

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 323-3562
FAX: (916) 445-0278
E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



July 10, 2013

Mr. Mark Refowitz
Orange County Health Care Agency
405 W. 5th Street, Suite 721
Santa Ana, CA 92701

And Affected State Agencies and Interested Parties (See Mailing List)

Re: **Final Staff Analysis and Proposed Statement of Decision, and Notice of Hearing**
General Health Care Services for Inmates, 07-TC-12
Penal Code Section 4011.10
Orange County Health Care Agency, Claimant

Dear Mr. Refowitz:

The final staff analysis and proposed statement of decision for the above-named matter is enclosed.

Hearing

This matter is set for hearing on **Friday, July 26, 2013**, at 10:00 a.m., State Capitol, Room 447, Sacramento, California. Please let us know in advance if you or a representative of your agency will testify at the hearing, and if other witnesses will appear. If you would like to request postponement of the hearing, please refer to section 1183.01(c)(2) of the Commission's regulations.

Special Accommodations

For any special accommodations such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device, materials in an alternative format, or any other accommodations, please contact the Commission Office at least five to seven *working* days prior to the meeting.

Please contact Heidi Palchik at (916) 323-3562 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Heather Halsey".

Heather Halsey
Executive Director

ITEM 4
TEST CLAIM
FINAL STAFF ANALYSIS
AND
PROPOSED STATEMENT OF DECISION

Penal Code Section 4011.10

Statutes 2005, Chapter 481 (SB 159) and Statutes 2006, Chapter 303 (SB 896)

General Health Care Services for Inmates

07-TC-12

Orange County Health Care Agency, Claimant

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Attached is the proposed statement of decision for this matter. This executive summary and the proposed statement of decision also function as the final staff analysis, as required by section 1183.07 of the Commission on State Mandates' (Commission) regulations.

Overview

This test claim seeks reimbursement for costs incurred by local law enforcement agencies for treatment of law enforcement patients receiving emergency medical care. Penal Code section 4011.10 allows local agencies, including county sheriffs, chiefs of police, and directors or administrators of local detention facilities, to contract with hospitals providing emergency health care services for local law enforcement patients. It also sets statutory limits on the amount that hospitals that do not contract with local agencies may charge for emergency health care services at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital's actual costs. Prior to the enactment of the test claim statutes, local agencies were not expressly authorized to contract for emergency health care services for law enforcement patients and no cap for the cost of services provided by non-contracting hospitals was in place. The test claim statutes were intended to "...save taxpayers dollars by enabling county sheriffs and police chiefs reasonable control over medical costs for inmates, suspects and victims of crime..."¹

The claimant, Orange County Health Care Agency², seeks reimbursement for costs incurred to treat law enforcement patients at contracting and non-contracting hospitals. Claimant alleges

¹ Exhibit F, Senate Floor Analysis, Senate Bill 159, as amended August 31, 2005, p. 6.

² Government Code section 17581 defines local agency as "any city, county, special district, authority, or other political subdivision of the state." Although there is no evidence in the record

that the test claim statute's rate structure for non-contracting hospitals has caused claimant to incur \$1,841,893.49 in additional emergency medical costs during the 2007-2008 fiscal year and will cause claimant to incur an amount similar to the \$1,841,893.49 in additional medical costs for each year going forward.³ Prior to the enactment of Penal Code section 4011.10, claimant reimbursed emergency service providers at lower rates set by claimant's "Medical Services Initiate" (MSI) program, which is a federal, state, and county funded health care program that provides medical care for Orange County residents with an income of less than 200 percent of the federal poverty rate.⁴

Procedural History

Claimant filed the test claim on June 30, 2008. Based on the June 30, 2008 filing date, the potential period of reimbursement for this test claim begins on July 1, 2007. On July 23, 2008, Commission staff deemed the filing complete and numbered it 07-TC-12. On August 22, 2008, the Department of Finance (Finance) submitted comments opposing the test claim. On March 20, 2013, Commission staff issued the draft staff analysis and proposed statement of decision. On March 29, 2013, the claimant submitted a request for an extension of time to comment on the draft staff analysis and for a continuance of the hearing of this matter, both of which were granted for good cause. On May 20, 2013, Finance submitted comments concurring with the recommendation in the draft staff analysis that the test claim should be denied. On May 28, 2013, the claimant submitted comments expressing disagreement with the conclusion in the draft staff analysis that Penal Code section 4011.10 does not impose any state-mandated activities on local agencies.

that the County of Orange authorized the Orange County Health Care Agency to file this test claim, staff deemed the test claim complete in 2008. Going forward, claims filed with the Commission must be filed by the officer or entity designated by the local agency's governing body to file mandate claims on its behalf.

³ Exhibit A, Test claim, dated June 30, 2008, section 6 ("Declarations"), pp. 3-4, "Declaration of Melissa Tober."

⁴ See Exhibit F, Orange County Health Care Agency Web site, Medical Services Initiative (MSI), <http://ohealthinfo.com/about/medical/msi> (accessed on July 8, 2013).

Commission Responsibilities

Under article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, local agencies, including school districts, are entitled to reimbursement for the costs of state-mandated new programs or higher levels of service. In order for local government to be eligible for reimbursement, one or more similarly situated local agencies or school districts must file a test claim with the Commission. “Test claim” means the first claim filed with the Commission alleging that a particular statute or executive order imposes costs mandated by the state. Test claims function similarly to class actions: all members of the class have the opportunity to participate in the test claim process, and all are bound by the final decision of the Commission for purposes of that test claim.

The Commission is the quasi-judicial body vested with exclusive authority to adjudicate disputes over the existence of state-mandated programs within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6. In making its decisions, the Commission cannot apply article XIII B as an equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.

Claims

The following chart provides a summary of the claims and issues raised and staff’s recommendation.

Subject	Description	Staff Recommendation
<u>Penal Code section 4011.10, as added by Statutes 2005, chapter 481.</u>	Penal Code section 4011.10 permits a county sheriff or police chief to contract with providers of emergency health care services. Hospitals that do not contract with the sheriff or police chief for emergency health care services shall provide these services to their departments at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital’s actual costs.	<i>Deny</i> – the plain language of section 4011.10 allows county sheriffs and police chiefs to contract for emergency health care services, but does not impose any state-mandated activities on these local agencies. A statute that simply results in increased costs, without mandating local agencies to perform a new program or higher level of service, does not require reimbursement under the Constitution.
<u>Penal Code section 4011.10, as amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 303.</u>	Penal Code section 4011.10 permits a county sheriff, police chief, <u>or other public agency that contracts for emergency health services</u> to contract with providers of emergency health care services. Hospitals	<i>Deny</i> – the plain language of section 4011.10 allows public agencies that contract for emergency health services to contract

	<p>that do not contract with the sheriff or police chief for emergency health care services shall provide these services to their departments at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital's actual costs.</p> <p>Claimant alleges that the test claim statute's rate structure for non-contracting hospitals has caused it to incur increased costs mandated by the state.</p>	<p>with providers of emergency health care services, but does not impose any state-mandated activities on these local agencies. A statute that simply results in increased costs, without mandating local agencies to perform a new program or higher level of service, does not require reimbursement under the Constitution.</p>
--	---	--

Analysis

Staff recommends that the Commission deny this test claim.

Penal Code section 4011.10, as added and amended by the test claim statutes, states in relevant part the following:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a county sheriff, police chief or other public agency that contracts for emergency health services, *may contract with providers of emergency health care services for care to local law enforcement patients.* Hospitals that do not contract with the county sheriff, police chief, or other public agency that contracts for emergency health care services shall provide emergency health care services to local law enforcement patients at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital's actual costs according to the most recent Hospital Annual Financial Data report issued by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, as calculated using a cost-to-charge ratio. (Emphasis added.)

The claimant alleges that the test claim statute mandates a new requirement for it to pay hospitals that do not contract with the county a fixed amount (110 percent) above the medical provider's actual costs. Before the statute was enacted, claimant had the ability to negotiate reimbursement rates with providers and was able to negotiate an indigent rate "much lower than the test claim statutes' rate structure for non-contracting hospitals." The claimant alleges that:

The State has eviscerated the favorable relationship between [claimant] and the providers. In its place, the State mandated Orange County taxpayers – already burdened as donors to the State – pay a higher rate for inmate medical care than the previous rates providers consensually received. Since [claimant] has no

authority to pay less than that amount to non-contracted facilities, those facilities have no reason to enter contracts with [claimant].⁵

Penal Code section 4011.10, however, does not require local law enforcement agencies to perform any activities. Penal Code section 4011.10, as added by Statutes 2005, chapter 481, and amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 303, authorizes local agencies to contract for emergency medical services for law enforcement patients and caps the amount that non-contracting hospitals may charge. Nothing in section 4011.10 directs or obligates police chiefs, county sheriffs, or other local agencies that contract for emergency health care services to engage in any activity or task. Although the claimant has filed a declaration showing that it has incurred increased costs as a result of Penal Code section 4011.10, the statute does not impose any mandated activities on the claimant or mandate the county to increase its level of service provided to the public. A statute that simply results in increased costs, without mandating local agencies to perform new activities or a higher level of service, does not require reimbursement under the Constitution. As the courts have determined, “Section 6 was not intended to entitle local entities to reimbursement for all increased costs resulting from legislative enactments, but only those costs mandated by a new program or an increased level of service imposed upon them by the State.”⁶

Accordingly, staff finds that Penal Code section 4011.10, as added and amended in 2005 and 2006, does not impose a state-mandated program on local agencies.

Conclusion and Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed statement of decision to deny this test claim.

⁵ Exhibit E, Claimant’s comments on draft staff analysis and proposed statement of decision, page 2.

⁶ *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1816; see also, *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. State of California* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835; *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 876.

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE TEST CLAIM ON:

Penal Code Section 4011.10, as enacted by Statutes 2005, Chapter 481 (SB 159), and amended by Statutes 2006, Chapter 303 (SB 896)

Filed on June 30, 2008

By Orange County Health Care Agency,
Claimant.

Case No.: 07-TC-12

General Health Care Services for Inmates

STATEMENT OF DECISION
PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT
CODE SECTION 17500 ET SEQ.;
TITLE 2, CALIFORNIA CODE OF
REGULATIONS, DIVISION 2,
CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7.

(Adopted July 26, 2013)

STATEMENT OF DECISION

The Commission on State Mandates (Commission) heard and decided this test claim during a regularly scheduled hearing on July 26, 2013. [Witness list will be included in the final statement of decision.]

The law applicable to the Commission's determination of a reimbursable state-mandated program is article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, Government Code section 17500 et seq., and related case law.

The Commission [adopted/modified] the proposed statement of decision to [approve/deny] the test claim at the hearing by a vote of [vote count will be included in the final statement of decision].

Summary of the Findings

This test claim addresses a 2005 test claim statute and 2006 amendment thereto that allows local law enforcement agencies, including county sheriffs, chiefs of police, and directors or administrators of local detention facilities, to contract with hospitals providing emergency health care services for local law enforcement patients. Penal Code section 4011.10, as added and amended by the test claim statutes, also sets statutory limits on the amount that hospitals that do not contract with local agencies may charge for emergency health care services at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital's actual costs. Prior to the enactment of the test claim statute, local law enforcement agencies procuring emergency health care services for law enforcement patients

were not expressly authorized to contract with hospitals for emergency health care services and the amount that non-contracting hospitals could charge for these services was not capped.

Claimant requests reimbursement for complying with the Penal Code section 4011.10 rate structure for compensating hospitals when there is no contract, i.e., for having to pay 110 percent of the non-contracting hospital's actual costs for emergency services. Claimant alleges that before the statute was enacted, it had the ability to negotiate reimbursement rates with providers and was able to negotiate an indigent rate "much lower than the test claim statutes' rate structure for non-contracting hospitals."

The Commission denies this test claim. The plain language of Penal Code section 4011.10, as added by Statutes 2005, chapter 481, and amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 303, authorizes local law enforcement agencies, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to contract with hospitals for emergency health care services for local law enforcement patients and capping the amount that non-contracting hospitals can charge for emergency health care services. Penal Code section 4011.10 does not direct or obligate local agencies to contract with hospitals for emergency health care services for law enforcement patients and does not require local agencies to perform any other activities. Rather, section 4011.10 gives local agencies the option to contract for emergency services.

Although claimant may have incurred increased costs as a result of being in a weaker bargaining position due to the statute, reimbursement under the Constitution is not required. A statute that indirectly results in increased costs, without mandating local agencies to perform new activities or a higher level of service, does not require reimbursement under article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution. As the courts have determined, "Section 6 was not intended to entitle local entities to reimbursement for all increased costs resulting from legislative enactments, but only those costs mandated by a new program or an increased level of service imposed upon them by the State."⁷

Accordingly, the Commission finds that Penal Code section 4110.10, as added and amended in 2005 and 2006, does not impose a state-mandated program on local agencies.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

I. Chronology

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 06/30/2008 | Claimant, Orange County Health Care Agency, filed the test claim with the Commission. |
| 07/23/2008 | Commission staff deemed the filing complete and issued a notice of complete test claim filing and schedule for comments. |

⁷ *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1816; see also, *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. State of California* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835; *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 876.

08/22/2008 Department of Finance (Finance) filed comments on the test claim.

03/20/2013 Commission staff issued the draft staff analysis and proposed statement of decision, setting the matter for the May 24, 2013 hearing.

03/29/2013 Claimant requested an extension of time to file comments and a postponement of the hearing.

04/02/2013 Claimant's request for an extension of time and postponement of hearing was granted and this matter was set for hearing on July 26, 2013.

05/20/2013 Finance filed comments on the draft staff analysis.

05/28/2013 Claimant filed comments on the draft staff analysis.

II. Background

This test claim seeks reimbursement for costs incurred by claimant as a result of procuring emergency medical services for law enforcement patients at hospitals that claimant does not contract with for such services. Penal Code section 4011.10 authorizes local law enforcement agencies, including county sheriffs, chiefs of police, and directors or administrators of local detention facilities, to contract with hospitals providing emergency health care services for local law enforcement patients. The test claim statute, Penal Code section 4011.10, also sets statutory limits on the amount that hospitals that do not contract with local agencies may charge for emergency health care services for law enforcement patients at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital's actual costs.⁸

Prior law requires that law enforcement patients receive emergency medical care when necessary.⁹ However, prior to the enactment of the test claim statute, local agencies were not specifically authorized to contract for emergency health care services for law enforcement patients. As stated by the Legislative Counsel's Digest, section 4011.10 was enacted because:

Existing law authorizes the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to contract with providers of emergency health care services. Existing law specifies that hospitals and ambulance or other nonemergency response services that do not contract with the department shall provide those services at the Medicare rate.

This bill would apply these provisions to county sheriffs, chiefs of police, and directors or administrators of local departments of correction, except that it specify that hospitals that do not contract with local law enforcement agencies

⁸ Penal Code section 4011.10(b).

⁹ Penal Code section 4011.5.

shall provide their services at a rate equal to 110% of the hospital's actual costs, as specified.¹⁰

Section 4011.10 was also enacted to:

...save taxpayers dollars by enabling county sheriffs and police chiefs reasonable control over medical costs for inmates, suspects and victims of crime. This bill would ensure that local law enforcement agencies will be limited to reasonable and allowable costs under Medicare billing practices. This bill is consistent with existing law with respect to state prisoner health care...Under this bill, a county sheriff or police chief can continue to negotiate contracts with health care providers for emergency and non-emergency services for people under their jurisdiction...¹¹

The test claim statute was modeled after Penal Code section 5023.5. Section 5023.5, enacted by Statutes 2004, chapter 227 and effective August 16, 2004, allows the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) and the California Youth Authority (CYA) to contract with providers of emergency health care services. Hospitals that do not contract with the CDCR or the CYA for emergency health care services must provide these services to these departments at the rate established by Medicare. Neither CDCR nor CYA may reimburse a hospital that provides these services, and that the department has not contracted with, at a rate that exceeds the hospital's reasonable and allowable costs, regardless of whether the hospital is located within or outside of California. Penal Code section 4011.10 was added by Statutes 2005, chapter 481, to allow local public entities other than the CDCR and CYA to contract for emergency health care services.

As originally enacted, Penal Code section 4011.10 stated, in relevant part:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a county sheriff or police chief *may contract* with providers of emergency health care services. Hospitals that do not contract with the sheriff or police chief for emergency health care services shall provide these services to their departments at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital's actual costs according to the most recent Hospital Annual Financial

¹⁰ Legislative Counsel's Digest, Statutes of 2005, Chapter 481, S. B. No. 159. Section 4011.10 also states that the Legislature intended section 4011.10 to: (1) provide county sheriffs, chiefs of police, and directors or administrators of local detention facilities with an incentive not to engage in practices designed to avoid payment of legitimate emergency health care costs for the treatment or examination of persons lawfully in their custody, and to promptly pay those costs as requested by the provider of services; and (2) encourage county sheriffs, chiefs of police, and directors or administrators of local detention facilities to bargain in good faith when negotiating a service contract with hospitals providing emergency health care services.

¹¹ Exhibit F, Senate Rules Committee, Third Reading, Senate Bill 159, as amended May 3, 2005, p. 5.

Data report issued by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, as calculated using a cost-to-charge ratio. (Emphasis added.)

Section 4011.10 was amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 303, as urgency legislation to state, in relevant part:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a county sheriff, police chief or other public agency that contracts for emergency health services, *may contract with providers of emergency health care services for care to local law enforcement patients.* Hospitals that do not contract with the county sheriff, police chief, or other public agency that contracts for emergency health care services shall provide emergency health care services to local law enforcement patients at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital's actual costs according to the most recent Hospital Annual Financial Data report issued by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, as calculated using a cost-to-charge ratio. (Emphasis added.)

The 2006 amendment did not alter the purpose of section 4011.10 or the Legislature's statement of intent contained in section 4011.10.¹² Both Statutes 2005, chapter 481 and Statutes 2006, chapter 303 contained a January 1, 2009 sunset date for section 4011.10. However, later amendments to this section extended and then eliminated the sunset provision. Although section 4011.10 has been subsequently amended, claimant has not pled these amendments and the amendments are not relevant to the test claim.¹³

III. Position of Claimant and Interested Parties

A. Claimant's Position

Claimant alleges that the test claim statute constitutes a reimbursable state-mandated program or higher level of service within an existing program. Claimant "is the department that pays claims for health care provided to persons in the custody of the Orange County Sheriff."¹⁴ Claimant contracts for some of the care of its inmates, but there are instances when claimant uses the services of hospitals that claimant does not contract with. Claimant requests reimbursement for complying with the Penal Code section 4011.10 rate structure for compensating hospitals when there is no contract, i.e., for having to pay 110 percent of the non-contracting hospital's actual costs for emergency services.

¹² Statutes 2006, chapter 303.

¹³ Statutes 2008, chapter 142 (extending provisions section 4011.10 until January 1, 2014); Statutes 2011, chapter 39 (recasting provisions of section 4011.1 to apply to health care services generally, instead of emergency health care services, and deleting the provision making section 4011.10 inoperative as of January 1, 2014).

¹⁴ Exhibit A, Test claim, dated June 30, 2008, section 5 ("Written Narrative"), p 1.

Claimant alleges that the test claim statute's rate structure for non-contracting hospitals has caused claimant to incur \$1,841,893.49 in additional emergency medical costs during the 2007-2008 fiscal year and will cause claimant to incur an amount similar to the \$1,841,893.49 in additional medical costs for each year going forward.¹⁵ Prior to the enactment of Penal Code section 4011.10, claimant reimbursed emergency service providers at rates set by claimant's "Medical Services Initiative" (MSI) program, which is a federal, state, and county funded health care program that provides medical care for Orange County's low-income citizens.¹⁶ The test claim appears to indicate that prior to the enactment of the test claim, all hospitals within Orange County billed claimant an indigent rate for treatment of law enforcement patients pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 17000 et seq.¹⁷ Although the test claim does not explain why treatment of all law enforcement patients was previously billed at indigent rates, the indigent rates appear to be much lower than the test claim statute's rate structure for non-contracting hospitals.

Claimant did not provide a statewide cost estimate because after contacting numerous agencies and state-wide associations, it could find no one else with any increased costs to report.¹⁸

In comments submitted in response to the draft staff analysis, claimant disagreed with the conclusion that Penal Code section 4011.10 does not impose any state-mandated activities upon local agencies. Claimant's comments allege that Penal Code section 4011.10 "imposes new and unique mandated activity on Claimant...to provide medical services to inmates at an increased

¹⁵ Exhibit A, Test claim, dated June 30, 2008, section 6 ("Declarations"), pp. 3-4, "Declaration of Melissa Tober." Ms. Tober's declaration states that the test claim includes increased costs for both contracting and non-contracting hospitals and that 67% of the increased costs are associated with services provided by non-contracting hospitals. Ms. Tober's declaration does not indicate why the rate charged by Western Medical Center Anaheim, a contracting hospital, increased as a result of Penal Code section 4011.10.

¹⁶ *Id.*; See also, Exhibit F, Orange County Health Care Agency Web site, Medical Services Initiative (MSI), <http://ochealthinfo.com/about/medical/msi> (accessed on July 8, 2013). Claimant's website further states, "The MSI program contracts with all of the County's key clinics and hospitals and provides integrated care through contractual relationships with surgery centers, skilled nursing facilities, urgent care facilities, "minute clinics" and a variety of diagnostic centers and programs. Financial eligibility is determined on a case-by-case basis however, only persons with annual incomes below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level are eligible. In applying for the program, proof of Orange County residency and U.S. citizenship or legal residency is required." Neither the test claim nor claimant's website indicate why all law enforcement patients qualified as indigents under its MSI program.

¹⁷ Exhibit A, Test claim, dated June 30, 2008, Tober Decl., *supra*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁸ Exhibit A, Test claim, dated June 30, 2008, section 5 ("Written Narrative"), p. 2; See also section 6 ("Declarations"), pp. 5-6, "Declaration of Allan P. Burdick."

cost.” Claimant states that prior to the enactment of Penal Code section 4011.10, claimant was able to procure medical treatment for all law enforcement patients at indigent rates irrespective of whether an inmate was indigent.¹⁹ Claimant further states that Penal Code section 4011.10 “eviscerated” claimant’s ability to procure treatment for all law enforcement patients at indigent rates. That is, the test claim statute negatively affected claimant’s ability to bargain for indigent rates because the rate cap set by Penal Code section 4011.10--110 percent of the hospitals’ actual costs for emergency services--is higher than the indigent rate claimant was previously able to negotiate. Claimant states that as a result of the test claim statute, hospitals will no longer provide medical services at the indigent rate, which has caused claimant to incur increased costs.

B. Department of Finance’s Position

Finance submitted written comments on August 22, 2008. Finance argues that the activities involved in the test claim are not reimbursable on the following grounds:

- The test claim may have been filed after the statute of limitations pursuant to Government Code section 17551(c). Finance notes that section 17551 requires that a test claim be filed not later than 12 months of the effective date of the statute or 12 months of first incurring costs, whichever is later. Finance notes that the test claim was filed on June 30, 2008, approximately 30 months after the effective date of the test claim statute and 21 months after the test claim statute was amended in 2006. Finance notes that the test claim states that claimant first implemented the test claim statute on July 1, 2007. Finance admits that it does not have evidence indicating whether claimant first incurred costs prior to July 1, 2007.²⁰
- The test claim statute does not impose a new program or higher level of service on local agencies.
- The relevant provisions of the test claim statute are optional and do not require that public agencies to contract with emergency health care and medical response providers.

On May 20, 2013, Finance submitted comments concurring with the recommendation in the draft staff analysis that the test claim should be denied because “the plain language of the Penal Code section 4011.10 does not impose a new program or higher level of service on the local agencies within the meaning of Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution.”²¹

¹⁹ Exhibit E, Claimant comments, pp. 2-3. Claimant’s rebuttal comments also state: “Whether every inmate could or should have been considered truly indigent for MSI purposes is irrelevant: HCA and the hospitals *negotiated and agreed* that medical services for inmates would be paid at the MSI rates.”

²⁰ Exhibit B, Department of Finance Comments, pp. 1-2.

²¹ Exhibit D, Department of Finance Comments.

IV. Discussion

Article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution provides in relevant part the following:

Whenever the Legislature or any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on any local government, the state shall provide a subvention of funds to reimburse such local government for the costs of such programs or increased level of service, except that the Legislature *may, but need not*, provide a subvention of funds for the following mandates:

- (1) Legislative mandates requested by the local agency affected.
- (2) Legislation defining a new crime or changing an existing definition of a crime.
- (3) Legislative mandates enacted prior to January 1, 1975, or executive orders or regulations initially implementing legislation enacted prior to January 1, 1975.

The purpose of article XIII B, section 6 is to “preclude the state from shifting financial responsibility for carrying out governmental functions to local agencies, which are ‘ill equipped’ to assume increased financial responsibilities because of the taxing and spending limitations that articles XIII A and XIII B impose.”²² Thus, the subvention requirement of section 6 is “directed to state-mandated increases in the services provided by [local government] ...”²³

Reimbursement under article XIII B, section 6 is required when the following elements are met:

1. A state statute or executive order requires or “mandates” local agencies or school districts to perform an activity.²⁴
2. The mandated activity either:
 - a. Carries out the governmental function of providing a service to the public; or
 - b. Imposes unique requirements on local agencies or school districts and does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state.²⁵
3. The mandated activity is new when compared with the legal requirements in effect immediately before the enactment of the test claim statute or executive order and it increases the level of service provided to the public.²⁶

²² *County of San Diego v. State of California* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 68, 81.

²³ *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 56.

²⁴ *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates (San Diego Unified School Dist.)* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 874.

²⁵ *Id.* at 874-875 (reaffirming the test set out in *County of Los Angeles, supra*, 43 Cal.3d 46, 56.)

4. The mandated activity results in the local agency or school district incurring increased costs, within the meaning of section 17514. Increased costs, however, are not reimbursable if an exception identified in Government Code section 17556 applies to the activity.²⁷

The determination whether a statute or executive order imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program is a question of law.²⁸ The Commission is vested with exclusive authority to adjudicate disputes over the existence of state-mandated programs within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.²⁹ In making its decisions, the Commission must strictly construe article XIII B, section 6, and not apply it as an “equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.”³⁰

A. Evidence In The Record Supports The Finding That The Test Claim Was Filed Within The Statute Of Limitations

Although Finance suggests that that Government Code section 17551(c) may bar this test claim because the claim may not have been filed within 12 months of first incurring costs, evidence in the record supports the finding that the test claim was timely filed.

Statutes 2005, chapter 481 became effective on January 1, 2006, and Statutes 2006, chapter 303 became effective on September 18, 2006. The test claim was filed on June 30, 2008, approximately 30 months after the effective date of the test claim statute and 21 months after the test claim statute was amended in 2006.

Government Code section 17551(c) establishes the statute of limitations for the filing of test claims as follows:

Local agency and school district test claims shall be filed not later than 12 months following the effective date of a statute or executive order, or within 12 months of incurring increased costs as a result of a statute or executive order, whichever is later.

The test claim was not filed within 12 months following the effective date of the statutes. However, the test claim indicates that claimant “implemented” the test claim statute on

²⁶ *San Diego Unified School Dist.*, *supra*, 33 Cal.4th 859, 874-875, 878; *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.

²⁷ *County of Fresno v. State of California* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487; *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (Cal. Ct. App. 1st Dist. 2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1284; Government Code sections 17514 and 17556.

²⁸ *County of San Diego*, *supra*, 15 Cal.4th 68, 109.

²⁹ *Kinlaw v. State of California* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487.

³⁰ *County of Sonoma*, *supra*, 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1280 [citing *City of San Jose*, *supra*].

July 1, 2007, which resulted in a cost increase of \$1,841,893.49 in the 2007-2008 fiscal year.³¹ This statement is supported by the Declaration of Melissa Tober, which states that prior to July 1, 2007, claimant paid for emergency health care services for law enforcement patients “at rates equal to reimbursement rates for services provided through Orange County’s Medical Services for Indigents Program mandated by Welfare & Institutions Code 17000”

Based on the foregoing, the Commission finds that claimant first incurred additional costs beginning on July 1, 2007 - the date claimant first began to pay non-contracting hospitals as required by the test claim statute. The Commission further finds that there is no evidence in the record to support the finding that claimant incurred increased costs prior to July 1, 2007. Accordingly, the Commission finds that the test claim was filed within the statute of limitations provided in Government Code section 17551(c).

B. Penal Code Section 4011.10, As Added and Amended in 2006, Does Not Impose any State-Mandated Activities on Local Agencies

In 2005, the test claim statute added section 4011.10 to the Penal Code to state the following:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a county sheriff or police chief *may contract* with providers of emergency health care services. Hospitals that do not contract with the sheriff or police chief for emergency health care services shall provide these services to their departments at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital’s actual costs according to the most recent Hospital Annual Financial Data report issued by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, as calculated using a cost-to-charge ratio. (Emphasis added.)

Section 4011.10 was amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 303 as urgency legislation to state, in relevant part:

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a county sheriff, police chief *or other public agency* that contracts for emergency health services, *may contract* with providers of emergency health care services for care to local law enforcement patients. Hospitals that do not contract with the county sheriff, police chief, or other public agency that contracts for emergency health care services shall provide emergency health care services to local law enforcement patients at a rate equal to 110 percent of the hospital’s actual costs according to the most recent Hospital Annual Financial Data report issued by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, as calculated using a cost-to-charge ratio. (Emphasis added.)

Although the test claim does not explicitly state what new activities the test claim statute requires local agencies to perform, the test claim seeks reimbursement for the increased costs incurred as a result of section 4011.10. The claimant contends that Penal Code section 4011.10 requires

³¹ Exhibit A, Test claim, dated June 30, 2008, Tober Decl., *supra*, pp. 3-4.

local agencies to pay 110 percent of hospitals' actual costs for providing emergency health care services to law enforcement patients. The claimant further alleges that before the statute was enacted, it had the ability to negotiate reimbursement rates with providers and was able to negotiate an indigent rate "much lower than the test claim statutes' rate structure for non-contracting hospitals." The claimant alleges that:

The State has eviscerated the favorable relationship between [claimant] and the providers. In its place, the State mandated Orange County taxpayers – already burdened as donors to the State – pay a higher rate for inmate medical care than the previous rates providers consensually received. Since [claimant] has no authority to pay less than that amount to non-contracted facilities, those facilities have no reason to enter contracts with [claimant].³²

The plain language of section 4011.10, however, does not require local agencies to perform any activities or provide an increased level of service to the public. Moreover, subdivision (e) specifies:

Nothing in this section shall require or encourage a hospital or public agency to replace any existing arrangements that any city police chief, county sheriff, or other public agency that contracts for health services for those departments, has with his or her health care providers.

As noted in legislative history, section 4011.10 was designed to save local agencies money by capping the amount that non-contracting hospitals charge for emergency medical services, which could vary greatly from hospital to hospital prior to the enactment of the test claim statute.³³

Prior to the enactment of section 4011.10, Penal Code section 4011.5 authorized law enforcement agencies to procure emergency medical care when necessary.³⁴ Section 4011.10 allows local agencies to contract for this emergency medical care and caps the amount that non-contracting hospitals may charge. Section 4011.10 allows local agencies to decide whether or not to contract for emergency health care services for law enforcement patients.

Pursuant to section 4011.10, claimant has the option of contracting for medical services or using non-contracting hospitals for these services. In this case, the claimant has made the decision to contract with one hospital for emergency services for inmates, Western Medical Center Anaheim, but in most cases uses non-contracting hospitals for emergency services. In fiscal year 2007-2008, claimant chose to use the emergency services of 21 non-contracting hospitals. These decisions are based on local discretion, and are not mandated by the state. The test claim statute does not require the claimant to contract, or to use non-contracting hospitals. However, if a non-

³² Exhibit E, Claimant's comments on draft staff analysis and proposed statement of decision, page 2.

³³ Exhibit F, Senate Floor Analysis, Senate Bill 159, as amended August 31, 2005, pp. 5-6.

³⁴ Penal Code section 4011.5.

contracting hospital is used, the statute was designed to save local agencies' money by capping the amount that non-contracting hospitals may charge. As the test claim statute provides local agencies with the option to either contract for emergency services or to use non-contracting hospitals whose ability to charge is capped, the test claim statute does not mandate claimant to perform any activities.

Claimant's rebuttal arguments allege that section 4011.10 amounts to a state mandate because section 4011.10 has made it impossible for claimant to convince hospitals to provide services at the lower indigent rate. Claimant's rebuttal comments also clarify that prior to the enactment of section 4011.10, claimant was able to procure medical care for all inmates at indigent rates, whether or not every inmate was truly indigent. As a result, while section 4011.10 was designed to provide local agencies with more bargaining power and lower rates charged to local agencies, section 4011.10 had the opposite effect on claimant because claimant was uniquely situated and able to negotiate care for inmates at very low indigent rates. Although section 4011.10 may have affected claimant differently than the Legislature intended and may have caused claimant to incur increased costs, section 4011.10 does not mandate claimant to perform any activities or to provide an increased level of service to the public. Thus, section 4011.10 simply results in increased costs and does not require reimbursement under the Constitution. As the courts have determined, "Section 6 was not intended to entitle local entities to reimbursement for all increased costs resulting from legislative enactments, but only those costs mandated by a new program or an increased level of service imposed upon them by the State."³⁵

Based on the foregoing, Penal Code section 4011.10, as added in 2005 and amended in 2006, does not impose a state-mandated program on local agencies.

V. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the Commission concludes that Penal Code section 4011.10, as added by Statutes 2005, chapter 481 and amended by Statutes 2006, chapter 303, does not impose a reimbursable state-mandated program on local agencies within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 17514.

³⁵ *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1816; see also, *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. State of California* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835; *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 876.

Commission on State Mandates

Original List Date:
Last Updated: 6/21/2013
List Print Date: 07/09/2013
Claim Number: 07-TC-12
Issue: General Health Care Services for Inmates

Mailing List

TO ALL PARTIES AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. However, this requirement may also be satisfied by electronically filing your documents. Please see <http://www.csm.ca.gov/dropbox.shtml> on the Commission's website for instructions on electronic filing. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

Ms. Lisa Velazquez	Tel: (916) 440-7700
Department of Health Care Services	Email lisa.velazquez@dhcs.ca.gov
1501 Capitol Avenue, MS 0010	Fax:
P.O. Box 997413 A-22	
Sacramento, CA 95814	

Ms. Kathy Rios	Tel: (916) 324-5919
State Controllers Office	Email krios@sco.ca.gov
Division of Accounting and Reporting	Fax: (916) 323-4807
3301 C Street, Suite 700	
Sacramento, CA 95816	

Mr. Jai Prasad	Tel: (909) 386-8854
County of San Bernardino	Email jai.prasad@atc.sbcounty.gov
Office of Auditor-Controller	Fax: (909) 386-8830
222 West Hospitality Lane, 4th Floor	
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0018	

Mr. Mark Refowitz	Tel: (714) 834-6254
Orange County Health Care Agency	Email mrefowitz@ochca.com
405 W. 5th St., Suite 721	Fax: (714) 834-3660
Santa Ana, CA 92701	

Mr. Jeff Goldstein	Tel: (949) 440-0845
MAXIMUS	Email jeffgoldstein@maximus.com
17310 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 340	Fax: (949) 440-0855
Irvine, CA 92614	

Mr. Christien Brunette	Tel: (916) 471-5510
MAXIMUS	Email christienbrunette@maximus.com
625 Coolidge Drive, Suite 100	Fax: (916) 366-4838
Folsom, CA 95630	

Mr. J. Bradley Burgess MGT of America 895 La Sierra Drive Sacramento, CA 95864	Tel: (916)595-2646 Email Bburgess@mgtamer.com Fax:
Mr. Geoffrey Neill California State Association of Counties 1100 K Street, Ste 101 Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916)327-7500 Email gneill@counties.org Fax: (916)321-5070
Mr. Andy Nichols Nichols Consulting 1857 44th Street Sacramento, CA 95819	Tel: (916)455-3939 Email andy@nichols-consulting.com Fax: (916)739-8712
Ms. Anita Worlow AK & Company 3531 Kersey Lane Sacramento, CA 95864	Tel: (916)972-1666 Email akcompany@um.att.com Fax:
Mr. Dennis Speciale State Controller's Office (B-08) Division of Accounting and Reporting 3301 C Street, Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 95816	Tel: (916)324-0254 Email DSpeciale@sco.ca.gov Fax:
Ms. Hortencia Mato City of Newport Beach 100 Civic Center Drive Newport Beach, CA 92660	Tel: (949)644-3000 Email hmato@newportbeachca.gov Fax:
Ms. Carla Shelton Department of Finance 915 L Street, 8th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916)445-3274 Email carla.shelton@dof.ca.gov Fax:
Ms. Marianne O'Malley Legislative Analyst's Office (B-29) 925 L Street, Suite 1000 Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916)319-8315 Email marianne.O'malley@lao.ca.gov Fax: (916)324-4281
Ms. Harmeet Barkschat Mandate Resource Services, LLC 5325 Elkhorn Blvd. #307 Sacramento, CA 95842	Tel: (916)727-1350 Email harmeet@calsdrc.com Fax: (916)727-1734
Ms. Ferlyn Junio Nimbus Consulting Group, LLC 2386 Fair Oaks Boulevard, Suite 104 Sacramento, CA 95825	Tel: (916)480-9444 Email fjunio@nimbusconsultinggroup.com Fax: (800)518-1385

Ms. Lacey Baysinger State Controller's Office Division of Accounting and Reporting 3301 C Street, Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 95816	Tel: (916) 324-0254 Email LBaysinger@sco.ca.gov Fax:
Ms. Marieta Delfin State Controller's Office (B-08) Division of Accounting and Reporting 3301 C Street, Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 95816	Tel: (916) 323-0706 Email mdelfin@sco.ca.gov Fax: (916) 322-4404
Mr. Mark Ibele Senate Budget & Fiscal Review Committee (E-22) California State Senate State Capitol, Room 5019 Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916) 651-4103 Email Mark.Ibele@sen.ca.gov Fax: (916) 323-8386
Ms. Anita peden County of Sacramento 711 G Street, Room 405 Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916) 874-8441 Email apeden@sacsheriff.com Fax: (916) 874-5263
Mr. Edward Jewik Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller's Office 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603 Los Angeles, CA 90012	Tel: (213) 974-8564 Email ejewik@auditor.lacounty.gov Fax: (213) 617-8106
Ms. Hasmik Yaghobyan County of Los Angeles Auditor-Controller's Office 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603 Los Angeles, CA 90012	Tel: (213) 893-0792 Email hyaghobyan@auditor.lacounty.gov Fax: (213) 617-8106
Mr. Tyler Asmundson Commission on State Mandates 980 9th Street, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916) 323-3562 Email Tyler.Asmundson@csm.ca.gov Fax:
Mr. Mark Rewolinski MAXIMUS 625 Coolidge Drive, Suite 100 Folsom, CA 95630	Tel: (949) 440-0845 Email markrewolinski@maximus.com Fax: (916) 366-4838
Mr. David Wellhouse David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc. 9175 Kiefer Blvd, Suite 121 Sacramento, CA 95826	Tel: (916) 368-9244 Email dwa-david@surewest.net Fax: (916) 368-5723
Mr. Leonard Kaye Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller's Office 500 W. Temple Street, Room 603	Tel: (213) 974-9653 Email lkaye@auditor.lacounty.gov Fax: (213) 617-8106

Los Angeles, CA 90012

Ms. Annette Chinn Cost Recovery Systems, Inc. 705-2 East Bidwell Street, #294 Folsom, CA 95630	Tel: (916) 939-7901 Email achinnrcs@aol.com Fax: (916) 939-7801
Ms. Susan Geanacou Department of Finance (A-15) 915 L Street, Suite 1280 Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916) 445-3274 Email susan.geanacou@dof.ca.gov Fax: (916) 449-5252
Mr. Jim Spano State Controller's Office (B-08) Division of Audits 3301 C Street, Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 95816	Tel: (916) 323-5849 Email jspano@sco.ca.gov Fax: (916) 327-0832
Ms. Jolene Tollenaar MGT of America 2001 P Street, Suite 200 Sacramento, CA 95811	Tel: (916) 443-9136 Email jolene_tollenaar@mgtamer.com Fax: (916) 443-1766
Mr. Tom Dyer Department of Finance (A-15) 915 L Street Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916) 445-3274 Email tom.dyer@dof.ca.gov Fax:
Mr. Allan Burdick Mandates Plus 1104 Corporate Way Sacramento, CA 95831	Tel: (916) 203-3608 Email allanburdick@gmail.com Fax:
Mr. Jay Lal State Controller's Office (B-08) Division of Accounting & Reporting 3301 C Street, Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 95816	Tel: (916) 324-0256 Email JLal@sco.ca.gov Fax: (916) 323-6527
Ms. Evelyn Tseng City of Newport Beach 100 Civic Center Drive Newport Beach, CA 92660	Tel: (949) 644-3127 Email etseng@newportbeachca.gov Fax: (949) 644-3339
Ms. Donna Ferebee Department of Finance (A-15) 915 L Street, 11th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916) 445-3274 Email donna.ferebee@dof.ca.gov Fax: (916) 323-9584
Ms. M. Carmen Green California State Sheriffs' Association 1231 I Street, Suite 200	Tel: (916) 375-8000 Email cgreen@calsheriffs.org Fax: (916) 375-8017

Sacramento, CA 95814

Ms. Jill Kanemasu State Controller's Office (B-08) Division of Accounting and Reporting 3301 C Street, Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 95816	Tel: (916) 322-9891 Email jkanemasu@sco.ca.gov Fax:
Ms. Mary Hale Orange County Health Care Agency Behavioral Health Services 405 W. 5th Street, 7th Floor Santa Ana, CA 92701	Tel: (714) 834-6032 Email mhale@ochca.com Fax: (714) 834-5506
Mr. Michael Byrne Department of Finance 915 L Street, 8th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916) 445-3274 Email michael.byrne@dof.ca.gov Fax:
Ms. Socorro Aquino State Controller's Office Division of Audits 3301 C Street, Suite 700 Sacramento, CA 95816	Tel: (916) 322-7522 Email SAquino@sco.ca.gov Fax:
Mr. Brian Uhler Legislative Analyst's Office (B-29) 925 L Street, Suite 1000 Sacramento, CA 95814	Tel: (916) 319-8328 Email brian.uhler@lao.ca.gov Fax:
Mr. Frank Murphy MAXIMUS 17310 Red Hill Avenue, Suite 340 Irvine, CA 92614	Tel: (949) 440-0845 Email frankmurphy@maximus.com Fax: (949) 440-0855
Ms. Kimberly Engelby Orange County Health Care Agency Auditor-Controller 405 W. 5th Street, 7th Floor Santa Ana, CA 92701	Tel: (714) 834-5264 Email kengelby@ochca.com Fax: (714) 834-5506
