

County Executive

Navdeep S. Gill



County of Sacramento

Board of Supervisors

Phillip R. Serna, District 1

Patrick Kennedy, District 2

Susan Peters, District 3

Sue Frost, District 4

Don Nottoli, District 5

May 30, 2017

The Honorable Reggie Jones-Sawyer
State Capitol, Room 2114
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: AB 1250 (Jones-Sawyer) – Counties and cities: contracts for personal services: OPPOSE

Dear Assembly Member Jones-Sawyer:

On behalf of the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, we unfortunately must write in opposition to Assembly Bill 1250 (Jones-Sawyer), which would establish specific standards for the use of personal services contracts by certain cities and counties. Ultimately, the bill would limit the ability of counties and cities to contract out for services.

Specifically, we are concerned that while AB 1250 provides some exceptions for emergency situations and technical expertise, we believe that allowing counties to use the least-costly methods of providing services while meeting operational needs in all circumstances is in the best interest of the counties, residents and service recipients. Adding additional hurdles such as those proposed by AB 1250 will increase costs and reduce opportunities to meet service delivery needs in the most cost-effective manner. This bill would severely limit options for city and county agencies to determine the most appropriate solution to providing efficient and effective public service, by establishing significant and costly obstacles for city and county contracting for personal services. AB 1250 effectively will leave agencies with limited choice, or lacking the ability to maintain and provide needed services altogether.

Furthermore, the requirement for local governments to demand contractors disclose information as part of their application that includes a description of all charges, claims or complaints filed against the contractors within the last 10 years, the total compensation the contractor provides to workers under the contract, and the total compensation of the five highest compensated officers is a significant overreach and could prove to be provide a disincentive for contractors to apply.

In closing, the bill proposes many provisions that are extremely costly and establishes new mandates that could trigger state reimbursement. The overall effect could also drive demand on local resources by limiting opportunities to seek service contracts where overall cost savings could be achieved. For the above reasons, we are opposed to AB 1250. Should you have any questions regarding our position, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,


Navdeep S. Gill
County Executive