



### Action Items for the 5/16/14 Planning Council Meeting

#### **Action Item #1: Support AB 1944 (Garcia): Serving 11 and 12 Year-Olds**

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

**Background:** Current law specifies that the preferred (and less expensive) placement for children who are 11 or 12 years of age is in a before and after school program and not in a school-age child care program or other arrangements chosen by the parent. Parents are required to complete an additional form to access school-age child care. This bill would eliminate this additional form and CDE would no longer have to submit an annual savings report to the Legislature.

The bill author states, "This proposal would continue to support the placement of subsidized 11 and 12 year old children in before and after school programs *but eliminate burdensome certified documentation required* of parents and the annual reports required from child care agencies."

**Pros:** This bill would reduce the administrative burden for Alameda County child care agencies that serve 11 and 12 year olds. The California Alternative Payment Program Association, the sponsor of the bill, states, "This change is needed by families who consistently have reported that the before and after school programs simply do not meet their full time, off hour, and year round care needs.

**Cons:** If this requirement is eliminated some children may continue to be served in school age child care or vouchered child care services, which may be more expensive. Also the Legislature will not be as well informed on where 11 and 12 year olds are being served.

**Next Steps:** If the Council approves support, ECEPC staff will send a letter of support and submit a request for the County's lobbyist to support this bill in Sacramento.

#### **Action Item #2: Support AB 2125 (Ridley-Thomas): Child Care Reimbursement Rates**

Recommended by the Public Policy Committee

**Background:** Currently in at least 22 counties including Alameda County, the Standard Reimbursement Rate (SRR) for Title V programs that are held to a higher quality standard are reimbursed less than vouchered programs that are reimbursed according to a Regional Market Rate (RMR). Even so, the RMR is based on a survey from 10 years ago so even these reimbursement rates are very out of date.

This bill would delete these requirements relating to assigned reimbursement rates and reimbursement adjustments. The bill would eliminate the SRR and instead would require, among other things, the reimbursement rate to be based on the most recent RMR survey with the ceiling established at the 100th percentile in each region per unit of average daily enrollment for a 250-day year.

**Pros:** Title 5 contractors are currently receiving rates that are less than the going rate for doggy day care in Alameda County. The field estimates this has resulted in the contraction and decreasing quality of the child care supply,



especially the infant toddler supply. Improving the reimbursement rates has been a long standing part of our public policy platform.

**Cons:** This bill will be extremely expensive. Some in the field are worried that rates will have to be sacrificed to increase slots, or vice versa.

**Next Steps:** If the Council approves support, ECEPC staff will send a letter of support and submit a request for the County's lobbyist to support this bill in Sacramento.

**Action Item #3: Support AB 2302 (Mullin): Child Care Facilities  
Recommended by the Public Policy Committee and the LINCC Committee**

**Background:** The Department of Education administers a Child Care Facilities Revolving Fund, to provide funding for the renovation, repair, improvement, or purchase of child care facilities for lease to school districts and Title 5 agencies. However there are many restrictions on this fund which make it difficult for providers to use. The bill would rmake lease terms more flexible and would require the department to adopt regulations for implementing and managing the fund, and to promote the availability of the fund on its Internet Web site. The bill would require the regulations to include, among other things, the development of forms, policies, and procedures for the management of the fund and the terms of the loan.

**Pros:** This bill would help ECE facilities funding be more effectively utilized. The Revolving Fund is not functioning effectively to fund anything but portables and it has been greatly depleted in recent years. The field has a vast array of other facilities needs, and facilities have a fundamental influence on children's lifelong development and health.

**Cons:** Drafting and approving regulations is a very cumbersome and time intensive process, that will not meet the shorter term needs of child care facilities needs of the child care field that has no other dedicated statewide facilities funding source.

**Next Steps:** If the Council approves support, ECEPC staff will send a letter of support and submit a request for the County's lobbyist to support this bill in Sacramento.

**Action Item #4: Support Zip Code Priority Submission to the State  
Recommended by the Data Committee**

**Background:** Each year the Planning Council is required to submit a priorities report which indicates by zip code and age the areas of the County with the least access to subsidized ECE. Please see the attached summary sheets that describe our new priorities. We have updated our data sources and feel that these priorities more accurately reflect current trends.

**Pros:** Accepting these priorities will enable us to comply with one of our state mandates and it will give us new data about ECE in Alameda County.



**Cons:** Fewer zip codes registered as high priority for preschool aged children. Also the way we are required to categorize priority zip codes still leaves out several zip codes that have hundreds of unserved children. Also we are still not required to break out need for infants and toddlers and school age children. We think this understates our need.

**Next Steps:** If the Council approves these priorities, we will obtain the required signatures from the Board of Supervisors and the County Superintendent of Schools. They are due to the state by the end of May. We will also continue advocacy with the state Coordinators Association to change how priorities are created.