

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

2020 Legislative Planning – Key Dates

County – Sponsored Legislative and Budget Proposals

- **July 22, 2019** – 1st Draft of Recommended Proposals Due to Legislative Analysts
- **Late July/Early August** – Review Meetings with Legislative Analysts
- **August 12, 2019** – 2nd Draft of Recommended Proposals Due to Legislative Analysts
- **September 9, 2019** – Final Draft Proposals Due
- **September 2019** – Review with Board Offices/Final Review by CEO
- **Mid-October 2019** – Final List of 2020 Bills

State Legislative Agenda

- **August 16, 2019** – 1st Draft of Recommended Changes Due to Legislative Analysts
- **Late August** – Review Meetings with Legislative Analysts
- **September 20, 2019** – 2nd Draft of Recommended Changes Due to Legislative Analysts
- **October 2019** – Review with Board Offices
- **November 2019** – Final Review by CEO
- **December 2019** – Consideration by the Board

Federal Legislative Agenda

- **October 22, 2019** – Draft of Recommended Changes Due to Legislative Analysts
- **Late October** – Review Meetings with Legislative Analysts
- **November 2019** – Review with Board Offices
- **December 2019** – Final Review by CEO
- **January 2020** – Consideration by the Board



Process for Pursuing County-Sponsored State Legislation

STEP 1

CEO Solicits Requests from Departments

STEP 2

Departments Prepare and Submit Proposals

STEP 3

CEO Assesses Department Proposals

STEP 4

Proposals Are Shared with Board Offices for Review

STEP 5

County Pursues Approved Bill Sponsors

Submissions must use the Recommended County-Sponsored Legislative Proposal Form and include:

- Detailed description of the issue;
- Description of the proposal;
- List of interested parties;
- Background on existing law;
- Projected fiscal impact;
- History of the proposal; and
- Reference to existing Board-policy, if applicable.

All proposals **must** be accompanied with suggested bill language that has been approved by County Counsel.

Once received, Legislative Analysts will assess the Department's proposal, which may include conducting review meetings with:

- Submitting Department;
- Other potentially-affected Departments;
- County Counsel;
- CEO Budget and Operations; and
- Board Offices.

The CEO's office will present the highest priority, well-developed proposals with the Board offices for final review.

Once the County officially pursues sponsorship for a proposal,

- The Sacramento Advocates will coordinate with legislators to secure an author for the bill; and
- The County, including the Department, will work with the author to develop a final Fact Sheet and bill language.

Bills must be introduced by the Legislature's bill introduction deadline in late February.

Do's

- Submit the highest-priority requests for the Department.
- Complete the entire Recommended County-Sponsored Legislation Proposal Form.
- Submit legislative language that has been approved by County Counsel.

Don'ts

- Do not contact legislators directly and "shop" your proposal.
- Do not submit proposals that the Department isn't prepared to work closely on throughout the legislative process. This includes, but is not limited to: quickly reviewing proposed amendments, testifying at committee hearings, meeting with stakeholders, among others.



**County of Los Angeles
Chief Executive Office – Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations**

RECOMMENDED COUNTY-SPONSORED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL FORM

Department:	
Division (if applicable):	
Contact Person’s Name:	
Phone Number:	
Email:	
Proposal Approved By:	(Name and Title)
	(Signature)

INSTRUCTIONS

Please provide the requested information in each text box provided. Note that the text box will automatically expand based on the amount of text entered. Please do not reformat this form.

SUMMARY

1) Give a brief description of the legislative proposal (one to two sentences):

Response:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1) Problem

- a. What issue does the proposal address? Give specific facts and/or examples.
- b. Does the proposal address an issue of statewide significance?
- c. Why is this proposal important to the County and/or the Department?
- d. Have counties been involved in any litigation regarding this issue? If so, cite the case.
- e. What other data, materials, or case law document this issue?

Response:

2) Interested Parties

- a. Does this proposal impact other County Departments?
- b. If so, which County Departments are impacted and has the Department vetted this proposal with them?
- c. What other counties, cities, organizations or constituent groups would be supportive of or opposed to the proposal?
- d. What counties, cities, organizations or constituent groups could be affected by the proposal? How?

Response:

PROPOSAL

1) Existing Law

- a. What current law is applicable to this proposal?
- b. Why is existing law inadequate to addressing this issue?

Response:

2) Suggested Legislation

- a. Describe the specific bill proposal.
- b. Do similar provisions existing in other California laws?

Response:

3) Fiscal Impact

- a. Would there be any potential fiscal impact to the State by this proposal? If so, describe.
- b. Would there be any potential fiscal impact to the County by this proposal? If so, describe.
- c. Would there be any potential fiscal impact to other local governments, or other organizations or constituent groups by this proposal?

Response:

HISTORY

- 1) Has this proposal been introduced in the Legislature before?
- 2) If so, what was the bill number, who was the author, who were the sponsors, and why did it fail to advance?

Response:

BOARD POLICY

- 1) What policy in the County’s State Legislative Agenda supports this proposal?
- 2) If there is not applicable policy from the State Legislative Agenda, what County initiative, adopted Board motion, or Board policy supports this proposal?

Response:

SUGGESTED BILL LANGUAGE

Please attach County Counsel-approved bill language for the proposal. Proposed bill language should be provided in red-line format and reference relevant code section(s).



Process for Taking a County Advocacy Position Federal/State Legislation and Budget Proposals

STEP 1

Department reviews a bill or budget proposal

STEP 2

Department recommends a position and provides comments/analysis

STEP 3

Analyst reviews bill/budget item and recommendation

STEP 4

A Pursuit is issued securing the County's position on the bill/budget

STEP 5

Sacramento/D.C. Lobbyist Team advocates for the County

Recommendations:

- Departments or Analysts identify bills/budget proposals that may impact the County.
- Departments, as the subject matter experts, provide input as to the operational and fiscal impact of bills and/or budget proposals.
- CEO-Legislative Affairs rely on Departments for a recommended position.

Considerations for taking a position:

- Legislation has an impact on the County or constituents.
- The legislation has been vetted by all relevant/impacted Departments.
- There is Board-approved policy in the [Federal](#) or [State](#) Legislative Agendas to take a position.
- It is appropriate timing in the legislative session to take a position.

Pursuit of Position:

- Reflects the County's recommended bill/budget position based on existing Board-approved policy.
- A pursuit includes:
 - bill background
 - information on existing law
 - Department comments justifying the position,
 - status of the proposal,
 - recommended position of support or opposition.

Sacramento/DC Advocacy:

- CEO-LAIR Sacramento and D.C. lobbyists, who are registered lobbyists, lead all advocacy efforts on bill/budget items.
- Sacramento and D.C. lobbyists strategically advocate on County priorities, engage key stakeholders and provide timely updates.

Do's

- Identify bills that will have an impact to the Department, budget, or operations.
- Prioritize bills/budget items that are most critical to the Department.
- Identify other departments that may be impacted by the legislation.
- Coordinate with the respective Legislative Analyst.

Don'ts

- Do not advocate independently on bills or budget proposals. *The CEO-LAIR Sacramento and D.C. lobbyists are authorized to engage with elected officials on legislation.*



County of Los Angeles
Chief Executive Office – Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO STATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Department:	
Division (if applicable):	
Contact Person's Name:	
Phone Number:	
Email:	
Submission Approved By:	(Name and Title)
	(Signature)

INSTRUCTIONS

Recommended additions and changes to the State Legislative Agenda should represent the Department's highest priorities and should be consistent with existing operational goals and plans.

New policy statements should represent emerging programs and issues for which the Department is seeking the Board's concurrence to guide future advocacy efforts in Sacramento. In cases where an existing policy is no longer relevant or needed, the Department may recommend deletion of that policy.

Each recommendation should be accompanied by a justification. If the recommendation would impact another County Department's operations or programs, concurrence by that department should be secured prior to submission.

Examples of recommended new policies, revisions to policies, and justifications are attached.

Please submit your department's recommended changes by August 16, 2019.

The CEO Legislative Analysts will review Departments' submissions and schedule follow-up meetings between August 19-30, 2019 to discuss.

If you have any questions, please contact your CEO Legislative Analyst.

Example: State Legislative Agenda Submission

10.7 Senior and Adult Services

18. Support proposals to enhance the confidentiality of investigators' and social workers' personal information in the Department of Motor Vehicles' records including, but not limited to, Adult Protective Services investigators and social workers.

Justification: New policy. The Workforce Development, Aging, and Community Services Department (WDACS) reports that the County Welfare Directors Association of California introduced legislation last year, SB 1093, that would have protected the home addresses of adult abuse investigators or social workers working in protective services. WDACS indicates that Adult Protective Services (APS) staff often face personal attacks and intimidation during the course of their work. The APS program is staffed by social workers who respond 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to reports of abuse and neglect. The program also has investigators that conduct investigations of alleged abuse and neglect in coordination with local law enforcement agencies. APS social workers often face the same dangers in the field as their child protective services counterparts, who are afforded this protection of the suppression of personal records by the Department of Motor Vehicles. This policy would allow the County to support similar measures to SB 1093 that would protect the safety and security of APS staff. **(Recommended by the Workforce Development, Aging, and Community Services Department; concurred by the Department of Children and Family Services)**

10.8 Community Services Block Grant Funding

1. Support proposals to equitably allocate Federal Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) funding based on data derived from the ~~2010~~ most recently completed Census, or a need-based formula, and oppose the use of CSBG grant funds to supplant existing funding of local programs.

Technical Change: Revised policy. The proposed revision to this existing policy is intended to update it to reference all forthcoming censuses. **(Recommended by the Chief Executive Office - Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations)**

10.11 Homelessness

7. ~~Spenser~~ Support legislation that would authorize the sale of ~~the Sylmar Armory surplus or otherwise unneeded State property~~ to the County of Los Angeles or the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority to provide ~~bridge~~ housing for ~~women~~ persons or families experiencing homelessness.

Justification: Revised policy. This existing policy, which was added to the State Legislative Agenda pursuant to a Board-approved motion (Kuehl and Barger) on October 3, 2017, is being revised because legislation authorizing the sale of the Sylmar Armory (AB 3251) was signed by the Governor on September 23, 2018. The revisions will allow the County to support future legislation that would make other State property available for purchase by the County or the Los Angeles Housing Services Authority for housing purposes. **(Recommended by the Chief Executive Office - Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations)**



County of Los Angeles
Chief Executive Office – Legislative Affairs and Intergovernmental Relations

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Department:	
Division (if applicable):	
Contact Person's Name:	
Phone Number:	
Email:	
Submission Approved By:	(Name and Title)
	(Signature)

INSTRUCTIONS

Recommended additions and changes to the Federal Legislative Agenda should represent the Department's highest priorities and should be consistent with existing operational goals and plans.

New policy statements should represent emerging programs and issues for which the Department is seeking the Board's concurrence to guide future advocacy efforts in Sacramento. In cases where an existing policy is no longer relevant or needed, the Department may recommend deletion of that policy.

Each recommendation should be accompanied by a justification. If the recommendation would impact another County department's operations or programs, concurrence by that department should be secured prior to submission to our office.

Examples of recommended new policies, revisions to policies, and justifications are attached.

Please submit your department's recommended changes by October 22, 2019.

The CEO Legislative Analysts will review Departments' submissions and schedule follow-up meetings the last week of October to discuss.

If you have any questions, please contact your CEO Legislative Analyst.

Example: Federal Legislative Agenda Submission

6. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP/Food Stamps)

6. Support proposals to eliminate the college student eligibility rules for the SNAP Program.

Justification: New policy. By eliminating student eligibility rules for college students in the SNAP, higher education students who are food insecure can become eligible for SNAP, which provides food assistance to low income families and individuals. Food insecurity can negatively impact a student's learning abilities, knowledge retention, and personal and social developments. A student, regardless of whether living in his/her parents' household or separately, school participation status (full or part time), or any other restrictions set forth for higher education students, should be able to participate in a food assistance program as long as they meet that program's eligibility requirements. **(Recommended by the Department of Public Social Services)**

7. Support proposals which will allow categorical eligibility to SNAP benefits for families participating in the National School Lunch Program and/or Former Foster Youth between the ages of 18 to 26.

Justification: New policy. According to the Department of Public Social Services, it will be beneficial to the households that are participating in the National School Lunch Program to automatically become eligible for SNAP benefits. This will not only reduce the administrative cost for the social service agencies, but it will also reduce food insecurity among school children which in return can have a positive impact on the students' educational achievements. Furthermore, SNAP benefits safeguard the health and well-being of low- and no-income individuals by increasing their food purchasing power and raising their level of nutrition. Former foster youth are some of our most vulnerable youth. Providing these youth with enhanced food access would improve health outcomes and support self-sufficiency. **(Recommended by the Department of Public Social Services)**

7. Children and Family Services

2. Support proposals ~~and funding which that~~ would increase services and funding to promote income security, housing, health care, education and vocational opportunities, and economic self-sufficiency for transition-age foster youth, nonminor dependents, and former foster youth emancipating from foster care, as well as ~~and which would~~ lower the age provision of the Independent Living Program to 14 years.

Technical Change: Revised policy. This technical change broadens the language to allow the County to support proposals that would provide funding and resources to a wider population of young adults who have been involved in the child welfare system. **(Recommended by the Department of Children and Family Services)**

~~8. Support proposals which allow fiscal penalties imposed on the State to be reinvested in the child support program.~~

Justification: Policy deletion. California was required by the Federal government to establish a statewide case management system by October 1, 1997. California failed to meet that deadline and was assessed penalties in excess of \$200.0 million per year. In 2007, California implemented a statewide case management system and penalties were no longer assessed. Therefore, this policy is no longer necessary and should be deleted from the Federal Legislative Agenda. **(Recommended by the Child Support Services Department)**