COUNCIL MEETING NOTICE/AGENDA

The public may listen in by calling: 1-800-839-9416
Participant Code: 298-2825

Date: Tuesday, September 19, 2017
Time: 10:00 AM – 5:00 PM
Location: Crowne Plaza Sacramento Northeast
5321 Date Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95841

Pursuant to Government code Sections 11123.1 and 11125(f), individuals with disabilities who require accessible alternative formats of the agenda and related meeting materials and/or auxiliary aids/services to participate in this meeting should contact Rihana Ahmad at (916) 322-9575 or email rihana.ahmad@scdd.ca.gov. Requests must be received by 5:00 pm, September 14, 2017.

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Lopez
2. ESTABLISH QUORUM
   A. Lopez
3. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS
   A. Lopez
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS
   This item is for members of the public only to provide comments and/or present information to the Council on matters not on the agenda. Each person will be afforded up to three minutes to speak. Written requests, if any, will be considered first.
5. APPROVAL OF JULY 2017 MINUTES
   A. Lopez
6. CHAIR REPORT
   A. Lopez

For additional information regarding this agenda, please contact Rihana Ahmad, 1507 21st Street, Ste. 210, Sacramento, CA 95811, (916) 322-9575. Documents for an agenda item should be turned into SCDD no later than 12:00 p.m. the day before the meeting to give members time to review the material. The fax number is (916) 443-4957.
7. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**
   A. 2017 Federal Programs and Landscape

**STAFF REPORTS**
B. Chief Deputy Director Report
C. Deputy Director of Policy and Planning Report
D. Deputy Director Regional Office Operations Report
E. CRA/VAS Update Report
F. DC Closure Report
G. QA Project Update Report

8. **UPDATE FROM DDS ON KEY INITIATIVES AND CHALLENGES**
   N. Bargmann

9. **DOWN SYNDROME PANEL PRESENTATION**
   A. Guest Speaker – personal experience
   R. Osterbach
   B. Explanation & Emerging Research
   UCEDD Presenters

10. **SPONSORSHIP REQUESTS**
    G. Rogin
    A. California Family Life Center

11. **STATEWIDE SELF-ADVOCACY NETWORK**
    D. Forderer

12. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

   A. **Self-Advocates Advisory Committee**
   D. Forderer

   B. **Legislative and Public Policy Committee**
   J. Lewis

1) **AB 1165** (Gloria) Property Taxation - SUPPORT
2) **AB 1264** (Garcia) Special Education Pupils: Individualized Education Program: Meetings: School Records - SUPPORT
3) **AB 1315** (Mullin) Mental Health: Early Psychosis and Mood Disorder Detection and Intervention - SUPPORT
4) **AB 1379** (Thurmond) Certified Access Specialist Program Funding – SUPPORT
5) **AB 959** (Holden) Developmental Services: Regional Centers - SUPPORT
6) **AB 1380** (Santiago) Developmental Services: Regional Center Services - WATCH
C. Self-Determination Advisory Committee

D. Employment First Committee

E. Executive Committee

13. CLOSED SESSION – PERSONNEL
Pursuant to Government Code 11126 (a)(1), the Council will have a closed session to consider the evaluation of performance of a public employee.

14. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION
Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126.3 (f), there will be an announcement of any action(s) taken during closed session.

15. OPEN SESSION PORTION OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR EVALUATION

16. CLOSED SESSION – LITIGATION
Pursuant to Government Code 11126 (e)(1), the Council will have a closed session to consider pending litigation.

17. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION
Pursuant to Government Code Section 11126.3 (f), there will be an announcement of any action(s) taken during closed session.

18. NEXT MEETING DATE & ADJOURNMENT
APPROVAL OF JULY 2017 MINUTES
Members Present
Alfredo Rubalcava (FA)
Andrea Vergne (FA)
April Lopez (FA)
Carmela Garnica (FA)
Catherine Blakemore
David Forderer (SA)
Elena Gomez
Francis Lau (FA)
Janelle Lewis (FA)
Jeana Eriksen
Julie Austin (FA)
Kecia Weller (SA)
Kris Kent
Larry Yin
Maria Marquez
Michele Villados
Ning Yang (SA)
Rebecca Donabed (SA)
Robert Taylor (SA)
Robin Hansen
Sandra Aldana (SA)
Sandra Smith (FA)
Olivia Raynor
Chisorom Okwuosa

Members Absent
Eric Gelber
Jacqueline Nguyen (FA)
Jay Lytton (SA)
Pete Sanchez (FA)
Charles Nutt (SA)

Others Attending
Janet Butts
John Comegys (Autism Vocations)
Kevin Sabo
Kristie Allensworth
Lisa Hooks
Mary Ellen Stives
Natalie Bocanegra
Patti Uplinger (Lanterman Housing Alliance)
Riana Hardin
Rihanna Ahmad
Robin Maitino
Sarah May
Scarlett Von Thenen
Sheraden Nicholau
Sonya Bingaman
Tamica Foots-Rachal
Vicki Smith
Wayne Glusker
Yolanda Cruz

1. CALL TO ORDER
Vice Chairperson Ning Yang (SA) called the meeting to order at 10:21 a.m.

2. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM
Vice Chair Yang (SA) established a quorum.

3. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS
Councilmembers and others in attendance introduced themselves.
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
On behalf of the Institute for Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders (FASD) at UCSD, staff member Mary Ellen Stives provided public comment on the dangers of FASD stating that FASD UCSD would like the Council to consider that FASD one of the nation’s leading preventable causes of disabilities and/or birth defects. Ms. Stives provided a FASD UCSD fact sheet for those interested in reading more.

Staff member Sonya Bingaman provided fliers and announced the 31st Annual Supported Life Conference on October 5-6, 2017 in Sacramento.

5. **APPROVAL OF MAY 2017 MEETING MINUTES**
The Council took the below action to approve the May 25, 2017, meeting minutes as amended. Correction(s)/revision(s) are noted below.

**Action 1**
It was moved/seconded (Forderer [SA]/Weller [SA]) and carried to approve the May 25, 2017 Council meeting minutes as amended. (See page 7 for the voting record of member’s present.)

**Amendment 1**
Page 13 of the packet, paragraph 6, first line, delete “Councilmember Janelle Lewis and.”

6. **CHAIR REPORT**
Vice-Chair Yang provided the Chair report in Council Chair April Lopez’s absence. Reported activities include: attendance and participation at the Council sponsored National Down Syndrome Congress’ annual conference; and planning of the August Statewide Self-Determination Advisory Committee meeting to receive pre-enrollment training and provide feedback.

7. **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT, 2017 FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND LANDSCAPE AND STAFF REPORTS**
Executive Director Aaron Carruthers provided a written report to Councilmembers highlighting activities since the May Council meeting. The report included the number of people served in May and June as well partnerships, policy work, and statewide presentations.

Executive Director Carruthers also provided his report on the activities that took place at the annual NACDD National Conference in Salt Lake City as well as an
update on federal funding, stating that Councils will remain at level funding for the current federal fiscal year. He also had the opportunity to have a brief one-on-one with AIDD’s new Commissioner, Melissa Ortiz. This afforded him the opportunity to share all the good works California and other Councils are doing nationwide.

Following Director Carruthers’ report, Holly Bins provided a report on the developmental center closures.

Staff reports were included in the packet starting on page 5.

8. CYCLE 40 GRANT PROPOSAL FUNDING
State Plan Committee Chair Sandra Smith presented the two proposal applications with the highest scores to the Council for consideration and approval. Grant Cycle 40 received 38 Grant Proposals, of those 21 did not pass the administrative review process; the remaining 17 went on to the scoring team. The State Plan Committee then met on July 10th to review the recommendations of the scoring team. The proposal applications with the highest scores are listed below.

Proposal SCDD4004 – Easterseals Southern California
The Customized Employment: Application and Validation project will bring an exciting innovative component to Competitive Integrated Employment by field testing for validity of the Discovery Fidelity Scale as it relates to outcomes from Customized Employment with Discovery. This proposal responds to State Plan Goal #2.2 to increase competitive integrated employment for people with I/DD. Specifically this goal will be met by building capacity among providers through hands on training, increasing the number of people with disabilities who are employed and implementing and field testing a fidelity scale to ensure best practices throughout the State.

Council members expressed the desire to have some intermediate measures put in place to determine what would be done with the Association of Community Rehabilitation Educators (ACRE) training as it was delivered. While competitive integrated employment was the long term outcome, members wanted to ensure some of the intermediate measures. Staff assured the Council that it could address those in the contract language and agreed with the intention of including those measures.
Proposal SCDD4007 – Lanterman Housing Alliance
This program will develop and release a Strategic Housing Framework to meet the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities in the State of California who meet the federal definition of I/DD. The formation of this Strategic Framework will be a vehicle to engage key stakeholders, establish benchmarks, encourage visionary problem solving and identify broad goals related to housing and services for California’s DD population.

Action 2
It was moved/seconded (Forderer [SA]/ Lewis [FA]) and carried to approve Grant Cycle 40 funding in the requested amount for Proposal SCDD4004 – Easterseals Southern California and Proposal SCDD4007 – Lanterman Housing Alliance. (See page 7 for the voting record of member’s present.)

9. EMPLOYMENT FIRST ANNUAL REPORT
Committee Chair Jenny Yang and Executive Director Aaron Carruthers provided an in-depth overview of the 2016 State of Employment for Californians with Developmental Disabilities. Details are provided in the handout entitled “EFC Report.” The report captured new data, state and federal changing trends, as well as the 2016 achievements.

Action 3
It was moved/seconded (Weller [SA]/ Forderer [SA]) and carried to approve the 2016 Employment First Report as presented. (See page 7 for the voting record of member’s present.)

10. UPDATE FROM DEPARTMENTS ON DD ACTIVITIES: KEY INITIATIVES AND CHALLENGES
The Departments of Rehabilitation, Health Care Services, and Aging reported on key initiatives and challenges relating to developmental disabilities.

Department of Rehabilitation
Director Joe Xavier and Chief Deputy Director Kelly Hargreaves provided updates on the CIE Blueprint and WIOA.

Department of Health Care Services
Councilmember Michele Villados provided updates on tobacco tax implementation and Medicaid.
The Department of Aging
Councilmember Chisorom Okwuosa provided updates on the HCB Setting compliance, the Ombudsman program, and the Silence = Violence abuse prevention efforts.

11. CONFLICT OF INTEREST WAIVER REQUEST
Staff Counsel Natalie Bocanegra presented the following COI waiver request to the Council for review and consideration.

North Bay Regional Center (NBRC) – Board Member Jose Ayala
Mr. Ayala is a consumer member of the NBRC board who works part-time for Napa Valley Supported Services, a regional center vendor. Mr. Ayala’s employment consists of a job placement at the Lixit Corporation doing product line assembly as part of his regional center employment services.

Action 4
It was moved/seconded (Forderer [SA]/Eriksen [SA]) and carried to approve Mr. Ayala’s waiver request provided he does not participate in any board decision that impact his employer and he also complies with Section 4622(k). (See page 7 for the voting record of member’s present.)

12. COMMITTEE REPORTS

a. Executive Committee – Committee Chair Jenny Yang provided a brief summary of the June 15, 2017 meeting.

b. State Plan Committee – Committee Chair Sandra Smith had nothing additional to report other than the aforementioned Grant Cycle 40 status.

c. Legislative and Public Policy Committee – Committee Chair Janelle Lewis provided an update on SB 433 stating that it was in assembly appropriations and being heard on August 23rd.

d. Employment First Committee – Other than the approval of the Employment First Report, no report was given.

e. Self-Advocates Advisory Committee – Committee Chair David Forderer provided a brief summary of the July 24, 2017 meeting.
f. Self Determination Advisory Committee – a verbal report was provided to members during agenda item 6, Chair Report.

13. STATEWIDE SELF-ADVOCACY NETWORK
Councilmember Forderer provided a written summary to the Council highlighting activities from the June 7-8, 2017 meeting.

14. SECRETARY TASK FORCE REPORT
Councilmember Kecia Weller provided a written summary to the Council highlighting the July 18, 2017 meeting. Members discussed ways to ensure access to services for populations that do not reach out due to immigration concerns, access to safe and affordable housing, and access to Mobile Crisis Supports.

15. OPTIONAL: REFRESHER ON ROBERT RULES OF ORDER
Staff Counsel Natalie Bocanegra provided Councilmembers with a brief overview of the Bagley Keene Open Meeting Act versus the Robert’s Rules of Order parliamentary procedures. The Bagley Keene Open Meeting Act is a state law which ensures that the meetings are public, while Robert’s Rules of Order are parliamentary procedures that set rules for how a meeting should run. Following her overview, Parliamentarian Kevin Sabo provided a refresher course on the different rules contained within Robert’s Rules of Order.

16. NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNMENT
The next meeting is on September 19th at the Crowne Plaza Hotel in Sacramento. The meeting was adjourned at 3:52 PM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Action 1</th>
<th>Action 2</th>
<th>Action 3</th>
<th>Action 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldana, Sandra</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Julie</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakemore, Catherine</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donabed, Rebecca</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eriksen, Jeana</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forderer, David</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnica, Carmela</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen, Robin</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent, Kris</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau, Francis</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Janelle</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, April</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquez, Maria</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okwuosa, Chisorom</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presnall, Shari</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raynor, Olivia</td>
<td>Not Present</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubalcava, Alfredo</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Sandra</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Robert</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergne, Andrea</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villados, Michele</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weller, Kecia</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang, Ning</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin, Larry</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORTS
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Chief Deputy Director’s Report  
September 19, 2017

Manage SCDD internal operations. Maximize efficiency and maintain a high level of performance, in order to advance our advocacy, capacity building and systems change efforts.

**Administrative**

- Planned and implemented internal Structural Deficit Workgroup Meeting.
- Led All HQ Meeting, including updates on key projects.
- Supported the Deputy Director of Regional Office Operations to manage the Cycle 40 Grant process.
- Supported the Deputy Director of Policy with dissemination of information on upcoming regional trainings and activities.
- Continued supervision of the Quality Assurance and Clients’ Rights Advocacy/Volunteer Advocacy Services programs.
- Participated in a Regional Managers’ meeting and provided updates from Headquarters.
- Supported SCDD Self-Advocacy Coordinator with management of SAAC and SSAN meetings.
- Supported staff with implementation of new document accessibility process.
- Streamlined internal procedures for processing billing, honoraria and travel reimbursements; reassigned staff as necessary.
- Staffed Statewide Self-Determination Advisory Committee meeting.
- Staffed Executive Committee meeting and followed through on directives.
- Continued efforts to relocate Headquarters and regional offices, as appropriate.
- Provided budget overview to Department of Finance.
- Continued review of 17/18 contract with Department of Social Services.
Initiated on-going QA/BSG coordination meetings.
- Continued to review and revise internal policies and procedures.
- In coordination with the Executive Team, tracked progress on short and long-term organizational goals.

**Personnel**

- Worked with the Personnel staff on recruitment, screening and interview processes for vacant positions at SCDD Headquarters and regional offices.
- Hired new Deputy Director of Policy at HQ.
- Conducted interviews for Travel/Front Desk Coordinator position.
- Met with the Deputy Director of Regional Office Operations and individual Regional Managers, as necessary.
- Continued to support SCDD’s Disability Advisory Committee.
- In coordination with Executive Team, addressed on-going training and personnel needs.
REPORT FROM
Vicki L. Smith
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, REGIONAL OFFICE OPERATIONS
TIME PERIOD: July 01, 2017 to August 30, 2017

The Deputy Director of Regional Office Operations (DDROO) provides leadership and supervision to the SCDD regional offices and the planning team at Headquarters (which monitors, prepares and reports on the SCDD State Plan).

Regional Operations:
- Supervise twelve regional offices for operations. Facilitate monthly managers meetings (at minimum, meetings rotate between face-to-face one month and teleconference the next month). Managers have recently completed their “Portrait of Services Assessment (POSA)” with their staff and Regional Advisory Committees to help build the platform for the State Plan reporting.

- Myself as well as one of the five other regional managers have completed the Academy Instructor Certification Courses (AICC) for the POST Commission at the California Highway Patrol Academy. We have four more managers scheduled to complete the certification by 12/31/2017 and the remaining five managers have the option of attending in 2018. This certification is required to teach and train law enforcement and provide POST certified units for the training. By having each regional manager certified, we expand our ability to train law enforcement exponentially. We are grateful to Stephen Bell, current Regional Advisory Committee member for North State and former Chief with California Highway Patrol.

Planning Team:
- Supervise the development, monitoring, assessment and analysis of the SCDD State Plan. The Planning Team is working on the Program Performance Report (PPR) for the 1st year accomplishments of the State Plan. A Draft will be presented to the State Plan Comm and to the Council at the next meetings.
Highlights of State Plan Activities (full version posted at www.scdd.ca.gov)
REGIONAL OFFICE AND HEADQUARTER ACTIVITIES FOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL OFFICE (RO)</th>
<th>MANAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Coast (NCRO)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North State (NSRO)</td>
<td>Sarah May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento (SACRO)</td>
<td>Sonya Bingaman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay (NBRO)</td>
<td>Lisa Hooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area (BARO)</td>
<td>Sheraden Nicholau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Valley Hills (NVHRO)</td>
<td>Dena Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast (CCRO)</td>
<td>David Grady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia (SEQRO)</td>
<td>Yolanda Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles (LARO)</td>
<td>Cindy Chiu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County (OCRO)</td>
<td>Scarlett VonThenen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino (SBRO)</td>
<td>Tamica Foots-Rachal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego/Imperial (SDIRO)</td>
<td>MaryEllen Stives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL #1.1: The Council will increase knowledge about self-determination and person-centered planning by monitoring, supporting and actively engaging in the implementation of the Self-Determination Program.

- LARO staff provided a two hour training to 14 community members in Spanish on 7/124/17 entitled "Person Centered Planning: What It Is & How to Do It Now" in Fullerton. Content included topics such as defining person centered planning (PCP), how it related to IPPs, IEPs, and self-determination; how it can be used now; who develops it; understanding how PCP is different from traditional system-centered planning; and, how it is developed and used for services. Additionally, a great deal of technical assistance was provided pertaining to regional centers, the IPP process, and the fair hearing appeals process. Pre- and post-tests indicated that attendees demonstrated a significant improvement in their knowledge of the subject. SCDD Los Angeles staff also distributed flyers promoting upcoming events and information: recruiting visitors for the Quality Assessment Project, promoting an event sponsored by the SCDD LA Office to promote Employment First, and requesting stakeholder to provide their stories about why Medicaid matters to them to the SCDD website. (7/24/17)(1 SA/13 FA/1 ORG)

GOAL #1.2: The Council will promote self-advocates in leadership roles in statewide networks a) through the strengthening of a statewide self-advocacy organization and by supporting self-advocates; b) within cross-disability leadership coalitions; and c) in training other self-advocates to become leaders.

- NCRO staff provided facilitation to the Ukiah People First Chapter and provided information about free local Alex Rorabaugh Recreation Center (ARRC) activities available to them on Sundays during the summer from 12 to 5pm. The ARRC is promoting healthy activities to the community including people with disabilities. The Chapter members decided to meet in August as a group to explore the center for future recreation activities. NCRO staff will provide a tour and introduce them to staff at the ARRC. The group has a goal to have more activities outside of regularly scheduled People First Chapter meetings. They are developing a calendar of activities outside of the monthly meetings to get more active in the community. (7/10/17)(9 SA/2 FA/4 OTH/3 ORG)
GOAL #2.1: The Council will increase and promote culturally competent strategies and resources that facilitate competitive, integrated employment (CIE) of people with I/DD.

- BARO staff, via conference call, provided consult and feedback to Cisco Talent Acquisition and Human Resources in a LifeChanger update call around their ability to ensure applicants with disabilities could advance in the recruitment process to have their resumes and applications seen by hiring managers. We have made some progress since the last call, and within a few weeks, the Cisco team should have several position listings that they can share with DOR and SCDD to test this process for this phase of LifeChanger. (7/26/17)(PM 1.3.1 – 5 OTH/3 ORG)

GOAL #2.2: The Council, in consultation with its federal partners, will increase identification, advocacy and/or sponsorship of legislative, regulatory, policy, procedure and/or practice changes to increase CIE for people with I/DD.

- HQ: Bob Giovati met with the staff of each legislator on the Assembly Human Services Committee & Assembly Privacy & Consumer Protection Committee to explain SB 433, which enables more efficient data-sharing between EDD & DOR. (7/11/17 & 7/12/17)(PM 1.3.4 – 14 OTH)

GOAL #3.1: The Council will work with housing entities to increase the development and/or provision of community housing for people with I/DD.

- SACRO staff provided input at the HCD Annual Action Plan public comment session, on the need for accessible and affordable housing for people with I/DD. There are currently over 1000 adults with I/DD who are in Supported Living and Independent living arrangements and depend on low-income housing, many living in substandard conditions. Strategic HUD's strategic plans (Goals) for 2014-2018 are: Goal 1: Strengthen the Nation’s Housing Market to Bolster the Economy and Protect Consumers • Strategic Goal 2: Meet the Need for Quality Affordable Rental Homes • Strategic Goal 3: Use Housing as a Platform to Improve Quality of Life • Strategic Goal 4: Build Strong, Resilient, and Inclusive Communities An additional 8 management objectives establishing strategies and metrics for acquisitions, departmental clearance, equal employment opportunity, financial management, grants management, human capital, information management, and organizational structure. (7/24/17)(PM 1.3.4 – 30 OTH/10 ORG)
GOAL #3.2: The Council will identify and decrease barriers to housing for people with I/DD.

- SACRO staff hosted a workshop/training with Housing Now and Banner Bank on Setting Financial Goals for 3 self-advocates 1 family member and 5 community support staff. The training included preparing a spending plan, decreasing spending and increasing income. Housing Now representative noted there is a 30% increase of homelessness in Sacramento County, 4000 people homeless. There are people moving to the Sacramento area from the Bay area. Sacramento County is among the fastest growing of rent costs in the nation. Before/After surveys were completed by 5 attendees. (7/25/17)(PM 1.3.2 – 3

GOAL #3.3: The Council, in consultation with its federal partners, will increase identification, advocacy and/or sponsorship of legislative, regulatory, policy, procedure and/or practice changes to increase housing for people with I/DD.

- NCRO staff facilitated a meeting with two Supervisors and two community agencies from the 1st and 2nd Supervisorial District in Mendocino County at the Board of Supervisors meeting in Ukiah CA. Staff provided information about the issue regarding lack of affordable housing for people with I/DD. The group discussed the progress of the Mendocino County and HUD partnership’s 28 apartment unit development project in Ukiah that was approved by City Planning. The project will move forward with minor changes. The group also discussed the new Vineyard View 121 housing units in progress on agriculture land north of Ukiah. The developer does not want to pay mitigation fees or include any low income/affordable accessible housing units in this project. The developer has met with the county in attempt to obtain a waiver so as not to comply with the inclusionary clause in the County General Plan. The housing committee advocates were sent by the County Behavioral Health Board to inform Supervisors of the difficulty in creating any new housing in the county because of NIMBY issues, lack of funding, and obstinate developers aiming to bypass the County General Plan. The meeting collaborators were 2 Board of Supervisors, 3 FA’s representing the First Nations People of Redwood Valley, Inclusive Education and Community Partnerships (IECP), the County Behavioral Health Board, and SCDD North Coast. (7/3/17)(3 FA/2 OTH)
GOAL #4.1: The Council and its federal partners will increase knowledge and awareness for people with I/DD and their families about the availability of and access to health and public safety-related services and supports.

- LARO & SBRO staff met with the Emergency Manager of San Bernardino Community College District to discuss "Ready Access Functional Needs" in the So California for individuals with I/DD and their families. This regional AFN emergency management workgroup is in collaboration with the Cal OES (Governor's Office of Emergency Services) to provide effective disaster and emergency preparations and responses. Training and aligning resources were discussed. The next meeting is scheduled next month to discuss a kick-off conference in So Cal. (7/27/17)(3 OTH/2 ORG)

GOAL #4.2: The Council, its federal partners, and self-advocates will increase information and training to law enforcement, court personnel, health care providers, and/or other care professionals about disability-related health and safety issues.

- HQ: LD-4 (Victimology) Sacramento Police Department Recruit Academy: This curriculum has (again) changed, both in content and in teaching style. Academy staff (and recruits) all report that they want more class time spent in scenario-based training, which is a challenge with Victimology. Role plays that require 'pretend' victimization do NOT come close to approximating the trauma, confusion, anger, and lack of memory and control demonstrated by most victims in the aftermath of a traumatic event, whether natural, criminal, or accidental in nature. By bringing in actual victims who are (wounded and) active, former, or retired law enforcement officers &/or family members of officers killed in the line of duty, recruits are given the opportunity to reflect on the risks of death and disability related to this career field. One guest speaker is the father of a child with Down Syndrome, whose daughter was killed (by the nanny) in a highly publicized 'shaken baby' (rotational head injury) case. This class is used as the precursor to LD-37 and lays some foundational groundwork for the Persons with Disabilities class. (7/19/17)(1 FA/55 OTH/3 OTH)
GOAL #4.3: The Council, in consultation with its federal partners, will increase identification, advocacy and/or sponsorship of legislative, regulatory, policy, procedure and/or practice changes to increase accessibility to health care and public safety services for people with I/DD and their families.

- SBRO: On August 1, 2017, The San Bernardino Regional Office staff facilitated a meeting with the Cal OES Team Lead at the San Bernardino Regional Office. The purpose of the meeting was to developing tangible tools, resources and training that will serve as a model for Access to Functional Need (AFN) support agencies and networks in the region. During the meeting, the following items were discussed to increase identification, advocacy and practice changes to increase accessibility to public safety for people with I/DD and their families. We discussed American Red Cross – First Aid/CPR/AED training for the Regional Office Staff, Developmental Center (DC) staff, and the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) and Statewide Self-Advocacy Network (SSAN) representatives for the region, so that they can learn and practice critical lifesaving skills for certification. We will work with the colleges to offer Continuing Education Units (CEU) to participants. In addition, trainings in the community were added to the planning for the San Bernardino region for personal safety and training based on the American Red Cross curriculum called the "Pillowcase Preparedness Project" to assist self-advocates and their families in preparing for a natural disaster. (3 OTH/2 ORG)

GOAL #5.1: The Council and its federal partners will increase knowledge and awareness of developmental milestones and intervention services for families of young children and professionals.

- OCRO met with Certified Child Life Specialist and Behavior Specialist from Child Behavior Pathways on July 6, 2017. This was a follow-up to the meeting in June to discuss ways in which our agencies can collaborate to assist families of young children with I/DD with strategies on handling social/emotional and behavioral concerns. The Child Behavior Pathways program is run by a multidisciplinary team of experts from both CHOC Children's and UC Irvine who have expertise in early childhood behavior and learning issues. Child Behavior Pathways is an evidence-based parenting education program that offers low-cost and free tools for parents. This was a follow-up planning meeting to share information on SCDD as well with the intent that future collaborations may occur due to the intersection in who we serve and how we can provide parents of young children with I/DD a more holistic approach. (7/6/17)(2 OTH/2 ORG)
GOAL #5.2: The Council, in consultation with its federal partners and other stakeholders, will increase awareness and knowledge for families and self-advocates about the availability of and access to services which support inclusive education.

- SEQRO was invited to give a quick presentation on the services that are offered through the office to a group of 12 family advocates, 4 self-advocates and 2 professionals at the Mariposa community center. The Sequoia office provided information on inclusive education, the one page IEP Basics sheet and the one page Transition page. (4 SA/12 FA/2 OTH)

GOAL #5.3: The Council, in consultation with its federal partners and in collaboration with educators and stakeholders, will increase information and technical assistance to prepare and empower students, families and professionals in developing individualized transition plans that lead to employment, post-secondary education &/or independent living options & opportunities.

- SBRO: On Wednesday, July 17, 2017 at St. Joseph Catholic Church in Fontana within San Bernardino County, addressing the monthly parent support group of Angeles Especiales, SBRO staff collaborated with Exceptional Parents Unlimited (EPU) to provide an educational training presentation solely in Spanish language. The presentation entitled "Entendiendo el Plan de Transicion Individualizado" (Understanding the Individualized Transition Plan) was provided to the attendees to provide vital information regarding students transitioning to adulthood and the important educational rights and responsibilities families need to know to better navigate the system. This collaborative effort between SBRO and EPU was designed to increase information and technical assistance to prepare and empower students, families and professionals in developing individualized transition plans that lead to employment, post-secondary education &/or independent living options & opportunities. (18 SA/48 FA/2 OTH/3 ORG)
GOAL #5.4: The Council, in consultation with its federal partners, will increase identification, advocacy and/or sponsorship of legislative, regulatory, policy, procedure and/or practice changes to increase access to quality education services throughout the lifespan for people with I/DD.

- SDIRO staff attended the public forum with parents and educators regarding the Adult Transition Program at the San Dieguito Unified High School District. The district is attempting to locate 47 students, 3 teachers and 10 support staff in "Relocatables" (i.e. storage containers) on the campus of a middle school that has been recently renovated, has state of the art facilities, while the ATP program will have access to none of the facilities, much less a peer group. This was the first opportunity the community has been given to see the actual units, and had even more to say following the tour. The units are without natural light, are too small, do not meet ADA standards for accessibility, have only 1 bathroom per unit, no place to have lunch, have "calming rooms" that lock. These facilities are not only separate, but are unequal as well. Testimony has been provided by staff at two previous boards of trustee meetings regarding this situation, and staff enlisted the support of Disability Rights CA, who authored a letter expressing concerns as well. The tone of the public forum has changed since receiving the letter from DRC, and is now looking at other options, such as locating the students on a high school campus, in the community, or even in storefronts in the community. A bright spot was a parent of a typically developing student who spoke as a taxpayer, and said she is not in support of segregation and discrimination like this, and wanted ALL parents in the district to be made aware of what is going on. (7/28/17)(7 SA/70 FA/7 OTH/4 ORG)

GOAL #6.1: The Council, in collaboration with our federal DD partners, will reduce service access barriers and decrease the disparity in available information, which describes services and supports that may be purchased throughout California’s Regional Center system, by translating and providing that information in Spanish and tracking statewide POS disparity data for Spanish-speaking self-advocates and families.

- HQ began identifying the DDS supplied Regional Center funded service codes into service categories for Early Start, Children, Adults and Senior services. Began translating descriptions to plain language to prepare for Spanish translation for a September 2017 rollout.
GOAL #6.2: The Council will increase the knowledge and skills of people with I/DD to move from institutional to community settings and to increase their ability to self-advocate.

- NBRO staff met with self-advocates at Sonoma Developmental Center Bentely Unit, to discuss mobility needs and access to transportation services in the community for people disabilities. Discussion included the ADA and reasonable accommodations for transportation. Self-advocates were shown a video on how to ride a bus for people with disabilities that included an example for (blindness, visual/hearing/speech/mobility impairments, cognitive disabilities). Participants were also provided with a copy of the Solano County Mobility Guide brochure. (7/18/17)(23 SA/7 OTH/1 ORG)

GOAL #6.3: The Council will increase outreach, training, and technical assistance to improve the quality of and access to services, including (but not limited to) Regional Centers, education, transportation, public benefits, child care, and recreation for people with I/DD and their families.

- NVHRO was invited to participate at the San Joaquin Regional Transit luncheon to give input into transportation issues and concern. NVHRO staff participated in an on-line survey and from that was invited to this luncheon. Dollars leveraged was $50 for the lunch that was provided to the two SCDD staff in attendance. This was a great opportunity to share issues and concerns with the Transit Company- some of the issues were 1) need for more training for the contractors providing transportation thru the dial a ride program. There has been incidence of rudeness from the drivers and the dispatch personnel, 2) lack of buses later in the evenings and weekends, 3) safety surrounding the bus stops, and 4) better and shorter routes or more express routes for popular locations. SCDD staff also shared upcoming community outreach events that SJRTD should participate at as well as information about the Dept. of Rehab paid internships to encourage SJRTD to employ individuals with intellectual/developmental disabilities. Information was also given regarding the Council of Governments (COG) Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC) regularly schedule meetings as a way to get input from the ridership. The SJRTD Marketing staff members were very appreciative of our input, information and attendance and this first time event. SJRTD did share that they are looking into a "UBER" like option for people - it is in a pilot stage currently- but they will keep us informed as time goes on. (7/27/17)(1 SA/1 FA/5 OTH)
GOAL #6.4: The Council, in consultation with its federal partners, will increase identification, advocacy and/or sponsorship of legislative, regulatory, policy, procedure and/or practice changes to increase access to quality community-based services for people with I/DD and their families.

- NSRO staff contacted staff at the offices of Legislators Assemblymember Brian Dahle, Assembly District 1 and Assemblymember Jim Wood, Assembly District 2 to clarify and confirm which counties they represent. Assembly District 1 staff member Simon Watson assisted NSRO staff to obtain another copy of the District Map. NSRO staff educated assembly staff on the State Council on Developmental Disabilities (SCDD). NSRO staff followed up by sending the staff member additional information on the legislation SCDD has supported this year, training documents NSRO staff has produced and uses as well as provided a copy of the Council Statement on Medicaid and Federal Health Care Benefits. (7/28/17)(2 OTH/1 ORG)
SCDD provides comprehensive clients’ rights advocacy services (CRA) and volunteer advocacy services (VAS) for persons with I/DD who are residents of state developmental centers and the state operated community facility through an interagency agreement with DDS.

Project Staff
Sonoma DC
Tobias Weare, CRA
Ross Long, VAS
Michele Sloane, Office Tech

Porterville DC
CRA Vacancy
Connie Wilson, Office Tech
VAS Coordinator Vacancy

Fairview DC
Laurie St. Pierre, CRA
VAS Coordinator Vacancy

Canyon Springs CF
Robbin Puccio, CRA
Julie Hillstead, VAS

CRA/VAS Project Manager
Holly R. Bins

Sonoma Developmental Center
The CRA reviewed attended 9 IPPs; 7 transfer meetings; attended 1 HRC meetings; attended 11 court hearings; 1 self-advocacy meetings; trained NRF staff on restricted access; 4 denial of rights reviews; 3 restricted access reviews, provided 2 new and annual employee trainings, attended policy review committee. CRA and VAS attended 2 Regional Project RC liaison meeting. The VAS Coordinator and volunteer advocates attended 12 IPP meeting and special team mtgs and 22 transition meetings both at SDC and community. Rights presentations at 1 SDC advocacy groups and 1 SDC employee orientations; attended court on SDC campus for 11 VAS clients.

Porterville Developmental Center
CRA and VAS project staff attended weekly human rights committee/behavior management, 70 restrictive plan reviews, daily IAT or incident action team, 19 IPP meetings and 6 transition mtgs, 8 denial of rights reviews, provided 2 PDC employee orientation training, 4 medical restraint reviews, 2 request for release, 2 community home visits, 2 regional project advisory meetings, 3 risk management reviews, 5 General event reports generated, attended Supported Life Self Advocacy Conference in Sacramento. Recruitment underway to fill vacancy for VAS Coordinator.

Canyon Springs Community Facility
VAS Coordinator and volunteers attended attended 6 IPP/special team meetings; 1 whole person assessment meeting; 1 transition meetings, community placement follow ups, 2 HRC/BMC meetings. VAS assisted with PDC VAS coverage. CRA attended 2 transition meetings; there are no denial of rights at CS at this time; participated in 5 IPP meetings, attended 2 human rights meetings, facilitated 5 self-advocacy meetings, attended 16 Emerging Risk Notification meetings, escort ratios and restricted access reviewed; assisted 14 clients in court communication and assistance, provided 2 rights trainings at the facility.
 Clients’ Rights Advocate and Volunteer Advocacy Services

Developmental Center Closure Update

September 19, 2017

SCDD's State Plan calls to increase the knowledge and skills of people with intellectual/developmental disabilities to move from institutional to community settings and to increase their ability to self-advocate. To better understand the experiences of people transitioning, the Council is surveying people who have transitioned from the DC/CF, stakeholders and the community on the closure and transfer process.

Please take the survey and assist us in developing pertinent training and technical assistance for individuals transitioning out of the Developmental Centers.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/NJRRHKG

Community Transition Numbers for 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>TOTAL number of transitions to community</th>
<th>Aug 1 2017 census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Springs*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Canyon Springs Community Facility and Porterville Developmental Center Secure Treatment Area are not scheduled for closure. The Porterville Developmental Center General Treatment Area is scheduled to close in 2021. Sonoma DC is scheduled to close by December 31, 2018. Fairview Developmental Center is scheduled to close by 2019.*

**California Department of Public Health (CDPH) and Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Springs</td>
<td>CDPH surveyed CS in August 2017. No conditions of participation out pending final findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>CMS settlement agreement extended to December 31 2017 CDPH and CMS surveyed FDC Nursing Facility the week of August 21 2017. CDPH found no deficiencies. CMS found some deficiencies no conditions of participation were found out. Final results pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville</td>
<td>CMS settlement agreement extended to December 31 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>CMS notified DDS of cancellation of settlement agreement with SDC on 05/13/2016. ICF units were decertified by CMS as of 07/01/2016. CDPH and CMS surveyed the Nursing and Medical programs in August 2017. SDC passed both surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Porterville and Fairview Certified Unit Population Projections**

The projections below establish the maximum permissible client census eligible for federal funding in the PDC and FDC certified units as of the first calendar day of the listed month. Federal Financial Participation is only permissible for clients on the Client List as of June 27, 2016. No Federal Financial Participation can be sought for the number of clients that exceed the projections below, even if the clients that exceed the census limits below are on the Client List as of June 27, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Census</th>
<th>Porterville DC – General Treatment Area ICF</th>
<th>Actual ICF Census</th>
<th>Fairview DC ICF</th>
<th>Actual ICF Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2020</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCDD Clients’ Rights Advocate (CRA) current observations inside the DC/CF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Springs</td>
<td>Clients are requesting assistance with trust account activities. The CRA has been active with court proceedings with clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>A nursing unit was consolidated into other units. CRA reviewing the process of providing informed consent for individuals residing and transition from FDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville</td>
<td>Noted increase in complaints about slow transition activity. The slow process increases frustration for some clients. Recruitment is underway to fill the CRA position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>SDC continues to consolidate units in both ICF and nursing programs. Families and stakeholders involved in transition meetings are working cooperatively. Offsite programming cancellations noted due to staffing shortages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCDD Volunteer Advocacy Services (VAS) community transition current trends

The VAS Project serves approximately 26% of the individuals residing in the DC/CFs. A volunteer advocate or the VAS Project Coordinator provides direct advocacy services for twelve months post placement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Springs</td>
<td>There are currently eight volunteer advocates. The VAS Coordinator assisted staff and clients to create Goal Boards or Vision Boards. The Coordinator is assisting clients with achieving competitive, integrative employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>VAS Coordinator and advocates attended three meetings with clients for transition activity. Recruitment efforts underway to fill the VAS Coordinator vacancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville</td>
<td>Two new advocates recruited. Transition activity continues out of General Treatment area. Recruitment efforts underway to fill the VAS Coordinator vacancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Five VAS consumers transitioned this reporting period. All community homes to house clients from SDC have been purchased. Homes are now in early stages of renovation. Transition has been flat for reporting period but is to increase in autumn months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mover Longitudinal Study Continues

Note: Terminology Change—future reports will reflect new terminology for the Adult Consumer Survey (ACS), that will now be called In-Person Survey (IPS).

As the AFS/FGS has now closed, SCDD is gearing up for the statewide In-Person Survey (IPS) cycle. The IPS cycle will involve face-to-face interviews of over 8400 adult individuals being served by regional center and receiving at least one regional center funded service other than case management. It is expected that this cycle will begin in October 2017.

While SCDD prepares for the IPS cycle, the MLS continues with the expanded number of movers to interview. Please refer to the following pages for the total number of movers enrolled, when movers were transitioned into the community, and into what counties people are moving.

UC Davis is in the process of collecting and analyzing the first year data for the MLS which will be available soon at:

http://www.dds.ca.gov/QA/
MOVER LONGITUDINAL STUDY
September 2017

Movers Enrolled (Total = 205)

Surveys Completed Over Time

169 3 Month Survey
117 6 Month Survey
58 1 Year Survey

Month of Move

Developmental Center
Fairview
Porterville
Sonoma

Number of Movers
Movers Enrolled by Regional Center

To view reports of past cycles as well as Regional Center specific reports, go to:

http://www.dds.ca.gov/QA/
## Where People Are Moving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendocino</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tehama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To view reports of past cycles as well as Regional Center specific reports, go to:

http://www.dds.ca.gov/QA/
SPONSORSHIP REQUEST
THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM DETAIL SHEET

ISSUE: California Family Life Center.

AMOUNT REQUESTED: $999.00

BACKGROUND: The California State Council on Developmental Disabilities (Council) supports events that promote self-advocacy, leadership and education, thereby enabling people with developmental disabilities and their family members to expand their knowledge and skills.

ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION: Through the partnership of California Family Life Center (CFLC), the Department of Rehabilitation (Temecula) and Mt. San Jacinto Community College, CFLC will conduct an Ability Job and Resource Fair that will provide access to economic and educational opportunity to underserved populations. CFLC is targeting 30 local employers and resource agencies and anticipate 200+ consumers and family members for this event.

The goal of the Ability Job and Resource Fair is to increase the ability of consumers and family members to access employment and community resources. According to CFLC, employment for individuals with disabilities is a very important issue since employment can be crucial for psychological health, and is a benefit for socialization, integration, and skills development. CFLC recognizes that for most individuals employment is necessary to achieve and maintain financial independence. Community resources will be available to unemployed and underemployed individuals at this event as well. The presenters at this event will be governmental entities and community organizations. In addition, the employers who participate in this job fair have been identified as being committed to hiring practices that are inclusive and diverse and also recognize the underutilized potential of individuals with disabilities.

SCDD funds would be used for costs associated with supplies and advertising and printing.

The event is scheduled for Friday, October 13, 2017.
COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL/OBJECTIVE: Individuals with developmental disabilities, their families and their support and/or professional staff will increase their knowledge and skills so as to effectively access needed educational and/or community-based services through at least 225 trainings, conferences, workshops, webinars, and/or resource materials developed by the Council on topics such as rights under IDEA, rights under California’s Lanterman Act etc. on an annual basis.

PRIOR COUNCIL ACTIVITY: Since the beginning of FY 2017-18, the Council has awarded $3,996 in funds for sponsorship requests. The Council allocates $25,000 per fiscal year for sponsorships. The fiscal year began July 1, 2017.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve California Family Life Center’s for sponsorship.

ATTACHMENTS(S): California Family Life Center’s request for sponsorship.

PREPARED: Kristie Allensworth, August 25, 2017
Sponsorship Request Application Checklist

The checklist below will help you identify the information needed to complete the sponsorship request application. We suggest you print this page to use while you gather information for the sponsorship application.

To allow sufficient time for processing and review, we recommend that sponsorship requests be submitted at least 3 months before an event. Please submit this checklist with the sponsorship request application.

Information Checklist

☒ Name of your Company/Organization
☒ Name of Project/Event/Program
☒ Project/Event Date
☒ Contact Name
☒ Contact Email, Address and Phone Number
☒ Amount of Funding Requested
☒ Approximate Total Cost of Project/Event
☒ The answer to this question: How this event/conference will increase the ability of consumers and family members to exercise control, choice and flexibility in the services and supports they receive, including a description of the specific way SCDD's funding would be utilized
☒ Event/Program Objectives
☒ Target Audience: The number and type of expected attendees (i.e. teachers, providers, administrators, etc.), including how many of those attendees are expected to be consumers and family members
☒ The answer to this question: How many presenters or panelists will participate in the event and what number of the presenters or panelists will be consumers
☒ A list of other sponsors/major contributors
☒ The answer to this question: How you will conduct outreach to increase consumer and family involvement in the conference
☒ Have you included a complete and total budget, including the amount you are requesting ($999 limit), details on the amount and sources of other funds solicited or obtained
☐ Have you included a list of other SCDD sponsorships and grants you have previously requested and/or received  N/A

☒ Have you included a letter of recommendation from a consumer and/or family organization that supports your efforts to improve consumer and family self-advocacy
California State Council for Developmental Disabilities Sponsorship Application

Location: Mt San Jacinto College Menifee Campus

Through the partnership of California Family Life Center, the Department of Rehabilitation (Temecula) and Mt. San Jacinto Community College will conduct an Ability Job and Resource fair that will provide access to underserved populations for economic and educational opportunity. The proposed job fair will target 30 local employers and education agencies in the local area.

Event time: Friday October 13, 2017

We are targeting 30 local employers and resource agencies and anticipate 200+ consumers and family members for this event.

The Ability Job and Resource Fair will increase the ability of consumers and family members to access employment and community resources. Employment for individuals with disabilities is a very important issue. We believe that employment can be crucial for psychological health, and is a benefit for socialization, integration, and skills development. We recognize that for many individuals, employment is necessary to achieve and maintain financial independence. Community resources will be available to unemployed and underemployed individuals at this event as well. The employers at the job fair will be those that are committed to hiring practices that are inclusive and diverse as well as recognize the underutilized potential of individuals with disabilities.

Outreach will be conducted through social media to include website, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. Posters and flyers will be created and PSA’s created for the local media. Each partnering agency is currently serving individuals with disabilities and will outreach to consumers within each organization. Presentations will be conducted at the Workforce Development Board, local Chamber of Commerce’s, and other agencies to promote the Ability Job and Resource Fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Promotions</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Costs (Brochures, signs, banners, forms, Job Fair Packets, etc.)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$999</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget for CFLC Job Fair

For questions please contact me at 951-765-9671 or mjramirez@cflckids.org.

Sincerely,

Mary Jo Ramirez, Executive Director
## Budget Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising &amp; Promotions</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Costs (Brochures, signs, banners, forms, Job Fair Packets, etc.)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$999</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplies include, but are not limited to, pens, pencils, and other general office supplies associated with the planning and implementation of the job fair.

Advertising and Promotions includes costs associated with outreach through social media, printed materials and other avenues utilized to promote the job fair.

Printing Costs include brochures, flyers, posters, banners and materials for the job fair (such as packets and other forms).
List of other sponsors/major contributors

- California Family Life Center
- Department of Rehabilitation
- State Council for Developmental Disabilities
- City of Temecula
- Mount San Jacinto Community College
- Riverside Workforce Development Board
- Riverside County Office of Education
- Autism Society
July 21, 2017

Re: SCDD Sponsorship Application

To Whom It May Concern:

The Riverside County Office of Education (RCOE) is in full support of the California Family Life Center’s (CFLC) application for the California State Council on Developmental Disabilities (SCDD).

RCOE has worked with CFLC to provide low-income, disadvantaged youth the opportunity to earn their high school diploma through RCOE’s Come Back Kids credit recovery Program and hands on training through the Riverside County YouthBuild Program. Currently CFLC is partnering with RCOE for the Riverside County YouthBuild Plus Program PY 2015/2018. They provide oversight of the daily operations and reports related to the program and are a liaison with RCOE to comply with program performance and fiscal requirements.

CFLC has over 30 years of experience working with young adults, local agencies, cities, and Riverside County. It is their experience and connection to the community that makes them a bridge for young adults to access education, employment, certifications, and life experiences that they might not have achieved if it had not been for CFLC.

These funds would allow CFLC to provide a valuable opportunity for local employers and the underserved population of the community.

Sincerely,

Diana Walsh-Reuss, Ed.D.
Riverside County
Associate Superintendent of Schools
Division of Student Programs and Services
(951) 826-6602 / FAX: [951] 826-6406
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1. CALL TO ORDER
   Chairperson Janelle Lewis (FA) called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

2. ESTABLISH QUORUM
   A quorum was established.

3. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS
   Members and others introduced themselves as indicated.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS
   Committee Chair Lewis announced that per the request that was made at
   the last meeting, member updates will include the DDS Safety Net Plan,
   updates disparity issues and DDS's work in this area.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 2017 MEETING MINUTES
   It was moved/seconded (Lapin [FA]/Lopez [FA]) and carried to adopt the
   March 8, 2017 meeting minutes as amended. (Unanimous: Lopez, Lapin,
   Lewis, Davidson; and Aldana)

   Amendment 1
   Page 7, paragraph 5, correct Bob Giovati’s title to read, Policy and
   Planning.
Amendment 2
Page 7, bullet 3 under AB 433, correct the word “overseas” to read “oversees”.

Amendment 3
Page 8, item c.3) AB 340, remove “Lewis” from seconding the motion.

6. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Housing Presentation
      Regional Manager Sheraden Nicholau provided an in-depth overview of a presentation on affordable and accessible housing. The presentation touched on the different challenges the I/DD community faces as well as touching on the different programs/projects out there and how eligibility and waiting lists can differ depending on county.

      The Committee participated in an in-depth discussion on ways to get involved as well as how different public programs and services can help. Public member Karen Mulvaney also provided public comment bringing up accessory dwelling units and a current bill that touches on ADU's, AB 2406 (Thurman).

      Following the discussion, Regional Manager Nicholau offered to present at future meeting should the Committee decide to delve into any specific area of housing.

   b. Legislative Presentation
      1) Assembly Bill (AB) 1165 (Gloria) Property Taxation
         Following a discussion on the intent of the language “parents/guardians,” the Committee was in support of expanding the authorization to transfer the base year value of an original property to a person who is the parent or legal guardian of a severely and permanently disabled child and resides with the child and acted to recommend a support position on both AB 1165 and companion bill ACA 12.

         It was moved/seconded (Lapin [FA]/Davidson [FA]) and carried to recommend supporting AB 1165 and companion bill ACA 12.
(Unanimous: Lopez, Lapin, Lewis, Davidson; and Aldana)
2) AB 1264: (Garcia) Special Education Pupils. Individual Education Program (IEP): Meetings: School Records.
Committee members discuss the intent of this bill and felt that having access to reports and school records 5 business day was a good start to allowing parents/guardians adequate time to review IEPs.

It was moved/seconded (Davidson [FA]/Lopez [FA]) and carried to recommend supporting AB 1264. (Unanimous: Lopez, Lapin, Lewis, Davidson; and Aldana)

3) AB 1315: (Mullin) Mental Health: Early Psychosis and Mood Disorder Detection and Intervention.
Committee members reviewed the language contained in AB 1315 establishing an advisory committee to the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission for purposes of creating an early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention competitive selection process. Members voted unanimously to recommend a support position without discussion.

It was moved/seconded (Lapin [FA]/Davidson [FA]) and carried to recommend supporting AB 1315. (Unanimous: Lopez, Lapin, Lewis, Davidson; and Aldana)

4) AB 1379: (Thurmond) Certified Access Specialist Program (CASP) Funding.
Committee members discussed the benefits of indefinitely extending the increase to business license/permit fees in order to create a funding stream for CASPs. Evelyn Abouhassan noted that the author inadvertently wrote in a 2/3rd vote requirement which means this bill would need Republican votes.

It was moved/seconded (Lapin [FA]/Davidson [FA]) and carried to recommend supporting AB 1379. (Unanimous: Lopez, Lapin, Lewis, Davidson; and Aldana)

5) AB 1380: (Santiago) Developmental Services: Regional Center Services.
Following Committee discussion, members agreed to keep AB 1380 on the watch list. There is still uncertainty on the intent behind this bill.

7. UPDATES
   a. Senate Bill (SB) 433 – Deputy Director Bob Giovati provided an update on this bill stating that if it gets off the Assembly floor, it will go back to Senate for a vote on the amendments before going to the Governor’s desk. Deputy Director Giovati further stated that Mendoza’s office will continue to provide SCDD with updates.

   b. SCDD Bylaws – Committee Chair Lewis provided an informational copy of the relevant bylaw changes as they pertain to LPPC.

   c. Cycle 40 Grant Updates – Committee Chair Lewis provided an overview of the two Grants that were funded by the Council at the July 25th Council meeting and asked Committee members to think about ways to link the different work being done by the committees. One suggestion was to have a joint committee meeting with both LPPC and the State Plan Committee.

       Grants that received Cycle 40 Grant funds were: 1) Easter Seals; and 2) Lanterman Housing Alliance.

   d. Medicaid Update – The challenges facing Medicaid will likely continue to be an ongoing battle. Focus should be on House Republicans. Recommendations.

   e. 2016 Employment First Report – The report was approved at the July 25th Council meeting and is now with DOR to review the report for any accessibility issues.

   f. CIE Blueprint Update – The Blueprint is now finalized and expected to be released soon.

   g. Self-Determination Waiver Update – The next Statewide Self-Determination Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for August 28th. Agenda items will include: train-the-trainer pre-enrollment trainings and person-centered planning.
h. CalABLE Update – Due to the lack of responses, the RFP was re-sent and proposals are due back by September 5\textsuperscript{th}. The goal is to launch the RFP by end of the year. CalABLE is also looking at how other states are doing this as well as working on clean-up language in several bills.

i. Lanterman Coalition – The Lanterman Coalition is currently very provider-driven. Members thought that perhaps this could be a future agenda item in order to open up discussion around possible ways to realign the Coalition to ensure person-served and family representation.

8. MEMBER UPDATES

Committee members provided updates from their local areas including updates on the Developmental Center Taskforce activities and the DDS Safety Net Report.

9. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
A Robert’s Rules of Order plain language quick guide was provided to Committee members in order to provide a refresher to members that may not have received formal training in the past.

10. ADJOURNMENT
Meeting at adjourned at 3:15 p.m.
BILL: (ACA 12 and) AB 1165, as amended, Gloria. Property taxation: base year value transfers

ISSUE: Property taxation.

SUMMARY: According to the author, ACA 12 will submit to the voters of California whether to authorize the legislature to extend an existing, once in a lifetime opportunity to transfer "base year value" for homeowners with severely disabled children who need to purchase a new home or dwelling.

If ACA 12 is approved by the voters, AB 1165 will authorize the transfer of the base year value of a new home as described.

BACKGROUND/ISSUES/ANALYSIS: The author states: Proposition 13 established the concept of a base year value for property tax assessments and limitations on the tax rate and assessment increase for real property.

The California Constitution and state statutes surrounding property tax law and Prop. 13 allow a one-time transfer of the base year value of their personal residence to a replacement property. This transfer is only authorized for persons over the age of 55 and persons who are severely and permanently disabled.

For example, if a person purchased a house in 1980, the assessed value of that house is based on that purchase date and if the person needed to move in 2017 and they meet the criteria for transferring the base year, they may transfer that assessable "base" to another house. This can only be done once and in very limited circumstances.

The provisions in the law governing base year transfers - homeowners having an opportunity to transfer their base year - do not allow for a transfer when the individual has a severely and permanently disabled child. They only allow for the transfer if the resident is the disabled person.

DISCUSSION: The author adds: This problem was first identified when a severe and permanently disabled veteran returned home from war. The veteran, an adult child living with his parents, was no longer able to live in his parent's home due to his disability and needed to move. Because the adult child was not an "owner," existing law did not afford the family the
ability to utilize the significant property tax relief afforded under the base year value transfer provisions. The family was required to endure a lengthy, complicated and costly legal process in establishing a guardianship or trust. A more direct and available option should be established to assist those families caring for children who are permanently and severely disabled.

Last year, in its analysis of ACA 6 (Brown/Salas), the Board of Equalization had “insufficient information to estimate the number of transfers that will occur each year.” This is likely because the tax relief provisions contained in these bills, while hugely significant to the families and individuals involved, are relatively rare and are not likely to have a major impact on state revenues.

RECOMMENDATION: Support ACA 12 and AB 1165.

COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE: Goal 3 – Housing.

ATTACHMENTS: Text of ACA 12 and AB 1165.

PREPARED BY: Bob Giovati.
An act to amend Section 69.5 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, relating to taxation, to take effect immediately, tax levy.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 1165, as amended, Gloria. Property taxation: base year value transfers.

The California Constitution and existing property tax law authorize a person who is either severely disabled or over 55 years of age to transfer the base year value, as defined, of property that is eligible for the homeowners' property tax exemption to a replacement dwelling that is of equal or lesser value located within the same county as the property from which the base year value is transferred, and if a county ordinance so providing has been adopted, to a replacement dwelling that is located in a different county.

This bill would expand this authorization to transfer the base year value of an original property to a person who is the parent or legal guardian of a severely and permanently disabled child and resides with the child.

By changing the manner in which local assessors assess property for property taxation purposes, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.
The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement. This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to the statutory provisions noted above.

Existing law requires the state to reimburse local agencies annually for certain property tax revenues lost as a result of any exemption or classification of property for purposes of ad valorem property taxation. This bill would provide that, notwithstanding those provisions, no appropriation is made and the state shall not reimburse local agencies for property tax revenues lost by them pursuant to the bill.

This bill would take effect immediately as a tax levy but would become operative only if Assembly Constitutional Amendment-5 12 of the 2017–18 Regular Session is approved by the voters.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 69.5 of the Revenue and Taxation Code is amended to read:

69.5. (a) (1) Notwithstanding any other law, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 2 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution, any person over 55 years of age, any severely and permanently disabled person, or any person with who is the parent or legal guardian of a severely and permanently disabled child and resides with the child, who resides in property that is eligible for the homeowners' exemption under subdivision (k) of Section 3 of Article XIII of the California Constitution and Section 218 may transfer, subject to the conditions and limitations provided in this section, the base year value of that property to any replacement dwelling of equal or lesser value that is located within the same county and is purchased or newly constructed by that person as his or her principal residence within two years of the sale by that person of the original property, provided that the base year value of the original property shall not be transferred to the replacement dwelling until the original property is sold.
(2) Notwithstanding the limitation in paragraph (1) requiring that the original property and the replacement dwelling be located in the same county, this limitation shall not apply in any county in which the county board of supervisors, after consultation with local affected agencies within the boundaries of the county, adopts an ordinance making the provisions of paragraph (1) also applicable to situations in which replacement dwellings are located in that county and the original properties are located in another county within this state. The authorization contained in this paragraph shall be applicable in a county only if the ordinance adopted by the board of supervisors complies with all of the following requirements:

(A) It is adopted only after consultation between the board of supervisors and all other local affected agencies within the county's boundaries.

(B) It requires that all claims for transfers of base year value from original property located in another county be granted if the claims meet the applicable requirements of both subdivision (a) of Section 2 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution and this section.

(C) It requires that all base year valuations of original property located in another county and determined by its assessor be accepted in connection with the granting of claims for transfers of base year value.

(D) It provides that its provisions are operative for a period of not less than five years.

(E) The ordinance specifies the date on and after which its provisions shall be applicable. However, the date specified shall not be earlier than November 9, 1988. The specified applicable date may be a date earlier than the date the county adopts the ordinance.

(b) In addition to meeting the requirements of subdivision (a), any person claiming the property tax relief provided by this section shall be eligible for that relief only if the following conditions are met:

(1) The claimant is an owner and a resident of the original property either at the time of its sale, or at the time when the original property was substantially damaged or destroyed by misfortune or calamity, or within two years of the purchase or new construction of the replacement dwelling.
(2) The original property is eligible for the homeowners’ exemption, as the result of the claimant’s ownership and occupation of the property as his or her principal residence, either at the time of its sale, or at the time when the original property was substantially damaged or destroyed by misfortune or calamity, or within two years of the purchase or new construction of the replacement dwelling.

(3) At the time of the sale of the original property, the claimant or the claimant’s spouse who resides with the claimant is at least 55 years of age, is severely and permanently disabled, or has is the parent or legal guardian of a severely and permanently disabled child and resides with the child.

(4) At the time of claiming the property tax relief provided by subdivision (a), the claimant is an owner of a replacement dwelling and occupies it as his or her principal place of residence and, as a result thereof, the property is currently eligible for the homeowners’ exemption or would be eligible for the exemption except that the property is already receiving the exemption because of an exemption claim filed by the previous owner.

(5) The original property of the claimant is sold by him or her within two years of the purchase or new construction of the replacement dwelling. For purposes of this paragraph, the purchase or new construction of the replacement dwelling includes the purchase of that portion of land on which the replacement building, structure, or other shelter constituting a place of abode of the claimant will be situated and that, pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (g), constitutes a part of the replacement dwelling.

(6) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a), the replacement dwelling, including that portion of land on which it is situated that is specified in paragraph (5), is located entirely within the same county as the claimant’s original property.

(7) The claimant has not previously been granted, as a claimant, the property tax relief provided by this section, except that this paragraph shall not apply to any person who becomes severely and permanently disabled subsequent to being granted, as a claimant, the property tax relief provided by this section for any person over the age of 55 years. In order to prevent duplication of claims under this section within this state, county assessors shall report quarterly to the State Board of Equalization that information from claims filed in accordance with subdivision (f) and from.
county records as is specified by the board necessary to identify fully all claims under this section allowed by assessors and all claimants who have thereby received relief. The board may specify that the information include all or a part of the names and social security numbers of claimants and their spouses and the identity and location of the replacement dwelling to which the claim applies. The information may be required in the form of data processing media or other media and in a format that is compatible with the recordkeeping processes of the counties and the auditing procedures of the state.

(c) The property tax relief provided by this section shall be available if the original property or the replacement dwelling, or both, of the claimant includes, but is not limited to, either of the following:

1. A unit or lot within a cooperative housing corporation, a community apartment project, a condominium project, or a planned unit development. If the unit or lot constitutes the original property of the claimant, the assessor shall transfer to the claimant's replacement dwelling only the base year value of the claimant's unit or lot and his or her share in any common area reserved as an appurtenance of that unit or lot. If the unit or lot constitutes the replacement dwelling of the claimant, the assessor shall transfer the base year value of the claimant's original property only to the unit or lot of the claimant and any share of the claimant in any common area reserved as an appurtenance of that unit or lot.

2. A manufactured home or a manufactured home and any land owned by the claimant on which the manufactured home is situated. For purposes of this paragraph, "land owned by the claimant" includes a pro rata interest in a resident-owned mobilehome park that is assessed pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 62.1.

(A) If the manufactured home or the manufactured home and the land on which it is situated constitutes the claimant's original property, the assessor shall transfer to the claimant's replacement dwelling either the base year value of the manufactured home or the base year value of the manufactured home and the land on which it is situated, as appropriate. If the manufactured home dwelling that constitutes the original property of the claimant includes an interest in a resident-owned mobilehome park, the assessor shall transfer to the claimant's replacement dwelling the base year value of the claimant's manufactured home and his or
her pro rata portion of the real property of the park. No transfer of
base year value shall be made by the assessor of that portion of
land that does not constitute a part of the original property, as
provided in paragraph (4) of subdivision (g).

(B) If the manufactured home or the manufactured home and
the land on which it is situated constitutes the claimant's
replacement dwelling, the assessor shall transfer the base year
value of the claimant's original property either to the manufactured
home or the manufactured home and the land on which it is
situated, as appropriate. If the manufactured home dwelling that
constitutes the replacement dwelling of the claimant includes an
interest in a resident-owned mobilehome park, the assessor shall
transfer the base year value of the claimant’s original property to
the manufactured home of the claimant and his or her pro rata
portion of the park. No transfer of base year value shall be made
by the assessor to that portion of land that does not constitute a
part of the replacement dwelling, as provided in paragraph (3) of
subdivision (g).

This subdivision shall be subject to the limitations specified in
subdivision (d).

(d) The property tax relief provided by this section shall be
available to a claimant who is the coowner of the original property,
as a joint tenant, a tenant in common, a community property owner,
or a present beneficiary of a trust subject to the following
limitations:

(1) If a single replacement dwelling is purchased or newly
constructed by all of the coowners and each coowner retains an
interest in the replacement dwelling, the claimant shall be eligible
under this section whether or not any or all of the remaining
coowners would otherwise be eligible claimants.

(2) If two or more replacement dwellings are separately
purchased or newly constructed by two or more coowners and
more than one coowner would otherwise be an eligible claimant,
only one coowner shall be eligible under this section. These
cowners shall determine by mutual agreement which one of them
shall be deemed eligible.

(3) If two or more replacement dwellings are separately
purchased or newly constructed by two coowners who held the
original property as community property, only the coowner who
has attained 55 years of age, is severely and permanently disabled,
or has is the parent or legal guardian of a severely and permanently
disabled child and resides with the child, shall be eligible under
this section. If both spouses are over 55 years of age, they shall
determine by mutual agreement which one of them is eligible.

In the case of coowners whose original property is a multiunit
dwelling, the limitations imposed by paragraphs (2) and (3) shall
only apply to coowners who occupied the same dwelling unit
within the original property at the time specified in paragraph (2)
of subdivision (b).

(e) Upon the sale of original property, the assessor shall
determine a new base year value for that property in accordance
with subdivision (a) of Section 2 of Article XIII A of the California
Constitution and Section 110.1, whether or not a replacement
dwelling is subsequently purchased or newly constructed by the
former owner or owners of the original property.

This section shall not apply unless the transfer of the original
property is a change in ownership that either (1) subjects that
property to reappraisal at its current fair market value in accordance
with Section 110.1 or 5803 or (2) results in a base year value
determined in accordance with this section, Section 69, or Section
69.3 because the property qualifies under this section, Section 69,
or Section 69.3 as a replacement dwelling or property.

(f) (1) A claimant shall not be eligible for the property tax relief
provided by this section unless the claimant provides to the
assessor, on a form that shall be designed by the State Board of
Equalization and that the assessor shall make available upon
request, the following information:

(A) The name and social security number of each claimant and
of any spouse of the claimant who is a record owner of the
replacement dwelling.

(B) Proof that the claimant or the claimant’s spouse who resided
on the original property with the claimant was, at the time of its
sale, at least 55 years of age, severely and permanently disabled,
disabled, or had was the parent or legal guardian of a severely
and permanently disabled child and resided with the child. Proof
of severe and permanent disability shall be considered a
certification, signed by a licensed physician and surgeon of
appropriate specialty, attesting to the claimant’s severely and
permanently disabled condition or the child’s severely and
permanently disabled condition. In the absence of available proof
that a person is over 55 years of age, the claimant shall certify under penalty of perjury that the age requirement is met. In the case of a severely and permanently disabled claimant either of the following shall be submitted:

(i) A certification, signed by a licensed physician or surgeon of appropriate specialty that identifies specific reasons why the disability necessitates a move to the replacement dwelling and the disability-related requirements, including any locational requirements, of a replacement dwelling. The claimant shall substantiate that the replacement dwelling meets disability-related requirements so identified and that the primary reason for the move to the replacement dwelling is to satisfy those requirements. If the claimant, or the claimant’s spouse or guardian, so declares under penalty of perjury, it shall be rebuttably presumed that the primary purpose of the move to the replacement dwelling is to satisfy identified disability-related requirements.

(ii) The claimant’s substantiation that the primary purpose of the move to the replacement dwelling is to alleviate financial burdens caused by the disability. If the claimant, or the claimant’s spouse or guardian, so declares under penalty of perjury, it shall be rebuttably presumed that the primary purpose of the move is to alleviate the financial burdens caused by the disability.

(C) The address and, if known, the assessor’s parcel number of the original property.

(D) The date of the claimant’s sale of the original property and the date of the claimant’s purchase or new construction of a replacement dwelling.

(E) A statement by the claimant that he or she occupied the replacement dwelling as his or her principal place of residence on the date of the filing of his or her claim.

(F) Any claim under this section shall be filed within three years of the date the replacement dwelling was purchased or the new construction of the replacement dwelling was completed subject to subdivision (k) or (m).

(2) A claim for transfer of base year value under this section that is filed after the expiration of the filing period set forth in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (1) shall be considered by the assessor, subject to all of the following conditions:
(A) Any base year value transfer granted pursuant to that claim shall apply commencing with the lien date of the assessment year in which the claim is filed.

(B) The full cash value of the replacement property in the assessment year described in subparagraph (A) shall be the base year value of the real property in the assessment year in which the base year value was transferred, factored to the assessment year described in subparagraph (A) for both of the following:

(i) Inflation as annually determined in accordance with paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 51.

(ii) Any subsequent new construction occurring with respect to the subject real property that does not qualify for property tax relief pursuant to the criteria set forth in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (h).

(g) For purposes of this section:

(1) “Person over the age of 55 years” means any person or the spouse of any person who has attained the age of 55 years or older at the time of the sale of the original property.

(2) “Base year value of the original property” means its base year value, as determined in accordance with Section 110.1, with the adjustments permitted by subdivision (b) of Section 2 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution and subdivision (f) of Section 110.1, determined as of the date immediately prior to the date that the original property is sold by the claimant, or in the case where the original property has been substantially damaged or destroyed by misfortune or calamity and the owner does not rebuild on the original property, determined as of the date immediately prior to the misfortune or calamity.

If the replacement dwelling is purchased or newly constructed after the transfer of the original property, “base year value of the original property” also includes any inflation factor adjustments permitted by subdivision (f) of Section 110.1 for the period subsequent to the sale of the original property. The base year or years used to compute the “base year value of the original property” shall be deemed to be the base year or years of any property to which that base year value is transferred pursuant to this section.

(3) “Replacement dwelling” means a building, structure, or other shelter constituting a place of abode, whether real property or personal property, that is owned and occupied by a claimant as his or her principal place of residence, and any land owned by the
claimant on which the building, structure, or other shelter is situated. For purposes of this paragraph, land constituting a part of a replacement dwelling includes only that area of reasonable size that is used as a site for a residence, and "land owned by the claimant" includes land for which the claimant either holds a leasehold interest described in subdivision (c) of Section 61 or a land purchase contract. Each unit of a multiunit dwelling shall be considered a separate replacement dwelling. For purposes of this paragraph, "area of reasonable size that is used as a site for a residence" includes all land if any nonresidential uses of the property are only incidental to the use of the property as a residential site. For purposes of this paragraph, "land owned by the claimant" includes an ownership interest in a resident-owned mobilehome park that is assessed pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 62.1.

(4) "Original property" means a building, structure, or other shelter constituting a place of abode, whether real property or personal property, that is owned and occupied by a claimant as his or her principal place of residence, and any land owned by the claimant on which the building, structure, or other shelter is situated. For purposes of this paragraph, land constituting a part of the original property includes only that area of reasonable size that is used as a site for a residence, and "land owned by the claimant" includes land for which the claimant either holds a leasehold interest described in subdivision (c) of Section 61 or a land purchase contract. Each unit of a multiunit dwelling shall be considered a separate original property. For purposes of this paragraph, "area of reasonable size that is used as a site for a residence" includes all land if any nonresidential uses of the property are only incidental to the use of the property as a residential site. For purposes of this paragraph, "land owned by the claimant" includes an ownership interest in a resident-owned mobilehome park that is assessed pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 62.1.

(5) "Equal or lesser value" means that the amount of the full cash value of a replacement dwelling does not exceed one of the following:

(A) One hundred percent of the amount of the full cash value of the original property if the replacement dwelling is purchased
or newly constructed prior to the date of the sale of the original property.

(B) One hundred and five percent of the amount of the full cash value of the original property if the replacement dwelling is purchased or newly constructed within the first year following the date of the sale of the original property.

(C) One hundred and ten percent of the amount of the full cash value of the original property if the replacement dwelling is purchased or newly constructed within the second year following the date of the sale of the original property.

For the purposes of this paragraph, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (4) of subdivision (h), if the replacement dwelling is, in part, purchased and, in part, newly constructed, the date the “replacement dwelling is purchased or newly constructed” is the date of purchase or the date of completion of construction, whichever is later.

(6) “Full cash value of the replacement dwelling” means its full cash value, determined in accordance with Section 110.1, as of the date on which it was purchased or new construction was completed, and after the purchase or the completion of new construction.

(7) “Full cash value of the original property” means, either:

(A) Its new base year value, determined in accordance with subdivision (e), without the application of subdivision (h) of Section 2 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution, plus the adjustments permitted by subdivision (b) of Section 2 of Article XIII A and subdivision (f) of Section 110.1 for the period from the date of its sale by the claimant to the date on which the replacement property was purchased or new construction was completed.

(B) In the case where the original property has been substantially damaged or destroyed by misfortune or calamity and the owner does not rebuild on the original property, its full cash value, as determined in accordance with Section 110, immediately prior to its substantial damage or destruction by misfortune or calamity, as determined by the county assessor of the county in which the property is located, without the application of subdivision (h) of Section 2 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution, plus the adjustments permitted by subdivision (b) of Section 2 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution and subdivision (f) of Section 110.1, for the period from the date of its sale by the claimant to
the date on which the replacement property was purchased or new
collection was completed.
(8) "Sale" means any change in ownership of the original
property for consideration.
(9) "Claimant" means any person claiming the property tax
relief provided by this section. If a spouse of that person is a record
owner of the replacement dwelling, the spouse is also a claimant
for purposes of determining whether in any future claim filed by
the spouse under this section the condition of eligibility specified
in paragraph (7) of subdivision (b) has been met.
(10) "Property that is eligible for the homeowners' exemption"
includes property that is the principal place of residence of its
owner and is entitled to exemption pursuant to Section 205.5.
(11) "Person" means any individual, but does not include any
firm, partnership, association, corporation, company, or other legal
entity or organization of any kind. "Person" includes an individual
who is the present beneficiary of a trust.
(12) "Severely and permanently disabled" means any person
described in subdivision (b) of Section 74.3.
(13) For the purposes of this section, property is "substantially
damaged or destroyed by misfortune or calamity" if either the land
or the improvements sustain physical damage amounting to more
than 50 percent of either the land's or the improvement's full cash
value immediately prior to the misfortune or calamity. Damage
includes a diminution in the value of property as a result of
restricted access to the property where the restricted access was
caused by the misfortune or calamity and is permanent in nature.
(h) (1) Upon the timely filing of a claim described in
subparagraph (F) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (f), the assessor
shall adjust the new base year value of the replacement dwelling
in conformity with this section. This adjustment shall be made as
of the latest of the following dates:
(A) The date the original property is sold.
(B) The date the replacement dwelling is purchased.
(C) The date the new construction of the replacement dwelling
is completed.
(2) Any taxes that were levied on the replacement dwelling prior
to the filing of the claim on the basis of the replacement dwelling's
new base year value, and any allowable annual adjustments thereto,
shall be canceled or refunded to the claimant to the extent that the
taxes exceed the amount that would be due when determined on
the basis of the adjusted new base year value.
(3) Notwithstanding Section 75.10, Chapter 3.5 (commencing
with Section 75) shall be utilized for purposes of implementing
this subdivision, including adjustments of the new base year value
of replacement dwellings acquired prior to the sale of the original
property.
(4) In the case where a claim under this section has been timely
filed and granted, and new construction is performed upon the
replacement dwelling subsequent to the transfer of base year value,
the property tax relief provided by this section also shall apply to
the replacement dwelling, as improved, and thus there shall be no
reassessment upon completion of the new construction if both of
the following conditions are met:
(A) The new construction is completed within two years of the
date of the sale of the original property and the owner notifies the
assessor in writing of completion of the new construction within
six months after completion.
(B) The fair market value of the new construction on the date
of completion, plus the full cash value of the replacement dwelling
on the date of acquisition, is not more than the full cash value of
the original property as determined pursuant to paragraph (7) of
subdivision (g) for purposes of granting the original claim.
(i) Any claimant may rescind a claim for the property tax relief
provided by this section and shall not be considered to have
received that relief for purposes of paragraph (7) of subdivision
(b), and the assessor shall grant the rescission, if a written notice
of rescission is delivered to the office of the assessor as follows:
(1) A written notice of rescission signed by the original filing
claimant or claimants is delivered to the office of the assessor in
which the original claim was filed.
(2) (A) Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the
notice of rescission is delivered to the office of the assessor before
the date that the county first issues, as a result of relief granted
under this section, a refund check for property taxes imposed upon
the replacement dwelling. If granting relief will not result in a
refund of property taxes, then the notice shall be delivered before
payment is first made of any property taxes, or any portion thereof,
imposed upon the replacement dwelling consistent with relief
granted under this section. If payment of the taxes is not made,
then notice shall be delivered before the first date that those
property taxes, or any portion thereof, imposed upon the
replacement dwelling, consistent with relief granted under this
section, are delinquent.

(B) Notwithstanding any other provision in this division, any
time the notice of rescission is delivered to the office of the assessor
within six years after relief was granted, provided that the
replacement property has been vacated as the claimant’s principal
place of residence within 90 days after the original claim was filed,
regardless of whether the property continues to receive the
homeowners’ exemption. If the rescission increases the base year
value of a property, or the homeowners’ exemption has been
incorrectly allowed, appropriate escape assessments or
supplemental assessments, including interest as provided in Section
506, shall be imposed. The limitations periods for any escape
assessments or supplemental assessments shall not commence until
July 1 of the assessment year in which the notice of rescission is
delivered to the office of the assessor.

(3) The notice is accompanied by the payment of a fee as the
assessor may require, provided that the fee shall not exceed an
amount reasonably related to the estimated cost of processing a
rescission claim, including both direct costs and developmental
and indirect costs, such as costs for overhead, personnel, supplies,
materials, office space, and computers.

(j) (1) With respect to the transfer of base year value of original
properties to replacement dwellings located in the same county,
this section, except as provided in paragraph (3) or (4), shall apply
to any replacement dwelling that is purchased or newly constructed
on or after November 6, 1986.

(2) With respect to the transfer of base year value of original
properties to replacement dwellings located in different counties,
except as provided in paragraph (4), this section shall apply to any
replacement dwelling that is purchased or newly constructed on
or after the date specified in accordance with subparagraph (E) of
paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) in the ordinance of the county in
which the replacement dwelling is located, but shall not apply to
any replacement dwelling which was purchased or newly
constructed before November 9, 1988.

(3) With respect to the transfer of base year value by a severely
and permanently disabled person, this section shall apply only to
replacement dwellings that are purchased or newly constructed on
or after June 6, 1990.
(4) The amendments made to subdivision (e) by the act adding
this paragraph shall apply only to replacement dwellings under
Section 69 that are acquired or newly constructed on or after
October 20, 1991, and shall apply commencing with the 1991–92
fiscal year.
(k) (1) In the case in which a county adopts an ordinance
pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) that establishes an
applicable date which is more than three years prior to the date of
adoption of the ordinance, those potential claimants who purchased
or constructed replacement dwellings more than three years prior
to the date of adoption of the ordinance and who would, therefore,
be precluded from filing a timely claim, shall be deemed to have
timely filed a claim if the claim is filed within three years after the
date that the ordinance is adopted. This paragraph may not be
construed as a waiver of any other requirement of this section.
(2) In the case in which a county assessor corrects a base year
value to reflect a pro rata change in ownership of a resident-owned
mobilehome park that occurred between January 1, 1989, and
January 1, 2002, pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of
Section 62.1, those claimants who purchased or constructed
replacement dwellings more than three years prior to the correction
and who would, therefore, be precluded from filing a timely claim,
shall be deemed to have timely filed a claim if the claim is filed
within three years of the date of notice of the correction of the base
year value to reflect the pro rata change in ownership. This
paragraph may not be construed as a waiver of any other
requirement of this section.
(3) This subdivision does not apply to a claimant who has
transferred his or her replacement dwelling prior to filing a claim.
(4) The property tax relief provided by this section, but filed
under this subdivision, shall apply prospectively only, commencing
with the lien date of the assessment year in which the claim is
filed. There shall be no refund or cancellation of taxes prior to the
date that the claim is filed.
(I) No escape assessment may be levied if a transfer of base
year value under this section has been erroneously granted by the
assessor pursuant to an expired ordinance authorizing intercounty
transfers of base year value.
(m) (1) The amendments made to subdivisions (b) and (g) of this section by Chapter 613 of the Statutes of 2001 shall apply:

(A) With respect to the transfer of base year value of original properties to replacement dwellings located in the same county, to any replacement dwelling that is purchased or newly constructed on or after November 6, 1986.

(B) With respect to the transfer of base year value of original properties to replacement dwellings located in different counties, to any replacement dwelling that is purchased or newly constructed on or after the date specified in accordance with subparagraph (E) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) in the ordinance of the county in which the replacement dwelling is located, but not to any replacement dwelling that was purchased or newly constructed before November 9, 1988.

(C) With respect to the transfer of base year value by a severely and permanently disabled person, to replacement dwellings that are purchased or newly constructed on or after June 6, 1990.

(2) The property tax relief provided by this section in accordance with this subdivision shall apply prospectively only commencing with the lien date of the assessment year in which the claim is filed. There shall be no refund or cancellation of taxes prior to the date that the claim is filed.

(n) A claim filed under this section is not a public document and is not subject to public inspection, except that a claim shall be available for inspection by the claimant or the claimant’s spouse, the claimant’s or the claimant’s spouse’s legal representative, the trustee of a trust in which the claimant or the claimant’s spouse is a present beneficiary, and the executor or administrator of the claimant’s or the claimant’s spouse’s estate.

(o) The amendments made to this section by the act adding this subdivision shall apply commencing with the lien date for the 2012-13 fiscal year.

SEC. 2. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding Section 2229 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, no appropriation is made by this act and the state
shall not reimburse any local agency for any property tax revenues
lost by it pursuant to this act.

SEC. 4. This act provides for a tax levy within the meaning of
Article IV of the California Constitution and shall go into
immediate effect. However, the provisions of this act shall become
operative only if Assembly Constitutional Amendment § 12 of the
2017–18 Regular Session is approved by the voters and, in that
event, shall become operative on January 1, 2019.

ISSUE: School records.

SUMMARY: This bill requires that parents be offered copies of any available completed school records related to the pupil’s current levels of performance, and any assessment reports, prior to a meeting regarding a student’s individualized education program (IEP).

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS: Specifically, this bill:

1) Requires, before any meeting regarding an IEP, a public agency offer to provide the parent or guardian copies of any available, completed school records related to the pupil’s current levels of performance, and any available, completed assessment reports, if those records and reports are related to that meeting. If the parent or guardian requests those copies, the public agency will make them available to the pupil’s parent or guardian at least five business days prior to any meeting regarding an IEP.

2) Allows for a public agency to charge no more than the actual cost of reproducing the records, but if this cost effectively prevents the parent or guardian from exercising the right to receive the copy or copies, the copy or copies must be reproduced at no cost. (Source: Assembly Appropriations Analysis).

DISCUSSION: According to the author, “AB 1264 would encourage school districts to automatically provide parents/guardians with copies of assessments and other educational records (i.e. draft copy of the proposed IEP, student work samples, data collections, etc.) five school days prior to the date of the scheduled IEP meeting... Most parents are not aware that they can make a request to view these important educational documents before an IEP meeting.

If parents were automatically provided with all this information 5 days prior to an IEP meeting, it would allow them to become familiar with any documentation that will be a part of the IEP meeting, as well as prepare their questions in advance of the IEP meeting.
Implementing this change will also encourage further transparency from the school district to the parent/guardian, as well as ensure that everyone attending the IEP meeting has the same information at relatively the same time. This makes the IEP process, especially for parents/guardians, more equitable for all IEP meeting attendees, rather than allowing the school district to be the only party to have this information in advance." (Source: Assembly Appropriations Analysis).

RECOMMENDATION: Support AB 1264.

COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE: Goal 5 – Lifelong inclusive education.

ATTACHMENTS: Text of AB 1264.

PREPARED: Bob Giovati.
Intended to amend Sections 56043 and 56504 of the Education Code, relating to special education pupils.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST


1 Existing law requires local educational agencies to identify, locate, and assess individuals with exceptional needs and to provide those pupils with a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment, with special education and related services as reflected in an individualized education program. Existing law requires a local educational agency to initiate and conduct meetings for the purposes of developing, reviewing, and revising the individualized education program of each individual with exceptional needs in accordance with federal law.

Existing law requires a parent of an individual with exceptional needs to have the right and opportunity to examine all school records of his or her child and to receive copies of those records within 5 business days after a request is made by the parent, either orally or in writing.
Existing law requires a public agency to comply with a request for school records without unnecessary delay before any meeting regarding an individualized education program.

This bill would require a public agency, before any meeting regarding an individualized education program, to offer to provide to the parent or guardian copies of any available, completed school records related to the pupil's current levels of performance, and any available, completed assessment reports, related to that meeting. The bill would require the public agency, if the parent or guardian requests those copies, to make them available to the parent or guardian at least 5 business days before the meeting. The bill would prohibit a public agency from charging a parent or guardian for no more than the actual cost of reproducing these copies, but if the cost effectively prevents the parent or guardian from exercising the right to receive the copies, the public agency would be required to reproduce the copies at no cost. The bill would require notice of an individualized education program meeting to include a check box for a parent or guardian to request these school records and would require, if notice is provided verbally, a parent or guardian to be asked if he or she wishes to request these school records. By imposing additional duties on local educational agencies, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The bill would also make conforming changes.

(2) The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to the statutory provisions noted above.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 56043 of the Education Code is amended to read:

56043. The primary timelines affecting special education programs are as follows:
(a) A proposed assessment plan shall be developed within 15 calendar days of referral for assessment, not counting calendar days between the pupil’s regular school sessions or terms or calendar days of school vacation in excess of five schooldays, from the date of receipt of the referral, unless the parent or guardian agrees in writing to an extension, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 56321.

(b) A parent or guardian shall have at least 15 calendar days from the receipt of the proposed assessment plan to arrive at a decision, pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 56321.

(c) Once a child has been referred for an initial assessment to determine whether the child is an individual with exceptional needs and to determine the educational needs of the child, these determinations shall be made, and an individualized education program team meeting shall occur within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the assessment, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 56302.1, except as specified in subdivision (b) of that section, and pursuant to Section 56344.

(d) The individualized education program team shall review the pupil’s individualized education program periodically, but not less frequently than annually, pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 56341.1.

(e) A parent or guardian shall be notified of the individualized education program team meeting early enough to ensure an opportunity to attend, pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 56341.5. In the case of an individual with exceptional needs who is 16 years of age or younger, if appropriate, the meeting notice shall indicate that a purpose of the meeting will be the consideration of the postsecondary goals and transition services for the individual with exceptional needs, and the meeting notice described in this subdivision shall indicate that the individual with exceptional needs is invited to attend, pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 56341.5.

(f) (1) An individualized education program required as a result of an assessment of a pupil shall be developed within a total time not to exceed 60 calendar days, not counting days between the pupil’s regular school sessions, terms, or days of school vacation in excess of five schooldays, from the date of receipt of the parent’s or guardian’s written consent for assessment, unless the parent or
(2) A meeting to develop an initial individualized education program for the pupil shall be conducted within 30 days of a determination that the child needs special education and related services pursuant to Section 300.323(c)(1) of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations and in accordance with Section 56344.

(g) (1) Beginning not later than the first individualized education program to be in effect when the pupil is 16 years of age, or younger if determined appropriate by the individualized education program team, and updated annually thereafter, the individualized education program shall include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals and transition services needed to assist the pupil in reaching those goals, pursuant to paragraph (8) of subdivision (a) of Section 56345.

(2) The individualized education program for pupils in grades 7 to 12, inclusive, shall include any alternative means and modes necessary for the pupil to complete the district’s prescribed course of study and to meet or exceed proficiency standards for graduation, pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) of Section 56345.

(3) Beginning not later than one year before the pupil reaches 18 years of age, the individualized education program shall contain a statement that the pupil has been informed of the pupil’s rights under this part, if any, that will transfer to the pupil upon reaching 18 years of age, pursuant to Section 56041.5, subdivision (g) of Section 56345, and Section 300.520 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

(h) Beginning at the age of 16 years or younger, and annually thereafter, a statement of needed transition services shall be included in the pupil’s individualized education program, pursuant to Section 56345.1 and Section 1414(d)(1)(A)(i)(VIII) of Title 20 of the United States Code.

(i) A pupil’s individualized education program shall be implemented as soon as possible following the individualized education program team meeting, pursuant to Section 300.323(c)(2) of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations and in accordance with Section 56344.

(j) An individualized education program team shall meet at least annually to review a pupil’s progress, the individualized education program, including whether the annual goals for the pupil are being
achieved, the appropriateness of the placement, and to make any
necessary revisions, pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 56343.
The local educational agency shall maintain procedures to ensure
that the individualized education program team reviews the pupil’s
individualized education program periodically, but not less
frequently than annually, to determine whether the annual goals
for the pupil are being achieved, and revises the individualized
education program as appropriate to address, among other matters,
the provisions specified in subdivision (d) of Section 56341.1,
pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 56380.
(k) A reassessment of a pupil shall occur not more frequently
than once a year, unless the parent and the local educational agency
agree otherwise in writing, and shall occur at least once every three
years, unless the parent and the local educational agency agree, in
writing, that a reassessment is unnecessary, pursuant to Section
56381, and in accordance with Section 1414(a)(2) of Title 20 of
the United States Code.
(l) A meeting of an individualized education program team
requested by a parent to review an individualized education
program pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 56343 shall be held
within 30 calendar days, not counting days between the pupil’s
regular school sessions, terms, or days of school vacation in excess
of five schooldays, from the date of receipt of the parent's or
guardian’s written request, pursuant to Section 56343.5.
(m) If an individual with exceptional needs transfers from
district to district within the state, the following are applicable
pursuant to Section 56325:
(1) If the child has an individualized education program and
transfers into a district from a district not operating programs under
the same local plan in which he or she was last enrolled in a special
education program within the same academic year, the local
educational agency shall provide the pupil with a free appropriate
public education, including services comparable to those described
in the previously approved individualized education program, in
consultation with the parents or guardians, for a period not to
exceed 30 days, by which time the local educational agency shall
adopt the previously approved individualized education program
or shall develop, adopt, and implement a new individualized
education program that is consistent with federal and state law,
pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 56325.
(2) If the child has an individualized education program and transfers into a district from a district operating programs under the same special education local plan area of the district in which he or she was last enrolled in a special education program within the same academic year, the new district shall continue, without delay, to provide services comparable to those described in the existing approved individualized education program, unless the parent and the local educational agency agree to develop, adopt, and implement a new individualized education program that is consistent with state and federal law, pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 56325.

(3) If the child has an individualized education program and transfers from an educational agency located outside the state to a district within the state within the same academic year, the local educational agency shall provide the pupil with a free appropriate public education, including services comparable to those described in the previously approved individualized education program, in consultation with the parents or guardians, until the local educational agency conducts an assessment as specified in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a) of Section 56325.

(4) In order to facilitate the transition for an individual with exceptional needs described in paragraphs (1) to (3), inclusive, the new school in which the pupil enrolls shall take reasonable steps to promptly obtain the pupil’s records, as specified, pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 56325.

(n) (1) The parent or guardian shall have the right and opportunity to examine all school records of the child and to receive complete copies within five business days after a request is made by the parent or guardian, either orally or in writing, and before any meeting regarding an individualized education program of his or her child or any hearing or resolution session pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 56500), in accordance with subdivision (a) of Section 56504 and Chapter 6.5 (commencing with Section 49060) of Part 27.

(2) Before any meeting regarding an individualized education program, a public agency shall offer to provide to the parent or guardian copies of any available, completed school records related to the pupil’s current levels of performance, and any available, completed assessment reports, if those records and reports are related to that meeting. If the parent or guardian requests those
copies, the public agency shall make them available to the pupil’s
parent or guardian at least five business days prior to the meeting,
in accordance with subdivision (b) of Section 56504.

(o) Upon receipt of a request from a local educational agency
where an individual with exceptional needs has enrolled, a former
educational agency shall send the pupil’s special education records,
or a copy of those records, to the new local educational agency
within five working days, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section
3024 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

(p) The department shall do all of the following:
(1) Have a time limit of 60 calendar days after a complaint is
filed with the state educational agency to investigate the complaint.
(2) Give the complainant the opportunity to submit additional
information about the allegations in the complaint.
(3) Review all relevant information and make an independent
determination as to whether there is a violation of a requirement
of this part or Part B of the federal Individuals with Disabilities
Education Act (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1400 et seq.).
(4) Issue a written decision pursuant to Section 300.152(a)(5)
of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

(q) A prehearing mediation conference shall be scheduled within
15 calendar days of receipt by the Superintendent of the request
for mediation, and shall be completed within 30 calendar days
after the request for mediation, unless both parties to the prehearing
mediation conference agree to extend the time for completing the
mediation, pursuant to Section 56500.3.

(r) Any request for a due process hearing arising from
subdivision (a) of Section 56501 shall be filed within two years
from the date the party initiating the request knew or had reason
to know of facts underlying the basis for the request, except that
this timeline shall not apply to a parent if the parent was prevented
from requesting the due process hearing, pursuant to subdivision
(l) of Section 56505.

(s) The Superintendent shall ensure that, within 45 calendar
days after receipt of a written due process hearing request, the
hearing is immediately commenced and completed, including any
mediation requested at any point during the hearing process, and
a final administrative decision is rendered, pursuant to subdivision
(f) of Section 56502.
(t) If either party to a due process hearing intends to be represented by an attorney in the due process hearing, notice of that intent shall be given to the other party at least 10 calendar days before the hearing, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 56507.

(u) Any party to a due process hearing shall have the right to be informed by the other parties to the hearing, at least 10 calendar days before the hearing, as to what those parties believe are the issues to be decided at the hearing and their proposed resolution of those issues, pursuant to paragraph (6) of subdivision (e) of Section 56505.

(v) Any party to a due process hearing shall have the right to receive from other parties to the hearing, at least five business days before the hearing, a copy of all documents, including all assessments completed and not completed by that date, and a list of all witnesses and their general area of testimony that the parties intend to present at the hearing, pursuant to paragraph (7) of subdivision (e) of Section 56505.

(w) An appeal of a due process hearing decision shall be made within 90 calendar days of receipt of the hearing decision, pursuant to subdivision (k) of Section 56505.

(x) A complaint filed with the department shall allege a violation of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1400 et seq.) or a provision of this part that occurred not more than one year before the date that the complaint is received by the department, pursuant to Section 56500.2 and Section 300.153(c) of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 2. Section 56504 of the Education Code is amended to read:

56504. (a) (1) The parent or guardian shall have the right and opportunity to examine all school records of his or her child and to receive copies pursuant to this section and to Section 49065 within five business days after the request is made by the parent, either orally or in writing. The public agency shall comply with a request for school records without unnecessary delay before any meeting regarding an individualized education program or any hearing pursuant to Section 300.121, 300.301, 300.304, or 300.507 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations or resolution session pursuant to Section 300.510 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal
Regulations and in no case more than five business days after the request is made orally or in writing.

(2) (A) The parent or guardian shall have the right to a response from the public agency to reasonable requests for explanations and interpretations of the records.

(B) If a school record includes information on more than one pupil, the parents or guardians of those pupils have the right to inspect and review only the information relating to their child or to be informed of that specific information.

(C) A public agency shall provide a parent or guardian, on request of the parent or guardian a list of the types and locations of school records collected, maintained, or used by the agency.

(3) A public agency may charge no more than the actual cost of reproducing the records, but if this cost effectively prevents the parent or guardian from exercising the right to receive the copy or copies, the copy or copies shall be reproduced at no cost.

(b) (1) Before any meeting regarding an individualized education program, a public agency shall offer to provide to the parent or guardian copies of any available, completed school records related to the student’s current levels of performance, and any available, completed assessment reports, if these records and reports are related to that meeting. If the parent or guardian requests any of those copies, the public agency shall provide them to the parent or guardian at least five business days before the meeting.

(2) A public agency shall not charge a parent for the cost to provide copies pursuant to paragraph (1).

(c) A public agency may charge a parent or guardian no more than the actual cost of reproducing the records requested pursuant to this section, but if this cost effectively prevents the parent or guardian from exercising the right to receive the copy or copies, the copy or copies shall be reproduced at no cost.

(d) (1) Notice of an individualized education program meeting pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 56341.5 shall include a check box for a parent or guardian to request school records pursuant to this section. A parent or guardian who is notified verbally of an individualized education program meeting shall be asked if he or she wishes to request school records pursuant to this section.
(2) A notice to a parent or guardian of all the procedural safeguards under the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. Sec. 1400 et seq.), and the rights and procedures contained in this chapter, shall include the right to obtain school records pursuant to this section within five business days after the request is made.

SEC. 3. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.
BILL: AB 1315, as amended, Mullin. Mental health: early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention.

ISSUE: Early Psychosis and Mood Disorder Detection.

SUMMARY: According to the author, the purpose of AB 1315 is to address an unmet need to provide evidence-based early psychosis detection and intervention services and supports to transition-aged youth and young adults who are at risk of, or experiencing, psychotic symptoms or have psychotic disorders.

BACKGROUND/ISSUES/ANALYSIS: The author states: Fifty percent of all mental illness begins by the age of 14 and 75 percent by the age of 24, yet young people are often reluctant and afraid to seek help.

Approximately 100,000 adolescents and young adults experience first episode psychosis each year. Untreated psychosis increases a person's risk for suicide, involuntary emergency care, poor clinical outcomes, and can initiate a trajectory of accumulating disability into later adulthood. The average delay in receiving diagnosis and treatment for psychotic disorders is 18.5 months following the onset of psychotic symptoms.

Clinical research conducted world-wide supports a variety of evidence-based interventions for ameliorating psychotic symptoms and promoting functional recovery-oriented treatment. Changing the paradigm from reactive to proactive early detection and treatment has demonstrated efficacy and is cost-beneficial as recognized by both the federal SAMHSA and the National Institute of Mental Health, as well as independent evaluators. The overarching goal is to intervene early, and to improve the client experience in accessing services and in working towards life-long recovery and wellness.

DISCUSSION: The author adds: AB 1315 will serve as a catalyst to invigorate evidence-based practices in California and will address a significant unmet gap in California's delivery system for transition-aged youth and young adults.
AB 1315 establishes a special fund and a competitive selection process to make awards as specified to create new, and expand existing, evidence-based early psychosis detection and intervention services and supports. The Early Psychosis Detection and Intervention Fund will be created for the purpose of private donations, and the deposit of other federal or state grants as applicable. Awards from this fund will be made according to a competitive selection process across interested County Behavioral Health Departments. Awardees will meet specified requirements for evidence-based services and supports, and provide a contribution of local funds, such as local Mental Health Services Act funds. This private-public partnership is new and integral to achieving innovation in mental health care services for this very vulnerable target population. The Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (Commission) will administer the competitive process with the expertise and assistance of an Advisory Committee.

A key aspect of AB 1315 is a focus on outcome oriented, evidence-based practices, with a designated evaluation framework as a component to the competitive selection process.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Support AB 1315.

**COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE:** Goal 4 – Health and Safety.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Text of AB 1315.

**PREPARED:** Bob Giovati
An act to add Part 3.4 (commencing with Section 5835) to Division 5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, relating to mental health, and making an appropriation therefor.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1315, as amended, Mullin. Mental health: early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention.

Existing law, the Mental Health Services Act, an initiative measure enacted by the voters as Proposition 63 at the November 2, 2004, statewide general election, establishes the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission to oversee various mental health programs funded by the act. Proposition 63 requires the State Department of Health Care Services, in coordination with counties, to establish a program designed to prevent mental illnesses from becoming severe and disabling.
This bill would establish an advisory committee to the commission for purposes of creating an early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention competitive selection process to, among other things, expand the provision of high-quality, evidence-based early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention services in this state by providing funding to the counties for this purpose. The bill would require a county that receives an award of funds for the purposes of these provisions to contribute local funds, as specified.

This bill would prescribe the membership of the advisory committee, including the chair of the commission or his or her designee. The committee would, among other duties, provide advice and guidance on approaches to early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention programs.

This bill also would establish the Early Psychosis and Mood Disorder Detection and Intervention Fund within the State Treasury and would provide that moneys in the fund are continuously appropriated to, and under the administrative control of, the commission for the purposes of the bill. The fund would consist of private donations and federal, state, and private grants. The bill would authorize the advisory committee to elect not to make awards if available funds are insufficient for that purpose. The bill would authorize the advisory committee to coordinate and provide funding for clinical research studies, as specified. The bill would require those studies to be made available annually to the public. The bill would also state that funds shall not be appropriated from the General Fund for the purposes of the bill and that implementation of the grant program shall be contingent upon the deposit into the fund of at least $500,000 in nonstate funds for the purpose of funding grants. By creating a new continuously appropriated fund, this bill would make an appropriation.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Part 3.4 (commencing with Section 5835) is added to Division 5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:
PART 3.4. EARLY PSYCHOSIS DETECTION
AND INTERVENTION COMPETITIVE SELECTION PROCESS
ACT PLUS (EPI PLUS) PROGRAM

5835. (a) This part shall be known, and may be cited, as the
Early Psychosis Detection and Intervention Competitive Selection
Process—Act: Plus (EPI Plus) Program to encompass early
psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention.

(b) As used in this part, the following definitions shall apply:
(1) “Commission” means the Mental Health Services Oversight
and Accountability Commission established pursuant to Section
5845.
(2) “Early psychosis and mood disorder detection and
intervention” refers to a program that utilizes evidence-based
approaches and services to identify and support clinical and
functional recovery of individuals by reducing the severity of first,
or early, episode psychotic symptoms, other early markers of
serious mental illness, such as mood disorders, keeping individuals
in school or at work, and putting them on a path to better
health and wellness. This may include, but is not limited to, all of
the following:
(A) Focused outreach to at-risk and in-need populations as
applicable.
(B) Recovery-oriented psychotherapy.
(C) Family psychoeducation and support.
(D) Supported education and employment.
(E) Pharmacotherapy and primary care coordination.
(F) Use of innovative technology for mental health information
feedback access that can provide a valued and unique opportunity
to assist individuals with mental health needs and to optimize care.
(G) Case management.

5835.1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:
(a) Fifty percent of all mental illness begins by the age of 14
and 75 percent by the age of 24, yet young people are often afraid
to reach out for help.
(b) Psychotic symptoms, such as hallucinations, delusions,
unusual or disorganized behaviors or speech, and negative actions,
such as social withdrawal, usually emerge during late adolescence
or early adulthood and derail important developmental milestones,
such as developing relationships, completing school, or entering the workforce.

(c) Approximately 100,000 adolescents and young adults in the United States experience first episode psychosis each year.

(d) Untreated psychosis increases a person’s risk for suicide, involuntary emergency care, and poor clinical outcomes, and may initiate a trajectory of accumulating disability into later adulthood.

(e) The average delay in receiving appropriate diagnosis and treatment for psychotic disorders is 18.5 months following the onset of psychotic symptoms.

(f) In the United States, people diagnosed with psychotic and mood disorders, such as bipolar disorder, major depression, and schizophrenia, die an average of 11 years earlier than the general population.

(g) Changing the paradigm from reactive to proactive early detection and treatment has demonstrated efficacy and cost benefit as recognized by the National Institute of Mental Health, the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, along with documented outcomes from other states, such as New York.

(h) According to numerous documented reports, including analyses and research conducted by the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and the National Institute of Mental Health, evidence-based strategies have emerged to identify, diagnose, and treat the needs of individuals with early serious mental illness, including psychotic symptoms and disorders.

(i) Clinical research conducted worldwide, and within California and the United States, supports a variety of evidence-based interventions for ameliorating psychotic symptoms and promoting functional recovery-oriented treatment, including cognitive and behavioral psychotherapy, low doses of atypical antipsychotic medications, family education and support, educational and vocational rehabilitation, and coordinated care approaches to case management.

(j) Empowering patients and families with innovative social media and mental health information feedback access that harnesses advances in technology can provide a valued and unique opportunity to assist individuals with mental health needs and to optimize care.
(k) Comprehensive public and private partnerships at both local and regional levels are necessary to develop and maintain high-quality, patient-centered, and cost-effective care for individuals experiencing psychotic symptoms or psychotic disorders to facilitate their recovery and lead toward wellness.

5835.2. (a) There is hereby established an advisory committee to the commission. The Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission shall accept nominations and applications to the committee, and the chair of the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission shall appoint members to the committee, unless otherwise specified. Membership on the committee shall be as follows:

(1) The chair of the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission, or his or her designee, who shall serve as the chair of the committee.

(2) The director of the County Behavioral Health Directors Association of California, or his or her designee.

(3) The director of a county behavioral health department that administers an early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention-type program in his or her county.

(4) A representative from a nonprofit community mental health organization that focuses on service delivery to transition-aged youth and young adults.

(5) A psychiatrist or psychologist.

(6) A representative from the Behavioral Health Center of Excellence at the University of California, Davis, or a representative from a similar entity with expertise from within the University of California system.

(7) A representative from a health plan participating in the Medi-Cal managed care program and the employer-based health care market.

(8) A representative from the medical technologies industry who is knowledgeable in advances in technology related to the use of innovative social media and mental health information feedback access.

(9) A representative knowledgeable in evidence-based practices as they pertain to the operations of an early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention-type program, including knowledge of other states' experiences.
1 (10) A representative who is a parent or guardian caring for a
2 young child with a mental illness.
3 (11) An at-large representative identified by the chair.
4 (12) A representative who is a person with lived experience of
5 a mental illness.
6 (b) The advisory committee shall be convened by the chair and
7 shall, at a minimum, do all of the following:
8 (1) Provide advice and guidance broadly on approaches to early
9 psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention programs
10 from an evidence-based perspective.
11 (2) Review and make recommendations on the commission’s
12 guidelines or any regulations in the development, design, selection
13 of awards pursuant to this part, and the implementation or oversight
14 of the early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention
15 competitive selection process established pursuant to this part.
16 (3) Assist and advise the commission in the overall evaluation
17 of the early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention
18 competitive selection process.
19 (4) Provide advice and guidance as requested and directed by
20 the chair.
21 (5) Select a core set of standardized clinical and outcome
22 measures that the funded programs would be required to collect,
23 subject to future revision. A free data sharing portal shall be
24 available to all participating programs.
25 (6) Inform the funded programs about the potential to
26 participate in clinical research studies.
27 5835.3. (a) The Early Psychosis and Mood Disorder Detection
28 and Intervention Fund is hereby created within the State Treasury
29 and, notwithstanding Section 13340 of the Government Code,
30 continuously appropriated to, and under the administrative control
31 of, the commission for the purposes of this part. The commission
32 may use no more than five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000)
33 of the amount deposited annually into the fund for administrative
34 expenses in implementing this part, including providing technical
35 assistance.
36 (b) There shall be paid into the fund all of the following:
37 (1) Any private donation or grant for the purposes of this part.
38 (2) Any other federal or state grant for the purposes of this part.
(3) Any interest that accrues on amounts in the fund and any moneys previously allocated from the fund that are subsequently returned to the fund.

(c) Moneys shall be allocated from the fund by the commission for the purposes of this part.

(d) Distributions from the fund shall be supplemental to any other amounts otherwise provided to county behavioral health departments for any purpose and shall only be used to augment services and supports identified for the purposes of this part.

(e) The advisory committee may elect not to make awards if available funds are insufficient for that purpose.

(f) Funds shall not be appropriated from the General Fund for the purposes of this part.

5835.4. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature to authorize the commission to administer a competitive selection process as provided in this part to create new, and to expand and improve the fidelity of existing, service capacity for early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention services in California.

(b) The core objectives of this competitive selection process include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

(1) Expanding the provision of high-quality, evidence-based early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention services within California.

(2) Improving access to effective services for transition-aged youth and young adults at high risk for, or experiencing, psychotic symptoms, including the prodromal phase, or psychotic disorders.

(3) More comprehensively and effectively measuring programmatic effectiveness and enrolled client outcomes of programs receiving awards in the competitive selection process.

(4) Improving the client experience in accessing services and in working toward recovery and wellness.

(5) Increasing participation in school attendance, social interactions, personal bonding relationships, and active rehabilitation, including employment and daily living function development for clients.

(6) Reducing unnecessary hospitalizations and inpatient days by appropriately utilizing community-based services and improving access to timely assistance to early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention services.
(7) Expanding the use of innovative technologies for mental health information feedback access that can provide a valued and unique opportunity to optimize care for the target population. This may include technologies for treatment and symptom monitoring.

(8) Providing local communities with increased financial resources to leverage additional public and private funding sources to achieve improved networks of care for the target population, including transition-aged youth and young adults.

(c) Funds allocated by the commission for the purposes of this part shall be made available to selected counties, or counties acting jointly, through a competitive selection process.

(d) (1) Notwithstanding any other law, a county, or counties acting jointly, that receive an award of funds for the purposes of this part shall be required to provide a contribution of local funds. The local funds may include local Mental Health Services Act moneys and county general fund revenues.

(2) Upon approval of the commission, after consultation with the Department of Finance and the State Department of Health Care Services, other locally acquired funding, such as federal grants or allocations, or other special funds, may also be recognized for the purpose of contributing toward any contribution requirements for the purposes of this part.

(e) Awards made by the commission shall be used to create, or expand existing capacity for, early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention services and supports. The commission shall ensure that awards result in cost-effective and evidence-based services that comprehensively address identified needs of the target population, including transition-aged youth and young adults, in counties and regions selected for funding. The commission shall also take into account at least the following criteria and factors when selecting recipients of awards and determining the amount of awards:

(1) A description of need, including, at a minimum, a comprehensive description of the early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention services and supports to be established or expanded, community need, target population to be served, linkage with other public systems of health and mental health care, linkage with schools and community social services, and related assistance as applicable, and a description of the request for funding.
(2) A description of all programmatic components, including outreach and clinical aspects, of the local early psychosis and mood disorder detection and intervention services and supports.

(3) A description of any contractual relationships with contracting providers as applicable, including any memorandum of understanding between project partners.

(4) A description of local funds, including the total amounts, that would be contributed toward the services and supports as required by the commission through the competitive selection process, implementing guidelines, and regulations.

(5) The project timeline.

(6) The ability of the awardee to effectively and efficiently implement or expand an evidence-based program as referenced in this part.

(7) A description of core data collection and the framework for evaluating outcomes, including improved access to services and supports and a cost-benefit analysis of the project.

(8) A description of the sustainability of program services and supports in future years.

(f) The commission shall determine any minimum or maximum awards, and shall take into consideration the level of need, the population to be served, and related criteria as described in subdivision (e) and in any guidance or regulations, and shall reflect the reasonable costs of providing the services and supports.

(g) Funds awarded by the commission for purposes of this part may be used to supplement, but not supplant, existing financial and resource commitments of the county or counties acting jointly, that receive the award.

(h) The commission may consult with a technical assistance entity, as described in paragraph (5) of subdivision (a) of Section 4061, initiate an interagency agreement with another public entity, including the University of California system, or contract for necessary technical assistance to implement this part.

(i) The advisory committee may coordinate and provide funding for clinical research studies. The committee may allocate an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the total amount deposited in the Early Psychosis and Mood Disorder Detection and Intervention Fund for clinical research studies. The advisory committee shall determine, in conjunction with the principal investigators, the data elements to be included in clinical research studies funded pursuant
to this subdivision. The results of the clinical research studies shall be made available annually to the members of the public, including stakeholders and members of the Legislature.

5835.5. The commission may adopt guidelines or regulations, in consultation with the advisory committee established in Section 5835.2, as well as other stakeholders as necessary, to exercise the powers and perform the duties conferred or imposed on it by this part, including defining eligible costs and determining minimum and maximum awards under the competitive selection process and any stipulating conditions. A guideline or regulation adopted pursuant to this section shall not be subject to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code).

5835.6. The commission may adopt emergency regulations to expedite the award of funds pursuant to this part.

5835.7. Implementation of the grant program established pursuant to Section 5835.4 and the adoption of regulations pursuant to Sections 5835.5 and 5835.6 shall be contingent upon the deposit into the fund established pursuant to Section 5835.3 of at least five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000) in nonstate funds for the purpose of funding grants pursuant to this part.
BILL: AB 1379, as amended, Thurmond. Certified access specialist program: funding

ISSUE: ADA compliance.

SUMMARY: The sponsor (Disability Rights California) states: AB 1379 increases resources for local jurisdictions to ensure local building inspectors have the appropriate training and skills to assist businesses to comply with state and federal access laws when reviewing building plans for new construction or renovations.

BACKGROUND/ANALYSIS: The sponsor further declares that the bill extends the sunset on the business license fee currently collected by local jurisdictions. The measure also temporarily increases and collects a $4 (instead of $1) fee on business licenses and renewals. For jurisdictions with no business license fee, it allows this fee to be collected from building permits. AB 1379 allows the local jurisdictions to temporarily retain 90% of the fee instead of the current 70% which will be placed in a special fund for CASp (Certified Access Specialists) certification and training.

DISCUSSION: The sponsor adds: “Many local jurisdictions do not have sufficient resources to provide Certified Access Specialists’ training and certification for local building inspectors. Without the resources for appropriate training and certification, local building inspectors do not have the skills and knowledge to ensure that building plans they review, comply with state and federal access laws. Some jurisdictions do not require business licenses. AB 1379 would make it so that jurisdictions that do not have business licenses can still collect a fee by including building permits, if no business license exists in the jurisdiction. Building inspector CASps play an essential role in ensuring accessibility as they provide permitting and plan check services for new construction and renovations. This bill is a proactive measure to increase resources to accomplish this goal. The measure is a balanced approach to address the needs of the disability, local jurisdictions, and business community by providing resources to help ensure equal access and compliance”.

RECOMMENDATION: Support AB 1379.

COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE: Goal 6 - Formal and informal community supports.

ATTACHMENTS: Text of AB 1379.

PREPARED: Bob Giovati.
AN ACT TO AMEND SECTION 4459.5 OF THE GOVERNMENT CODE, RELATING TO DISABILITY ACCESS, AND MAKING AN APPROPRIATION THEREFOR.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 1379, as amended, Thurmond. Certified access specialist program: funding.

Existing law requires the State Architect to establish and publicize a program for voluntary certification by the state of any person who meets specified criteria as a certified access specialist (CASp), as provided. Existing law, on and after January 1, 2013, and until December 31, 2017, inclusive, requires that any applicant for an original or renewal of a local business license or equivalent instrument or permit to pay an additional fee of $1 for that license, instrument, or permit, to be collected by the city, county, or city and county that issued the license, instrument, or permit.

This bill would make nonsubstantive changes to this provision: extend the operation of this fee indefinitely and, on and after January 1, 2018, and until December 31, 2023, increase the amount from $1 to $4. The bill would revert the amount of the fee back to $1 on and after January 1, 2024. The bill, in any city, county, or city and county that does not issue a business license or an equivalent instrument or permit, would require an applicant for a building permit to pay an additional fee of
$4 on and after January 1, 2018, and until December 31, 2023, and an additional fee of $1 on and after January 1, 2024, for the building permit, to be collected by the city, county, or city and county that issued the building permit.

(2) Existing law requires that the city, county, or city and county retain 70% of the fees collected under the above-described provision, to be used to, among other things, fund increased CASp services in that jurisdiction for the public. Existing law requires that the remaining 30% of the fees be transmitted on a quarterly basis to the Division of the State Architect for deposit in the Disability Access and Education Revolving Fund, a continuously appropriated fund.

This bill, on and after January 1, 2018, and until December 31, 2023, inclusive, would require the city, county, or city and county to instead retain 90% of the fees collected. The bill would revert the amount retained back to 70% on and after January 1, 2024. The bill would also require the moneys retained by the city, county, or city and county to instead be deposited in a special fund, established by the city, county, or city and county to be known as the "CASp Certification and Training Fund," and used for increased CASp training and certification within that local jurisdiction.

By extending the operation of fees deposited in the Disability Access and Education Revolving Fund, thereby increasing the amount of money in a continuously appropriated fund, this bill would make an appropriation.

(3) By extending the operation of the above-described fee, thereby requiring local officials to collect and allocate these revenues beyond December 31, 2018, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to the statutory provisions noted above.

SECTION 1. Section 4467 of the Government Code is amended to read:

4467. (a) (1) On and after January 1, 2013, and until December 31, 2017, inclusive, any applicant for a local business license or equivalent instrument or permit, and from any applicant for the renewal of a business license or equivalent instrument or permit, shall pay an additional fee of one dollar ($1) for that license, instrument, or permit, which shall be collected by the city, county, or city and county that issued the license, instrument, or permit.

(2) On and after January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2023, the following shall apply:
   (A) Any applicant for a local business license or equivalent instrument or permit, and any applicant for the renewal of a business license or equivalent instrument or permit, shall pay an additional fee of four dollars ($4) for that license, instrument, or permit, which shall be collected by the city, county, or city and county that issued the license, instrument, or permit.
   (B) In any city, county, or city and county that does not issue a business license or an equivalent instrument or permit, an applicant for a building permit shall pay an additional fee of four dollars ($4) for that building permit, which the city, county, or city and county that issued the building permit shall collect.

(3) On and after January 1, 2024, the following shall apply:
   (A) Any applicant for a local business license or equivalent instrument or permit, and any applicant for the renewal of a business license or equivalent instrument or permit, shall pay an additional fee of one dollar ($1) for that license, instrument, or permit, which shall be collected by the city, county, or city and county that issued the license, instrument, or permit.
   (B) In any city, county, or city and county that does not issue a business license or an equivalent instrument or permit, an applicant for a building permit shall pay an additional fee of one dollar ($1) for that building permit, which the city, county, or city and county that issued the building permit shall collect.

(b) (1) The city, county, or city and county shall retain the percentage of the fees collected under this section, section as specified in paragraph (2), of which up to 5 percent of
the retained moneys may be used for related administrative costs
of this chapter. The city, county, or city and county shall deposit
the remaining moneys shall be used to fund increased certified
access specialist (CASp) services in that jurisdiction for the public
in a special fund, established by the city, county, or city and county
to be known as the “CASp Certification and Training Fund.” The
moneys in the fund shall be used for increased certified access
specialist (CASp) training and certification within that local
jurisdiction and to facilitate compliance with construction-related
accessibility requirements. The highest priority shall be given to
the training and retention of certified access specialists to meet the
needs of the public in the jurisdiction as provided in Section 55.53
of the Civil Code.
(2) The amount of fees collected under this section and retained
by the city, county, or city and county shall be in the following
amounts:
(A) On and after January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2023,
inclusive, 90 percent.
(B) On and after January 1, 2024, 70 percent.
(c) The remaining 30 percent amount of all fees collected under
this section and not retained by the city, county, or city and county
pursuant to subdivision (b) shall be transmitted on a quarterly basis
to the Division of the State Architect for deposit in the Disability
Access and Education Revolving Fund established under Sections
4465 and 4470. The funds shall be transmitted within 15 days of
the last day of the fiscal quarter. The Division of the State Architect
shall develop and post on its Internet Web site a standard reporting
form for use by all local jurisdictions. Up to 75 percent of the
collected funds in the Disability Access and Education Revolving
Fund shall be used to establish and maintain oversight of the CASp
program and to moderate the expense of CASp certification and
testing.
(d) Each city, county, or city and county shall make an annual
report, commencing March 1, 2014, to the Division of the State
Architect of the total fees collected in the previous calendar year
and of its distribution, including the moneys spent on administrative
services, the activities undertaken and moneys spent to increase
CASp services, the activities undertaken and moneys spent to fund
programs to facilitate accessibility compliance, and the moneys
transmitted to the Disability Access and Education Revolving Fund.

SEC. 2. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

SECTION 1. Section 4459.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:

4459.5. (a) The State Architect shall establish and publicize a program for voluntary certification by the state of any person who meets specified criteria as a certified access specialist. No later than January 1, 2005, the State Architect shall determine minimum criteria a person is required to meet in order to be a certified access specialist, which may include knowledge sufficient to review, inspect, or advocate universal design requirements; completion of specified training, and testing on standards governing access to buildings for persons with disabilities.

(b) The State Architect, upon appropriation of funds by the Legislature, may implement the program described in subdivision (a) with startup funds derived, as a loan, from the reserve of the Public School Planning, Design, and Construction Review Revolving Fund. The loan shall be repaid when sufficient fees have been collected pursuant to Section 4459.8:

CORRECTIONS:
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AB 959 – Regional Center Service Transparency  
Assembly Member Chris Holden

SUMMARY

AB 959 would require regional centers to include a link to a webpage created by the Department of Developmental Services that includes both a list of services offered to regional center consumers and a description of those services. This bill will also ensure that information is provided to the consumer in a manner that is culturally and linguistically appropriate.

Background

The Lanterman Act created the regional center system to provide services to Californians, with developmental disabilities, designed to enable them to live within their own communities.\(^1\) Under the Act, individuals with developmental disabilities are first evaluated by the regional center through the Individual Placement Program (IPP) or Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) to determine what services would best suit their needs.\(^2\) Recently there has been data that shows a disparity in the access to and utilization of developmental services that are due wide array of issues such as language access and transportation services.

Regional centers are nonprofit corporations that contract with the State Department of Developmental Services (DDS) to coordinate services and provide access to individuals and families with developmental disabilities. However, there have been serious disparities among access to these services provided through regional centers. There has been 11 million dollars provided to make progress toward reducing disparities, but there has been no closure of the access gap. Low income parents are not properly informed about the public services available to them. This drives the disparity in access to services that the Lanterman Act awards to Californians. Parents cannot effectively plan and advocate for their child during their Individual Program Plan (IPP) if they are not fully informed of the services available before this contract can be formed

Existing Law:

Welfare and Institutions Code 4629.5: Existing law requires a regional center to include specified information on its Internet Web site for the purpose of promoting transparency and access to public information. This information includes a list of services provided by the regional center to consumers within its catchment area.

THE SOLUTION

AB 959 requires that Department of Developmental Services to create a list of type of services offered by each regional center. There will also be a description of those services written in plain language for the parents to understand. This information will be presented on the website of each regional center for the parent to be made aware before finalizing the IPP. This bill will also increase access by reducing the language barrier for people who primary language is not protected under the current law. Making the information more accessible and comprehensible is a step toward reducing disparities increasing accountability, and empowering the parents and children with developmental disabilities. Regional centers should equip parents with every available tool to advocate for their child.

Support

Support:
- Professional Child Development Associates
- State Council of Developmental Disabilities
- California Association for Health Services at Home
- DIR/Floortime Coalition of California
- Disability Organizing Group for Initiating Total Equality
- Danny’s Farm
- Education Spectrum
- Etta

Contact: Morrise Richardson, Assembly Fellow  
916-319-2041 || 916-319-2141 Fax  
Morrise.Richardson@asm.ca.gov

BILL: AB 1380, as amended, Santiago. Developmental services: regional center services.

ISSUE: In-home hourly respite rates workers and provider rates.

SUMMARY: Requires the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) to conduct a review and submit a report to the Legislature regarding specific information pertaining to in-home respite provider rates, requires DDS contracts with regional centers to include requirements that regional centers biennially review all vendor contracts in order to ensure contract compliance, requires DDS to submit a report to the Legislature detailing the outcomes of vendor contract reviews, and requires an employer, prior to employing an in-home respite worker, to submit a person's fingerprints to the Department of Justice (DOJ) for purposes of obtaining criminal record information.

DISCUSSION: Specifically, this bill:

1) Requires DDS to conduct a review of in-home respite provider rates by November 1, 2019, and requires the review to include all of the following, as specified:
   a) Acquisition and analysis of vendor cost statements;
   b) Acquisition and analysis of information from vendors regarding hourly wages paid to respite workers; and
   c) Identification of whether vendors' temporary hourly rates should be converted to permanent rates using information provided by cost statements.

2) Requires DDS to report the results of the review to the Legislature by January 1, 2020, including a proposal of necessary Legislative changes to ensure the appropriateness of in-home hourly respite rates, as specified.

3) Repeals, as of January 1, 2024, provisions of this bill related to DDS's review of and report on in-home respite provider rates.

4) Requires DDS's contract with a regional center to include a requirement that:
a) The regional center develop a process to review and document the outcomes of all vendor contracts at least once every two years, as specified; and

b) The regional center take appropriate action in order to ensure that vendors comply with contracts, as specified.

5) Requires, after reviewing vendor contracts, each regional center to submit within three months of the end of the biennial period the findings of the reviews to DDS, and further requires DDS, within three months of receiving the vendor contract reviews, to submit a report to the Legislature describing the outcome of the reviews, as specified.

6) Requires that, prior to employing an in-home respite worker, as specified, an employer submit the person’s fingerprints to the DOJ for the purpose of obtaining criminal record information.

7) Requires the fingerprints to be on a card provided by the DOJ for the purpose of obtaining a set of fingerprints.

8) Allows fingerprints to be taken by any local law enforcement officer or agency for the purpose of obtaining criminal record information.

9) Requires the DOJ, within 30 calendar days of the receipt of the fingerprints, to notify the employer of the criminal record information, as specified.

10) Requires the DOJ, in the event that no criminal record information has been recorded, to provide an employer with a statement of that fact as soon as possible, but not later than 30 days after the fingerprints are received.

11) Requires DOJ to charge a fee to the employer to cover the reasonable costs of administering provisions of the bill relating to fingerprinting.

12) Requires the DOJ to notify an employer if new fingerprints are required as soon as possible but no later than 30 days after fingerprints were received.

13) States Legislative intent relating to the ability of DOJ to charge a fee related to fingerprinting in order to comply with the 30-calendar-day requirements specified under the provisions of this bill.
14) Requires DOJ to notify the employer in the event that the person is found to be convicted of specified violations or attempted violations or if there is no criminal record information recorded.

15) Prohibits a person from being hired as an in-home respite worker if they have been convicted in the last 10 years for, or incarcerated following conviction for fraud against a government health care or supportive services program, as specified.

16) Prohibits a person from being hired as an in-home respite worker who, in the last 10 years, has been convicted for, or incarcerated following conviction for, certain crimes, as specified.

17) Allows an employer to deny employment to a person under specified circumstances.

18) Specifies that an employer is not required to hire a person who is the subject of a DOJ report described under the provisions of this bill when the report indicates that the person has not committed certain crimes, as specified.

19) Prohibits an applicant from being eligible to provide or receive payment for providing in-home respite services for 10 years following a conviction for, or incarceration following a conviction for, certain crimes, as specified.

20) Prohibits an application from being denied if an applicant has obtained a certificate of rehabilitation, as defined in current law, or if the information or accusation against him or her has been dismissed pursuant to current law.

21) Allows a consumer who wishes to employ an individual who would otherwise be prohibited from providing in-home respite services under the provisions of this bill to petition DDS for an individual waiver as determined by a process substantially similar to processes in existing law.

22) Allows an applicant who has been convicted of an offense described in the provisions of this bill to seek a general exception to the exclusion provided for by this bill from DDS and requires DDS to use existing processes and factors to determine whether to grant or deny the waiver, as specified.
23) Requires a regional center to notify a consumer whose individualized program plan (IPP) includes in-home respite care that a criminal record check is available and may be conducted.

RECOMMENDATION: None.

COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE:

ATTACHMENTS: Text of AB 1380

PREPARED: Bob Giovati.
ASSEMBLY BILL No. 1380

Introduced by Assembly Member Santiago

February 17, 2017

An act to add Sections 4629.2 and 4686.1 to, and to add and repeal Section 4573 of, the Welfare and Institutions Code, relating to developmental services.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 1380, as amended, Santiago. Developmental services: regional center services.

Existing law, the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act, requires the State Department of Developmental Services to enter into contracts with private nonprofit corporations to operate regional centers for the provision of community services and supports for persons with developmental disabilities and their families. Existing law sets forth the duties of the regional centers, including, but not limited to, development of individual program plans, the purchase of needed services to implement the plan, and monitoring of the delivery of those services.

This bill would require all regional center contracts to include provisions requiring the regional center to develop a process by which all vendor contracts are reviewed at least once every 2 years and to
require that the regional center take appropriate action to ensure that vendors comply with the contracts, up to and including terminating the vendorization if necessary.

The bill would also require each regional center to submit the findings of the vendor contract reviews to the department. The bill would require the department to submit a report to the Legislature describing in detail the outcomes of the reviews, including what steps are being taken by each regional center to ensure that vendors comply with contract requirements and how many, if any, contracts are terminated as a result of the reviews.

Existing law authorizes the provision of in-home respite care for regional center consumers and specifies training requirements for those providers.

This bill would require an employer to submit the fingerprints of a prospective in-home respite worker to the Department of Justice for a criminal background check prior to employment. The bill would prohibit employment of an in-home respite worker that has been convicted for, or incarcerated following conviction for, specified crimes, including fraud against a government health program or a serious or violent felony, as specified, and would authorize a consumer or an applicant to petition the State Department of Developmental Services for a waiver of, or to seek an exception from, as applicable, these provisions.

The bill would also require the State Department of Developmental Services to conduct an in-depth review of in-home respite provider rates by November 1, 2018, and to report the results of that review, on or before January 1, 2020, to the Legislature, as provided.

Existing law requires an entity that receives payments from one or more regional centers to contract with an independent accounting firm to obtain an independent audit or independent review report of its financial statements relating to payments made by regional centers.

This bill would specifically require the State Department of Developmental Services to collect in-home respite care vendors' financial statements.


The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. Section 4573 is added to the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:
AB 1380

4573. (a) The State Department of Developmental Services shall conduct an in-depth review of in-home respite provider rates by November 1, 2018. The review shall include all of the following:

(1) Obtain and analyze all vendors’ cost statements to determine the costs of providing services.

(2) Obtain and analyze information from vendors on the hourly wages they pay to respite workers and analyze this information to determine whether hourly rates are reasonable.

(3) Using information from the cost statements, identify whether vendors’ temporary hourly rates should be converted to permanent rates.

(4) Obtain information describing how each provider allocated the rates, including information distinguishing between the amount allocated for full respite services and the amount allocated for employer of record services, and including the amount vendors allocated for administrative costs in 2015–16, direct care services in 2015–16, and all other costs.

(b) (1) On or before January 1, 2020, the department shall report the results of the review required pursuant to subdivision (a) to the Legislature, including a proposal on the extent to which legislative changes are needed to ensure that in-home hourly respite rates are appropriate.

(2) The report required pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

(c) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2024, and as of that date is repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 4629.2 is added to the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

4629.2. In addition to the requirements set forth in Section 4629, the State Department of Developmental Services’ contract with a regional center shall include both of the following:

(a) A requirement that the regional center develop a process by which all vendor contracts are reviewed at least once every two years. The outcome of those reviews shall be documented in the regional center’s files.

(b) A requirement that the regional center take appropriate action to ensure that vendors comply with the contracts, up to and including terminating the vendorization if necessary.
(c) After reviewing the vendor contracts pursuant to subdivision (a), each regional center shall submit, within three months of the end of the biennial period, the findings of the reviews to the State Department of Developmental Services. Within three months of receiving the vendor contract reviews, the State Department of Developmental Services shall submit a report to the Legislature describing in detail the outcomes of the reviews, including what steps are being taken by each regional center to ensure that vendors comply with contract requirements, and how many, if any, contracts are terminated as a result of the reviews. The report shall be submitted in accordance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

SEC. 3. Section 4686.1 is added to the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

4686.1. (a) (1) Prior to employing an in-home respite worker, as defined in Section 4686, the employer shall submit the person’s fingerprints to the Department of Justice for the purpose of obtaining criminal record information.

(2) The fingerprints submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be on a card provided by the Department of Justice for the purpose of obtaining a set of fingerprints.

(3) Fingerprints may be taken by any local law enforcement officer or agency for purposes of paragraph (1).

(4) Within 30 calendar days of the receipt of the fingerprints, the Department of Justice shall notify the employer of the criminal record information, as provided in this subdivision. If no criminal record information has been recorded, the Department of Justice shall provide the employer with a statement of that fact as soon as possible, but not later than 30 calendar days from the date of receipt of the fingerprints. If new fingerprints are required for processing, the Department of Justice shall, as soon as possible, but not later than 30 calendar days from the date of receipt of the fingerprints, notify the employer that the fingerprints were illegible.

(5) The Department of Justice shall charge a fee to the employer to cover the reasonable costs of administering this section.

(6) It is the intent of the Legislature that the Department of Justice charge a fee to cover its reasonable costs in providing services in accordance with this section to comply with the 30-calendar-day requirement for provision to the department of the criminal record information, as contained in this subdivision.
(b) (1) If it is found that the person has ever been convicted of a violation or attempted violation of Section 243.4 of the Penal Code, a sex offense against a minor, or of any felony that requires registration pursuant to Section 290 of the Penal Code, or that the person has been convicted or incarcerated within the last 10 years as the result of committing a violation or attempted violation of Section 273a or 273d or of subdivision (a) or (b) of Section 368 of the Penal Code, or as the result of committing a theft, robbery, burglary, or any felony, the Department of Justice shall notify the employer of that fact.

(2) A person who, in the last 10 years, has been convicted for, or incarcerated following conviction for, fraud against a government health care or supportive services program shall not be hired as an in-home respite worker.

(3) A person who, in the last 10 years, has been convicted for, or incarcerated following conviction for, a violation of subdivision (a) of Section 273a or of Section 368 of the Penal Code, or similar violations in another jurisdiction, shall not be hired as an in-home respite worker.

(4) An employer may deny employment to a person who is the subject of a report under paragraph (1) when the report indicates that the person has committed any of the crimes identified in paragraph (1) that are not included in paragraph (2) or (3).

(5) This section does not require an employer to hire a person who is the subject of a report under paragraph (1) when the report indicates that the person has not committed any of the crimes indicated in paragraph (1).

(c) Subject to subdivision (d), an applicant who is subject to this section is not eligible to provide or receive payment for providing in-home respite services for 10 years following a conviction for, or incarceration following a conviction for, any of the following:

(1) A violent or serious felony, as specified in subdivision (c) of Section 667.5 and in subdivision (c) of Section 1192.7 of the Penal Code.

(2) A felony offense for which a person is required to register under subdivision (c) of Section 290 of the Penal Code. For purposes of this paragraph, the 10-year time period specified in this section shall commence with the date of conviction for, or
incarceration following a conviction for, the underlying offense, and not the date of registration.

(3) A felony offense described in paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of, or in paragraph (2) of subdivision (g) of, Section 10980.

(d) (1) Notwithstanding subdivision (c), an application shall not be denied under this section if the applicant has obtained a certificate of rehabilitation under Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 4852.01) of Title 6 of Part 3 of the Penal Code or if the information or accusation against him or her has been dismissed pursuant to Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code.

(2) A consumer who wishes to employ an in-home respite worker who would be prohibited pursuant to this section may petition the State Department of Developmental Services for an individual waiver through a process substantially similar to the process prescribed in subdivision (d) of Section 12305.87.

(3) An applicant who has been convicted of an offense specified in subdivision (b) or (c) may seek from the State Department of Developmental Services a general exception to the exclusion provided for in this section. The department shall use the process and factors prescribed in Section 12305.87 to make the determination whether to grant or deny the waiver.

(e) A regional center shall notify a consumer whose individual program plan includes in-home respite care that a criminal record check is available, and that the check can be performed by the Department of Justice.

SEC. 4. The State Department of Developmental Services shall collect in-home respite care vendors’ financial statements, as described in Section 4652.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.
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1. CALL TO ORDER
   Chairperson Jenny Yang (SA) called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. ESTABLISH QUORUM
   A quorum was established.

3. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS
   Members and others introduced themselves as indicated.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS
   In Council member Janelle Lewis’ absence, Executive Director Aaron Carruthers provided public comment on one of the Cycle 40 Grant application that specifically focused on employment. Executive Director Carruthers stated that if approved, the Grant would bring an innovative component to Competitive Integrated Employment by field testing for validity of the Discovery Fidelity Scale as it relates to outcomes from Customized Employment with Discovery.
5. **APPROVAL OF THE MAY 2017 MEETING MINUTES**
   It was moved/seconded (Gomez/Curtright) and carried to adopt the May 3, 2017 meeting minutes as amended. (Unanimous: Wheeler, Curtright, Gomez, Yang, Issacs; and Ruder)

   *Amendment 1*
   Page 5, last bullet, last sentence, add the word “work” after “system and” so that the sentence would now read “…maximizing the benefits of both the educational system and work experience…”

   *Amendment 2*
   Page 6, first sentence, replace the word “weekend” with “we can”

6. **LEGISLATIVE AND PUBLIC POLICY**
   This agenda item was tabled until the Chair of the Legislative and Public Policy Committee was able to attend.

7. **ROLE OF EDD AND WORKFORCE SYSTEM IN CIE**
   Presenters Lajuana Thompson, Sam Martin, and Robbie from the Employment Development Department (EDD) and Eric Glunt from the Interwork Institute at San Diego State University provided an in-depth overview on the programs and services provided by EDD’s Workforce Services Branch (WSB). Presenters touched on ways that WSB and EFC could benefit from information sharing, local partnerships, and leveraging local resources.

   Committee members felt that many departments and local programs were each is doing our own thing and not sharing information. Consensus was that it would be far more effective to work together to build partnerships which they felt were key to leveraging resources.

8. **FINALIZE 2016 EFC REPORT**
   Since the last EFC meeting Executive Director Aaron Carruthers has incorporated Committee member comments on two versions since the May meeting. An overview of those comments is provided in V4 of the 2016 EFC Report.

   Following their review, the Committee provided the following feedback:
   
   1) Accept track changes throughout V4 of the 2016 EFC Report.
2) Be consistent with the term I/DD throughout the report.

3) Spell out CIE the first time it is used and use “CIE” thereafter.

4) Use the State definition of the Developmental Disability.

5) Page 4, specify “SSI” benefits not “federal benefits”.

6) Page 6, provide footnotes with line graph definitions.

7) Page 8, paragraph 4, note why we the numbers are not disaggregated by race/ethnicity and that with the passage of new legislative this would now be possible. (SB433)

8) Rework the Executive Summary to include additional work needed on CIE.

It was moved/seconded (Curtright/Gomez) and carried to recommend Council approval of the 2016 EFC Report with the above changes. (Unanimous: Wheeler, Curtright, Gomez, Yang, Issacs; and Ruder)

Following the approval of the revised report, Committee member Elena Gomez offered to have staff at the Department of Rehabilitation review the report for accessibility.

9. SCDD REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES REPORT
Deputy Director Vicki Smith reported on regional employment activities that have occurred since the last meeting.

Committee member Barbara Wheeler requested that more summaries be provided which differed for the more blended approach of reporting numbers and narrative at the May meeting. Deputy Vicki Smith informed the committee that they could pull for whatever numbers the committee is looking for but is not quite sure of the specifics the committee wants. Chair Nang reminded the committee that they just adopted the CECY platform and that perhaps the committee needed to go through that to figure out which statistics they would be looking for.
10. **BLUEPRINT**  
   a. Targeted Outcomes and Local Partnership Agreements  
      Committee member Denyse Curtright and Michael Clay presented the final CIE Blueprint goals and targeted outcomes to the Committee. Targeted outcomes for the three Blueprint goals include, written guidance outlining coordination at state and local level, increased opportunities for individuals with I/DD who choose CIE, and adequately preparing individuals with I/DD engage in CIE.

   b. Oversight and Outreach  
      Committee member Sarah Isaacs provided verbal report on DRC’s progress on oversight and outreach activities stating that it has been exciting for advocates to see the shift from family members being resistant, to family members now asking how to get their children into a work setting.

      DRC is currently reviewing and updating their annual advocacy plan as well as looking at their five-year planning process for the advocacy plan. Updates are expected to be completed in October with the three main priorities being community outreach, workshop monitoring, and internship monitoring.

      The Committee discussed ways that they, or perhaps the State Council’s Self-Advocacy Advisory Committee (SAAC), could assist with community outreach. Committee Chair Yang will work with Council staff to get this topic on a future SAAC agenda.

11. **REVIEW EFC GOALS AND IDENTIFY NEW PRIORITIES**  
   This agenda item was tabled until the October meeting.

12. **MEMBER CIE ACTIVITIES DISCUSSION**  
   Committee Member Barbara Wheeler reported that USC was currently working with the Los Angeles Regional Office on two CIE projects.

13. **MEETING DEBRIEF**  
   The next meeting was scheduled for October 24th from 10:00 AM to 3:00 PM.

14. **ADJOURNMENT**  
   Meeting at adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
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Attending Members
April Lopez (FA)
David Forderer (SA)
Janelle Lewis (FA)
Jenny Yang (SA)
Michele Villados
Sandra Smith (FA)

Members Absent

Others Attending
Gabriel Rogin
Natalie Bocanegra
Robin Maitino
Wayne Glusker
Rihana Ahmad
Dennis Villanueva

1. CALL TO ORDER
Chairperson Jenny Yang (SA) called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

2. ESTABLISH QUORUM
A quorum was established.

3. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS
Members and others introduced themselves as indicated.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS
There were no public comments.

5. CLOSED SESSION - PERSONNEL
Entered into closed session at 9:26 a.m.

6. RECONVENE OPEN SESSION
Session reconvened at 1:38 p.m.

The reportable actions taken in closed session:
It was moved/seconded (Villados [DHCS]/Forderer [SA]) and carried to approve the final draft of the Annual Executive Director Evaluation (July 2016 – June 2017) as presented by Michelle Jordan, LLC, and recommend that Council adopt this final draft. (Unanimous: Lopez, Forderer, Lewis, Yang, Villados, and Smith)
It was moved/seconded (Villados [DHCS]/Smith [FA]) and carried to approve the Executive Committee’s recommendation of a plan for Michele Villados and April Lopez to present the Executive Director of SCDD with a final edited copy of the page 6 of the “Annual Executive Director Evaluation, July 2016 – June 2017, Survey Results Report” along with a written list of recommendations of Executive Director priorities for the coming year, to be followed by verbal discussion of the overall Executive Director evaluation and to request that the Executive Director provide a follow-up response to Michele and April within the 2 weeks after the full Council meeting. Additionally, it was recommended that a 6-month review with the SCDD Chair occur to discuss updates on progress. (Unanimous: Lopez, Forderer, Lewis, Yang, Villados, and Smith)

7. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 2017 MEETING MINUTES
   It was moved/seconded (Forderer [SA]/Lewis [FA]) and carried to adopt the June 15, 2017 meeting minutes as presented. (Unanimous: Lopez, Forderer, Lewis, Yang, Smith; and Villados)

8. SPONSORSHIP REQUESTS
   a. Chief Deputy Director Gabriel Rogin presented the Resources for Independence Central Valley (RICV) request for $999.00 in sponsorship funds for their “8th Annual Self-Advocacy Conference: Celebrate Me!”. This event is to take place on September 14, 2017. Council funds would be used towards purchasing supplies needed to make the conference a success. It was moved/seconded (Lewis [FA]/Smith [FA]) and carried to fund the September 14, 2017 RICV Conference in the amount of $999.00. (Unanimous: Forderer, Lewis, Yang, and Smith)

   Chief Deputy Director Gabriel Rogin presented the Cal APSE (Association for People Supporting Employment First) request for $999.00 in sponsorship funds for their event, “Moving Beyond Conversion and Compliance: Supporting a rich life – from vision to practice”. This event is to take place on October 4, 2017 at the Sacramento Crowne Plaza Hotel. Council funds would be used towards facility costs, marketing and speaker fees.
It was moved/seconded (Lewis [FA]/Smith [FA]) and carried to fund the October 4, 2017 Cal APSE event in the amount of $999.00. (Unanimous: Forderer, Lewis, Yang, and Smith)

9. REGIONAL CENTER CONFLICT OF INTEREST WAIVER REQUESTS AND INTERIM PROCESS

Far Northern Regional Center (FNRC)

Legal Counsel Natalie Bocanegra presented and reviewed waiver requests submitted by each of the following FNRC Board Members:

A. Board Member William Battles
   Mr. William Battles is a board member of the FNRC as a consumer representative of People First. He is a regional center consumer who works 15 hours per week as a Peer Instructor for We Care A Lot, a regional center provider of employment services. Mr. Battles’ employment is part of his employment services received through the regional center. Therefore, his conflict resolution plan must follow the rules of W&I Section 4622(k).

B. Board Member Adam Beals
   Mr. Adam Beals serves as the consumer representative on the governing board of the FNRC. He works approximately 18 hours per week for Siskiyou County Opportunity Center (SCOC), a regional center provider of employment services. Mr. Beals’ employment is part of his employment services received through the regional center. Therefore, his conflict resolution plan must follow the rules of W&I Section 4622(k).

C. Board Member Leslie Corletto
   Ms. Leslie Corletto is a member of the governing board of the FNRC. He works approximately 15 hours per week as receptionist of Rowell Family Empowerment Center, a regional center provider. Ms. Corletto’s employment is part of her employment services received through the regional center. Therefore, her conflict resolution plan must follow the rules of W&I Section 4622(k).

D. Board Member Ronda Dever
Ms. Ronda Dever is a member of the governing board of the FNRC. Ms. Dever’s mother is a respite worker for Ms. Dever’s autistic son and works for ARC of Butte County (ARC). Ms. Dever’s mother does not live with Ms. Dever nor does Ms. Dever receive any financial benefit from her mother. She does not provide respite services for any other persons.

E. Board Member Roger Hatton
Mr. Roger Hatton serves on the governing board of the FNRC as a consumer representative. Mr. Hatton works part-time for CPE Food Pantry and GCD Gym. He works approximately 29 hours per week driving delivery vehicles for these businesses. Mr. Hatton’s employment is part of his employment services received through the regional center. Therefore, his conflict resolution plan must follow the rules of W&I Section 4622(k).

F. Board Member Susan Hess
Ms. Susan Hess serves on the governing board of the FNRC as a consumer representative. Ms. Hess works approximately 4 hours per week at Little Red Hen, a regional center provider. Her husband also works about 4 hours per week at little Red Hen. Ms. Hess’ employment is part of her employment services received through the regional center. Therefore, her conflict resolution plan must follow the rules of W&I Section 4622(k).

G. Board Member Michelle Phillips
Ms. Michelle Phillips serves on the governing board of the FNRC as a consumer representative. Ms. Phillips works as a Life Guide and Peer Instructor approximately 15 hours per week for We Care A Lot, a regional center provider. Ms. Phillips’ employment is part of her employment services received through the regional center. Therefore, her conflict resolution plan must follow the rules of W&I Section 4622(k).

H. Board Member Colleen Ryberg
Ms. Colleen Ryberg is a member of the governing board of the FNRC. Ms. Ryberg’s daughter-in-law is a provider of occupational therapy services to regional center consumers. Her daughter-in-law does not live with Ms. Ryberg, and Ms. Ryberg does not receive any financial benefit from her daughter-in-law’s employment.
I. Board Member Rod Zikan

Mr. Rod Zikan is a member of the governing board of the FNRC. He was appointed to the board under W&I Code Section 4622(i) as the representative of the board’s advisory committee made up of providers. Mr. Zikan is employed by regional center providers BRAVO Program, Oasis Residential, and Don Ostendorf Center for Counseling. BRAVO Program provides adult day care services. Oasis Residential provides residential care services, and Don Ostendorf Center for Counseling provides counseling services. Therefore, his conflict resolution plan must follow the rules of W&I Section 4622 (k).

Dennis Villanueva, a case manager from FNRC, presented at the meeting. He explained that FNRC was administering a day program, called Community Integrated Day Employment Services, that included an employment first component that creates employment opportunities for participating consumers. As a result, these activities triggered conflict of interest issues under the DDS regulations and that is why the Council received multiple waiver requests. Committee member Janelle Lewis commented that, while this program is relatively unique, she thinks that other regional centers may develop similar programs so we should be aware of this issue.

Ms. Bocanegra stated that the staff recommendation is to approve each of these FNRC requests.

It was first/seconded (Lewis[FA]/Smith[FA]) and carried to adopt staff’s specified recommendations to approve the respective waiver requests and mitigation plans submitted for FNRC Board Members Battles, Beals, Corletto, Dever, Hatton, Hess, Phillips, Ryberg and Zikan. (unanimous)

Harbor Regional Center (HRC)

Additionally, the Committee reviewed Harbor Regional Center’s conflict of interest waiver request for Executive Director Patricia Del Monico.

The Committee was advised of a 2013 letter to DDS and the Council’s position that there is no statutory authority for SCDD to consider waiver requests submitted by Executive Directors or other regional center staff.
Councilmember Janelle Lewis commented that there should be oversight of these conflict of interest issues. Legal Counsel pointed out that the Lanterman Act assigns oversight and enforcement responsibility to DDS. With regard to SCDD’s involvement, the legal advice of both prior and current counsel is that there is no statutory authority that supports the Council’s formal participation in the waiver approval process for regional center executive directors. She explained that the Council’s specific position was formally communicated to DDS in the 2013 letter during DDS’s regulatory process on waiver requests. However, DDS proceeded with the adoption of regulations incorporating the Council’s review of waiver requests from regional center executive directors. This is the reason that these requests have been routed to the Council. The Council has declined to take action on these requests in the past.

Chief Deputy Director Gabriel Rogin commented that he saw this as a two part issue. The first part is whether SCDD can even consider this type of request, and the second part is looking at the merits and facts of the request. He pointed out that the committee is at the first question. If the answer remains that the Council does not get involved in these requests, then the committee does not go to the second issue.

Acknowledging the Council’s May 17, 2013, letter to the Department of Developmental Services and the Council’s current position, the Executive Committee declined to take action on this request.

It was first/seconded (Forderer [FA]/Smith [SA]) to decline taking action on this request due to concerns regarding statutory authority. (unanimous)

10. **ADJOURNMENT**
   Meeting adjourned at 2:19 p.m.
## Council Report for FY 16-17
### Expenditures through June-17

### FEDERAL GRANT (BSG)
*Based on Federal Fiscal Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Grant Award</th>
<th>Monthly Expenditure</th>
<th>Year-To-Date Expenditure</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Deficit YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$4,531,915</td>
<td>$425,023</td>
<td>$3,479,202</td>
<td>$1,052,713</td>
<td>$-197,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$1,748,250</td>
<td>$127,193</td>
<td>$1,203,623</td>
<td>$544,627</td>
<td>$96,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants / Special Items</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$25,334</td>
<td>$39,590</td>
<td>$160,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,480,165</strong></td>
<td><strong>$577,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,722,415</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,757,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$-100,185</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUALITY ASSESSMENT (QA)
*Based on State Fiscal Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Monthly Expenditure</th>
<th>Year-To-Date Expenditure</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$1,684,876</td>
<td>$141,967</td>
<td>$1,607,269</td>
<td>$77,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$754,234</td>
<td>$58,486</td>
<td>$533,338</td>
<td>$220,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,439,110</strong></td>
<td><strong>$200,453</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,140,607</strong></td>
<td><strong>$298,503</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRA/VAS
*Based on State Fiscal Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Monthly Expenditure</th>
<th>Year-To-Date Expenditure</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$1,219,055</td>
<td>$100,208</td>
<td>$1,247,572</td>
<td>$-28,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$557,945</td>
<td>$27,224</td>
<td>$276,845</td>
<td>$281,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,777,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$127,432</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,524,417</strong></td>
<td><strong>$252,583</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Updated 9/1/17*