June 13, 2017

The Honorable Reggie Jones-Sawyer  
Member, California State Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 2117  
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Assembly Bill 1250 (Jones-Sawyer), Counties and Cities: Contracts for Personal Services  
OPPOSE

Dear Assemblymember Jones-Sawyer:

As Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Shasta, I write to join the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), the Urban Counties of California (UCC), and the Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC), to adamantly inform you that Shasta County is opposed to your Assembly Bill (AB) 1250, which would establish specific standards for the use of personal services contracts by cities and counties. AB 1250 significantly interferes with the ability of counties to enter into personal services contracts and creates additional workload for county staff. The additional hurdles will increase costs and reduce opportunities to meet service delivery needs in the most cost-effective manner.

AB 1250 would provide that a city or county agency may only contract for personal services currently or customarily performed by county employees when all of the following conditions apply: The Board of Supervisors clearly demonstrates that the proposed contract will result in actual overall cost savings to the county for the duration of the contract; proposals to contract out work shall not be approved solely on the basis that savings will result from lower contractor pay rates or benefits; the contract does not cause the displacement of county employees; the contract does not cause vacant positions in county employment to remain unfilled; cost-saving audits are conducted based on outlined standards, the cost of which would be reimbursed by the contractor; and other specified conditions.

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 state, counties, residents, and service recipients. Adding additional hurdles will increase costs and reduce opportunities to meet service delivery needs in the most cost effective manner. Furthermore,
undefined terms such as “expert knowledge” creates a concern that any attempt to contract out could lead to increased litigation.

AB 1250 would establish unnecessary hurdles that would delay the award of contracts, reduce the pool of eligible contractors and consultants, especially troublesome for rural counties who already have a limited pool of qualified contractors and consultants, increase costs and adversely impact the ability to provide essential services to county residents. The County of Shasta already has pre-and long-established administrative policies, procedures, and auditing practices to ensure legal compliance of contracts for outsourced services. AB 1250 would also eliminate exemptions granted under current law which would further inhibit the County’s ability to conduct essential business in a timely and cost-effective manner.

The numerous amendments to this bill continue to fail to address the fundamental problems with the bill. Its inconsistent and onerous requirements interfere with the ability for counties to successfully administer programs which are vital to their residents. Furthermore, AB 1250 impacts the renewal of existing contracts and subjects private employer information to the California Public Records Act, which not only creates additional workload but opens the door to litigation over personal privacy violations.

For all of these reasons, the County of Shasta urges you to work with CSAC, RCRC, and the UCC to address the above issues. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

David A. Kehoe, Chairman
Board of Supervisors
County of Shasta
State of California

cc: CSAC
    RCRC
    Senator Ted Gaines, State Senate District 1
    Assemblymember Brian Dahle, State Assembly District 1