

# TRANSCRIBED BY AI

## Transcript

January 28, 2026, 9:32PM

□ **Claudia P. Alarcon** started transcription

**R1** **Room 140** 0:03

Is being transcribed.

Let's kick things off. Welcome everybody.

Good afternoon.

Welcome to this afternoon's meeting. The family and social services.

Cluster Agenda review meeting. We will begin with roll call of the board offices. I

know that SD five could not make it today. So we'll start with SD4.

Golden hair with SD4.

You know kasarna with SD4.

I guess D3 don't Porto SD3 one of these here too.

You're welcome to make Lizzie's voice. No. OK, SD 2.

Lowanna Hills, SD Two, I believe we have.

**EM** **Escobedo, Marina** 0:43

But I'll also join online.

**R1** **Room 140** 0:47

The Ester is walking in but she can't be part of the call because we already skipped that stupid.

So we'll do Anthony, SD one. Esther, please introduce yourself.

Hi Esther Lim. SD4 fantastic. OK.

So we are now going to move to consent items.

We do not have any consent items, so we will go to item 3, board votes, ST3 and SD2, consenting Education, Coordinating Council, aligning education, work with systems impacted view and funded in Los Angeles County.

Children and youth system of care partnership.

Take it on. Yeah. Thanks, Anthony. This is a motion.

That hopefully is not anyone.

It's a motion to consent, the Education Coordinating Council or the ECC at the Brown ax body and move it to become a work group under the OT Strategic Plan and Systems of Care Partnership.

So the proactives are pretty straightforward.

It's just sun setting.

It has a brownie and directing that the work continues.

In the form of a workgroup and the reason this came about was there were different limitations, that being a brown ax body created around some Poe. Be part of this work and how they were able to be nimble and adaptive.

So this will hopefully give them more flexibility.

So I'll pass it over to SD too, in case you've had anything to add. Thanks for.

Yeah. No, thank you for that, I.

I noted, too, that it's really help helping with promoting like engagement with school districts and community partners.

And allowing for the transition for this to just be seamless. So.

Have Elena here, too, from OCP, in case you wanted to add in anyone has questions.

I think you guys covered it very well.

I would just add that it was vetted with the ECC members and child welfare advocates, as well as being publicly presented in an ECC meeting. Overwhelmingly, the feedback has been positive.

**NO** **Nancy Olivares** 2:41  
Size.

**R1** **Room 140** 2:51  
This is allowing for greater engagement, greater involvement of a broader stakeholder group, and fitting very well within strategic alignment with our new strategic plan and very much allowing and enabling the current ECC strategic plan. Colleagues, any questions for the authors or OCP on this motion?  
Once going twice, OK.

**NO** **Nancy Olivares** 3:18  
I love you.

**R1 Room 140** 3:20

Fantastic presentation, all bases covered.

Thank you. Questions needed.

Do we have any public comment on this matter?

Wolf in the room. Any any online.

Any public commenters online?

**NO Nancy Olivares** 3:31

The thing.

**R1 Room 140** 3:34

And hearing none, thank you to the authors presentation, we'll move to item 4 on today's agenda, presentation and discussion items, office and Council, 2026, child welfare, legislative updates. Dentures, if you would mind introducing yourselves.

My name is Jacqueline Castle.

I'm here with my colleague.

Madness. Next 45 minutes we are going to talk child welfare before we get into it.

We do have to pull up the presentation.

Let's start there.

Just one second.

No worries.

That I was afraid it was becoming interactive.

So.

All right. So before we dive into the content, we do have to go over our disclaimer, take me to the next slide pair of content, unless you get our permission.

Sliver all right.

Right. So let's start with where we're at in the current legislative cycle.

So we are in year two of the 20252026 legislative cycle. As you know, legislators have two years to introduce debate pass bills.

Them get vetoed in the first year.

Some get stuck in committee, some move on to 2026 or further consideration. The ones we're gonna discuss today are the ones that were chapters in 2025 and take effect on January 1st. Unless the side fail.

Give you a sense of the scale and outcome activity. In 2025, lawmakers introduced

about 2833 bills. 794 of those bills were chapters, 916 bills failed, and the Governor 123 bills.

Let's jump in.

Let's start with bills affecting confidentiality and juvenile records access.

With SB-413.

This is a Los Angeles County sponsored Bill. Under existing law, welfare and institutions code Section 827 limits who can access these records.

And that's really to protect the privacy, interest and welfare of institutions.

Code Section 827 also states the former law that County Council city attorneys representing the agency in juvenile dependency proceedings they have access to these records.

No need to file JD 570 petition.

SB-413 now does is expands access to include.

County Council and city attorneys representing the county agency or the probation Department in connection with the administration or review of services provided by that respective agency to the child. The sibling, the legal guardian or going to include County Council in the Justice Safety Division.

That's going to include County Council.

In services division, if they're representing DCFS, as long as it's in connection with the administration review of those services.

Now, SD413 also verifies that if you are an attorney representing a person who is or was a subject of the case file under juvenile proceedings pursuant to Wilfrid Sug Code 300, and you also get access to those records.

So that's gonna include.

Attorneys or pre petition advocacy attorneys or attorneys representing a former foster youth in habeas corpus corpus proceedings.

But the biggest change to SB-413 is how it relates.

Civil attorneys.

So that's gonna take us to the next slide, Carol.

So you're a civil attorney representing a party in a civil proceeding. In the case that is filed by or on behalf of the subject of the case file where the defendant is DCFS probation or their employees, you now have access to records you don't to file a J. 570.

Well, that used to take months or even a year to resolve.

This is actually in direct response to.

I believe it's like in 2019.

The bill that passed that extended the childhood sexual assault claims.

And so there was just a surge of lawsuits.

And so, SB-413 is really streamlining that process and allowing attorneys to have access to those records.

That's not without protecting sensitive information. So, for example, any immigration information about any individual in the file that has three main confidential information regarding a minor or their siblings that also remains confidential.

And let's get a court order for that to be released.

So cannot share that information in any other proceeding unless you get a court order you can't share it with anyone who's not legally entitled to see it. And you can only use it in that civil proceeding.

B413 also places limits on the dissemination of those records.

So the civil drink is shared with their legal team.

So investigators, paralegals, anyone on their team who's helping them with the case attorney has to ensure that all the records are returned to that attorney at the end of the civil proceeding, that they're destroyed and they're not passed along to anyone else.

And that's really again to protect any misuse of the documents and D minor. So examples of these attorneys would include.

Attorneys representing Booth, the sibling legal guardians.

Or even outside council, hired by the county to represent the county, they'll now have access to these records with those limitations put in place.

The attorney represent someone other than the youth and they want to submit the records into that civil proceeding. They have to file a motion for application for ceiling and give the youth an opportunity to object to that. Like if they want their records to be public or we.

Grant that unless there's some sort of unusual circumstance.

That's the big changes with SB.

Now we're gonna shift gears a bit and talk about the California Public Records Act.

The question?

Because of.

Who they are suing County on behalf of someone pledges that they were sexually abused.

Here.

How the lawyers get all the records without?

Out seeing it or like how does this make it? Those lawsuits move more quickly, so the lawyer it takes away the the court process so they don't have to file the JD 570 petition and go through the court process. They still, we anticipate we'll have to file. The DSA with County Council social workers are still going to have to go through their process of redacting records before providing those over, fill some bit of a process if they have to go through to get the record.

Just removed one step.

And that was a very long course step.

I mean I it was taking or even a year to resolve those issues, whereas if we get adsa, it's not gonna take nearly as well move the cases forward more efficiently.

OK.

So CPRA, as many of you know, the California Public Records Act requires that. Public agencies make the records available for public inspection.

Usually the respond within 10 days and an additional 14 days is allowed under unusual circumstances.

That includes like interdepartmental delays, large scale searches or for example, if there's a state of emergency that affects staffing or.

What AB 370 does, it says, hey, if there's a state of emergency, it has to directly impact the agencies ability to respond to those requests.

It can't just affect, it has to have a direct impact on it.

It also adds cyber attacks to a list of unusual circumstances, but if there is a cyber attack, you don't have to send the records over right away and you have to try to obtain the records in an effective system, you have to try to get those records in.

Paper format if it's available.

Otherwise you have until the end of the cyber to turn over.

There's those documents and you get that additional port.

Green why we were talking about the CPRA. If juvenile records aren't subject to the CPRA, the reason we're bringing it to your attention is because we do get our fair share of requests.

So we kind of just want to build new timelines and things affecting the CPRA.

Do you have a question back to 413? You said that was county sponsored legislation, right?

Yes, that DCFS that asked for it.

Or is it different department that was pushing forward with layer that I don't know

the answer to?

That's a great question.

I could figure that and send you an e-mail up.

All right, so transgender privacy act.

So existing law individuals, including minors, they could petition the court to change their name.

Legally, they could petition the court to get a gender marker change.

Like male, female or non binary and under existing law there was confidentiality protections for minors.

All the records were automatically kept confidential by the and only the attorneys, legal guardian or the youth themselves had access to these records. If you were an adult, you had to file a separate request to get your records made confidential.

So you really risk having your information made public if the court didn't grant the request. And this is we're dealing very deep personal information.

So there was risk associated with that.

But the Transgender Privacy Act does is, oh, we need to go back.

Here we are OK.

Oh, no, back there. We are, OK.

So with the Transgender Privacy Act, does is it extends these confidentiality to all individuals, regardless of age?

So request a court for earlier records to be made confidential and the court will grant those requests, as I believe by July 1st to start making all records associated with a request to change their name or non binary status or to male female gender markers they all have.

To be confidential by July of 2026, anyone start sharing that information without the petitioners consent? Then the petitioner is going to have an opportunity to file a legal action for damages and attorney's fees.

I think what the Transgender Privacy Act it's really affirming that your gender identity is deeply personal and it's protected under the California constitutional right to privacy.

And this was passed as an urgency statute, and that was in response to harassment, hate crimes and assaults that were going on in individuals.

Happy that this was passed.

OK.

So let's talk about some bills that affect juvenile court proceedings, and we'll start

with incarcerated parents and non minor defendants.

So as many of you might know.

Parents have a right to notice and an opportunity to be present at hearings that affect their child.

Like if it affects their parental rights or if they're going to be judged at the pending of the court. So an adjudication hearing, they have a right to be present unless they waive that right or the prison confirms to the court that they're not going to be present.

Usually, the court can offer teleconferencing or video conferencing if it's available, and we're unable to garnish that incarcerated parents presence.

So what AB651 does is it now requires notice and opportunity for this incarcerated parent to be present at additional dependency proceedings, and those include hearings pursuant to welfare institutions, Code 388, when the incarcerated parent is a petitioner that includes hearings under disposition that.

Includes review hearings under 366.2122 and two, five and parentage determinations.

The existing law remains the same.

They they have to be present unless they waive that right and the court can offer telecom videoconferencing.

Relates to non minor dependents.

So youth are entitled to participate.

Juvenile counsel.

Their choice if you have a right to a continuance if they're over the age of 10, the court usually grants that all these rights were not codified in statute for non minor dependents.

So what AG651 does? It just extends those rights, codifies it into the statute.

I can ask a question about.

Or it's a same 18651 parent part?

**NO** Nancy Olivares 15:59

Open my app.

**R1** Room 140 16:03

Had asked this in either way, but are we sure that the parents are getting information about the hearings from like, those are the presidents where they are so that they



know about the hearing and know of their rights to be present?

Kind of. Can you reassure them? Do we know that parents that are incarcerated get notice of hearing and of their right to be present?

Yes, the social workers provide that notice to them, and we're giving social workers the same training so that they're aware that they need to start.

Ensuring that the notice is sent and ensuring that they're trying to get their appearance in court because it usually takes longer if they're in state court, I think it takes six weeks, right? Throughout six weeks to get their presence in court.

So we're providing the same training so that they're aware to ensure that they're getting the notice that they need and that they're, if I may, if the parent waives their right, they have to sign a waiver and the court case cannot go forward.

Without knowing that the parent has waived and signed a document that the court has in front of.

Or the parent is present in person or the present parent is present online.

Wanna make sure that someone is actually explaining to those? That's what they're signing and what it means.

Well, they're gonna get their notice through DCFS.

DCFS informs them of the hearing.

And then they also have their attorney that will also notify them of the hearing.

Even if the parent the parent hasn't come to court or appeared then or virtually the parents attorneys do reach out to them.

And how that communication with them also have to be physically present to be appointed an attorney.

There's already an attorney that's working to make communication with them to help explain the process as well.

I've also seen in trial courts is that I've had some courts order both County Council and the parents attorney to collaborate with the institution to ensure that the incarcerated parent knows of their upcoming. That's what I'm worried is not happening.

Oh, some courts ordered that, but they still are getting their notice.

And they still have to file the waiver if they don't want a 10.

So they should be getting their notice.

Is there a plan also to?

Drain.

The folks at Vin's about this, so that they know this is coming too.

Don't have the answer to that question.

I know that DCFS is being trained, gonna be providing information to the the process for the prisons isn't different.

There's already existing requirements for incarcerated parents to be noticed and be provided an opportunity to be present for certain hearings that's been in effect for many years.

This is just additional hearings that they're available for, and even though the requirement wasn't there before.

There were many courts that were already ordering DCFS to work with the. Institutions to have the parent appear virtually or or in person, even if it wasn't statutorily required. Thank you.

So let's talk about some bills that affect placement and stability.

OK.

So AB349.

So the AFDCFC program provides financial support to caregivers that have foster youth in their care.

That's gonna include group homes, relatives or foster homes.

There's also an additional \$489 supplement that's provided to the caregiver to assist Foster youth who are actually parents.

So that \$489 goes to help that child.

But what AB349?

In July 1st of 2026, that \$489.

Supplement has to be adjusted annually for inflation to reflect rising child care costs.

Highlight that that has not included 26. This bill really understands that.

Hey, the pressure formula is going up. The price for child care is going up.

Everything associated with raising a child is going up, and this needs to be increased.

Let's talk about AB896 going up to.

It has to be adjusted using the necks that they have with other other foster care rates, so we don't know what it's going to go up to, but they're going to take into effect inflation.

Hopefully by this year.

More than 489.

1000 by July 1.

Can you go back by July 1?

It says by July 1st, yeah. So we'll know around that time.

Happy to report that to find the answer to that.

So the foster care placement transition plan, so under existing law, social workers and probation officers have to create a placement preservation strategy before moving to foster youth to a different placement setting.

So that's really to maintain their stability with placement.

And law says each child welfare agency now has to adopt A placement transition policy to support youths transitioning from various placements and from reunification to back with their parents.

A policy has to incorporate the use input the caregivers input.

The transition also provides guidance to social workers as to how to obtain that information, incorporate into case plans that really support the youth strength and needs, while also reducing trauma.

AB562.

Requires social workers to investigate the circumstances of each child taken into temporary custody within 30 days.

They have to notify and identify relatives to evaluate for placement and to incorporate them into the for the child's care.

I.

January 1 of 2027 each county now has to annually review publicly available data, comparing their relative placement rates to the statewide average.

Yeah, do the same for Indian children.

Taken into consideration, the Indian Child Welfare Act placement preferences. For some reason the the the county's rate falls below the statewide average.

Then the director of DCFS or the must consult with the Center for Excellence in Family finding engagement and support to identify best practices that may be adopted by the county to improve their placement rates.

This is really just to maintain the family ties for the child.

Well, here, right.

Next question about 8896, the transition planning.

Yeah, of course.

Not a question for you. I think it's a question for all though. So sorry, I'll put you on the spot, but can or maybe it's for Anthony actually.

Can we request for come in and talk to us about what their placement transition planning policy is?

Sounds like a lovely plan.

By the way.

Oh, it's Brandon. Hi, Brandon.

No, I don't need to put you on.

You guys don't need to answer right now.

I know you're not.

Or didn't have a heads up, but I'd just be curious to see if this changes what we already do.

So transitional housing.

So transitional housing placements are licensed through the state they serve, foster youth ages 16 through 18 and non minor dependents transitioning to adulthood.

Typically, participants share units.

They share bathrooms, they share bedrooms.

Doesn't matter your gender identity.

**NO** Nancy Olivares 23:50

Yes.

**R1** Room 140 23:52

The county will support that.

The traditional housing applicants also have to obtain county certification and they have to specify the population that they're going to serve.

So it's not gonna be youth and non minor dependents or both.

You have to specify that to get their certification, so the new law requires that any decisions made about sharing units, bathrooms or bedrooms have to be made in collaboration between the youth and the provider.

So it's kind of 15, a youth autonomy and their comfort level and also any contracts with the additional housing providers can't contain.

Any unreasonable barriers for participation?

Asked to be flexible to meet the needs of the minor and the non minor dependents that they serve.

This really is giving non minor dependents at adult level decision making authority unless for some reason it's been limited editors.

**NO** Nancy Olivares 24:43

OK.

**R1 Room 140** 24:44

So next we're gonna talk about some bills affecting transitional age youth and non minority.

OK, AB 373.

OK.

So Council are usually appointed for youth and non minor dependent to advocate for what's in their best interest for their safety and emotional well-being and their physical safety as well for non minor dependents.

Council has to follow their action, whatever they want, they tell the court for some reason. It goes against their safety and well-being.

Then the attorney was able to override that and make that representation to them. But AB 373 does. It removes that requirement.

So now you have to follow the non minor dependence wishes, even if it runs contrary to their safety and well-being.

It's really just the autonomy for the non minor dependent, ensuring that they're treated like adults back to their legal matters.

Non minor dependents in the county of residence.

So long time now non minor dependents who entered care and let's Los Angeles County and then trans move to let's say Riverside County.

They had to wait a year before requesting the LA County for a transfer to the.

So meantime, they had to travel back and forth to the LA County.

It was a disruption in services and as you can see, that's overly burdensome.

For a non minor dependent, so AB 890 does is it reduces that one year requirement to six months.

So when the youth makes a request to answer the case, the court will usually grant that request. If it's in the use vest interest.

And then Bill also requires the court to ask the non minor defendant each review hearing. Do you want your case transferred? If the case is transferred, they have to transfer the case within 30 days and then the receiving jurisdiction will assume jurisdiction within.

AB243, you know, confidentiality rules really sharing between county agencies and schools.

So colleges had a difficult time verifying whether a student was a foster youth or probation youth, which really delayed financial support for that student.

So what AB243 does.

Is it with the youth? Consent authorizes limited carrying between schools and county agencies to verify whether the youth is eligible for PRACTITION.

Or tuition reimburse waivers.

Make it a crime, though, to disclose or misuse any of that information without the use consent.

So it this simply just is a process simpler for the youth, the schools and county staff, while also maintaining that confidentiality.

Direct admissions program. Oh. Under existing law, the California State University system deals with academic standards for admission.

Also deals with ensuring has enough available space for any California resident. It also has a dual admissions program where eligible freshmen can transfer to a CSU if they've completed years, which is usually at a Community College.

SB640 does it that it establishes a direct admissions program to a CSU system.

So any eligible high school senior who's completed the transfer requirements will automatically get an admissions to the CSU system.

And they'll get a letter from the Chancellor, and that letter will say, hey, you've been admitted, here's how you can enroll and you'll get that before the priority registration period. And community colleges are gonna assist in the outreach.

So through their orientation, through emails, social workers are gonna be advised to for that eligible high school seniors.

Aware of this program, if I'm not mistaken, I think there's also.

So a.

Possible spill. So I don't have much more on it, but I'm happy to see that.

This bill.

But is there money for themselves?

You.

**NO** Nancy Olivares 28:43

Is that?

**R1** Room 140 28:44

The answer to that question, but dig it in.

Great. How do they pay for it?

Sure, there's some sort of financial aid for foster youth, but.

Just curious if someone.

Navigate that.

I really hope someone would, especially their counselors.

Thanks for that question. If you want to that question, get back to you, that would be great and.

We could circle back at the end and write down the questions that you want.

And I could even.

All right.

Thank you.

No problem.

XB624. OK, so the credit provides a refundable payment to all foster youth, and that's been going on since about 2022.

And what, 56 to four does is it creates the foster act.

Outreach and support for the tax education readiness and that requires a California Department of Social Services to issue guidance to county welfare departments and juvenile probation departments by July 30th, 2026. It has to include best practices to support non minor dependents to file their state and.

**NO** Nancy Olivares 29:42

Yeah.

All right.

**R1** Room 140 29:58

Federal income taxes and to claim this foster youth tax credit.

Know if that's going to change anything in practice.

'Cause, I imagine that we're already doing best practices in assisting foster use in this way.

Anticipate.

That it's gonna have more stringent or specific requirements or additional workload.

Base workers.

I will put my down 30th. I anticipate it'll be more.

So how to Kate, the foster youth, on how to why they even need to file taxes?

Educate them on this false view.

Tina, 8, social workers on how to help them get the documents that they need to even file tax returns.

But again, we'll get more information.

OK.

So now I'm going to turn it over to Carol, and she's going to go over some bills involved.

So again, everyone. So we'll jump right in.

Is child and family team meetings or CFTS?

CFTS were already required as part of case planning and need to include file their parent or guardian, their caregiver, and when applicable, their court appointed education rights holder.

Sometimes therapists support people, all different kinds of stakeholders.

Meeting designed to bring everyone together to make collaborative decisions about the child's care services and placement, and they were standard in in cases where a child.

Is an out of home care.

They were not typically required as part of family maintenance services or when a child was in a parent's care.

AB18 took effect on July 1st, 2025, which now requires CFTS for those family maintenance cases as well.

There's also new documentation requirements for CFTS.

Previously, CFT's were held and required as part of case planning.

There was not real time standardized documentation requirements. So now under SB119 that went into effect on January 1st 2026 at a free CFT must be documented using a standardized form and SB 19119 requires that CFT action plan be attached to court reports.

For both disposition hearings under welfare institutions, code section 358.1 and review hearings under Section 366. So for the social workers, this means that they will need to ensure that all their CFT documentation is complete, consistent and ready to be provided to the.

Court.

Hey I have a question about that.

That is significant.

That's a lot more work for social workers.

Before, let's do this. Obviously curious like on GCFS and maybe Brandon.

I don't know if you're on or.

Interesting to hear the plan to do this and what the.



**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 33:18

I'm on Lizzie. What? What?

I'm thinking we should do is collect all the questions that you have related to the department on this all those there and he's writing them down and then we'll just send Omnibus reply e-mail with just like our policies and our plans on each of the places you have.

**R1** **Room 140** 33:23

Yeah.

**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 33:33

Questions, if that's OK.

**R1** **Room 140** 33:35

Yeah, of course.

It just this feels like significant.

**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 33:36

Yeah.

**R1** **Room 140** 33:40

Amount of new work.

**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 33:43

Around furs. Yeah. Oh.

**R1** **Room 140** 33:43

Yes, CFG.

No, I'm not the first one. The CFT is for all family maintenance.

**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 33:49

Yeah.

**R1** **Room 140** 33:51

The CFTS that are conducted now are conducted regularly every 90 days. Parents can ask for an earlier CFT if issues arise. The court order CFTS, they're when.

**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 33:52

Got it.

**R1** **Room 140** 34:04

They're not required when it doesn't really require the level of a CFT.

**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 34:09

Yeah.

**R1** **Room 140** 34:09

And they're very time intensive.

**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 34:11

And just in terms of the workload, Lizzie, you're right, it is workload.

But a couple things.

One CF TS are part of our core practice model. We we wanna work in teams and so we're generally supportive of that idea. And in fact, we're in the process of establishing third party neutral CFT facilitators.

So we're we're moving staff around to to increase our capacity.

Naturally, to do CFTS, I mean this is part of that.

And just so you know.

That's going to be allowed by tiered rate structure.

We're going to be able to repurpose some staff.

That's cost neutral to add more staff here, but you're all right.

It is more of a workload, but it's a workload we think is good for families and want to take on.

**R1** **Room 140** 34:54

Totally, I don't.

I I agree with you.

I just about what the plans were 'cause I know it will be a a shift in workload.

**BN** **Brandon Nichols** 34:56

Yeah.

Yeah, and and and we, we did have plans already underway to increase our CFT capacity.

So this aligns with those existing plans.

**R1** **Room 140** 35:15

So can you updates to the family urgent response system or first, this is another Los Angeles County supported Bill and under existing law, CDSS is required to establish a statewide hotline as the entry point for the family urgent response system to respond to calls from caregivers or current.

And former foster youth during moments of instability and under current law, the county's miss first direct calls through the first state hotline before dispatching mobile response systems.

So maybe 898 expands the 1st.

System by authorizing county based mobile response teams to respond to locally identified needs. In addition to hotline calls and expands eligibility as these teams may support children and families receiving family preservation services or voluntary or court ordered family maintenance services, and the bill also reaffirms the statewide 20.

47 line as a primary entry point for accessing for support.

Regarding the domestic violence consultant pilot program, this is another Los Angeles County supported Bill.

The original program partnered Los Angeles DCFS offices with local domestic violence service providers to ensure that families experiencing domestic violence receive specialized trauma, informed support, and due to the program's success, AB 779 was enacted to expand these efforts statewide.

So AB 779 establishes a three-year pilot program allowing counties to partner with. Domestic violence consultants who are trained advocates offering support and guidance to county social workers in addressing the complex dynamics of cases involving family violence.

Now.

We're going to get into the family Preparedness Plan Act of 2025 and so over these next few slides, we're going to discuss AB 495, which responds to the active

immigration enforcement on families, especially the separation of children from parents.

And it aims to create clear, enforceable caregiving tools that protect children's well-being while preserving parental rights during detention or deportation.

So that is the caregiver authorization affidavit under Family code section 666550 and 6552. Under existing law, an adult caregiver who is 18 or over can already sign a caregiver authorization affidavit for a minor residing in their home and the AFF. Allows a caregiver to enroll the child in school and consent to school related medical care, such as immunizations or physical exams.

In addition, certain relatives have the ability to consent to General Medical and dental care, even if they don't have a formal guardianship. Now, under AB495, it expands the family codes definition of relative or purposes of the caregivers authorization affidavit to include any adult related to.

The child by blood adoption or marriage within 5° of kinship.

This covers extended family.

Me like stepparents step siblings, great aunts, great grandparents and also includes the spouse of a qualifying relative, even if the marriage ended in death or divorce.

So the key take away is that more extended family members are now eligible to step in needing a formal guardianship, and this change is especially important for families affected by incarceration deportation.

Illness or housing instability?

So social workers may see the caregiver authorization affidavit accepted by schools as sufficient documentation for enrollment or school related medical care, and doctors will probably likewise recognize it as a valid consent for relatives to authorize General Medical and dental treatment. Question there.

Has any concern for DCFS in terms of more parents or caregivers, stakeholders engaged with a child?

Have authority to come out of school.

Sign them up for medical care.

That a parent or direct caregiver may be opposed to, or there's documentation that they don't want them to have that that this gives we need to additional people.

I don't know if you would know.

So I haven't seen a lot of these AF US does see these caregiver authorization affidavits already.

As an outstation attorney assigned to a couple of the DCFS offices, I don't see them a

whole lot.

And it's typically in situations where.

Parent is not available and the form is already existing online and kind of gives some. It's on the state court self help website and it gives some information.

For caregivers about what they're able to do, and it also indicates whether they have consent from the parent or don't have consent from a parent. And typically, if a parent opposes.

And of the caregiver typically going to create an issue so.

It's not meant to be a situation when the parents not available.

To like circumvent something that.

Parent parent opposes where their child.

Is of their home.

It would be a different mechanism or they don't want vaccinations.

And their grandmother does.

Describe it.

So I think definitely issues can arise, but typically when I've seen them, it's not.

So AB 495 kind of along those same lines.

Adds to guardianship nominations under probate Code 1502 and two 105 S under existing law. Courts may formally establish guardianships over the person, the estate, or both. Courts may also appoint joint guardians to share responsibility when a parent formally chooses someone to act as.

A guardian or nominates them.

That choice becomes valid as soon as it is made clear, unless other conditions apply.

Now AB 495 creates a new form of joint guardianship where parents can nominate a temporary guardian offering additional protection for families who may face temporary disruptions.

Example, if a custodial parent expects to be unavailable due to immigration detention or deportation, the parent can nominate someone they trust to serve jointly as a guardian.

This will grant the appointed Guardian shared authority with the parent over their child.

Ensuring their child continues to receive care and legal protection without delay or uncertainty.

495 clarifies that these nominations take effect immediately, allowing the courts to quickly grant guardianships upon certain events occurring like detention, illness,

military deployment, unless the parent specifically states that they should only apply in certain situations like absence, incapacitation made the Guardian nomination remains valid, even if.

The parent later becomes unavailable unless the written document clearly says otherwise.

Importantly, these court records related to these guardianships are required to be kept confidential to safeguard the privacy of families, particularly in sensitive situations such as those involving immigration related disruptions.

A quick question in these situations, what happens if the?

Parent comes like.

Terminate it.

So we were going to have to see how this plays out the way that it seems to be intended is to provide more flexibility because typically when you have a probate guardianship, not as easy to.

For lack of a better word, so these situations, this AB 485 appears to be making it a little bit more flexible to allow for those situations, but we haven't really seen how it's going to work.

AB495 also makes updates to disclosures or local education agencies. So under existing law, schools are already prohibited from collecting immigration or citizenship status of students or their family members, unless specifically required by law, and families must be informed that every child has a right to.

Free public education, regardless of their immigration status.

Religious beliefs since 2018, local education agencies have been required to adopt policies that limit cooperation with immigration enforcement based on model policies issued by the Attorney General.

So now AB 495 just strengthens these protections by requiring schools to share updated guidance from the Attorney general issued on January 6th, 2025.

Guidance provides families with practical tools, including emergency planning resources.

Caregiver authorization affidavits and reminders to keep emergency contact information up to date and the local education agencies must also revise their policies to reflect this guidance and incorporate any future updates.

The intent is to ensure that schools remain safe, supportive environments for all students, and that families are equipped with clear, actionable information, especially during immigration related disruptions.

2495 also made a significant change with respect to daycare with the Liege and Immigration Enforcement and parental rights. Previously, there were no rules stopping child care programs from collecting immigration or citizenship information or requiring them to report law enforcement inquiries, but now 8490.

Five changes that bans childcare programs from collecting immigration related information unless required by law.

And if immigration enforcement asks for access or information, license programs must report it to the Department of Social Services and the Attorney General.

Programs must also ask parents to review and update emergency contact information and follow any instructions parents provide before taking other action. If the parent ISN.

Available.

Ask US offline, but I'm just curious how this.

Question.

Yeah, I'm not sure because I'm sure there are conflicting directives.

Question that we're going to have to follow up on.

And also who does the training for that?

The state or DCFS?

Well, this one is for licensed childcare facilities.

So if it would be the state as part of their facilities licensing requirements or yearly reporting or.

Now we're going to turn to some updates to adoption.

Some adoption reforms.

California law also already recognizes jurisdiction for certain adoption cases, but lack clarity for Interstate adoptions or when homestead's were incomplete.

So now SB-40 aims to reform the adoption process in California by expanding the Court's jurisdiction and clarifying documentation requirements clarifies that California courts have jurisdiction over adoption proceedings when the.

Minor was born in California and either 1A legal proceeding is not required to make the minor available for adoption, such as when the biological parents consent or two.

The legal proceeding to make the child available for adoption, it's going to be in California.

SB-40 also requires an adoption order to include the names of the adoptive parent or parents, and any existing parent or parents who will maintain their parental rights after the finalization of the adoption.

Bill also requires additional documentation for out-of-state adoption petitioners if their home study report does not meet California standards or is missing required information.

Legislation this legislation is intended to provide more clarity and flexibility in the adoption process, while ensuring that there is still a thorough evaluation of perspective adopted families.

Also have updates to the adoption assistance program or AAP.

Under existing law, AAP provides financial support to adoptive families of eligible foster children since are allowed for group homes, STRTPS and out-of-state facilities only if it is Title 4E eligible.

Historically, AP payments were complicated when a child was placed in a residential treatment facility out of state, especially if the adoptive parents did not live there.

Maybe 118 clarifies and authorizes counties to continue paying AAP if at least one adoptive parent lives in the same state as a treatment facility and placement is necessary. These can only pay the California STRTP rate or the facility's state rate, whichever is lower, to prevent cost.

Escalation, while still allowing for specialized treatment if needed.

Now we're going to shift our focus to new law, expanding access to opioid overdose prevention.

And substance use disorder services.

So opioid antagonist access and liability protections under existing law, licensed healthcare providers may issue standing orders for opioid antagonists like Narcan and naloxone to individuals at risk of opioid overdose as well as to family, friends, or others who may be able to help.

License healthcare providers acting with reasonable care when issuing a prescription or a standing order are protected from professional review, civil liability, and criminal prosecution.

Individuals who received an opioid antagonist must complete training, and if they administered it in good faith and with reasonable care, they were also protected from liability and prosecution.

No. AB 1037 authorizes licensed care providers to issue standing orders for opioid antagonists to treat any overdose, not just those involving opioids.

It's maybe 10.

37 also eliminates the training requirements for individuals who possess, dispense, or distribute opioid antagonists, including those at risk of overuse and those in a



position to assist.

This bill also Shields licensed healthcare providers from liability for injuries caused by others when issuing standing orders.

Extends that protection to individuals who possess, distribute, or administer opioid antagonists, subject to specified limitations.

In short, AB1037 makes it easier for social workers others to help during a drug overdose.

It covers all types of overdoses, removes the training requirement and allows you to carry, share and use opioid antagonists like naloxone as you act in good faith and are not paid. You are protected from legal consequences.

The intent is to save lives by removing barriers and encouraging quick, responsible action.

Finally, we'll review a set of measures that strengthen system accountability and improve coordination statewide.

With respect to child abuse reporting under existing law, the California's Child Abuse Central Index or khaki not provide subsequent screening notices of potential wrongdoing to any agency other than the Department of Social Services.

Therefore, local court appointed special advocates, or Casa programs do not receive such notice.

This is.

Christine law allowed Casa programs to request a DOJ background check for staff or volunteers, but doing so was optional.

Under new law, AB 741 makes DOJ fingerprinting and background checks necessary or mandatory for all cost of staff and volunteers covering both state and federal databases. And the bill requires the DOJ to monitor the khaki and notify the CAA program if the Casa employee or Vol.

Is added to that index.

There's also mandatory reporter inspect extension under the child abuse and Neglect Reporting Act or camera.

Right, mandates reporters are required to report known or suspected child abuse to child welfare agencies.

AB653 now establishes the child abuse mandated Entertainment Reporter act or camera.

Expands camera by adding talent. Agents, managers and coaches who provide services to minors, to the list of mandated reporters under California law.

Who's training those people?

That I'm not sure.

We would have to add that to our list of questions.

And in another piece of mandated reporting reform currently mandated, reporters often receive inconsistent training with little attention to racial disparities or the broader impact of reporting.

And so to address this, AB 119 requires that a standardized statewide training curriculum be developed by July 1st, 2027.

That kind of ties in this training will include, among other things, the historical context of reporting laws and their racial impact.

Clear definitions of general versus severe neglect.

And guidance for working with children who have disabilities, behavioral needs or are under the age of five, this training will be available online.

Now about AB 1094.

Previously, under the Penal Code, Section 206, ORTRA carried a life sentence with parole eligibility after seven years, regardless of the victim's age. Now under AB1094, it prohibits a person imprisoned for committing the crime of torture from being eligible for parole until they

Have served at least 10 years if the defendant is an adult who had the care or custody of the victim.

Victim and the victim was 14 years of age or younger at the time of the crime.

So this bill is underscoring the legislature's intent to treat abuse by caregivers as an aggravated offense.

It's going back to.

B 119 and the.

Things that will be coming out by July 2027.

I just want to also make sure that that's connecting with our mandated supporter initiative and paradigm shift that we're working on in the county and that we're engaged with that effort and input as well.

Other questions?

Just a comment noted.

So moving on to AB250, regarding sexual assault and the statute of limitations, as you know, in recent years the legislature has passed several bills modifying the statute of limitations for bringing actions for damages arising from sexual assault.

And under AB277 and prior laws, certain civil claims for sexual assault that occurred

after the plaintiff turned 18 could be revived, even if the statute of limitations had expired, but only if the claim alleged that an entity.

Such as an employer or institution covered up the assault and the claim was filed by December 31st, 2023.

Under this new law, survivors of sexual assault now have a longer period through the end of 2027 to bring civil claims that were previously time barred. The bill holds perpetrators and any entities that covered up or attempted to cover up the abuse accountable for the HAR.

Inflicted on survivors, and so for agencies, this means continued attention.

To reporting duties, documentation and record preservations. Since older incidents could still lead to claims.

So together, these laws reflect California's ongoing commitment to child safety, family preservation, and equitable treatment across the child welfare system.

That's it for us.

Any questions?

Think there's any final questions?

And hearing none.

Thank you both for their very comprehensive presentation and congratulations on continuing first presentation cluster.

Thank you.

Those are the wonderful audience. Do we have any public comment this presentation?

I'm in person or online.

Thank you again and County Council for that presentation.

We will now move to item five general public comment.

Any folks in person or online who would like to by general public comment online, please raise your hand called on in the order in which you raise your hand.

Hearing none and hearing none, I will call this meeting adjourned.

Thank you everybody for taking the time this afternoon.

□ **Claudia P. Alarcon** stopped transcription