



Alameda County Child Care Planning Council
Public Policy Committee
April 6, 2016
MINUTES

“The mission of the Public Policy Committee is to support the mission of the Planning Council by monitoring and developing early care and education legislation, policies and regulations that impact children, families and child care providers and recommending appropriate action to the Child Care Planning Council.”

Attendees:

Daryl Hanson	Consultant	Melinda Martin	Consultant
Margaret Jerene	Steering Committee, First Five	Lorita Riga	Consultant
Jenna Churchman	Steering Committee, Co-Chair, SSA	Rosemary Obeid	4Cs of Alameda County

Angie Garling, Ellen Dektar, ECEPC Staff

I. Announcements

- People felt the speakers and format of the legislative staff breakfast worked well and think it’s an effective communication tool.

II. Report out from ECEPC Committees

- LINCC met on March 3rd and discussed Facilities Fund updates including decreasing funding levels and the group’s interest in supporting a facilities survey in Oakland if funds are available. *Public Policy should consider writing a letter in April to the First Five Commission about the importance of the Child Care Fund as funds for everything decrease.* They also discussed the housing crisis and new policies and programs being developed and whether there is room for child care or child care staff inclusion in funding mechanisms. *Staff will research this.*
- State Contractors met and discussed the state level efficiencies work and zip code priorities that will be submitted to the California Department of Education. HUSD and CVUSD may apply for special needs ece funds from the California Department of Education and St. Mary’s may apply for 2-4 slots from this funding.

III. Federal, State Legislation and Budget

- AB 2368 (Santa Clara Pilot): Support
- Foster Care Bridge Program: Budget Request: Support. \$22 million would support a six month voucher for child care for foster parents with new children, \$4 million would support child care navigators at Resource and Referral agencies that would help clients get connected to child care after six months, and \$5 million would support trauma training for ece providers. Pro: new funding source Con: not enough funding to cover the true needs. It would allow counties with waivers access to the funding. There was a subsequent discussion about a couple of different funding sources for respite and for children in foster care which are administered by the Social Services Agency.

- One program provides \$250 to foster parents for child care for six months and is capped at 150 children. This is only for new foster children. It is thought that Foster Family Agencies do not refer to this program so it is underutilized.
- The second program is CAP (Alternative Payment vouchers) for which SSA contracts with APs (including Davis Street). This is for respite care for children at risk of abuse and neglect, although some thought that the contract language was exactly like the AP contract language and criteria and does not need to be used for children at risk of abuse and neglect, just low income children who could include homeless children.
- Social Services Agency is researching and comparing these contracts and trying to ascertain why they are not fully utilized:
 - Documentation needed?
 - \$250 is not enough of a subsidy?
- If these programs are not fully utilized would adding the criteria of homeless families expand utilization?
- SB 1154 (Patty Siegel Act): Support Resource and Referral clean up bill that was held up last year in Appropriations
- AB 2410 (Bonta) DRDP: Watch
 - The Preschool Learning Foundations define appropriate kindergarten readiness although they are lengthy and not in statute.
 - A definition of K Readiness would be ok if it were not academically focused—which is the usual bias-- and it was comprehensive.
 - A major issue with the DRDP is that there is no prep time.
 - If different local tools were used to measure K Readiness it would be difficult to look County wide at children’s scores and therefore to target resources.
- AB 1644 (Bonta) Mental health: This Committee previously supported this bill but the update is that BHCS is reviewing it to make sure the model is appropriate to young children.

Additionally some research group should do an analysis of the impact of minimum wage increases on the child care field—both as staff and as consumers. *Jenna will send a recent study on the demographics of those on the minimum wage, eg, 36% of minimum wage workers have children.*

IV. Governor’s Block Grant Proposal

- No updates

V. AB 833 Implementation Update

- Angie reported that it may impact the Regional Market Rate.
- Can pilot 12 month or greater eligibility
- There will be a proposal to increase the Support Services rate for Alternative Payment agencies
- There will be an April 21st Planning Council meeting at BANANAS from 12-1 to review the draft report which will be submitted to the Board, as well as legislation supported by this Committee today

VI. Develop May Agenda and May Meeting Date and Time

- May 4th so we don’t back up too close to the Planning Council
- Approve letter to First Five on the importance of facilities funds

Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 4, 9:30-11:30 **4Cs of Alameda County



**Alameda County Child Care Planning Council
Public Policy Committee
April 6, 2016
MINUTES**