUTH	+7,505	+13,758	+5,164	-5,164
SUTTER CREEK	+16,267	+33,860	+13,697	-13,697

BUTTE COUNTY	+0	+376,296	+8,678,307	+0
BIGGS	+8,759	+27,497	+3,946	-3,946
CHICO	+209,271	+542,603	+152,546	-152,546
GRIDLEY	+49,283	+78,015	+37,118	-37,108
OROVILLE	+105,659	+178,682	+182,900	-178,682
PARADISE	+0	+444,719	-43,689	+0

CALAVERAS COUNTY	+66,689	+55,189	+1,792,899	-55,189
ANGELS CAMP	+34,142	+44,797	+25,319	-25,309

COLUSA COUNTY	+23,824	+32,532	+992,134	-23,824

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
COLUSA	+48,478	+79,300	+32,473	-32,473
WILLIAMS	+22,538	+32,206	+14,661	-14,661

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	+1,276,744	+1,692,885	+58,456,877	-1,276,744
ANTIOCH	+549,484	+870,524	+461,621	-461,621
BRENTWOOD	+61,294	+87,940	+65,416	-61,294
CLAYTON	+55,008	+87,103	+48,258	-48,258
CONCORD	+1,173,165	+2,009,342	+906,558	-906,558
EL CERRITO	+732,516	+442,345	+486,217	-442,345
HERCULES	+78,307	+125,789	+98,515	-78,307
LAFAYETTE	+0	+502,807	-38,620	+38,620
MARTINEZ	+623,038	+458,811	+521,531	-468,811
MORAGA	+129,138	+292,795	+81,914	-81,914
PINOLE	+235,251	+281,664	+170,102	-170,102
PITTSBURG	+633,968	+656,464	+392,058	-392,058
PLEASANT HILL	+0	+518,200	-55,612	+55,612
RICHMOND	+5,157,840	+1,478,843	+2,809,688	-1,478,843
SAN PABLO	+158,210	+393,501	+102,030	-102,030
WALNUT CREEK	+787,417	+1,122,188	+728,226	-728,226

DEL NORTE COUNTY	+1,226	+47,366	+711,084	-1,226
CRESCENT CITY	+20,480	+60,813	+6,126	-6,126

EL DORADO COUNTY	+208,164	+233,508	+5,953,232	-208,164
PLACERVILLE	+121,270	+136,687	+96,432	-96,432
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	+607,149	+421,017	+517,547	-421,017

FRESNO COUNTY	+181,023	+1,318,781	+54,473,317	-181,023
CLOVIS	+395,637	+667,712	+456,158	-395,637
COALINGA	+81,041	+131,725	+57,319	-57,319
PIPEBEACH	+37,219	+72,780	+21,419	-21,419
FOWLER	+27,842	+50,207	+18,546	-18,546
FRESNO	+5,272,352	+4,605,423	+5,347,154	-4,605,423
HURON	+29,621	+54,332	+24,640	-24,640
KELSAN	+34,443	+77,879	+28,085	-28,085
KINGSBURG	+58,311	+102,788	+39,254	-39,254
MENLOTA	+41,917	+90,935	+38,496	-38,496
ORANGE COVE	+22,485	+78,832	+6,919	-6,919

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
PARLIER	+19,643	+55,675	+8,133	-8,033
REEMLEY	+115,043	+222,545	+82,798	-82,798
SANGER	+212,621	+252,591	+161,267	-161,267
SAN JOAQUIN	+8,631	+38,901	+844	-844
SELMA	+116,681	+215,528	+81,253	-81,253

GLENN COUNTY	+76,694	+55,024	+1,610,962	-55,024
ORLAND	+79,788	+81,829	+46,883	-46,883
WILLOWS	+84,219	+96,366	+44,213	-44,213

HUMBOLDT COUNTY	+105,474	+276,121	+6,799,007	-105,474
APCATA	+176,199	+264,325	+131,411	-131,411
BLUE LAKE	+20,832	+23,663	+15,362	-15,362
EUREKA	+530,159	+471,438	+341,280	-341,280
FERRISALE	+11,345	+27,106	+3,888	-3,888
FORTUNA	+49,288	+150,017	+27,342	-27,342
RIO DELL	+11,331	+53,145	+1,573	-1,573
TRINIDAD	+4,523	+7,648	+3,218	-3,218

IMPERIAL COUNTY	+99,026	+242,169	+5,172,181	-99,026
BRAWLEY	+254,891	+303,284	+203,248	-203,248
CALEXICO	+157,748	+293,827	+108,334	-108,334
CALIPATRIA	+41,224	+51,666	+30,303	-30,303
EL CENTRO	+406,765	+485,508	+285,543	-285,543
HOLTVILLE	+72,234	+89,107	+57,415	-57,405
IMPERIAL	+81,876	+69,589	+68,878	-68,878
WEST-ORLAND	+15,809	+31,586	+10,298	-10,298

INYO COUNTY	+37,151	+45,723	+1,744,487	-37,151
BISHOP	+43,585	+65,951	+36,532	-36,532

KERN COUNTY	+312,505	+1,847,684	+50,467,659	-312,505
ARVIN	+4,086	+138,985	-6,337	+0
BAKERSFIELD	+1,712,159	+2,121,335	+1,488,009	-1,488,009
CALIFORNIA CITY	+224,872	+53,865	+153,546	-53,865
DELANO	+144,756	+328,076	+88,407	-88,407

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
MARICOPA	+4,845	+18,409	+1,848	-1,848
MCFARLAND	+20,672	+102,963	+8,543	-8,543
RIDECREST	+149,899	+314,727	+113,163	-113,163
SHAFTER	+37,088	+138,730	+21,204	-21,204
TIFT	+46,847	+104,559	+32,724	-32,724
TEHACHAPI	+61,778	+80,292	+47,848	-47,848
WASCO	+21,563	+194,133	+3,428	-3,428

KINGS COUNTY	+193,748	+188,511	+6,563,980	-188,511
AVENAL	+0	+80,876	-6,694	+0
CORDOBA	+84,850	+125,712	+58,956	-58,956
HANFORD	+285,140	+417,845	+250,269	-250,269
LEWIS	+163,473	+178,565	+132,484	-132,484

LAKE COUNTY	+112,314	+97,295	+3,134,886	-97,295
CLEAR LAKE	+0	+258,332	+0	+0
LAKEPORT	+58,558	+72,683	+55,793	-55,793

LASSEN COUNTY	+0	+56,291	+1,198,243	+0
SUSANVILLE	+82,130	+128,825	+57,688	-57,688

LOS ANGELES COUNTY	+32,545,975	+19,106,904	+975,165,767	-19,106,904
ALHAMBRA	+1,072,013	+1,278,250	+947,233	-947,233
ARCADIA	+730,182	+895,724	+612,560	-612,560
ARTESIA	+0	+278,297	-36,260	+36,260
AVALON	+102,584	+40,555	+96,903	-40,555
AZUSA	+483,100	+590,455	+394,172	-394,172
BALDWIN PARK	+334,652	+1,014,695	+254,657	-254,657
BELL	+73,675	+501,076	+17,512	-17,512
BELLFLOWER	+0	+1,849,186	-120,391	+120,391
BELL GARDENS	+129,989	+678,629	+39,070	-39,070
BEVERLY HILLS	+2,339,649	+629,862	+2,146,141	-629,862
BRADLEY	+11,530	+16,463	+12,862	-11,530
BURBANK	+2,464,937	+1,646,803	+2,117,933	-1,646,803
CARSON	+0	+1,580,561	-180,815	+180,815
CERRITOS	+0	+1,038,619	-101,456	+101,456
CLAREMONT	+417,444	+656,756	+443,379	-417,444
COMMERCE	+0	+210,129	-31,780	+31,780

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
COMPTON	+597,537	+1,626,875	+270,069	-270,069
COMINA	+642,126	+918,799	+599,421	-599,421
CUDAHY	+0	+351,214	-44,495	+44,405
CULVER CITY	+651,663	+742,185	+593,445	-593,445
DOVEY	+1,302,597	+1,607,435	+914,944	-914,944
DUARTE	+105,191	+344,948	+129,473	-105,191
EL MONTE	+687,936	+1,592,645	+473,311	-473,311
EL SEGUNDO	+153,152	+269,463	+120,129	-120,129
GARFENA	+616,950	+883,348	+465,514	-465,514
GLENDALE	+2,319,326	+2,720,177	+2,127,940	-2,127,940
GLENHOLM	+518,003	+767,736	+517,149	-517,149
HAWAIIAN GARDENS	+22,067	+210,226	-7,119	+0
HAWTHORNE	+686,751	+1,113,151	+537,519	-537,519
HERMOSA BEACH	+718,939	+351,642	+729,325	-351,642
HIDDEN HILLS	+30,602	+34,503	+46,899	-30,602
HUNTINGTON PARK	+258,713	+914,990	+122,069	-122,069
INDUSTRY	+568,643	+12,921	+418,100	-12,921
INGLEWOOD	+1,440,042	+1,843,524	+1,202,777	-1,202,777
IRVINDALE	+153,334	+20,044	+266,559	-20,044
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	+0	+392,177	-43,710	+43,710
LA HABRA HEIGHTS	+0	+95,743	-6,867	+0
LAKEWOOD	+192,452	+1,452,767	+36,576	-36,576
LA MIRADA	+0	+797,588	-97,402	+97,402
LANCASTER	+0	+947,332	-109,676	+109,676
LA PUENTE	+0	+600,964	-80,989	+80,989
LA VERNE	+460,848	+474,765	+663,490	-460,848
LAWDALE	+0	+460,482	-52,288	+52,288
LOMITA	+0	+367,969	-40,151	+40,151
LOND BEACH	+12,148,462	+7,041,543	+11,823,804	-7,041,543
LOS ANGELES	+113,109,304	+57,980,681	+108,651,495	-57,980,681
LYMWOOD	+321,611	+956,264	+162,031	-162,031
MANHATTAN BEACH	+666,643	+563,664	+916,121	-663,664
PARAMOUNT	+104,614	+428,762	+55,488	-55,408
MONROVIA	+578,738	+597,597	+624,383	-597,597
MONTECELLO	+591,526	+1,040,156	+392,195	-392,195
MONTEREY PARK	+995,595	+1,069,055	+1,031,612	-995,595
NORWALK	+0	+1,659,666	-194,207	+194,207
PALMDALE	+0	+247,259	-29,949	+29,949
PALOS VERDES ESTATES	+423,866	+279,757	+500,388	-279,757
PARAMOUNT	+0	+721,188	-87,024	+87,024
PASADENA	+3,379,452	+2,344,521	+3,219,435	-2,344,521
PICO RIVERA	+0	+1,051,794	-129,543	+129,543
POSDONA	+2,081,968	+1,866,603	+2,236,922	-1,866,603
RANCHO PALOS VERDES	+116,745	+711,788	+70,974	-70,974
REDONDO BEACH	+1,576,695	+1,136,951	+1,650,165	-1,136,951
ROLLING HILLS	+8,913	+39,912	+7,925	-7,925

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	+0	+149,861	-16,790	+16,790
ROSEHEAD	+1	+834,133	-105,336	+105,336
SAN DIMAS	+227,115	+482,024	+292,010	-227,115
SAN FERNANDO	+313,729	+347,614	+248,117	-248,117
SAN GABRIEL	+325,968	+587,828	+236,594	-236,594
SAN MARINO	+724,899	+258,954	+695,693	-258,954
SANTA FE SPRINGS	+439,321	+282,559	+331,615	-282,559
SANTA MONICA	+1,820,622	+1,720,089	+1,926,620	-1,720,089
SIERRA MADRE	+279,833	+210,888	+256,968	-210,888
SIGNAL HILL	+9,250	+114,055	-1,465	+1
SOUTH EL MONTE	+0	+338,001	-43,814	+43,814
SOUTH GATE	+65,460	+1,324,681	-101,781	+0
SOUTH PASADENA	+933,693	+442,365	+868,505	-442,365
TEMPLE CITY	+0	+574,381	-57,536	+57,536
TORRANCE	+2,890,931	+2,558,932	+2,359,174	-2,359,174
VERNON	+807,431	+1,751	+420,899	-1,751
WALNUT	+71,866	+244,593	+77,792	-71,866
WEST COVINA	+1,143,308	+1,614,791	+1,124,831	-1,124,831
WESTLAKE VILLAGE	+0	+221,618	+0	+0
WHITTIER	+688,978	+1,356,693	+479,973	-479,973

MADERA COUNTY	+54,678	+167,500	+5,305,815	-54,678
CHOWCHILLA	+56,583	+101,134	+40,489	-40,489
MADERA	+179,122	+441,372	+173,628	-173,628

MARIN COUNTY	+616,657	+567,299	+12,956,848	-567,299
BELVEDEPE	+135,063	+46,723	+113,779	-46,723
CORTE MADERA	+203,557	+166,169	+178,864	-166,169
FAIRFAX	+183,222	+143,829	+158,093	-143,829
LARKSPUR	+374,655	+221,866	+372,316	-221,866
HILL VALLEY	+568,502	+252,338	+515,569	-252,338
NOVATO	+432,017	+859,996	+446,553	-432,017
ROSS	+91,231	+56,317	+82,738	-56,317
SAN ANSELMO	+351,951	+234,551	+206,468	-234,551
SAN RAFAEL	+727,408	+869,862	+591,080	-591,080
SAUSALITO	+302,642	+146,475	+300,495	-146,475
TIBURON	+138,130	+130,091	+118,832	-118,832

MARIPOSA COUNTY	+0	+29,271	+308,403	+1

MENDOCINO COUNTY	+196,651	+173,297	+5,615,189	-173,297

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
FORT IRAGO	+36,284	+103,800	+14,579	-14,579
POINT ARENA	+3,811	+8,271	-833	+0
UXIAH	+117,202	+236,478	+70,772	-70,772
WILLITS	+87,414	+77,996	+66,973	-66,973

MERCED COUNTY	+268,652	+349,222	+12,426,166	-268,652
ATWATER	+184,958	+355,534	+173,288	-173,288
DOS PALOS	+49,537	+61,299	+31,630	-31,630
GUSTINE	+58,026	+63,401	+42,832	-42,832
LIVINGSTON	+87,700	+106,582	+83,353	-83,353
LOS RANOS	+158,896	+212,756	+126,689	-126,689
MERCED	+615,616	+738,643	+479,277	-479,277

MODOC COUNTY	+18,407	+22,728	+799,239	-18,407
ALTURAS	+39,266	+58,867	+23,912	-23,912

MONO COUNTY	+48,868	+22,616	+1,829,837	-22,616

MONTEREY COUNTY	+137,943	+748,266	+18,127,611	-137,943
CARMEL	+76,866	+91,618	+28,444	-28,444
DEL REY OAKS	+28,214	+30,338	+14,387	-14,387
GONZALES	+58,723	+56,959	+39,043	-39,043
GREENFIELD	+29,760	+85,741	+26,396	-26,396
KING	+93,322	+108,100	+59,810	-59,810
MARINA	+142,370	+401,791	+98,860	-98,860
MONTEREY	+479,728	+545,795	+334,410	-334,410
PACIFIC GROVE	+248,792	+310,698	+160,764	-160,764
SALINAS	+1,811,852	+1,589,765	+638,214	-638,214
SAND CITY	+3,341	+3,581	+2,661	-2,661
SEASIDE	+278,949	+725,235	+147,899	-147,899
SOLEDAD	+47,315	+116,507	+18,181	-18,181

NAPA COUNTY	+151,739	+253,794	+6,828,687	-151,739
CALISTOGA	+57,787	+77,139	+52,155	-52,155
NAPA	+983,214	+1,011,998	+882,598	-882,598
ST HELENA	+66,494	+96,191	+59,293	-59,293

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
YOUNTVILLE	+14,398	+56,298	+7,715	-7,705

NEVADA COUNTY	+53,740	+137,645	+4,125,207	-53,740
GRASS VALLEY	+103,996	+136,298	+106,635	-103,996
NEVADA CITY	+39,657	+47,307	+39,074	-39,074

ORANGE COUNTY	+0	+5,810,719	+85,484,911	+0
ANAHEIM	+2,080,831	+4,381,341	+1,591,750	-1,591,750
ANAHEIM	+424,022	+580,025	+474,453	-424,022
BUENA PARK	+777,408	+1,248,651	+563,565	-563,565
COSTA MESA	+1,409,530	+1,625,474	+1,237,107	-1,237,107
CYPRESS	+379,988	+786,089	+329,222	-329,222
FOUNTAIN VALLEY	+633,296	+1,071,857	+511,321	-511,321
FULLERTON	+1,680,345	+2,013,371	+1,368,410	-1,368,410
GARDEN GROVE	+1,104,730	+2,452,447	+834,690	-834,690
HUNTINGTON BEACH	+3,057,993	+3,362,941	+3,000,090	-3,000,090
IRVINE	+383,018	+1,273,112	+406,166	-383,018
LAGUNA BEACH	+674,534	+350,494	+682,642	-350,494
LA HABRA	+693,078	+897,184	+575,483	-575,483
LA PALMA	+211,391	+305,308	+182,352	-182,352
LOS ALAMITOS	+142,805	+224,354	+116,538	-116,538
NEWPORT BEACH	+2,265,866	+1,269,026	+2,042,969	-1,269,026
ORANGE	+1,282,326	+1,835,506	+1,080,872	-1,080,872
PLACENTIA	+439,574	+693,263	+396,171	-396,171
SAN CLEMENTE	+438,681	+540,326	+445,857	-438,681
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	+228,644	+382,953	+270,426	-228,644
SANTA ANA	+3,141,856	+4,082,474	+2,681,457	-2,681,457
SEAL BEACH	+509,997	+508,393	+385,175	-385,175
STANTON	+201,788	+401,869	+158,840	-158,840
TUSTIN	+369,141	+725,157	+384,447	-369,141
VILLA PARK	+96,731	+138,886	+86,529	-86,529
WESTMINSTER	+357,242	+1,402,541	+200,778	-200,778
YORBA LINDA	+0	+580,725	-34,867	+34,867

PLACER COUNTY	+187,929	+307,967	+8,876,669	-187,929
AUBURN	+111,148	+148,838	+103,843	-103,843
COLFAX	+13,250	+19,596	+12,160	-12,160
LINCOLN	+45,449	+82,296	+60,337	-45,449
ROCKLIN	+83,739	+145,814	+109,807	-83,739
ROSEVILLE	+256,008	+492,299	+274,140	-256,008

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB B FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
***** PLUMAS COUNTY	+0	+44,961	+971,675	+0
PORTOLA	+17,277	+36,682	+11,419	-11,419
***** RIVERSIDE COUNTY	+300,160	+1,755,493	+51,536,570	-300,160
BANNING	+140,165	+283,182	+141,477	-140,165
BEAUMONT	+91,793	+136,356	+85,266	-85,266
BLYTHE	+99,785	+132,562	+64,257	-64,257
CATHEDRAL CITY	+0	+293,768	+0	+0
COACHELLA	+45,919	+183,527	+28,640	-28,640
COACHELLA	+685,236	+761,431	+674,812	-674,812
DESERT HOT SPRINGS	+77,452	+125,595	+98,952	-77,452
HEPET	+311,545	+476,147	+311,157	-311,157
INDIAN WELLS	+5,736	+32,090	+5,766	-5,736
INDIO	+257,981	+449,117	+289,394	-257,981
LAKE ELSINORE	+60,113	+120,633	+79,287	-60,113
MORCO	+285,531	+411,890	+229,891	-229,891
PALA DESERT	+0	+229,647	-29,162	+29,162
PALA SPRINGS	+1,455,477	+654,693	+1,661,913	-654,693
PEDRIS	+65,012	+139,859	+69,626	-65,012
RANCHO MIRAGE	+0	+126,996	-20,346	+20,346
RIVERSIDE	+1,482,027	+3,346,419	+1,071,562	-1,071,562
SAN JACINTO	+58,308	+140,032	+61,257	-58,308
***** SACRAMENTO COUNTY	+1,323,927	+2,026,260	+83,763,431	-1,323,927
FOLSOM	+128,506	+234,123	+211,892	-128,506
GALT	+35,298	+107,302	+20,971	-20,971
ISLETON	+23,164	+17,962	+15,005	-15,005
SACRAMENTO	+8,125,436	+5,470,284	+7,040,608	-5,470,284
***** SAN BENITO COUNTY	+16,025	+64,207	+1,118,650	-16,025
HOLLISTER	+109,844	+230,932	+79,703	-79,703
SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	+13,045	+24,831	+7,334	-7,334
***** SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	+1,371,887	+2,352,398	+65,696,476	-1,371,887
ADELANTO	+19,569	+44,077	+13,821	-13,821

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB B FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
BARSTOW	+209,715	+345,084	+147,919	-147,919
BIG BEAR LAKE	+0	+175,498	+0	+0
CHINO	+609,237	+808,719	+553,152	-553,052
COLTON	+349,567	+545,444	+350,975	-349,567
FONTANA	+386,944	+818,196	+523,213	-386,944
GRAND TERRACE	+0	+168,582	-13,728	+0
LEMA LINA	+97,341	+226,028	+70,854	-71,854
MONTCLAIR	+384,050	+458,594	+365,414	-365,414
NEEDLES	+79,174	+81,458	+61,929	-61,929
ONTARIO	+1,393,701	+1,792,538	+1,722,821	-1,393,701
RANCHO CUCAMONCA	+290,810	+1,103,246	+282,098	-282,098
REDLANDS	+889,878	+877,977	+1,041,038	-877,977
RIALTO	+402,677	+795,953	+442,818	-402,677
SAN BERNARDINO	+1,399,082	+2,375,618	+1,190,014	-1,190,014
UPLAND	+939,661	+952,878	+998,358	-939,661
VICTORVILLE	+0	+292,873	-34,544	+34,544

SAN DIEGO COUNTY	+1,370,152	+4,825,065	+96,076,573	-1,370,152
CARLESEAD	+1,021,909	+692,893	+1,122,257	-692,893
CHULA VISTA	+1,056,772	+1,642,755	+834,247	-834,247
ESCONDIDO	+616,282	+375,870	+597,179	-375,870
DEL MAR	+119,602	+98,468	+109,995	-98,468
EL CAJON	+819,551	+1,454,771	+653,130	-653,030
ESCONDIDO	+715,695	+1,275,875	+659,283	-659,283
IMPERIAL BEACH	+283,170	+446,841	+217,980	-217,980
LA MESA	+574,804	+978,994	+435,409	-435,409
LEON GROVE	+140,698	+404,379	+89,236	-89,236
NATIONAL CITY	+413,657	+1,027,683	+233,724	-233,724
OCEANSIDE	+1,444,841	+1,521,363	+1,703,627	-1,444,841
POWAY	+0	+997,872	+0	+0
SAN DIEGO	+12,186,264	+17,275,576	+10,682,578	-10,682,578
SAN MARCOS	+113,492	+347,011	+119,584	-113,492
SANTEE	+0	+1,163,455	+0	+0
VISTA	+439,399	+720,798	+473,471	-439,399

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY	+8,288,397	+1,728,879	+154,506,816	-1,728,879

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	+831,816	+983,458	+49,753,207	-831,816
ESCALON	+44,696	+62,467	+37,231	-37,231
LODI	+671,277	+692,270	+521,677	-521,677

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
MANTECA	+305,354	+498,974	+300,758	-300,758
RIPON	+69,541	+73,892	+53,018	-53,018
STOCKTON	+2,718,582	+3,023,345	+2,313,198	-2,313,098
TRACY	+368,373	+372,698	+350,741	-350,741

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	+205,117	+403,489	+12,195,849	-205,117
ARROYO GRANDE	+119,653	+228,281	+112,156	-112,156
ATASCADERO	+0	+320,993	-25,015	+0
EL PASO DE ROBLES	+190,761	+188,509	+216,789	-188,509
GREYER CITY	+66,060	+173,389	+60,634	-60,634
MORFEO BAY	+180,572	+178,837	+144,033	-144,033
PISMO BEACH	+63,240	+104,383	+48,522	-48,522
SAN LUIS OBISPO	+469,790	+671,545	+305,499	-305,499

SAN MATEO COUNTY	+916,365	+1,499,174	+39,549,299	-916,365
ATHERTON	+174,256	+152,000	+140,061	-140,061
BELMONT	+270,621	+476,867	+201,793	-201,793
BRISBANE	+99,352	+57,777	+78,900	-57,777
BURLINGAME	+495,320	+509,327	+350,185	-350,185
COLMA	+0	+7,687	-3,278	+3,278
DAILY CITY	+1,338,843	+1,531,502	+995,729	-995,729
FOSTER CITY	+0	+456,940	-32,918	+32,918
HALF MOON BAY	+37,653	+142,836	+19,983	-19,983
HILLSBOROUGH	+402,856	+206,879	+386,899	-206,879
MENLO PARK	+441,240	+524,739	+345,874	-345,874
MILLBRAE	+281,807	+391,302	+182,398	-182,398
PACIFICA	+642,632	+717,412	+478,495	-478,495
PORTOLA VALLEY	+26,842	+77,665	+18,885	-18,885
REDWOOD CITY	+1,250,271	+1,073,044	+1,038,412	-1,038,412
SAN BRUNO	+361,324	+689,215	+239,918	-239,918
SAN CARLOS	+394,735	+482,861	+308,424	-308,424
SAN MATEO	+919,587	+1,534,868	+679,125	-679,125
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	+961,591	+975,004	+668,725	-668,725
WOODSIDE	+44,767	+103,566	+33,213	-33,203

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	+462,478	+760,689	+21,432,758	-462,478
CARPINTERIA	+108,927	+210,869	+89,264	-89,264
GUADALUPE	+17,301	+72,703	+9,462	-9,462
LOMOC	+230,524	+511,156	+170,639	-170,639
SANTA BARBARA	+863,149	+1,458,587	+638,265	-638,265

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
FORT JONES	+7,021	+10,586	+5,256	-5,256
MONTAGUE	+17,101	+26,349	+15,268	-15,268
MT. SHASTA	+37,917	+55,539	+33,340	-33,340
TULELAKE	+18,355	+15,792	+4,981	-4,981
WEED	+28,784	+56,025	+15,383	-15,383
YREKA	+99,216	+119,368	+84,403	-84,403

SOLANO COUNTY	+696,122	+617,012	+17,214,785	-617,012
BENICIA	+699,583	+321,032	+689,680	-321,032
DIXON	+144,874	+156,419	+157,520	-144,874
FAIRFIELD	+940,800	+1,149,444	+936,424	-936,424
RIO VISTA	+46,913	+62,272	+41,695	-41,695
SUISUN	+59,757	+228,130	+63,667	-59,757
VACAVILLE	+602,666	+874,241	+589,750	-589,750
VALLEJO	+1,077,425	+1,610,782	+1,006,676	-1,006,676

SONOMA COUNTY	+574,118	+772,508	+24,980,763	-574,118
CLOVERDALE	+91,911	+79,475	+76,974	-76,974
COTATI	+33,343	+69,394	+29,077	-29,077
HEALDSBURG	+152,902	+140,910	+130,356	-130,356
PETALUMA	+475,370	+671,779	+388,811	-388,811
ROHNERT PARK	+191,838	+466,943	+236,297	-191,838
SANTA ROSA	+1,250,317	+1,650,013	+1,102,362	-1,102,362
SEBASTOPOL	+95,002	+110,611	+84,717	-84,717
SONOMA	+127,053	+120,438	+109,250	-109,250

STANISLAUS COUNTY	+0	+688,797	+23,780,661	+0
CEES	+128,480	+273,179	+141,089	-128,480
HUGHSON	+14,534	+58,244	+6,132	-6,132
MODESTO	+1,152,624	+2,143,616	+904,622	-904,622
NEWMAN	+39,356	+55,434	+29,875	-29,875
OAKDALE	+192,355	+168,777	+142,928	-142,928
PATTERSON	+46,983	+85,721	+26,981	-26,981
RIVERBANK	+115,563	+113,627	+75,354	-75,354
TURLOCK	+276,950	+537,018	+255,719	-255,719
WATERFORD	+12,163	+54,352	+7,489	-7,489

SUTTER COUNTY	+89,205	+134,404	+5,028,057	-89,205

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB 8 FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
LIVE OAK	+33,702	+60,384	+24,263	-24,263
YUBA CITY	+413,256	+372,659	+347,645	-347,645

TEHAMA COUNTY	+53,900	+101,905	+2,315,542	-53,900
COKNING	+45,831	+95,938	+46,082	-45,831
RED BLUFF	+167,383	+191,370	+155,535	-155,535
TEHAMA	+2,574	+7,434	+1,741	-1,741

TRINITY COUNTY	+0	+31,237	+657,025	+0

TULARE COUNTY	+472,329	+634,649	+23,415,559	-472,329
DIUNA	+103,625	+198,375	+72,855	-72,855
EXETER	+81,964	+110,864	+79,944	-79,944
FARMERSVILLE	+23,274	+110,046	+16,233	-16,233
LINDSAY	+96,483	+135,130	+68,448	-68,448
PORTERVILLE	+207,558	+414,517	+198,937	-198,937
TULARE	+279,787	+444,311	+264,318	-264,318
VISALIA	+613,825	+1,025,795	+613,627	-613,627
WOODLAKE	+25,614	+104,598	+17,342	-17,342

TUOLUMNE COUNTY	+92,442	+87,815	+2,928,686	-87,815
SONORA	+49,109	+67,760	+31,251	-31,251

VENTURA COUNTY	+1,124,369	+1,374,562	+34,719,697	-1,124,369
CAMARILLO	+0	+759,329	-63,119	+63,119
FILLMORE	+99,696	+189,893	+77,332	-77,332
OJAI	+137,850	+136,745	+129,545	-129,545
OXNARD	+1,662,144	+2,170,997	+1,425,120	-1,425,120
PORT HUENEME	+260,353	+351,681	+247,142	-247,142
SAN BUENAVENTURA	+1,066,235	+1,525,528	+1,055,919	-1,055,919
SANTA PAULA	+292,226	+404,515	+269,145	-269,145
SINI VALLEY	+0	+1,530,548	-125,561	+125,561
THOUSAND OAKS	+0	+1,796,411	-130,953	+130,953

YOLO COUNTY	+241,629	+287,970	+9,849,879	-241,629

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) A&B FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
DAVIS	+817,345	+713,890	+700,213	-700,213
WINTERS	+47,770	+51,608	+34,396	-34,396
WOODLAND	+821,649	+595,632	+642,172	-595,632

YUBA COUNTY	+64,627	+126,774	+5,323,009	-64,627
MARYSVILLE	+200,744	+194,697	+149,666	-149,666
WHEATLAND	+11,922	+30,221	+6,077	-6,077

COMPARISON OF FISCAL RELIEF REDUCTION ALTERNATIVES
 Legislative Analyst - June 25, 1982

City/County	(1) AB B FORMULA	(2) PER CAPITA FORMULA	(3) NET BAILOUT AMOUNT	(4) LOWER OF (1), (2), OR (3)
CITY TOTALS	+345,500,000	+345,537,559	+304,517,889	-221,618,064
COUNTY TOTALS	+61,000,000	+60,991,991	+2,297,100,272	-40,238,792
GRAND TOTAL	+406,500,000	+406,529,550	+2,601,618,161	-261,856,856

NOTE: THE TOTALS FOR CITIES REFLECT THE PROVISION OF \$2.2 MILLION IN FUNDING FOR NO PROPERTY TAX CITIES.

THE TOTALS DO NOT REFLECT THE ENTERPRISE SPECIAL DISTRICT REDUCTIONS

APPENDIX III

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

AB 28X
FINAL
FORMULA

City/County	

ALAMEDA COUNTY	874,384
ALAMEDA	57,686
ALBANY	9,147
BERKELEY	120,469
DUBLIN	0
EMERYVILLE	10,658
FREMONT	30,394
HAYWARD	111,115
LIVERMORE	34,234
NEWARK	13,253
OAKLAND	581,657
PIEDMONT	3,253
PLEASANTON	26,048
SAN LEANDRO	27,711
UNION CITY	40,922

ALPINE COUNTY	0

AMADOR COUNTY	15,152
AMADOR	0
IONE	62
JACKSON	1,211
PLYMOUTH	0
SUTTER CREEK	8

BUTTE COUNTY	0
BIGGS	617
CHICO	4,929
GRIDLEY	581
DROVILLE	7,760
PARADISE	0

CALAVERAS COUNTY	18,027

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

AB 28X
FINAL
FORMULA

City/County	
ANGELS CAMP	0

COLUSA COUNTY	10,243
COLUSA	684
WILLIAMS	1,741

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	519,862
ANTIOCH	0
BRENTWOOD	6,039
CLAYTON	0
CONCORD	19,270
DANVILLE	0
EL CERRITO	11,833
HERCULES	9,471
LAFAYETTE	0
MARTINEZ	9,677
MORAGA	1,897
PINOLE	8,631
PITTSBURG	32,038
PLEASANT HILL	0
RICHMOND	93,618
SAN PABLO	3,476
WALNUT CREEK	13,093

DEL NORTE COUNTY	579
CRESCENT CITY	311

EL DORADO COUNTY	72,811
PLACERVILLE	1,190
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	13,273

FRESNO COUNTY	85,476
CLOVIS	46,265

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

AB 28X
FINAL
FORMULA

City/County	
COALINGA	281
FIREBAUGH	63
FOWLER	1,802
FRESNO	384,811
HURON	0
KERMAN	0
KINGSBURG	165
MENDOTA	2,294
ORANGE COVE	598
PARLIER	748
REEDLEY	0
SANGER	0
SAN JOAQUIN	136
SELMA	1,267

GLENN COUNTY	16,897
ORLAND	1,705
WILLOWS	1,930

HUMBOLDT COUNTY	49,803
ARCATA	0
BLUE LAKE	0
EUREKA	11,510
FERNDALE	485
FORTUNA	310
RIO DELL	241
TRINIDAD	0

IMPERIAL COUNTY	46,758
BRAWLEY	4,058
CALEXICO	5,012
CALIPATRIA	0
EL CENTRO	12,709
HOLTVILLE	0
IMPERIAL	0
WESTMORLAND	198

INYO COUNTY	14,041

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
BISHOP	0

KERN COUNTY	147,559
ARVIN	0
BAKERSFIELD	92,088
CALIFORNIA CITY	944
DELANO	5,262
MARICOPA	3,674
MCFARLAND	152
RIDGECREST	1,971
SHAFTER	0
TAFT	5,264
TEHACHAPI	3,493
WASCO	0

KINGS COUNTY	59,133
AVENAL	0
CORCORAN	3,160
HANFORD	0
LEMOORE	3,714

LAKE COUNTY	31,652
CLEAR LAKE	0
LAKEPORT	0

LASSEN COUNTY	0
SUSANVILLE	0

LOS ANGELES COUNTY	6,005,542
ALHAMBRA	50,937
ARCADIA	0
ARTESIA	0
AVALON	1,552

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
AZUSA	0
BALDWIN PARK	0
BELL	1,809
BELLFLOWER	0
BELL GARDENS	0
BEVERLY HILLS	70,538
BRADBURY	1,279
BURBANK	129,744
CARSON	0
CERRITOS	0
CLAREMONT	27,611
COMMERCE	0
COMPTON	31,613
COVINA	0
CUDAHY	0
CULVER CITY	35,805
DOWNEY	14,500
DUARTE	16,922
EL MONTE	24,891
EL SEGUNDO	12,879
GARDENA	10,767
GLENDALE	0
GLENDORA	0
HAWAIIAN GARDENS	0
HAWTHORNE	32,048
HERMOSA BEACH	9,079
HIDDEN HILLS	2,428
HUNTINGTON PARK	12,316
INDUSTRY	46,176
INGLEWOOD	18,143
IRWINDALE	3,468
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE	0
LA HABRA HEIGHTS	0
LAKESWOOD	0
LA MIRADA	0
LANCASTER	0
LA PUENTE	0
LA VERNE	28,239
LAWDALE	0
LOMITA	0
LONG BEACH	505,172
LOS ANGELES	5,753,625
LYNWOOD	208

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
MANHATTAN BEACH	32,126
MAYWOOD	1,329
MONROVIA	16,909
MONTEBELLO	0
MONTEREY PARK	13,760
NORWALK	0
PALMDALE	0
PALOS VERDES ESTATES	4,743
PARAMOUNT	0
PASADENA	185,472
PICO RIVERA	0
POMONA	154,375
RANCHO PALOS VERDES	0
REDONDO BEACH	93,027
ROLLING HILLS	0
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES	0
ROSEMEAD	0
SAN DIMAS	36,535
SAN FERNANDO	0
SAN GABRIEL	0
SAN MARINO	4,946
SANTA FE SPRINGS	27,903
SANTA MONICA	151,496
SIERRA MADRE	3,664
SIGNAL HILL	0
SOUTH EL MONTE	0
SOUTH GATE	0
SOUTH PASADENA	10,213
TEMPLE CITY	0
TORRANCE	14,043
VERNON	17,397
WALNUT	9,279
WEST COVINA	0
WESTLAKE VILLAGE	0
WHITTIER	0

MADERA COUNTY	25,818
CHOWCHILLA	0
MADERA	0

MARIN COUNTY	174,210

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

AB 28X
FINAL
FORMULA

City/County

BELVEDERE	872
CORTE MADERA	6,062
FAIRFAX	2,888
LARKSPUR	6,642
MILL VALLEY	7,305
NOVATO	2,195
ROSS	947
SAN ANSELMO	5,680
SAN RAFAEL	6,220
SAUSALITO	6,005
TIBURON	0

MARIPOSA COUNTY	0

MENDOCINO COUNTY	53,217
FORT BRAGG	504
POINT ARENA	0
UKIAH	378
WILLITS	0

MERCED COUNTY	109,765
ATWATER	0
DOS PALOS	0
GUSTINE	3,886
LIVINGSTON	0
LOS BANOS	5,937
MERCED	25,716

MODOC COUNTY	7,024
ALTURAS	1,289

MONO COUNTY	6,945

MONTEREY COUNTY	65,134

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83

FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

AB 28X
FINAL
FORMULA

City/County

CARMEL	4,576
DEL REY OAKS	1,114
GONZALES	5,677
GREENFIELD	0
KING	740
MARINA	0
MONTEREY	14,032
PACIFIC GROVE	7,944
SALINAS	12,001
SAND CITY	320
SEASIDE	6,875
SOLEDAD	2,145

NAPA COUNTY	71,648
CALISTOGA	1,218
NAPA	3,722
ST HELENA	3,812
YOUNTVILLE	0

NEVADA COUNTY	25,375
GRASS VALLEY	8,900
NEVADA CITY	0

ORANGE COUNTY	0
ANAHEIM	71,337
BREA	58,328
BUENA PARK	34,438
COSTA MESA	86,044
CYPRESS	0
FOUNTAIN VALLEY	12,133
FULLERTON	50,242
GARDEN GROVE	34,037
HUNTINGTON BEACH	39,827
IRVINE	42,550
LAGUNA BEACH	10,234
LA HABRA	31,565
LA PALMA	3,880

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
LOS ALAMITOS	6,180
NEWPORT BEACH	92,833
ORANGE	80,238
PLACENTIA	12,393
SAN CLEMENTE	27,169
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	36,781
SANTA ANA	65,205
SEAL BEACH	49,638
STANTON	6,122
TUSTIN	30,999
VILLA PARK	721
WESTMINSTER	3,646
YORBA LINDA	0

PLACER COUNTY	88,737
AUBURN	0
COLFAX	0
LINCOLN	7,311
ROCKLIN	13,471
ROSEVILLE	23,390

PLUMAS COUNTY	0
PORTOLA	0

RIVERSIDE COUNTY	141,730
BANNING	0
BEAUMONT	0
BLYTHE	1,270
CATHEDRAL CITY	0
COACHELLA	1,174
CORONA	34,505
DESERT HOT SPRINGS	12,459
HEMET	14,482
INDIAN WELLS	27
INDIO	31,920
LAKE ELSINORE	9,670
LA QUINTA	0

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
 ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
 FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
NORCO	0
PALM DESERT	0
PALM SPRINGS	41,787
PERRIS	6,279
RANCHO MIRAGE	0
RIVERSIDE	579
SAN JACINTO	8,927

SACRAMENTO COUNTY	625,133
FOLSOM	20,672
GALT	498
ISLETON	1,123
SACRAMENTO	393,597

SAN BENITO COUNTY	7,567
HOLLISTER	4,761
SAN JUAN BAUTISTA	137

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	647,779
ADELANTO	2,223
BARSTOW	0
BIG BEAR LAKE	0
CHINO	21,253
COLTON	0
FONTANA	62,246
GRAND TERRACE	0
LOMA LINDA	8,412
MONTCLAIR	8,073
NEEDLES	3,117
ONTARIO	183,122
RANCHO CUCAMONGA	0
REDLANDS	47,352
REALTO	29,892
SAN BERNARDINO	42,261
UPLAND	35,057
VICTORVILLE	0

SAN DIEGO COUNTY	646,960

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
CARLSBAD	44,975
CHULA VISTA	0
CORONADO	8,877
DEL MAR	2,692
EL CAJON	0
ESCONDIDO	15,399
IMPERIAL BEACH	0
LA MESA	0
LEMON GROVE	0
NATIONAL CITY	21,497
OCEANSIDE	133,592
POWAY	0
SAN DIEGO	278,165
SAN MARCOS	5,515
SANTEE	0
VISTA	39,251

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY	539,701

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	288,030
ESCALON	5,989
LODI	22,299
MANTECA	0
RIPON	0
STOCKTON	24,259
TRACY	8,681

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	96,852
ARROYO GRANDE	7,414
ATASCADERO	0
EL PASO DE ROBLES	14,372
GROVER CITY	366
MORRO BAY	6,129
PISMO BEACH	1,733
SAN LUIS OBISPO	28,715

SAN MATEO COUNTY	432,691

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
ATHERTON	3,014
BELMONT	3,304
BRISBANE	4,237
BURLINGAME	15,239
COLMA	0
DALY CITY	13,962
FOSTER CITY	0
HALF MOON BAY	267
HILLSBOROUGH	3,206
MENLO PARK	5,966
MILLBRAE	4,399
PACIFICA	0
PORTOLA VALLEY	202
REDWOOD CITY	13,816
SAN BRUNO	2,421
SAN CARLOS	1,542
SAN MATEO	38,108
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	15,391
WOODSIDE	49

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	218,373
CARPINTERIA	0
GUADALUPE	1,307
LOMPOC	13,102
SANTA BARBARA	7,500
SANTA MARIA	14,399

SANTA CLARA COUNTY	936,150
CAMPBELL	23,445
CUPERTINO	289
GILROY	8,152
LOS ALTOS	13,160
LOS ALTOS HILLS	2,445
LOS GATOS	14,094
MILPITAS	74,357
MONTE SERENO	0
MORGAN HILL	2,675
MOUNTAIN VIEW	82,182
PALO ALTO	85,271

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
SAN JOSE	740,987
SANTA CLARA	61,546
SARATOGA	3,982
SUNNYVALE	186,306

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY	10,560
CAPITOLA	0
SANTA CRUZ	19,277
SCOTTS VALLEY	1,363
WATSONVILLE	5,821

SHASTA COUNTY	31,598
ANDERSON	0
REDDING	5,141

SIERRA COUNTY	2,530
LOYALTON	225

SISKIYOU COUNTY	30,768
DORRIS	0
DUNSMUIR	0
ETNA	0
FORT JONES	846
MONTAGUE	1,102
MT SHASTA	0
TULELAKE	414
WEED	2,462
YREKA	642

SOLANO COUNTY	195,024
BENICIA	10,719
DIXON	9,263
FAIRFIELD	0

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

City/County	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
RIO VISTA	4,249
SUISUN	1,352
VACAVILLE	0
VALLEJO	0

SONOMA COUNTY	241,237
CLOVERDALE	0
COTATI	0
HEALDSBURG	5,757
PETALUMA	1,434
ROHNERT PARK	30,860
SANTA ROSA	38,275
SEBASTOPOL	0
SONOMA	0

STANISLAUS COUNTY	0
CERES	14,171
HUGHSON	292
MODESTO	1,246
NEWMAN	3,449
OAKDALE	0
PATTERSON	680
RIVERBANK	2,268
TURLOCK	0
WATERFORD	0

SUTTER COUNTY	42,033
LIVE OAK	257
YUBA CITY	26,248

TEHAMA COUNTY	25,451
CORNING	0
RED BLUFF	5,823
TEHAMA	104

TRINITY COUNTY	0

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

AB 28X
FINAL
FORMULA

City/County	

TULARE COUNTY	198,110
DINUBA	0
EXETER	2,239
FARMERSVILLE	0
LINDSAY	783
PORTERVILLE	0
TULARE	647
VISALIA	0
WOODLAKE	0

TUOLUMNE COUNTY	28,513
SONORA	158

VENTURA COUNTY	424,868
CAMARILLO	0
FILLMORE	2,231
OJAI	0
OXNARD	92,898
PORT HUENEME	14,070
SAN BUENAVENTURA	17,021
SANTA PAULA	0
SIMI VALLEY	0
THOUSAND OAKS	0

YOLO COUNTY	91,850
DAVIS	10,401
WINTERS	630
WOODLAND	22,368

YUBA COUNTY	30,516
MARYSVILLE	2,764
WHEATLAND	978

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 28X
ON CITIES AND COUNTIES IN 1982-83
FINAL

Legislative Analyst - Feb. 22, 1983

<u>City/County</u>	AB 28X FINAL FORMULA
CITY TOTALS	14,127,593
COUNTY TOTALS	14,529,815