

Chapter Twelve

Human Services

Section 1: GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Counties are committed to the delivery of public social services at the local level. However, counties require adequate and ongoing federal and state funding, maximum local authority, and flexibility for the administration and provision of public social services.

Inadequate funding for program costs strains the ability of counties to meet accountability standards and avoid penalties, putting the state and counties at risk for hundreds of millions of dollars in federal penalties. Freezing program funding also shifts costs to counties and increases the county share of program costs above statutory sharing ratios, while at the same time running contrary to the constitutional provisions of Proposition 1A.

At the federal level, counties support economic stimulus efforts that help maintain service levels and access for the state's neediest residents. Counties are straining to provide services to the burgeoning numbers of families in distress. People who have never sought public assistance before are arriving at county health and human services departments. Counties report long lines in their welfare departments as increasing numbers of people apply for programs such as Medicaid, Supportive Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP or Food Stamps), Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), and General Assistance. For these reasons, counties strongly urge that any federal stimulus funding must be shared directly with counties for programs that have a county share of cost.

Counties support federal economic stimulus efforts in the following areas: An increase in the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) for Medicaid and Title IV-E, and benefit increases for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP); Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF); the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA); Community Services Block Grants (CSBG); child support incentive funds; and summer youth employment funding.

Counties support the full implementation of the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA) and the expansion of coverage to the fullest extent allowed under federal law. Health care eligibility and enrollment functions must build on existing local infrastructure and processes and remain as accessible as possible. Counties are required by law to administer eligibility and enrollment functions for Medi-Cal, and recognize that many of the new enrollees under the ACA may also participate in other human services programs. For this reason, counties support the continued role of counties in Medi-Cal eligibility, enrollment, and retention functions. Further, enhanced data matching and case management of these enrollees must include adequate funding and be administered at the local level.

Prior to Proposition 13 in 1978, property taxes represented a stable and growing source of funding for county-administered human services programs. Until SB 154 (1978) and AB 8 (1979), there was a gradual erosion of local control in the administration of human services due to legislation and regulations promulgated by the state, which included dictating standards, service levels and administrative constraints.

Despite state assumption of major welfare program costs after Proposition 13, counties continue to be hampered by state administrative constraints and cost-sharing requirements, which ultimately affect the ability of counties to provide and maintain programs. The state should set minimum standards, allowing counties to enhance and supplement programs according to each county's local needs. If the state implements performance standards, the costs for meeting such requirements must be fully reimbursed.

Counties also support providing services for indigents at the local level. However, the state should assume the principal fiscal responsibility for administering programs such as General Assistance. The structure of federal and state programs must not shift costs or clients to county-level programs without full reimbursement.

Section 2: HUMAN SERVICES FUNDING DEFICIT

While counties are legislatively mandated to administer numerous human services programs including Foster Care, Child Welfare Services, CalWORKs, Adoptions, and Adult Protective Services, funding for these services was frozen at 2001 cost levels. The state's failure to fund actual county cost increases led to a growing funding gap of nearly \$1 billion *annually*. This put counties in the untenable position of backfilling the gap with their own limited resources or cutting services that the state and county residents expect us to deliver.

2011 Realignment shifted fiscal responsibility for the Foster Care, Childre Welfare Services, Adoptions and Adult Protective Services programs to the counties. Counties remain committed to the overall principle of fair, predictable and ongoing funding for human services programs that keeps pace with actual costs.

Section 3: CHILD WELFARE SERVICES/FOSTER CARE

A child deserves to grow up in an environment that is healthy, safe, and nurturing. To meet this goal, families and caregivers should have access to public and private services that are comprehensive and collaborative.

The existing approach to budgeting and funding child welfare services was established in the mid-1980's. Since that time, dramatic changes in child welfare policy have occurred, as well as significant demographic and societal changes, impacting the workload demands of the current system. 2011 Realignment provides a mechanism that will help meet the some of the current needs of the child welfare services system, but existing workload demands and regulations remain a concern

The ideal focus of children's services is to expand the capacity of families and caregivers to meet the needs of their children. Counties have and will continue to provide immediate leadership to focus and obtain additional resources for family preservation and support services.

When, despite the provision of voluntary services, the family or caregiver is unable to minimally ensure or provide a healthy, safe, and nurturing environment, a range of intervention approaches will be undertaken. When determining the appropriate intervention approach, the best interest of the child should always be the first consideration. These efforts to protect the best interest of children and preserve families may include:

1. A structured family plan involving family members and all providers, with specific goals and planned actions;
2. A family case planning conference;
3. Intensive home supervision; and/or
4. Juvenile and criminal court diversion contracts.

When a child is in danger of physical harm or neglect, either the child or alleged offender may be removed from the home, and formal dependency and criminal court actions may be taken. Where appropriate, family preservation and support services should be provided.

When parental rights must be terminated, counties support a permanency planning process that quickly places children in the most stable environments, with adoption being the permanent placement of choice. Counties support efforts to accelerate the judicial process for terminating parental rights in cases where there has been serious abuse and where it is clear that the family cannot be reunified. Counties also support adequate state funding for adoption services.

Furthermore, counties seek to obtain additional funding and flexibility at both the state and federal levels to provide robust transitional services to foster youth such as housing, employment services, and increased access to aid up to age 25. Counties also support such ongoing services for former and emancipated foster youth up to age 25, and pledge to help implement the Fostering Connections to Success Act of 2010 to help ensure the future success of this vulnerable population.

With regards to case- and workload standards in child welfare, counties remain concerned about increasing workloads and fluctuations in funding, both of which threaten the ability of county child welfare agencies to meet their federal and state mandates in serving children and families impacted by abuse and neglect.

Counties support a reexamination of reasonable caseload levels at a time when cases are becoming more complex, often more than one person is involved in working on a given case, and when extensive records have to be maintained about each case. Counties support ongoing augmentations for Child Welfare Services to partially mitigate workload concerns and the resulting impacts to children and families in crisis. Counties also support efforts to document workload needs and gather data in these areas so that we may ensure adequate funding for this complex system.

As our focus remains on the preservation and empowerment of families, we believe the potential for the public to fear some increased risk to children is outweighed by the positive effects of a research-supported family preservation emphasis. Within the family preservation and support services approach, the best interest of the child should always be the first consideration. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) programs allow counties to take care of children regardless of the status of parents.

Section 4: EMPLOYMENT AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY PROGRAMS

There is strong support for the simplification of the administration of public assistance programs. The state should continue to take a leadership role in seeking state and federal legislative and regulatory changes to achieve simplification, consolidation, and consistency across all major public assistance programs, including Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), Medicaid, Medi-Cal, and Food Stamps. In addition, electronic technology improvements in welfare administration are an important tool in

obtaining a more efficient and accessible system.

California counties are far more diverse from county to county than many regions of the United States. The state's welfare structure should recognize this and allow counties flexibility in administering welfare programs. Each county must have the ability to identify differences in the population being served and provide services accordingly, without restraints from federal or state government. There should, however, be as much uniformity as possible in areas such as eligibility requirements, grant levels and benefit structures. To the extent possible, program standards should seek to minimize incentives for public assistance recipients to migrate from county to county within the state.

A welfare system that includes shrinking time limits for assistance should also recognize the importance of and provide sufficient federal and state funding for education, job training, child care, and support services that are necessary to move recipients to self-sufficiency. There should also be sufficient federal and state funding for retention services, such as childcare and additional training, to assist former recipients in maintaining employment. Any state savings from the welfare system should be directed to counties to provide assistance to the affected population for programs at the counties' discretion, such as General Assistance, indigent health care, job training, child care, mental health, alcohol and drug services, and other services required to accomplish welfare-to-work goals. In addition, federal and state programs should include services that accommodate the special needs of people who relocate to the state after an emergency or natural disaster. It is only with adequate and reliable resources and flexibility that counties can truly address the fundamental barriers that many families have to self-sufficiency.

The state should assume the principal fiscal responsibility for the General Assistance program. Welfare-to-work efforts should focus on prevention of the factors that lead to poverty and welfare dependency including unemployment, underemployment, a lack of educational opportunities, food security issues, and housing problems. Prevention efforts should also acknowledge the responsibility of absent parents by improving efforts for absent parent location, paternity establishment, child support award establishment, and the timely collection of child support.

California's unique position as the nation's leading agricultural state should be leveraged to increase food security for its residents. Also, with the recent economic crisis, families and individuals are seeking food stamps and food assistance at higher rates. Counties support increased nutritional supplementation efforts at the state and federal levels, including increased aid, longer terms of aid, and increased access for those in need.

Counties also recognize safe, dependable and affordable child care as an integral part of attaining and retaining employment and overall family self-sufficiency, and therefore support efforts to seek additional funding to expand child care eligibility, access and quality programs.

Finally, counties support efforts to address housing supports and housing assistance efforts at the state and local levels. Long-term planning, creative funding, and accurate data on homelessness are essential to addressing housing security and homelessness issues.

Section 5: CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

Counties are committed to strengthening the child support enforcement program through implementation of the child support restructuring effort of 1999. Ensuring a seamless transition and efficient ongoing operations requires sufficient federal and state funding and must not result in any

increased county costs. Further, the state must assume full responsibility for any federal penalties for the state's failure to establish a statewide automated child support system. Any penalties passed on to counties would have an adverse impact on the effectiveness of child support enforcement or other county programs.

More recently, the way in which child support enforcement funding is structured prevents many counties from meeting state and federal collection guidelines and forces smaller counties to adopt a regional approach or, more alarmingly, fail outright to meet existing standards. Counties need an adequate and sustainable funding stream and flexibility at the local level to ensure timely and accurate child support enforcement efforts, and must not be held liable for failures to meet guidelines in the face of inadequate and inflexible funding.

Moreover, a successful child support enforcement program requires a partnership between the state and counties. Counties must have meaningful and regular input into the development of state policies and guidelines regarding child support enforcement.

Section 6: PROPOSITION 10: THE FIRST FIVE COMMISSIONS

Proposition 10, the California Children and Families Initiative of 1998, provides significant resources to enhance and strengthen early childhood development. Local children and families commissions (First 5 Commissions), established as a result of the passage of Proposition 10, must maintain the full discretion to determine the use of their share of funds generated by Proposition 10. Further, local First 5 commissions must maintain the necessary flexibility to direct these resources to the most appropriate needs of their communities, including childhood health, childhood development, nutrition, school readiness, child care and other critical community-based programs. Counties oppose any effort to diminish local Proposition 10 funds or to impose restrictions on their local expenditure authority.

In recognition that Proposition 10 funds are disseminated differently based on a county's First 5 Commission structure and appropriated under the premise that local commissions are in a better position to identify and address unique local needs, counties oppose any effort to lower or eliminate the state's support for county programs with the expectation that the state or local First 5commissions will backfill the loss with Proposition 10 revenues.

Section 7: REALIGNMENT

In 1991, the state and counties entered into a new fiscal relationship known as realignment. Realignment affects health, mental health, and social services programs and funding. The state transferred control of programs to counties, altered program cost-sharing ratios, and provided counties with dedicated tax revenues from the sales tax and vehicle license fee to pay for these changes.

Counties support the concept of state and local program realignment and the principles adopted by CSAC and the Legislature in forming realignment. Thus, counties believe the integrity of realignment should be protected. However, counties strongly oppose any change to realignment funding that would negatively impact counties. Counties remain concerned and will resist any reduction of dedicated realignment revenues or the shifting of new costs from the state and further mandates of new and greater fiscal responsibilities in this partnership program.

With the passage of Proposition 1A, the state and counties entered into a new relationship whereby local property taxes, sales and use taxes, and Vehicle License Fees are constitutionally dedicated to local governments. Proposition 1A also provides that the Legislature must fund state-mandated programs; if not, the Legislature must suspend those state-mandated programs. Any effort to realign additional programs must occur in the context of these constitutional provisions.

In 2011, counties assumed 100 percent fiscal responsibility for Child Welfare Services, adoptions, adoptions assistance, Child Abuse Prevention Intervention and Treatment services, foster care and Adult Protective Services as part of the 2011 Public Safety Realignment. Please see the Realignment chapter of the CSAC Platform and accompanying principles.

Section 8: FAMILY VIOLENCE

CSAC remains committed to raising awareness of the toll of family violence on families and communities by supporting efforts that target family violence prevention, intervention, and treatment. Specific strategies for early intervention and success should be developed through cooperation between state and local governments, as well as community and private organizations addressing family violence issues.

Section 9: AGING AND DEPENDENT ADULTS

California is already home to more older adults than any other state in the nation, and the state's 65 and older population is expected to double over the next 20 years, from 3.5 million in 2000 to 8.2 million in 2030. The huge growth in the number of older Californians will affect how local governments plan for and provide services, running the gamut from housing and health care to transportation and in-home care services. While many counties are addressing the needs of their older and dependent adult populations in unique and innovative ways, all are struggling to maintain basic safety net services in addition to ensuring an array of services needed by this aging population.

Counties support reliable funding for programs that affect older and dependent adults, such as Adult Protective Services and In-Home Supportive Services, and oppose any funding cuts, or shifts of costs to counties without revenue, from either the state or federal governments. Furthermore, counties are committed to addressing the unique needs of older and dependent adults in their communities, and support collaborative efforts to build a continuum of services as part of a long-term system of care for this vulnerable but vibrant population.

Adult Protective Services

The Adult Protective Services (APS) Program is the state's safety net program for abused and neglected adults and is now solely financed and administered at the local level by counties. As such, counties provide around-the-clock critical services to protect the state's most vulnerable seniors and dependent adults from abuse and neglect. Timely response by local APS is critical, as studies show that elder abuse victims are 3.1 times more likely to die prematurely than the average senior. Counties must retain local flexibility in meeting the needs of our aging population.

In-Home Supportive Services

The In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program is a federal Medicaid program administered by the state and run by counties that enables program recipients to hire a caregiver to provide services that enable that person to stay in his or her home safely. Individuals eligible for IHSS services are

disabled, age 65 or older, or those who are blind and unable to live safely at home without help. All Supplementary Income/ State Supplemental Payment recipients are also eligible for IHSS benefits if they demonstrate an assessed need for such services.

As part of the 2012-13 state budget, the Legislature and Governor approved major policy changes within the Medi-Cal program aimed at improving care coordination, particularly for people on both Medi-Cal and Medicare. Also approved as part of this Coordinated Care Initiative (CCI) are a number of changes to the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) program, including state collective bargaining for IHSS, creation of a county IHSS Maintenance of Effort (MOE), and creation of a Statewide Authority. County social workers evaluate prospective and ongoing IHSS recipients, who may receive assistance with such tasks as housecleaning, meal preparation, laundry, grocery shopping, personal care services such as bathing, paramedical services, and accompaniment to medical appointments. Once a recipient is authorized for service hours, the recipient is responsible for hiring his or her provider. Although the recipient is considered the employer for purpose of hiring, supervising, and firing their provider, state law requires counties to establish an “employer of record” for purposes of collective bargaining to set provider wages and benefits. In 2014, the state will become the employer of record for the eight Coordinated Care Initiative (CCI) counties.

IHSS cases are funded by one of three programs in California: the Personal Care Services Program (supported by federal Medicaid funds, state funds and county funds), the IHSS Residual Program (supported by state and county funds), or the IHSS Plus Waiver (supported by federal Medicaid funds, state funds and county funds). IHSS Program Administration is supported by a combination of federal, state and local dollars.

Costs and caseloads for the program continue to grow. State General Fund costs for the IHSS program have quadrupled from 1998 to 2008. Federal funds have almost quadrupled. County costs have grown at slightly slower pace – tripling over ten years. According to the Department of Social Services, caseloads are projected to increase between five and seven percent annually going forward.

Counties support the continuation of federal and state funding for IHSS, and oppose any efforts to further shift IHSS costs to counties. Furthermore, counties are committed to working with the appropriate state departments and stakeholders to draft, submit, and implement new ideas to continue and enhance federal support of the program.

Section 10: VETERANS

Counties provide services such as mental health treatment, substance use disorder treatment, and social services that veterans may access. Specific strategies for intervention and service delivery to veterans should be developed through cooperation between federal, state and local governments, as well as community and private organizations serving veterans.