

All letters must be emailed to SBUD.Committee@senate.ca.gov along with all individuals CC'd at the bottom of the letter.

In addition to submitting the letter, please email a copy to legcoordinator@counties.org

****COUNTY LETTERHEAD****

[DATE]

The Honorable Monique Limón
Senate President Pro Tempore
1021 O Street, Suite 8518
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable John Laird
Chair, Senate Committee on Budget
and Fiscal Review
1021 O Street, Suite 8720
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Roger Niello
Vice Chair, Senate Committee on
Budget and Fiscal Review
1021 O Street, Suite 7110
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable [State Senator(s) that
represent your County]
California State Senate, District [#]

RE: 2026-2027 Governor's Budget Proposal and County Partnership

Dear President Pro Tempore Limón, Senator Laird, Senator Niello, and [State Senator(s) that represent your district]

County writes to express their strong commitment to a collaborative partnership between the state and local governments to develop a budget that supports the needs of California's 58 counties. In this time of grave uncertainty, we look forward to working together to protect residents from significant reductions to essential services.

We recognize that this year's state budget deliberations are shaped by ongoing state and federal tensions and recent federal policies that impact California's fiscal condition. The Governor's budget proposal estimates billions of dollars in federal fund expenditures in 2026-27, which may change depending on unanticipated federal actions that have economic implications and the continued implementation of H.R. 1. However, even with the fiscal uncertainty, it is paramount that this budget takes meaningful action to address the onslaught that is coming, particularly in implementing H.R. 1. While the proposed budget minimizes the state deficit with additional revenue, it does not share the wealth with counties that deliver critical services on behalf of the state to millions of Californians every day. Recent state-level cuts and funding delays to core safety-net programs, like In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), and to the Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention (HHAP) Program, along with the lack of implementation funding for

Proposition 36 (2024), further erode counties' ability to meet the needs of their constituents. Not to mention counties are facing mounting crises due to federal actions, such as H.R. 1, which will shift billions of dollars in new Medi-Cal, CalFresh, and indigent care costs to counties — without removing the mandates to deliver these services. _____ County does not have a fund source to absorb these impacts. Without meaningful support from the state, our communities will suffer as the safety net crumbles.

To this end, _____ County submits the following comments regarding The Governor's 2026-27 budget proposal to inform budget conversations throughout the spring and summer:

County HHS H.R. 1 Impacts

The enactment of H.R. 1 fundamentally shifted significant fiscal responsibility for safety net programs from the federal government to states and counties. While the Governor's budget proposal includes funding to address the state's increased costs from H.R. 1 impacts, _____ County is deeply concerned that there is no funding to help counties respond to the massive new fiscal burden that has been placed upon them.

[Please note how your county will be affected by the Governor's proposal (include examples of the difficulties faced by members of your local communities through lack of funding for H.R. 1 implementation)].

As you know, counties are the safety net providers in California performing the on-the-ground work to enroll and serve vulnerable families, children, and older adults. Absent state support to address these county budget impacts, the state's safety net will crumble as counties cannot backfill federal funding on our own. If the safety net crumbles, local and state economies will as well. When healthcare fails, individuals cannot work and children will miss school due to illness. _____ County calls for workable policy and fiscal solutions, including investments and administrative relief, to meet our shared goal of preserving health care, public health, social services, and behavioral health services in our communities.

Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention (HHAP) Program

_____ County appreciates that last year's \$500 million commitment for the HHAP program in 2026-27 remains. However, we continue to call for full funding of \$1 billion for Round 7. Through prior investments for the HHAP program and the demonstrated work of local government and our partners on the ground, as the Governor stated in his state of the state address, California is making significant strides in reducing homelessness. The only way to sustain this progress is to fully fund the HHAP program and distribute Round 7 funding by the enacted September 1, 2026 goal date, especially after a year in which no HHAP funding was provided.

[Please note how your county and members of your community will be impacted if additional HHAP funding is not included in the 2026-27 state budget.]

In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS)

County is strongly opposed to the proposal to remove the state's share of costs for IHSS hours per case growth. This proposal appears to be a significant cost shift to counties that would result in state General Fund savings of \$233.6 million starting in 2027-28. IHSS costs are already outpacing Realignment revenues, the fund source intended to cover them. Any cost shift would undermine the existing fiscal structure of the county IHSS maintenance of effort (MOE) established in 2019 (Chapter 27, Statutes of 2019). Further, increased IHSS costs for counties would take away funding from other mandated critical health and human services programs such as Child Welfare and Mental Health at a time when counties are strained by the increased safety net program costs as a result of the implementation of H.R. 1.

[Please note how your county and members of your community will be impacted if IHSS funding is not included in the 2026-27 state budget.]

Medi-Cal Mobile Crisis Services

County is also concerned about the Governor's budget proposal to make Medi-Cal Mobile Crisis Services an optional county benefit. This will shift tens of millions per year in costs from the state to the counties and undercut recent progress by the state and counties to bolster the community behavioral health system.

[Please note how your county and members of your community will be impacted if Medi-Cal Mobile Crisis Services are made optional by the 2026-27 state budget.]

Proposition 36

The 2025 Budget Act appropriated \$50 million General Fund one-time to county behavioral health departments for Proposition 36 implementation, however this funding is only for one of multiple county departments impacted by the measure, and it has still not been allocated to counties to meet the demand for substance use disorder and mental health treatment. The Governor's budget proposal does not include any new funding to address county costs to implement Proposition 36 in 2026-27 or thereafter. **County**

County requests adequate, sustained funding for implementation of Proposition 36 to meet the expectations of voters who overwhelmingly approved the initiative in 2024. This

[DATE]

Page 4 of 5

includes associated costs for increased caseloads impacting probation, behavioral health, indigent defense providers, district attorneys, and sheriff's offices.

[Please note how your county and members of your community will be impacted if Proposition 36 implementation funding is not included in the 2026-27 state budget.]

 County recognizes the difficult challenge in crafting a budget during these uncertain times. We are eager to partner with the Legislature and the Governor's Administration to work toward equitable solutions that protect all Californians by offering the expertise and on-the-ground realities to help make informed decisions. California is at a critical stage where we cannot lose the economic progress and momentum we have achieved over the last several years. When H.R. 1 forces counties to backfill the full cost of indigent care, public and rural hospitals are pushed toward closure. Cuts to IHSS pull caregivers out of the workforce. Delays in homelessness and Proposition 36 funding drive up public safety risks and health costs. The result is a ripple effect that weakens local economies and harms communities across California. Counties can provide practical insights and local knowledge essential for shaping policies that work in real-world contexts.

 County looks forward to partnering with the Legislature and the Administration to craft a budget that safeguards core services and enables counties to continue supporting our shared constituents.

Respectfully,

Name

Title

 County

CC : Honorable Members, Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review
Christopher Woods, Chief Fiscal Adviser, Budget Director, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Monique Limón
Misa Lennox, Policy Director, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Monique Limón
Elisa Wynne, Staff Director, Senate Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review

[DATE]

Page 5 of 5

Kirk Feely, Fiscal Director, Senate Republican Caucus

Gabriel Petek, Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office

Carolyn Chu, Chief Deputy Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office