



March 26, 2026

Mr. Rajiv Narayan  
Office of the County Counsel  
County of Santa Clara  
70 West Hedding Street  
San Jose, CA 95110

*And Parties, Interested Parties, and Interested Persons (See Mailing List)*

**Re: Proposed Decision on the Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, 25-RAD-01**

*Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams, 24-TC-05*

Statutes 2023, Chapter 841 (AB 1402); Penal Code Section 11171(f)

County of Santa Clara, Claimant

Dear Ms. Kato and Mr. Narayan:

The Proposed Decision on the Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision for the above-captioned matter is enclosed for your review.

**Hearing:** This matter is set for hearing on **Friday, April 10, 2026, in person at 10:00 a.m., at California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), First Floor Auditorium, 1220 N Street, Sacramento, California, 95814 and via Zoom.**

The Commission is committed to ensuring that its public meetings are accessible to the public and that the public has the opportunity to observe the meeting and to participate by providing written and verbal comment on Commission matters whether they are physically appearing at the in-person meeting location or participating via Zoom. If you want to speak during the hearing and you are in-person, please come to the table for the swearing in and to speak when your item is up for hearing. If you are participating via Zoom, you must use the "Raise Hand" feature in order for our moderators to know you need to be unmuted.

You may join the meeting via Zoom through the link below and can listen and view through your desktop, laptop, tablet, or smart phone. This will allow you to view documents being shared as well.

There are three options for joining the meeting via Zoom:

1. Through the link below you can listen and view through your desktop, laptop, tablet, or smart phone using Zoom. This will allow you to view documents being shared as well. **(You are encouraged to use this option.)**

[https://csm-ca-  
gov.zoom.us/j/88986511013?pwd=yjk4vUbelzOVIMWuVeBVfwFpp3bCO3.1](https://csm-ca.gov.zoom.us/j/88986511013?pwd=yjk4vUbelzOVIMWuVeBVfwFpp3bCO3.1)  
Passcode: 041026

2. Through one tap mobile on an iPhone in the US. This process will dial everything for you without having to key in the meeting ID number. If you have the Zoom application on your iPhone you can view the meeting and documents being shared as well.

+1408-961-3928,,88986511013#,,,,\*041026# US  
+1408-961-3929,,88986511013#,,,,\*041026# US

3. Through your landline or non-smart mobile phone, either number works. You will be able to listen to the proceedings but will not be able to view the meeting or any documents being shared. If you would like to speak, press #2 to use the "Raise Hand" feature.

+1 408 961 3927 +1 408 961-3928 +1 408 961-3929 US Toll  
+1 855 758 1310 US Toll-free

Webinar ID: 889 8651 1013  
Passcode: 041026

Please don't hesitate to reach out to us for help with technical problems at [csminfo@csm.ca.gov](mailto:csminfo@csm.ca.gov) or 916 323-3562.

**Testimony at the Commission Hearing:** If you plan to address the Commission on an agenda item, please notify the Commission Office **not later than noon on the Tuesday prior to the hearing, April 7, 2026**. Please also include the names of the people who will be speaking for inclusion on the witness list and the names and email addresses of the people who will be speaking both in person and remotely to receive a hearing panelist link in Zoom. When calling or emailing, please identify the item you want to testify on and the entity you represent. The Commission Chairperson reserves the right to impose time limits on presentations as may be necessary to complete the agenda.

**Time to File Written Comments:** Any person may submit comments in writing on any agenda item by filing them in accordance with section 1181.3 of the Commission's regulations. If you plan to file any written document, please note that comments filed at least 15 days in advance of the meeting shall be included in the Commissioners' hearing binders, a copy of which is available for public viewing at the Commission meeting. Additionally, comments filed more than five days in advance of the meeting shall be included in the Commission's meeting binders, if feasible, or shall be provided to the Commission when the item is called, unless otherwise agreed by the Commission or the executive director. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § § 1181.3 and 1181.10(b)(1)(A-B)).

However, written comments filed less than five days in advance of the meeting, the commenter shall electronically file (or e-file) a PDF copy with the Commission via the Commission's e-filing system, available on the Commission's website <https://www.csm.ca.gov/dropbox.shtml> at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Commission staff shall provide copies of the comments to the Commission and shall place a copy on a table for public review when the item is called or, in the case of participation via teleconference, shall provide an electronic copy to the Commission and post a copy on the Commission's website, and may share the document with the Commission and the public using the "share" function. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § § 1181.3 and 1181.10(b)(1)(C)).


**Postponement:** If you would like to request postponement of the hearing, please refer to section 1187.9(b) of the Commission's regulations.

**Special Accommodations:** For any special accommodations such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device, materials in an alternative format, or any other

Mr. Narayan  
March 26, 2026  
Page 3

accommodations, please contact the Commission Office at least five to seven working days prior to the meeting.

Very truly yours,



Juliana F. Gmur  
Executive Director

**ITEM 2**  
**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF AN ADOPTED DECISION**  
**PROPOSED DECISION**

25-RAD-01

*Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams, 24-TC-05*

Penal Code Section 11171(f)

Statutes 2023, Chapter 841 (AB 1402), Effective January 1, 2024

County of Santa Clara, Requester

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Overview**

Pursuant to Government Code section 17559(a) and section 1187.15 of the Commission on State Mandates (Commission's) regulations, the County of Santa Clara (claimant and requester) filed a Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision (RAD) for the Test Claim Decision, *Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams, 24-TC-05*.<sup>1</sup>

In ruling on the Test Claim Decision, the Commission had found partially reimbursable costs by a vote of 5-1 with one member abstaining.<sup>2</sup>

The requester now asks that the Commission order a Reconsideration of an Adopted Test Claim Decision to amend it such that the "Decision the Commission ultimately adopts should treat all child abuse exams the same, regardless of insurance status,"<sup>3</sup> based on the following three arguments:

1. The Adopted Decision errs in concluding that the test claim statute does not impose any new activities or a higher level of service on counties.
2. The Adopted Decision errs in speculating that an amended test claim pleading SB 580 (2002)<sup>4</sup> would have addressed the claimant's concerns.

---

<sup>1</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision.

<sup>2</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 23 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>3</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 5.

<sup>4</sup> On page 3 of Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, the requester uses the years 2022 and 2002 to describe SB 580. The second notation to the bill is correct. SB 580 refers to Statutes 2002, chapter 249 (SB 580), which originally added Penal Code section 11171 in 2002, as the requester states.

3. The Adopted Decision will force counties to subsidize private medical insurance companies to further a State policy.<sup>5</sup>

Reconsideration is a two-step hearing process. Before the Commission considers the merits of a RAD, Commission staff must prepare a written analysis and recommend whether the RAD should be granted.<sup>6</sup> Reconsideration may *not* be granted based on allegations that the decision is based on a mistake in law. The Commission may order a reconsideration or amend all or part of an adopted decision on a test claim “only upon a showing of new or different facts, circumstances, or law, or a clerical error”<sup>7</sup> that is “likely to support an amendment to the findings or conclusions in the adopted decision on the test claim.”<sup>8</sup> Five affirmative votes are required to grant the RAD and schedule the matter for a hearing on the merits.<sup>9</sup>

Staff recommends that the Commission decline to hear this RAD because the requester has set forth no new or different facts, new law, new circumstances, or clerical error as required by the Commission’s regulations.

### **Procedural History**

On December 31, 2024, the requester filed the Test Claim entitled *Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams*, 24-TC-05.<sup>10</sup> In response, the Department of Finance (Finance) submitted comments on April 10, 2025, and the Kern County Department of Human Services filed late comments on April 11, 2025.<sup>11</sup> The requester filed rebuttal comments on May 7, 2025.<sup>12</sup>

Commission staff issued the Draft Proposed Decision on September 26, 2025.<sup>13</sup> The requester filed comments on the Draft Proposed Decision on October 7, 2025<sup>14</sup> and

---

<sup>5</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 2-5.

<sup>6</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>7</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(a).

<sup>8</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>9</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>10</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>11</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>12</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>13</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>14</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

Commission staff issued the Proposed Decision on January 26, 2026, to be heard on February 13, 2026.<sup>15</sup>

The requester filed additional comments on the Proposed Decision on January 28, 2026<sup>16</sup> and Commission staff issued a Revised Proposed Decision on February 2, 2026.<sup>17</sup>

The Commission adopted its Decision on February 13, 2026.<sup>18</sup> Commission staff served the adopted Decision on the requester on February 18, 2026.<sup>19</sup>

The requester filed this RAD on March 9, 2026.<sup>20</sup> On March 10, 2026, the RAD was served to those on the mailing list for this Test Claim, and a Notice of Hearing was issued for April 10, 2026. There is no comment period at this stage.<sup>21</sup> If the RAD is granted, comment will become available on the draft proposed decision issued prior to the subsequent hearing on the merits.<sup>22</sup>

### **Commission Responsibilities**

Government Code section 17559(a) and section 1187.15 of the Commission's regulations authorize the Commission, within a limited timeframe, to order a reconsideration of all or part of an adopted test claim decision on petition of any party: "The commission may order a reconsideration of all or part of a test claim or incorrect reduction claim of any party."<sup>23</sup>

Reconsideration is a two-step hearing process. Before the Commission considers a RAD, Commission staff must prepare a written analysis and recommend whether the RAD should be granted.<sup>24</sup> The Commission may order a reconsideration or amend all or part of an adopted decision on a test claim "only upon a showing of new or different

---

<sup>15</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 30 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>16</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 30 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>17</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 30 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>18</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 23 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>19</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 23 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>20</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 1.

<sup>21</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>22</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(f)(1)(A)-(B).

<sup>23</sup> Government Code section 17559(a).

<sup>24</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

facts, circumstances, or law, or a clerical error”<sup>25</sup> that is “likely to support an amendment to the findings or conclusions in the adopted decision on the test claim.”<sup>26</sup> Five affirmative votes are required to grant the RAD and schedule the matter for a hearing on the merits.<sup>27</sup>

If the Commission grants the RAD, Commission staff must then prepare a draft proposed decision on the merits and issue it for comment.<sup>28</sup> The subsequent hearing on the merits must then be conducted to determine if the adopted decision in question must be revised to correct for “a clerical error or new or different facts, circumstances, or law.”<sup>29</sup> Five affirmative votes are again required to revise a previously adopted decision.<sup>30</sup>

**Claims**

The following chart provides a brief summary of the claims and issues raised and staff’s recommendation.

Issue	Description	Staff Recommendation
Was the Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision timely filed?	Section 1187.15(a) of the Commission’s regulations provides:  (a) Notwithstanding section 1187.11(b) of these regulations, the Commission may order a reconsideration or amend all or part of an adopted decision on a test claim (including a new test claim decision adopted pursuant to a mandate redetermination) or incorrect reduction claim on petition of any party, interested party, or Commission member only upon a showing of new or different facts, circumstances, or law, or a	<i>Yes, timely filed –</i>  This Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision was filed on March 9, 2026, which is within 30 days from February 18, 2026, the date the requester was served with the adopted Test Claim Decision.  Because the Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision was automatically stayed 30 days from the expiration of the 30-day period after the adopted decision was served on the requester, the

<sup>25</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(a).

<sup>26</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>27</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>28</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(f)(1)(A)-(B).

<sup>29</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(f).

<sup>30</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(f)(2).

Issue	Description	Staff Recommendation
	<p>clerical error. The power to order a reconsideration or amend an adopted decision on a test claim or incorrect reduction claim shall expire 30 days after the adopted decision is served on the claimant or requester. If additional time is needed to evaluate a petition for reconsideration filed before the expiration of the 30-day period, the Commission may grant a stay of that expiration for no more than 30 days, solely for the purpose of considering the petition. A request for reconsideration shall be deemed automatically stayed for the 30-day period. If no action is taken on a petition within the time allowed for ordering reconsideration, the petition shall be deemed denied.</p>	<p>Commission’s power to order a reconsideration expires 60 days from February 18, 2026, which is April 20, 2026.</p>
<p>Has the requester satisfied the Commission’s regulatory requirement for a RAD by presenting new or different facts, new circumstances, new law, or clerical error likely to support an amendment to the findings or conclusions in the adopted decision on the Test Claim?</p>	<p>Reconsideration may <i>not</i> be granted based on allegations that the decision is based on a mistake in law. The Commission may order a reconsideration or amend all or part of an adopted decision on a test claim “only upon a showing of new or different facts, circumstances, or law, or a clerical error”<sup>31</sup> which is “likely to support an amendment to the findings or conclusions in the</p>	<p><i>Deny</i> - The requester’s arguments present no new facts, circumstances, law or clerical error. Analysis of the likelihood of supporting amendment is therefore not possible.</p>

<sup>31</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(a).

Issue	Description	Staff Recommendation
	<p>adopted decision on the test claim.”<sup>32</sup></p> <p>Five affirmative votes are required to grant the RAD and schedule the matter for a hearing on the merits.<sup>33</sup></p>	
<p>Does the requester’s first argument provide new or different facts, new circumstances, new law, or clerical error as required by section 1187.15 of the Commission’s regulations?</p>	<p>The requester’s first argument is: “The Adopted Decision errs in concluding that the Test Claim Statute does not impose any new activities or a higher level of service on counties.”<sup>34</sup></p>	<p>No. The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error regarding whether new activities or higher level of service were required by the test claim statute. That question was thoroughly addressed in the Decision and at the Commission’s February 13, 2026, hearing.</p>
<p>Does the requester’s second argument provide new or different facts, new circumstances, new law, or clerical error as required by section 1187.15 of the Commission’s regulations?</p>	<p>The requester’s second argument is: “The Adopted Decision errs in speculating that an amended test claim pleading SB 580 (2002)<sup>35</sup> would have addressed the Claimant’s concerns.”<sup>36</sup></p>	<p>No. The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error in declaring its belief that an amended test claim pleading SB 580 (2002) would not have resulted in a full, rather than partial, test claim approval.</p>
<p>Does the requester’s third argument provide new or different facts, new circumstances, new law, or</p>	<p>The requester’s third argument is: “The Adopted Decision will force counties to subsidize private medical</p>	<p>No. The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error in its last</p>

<sup>32</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>33</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>34</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 2.

<sup>35</sup> On page 3 of Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, the requester uses the years 2022 and 2002 to describe SB 580. The second notation to the bill is correct. SB 580 refers to Statutes 2002, chapter 249 (SB 580), which originally added Penal Code section 11171 in 2002, as the requester states.

<sup>36</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 3.

Issue	Description	Staff Recommendation
clerical error as required by section 1187.15 of the Commission's regulations?	insurance companies to further a State policy.” <sup>37</sup>	argument. Difficult financial circumstances are not new or relevant to the determination of reimbursement under the Constitution, as required. Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution is not applied as an “equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.” <sup>38</sup>

### **Staff Analysis**

This RAD is timely as it was filed on March 9, 2026, which is within 30 days from February 18, 2026, the date the requester was served with the adopted Test Claim Decision.<sup>39</sup> It is also complete as the requester stated their request and argument for reconsideration, and attached a copy of the contested Test Claim Decision and other referenced materials.<sup>40</sup> The diligence requirement, in this case, is inapplicable because it is a requirement regarding a party's behavior in belatedly marshalling *new* evidence or legal authority,<sup>41</sup> but no new evidence or legal authority is presented in this RAD.

The requester argues the following:

1. The Adopted Decision errs in concluding that the Test Claim Statute does not impose any new activities or a higher level of service on counties.
2. The Adopted Decision errs in speculating that an amended test claim pleading SB 580 (2002)<sup>42</sup> would have addressed the claimant's concerns.

<sup>37</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 4.

<sup>38</sup> *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1281 citing *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1817.

<sup>39</sup> Government Code section 17559(a); California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e); Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 1.

<sup>40</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e); Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision.

<sup>41</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e); *Baldwin v. Home Savings of America* (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 1192, 1199.

<sup>42</sup> On page 3 of Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, the requester uses the years 2022 and 2002 to describe SB 580. The second notation to

3. The Adopted Decision will force counties to subsidize private medical insurance companies to further a State policy.<sup>43</sup>

In response to the requester's three arguments:

1. The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error regarding whether new activities or higher level of service were required by the test claim statute. That question was thoroughly addressed in the Decision and at the Commission's February 13, 2026, hearing.<sup>44</sup>
2. The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error in declaring its belief that an amended test claim pleading SB 580 (2002) would not have resulted in a full, rather than partial, test claim approval.
3. The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error in its last argument, which is that "the Adopted Decision will also adversely affect counties who are under tremendous financial strain" and "requires counties to subsidize the costs of private medical insurers."<sup>45</sup> The requester further asserts that certain federal funding has been cut as of July 1, 2025, causing "massive ongoing revenue loss."<sup>46</sup> For this argument, the requester cites one published decision interpreting Article XIII B, section 6's general intent to prevent transfer of financial responsibility from state to local government, a case which pre-dates the test claim and thus is not new law.<sup>47</sup> Nor are difficult financial circumstances new or relevant to the determination of reimbursement under the Constitution, as required. Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution is not applied as an "equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities."<sup>48</sup>

---

the bill is correct. SB 580 refers to Statutes 2002, chapter 249 (SB 580), which originally added Penal Code section 11171 in 2002, as the requester states.

<sup>43</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 2-5.

<sup>44</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 2, 42, and 62-63 (Test Claim Decision); Exhibit B, Excerpts of Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings, Hearing of Commission on State Mandates, February 13, 2026, pages 50 and 60-62.

<sup>45</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 4.

<sup>46</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 4.

<sup>47</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 4 citing *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46.

<sup>48</sup> *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1281 citing *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1817.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the forgoing analysis, staff finds that this RAD fails to satisfy the requirements of section 1187.15 of the Commission's regulations and should be denied.

## **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission deny this RAD and authorize staff to make any technical, non-substantive changes to the Proposed Decision following the hearing.

BEFORE THE  
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE REQUEST FOR  
RECONSIDERATION OF AN ADOPTED  
DECISION

Penal Code Section 11171(f)  
Statutes 2023, Chapter 841 (AB 1402),  
Effective January 1, 2024  
Filed on March 9, 2026  
County of Santa Clara, Requester

Case No.: 25-RAD-01

*Child Physical Abuse and Neglect  
Exams, 24-TC-05*

DECISION PURSUANT TO  
GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 17500  
ET SEQ.; CALIFORNIA CODE OF  
REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, DIVISION 2,  
CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7.

*(Adopted April 10, 2026)*

**DECISION**

The Commission on State Mandates (Commission) heard and decided this Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision (RAD)<sup>49</sup> during a regularly scheduled hearing on April 10, 2026. [Witness list will be included in the adopted Decision.]

The law applicable to the Commission’s determination of a RAD is Government Code Section 17559(a), California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15, and related constitutional, regulatory, case, and common law.

The Commission [adopted/modified] the Proposed Decision as its Decision by a vote of [vote will be included in the adopted Decision], as follows<sup>50</sup>:

<b>Member</b>	<b>Vote</b>
Lee Adams, County Supervisor	
Deborah, Gallegos, Representative of the State Controller	
Karen Greene-Ross, Public Member	
Renee Nash, School District Board Member	
William Pahland, Representative of the State Treasurer, Vice Chairperson	
Michele Perrault, Representative of the Director of the Department of Finance, Chairperson	

<sup>49</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision.

<sup>50</sup> An order for reconsideration requires five votes. “Five affirmative votes shall be required to grant the request for reconsideration and schedule the request for a second hearing on the merits.” California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

Member	Vote
Alexander Powell, Representative of the Director of the Governor’s Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation	

**Summary of the Findings**

Pursuant to Government Code section 17559(a) and section 1187.15 of the Commission’s regulations, the County of Santa Clara has filed a RAD of the Test Claim Decision on *Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams*, 24-TC-05, adopted by the Commission on February 13, 2026. The Commission partially approved this Test Claim. The requester contends that the Decision needs to be reconsidered for full approval.

Reconsideration is a two-step hearing process. Before the Commission considers the merits of a requester’s legal argument, the Commission must first decide *whether to hear* the RAD. The Commission may order a reconsideration or amend all or part of an adopted decision on a test claim “only upon a showing of new or different facts, circumstances, or law, or a clerical error”<sup>51</sup> that is “likely to support an amendment to the findings or conclusions in the adopted decision on the test claim.”<sup>52</sup> A super-majority of five affirmative votes is required to grant the RAD and to schedule it accordingly for a hearing on the merits.<sup>53</sup>

The Commission denies this RAD because the requester has shown no new or different facts, circumstances, or law, and has not shown a clerical error.

**COMMISSION FINDINGS**

**I. Chronology**

- 02/13/2026 The Commission partially approved *Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams*, 24-TC-05 by a 5-1 vote with one member abstaining.<sup>54</sup>
- 02/18/2026 Commission staff served the Adopted Decision for *Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams*, 24-TC-05.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(a).

<sup>52</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>53</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>54</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 23 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>55</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 23 (Test Claim Decision).

- 03/09/2026 The requester filed *Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, 25-RAD-01* on the Adopted Decision for *Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams, 24-TC-05*.<sup>56</sup>
- 03/10/2026 Commission Staff issued the Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision and Notice of Hearing.<sup>57</sup>

## II. Background

Pursuant to Government Code section 17559(a) and section 1187.15 of the Commission's regulations, the requester asks that the Commission order a reconsideration of the Test Claim Decision adopted February 13, 2026, which partially approved *Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams, 24-TC-05*.<sup>58</sup> The Test Claim Decision was partially approved for only the following costs under article XIII B, section 6(c) of the California Constitution:

- Costs incurred for child physical abuse and neglect exams conducted in accordance with Penal Code section 11171, by the county's designated Sexual Assault Response Teams (SART), Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner (SAFE) teams, or other qualified medical evidentiary examiners, when the child is eligible for Medi-Cal or Victim Compensation Board coverage.

Reimbursement is **not** required to the extent the Legislature appropriates funds for child physical abuse and neglect exams under Penal Code section 11171(g).<sup>59</sup>

All other claims for reimbursement were denied.<sup>60</sup>

### Reconsideration Process

Government Code section 17559(a) and section 1187.15 of the Commission's regulations authorize the Commission, within a limited timeframe, to order a reconsideration of all or part of an adopted test claim decision on petition of any party.

Government Code section 17559(a) states:

***The commission may order a reconsideration of all or part of a test claim*** or incorrect reduction claim on petition of any party. The power to order a reconsideration or amend a test claim decision shall expire 30 days after the statement of decision is delivered or mailed to the claimant. If additional time is needed to evaluate a petition for reconsideration filed

---

<sup>56</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision.

<sup>57</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision.

<sup>58</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision.

<sup>59</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 80 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>60</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 80 (Test Claim Decision).

prior to the expiration of the 30-day period, the commission may grant a stay of that expiration for no more than 30 days, solely for the purpose of considering the petition. If no action is taken on a petition within the time allowed for ordering reconsideration, the petition shall be deemed denied.<sup>61</sup>

Section 1187.15 of the Commission's regulations further provides, in relevant part:

(a) Notwithstanding section 1187.11(b) of these regulations, the Commission may order a reconsideration or amend all or part of an adopted decision on a test claim (including a new test claim decision adopted pursuant to a mandate redetermination) or incorrect reduction claim on petition of any party, interested party, or Commission member **only upon a showing of new or different facts, circumstances, or law, or a clerical error**. The power to order a reconsideration or amend an adopted decision on a test claim or incorrect reduction claim shall expire 30 days after the adopted decision is served on the claimant or requester. If additional time is needed to evaluate a petition for reconsideration filed before the expiration of the 30-day period, the Commission may grant a stay of that expiration for no more than 30 days, solely for the purpose of considering the petition. **A request for reconsideration shall be deemed automatically stayed for the 30-day period**. If no action is taken on a petition within the time allowed for ordering reconsideration, the petition shall be deemed denied.

...

(e) Before the Commission considers the request for reconsideration, Commission staff shall prepare a written analysis that includes a review of the entire record. **The written analysis shall address whether the request for reconsideration is timely, complete, diligent, and is based on a clerical error or new or different facts, circumstances, or law that is likely to support an amendment** to the findings or conclusions in the adopted decision on the test claim or incorrect reduction claim, and include a recommendation on whether or not the request for reconsideration should be granted. The Commission shall consider the request for reconsideration and the written staff analysis at a scheduled meeting. **Five affirmative votes shall be required to grant the request for reconsideration and schedule the request for a second hearing on the merits**.<sup>62</sup>

Accordingly, reconsideration is a two-step hearing process. Before the Commission considers the merits of a RAD, Commission staff must prepare a written analysis and

---

<sup>61</sup> Government Code section 17559(a), emphasis added.

<sup>62</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15, emphasis added.

recommend whether the RAD should be granted.<sup>63</sup> The Commission may order a reconsideration or amend all or part of an adopted decision on a test claim “only upon a showing of new or different facts, circumstances, or law, or a clerical error”<sup>64</sup> that is “likely to support an amendment to the findings or conclusions in the adopted decision on the test claim.”<sup>65</sup> Five affirmative votes are required to grant the RAD and schedule the matter for a hearing on the merits.<sup>66</sup>

If the Commission grants the RAD, Commission staff must then prepare a draft proposed decision on the merits and issue it for comment.<sup>67</sup> The subsequent hearing on the merits must then be conducted to determine if the adopted decision in question must be revised to correct for “a clerical error or new or different facts, circumstances, or law.”<sup>68</sup> Five affirmative votes are again required to revise a previously adopted decision.<sup>69</sup>

### Underlying Facts of the Test Claim Decision

On December 31, 2024, the requester filed the Test Claim entitled *Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams*, 24-TC-05.<sup>70</sup> In response, the Department of Finance (Finance) submitted comments on April 10, 2025, and the Kern County Department of Human Services filed late comments on April 11, 2025.<sup>71</sup> The requester filed rebuttal comments on May 7, 2025.<sup>72</sup>

Per section 1183.1 of the Commission’s regulations, staff analyzed the Test Claim Decision for, among other things, completeness, timeliness, and the signature of the designated local official.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>64</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(a).

<sup>65</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>66</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>67</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(f)(1)(A)-(B).

<sup>68</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(f).

<sup>69</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(f)(2).

<sup>70</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>71</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>72</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>73</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1183.1.

Commission staff issued the Draft Proposed Decision on September 26, 2025.<sup>74</sup> The requester filed comments on the Draft Proposed Decision on October 7, 2025<sup>75</sup> and Commission staff issued the Proposed Decision on January 26, 2026, to be heard on February 13, 2026.<sup>76</sup>

The requester filed additional comments on the Proposed Decision on January 28, 2026,<sup>77</sup> and Commission staff issued a Revised Proposed Decision on February 2, 2026.<sup>78</sup>

After the presentation of argument by the requester, comment by Finance, and public discussion among the Commissioners, the Commission voted 5-1 with one member abstaining to partially approve the Test Claim for only the following costs under article XIII B, section 6(c) of the California Constitution:

- Costs incurred for child physical abuse and neglect exams conducted in accordance with Penal Code section 11171, by the county's designated Sexual Assault Response Teams (SART), Sexual Assault Forensic Examiner (SAFE) teams, or other qualified medical evidentiary examiners, when the child is eligible for Medi-Cal or Victim Compensation Board coverage.

Reimbursement is **not** required to the extent the Legislature appropriates funds for child physical abuse and neglect exams under Penal Code section 11171(g).<sup>79</sup>

All other claims for reimbursement were denied.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>75</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 29 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>76</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 30 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>77</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 30 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>78</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 30 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>79</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 80 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>80</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 80 (Test Claim Decision).

The Decision of the Commission was adopted on February 13, 2026.<sup>81</sup> Commission staff served the adopted Decision on February 18, 2026.<sup>82</sup>

On March 9, 2026, the requester filed this RAD alleging that the Decision:

[has] no basis upon which [it] rationally distinguishes between child abuse exam[s] provided to child victims who are covered by private medical insurance and child victims who are covered by Medi-Cal, or whose costs would be covered by the Victim Compensation Board. .... Striking this distinction creates legal errors in the Adopted Decision and practical consequences for counties, which are detailed below.<sup>83</sup>

### **III. Positions of the Parties**

#### **A. County of Santa Clara**

The requester asks the Commission to reconsider the Test Claim Decision pursuant to Government Code section 17559(a) and section 1187.15 of the Commission's regulations, and to set the matter for hearing to amend such that the "Decision the Commission ultimately adopts should treat all child abuse exams the same, regardless of insurance status."<sup>84</sup>

This RAD makes the following three arguments:

1. The Adopted Decision errs in concluding that the test claim statute does not impose any new activities or a higher level of service on counties.
2. The Adopted Decision errs in speculating that an amended test claim pleading SB 580 (2002)<sup>85</sup> would have addressed the claimant's concerns.
3. The Adopted Decision will force counties to subsidize private medical insurance companies to further a State policy.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 23 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>82</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 23 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>83</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 2.

<sup>84</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 5.

<sup>85</sup> On page 3 of Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, the requester uses the years 2022 and 2002 to describe SB 580. The second notation to the bill is correct. SB 580 refers to Statutes 2002, chapter 249 (SB 580), which originally added Penal Code section 11171 in 2002, as the requester states.

<sup>86</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision pages 2-5.

## IV. Discussion

Reconsideration of a test claim decision is narrowly available. Commission decisions, adopted after a full opportunity for written and oral argument by the parties, are final and binding, and serve to exhaust the parties' administrative remedies.<sup>87</sup>

The Commission's reconsideration is, however, authorized by statute for a short period of time after the decision is issued.<sup>88</sup> Reconsideration may *not* be granted based on allegations that the decision is based on a mistake in law. Reconsideration may only be ordered "only upon a showing of new or different facts, circumstances, or law, or a clerical error"<sup>89</sup> that is "likely to support an amendment to the findings or conclusions in the adopted decision on the test claim."<sup>90</sup> No such showing has been made here and thus the Commission denies reconsideration.

### **A. The Commission Denies the Request for Reconsideration of the Test Claim Decision Adopted on February 13, 2026, Because the Requester Has Set Forth No New or Different Facts, New Circumstances, New Law, or Clerical Error.**

#### **1. This RAD Is Timely Filed and Complete, and Diligence Is Inapplicable.**

This RAD is timely as it was filed on March 9, 2026, which is within 30 days from February 18, 2026, the date the requester was served with the adopted Test Claim Decision.<sup>91</sup> It is also complete as the requester clearly stated their request and argument for reconsideration, and attached a copy of the contested Test Claim Decision and other referenced materials.<sup>92</sup> The diligence requirement, in this case, is inapplicable because it is a requirement regarding a party's behavior in belatedly marshalling *new* evidence or legal authority,<sup>93</sup> but no new evidence or legal authority is presented in this RAD.

---

<sup>87</sup> *California School Boards Ass'n v. State of California* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 1183, 1200-1201.

<sup>88</sup> Government Code section 17559(a).

<sup>89</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15.

<sup>90</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

<sup>91</sup> Government Code section 17559(a); California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e); Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision page 1.

<sup>92</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e); Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision.

<sup>93</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e); *Baldwin v. Home Savings of America* (1997) 59 Cal.App.4th 1192, 1199.

**2. The Requester’s Argument that the Test Claim Statute Imposes “New Activities or a Higher Level of Service on Counties” Was Considered and Decided in the Test Claim Decision and Is Therefore Not New Facts, Circumstances, Law, or Clerical Error.**

The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error regarding whether new activities or higher level of service were required by the test claim statute. That question was thoroughly addressed in the Decision and also at the Commission’s February 13, 2026, hearing.<sup>94</sup>

The requester cites two long-standing published mandate cases which pre-date the Test Claim Decision and therefore does not present any new law.<sup>95</sup>

The requester further cites nothing new nor a clerical error, but is merely re-stating an argument it made during the test claim process that “paying for child abuse exams is the new reimbursable activity” and thus “providing child abuse exams free of charge ... is new and increases the level of service provided to the public.”<sup>96</sup>

**3. The Requester’s Assertion that an Amended Test Claim Pleading SB 580 (2002) Would Not Have Addressed Its Concerns Is Not New Facts, Circumstances, Law, or Clerical Error.**

The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error in declaring its belief that an amended test claim pleading SB 580 (2002) would not have resulted in a full, rather than partial, test claim approval.

The requester asserts that it could not have succeeded at full test claim approval had it pled the 2002 statute, which is an argument, but is not new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error:

---

<sup>94</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 2, 42, and 62-63 (Test Claim Decision); Exhibit B, Excerpts of Reporter’s Transcript of Proceedings, Hearing of Commission on State Mandates, February 13, 2026, pages 50 and 60-62.

<sup>95</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 2-3 citing *San Diego Unified School District v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859 and *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2021) 59 Cal.App.5th 546, 556-558.

<sup>96</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 2, 42, and 62 citing the Decision (“The claimant has also characterized payment for the exams as an “activity,” but payment is not an activity for purposes of article XIII B, section 6(a). The courts are clear that increased costs (i.e., payments) alone do not constitute a new program or higher level of service under article XIII B, section 6(a).”) citing the Test Claim (“In other words, the new activity mandated by Subdivision(f) - and the corresponding new program or higher level of service – is the new requirement that the County assume the full cost of providing child abuse and neglect exams free of charge whenever the State declines to reimburse these costs.”).

In other words, there are no legally compelled activities in SB 580 of which the Commission could have taken jurisdiction, if only the Claimant were to plead them. As the Adopted Decision goes on to find, the duty to provide child abuse exams is practically compelled by “[other child welfare and public safety] statutes and practical realities” that leave the counties with “no true alternative.” (*Id.* at pp. 51-56.)

...

If it was the case that pleading SB 580 is the missing link that precluded the Adopted Decision from approving reimbursement for child abuse exams rendered to children who have private medical insurance, the Adopted Decision never explains how exactly it could approve reimbursement for *any* child abuse exams.<sup>97</sup>

This assertion does not present any new or different facts, law, circumstances, or clerical error. In addition, the Test Claim Decision already addresses the mandate elements, including legal and practical compulsion, for the performance of those child abuse exams previously funded by the state.<sup>98</sup> The Commission found, based on existing case law interpreting article XIII B, section 6, that providing child physical abuse and neglect exams is mandated by state law under practical compulsion principles and, thus, the cost of the exams, which have been shifted from the state to the counties with respect to previous Medi-Cal and VCB reimbursement *for the exams* are a component of the mandated program pursuant to article XIII B, section 6(c).<sup>99</sup> However, the activities stated in 2023 test claim statute were not *newly* compelled because the child abuse and neglect exam program began under a 2002 statute effective January 1, 2004.<sup>100</sup> The requester, as claimant, expressly did not plead the 2002 statute.<sup>101</sup>

#### **4. The Requester’s Concern that the Adopted Decision “Will Force Counties to Subsidize Private Medical Insurance Companies to Further a State Policy” Is Not New Facts, Circumstances, Law, or Clerical Error.**

The requester asserts no new or different facts, circumstances, law, or clerical error in its last argument, which is that “the Adopted Decision will also adversely affect counties who are under tremendous financial strain” and “requires counties to subsidize the costs

---

<sup>97</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 3.

<sup>98</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 71-78 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>99</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 71 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>100</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 33 and 56-58 (Test Claim Decision).

<sup>101</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, pages 40, 57, and 62-63 (Test Claim Decision).

of private medical insurers.”<sup>102</sup> The requester further asserts that certain federal funding has been cut as of July 1, 2025, causing “massive ongoing revenue loss.”<sup>103</sup> For this argument, the requester cites one published decision interpreting Article XIII B, section 6’s general intent to prevent transfer of financial responsibility from state to local government, a case which pre-dates the test claim and thus is not new law.<sup>104</sup> Nor are difficult financial circumstances new or relevant to the determination of reimbursement under the Constitution as required. Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution is not applied as an “equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.”<sup>105</sup>

As none of the requester’s arguments satisfy the requirement of section 1187.15 of the Commission’s regulations that new or different facts, new circumstances, new law, or a clerical error be presented, there is no potential basis for reconsideration of the Test Claim Decision.

Also, given no new or different facts, new circumstances, new law, or a clerical error, the Commission cannot analyze, as required by regulation, whether such is “likely to support an amendment to the findings or conclusion in the adopted decision on the test claim.”<sup>106</sup>

## **V. Conclusion**

The Commission therefore declines to order reconsideration.

---

<sup>102</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 4.

<sup>103</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 4.

<sup>104</sup> Exhibit A, Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision, page 4 citing *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46.

<sup>105</sup> *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1281 citing *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1817.

<sup>106</sup> California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 1187.15(e).

## DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY EMAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

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

On March 26, 2026, I served the:

- **Current Mailing List dated March 25, 2026**
- **Proposed Decision on the Request for Reconsideration of an Adopted Decision issued March 26, 2026**

*Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams, 25-RAD-01 (24-TC-05)*  
Statutes 2023, Chapter 841, (AB 1402); Penal Code Section 11171(f)  
County of Santa Clara, Claimant

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

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on March 26, 2026 at Sacramento, California.



---

Jill Magee  
Commission on State Mandates  
980 Ninth Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 323-3562

# COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

## Mailing List

**Last Updated:** 3/25/26

**Claim Number:** 24-TC-05

**Matter:** Child Physical Abuse and Neglect Exams

**Claimant:** County of Santa Clara

### TO ALL PARTIES, INTERESTED PARTIES, AND INTERESTED PERSONS:

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

**Adaoha Agu**, *County of San Diego Auditor & Controller Department*

Projects, Revenue and Grants Accounting, 5530 Overland Avenue, Ste. 410 , MS:O-53, San Diego, CA 92123

Phone: (858) 694-2129

Adaoha.Agu@sdcounty.ca.gov

**Karina Alvarez**, *Auditor-Controller, County of Imperial*

940 W. Main Street, Suite 108, El Centro, CA 92243

Phone: (442) 265-1299

karinabalvarez@co.imperial.ca.us

**Rachelle Anema**, *Assistant Auditor-Controller, County of Los Angeles*

Accounting Division, 500 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Phone: (213) 974-8321

RANEMA@auditor.lacounty.gov

**Lili Apgar**, *Specialist, State Controller's Office*

Local Reimbursements Section, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 324-0254

lapgar@sco.ca.gov

**Socorro Aquino**, *State Controller's Office*

Division of Audits, 3301 C Street, Suite 700, Sacramento, CA 95816

Phone: (916) 322-7522

SAquino@sco.ca.gov

**Aaron Avery**, *Legislative Representative, California Special Districts Association*

1112 I Street Bridge, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 442-7887

Aarona@csda.net

**David Bass**, Vice Mayor, *City of Rocklin*  
3970 Rocklin Road, Rocklin, CA 95677  
Phone: (916) 663-8504  
David.Bass@rocklin.ca.us

**Deborah Bautista**, *County of Tuolumne*  
El Dorado Hills Community Services District, 2 South Green St. , Sonora, CA 95370  
Phone: (209) 533-5551  
dbautista@co.tuolumne.ca.us

**Mary Bedard**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Kern*  
1115 Truxtun Avenue, 2nd Floor, Bakersfield, CA 93301  
Phone: (805) 868-3599  
bedardm@co.kern.ca.us

**Ginni Bella Navarre**, Deputy Legislative Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*  
925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 319-8342  
Ginni.Bella@lao.ca.gov

**Ben Benoit**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Riverside*  
4080 Lemon Street, 11th Floor, Riverside, CA 92502  
Phone: (951) 955-3800  
bbenoit@rivco.org

**Angela Bickle**, Interim Auditor-Controller, *County of Trinity*  
11 Court Street, P.O. Box 1230, Weaverville, CA 96093  
Phone: (530) 623-1317  
abickle@trinitycounty.org

**Nathan Black**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Sutter*  
1160 Civic Center Blvd., Suite D, Yuba City, CA 95993  
Phone: (530) 822-7127  
nblack@co.sutter.ca.us

**Joanne Bohren**, Auditor/Controller, *County of Contra Costa*  
1025 Escobar Street, Martinez, CA 94553  
Phone: (925) 608-9300  
info@ac.cccounty.us

**Laura Bowers**, Interim Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector, *County of Santa Cruz*  
Auditor-Controller's Office, 701 Ocean Street, Room 100, Santa Cruz, CA 95060-4073  
Phone: (831) 454-2500  
laura.bowers@santacruzcounty.us

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

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

**Jeffrey Burgh**, Auditor Controller, *County of Ventura*  
800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009-1540

Phone: (805) 654-3151  
Jeff.Burgh@venturacounty.gov

**Stephanie Butters**, Assistant Director of Finance, Auditor-Controller, *County of Mono*  
25 Bryant Street, PO Box 556, Bridgeport, CA 93517  
Phone: (760) 932-5496  
sbutters@mono.ca.gov

**Rica Mae Cabigas**, Chief Accountant, *Auditor-Controller*  
Accounting Division, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Phone: (213) 974-8309  
rcabigas@auditor.lacounty.gov

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

**Lisa Cardella-Presto**, *County of Merced*  
2222 M Street, Merced, CA 95340  
Phone: (209) 385-7511  
LCardella-presto@co.merced.ca.us

**Nancy Cardenas**, Auditor-Controller, Treasurer, Tax Collector, *County of Lassen*  
221 South Roop Street, Ste. 1, Susanville, CA 96130  
Phone: (530) 251-8220  
ncardenas@co.lassen.ca.us

**Julissa Ceja Cardenas**, *California State Association of Counties*  
1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 327-7500  
jcejacardenas@counties.org

**Ali Chemkhi**, Senior Supervising Accountant/Auditor, *County of San Bernardino*  
Office of Auditor-Controller, 268 West Hospitality Lane, Fourth Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92415-  
0018  
Phone: (909) 382-7035  
ali.chemkhi@sbcountyatc.gov

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

**David Chiu**, City Attorney, *City and County of San Francisco*  
Office of the City Attorney, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102  
Phone: (415) 554-4700  
cityattorney@sfcityatty.org

**Carmen Chu**, Assessor-Recorder, *City and County of San Francisco*  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, City Hall, Room 190, San Francisco, CA 94102-4698  
Phone: (415) 554-5596  
assessor@sfgov.org

**Carolyn Chu**, Senior Fiscal and Policy Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*  
925 L Street, Suite 1000, Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: (916) 319-8326  
Carolyn.Chu@lao.ca.gov

**Nicole Coburn**, Assistant County Executive Officer, *County of Santa Cruz*  
809 Center Street, Rm 101, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Phone: (831) 454-2100  
nicole.coburn@santacruzcountyca.gov

**Cass Cook**, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector, *County of Tulare*  
221 South Mooney Blvd, Room 101 E, Visalia, CA 93291  
Phone: (559) 636-5200  
tulareauditor@co.tulare.ca.us

**Adam Cripps**, Interim Finance Manager, *Town of Apple Valley*  
14955 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, CA 92307  
Phone: (760) 240-7000  
acripps@applevalley.org

**Chamise Cubbison**, Auditor-Controller-Tax Collector, *County of Mendocino*  
501 Low Gap Road, Rm 1080, Ukiah, CA 95482  
Phone: (707) 234-6860  
cubbisonc@mendocinocounty.gov

**Thomas Deak**, Senior Deputy, *County of San Diego*  
Office of County Counsel, 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 355, San Diego, CA 92101  
Phone: (619) 531-4810  
Thomas.Deak@sdcounty.ca.gov

**Mandip Dhillon**, Auditor Controller, *County of Stanislaus*  
1010 10th Street, Modesto, CA 95354  
Phone: (209) 525-6398  
auditor@stancounty.com

**Cheryl Dillingham**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Humboldt*  
825 Fifth Street, Room 126, Eureka, CA 95501  
Phone: (707) 476-2452  
ctyauditor@co.humboldt.ca.us

**Executive Director**, *California Peace Officers' Association*  
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 1495, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 263-0541  
cpoa@cpoa.org

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

**Tracy Drager**, Auditor and Controller, *County of San Diego*  
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 166, San Diego, CA 92101  
Phone: (619) 531-5413  
tracy.drager@sdcounty.ca.gov

**Janet Dutcher**, Finance Director, *County of Mono*  
25 Bryant Street, PO Box 556, Bridgeport, CA 93517  
Phone: (760) 932-5496  
jdutcher@mono.ca.gov

**Richard Eberle**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Yuba*  
915 8th Street, Suite 105, Marysville, CA 95901  
Phone: (530) 749-7810  
reberle@co.yuba.ca.us

**Kevin Fisher**, Assistant City Attorney, *City of San Jose*  
Environmental Services, 200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor, San Jose, CA 95113  
Phone: (408) 535-1987  
kevin.fisher@sanjoseca.gov

**Tim Flanagan**, Office Coordinator, *County of Solano*  
Register of Voters, 678 Texas Street, Suite 2600, Fairfield, CA 94533  
Phone: (707) 784-3359  
Elections@solanocounty.com

**Rose Gallo-Vasquez**, County Clerk and Recorder, *County of Colusa*  
546 Jay Street, Ste. 200, Colusa, CA 95932  
Phone: (530) 458-0500  
clerkinfo@countyofcolusa.org

**Oscar Garcia**, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector, *County of Fresno*  
2281 Tulare Street, Room 105, Fresno, CA 93721  
Phone: (559) 600-3496  
ogarcia@fresnocountyca.gov

**Juliana Gmur**, Executive Director, *Commission on State Mandates*  
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 323-3562  
juliana.gmur@csm.ca.gov

**Joe Gonzalez**, *County of San Benito*  
440 Fifth Street Room 206, Hollister, CA 95023  
Phone: (831) 636-4090  
jgonzalez@auditor.co.san-benito.ca.us

**M. Green**, *California State Sheriffs' Association*  
1231 I Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 375-8000  
cgreen@calsheriffs.org

**Graciela Gutierrez**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Butte*  
25 County Center Drive, Suite 120, Oroville, CA 95965  
Phone: (530) 552-3599  
GGutierrez@ButteCounty.net

**James Hamilton**, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector/Public Administrator, *County of San Luis Obispo*  
1055 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93408  
Phone: (805) 781-5040  
jhamilton@co.slo.ca.us

**Andrew Hamilton**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Orange*  
1770 North Broadway, Santa Ana, CA 92706  
Phone: (714) 834-2450  
Andrew.Hamilton@ac.ocgov.com

**Joe Harn**, *County of El Dorado*  
360 Fair Lane, Placerville, CA 95667

Phone: (530) 621-5633  
joe.harn@edcgov.us

**Janine Harris**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Solano*  
675 Texas Street, Suite 2800, Fairfield, CA 94533  
Phone: (707) 784-6280  
auditorcontroller@solanocounty.gov

**Tom Haynes**, Chief Financial Officer, *County of Yolo*  
Financial Services, 625 Court Street, Room 102, Woodland, CA 95695  
Phone: (530) 666-8190  
Tom.Haynes@yolocounty.gov

**Jenavive Herrington**, Auditor-Controller/County Clerk, *County of Lake*  
255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, CA 95453  
Phone: (707) 263-2311  
jenavive.herrington@lakecountyca.gov

**Chris Hill**, Principal Program Budget Analyst, *Department of Finance*  
Local Government Unit, 915 L Street, 8th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 445-3274  
Chris.Hill@dof.ca.gov

**Tiffany Hoang**, Associate Accounting Analyst, *State Controller's Office*  
Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 740,  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
Phone: (916) 323-1127  
THoang@sco.ca.gov

**Ken Howell**, Senior Management Auditor, *State Controller's Office*  
Audits, Compliance Audits Bureau, 3301 C Street, Suite 725A, Sacramento, CA 95816  
Phone: (916) 323-2368  
KHowell@sco.ca.gov

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

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

**Emma Jungwirth**, Senior Legislative Advocate, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*  
1100 K Street, Ste 101, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 650-8115  
ejungwirth@counties.org

**Harshil Kanakia**, Administrative Services Manager, *County of San Mateo*  
Controller's Office, 555 County Center, 4th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063  
Phone: (650) 599-1080  
hkanakia@smcgov.org

**Anne Kato**, Acting Chief, *State Controller's Office*  
Local Government Programs and Services Division, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA  
95816

Phone: (916) 322-9891  
akato@sco.ca.gov

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

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

**Rob Knudson**, Assistant Director of Finance, *County of Kings*  
1400 W. Lacey Blvd, Hanford, CA 93230  
Phone: (559) 852-2712  
Robert.Knudson@co.kings.ca.us

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

**Edward Lamb**, Director of Finance, *County of Glenn*  
516 West Sycamore Street, Willows, CA 95988  
Phone: (530) 934-6421  
ttc@countyofglenn.net

**Government Law Intake**, *Department of Justice*  
Attorney General's Office, 1300 I Street, Suite 125, PO Box 944255, Sacramento, CA 94244-2550  
Phone: (916) 210-6046  
governmentlawintake@doj.ca.gov

**Eric Lawyer**, Legislative Advocate, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*  
Government Finance and Administration, 1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 650-8112  
elawyer@counties.org

**Kim-Anh Le**, Deputy Controller, *County of San Mateo*  
555 County Center, 4th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063  
Phone: (650) 599-1104  
kle@smcgov.org

**William Lee**, Chief Deputy District Attorney, *County of San Bernardino District Attorney's Office*  
303 W. 3rd Street, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0502  
Phone: (909) 382-3800  
WLee@sbcda.org

**Klaus Leitenbauer**, Director of Finance, *County of Alpine*  
P.O. Box 266, Markleeville, CA 96120  
Phone: (530) 694-2284  
kleitenbauer@alpinecountyca.gov

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

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

**Kenneth Louie**, Chief Counsel, *Department of Finance*  
1021 O. Street, Suite 3110, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 322-0971  
Kenny.Louie@dof.ca.gov

**Everett Luc**, Accounting Administrator I, Specialist, *State Controller's Office*  
3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816  
Phone: (916) 323-0766  
ELuc@sco.ca.gov

**Van Maddox**, Auditor/Treasurer/Tax Collector, *County of Sierra*  
211 Nevada Street, 2nd Floor, P.O. Box 425, Downieville, CA 95936  
Phone: (530) 289-3273  
auttc@sierracounty.ca.gov

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

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

**Ensen Mason**, Auditor-Controller/Treasurer/Tax Collector, *County of San Bernardino*  
268 West Hospitality Lane, San Bernardino, CA 92415-0018  
Phone: (909) 387-8322  
webinfo@sbcountyatc.gov

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

**Luis Mercado**, Auditor, *County of Mariposa*  
4982 10th Street, PO Box 729, Mariposa, CA 95338  
Phone: (209) 966-7606  
lmercado@mariposacounty.org

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

**Rajiv Narayan**, Deputy County Counsel, *County of Santa Clara*  
**Claimant Representative**  
Office of the County Counsel, 70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, 9th Floor, San Jose, CA 95110  
Phone: (669) 786-4287  
rajiv.narayan@cco.sccgov.org

**David Neill**, Chief Counsel, *Office of Emergency Services*  
3650 Schriever Ave, Mather, CA 95655

Phone: (916) 845-8510  
David.Neill@caloes.ca.gov

**John Nibbelin**, County Attorney, *County of San Mateo*  
500 County Center, Redwood City, CA 94063  
Phone: (650) 363-4757  
jnibbelin@smcgov.org

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

**Martee Nieman**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Plumas*  
520 Main Street, Room 205, Quincy, CA 95971  
Phone: (530) 283-6246  
marteenieman@countyofplumas.com

**Patrick O'Connell**, County Clerk Recorder, *County of Alameda*  
1221 Oak Street, Room 249, Oakland, CA 94512  
Phone: (510) 272-6565  
pat.oconnell@acgov.org

**Margaret Olaiya**, Director of Finance, *County of Santa Clara*  
**Claimant Contact**  
70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, 2nd Floor, San Jose, CA 95110  
Phone: (408) 299-5201  
Margaret.Olaiya@fin.sccgov.org

**Diane Olson**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Siskiyou*  
311 Fourth Street, Room 101, Yreka, CA 96097  
Phone: (530) 842-8078  
dlolson@co.siskiyou.ca.us

**Jamie Ostroff**, *California Medical Association*  
1201 K Street, Suite #800, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (800) 786-4262  
memberservice@cmadocs.org

**Patricia Pacot**, Accountant Auditor I, *County of Colusa*  
Office of Auditor-Controller, 546 Jay Street, Suite #202, Colusa, CA 95932  
Phone: (530) 458-0424  
ppacot@countyofcolusa.org

**Arthur Palkowitz**, *Law Offices of Arthur M. Palkowitz*  
12807 Calle de la Siena, San Diego, CA 92130  
Phone: (858) 259-1055  
law@artpalk.onmicrosoft.com

**Kirsten Pangilinan**, Specialist, *State Controller's Office*  
Local Reimbursements Section, 3301 C Street, Suite 740, Sacramento, CA 95816  
Phone: (916) 322-2446  
KPangilinan@sco.ca.gov

**Deborah Paolinelli**, Assistant County Administrative Officer, *County of Fresno*  
2281 Tulare, Suite 304, Fresno, CA 93271  
Phone: (559) 600-1710  
dpaolinelli@fresnocountyca.gov

**Alice Park-Renzie**, *County of Alameda*  
CAO, 1221 Oak Street, Oakland, CA 94612  
Phone: (510) 272-3873  
Alice.Park@acgov.org

**Krista Peterson**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Tehama*  
444 Oak Street, Room J, Red Bluff, CA 96080  
Phone: (530) 527-3474  
kpeterson@tehama.gov

**Trevor Power**, Accounting Manager, *City of Newport Beach*  
100 Civic Center Drive, Newport Beach , CA 92660  
Phone: (949) 644-3085  
tpower@newportbeachca.gov

**Jonathan Quan**, Associate Accountant, *County of San Diego*  
Projects, Revenue, and Grants Accounting, 5530 Overland Ave, Suite 410, San Diego, CA 92123  
Phone: 6198768518  
Jonathan.Quan@sdcountry.ca.gov

**Juan Raigoza**, Auditor-Controller, *County of San Mateo*  
555 County Center, 4th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063  
Phone: (650) 363-4777  
jraigoza@smcgov.org

**Roberta Raper**, Director of Finance, *City of West Sacramento*  
1110 West Capitol Ave, West Sacramento, CA 95691  
Phone: (916) 617-4509  
robertar@cityofwestsacramento.org

**David Richstone**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Madera*  
200 W. 4th Street, Madera, CA 93637  
Phone: (559) 675-7707  
David.Richstone@maderacounty.com

**Chad Rinde**, Director of Finance, *County of Sacramento*  
700 H Street, Room 3650, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 874-7248  
RindeC@SacCounty.gov

**Monica Rocha**, *County of Santa Cruz*  
701 Ocean Street, Room 340, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Phone: (831) 454-2440  
monica.rocha@santacruzcountyca.gov

**Erick Roeser**, Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector, *County of Sonoma*  
585 Fiscal Drive, Suite 100, Santa Rosa, CA 95403  
Phone: (707) 565-3285  
Erick.Roeser@SonomaCounty.gov

**Benjamin Rosenfield**, City Controller, *City and County of San Francisco*  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 316, San Francisco, CA 94102  
Phone: (415) 554-7500  
ben.rosenfield@sfgov.org

**Tacy Oneto Rouen**, Auditor, *County of Amador*  
810 Court Street, Jackson, CA 95642-2131

Phone: (209) 223-6357  
trouen@amadorgov.org

**Jessica Sankus**, Senior Legislative Analyst, *California State Association of Counties (CSAC)*  
Government Finance and Administration, 1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 327-7500  
jsankus@counties.org

**Clinton Schaad**, *County of Del Norte*  
981 H Street, Suite 140, Crescent City, CA 95531  
Phone: (707) 464-7202  
cschaad@co.del-norte.ca.us

**Betsy Schaffer**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Santa Barbara*  
105 East Anapamu Street, Room 303, Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
Phone: (805) 568-2101  
bschaffer@co.santa-barbara.ca.us

**Tracy Schulze**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Napa*  
1195 Third Street, Suite B-10, Napa, CA 94559  
Phone: (707) 299-1733  
tracy.schulze@countyofnapa.org

**Angie Schwartz**, Deputy Director, *Department of Social Services*  
Children and Family Services, 744 P Street, MS 8-17-18, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 657-2614  
Angie.Schwartz@dss.ca.gov

**Cindy Sconce**, Director, *Government Consulting Partners*  
5016 Brower Court, Granite Bay, CA 95746  
Phone: (916) 276-8807  
cindysconcegcp@gmail.com

**Shelly Scott**, Assessor-Recorder-County Clerk, *County of Marin*  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Suite 208, San Rafael, CA 94903  
Phone: (415) 473-7215  
Assessor@marincounty.org

**Peggy Scroggins**, *County of Colusa*  
546 Jay Street, Ste 202, Colusa, CA 95932  
Phone: (530) 458-0400  
pscroggins@countyofcolusa.org

**Greg Sessions**, Interim Auditor Controller, *County of Calaveras*  
891 Mountain Ranch Road, San Andreas, CA 95249  
Phone: (209) 754-6343  
gsessions@calaverascounty.gov

**Rupa Shah**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Monterey*  
168 West Alisal Street, 3rd Floor, Salinas, CA 93901  
Phone: (831) 755-5040  
shahr@co.monterey.ca.us

**Camille Shelton**, Chief Legal Counsel, *Commission on State Mandates*  
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 323-3562  
camille.shelton@csm.ca.gov

**Carla Shelton**, Senior Legal Analyst, *Commission on State Mandates*  
980 9th Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 323-3562  
carla.shelton@csm.ca.gov

**Amy Shepherd**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Inyo*  
Auditor-Controller, 168 N. Edwards Street, Independence, CA 93526  
Phone: (760) 878-0343  
ashepherd@inyocounty.us

**Nolda Short**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Shasta*  
1450 Court Street, Suite 238, Redding, CA 96001  
Phone: (530) 245-6657  
nshort@co.shasta.ca.us

**Andrew Sisk**, *County of Placer*  
2970 Richardson Drive, Auburn, CA 95603  
Phone: (530) 889-4026  
asisk@placer.ca.gov

**Paul Steenhausen**, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, *Legislative Analyst's Office*  
925 L Street, Suite 1000, , Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 319-8303  
Paul.Steenhausen@lao.ca.gov

**David Swanson Hollinger**, Chief Deputy Director, *Department of Social Services*  
Executive , 744 P Street MS 8-17-11, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 657-2598  
David.Swansonhollinger@dss.ca.gov

**Jolene Tollenaar**, *MGT Consulting Group*  
2251 Harvard Street, Suite 134, Sacramento, CA 95815  
Phone: (916) 243-8913  
jolenetollenaar@gmail.com

**Gregory Totten**, Chief Executive Officer, *California District Attorneys Association*  
2495 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 575, Sacramento, CA 95833  
Phone: (916) 443-2017  
gtotten@cdaa.org

**James Touchstone**, General Counsel, *California State Sheriffs' Association*  
3777 North Harbor Boulevard, Fullerton, CA 92835  
Phone: (714) 446-1400  
jrt@jones-mayer.com

**Jessica Uzarski**, Consultant, *Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee*  
1020 N Street, Room 502, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 651-4103  
Jessica.Uzarski@sen.ca.gov

**Alejandra Villalobos**, Management Services Manager, *County of San Bernardino*  
Office of Auditor-Controller, 222 West Hospitality Lane, Forth Floor, San Bernardino, CA 92415  
Phone: (909) 382-3191  
alejandra.villalobos@sbccountyatc.gov

**Stephanie Wellemeier**, Auditor/County Clerk, *County of Modoc*  
108 E. Modoc Street, Alturas, CA 96101

Phone: (530) 233-6231  
auditor@co.modoc.ca.us

**Renee Wellhouse**, *David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc.*  
3609 Bradshaw Road, H-382, Sacramento, CA 95927  
Phone: (916) 797-4883  
dwa-renee@surewest.net

**Adam Whelen**, Director of Public Works, *City of Anderson*  
1887 Howard St., Anderson, CA 96007  
Phone: (530) 378-6640  
awhelen@ci.anderson.ca.us

**Gina Will**, Auditor-Controller, *County of Nevada*  
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 230, Nevada City, CA 95959  
Phone: (530) 265-1244  
auditor.controller@nevadacountyca.gov

**Kelly Winston**, Bureau Chief, *Child Welfare Policy & Program Development Bureau*  
744 P Street, MS 8-11-87, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 651-6100  
kelly.winston@dss.ca.gov

**Jeff Woltkamp**, *County of San Joaquin*  
44 N San Joaquin St. Suite 550, Stockton, CA 95202  
Phone: (209) 468-3925  
jwoltkamp@sjgov.org

**Arthur Wylene**, General Counsel, *Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC)*  
1215 K Street, Suite 1650, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 447-4806  
awylene@rcrcnet.org

**Elisa Wynne**, Staff Director, *Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee*  
California State Senate, State Capitol Room 5019, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 651-4103  
elisa.wynne@sen.ca.gov

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

**Siew-Chin Yeong**, Director of Public Works, *City of Pleasanton*  
3333 Busch Road, Pleasanton, CA 94566  
Phone: (925) 931-5506  
syeong@cityofpleasantonca.gov

**Traci Young**, IS Project Director, *City and County of San Francisco*  
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), 525 Golden Gate Ave, San Francisco, CA 94102  
Phone: (415) 653-2583  
tmyoung@sfgwater.org

**Luis Zamora**, Confidential Executive Assistant to the City Attorney, *City and County of San Francisco*  
Office of the City Attorney, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

Phone: (415) 554-4748  
Luis.A.Zamora@sfcityatty.org

**Jess Zayas**, Bureau Manager, *Department of Social Services*  
Finance & Accounting, 744 P Street MS 17-27, Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: (916) 654-0958  
Jess.Zayas@dss.ca.gov

**Helmholt Zinser-Watkins**, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, *State Controller's Office*  
Local Government Programs and Services Division, Bureau of Payments, 3301 C Street, Suite 700,  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
Phone: (916) 324-7876  
HZinser-watkins@sco.ca.gov