



**Policy Roundtable for Child Care**  
**SPECIAL MEETING – STATE BUDGET 2011-12**  
Thursday, February 24, 2011  
9:30 a.m. – Noon  
Fourth Floor Conference Room  
222 South Hill Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012



**Proposed Meeting Agenda**

- 9:30 1. Welcome and Introductions Terri Chew Nishimura, Chair
- Purpose of the Meeting
  - Setting the Process for Action
  - Key Assumptions
    - Cuts to child care and development are a given – no just saying “no to cuts”
    - Absorb fair share without dismantling the system and allow to grow as economic climate improves
    - Distribute across-the-board cuts evenly across child care and development programs – Center-based, California State Preschool Programs (part- and full-day), Migrant, Alternative Payment Programs, Resource and Referral, and CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care)
    - Prioritize spending for quality programs and infrastructure supports.
    - Most importantly, ensure the least amount of harm to children and their families
- 9:45 2. Setting Priorities and Process
- County Perspective Ron Morales, CEO/IGA
  - View from Sacramento Martha Flammer, CEO/IGA
- 10:00 3. Governor's 2011-12 Proposed Budget on Child Development Services Michele Sartell
- Overview of Key Issues
    - Cuts contract amounts by 34.6% while requiring programs to serve same number of children; families make up difference through co-pay in addition to family fee Members asked to weigh in:
    - Reduces income eligibility limit from 75 to 60% of State Median Income (SMI) Whit Hayslip  
Ruth Yoon
    - Exempts State Preschool from cuts to contract amounts and reduction in income eligibility limit Dora Jacildo
    - Eliminates child development services for 11 and 12 year old children Duane Dennis
    - Eliminates eligibility for CalWORKs cash aid benefits beyond 48 months Michael Gray
    - Allows sunset of exemption from participation in welfare-to-work activities for parents of young children/increase funding for CalWORKs Stage 1 Child Care Charlotte Lee
- Adam Sonenshein

*(List continued to next page)*

- Reduces funding for CalWORKs Stage 2 Child Care based on estimated caseload
- Restores funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 Child Care for 2010-11 and 2011-12
- Reduces federal funded quality improvement programs, potentially scaling back or eliminating 17 quality programs
- Diverts Proposition 10 reserves and 50% of future funds

10:30 4. Alternative Proposals to Governor’s Proposals for Child Development Services Kathy Malaske-Samu

- Legislative Analyst’s Office
- Child Development Field/Advocates

10:45 5. The Roundtable’s Response Terri Nishimura

- Identify Recommended Pursuits of Position

***Action Items***

11:45 6. Next Steps Terri Nishimura

12:00 7. Call to Adjourn

---

**Mission Statement**

The mission of the Policy Roundtable for Child Care is to serve as the official County body on all matters relating to child care, working in collaboration with the Child Care Planning Committee and the Children’s Planning Council, to build and strengthen the child care system and infrastructure in the County by providing policy recommendations to the Board.



# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 383  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
(213) 974-1411 • FAX (213) 620-0636

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

GLORIA MOLINA

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY

DON KNABE

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

SACHI A. HAMAI  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

January 3, 2011

The Honorable Jerry Brown  
Governor, State of California  
State Capitol  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Governor Brown:

In the coming weeks, you and the Legislature will consider various solutions to address the State's projected \$28.0 billion budget shortfall through FY 2011-12, as well as the ongoing structural deficit estimated at \$20.0 billion annually through FY 2015-16. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors fully understands that given the present condition of the State's fiscal crisis, the possibility exists that severe cuts will be made to critical health, human services and public safety programs even if revenues are increased through new fees or taxes. As such, now is the time for the County to partner with you and the Legislature to help fashion a State Budget that does the least harm to California's most needy and vulnerable residents.

While the County is willing to assume a fair share of potential funding cuts, it is imperative that we actively participate with you and the Legislature to determine which program funding is reduced, by how much and when. The County should also be involved in the development of alternatives to mitigate the impact of such funding reductions and determining mandate relief to accompany any reductions in funding for County services. As we work in this effort, it is essential that County programs and the residents we serve do not suffer disproportionate cuts.

Over the past three years, State Budget actions have resulted in a County loss of \$515.2 million. The vast majority of the reductions affected vital health, human services and public safety programs. The \$515.2 million in budget reductions, combined with the State's borrowing of \$365.0 million of County property tax revenues in FY 2009-10, has significantly strained our ability to provide vital services. As you are aware, the County, like many other local governments, is facing its own fiscal challenges as the economic downturn has resulted in sharp decreases in sales tax revenues and property tax collections, while the demand for County services has exponentially increased.



## COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 383  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
(213) 974-1411 • FAX (213) 620-0636

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

GLORIA MOLINA

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY

DON KNABE

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

SACHI A. HAMAI  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

January 3, 2011

The Honorable John A. Pérez  
Speaker, California State Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 219  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Speaker Pérez:

In the coming weeks, you and the Legislature will consider various solutions to address the State's projected \$28.0 billion budget shortfall through FY 2011-12, as well as the ongoing structural deficit estimated at \$20.0 billion annually through FY 2015-16. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors fully understands that given the present condition of the State's fiscal crisis, the possibility exists that severe cuts will be made to critical health, human services and public safety programs even if revenues are increased through new fees or taxes. As such, now is the time for the County to partner with you and the Legislature to help fashion a State Budget that does the least harm to California's most needy and vulnerable residents.

While the County is willing to assume a fair share of potential funding cuts, it is imperative that we actively participate with you and the Legislature to determine which program funding is reduced, by how much and when. The County should also be involved in the development of alternatives to mitigate the impact of such funding reductions and determining mandate relief to accompany any reductions in funding for County services. As we work in this effort, it is essential that County programs and the residents we serve do not suffer disproportionate cuts.

Over the past three years, State Budget actions have resulted in a County loss of \$515.2 million. The vast majority of the reductions affected vital health, human services and public safety programs. The \$515.2 million in budget reductions, combined with the State's borrowing of \$365.0 million of County property tax revenues in FY 2009-10, has significantly strained our ability to provide vital services. As you are aware, the County, like many other local governments, is facing its own fiscal challenges as the economic downturn has resulted in sharp decreases in sales tax revenues and property tax collections, while the demand for County services has exponentially increased.



# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION  
500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, ROOM 383  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012  
(213) 974-1411 • FAX (213) 620-0636

SACHI A. HAMAI  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

January 3, 2011

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

GLORIA MOLINA

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY

DON KNABE

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

The Honorable Darrell Steinberg  
Senate President pro Tempore  
State Capitol, Room 205  
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear President pro Tempore Steinberg:

In the coming weeks, you and the Legislature will consider various solutions to address the State's projected \$28.0 billion budget shortfall through FY 2011-12, as well as the ongoing structural deficit estimated at \$20.0 billion annually through FY 2015-16. The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors fully understands that given the present condition of the State's fiscal crisis, the possibility exists that severe cuts will be made to critical health, human services and public safety programs even if revenues are increased through new fees or taxes. As such, now is the time for the County to partner with you and the Legislature to help fashion a State Budget that does the least harm to California's most needy and vulnerable residents.

While the County is willing to assume a fair share of potential funding cuts, it is imperative that we actively participate with you and the Legislature to determine which program funding is reduced, by how much and when. The County should also be involved in the development of alternatives to mitigate the impact of such funding reductions and determining mandate relief to accompany any reductions in funding for County services. As we work in this effort, it is essential that County programs and the residents we serve do not suffer disproportionate cuts.


Over the past three years, State Budget actions have resulted in a County loss of \$515.2 million. The vast majority of the reductions affected vital health, human services and public safety programs. The \$515.2 million in budget reductions, combined with the State's borrowing of \$365.0 million of County property tax revenues in FY 2009-10, has significantly strained our ability to provide vital services. As you are aware, the County, like many other local governments, is facing its own fiscal challenges as the economic downturn has resulted in sharp decreases in sales tax revenues and property tax collections, while the demand for County services has exponentially increased.

The Honorable Jerry Brown  
January 3, 2011  
Page 2


Los Angeles County appreciates the State's difficult fiscal situation, and we understand that you and the Legislature will be forced to make many difficult decisions in the coming months to address the fiscal crisis.

We very much appreciate your consideration of our request and we look forward to working with you to develop a long-term solution to the State Budget crisis that will protect California's neediest families and children.


Sincerely,




MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Mayor, Board of Supervisors




GLORIA MOLINA  
Supervisor, First District



MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS  
Supervisor, Second District



ZEV YAROSLAVSKY  
Supervisor, Third District



DON KNABE  
Supervisor, Fourth District

c: Los Angeles County Legislative Delegation

January 21, 2011

The Honorable Jerry Brown  
Governor, State of California  
State Capitol  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Darrell Steinberg  
Senate President pro Tempore  
State Capitol, Room 205  
Sacramento, California 95814

The Honorable Bob Dutton  
Senate Minority Leader  
State Capitol, Room 305  
Sacramento, California 95814

The Honorable John A. Perez  
Speaker of the Assembly  
State Capitol, Room 219  
Sacramento, California 95814

The Honorable Connie Conway  
Assembly Minority Leader  
State Capitol, Room 3104  
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Governor and Legislative Leaders:

The restructuring of State and County government proposed in the Governor's 2011-12 Proposed Budget requires close coordination with counties, and therefore, we appreciate your willingness to engage county officials in this effort. As the top administrators for the 12 urban counties which have nearly three-fourths of California's total population, we are committed to working with both your Office and the State Legislature on the realignment proposal and other critical aspects of the proposed budget. As such, we will offer specific suggestions in the days ahead that we believe must be incorporated into the budget plan so that it is both feasible and sustainable for our counties, effective for the State and the people we serve in California.

Chief among the many issues that must be addressed is the issue of the adequacy, security and permanence of the revenues that must accompany the transfer of any new program responsibilities. A Constitutional Amendment which provides financial security for counties, including the identification of specific, dedicated revenue for year six and beyond, as well as provisions that guarantee State payments to counties including increases in the administrative cost of doing business, assurances that mandates are reimbursed and are transacted within a specific timeframe are essential in reaching an agreement.

Governor and Legislative Leaders  
January 21, 2011  
Page Two

Not only must the revenue be adequate, secure and permanent, it is also critical that the programs transferred to counties be only those programs which can be best administered at the county level. Programs that implement federal programs, or programs that rely heavily on federal funding, clearly belong at the State level, and should not be realigned to counties. Further, the success of this restructuring proposal will depend on whether sufficient county administrative control and flexibility are part of the final package. This issue is the very key to more efficient and effective program delivery. It will enable each county board of supervisors to better set priorities and consolidate program delivery and administrative costs, where possible and appropriate, given local needs and available resources.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We appreciate the opportunity to work collaboratively to ensure the needs of our respective organizations are met and look forward to discussing these and other issues.


Sincerely,

  
William T. Fujioka  
Chief Executive Officer  
Los Angeles County

  
Susan Muranishi  
Chief Administrative Officer  
Alameda County

  
Walter Ekard  
Chief Administrative Officer  
San Diego County

  
Steven C. Szalay  
Interim County Executive  
Sacramento County

  
Thomas G. Mauk  
County Executive Officer  
Orange County

  
David Twa  
Chief Administrative Officer  
Contra Costa County

Governor and Legislative Leaders

January 21, 2011

Page Three



Bill Luna  
Chief Executive Officer  
Riverside County



Marty Robinson  
Chief Executive Officer  
Ventura County



Gregory Devereaux  
Chief Administrative Officer  
San Bernardino County



David Boesch  
County Manager  
San Mateo County



Jeffrey V. Smith  
Chief Executive Officer  
Santa Clara County

This page intentionally blank



**Policy Roundtable for Child Care**  
**SPECIAL MEETING – STATE BUDGET 2011-12**  
 Thursday, February 24, 2011

Matrix of Governor's Proposals for State Budget 2011-12 and Responding Alternative Proposals and Roundtable's Recommended Positions on Items

Governor <sup>1</sup>	Budget Hearings Actions	Legislative Analyst's Office	Child Development Advocates	PRCC Recommended Positions
<p>Cuts child care &amp; development subsidies by 34.6% to CDE/CDD-contracted programs, except part-day State Preschool, while ~</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- requiring programs to continue serving the same number of children, and</li> <li>- families to make up the difference in co-payments in addition to parent fees</li> </ul> <p>➤ County Offices of Education (COEs) to work with local Alternative Payment Program (AP) agencies and direct service contractors to determine subsidy policies to reduce subsidies in aggregate by 34.6% ~</p> <p>COEs may consult with respective county welfare director and local planning council</p> <p>Each COE allowed to develop sliding scales of subsidies based on a number of family factors, yet in a way that retains the number of children and families programs currently serve</p> <p>Allows co-payments to exceed 10 percent of family income</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 13% across-the-board reduction, excluding part-day preschool, and CalWORKs Stages 1 and 2 Child Care</li> <li>- Reduces AP administrative and family support costs from 17.5 to 15%</li> <li>- Use one-time funds and other savings to backfill child care cuts (\$223 million)</li> </ul> <p><b>Assembly:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce all contracts, including State Preschool (and except CalWORKs Stages 1 and 2), by 10%</li> <li>- Approves \$150 million in inter-year deferrals (unspent, prior year one-time funds)</li> </ul> <p><b>Assembly and Senate:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce reimbursement rate for license-exempt providers from 80% to 60% of the market survey</li> </ul>	<p>Recommends adopting Guiding principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strike balance between providing access to care and ensuring a reasonable level of quality</li> <li>- Prioritize services for neediest families</li> <li>- Prioritize direct services over administrative and support activities</li> </ul> <p>Reject deep across-the-board reduction to subsidies.</p> <p>Reduce income level at which parents must begin to pay fee and/or increase the amount of fee required for families at each existing income level.</p> <p><i>Additional options not addressed in Governor's proposal:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce maximum reimbursement rate for licensed and/or license-exempt providers, basing rates on updated 2009 data</li> <li>- Reduce amount state provides to AP Program agencies for administration and support (i.e. 15% to 10%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impose modest across-the-board cut to all major CDE/CDD-contracted programs – center-based, State Preschool (inclusive of Part-day), Migrant, AP Program, CalWORKs Child Care Stages 2 and 3, and Resource and Referral Program without reducing reimbursement rates. [Consortium of child development organizations, CAPPA, CCFRNI]</li> <li>• Capture \$360 million in unspent job funding (set aside for \$3000 tax credits for hiring by micro-businesses).</li> <li>• Impose a modest increase in the sliding family fee scale while ensuring that parents are not paying more than 10% of their gross annual income.</li> <li>• Reduce reimbursement rate for license-exempt providers to 70 or 60% of licensed family child care rate. [Consortium of child development organizations]</li> <li>• Recapture \$83.1 million to spread across all CDE contract types. [CAPPA]</li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mr. Duane Dennis moved to support across-the-board cuts to all CDE/CDD-contracted child development programs, inclusive of State Preschool and CalWORKs Child Care; seconded by Ms. Esther Torrez. Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Mr. Duane Dennis moved to accept the Assembly's proposal to reduce all CDE/CDD contracts, including State Preschool, by 10%; Mr. Adam Sorenshein seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Ms. Kathy Malaske-Samu moved to accept the Assembly and the Senate's proposal to reduce reimbursement rates for license-exempt providers from 80% to 60% of the market survey; Mr. Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Ms. Malaske-Samu moved to reject the Senate's proposal to reduce the AP administrative and family support costs from 17.5% to 15%; rather efforts should be made to maintain costs at 17.5%; seconded by Ms. Dora Jacildo. Passed unanimously.</p>

<sup>1</sup> As applicable, may include proposals as expressed in budget bills (i.e. AB 92 (Blumenfeld) and SB 68 (Leno)) and Education Trailer Bill Language as proposed by the Department of Finance.

Governor <sup>1</sup>	Budget Hearings Actions	Legislative Analyst's Office	Child Development Advocates	PRCC Recommended Positions <sup>2</sup>
<p>Reduces income eligibility limit for CDE/CDD-contracted subsidized child care and development services, except part-day State Preschool, from 75 to 60% of State Median Income (SMI).</p> <p>- Also, applies to CalWORKs Stage 1 Child Care.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Also applies reduction to State Preschool</p> <p><b>Assembly:</b> Reduce income eligibility ceiling to 70% of SMI</p>	<p>Option: Further reduce maximum allowable income level for families eligible for subsidized child development services.</p> <p>- Conducted analysis that compares limiting income eligibility at 65%, 60% or 50% of SMI, resulting in losses of 9,500, 16,000, or 40,000 slots respectively.</p> <p>Additional option: Also apply lower income ceiling to preschool eligibility.</p>	<p>Reject this proposal that will result in disenrolling families earning between 60 and 75% of SMI. <i>[Consortium of child development organizations, CAPPA]</i></p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mr. Dennis moved to accept the Assembly's proposal to reduce the income eligibility ceiling to 70% of State Median Income (SMI); Ms. Torrez seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p>
<p>Exempts State Preschool Part-day from 34.6% cuts to contract amounts and reduction in income eligibility limit.</p> <p>- CalWORKs Stage 1 Child Care contractors also exempt from 34.6% cut</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Excludes part-day State Preschool and CalWORKs Stages 1 and 2 from proposed 13% across-the-board cuts<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>Assembly:</b> Would only exempt CalWORKs Stages 1 and 2 from proposed 10% across-the-board cuts</p>	<p>Apply reductions more consistently across programs and regions.</p> <p>Prioritize services for neediest families.</p>	<p>Fully consolidate CDE Title 5 educational center programs in Education Code and Budget Act to allow for more effective delivery of services to meet needs of families and communities and better align funding with agency expenses and community needs. <i>[Consortium of child development organizations]</i></p>	<p>(See page 1)</p>
<p>Eliminates child development services for 11 and 12 year olds.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Exempts children in non-traditional hours of care; would create priority wait list of after school programs for these low-income children</p> <p><b>Assembly:</b> Rejects proposal</p>	<p>Option: Further reduce maximum age at which child eligible for subsidized services.</p> <p>Alternative option: Provide subsidized care for school-age children ages 6-12 only during non-traditional hours, while prioritizing spots in school-based programs for displaced children.</p>	<p>Use Proposition 49 funds to meet the needs of working parents and their school age children enrolled in CDE/CDD-contracted programs and maintain eligibility for 11 and 12 year old children.</p> <p>Consolidate program management of different school age programs under one division. <i>[Consortium of child development organizations]</i></p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mr. Dennis moved to support the Assembly's proposal to reject eliminating CDE/CDD-contracted child development services for 11 and 12 year old children; Ms. Malaske-Samu seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p>

<sup>2</sup> Per Senator Liu's motion, during which she commented that State Preschool and CalWORKs Stages 1 and 2 were exempt due to being entitlements.  
Policy Roundtable for Child Care Special Meeting – Proposed State Budget 2011-12  
Matrix of Governor's Proposals and Responding Alternative Proposals  
February 24, 2011  
Page 2

Governor <sup>1</sup>	Budget Hearings Actions	Legislative Analyst's Office	Child Development Advocates	PRCC Recommended Positions*
<p>Reduces federal funded quality improvement programs, potentially scaling back or eliminating 17 quality programs.</p>	<p><b>Assembly:</b> Approves \$16 million in federal funds (re. ARRA) reduction in manner consistent with legislative intent and prioritization of programs</p>	<p>Suggests legislature come up with list of quality projects to maintain, reduce or eliminate.</p>	<p>Transfer high priority Proposition 98 programs (Resource and Referral, Child Care Initiative, Local Planning Councils) into Federal Quality Set-aside. <i>[Consortium of child development organizations]</i></p> <p>Preserve funding for direct services and supports to families and child care providers and teachers, comply with federal mandates, and analyze programs to determine potential for delayed funding and impacts on foundation and ongoing support of child development system. <i>[CCCFRN]</i></p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Ms. Malaske-Samu moved to advocate for using the existing CDE/CDD system which includes public input on CCDBG quality projects, to inform the legislature on how to prioritize the quality dollars; seconded by Mr. Dennis. The motion was amended to read "and include a policy hearing convened by the legislature to solicit input from stakeholders representing the child care and development field." The motion as amended passed unanimously.</p>

Governor <sup>1</sup>	Budget Hearings Actions	Legislative Analyst's Office	Child Development Advocates	PRCC Recommended Positions
<p>Eliminates funding for centralized eligibility lists (CELS).</p> <p>Provides local flexibility in establishing and administering "centralized waiting lists".</p> <p>County Offices of Education (COEs) to work with local Alternative Payment Program (AP) agencies and direct service contractors to determine priorities for enrolling children in subsidized programs as space becomes available</p> <p>COEs may establish centralized waiting list in cooperation the CDE/CDD-contracted AP Program agencies. If established, all contractors must participate</p> <p>Costs for establishing and maintaining allowable administrative expense and in addition to normal administrative allowance</p> <p>Local planning councils may assist COEs in administration of waiting lists</p>	<p><b>Assembly:</b> Approves elimination of CEL and transfer funds to direct child care and development services</p>	<p>Concurs with elimination of CELs.</p>	<p>Cut or eliminate low priority non-direct child development expenditures ~</p> <p>In consultation with CDE/CDD</p> <p>Acknowledges Governor's proposal to eliminate CELs, California Preschool Instructional Network (CPIN) and California Childhood Mentor Program</p> <p>Consider, in addition, exempt provider training and funding to welfare recipients as child care teachers</p> <p><i>[Consortium of child development organizations]</i></p>	<p>The Roundtable remained silent on this issue.</p>
<b>CalWORKS</b>				
<p>Eliminates eligibility for CalWORKS cash aid benefits beyond 48 months.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Approved Gov's proposal, except to limit safety net and child-only cases</p> <p><b>Assembly:</b> Extends exemptions for parents of young children</p>		<p>Maintain CalWORKS exemption for an additional one to two years. <i>[Consortium of child development organizations]</i></p>	<p>At this time, the Roundtable defers to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) to take the lead on CalWORKS related issues.</p>
<p>Allows sunset of exemption from participation in welfare-to-work activities for parents of young children as of June 30, 2011.</p>			<p>Extend exemption from CalWORKS welfare-to-work activities for families with young children. <i>[Consortium of child development organizations]</i></p>	
<p>Increases funding for CalWORKS Stage 1 Child Care due to sunset of exemption (see above).</p>				

Governor <sup>1</sup>	Budget Hearings Actions	Legislative Analyst's Office	Child Development Advocates	PRCC Recommended Positions
<p>Reduces funding for CalWORKS Stage 2 Child Care based on projected caseload due to eliminating monthly cash benefits after 48 months (see above).</p>				
<p>Restores CalWORKS Stage 3 Child Care for 2010-11 and 2011-12; service levels consistent with proposed policy solutions affecting age and income eligibility and reduced subsidy levels for 2011-12.</p>		<p>Weigh restoration of CalWORKS Stage 3 against other priorities - i.e. other CDD services</p>	<p>Review the proposed budget for CalWORKS Stage 3 for 2011-12.</p>	<p><b>Motion:</b> Mr. Dennis moved to support restoration of funding for CalWORKS Stage 3 Child Care; Mr. Sonenshein seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p>
<b>Other Proposals</b>				
<p>Subject to voter approval ~</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Diverts \$1 billion in Proposition 10 reserves to Medi-Cal services to children from birth to five years old effective July 1, 2011</li> <li>- Continues \$50 million in reimbursement funding included in the 2010-11 budget to provide services to children from birth to five years old through 2011-12</li> <li>- Redirects on an ongoing basis 50 percent of the state and local commission revenues to fund various state children's programs.</li> </ul> <p>Funds Early Learning Advisory Council Activities using federal funds.</p>	<p><b>Senate:</b> Approved shift of \$1 billion in State and local reserves to Medi-Cal</p> <p><b>Assembly:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Denied proposal to shift 50% of local funding on an on-going basis</li> <li>- Recommends elimination of State Commission; shifts funds to cover Medi-Cal services for children</li> </ul>			<p><b>Motion:</b> Ms. Malaske-Samu moved to recommend that only those First 5 funds that are unencumbered (not allocated or dedicated to a specific project) should be "swept". Further, funds that are swept from each county commission should be used to provide services as determined by the Governor to the children and families of that county; Mr. Dennis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.</p>
				<p>No action</p>

For questions or comments regarding this document, contact Michele Sartell, staff with the Office of Child Care, by e-mail at [msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov](mailto:msartell@ceo.lacounty.gov) or call (213) 974-5187.

*\*\* Please note:* The Roundtable's recommended positions must be submitted to the County's Intergovernmental Relations and External Affairs before presentation to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration. In effect, these recommended positions have not yet been approved by the Board.