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

**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.

*Please note that this graphic does not address all elements and nuances of the process for securing County sponsorship for State legislation. Please contact your CEO Legislative Analyst with any questions.*
## 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?
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?
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**

**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.

**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.

*Please note that this graphic does not address all elements of the process for securing a County position on legislation. Please contact your CEO Legislative Affairs Analyst with any questions.*
RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO STATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person’s Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Approved By:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Name and Title)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Signature)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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. Sponsor 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)
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.
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 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)
Today’s Agenda

- Introductions
- Planning and Proposals for 2020
- Departments’ 2020 Legislative Priorities
- Q & A Session
Introductions

- **Samara Ashley**, Assistant Chief Executive Officer
- **Brian Stiger**, Chief Legislative Advocate (State)
- **R.J. Lyerly**, Chief Legislative Advocate (Federal)
- Legislative Analysts
- Department Legislative Liaisons
Roles in Legislative Program

Board of Supervisors
CEO-LAIR
County Departments & County Counsel
Sacramento & DC Advocates
County Advocacy

- Pursuit of County Positions on Bills
- Advocacy by Sacramento or D.C. Staff
Planning and Proposals for 2020

2020 County-Sponsored Legislation

2020 State Legislative Agenda

2020-21 State Budget

2020 Federal Legislative Agenda
What is a County-Sponsored bill?

How many bills does the County sponsor each year?

When is the best time to start thinking about proposals for County-Sponsored Legislation?
County-Sponsored Legislation

Who does what?

- Step 1: CEO sends a memo to Department Heads soliciting recommendations for County-Sponsored Legislation.

- Step 2: Departments, working with County Counsel and program staff, develop thoughtful proposals.

- Step 3: Departments submit proposals to CEO-LAIR via a standardized form.
What information will be requested on the form?

- A detailed description of the issue;
- Description of the proposal (i.e. solution to identified issue);
- List of interested parties;
- Explanation of existing law;
- Projected fiscal impact;
- History of proposal; and (if applicable)
- Reference to existing Board-policy.
Determining what (and what not) to sponsor:

- CEO-LAIR conducts a review of all submitted proposals for County sponsorship, which includes:
  - Meetings with Departments;
  - Engagement of other potentially-affected Departments; and
  - Identification of the County’s highest priorities, working with:
    - **Board Offices**
    - **CEO Budget and Operations**
What happens next?

- CEO-LAIR issues a Sacramento Update identifying the proposals the County will sponsor

What if there is no existing policy in the State Legislative Agenda to support a County-Sponsored proposal?

- Addition of a new policy to the Agenda is recommended
- Board approval of the Agenda with the new policy
County-Sponsored Legislation

**DO -**

- Include suggested bill language that is red lined and approved by County Counsel, with reference to the applicable code section;
- Prioritize issues *prior* to submitting proposals; and
- Only submit proposals that the Department is committed to actively working on throughout the legislative process.

**DON’T -**

- Contact legislators directly and “shop” the proposal.
California’s State Budget Process

1. Governor Submits Proposed Budget in January
2. Budget BillIntroduced to Legislature
3. Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) Prepares Analysis and Overview
California’s State Budget Process
California’s State Budget Process

1. Governor Submits "MAY REVISE"
2. Budget Conference Committee Reconciles and Adopts Budget
3. Legislature Votes on Budget
4. Governor Signs Budget
Key State Budget Negotiators: The “Big 3”

Governor
Gavin Newsom

Senate President pro Tem
Toni Atkins

Assembly Speaker
Anthony Rendon
Budget Committee Chairs

Holly Mitchell, Chair, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee

Phil Ting, Chair, Assembly Budget Committee
The State Budget is still a bill.

Similar to legislative process but different in practical terms.

Most of the work occurs at the sub-committee level.

Important to get a head start.

The budget process begins July 1.
Things to Keep in Mind as You Build Your Request

- Contact your Legislative Analyst as early as possible when thinking about a budget proposal.
- Do your homework.
- Identify supporters of the proposal.
- Know your opposition.
Is the request due to a change in service levels?

What would be the fiscal and operational impact to the Department and to the County as a whole?

Is the request consistent with the Department’s goals and priorities and the County’s overall Strategic Plan?

Have you consulted with your CEO Budget Analyst?
What would be the fiscal and operational impact to the Department and the County, if the budget proposal is not successful?

What would the fiscal and operational benefits be to the Department and the County, if the budget proposal is approved?

How would the budget proposal benefit the clients the Department serves and the residents of the County?

Does the budget proposal affect other Departments?
Checklist

- Does the budget proposal impact other counties?
- Has the budget proposal been shared with any associations?
- Has the budget proposal been pursued in the past?
- Will the budget proposal be competing against other budget priorities?
Will the Department have program and fiscal staff available to testify before budget subcommittees on the proposed budget?

Do you expect to encounter any opposition for the budget proposal? If so, who would be most likely to oppose?

Does the budget proposal require a legislative change?
State Legislative Agenda

- General legislative principles
- Priorities for the year
- Issues of major County interest
- Updated annually
- Provides basis for County Advocacy
Memo to Departments - Early July

1\textsuperscript{st} Draft of Recommended Changes - 08/16/19

Review Meetings with Departments - Late August

2\textsuperscript{nd} Drafts of Recommended Changes - 09/20/19

Review with Board Offices - October 2019

Final Review by CEO - November 2019

Consideration by the Board - 12/10/19

\textit{Dates are approximate and subject to change}
Federal Legislative Agenda

- Memorialize legislative priorities
- Provides basis for County Advocacy

Federal Agenda Elements
- Federal Priorities
- General Legislative Principles
- Funding Priorities in Appropriations
- Policy Issues of Major County Interest
Federal Legislative Agenda - Key Dates

- Memo to Departments - Early October
- Department Submissions Due - 10/22/19
- Review Meetings with Departments - Late October
- LAIR adds Board Motion Updates - October 2019
- Review with Board Offices - November 2019
- Consideration by the Board - 01/07/20

Dates are approximate and subject to change
We would like to hear from you.

What are your 2020 legislative priorities?
Any questions?
Thank you for joining us today!

We look forward to working together on the County’s Legislative Priorities!
Los Angeles County
Legislative Affairs & Intergovernmental Relations