

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 2640 (Hadwick)

As Amended June 18, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

Authorizes local agencies to request to offset any reimbursement adjustments resulting from audits by the State Controller's Office (SCO) from any unpaid reimbursement claims.

Senate Amendments

Clarify the roles and process for offsets to occur.

COMMENTS

1) **State Mandates.** In 1979, the voters amended the California Constitution, requiring the state to reimburse local governments for the cost of new programs or higher levels of service mandated by the Legislature, the Governor, or any state agency (Section 6 of Article XIII B). However, not all mandates are reimbursable. The Constitution also creates specific exceptions when the state does not have to reimburse local governments for the new program or higher level of service:

- a) The local agency affected requests the mandate.
- b) The mandate defines a new crime or changes an existing definition of a crime.
- c) The Legislature enacted the mandate prior to 1975.
- d) The mandate concerns constitutional requirements to provide the public access to public meetings and records.

The Legislature established the State Mandates Commission (Commission) in 1984 as a quasi-judicial body to mediate disputes between the state and local agencies over what constitutes a reimbursable mandate. The Commission is tasked with resolving the complex legal questions associated with determinations of state mandated costs. The Commission's membership includes the following:

- a) The Director of the Department of Finance.
- b) The State Treasurer.
- c) The State Controller.
- d) The Director of the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (formerly the Office of Planning and Research).
- e) Two local government members (a city councilmember, member of a county board of supervisors, or a governing board member of a school district), appointed by the Governor.
- f) One public member with experience in public finance, appointed by the Governor.

When the Legislature created the Commission, it also created additional circumstances under which the state does not have to reimburse local agencies for state-mandated local programs, including when:

- a) The mandate has been declared existing law or regulation by action of the courts.
 - b) The mandate is federally-mandated.
 - c) The local agency has the authority to levy service charges, fees, or assessments sufficient to pay for the mandated program or increased level of service.
 - d) There is offsetting savings from an appropriation or another bill.
 - e) The mandate is necessary to implement a ballot measure approved by the voters.
- 2) *Proposition 1A.* Proposition 1A, passed by voters in 2004, generally required the state to pay all outstanding non-education mandate costs each year or else suspend the mandate's requirements, halting the practice of delaying payments indefinitely while still requiring local agencies to provide the mandated services. Proposition 1A allowed those delayed payments to be paid over a term of years. Local agencies worked with the state to secure the final repayment for pre-2004 mandate debt in the 2015-16 state budget. That debt, which at one time totaled more than \$1 billion, is now fully paid.
- 3) *Submitting Test Claims.* When a local agency wants to claim a state law or executive order increases costs, it submits a test claim to the Commission outlining the increased costs or level of service. The Commission hears the claim and decides whether it is a reimbursable state mandate. If the Commission determines that the requirement in question is a reimbursable mandate, it calculates the amount the state must pay local agencies based on actual costs or another Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology (RRM) the Commission develops.

Under the 1984 legislation, local agencies did not have a statute of limitations that limited the time they had to submit a test claim. In 2002, AB 3000 (Committee on Budget), Chapter 1124, Statutes of 2002, imposed a three-year statute of limitations. Later, AB 2856 (Laird), Chapter 890, Statutes of 2004, reduced the statute of limitations to one year from the effective date of the statute, or the date the local agency first incurred costs. Section 1183.1 of the California Code of Regulations requires local governments to file test claims with the Commission, which must be filed no later than 12 months following the effective date of a statute or executive order, or within 12 months of *first* incurring increased costs as a result of a statute or executive order, whichever is later.

- 4) *Reimbursement Process.* If the Commission determines there are costs mandated by the state, it must determine the amount to be subvented to local agencies and school districts for reimbursement. The Commission is then required to adopt "Parameters and Guidelines" that list the specific activities that are reimbursable. Once the Commission has adopted Parameters and Guidelines, local governments can submit claims for reimbursement based on the actual costs of the required activities. Alternatively, the Commission can adopt a RRM. The Legislature created the RRM process in 2004 with the intent to streamline the documentation and reporting process for mandates. An RRM allows local governments to be

reimbursed based on general allocation formulas or other approximations of costs, rather than detailed documentation of actual costs.

After the Commission adopts parameters and guidelines, those parameters and guidelines are sent to the SCO. The SCO then has 90 days to issue claiming instructions. The claiming instructions tell local governments how to file for reimbursement for the mandated activities with the SCO. Local governments then have 120 days to file their initial reimbursement claims with the SCO. Following the receipt of the initial reimbursement claims, the Commission estimates the statewide costs and sends the statewide cost estimate to the Legislature. Typically, within one year of local governments submitting claims for reimbursement, the Commission prepares a statewide cost estimate based on the claims or the RRM. After the cost estimate is prepared, mandates are considered for funding in the state budget. As noted earlier, Proposition 1A (2004) requires the Legislature to fund, suspend, or repeal non-education-related mandates. Suspending mandates relieves local governments of performing the mandate for one year, while repealing a mandate permanently eliminates it.

If the amount the Legislature appropriates is insufficient to pay all of the reimbursement claims filed and approved for reimbursement, the Controller will prorate the claims. If the funds to cover the remaining deficiency are not appropriated in the Budget Act, the Controller shall report this information to the legislative budget committees and the Commission.

- 5) *School Reimbursements.* In 2012-13, the state created two education mandates block grants—one for all active K-12 mandates and one for all active community college mandates. The block grants are an alternative mechanism for local educational agencies (LEAs) to seek mandate reimbursement. Instead of submitting detailed claims on an ongoing basis listing how much was spent on each mandated activity or using specific RRMs for specific mandates, LEAs can choose to receive funding for all mandated activities through the block grants. As of 2015-16, almost all LEAs were participating in the block grants. (Those LEAs not opting to participate in the block grants continue to submit claims to the Controller for reimbursement at a later date.)
- 6) *SCO Audits and Reductions.* State law authorizes the SCO to audit any mandate claim within three years of reimbursement, and an audit must be completed within two years of when the audit commenced. However, if no funds are appropriated or no payment is made to a claimant for the mandate for the fiscal year for which the claim is filed, the time for the Controller to initiate an audit must commence to run from the date of initial payment of the claim. When auditing a claim or RRM, the SCO reviews whether the local government's claim for reimbursement follows the Parameters and Guidelines set out by the Commission. The SCO also verifies that the information provided by the local government is accurate and sufficient to support the reimbursement. If the local government claimed reimbursement for activities not included in the Parameters and Guidelines or did not provide sufficient evidence for the claim, the SCO may reduce the reimbursement and may charge interest when the claim was already paid. The SCO is required to notify the claimant in writing within 30 days after the issuance of a remittance advice of any adjustment to a claim for reimbursement.

As detailed by a Legislative Analyst's Office review in 2016, "Last year, the SCO issued roughly 130 audit reports related to mandate claims. Each audit report included an average of

five local government reimbursement claims for particular mandates. Overall, this reflects an audit of roughly 1 percent of claims. In the 1 percent, or roughly 650 claims, audited, the SCO identified errors in 60 percent of them. As a result, reimbursements to local governments were reduced by \$170 million. While those claims audited were reduced by a significant amount, these reductions reflect a small share of the state's mandate payments overall. Moreover, this error rate likely does not reflect the error rate across all claims as SCO targets audits based on the risk factors discussed above. (Notably, reductions to community college claims reflected over half of the total adjustments.) Each audit report, which typically is performed by one auditor, requires six months to one year to complete."

If a local government believes the SCO incorrectly reduced its reimbursement, the local government may appeal the decision to the Commission. To overturn a reduction, the Commission must find that the SCO's reduction was arbitrary, capricious, or did not have sufficient evidence to support a reduction. For example, Sacramento County filed an incorrect reduction claim (IRC) on November 25, 2024 for Fiscal Years 2016-2019 on the Child Abduction and Recovery Program. According to the filing, "On February 23, 2022, the State Controller's Office (SCO) issued its final audit report on the County of Sacramento District Attorney's Office (DA's Office) claims for costs incurred based on the legislatively created Child Abduction and Recovery Program (Chapter 1399, Statutes of 1976; Chapter 162, Statutes of 1992; and Chapter 988, Statutes of 1996) for the period of July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2019... The SCO incorrectly reduced the County's claim of \$1,885,876 by \$465,094. The County requests the Commission of State Mandates to reverse the audit findings and to award the County the correct claim in the amount of \$1,885,876." The next tentative hearing date for the IRC is April 10, 2026.

According to the Author

"The State of California owes cities, counties, special districts, schools and community colleges over \$1.8 billion in unpaid reimbursable state mandate claims. Even after a reimbursement is issued, an audit or review may reduce the reimbursement amount paid. The local government then must pay that reduced amount, plus interest, back to the State. These repayments must occur even if the local government has other outstanding claims owed to them. For small, rural counties with tight budgets, repaying even a fraction of what little reimbursement they are owed can cripple their financial health. Assembly Bill 964 provides financial relief to local governments facing a massive back log of unpaid claims. By allowing a local government to offset any reduced reimbursement from other unpaid reimbursement claims, local governments can hold on to critical funding for their under resourced communities."

Arguments in Support

According to the State Association of County Auditors, sponsor of this bill, "For decades, local agencies have been assessing the new duties assigned to them by State laws and, if eligible, filing claims for reimbursement for the services rendered. However, if a subsequent State audit disallows the contested amounts on the claim, current law leaves open the possibility that agencies would be required to repay the funds that had likely been budgeted or even spent by the agency."

"Assembly Bill 2640 would prospectively allow the State and local agencies to address the balance of these disallowed claims by utilizing past due amounts currently owed the local agencies rather than withholding funds from current or future claims and harming critical services provided. This would allow the State to be made whole for the contested amount due,

while relieving local agencies the burden of clawing back funds that are needed for critical services.

"AB 2640 does not relieve the agency of the obligation to repay the subject funds; rather it provides a fair mechanism to correct the issue with significantly less harm to local agency services by utilizing funding that is owed to that agency."

Arguments in Opposition

None on file.

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

- 1) Unknown General Fund revenue reductions in a given fiscal year to the extent local agencies opt to offset amounts owed to the state, as reflected in an SCO audit, from previous balances of unpaid claims, rather than remitting funds to the SCO for those overpayments. These amounts would be more than offset in a future fiscal year by reducing the amounts that would be paid to local agencies for state-mandated program liabilities from previous fiscal years and avoid interest payments that accrue on unpaid balances. In short, the bill would result in near term General Fund revenue losses that would be more than offset by future General Fund savings. The overall impacts are unquantifiable and would depend upon the specific outcomes of any SCO audits, amounts of any required adjustments, balances of any unpaid claims for reimbursement, and the timing and amounts of any budget appropriations for local agency mandate reimbursements in the future.
- 2) The SCO estimates minor and absorbable costs for staff time to coordinate with local agencies regarding audit results and effectuate any direction from local agencies to offset any reduced reimbursements identified in an audit from unpaid claims balances. (General Fund)

VOTES:

ASM LOCAL GOVERNMENT: 10-0-0

YES: Carrillo, Ta, Johnson, Pacheco, Ramos, Ransom, Blanca Rubio, Stefani, Ward, Wilson

ASM EDUCATION: 9-0-0

YES: Patel, Hoover, Alvarez, Bonta, Castillo, Garcia, Lowenthal, Pellerin, Zbur

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 15-0-0

YES: Wicks, Hoover, Aguiar-Curry, Calderon, Caloza, Dixon, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Ta, Tangipa

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 76-0-4

YES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Castillo, Chen, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Flora, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle

Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria,
Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

ABS, ABST OR NV: Haney, Lee, Muratsuchi, Celeste Rodriguez

UPDATED

VERSION: June 18, 2026

CONSULTANT: Jimmy MacDonald / L. GOV. / (916) 319-3958

FN: 0003811