

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES

2009-2010 LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

Assembly Member Jim Beall, Jr., Chair

MEMBERS

Tom Berryhill, Vice Chair

Tom Ammiano

Isadore Hall, III

Dan Logue

Anthony Portantino

Norma Torres (2009)

Committee Staff

Eric Gelber, Chief Consultant

Frances Chacon, Principal Consultant

Michelle Doty Cabrera, Senior Consultant

Irene Frausto, Committee Secretary

1020 N Street, Room 124, Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 319-2089

**Assembly Committee on Human Services
2009-2010 Legislative Summary
Table of Contents**

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES/FOSTER CARE..... 6

AB 12 (Beall/Bass) California Fostering Connections to Success Act 9

AB 82 (Evans) Dependent children: psychotropic medications10

AB 154 (Evans) Adoption assistance: federal10

AB 270 (De La Torre) Dependent children10

AB 295 (Ammiano) Children: adoption services11

AB 421 (Beall) Seriously emotionally disturbed children: out-of-home placement11

AB 488 (Torres) Children's services programs: performance agreement contracts12

AB 595 (Adams) Placement of children: criminal background checks.....12

AB 665 (Torrico) State adoption services: investment.....12

AB 706 (Human Services Comm.) Dependent children.....12

AB 719 (Lowenthal) Transitional food stamps for foster youth.....12

AB 743 (Portantino) Foster care: sibling placement.....12

AB 767 (Ammiano) Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund of 2006: reversion of funds13

AB 770 (Torres) Indian tribes: foster care and adoption programs13

AB 921 (Jones) Juvenile court jurisdiction: services and benefits13

AB 938 (Judiciary Comm.) Dependent children: relative caregivers and foster parents14

AB 1067 (Brownley) Children in foster care: school proximity and travel costs .14

AB 1148 (Davis) Virtual Assistant Living and Education program.....14

AB 1324 (Bass) Foster youth: identity theft14

AB 1325 (Cook) Tribal customary adoption15

AB 1402 (Bass) Family connection grants15

AB 1655 (Evans) Dependent children: psychotropic medications15

AB 1808 (Galgiani) Foster children: Mental health services.16

AB 1852 (Portantino) Dependent children: locating extended family members...16

AB 1905 (Cook) Foster care: funding: placement approvals16

AB 1920 (Davis) Foster youth: personal information: pilot program16

AB 1933(Brownley) Foster children: education.....17

AB 1943 (Fletcher) Foster children: access to information.....17

AB 2015 (Arambula) Child abuse: interdisciplinary and integrated services17

AB 2129 (Bass) Foster care: residentially based services	17
AB 2342 (Evans) Foster youth: outreach programs	18
AB 2418 (Cook) Indian children	18
AB 2474 (Beall) Community care facilities: foster family agencies.....	18
AB 2698 (Block) Foster youth: identity theft	19
SB 118 (Liu) Child welfare services: incarcerated parents	19
SB 352 (Dutton) Juvenile offenders: health facilities.....	19
SB 597 (Liu) Child welfare services: foster care services, and adoption assistance.....	19
SB 654 (Leno) Independent Living Program.....	20
SB 945 (Liu) Juvenile court jurisdiction: services and benefits	20
SB 1214 (Wolk) Crisis nurseries	20
SB 1353 (Wright) Education: foster youth	21

IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES (IHSS).....21

AB 378 (Hagman) In-Home Supportive Services: provider training	27
AB 452 (Yamada) In-Home Supportive Services: California Independence Act of 2009	27
AB 682 (Lowenthal) In-Home Supportive Services program: Fraud.....	27
AB 1532 (Lieu) In-Home Supportive Services	28
AB 1763 (Lieu) In-Home Supportive Services	28
AB 1801 (Yamada) In-Home Supportive Services: quality assurance and fraud prevention	28
AB 1924 (A. Strickland) In-Home Supportive Services: fraud.....	29
AB 1970 (Fong) In-Home Supportive Services providers: emergency shelter services.....	29
AB 2274 (Beall) In-Home Supportive Services program.....	29
AB 2374 (Nestande) In-Home Supportive Services: pilot project	29
ACR 151 (Ma) In-Home Supportive Services.....	30
SB 141 (Maldonado) In-Home Supportive Services: provider timesheets.....	30
SB 142 (Maldonado) In-Home Supportive Services: authorized tasks	30
SB 791 (Yee) In-Home Supportive Services: COBRA	30
SB 886 (Florez) In-Home Supportive Services providers: electronic timekeeping.....	31

CalWORKs.....31

AB 510 (Evans) CalWORKs: aid amount calculation.....	34
AB 631 (Tran) Public assistance: home visits	34
AB 1057 (Beall) CalWORKs and Food Stamp Program: reporting.....	34
AB 1058 (Beall) CalWORKs eligibility: asset limits	35
AB 1193 (Audra Strickland) Public assistance: home visits	35
AB 1479 (Duvall) Public assistance: home visits.....	35
AB 1642 (Beall) CalWORKs and Food Stamp Program: reporting.....	35
AB 1866 (A. Strickland) Public assistance: home visits.	35
AB 1914 (Davis) Public social services: food stamp benefits.....	35
AB 2004 (Beall) Job creation, work incentive, and work subsidy programs	36
AB 2018 (Skinner) Food stamps: intercounty transfer of benefits	36
AB 2504 (A. Strickland) CalWORKs eligibility: fraudulent representations: fines.....	36

SB 1322 (Liu) Food Stamp Employment and Training program	37
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES	37
AB 140 (Beall) Developmental disabilities	44
AB 287 (Beall) Persons with developmental disabilities: employment	44
AB 302 (Beall) Developmental services: regional centers	45
AB 416 (Block) Developmental services: consumer abuse registry	45
AB 438 (Beall) Persons with developmental disabilities: criminal proceedings: diversion.....	45
AB 1589 (Comm. on A. & A.R.) Regional Centers: whistleblower protection: Related-party transactions.....	46
AB 2204 (Beall) Developmental services: stakeholder groups	46
AB 2430 (Chesbro) Department of Rehabilitation: blindness.....	46
AB 2702 (Chesbro) Developmental services: planning teams	46
ACR 162 (Beall) Disability History Week	47
SB 110 (Liu) People with disabilities: victims of crime.....	47
SJR 31 (Pavley) Individuals with disabilities: tax exempt accounts	47
COMMUNITY CARE LICENSING	47
AB 123 (Portantino) Housing for elderly or disabled persons	49
AB 407 (Beall) Continuing care contracts: retirement communities: closure.....	49
AB 1169 (Ruskin) Elderly care: continuing care contracts: financial reporting requirements.....	50
AB 1433 (Eng) Continuing care contracts: retirement communities: permanent closure	50
SB 781 (Leno) Residential care facilities for the elderly: eviction procedures	50
SB 892 (Alquist) Care facilities.....	51
SB 1329 (Leno) Residential care facilities for the elderly.....	51
CHILD CARE.....	51
AB 222 (Adams) Child care	53
AB 304 (Price) Child Care and Developments Services Act: alternative payment programs	54
AB 627 (Brownley) Child care: nutritional requirements	54
AB 1195 (Brownley) Child care and development programs: advisory committee.....	54
AB 1368 (Adams) Child day care: safety	54
AB 1979 (Adams) Child day care centers: inspections	55
AB 2084 (Brownley) Child day care facilities: nutrition.....	55
AB 2463 (Brownley) Child care resource and referral programs.....	55
SB 244 (Wright) Children's service: high risk children.....	55
SB 702 (DeSaulnier) Ancillary day care centers: employees: trustline providers	56
SB 1196 (DeSaulnier) Child care	56

FOOD ASSISTANCE.....56

AB 643 (Skinner) Food stamps: benefits transfers59
AB 719 (Lowenthal) Transitional food stamps for foster youth.....59
AB 1057 (Beall) CalWORKs and Food Stamp Program: reporting.....69
AB 1198 (Swanson) Food stamps: eligibility: drug felonies.....60
AB 1756 (Swanson) Food Stamps.....60

MISCELLANEOUS HUMAN SERVICES60

AB 325 (Beall) Federal Earned Income Tax Credit: community outreach60
AB 398 (Monning) Acquired brain trauma: administration61
AB 422 (Torres) State Youth and Family Master Plan.....61
AB 861 (Ruskin) Public health services: consolidated contracts61
AB 885 (Nestande/Eng) Area agencies on aging and independent living centers:
funding61
AB 1177 (Fong) Homelessness: Interagency Council on Homelessness62
AB 1758 (Ammiano) County wraparound services program62
AB 1766 (Gaines and Logue) Placer County Integrated Health and Human
Services Pilot Program.....62
AB 2017 (Hall) Personal income taxes: voluntary contributions: California
Youth Leadership Fund.....63
AB 2039 (Logue) Placer County integrated health and human services
programs63
AB 2206 (Hill) foster care: insurance63
AB 2229 (Brownley) Mandated child abuse reporting.....64
AB 2322 (Feuer) Abuse of children, elder, or dependent persons:
Confidentiality64
ACR 80 (Hill) Bill of Rights for the Children and Youth of California.....64
ACR 110 (Conway) Step Up California Month and Step Up California Day64
SB 516 (DeSaulnier) California Youth Legislature.....65
SB 774 (Ashburn) Social workers: criminal history65
SB 1084 (Liu) California Economic Security Task Force.....65

2009-2010 HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE BILL SUMMARY66

2009-2010 Legislative Summary Assembly Committee on Human Services

Jim Beall, Jr., Chair

The Assembly Committee on Human Services has jurisdiction over programs and services designed to assist the state's most vulnerable populations—children who have been abused or neglected, people with disabilities, low-income families, and the elderly. Its Chair is Jim Beall, Jr. (D-San Jose). The Committee was busy in 2009-2010, working on legislation intended to conform to the federal Fostering Connection to Success Act, promote family-based foster care placements, address program integrity in the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program, fight hunger by increasing participation in food assistance programs, and promote employment for individuals with developmental disabilities. The Committee also approved legislation to protect the elderly in residential care facilities, improve safety in child care facilities, and allow asset building for welfare recipients in the California Work Opportunity & Responsibility to Kids program (CalWORKs).

Following are overviews of the major areas within the Committee's jurisdiction, including discussion of selected current and ongoing policy issues, as well as a complete summary of bills referred to the Committee during the 2009-2010 Legislative Session.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES/FOSTER CARE

The child welfare system in California is made up of public and private agencies, institutions, and programs responsible for responding to the nearly 500,000 reports of suspected child abuse and neglect filed each year by concerned professionals and community members. These organizations provide services to children who are victims or are at risk of becoming victims and their families.

After a concerned individual reports an allegation of abuse or neglect, a county social worker determines if an investigation needs to occur and how quickly. An investigation may end the intervention, or it may begin the family's further involvement in the child welfare system. Whenever possible, families are provided with assistance and services so that their children may safely remain in or return to their home. In some cases of imminent risk of harm to the child, temporary or permanent removal from the home is necessary. In April 2010, approximately 63,000¹ children in California were living in out-of-home placements or foster care after being removed from their homes as a result of abuse or neglect.

¹ Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Williams, D., Zimmerman, K., Simon, V., Hamilton, D., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Frerer, K., Lou, C., Peng, C. & Moore, M. (2010). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved 10/20/2010, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research website. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare>

The California Department of Social Services (DSS) is the principal entity responsible for the state's child welfare system, although each of the state's 58 counties administers its own child welfare program. Federal and state laws provide the framework for child welfare services, which are funded through a combination of federal, state, and county resources. Federal funding is generally available in cases where a child's parents have incomes below specified levels, which applies to approximately 75% of children in foster care.

The judicial system and the Departments of Alcohol and Drug Programs, Developmental Services, Education, Health Care Services and Mental Health, along with their county counterparts, also provide critical services to children and families involved in the child welfare system. Child welfare services include a variety of interventions designed to protect children such as: (1) emergency response to reports of suspected abuse and neglect; (2) family maintenance (time-limited protective services to families in crisis); (3) family reunification (time-limited intervention and support services to help create a safe environment to which a child who was removed from home could return); and, (4) foster or out-of-home care.

Most of California's approximately 63,000 foster children entered foster care because of neglect (rather than abuse or abandonment). Due to efforts aimed at reducing the length of stay for children in foster care, and moving toward permanent placements more quickly, California has managed to decrease its overall foster care caseload by 10% over the past 10 years despite a growth in the overall number of children in the state. While this trend is encouraging, children of color continue to be overrepresented in foster care. In 2010, children of color made up three-quarters of the population (Black/African-American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American/Indian). Over the same period (2000-2010), California saw a 50% decline in the numbers of African-American children in foster care. These efforts must be applauded, but the state must not let up as African-American children are still more than five times as likely as white children to be in foster care as of 2009.

Foster care is intended to provide children with temporary out-of-home placements until they can safely return home or be permanently placed with relatives or other committed adults. Placement options vary, and as of 2010, foster children were placed with foster family homes (22%), foster family agencies (46%), kin (17%), group home providers (15%), or in other living arrangements. Group care placements are the least preferred and most expensive of these major placement categories.

Given the scope and complexity of issues surrounding child welfare services, the Committee devoted much attention to the problems and concerns of abused and neglected children during the 2009-2010 Legislative Session. There were more bills affecting this subject than any other: 42 were referred to the Committee, 38 passed the Legislature and 25 were enacted into law.

The two forces wielding the most influence over child welfare and foster care policy over the session were the federal Fostering Connections and Increasing Adoptions Act (federal Fostering Connections Act) (Public Law 110-351) and the California budget. The federal Fostering Connections Act, signed into law by President Bush in late 2008 pushed forward changes related to adoptions, education, relative caregivers, sibling placement and the upper age limit for foster care. Over this legislative session, the federal Fostering Connections Act spurred no fewer than 10 bills. Although some of the proposed changes were required, as found in provisions of **AB 154 (Evans)**, **AB 743 (Portantino)**, **AB 770 (Torres)** and **AB 1933 (Brownley)**, the Legislature also seized on several optional provisions of the federal Fostering Connections Act, most notably with the passage of **AB 12**, the California Fostering Connections to Success Act.

Signed into law on September 30, 2010, AB 12 will opt California in to two optional provisions of the federal Act and bring newly available federal dollars into the state. First, AB 12 will convert the state's subsidized relative guardian program, also known as the Kinship Guardian Assistance Program (Kin-GAP), into two identical programs: one federally subsidized, and one state-funded for families not federally eligible. The state and counties have invested in Kin-GAP for over 10 years as it has successfully moved children out of foster care and into long-term, stable placements with family members who agree to guardianship. With the federal Fostering Connections Act, federal matching funds will be available in this program for the first time, resulting in tens of millions of general fund (GF) savings.

Second, AB 12 will phase-in an extension for foster care to eligible youth up to age 21 over three years, starting in 2012. Foster youth who "age out" of or "emancipate" from foster care at 18 or 19 are highly at risk as they transition to adulthood. When compared to children who were not in foster care, foster children are more than twice as likely to drop out of high school. Former foster youth also face unemployment and incarceration at rates far higher than the general population. According to some studies, 24% to 50% of former foster children become homeless within the first 18 months of emancipation. With the passage of AB 12, California joins states such as Illinois and New York where transitional foster care services are available until the age of 21 and these outcomes have dramatically improved. As these two Fostering Connections Act changes are implemented, the landscape of the child welfare and foster care systems in California will change dramatically as a whole foster care system adjusts to balance the rights and responsibilities of *nonminor* dependents.

The other major influence in child welfare policy has been the strained California budget. In 2009, Governor Schwarzenegger unilaterally cut \$80 million GF, \$133 million total from the child welfare services budget through his line-item veto or "blue pencil" authority. Although the Legislature restored the \$80 million through the budget process, in 2010, Governor Schwarzenegger again cut the \$80 million with his blue pencil authority after the passage of the budget. It is still unclear what the total impact of this cut will be on the child welfare system down the line, but it has already meant that counties have had to lay off social workers, which has led to higher caseloads and potential negative impacts on the timeliness of child abuse and neglect investigations, as well as trending efforts toward family maintenance and reunification and family finding and engagement.

Over the course of the 2009-2010 Legislative Session, the courts also weighed in with decisions that have changed and shaped the direction of foster care policy significantly. Group home providers sued DSS in 2006 arguing that depressed group home rates ran afoul of the federal Child Welfare Act because they failed to meet the necessary costs associated with basic care and supervision of foster children. As these matters were being considered in the courts, the state took action in the 2010 budget to cut group home rates by 10%, but was ultimately prevented from doing so by the court. Ultimately, the United States Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals sided with the plaintiffs and the district court ordered an increase in group home rates of 32%². As part of the 2010-2011 budget package, the Legislature established a group home rates working group to develop recommendations for how best to revise rates. Along with existing reforms found in the Residentially-Based Services pilot projects (**AB 2129 (Bass)**), wraparound services (**AB 1758 (Ammiano)**), and intensive treatment foster care practices, stakeholders will need to consider, not just what rates are paid, but how to create an overall system of care that encourages appropriate alternatives to long-term group home placements for children in foster care.

Looking back, other areas of intense debate and proposed reforms included educational stability (**AB 1067 & AB 1933 (Brownley)**, **AB 1943 (Fletcher)**, **SB 1352 (Wright)**) and data sharing related to

² California Alliance of Child and Family Services v. Allenby (No. C 06-4095 MHP)

foster children. With advances in technology, school districts and law enforcement agencies sought ways to communicate more effectively and to respond more quickly to the needs of foster youth (**AB 1148 & AB 1920 (Davis), AB 1324 (Bass), AB 2698 (Block), AB 2229 (Brownley), AB 2322 (Feuer)**). While there is certainly promise through technology to ensure that foster youth do not fall through the cracks of overwhelmed educational and child welfare systems, efforts to allow for a greater flow of information are often stymied by differing interpretations of state and federal privacy laws. Toward that end, the Administrative Office of the Courts compiled a series of briefs: "Sharing Information About Children in Foster Care" in 2010 following recommendations put forth by the Child Welfare Council (CWC) and California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care. As CWC co-chair and California Supreme Court Associate Justice Carlos Moreno writes, "These briefs provide basic legal guidance about what information must be and may be shared and provides a starting point for discussions about how information can best be shared while still maintaining confidentiality." Another compelling issue in child welfare and foster care that is sure to invite future legislation and a continued conversation.

It is clear that the reforms of the past 10 years have vastly improved certain outcomes in California's child welfare system with emphases on family maintenance and reunification, permanency through relative guardianships and adoption incentives, and by focusing on the needs of foster youth to have greater educational stability. As California continues to struggle with budget deficits and human services programs are targeted, it must place an even greater emphasis on the needs of abused and neglected children. Provider reimbursement rates for foster family homes, foster family agencies, and other preferred residential placements have been cut in recent years on top of chronic underfunding; and the recruitment and retention of foster parents will continue to suffer as a result. Absent qualified residential placements for foster children, children may be placed out-of-county, where educational stability and access to mental health services, friends and family are even more difficult. And despite the success of AB 12, budget constraints have halted many more meaningful and needed policy reforms during the legislative process. Finally, the state must continue to work with its county and community partners to monitor any potential negative impacts of budget cuts to ensure the safety and wellbeing of abused and neglected children.

**AB 12 (Beall/Bass) – California Fostering Connections to Success Act
Chapter 559, Statutes of 2010**

1. Requires the Department of Social Services to exercise its option under federal law to enter into kinship guardianship assistance agreements with relative guardians of children who exit foster care, replacing California's existing state and county-funded Kinship Guardianship Assistance Program (Kin-GAP) with a new federally subsidized Kin-GAP program.
2. Extends foster care, Kin-GAP, and the Adoptions Assistance Program (AAP) services to age 21 for youth completing secondary education or an equivalent credential, enrolled in a postsecondary or vocational institution, participating in a program designed to promote or remove barriers to employment, employed at least 80 hours per month, or incapable of doing one of the above due to a documented medical condition.

AB 12 (Continued)

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (13-4)
Assembly Floor (72-0)
Assembly Concurrence (73-2)

Senate Human Services (3-0)
Senate Judiciary (4-0)
Senate Appropriations (11-0)
Senate Floor (27-9)

**AB 82 (Evans) – Dependent children: psychotropic medications.
Vetoed by the Governor**

Established a pilot project that added requirements, including that the child and his or her caregiver had been informed, of his or her right to request a hearing, and that a plan was in place for a physician to monitor the treatment, before a juvenile court could authorize the administration of psychotropic medications to children in foster care.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Assembly Judiciary (10-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)
Assembly Floor (78-0)
Assembly Concurrence (79-0)

Senate Human Services (4-0)
Senate Judiciary (5-0)
Senate Appropriations (13-0)
Senate Floor (37-0)

**AB 154 (Evans) Adoption assistance: federal law.
Chapter 222, Statutes of 2009**

Requires DSS, in accordance with federal law, to utilize any savings in state funds realized from changes in eligibility for adoption assistance on foster care and adoption services, including postadoption assistance. Requires DSS and licensed adoption agencies to inform prospective adoptive families of their potential eligibility for federal and state tax credits.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)
Assembly Floor (79-0)
Assembly Concurrence (78-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)
Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)
Senate Floor (39-0)

**AB 270 (De La Torre) Dependent children
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense file.**

Required the juvenile court to continue jurisdiction over a foster youth until specified documents and information had been provided to the foster youth at the age of majority by the county welfare department, including: the foster youth's addresses of residency while under the jurisdiction of the court, a voter registration form, a U.S. Selective Service registration form, an application for Social Security Income, and a consumer credit report.

AB 270 (Continued)

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)
Assembly Judiciary (9-1)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 295 (Ammiano) Children: adoption services
Chapter 427, Statutes of 2009**

Provides an extension, until June 30, 2010, for a pilot program established to support adoptions for foster youth over nine years of age in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Alameda, Kern and Sacramento counties, due to delays in the initial implementation. Also provides an extension for the required reporting until May 31, 2011.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Human Services (4-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)	Senate Appropriations (12-0)
Assembly Floor (78-0)	Senate Floor (39-0)
Assembly Concurrence (79-0)	

**AB 421 (Beall) Seriously emotionally disturbed children: out-of-home placement
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Authorized payments for 24-hour care of a child classified as seriously emotionally disturbed and placed out-of-home in an out-of-state, for-profit residential facility if a local education agency had placed the child in such a facility or if no comparable facility was willing to take the child or able to meet the child's needs.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Assembly Education (9-0)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 488 (Torres) Children's services programs: performance agreement contracts
Chapter 445, Statutes of 2009**

Authorizes DSS to renew or extend, for up to three additional years, performance agreements with private, non-profit agencies that provide unique and innovative services in the child welfare system. Requires the county or private nonprofit agency to fund an independent evaluation of the agency's performance, with a report of the results due to the department six months prior to the end of the agreement period.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (16-0)	Senate Appropriations (13-0)
Assembly Floor (72-0)	Senate Floor (39-0)
Assembly Concurrence (75-0)	

**AB 595 (Adams) Placement of children: criminal background checks
Chapter 246, Statutes of 2009**

Conforms state law to federal law by requiring background checks and by prohibiting persons convicted of child abuse or neglect, spousal abuse, crimes against a child, crimes involving violence, physical assault, battery, or certain drug- or alcohol-related offenses from becoming foster or adoptive parents.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)	Senate Public Safety (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)	Senate Appropriations (12-0)
Assembly Floor (79-0)	Senate Floor (35-0)

**AB 665 (Torrico) State adoption services: investment
Chapter 250, Statutes of 2009**

Expands, from only “adoptions” to “any legal permanency outcome,” the number of ways the state is allowed to expend federal adoption incentive bonus dollars. Legal permanency outcomes would include, but not be limited to, adoption, guardianship and reunification.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)	Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)
Assembly Floor (78-0)	Senate Floor (36-0)
Assembly Concurrence (77-0)	

**AB 706 (Human Services Committee) Dependent children
Chapter 120, Statutes of 2009**

Makes technical, clarifying, and conforming changes to provisions related to providing reunification services and scheduling of juvenile court review hearings concerning children who are dependents of the juvenile court and their parents or guardians.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)	Senate Judiciary (5-0)
Assembly Floor (79-0)	Senate Floor (40-0)
Assembly Concurrence (78-0)	

**AB 719 (Lowenthal) Transitional food stamps for foster youth
Chapter 371, Statutes of 2009**

Please see page 59

**AB 743 (Portantino) Foster care: sibling placement
Chapter 560, Statutes of 2010**

Requires California to place siblings together when they have been removed from their parents or guardians unless that placement is contrary to their safety or well-being pursuant to the federal Fostering Connections Act, and for notification to be provided to a child's attorney when there is a change in placement resulting in the separation of siblings.

AB 743 (Continued)

Legislative History

Assembly Judiciary (10-0)
Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Assembly Appropriations (13-0)
Assembly Floor (67-0)
Assembly Concurrence (78-0)

Senate Human Services (3-0)
Senate Judiciary (4-0)
Senate Appropriations (11-0)
Senate Floor (33-0)

**AB 767 (Ammiano) Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund of 2006: reversion of funds
Not heard by Assembly Human Services Committee: amended and re-referred to the Assembly
Housing and Community Development Committee
Chapter 123, Statutes of 2009**

Extends the set-aside of Proposition 1C funds for the Homeless Youth and Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhoods (BEGIN) Programs by two years.

Legislative History

Assembly Rules (8-0)
Assembly Housing and Community Develop. (7-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)
Assembly Floor (79-0)

Senate Transportation and Housing (11-0)
Senate Appropriations (11-0)
Senate Floor (34-0)

**AB 770 (Torres) Indian tribes: foster care and adoption programs
Chapter 124, Statutes of 2009**

Ensures that the state maximizes the opportunities for Indian tribes to operate foster care programs for Indian children pursuant to federal law.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)
Assembly Appropriations (15-0)
Assembly Floor (76-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)
Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)
Senate Floor (36-0)

**AB 921 (Jones) Juvenile court jurisdiction: services and benefits
Vetoed by the Governor**

Requires that, whenever the juvenile court orders a hearing to terminate jurisdiction on the basis of age, probation officers must provide wards who have been in foster care with a written notice that they are eligible for services and benefits to former foster children and with all necessary information on applying for and accessing these services and benefits.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (15-0)
Assembly Floor (78-0)
Assembly Concurrence (76-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)
Senate Appropriations (12-0)
Senate Floor (35-0)

**AB 938 (Judiciary Committee) Dependent children: relative caregivers and foster parents
Chapter 261, Statutes of 2009**

Requires a social worker to find the adult relatives of a child placed in foster care within 30 days of removal from his or her parents, and to notify the relatives, except when not appropriate due to a history of domestic violence, regarding options for the adult relative to participate in the care and placement of the child, as specified.

Legislative History

Assembly Judiciary (9-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)

Assembly Human Services (7-0)

Senate Appropriations (withdrawn)

Assembly Appropriations (13-0)

Senate Floor (36-0)

Assembly Floor (77-0)

Assembly Concurrence (78-0)

**AB 1067 (Brownley) Children in foster care: school proximity and travel costs
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Required the cost of school transportation for foster children to be covered by foster care grants by: expanding the definition of "care and supervision" to include travel costs to attend school; and, adding transportation for foster youth to the apportionments for home-to-school transportation.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-2)

Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 1148 (Davis) Virtual Assistant Living and Education program
Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services Committee.**

Required the Office of the State Foster Care Ombudsperson to take all necessary steps to establish and implement the Virtual Assistant Living and Education program: an interactive, secured Internet Web site that would maintain personal information relating to foster youth in a centralized location, including birth records, social security numbers, immunization and other medical records, school records, official identification cards, resumes, and important contacts.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 1324 (Bass) Foster youth: identity theft
Vetoed by the Governor**

Modified existing requirements on county welfare departments to request consumer disclosures of credit reports for specified foster youth and the procedures for responding to suspected identity theft discovered during this process. Required the Office of Privacy Protection to develop a list of nonprofit organizations and government agencies that assist consumers with identify theft issues.

AB 1324 (Continued)

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)

Assembly Appropriations (15-0)

Assembly Floor (76-0)

Assembly Concurrence (77-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)

Senate Appropriations (9-0)

Senate Floor (38-0)

**AB 1325 (Cook) Tribal customary adoption
Chapter 287, Statutes of 2009**

Establishes, as of July 1, 2010, customary adoption as an additional exception to termination of parental rights for parents of Indian children who have been adjudicated dependents of the court. Sunsets this additional exception on January 1, 2014, unless a later enacted status deletes or extends that date.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Assembly Judiciary (10-0)

Assembly Appropriations (15-0)

Assembly Floor (76-0)

Assembly Concurrence (78-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)

Senate Judiciary (5-0)

Senate Appropriations (13-0)

Senate Floor (39-0)

**AB 1402 (Bass) Family connection grants
Died; not heard in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.**

Requires the DSS to support California-based applications for the federal matching Family Connection Grant in order to connect foster kids with family members.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-1)

Assembly Appropriations (Not heard)

**AB 1655 (Evans) Dependent children: psychotropic medications
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Established a pilot in three counties to add requirements to the court approval process for the administration of psychotropic medications to foster children and to increase physician and court monitoring and oversight following approval.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Assembly Judiciary (9-0)

Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 1808 (Galgiani) Foster children: Mental health services
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Shifted responsibility for the provision of mental health services for foster youth in out-of-county placements from the jurisdictional county to the host county, and provided for corresponding adjustments in the payment and administration of those services.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 1852 (Portantino) Dependent children: locating extended family members
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Increased court oversight in efforts to find and form permanent connections with relatives of foster children by including nonrelative extended family members in relative search processes and by requiring training for social workers to fulfill these responsibilities.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-0)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 1905 (Cook) Foster care: funding: placement approvals
Chapter 562, Statutes of 2010**

Ensures continued approval and payments for foster youth relative caregiver homes pending the annual reassessment visit.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Human Services (3-0)
Assembly Appropriations (15-0)	Senate Appropriations (Senate Rule 28.8)
Assembly Floor (74-0)	Senate Floor (32-0)
Assembly Concurrence (76-0)	

**AB 1920 (Davis) Foster youth: personal information: pilot program
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Established an internet-based document storage pilot in three counties under the Office of the State Foster Care Ombudsman to provide foster children and their care providers with access to vital documents and other personal information as specified.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 1933 (Brownley) Foster children: education
Chapter 563, Statutes of 2010**

Extends requirements for local educational agencies to allow foster children to stay in their school of origin from the remainder of the school year to the duration of the court's jurisdiction.

Legislative History

Assembly Education (9-0)

Senate Education (7-0)

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Senate Appropriations (11-0)

Assembly Appropriations (15-0)

Senate Floor (35-0)

Assembly Floor (74-0)

Assembly Concurrence (77-0)

**AB 1943 (Fletcher) Foster children: access to information
Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services Committee**

Required the Department of Social Services to grant all county welfare departments with access to information related to all foster children in the Child Welfare Services Case Management System, and allowed county welfare departments and education providers to share specified data regarding foster children.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 2015 (Arambula) Child abuse: interdisciplinary and integrated services
Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services Committee.**

Added the *tracking* of child abuse to the specified uses of a county-authorized multidisciplinary team computerized database system and allowed for families to *electronically* authorize a multidisciplinary team program to create a record of relevant services received by the child and family for the creation of an integrated services plan.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 2129 (Bass) Foster care: residentially based services
Chapter 594, Statutes of 2010**

Extends to July 1, 2014, the deadline for the Department of Social Services to develop a plan to transform the current statewide system of group homes into a system of residentially based services, and provides that voluntary agreements between counties and private nonprofit agencies to test alternative program design and funding models for transforming individual group home programs into residentially based services programs must terminate on or before January 1, 2015.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Senate Human Services (4-1)

Assembly Appropriations (15-0)

Senate Appropriations (7-4)

Assembly Floor (74-0)

Senate Floor (26-7)

Assembly Concurrence (76-0)

AB 2342 (Evans) Foster youth: outreach programs
Vetoed by the Governor

Requires the Office of the State Foster Care Ombudsperson to develop a resource guide for emancipating foster youth outlining statewide programs and services related to education, housing, health, independent living programs, personal finance and employment opportunities.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-0)	Senate Human Services (3-2)
Assembly Appropriations (12-5)	Senate Floor (21-12)
Assembly Floor (54-20)	Senate Floor
Assembly Concurrence (55-23)	

AB 2418 (Cook) Indian children
Chapter 468, Statutes of 2010

Revises the definition of an "Indian child" for purposes of preserving his or her eligibility for application of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), as the following:

- 1) An Indian child as defined by ICWA, which is defined as any unmarried person who is under age 18 and is either: a) a member of an Indian tribe; or b) is eligible for membership in an Indian tribe and is the biological child of a member of an Indian tribe; or
- 2) An unmarried person who is over 18 years of age, but under 21 years of age, who is either a member of an Indian tribe or eligible for membership in an Indian tribe and the biological child of a member of an Indian tribe, and who is under the jurisdiction of the dependency court, unless that person or his or her attorney elects not to be considered an Indian child for purposes of the Indian child custody proceeding. Requires that all Indian child custody proceedings involving persons 18 and over must be conducted in a manner that respects the child's status as a legal adult.

Legislative History

Assembly Judiciary (10-0)	Senate Human Services (3-0)
Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Floor (33-0)
Assembly Floor (74-0)	
Assembly Concurrence (78-0)	

AB 2474 (Beall) Community care facilities: foster family agencies
Chapter 43, Statutes of 2010

Extends by one year, to January 1, 2012, the sunset provision on the requirement for certain foster family agencies to employ one full-time social work supervisor for every eight social workers.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Human Services
Assembly Floor (74-0)	Senate Floor (33-0)

**AB 2698 (Block) Foster youth: identity theft
Vetoed by the Governor**

Clarified existing requirements for county welfare departments to request credit reports on behalf of youth in foster care at 16 years of age in order to detect and correct potential identity theft and shares this responsibility with DSS.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-0)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (16-0)	Senate Appropriations (9-0)
Assembly Floor (71-0)	Senate Floor (35-0)
Assembly Concurrence (76-0)	

**SB 118 (Liu) Child welfare services: incarcerated parents
Chapter 338, Statutes of 2009**

Requires county social workers to include information about a parent's incarceration in the case plan of a child receiving child welfare services.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (5-0)	Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Senate Appropriations (12-0)	Assembly Appropriations (17-0)
Senate Floor (38-0)	Assembly Floor (75-0 - vote rescinded)
Senate Concurrence (35-0)	Assembly Floor (79-0)

**SB 352 (Dutton) Juvenile offenders: health facilities
Chapter 46, Statutes of 2009**

Makes clarifying statutory changes related to sharing information about delinquent wards of the juvenile court placed in licensed community facilities when placed out of county, including, among others, requiring the probation officer making the out-of-county placement to notify the probation officer of the other county at least 24 hours *prior* to the ward's transfer to the facility, instead of *within* 24 hours of the transfer.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (5-0)	Assembly Public Safety (7-0)
Senate Public Safety (7-0)	Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Senate Appropriations (13-0)	Assembly Appropriations (15-0)
Senate Floor (39-0)	Assembly Floor (72-0)

**SB 597 (Liu) Child welfare services; foster care services, and adoption assistance
Chapter 339, Statutes of 2009**

Makes changes in state law relative to child welfare services to conform to, the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, and modifies foster family agency staffing ratios and foster care group home payment rates and levels.

SB 597 (Continued)

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (3-0)
Senate Appropriations (8-0)
Senate Floor (36-1)
Senate Concurrence (33-1)

Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)
Assembly Floor (78-0)

**SB 654 (Leno) Independent Living Program
Chapter 555, Statutes of 2010**

Extends eligibility for Independent Living Program services to former foster youth placed with a nonrelative legal guardian, whose guardianship was ordered on or after the child's eighth birthday.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (4-1)
Senate Appropriations (6-3)
Senate Floor 23-12

Assembly Human Services (6-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)
Assembly Floor (76-0)

**SB 945 (Liu) Juvenile court jurisdiction: services and benefits
Chapter 631, Statutes of 2010**

Requires probation and parole officers to provide wards of the court formerly in foster care with notification regarding their eligibility for services and benefits available for former foster youth when the court terminates jurisdiction, or upon release of a ward from a non-foster care facility.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (4-0)
Senate Public Safety (7-0)
Senate Appropriations (9-0)
Senate Floor (30-0)
Senate Concurrence (34-0)

Assembly Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (15-1)
Assembly Floor (72-2)

**SB 1214 (Wolk) Crisis nurseries
Chapter 519, Statutes of 2010**

Extends the sunset of the DSS licensing provisions for crisis nurseries for voluntary placements until January 1, 2014, and allows county child welfare services departments to continue to use crisis nurseries as an emergency placement for children in the foster care system until July 1, 2012. After 2012, this bill would prohibit the use of crisis nurseries as an emergency placement for foster children.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (4-0)
Senate Appropriations (S. R. 28.8)
Senate Floor (33-0)
Senate Concurrence (37-0)

Assembly Human Services (6-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)
Assembly Floor (78-0)

**SB 1353 (Wright) Education: foster youth
Chapter 557, Statutes of 2010**

Requires consideration to be given to specified factors in making educational and school placement decisions for children and youth in foster care and requires that information about the number of school transfers a foster child has experienced and information about the child's educational progress as demonstrated by academic test scores and graduation credits, be included in the child's health and education summary.

Legislative History

Senate Education (7-0)

Senate Human Services (4-0)

Senate Floor (34-0)

Senate Concurrence (34-0)

Assembly Human Services (5-0)

Assembly Education (9-0)

Assembly Floor (71-0)

IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

The In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program serves more than 460,000 eligible individuals who are aged, blind, or have disabilities. The broad goal of the program is to provide care to people in their own homes in order to avoid placement in institutions such as Skilled Nursing Facilities, Residential Care Facilities, and other congregate care settings.

The program provides: (1) Domestic services such as housework, shopping for groceries and meal preparation; (2) Non-Medical Personal Care services such as toileting, dressing, transportation; (3) Paramedical services such as giving medications and changing a colostomy bag; and (4) Protective supervision for those who, due to cognitive decline or dementia, cannot be left alone for extended periods.

The IHSS program is supervised at the state level by the state Department of Social Services (DSS), and administered at the local level by counties, who perform eligibility determinations and assess the number of hours a client needs (up to a maximum of 283 hours per month). Each county is required to establish an employer of record for the purposes of collective bargaining, background checks on care providers, and other workforce development activities.

IHSS is available to those who are aged (65 and over), blind or disabled, living in their own homes (or are capable of doing so if IHSS services are provided), with income low enough to qualify for Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Program (SSI/SSP) benefits.

IHSS is funded with a mix of federal, state, and county funds. There are three program components: (1) the Medi-Cal Personal Care Services Program (PCSP); (2) the IHSS Plus Waiver Program; and (3) the IHSS Residual Program. Half of the costs of the PCSP and IHSS Waiver Plus programs are borne by the federal government, and the remainder is shared by the state (65%) and counties (35%). The Residual Program is entirely state and county-funded. Since the IHSS Plus Waiver Program was approved by the federal government in 2004, the Residual Program has become a small part of total IHSS, representing about 7% of total caseload.

PCSP is part of the federal Medicaid program (known in California as Medi-Cal), which partners with states to provide health insurance to the eligible poor. PCSP provides personal care tasks to Medi-Cal patients who, due to a medical condition, cannot perform such tasks on their own. PCSP also provides, secondarily, essential housekeeping and home management services. PCSP clients are entitled to 3.5

hours per day or 60 hours per month of services and must require assistance with at least two unmet needs of daily living in order to qualify.

The IHSS Plus Waiver Program, established in July 2004, expanded PCSP to cover certain previously ineligible services and providers. Previously, protective supervision was not covered and parents and spouses did not qualify as providers eligible for reimbursement. The IHSS Plus Waiver Program expanded federally funded coverage for these services and providers.

The IHSS Residual Program is a state-only program available to individuals who are eligible for IHSS but not federally funded Medi-Cal. The IHSS Plus Waiver Program expanded federal eligibility to many previously uncovered patients, greatly reducing the role of the Residual Program. Today, most Residual Program recipients are ineligible for federally funded IHSS programs due to immigration status.

Counties deliver services in one of three service delivery modes, or by a combination of different modes. The vast majority of IHSS clients receive care services from an individual provider (IP). A client interviews, hires, and fires a caregiver who is not an employee of the client, but serves as an independent contractor. This mode offers maximum autonomy to the consumer and relieves him or her from employer tasks such as withholding taxes and providing worker's compensation insurance. Some counties provide IHSS services through a contract with a home care agency. Such an agency employs and supervises caregivers who provide care to clients in their home. Clients have less autonomy in the selection of a caregiver in this mode of service delivery. Some counties employ their own care providers to deliver services to clients. Since they are county employees, the county is responsible for their work.

Counties must establish an employer of record for the purposes of collective bargaining. Nearly all of California's counties choose to meet this requirement through the establishment of a Public Authority. Public Authorities maintain registries of IPs, conduct background checks, and negotiate with labor unions for wages and benefits. Five counties choose to serve as their own employer of record and negotiate directly with labor unions.

Since 2000, the state has contributed its regular 65% share of non-federal dollars to increasing wages for IHSS workers, up to a designated cap, depending upon increases in state revenue. Currently, the state participates in wages of \$11.50 per hour plus 60 cents for health benefits, for a total of \$12.10 per hour. The 2009-10 Budget Act enacted in February 2009 reduced this amount to \$9.50 plus 60 cents for health benefits, for a total of \$10.10. However, the reduction was enjoined in *Dominguez et al. v. Schwarzenegger et al.* (DC ND Cal.), and is on appeal in the Ninth Circuit.

Budget Issues

Most of the legislative actions concerning the IHSS program over the 2009-2010 Legislative Session have been taken through the budget process, without being vetted through policy committees, even in instances where the budget actions effected significant policy changes.

2009-2010 Budget³

Budget-related legislation enacted in July 2009 for the 2009-10 budget year contained significant changes in the IHSS program, including service reductions and eliminations, the expansion of quality assurance and anti-fraud activities, the elimination of share-of-cost buyouts that previously lowered some recipients' out-of-pocket expenses, a reduction to the support of Public Authorities, and the receipt of federal stimulus funding.

In his 2009-2010 Budget, Governor Schwarzenegger proposed to eliminate IHSS services for nearly 90% of the caseload of recipients, or for all recipients with a functional index score (FI) of less than 4.0, for total General Fund (GF) savings of roughly \$700 million. The FI score is intended to be a standardized measure for overall need for assistance on a daily basis. Instead, the Legislature adopted, effective September, 2009: (1) restrictions in eligibility for domestic and related services, eliminating these services for 90,000 consumers, and; (2) the elimination of all services for a group of nearly 37,000 IHSS recipients with FI scores under 2.0.

These changes were initially estimated to save about \$73 million in 2009-10. For both of these reductions, the Legislature also adopted exemptions to protect recipients who receive paramedical services, protective supervision, or a total of more than 120 hours of services per month. The Legislature additionally authorized the DSS Director to waive these exemptions if they placed the program's federal funding at risk. The exemption for recipients receiving more than 120 hours of services was subsequently waived by the DSS.

In 2004, comprehensive legislation (**SB 1104 (Committee on Budget & Fiscal Review)**, Chapter 224, Statutes of 2004) was enacted to standardize assessment of IHSS recipients' needs and to ensure integrity in the IHSS program. Among its other requirements, SB 1104 directed DSS and the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to develop a new provider enrollment form that each person seeking to provide supportive services must complete, sign under penalty of perjury, and submit to the county. SB 1104 also gave DHCS authority to investigate suspected instances of fraud in the IHSS program. The bill required DSS, DHCS, and county quality assurance staff to work together and coordinate activities.

In July, 2009, **AB X4 1 (Evans)**, Chapter 1 of the 2009-10 Fourth Extraordinary Session, allocated additional 2009-10 and 2010-11 funds to DHCS and DSS for a total of 25 new fraud investigation and program integrity-related positions. AB X4 1 additionally included \$10 million in additional funds to be allocated to counties based on their approved plans. **AB X4 4 (Evans)**, Chapter 4 of the 2009-10 Fourth Extraordinary Session, the human services trailer bill, also included language changes to provisions governing the new provider enrollment form, requiring documentation to be submitted in person by applicant providers to county offices.

At the same time, **AB X4 19 (Evans)**, Chapter 17, Statutes of 2009 Fourth Extraordinary Session, was enacted to enhance program integrity and anti-fraud protections in the IHSS program. The 2009-10 Budget included the Administration's estimate of about \$162 million GF savings as a result of new anti-fraud activities in the IHSS program. Among other things, AB X4 19 required the following:

³ Portions of this section are excerpted from the Background Paper prepared for the Assembly Budget Committee and Senate Budget Subcommittee No. 3 Oversight Hearing on Implementation of Recent Changes in the IHSS Program, 10/28/09, available at <http://www.assembly.ca.gov/acs/subcommittee.asp?subcommittee=1>.

- Criminal background checks to be completed for all prospective providers as of October 1, 2009 and to be completed by July 1, 2010 for anyone who is already a provider on October 1, 2009.
- Effective November 1, 2009, all prospective providers are to complete an orientation at the time of their enrollment as a provider. Between November 1, 2009 and June 30, 2010, all current providers are to receive the orientation information.
- Unannounced visits to a recipient's home in targeted cases where there is cause for concern regarding program integrity. DSS is required to develop protocols for follow-up home visits and other actions if the provider and recipient are not present. Allows the provider and recipient the opportunity to address any suspicion of fraud that has resulted in a home visit.
- Timesheets are to include: (1) certification by the provider and recipient verifying that information is true and correct, and; (2) a statement that providers and recipients may be subject to criminal penalties if not. Effective July 1, 2011, requires the index fingerprint of providers and recipients be included on timesheets.
- Fingerprinting for new consumers will occur in the home at initial assessment as of April 1, 2010. For current consumers, effective April 1, 2010, the recipient will be fingerprinted at the next reassessment, also in the home, with exemptions for minors and those physically unable to provide fingerprints due to amputation.

There have been legal challenges to a number of the program changes pertaining to the IHSS program.⁴ These include *Oster v. Wagner* (DC ND Cal.), challenging elimination of all IHSS services to some 40,000 recipients based on "Functional Index Scores," and loss of domestic and related services to more than 90,000 thousand additional recipients based on "Functional Ranks." On October 23, 2009, the court issued a preliminary injunction preventing implementation of these cuts. The state has appealed. Another lawsuit, *Beckwith v. Wagner* (Alameda County Superior Court), challenges the exclusion of anyone convicted of a felony at any time from serving as an IHSS provider. The state's policy was enjoined in February 2010, and an appeal is pending.

2010-11 Budget

The total 2009-10 budget for the IHSS program was approximately \$5.5 billion (\$1.2 billion General Fund). The 2010-11 budget includes \$300 million in savings and cuts to the IHSS program through the following: (1) Using IHSS provider-generated revenue to draw down additional federal funds and offset General Fund expenditures in the program (\$190 million); (2) imposing a 3.6% across-the-board reduction to the hours assessed for IHSS recipients (\$35 million); and, (3) reflecting an updated caseload estimate based on an actual decline in recipients as compared to the previous caseload projection (\$75 million).

In addition, the human services budget trailer bill, **AB 1612**, Chapter 725, Statutes of 2010, included the following programmatic changes and provisions:

- The cuts in services based on FI scores and Functional Ranks, which were enacted as part of the 2009-10 budget but suspended due to pending litigation, are statutorily suspended until July 1, 2012. The limit on state participation in IHSS wages to \$9.50 per hour and benefits to \$0.60 per hour is also suspended until July 1, 2012. These cuts will take effect then only if a court issues an order allowing them to proceed that is not subject to appeal or for which the time to appeal has expired.

⁴ The status of these cases is, of course, subject to change.

- The list of crimes for which a conviction would bar an individual from being an IHSS provider was expanded to include all serious or violent felonies (as described in §§ 667.5(c) and 1192.7 of the Penal Code), felony offenses for which a person is required to register as a sex offender (pursuant to Penal Code § 290), and felony fraud in excess of \$950 in any public sector program, if the conviction occurred within the last 10 years. However, for these expanded crimes, a recipient may request an individual waiver from the ban for a specific provider. The county will be required to notify recipients if their intended provider has been convicted of any of the crimes on the expanded list and provide a waiver form, which if signed by the recipient, would re-lease the county from any liability.

In addition, an individual seeking to become a provider will be able to request a general exemption from DSS from the expanded list, which would enable the individual to provide services to any recipient wanting to hire that individual. DSS will be required to consider specified factors related to the individual's rehabilitation in granting or denying the request for the general exemption. If DSS denies the request, then the individual may appeal in a fair hearing.

Providers who have already completed the provider enrollment process or have begun the process and have their enrollment pending are not subject to the expanded list of excluded crimes; although, providers who have been denied enrollment based on a criminal background check and are currently appealing the denial are subject to the expanded list of crimes. These provisions take effect 90 days after the budget was enacted.⁵

- IHSS providers working in more than one county will now be able to obtain multi-county background check clearances. A provider will now only have to obtain a background check in one county in which the provider works that, if clear, will enable that provider to work in other counties. Counties (or nonprofit consortia or public authorities) will need verify through CMIPS whether a potential provider has already been cleared by another county (or nonprofit consortium or public authority). The process around notification of subsequent arrests is not addressed. These new provisions took effect upon enactment of the budget.
- The budget agreement maintained requirements for fingerprinting IHSS recipients.

In 1999, the United States Supreme Court, in *Olmstead v. L.C.* (1999) 527 U.S. 581, held that, under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), unnecessary institutionalization is a form of discrimination based on disability. The IHSS program is a critical component of California's efforts to comply with the "integration mandate" of the ADA.

The IHSS program is the fastest growing major social program in California. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), between 1998-99 and 2008-09, IHSS General Fund expenditures grew at an average annual rate of about 13%. Increased costs are due to a combination of increases in provider wages, significant growth in the caseload, and an increase in the average number of authorized hours per case. These changes reflect both the increasing population in the State of seniors

⁵ Under federal law, no exceptions or expungements are permitted with respect to the prior list of disqualifying crimes, under Welfare and Institutions Code § 12305.81(a): 1) fraud against a government health care or supportive services program; 2) a violation of subdivision (a) of Penal Code § 273a (specified abuse of a child); or 3) a violation of Penal Code § 368 (abuse of an elder or dependent adult).

and people with disabilities, and the success of the IHSS program in enabling even people with significant disabilities to remain in their homes as an alternative to far more costly institutionalization.

In a January 2010 report, entitled *Considering the State Costs and Benefits: In-Home Supportive Services Program*, the LAO considered the net fiscal impact of eliminating the IHSS program and concluded that elimination of the program would result in a net cost to the state General Fund if more than 32% of recipients entered a skilled nursing facility as a result. A subsequently conducted analysis suggests that the breakeven point may be even lower, resulting in net costs to the state if only 22% of IHSS recipients moved to nursing homes in the absence of IHSS services. Howes, C., *Costs and Benefits of In-Home Supportive Services for the Elderly and Persons with Disabilities: a California Case Study*, Institute for Women's Policy Research and PHI (May 3, 2010), <http://www.iwpr.org/pdf/E512HowesCBA.pdf>. Moreover, the LAO's analysis did not address the human costs of eliminating or drastically cutting the IHSS program on recipients' quality of life, regardless of the percentage who would be institutionalized as a result.

The growth—that is, the success—of the IHSS program has led to budget actions and budget proposals, including those discussed above, to control costs by cutting provider wages, limiting access to services within the program, narrowing eligibility for the program, and even elimination of the entire program. Proposals to control costs, improve program efficiency, and minimize waste and fraud in the IHSS program will likely be offered in the coming legislative sessions, as is appropriate. It would also be appropriate, however, if those proposals that entail substantial policy changes are effected through bills that are reviewed by the appropriate policy committees. Among other things, policy committee review provides an opportunity for input from experts and other stakeholders that will minimize enactment of legislation that will inevitably result in costly litigation.

It is also important that anti-fraud and program integrity measures be shown to be cost-effective. There is no solid data on the incidence or magnitude of fraud in the IHSS program and, therefore, estimates vary widely. Cost-benefit analyses should be offered along with any such proposals.

Fraud occurs within the IHSS program as it does in any government program or activity—not only those that serve low-income or disabled individuals. But most recipients of government funds or beneficiaries of government programs are not treated with the same level of suspicion. The overwhelming majority of IHSS recipients are legitimately eligible to the services they receive. Application processes for many social services programs, however, increasingly resemble booking procedures. Careful consideration should be given to anti-fraud or program integrity efforts that unnecessarily stigmatize eligible recipients and providers based on unsubstantiated and unwarranted assumptions and generalizations.

None of the IHSS bills referred to the Human Services Committee over the 2009-2010 Legislative Session was enacted into law. (One resolution, **ACR 151 (Ma)**, was adopted.) However, the substance of several measures was ultimately enacted through budget trailer bills, including: **AB 1763 (Lieu)**, which would have obviated the need for many IHSS providers who provide services to individuals in more than one county to undergo multiple criminal background checks; **SB 141 (Maldonado)**, which required that IHSS timesheets include a legal certification signed by the provider and the recipient verifying that the information is true and correct; and **SB 142 (Maldonado)**, requiring DSS to develop a process by which providers receive a list of approved tasks to be performed for each recipient, and complete lists of tasks available under the IHSS program.

**Amended into different subject matter; re-referred to Senate BP&ED Committee.
Held in Senate Business and Professions Committee.**

Directed public authorities (the employer of record for In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) workers), with input from their advisory committees and other stakeholders, to develop training standards and core topics for the training they provide to IHSS workers and clients.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-0)

Assembly Appropriations (11-5)

Assembly Floor (62-4)

Senate Human Services (4-1)

Senate Appropriations (7-1)

Senate Floor (Inactive File)

Senate Rules (27-7)

Senate Business & Professions (Held in Comm.)

**AB 452 (Yamada) In-Home Supportive Services: California Independence Act of 2009
Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services.**

1. Established the California Independence Program, a voluntary program to allow aged, blind, and disabled individuals who are otherwise ineligible for IHSS to have access to the county's provider registry services, at a reasonable fee, to be determined by the county.
2. Made recipients and providers of services under the California Independence Program subject to specified requirements.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 682 (Lowenthal) In-Home Supportive Services: Fraud
Died; on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.**

1. Required DSS, beginning January 1, 2010, to use existing resources or a special appropriation, if any, to dedicate two positions to evaluating implementation of five program assurance provisions of the Welfare and Institutions Code related to the IHSS program.
2. Required DSS to provide a report to the legislature by December 31, 2010, on the magnitude of IHSS fraud and ways to fix the problem.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)

Assembly Appropriations (12-5)

Assembly Floor (49-28)

Senate Human Services (4-1)

Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

AB 1532 (Lieu) In-Home Supportive Services

Chapter 117, Statutes of 2010

Amended into different subject matter; re-referred to Assembly Committee on Public Safety.

1. Required specified additional funding made available to counties for IHSS for FY 2008-09 and 2009-10 to be used to supplement, and not to supplant, the level of county expenditures made for the 2007-08 fiscal year for the program, and prohibits those funds from being used to fund any other program.
2. Included an urgency provision.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

AB 1763 (Lieu) In-Home Supportive Services

Died; on the Senate Inactive File

Some Provisions of this bill were included in the 2010-11 Budget Trailer Bill, AB 1612, Chapter 725, Statutes of 2010.

Authorized adjacent or contiguous counties, nonprofit consortia, and public authorities to enter into agreements, meeting specified requirements, designating one such entity to receive criminal background clearance information and notification of subsequent arrests concerning In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) providers, and to maintain a common list of individuals seeking to be listed on the registry of eligible IHSS providers in more than one county.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-0)

Assembly Appropriations (12-5)

Assembly Floor (54-22)

Senate Human Services (4-0)

Senate Public Safety (5-1)

Senate Appropriations (7-4)

Senate Floor (Placed on Inactive)

AB 1801 (Yamada) In-Home Supportive Services: quality assurance and fraud

Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services Committee.

Required the Department of Social Services, in collaboration with others, to continue annual reporting on IHSS quality assurance and fraud prevention and detection activities, and to identify and report on stable funding sources for IHSS, and solicit recommendations for improving the delivery of long-term care services

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 1924 (A. Strickland) In-Home Supportive Services: fraud
Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services Committee.**

Deleted the provision limiting counties' authority to investigate fraud in connection with the provision or receipt of In-Home Supportive Services to overpayments of \$500 or less.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 1970 (Fong) In-Home Supportive Services providers: emergency shelter Services
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Permitted county social services departments to make In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) provider registries available to emergency shelters during a declared state of emergency.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)

Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 2274 (Beall) In-Home Supportive Services
Vetoed by the Governor**

Allowed an In-Home Supportive Services recipient who receives services from an entity authorized by a federal Section 1115 Medicaid waiver, subject to program requirements, to select any qualified person to provide the services, and defined "qualified person" to include an employee of such an entity who is available and eligible to provide the services.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)

Assembly Appropriations (10-5)

Assembly Floor (48-26)

Senate Human Services (3-2)

Senate Appropriations (S. R. 28.8)

Senate Floor (24-13)

**AB 2374 (Nestande) In-Home Supportive Services: pilot project
Died; held on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.**

Changed from January 1, 2009 to January 1, 2011 the start date for up to five consenting counties to establish pilot projects offering In-Home Supportive Services recipients a choice of having services provided by a contracting agency or a public authority.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-0)

Assembly Appropriations (17-0)

Assembly Floor (74-1)

Senate Human Services (4-8)

Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**ACR 151 (Ma) In-Home Supportive Services
Resolution Chapter 143, Statutes of 2010**

Declares the intent of the Legislature to ensure the preservation of home care and personal services to seniors and people with disabilities through the In-Home Supportive Services program.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)

Senate Floor (25-9)

SB 141 (Maldonado) In-Home Supportive Services: provider timesheets

Held in Assembly Appropriations (Not heard).

Provisions of this bill and SB 142 were included in the 2009-10 Budget Trailer Bill, AB 19 X4, Chapter 17, Statutes of 2009 Fourth Extraordinary Session

Required that timesheets for In-Home Supportive Services contain a legal certification signed by the provider and recipient verifying that the information is true and correct, authorized, in addition to other criminal penalties, the imposition of a specified civil penalty against a person who is convicted of fraud, as defined, resulting from intentional deception or misrepresentation in the provision of timesheet information under the IHSS program.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (5-0)

Assembly Human Services (7-0)

Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)

Assembly Appropriations (Not heard)

Senate Floor (29-1)

SB 142 (Maldonado) In-Home Supportive Services: authorized tasks

Died in the Assembly Appropriations Committee (Not heard).

Provisions of this bill and SB 141 were included in the 2009-10 Budget Trailer Bill, AB 19 X4, Chapter 17, Statutes of 2009 Fourth Extraordinary Session

Required DSS, on or before December 31, 2011, in consultation with county welfare departments and other stakeholders, to develop a process to ensure that IHSS program providers receive a list of approved tasks to be performed for each recipient under the provider's care and a complete list of tasks available under the IHSS program.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (5-0)

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)

Assembly Appropriations (Not heard)

Senate Floor (32-1)

SB 791 (Yee) In-Home Supportive Services: COBRA

Vetoed by the Governor

Provided that, for purposes of IHSS providers, the entity that administers health benefits under the federal Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (COBRA) shall be the same entity that implements a federal COBRA subsidy under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (5-0)
Senate Floor (36-1)

Assembly Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Floor (63-5)

SB 886 (Florez) In-Home Supportive Services providers: electronic timekeeping Died; on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.

Authorized counties to use electronic timekeeping for purposes of verifying hours completed and ensuring quality home care for In-Home Supportive Services recipients.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (4-0)
Senate Appropriations (S. R. 28.8)
Senate Floor

Assembly Human Services (4-1)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

CALIFORNIA WORK OPPORTUNITY & RESPONSIBILITY TO KIDS (CalWORKs)

As of March 2010, 562,000 California families⁶ relied on CalWORKs, the state's welfare-to-work program, for monthly income assistance and employment-related services in order to become self-sufficient. CalWORKs was created in 1997 as part of California's implementation of federal welfare reform. The State Department of Social Services (DSS) administers the program at the state level, and county welfare departments administer it locally.

CalWORKs is funded by the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) block grant, state General Fund dollars (also known as Maintenance of Effort, or MOE dollars), and county funds. The program's combined federal, state, and local 2009-2010 appropriation was \$5.9 billion.

There are three basic kinds of CalWORKs families: single parent, two-parent, and "child only." Child only families have no eligible adult (e.g. the parents are undocumented, or the adults are being sanctioned for violation or program rules).

The maximum monthly aid for a typical family of a mother and two children is currently \$694. Reduced from \$723 to \$694 in July 2009, the grant is now at the same level as a family of three would have received in 1989. A statutory cost-of-living adjustment has been applied to CalWORKs benefits since 1971, but this has often been suspended, and in July 2009 was eliminated permanently. With a cost-of-living adjustment applied annually, the 1989 grant amount of \$694 would currently be \$1,222 in 2010 dollars—a difference of \$528⁷.

Generally speaking, adults are limited to a total of 60 months of CalWORKs cash assistance (The new time limits that take effect on July 1, 2011 are outlined under Major Budget Changes to CalWORKs in 2009-10). If a family has not entirely left aid by that time, the children qualify for "safety net assistance" until they reach age 18. Some families qualify for hardship exceptions or extensions from the limit if they are disabled, of advanced age, or have been unable to engage in employment because of domestic abuse or care for a disabled family member. Months do not count toward the 60-month

⁶ <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/research/res/pdf/caltrends/CA237Caseload.pdf>

⁷ http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm

limit if child support payments from a non-custodial parent have compensated the state for the aid paid.

Work requirements

Able-bodied adult parents are required to participate in 32 hours per week (or 35 hours for a two-parent family) of welfare-to-work activities designed to lead to employment and self-sufficiency. About half of adult CalWORKs recipients are employed at least part-time. Others participate in job search, vocational training, education, or services such as mental health, domestic violence prevention or substance treatment. An "earned income incentive" excludes the first \$225 in earnings and half the remainder from being counted against a family's CalWORKs payment, allowing families to increase their net income by working.

Federal law requires states to meet a minimum Work Participation Rate (WPR). This rate shows the designated percentage of eligible TANF adults participating in work-related activities. California must meet a rate of 50% of the state's entire caseload (All Families Rate) and 90% of the Two-Parent caseload. This requirement can be reduced by a Caseload Reduction Credit (CRC), which is based on the percentage caseload reduction since 2005. In 2006, Congress enacted the Deficit Reduction Act (DRA), reauthorizing the TANF block grant for an additional five years and imposing more stringent work standards states must meet to avoid federal penalties. In response, California adopted a set of reforms in its 2006-07 budget designed to improve counties' ability to meet the new WPRs while preserving the availability of services to meet differing clients' needs and the safety net for children.

In February of 2008, new federal regulations implementing the DRA were published, effective October 1, 2008. Primary among the many regulations are restrictions on the types of expenditures that may be counted as MOE and changes to the CRC calculation that are derived from the excess MOE. These changes have the negative effect of significantly reducing California's CRC by 50%. Because excess MOE could previously be used to augment WPRs, this makes complying with the federal WPRs very difficult, triggering federal penalties. In 2007, California did not meet the All Families Rate, but the penalty was ultimately waived by the federal government due to its recognition that states had great difficulty meeting the "significant challenges in meeting these new (DRA) requirements." In 2008, California again did not meet the All Families Rate. It remains to be seen whether or not the penalty will be waived again. Up to a 5% penalty can be assessed on California's \$3.7 billion federal TANF block grant.

TANF Reauthorization in 2010

The \$3.7 billion TANF block grant that California receives from the federal government was scheduled for reauthorization in 2010; however, Congress did not work on legislation to reauthorize it. Instead, on September 30th, President Obama signed into law a bill that extended the TANF block grant through December 3, 2010, as part of the "continuing resolution" that funds government programs.

The TANF block grant provides the funding to states that supports cash assistance programs and a wide range of other benefits and services for low-income families. If, as hoped, Congress acts in 2011 to extend and improve temporary assistance because reauthorization it will offer a fresh opportunity for advocates to press Congress for measures to make TANF responsive to the mothers and children the program is intended to serve. While TANF has been a success for some California families, in recent years it has become less flexible and less effective in moving families out of poverty due to the challenges mentioned earlier in regards to the DRA.

Major Changes to CalWORKs in 2009-10

Governor Schwarzenegger proposed to eliminate the program entirely under his last two budget proposals, which would have made California the only state in the nation without a welfare program. Additionally, eliminating CalWORKs would cause California to permanently lose the state's annual \$3.7 billion TANF block grant, as well as hundreds of millions in additional federal funds provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and related economic activity that comes with large infusions of money into our economy.

While the elimination of the program was ultimately avoided, as one of his last acts in office, the Governor vetoed \$256 million in funding of Stage 3 Child Care, which effectively would have eliminated subsidies for families who have successfully exited the welfare-to-work program needed to keep their children in safe, supervised settings while they work or attend school. A total of 55,000 children would lose child care as of November 1, 2010. To avoid a disruption in child care services, and in coordination with Speaker Perez, the Chairman of the Assembly Human Services Committee, Jim Beall, reached out to the First 5 Commissions to provide bridge funding to keep Stage 3 going and ultimately these parents working until a permanent solution could be found. As well, as this publication goes to print, advocacy groups have temporarily stopped the elimination of Stage 3 when an Alameda County Superior Court judge issued an emergency order in *Parent Voices Oakland v. O'Connell*⁸. A hearing will be held to determine if the order will stay.

Final Budget Actions

- In 2009, grants were cut by 4% for a reduction of \$146.9 million
- Suspension of the July 2009 Cost-of-Living-Adjustments (COLA) for grants: \$79.1 million
- Permanent elimination of the COLA, effective July 2010
- Cut \$528 million from CalWORKs and of that amount \$375 million from the county's operating funds. Counties have not had a cost-of-doing business increase since 2001 and report that they have been underfunded by approximately a billion dollars.

Changes Effective July 1, 2001

- Under new state time limits, adult recipients may receive aid up to 48 cumulative months. On the following 49th month, the adult portion of the grant is eliminated and the children's portion of the cash grant is provided under the Safety Net program for one year. After that year is up and the adult is still eligible, the adult receives his/her portion of the grant for the remaining 12 months left on the 60-month clock.
- For families not complying with work requirements, stricter and graduated sanctions were created such as sanction months now count toward the 60-month time clock.
- Counties now must conduct a "Self Sufficiency Review" (SSR) for families who are not in compliance with work requirements with an emphasis on services and resources on how to assist the family increase their work participation hours or remove barriers that might prevent them from working. The penalty for not participating in an SSR is a 50% reduction on a family's cash grant.

⁸ <http://www.wclp.org/Resources/WCLPContent/tabid/1088/smld/3613/ArticleID/714/reftab/1035/t/TRO-preserves-child-care-subsidies/Default.aspx>

Legislative Efforts

The recession had many negative effects on all Californians but was particularly hard on low-income families in the CalWORKs program who are trying to develop job skills and secure employment and become self-sufficient.

With a state unemployment rate at 12.4%⁹, accomplishing self-sufficiency became that much more difficult. As a result, many bills attempted to mitigate that difficulty by: a) excusing participants from work requirements because job supportive services were not available due to funding reductions in the program (**AB 510 (Evans)**), b) eliminating the eligibility requirement that a vehicle be counted (**AB 1058 (Beall)**), c) providing counties with technical support to encourage subsidized employment options (**AB 2004 (Beall)**), d) allowing participants in the Food Stamp Employment and Training program to fulfill their work requirement through a public service placement in a public or private nonprofit agency (**SB 1322 (Liu)**), and e) reducing the number of times a participant must report their income to the county thereby reducing the bureaucracy and saving scarce county time and money (**AB 1642(Beall)**).

AB 510 (Evans) CalWORKs: aid amount calculation Held in Senate Appropriations and subsequently amended into different subject matter.

Provided that, as of January 1, 2009, any month in which California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program (CalWORKs) program participants are excused from participation in welfare to work activities because the necessary supportive services are unavailable due to insufficient funding in the CalWORKs program will not be counted as a month of receipt of aid.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)

Senate Human Services (3-2)

Assembly Appropriations (12-5)

Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

Assembly Floor (50-28)

AB 631 (Tran) Public assistance: home visits Died; failed passage in Assembly Human Services.

Required, statewide, welfare fraud investigators to make a "home call" to verify a preliminarily approved CalWORKs applicant's eligibility, and to report the finding to the appropriate county officials before the application receives final approval.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (2-5 failed)

AB 1057 (Beall) CalWORKs and Food Stamp Program: reporting

Please see page 59

⁹ http://www.edd.ca.gov/About_EDD/pdf/urate201010.pdf

**AB 1058 (Beall) CalWORKs eligibility: asset limits
Died; on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.**

Excluded the value of a motor vehicle from consideration when determining or re-determining CalWORKs eligibility; and also deleted existing requirements on counties for assessing the value of a motor vehicle for the purposes of CalWORKs eligibility.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-2)

Senate Human Services (3-2)

Assembly Appropriations (12-5)

Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

Assembly Floor (48-30)

**AB 1193 (Audra Strickland) Public assistance: home visits
Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services Committee.**

Required the district attorney's office in the county of residence of an applicant for CalWORKs, within 10 days of the applicant's preliminary approval, to arrange for an authorized investigator to conduct a home call, consisting of a brief interview with the applicant and walk-through of the applicant's residence.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 1479 (Duvall) Public assistance: home visits
Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services Committee.**

Required, statewide, that a district attorney make a "home call" to verify a preliminarily approved CalWORKs applicant's eligibility; and to report the finding to the appropriate county officials before the application receives final approval.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 1642 (Beall) CalWORKs and Food Stamp programs: reporting
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Converted the Food Stamp Program and CalWORKs recipient income reporting periods from quarterly to semi-annual, as specified.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)

Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 1866 (A. Strickland) Public assistance: home visits
Died; failed passage in the Assembly Human Services Committee.**

Required an inspection of all homes for applicants to CalWORKs.

AB 1866 (Continued)

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (2-3 Failed passage)

**AB 1914 (Davis) Public social services: food stamp benefits
Vetoed by the Governor**

Clarified existing regulations for persons that are applying to the Food Stamp Program and awaiting Unemployment Insurance benefits.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)

Senate Human Services (3-2)

Assembly Appropriations (10-5)

Senate Appropriations (7-4)

Assembly Floor (45-28)

Senate Floor (23-13)

Assembly Concurrence (51-27)

**AB 2004 (Beall) Job creation, work incentive, and work subsidy programs
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Encouraged job growth for low-income persons by creating a supplemental structure for counties with few resources or technical expertise to receive assistance with establishing a subsidized employment program.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)

Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 2018 (Skinner) Food stamps: inter-county transfer of benefits
Vetoed by the Governor**

Established an inter-county transfer process for food stamp recipients who move from one county to another, as specified.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-0)

Senate Human Services (4-0)

Assembly Appropriations (13-0)

Senate Appropriations (8-0)

Assembly Floor (62-1)

Senate Floor (35-0)

Assembly Concurrence (67-6)

**AB 2504 (A. Strickland) CalWORKs eligibility: fraudulent representations: fines
Died; failed passage in the Assembly Human Services Committee.**

Doubled fines for families of the California Work and Responsibility to Kids Program (CALWORKS) that are found to have made fraudulent claims and diverts the funds to county district attorneys offices and special investigative units for the benefit of county general funds, the district attorneys, and the hiring of more welfare fraud investigators, as specified.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (2-4 failed passage)

**SB 1322 (Liu) Food Stamp Employment and Training program
Vetoed by the Governor**

Allowed participants in the Food Stamp Employment and Training program to fulfill their work requirement through a public service placement in a public or private nonprofit agency.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (3-1)
Senate Appropriations 10-0
Senate Floor (36-0)
Senate Concurrence (34-0)

Assembly Human Services (4-2)
Assembly Judiciary (7-0)
Assembly Appropriations (12-5)
Assembly Floor (58-16)

DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

With enactment of the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Lanterman Act; Welfare & Institutions Code § 4500 *et seq.*) the California Legislature established a comprehensive statutory scheme to provide services and supports to people with developmental disabilities.¹⁰ In its landmark opinion in *Association for Retarded Citizens-California v. Department of Developmental Services (ARC v. DDS)* (1985) 38 Cal.3d 384, 388, the California Supreme Court noted that "[t]he purpose of the [Lanterman Act] is twofold: to prevent or minimize the institutionalization of developmentally disabled persons and their dislocation from family and community ... and to enable them to approximate the pattern of everyday living of nondisabled persons of the same age and to lead more independent and productive lives in the community."

Direct responsibility for implementation of the Lanterman Act service system is allocated between the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) and 21 Regional Centers (RCs). RCs are private nonprofit entities established pursuant to the Lanterman Act that contract with DDS to carry out many of the state's responsibilities under the Act. See, e.g., Welf. & Inst. Code § 4620. RCs are to "assist persons with developmental disabilities and their families in securing those services and supports which maximize opportunities and choices in living, working, learning and recreating in the community." Welf. & Inst. Code § 4640.7(a). The main roles of RCs include intake and assessment, individualized program plan development, case management, and securing services through generic agencies (e.g., school districts, In-Home Supportive Services) or by purchasing services provided by vendors. RCs also share primary responsibility with local education agencies for provision of early intervention services under the California Early Intervention Services Act the Early Start Program. These services are funded through Part C of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, to promote a coordinated family service system for children from birth to 36 months who have a developmental delay or an established risk condition.

Approximately 40,000 vendored service providers deliver a wide range of services to more than 240,000 consumers,¹¹ such as respite care, transportation, day treatment programs, residential placements, supported living services, work support programs, and various social and therapeutic

¹⁰ The term "developmental disability" means a disability that originates before an individual attains age 18 years, continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual. It includes mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism. It also includes disabling conditions found to be closely related to mental retardation or to require treatment similar to that required for individuals with mental retardation, but does not include other handicapping conditions that are solely physical in nature. Welf. & Inst. Code § 4512(a).

¹¹ Diagnostic and demographic information about the population served by regional centers is available on DDS' website: <http://www.dds.cahwnet.gov/FactsStats/Home.cfm>.

activities.

Lanterman Act services are intended to meet the needs and choices of each person with developmental disabilities, regardless of age or degree of disability, and to promote his or her integration into the mainstream of the community. Welf. & Inst. Code § 4501. Such services must protect the personal liberty of the individual, be provided with the least restrictive conditions necessary to achieve the purposes of the treatment, services or supports, and enable the individual to approximate the pattern of everyday living available to people without disabilities of the same age. Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 4501, 4502(a)(b), 4750.

Under the Lanterman Act, each Californian with a developmental disability is legally *entitled* to “treatment and habilitation services and supports in the least restrictive environment.” § 4502. The California Supreme Court explained that this “entitlement” consists of a “basic right and a corresponding basic obligation: the right which it grants to the developmentally disabled person is to be provided with services that enable him to live a more independent and productive life in the community; the obligation which it imposes on the state is to provide such services.” *ARC v. DDS*, 38 Cal.3d at 391.

Services provided to people with developmental disabilities are determined through an individual planning process. E.g., Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 4418.3, 4512(j), 4646, 4646.5, 4647. Under this process, planning teams—which include, among others, the person with a developmental disability, referred to in the Act as “consumers” (Welf. & Inst. Code § 4512(d)), his or her legally authorized representative, and one or more regional center representatives—jointly prepare an Individual Program Plan (IPP) based on the consumer’s needs and choices.

The Lanterman Act requires that the IPP promote community integration. Welf. & Inst. Code § 4646(a). To this end, DDS and RCs must ensure that planning teams develop goals that maximize opportunities and teach skills needed for each person to develop relationships, be part of community life, increase control over his or her life and acquire increasingly positive roles in the community. Welf. & Inst. Code § 4646.5. The IPP must give the highest preference to those services and supports that allow minors to live with their families and adults to live as independently as possible in the community. E.g., Welf. & Inst. Code § 4648(a)(1), (2).

In addition to its role in monitoring RCs' compliance with state and federal law, DDS also operates four large state institutions, called developmental centers (DCs)¹² and one smaller state facility.¹³ One large DC (Agnews DC, in San Jose) and one small state facility (Sierra Vista, in Yuba City) were closed in 2009. The four remaining DCs are licensed and federally certified as Nursing Facility (NF), Intermediate Care Facility/Developmentally Disabled (ICF/DD) and acute care hospitals. The one smaller state-operated facility is licensed as an ICF/DD. These facilities provide an array of services and supports for individuals who have been determined to be in need of a secure environment, or who have special medical and/or behavioral program needs. Approximately 2,000 of the individuals receiving services under the Lanterman Act (about 0.8%) reside in a DC.

Budget Issues

¹² Fairview DC (Costa Mesa), Lanterman DC (Pomona), Porterville DC (Porterville), Sonoma DC (Eldridge).

¹³ Canyon Springs (Cathedral City).

Services for people with developmental disabilities are funded through a combination of federal and state funds.¹⁴ The 2010-11 budget for DDS and RCs is approximately \$4.8 billion, of which \$640 million (13%) funds the DCs, which serve 0.8% of the population.

Like all areas of state government, DDS and RCs have had to take steps to deal with the state's fiscal crisis. With limited exceptions, for example, most community provider rates have been frozen since FY 2003-04. The limited cost-of-living and other rate adjustments granted by the Legislature for residential and day programs in the past two decades have been far outstripped by inflation. The FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 budgets included an additional 3% reduction in provider rates. The FY 2010-11 budget continues the 3% reduction and includes an additional 1.25% reduction.

DDS and RCs have been required to institute numerous other cost-savings measures over the last 2 years. In FY 2008-09, in addition to various rate freezes and caps, these measures included, for example:

- Indefinitely restricting the use of purchase of service funds for starting new programs except extraordinary circumstances or to protect consumer health and safety.
- Requiring RCs to establish an internal review process of IPPs and individualized family service plans to ensure conformity with federal and state law and regulations.
- As part of this internal process, requiring RCs to consider a family's responsibility for providing similar services and supports for a minor child without disabilities in identifying a consumer's service and support needs as provided in the least restrictive and most appropriate setting as noted.

In FY 2009-10, cost-savings measures included suspending RC contract requirements specifying average service coordinator-to-consumer ratios, certain staff expertise requirements, and specified fiscal reporting requirements. In addition, DDS was directed to work with stakeholders to submit a plan to the Legislature that identified specific cost containment measures to achieve up to \$100 million in General Fund (GF) reductions for the 2009-2010 Fiscal Year. Then, due to a worsening economy, the Governor's May Budget Proposal required an additional \$234 million in reductions from DDS, which, unlike the first \$100 million, could come from the entire DDS budget, including DCs.

DDS adopted proposals to achieve a total of \$334 million in General Fund savings. These included \$78.8 million in savings through expanding federal funding to offset GF expenditures. Detailed information on the specifics of the adopted cost-savings measures is available on DDS' website: <http://www.dds.cahwnet.gov/Budget/Home.cfm>.

In addition, the Governor vetoed an additional \$50 million from the DDS budget, specifically RCs Purchase of Services for services provided to children up to age 5, which he proposed be offset with funding from the California Children and Families Commission. Finally, as noted, the FY 2010-11 budget continues the 3% reduction in provider rates and RC operations and includes an additional 1.25% reduction.

Monitoring the impact of the budget actions on consumers and family members will be an ongoing focus of the Human Services Committee's activities in the upcoming session. It will be important to

¹⁴ Approximately 90,000 consumers living in the community receive services funded through the federal Medicaid HCBS Waiver, which funds 50% of the costs of allowable services. The number of consumers who are funded through the HCBS Waiver is capped, but increases by 5,000 each year. In fiscal year 2009-10 the cap was 90,000, and will be 95,000 in federal fiscal year 2010-11.

determine the cumulative impact of rate cuts and freezes, caps and suspensions of services, increases in RC caseloads, etc. on the ability of the state to continue to meet the needs of all persons with developmental disabilities by providing quality services and supports in the least restrictive settings.

While the budget was the primary focus of activity concerning the developmental disabilities service system over the 2009-2010 Legislative Session, there were significant policy issues addressed, including the following:

Regional Center Oversight

In addition to the development of cost-savings measures through the budget process, the state's fiscal crisis has also brought attention to RC fiscal and management practices and DDS' general oversight of RCs. Oversight was the subject of hearings by the Assembly Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review and, in response to a request from the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, a review of RC fiscal policies and practices, and DDS' oversight of RCs conducted by the Bureau of State Audits (BSA).¹⁵ The Human Services Committee conducted a joint oversight hearing (with the Senate Human Services Committee) in November 2010 on the BSA audit and DDS oversight of RCs, generally.¹⁶ Issues, such as the following, were raised at the hearing and will likely be the subject of ongoing policy discussions:

- Whether DDS is sufficiently monitoring RCs to ensure their compliance not only with respect to required fiscal policies and practices but also with respect to the law related to the development and implementation of IPPs consistent with consumer choice and the provision of services in least restrictive settings.
- Whether DDS has sufficient authority under the Lanterman Act to ensure that RCs are complying with their obligations to consumers as set forth in the Lanterman Act and federal law, and are doing so in a cost-effective manner.
- Whether there are ways to increase DDS' ability to monitor RCs' fiscal and other policies and practices that will not impinge on the integrity of the IPP process.
- Whether RC fiscal practices—particularly with respect to rate-setting and provider selection—are sufficiently transparent to ensure accountability and cost-effectiveness in their use of public funds.
- Whether the right balance has been struck between allowing flexibility in the operation of RCs, on the one hand, and establishing statewide standards and guidelines for RC fiscal practices and the IPP process, on the other hand.
- Whether there is adequate communication—including training and information sharing—between DDS and RCs, among RCs, and between RC management and employees—on efficient and cost-effective practices and procedures related to such matters as rate-setting, provider selection, resource development, the IPP process, and employer-employee relations.
- Whether policies and procedures are in place to ensure that RC employees are adequately protected against retaliation when raising issues concerning improper or inefficient RC policies and practices.

¹⁵ In August 2010, BSA issued a report of its review entitled, *Department of Developmental Services: A more uniform and transparent procurement and rate-setting process would improve the cost-effectiveness of regional centers*, California State Auditor, Bureau of State Audits, Report: 2009-118 (August 2010).

¹⁶ A Background Briefing Paper prepared for the hearing is available on the Committee's website (under Joint Hearings).

Deinstitutionalization

Deinstitutionalization/*Olmstead* implementation was another focus of activity over the 2009-2010 Legislative Session. The population of people with developmental disabilities in state-operated institutions has continued to decline. DDS and RC efforts to downsize large facilities so they become eligible for federal funds continued. Two state facilities were closed during the Session: Agnews DC, in San Jose, and Sierra Vista, in Yuba City. The plan to close Agnews DC was approved as part of the Governor's 2005-2006 Budget. The last Agnews DC residents moved out in March 2009. Under the plan, approximately 85% of Agnews' residents were expected to move to the community, with the rest likely moving to another DC. In fact, through the IPP process, it was determined that almost all former Agnews residents could move to community living arrangements. Between July 1, 2004 and March 27, 2009, a total of 327 Agnews residents transitioned to living arrangements in the community (including five who returned to their family homes); and 20 residents transferred to other DCs. Thirty percent of those who transitioned to the community lived at Agnews for 31-40 years, 56% had significant health and extensive personal care needs, and 39% required significant behavioral support.

This has clear implications for the residents of other DCs, all of which (with the possible exception of the secure treatment program at Porterville DC) serve populations similar to Agnews. While those remaining in DCs, generally, have more severe disabilities and more complex needs than most consumers living in the community, there are many individuals currently living safely and successfully in the community, including the former residents of Agnews, with equally severe disabilities and complex needs. This is strong support for the conclusion drawn 26 years ago in an Assembly Office of Research report¹⁷—that the primary obstacle preventing most remaining DC residents from moving to the community is not their disabilities or needs, but the availability of resources to meet those needs and the commitment to ensuring that those resources are developed and provided.¹⁸

On April 1, 2010, DDS submitted to the Legislature a Plan for the Closure of Lanterman DC. The Plan was approved as part of the 2010-2011 Budget. In the Plan, DDS notes:

The Plan builds on several innovative strategies which contributed to the closure of Agnews in 2009. These strategies were developed to provide community opportunities to meet the specific needs of the Agnews residents and enable them to remain near their families. The Agnews closure included the establishment of new residential service options, including a licensure category for facilities to serve individuals with enduring medical needs; the enhancement of the community health care system to provide access to needed services; and a program for state employees to continue working with former residents in community settings. These new community services and supports provided meaningful choices and reliable services to consumers who transitioned from Agnews. This Plan incorporates those key service improvements.

2010-2011 Budget trailer bill language included a number of provisions related to the Plan, including authorizing a program to enable state employees to continue working with former Lanterman DC residents in the community.

¹⁷ *Keeping the Promise of the Lanterman Act: Report 1: Quality Services for People with Developmental Disabilities*, Assembly Office of Research (April 1984).

¹⁸ The Human Services Committee held a joint oversight hearing (with the Select Committee on Disabilities) on April 27, 2010 on the Final Report on the Closure of Agnews Developmental Center. A Background Briefing Paper for the hearing is available on the Committee's website (under Joint Hearings).

No closure date is specified for Lanterman DC; however, the Plan provides that "Residents will not move from Lanterman until appropriate services and supports identified in the individual plan are available either in the community or at another DC."

Individual Budgets

Among the budget savings measures discussed above, is development of an Individual Choice Budget model. **AB 9 4X (Evans)**, Chapter 9, Statutes of 2009 Fourth Extraordinary Session, added Section 4648.6 to the Welfare and Institutions Code requiring DDS, in consultation with stakeholders, to develop an alternative service delivery model that provides an Individual Choice Budget for obtaining quality services and supports which provides choice and flexibility within a finite budget that in the aggregate reduces regional center purchase of service expenditures, reduces reliance on the state general fund, and maximizes federal financial participation. The individual budget will be determined using a fair, equitable, transparent standardized process.

Progress on development of the Individual Choice Budget has been slow, in large part related to issues about how such a model can be implemented without the loss of federal funds. Concerns have been expressed that many providers of "temporarily" suspended services, which are intended to be available when the model is implemented in a manner that will achieve sufficient cost savings, will not survive a prolonged period when such services are not funded.

Whether through the Individual Choice Budget model or through implementation of a Self-Directed Services Waiver,¹⁹ it is likely that some mechanism by which eligible individuals will become more empowered to gain control over the selection of services and supports that meet their needs will be among the system reforms receiving continued attention in the next legislative session.

Employment First Policy

A May 2007 Report to the Legislature and the Governor, prepared by the State Council on Developmental Disabilities pursuant to SB 1270 (Chesbro), Chapter 397, Statutes of 2006, included recommendations for improvements to the transition services planning process for students and recommended policies and initiatives to expand employment opportunities for people with developmental disabilities.²⁰ In 2009, the Legislature enacted **AB 287 (Beall)**, Chapter 231, Statutes of 2009, to continue efforts to expand employment opportunities—particularly integrated employment—for people with developmental disabilities. As noted in AB 287's legislative findings, research demonstrates that wages and hours worked increase dramatically as individuals move from facility-based to integrated employment, and suggests that other benefits include expanded social relationships, heightened self-determination, and more typical job acquisition and job roles.

AB 287 requires the State Council on Developmental Disabilities to form a standing Employment First Committee to, among other things, develop an Employment First Policy, the intended outcome of which is a significant increase in the number of individuals with developmental disabilities who engage in integrated employment, self-employment, and microenterprises, and in the number of individuals who earn wages at or above minimum wage. The first annual report of the Employment First Committee, which is to include the proposed Employment First Policy and other recommended legislative, regulatory, and policy changes, is due on July 11, 2011. Legislation to adopt and begin

¹⁹ DDS is reportedly continuing discussions with the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services in developing this new service option.

²⁰ *SB 1270 Report on Expanding Opportunities and Choice in California's Day Program Services for Individuals with Developmental Disabilities* (May 2007.)

implementation of the state's new Employment First Policy will likely be introduced during the next session.

Housing

A byproduct of the trend toward deinstitutionalization and downsizing of large licensed facilities has been the development of models for increasing the permanent supply of affordable housing for people with developmental disabilities. As more people with developmental disabilities, including those with significant and complex needs, move to the community, the demand for innovative and affordable housing options continues to rise. One response to this increasing housing demand was AB 2100 (Steinberg), Statutes of 2004, Chapter 831. AB 2100 was enacted in anticipation of the plan to close Agnews DC. It authorized the three Bay Area RCs that would be participating in the Agnews closure process to, with DDS approval, provide for, secure, and ensure payment of lease agreements for housing for people with developmental disabilities.

Housing models involving development of a permanent stock of affordable and accessible housing for people with developmental disabilities are likely to become more common. A DDS report to the Legislature released on April 4, 2008, called "Controlling Regional Center Costs," supports the cost-effectiveness of the AB 2100 model. DDS points out that "rates for licensed residential facilities include mortgage, lease, and/or rent costs. . . . Because the housing is privately owned by a service provider, the public tax dollar investment is never recouped by the state. The property is 'bought' repeatedly through the rate paid to the service provider." The Report concludes that an alternative "is for the state to change the current financing structure of community housing for individuals with developmental disabilities to a 'buy-it-once' strategy that will generate long-term savings." The other advantage of the model, noted in the Report, is that consumers do not have to move if the provider is changed.

The 2010-2011 Budget trailer bill expanded the availability of residential facilities to provide special health care and intensive support services to adults in homelike settings—Adult Residential Facilities for Persons with Special Health Care Needs (ARFPSHN, or SB 962 Homes)—from a pilot program limited to former residents of Agnews DC to make such homes available to residents of Lanterman DC. An issue for the near future is whether, in light of the success of the pilot, the SB 962 model should be available to consumers statewide, as had initially been proposed.²¹

Other Bills

The Committee heard several other significant bills affecting people with developmental disabilities. Among those was **AB 140 (Beall)**, which establishes a dispute resolution process that applies to inter-agency disputes between an RC and a generic agency, such as a local education agency. **AB 1589 (Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review)** was not enacted but would have required RCs to disclose information on "related persons transactions" and established whistleblower

²¹ An independent evaluation of the SB 962 Pilot Project was conducted by the Center for Human Services, UC Davis Extension, University of California. The Final Report of the evaluation, released in the summer of 2010, was highly favorable, concluding that "consumers are receiving high quality care and have good access to health care in their homes and in the community. Moreover, the SB 962 model appears to be cost-effective and to have contributed in meaningful ways to consumers' health, quality of life, level of functioning and overall happiness." *Evaluation of Senate Bill 962 Pilot Project—Final Report*, Center for Human Services, University of California, Davis, Extension (June 2010), p. vii.

protections for RC employees who report improper RC activity. **SB 110 (Liu)** expands the scope of provisions related to elders who are victims of crimes, abuse, or neglect to include people with developmental disabilities and other non-elder dependent adults, including provisions related to law enforcement training and county interagency death review teams. Two resolutions were heard and passed by the Legislature impacting people with disabilities, including people with developmental disabilities: **ACR 162 (Beall)**, designates the second week of each October as Disability History Week. **SJR 31 (Pavley)** urges the President and Congress to immediately enact the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2009 (ABLE Act), creating tax-exempt accounts for individuals with disabilities.

**AB 140 (Beall) Developmental disabilities
Chapter 84, Statutes of 2009**

Establishes a dispute resolution process that applies to inter-agency disputes between a regional center (RC) and a generic agency, such as a local education agency, when the RC believes that a generic agency is legally obligated to fund or provide a service contained in the service plan for any child less than six years of age.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Assembly Appropriations (16-0)
Assembly Floor (70-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)
Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)
Senate Floor (40-0)

**AB 287 (Beall) Persons with developmental disabilities: employment
Chapter 231, Statutes of 2009**

Requires that the State Council on Developmental Disabilities establish a standing Employment First Committee (Committee) to identify strategies, best practices, and incentives, and to develop an Employment First Policy, the intended outcome of which is a significant increase in the number of people with developmental disabilities who are employed in integrated work, self employment, and microenterprises, and in the number earning wages at or above minimum wage. Requires that the Committee annually report to the Legislature and the Governor on its work and recommendations. Makes related legislative findings and declarations.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-2)
Assembly Appropriations (12-4)
Assembly Floor (53-24)

Senate Human Services (4-1)
Senate Appropriations (8-5)
Senate Floor (26-10)

AB 302 (Beall) Developmental services: regional centers
Amended into different subject matter, re-referred to Senate Public Safety Committee.

1. Required the Department of Developmental Services (DDS), using existing data, to determine how purchase-of-service funds are spent based on consumer ethnicity and primary language.
2. Required DDS to annually update these data, for the state as a whole and for each RC, and post the data on its Web site.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-2 - not relevant)	Senate Human Services (Not heard)
Assembly Appropriations (12-5 - not relevant)	Senate Public Safety (6-0)
Assembly Floor (48-29 - not relevant)	Senate Floor (29-0)
Assembly Concurrence (75-0)	

AB 416 (Block) Developmental services: consumer abuse registry
Died; on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.

1. Required the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) to develop a registry for tracking and investigating reports of substantiated abuse of developmental center and regional center consumers.
2. Required DDS service providers to report "any evidence" of abuse of a consumer by a worker to appropriate agencies investigating such abuse under current law and requires the establishment of penalties for the hiring of workers found in the abuse registry.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)
Assembly Health (16-0)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

AB 438 (Beall) Persons with developmental disabilities: criminal proceedings: diversion
Died; on the Senate Appropriations Suspense file.

1. Provided for diversion to community services, as appropriate, of people with developmental disabilities who become involved in the criminal and juvenile justice systems.
2. Required that, by July 1, 2010, DDS convene a task force to identify strategies and best practices for local interagency coordination and cooperation in addressing the needs of adults and juveniles with developmental disabilities in the criminal and juvenile justice systems.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)	Senate Human Services (3-2)
Assembly Public Safety (5-2)	Senate Public Safety (5-2)
Assembly Appropriations (11-5)	Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)
Assembly Floor (47-31)	

AB 1589 (Comm. on A. & A.R.) Regional centers: whistleblower protection: Related-party transactions

Died; on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.

Required regional centers (RCs) to disclose information on "related-persons transactions" and established whistleblower protections for RC employees who report improper RC activities.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-0)

Assembly Judiciary (6-0)

Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

AB 2204 (Beall) Developmental services: stakeholder groups

Died; on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.

Required the Department of Developmental Services to take into account the state's ethnic, sexual orientation, gender identity, geographic, socioeconomic orientation diversity when convening or consulting with stakeholder groups under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)

Senate Human Services (3-2)

Assembly Appropriations (11-5)

Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

Assembly Floor (45-27)

AB 2430 (Chesbro) Department of Rehabilitation: blindness

Died; on the Assembly inactive file.

Required that at least 20% of the board members of organizations and agencies whose sole mission is to provide services to persons who are blind or visually impaired and that receive grants or contracts from the Department of Rehabilitation consist of persons who are blind or visually impaired.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-0)

Assembly Appropriations (12-5)

Assembly Floor (Placed on Inactive)

AB 2702 (Chesbro) Developmental services: planning teams

Died; on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.

Required that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, regional centers shall ensure that, in developing, reviewing, or modifying a consumer's individual program plan (IPP) or individualized family service plan (IFSP), all decisions must be made pursuant to procedures established in, respectively, the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Lanterman Act) or California Early Intervention Services Act (CEISA).

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-1)

Senate Human Services (4-1)

Assembly Appropriations (12-0)

Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

Assembly Floor (65-7)

**ACR 162 (Beall) Disability History Week
Resolution Chapter 75, Statutes of 2010.**

Designates the second week of October 2010, and annually thereafter, as Disability History Week, and encourages public and private institutions of higher education, state and local agencies, nonprofit and community-based organizations, and private businesses and corporations to observe Disability History Week by dedicating appropriate classroom instructional time or by coordinating all-inclusive activities to be conducted during that week to afford opportunities for students and the general public to learn more about the disability community and to celebrate and honor its role in contemporary American society.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Senate Floor (34-0)

Assembly Concurrence (75-0)

**SB 110 (Liu) People with disabilities: victims of crime
Chapter 617, Statutes of 2010**

Expands the scope of selected provisions related to elders who are victims of crimes, abuse, or neglect to include non-elder dependent adults, including provisions related to law enforcement training and county interagency death review teams.

Legislative History

Senate Human Public Safety (6-0)

Assembly Public Safety (7-0)

Senate Appropriations (13-0)

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Senate Floor (31-1)

Assembly Appropriations (17-0)

Senate Concurrence (35-0)

Assembly Floor (78-0)

**SJR 31 (Pavley) Individuals with disabilities: tax exempt accounts
Resolution Chapter 54, Statutes of 2010.**

Urges the President and Congress to immediately enact the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2009 (ABLE Act), creating tax-exempt accounts for individuals with disabilities.

Legislative History

Senate Health (9-0)

Assembly Human Services (5-0)

Senate Floor (29-0)

Assembly Floor (75-0)

Senate Concurrence (32-0)

COMMUNITY CARE LICENSING

The Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) of the Department of Social Services is responsible for the regulatory and licensing activities related to residential and non-residential programs. CCLD is charged with providing preventative and protective services to people in "community care facilities": 24-hour senior, adult, and child residential care homes as well as non-residential programs (e.g., child care centers and adult day programs). Health facilities—such as skilled nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, congregate living health facilities, and adult day health centers—are licensed by the Department of Public Health. According to CCLD statistics, as of October 6, 2010 there were about 84,000 residential and non-residential programs licensed by CCLD, serving more than 1.4 million children and adults.

CCLD oversees the criminal background check and administrator certifications conducted to ensure the eligibility of community care providers and their employees. CCLD is responsible for ensuring that licensed homes meet all necessary fire safety requirements and obtaining health screening reports from physicians to verify that the applicant and personnel are capable of performing assigned tasks. In addition, CCLD reviews financial plans and conducts pre-licensing visits to ensure that the home is in compliance with laws and ready to begin operation. CCLD also oversees compliance and administers corrective action when a home fails to adequately protect the health and safety of its occupants.

In 2003, the visit protocol was changed by the Legislature to reflect actual visits as reported by CCL, ending the previous requirement that licensed homes be visited annually to one that required a random visit every five years. Given staffing limits, actual practice resulted in visits to only 10% of homes. The Legislature has added positions in subsequent years, and the Governor's 2007-08 budget proposed to increase the random visitation requirement to 30%. The Governor's 2008-09 budget, however, proposed to reduce the visitation requirement to 14% per year, requiring random visits once every seven years. That proposal was rejected.

Under state licensing law, local governments currently have some ability to control the location of residential care homes licensed for seven or more residents, since such facilities are subject to local use and zoning regulations. The law treats licensed homes for six or fewer residents as single family homes for zoning purposes, except for a 300-foot separation requirement that applies to many types of licensed housing. The 300-foot standard has been in place as part of the Community Care Facilities Act since 1978.

The state has an interest in assuring the adequate availability of housing serving the needs of children and adults who require residential care. Land use limitations are subject to scrutiny under the Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §3604, which prohibits discriminatory land use practices with respect to housing for people with disabilities (including seniors with disabilities) and children (familial status discrimination). The Act prohibits local governments from discriminating in housing on the basis of residents' familial status or disability. As more people with disabilities who have been or otherwise would be institutionalized in nursing facilities or state institutions move into the community, neighborhood opposition continues to be an obstacle in some instances. The Human Services Committee held an informational hearing in February 2009 addressing issues related to the siting of licensed homes for people with disabilities, including strategies for addressing so-called "Not in My Backyard" (NIMBY) barriers. The background paper prepared for that hearing (available on the Committee's website) includes an overview of the legal issues related to the siting of licensed homes for people with disabilities. *Working Together to Ensure Housing Opportunities for People with Disabilities and Children, Background Briefing Paper*, Assembly Committee on Human Services, (February 2009).

The future of community care licensed residential programs is a movement toward smaller, less institutional settings. New licensing categories are likely to emerge to meet the needs of the growing population of seniors and people with disabilities looking to be part of the community. One recent example is the new category of Adult Residential Facilities for People with Special Health Care Needs, or so-called SB 962 homes, which started as a pilot project to meet the specialized health care needs of people with developmental disabilities moving out of Agnews Developmental Center in small, home-like settings and has now been expanded to be available to people who will be moving from Lanterman Developmental Center. Based on the demonstrated success of the model, it will potentially be further expanded to be available to people with developmental disabilities throughout the state.

Some advocates have proposed that some program oversight functions of CCLD be shifted to agencies with more direct expertise and responsibility for providing services to people with disabilities. This might, for example, involve giving more responsibility for monitoring licensed residential and non-residential programs for people with developmental disabilities to the Department of Developmental Disabilities. Such proposals may both be more cost-effective and remove barriers to community living.

A number of bills heard by the Committee in the 2009-2010 Legislative Session related to residential facilities for seniors, including Residential Care Facilities for the Elderly (RCFEs) and Continuing Care Retirement Communities (CCRCs). **AB 407 (Beall & Eng)** and **AB 1433 (Eng & Beall)** established rights, requirements, and procedures in the event of, respectively, permanent closures of CCRCs and residential temporary relocations of CCRC residents. **AB 1169 (Ruskin)** specified financial disclosure requirements for CCRC contracts and providers' annual financial reports. **SB 781 (Leno)** specified additional information that must be provided to RCFE residents receiving eviction notices. **AB 123 (Portantino)** exempted from licensing homes covered by the low income tax credit and Section 8 subsidized housing when the home is occupied by elderly or disabled persons receiving supportive services if the services are not provided by the owner or operator of the home.

AB 123 (Portantino) Housing for elderly or disabled persons
Chapter 82, Statutes of 2009

Exempts from Department of Social Services community care licensing two additional types of housing: residences covered by the low income housing tax credit and Section 8 subsidized housing, if it is occupied by elderly or disabled persons and if supportive services are made available to residents at their option and if the supportive services are not provided by the owner or operator of the facility.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)

Assembly Appropriations (16-0)

Assembly Floor (70-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)

Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)

Senate Floor (40-0)

AB 407 (Beall/Eng) Continuing care contracts: retirement communities: closure
Chapter 442, Statutes of 2009

Imposes requirements on continuing care retirement communities in the event of their permanent closure, including requiring operators to provide at least 120 days advance notice of permanent closures and to adopt a relocation plan to ensure that the closure is orderly and all residents are adequately provided for.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Assembly Appropriations (16-0)

Assembly Floor (80-0)

Assembly Concurrence (78-0)

Senate Human Services (5-0)

Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)

Senate Floor (38-0)

AB 1169 (Ruskin) Elderly care: continuing care contracts: financial reporting requirements
Chapter 513, Statutes of 2009

1. Requires continuing care contracts to include a disclosure that, if the provider is meeting its statutory reserve requirements, resident funds, including but not limited to, entry fees, monthly fees, and other fees, may be transferred from one continuing care retirement community (CCRC) to benefit the residents at one or more other CCRCs controlled by the same entity, or used to meet community needs as required by the provider's non-profit status under the Internal Revenue Code.
2. Defines "reserves" for the purpose of a provider's annual financial report.
3. Requires that a CCRC provider's annual financial report include disclosure of any funds accumulated for identified projects or purposes, including, but not limited to, project designated to meet the needs of the community as required by the provider's nonprofit status.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Aging and Long Term Care (4-2)	Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)
Assembly Appropriations (11-4)	Senate Floor (35-0)
Assembly Floor (51-28)	
Assembly Concurrence (74-0)	

AB 1433 (Eng and Beall) Continuing care contracts: retirement communities: permanent closure Chapter 443, Statutes of 2010

Defines "residential temporary relocation" in the context of continuing care contracts of residents who live in continuing care retirement communities, and establishes related rights, requirements, and procedures.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (17-0)	Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)
Assembly Floor (68-0)	Senate Floor (35-0)
Assembly Concurrence (77-0)	

SB 781 (Leno) Residential care facilities for the elderly: eviction procedures Chapter 617, Statutes of 2009

Provides additional information to a resident receiving a notice of eviction from a Residential Care Facility for the Elderly. Additional information includes reasons for the eviction, the effective date of the eviction, resources available to help in identifying alternative housing, and notification of the resident's right to file a complaint with DSS.

Legislative History

Senate Judiciary (5-0)	Assembly Judiciary (10-0)
Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)	Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Senate Floor (36-0)	Assembly Appropriations (17-0)
Senate Concurrence (39-0)	Assembly Floor (74-0)

SB 892 (Alquist) Care facilities Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.

Specified additional crimes with respect to which the Department of Social Services (DSS) is prohibited from granting an exemption to operators, staff and employees of residential care facilities for the elderly.

Legislative History

Senate Public Safety (5-0)

Assembly Human Services (5-0)

Senate Appropriations (S. R. 28.8)

Assembly Public Safety (7-0)

Senate Floor (33-0)

Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**SB 1329 (Leno) Residential care facilities for the elderly
Vetoed by the Governor**

Required licensees of residential care facilities for the elderly, with certain exceptions, to notify the Department of Social Services (DSS) and, in some instances, residents and applicants for potential residence, of specified events, and required DSS to initiate compliance plans, noncompliance conferences, or other administrative actions upon receipt of the notification.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (4-0)

Assembly Human Services (4-0)

Senate Appropriations (9-0)

Assembly Judiciary (7-0)

Senate Floor (30-0)

Assembly Appropriations (13-4)

Senate Concurrence (26-11)

Assembly Floor (73-3)

CHILD CARE

This Committee shares jurisdiction over child care issues with the Assembly Education Committee; although, much of the policy changes affecting this area have and continue to be carried out through the budget process. This Committee is responsible for the licensing of child day care facilities and Stage One Child Care.

Care is provided to children in families currently or previously receiving support through the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program (CalWORKs), the state's welfare-to-work program, as well as to other low-income working families subject to available resources. The state spends a total of \$3.1 billion on child care. Of that amount, \$1.4 billion are federal funds from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Child Care and Development block grants. An estimated 200,000 eligible children go unserved and are on waiting lists because of a shortage of child care resources.

State administration

The state's child care system has a dual purpose: caring for children while their parents work and enhancing their developmental potential as they prepare for and attend school. Two state departments administer child care programs: the Department of Education (responsible for more than 2/3 of the funds) and the Department of Social Services (responsible for administering the first stage of child care for CalWORKs recipients).

Families are eligible for subsidized care when their incomes are lower than 75% of the State Median Income (SMI). For families whose incomes are above 44% of SMI, a graduated schedule of family fees applies, up to 8% of gross income.

Reimbursement rates

Rates to providers, paid through Alternative Payment Programs, are based upon a Regional Market Rate (RMR), up to the 85th percentile of cost of equivalent care based on surveys of private providers in every region. Child care centers contracting with the state Department of Education (CDE) are paid a single Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR), adjusted for infants and toddlers, children with exceptional needs or disabilities, children at risk of abuse or neglect, and children with limited English proficiency.

CalWORKs child care

More than half of the total cost of subsidized child care is spent for current or former recipients of CalWORKs. Delivery of care for this population is provided through a three-stage process. Stages One and Two are statutory entitlements. In Stage One, CalWORKs applicants and recipients are provided care early in their welfare-to-work activities before their care situation becomes stabilized. In Stage Two, current and former recipients are guaranteed care while they continue to participate and for two years after they leave aid. Stage Three care is not a statutory entitlement but has been provided since CalWORKs began, covering families after Stage Two until they no longer need care or exceed the general subsidized care income eligibility limits.

Subsidized child care

Child care for low-income families, whether they are recipients of CalWORKs or not, is provided by a variety of entities. Child care centers, which contract directly with CDE, must meet established educational and health and safety standards enforced by CDE (known as “Title V” programs). Licensed family day care must meet health and safety standards enforced by the Department of Social Services (DSS). There is also specialized care such as migrant care, and informal license-exempt care provided by relatives or for a single child. Alternative Payment Programs administer voucher payments, and Resource and Referral agencies help families find appropriate care, provide education for the community, and provide training and support for providers.

Final Budget Actions²²:

- Cut \$256 million from CalWORKs Stage 3 child care, which serves working families who have successfully transitioned off CalWORKs cash assistance. This reduction will terminate Stage 3 child care for approximately 55,000 children effective November 1, 2010.
- Reduced funding of \$12.4 million to license-exempt provider reimbursement rates. Reduces the rate from 90% of the licensed provider limits to 80%.
- Reduced funding of \$83.1 million on a one-time basis by requiring contractors to utilize accumulated reserves to offset contract amounts.
- Reduced funding by \$17.1 million to reflect a reduction in the administrative and support services cost allowance for voucher-based contractors from 19% of the contract amount to 17.5%.
- Reduced funding for the California State Advisory Council on Early Childhood Education and Care by \$503,000. The Governor established the Council by executive order in November 2009 to help improve the state’s child care and early childhood education programs, including by identifying opportunities for coordination.

Legislative efforts

²² The 2010 Budget Act. <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/pdf/Enacted/BudgetSummary/FullBudgetSummary.pdf>

Many of the child care bills that were introduced by the Senate and Assembly developed out of concern for child daycare health and safety. In particular, the issue of childhood obesity has taken center stage, not only here in California but across the nation and even at the White House. First Lady Michelle Obama and Governor Schwarzenegger have a shared interest in improving the health of overweight children. The goal, as set out in a report from the White House Task Force on Childhood Obesity, is to reduce childhood obesity from 20% to 5% by 2030. California's Governor hosted his "Governor's 2010 Summit on Health, Nutrition and Obesity: Actions for Healthy Living." According to Schwarzenegger, "Obesity's a huge problem for the state of California and we have one out of three children being obese, two out of five adults being obese or overweight and I think those are staggering numbers."²³ Childhood obesity costs California \$50 billion per year. As a result, **AB 627 (Brownley)** and **AB 2084 (Brownley)** sought to improve health outcomes of children by setting nutritional guidelines in day care settings since approximately 1.2 million children spend much of their week in the care of these providers. AB 2084 was signed by the Governor and will create minimum standards for beverages that are served in licensed child day care facilities such as requiring that safe drinking water is available and that only 1% or nonfat milk is served to children over two years of age.

In terms of child safety, gaps threatening the well-being of children were unfortunately discovered. It was discovered that a child was abused while in the care of a gymnasium child care center. Under current law, temporary day care offered in gyms and stores are a relatively new service, and unfortunately, state law has not caught up with ensuring that government oversight is ensuring child safety. **SB 702 (DeSaulnier)** and **AB 222 (Adams)** filled this legal gap by requiring that employees in these temporary day care settings obtain background clearances called "TrustLine."

AB 1368 (Adams) also improved children's safety in a day care setting by requiring that at least one person be present, at all times, who has 15 hours of health and safety training and a current course completion card in pediatric first aid and CPR.

AB 222 (Adams) Child Care Chapter 431, Statutes of 2010

Fixes two problems facing ancillary day care centers due to the passage of new legislation requiring a criminal records clearance for each employee by January 1, 2011.

Legislative History

Assembly U. & C. (11-0 – not relevant)	Senate Human Services (4-0)
Assembly Appropriations (14-1 – not relevant)	Senate Appropriations (S. R. 28.8)
Assembly Floor (54-13 – not relevant)	Senate Floor (28-7)
Assembly Concurrence (72-2)	

AB 304 (Price) Child Care and Developments Services Act: alternative payment programs Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.

Required that by January 1, 2011, all child care alternative payment providers offer their child care providers the option of receiving state subsidy reimbursements via electronic banking.

Legislative History

²³ KABC-TV/DT news article on February 24, 2010,
<http://abclocal.go.com/kabc/story?section=news/state&id=7296404>

Assembly Human Services (5-2)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 627 (Brownley) Child care: nutritional requirements
Vetoed by the Governor**

Required that child day care facilities meet specified health and nutritional requirements, as specified.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)	Senate Education (7-2)
Assembly Appropriations (12-5)	Senate Health (7-3)
Assembly Floor (49-28)	Senate Appropriations (8-5)
Assembly Concurrence (50-29)	Senate Floor (23-12)

**AB 1195 (Brownley) Child care and development programs: advisory committee
Not heard in Assembly Human Services: amended and re-referred to Assembly Education.**

Required the Child Development Policy Advisory Committee to assist the state Department of Education in the development of a plan to implement any new federal child care or early childhood education grant funds made available after March 1, 2009.

Legislative History

Assembly Education (8-1)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 1368 (Adams) Child day care: safety
Chapter 528, Statutes of 2009**

Extends to small family child care homes the requirement that at least one person be present, at all times, who has 15 hours of health and safety training and a current course completion card in pediatric first aid and CPR.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (7-0)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (16-0)	Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)
Assembly Floor (76-0)	Senate Floor (36-0)

**AB 1979 (Adams) Child day care centers: inspections
Died; not heard in Assembly Human Services Committee.**

Required the Department of Social Services to make annual unannounced visits of all licensed child day care centers.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (Not heard)

**AB 2084 (Brownley) Child day care facilities: nutrition
Chapter 593, Statutes of 2010**

Creates minimum standards for beverages that are served in licensed child day care facilities.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)

Senate Health (6-1)

Assembly Appropriations 11-5)

Senate Appropriations (7-4)

Assembly Floor (44-26)

Senate Floor (22-15)

Assembly Concurrence 50-27)

**AB 2463 (Brownley) Child care resource and referral programs
Died; held on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.**

Codified responsibilities of the statewide child care resource and referral network.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Senate Education (6-2)

Assembly Appropriations (12-5)

Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

Assembly Floor (50-24)

**SB 244 (Wright) Children's service: high risk children
Died in the Assembly Appropriations Committee (not heard).**

Required the state Department of Education to conduct a study on the feasibility of providing priority enrollment in high-quality child care and development programs for children from birth to five years of age who are in the foster care system, in relative care or reunification, or were formerly in the foster care system, who are at risk of abuse, neglect, or exploitation, are homeless, or have a custodial parent in the foster care system, on probation or parole, or in a correctional or residential treatment facility.

Legislative History

Senate Education (6-1)

Assembly Human Services (5-0)

Senate Appropriations (7-5)

Assembly Appropriations (Not heard)

Senate Floor (28-11)

**SB 702 (DeSaulnier) Ancillary day care centers: employees: trustline providers
Chapter 199, Statutes of 2009**

Requires a business, which provides temporary day care services for children whose parents are shopping at their business, to obtain a Trustline clearance for any person that supervises children. This bill allows a 12-month phase-in period for these businesses to comply with the new Trustline requirement.

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (5-0)	Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Senate Appropriations (S.R. 28.8)	Assembly Appropriations (14-3)
Senate Floor (29-4)	Assembly Floor (61-16)
Senate Concurrence (23-5)	

**SB 1196 (DeSaulnier) Child care
Died; in the Assembly Human Services Committee (not heard)**

Provided that, commencing January 1, 2011, a person 18 years of age or over who provides care or supervision in an ancillary day care center, shall be registered as a trustline provider. (The substance of this bill was amended into AB 222 (Adams) (see above).

Legislative History

Senate Human Services (4-0 – not relevant)	Assembly Human Services (Not heard)
Senate Appropriations (33-0 – not relevant)	

FOOD ASSISTANCE

Today, nearly 40 million Americans—almost 13% of the population—are receiving Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits (formerly known as Food Stamps), a new record for the nation's premier anti-hunger program. In California, almost three million persons are receiving CalFresh (California's new name for the Food Stamp Program), up from two million in 2007. Food banks in the state are also experiencing steep increases in the number of clients they serve. Since the advent of the economic crisis in December 2007, they have seen an increase of 30 to 50%.

SNAP is the nation's number one anti-hunger program for the poor. The benefits, entirely funded by the federal government, are made available for food purchase monthly through an ATM-like debit card. To qualify, a person's income must meet both net and gross income tests, and resources, such as cash on hand, cannot exceed \$2,000, or \$3,000 for disabled and elderly people, when a child lives in the home. The federal, state, and county governments share in the cost of administration (50/35/15), contributing \$412 million, \$310 million, and \$99 million, respectively, in 2009-2010²⁴. SNAP, or CalFresh, is administered locally by county welfare departments.

California has added its own state laws, such as the finger-imaging requirement, where all adult household members are required to submit a fingerprint before benefits are disbursed. On average, an individual receives \$150 and a household receives \$350 in benefits per month.

There are two basic populations served by SNAP—assistance and non-assistance (NAFS). The assistance component serves families in which all members also receive income assistance, principally

²⁴ CDSS Local Assistance Binder Estimates, May Revise 2010, page 6, line 417

from a CalWORKs grant. More than 99% of assistance households contain children. The non-assistance component consists of households where at least one eligible member does not receive income assistance. Within the non-assistance population, "able-bodied adults without dependents" (ABAWDs) are generally limited to receive food stamps for only three months in a 36-month period unless they qualify for an employment or county-sponsored waiver. However, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 eliminated this time limit restriction until September 30, 2010.

According to United States Department of Agriculture participation rate data, only about half of eligible Californians actually receive SNAP benefits. Advocates for the poor assert that this is largely explained by systematic barriers such as: 1) welfare department office hours not being accessible for working families, 2) burdensome application processes imposed by California such as the fingerprint imaging requirement and the intake face-to-face interviews for assistance clients; and 3) reporting and verification requirements that families must comply with to continue their benefits. A recent federal waiver allows California to waive this in-person interview requirement for non-assistance clients and for the interview, instead, to be conducted over the phone.

Lost Revenues to Communities

When CalFresh benefits are spent at grocery stores, not only families and individuals benefit—the economy as a whole benefits. According to Moody's Investor Services, Food Stamps have the highest economic multiplier effect out of all government programs or fiscal policy tools that stimulate the economy.

The national SNAP participation rate is 67%. Because only 50% of Californians who are *eligible* are receiving assistance, the state is bypassing billions of dollars in federal benefits and the resulting economic activity. Indeed, California is second to last in the nation in USDA's biennial report on SNAP participation. The economic effect of this low participation rate is very significant to California's economy. The California Food Policy Advocates estimates that California leaves \$3.7 billion in federal funds on the table.²⁵ As mentioned above, not only are California families not receiving much needed food assistance, but the economic "multiplier effect" of these dollars on businesses and local and state coffers is quite impressive. Moody's finds that for every food stamp dollar spent, a \$1.73 is generated in economic activity. The USDA finds this amount to be eleven cents higher at \$1.84. Businesses where these federal benefits would be spent—grocery stores, farmer's markets, and other retailers—are missing out on much needed revenues. These dollars would sustain and potentially create new jobs in retail stores, trigger farmers to produce more, and allow truckers to transport these additional goods. For county and state General Funds, the benefits would free up a family's discretionary income and would, in effect, direct these dollars to taxable purchases, creating sales tax revenue, which is split between the state and counties.

The California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) provides state-funded food stamps to legal immigrants ineligible for federal food stamps because of their immigration status. It is entirely funded by the state General Fund, costing a total of \$36.6 million in 2009-10. According to the Department of Social Services²⁶ the projected number of CFAP participants in 2010-11 will be almost 40,000.

Final Budget Actions

Relative to other human services programs, the food assistance budget went largely unchanged. This is mostly a function of the federal government funding all of the benefits and 50% of the

²⁵ <http://cfpa.net/ldep/ldep2009.pdf>

²⁶ CDSS Local Assistance Binder Estimates, May Revise 2010, page 241

administrative cost of the program. However, the state does provide General Fund dollars for its 35% share of the administrative cost of the benefits (\$310 million in 2009-10).²⁷ The 2010-2011 Budget:

- Allocates \$30 million in one-time federal dollars to absorb increased CalFresh administrative costs in the NAFS caseload. This appropriation was controversial since USDA was encouraging California to use these one-time funds to make program improvements, including moving CalFresh from quarterly to semi-annual reporting.
- Implements an Inter-County Transfer process so that CalFresh participants do not have to reapply for benefits when moving one county to another.

Legislative changes

Several measures were introduced in the 2009-2010 Legislative Session that would have made participation less difficult by removing barriers.

One of the primary barriers to CalFresh (and CalWORKs) is the burdensome reporting requirement. **AB 1642 (Beall)** (see CalWORKs, above) would have made a significant difference in the lives of the participants of CalFresh, the work of the county eligibility workers, and the effect on California's economy. This bill would have made California the last state to convert its CalWORKs and CalFresh programs to "semi-annual reporting" (SAR) which would have allowed these program participants to submit their income reports only twice per year instead of four times. The reduction in paperwork would have saved counties precious labor time, kept participants from falling off the program because of confusing and burdensome paperwork requirements, and injected additional CalFresh dollars into the state which would trigger a multiplier effect, as discussed earlier.

Since the Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System's (SFIS) birth in 2000, several bills and budget proposals have been introduced to eliminate, what many food assistance advocates believe to be a barrier to assistance. All have failed. SFIS is the state's system to "deter" an applicant's attempt to obtain duplicate aid in more than one county by taking an applicant's fingerprint, photograph and personal descriptor information. California and four other states are the only ones that operate such a system and the federal government does not require it.

The California State Auditor estimates that it has cost the state \$31 million to develop the system, and \$5 million annually to maintain it (not including county administration time).²⁸ DSS estimates that SFIS deters approximately \$68.7 million²⁹ in duplicate aid annually but cannot empirically prove that amount because the extent of duplicate aid fraud was not determined before implementation of SFIS. **AB 1057 (Beall)** would have implemented SAR as well, as discussed above, but also would have eliminated SFIS and instead created a different verification system by using the already existing Department of Motor Vehicles identifiers.

AB 719 (Lowenthal) successfully obtained "transitional" CalFresh benefits for foster youth who are exiting foster care. Twelve months of food assistance will be available to these young adults to help them transition into adulthood while minimizing the paperwork requirements.

²⁷ Ibid, page 6, line 417

²⁸ California State Auditor, Department of Social Services: For the CalWORKs and Food Stamp Programs, It Lacks Assessments of Cost-Effectiveness and Misses Opportunities to Improve Antifraud Efforts, November 2009, Report 2009-01, page 10.

²⁹ CDSS document entitled, "Annual Cost of Operating the Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS) October 16, 2008.

California renamed its Food Stamp Program, "CalFresh," in 2010. AB 433 (Beall), Chapter 625, Statutes of 2008, required that DSS and advocacy groups rename California's Food Stamp Program. California was prompted to make a change by federal and state law. In 2008, Congress passed the Farm Bill (Public Law 110-246) which included a provision that renamed the Food Stamp Program the "Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program" (also known as SNAP). States could use this federal name or chose another. California, like many other states, chose to explore other naming options. In 2008, the California legislature passed Assembly Member Beall's AB 433, which required the development of a name for California that reflected several facts; "stamps" no longer exist, the program can support healthy living, the program has benefits to California agriculture, and that food stamps is a health a nutrition program. In 2009, the state and stakeholders went through a process to explore naming options, including consideration of the name SNAP. This process included key informant interviews, focus group testing, and broader surveying on the various options. As a result, in 2010, California has a new name—*CalFresh – better food for better living*.

**AB 643 (Skinner) Food stamps: benefits transfers
Died; held on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.**

Specified that "aid," for purposes of the provisions relating to a recipient's change of residence, includes benefits under the food stamp program, thereby requiring county welfare offices to transfer a food stamp recipient's benefits from one county to another without requiring the recipient to reapply in the new county.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-2)

Senate Human Services (4-1)

Assembly Appropriations (12-5)

Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

Assembly Floor (48-28)

**AB 719 (Lowenthal) Transitional food stamps for foster youth
Chapter 371, Statutes of 2009**

Provides 12 months of federal food stamp benefits to youth emancipating from foster care, effective July 1, 2010.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)

Senate Human Services (4-1)

Assembly Appropriations (17-0)

Senate Appropriations (8-5)

Assembly Floor (75-0)

Senate Floor (22-12)

Assembly Concurrence (78-0)

**AB 1057 (Beall) CalWORKs and Food Stamp Program: reporting
Died; on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Eliminated the Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System requirement for Food Stamp-only applicants, and instead, would have used the Department of Motor Vehicles or other state agency information to

AB 1057 (Continued)

verify an applicant's identification to prevent duplicate aid fraud; and would have converted the Food Stamp and CalWORKs programs recipient income reporting periods from quarterly to semi-annually.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-2)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 1198 (Swanson) Food stamps: eligibility: drug felonies
Died; held on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.**

Restored federal food stamp eligibility to specified Californians who have been convicted of drug-related felonies.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-2)	Senate Human Services (3-2)
Assembly Appropriations (11-4)	Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)
Assembly Floor (45-31)	

**AB 1756 (Swanson) Food Stamps
Died; held on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.**

Restored federal food stamp eligibility to all Californians with drug felony convictions; and eliminates the eligibility conditions for drug users and possessors.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-)	Senate Human Services (3-2)
Assembly Appropriations (10-5)	Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)
Assembly Floor (44-31)	

MISCELLANEOUS HUMAN SERVICES

**AB 325 (Beall) Federal Earned Income Tax Credit: Community outreach
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Designated the Department of Community Services Development (DCSD) as the lead agency responsible for administering the federal Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) programs in the state; and required DCSD to be responsible for efforts designed to increase the number of eligible persons in the state who apply for and receive the EITC.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-2)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 398 (Monning) Acquired brain trauma: administration
Chapter 439, Statutes of 2009**

Transfers the administrative duties and oversight of the California traumatic brain injury program from the Department of Mental Health to the Department of Rehabilitation, and extends the program's sunset date from July 1, 2012 to July 1, 2019.

Legislative History

Assembly Health (19-0)	Senate Human Services (4-1)
Assembly Human Services (7-0)	Senate Health (9-0)
Assembly Floor (77-0)	Senate Floor (35-0)
Assembly Concurrence (63-9)	

**AB 422 (Torres) State Youth and Family Master Plan
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a State Youth and Family Master Plan that includes: general guiding principles that California should follow when developing policies, identification of all state agencies involved in providing services for youth and families, identification of opportunities through which cooperation between governmental agencies is likely to provide more efficient services, mechanisms through which state policies affecting the state's youth and families can be assessed to determine which ones are effective, and identification of ways in which the state hinders local governments' efforts to serve youth and families.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

**AB 861 (Ruskin) Public health services: consolidated contracts
Not heard by Assembly Human Services; amended and re-referred to Assembly Health.**

Requires the California Department of Public Health to develop and implement a model consolidated and streamlined administration and contracting process for the department's Center for Infectious Diseases and Center for Family Health prior to July 1, 2011.

Legislative History

Assembly Health (9-0)	Senate Health (9-0)
Assembly Appropriations (16-0)	Senate Floor (35-0)
Assembly Floor (76-0)	

**AB 885 (Nestande) Area agencies on aging and independent living centers: funding
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

1. Establishes a continuous appropriation from the Federal Trust Fund to the California Department of Aging for the Area Agencies on Aging and to the California Department of Rehabilitation for the Independent Living Centers in any year in which the state budget is not enacted by July 1.

AB 885 (Continued)

2. Authorizes the Department of Finance to reduce the applicable Budget Act allocations by the amount paid pursuant to this bill.

Legislative History

Assembly Aging and Long Term Care (6-0)
Assembly Human Services (7-0)
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

AB 1177 (Fong) Homelessness: Interagency Council on Homelessness Died; held on the Senate Appropriations Suspense File.

Established the Interagency Council on Homelessness with a mission to construct cross-agency and community cooperation in responding to homelessness, to use a more efficient and supportive method in implementing evidence-based approaches to address homelessness, and, to the extent possible, plan an end to homelessness in the state.

Legislative History

Assembly Business & Professions (7-4)	Senate Transportation & Housing (6-4)
Assembly Human Services (5-2)	Senate Human Services (4-1)
Assembly Appropriations (12-5)	Senate Appropriations (Held on Suspense)
Assembly Floor (49-29)	

AB 1758 (Ammiano) County wraparound services program Chapter 561, Statutes of 2010

Removes "pilot project" references for county wraparound services programs administered by DSS and designed to keep children in their homes with family-based support services as an alternative to group home placement. Adds nonrelative extended family members to the list of family members and guardians eligible for wraparound services.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (15-0)	Senate Appropriations (9-0)
Assembly Floor (74-0)	Senate Floor (35-0)
Assembly Concurrence (76-0)	

AB 1766 (Gaines and Logue) Placer County Integrated Health and Human Services Pilot Program. Chapter 364, Statutes of 2010

Changes the date upon which the Placer County pilot program to integrate the funding and delivery of services and benefits for the county health and human services system becomes inoperative from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2016, and extends the sunset date of the program from January 1, 2012 to January 1, 2017.

AB 1766 (Continued)

Legislative History

Assembly Loc. Govt. (8-0 – not relevant)	Senate Rev. & Tax (3-0 – not relevant)
Assembly Rev & Tax (9-0 – not relevant)	Senate Appropriations (11-0 – not relevant)
Assembly Appropriations (16-0 – not relevant)	Senate Floor (35-0)
Assembly Floor (71-0 – not relevant)	
Assembly Concurrence (76-0)	

**AB 2017 (Hall) Personal income taxes: voluntary contributions: California Youth Leadership Fund
Vetoed by the Governor**

Allowed taxpayers to make voluntary contributions to the California Youth Leadership Fund on their state personal Income Tax returns.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-0)	Senate Rev. & tax (4-1)
Assembly Rev. & Tax (9-0)	Senate Appropriations (S. R. 28.8)
Assembly Appropriations (16-1)	Senate Floor (30-2)
Assembly Floor (71-0)	
Assembly Concurrence (73-0)	

**AB 2039 (Logue) Placer County integrated health and human services programs
Vetoed by the Governor**

Deleted the date upon which the Placer County pilot program to integrate the funding and delivery of services and benefits for the county health and human services system becomes inoperative and deletes the sunset date. (Subsequently enacted, but with an extended sunset date, as AB 1766 (Gaines and Logue); see above.)

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Human Services (3-0)
Assembly Appropriations (15-0)	Senate Appropriations (S. R. 28.8)
Assembly Floor (74-0)	Senate Floor (34-0)
Assembly Concurrence (76-0)	

**AB 2206 (Hill) foster care: insurance
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense file.**

Limited the Foster Family Home and Small Family Home Insurance Fund liability exclusions to only those criminal or intentional acts committed by a foster parent.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-1)	
Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)	

**AB 2229 (Brownley) Mandated child abuse reporting
Chapter 464, Statutes of 2010**

Creates a new, time-limited authority for counties to create child abuse multidisciplinary personnel teams (MDTs), comprised of two or more persons (rather than 3 as previously required) and permits electronic and phone communication of confidential information by team members as specified.

Legislative History

Assembly Public Safety (7-0)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Public Safety (7-0)
Assembly Appropriations (16-0)	Senate Appropriations (S. R. 28.8)
Assembly Concurrence (76-0)	Senate Floor (32-0)

**AB 2322 (Feuer) Abuse of children, elder, or dependent persons: Confidentiality
Chapter 551, Statutes of 2010**

Modifies statutes related to MDTs and broadens the scope of information that may be included in a county MDT computerized database to include information regarding nonrelatives living in the home of a child and authorizes specified CalWORKs case managers to participate in an MDT.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (6-0)	Senate Human Services (5-0)
Assembly Appropriations (16-0)	Senate Appropriations (8-0)
Assembly Floor (77-0)	Senate Floor (36-0)
Assembly Concurrence (77-0)	

**ACR 80 (Hill) Bill of Rights for the Children and Youth of California
Resolution Chapter 101, Statutes of 2009**

Declares the Legislature's support for a Bill of Rights for the Children and Youth of California that resolves to invest in all children and youth so that they may live in a just, moral, and supportive society and have the same rights regardless of their culture, race, gender or gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, or disability.

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (5-0)	Senate Floor (24-12)
-------------------------------	----------------------

**ACR 110 (Conway) Step Up California Month and Step up California Day
Resolution Chapter 108, Statutes of 2010**

Designates February 2010 and February 2011 as Step Up California Month and February 3, 2010 and February 3, 2011 as Step Up California Day and encourages and supports activities related to reducing poverty and increasing economic opportunity, and makes legislative findings and declarations

Legislative History

Assembly Human Services (4-1)	Senate Floor (26-4)
-------------------------------	---------------------

**SB 516 (DeSaulnier) California Youth Legislature
Died: in the Assembly Revenue & Taxation Committee (not heard).**

1. Establishes the California Youth Legislature (CYL), composed of students, ages 14 to 18 years, inclusive, and, subject to specified considerations, appointed by Members of the Legislature, to provide model legislation and advocate for the needs of youth.
2. Establishes in the State Treasury the California Fund for Youth to receive contributions from tax return designations to support the sessions of the CYL.

Legislative History

Senate Revenue & Taxation (5-2)

Assembly Human Services (4-2)

Senate Appropriations (7-5)

Assembly Revenue & Taxation (Not heard)

Senate Floor (24-14)

**SB 774 (Ashburn) Social workers: criminal history
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File**

Requires counties to obtain a Department of Justice summary criminal history on applicants for or transferees within the county welfare department who have frequent and routine contact with children.

Legislative History

Senate Public Safety (7-0)

Assembly Human Services (4-1)

Senate Human Services (3-0)

Assembly Public Safety (7-0)

Senate Appropriations (12-0)

Assembly Approps. (Held on Suspense)

Senate Floor (39-0)

**SB 1084 (Liu) California Economic Security Task Force
Died; held on the Assembly Appropriations Suspense File.**

Authorized the establishment of the 13-member California Economic Security Task Force for the purpose of analyzing and developing a strategy to increase self sufficiency and reduce poverty in California by 50% by 2020.

Legislative History

Senate B., P. & E. D (6-3)

Assembly J., E. D. & E. (4-2)

Senate Appropriations (7-3))

Assembly Human Services (4-2)

Senate Floor (22-13)

Assembly Appropriations (Held on Suspense)

2009-2010 Assembly Human Services bills

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Referred</u>	<u>Analyzed</u>	<u>Heard</u>	<u>Passed</u> <u>HS</u>	<u>Enrolled</u>	<u>Chaptered</u>	<u>Vetoed</u>
Child welfare/ Foster care	42	38	38	38	29	25	4
IHSS	15	11	11	11	2	1	1
CalWORKs	13	11	11	8	3	1	3
Developmental Disabilities	12	12	12	12	6	6	0
Community Care Licensing	7	7	7	7	5	5	0
Child care	10	8	7	7	5	4	1
Food assistance	3	3	3	3			
Miscellaneous human services	16	16	15	15	1	1	0
TOTAL	118	106	104	101	51	43	9

12/02/2010 9:49 AM