

Item 2

Proposed Minutes

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Location of Meeting: Room 447
State Capitol, Sacramento, California
December 6, 2013

Present: Member Eraina Ortega, Chairperson
Representative of the Director of the Department of Finance
Member Richard Chivaro, Vice Chairperson
Representative of the State Controller
Member Andre Rivera
Representative of the State Treasurer
Member Ken Alex
Director of the Office of Planning and Research
Member Sarah Olsen
Public Member
Member Carmen Ramirez
City Council Member
Member Don Saylor
County Supervisor

NOTE: The transcript for this hearing is attached. These minutes are designed to be read in conjunction with the transcript.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairperson Ortega called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Executive Director Heather Halsey called the roll.

Chairperson Ortega acknowledged the passing of Mr. Albert Beltrami who was a public member of the Commission from April 1996 through July 2001.

Member Ramirez acknowledged the passing of Mr. Nelson Mandela of South Africa.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Item 1 September 27, 2013

Member Chivaro made a motion to adopt the minutes. With a second by Member Alex, the September 27, 2013 hearing minutes were adopted by a vote of 7-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

The Chairperson asked if there was any public comment. There was no response.

CONSENT CALENDAR

If there are no objections to any of the following action items designated by an asterisk (), the Executive Director will include each one on the Proposed Consent Calendar that will be presented at the hearing. The Commission will determine which items will remain on the Consent Calendar.*

HEARINGS AND DECISIONS PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7 (GOV. CODE, § 17551, 17557, and 17559) (action)

PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES AND PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES AMENDMENTS

- Item 9* *Immunization Records - Pertussis*, 11-TC-02
Health and Safety Code Sections 120325 and 120335
Statutes 2010, Chapter 434 (AB 354)
Twin Rivers Unified School District, Claimant

INFORMATIONAL HEARING PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 8 (action)

STATEWIDE COST ESTIMATE

- Item 11* *Uniform Complaint Procedures (K-12)*, 03-TC-02
Education Code Sections 250, 251, 262.3
Statutes 1982, Chapter 1117; Statutes 1988, Chapter 1514;
Statutes 1998, Chapter 914
California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections 4611, 4621, 4622, 4631, and 4632
Register 92, Number 3; Register 93, Number 51
Solana Beach School District, Claimant

ADOPTION OF COMMISSION ORDER TO INITIATE RULEMAKING PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, DIVISION 2, CHAPTER 2.5

- Item 12* General Cleanup Provisions
California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Division 2, Chapter 2.5, Articles 1, 2, 3, 4.5, 5, 6, 6.5, 7, 8, 8.5, and 10
Sections 1181 through 1189.61 and 1190 through 1190.05

Executive Director Halsey announced that after the agenda for this hearing was released, the parties agreed to place Item 9 on the Consent Calendar. Chairperson Ortega asked if there was any objection to adding Item 9 to the Consent Calendar. No objection was made. Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the consent calendar. With a second by Member Saylor, the consent calendar was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

HEARINGS AND DECISIONS PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7 (GOV. CODE, § 17551, 17557, and 17559) (action)

Executive Director Heather Halsey swore in parties and witnesses participating in the hearing.

APPEAL OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DECISIONS PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, SECTION 1181(c)

- Item 2 Appeal of Executive Director Decisions

There were no appeals to consider.

TEST CLAIMS

- Item 3 *Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) II and III*,
05-TC-02, 05-TC-03, and 08-TC-06
- Education Code Sections 60601, 60602, 60603, 60604, 60605, 60605.6,
60606, 60607, 60611, 60615, 60630, 60640, 60641, 60642.5
- Statutes 1995, Chapter 975; Statutes 1997, Chapter 828; Statutes 1999,
Chapter 735; Statutes 2000, Chapter 576; Statutes 2001, Chapter 20; Statutes
2001, Chapter 722; Statutes 2002, Chapter 1168; Statutes 2003, Chapter 773;
Statutes 2004, Chapter 183; Statutes 2004, Chapter 233; Statutes 2005,
Chapter 676; Statutes 2007, Chapter 174; Statutes 2007, Chapter 730;
Statutes, 2008, Chapter 473, Statutes 2008, Chapter 757
- California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections 850, 851, 852, 853, 855,
857, 858, 859, 861, 862, 863, 864.5, 865, 866, 867, 867.5, and 868
- Register 2005, No. 34 (Sept. 21, 2005), Register 2006, No. 45 (Dec. 8,
2006)¹
- San Diego Unified School District, Grant Joint Union High School District
Twin Rivers Unified School District, Claimants

These test claims seek reimbursement for administration of the Standardized Testing and Reporting program, as required by the test claim statutes and regulations.

Senior Commission Counsel Eric Feller presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the proposed statement of decision to deny the test claim.

Parties were represented as follows: Art Palkowitz, representing the claimant; Jillian Kisse and Kathy Lynch, representing the Department of Finance.

Following discussion among the Commission members, staff, and parties, Member Ramirez made a motion to continue the item to a future meeting in order to allow the claimant time to gather additional evidence in support of claimed costs above amounts appropriated by the state for the program. The motion was seconded by Member Saylor. Following additional discussion among the Commission members, staff, and parties, the motion failed by a vote of 2-5, with Member Ramirez and Member Saylor voting yes. Member Chivaro made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation to deny the test claim. With a second by Member Olsen, the motion to adopt the staff recommendation to deny the test claim was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

- Item 4 *Medi-Cal Eligibility of Juvenile Offenders*, 08-TC-04
- Welfare and Institutions Code section 14029.5
- Statutes 2006, Chapter 657
- County of Alameda, Claimant

This test claim seeks reimbursement for counties to help juveniles whose Medi-Cal coverage is terminated as a result of incarceration in a juvenile detention facility for 30 days or more, to obtain Medi-Cal or other health coverage immediately upon release from custody.

Senior Commission Counsel Eric Feller presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the proposed statement of decision to partially approve the test claim.

¹ Test Claim 08-TC-06 refers to regulations effective February 2007, but there were no test claim regulations effective on that date.

Parties were represented as follows: Nicole Wordelman, representing the claimant; Eduardo Cavazos, representing the Department of Health Care Services; Lee Scott, Michael Byrne, and Kathy Lynch representing the Department of Finance.

Following discussion among the Commission members, staff, and parties, Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation. With a second by Member Chivaro, the motion to adopt the staff recommendation to partially approve the test claim was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

REQUEST FOR MANDATE REDETERMINATION

Item 5 *Sexually Violent Predators (CSM-4509)*, 12-MR-01

Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 6601 through 6605, and 6608
Statutes 1995, Chapter 762 (SB 1143); Statutes 1995, Chapter 763
(AB 888); Statutes 1996, Chapter 4 (AB 1496)

As Alleged to be Modified by: Proposition 83,
General Election, November 7, 2006

California Department of Finance, Requestor

In a previous hearing, the Commission found that the state's liability had been modified based on a subsequent change in law, and that a new test claim decision was required to reflect the state's modified liability under the test claim statute. In this hearing, the only issue before the Commission was the period of reimbursement applicable to the redetermination request and the adoption of the proposed new test claim decision; including the analysis of the new issue identified at the September 27, 2013 hearing raised by the County of Los Angeles which it was alleged might affect the period of reimbursement for this mandate redetermination.

Commission Counsel Matt Jones presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the staff analysis and proposed statement of decision, ending reimbursement for most of the test claim activities as of July 1, 2011 and direct staff to prepare a new expedited parameters and guidelines to reflect the state's modified liability under the new test claim decision.

Parties and interested parties were represented as follows: Hasmik Yaghobyan on behalf of County of Los Angeles; Craig Osaki, on behalf of the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office; Michael Byrne, representing Requestor, the Department of Finance.

Following discussion among the Commission members, staff, and parties, Member Saylor made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation. With a second by Member Chivaro, the motion to adopt the staff recommendation to adopt the new test claim decision and direct staff to prepare a new expedited parameters and guidelines to reflect the state's modified liability was adopted by a vote of 6-1 with Member Ramirez voting no.

Item 6 *Local Recreational Areas: Background Screenings (01-TC-11)*, 12-MR-02

Public Resources Code Section 5164

Statutes 2001, Chapter 777

As Alleged to be Modified by: Statutes 2010, Chapter 719 (SB 856)

California Department of Finance, Requestor

This redetermination request alleges that the state's liability under Public Resource Code section 5164 has been modified by a subsequent amendment to that section, to now provide local agencies with fee authority sufficient to cover the costs of the mandated activities.

Commission Counsel Matt Jones presented this item and recommended that the Commission find that the Department of Finance has made an adequate showing that the state's liability has been modified, and direct staff to schedule a second hearing on the request.

Parties and interested parties were represented as follows: Michael Byrne and Kathy Lynch, representing Requester, the Department of Finance.

Department of Finance indicated concurrence with the staff recommendation and there was no discussion. Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation. With a second by Member Chivaro, the motion to adopt the staff recommendation, finding that the Department of Finance has made an adequate showing that the State's liability has been modified and directing staff to schedule a second hearing on the request, was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES AND PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES AMENDMENTS

Item 7 *Interagency Child Abuse and Neglect Investigation Reports*, 00-TC-22

Penal Code sections 11165.9, 11166, 11166.2, 11166.9, 11168 (formerly 11161.7), 11169, 11170, and 11174.34 (formerly 1166.9)

Statutes 1977, Chapter 958; Statutes 1980, Chapter 1071; Statutes 1981, Chapter 435; Statutes 1982, Chapters 162 and 905; Statutes 1984, Chapters 1423 and 1613; Statutes 1985, Chapter 1598; Statutes 1986, Chapters 1289 and 1496; Statutes 1987, Chapters 82, 531, and 1459; Statutes 1988, Chapters 269, 1497, and 1580; Statutes 1989, Chapter 153; Statutes 1990, Chapters 650, 1330, 1363, and 1603; Statutes 1992, Chapters 163, 459, and 1338; Statutes 1993, Chapters 219 and 510; Statutes 1996, Chapters 1080 and 1081; Statutes 1997, Chapters 842, 843, and 844; Statutes 1999, Chapters 475 and 1012; and Statutes 2000, Chapter 916; and executive orders California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 903 (Register 98, Number 29), and "Child Abuse Investigation Report" Form SS 8583 (Rev. 3/91)

County of Los Angeles, Claimant

These parameters and guidelines address reimbursable activities under the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act found in the Penal Code commencing at section 11164.

Commission Counsel Matt Jones presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the proposed statement of decision and parameters and guidelines.

Parties were represented as follows: Ed Jewik, representing the claimant; Michael Byrne and Kathy Lynch, representing the Department of Finance.

Following discussion among the Commission members, staff, and parties, Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation. With a second by Member Ramirez, the motion to adopt the staff recommendation adopting the proposed statement of decision and parameters and guidelines was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

Item 8 *Peace Officers Procedural Bill of Rights II*, 03-TC-18

Government Code Sections 3304, 3306.5, 3309 and 3312

Statutes 1976, Chapter 465; Statutes 1998, Chapter 786; Statutes 2000, Chapter 209; and Statutes 2002, Chapter 170

City of Newport Beach, Claimant

These parameters and guidelines address amendments to activities associated with the Peace Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act relating to notices required to be provided to an officer, access to officer personnel files, and the notice requirements to search an officer's locker.

Assistant Executive Director Jason Hone presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the proposed statement of decision and parameters and guidelines.

Parties were represented as follows: Allan Burdick, representing the claimant; Michael Byrne and Kathy Lynch, representing the Department of Finance.

Following discussion among the Commission members, staff, and parties, Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation. With a second by Member Alex, the motion to adopt the staff recommendation adopting the proposed statement of decision and parameters and guidelines was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIMS

Item 10 *Health Fee Elimination*, 05-4206-I-04 and 05-4206-I-08

Education Code Section 76355

Statutes 1984, Chapter 1 (1983-1984 2nd Ex. Sess.);
Statutes 1987, Chapter 1118

Fiscal Years 1999-2000, 2000-2001, 2001-2002 and 2002-2003

San Mateo Community College District and San Bernardino Community College, Claimants

This consolidated incorrect reduction claim addresses costs reduced by the State Controller's Office on reimbursement claims filed under the Health Fee Elimination program.

Commission Counsel Matt Jones presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the statement of decision and request that the State Controller's Office reinstate costs claimed as specified and reexamine its findings and reductions as provided.

Parties were represented as follows: Keith Petersen, representing the claimants; Michael Byrne, representing the Department of Finance; Shawn Silva and Jim Spano, representing the State Controller's Office.

The witnesses for the State Controller's Office narrowed their testimony to three disputed issues: 1) the application of the health fee rule to San Bernardino's reimbursement claims; 2) hepatitis immunizations disallowed in San Bernardino's reimbursement claims; and 3) the disallowed salaries and benefits of two employees in San Mateo's reimbursement claims.

Following discussion among the Commission members, staff, and parties, Member Saylor made the first in a series of three motions corresponding to the three disputed issues as presented in the State Controller's Office testimony:

1. Member Saylor made a motion to modify the staff recommendation on the offsetting revenue reductions made in San Bernardino's claims, by striking the "arbitrary and capricious" language from the findings and adopting the recommendation to remand the issue back to the Controller. With a second from Member Alex, the motion was adopted by a vote of 7-0.
2. Member Saylor made a motion to approve the staff recommendation to reinstate costs for hepatitis immunizations. With a second from Member Alex, the motion was adopted 7-0.
3. Member Alex made a motion to reject staff's recommendation to reinstate the costs of salaries and benefits for two employees of San Mateo that were reduced by the

Controller, and instead find that the reductions made by the Controller were entitled to deference, and were supported by some evidence and, thus, were not arbitrary and capricious. With a second from Member Chivaro, the motion was adopted by a vote of 6-1 with Member Saylor voting no.

Member Olsen made a motion to adopt the staff recommendation on the remaining issues identified in the statement of decision. With a second from Member Chivaro, the motion was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

Following additional discussion among the Commission members, staff, and parties, Chair Ortega directed Commission staff to modify the statement of decision, consistent with the Commission's findings made in the three motions above, and schedule it for adoption at the January 24, 2014, where the sole issue for determination will be whether the modified statement of decision reflects the decision made by the Commission at the December 6, 2013 hearing.

HEARINGS ON COUNTY APPLICATIONS FOR FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL DISTRESS PURSUANT TO WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS CODE SECTION 17000.6 AND CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, ARTICLE 6.5 (info/action)

- Item 13 Assignment of County Application to Commission, a Hearing Panel of One or More Members of the Commission, or to a Hearing Officer
Note: This item will only be taken up if an application is filed.

No applications were filed.

STAFF REPORTS

- Item 14 Legislative Update (info)

Program Analyst Kerry Ortman presented this item.

- Item 15 Chief Legal Counsel: New Filings, Recent Decisions, Litigation Calendar (info)

Chief Legal Counsel Camille Shelton presented this item.

- Item 16 Executive Director: Workload and Tentative Agenda Items for Next Meeting (info/action)

Executive Director Heather Halsey presented this item.

CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 11126 AND 11126.2 (action).

PENDING LITIGATION

To confer with and receive advice from legal counsel, for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the following matters pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e)(1):

1. *State of California Department of Finance, State Water Resources Control Board, and California Regional Water Quality Board, San Diego Region v. Commission on State Mandates and County of San Diego, et al. (petition and cross-petition), Third District Court of Appeal, Case No. C070357 (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2010-80000604) [Discharge of Stormwater Runoff, Order No. R9-207-000, 07-TC-09*

California Regional Water Control Board, San Diego Region Order No. R9-2007-001, NPDES No. CAS0108758, Parts D.1.d.(7)-(8), D.1.g., D.3.a.(3), D.3.a.(5), D.5, E.2.f, E.2.g,F.1, F.2, F.3, I.1, I.2, I.5, J.3.a.(3)(c) iv-vii & x-xv, and L]

2. *California School Board Association (CSBA) v. State of California et al.*, Alameda County Superior Court Case No. RG11554698 [2010-2011 Budget Trailer Bills, Mandates Process for K-12 Schools, Redetermination Process]
3. *State of California Department of Finance, State Water Resources Control Board, and California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region v. Commission on State Mandates and County of Los Angeles, et al* (petition and cross-petition).
Second District Court of Appeal, Case No. B237153 (Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No. BS130730)
[*Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Discharges*, 03-TC-04, 03-TC-19, 03-TC-20, and 03-TC-21, Los Angeles Regional Quality Control Board Order No. 01-182, Permit CAS004001, Parts 4C2a., 4C2b, 4E & 4Fc3]

PERSONNEL

To confer on personnel matters pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1):

The Commission adjourned into closed executive session pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e) to confer with and receive advice from legal counsel for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the pending litigation published in the notice and agenda; to confer and receive advice from legal counsel regarding potential litigation, and to confer on personnel matters pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1).

REPORT FROM CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 11:58 a.m., Chairperson Ortega reconvened in open session, and reported that the Commission met in closed executive session pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e) to confer with and receive advice from legal counsel for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the pending litigation listed on the public notice and agenda, and potential litigation, and to confer on personnel matters pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1) and that no action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, Chairperson Ortega adjourned the meeting at 11:59 a.m.

Heather Halsey
Executive Director

PUBLIC MEETING

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES



TIME: 10:00 a.m.

DATE: Friday, December 6, 2013

PLACE: State Capitol, Room 447
Sacramento, California



REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS



Reported by:

Daniel P. Feldhaus

California Certified Shorthand Reporter #6949

Registered Diplomate Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter

Daniel P. Feldhaus, C.S.R., Inc.

Certified Shorthand Reporters

8414 Yermo Way, Sacramento, California 95828

Telephone 916.682.9482 Fax 916.688.0723

FeldhausDepo@aol.com

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

ERAINA ORTEGA
(Commission Chair)
Chief Deputy Director
Department of Finance

KEN ALEX
Director
Office of Planning & Research

RICHARD CHIVARO
Representative for JOHN CHIANG
State Controller

SARAH OLSEN
Public Member

M. CARMEN RAMIREZ
Oxnard City Council Member

ANDRÉ RIVERA
Representative for BILL LOCKYER
State Treasurer

DON SAYLOR
Yolo County Supervisor
Local Agency Member



COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT

HEATHER A. HALSEY
Executive Director
(Items 2 and 16)

JASON HONE
Assistant Executive Director
(Item 8)

CAMILLE N. SHELTON
Chief Legal Counsel
(Item 15)

A P P E A R A N C E S

PARTICIPATING COMMISSION STAFF

continued

ERIC D. FELLER
Senior Commission Counsel
(Item 3 and Item 4)

MATTHEW B. JONES
Commission Counsel
(Items 5, 6, 7 and 10)

KERRY ORTMAN
Program Analyst
(Item 14)



PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Appearing Re Item 3:

For Claimants San Diego Unified School District, Grant Joint Union High School District, and Twin Rivers Unified School District

ARTHUR PALKOWITZ
Stutz, Artiano, Shinoff & Holtz
2488 Historic Decatur Road, Suite 200
San Diego, California 92106

For Department of Finance

JILLIAN KISSEE
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

KATHY LYNCH
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

A P P E A R A N C E S

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Appearing Re Item 4:

For Claimant County of Alameda

NICOLE WORDELMAN
Legislative Advocate
Platinum Advisors
1215 K Street, Suite 1150
Sacramento, CA 95814

For Department of Health Care Services:

EDUARDO CAVAZOS
Office of Legal Services
Department of Health Care Services
1501 Capitol Ave (MS 0010)
Sacramento, CA 95811

For Department of Finance

MICHAEL BYRNE
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

KATHY LYNCH
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

LEE SCOTT
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

A P P E A R A N C E S

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Appearing Re Item 5:

For County of Los Angeles

HASMIK YAGHOBYAN
SB 90 Administration
County of Los Angeles Auditor Controller's Office
500 West Temple, Room 525
Los Angeles, California 90012

CRAIG OSAKI
Los Angeles Public Defender's Office
210 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

For Requestor Department of Finance

MICHAEL BYRNE
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Appearing Re Item 6

For Requestor Department of Finance

MICHAEL BYRNE
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

KATHY LYNCH
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

A P P E A R A N C E S

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Appearing Re Item 7:

For Claimant County of Los Angeles

ED JEWIK
Program Specialist V
Department of Auditor-Controller Accounting Division

For Department of Finance

MICHAEL BYRNE
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

KATHY LYNCH
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Appearing for Item 8:

For Claimant City of Newport Beach

ALLAN BURDICK
CSAC SB-90 Service
2001 P Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, California 95811

For Department of Finance:

MICHAEL BYRNE
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

A P P E A R A N C E S

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Appearing Re Item 10:

For Claimants San Mateo Community College District and
San Bernardino Community College District:

KEITH B. PETERSEN
SixTen and Associates
5252 Balboa Avenue, Suite 900
San Diego, California 92117

For Department of Finance:

MICHAEL BYRNE
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

For State Controller's Office:

SHAWN D. SILVA
Staff Counsel
State Controller's Office
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1850
Sacramento, California 95814

JIM L. SPANO
Chief, Mandated Cost Audits Bureau
Division of Audits
State Controller's Office
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 725
Sacramento, California 95814



I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Call to Order and Roll Call	13
II. Approval of Minutes	
Item 1 September 27, 2013	15
III. Public Comment for Matters Not on the Agenda	15
IV. Proposed Consent Calendar	
Items 9, 11, and 12	16
V. Hearings and Decisions on Test Claims and Parameters and Guidelines Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Chapter 2.5, Article 7	
A. Item 2 Appeal of Executive Director Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 1181(c) (<i>None</i>)	17
B. Test Claim	
Item 3 <i>Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) II and III</i> 05-TC-02, 05-TC-03, 08-TC-06 San Diego Unified School District, Grant Joint Unified School District, Twin Rivers Unified School District	17
Item 4 <i>Medi-Cal Eligibility of Juvenile Offenders</i> 08-TC-04 County of Alameda	35

I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
VI. Hearings and Decisions on Test Claims and Parameters and Guidelines Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Chapter 2.5, Article 7	
C. Mandate Redetermination	
Item 5 <i>Sexually Violent Predators (CSM 4509)</i> 12-MR-01 Department of Finance	43
Item 6 <i>Local Recreational Areas: Background Screenings</i> 01-TC-11, 12-MR-02 Department of Finance	64
D. Parameters and Guidelines and Parameters and Guidelines Amendments	
Item 7 <i>Interagency Child Abuse and Neglect Investigation Reports</i> 00-TC-22 County of Los Angeles	66
Item 8 <i>Peace Officers Procedural Bill of Rights II</i> 03-TC-18 City of Newport Beach	69
Item 9* <i>Immunization Records - Pertussis</i> 11-TC-02 Twin Rivers Unified School District (<i>Consent Item</i>)	16
E. Incorrect Reduction Claims	
Item 10 <i>Health Fee Elimination</i> 05-4206-I-04 and 05-4206-I-08 San Mateo Community College District and San Bernardino Community College	75

I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
VI. Informational Hearing Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Chapter 2.5, Article 8	
A. Statewide Cost Estimate	
Item 11* <i>Uniform Complaint Procedures (K-12)</i> 03-TC-02 Solana Beach School District <i>(Consent item)</i>	16
B. Adoption of Commission Order to Initiate Rulemaking Pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Division 2, Chapter 2.5	
Item 12* <i>General Cleanup Provisions (Consent item)</i>	16
VII. Hearings on County Applications for Findings of Significant Financial Distress Pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code Section 17000.6 and California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Article 6.5	
Item 13 <i>Assignment of County Application to Commission, a Hearing Panel of One or More Members of the Commissions, or to a Hearing Officer (None)</i>	109
VIII. Reports	
Item 14 <i>Legislative Update</i>	109
Item 15 <i>Chief Legal Counsel: Recent Decisions, Litigation Calendar</i>	110

I N D E X

<u>Proceedings</u>	<u>Page</u>
VIII. Reports <i>continued</i>	
Item 16 Executive Director: Workload and Tentative Agenda Items for Next Meeting	111
IX. Closed Executive Session Pursuant to Government Code Sections 11126 and 11126.2	112
A. Pending Litigation	
B. Personnel	
X. Report from Closed Executive Session . . .	113
Adjournment	113
Reporter's Certificate	114



Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Friday, December 6,
2 2013, commencing at the hour of 10:00 a.m., thereof, at
3 the State Capitol, Room 447, Sacramento, California,
4 before me, DANIEL P. FELDHAUS, CSR #6949, RDR and CRR,
5 the following proceedings were held:

6 --oOo--

7 CHAIR ORTEGA: Good morning, everyone. I
8 wanted to call the Commission on State Mandates to order.

9 If you could call the roll.

10 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

11 MEMBER ALEX: Here.

12 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

13 MEMBER CHIVARO: Here.

14 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

15 MEMBER OLSEN: Here.

16 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

17 CHAIR ORTEGA: Here.

18 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

19 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Here.

20 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

21 MEMBER RIVERA: Here.

22 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

23 MEMBER SAYLOR: Here.

24 MS. HALSEY: Thank you.

25 CHAIR ORTEGA: Before we begin with the

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 calendar today, I wanted to take a moment to acknowledge
2 the passing of Mr. Albert Beltrami.

3 As many of you know, he served as a public
4 member of the Commission from April 1996 through July of
5 2001. Mr. Beltrami had a long and distinguished career
6 in public service, including serving as a lieutenant
7 commander in the United States Navy, working as a city
8 manager in several California cities, and as the chief
9 administrative officer at Mendocino County for 25 years.
10 He was affectionately known there as "the sixth
11 supervisor," and was well-respected as an advisor to the
12 board of supervisors.

13 So we wanted to acknowledge and recognize his
14 great loss. And I think many of you probably served with
15 him.

16 So thank you.

17 And Ms. Ramirez also wanted to make some
18 comments.

19 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Thank you, Chair.

20 I appreciate the opportunity to just note what
21 the world is noting now, the passing of Nelson Mandela
22 of South Africa, who was a great leader in the history of
23 humanity, leading that country out of darkness into
24 democracy. And I really appreciate this opportunity to
25 acknowledge it.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 We're not living in a bubble here at the
2 Commission. We know what's going on in the world.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR ORTEGA: Thank you.

5 Okay, I guess we could get started with the
6 calendar today.

7 Are there any objections or corrections to the
8 September 27th minutes?

9 MEMBER CHIVARO: I'll move approval.

10 MEMBER ALEX: Second.

11 CHAIR ORTEGA: A motion and a second.

12 If there are no objections, the minutes will be
13 adopted.

14 Heather?

15 MS. HALSEY: We can do this by voice or roll
16 call.

17 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, all those in favor?

18 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*

19 CHAIR ORTEGA: Any opposed?

20 *(No response)*

21 CHAIR ORTEGA: Thank you.

22 MS. HALSEY: The motion carries.

23 And now we'll take up public comment for
24 matters not on the agenda. Please note the Commission
25 cannot take action on items not on the agendas. However,

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 it can schedule issues raised by the public for
2 consideration at future meetings.

3 CHAIR ORTEGA: Is there any general public
4 comment?

5 *(No response)*

6 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, hearing none, we'll move
7 forward.

8 MS. HALSEY: Next, we have a proposal to add
9 another item to the Consent Calendar. After the agenda
10 for this hearing was released, the parties agreed to
11 Item 9, POST parameters and guidelines, *Immunization*
12 *Records - Pertussis*, on consent.

13 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, any objections to adding
14 Item 9 to the Consent Calendar?

15 *(No response)*

16 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, do we have a motion on the
17 Consent Calendar?

18 MEMBER OLSEN: I'll move.

19 MEMBER SAYLOR: Second.

20 CHAIR ORTEGA: Consent Calendar has been moved
21 and seconded.

22 All in favor?

23 *(A chorus of "ayes" was heard.)*

24 CHAIR ORTEGA: Any objections or abstentions?

25 *(No response)*

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 CHAIR ORTEGA: Thank you. The Consent Calendar
2 has been passed.

3 MS. HALSEY: Let's move to the Article 7
4 portion of the hearing.

5 Will the parties and witnesses please rise for
6 Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10, please?

7 *(Parties and witnesses stood.)*

8 MS. HALSEY: Do you solemnly swear or affirm
9 that the testimony which you are about to give is true
10 and correct based on your personal knowledge,
11 information, or belief?

12 *(Chorus of "I dos" was heard.)*

13 MS. HALSEY: Thank you.

14 Item 2 is reserved for appeals of Executive
15 Director decisions. There are no appeals to consider
16 under Item 2 at this hearing.

17 Item 3, Senior Commission Counsel Eric Feller
18 will present Item 3, a test claim on *Standardized Testing*
19 *and Reporting, STAR II and III.*

20 MR. FELLER: Good morning.

21 These test claims seek reimbursement for
22 administration of the *Standardized Testing and Reporting,*
23 or *STAR* program, as required by the test-claim statutes
24 and regulations.

25 The Commission does not have jurisdiction over

1 several of the statutes and regulations because the
2 Commission has already issued a prior final decision on
3 the Education Code sections out in 1997 and several other
4 test-claim statutes and regulations were filed beyond the
5 statute of limitations.

6 Although staff found a handful of newly
7 required activities in the test-claim statutes and
8 regulations, we conclude that the State has appropriated
9 state and federal funds for the STAR program that are
10 intended to pay for the costs of the newly required
11 activities in an amount sufficient to pay for them.

12 Staff recommends the Commission adopt the
13 proposed statement of decision to deny the test claim.

14 Would the parties and witnesses please state
15 your names for the record?

16 MR. PALKOWITZ: Art Palkowitz on behalf of the
17 claimant.

18 MS. KISSEE: Jillian Kisse, Department of
19 Finance.

20 MS. LYNCH: Kathy Lynch, Department of Finance.

21 CHAIR ORTEGA: Mr. Palkowitz?

22 MR. PALKOWITZ: Yes, good morning. Thank you.

23 I would like to thank staff for their extensive
24 analysis on this test claim, which included 79 pages and
25 hundreds of footnotes.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 What I would like to do is address an issue.
2 As was mentioned, there are activities that have been
3 determined to be new activities. And what staff has done
4 an extensive analysis is that there has been funding over
5 the years and based on that funding, there are no net
6 costs, and, therefore, their activities are not
7 reimbursable.

8 On page 24 of the analysis, it correctly states
9 that San Diego Unified School District, the claimant, did
10 estimate back in 2004, when this was filed, that they
11 estimated they would incur \$500,000 of annual costs for
12 the Year '04-05, and then 550,000 to implement it in
13 '05-06 and beyond.

14 What staff has preliminarily determined is that
15 based on the funding that's been provided over the years,
16 there are no net costs. And they've cited as authority
17 Government Code section 17556(e), which is on page 72.
18 Page 72 quotes that statute. And in reviewing that
19 statute, it states that "There shall not be any mandated
20 costs found if it results in no costs."

21 I would have issue with that analysis.

22 What the analysis is doing is saying the State
23 is providing X dollars, and based on that X dollars,
24 there should not be any net costs because those fundings
25 should be applied to this program.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 However, this analysis is not providing the
2 opportunity for a school district to determine if they do
3 have costs over and above the funding.

4 To deny the claim after it is determined there
5 are new activities on the basis that the funding should
6 be enough to cover the costs really, I believe, is not
7 fundamentally what the Government Code relates to when it
8 refers to mandates.

9 The task of the Commission is to determine if
10 there are new activities.

11 If the State provides -- or federal as it's
12 indicated in this situation is providing funding to the
13 local agencies, it should be, and it is allocated on a
14 form that will allow each agency to file a form, and then
15 deduct the costs they receive.

16 What is being done now is taking this analysis
17 away from the districts, and using the funding as a
18 mechanism to say, "Since there is this amount of funding,
19 there can't be any net costs."

20 Fundamentally, statutory and case law, I don't
21 believe, supports that type of analysis.

22 The form allows for each school district to
23 file a claim annually; and if they do receive the
24 funding, those funding costs are listed on the form, and
25 are deducted, and could actually result in a net cost.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 But without that attempt for each school
2 district to go through that process, we are now
3 determining that these activities are not reimbursable.

4 So based on that analysis, we feel that the
5 Commission should determine that this is a reimbursable
6 mandate; allow each district to file the form annually;
7 and based on the funding they receive, it would then be
8 determined if there are any net costs that could be
9 claimed.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIR ORTEGA: Finance?

12 MS. LYNCH: Thank you.

13 Very quickly, Finance does agree with the
14 staff's conclusion that there are no reimbursable state
15 mandates here because of funding.

16 We also believe that there are some federal
17 issues and I just want to get that clear for the record.

18 But back to the funding issue, if you look at
19 17556(e), it is very clear, and to the extent that
20 it says the statute, so on and so on -- let's see: If
21 there's basically an appropriation in a budget bill or
22 other bill that provides for an offsetting savings to
23 local agencies or school districts, there are no costs
24 mandated by state. And that's the situation we have
25 here.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 So to wait until the very end and adjust things
2 at the end, is completely contrary to this, the plain
3 language of this statute right here.

4 In addition, there is no evidence before this
5 Commission right now that the funding is insufficient.
6 And the Commission staff did a nice job of outlining the
7 funding for every particular year here. And absent
8 anything to the contrary, we believe the Commission
9 should adopt the decision of the staff.

10 CHAIR ORTEGA: Camille?

11 MS. SHELTON: I'm sorry.

12 Just a couple of things. The plain -- this is
13 a question of law of that. Ultimately, a question of
14 law. And the plain language of the appropriation
15 required that any money appropriated by state or federal
16 funds be first used to pay for any potential mandated
17 activities in the STAR program. That's how the draft
18 staff analysis was issued in September; and we issued it
19 for comment.

20 The claimant did ask for an extension of time
21 to look at that and maybe to provide evidence that they
22 had any increased costs; and no comments were filed back.

23 If a school district, in the future, determines
24 that they do have increased costs beyond the funding
25 appropriated and they applied the funding in accordance

1 with those statutes, they can still file a test claim at
2 that point, under Government Code section 17551.

3 But right now, there's no evidence of any
4 increased costs mandated by the State.

5 MR. PALKOWITZ: If I may respond?

6 This claim, I believe, was filed in 2004.

7 We're at the end of 2013.

8 What the suggestion is, is that if there is a
9 change in appropriation or change in the costs incurred
10 by a local agency, we would be required to file a new
11 claim form, go through the time and expense, and wait,
12 potentially, seven years for another result. That
13 doesn't seem economically to anyone's best interests,
14 whether it be a local agency or at the state level.

15 I think if we review past claims that have been
16 filed over the years, you will find claims that have
17 reimbursement amounts, and those costs are deducted from
18 the claim form. So this is not any new precedent we're
19 setting here.

20 MS. SHELTON: The difference here is the plain
21 language and the appropriation that requires that the
22 money first be used to pay for mandated activity. That's
23 the difference.

24 If that language was not there, then
25 Mr. Palkowitz would be correct because we would have no

1 way of knowing where the money was applied.

2 Here, it has to be applied first to the
3 mandated activities. So the burden shifts, and it has
4 always been, with the claimant to prove they have
5 increased costs beyond that.

6 MS. HALSEY: And I just wanted to add, there's
7 just no evidence that there are any increased costs to
8 date, and that is the problem.

9 MR. PALKOWITZ: Well, I thought that on
10 page 24, when the claimants submitted that they had
11 costs, why would that not be evidence that they have
12 incurred increased costs for these activities?

13 MS. SHELTON: In that declaration there was no
14 discussion of any appropriation made by the State for
15 this program. So there was not any discussion of
16 receiving money from the state or federal government.

17 MR. PALKOWITZ: When the claimant is filing the
18 form at the enactment of the statute, I'm not sure if
19 they're really able to determine the amount of the costs
20 or the amount of the appropriation that will be given to
21 them at that time, and how much of that would actually go
22 to that cost.

23 So, to me, to hold the District -- the District
24 complied with the filing, stated that they made an
25 estimate, and determined they were going to have

1 increased costs. For them to say, "Well, hold on. We
2 didn't know at that time if we were going to apply all of
3 the appropriations or we would have more costs than
4 appropriated," and now to say they should be barred, or
5 these activities should be barred, because at the time
6 they filed, or even after, because the appropriation may
7 be enough for all the costs, I don't think that's what
8 the claim statutes and the case law are consistent with.

9 MS. SHELTON: Just to conclude, that we gave
10 the claimant community an opportunity to file evidence in
11 the record to support their burden of proof that they
12 have is to show increased costs mandated by the State,
13 and nothing was filed.

14 CHAIR ORTEGA: I think that remains a question
15 as there's nothing on the record about what those costs
16 are above the appropriated costs. And until that time,
17 with respect to the time-line, you know, we can
18 acknowledge that it would take some time for that to
19 happen. But absent something happening on the record,
20 I'm not sure how we could act any differently.

21 MR. PALKOWITZ: So what is the authority that
22 requires that the claimant file costs over and above the
23 appropriation?

24 MS. SHELTON: The Budget Act. The plain
25 language of the Budget Act that was cited requires that

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 it first be used -- the money first be used to pay for
2 the mandated programs.

3 MR. PALKOWITZ: Okay.

4 MS. SHELTON: Under the statutory scheme for
5 mandates, the claimant has the burden of proof on all
6 issues and elements of mandates law. Increased costs
7 mandated by the State is a question of fact, and that
8 question of fact has to be proved by the claimant.

9 So an opportunity was provided for evidence to
10 come in, and an extension was granted to allow that to
11 occur; and nothing has been filed.

12 MR. PALKOWITZ: Okay.

13 CHAIR ORTEGA: Is there any discussion from the
14 Members?

15 Mr. Saylor?

16 MEMBER SAYLOR: I have a question for Camille.

17 So is there any limitation in time for when a
18 claimant on this matter could bring forward evidence to
19 prove that their costs are higher than the mandated
20 budget amount?

21 MS. SHELTON: You mean, if you took action
22 today and --

23 MEMBER SAYLOR: Let's assume that the
24 Commission finds in agreement with the staff's
25 recommendation to us. At some point, is there any

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 limited time period that a school district can come
2 forward with evidence that you're describing, that shows
3 that the budgeted funds were insufficient to cover the
4 mandate cost?

5 MS. SHELTON: The Government Code in
6 section 17551(c) says that they can file a test claim
7 within one year of first incurring costs.

8 And under the Commission's regulations, it
9 actually gives them an extra fiscal year. So if they
10 incur increased costs next year, in '14-15, they would
11 have until '15-16 to file a test claim.

12 MEMBER SAYLOR: So these districts say that
13 they have costs beginning in 2004 or 2005?

14 MS. SHELTON: Then with this decision, they
15 needed to file evidence to support that.

16 MEMBER SAYLOR: Okay, so if we find in favor of
17 the staff recommendation, then those districts that have
18 incurred costs -- the three districts that are here as
19 claimants -- they would no longer have standing to ask
20 for additional funds above the budgeted amount?

21 MS. SHELTON: Right, that's correct. And
22 that's why on our mail list, we have any school district
23 in the state that has requested to be included on the
24 mail list, have received notice of this claim, and have
25 had the opportunity to file comments under the system.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MEMBER SAYLOR: Did you know that?

2 MR. PALKOWITZ: Did I know what?

3 MEMBER SAYLOR: Did you know that this was --
4 yeah, and when did you know it?

5 MR. PALKOWITZ: Did I know...?

6 MEMBER SAYLOR: Did you know that there was a
7 requirement that you bring evidence during this extended
8 time, from September to October, of additional costs?

9 MR. PALKOWITZ: Well, when the analysis came
10 out, I requested additional time to review it and analyze
11 it.

12 I think there is always a burden to try to
13 prove more evidence than was submitted eight years ago on
14 what happened. So I was aware of that.

15 But regarding your comment, I don't think I
16 believe the decision by the Commission would go to all
17 school districts, not only the claimants. All school
18 districts would be barred from making a claim for this
19 period of time.

20 So if a school district down the road or had
21 any costs over and above the appropriation, or the
22 appropriation stopped, then a district could file a new
23 claim at that point and go through this process again and
24 come back to you and ask you at that time for
25 reimbursement.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MS. HALSEY: I just wanted to point out one
2 more factual thing that we do have in the record.

3 The appropriations made over the years since
4 this mandate was enacted have been over \$60 million a
5 year. And they're showing 5,000 in costs.

6 I don't see how the \$60 million doesn't cover
7 it. And there's been no evidence introduced to show that
8 it wouldn't.

9 And so I can see the concern that maybe someday
10 that funding wouldn't be available any longer. And if
11 that were the case, then a new test claim could be filed
12 and could be reimbursed.

13 CHAIR ORTEGA: Any other questions or comments?

14 Ms. Ramirez?

15 MEMBER RAMIREZ: As to this request,
16 procedurally, would it be possible to allow more time for
17 the evidence here? Or are we out of time?

18 MS. SHELTON: The Commission, on their own
19 motion, may continue any matter. It's up to the
20 Commission. You would have to vote on that and have a
21 majority.

22 MEMBER RAMIREZ: And if we did have to vote on
23 that, to extend the time to let the claimant file
24 additional evidence, we could do that?

25 MS. SHELTON: It's up to the Commission. It's

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 within your discretion.

2 MEMBER RAMIREZ: I see.

3 Well, I would make a motion that we allow some
4 very limited period of time, perhaps to the next meeting,
5 to see what the claimant can provide.

6 MEMBER SAYLOR: Second.

7 MS. SHELTON: Can I just clarify?

8 It would have to be not -- is your motion to
9 give them all the way until the January hearing to
10 provide evidence, or time enough for us to prepare a
11 staff analysis?

12 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Absolutely.

13 MS. SHELTON: Because our staff analysis has to
14 be filed right after Christmas.

15 MS. HALSEY: Actually, our staff analyses for
16 January have already gone out.

17 MS. SHELTON: Well, we wouldn't even do a
18 draft. It would just be a final.

19 MEMBER SAYLOR: Or the next meeting.

20 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes, I would move that.

21 MR. PALKOWITZ: If the Commission is thinking
22 of your suggestion, I appreciate that.

23 With the holidays, I honestly couldn't provide
24 you a good-faith statement that we'd be able to get any
25 information by the end of this month, even.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MEMBER RAMIREZ: I think December is always
2 difficult.

3 What would be reasonable for the staff and for
4 the claimant?

5 MEMBER ALEX: You mentioned that you had
6 requested an extension and received it previously --

7 MR. PALKOWITZ: Yes.

8 MEMBER ALEX: -- but did not submit anything.

9 MR. PALKOWITZ: Correct.

10 MEMBER ALEX: Is there anything that has
11 changed? Is there any reason to think that there would
12 be additional evidence at this point that wasn't
13 provided, given the extension previously?

14 MR. PALKOWITZ: I did contact several districts
15 and tried to get information on what their claims were,
16 and I wasn't successful in doing that.

17 Would I be more successful with more -- a
18 longer period of time? I would try my best. I cannot
19 give any guarantee that despite my best efforts, I'll be
20 here in the next month or two and tell you I found
21 something. But I would like to attempt to exhaust it
22 some more.

23 MEMBER OLSEN: I'd just like to take a reality
24 check here for a moment.

25 Mr. Palkowitz, is there any chance that any

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 information you would gather would show costs in excess
2 of \$6 million a year?

3 MS. KISSEE: Sixty.

4 MS. LYNCH: Sixty.

5 MEMBER OLSEN: I'm sorry, \$60 million a year?

6 MR. PALKOWITZ: Yes, there's a chance.

7 This is a large program statewide. I mean,
8 this goes and impacts many grades in K through 12.

9 You know, I think what's going on with this
10 program, and what I experienced -- I mean, this dramatic
11 change is coming forward with Common Core and other
12 programs. And so I'm having trouble getting ahold of
13 districts and finding out their history of costs over the
14 last decade.

15 MS. SHELTON: I also have to say that you would
16 have to show that any excess costs have not paid for only
17 the activities that are new, and that are identified on
18 page 71. It's not providing the STAR testing to every
19 student. That is not a new program, higher level of
20 service. It's only those activities on page 71.

21 MR. PALKOWITZ: Well, but I don't -- the
22 \$60 million is not going to just those programs, either.

23 MS. SHELTON: Oh, the \$60 million has to first
24 be paid for all mandated activities.

25 MR. PALKOWITZ: But the \$60 million also pays

1 for the other activities, too.

2 MS. SHELTON: But you have to pay first the
3 mandated activities.

4 CHAIR ORTEGA: We have a motion and a second on
5 the floor to continue the matter until the March hearing.

6 I'm going to say, I'm not in support of
7 continuing the matter at this point. I think, you know,
8 we would be denying the time period that we've discussed
9 today; but if there are future costs identified, if the
10 appropriation is not enough, there is an ability to file
11 a future test claim. So we're not precluding ever
12 getting reimbursement for any duties in the future.

13 So please call the roll on the motion.

14 MS. HALSEY: Is there a motion?

15 MEMBER ALEX: You need a second.

16 CHAIR ORTEGA: No, there was a second here.

17 MS. HALSEY: This is to continue?

18 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

19 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Mr. Saylor seconded. I don't
20 know if he wants to withdraw his second.

21 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

22 MEMBER ALEX: No.

23 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

24 MEMBER CHIVARO: No.

25 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MEMBER OLSEN: No.

2 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

3 CHAIR ORTEGA: No.

4 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

5 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

6 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

7 MEMBER RIVERA: No.

8 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

9 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

10 MS. HALSEY: The motion fails.

11 CHAIR ORTEGA: Do we have a motion on the staff
12 recommendation or anything else?

13 MEMBER CHIVARO: I'll move staff
14 recommendation.

15 MEMBER OLSEN: I'll second.

16 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, a motion and a second on
17 the staff recommendation.

18 Please call the roll.

19 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

20 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

21 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

22 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

23 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

24 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

25 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

2 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

3 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

4 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

5 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

6 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

7 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

8 MS. HALSEY: The motion carries.

9 CHAIR ORTEGA: Thank you.

10 MS. HALSEY: Moving on to Item 4, Senior
11 Commission Counsel Eric Feller will present Item 4, a
12 test claim on *Medi-Cal Eligibility of Juvenile Offenders*.

13 MR. FELLER: This test claim seeks
14 reimbursement for counties to help juveniles whose
15 Medi-Cal coverage is terminated as a result of
16 incarceration in a juvenile detention facility
17 for 30 days or more, to obtain Medi-Cal or other health
18 coverage immediately upon release from custody.

19 Test-claim statute requires county juvenile
20 detention facilities to provide specified information
21 regarding Medi-Cal eligibility to county welfare
22 departments and if the ward is a minor, provide notice to
23 the ward's parent or guardian beginning January 1, 2008.

24 The county welfare department is then required
25 to perform specified mandated activities related to

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 initiating an application for Medi-Cal or other benefits
2 for the ward. These are all newly required activities
3 that impose costs mandated by the State.

4 Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the
5 proposed statement of decision to partially approve the
6 test claim.

7 Would the parties and witnesses please state
8 your name for the record?

9 MS. WORDELMAN: Nicole Wordelman on behalf of
10 the claimant.

11 MR. CAVAZOS: Eduardo Cavazos on behalf of the
12 Department of Health Care Services.

13 MR. SCOTT: Lee Scott, Department of Finance.

14 MR. BYRNE: Michael Byrne, Department of
15 Finance.

16 MS. LYNCH: Kathy Lynch, Department of Finance.

17 CHAIR ORTEGA: Ms. Wordelman?

18 MS. WORDELMAN: The claimants simply wanted to
19 express appreciation for all of the time and effort going
20 into the test claim, and they concur with the staff
21 recommendation.

22 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, the Department of Finance,
23 or Mr. --

24 MR. SCOTT: The Department of Finance concurs
25 with staff. We believe that costs may exist for the

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 detention facilities. However, we are unsure if costs
2 exist for the county welfare department.

3 We've asked the Department of Health Care
4 Services to be here today to elaborate.

5 CHAIR ORTEGA: Mr. Cavazos?

6 MR. CAVAZOS: Yes. The Department of Finance
7 requested that the Department of Health Care Services
8 explain how the state and federal government reimburses
9 the county welfare department for their eligibility
10 workers.

11 Under state law and under federal law, the
12 state and federal government provide for eligibility
13 workers, the counties. These eligibility workers help
14 with the application intake, which means they help the
15 potential Medi-Cal beneficiaries fill out their
16 application and receive additional information.

17 The State pays for these costs. I have it in
18 John Zapata's declaration gave the statutory authority
19 for the eligibility workers, but we also have statutory
20 authority that explains the reimbursement for the county
21 and it's in -- pardon me, one moment -- state law,
22 Welfare and Institutions Code 14150 to 14153, and onward
23 to 14158. We provide for state and federal reimbursement
24 for the county's costs for their eligibility workers.
25 And these eligibility workers are employed by the --

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 well, not employed, but they are associated with the
2 county welfare department. That's one side of their
3 administrative costs that the State pays for.

4 The other side of the administrative costs that
5 is broader that the State pays for is County Medi-Cal
6 Administrative Activities program, which is a program
7 that is half reimbursed by the federal government and the
8 other half is actually paid for by the counties.

9 In the department's original comment, dated
10 June 11, 2009, on page 34, I just wanted to provide an
11 update to that. Because in there, we state that the
12 State -- and in turn, counties -- received a federal
13 disallowance for the county probation officers providing
14 the administrative activities that we're discussing right
15 now. Basically, that means that the federal government
16 says that these administrative activities provided by the
17 county probation officers were unallowable by --
18 unallowable for receiving federal reimbursement.

19 However, in November, we received an update
20 from the federal government, saying that prerelease
21 administrative activities for inmates performed under
22 CMAA program is now allowable. Since it's November, we
23 haven't had time to implement it entirely. We have sent
24 out a policy and procedure letter informing the counties
25 that this additional federal reimbursement is allowable.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 The implications of that, if anything, if the
2 county does incur costs, they have the opportunity to
3 choose to enter into the CMAA -- this optional CMAA
4 program and reduce their costs by half. So if the costs
5 that they occurred are 15,000, 17,000, they may have the
6 opportunity. We don't know yet because we haven't filled
7 out the county claiming plan for the county if it chooses
8 to participate in CMAA but it could be reduced by half --
9 approximately half. They could get federal reimbursement
10 to reduce those costs if they, in fact, have incurred
11 those costs, or will can occur those costs.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes, please.

14 MR. BYRNE: Michael Byrne, Department of
15 Finance.

16 We agree with staff that the costs are there.
17 But the Department of Health Care Services and all of
18 their correspondence since 2009 have come out and said,
19 no, this is paid through with Medi-Cal monies.

20 Mr. Scott and I, about six weeks ago, went down
21 to Oakland and met with the Probation Department and
22 said: Commission on State Mandates is ruling that there
23 is a reimbursable cost here; and the Department of Health
24 Care Services is saying, no, they fund it through
25 Medi-Cal monies. Which -- who's right? Do we have any

1 proof for anything?

2 And the people we met with said, "No, we didn't
3 do this stuff. Welfare people came over and did this
4 all."

5 So we kind of left that meeting, and contacted
6 the Department of Health Care Services, and say, "You're
7 going to have to help us through this because we can't
8 tell who is paying for what."

9 So we're to a point now that, you know, we
10 concur with staff that costs are there; and we're just
11 down to, what monies are being used to fund those costs.
12 And maybe the proper place to deal with those issues is,
13 if the Commission approves the staff recommendation, is
14 the P and G process and the State Controller's SCE
15 process.

16 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, Camille?

17 MS. SHELTON: A couple of thoughts. The new
18 information that was provided by Health Care Services,
19 I think might -- it sounds like potential offsetting
20 revenue coming from the federal government.

21 We would have to take a look at those all-
22 county letters and make that determination.

23 But in order to deny a claim, you have to show
24 that an appropriation was specifically made for the
25 mandated activities here. And we still don't see that in

1 any of the -- in the laws that you've identified. We did
2 take a look that. It pays for a lot of things. And this
3 is just -- there is no requirement unlike the prior claim
4 that they first be paid for the mandated activities. So
5 we can't trace the money without an audit.

6 So in the past, we have approved those test
7 claims, have the Controller's office, you know, audit
8 those reimbursement claims. You know, the reimbursement
9 claims are filed under penalty of perjury, and they're
10 going to have to show things.

11 But for sure, when we do address the parameters
12 and guidelines, we will update the potential offsetting
13 revenues there. And if we do see that the money could be
14 used for these activities, those would be identified.

15 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, Ms. Ramirez?

16 MEMBER RAMIREZ: I have a question for
17 Mr. Cavazos.

18 MR. CAVAZOS: Yes.

19 MEMBER RAMIREZ: You indicated that the federal
20 government had changed the rule; correct?

21 MR. CAVAZOS: Yes.

22 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Was there a rationale given?

23 MR. CAVAZOS: It was a matter of interpreting
24 federal law.

25 In the past, there was -- they interpreted a

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 federal law, inmates had said that no Medi-Cal
2 reimbursement was allowed for inmates while they're in
3 custody, inside the incarceration facility. And although
4 under this program the federal has been giving us leeway
5 for the medical costs, we've managed to have the federal
6 government reexamine the administrative costs side of it;
7 and we are in the process of making sure that their
8 interpretation of federal law would allow the state and
9 counties to receive as much federal reimbursement
10 possible.

11 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Can you say, is there a
12 distinction between juvenile inmates versus adult inmates
13 in terms of this?

14 MR. CAVAZOS: Well, we have a case law that
15 makes a distinction of juvenile inmates. But from the
16 federal perspective, for the federal reimbursement
17 perspective, there really isn't a difference.

18 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Thank you.

19 MR. FELLER: Can I just add one thing?

20 As the standard -- the statutory standard in
21 17556, is that the money that's appropriated be
22 specifically intended to fund the mandated activities.
23 And we couldn't find any money specifically intended to
24 fund these mandated activities, as Camille pointed out.
25 The activities Mr. Cavazos pointed out are pre-release

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 administrative activities, but not specifically intended
2 to fund the mandated activities. And that's why the
3 recommendation is as it is.

4 MEMBER OLSEN: I'll move the staff
5 recommendation.

6 MEMBER CHIVARO: Second.

7 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, there's a motion and a
8 second.

9 CHAIR ORTEGA: Please call the roll.

10 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

11 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

12 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

13 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

14 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

15 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

16 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

17 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

18 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

19 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

20 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

21 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

22 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

23 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

24 MS. HALSEY: The motion carries.

25 Item 5, Commission Counsel Matt Jones will

1 present a mandate redetermination on *Sexually Violent*
2 *Predators*.

3 MR. JONES: Good morning. The Commission
4 conducted the second hearing of the two-step hearing
5 process on this redetermination request on
6 September 27th, 2013, finding that the State's liability
7 had been modified based on a subsequent change in law,
8 and that a new test-claim decision was required to
9 reflect the State's modified liability under the
10 test-claim statute.

11 However, at that same hearing, an issue was
12 raised by the County of Los Angeles which it was alleged
13 might affect the period of reimbursement for this mandate
14 redetermination. Therefore, the Commission approved the
15 redetermination request but reserved its determination on
16 the period of reimbursement pending staff's evaluation
17 and recommendation on the new substantive issue.

18 In this hearing, the only issue before the
19 Commission is the period of reimbursement applicable to
20 the redetermination request and the adoption of the
21 proposed new test-claim decision, including the analysis
22 of the new issue identified at the last hearing.

23 Staff finds in the new analysis that the
24 stipulation alleged by the County of Los Angeles has no
25 effect on the period of reimbursement applicable to this

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 redetermination request.

2 Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the
3 staff analysis and proposed statement of decision, ending
4 reimbursement for most of the test-claim activities as of
5 July 1, 2011, as specified.

6 Staff further recommends that the Commission
7 direct staff to prepare a new expedited parameters and
8 guidelines to reflect the State's modified liability
9 under the new test-claim decision.

10 Will the parties and witnesses please state
11 your names for the record?

12 MS. YAGHOBYAN: Hasmik Yaghobyan on behalf of
13 L.A. County.

14 MR. OSAKI: Craig Osaki, on behalf of the L.A.
15 County Public Defender's office.

16 MR. BYRNE: Michael Byrne, Department of
17 Finance.

18 CHAIR ORTEGA: Thank you.

19 And I just want to remind everyone that we had
20 a lengthy hearing on this last time. So, let's
21 definitely keep any comments to the specific issue about
22 the time-line here.

23 Ms. Yaghobyan?

24 MS. YAGHOBYAN: Thank you.

25 I will make it very short. But the one thing

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 I have to mention, because it is very interesting because
2 I see that the Commission staff are actually
3 contradicting their previous recommendation that this
4 Commission adopted. Because for ten months, we were
5 fighting and saying that Prop. 83 was not changing law;
6 that Prop. 83 was a mirror image of SB 1128.

7 But now, the Commission with their staff
8 analysis on page 2, actually they're admitting, that
9 they're saying that incidentally, the activities that
10 were claimed incidentally -- Prop. 83 incidentally is
11 saying the same as SB 1128, which was enacted a few
12 months before Prop. 83 was enacted.

13 Having that in mind, the second disagreement,
14 the reason we are disagreeing with the Commission's staff
15 is because the Commission is saying even -- let's say
16 there was a new law, the stipulation that we discussed
17 last time, the Commission is not bound by the
18 stipulation.

19 But the fact is, the Commission don't have to
20 be bound by the stipulation. This is the law of the
21 state. The Supreme Court bound the State, the County on
22 this stipulation. So it is a law of the state. The
23 Commission doesn't have to be bound.

24 The only fact that the Commission has to
25 decide, at least for those pre-Prop. 83 defendants, if

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 there was a new law to begin with, there is no new law.
2 And the County is still obligated to provide the services
3 until these people are out of the jurisdiction.

4 And Mr. Osaki is going to give more
5 information.

6 MR. OSAKI: Good morning, Members of the
7 Commission and staff.

8 I'm here to speak to you today about the
9 stipulation in L.A. County, the case of *People versus*
10 *Castillo* and the impact on the Commission's decision.

11 First of all, I'll address the pertinent parts
12 of the stipulation for the Commission.

13 Now, this stipulation was entered into between
14 the L.A. District Attorney's office, the L.A. County
15 Public Defender's office, and the L.A. Superior Courts.

16 This agreement basically indicated that for
17 cases filed prior to September 20th, 2006, cases would
18 proceed under the old law. And just to clarify, under
19 this old law, this Commission determined that costs would
20 be reimbursable.

21 This agreement also indicated that these cases
22 would have to be tried in a two-year period, and after an
23 individual gets committed under a two-year provision, the
24 D.A. would be authorized to file a recommitment petition,
25 which is also authorized under the old law. This is

1 significant since there are no recommitment provisions in
2 the initiative.

3 Now, a few things about the stipulation and the
4 number of cases impacted.

5 First, there was a subsequent stipulation which
6 lifted the requirement that the case -- these cases had
7 to be completed in two years. However, it should be made
8 clear that the cases under this agreement, it's a finite
9 number.

10 This agreement only impacts those few remaining
11 cases that have not had their initial trials and their
12 recommitment trials.

13 Next, I'll address the California Supreme Court
14 decision in *Castillo*, because I believe the staff
15 analysis was incorrect in its interpretation of that
16 decision.

17 On page 2 of the final revised staff analysis,
18 they write, "While the County may be bound by the terms
19 of the stipulation," in essence, they write that the
20 decision does not bind the Commission, presumably because
21 the Commission was not part of that stipulation.

22 I believe this analysis to be incorrect. And
23 let me explain.

24 Now, Mr. Castillo was one of the individuals
25 that went to trial under the agreement. He is the one

1 involved in the case of *People versus Castillo* that went
2 to the California Supreme Court. And after trial was
3 completed, the Court imposed the two-year commitment on
4 Mr. Castillo pursuant to the agreement, even though the
5 law, for the rest of the state at that time was the
6 initiative.

7 Mr. Castillo filed an appeal challenging that
8 two-year commitment.

9 The California State Attorney General's office
10 challenged the two-year term.

11 Now, that is important to note there was
12 opposition from L.A. County, from both the District
13 Attorney's office and the Public Defender's office.

14 Now, it's important to note that the Attorney
15 General was not a party to the stipulation. And yet the
16 California Supreme Court upheld the two-year term. And
17 the agreement, and bound the State to this agreement.

18 For example, another -- just to show you that
19 this agreement is not just bound to the County, for
20 example, the Department of Mental Health, now the
21 Department of State Hospital, that is another state
22 agency. Now, they were not a party to the agreement or
23 the stipulation, and yet they would be bound to follow
24 this two-year agreement as well because it is the law of
25 the state. It is the California Supreme Court decision.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 So what happened here? The California Supreme
2 Court, in essence, created two tracks: Those cases,
3 under the new law, under the initiative, and those cases
4 under the agreement in L.A. County.

5 So now that we know the *Castillo* decision did
6 not bind just the County to its decision, well, what
7 impact does this *Castillo* decision have on this
8 Commission? I submit to this Commission, that the
9 California Supreme Court, in essence, created two types
10 of cases for this Commission to consider: Cases under
11 which the initiative applies, and those cases that are
12 governed under the old law pursuant to the L.A. County
13 agreement.

14 Now, the cases under the initiative I won't
15 belabor. We have had our hearings, we've pointed out
16 our objections; but ultimately, my understanding is that
17 17556(f), this Commission has basically found that
18 certain activities are not to be reimbursable because
19 there was an initiative passed.

20 However, for those few remaining cases under
21 this agreement, the applicable law would be the old law,
22 which this same Commission found costs to be
23 reimbursable.

24 I ask this Commission to follow the Supreme
25 Court's lead and create two tracks of cases: Those cases

1 under the initiative and those cases remaining under the
2 L.A. County agreement.

3 Since those L.A. County cases are not governed
4 under the initiative, 17556(f) does not apply. Instead,
5 what should govern is this Commission's prior finding
6 that costs are reimbursable.

7 If the Commission does not create these two
8 tracks of cases, I believe it would not be following the
9 Supreme Court decision. It would create an absurd
10 result, whereby cases utilizing the old law that this
11 Commission found to be reimbursable, would ultimately not
12 be reimbursable.

13 I would request the Commission the following:
14 Find that activities 1 through 8 be fully reimbursable
15 for those few cases under the stipulation; and also find
16 that the recommitment petitions authorized pursuant to
17 the stipulation be reimbursed for activities 1 through 5,
18 and activities 7 and 8.

19 Now, I specifically -- I'm deleting references
20 to subsequent hearings under 6605 and 6608 of the Welfare
21 and Institutions Code, since they are expressly included
22 in the initiative and are not referenced in the
23 stipulation.

24 But I believe the rest of the activities are
25 covered in the stipulation and, thus, are reimbursable.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 Thank you for your time and attention.

2 And I would be happy to address any questions
3 from the Commission.

4 CHAIR ORTEGA: Mr. Byrne?

5 MR. BYRNE: Michael Byrne, Department of
6 Finance.

7 We concur with the staff recommendation.

8 CHAIR ORTEGA: Matt -- go ahead, Mr. Alex.

9 MEMBER ALEX: I have some questions.
10 Who did the Attorney General represent in the
11 proceeding at the Supreme Court?

12 MR. OSAKI: It was -- at that point in time,
13 what had happened is that the State -- well, there was a
14 jury trial with Mr. Castillo. The jury found that
15 Mr. Castillo qualified as an SVP, and the District
16 Attorney was prosecuting that case.

17 Usually what happens is that --

18 MEMBER ALEX: So the State -- the Attorney
19 General handled it on appeal and became the
20 representative of the people?

21 MR. OSAKI: That's basically what it is.

22 MEMBER ALEX: Okay.

23 MR. OSAKI: What's unusual about this case, is
24 that the basis for the appeal by Mr. Castillo, obviously,
25 was not the two-year stipulation, because obviously that

1 was okay with him.

2 The basis were other legal grounds. He was
3 challenging the commitment.

4 The Attorney General, despite the agreement,
5 took the position that "Wait a minute, this is not the
6 law of the land." And at that point in time, L.A.
7 County -- both the L.A. County Public Defender's and the
8 District Attorney's offices opposed the imposition of the
9 indeterminate term because of this agreement. And it
10 created an unusual situation where a prosecuting agency
11 was opposing the State Attorney General's office in the
12 amicus.

13 MEMBER ALEX: That's interesting.

14 It's also -- isn't it typical when the State
15 Attorney General handles an appeal from a local district
16 attorney that the representation is not of the state,
17 it's of the people as described by the original
18 jurisdiction?

19 MR. OSAKI: However, in this case, it is
20 different, a little bit different. Because what the
21 Attorney General's office was, in fact, representing the
22 State, because they were trying to say that this
23 agreement in L.A. County was inappropriate because that
24 was not the law of the state. And so, in essence, they
25 were representing the State at that time.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MEMBER ALEX: Okay, and then you stated a
2 couple of times, that the Supreme Court ruling bound the
3 State. And you said it in a conclusory way. But it's
4 kind of the central question here, and I wonder if you
5 have a basis for saying why the State would be bound.

6 MR. OSAKI: Well, what it is, is that I was
7 challenging the staff's assertion that the County alone
8 is bound. And what I'm saying is that, no, what happened
9 in this case, is that obviously the Attorney General's
10 office was not a party to the stipulation, and yet they
11 are bound. Also, the Department of --

12 MEMBER ALEX: Well, let's explore that for a
13 second.

14 In what way is the Attorney General's office
15 bound, and why does that mean the State is bound? I
16 mean, I'm sorry to be a lawyer here --

17 MR. OSAKI: No, no, I understand. No, I
18 understand.

19 But as we went further, they were representing
20 the State's interest at this time, as I explained
21 earlier.

22 So what the Supreme Court did, was they
23 indicated that the position taken by the Attorney General
24 was incorrect, okay.

25 Now, the staff's interpretation that only the

1 County was bound, implying that this agreement was just a
2 county measure, okay. But even the case itself bound the
3 Attorney General from challenging this agreement in
4 future prosecutions. So the State was bound to this
5 California Supreme Court.

6 Now, the other thing, too, I gave an example
7 where another State agency, even though they were not a
8 party to the stipulation would also be bound, such as the
9 Department of Mental Health or the Department of State
10 Hospitals. If they decided, "Well, we're not going to
11 abide by this two-year stipulation," we can go to the
12 courts, that "We have an agreement. Hey, we have to
13 enforce this two-year agreement."

14 So this is a state law, and it's bound to
15 everyone.

16 MEMBER ALEX: One more question, and then it
17 looks like there's some other views.

18 How many cases are we talking about?

19 MR. OSAKI: Very few, actually. Right now, we
20 have less than 20 cases with their initial trials.

21 With respect to recommitment trials, at this
22 point in time, I haven't crunched those numbers. I was
23 not asked to provide those numbers. I apologize. But
24 even with the initial commitments, we're talking about
25 cases that were filed prior to 2006, so they are being

1 whittled away. And so we are dealing with a finite
2 number.

3 MR. JONES: I'd like to clarify just a couple
4 of things, but then I'd mostly want to just stand on the
5 staff analysis and answer questions if anyone else has
6 them.

7 But first, I disagree with the view that the
8 *Castillo* case binds the whole state, not least because
9 the Attorney General was representing the County on
10 appeal in that particular case. And in that same
11 opinion, the Supreme Court cites at least three, four,
12 five other cases that I've cited to just in the short
13 section that I thought was relevant, in which other
14 cases, other Court of Appeal opinions and Supreme Court
15 opinions had sort of worked out these details in terms of
16 retroactivity of Prop. 83 and SB 1128.

17 The reason that the Court -- in my reading of
18 the case, the reason that the Court bound the Attorney
19 General on appeal as representing L.A. County to abide
20 by this stipulation, is simply that at the time the
21 stipulation was entered into, there was some substantial
22 legal uncertainty about how these changes -- you know,
23 it was mentioned that there's no recommitment procedure
24 under the new law, all terms are indeterminate instead of
25 two-year terms.

1 And so there was substantial legal uncertainty
2 as to how those would apply retroactively to cases
3 pending at the time.

4 All those details and all those questions have
5 since been worked out and, in fact, were worked out by
6 the time *Castillo* made it to the Supreme Court. And the
7 Supreme Court recognized that those details had been
8 worked out, and only bound the Attorney General to abide
9 by the stipulation in this case because at the time the
10 stipulation was entered into, it was entered into in good
11 faith by the County and the District Attorney, it was
12 signed by the Superior -- by the presiding judge of the
13 Superior Court in L.A. County in good faith, and it was
14 because nobody quite knew how this was going to apply
15 retroactively.

16 Now we know, and the Attorney General was only
17 held to abide by the stipulation for cases like this
18 coming out of L.A. County.

19 I think it's quite a stretch to say that this
20 binds the entire state.

21 MR. OSAKI: If I may respond very briefly.

22 With respect to the other cases that were just
23 cited, those were Court of Appeal cases; but most
24 importantly, those are cases that did not have the
25 stipulation, the unusual circumstance that we have in

1 this case. So the Supreme Court specifically dealt with
2 this whole retroactivity thing in light of the agreement
3 that we have in L.A. County, as opposed to those cases
4 that were cited -- just previously cited right now, where
5 there was no agreement in those cases.

6 And I could indicate to this Commission that my
7 understanding is that we're the only county that had such
8 an agreement. So we're not talking widespread, you know,
9 application here.

10 And the thing is that when I say it applies to
11 the State, it, of course, applies to the State as it
12 applies with respect to this agreement to those limited
13 cases.

14 So, yes, it applies to the State to those
15 individuals. And because the Supreme Court has allowed
16 for these two tracks of cases to exist at this current
17 time, I think the Commission's job as to ascertain:
18 Well, wait a minute. There are cases that are pursuant
19 to the initiative. There those cases that are pursuant
20 under the old law.

21 I think those cases that are still going
22 forward, those few remaining cases, are still
23 reimbursable.

24 MS. SHELTON: The only comment that I was going
25 to make was that the only reason why those few cases are

1 being governed under the old law, is because of an
2 agreement made, not because of an interpretation of what
3 the law is.

4 The State did not force the parties to enter
5 into that agreement. It was a decision made in good
6 faith as the *Castillo* court mentioned. But it's not
7 mandated by the State to interpret the law the way the
8 stipulation does.

9 MS. HALSEY: I just have one thing quick to add
10 to that, and that is that the Attorney General had issued
11 a memorandum to all District Attorneys prior to the time
12 that L.A. County entered into that agreement, stating
13 that the Attorney General's interpretation was that
14 indeterminate commitment would apply to all pending
15 claims. And L.A. still chose to go this other route.
16 So I just wanted to reinforce the idea that the agreement
17 was not mandated by the State, that was a discretionary
18 choice of L.A. County.

19 MR. OSAKI: But what's interesting about it is
20 that the Supreme Court looked at it. They actually
21 looked at the agreement.

22 They could have said, "No, we're not going to
23 abide by the agreement," that "We want a uniform law
24 throughout the whole state." But they didn't do that.
25 They said, "You know, as a result of principles of

1 judicial estoppel, we have to, you know, abide by this
2 agreement because the Superior Court got involved in this
3 whole agreement, and to maintain the integrity of the
4 judicial system, we have to enforce the agreement."

5 And I'm just asking that this Commission has to
6 enforce the intentions of the California Supreme Court.

7 MEMBER ALEX: So I think this is not an easy
8 decision, but the way I see it, the question really --
9 look, the County had the right to enter into an
10 agreement, and it's probably binding on the County -- it
11 almost certainly is, now that the Supreme Court has
12 confirmed it.

13 The question is whether that decision, finding
14 that the County agreement applies, whether that decision
15 recognizing that agreement applies to the State as a
16 whole or some subset, and whether the Commission, as a
17 part of the State of California, is bound by that.
18 And from my perspective, I suspect it's not.

19 MR. OSAKI: Well, and let me address that
20 position as well, because as I indicated, it is not just
21 bound to the County, because there are other parties that
22 have to be involved to enforce such a stipulation. So
23 those other parties are also, you know, bound to follow
24 the stipulation.

25 Now, we're all focusing on whether or not this

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 Commission is bound and so forth. But I would submit to
2 you, that's really not the analysis. The analysis really
3 is, we have two tracks of cases. We know that. And we
4 have some cases under the initiative, and we know that
5 this Commission has ruled that under 17556(f), they're
6 not reimbursed -- or certain activities are not
7 reimbursable.

8 I'm just simply saying that this Commission has
9 also made a determination that the applicable law is what
10 governs. And there's two applicable laws here.

11 MEMBER ALEX: The problem, though, is that if
12 the Commission is not bound by the Supreme Court
13 determination, then there is no mandate because that --
14 the Commission has already determined there is no mandate
15 under the statute. And so if this Commission is not
16 bound, then mandate goes away, even with respect to the
17 County of L.A.

18 MR. OSAKI: I apologize, I didn't understand
19 that.

20 MS. SHELTON: Well, the issue is reimbursement,
21 not whether -- I mean, the issue is whether reimbursement
22 is required, right, versus whether you have to comply
23 with the *Castillo* decision.

24 Yes, you have to comply with the *Castillo*
25 decision, but that decision does not bind the decision on

1 reimbursement.

2 MR. OSAKI: Yes, and what I'm saying is that
3 I'm not saying just simply because the Supreme Court says
4 this, I'm just saying, the Supreme Court has created two
5 tracks, and that there are two different laws to be
6 applied.

7 And what I've seen is that depending on the law
8 that's applied, one's reimbursable and one's not.

9 And so what I'm saying is that those few cases,
10 yes, this Commission has already made that determination
11 of reimbursement, right? So those shouldn't be applied
12 because that's the state of the law as to those limited
13 cases.

14 CHAIR ORTEGA: What remains a problem for me in
15 the argument is that the two tracks are created pursuant
16 to an agreement that the County entered into. And the
17 track -- that second track is not something that was
18 mandated by the State. And so that, again, leads us to
19 the question of, is reimbursement required.

20 MR. OSAKI: Well, the second track is mandated
21 by the --

22 MS. YAGHOBYAN: It was mandated.

23 MR. OSAKI: It was mandated by the State.

24 There was a Commission finding, right, back in nineteen
25 ninety- --

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MS. YAGHOBYAN: So that is no new law for those
2 people, so there is no new determination --
3 redetermination for those people.

4 MR. OSAKI: And in the event that the
5 Commission has concerns over the agreement, that's what
6 the Supreme Court addressed. The Supreme Court said,
7 yes, the agreement is enforceable.

8 CHAIR ORTEGA: All right, any comments or
9 questions from the Members?

10 MEMBER SAYLOR: Move approval of the staff's
11 recommendation.

12 MEMBER CHIVARO: Second.

13 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

14 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

15 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

16 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

17 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

18 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

19 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

20 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

21 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

22 MEMBER RAMIREZ: No.

23 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

24 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

25 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

2 MS. HALSEY: The motion carries.

3 MS. YAGHOBYAN: Thank you.

4 MS. HALSEY: Item 6, Commission Counsel Matt
5 Jones will present a request for mandate redetermination
6 on *Local Recreational Areas: Background Screenings*.

7 MR. JONES: This redetermination request
8 alleges that the State's liability under Public Resource
9 Code section 5164 has been modified by a subsequent
10 amendment to that section, enacted as a part of Statutes
11 2010, Chapter 719, SB 856.

12 The Department of Finance brings this
13 redetermination request alleging that local agencies now
14 have fee authority under the amended statute, which is
15 sufficient to cover the costs of the mandated activities
16 as a matter of law; and that this constitutes a
17 subsequent change in law in accordance with section 17570
18 and 17556(e).

19 At this hearing -- at this first hearing,
20 excuse me -- of the two-step hearing process, the only
21 issue before the Commission is whether the requester has
22 made an adequate showing that the state's liability under
23 Article XIII B, section 6, has been modified based on a
24 subsequent change in law, as defined in section 17570.
25 If the Commission determines that the requester has made

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 this showing, the Commission shall proceed to a second
2 hearing to determine if a new test-claim decision shall
3 be adopted to reflect the State's modified liability
4 under the test-claim statutes.

5 Staff recommends that the Commission find that
6 the Department of Finance has made an adequate showing
7 that the State's liability has been modified, and direct
8 staff to schedule a second hearing on the requests.

9 Will the parties and witnesses please state
10 your names for the record?

11 MR. BYRNE: Michael Byrne, Department of
12 Finance.

13 MS. LYNCH: Kathy Lynch, Department of Finance.

14 MR. BYRNE: We concur with the staff
15 recommendation.

16 MEMBER OLSEN: I move the staff recommendation.

17 MEMBER CHIVARO: Second.

18 MS. HALSEY: Motion and a second.

19 Mr. Alex?

20 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

21 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

22 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

23 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

24 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

25 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

2 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

3 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

4 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

5 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

6 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

7 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

8 MS. HALSEY: The motion carries.

9 Moving on to Item 7, Commission Counsel Matt
10 Jones will present parameters and guidelines on
11 *Interagency Child Abuse and Neglect Investigation*
12 *Reports*, or ICAN.

13 MR. JONES: These parameters and guidelines
14 address reimbursable activities under the Child Abuse and
15 Neglect Reporting Act, or CANRA, found in the Penal Code
16 commencing at section 11164.

17 In the test-claim statement of decision adopted
18 December 6th, 2007, the Commission approved reimbursement
19 for statutory requirements imposed on county
20 law-enforcement agencies, county probation departments,
21 and county welfare agencies to cross-report suspected
22 child-abuse cases and to forward to the Department of
23 Justice a report on every case that the agency
24 investigates that is determined not to be unfounded --
25 excuse me, to be not unfounded.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 In addition, local agencies were required to
2 perform a number of notice and record-keeping
3 requirements.

4 The primary issues in dispute in this proposed
5 statement of decision involve reasonably necessary
6 activities proposed by the claimant, the scope of
7 investigation necessary to comply with the mandate, the
8 claimant's proposed RRM -- or reasonable reimbursement
9 methodology -- for tasked repetitive activities involved
10 in the investigation and reporting requirements, and
11 whether there are offsetting revenues that must be
12 identified in the parameters and guidelines.

13 Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the
14 proposed statement of decision and parameters and
15 guidelines, determining the scope of reimbursement,
16 rejecting the RRM, and describing possible offsetting
17 revenues.

18 Will the parties and witnesses please state
19 your names for the record?

20 MR. JEWIK: Ed Jewik, representing County of
21 Los Angeles.

22 MR. BYRNE: Michael Byrne, Department of
23 Finance.

24 MS. LYNCH: Kathy Lynch, Department of Finance.

25 CHAIR ORTEGA: Mr. Jewik?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MR. JEWIK: I just want to thank the Members of
2 the Commission, and the exceptional work done by the
3 staff of the Commission. And we concur with the staff
4 recommendation.

5 MR. BYRNE: Department of Finance concurs with
6 the staff recommendation.

7 MEMBER OLSEN: I'll move the staff
8 recommendation.

9 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Second.

10 MS. HALSEY: A motion and a second.

11 Mr. Alex?

12 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

13 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

14 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

15 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

16 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

17 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

18 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

19 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

20 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

21 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

22 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

23 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

24 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

25 MS. HALSEY: The motion carries.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Thank you.

Item 8, Assistant Executive Director Jason Hone will present parameters and guidelines on *Peace Officers Procedural Bill of Rights*, or *POBR II*.

MR. HONE: Good morning. The *Peace Officers Procedural Bill of Rights* program, or *POBR II*, addresses amendments to activities associated with the Peace Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act. The Act provides a series of rights and procedural safeguards to peace officers employed by local governments that are subject to investigation or discipline.

The test-claim statement of decision approved reimbursement for activities relating to notices required to be provided to an officer, access to officer personnel files, and the notice requirements to search an officer's locker.

The claimant has requested alleged reasonably necessary activities for serving and filing the notices, scheduling appointments to inspect the personnel file, monitoring the officer while he or she reviews the personnel file, and paying the officer's salary during the time it takes to inspect the personnel file while away from his or her normal duties.

Staff recommends that the Commission deny these additional activities.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 Paying the officer's salary was specifically
2 found not to be reasonable in the test-claim statement of
3 decision.

4 As for the filing and service, scheduling of
5 appointments, and monitoring the officer, no evidence has
6 been submitted into the record that those activities are
7 reasonably necessary to implement the mandated
8 activities.

9 Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the
10 proposed statement of decision and parameters and
11 guidelines for this program.

12 Will the parties and the representatives please
13 state your names for the record?

14 MR. BURDICK: Allan Burdick on behalf of the
15 claimant.

16 MR. BYRNE: Michael Byrne, Department of
17 Finance.

18 MS. LYNCH: Kathy Lynch, Department of Finance.

19 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay.

20 MR. BURDICK: I think, as pointed out --
21 Members of the Commission, as was pointed out by the
22 staff, general agreement on the major tasks and
23 activities. There are just a few kind of sub-tasks that
24 are related to those. And the issues for all of them are
25 really, you know, are they reasonably necessary or not?

1 And the question, I guess, is how much detail do you need
2 to get into some of these tasks? So kind of let me
3 provide them.

4 The first one relates to providing notices.
5 And these are notices given to the officer, both before
6 there's an investigation and after there's an
7 investigation of an officer, that there has been an
8 activity performed which would result in some
9 disciplinary action.

10 The test claimant feels that, you know, there's
11 a one-year statute of limitation for this process. And
12 so it requested, instead of the word "given," it used the
13 word "serve." It could use "given" and "signed" and
14 "noted." But because of the one year in effect, this is
15 a legal process, they felt that the word "serve" should
16 be used, or something beyond the word "given." "Given"
17 could just mean handed to them, and there is really no
18 record that that activity was provided. And so that's
19 the first one.

20 The second thing really relates to personnel
21 files and somebody coming to inspect their files. And
22 there is a slight difference between cities or counties,
23 but I don't think it really makes a lot of difference in
24 relating to these.

25 And the first one is to make an appointment.

1 So if somebody wants to review their file, cities and
2 counties feel they need to make an appointment to come.
3 That way, the materials are available when they get
4 there, their file and their record.

5 And, secondly, the claimant believes that while
6 they're reviewing their file, an officer or
7 representative of the employer should be there to review,
8 to watch the officer while they review them -- these are
9 very sensitive files -- the files, to make sure nothing
10 is taken from the file.

11 Secondly is the monitoring, and that's kind of
12 what I added on there is that they watch the officer
13 reviewing his or her personnel file during that
14 particular process.

15 And then the third one is, in those cases where
16 an officer is on duty and comes in and reviews their
17 file, that the City be able to claim the time that that
18 officer was away from his or her duty.

19 So those are relatively minor differences.

20 The real question is, are they reasonably
21 necessary or not? And I think it gets to the level of
22 detail that you have to provide in the parameters and
23 guidelines. You know, there are certain things just
24 assume this is the net reasonable -- just kind of the
25 normal process for doing this, or is this something that

1 goes beyond what is normally expected by a police
2 department in conducting these legal activities?

3 Thank you very much.

4 MR. BYRNE: Michael Byrne, Department of
5 Finance.

6 We concur with the staff recommendation.

7 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay. Jason?

8 MR. HONE: I can respond to some of the points
9 that Mr. Burdick raised.

10 I'll start with the third point, which was
11 paying the officer's salary. And I would just stand on
12 the staff analysis, that recognizes that the Commission's
13 decision on the test claim specifically identified that
14 as something that was not reimbursable.

15 As for the first alleged reasonably necessary
16 activity, as he stated here, is a little different than
17 it was in the written comments in the record. But to
18 replace "given" with "give," the plain language of the
19 statute says "given," give the notice to the officer. So
20 did the activity as it was approved in the test-claim
21 decision.

22 Secondly, appointments and monitoring, while
23 those could be reasonably necessary, this was discussed
24 pretty thoroughly in the staff analysis, both the draft
25 staff analysis and in the final.

1 There's just no evidence in the record -- there's no
2 documentary evidence -- and even, we gave an example of,
3 of what documentary evidence might be in that case, which
4 would be, you know, something submitted by either oral or
5 written testimony, provided under oath or affirmation by
6 a person who has personal knowledge, information, or
7 belief about the assertions made.

8 We don't have that in the record. So that's
9 where we are with that.

10 MEMBER ALEX: Mr. Burdick, do you know if, in
11 the union contracts for officers, whether there's a
12 requirement that they be served in an official way?

13 MR. BURDICK: No, I don't think there is. You
14 know, and as I stated, they typically go by the statute,
15 in which it says "does give them." I just think that
16 because of the nature of this, is that, you know, this is
17 a legal document, there's a one-year statute of
18 limitation. And it kind of depends on the severity of
19 the thing.

20 If it's a very minor kind of allegation, you
21 know, like a citizen says, you know, the officer said
22 something, they may not actually ask them to sign it,
23 file, serve it, do it more legalistically.

24 But if it's a serious offense or miner offense,
25 then they do that as kind of what they feel is reasonably

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 necessary.

2 So these aren't major issues. It's just
3 certain things that the department felt that they very
4 typically do in many of the cases.

5 MEMBER OLSEN: I'll move the staff
6 recommendation.

7 MEMBER ALEX: Second.

8 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

9 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

10 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

11 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

12 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

13 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

14 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

15 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

16 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

17 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

18 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

19 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

20 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

21 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

22 MR. BURDICK: Thank you very much.

23 MS. HALSEY: Item 9 was on consent.

24 Item 10, Commission Counsel Matt Jones will
25 present an incorrect reduction claim on *Health Fee*

1 *Elimination.*

2 MR. JONES: This consolidated incorrect
3 reduction claim addresses costs reduced by the Controller
4 on reimbursement claims filed under the Health Fee
5 Elimination program. The primary issues in dispute are
6 the statute of limitations applicable to audits, the
7 proper application of the health fee rule in light of the
8 *Clovis Unified School District versus State Controller*
9 decision, the proper development and application of
10 indirect cost rates, reductions of salaries and benefits,
11 other outgoing expenses, student insurance costs, and
12 health services provided under the mandate, on grounds
13 that the claimant's documentation was insufficient and
14 not consistent with the parameters and guidelines and
15 claiming instructions.

16 Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the
17 statement of decision and request that the Controller
18 reinstate costs claimed as specified and reexamine its
19 findings and reductions as provided.

20 Staff further recommends that the Commission
21 authorize staff to make any technical non-substantive
22 changes to the statement of decision and parameters and
23 guidelines after the hearing.

24 Will the parties and witnesses please state
25 your names for the record?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MR. PETERSEN: Keith Petersen, representing the
2 claimants.

3 MR. SPANO: Jim Spano with the security office.

4 MR. SILVA: Shawn Silva with the State
5 Controller's Office.

6 MR. PETERSEN: Stand on the written submission.

7 Okay, Mr. Silva?

8 MR. SILVA: The Controller -- I'd like to let
9 Mr. Spano address some of the factual issues, since he's
10 an auditor and deals with those, and I will delve into
11 some of the legal concerns we have.

12 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay.

13 MR. SPANO: We support the Commission staff
14 conclusions on all the issues except for three, which
15 I'll go over briefly here in the testimony.

16 The first issue relates to Issue B, pages 30
17 through 34 of the Commission final staff analysis. The
18 Commission determined that the claim filed by
19 San Bernardino Community College District during the
20 audit period understated authorized health fee revenues.
21 The Controller determined that offsetting revenues by
22 deducting students who received the board of governor's
23 grant waivers from student enrollment and multiply the
24 difference by authorized student health fees.

25 The Commission staff believes that the record

1 does not demonstrate whether all exempt students pursuant
2 to Government Code section 76355 were excluded from the
3 fee calculation. Therefore, the Commission staff
4 recommends that the issue be remanded for the Controller
5 to reexamine our calculation of understated authorized
6 health fees revenues.

7 Specifically, the Commission staff indicated
8 that the record does not support whether the Controller
9 excluded: One, student attending an apprenticeship
10 training program; and, two, students who depend on prayer
11 for healing.

12 During the audit, the District provided our
13 office with the total enrollment and total students who
14 received Board of Governor grant waivers. The District
15 did not provide our office with the number of students
16 attending an apprenticeship training program or the
17 number of students who depends on prayer for healing.

18 Community college districts provides the number
19 of students attending an apprenticeship training program
20 annually to the California Community College Chancellor's
21 office. The Chancellor's office confirmed to our office
22 that the District reported no students attending an
23 apprenticeship training program. Therefore, no excluded
24 costs -- or students.

25 The number of students who depends on prayer

1 for healing was not provided to the Chancellor's office.

2 MR. SILVA: With respect to the legal concerns,
3 we agree with the ultimate result, which is, we are happy
4 to look at any documents that the claimant may have which
5 would support that there are exemptions and, therefore,
6 there should be less offsetting revenue and reinstated
7 costs. However, we believe the staff's approach
8 essentially shifts the burden for putting forth a claim
9 to the Controller's Office. If the claimant believes
10 that they've incurred costs or, in this case, if they
11 believe that the offsetting revenue is not as much as it
12 would appear on its face based on the number of students,
13 it would be up to them to claim that they have certain
14 exemptions that should apply; and, therefore, the
15 offsetting revenues should be reduced.

16 In this case, the staff analysis essentially
17 shifts the burden to the Controller to disprove that
18 there were certain exemptions available, which on a
19 commonsense level it doesn't make sense, because that
20 information is uniquely under the control of the claimant
21 themselves.

22 We were able to verify, at least those who --
23 on the apprenticeship issue, however, that still leaves
24 the question of those who have applied to use healing --
25 prayer for healing instead of going through the Health

1 Services program.

2 And that is our concern is, we have no problem
3 reviewing those documents, but we don't believe that the
4 decision was arbitrary and capricious because there was
5 no evidence presented by the claimant to support an
6 alteration to the calculation.

7 And Mr. Spano will go to the next issue now.

8 MR. JONES: May I -- would you mind if we break
9 this up by each issue? You mentioned you had only three
10 issues in dispute, anyway. Is that all right?

11 MR. SILVA: That makes sense.

12 MR. JONES: Thank you.

13 With respect to the health fee offsetting
14 revenues issue, I'd like to point out that these audits
15 are from '04-05, I believe -- excuse me, the IRC is from
16 '04-05. The audit is from 1999 through 2003. And so
17 during the audit process, and even during the early
18 stages of the IRC and comments and so forth, the health
19 fee rule still hadn't yet been resolved by the courts.
20 It now has.

21 The *Clovis Unified* decision was 2007 -- 2009 --
22 2010. Okay. Keith is saying '10. That was actually
23 going to be my first guess, but I couldn't remember. I
24 apologize.

25 So 2010 we have the *Clovis Unified* decision

1 that resolves the issue of how the health fee rule is
2 supposed to operate, which is that whatever the
3 maximum -- so the health fees were reinstated in the 1987
4 test-claim statute, and they were capped at a dollar
5 amount, which was then supposed to adjust for inflation.
6 And then the Chancellor of the Community Colleges
7 notifies the other districts when -- and somebody can
8 correct me if I'm wrong on any detail of this -- but my
9 understanding is that the Chancellor of Community
10 Colleges notifies the districts when the inflation
11 adjustment is supposed to take place, and says, "Okay,
12 now this year, going forward, you can charge \$8 or you
13 can charge \$9 or \$10."

14 And so San Mateo's claim was very simple
15 because they simply didn't adjust their fee on the
16 schedule that was provided for by the Controller -- or
17 excuse me, by the Chancellor. And so after we have
18 *Clovis* that says essentially the maximum fee authority
19 that you have is the amount that you have to declare as
20 the offsetting revenue, after *Clovis*, it seems pretty
21 clear how San Mateo's fee authority should be resolved.
22 You simply take the \$1 difference that they didn't charge
23 and multiply it by the number of students they claim. No
24 problem, that one's done.

25 However, San Bernardino, it's not entirely

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 clear from the documents in the record -- at least to
2 me -- how many students were actually subject to the fee,
3 and how many students were exempt from the fee; nor, in
4 fact, exactly what amount was charged to each student,
5 and whether that amount represented the maximum that was
6 allowable for that school year or that semester.

7 So the staff is recommending that the
8 Commission remand this issue to the Controller only to
9 resolve the question of how many students were subject to
10 and not exempt from the fee. And the record indicates
11 that the only information that the Controller has
12 considered thus far, has been the enrollment information,
13 which would be the global "how many students might be
14 subject to this fee" and then the exemption information
15 contained in the BOG waiver report, which is going to be
16 your low-income students, who I presume most, if not all
17 of them are going to be exempt from the health fee.

18 The record doesn't indicate any consideration
19 of students who depend on prayer for healing, which is
20 specifically exempt under the statute from the health
21 fee, or students who are entered into a qualified
22 apprenticeship training program.

23 Staff is recommending that the Controller work
24 with San Bernardino to establish if San Bernardino has
25 any records of those numbers; because as I said at the

1 beginning, during the IRC and during the audits and even
2 during the claim years, there was still substantial
3 disagreement between the Controller and the claimant
4 community -- that is, the community college districts --
5 over how the health fee rule should be applied and how
6 much offsetting revenue they were supposed to be
7 claiming. And so it's not clear in this record that the
8 information has been laid out, that allows us, now that
9 we have the wisdom of Clovis, to determine exactly what
10 the offsetting revenues look like.

11 MEMBER RAMIREZ: I have a question.

12 Mr. Jones, could you just review the
13 burden-of-proof issue that was raised by the Controller's
14 representative?

15 MR. JONES: I completely agree with the
16 Controller that the district -- that these documents
17 would be uniquely in control of the district; and that
18 the district should have to bring something forward.
19 And if they can't, then absolutely, the Controller should
20 be able to use whatever information they have available,
21 which clearly includes the BOG report and the enrollment
22 numbers that have already been submitted.

23 If a district has figures, though, on how many
24 students in the district would depend on prayer for
25 healing, I think it would be appropriate to remand this

1 question to the Controller, and let them at least
2 consider that small adjustment.

3 And the same with the apprenticeship training
4 program.

5 Only because the audit and the comments on the
6 IRC and the rebuttal comments and none of the record that
7 I can -- nothing in the record that I can see indicates
8 that those exemptions have been considered.

9 So I think it would be appropriate for the
10 Commission to remand this issue, and allow the district
11 to try to come forward with some documentation for the
12 audit years.

13 I'm sorry, does that answer your question?

14 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

15 CHAIR ORTEGA: Anything else on the first set
16 of issues?

17 MR. SILVA: Well, I would just add that, as I
18 said, we're perfectly happy to look at the documentation.
19 Our concern is with the determination that our decision
20 was arbitrary and capricious. Our determination was
21 made -- the audit findings were made based on the
22 information and the claim made at the time, which itself
23 was done before *Clovis* was decided. So how can a
24 subsequent action by the Court make what was a very
25 reasonable decision by the Controller's office, arbitrary

1 and capricious?

2 Basically, I'm asking that you strike that
3 phrase from the decision, and simply remand it based on
4 the changes caused by the *Clovis* decision.

5 MS. SHELTON: I think that's fine. I think
6 that's fine. Because it's just asking them to do
7 additional work, and it's not really -- a decision yet
8 hasn't been made on the number.

9 MR. PETERSEN: Can we have the same
10 consideration on the rest of the findings?

11 I guess not.

12 MR. SPANO: Okay, on to Issue Number 2.

13 MS. SHELTON: Yes.

14 MR. SPANO: This is issue F.4, pages 48 through
15 57, of the Commission's final staff analysis.

16 A little background.

17 The mandate requires community colleges to
18 continue providing health services at the level provided
19 during the base year, which is 1986-87.

20 The Commission calls this a maintenance effort
21 requirement.

22 The parameters and guidelines instructions
23 provide a long list of services that may be eligible for
24 reimbursement in the claim year to the extent those
25 services were provided in the base year.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 And this issue relates to San Bernardino
2 Community College -- it relates to San Bernardino
3 Community College District.

4 MR. PETERSEN: The labs or what?

5 MR. SPANO: The parameters and guidelines
6 identify four services under immunization: Diphtheria,
7 tetanus, measles, rubella, influenza and others, or
8 information.

9 The parameters and guidelines and claiming
10 instructions do not list hepatitis-B, therefore, we made
11 an adjustment.

12 After further review of the documentation, we
13 verify that influenza and outside lab services were
14 provided in the base year. Therefore, we agree that
15 these services should be reinstated.

16 MR. SILVA: And after review of the
17 Commission's -- the staff's analysis, although we have
18 some concerns with the specific analysis, we do not
19 oppose reinstating the costs for the hepatitis
20 vaccinations.

21 MR. PETERSEN: Can I ask a question?

22 For that, for hepatitis, are you only agreeing
23 with the concept, the finding?

24 MR. SILVA: As I said, we have concerns with
25 the analysis, but we do not oppose reinstating those

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 costs.

2 MR. PETERSEN: Thank you.

3 MR. JONES: I would stand on the analysis,
4 unless the Members have questions about that issue.

5 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, any questions on Issue
6 Number 2 that's been raised?

7 *(No response)*

8 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay. Let's move forward to the
9 third grouping.

10 Go ahead, Mr. Spano.

11 MR. SPANO: Okay, the third issue relates to
12 issue D.1, pages 42 through 47 of the final staff
13 analysis.

14 The Controller's office determined that
15 salaries and benefits claimed for Dee Howard and Ernest
16 Rodriguez, both full-time faculty, are unallowable in
17 the audit of San Mateo County Community College District,
18 on the grounds that the District did not provide
19 documentation supporting that these employees worked in
20 the health center.

21 The Commission staff believes that the
22 Controller's office disallowance of salaries and benefits
23 for these employees was arbitrary and capricious or
24 entirely lacking evidence support; and costs claimed for
25 these employees should be reinstated.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 Consistent with what's in the staff analysis,
2 the District provided support for Ernest Rodriguez and
3 Dee Howard with posting to employees' earning reports,
4 showing that the employees were funded out of the
5 district health service program. And an unsworn letter
6 from Kathy Blackwood, chief financial officer, stating
7 that the employees were full-time faculty assigned to the
8 Health Services.

9 These two employees who were classified as
10 full-time faculty, we requested additional corroborating
11 evidence from the District supporting their work in the
12 health center. However, the District provided no
13 additional information for these employees. So we didn't
14 have additional corroborating evidence to support the
15 costs claimed.

16 The Commission staff states that the
17 Controller's office substantiated hours claimed for
18 Gloria D'Ambra and Donna Elliott, both office assistants,
19 with the same documentation that the Controller's office
20 had determined to be unallowable to Dee Howard and Ernest
21 Rodriguez, which is the employees earning statement and
22 declaration -- or the letter.

23 We disagree.

24 The District also provided other corroborating
25 evidence for Gloria D'Ambra and Donna Elliott. The

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 corroborating evidence consists of employees'
2 classification, job announcement, personnel action forms
3 relating to the costs incurred in the district health
4 center for the work actually performed. And those are in
5 our comments, Tab 8, pages 24, 25, 26, 40, 41, 44, and
6 45.

7 The Commission staff also states that the
8 District supported the health center counseling costs for
9 Arlene Wiltberger and classified as full-time faculty
10 with posting to the employees' earnings and by personal
11 action forms, academic administrative salary orders, and
12 an approval of personnel action form. We agree.

13 The additional information provided by the
14 District corroborating Ms. Wiltberger corroborated that
15 she worked in the health center. The documentation
16 supported that she was assigned as a counselor in the
17 health center rather than a full-time faculty over the
18 three-year audit period. For instance, the documentation
19 included quite a few other corroborating documentation
20 other than just the employee's earning report. It
21 included the -- in six instances, there was academic
22 administrative personnel action forms during the audit
23 period, identified here as a counselor in a student
24 counseling psychological service department. There was
25 an increase in staff allocation and temporary

1 reassignment form during the audit period, recommending a
2 temporary increase in staff allocation for Ms. Wiltberger
3 as counselor. And there's approval of a personnel action
4 form showing changes in assignment for Ms. Wiltberger as
5 a counselor.

6 So in contrast, all we have for Dee Howard and
7 Ernest Rodriguez was posting to the employee's earnings
8 report, showing that the employees were funded out of the
9 district health service program and an unsworn letter
10 from Kathy Blackwood, chief financial officer.

11 MR. SILVA: And this again raises the concerns
12 we had concerning the burden of proof. But note that in
13 the staff's analysis, they concluded -- first of all, the
14 staff's analysis concluded that the claimants did not
15 meet the requirements of the P's and G's as far as
16 demonstrating that individual hours of each employee
17 attributed to the mandate. And we believe that in itself
18 is a valid basis to deny the claim because they have not
19 even met the requirements of the P's & G's.

20 However, the auditors did work with them, asked
21 them for these different documents; and at least as to
22 those other employees, were able to get documents that
23 are created back during the process. These were the
24 personnel action forms. And there were numerous forms
25 for each of these employees, which helped to validate;

1 and the mere fact that they were billed to the Health
2 Services program rather than some direct evidence that
3 they worked there.

4 And one of our big concerns is the phrase used
5 by the staff is "on the basis of same or similar
6 evidence, we have to come to the same conclusion." And
7 while we would agree that if the evidence is identical,
8 a different decision for different people would be almost
9 by definition arbitrary and capricious. However, when
10 you start getting into the question of what is "similar
11 evidence," you're getting into the question of reweighing
12 the evidence. And the staff itself noted in the final
13 staff analysis, citing a court case, that the court, or
14 in this case the Commission, did not have the authority
15 to reweigh evidence.

16 The question is merely whether there was
17 sufficient evidence for the Controller to make their
18 decision. And given the fact that the claimant did not
19 even meet the requirements of the P's & G's, we believe
20 we've met that threshold.

21 And I think as Mr. Spano has demonstrated,
22 there was a substantial difference in not only the amount
23 of documentation supporting the salaries for those other
24 employees, but in the number -- the sheer number, there
25 was, I believe, eight forms from within the system which

1 showed that the one employee who we did reimburse --
2 Ms. Wiltberger -- was, indeed, a counselor rather than a
3 full-time faculty, as her job description might have
4 indicated.

5 So based on that, we believe that the decision
6 made by the Controller's office was not arbitrary,
7 capricious; and that the way -- the staff's approach has
8 essentially shifted -- has altered the standard of
9 review, and basically shifted the burden to us to
10 disprove that those two employees were not engaged in
11 reasonable mandated activities.

12 MR. JONES: I guess I can see where the
13 Controller is coming from, that it feels like a
14 burden-shifting; that it feels like, you know, that
15 there's -- that we're reweighing evidence. And this is
16 certainly -- this is the grayest of these three issues
17 that's been brought up today, and the one that we
18 struggled with at our staff recommendation. But it
19 seemed to me, in reading this record, that certainly the
20 early documents, and even some of the later documents,
21 it seemed to me that the documentation -- it's really a
22 question of reliability.

23 The claimant has the right to reimbursement of
24 all their costs. And they file their claims under
25 penalty of perjury. And, yes, admittedly, this claimant

1 did not meet the requirements of the claiming
2 instructions and the P's & G's with respect to actual
3 hours worked and, you know, all this documentation that
4 appears to be required.

5 But as is pointed out, the Controller did work
6 with the claimant to try to verify and validate as much
7 of the costs claimed as possible.

8 And with respect to these last two, this record
9 looks like -- one of the things that struck me in reading
10 this record is that it looks a lot like the Controller
11 denied these two employees based largely on their job
12 description as full-time faculty.

13 Yes, we have an e-mail from Kathy Blackwood,
14 chief financial officer of the District, who -- and it's
15 not a sworn declaration of any kind. But we also have
16 accounting records that are business records, and would
17 be -- you know, would be admissible, generally speaking,
18 over and above the hearsay rule in a court. And those
19 accounting records do show that these people were --
20 their time was billed to the Health Services department,
21 if the accounting codes can be read correctly, or can be
22 deciphered.

23 And then the other thing that's interesting is
24 that those same accounting records were used to deny
25 costs for overtime wages for a couple of employees as

1 well. So if those same accounting records -- and there
2 may have been more than that on the overtime costs, but
3 that's all I can see in the record. And so if those same
4 accounting records can be used to deny a certain portion
5 of someone's pay because it's overtime, and it's billed
6 to a different code, then what's the problem with
7 applying that same logic to accept an employee -- two
8 employees whose costs were claimed under penalty of
9 perjury, in the first instance and, you know, we have
10 these accounting records, payroll records that show that
11 they were billed to Health Services.

12 So, yes, the quantum of evidence is different,
13 for different employees; and perhaps the District could
14 have done better. But initially, they filed their claim
15 under penalty of perjury, and they are entitled to all
16 costs claimed -- or not all costs claimed, but all costs
17 that are reimbursable under the P's & G's and under the
18 test claim.

19 So, like I said, that was the grayest of the
20 three issues, but that's where staff's recommendation
21 came down.

22 And I'd be happy to elaborate further for the
23 Members if you have questions.

24 CHAIR ORTEGA: Any questions or comments from
25 the Members?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 Oh, sorry.

2 MR. PETERSEN: Yes, I'm still here.

3 Mr. Spano mentioned, at least twice, that the
4 chief financial officer's e-mail was not sworn. I don't
5 know if there's any evidentiary standard for that.
6 Commission staff mentioned the claim was filed under
7 penalty of perjury. That's true.

8 The claim was based on records produced in the
9 normal course of business. They were not created for the
10 audit.

11 And as far as I know, the State Controller is
12 not required to provide sworn audits or provide an audit
13 under penalty of perjury. They're the only one here that
14 doesn't have to do that.

15 CHAIR ORTEGA: Any other comments or questions
16 from the --

17 MEMBER CHIVARO: I just have a question for the
18 gentleman.

19 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

20 MEMBER CHIVARO: So what is it you're saying
21 that the Controller's Office -- how much weight should
22 they afford the document that's under penalty of perjury?

23 Should they take it without question?

24 MR. JONES: No, not at all. I mean, the
25 parameters and guidelines and claiming instructions do

1 require some documentation. And certainly the updated
2 claiming instructions for this program come very close to
3 the language in the contemporaneous source document rule
4 that was the source of contention in *Clovis*.

5 But here, we have the claim -- the claimant
6 initially saying that these two employees are health
7 services employees in spite of their job titles. You
8 have an e-mail in which someone with a basis of knowledge
9 has made a statement -- maybe not a sworn declaration --
10 but has made a statement in which they've explained how
11 someone whose title is full-time faculty, would be billed
12 to health services; and then you have payroll records
13 that show that their pay was, in fact, drawn on those
14 accounts, which, again, those are business records, not
15 produced for the audit, as Mr. Petersen points out.

16 So, no, they certainly don't -- certainly, the
17 Controller isn't expected to just buy into everything
18 that's claimed. But there was some documentation here.
19 So staff felt that this seemed like it was enough
20 documentation that it would be inconsistent to disallow
21 costs for these two employees, and yet allow costs for
22 several other employees whose job titles, at least, don't
23 necessarily imply that they work in health services, such
24 as some office assistants and so forth. And, of course,
25 Mr. Spano pointed out, there's plenty of documentation

1 for those employees as well.

2 And in light of another employee whose job
3 title is the same, full-time faculty, but who is tasked
4 to counseling duties in health services.

5 So I don't think it's a huge leap to see that
6 these two employees were in the same situation. They
7 were full-time faculty who were tasked to health
8 services.

9 The documentation is a little bit less, but it
10 seemed inconsistent to disallow one and not the other.

11 MEMBER CHIVARO: Thank you.

12 MR. SILVA: Can I respond?

13 I think the fact that we've had to go into all
14 this evidence is, in fact, itself evidence, and we're
15 reweighing the evidence.

16 The standard is -- the decision on the
17 Controller is upheld unless it's arbitrary, capricious,
18 or whether it's entirely lacking in evidence. But yet
19 the statement was, we have to look at the reliability of
20 the evidence.

21 Reliability is really a synonym for reweighing.
22 The Commission staff is applying their determination on
23 what evidence is good enough or not good enough, but not
24 asking the basic question: Did the Controller's office
25 make a decision without evidence?

1 And as we pointed out, there's a substantial
2 distinction in the evidence between the employees that
3 we approve their salaries, and those we didn't.

4 If they were actually employees who were
5 working at the health services clinic, why did they not
6 provide those same pay -- what was it, employee actions,
7 personnel action forms for which they had numerous of
8 those forms for the employees who we did?

9 So we think that that is the basic -- the core
10 problem, is that they're reweighing the evidence and
11 deciding that they think what's there is good enough.
12 But they're not saying that we acted without any
13 evidence, which is the standard.

14 MR. JONES: I don't know that that is the
15 standard. And, actually, Mr. Silva, you had suggested
16 that if you were inconsistent, and that would by
17 definition be arbitrary and capricious. And that's --
18 my opinion is, these IRCs can't be viewed without looking
19 at the facts. They're incredibly fact-specific. Because
20 the claimant is saying one thing and the Controller is
21 saying another, and we have to dive into the record to
22 determine what's -- to determine who has got the better
23 argument, really. I mean, these are very fact-specific
24 claims, much more so than any test claim or P's & G's or
25 anything else that the Commission is doing.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 So I think inconsistency is really the focus of
2 my analysis and my recommendation. Just that there has
3 to be -- yes, there can be distinctions and the quantum
4 of evidence is different. But ultimately, it's whether
5 it's inconsistent to deny some costs on the basis of
6 similar documentation or a similar level of
7 documentation. And I kind of -- I don't know how I would
8 make a recommendation on an IRC without getting into
9 that, to some extent.

10 CHAIR ORTEGA: Mr. Saylor?

11 MEMBER SAYLOR: I'm ready to move approval of
12 the recommendations that we've got before us.

13 MEMBER ALEX: Can I ask Camille a question?

14 I just want to make sure I understand the
15 standard of review of the auditor's decision.

16 As the Commission, do we evaluate whether their
17 action was arbitrary and capricious?

18 MS. SHELTON: Yes.

19 MEMBER ALEX: Okay, so that's a very high
20 standard. All right.

21 MS. SHELTON: I was going to say, on this type
22 of issue. I mean, there's different types of issues.

23 On this type of issue, yes.

24 I was just going to mention, this one was
25 difficult. We sat around for a few days talking about it

1 and looking at it.

2 We have had other incorrect reduction claims
3 where the Commission has found something similar to be
4 arbitrary and capricious when the Controller's office has
5 used documentation differently, for different purposes,
6 within the same claim. So it's not being used
7 consistently.

8 I can remember -- I don't remember the names,
9 but two recent ones where that occurred, where they had
10 documentation filed in the record from the claimant, and
11 the Controller's office came to different conclusions
12 with similar documentation.

13 And that's basically where I was feeling the
14 comfort level of the recommendation, because it is
15 consistent with what the Commission has done in the past.

16 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes?

17 MEMBER RAMIREZ: I just want to know
18 procedurally, if there was a way, if it would have been
19 appropriate -- or did it happen that there was some
20 discussion between our staff and Controller's staff about
21 this issue.

22 MS. SHELTON: There are procedures in the
23 Commission's regulations where the parties can request an
24 informational meeting. There's also procedures where the
25 Executive Director can call for one.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 It is a legal issue, and it's sort of a yes-no
2 decision. So I don't know how much we would end up
3 getting back from an informational meeting when, still,
4 the parties are going to dispute a "yes" and a "no."

5 MEMBER OLSEN: I'll second the motion. I don't
6 think it's been seconded yet.

7 MEMBER ALEX: I have a comment -- or I guess an
8 opinion before we vote on it.

9 First, I think the three different claims have
10 three different outcomes for me.

11 On the first, I think we should strike the
12 "arbitrary and capricious" determination, it has no
13 effect on the outcome. It gets remanded either way. We
14 might as well not make that determination.

15 On the second, there's an agreement about the
16 outcome. So let's leave that.

17 On the third, my feeling -- and this may be my
18 legal bias -- but in an arbitrary and capricious
19 determination, where there is evidence in the record that
20 the Controller has acted on a reasoned basis, whether we
21 agree with it or not, I don't think that's arbitrary and
22 capricious. So that's my own view of it. But
23 nonetheless.

24 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Are you making a motion,
25 Mr. Alex?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MEMBER ALEX: Procedurally, I don't think I
2 can, right?

3 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Well, we can strike --

4 MS. HALSEY: Do we have a motion and a second
5 for the staff recommendation?

6 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

7 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes, we could ask that the maker
8 of the motion withdraw the motion, and a second motion
9 could be made perhaps to separate the issues, at least?

10 MEMBER SAYLOR: Sure, you could always ask for
11 a substitute motion as well.

12 In this instance, I will withdraw the motion
13 and, instead, treat each one of the three issues
14 separately.

15 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, so do we have a motion
16 then on Issue Number 1?

17 MEMBER SAYLOR: I move that we accept the
18 recommendation, and that we strike the phrase "arbitrary
19 and capricious."

20 MEMBER ALEX: Second.

21 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

22 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

23 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

24 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

25 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

2 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

3 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

4 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

5 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

6 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

7 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

8 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

9 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

10 MS. HALSEY: The motion carries.

11 CHAIR ORTEGA: And then Issue 2.

12 MEMBER SAYLOR: I move approval of the
13 recommendation as packaged in the staff report to us.

14 MEMBER ALEX: Second.

15 CHAIR ORTEGA: Mr. Alex?

16 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

17 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

18 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

19 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

20 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

21 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Ortega?

22 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

23 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

24 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

25 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

2 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

3 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

4 MS. HALSEY: The motion carries.

5 CHAIR ORTEGA: And Issue Number 3.

6 MEMBER SAYLOR: And I move approval of the
7 recommendation in the third issue as well.

8 MS. HALSEY: Is there a second?

9 *(No response)*

10 MS. SHELTON: The third issue on the denial of
11 the salaries, benefits of the 29 individuals.

12 MEMBER SAYLOR: Right, yes.

13 MEMBER OLSEN: Mr. Alex, it was your -- if you
14 would like to have the --

15 MEMBER SAYLOR: Do you want to do something
16 else?

17 MEMBER ALEX: So I move on the third issue,
18 that the staff recommendation be stricken. Is that -- is
19 that technically correct? How should we --

20 MS. SHELTON: Can we -- I'm confused.

21 Did Mr. Saylor have a motion on this issue?

22 MEMBER SAYLOR: There was no second.

23 MS. SHELTON: Okay, so your motion would be
24 then to disagree with the staff recommendation on that
25 issue and, instead, find that the Controller's office

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 acted reasonably with respect to the audit, and,
2 therefore, that the reductions made for those two
3 employees were correct?

4 MEMBER ALEX: A far better statement of my
5 motion.

6 MS. SHELTON: Okay.

7 MEMBER CHIVARO: And I second.

8 CHAIR ORTEGA: Any comments or --

9 (No response)

10 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay. Call the roll.

11 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

12 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

13 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

14 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

15 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

16 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

17 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

18 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

19 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

20 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

21 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

22 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

23 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

24 MEMBER SAYLOR: No.

25 MR. PETERSEN: Congratulations.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MS. SHELTON: We do need findings on the other
2 issues that were not disputed. So I do need a motion on
3 the other.

4 MR. PETERSEN: Well, they were disputed.

5 MS. SHELTON: Okay, well, that were not
6 discussed in testimony today.

7 MS. HALSEY: The remainder of the staff
8 analysis.

9 MR. PETERSEN: Well, splitting hairs has
10 become --

11 CHAIR ORTEGA: Do we have a motion on the
12 balance of the staff recommendation?

13 MEMBER OLSEN: I will move adoption of the
14 remaining portions of the staff analysis.

15 MEMBER CHIVARO: I'll second.

16 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Alex?

17 MEMBER ALEX: Yes.

18 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Chivaro?

19 MEMBER CHIVARO: Yes.

20 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Olsen?

21 MEMBER OLSEN: Yes.

22 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ortega?

23 CHAIR ORTEGA: Yes.

24 MS. HALSEY: Ms. Ramirez?

25 MEMBER RAMIREZ: Yes.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Rivera?

2 MEMBER RIVERA: Yes.

3 MS. HALSEY: Mr. Saylor?

4 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

5 MS. SHELTON: Okay, the decision has been made
6 and it has been adopted.

7 The staff recommendation was to allow staff to
8 make any non-substantive changes.

9 I don't think it's that difficult to make this
10 change and issue it to the parties with respect to the
11 two individuals to strike and rewrite that portion of the
12 analysis.

13 Does the Commission want to see the decision
14 again at the next hearing or allow the parties, if we
15 issue, to object and bring any objections to the
16 Commission?

17 CHAIR ORTEGA: The second.

18 MEMBER OLSEN: The latter, yes.

19 MEMBER SAYLOR: Yes.

20 CHAIR ORTEGA: Everybody agrees? Yes.

21 MR. PETERSEN: Excuse me, you're saying it's
22 not a scheduled item unless somebody objects?

23 MS. SHELTON: They've adopted their decision.
24 We will issue the decision consistent with the
25 Commission's ruling today.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 If you don't --

2 MS. HALSEY: If you think we didn't capture it
3 properly, you could object.

4 MR. PETERSEN: Does that put that in the 30-day
5 rule for errors?

6 MS. HALSEY: Yes.

7 MS. SHELTON: Yes.

8 MR. PETERSEN: When is your next hearing?

9 MS. SHELTON: January.

10 MR. PETERSEN: 24th. All right.

11 Will that be 30 days?

12 MS. SHELTON: We could work that out at the
13 staff level when we issue it. We could do the letter in
14 half a day.

15 MR. PETERSEN: The decision will be more than
16 30 days on January 24.

17 MS. SHELTON: I see what you're saying.

18 It might be safer to keep your decision and
19 bring back a decision for adoption at the January
20 hearing.

21 MS. HALSEY: Just to adopt the SOD.

22 MS. SHELTON: Just to adopt the SOD.

23 CHAIR ORTEGA: That's fine, yes.

24 MS. HALSEY: So the sole issue for
25 determination will be whether the decision you see

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 reflects the decision you made today.

2 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, that's fine.

3 Thank you.

4 MS. HALSEY: Item 11 and Item 12 are on the
5 Consent Calendar.

6 Item 13 is reserved for county applications for
7 a finding of significant financial distress or SB 1033
8 applications. No SB 1033 applications have been filed.

9 Item 14, Commission Staff Member Kerry Ortman
10 will present the legislative update.

11 MS. ORTMAN: This one will be pretty easy,
12 guys.

13 Commission staff continues to monitor
14 legislation for bills that might affect the mandates
15 process. There are no new mandates bills at this time.

16 Staff has additionally been monitoring the
17 treatment of state-mandated programs in the Budget Act
18 and trailer bills.

19 Along those lines, staff has reviewed the
20 Education Omnibus trailer bill, AB 86. The bill made the
21 following three changes relative to education mandates.

22 First, the trailer bill amended the Education
23 Code relative to the *Behavioral Intervention Plans*
24 program to direct the Superintendent of Public Education
25 to repeal the regulations governing the use of behavioral

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 interventions with individuals with exceptional needs
2 receiving special education and related services. The
3 amendments also prohibit the adoption of any additional
4 regulations.

5 Second, following the Budget Act addition of
6 \$50 million to the Education Mandate Block Grant Fund,
7 the trailer bill amended the Government Code to add
8 *Graduation Requirements and Pupil Expulsions and*
9 *Suspensions* to the listed programs funded by the block
10 grant.

11 Finally, the trailer bill also amended the
12 Government Code to reflect the suspension in the Budget
13 Act of state mandated education programs previously
14 included in the block grants.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIR ORTEGA: Any questions regarding the
17 legislative report?

18 *(No response)*

19 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay.

20 MS. HALSEY: Item 15, Chief Legal Counsel
21 Camille Shelton will present the Chief Legal Counsel
22 report.

23 MS. SHELTON: As I've noted in this report, the
24 Second District Court of Appeal did issue their decision
25 on the *Stormwater and Urban Runoff Discharge* case filed

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 by the County of L.A. and the associated cities, finding
2 that that permit was mandated by federal law.

3 Since I issued this report, the County and the
4 Cities have filed a petition for review with the
5 California Supreme Court, and that remains pending.

6 CHAIR ORTEGA: Any questions?

7 *(No response)*

8 CHAIR ORTEGA: No?

9 MS. HALSEY: Item 16 is the Executive
10 Director's report.

11 And today, I've kept it short. I'm just
12 reporting on workload and tentative agenda items for the
13 next meeting.

14 After today's hearing, we have 21 test claims
15 pending. Ten of those are the *NPDES* claims, which are on
16 hold pending outcome of Supreme Court decision.

17 Also, we have two parameters and guidelines,
18 five parameters and guidelines amendments, six statewide
19 cost estimates, and 79 IRCs, and also three mandate
20 redeterminations.

21 So the Commission is making good progress
22 towards eliminating our backlog and hearing claims in
23 a timely manner, particularly test claims.

24 We expect to hear all of the remaining test
25 claims with the exception of the *NPDES* claims by March or

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1 May, at the latest, if there is requests or extensions or
2 postponements, and barring any complications with these
3 matters.

4 We also expect to present a significant number
5 of IRCs to the Commission for determination in the new
6 year. So we'll have a lot more of these kinds of issues
7 that we had today. We haven't seen many of those in a
8 while. So that will be the trend for 2014.

9 Tentative agenda items: Please check the
10 agenda to see if your items are coming up. If you have
11 any test claims pending, they are coming up in the next
12 hearing or two. So expect to receive draft staff
13 analyses for your review and comment about eight to ten
14 weeks prior to the hearing date, and then a final staff
15 analysis about two weeks prior to the hearing.

16 And that's all I have.

17 CHAIR ORTEGA: Okay, we're now going to recess
18 into closed session.

19 The Commission will meet in closed session
20 pursuant to 11126(e) of the Government Code to confer
21 with and receive advice from legal counsel, for
22 consideration and action, and as necessary and
23 appropriate, upon the pending litigation listed on the
24 published notice and agenda; and to confer and receive
25 advice from legal counsel regarding potential litigation.

Commission on State Mandates – December 6, 2013

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

The Commission will also confer on personnel matters pursuant to Government Code sections 11126(a)(1).

I think we'll reconvene in about 15 minutes.

Thank you, everyone.

(The Commission met in closed executive session from 11:54 a.m. to 11:58 a.m.)

CHAIR ORTEGA: We will return from closed-session, recessed closed session.

No action was taken, and we will be adjourned.

MEMBER RAMIREZ: Happy holidays.

MEMBER ALEX: Happy holidays.

MEMBER OLSEN: Happy holidays.

(The meeting concluded at 11:59 a.m.)

--oOo--

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were duly reported by me at the time and place herein specified; and

That the proceedings were reported by me, a duly certified shorthand reporter and a disinterested person, and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting by computer-aided transcription.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand on the 31st of December 2013.



Daniel P. Feldhaus
California CSR #6949
Registered Diplomat Reporter
Certified Realtime Reporter