

7-16-1981

Impact of the 1981-82 State Budget Provisions on Refugee Services

Assembly Publications Office

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caldocs_assembly



Part of the [Legislation Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Assembly Publications Office, "Impact of the 1981-82 State Budget Provisions on Refugee Services" (1981). *California Assembly*. Paper 74.

http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/caldocs_assembly/74

This Hearing is brought to you for free and open access by the California Documents at GGU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in California Assembly by an authorized administrator of GGU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jfischer@ggu.edu.

IMPACT OF THE 1981-82 STATE BUDGET PROVISIONS ON REFUGEE SERVICES

TRANSCRIPT OF THE JULY 16, 1981 MEETING



Sponsored by
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.
17th Assembly District

Chaired by
Assemblyman Art Agnos
16th Assembly District

State Capitol
Sacramento, California

KFC
22
L500
A12
1981
no. 1

KFC
22
L500
A12
1981
no.1

LAW LIBRARY

GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY

Impact of the 1981-82 State Budget Provisions
on Refugee Services

Transcript of the July 16, 1981 Meeting
Sponsored by
Assembly Speaker Willie L. Brown, Jr.
17th Assembly District

Chaired by
Assemblyman Art Agnos
16th Assembly District

State Capitol
Sacramento, California

81-11-18

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM
July 16, 1981

ASSEMBLYMAN ART AGNOS: The administration and agencies that serve the refugee programs are here to tell what they perceive to be their charge under the mandate of the budget control language. Then we're going to give you an opportunity to talk to us as to what you see the potential problems are and we hope that by the end of today's hearing you will have a better idea of what your difficulties are and have a better idea of how this language may be implemented. Keep in mind there are two separate parts of government represented here -- the people who will be speaking with you are various heads or deputy directors of State agencies that will be administering this program. Masako Dolan and I represent the legislative branch which passes some of these laws, but doesn't administer them. Obviously, the Governor's office and his departments do that. So you have two different branches that are here today and hopefully we'll work together to meet the needs of your clients. With that in mind I would like to ask Masako Dolan who is the consultant to Senator John Garamendi and the author of the budget language which has created some of the changes in refugee services.

MASAKO DOLAN: I was asked to describe how I got involved in this as well as the impact of the language, or, actually, how I got involved in this dirty work. That comes about because I made a wrong decision. I walked into the wrong committee meeting at the wrong time and was asked to look into the situation. The Senate Health and Welfare Subcommittee was looking at the issue on the

Indochinese and the Refugee Program. They realized this was a program that was in a number of different budgets. The Subcommittee announced and held a hearing on this topic. Senator's Greene and Garamendi both were deeply concerned that given the limited dollars we had, some priorities had to be placed in terms of social service funding. The budget control language comes from our federal appropriations for social services. We get an allocation for one year for social services. Until this year, the county welfare departments could utilize whatever they wanted in order to fund their Title XX social services to the refugees. The remainder of the allocation, the difference between what was expended and what the allocation is, went into the second year of funding for contracts. The monies that we're talking about are the contract monies which were not expended by the counties in this last fiscal year. The reason the state developed this system was the uncertainties about the amount of federal dollars available for social services, meaning you could enter into contracts not knowing how much federal dollars would be available. Many times the federal government would augment last its allocation so that more monies would be freed up. Now last year I understand \$21,000,000.00 was made available for contracts. This year, and I'm talking about October 1 this year's funding for contracts, initially I was told the amount would be \$11,000,000.00 and then there was some hope that there would be a federal reallocation so that there would be \$14,000,000.00 available. There's concern that the federal government is going to hold on its last quarters' allocation for social services because of their concern that the cash assistance and Medicaid payments for refugees will exceed what they had anticipated. If they do impound that money, that means

there will virtually be no money for contracts. We were working with the concern that we understood the President's proposals would reduce the Title XX funding to counties by about 25% and that Congress had made, at least in the reconciliation Bill, cuts in social service supports. If we did not put a limit to the allocation that counties could expend for Title XX money, there would be no money at the end of next year for contracts. The Senators felt these were important services and that we needed to set a limit. Initially we decided to take the same proportion of the money of this current year for next year and let the remainder go out for contracts. Later, because of the technical difficulties, there was a flat 35% as a maximum amount counties could utilize in this fiscal year so that 65% of the remaining dollars could go for contracts for services. That's the first thing that the Budget Language proposed to address.

The second piece of concern was that, as of April 1, the State was providing assistance for AFDC and the counties were picking up 100% county cost of GA for refugees who are time expired. The realization that the number might grow, given the fact that the first wave of refugees were more educated, more Westernized, and had more skills than the current stream, placed the priority for the services of what we felt were inadequate funds from the federal government, to be placed on English as the second language, employment service training and other related social services in support of employment. These are a top priority, the language did not say "exclusively" -- the limitations were placed probably because of the lack of federal funding. The President's proposals recommended a reduction of \$21,000,000.00 and I recall seeing that both Houses of Congress have reduced that, about \$41,000,000.00. We're looking at diminished

resources, therefore we have set a priority. We have given the State departments an extremely difficult task with diminished resources, they must try to provide services to an ever-growing number of refugees, who need the services. The people here are concerned about the first call for the federal dollar to be on cash assistance and on Medicaid expenditures, and not on the social services.

The other piece of the language, said if there isn't sufficient money to provide services for employment training the money should be focused on the time expired. Because the state and the counties cash assistance recipients become a burden to the state; also on the new entrant because that hopefully would be a way of changing the system in terms of working with people who first get here -- given that we have very limited resources. The next priority statement was -- if there's sufficient funding to provide those two groups with services -- then there should be assurance that only primary households should get the services. That comes of real concern that with scarce resources that you should target the services to one person per family if you can't serve everyone. Primary head of household is language actually that is in a federal AFDC court decision and is also currently in both versions of Senate and House Reconciliation Bill. I know that some people raise the issue that that was unconstitutional and I would suggest that anyone who wants to follow-up on that should look at the Wescott versus Califano U.S. Supreme Court decision where that was discussed. A state said we cannot limit AFDC to the father, and you're saying that we have to provide it to the mother too. We ask the question of utilizing a word like "primary head of household". And of course, you can do that but the federal law did not say it. That's why Congress is

acting in this manner. If people want to take legal action on that, I suggest that they do this kind of research.

The third, and probably the most controversial aspect of the Language, has to do with having EDD provide some technical assistance and to test the employment preparation program in two areas of the state, through an inner agency agreement. The technical assistance was a real concern. Although the services systems are being developed and integrated informally at the local level and through a grant structure in several areas through a contract with DSS, that, by and large, it's been a haphazard development. A major piece of the system excludes EDD and one of the realities of our program is that people could choose to go to college and get support under the cash assistance programs without the same kinds of sanctions or requirements to seek work that are implicit in the AFDC System. The EPP Test is a program where cash assistance has been work tested in certain sites, we feel it has been very effective for welfare recipients and we're asking that EDD look at adapting that program in two areas of the State. Certainly, the outreach has to be different among the different language groups. But it's built on linkages among the community providers and with a definition of who does what in what sequence and with a building of accountability. The language also requires that to the extent administratively feasible, EDD should use the local contract system -- the private and public system. Now I know that many people are really upset -- that their services are not the top priority ones. But that's the background.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Did everybody understand that? Every single person in this room understood that? Okay then. I'm going to ask you all to explain it to me because I didn't get it all. Who

wants to start? Who has a question about what they heard? I'm going to let you comment later on what you think is wrong with a situation or your questions about the process. So if everybody in this room understands what Masako just got through talking about for ten minutes, we'll move on. If you don't understand something about the technical things that she said, I'd like to give you an opportunity now before I let her go on to explain or clarify something that you did not understand because I have some questions. If you have a technical question of Masako Dolan, please stand and speak as loud as you can.

QUESTION: She made a statement that major pieces of the system exclude EDD and I would like a clarification.

MASAKO DOLAN: That's an overstatement. You're absolutely right. For example, in AFDC which is applicable to part of the refugee cash assistance program, EDD has specified roles in terms of registering the AFDC parent and the sequence of services they have to provide them. If a person is offered employment that meets the good cause qualifications, then a person could be sanctioned for not cooperating. What we have funded are a number of employment training programs without EDD being built into the system. For a person who may be what we call "a mandatory registrant", the Employment Development Department does not know if he is or not receiving training. It varies from county to county. You have some very well organized counties where they've actually identified who does what so that this duplication is limited. It's not a statewide kind of process, however, so that in certain areas you may have some of the Social Services Agencies who fund Employment Training Programs. They find that they offer a job to a refugee who is a mandatory registrant and they can't be sanctioned because EDD has its own procedures and they weren't party

to the offer of the employment that might have qualified the trainee. So it's in our horrendous bureaucratic scheme that as long as the federal regulations are as they are, they should be built into the system everywhere. Not in just those areas where you have very well developed forms who have done this integration.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Does that answer your question?

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: All except that I still have questions about it.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay, ask it again.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I don't see how EDD is excluded from the process. That was the statement.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I think Masako is saying "that's not correct." It's not excluded from the process. It was misstated. Next question. Next row. Yes Sir.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: You had a statement about EDD having a certain process or certain program they would like followed.

MASAKO DOLAN: Well, the language requires in two areas of the state the Employment Development Department test the employment preparation program. That's what the language says. I don't know that EDD would say, "Hey, this is what we want to do."

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: EDD is here, I think. Miss Bissell are you representing EDD?

JOAN BISSELL: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Do you want to answer that?

JOAN BISSELL: We have begun discussions with the Department of Social Services about two sites that might be suitable and are interested in participating in an Employment Preparation Program. Those discussions however are very preliminary. No decisions have

yet been finalized. The emphasis is going to be upon using those service providers who have applied through the routine DSS RFP Request for Proposal Process and building upon the employment related services that have been proposed by the service providers. Our intent is to cause absolutely minimal, if any, disruption. On behalf of Douglas Patino, our director...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Ms. Bissell -- I'm sorry. I don't want you to get into your presentation. I just want to answer his question. Mr. Morales? Does that get it? Okay. I just want to make sure everybody gets their questions answered. Third row? Okay.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: On a paragraph on page 256 of the Budget Language, does that have anything to do with what we are talking about?

MASAKO DOLAN: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay. Next question. Yes, Sir.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I was wondering what is meant particularly by employment related services?

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: If you don't have an answer to that -- I mean we can refer them to someone.

MASAKO DOLAN: Subject to interpretation, in terms of the administrating agency, is the term, employment related services. When you talk about employment related services you're talking about child care, health, transportation -- those kinds of services that are a barrier to employment, so it's a broad definition. Now as in terms of the way WIN operates and some of the other programs, the administrating agencies may interpret it more narrowly. It was stating a priority for service along with the people who get priority for service. Nothing says that the priority for services groups gets

only one of the services. I don't know if that answers it. It's an administrative decision, I think.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Did that answer your question, Sir?
All right. A little louder. I'm sorry I can't hear.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I'd like to know who is responsible for the Budget Language?

MASAKO DOLAN: I should tell you that I myself alone was not the author of the language -- that this language came out of negotiation of the Senators with Douglas Patino and Marion Woods.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: The answer is no. We're going to let Mr. Woods and Ms. Bissell comment on that in their presentation.

MASAKO DOLAN: Can I make a statement?

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Yes. Sure.

MASAKO DOLAN: I did ask for any available information on what was effective in the programs that are currently being funded and what were the measures of effectiveness and there is no consistent evaluation in this State of what works -- what set of programs, what combination. Okay. That much we did know.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay. Next, oh same row.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Were there any public hearings?

MASAKO DOLAN: Yes. There was a hearing of the Subcommittee of Health and Welfare -- Senate Subcommittee -- also Senator Garamendi did participate in an advisory committee that DSS had when they were looking at the refugees and was familiar with a number of people testifying.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: That question sort of underlines one that I have and seems to be the feeling in people's minds, that this was done very suddenly. I think that's what that question is

probably aimed at, that it was not phased in over a long period of time. Was this a fast decision based on any information that came in late in the budgetary process or was this a long time in the works.

MASAKO DOLAN: Well, it started with the first item that the Senate looked at in the Health and Welfare Aid Agency. When the refugee item came up it became a discussion and we started the discussion with the various agencies. Actually, before that we delayed it, so it came up very early in the budget cycle. The language itself surfaced late because that's the way control language does.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay. Yes.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MASAKO DOLAN: No. What I said was that the controlled language requires a test of the employment preparation program adapted for refugees in two areas of the State.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: So it has not been tested yet.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MASAKO DOLAN: Okay. In the Carter Welfare Reform Package, I believe there were fifteen demonstrations of a job search assistance program that was developed for welfare recipients in the various parts of the state. We have some preliminary data of that and I say preliminary data because, very frankly, the Reagan administration has refused to fund the final piece of the evaluation -- so we don't know whether they have been very effective in putting welfare recipients to work. Okay. That's one piece. California has had experience in eight or nine sites with what we call the Job Search Assistance Program and that has had varying success, but, on the whole, very positive.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I don't understand \$12 million in...

(Inaudible)...available for contracts. (Inaudible)

MASAKO DOLAN: Okay. The contract money runs from October 1 to October 1, the federal fiscal year, so we have not completed this federal fiscal year. It was anticipated, at least when we were in the discussions, that there might be \$11 million available at the end of this fiscal year for the contracts that everyone has put in their RFP for. Later, we were heartened and thought it might be \$14 million. The latest word is that the Department of Health and Human Services may be holding onto that money because of increased costs of tax assistance and Medicaid payment for this third quarter so there may be no additional money for Social Services. But I think that the people from DSS can speak much better to that.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Next question, same row.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MASAKO DOLAN: Both departments can define how they see that language.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Same row, yes Sir.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MASAKO DOLAN: I think it says that they have top priority. I've seen recently a description of a survey of refugees in Sacramento which put mental health at the lowest of what that particular group felt was an urgent need, that English as a second language had top priority. It was top priority in terms of the funding scheme.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Same row, yes Sir.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I don't think we are...(Inaudible).

MASAKO DOLAN: Perhaps I didn't understand. It was top priority that was...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Testimony. You want to ask it again

in...(Inaudible)

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: ...(Inaudible) bilingual (Inaudible)...
I do not see any preparation or any provisions (Inaudible)...especially
your new arrivals...(Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: So ask your question again, in the form
of a question. I know you said I do not see how they're prepared.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Would you have any provisions or
federal agencies from which the refugees or the newly arrived, readily
adaptable to the (Inaudible)...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay, we will have the departments answer
that rather than Ms. Dolan who worked with the language, just to
remind everybody, worked with the language and the subcommittees to
develop the language. Departments will talk about the implementation
of how this language will become programmed. Okay, we'll go back to
the next row. The man with the tan jacket on the aisle.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: You have to talk a little louder, Tom.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)...My name is Tom...(Inaudible)

MASAKO DOLAN: No, we have not talked in terms of this
particular language of reorganizing the Mental Health Service system.
The legislature took action in terms of increasing the County's share
of costs of community mental health in the budget actions which had
to do with our decreasing revenues. But, no, the control language
did not address restructuring the mental health system.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Tom, go ahead. We can't hear too well,
you have to talk...come on down a little closer.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)...take action at the
contents of the hearing (Inaudible)...if you do make changes (Inaudible)

...supervised meeting. Would you be considered responsible for the (Inaudible) mental health because that is an area that is funded so that when the (Inaudible)...start looking toward that part of the system. (Inaudible)...

MASAKO DOLAN: Okay, the language does not eliminate mental health as a possible service to be funded. But I think that what really is going to occur is the impact of the federal reduction on what is available to be funded. The language is priority; it does not say you do not fund mental health.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: What she's saying, then, it can be included in funding but what will probably limit the funding will be the amount of federal money that comes to this State for them to provide in these various areas, Tom.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)...We all know that (Inaudible)...Where is that priority (Inaudible)...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay, next question. Sister Walsh.

SISTER SHEILA WALSH: (Inaudible)...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I'm sorry, we can't hear you. All of you back there might have to come a little closer because...and stuff muffles the voice.

SISTER WALSH: I have two questions for you. One: in the budget (Inaudible)...paragraph two (Inaudible)...what was the objective of the (Inaudible)...

MASAKO DOLAN: I think it says other services related to employment. Let me take a look...for employment. As I explained earlier, we have, when in other employment programs, like WIN, it covers a wide range of services that are considered necessary to remove the barriers to employment. They may be health related,

they may be child care transportation or the usual ones.

SISTER WALSH: (Inaudible)

MASAKO DOLAN: Well, you can't...you need to have those supportive services or a person can't participate in the program. So, yes.

SISTER WALSH: For my other question, here. (Inaudible)... priorities (Inaudible)...working your own farm and (Inaudible)...What would you think (Inaudible)...

MASAKO DOLAN: I think in setting the priorities the process occurred differently -- just the reverse. One concern was in terms of cash assistance with the State and the County having to pay a share, recognizing that we had major cuts in the budget. The second concern was that we need to work with the new entrants; that we wanted everyone to understand that employment was a State policy for new entrants.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay?

SISTER WALSH: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay. Well, you got the information. Your question has been answered. You may not like the answer. Right? Is that what you're saying?

SISTER WALSH: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay. Same row. Anybody else. Okay, next row back.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: My name is Roger (Inaudible)...and I would like to know how much money will be paid in interest rates to the federal government next year?

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I'm not sure that is Masako's area.

MASAKO DOLAN: I would hope that everyone here would write

the federal government and ask them. I think that one of the problems in planning at the State level is that we never know until the end of the federal year how much we actually have to expend. And sometimes we don't even know then, because they have continuing resolutions. So, I don't know, that is not something I can answer.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: But, let me answer part of it. As Masako suggested, I think it is extremely important that everybody in this room make a commitment that they write a letter to the President of the United States, to the two United States Senators and whatever Congressman you have a relationship with, to ask them for as much funding for these programs as is possible for them to arrange. And through yourselves, through the groups that are friends of your groups or clients or constituents of your groups, that they also write letters. It is extremely important. Speaking as a politician, we pay attention to those. Please don't underestimate the value of writing a good, thoughtful letter. Not some mimeographed thing that everybody signs but everybody sitting down, even if it is not the greatest English, we understand that it is coming from people who are out there. So it is extremely important that everybody in this room who represents hundreds of people in their own agency, send that message as well as your friend who might be interested in this, to the Federal Legislature and the President of the United States, and friends in other states who might be...For example, Asian representatives who you know may represent other parts of the United States who might be sympathetic to this problem. Such as Patsy Mink of Hawaii, that kind of person. Go ahead with your next question.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: As I understand the language in the Bill, the origin of funding, whatever amount that may be...for

instance, (Inaudible) 65% in the community from voluntary agencies and 35% (Inaudible)...My question is if the (Inaudible) that are presently committed (Inaudible)...if those would fall under refundable (Inaudible)...if that amount is equal to an amount less than 65% and there is a cut (Inaudible)...

MASAKO DOLAN: Okay, first of all, in terms of the contracts it is public and private agencies. So that nothing precludes a County, and in fact some counties have put in contracts. Secondly, in terms of the way the federal dollars flow, for example, what you are expending this year, the remainder, if you subtract that from the social service allocation, that becomes the pot of money that the State utilizes for contracts, the federal fiscal year, so the Counties get their first shot. Okay, it is what is left over that goes for contracts in the second fiscal year. So that you would be limited, and it says not to exceed, it could be less if the Department chose to, and that was our concern -- that we didn't know precisely how much money the federal government would allocate for Social Services this year. We didn't think that you should have to suffer a small, you know to have less than what you were currently expended as a portion of the federal allocation.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)...approximately the same amount (Inaudible)...

MASAKO DOLAN: Not the same amount. The same proportion of the federal dollar and that is the problem, frankly.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Do you anticipate a (Inaudible)...

MASAKO DOLAN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay, same row. Hands please. Okay.

I can't see...is that Mike Huynh back there. Mike is there someone in front of you, a lady sitting in the next row or is she sitting next to you.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay, good, fine. I think you may have to come down. Those people who are in that row, if you'll just come half way down so that we can hear you because it it...that's good, right there if you want.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I'm (Inaudible)...from (Inaudible) ...and I am here to ask a question (Inaudible)...Bay area. I have two questions please. One is: Members of the (Inaudible) group consult with members of the refugee group not the agency. (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Only the hearing (Inaudible)...

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: In which countries...(Inaudible) or not.

MASAKO DOLAN: Okay, I think that...Senators have constituency groups with refugees and in the past, have met with them. I don't know if they consulted them, with them, precisely on that language. Okay. I don't know but they have spoken with them.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: The answer is not at that particular time. If you're familiar with the budget processes, we're preparing the state budget, when it comes down to the point where this language was done it is too late to go out into the community. We have hearings, where if, we hope people hear about it, will come and speak to us in rooms such as this. However, many times they don't get the message in time for them to come up, but...so I would answer your question by saying not at the time this language was drafted but at some time previously Senator Greene and Senator Garamendi

have spoken with groups in their respective districts and perhaps in other parts of the State. But not at the time when this was done.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Second question. What is the... (Inaudible) of refugees that will (Inaudible)...that will identify us (Inaudible)...

MASAKO DOLAN: The departments would have to answer that.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: All right, we'll have that question (Inaudible). Which department would handle that? Marion? Would that be yours? Okay, Mr. Woods will be handling that question when his time comes. Okay, Mike, come on down, Michael. And the lady that is sitting next to you, if you'll both come down, we'll finish that and get on with the presentation.

MR. MICHAEL HUYNH: I am with the Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement Center and the language that you wrote...(Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Michael, all right. We answered that a little bit before with the question that was asked, by the lady before you, which was simply, at the time that this language was drafted, we do have hearings in rooms such as this where we invite members of the public to speak to those issues. Also, during the budget process, people have an opportunity to come. Some don't hear about it and, my experience has been that many of the refugee programs simply are not tuned into the legislative process that we have up here and we hope that improves with each year. And, hopefully, with the number of people that have come today, this kind of thing will never happen again in that they will not have an opportunity to participate. But for us to explain now why we didn't consult with them is sort of old news and it is hard to go back over that. What she has said is that the two Senators, Senator Bill Greene from

Los Angeles and Senator Garamendi from this part of the State, have contacts with various refugee groups in their districts and have discussed these matters, evidently, with them in the past.

MASAKO DOLAN: No, I said that they discussed refugee matters but I don't know if they have spoken, particularly, about the impact of this language. Okay?

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: About this particular language. So they have an understanding or a sense at least from their perspective of what is happening in the refugee community. But as far as this language is concerned, it was not discussed with the kind of depth that we are going into now. We wish perhaps it could have been done but in view of how it came down, it wasn't. I don't know what we can do about it now, except what we are now doing. And that is to have people learn more about it and see how it is going to be implemented.

MR. HUYNH: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I'm sorry, what was the last...I liked the first part of that question, but I'm not sure I like the last part. The first part was great; what was the last part? What was the last part, Michael. I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last part.

MR. HUYNH: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I didn't know about it either to tell you the truth. When we're going in, it is hard to describe. And I really don't know how to put it in terms that people who are new to this country can understand what our budget process is like. But at the end of this, it is mere madness and very often things are going on in the two different Houses. Those of you who know our system, know that we have two different bodies in the State Legislatur

One is the Senate where Ms. Dolan works with the two Senators. And one is the Assembly, where I work with other Assemblyman in a subcommittee just like hers. Our subcommittee did not consider this language. It was done much after we had finished our work. And, therefore, I had no opportunity to work on that. So the answer to your question is, I didn't give up, I just never got into the fight because it was done after we had finished our work, when they inserted it and then it went to the conference committee. I hope that as I get around, and as you talk to the legislators from your areas, you will learn about this process because in this post-Prop 13 Era, most of the decisions that affect you will be made by us. People in the Assembly where I work on this side of the building and where Ms. Dolan works on the other side of the building with the Senators, and the people who you see before you are the most important people in determining the destiny of your program. And, therefore, it is vital, it is vital, that you get to know us and them so that you can tell us the kinds of things we're doing now. I apologize that we did not do as good a job as we should have as an institution in getting to you. But, let's go from there and make sure it doesn't happen again. Now that some of you are starting to learn where Sacramento is, some of you obviously know, get as familiar as you can be. As you see, from this hearing, it is as easy as this to participate in these decisions. It happens just like this. Maybe a little bit more formal, but very much the same. And, therefore, we need your participation so that we don't make any mistakes, if this is considered to be one, in terms of the process that the decision was made. Okay? I hope that helps. I know it doesn't change it, but I hope it helps from here on. Because there will be

other decisions. There will be other programs that will affect you in the same way and I hope you will have more to say. But it is up to you to be as aggressive as Michael just was and if you can start it with a nice compliment that helps to make sure that you don't get left out.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)...and I would like to know if any consideration, have you ever considered the fact that the State Advisory Council, the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Governor's Refugee Board, the California Forum on Refugee Affairs with statewide forum,-- I understand you hold the forum in California and all the major groups had (Inaudible)...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Probably was, but they didn't think it was heavy enough to change their minds.

MASAKO DOLAN: I think every member of the Budget Conference Committee saw all the letters, yes.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Ma'am, I have another question. When some people appeared at (Inaudible)...earlier hearing (Inaudible)...Senators Garamendi and Greene were here and (Inaudible)...was cut off. They really didn't want to (Inaudible)...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: You're talking about the Conference Committee?

MASAKO DOLAN: No, the Budget Committee.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: ...(Inaudible) before the Conference Committee. (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: The Senate Subcommittee on Health.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I'm sorry. That's really not appropriate for today's meeting. I don't know what we can do about it; that

happened then. I think you should take it up with those two Senators and your own, but what can we do about it today?

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MR. GRISWALD: I have...(Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: A little louder, Mr. Griswald.

MR. GRISWALD: This question really has to do with...
(Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay.

MR. GRISWALD: (Inaudible)...to the purpose of today's hearing or is there realistic (Inaudible)...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: The purpose of today's hearing is to go over the language so that everybody understands it. Secondly, to have those departments whose responsibility it is to administer that language. The legislature only sets the policy through the law, as you know. Then it is up to the administration under Governor Brown and the department heads that are here to administer that. Many times, between what we set as the law and what the departments administer, there is a gap or there are interpretations to be made. We want to make sure that the interpretations that are made will have the input that you have to participate in since it was limited when the law was set, as you've heard. There will be no agency legislation that I can think of that will change that budget language this year. We're going to live with it as it is. I don't see any hope of changing it. And I wouldn't spend a lot of time trying to think of it. But I think what we can do is make sure that it is implemented as fairly and as thoughtfully as possible and that is what today's hearing is about. Okay, we've finished the questions unless somebody else has any of the language itself. We're going

to now move to the departments who will be administering this language, and these are the people who really put their hands on the programs. I am going to ask, because she has a time problem, Ms. Beverlee Myers, who is the Director of Health to begin and we'll move from there.

MS. BEVERLEE MYERS: Particularly since we're not directly involved in administering it, we have a vital interest in the interpretation of the language, and while we support the language that says other services directly in support, we believe that that should be classified to include health related services. Just by way of information, last year the Department of Social Services directly invested about \$2.4 million on health related services, health assessment counseling/education through contracts with the County Public Health Department and the University of California, San Diego. That was about 12% of the total funds spent on refugee support. We believe it had a very positive impact in reducing barriers to employment services and my department has worked very closely with social services. In addition, of course, the Department of Health and Human Services at the federal level has a special targeted public health oriented program for refugees and last year we received about \$1.28 million for direct public health programs that is administered by my department and we awarded those funds to 14 high-refugee impacted local public health jurisdictions here in the State. However, it should be recognized that the Counties requested over \$4 million and we were only able to award from the federal government \$1.28 million so that we have a gap in the needs out there in health services and particularly since other health service funding is being cut back at the federal level. (Inaudible)

...the Public Health Service Hospital in San Francisco is scheduled to be closed, which has been a major health resource for refugees. We support, basically, the position that the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Governor's Refugee Task Force adopted in suggesting that DSS do include in its interpretation health related services among those which are conducive to employment promotion. I think it should be pointed out that the refugees present, that are now coming into the country, have much worse problems for local public health jurisdictions than did the earlier wave of relatively more sophisticated refugees in the late '70's. And I am concerned about the tremendous impact that any reduction in funding for health related services would have on the refugee programs. While I think it is clear that the budget language is to promote refugee employment and self-sufficiency, I believe that any cuts in the health services area would seriously damage our ability to assimilate these into American society and help them become self-supporting. So we think that health services are essential to this. I'm sorry that I can't stay longer. Deaton, of my staff, will be here to assist in answering any questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Will you be getting any money under this language now that -- or will it...

MS. MYERS: It will be dependent upon the Department of Social Services' interpretation. I think that Masako was saying that the intent was, in the other language, that we would interpret that, obviously, to be some health related services. I don't know whether there would still be the direct grants to County health departments for the kind of health services that have been funded in the past, the \$2.4 million. I think that is something, whether

it is a fiscal restraint as much as anything else.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Masako, do you want to help with that?

MASAKO DOLAN: I think that what's problematic is that Medi-Cal does pick up funding for health services for refugees. So it isn't only the \$2 million...

MS. MYERS: Not the public health oriented services.

MASAKO DOLAN: But in terms of many medical...

MS. MYERS: Transportation...

MASAKO DOLAN: ...and what happens is there is a problem that all Medi-Cal recipients have. And that is access, a good access, to the services and that's where a lot of the money has gone.

MS. MYERS: Yeah, the public health oriented services that have been funded through social services or transportation related to getting them to emergency services information and referral, translation/interpretation, those kinds of thing which are social services related to health services which are essential which we can't fund through our public health services grants which are organized towards tuberculosis control, venereal disease control, and things like that, which are not really refunded through Medi-Cal.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: In view of what you've heard so far, what recommendations or suggestions would you have for these program providers from your perspective on your services. Not the other.

MS. MYERS: My recommendations are, I think, that we work very closely together through the Advisory Committees with Mr. Woods and EDD to help set administratively what the priorities are and to demonstrate what...

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MS. MYERS: No. We have to get it from the social services

side. Medi-Cal, by federal law, is medically related services. It's a very medical oriented program and it is being cut back tremendously at the federal level -- potential 100 million to 600 million dollars -- we don't know what will be coming out of the Conference Committee and there's clearly no way in this State we will be expanding services covered under Medi-Cal. The cutbacks in Medi-Cal were clearly a top priority with the Legislature. I don't see expanding services.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay? Anymore burring of Ms. Myers? Thank you very much. (Applause) What did she say that was so great? It struck me as I was listening to people that I ought to review very quickly for you the California Legislative Process -- how the budget decisions are made. In a few months, probably in October or November, the State departments such as Ms. Myers' and the others that you see represented here will begin to prepare for next year's budgets. They will start to work with the amounts of money they will need in the various categories that they have under their administration. Those figures will be worked over by the Governor and his Department of Finance and these various departments beginning in November, perhaps as late as December -- but certainly by December for about two to three months. By late January, the Governor will introduce the budget which is a big thick book about the size of a telephone directory for New York, and it comes to the Legislature where we start to examine and review it. We begin that process around March. There are two parts of the Legislature -- the Assembly and the Senate. Each part of the Legislature reviews it separately from the other. So the Assembly examines this budget page by page through the Assembly Ways and Means Committee and the Senate does it through the Senate Finance Committee. Senator Greene and Senator Garamendi are on the Senate

Finance Committee and work on a subcommittee. Each of the two big committees that handle this budget have smaller committees to deal with portions of the budget. The committee that I chair handles the Health and Welfare Budget. So we take that and we go over it page by page. We have hearings everyday or every other day where we invite people to come from all over the state -- last year we went to other parts of the state to ask their views of it. And it's that point where you have an opportunity to participate and give us your view. As we come to the end of that process, usually by late May, we have to finish our work and make our final recommendations on how much we should spend on every single item -- it comes to the full committee -- they pass it -- it goes to the Assembly floor where the entire 80 Members in the Assembly and the entire 40 Members of the Senate vote. Each document is different. There are different recommendations -- the Senate may make different recommendations than the Assembly does -- as they did in this case. The Assembly really didn't make any recommendation in this particular issue, but the Senate did. There are two budgets, one from the Assembly, and one from the Senate. Remember it started as one from the Governor. After we get through examining it, changing it, revising it, adding, cutting -- all of it must be made into one again. So after the Assembly passes it and the Senate passes it, it will go into what is called a Conference Committee which is made up of members of each House who are to resolve the differences. At this point, it becomes one again. So we sit there and we negotiate on each item where there is a different amount of money allocated -- we might have allocated more money in the Assembly -- the Senate may have allocated less or vice versa. It must be resolved and made into one budget

again which is what occurs in the Conference Committee. It can no longer be examined by the subcommittee that I chair. We don't touch it. It's beyond us at that point, and that's where this budget control language occurred. You may agree with it or you may not agree with it, but these are the steps and the point where it occurred in this process was in the Conference Committee. Okay. No? Well it was resolved in the Conference Committee -- it was made in the Senate version. The Senate version had this language, the Assembly did not and therefore that had to be resolved in the Conference Committee once the budget is passed and that's why we in the Assembly didn't really participate in it, if you call it that way, unless you call our non-participation, participation. Once it's resolved by the Conference Committee, it goes to the Governor where he signs it and we are where we are now. This occurs every year. It will start again next year and it will be an opportunity for you to see and make changes if you do not like what happens this year. It is a very important place for change. Very often changes occur. It is easier than introducing a law. That is a whole separate process. The budget is a law unto itself. As I said, in the Senate when they did their version of the budget they put this in language. The Assembly did not. It had to go to this one committee and that's why you hear these terms -- Conference Committee. That is made up of both Senators and Assemblymen who resolve the differences, in this case, they resolved it in favor of what the Senate wanted to do rather than what the Assembly wanted to do. I want to move on if I may, to Mr. Marion Woods who -- oh, I'm sorry -- a question back there.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Well, let me try it one more time. What happened -- we (Assembly) did not recommend this language. We didn't put it into our version of the budget. That was our decision. In other words we didn't want to do it this way. Okay. But the Senate did. Now all we can do at that stage is refuse to agree, the budget is passed and it goes to this higher step which we call the Joint Budget Conference Committee. There they must resolve it one way or the other. Sometimes it goes the way the Assembly wants it, sometimes it goes the way the Senate wants it. In this case it went the way the Senate wants it, therefore that became the Budget Law. It's all done through verbal negotiations, some in writing like the letter from Jerry Patterson and it's a negotiation process much the way you see it. You can watch it when it goes on, by the way. None of this is done in secret. It's all done in a room just like this right across the hall and at that point you will hear the Assemblymen and women with the Senators arguing which way they should do it. But like all human beings, as we come down to the final stages of this process, they become irritable, they become impatient and that's why the lady from San Francisco found herself not being able to speak quite as long or not even to get a chance to speak, because it is a maddening process to go through and it's one that's very difficult to describe until you see it. It's not something that is ideal, but it's better than any other system that I know of.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: It's hopeless in terms of changing that language, that's correct. We have to live with the language as we are now discussing it. The next chance to change it will be in next year's budget. This language is subject to interpretation and it

will be interpreted and administered by these departments. So they can say if there is a choice, and some people might say this is how much you can do? Others might say this is how much you can do. That's what we mean by interpretation and it's up to them to interpret the language -- that's exactly why I want to deal with this. Okay. As far as changing that particular language, how it is interpreted is the subject of what this is all about and we're about to hear from them -- but I seem to be stimulating more questions. Yes, Sir?

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Well, technically, something can be done -- an urgency bill as someone suggested -- we could amend the bill or we could do something to change it, but I don't believe that there is much support for that at this point. However, after today's hearing we will -- it's being recorded as you see up there -- have an opportunity to review this with other people even though I'm the only politician who is here, we will have an opportunity for others to hear it and, if there is an opportunity certainly there are those of us that agree more with the Assembly version than the Senate version and we will examine the possibility of changing it. However, I do not want to give anybody in this room any hope to change it at this point. Did I make myself clear, Sir? No -- what I'm saying is technically there is always hope to do a bill but realistically speaking I do not want to give anybody false hope at this point. Okay. I seem to have a lot of questions on this point, so go ahead.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Who do we tell our Assemblyman to contact?

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Well, you ought to start with them. They'll know who to go to -- well for instance -- the Speaker and I,

although he's got a little more muscle than I have. Speaker Willie Brown, by the way, arranged this meeting through his assistant Karen Sonoda, who is seated to my left, because we heard from so many people, not only from San Francisco, but statewide. He asked Karen to arrange all this and have these department heads here. So I don't want to say it's "dead", I just want to say there is little hope at this point, because even if you convince the Assembly, which is already convinced, you have to convince the Senate which is a whole separate body and that can be difficult from what we're learning right now. Yes, Sir.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: On behalf of the Vietnamese Refugees (Inaudible)... (Laughter)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: (Inaudible)

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I would like to ask you to relate to the Senate, the Refugees, even though at this point they cannot participate in the Democratic process...and I think most of them will become citizens, and at that time, they will participate by voting...

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Can you tell me where you live?

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Berkeley.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay, well you know your Senator, I think is Nick Petris, if I remember. Do you know? I think you ought to talk to him so that he can relay your views directly to the Senate. I will do that also. I will do a favor for you, but I think you ought to do it yourself with members of your constituents -- whether they can speak English or not -- I want to tell you Nick Petris, for example, couldn't speak English when he was young nor could his parents. Because his folks came from another country, like you did, he understands what the sensitivities and difficulties are in speaking

English. I don't think you will have any problems speaking with him as with a number of other Senators, whether they could speak English or not in their youth. I would not be shy about speaking directly to the Senator, and I certainly will convey your message also.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Take an interpreter with you and speak to him. Take a translator and an interpreter and speak to him. Okay -- yes, Sir.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I hope that's what we're doing. I know we're taking a little bit longer time, but many of you came long distances and I don't want you to feel as though you didn't get a chance to speak today. These folks are more important than I am at this stage so I want to get to them, but I want to answer all your questions.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Well the change, I assume, is to preserve the way it is now rather than go to the prioritized language. What I'm saying is I don't think that it can be done right now. Although it is not dead, there is little hope. We will check that out depending on what the future holds, I don't think it can happen but we will not give up on it.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

MR. MARION WOODS: I have bad news and I don't enjoy being the bearer of bad news but, with the limited time I have here, I will try to be as honest, fair and as clear as I can. Up to this point we have been really talking about the past, how the budget language

was developed, and what interpretation means. I will give just a few minutes of attention to the past and go on to describe what my department is planning and what can be expected. As far as the past goes, I want to assure you that the Senators who developed the budget language, Senator Bill Greene and Garamendi, were fully cognizant of your interests. They read your letters and I personally was involved in about 99% of the discussions around that language and I, too, expressed the concerns which have been expressed to me by the State Advisory Committee, the Citizen's Task Force and others of you who sent us copies of your letters to the Senators and to the Legislature. In Senator Greene's view the language developed and adopted was the best of the alternatives which were considered. In the Senate at the time of our budget hearing, there was some antagonism and some hostility around this program. In my view the problem we have is not the budget language but the reduced amount of money -- that's the problem. Even if there was no budget language, the prioritized services would have had a negative impact on the amount of dollars and the number of programs funded. The alternatives considered were, having equitable cuts, cutting all the programs proportionately depending upon what that proportion was of the total pie. A second alternative was to develop the program around impacted areas, the highest areas of impact where the population of refugees or former refugees lived. And a third alternative was to target the funds, focus the funds, in other words, prioritize. One final note about the process that Assemblyman Agnos described, for those of us in the executive branch of the budget process, 1981 and 1982 is over. Our focus now is on the 82 - 83 budget. The budget that the Legislature will consider in March, 1982, from this department will

probably be on my desk mid-August in 1981. That gives you an idea of the kind of timeline we're on. For us 1981-82 is over, we are now focusing on 1982-83. The issue here as I understand it really can be asked in one question, "Will there be funding for Mental Health Services, Health Services, and Social Adjustment Services?". If the answer to that is yes, there is plenty of money, then this meeting is over and there will be no need to stay any longer. If the answer is no, there is no money, then the tension that that will create, would cause us to be here forever and not resolve it. I think the answer is yes-no. There may be some and that's the bad news that I bring.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Excuse me Marion, may I interrupt you just for a moment. I've got the list here for those who wish to sign-up to speak. I'm going to pass this around again and I'd like to ask everyone who is here to print their name, address and if they wish their telephone number so that the Speaker and I can communicate with you in the future on various issues of importance to you. I think there are a lot of people, about 40, who want to speak. Okay, I'm sorry, would you proceed?

MR. WOODS: I have listed 11 questions during the prior conversation that pertain to the Department of Social Services. I have prepared a presentation to give you which will answer all but three of those questions and at the end of that presentation we'll deal with those three questions. Can everybody see this easel over here? Can you see it back there? Let me just briefly go through some things I think all of you know, in terms of the size of the population that we're referring to -- we're expecting 200,000 Indochinese refugees by October 1, an additional 5,000 Soviet Jews and a significant

number of Cubans. We estimate about 9300 Cubans, who are not refugees but new entrants. We currently have 3 to 4,000 a month coming into California. We expect that to increase by 5,000 in the Fall. And this includes the secondary migration. By October 1 there will almost be 145,000 refugees on Cash Assistance of which, 123,000 are time eligible and 21,000 time expired. This information was available to the Senate Subcommittee at the time they made the decision about the budget language. They concentrated on this because these 21,000 persons impact on State and County funds. In our current period, these are the funds that we estimate will be allocated, 9.1 million to County welfare departments, 21 million to contractors such as the providers which you represent, and 3.3 million to State agencies, that is DSS, Mental Health, and Health and Education for Daycare. For the period coming up October 1 to September 30, we are estimating the budget control language will provide no more than 35%. The counties are capped in terms of your question Hoffman, the Senate recommended the counties be capped at no more than 35% of the money. We estimate that to be 6.9 million which will then give us 16.6 million for contracts with service providers. That represents a reduction of almost 11 million which is a 33% cut from the amount of money that we had last year. If there was no cut and there was in fact a 6% cost of living factor to all the programs, we still would not have enough money with just that alone to fund all of the programs which currently exist. In terms of support services this 9.1 million this year, which represents about 27% of all of the refugee money being spent in the state, Employment Services 27% of all the refugee money, Child Care Services 5% or 1.5 million, ESL 5.4 million or 16%, Social Adjustment Services, 4.8 million which

represents 14%, Self-related Services 2.4 million which represents 7% and Mental Health Services 1.3 million which is 4%. That's what is happening currently in the State.

...that no employment was occurring. And in our survey with you and other participating, we have found that the average number of persons who are finding jobs are 500 a month, 6,000 for the current year. Persons who are receiving vocational training are being placed from that training, at a rate of 2,400 a year. The County Welfare Department in their process have placed 1,000 for this year and the demonstration EDD project has placed 590 for almost 10,000 persons who have been placed in jobs as a result of the services which you and others provide.

We have already talked about the budget control language -- the goal was to help as many refugees achieve economic self-sufficiency in the shortest period of time. I'm being very careful about this because I've learned that you are listening very carefully. And the lady who raised the question about self-sufficiency, whether that means 3 months, 6 months, I can't answer that specific. But the language says the top priority for funds after the County Welfare Department, that is the \$6.9 million, shall be employment, training, ESL and other services directly in support of employment directed activities. In the Department, we interpret that to mean Mental Health Services will be eligible if they are tied into an employment component. Health Services are eligible if they are tied into an employment component. That is our interpretation and maybe that should be discussed by you and those of us who will seek your guidance. In terms of the target groups, they are as follows: Employable, time-expired adult who continues or is likely to receive

cash benefits, and the employable adults who recently have arrived in the United States and who receive or are likely to receive cash assistance. This can be traced back to the committee's concern about trying to minimize, reduce, decrease or eliminate the number of persons who will be a financial burden for the State and the County. If there are insufficient funds for these priorities, then we will give them to the primary wage earner in the household. In terms of the question about whether a study has been made about the population that is classified as "primary wage earners", we are in the process of completing a survey to determine the impact of these priorities and definitions in the budget control language. The impact of this classification, primary wage earners, and other priorities on who gets services, depends mostly on the level of federal funding. We don't have any expectations that we are going to provide services to all the persons who are in need of them. These services, of course, are provided by contract, public and private non-profit agencies, ENT agency...(Inaudible)...with the EDD to do these things. The budget language contracts with EDD will be to provide information and technical assistance throughout the State. We will seek their consultation on all of the proposals and programs that are funded for employment training. Furthermore, we would have an implementation of employment preparation program in two areas and I think Dr. Bissell might want to discuss what those two areas are later. And the contract, if administratively feasible, with public and private agencies in implementing the employment preparation project. In the Title XX type social services, as we indicated CDW's will be given not more than 35% of the existing money through federal allocation. This is merely a recitation of the type of priorities for support services. Our

interpretation of the budget language, as we would implement it, will be: (1) Title XX type Social Services for County Welfare Departments; (2) Employment Services; (3) ESL; (4) vocational English as a second language; (5) Health and related services; and (6) Mental Health related and Social Adjustment Services last. We do not have any problem administratively in the Department of trying to also implement the Department's policy. That is, in each region of the State, we want to find a full range of services. That is what we did last year when we had \$21 million. In every county where there is a refugee program that is funded, every county has all of these components. We are prepared, or I am prepared, to discuss with the Secretary the recommendations from the staff that says we can provide in all counties a range of services through the top four without much difficulty. There would be no problem in doing that. We do not have a plan, at this point, to bring in these other three. Those health related, no health related and social adjustment services. That's where we are with the Department's interpretation of the budget language. The Department is prepared, and I have a recommendation which I will discuss with the Secretary later on, to fund the first five that are in the budget control language. We have a plan to provide a full range of services in every county for these five. We do not have in our plan, at this time, funds and plans to save these two -- Mental Health related services and Social Adjustment Services. There was one question that was raised as to whether or not there is any advance planning with the Department of Mental Health in the event that no mental health services will be funded. We have been discussing it with Mental Health, we wrote them a letter on June 18, 1981, about the possibility of this happening because of our estimate

of \$15.6 million. And mind you, that is an estimate. The President has deferred \$35 million of funds for this quarter. It could be less than that, we don't know. As of this moment, we have not received an allocation for the fourth quarter for cash assistance and Medi-Cal. We have written seven letters and telegrams to Secretary (Russell) Schweickart. We have not had a reply; he has not answered either by telephone call or Mario Obledo. We have informed every member of the California delegation of this problem. We don't know what the answer is. In a letter to the Mental Health Department on June 18, this was discussed. This morning, I received a reply from Dr. Loeb asking for a meeting to discuss it further. The preliminary discussions that have occurred at the staff level have called attention to the lack of federal dollars, or little or no dollars available this year for mental health services. The question that occurs here, which is even a larger and more important application, is that we have to look beyond to the refugees specific dollars and begin to plan to utilize the sources which exist with both the...(Inaudible)...health, Mental Health, and EDD to provide a comprehensive program. As you know, two years ago the mental health component was funded directly by HHS regional office. Last year, without prior consultation with us, we were informed that the mental health component would come from the Social Services dollars allocated. We were not prepared for that and at the time we went into that agreement with Mental Health, we advised them a year ago that the chances were likely that we could not do this again in the third year. They have known for that long. Speaking of that, I might also say that Mental Health has been slow in getting that program to full implementation. The claims so far, are less than

the amount we had projected. We have two quarters of claims, the \$1.3 million funded last year -- there is money. So, one of the alternatives we have in our discussions with Dr. Loeb is to try to get an idea of how much money is left or how much money will be left come October 1 to see what the possibility of carry-over in contract extension with no additional money. We will look at that at the same time, to see if we are going to have any money after these five priorities to supplement that contract. That has not been done as of this moment. One question was, what will be done, given the budget control language, to prepare refugees for participation in ESL employment and other services. We intend to fund, within available funding, "world of work" type employment orientation for those refugees considered to be employable. Now that is another way of defining creaming, to be honest with you. And that is after the assessment of individual refugees. And this orientation should include what to expect, where one goes, and the ways of preparing minimally how to look for a job, resume, resume preparation, etc.

Were there any studies that looked into attainment of self-sufficiency prior to the budget language? The answer is no. There was no scientific study to do that. This track was moving very fast, as you might imagine. Our efforts last year to get funding for an evaluation of services and a demography or study of who is a refugee, thus far we have been unable to get that kind of funding from the federal government. We are still pursuing it with some foundations. I think it is still early enough in this program to begin a longitudinal demography so that we will know more than we know now about what exists and what the specific problems are, so that assessments of needs can be made in a much more specific way at the State level.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Okay, I'm mindful of the time and I'm going to have to ask your forgiveness. I have to leave to go to San Francisco where I have to speak before the Board of Supervisors at 2:00 p.m. Steve Thompson, who is the Director of the Office of Research for the State Assembly, and one of the big shots we have here in the State will be taking my place to Chair this meeting along with Pam Haynes who is my consultant on the Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee. They will be picking it up as soon as I leave. Please understand where I'm going and what I'm going to be doing in San Francisco. Just to comment a moment, the way we're going to do it the rest of the day, with your permission, is to finish if we can by about 2:30 p.m. We'd like to skip lunch and we'll stay here as long as you wish so that we can finish this and maybe have lunch afterwards. I'm going to ask the other presenters to keep that in mind and then we'll get to your part of it which is to comment on those things that you wish to discuss and understand that it will do us no good right now to complain about what happened. You can just try to educate these people who will be administering this language for the next year. If we are to change it, that will occur in next year's budget language with some outside hope that something miraculous might occur this year. To be as candid and honest as I can be, I really doubt it. As you prepare your thoughts for your comments, please bear that in mind. It will be more productive in terms of using our time and your opportunity to talk to the people who will administer these programs from the top down, as we hear from you, speak to those issues that will implement this best.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)...consider those first five items (Inaudible)....

MR. WOODS: I'll try. Of course, in a broad generic sense, health problems can be a barrier to living a good life. A person obviously needs health before they can be employed. What we are talking about doing is a system that begins a requirement for health screening before referring or doing any kind of job placement activity. There are fears that exist, that there are people working who have health problems that have not been detected. The first assessment in the plans that we are developing will be health screening. We see that as tying in or connecting with employment programs. Now Jo Fredericks from my staff is here and Jo may want to clarify a little more specific if I have missed something.

This is why I was trying to make the emphasis into the question about saying that the question is really that we've got to look beyond the refugee population or the refugee problem and make sure that we are utilizing the existing resources in Mental Health, EDD, CDW that exists. Because of the shortage of dollars that we have, we are going to give a lot of attention to connecting and linking with those resources that do exist.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)...(Beverlee Myers?)

JOAN BISSELL: I think, Beverlee, what we're saying is that for health and health related kinds of things, there will be that initial screening, to the extent that we can fund it. There may not be the same amount of money there next year to do that. But to the extent that there is money available, that will occur. Also for the employables that are going through a system, if they're midway -- say they are in vocational training or something -- they may have a problem with anemia as Dr. (Inaudible) has explained to me before. We would see that I & R or that kind of counseling and the health

education would occur to the extent that funds are available for the employable person in the system -- the employability system. However, full scale health related kinds of services will not be available and probably will not be available to the extent that they were last year because of the net reduction in funds across the board. In answer to your question, hopefully, the systems that are in existence now, the ones that are working would be utilized. We've got to look at those that aren't working as well.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: Is this helpful to do it this way? I don't mind doing it on one condition. That it cuts down on a number of speeches we're going to get when we finish. Okay. The man from Public Health and then I'll take the two ladies. Mr. Public Health over there.

MR. PUBLIC HEALTH: (Inaudible)...If you're only covered by the (Inaudible) male member of the family (Inaudible) in that household, how can you guarantee that (Inaudible)....

JOAN BISSELL: The intent is not to focus solely on the person through the employment system. I'm not saying that only the male wage earner would get this service. The access to the extent that money is available before a person is ever identified as employable would be for any refugee who walks in that door. The continued follow-up or problems that arise later on would also be available for those who get into the employment system.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

JOAN BISSELL: I don't think the argument is that health education should not occur. The issue is how much can we pay for and whatever resources are we going to have to be utilized in the community. And I recognize that resources are being cut back overall.

But in terms of prioritization, it will be education, out-reach, an explanation and maybe making appointments, etc. But we can't do a full fledged health education program and be able to do the other kinds of things that we want to do as well. The money is not there.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: A little louder please, Pat...

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Why do (Inaudible)...

JOAN BISSELL: It is the access to and the explanation that the service is available. We will not fund the hands-on, actual screening.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

JOAN BISSELL: For instance, I think that, in fact, maybe Kathleen you can help me out here. That if there is a need for a refugee to get dental work, or if there is going to be screening and X-rays that will occur, there might be someone that we fund that can speak the language, can explain what will occur and can be the linkage. We will not view the actual X-rays, we will not do the actual blood tests. That again, is an example of resources that are available in other areas rather than refugee money.

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: The lady next to Ms. Franks there.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: A little louder.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I was just getting ready for you.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: The women and children are important to the future of the refugees. We are not (Inaudible)...the children, the women and the husbands too have access to health care. (Inaudible)

ASSEMBLYMAN AGNOS: I don't think anybody would argue with that and what we're saying to you is that we're trying to do the best we can with what we have. And maybe this is a good point for me to leave with one statement that is stimulated by Marion. And that is, he spoke in his presentation very briefly about something I would like to expand upon without overdoing it. That is, the hostility that the subject engenders up here, (Sacramento). There is some hostility to many of these programs on the part of the State Legislature, who reflects some of the hostility that maybe some of you have experienced, and certainly have read about in the general community. There are people who do not understand a great deal about your culture, or who you are and still have yet to learn that. Because of that lack of understanding, there is some resistance to using their State tax dollars for these programs, -- or at least their federal tax dollars and in their minds it is all the same, it doesn't matter where it comes from. It is difficult for those of us who agree with you that these services should not only be maintained but expanded upon to persuade others who do not understand and therefore have some hostility. We need your help with the kind of work that you're doing. We're the general community that has to explain what it is that you're doing and how the people that you work with become productive members of our society. Let me just give you an example of a very small bill that was flying through this Legislature that Speaker Willie Brown and I helped to stop. It was introduced in the Senate to make it a misdemeanor to eat a dog because there were rumors about the Asian culture in general and Indochinese in particular eating many dogs. You should have heard the testimony before the committee from people who came here from various parts of California saying they actually

witnessed Southeast Asian refugees catching dogs, eating them in their backyards and all of that kind of thing. As a result, they wanted to pass a law that was an insult to the culture of those people. It was flying through this Legislature virtually unanimously until it came to the Assembly Parks and Wildlife Committee. When many of the legislators heard the facts, understood that this was an offensive thing to the culture of people we had invited to this country. Because of the politics, lack of understanding, the confusion and indeed the hostility about who you are and what you represent in our country, maybe it's not new just to your particular generation of refugees. It happened when my family came here 40 years ago. It happened when other families came who are immigrants, and each time an immigrant group comes here there is the same kind of problem. We're just dealing with it in a new phase. Nevertheless, many of the legislators understood that this was an insult and there are different ways you can vote in this place. One is to simply not vote, to abstain. And we killed that bill because enough people on that committee understood that it was politically risky to vote no. They simply refused to vote and therefore the author of that bill could not get enough votes to pass it and it died. But it passed through the Senate because there was no one over there opposing it. It finally was stopped here and once the facts were presented to the legislators, many of whom do not represent constituencies such as yours, they still understood that it was not the right way to educate a new group of people to our country. That's the kind of problem you're facing. I don't think I'm telling you anything new but perhaps I'm reinforcing some of what your instincts are about what is going on in our society. These are difficult economic times for all Americans

who have been here a long time. They see many of your constituents as being the competition for some of the work that they're doing. I think it's important that we get across to them that we can create enough jobs and that's really the challenge, not to fight among ourselves for those that are presently created. I hope you will take that message back to your constituents that there are friends up here who understand the problem, that there are other people who may not be as publically friendly but privately understand and will work behind the scenes and that there is plenty of hope for the kind of future that they hope to have in this country. Even though money may be cut and those kinds of things may occur, it is not hopeless and we will continue to work with the people that are here to do the best that we can with what we have and tomorrow we will work for more. The kind of things that Michael Huynh did in San Francisco when they had a fundraiser for refugees from East Africa was very good. It was for East African countries that are now going through the same kind of deprivation that some of you and indeed many of your clients did in Southeast Asia, this is the kind of public relations that will help Americans understand that you are here to stay, and that your clients are here to participate in all phases of American life once you get the basic tools to do that with. I hope that you will take this message back and through this kind of meeting we will improve the situation that some of you are not happy with now. The rest of the day after I leave will be handled by Mr. Thompson and the order will be Mr. Dias, Mr. Woods, Ms. Bissell and Dr. Barton. I hope we will finish that in the next 15 to 20 minutes and then we will allow you to spend the next hour and a half to respond with your general comments that you have brought with you. I'm going to turn the

meeting over to Steve who will finish those questions for Marion and Jo and will go on to the next presenter. Thank you very much. I think that there were some additional questions of Marion Woods.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

JOAN BISSELL: Yes, the situation is as follows: when the budget was put together for this current fiscal year there was an underestimation of the amount of money that would be needed for cash, medical and administrative costs for the refugee program. Because they are finding, not only in California, but nation-wide the costs are escalating and they are concerned that there may indeed be a shortfall. The President has issued a recession letter where 35 million dollars for the social service fund for the refugees has been held up pending a determination whether or not there will indeed be a shortfall. Now, the issue is that if there is indeed a shortfall, that the attempt to get a supplemental appropriation is something that they are looking at very seriously. However, we are also faced with a timing problem and that is, when do they determine whether there will be a shortfall or not and when will the states know what the final allocation for service dollars is. That's a very serious problem because as most of you know we have to have the award of contract and the money encumbered by September 30 of this year in order not to lose the money. We have done a couple of things that you should know about and that is: (1) We have just recently recieved as of today, an ability from the federal government to use unexpended dollars in this current contract year next year. That will require a budget modification but we will get an extension in time so that if there is a lag in the time the money is encumbered and the deed contracts for the following year are let. Then there will not be a disruption in

services to the degree that there is unexpended money left at the end of this quarter; (2) We've asked formally for the waiver of the need to encumber the money by September 30 so that if we get the feedback by September 15, everyone isn't running around trying to write contracts, get their boards to approve them and that sort of thing, but we don't lose the money.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)

JOAN BISSELL: EDD is interested in participating in this program both in a technical assistant standpoint as well as making sure that they have the resources to provide services directly to them. The draft inter-agency agreement complies with the budget control language and has two parts, the technical assistance as well as EDD in two areas of the State. It is true that EDD has also participated in the RSP and is requesting to do employment services in other parts of the State.

MR. STEVE THOMPSON: Would everybody keep their questions directly to testimony that Marion Woods presented so that we can proceed. Yes, Sir?

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: (Inaudible)...

To defer our 35 million dollars in social services money while they make the assessment of the shortfall on Medi-Cal and cash assistance. They have not made the decision about the allocation of a 4th quarter and Congress has not yet voted on the President's recession letter.

JOAN BISSELL: There are really two separate issues. One is a problem with a 4th quarter allocation for cash and Medi-Cal. We know it's coming but the timing is a problem. And the second is, what's happening with the service money. The Congress has an ability

to act within 45 working days, I think. If you're interested in not having that social service money held up or you feel one way or another you might want to let the California delegation know that.

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: Isn't it also true that if they don't make a decision in 45 days it comes automatically?

JOAN BISSELL: Yes.

STEVE THOMPSON: I'm going to make a ruling from the Chair at this point. Some of the questions relate more than just to Marion Woods' testimony so I think I'm going to have representatives of the Department of Mental Health and EDD make their presentations, hold questions and then open questions to the entire panel. With that comment, I would ask the representatives of the Department of Mental Health to testify, Dr. James Barton, who also has been the director of a county program. He has knowledge of services at the local level along with Wilma O'Callaghan who's also to assist Dr. Barton.

DR. JAMES BARTON: I'm the Deputy Director of Mental Health for the State Department of Mental Health. I want to, first, give you a brief overview of the mental health programs that have been funded under this program. Through an inter-agency agreement that was signed last year between the Department of Mental Health and the Department of Social Services there was a transfer of 1.3 million dollars of the federal Indochinese refugee assistance program money to the Department to set up some mental health programs. These programs were to be designed specifically to aid people with emotional problems which might prevent them from securing or holding gainful employment. The purpose of this was really to address the exact issues that we're addressing today. The period of the agreement

was from October 1 of 1980 to September 30 of 1981 and we started the program in the middle of October, the first such program was funded by the end of November. Ten other agencies were funded so there's a total of 11 agencies that are funded for mental health programs throughout the State. They are in seven counties and those seven counties are San Francisco, Sacramento, Orange, San Diego, San Jose, Los Angeles and Alameda County. It's a unique program in some respects because not only is the program addressing itself to the needs of the mental health needs of Indochinese refugees, but it also is a training program to train Indochinese workers. As a result of that effort we've had some interesting results. Mr. Woods talked about the slow start, but in fact I think this was a fairly rapid start in terms of getting these programs off the ground within two months of getting the signing of the inter-agency agreement. Currently, we're serving about 2,800 people a month in these 11 programs and in the process of doing this we have, in fact, trained a large number of individuals to be mental health workers. Some of those trainees have moved out, which is again a unique feature of this program, into gainful employment in other mental health programs, so that the program we think has been quite successful. It has met many of the goals that were established and has been functioning the way it should. It functions not only in terms of dealing with emotional problems that might prevent people from getting jobs but is in fact a job training program in and of itself. I think the concern that we have is that on the priority list we're right below the cut-off point. When we became aware of this we did become quite concerned about the future of these programs and it seems at this point that we have a couple of choices. One of which

is to notify the projects that as of the fiscal year they will no longer be funded and that we will then make whatever efforts we can make to provide mental health services through the County programs. The other choice is that we will continue our negotiations and discussions with the Director of the Department of Social Services to discuss the setting of the priorities and to participate in attempting to maintain those programs which we feel are meeting the mandate of the budget language, which is really to help people become gainfully employed and to maintain their ability to get up to the level of the urban poor. That's my brief presentation. I will be available for questions later since Steve has indicated that he'd really like to have us hold the questions.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you Dr. Barton. Joan Bissell is the next person to present testimony. She represents the State Department of Employment Development and they will have a larger role than they've had in the past under the new language.

JOAN BISSELL: I'm here representing Douglas Patino, our Director. The principal points I wanted to underscore were first our interpretation of the budget act language. We see the language as telling EDD, the Employment Development Department that it will make a major commitment to serve refugees. Douglas Patino has been Director of EDD for a year. I think I can say in all honesty that he found there were client groups that deserved and needed more attention. He issued on January 9 what is called a field office directive, a directive to all of our field offices around the State entitled, "Employment Assistance to Refugees". In that, he indicated the philosophy the Department would be taking in improving it's services to refugees. I would like to very briefly highlight

a few of the points he made because I think they underscore the confusion which has arisen over the past several weeks. In the first instance, he did indeed emphasize the need for mental health services and health services. One sentence is telling of the philosophies that we plan to have, "Because of overcrowded unsanitary conditions and poor nutrition experienced prior to arriving in this country, many of the Indochinese refugees have health problems. Many of the recent arrivals need medical treatment before they are ready to be referred to work or training." He goes on "and in some considerable detail explains the responsibility which our field offices will have in coordinating with service providers, with voluntary resettlement agencies, with mutual assistance organizations, with county welfare departments in assuring that a full range of services are provided to refugees." Then he gives an entire list of all of the existing expertise and experience that should be drawn upon. There is an entire listing statewide of the agencies that our field office directors should be working with closely. Another point that I wanted to deal with, is the nature of the employment preparation program which we are to be implementing in two areas in the State. If we understood the mandate of the Legislature, there are to be two areas that want to participate in an employment program. We have been contacted by a number of areas that have indicated such an interest, those are being given full consideration by ourselves, and the Department of Social Services. DSS has made it extremely clear to us repeatedly, that one of their key priorities will be absolutely minimal disruption to existing service delivery systems. For example, given two counties that were served mutually within the Department of Social Services region, if that is not the routine way

that we deliver services the Department of Social Services has made it clear under this program, the original service delivery structure will be maintained. In terms of the emphasis of the employment preparation program, the intent language in the bill summarizes by saying, "the Legislature recognizes that most employable persons who receive public assistance would prefer to be self-supporting if offered the opportunity to do so. The emphasis of the employment preparation programs is first on assisting to obtain job placement." We find that there indeed are many high demand jobs available in the community but the problem is the linkage. We find employers repeatedly tell us they consider the Indochinese to be hardworking, they want them, the problem is to make the link, that's what we're responsible for under the employment preparation program. The next major thing that we're responsible for is coordination of a wide-range of local resources. There are federal dollars available to comprehensive employment and training acts, CETA, some of which we administer and we have used those dollars to develop programs for refugee clients. There are also over a billion dollars of local prime sponsors, (that's the entity that delivers CETA dollars statewide) available that can be used to provide employment and training opportunities for refugees. There are vocational education resources through adult education. There are child care facilities administered through the Department of Education. It is our responsibility under the Employment Preparation Program and as adapted in this instance, to meet the needs of refugees. We see precisely the same responsibilities incumbent on us to pull together all of those resources so that they do serve the needs of the client group. The other major emphasis that we see the program having in this instance is what we refer to

as a career upgrade component. One of the things we have repeatedly found is that a large majority of the refugees are very interested in going to college at the same time they are working. The principle we see here is one where an entry level position would not be a deadend job, we would work very closely with coordinating with continued education and training opportunities and a career matters so that there can be progression. Our Legislature has made it clear that it is the emphasis they want in the program. The California Work Site and Training Act as referred to as SWEDA is our state employment legislation. In our major pieces, the principle difference between that and the federal legislation is the emphasis on this continued career upgrade, continued opportunities for further advancement. There are two other elements that we see as unique in the program that we are going to be implementing pursuant to the Budget Act. One of those is linking of employment with needed services. We all have to deal with the reality of shrinking employment and social service resources. As such, what we see is opportunities in the job market and opportunities for career training which are linked with desperately needed services, for example health services, day care services, adult day care services for the older members of families. We see those being provided at the same time people are in jobs, which to say the refugees who are ready to enter the labor market would have job opportunities in health care, in day care, adult day care and so forth. We're going to be working to develop some model approaches. The last thing we see as our principle responsibility is what is referred to as information and technical assistance. What we see there is taking some of the model programs, many of which, I know you have been involved in developing related to English as a second language to bi-lingual training and integrating

those with employment training. What we find is that we really tend to have two separate systems, the vocational training system and the English as a second language, bi-lingual training system. Those must be integrated so that people are developing the vocational language skills that they need to get immediately, not just a job, but a quality job. We've spent many months in our department trying to prepare for what we consider one of our most important challenges. We will be fully open at every point to all the input and expertise that we can obtain from you and what I would like to do is send to each one of you a copy of the field office directive that was issued in January setting forth the philosophy that I was describing and also a description of the way we see the program being implemented. The latter will not be ready for a few more weeks because we are working closely with the Department of Social Services to be certain that the program builds upon all of those services that have been provided over the last several years and builds upon the proposals submitted in the request for proposal process. So to be vigorous in assuring that the service providers who were the first ones to offer services this year are the ones through whom employment is provided, will take us a few more weeks. We will keep you informed constantly.

STEVE THOMPSON: I saw Joe Diaz in the room somewhere, he is the Deputy Secretary of the Health and Welfare Agency. Joe, do you want to end with a brief comment? I know many of you are aware of what has been going on with the cap force in terms of C & C. Just to give you an idea of what is going on agency-wise, there are 600 programs in the Health and Welfare Agency that are all being reduced by 30 to 45%. Many, many departments are experiencing even greater cuts. What you can do today and tomorrow is to separate the issues of

priorities that were outlined by the State. I know Director Woods has been instrumental in commenting particularly on notations affecting his Department of Social Services. But just as his Department is being impacted today by Washington we also have the Employment Department, Health Services, Department of Rehabilitation, Mental Health, and on and on and on. It's important enough for you to consider where the total funding level will be 30 or 60 days from today. Please get a telegram out to the people you know in California that are delegates to the conference committee in Washington but also to the President because that's the bottom line. We're talking today about specific priorities in our State Budget but I'm looking at the long run. What will happen is the old wall program, because if one department is impacted on at the federal funding level you can bet your even dollar that impact hits across the line to other departments as well, Mental Health, Rehabilitation, Health Services, Employment Development. They're not independent items, they are all tagged in together and this time next year we prevail that there is going to be 30 to 60% cuts in many other areas. It's very important that you express your views and make them known to your federal delegation. I congratulate all the people involved because they have been working and putting out a massive effort trying to reconcile with diminishing resources and I think an example of this has been following very closely to what the Legislature has prescribed in it's language. If there are any difficulties I know that they are agreeable to your input and it's not set in stone but I think by all means you have to give them the value of your expertise and advice.

JO FREDERICKS: The focal point is that there might be a

misunderstanding about the money that's being held up in Washington. We say that there is 15.6 million dollars available this year for contracted services. We are saying that's only if the President releases the 35 million that is being held up right now. Does everyone understand that? We're not talking about next year RFP time, we're talking about the money that we would use to fund the proposals that we have in our office right now. Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: There's a representative of the Department of Health, Dr. Myers, would you come up and sit with us during the next phase. We have a long list of people who have asked to testify, some of whom have already made their statement. What I would like to do is to provide some definition to the rest of the testimony. As we go through the list I would hope that you would ask any of the people up here any technical or administrative questions related to the implementation plan that's been described previously. Michael Huynh has already testified from the Center for Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement. The first person is Delores Churchill from the Orange County Human Services Agency.

DELORES CHURCHILL: The wave of the refugees who are continuing to come, are coming with more health problems, and to disregard that is not making sense. It looks as if the money will not be well spent because there will be a duplication of employment services with no ultimate productivity with short-term employment. I guess there are all kinds of administrative kinds of questions. I have a concern, not that I disagree, Jo, with what you were saying. You were going to look at defining health related services. I'm just wondering if there is enough information that's really available to make those kinds of decisions. I had some concern as to how you're

going to be administratively making decisions. I am making a request that for areas like ourselves where public health services have been identified as the favorite spot to slash funds, it would be very helpful if you could send out to us the specifics that you're going to use in determining whether or not you're going to give any kind of health related funds, so that the local area can begin planning. You're basing a lot of this on available community resources and in the area of health community, resources are rapidly shrinking this year. We don't need the money; we need to do some planning. My third question is a result of your remark about some commitment that has already been made to EDD. Is EDD going to be funded a certain portion under the RFP system?

JOAN BISSELL: The specific activities which I referred to are presently being funded through our own resources. We administer the Governor's discretionary CETA 4% grant and we have begun the technical assistance activities. We began the planning for implementation and the other resources, which we presently are recipients of, are dollars that have been provided through last year's RFP process for demonstration programs.

STEVE THOMPSON: Joan, is the answer to her question that there hasn't been a funding decision yet?

JOAN BISSELL: We are very much in discussion right now. We have come to no decision yet.

STEVE THOMPSON: Mrs. Churchill, they haven't agreed on an amount of money.

SISTER WALSH: I'm Sister Sheila Walsh representing the California Catholic Conference and the California Conference of Charity Director. Many of you have already received the statement

that we officially sent to the Legislature on the budget control language. We were opposed to it and we continue to oppose it for the reasons that we mentioned. One of our big concerns is the Department of Mental Health and Department of Social Services regarding the flexibility of interpreting other services and that the prioritization does not eliminate mental health or social services adjustment. In addition to representing Catholic charities I am also a member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee, the Governor's Task Force and an elected representative of that body to the State Advisory Council. Both of those groups have also gone on record, although I'm not speaking for them, that urge that we go on record stating that we would want other services to be described in the budget control language including health, mental health, and social service adjustment as defined in the State Department of Social Services' regulations for the RFP's. Sometime last year in April we were asked by the Health and Welfare Agency, the Office of Refugee Affairs, to issue a statement for incorporation to the state master plan of refugees. In that statement we encouraged that the legislation enacted in 1980, SJR-24 -- No. 119, authored by Senator Roberti, be implemented which would establish, at the Governor's level, an officer of Commission and Refugee Affairs and designate it's director as Coordinator of Refugee Affairs. The reason I mention our concerns, is the high increase in administrative costs. When Marion Woods did his chart and presentation I didn't see anything in there describing the state administrative costs currently or projected for Department of Social Services. We're concerned with Employment Development and the additional state administrative costs and less money getting to the refugees. What we would like to ask the Legislature for is the

Health and Welfare Agency to monitor this in some way to keep the administrative costs down so that more of the limited funds could possibly get to the refugees. Another issue that we're concerned about is the definition of "arrival" and we would like this to be a very broad definition. I don't know if they do or do not have a definition of a new arrival and we'd also like consideration of those about or almost becoming time expired. When we talk about the definition of "time expired", those people that have been here for a while and working in vocational training, be considered in that definition. Some Catholic charity agencies would really like the interpretation of the budget control language to be that whichever counties are selected, those counties contract for services with refugees with private nonprofit agencies with proven track records in working with refugees. In the event there are not enough proposals from such qualified agencies that the Employment Development Department issue an RFP for services in the county selected.

STEVE THOMPSON: Did anyone want to respond to the questions and definitions that Sister Walsh made?

Sister Sheila we are currently polling as many of the providers as we can right now to ask them to assist in assigning the new arrivals and the time expired. Probably based on the availability of money we would have to do some prioritizing, for instance, if we're talking about time expired we may use those that have indeed been here in excess of 36 months. If we don't have enough money to do those, there might be 24 months or so, but we have been asking assistance from the people who serve the refugees to assist us in defining those terms.

STEVE THOMPSON: The next person to testify is Ky Xuan Nguyen

from the Indochinese Resettlement and Cultural Center in San Jose.

KY XUAN NGUYEN: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the Committee. I understand that there is limited funds and there is the budget control language which make it difficult to help refugees. We are aware of the lack of funds but we still have refugees to help and we would like that the assistance given them should not be limited to any area but what we would like to see it have those kind of services provided in a cost effective and efficient way. Therefore this is a statement which I'm going to read and this is a statement by the Indochinese Resettlement Cultural Center. "As one of the service providers in Santa Clara County and a member of the...(Inaudible)...Assistance in the Bay Area we wish to make the following statement. Owing to their cultural conditioning in the Chinese refugees both employment related and social services. Exclusion of either at the expense of the other would be a serious barrier to their self-support plan. (2) Service agencies...(Inaudible)...by Indochinese with proven success records should be given priority funding to serve Indochinese. The members and the services delivered by their multi-cultural, multi-lingual experience and dedicated personnel has proved to be most efficient and cost effective. (3) Indochinese service agencies with proven success records should be selected to provide both employment related and social services. Our process experiences indicate that the combination of these services minimizes the costs and maximizes the results." Now, I just heard that social adjustment would be out. There's no funding for that and so I think that it would be difficult for you to want to be self-sufficient and I would like to know the philosophy behind the shipping out of social adjustment.

I don't think it's a philosophy, it's a question of priorities and where money would be best spent. I think as Marion Woods indicated if there was enough money they would fund all of the 7 listed services. With less money and the direction of the Legislature, they felt that they had to cut it off at the fourth level of service, so it's not a question of denial, it's a question of what you can do with dollars.

And, I'd like to stress this point of owing to their cost or conditioning. Now, it is very hard for Indochinese to go alone and reach self-sufficiency without social adjustment services.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you very much. Could you leave a copy of your statement with the sergeant-at-arms right there? That would help in doing the transcript. The next person is Edward Kawazoe.

EDWARD KAWAZOE: You have my name correct. I'm a Project Director for a refugee project in San Jose, Santa Clara County, Asian Americans for Community Involvement and we also have a mental health project.

I would like some clarification on some of the comments Mr. Woods made. As I understood it there were 7 priority items; Mr. Woods had plans for 5 of those that he was going to submit to Secretary Obledo sometime this week. Just prior, it was my understanding that he indicated, in a given county regardless of what happens or it was his sense, that all 7 of those services would be funded in some fashion or would be provided in some fashion.

STEVE THOMPSON: I think he indicated they were now being so provided but under the priorities they would not longer be able to provide those that weren't on the cut-off list, but Jo Fredericks

can respond to that.

JO FREDERICKS: That's an accurate interpretation.

In other words Mental Health and all of the range of services that he identified are currently being provided but with the limited money next year, unless we get enough money to do all seven, only the first five would be funded.

STEVE THOMPSON: And my understanding is that if those 6 or 7 are not funded they would be somehow funded or hopefully funded or supported through local resources or another.

JO FREDERICKS: The idea was to the extent that there was money left over from the current contracts and because of late start-up time, etc., we have asked and received permission to extend those contracts in title, only if it's desired by the respective agencies. In the meantime to try to work with either the federal government or some of the local areas to indeed pick-up the -- to meet the need that is not being met because of the limited refugee resettlement dollars.

EDWARD KAWAZOE: I'm speaking for Santa Clara County by and large and if you look at Santa Clara County and the list of agencies for services for refugees, one of the things within our County, and I assume it's true through the State of California, is that the project that has social adjustment services really serve as a reservoir pool for a capable staff. When you look outside of those funded agencies, to let's say, the established public institutions by and large, they have very little if no linguistic capabilities. The triple effect of not funding social services is that you may have a lot of well intended people but you're not going to have people that have linguistic capabilities. I'm sure that can have

a very dramatic effect in Santa Clara County. One of the things that I'm troubled by is a matter of approach. At least in my point of view, we have been carried away by the thought of self-support and self-sufficiency. I think if we look at the refugee population that's coming into our County, we look at the appraisal of how long it will take them to become self-supporting and self-sufficient in a very full way. It's going to extend beyond 3 years. That's where we are. I think we all recognize we're in hard times. It's going to be very much harder for new refugees to make a transition into American life. I come from Santa Clara County, that is renowned for having a number of jobs that are quite attractive to refugees, especially the electronics business. This one emphasis on employment, although it's important, it somewhat presumes that there's a whole lot of jobs out there, a whole lot of quality jobs. If you go through Santa Clara County there are not a whole lot of quality jobs. I think that the urban pull will continue to have their problems, problems of new refugees will be multiplied. One of the novel kinds of things that some of us program directors think of from time to time is that it would seem that from the plan, this proportion amount of dollars are being directed toward time expired people. Would not that money be better spent in some other areas that are basic human services? I would consider them pre-employment kinds of services. I'm really speaking to the issue of people coming into the County that have no English capability, come from oral cultures, are totally unfamiliar with where they are, be it Santa Clara County, Napa County or Alaska. I think that if we're serious about it in a concrete way of self-sufficiency and self-support, I think we have to meet those primary human needs. I'm not even talking about

employment needs. Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: The next person to testify is Father Flecher Davis, who is the Vice Chairman, State Advisory Council for Refugees.

FATHER FLECHER DAVIS: Thank you, I want to offer my congratulations to Assemblyman Brown and his staff for having this hearing at all. Our concern has arisen out of several things. I'll limit my comments to two particular concerns. The first is the process of closed procedures by which the budget control language was agreed upon. I'm an interested citizen, I'm a service provider for refugees, I'm a VOLAG representative, I share a County forum, but I'm here today in the capacity of representing the Southern California Council of Churches and most importantly as representative of the State Advisory Council. I was not informed of these things in time to present any kind of meaningful testimony. Inter-agency agreements and Senate language proposals were entered into without meaningful participation from the field. Substitute changes were entered into in the State Department of Social Services plan without consultation and in violation of that document and there has been an exclusion until today of input from the field in this process. The second area of concern is in funding new agencies or players at this point which omits evaluation of the track record of the Department of Social Services. Specifically, obviously I'm speaking of the inclusion of the Employment Development Department in the budget control language. The performance of the Department of Social Services a year ago in providing refugee services was open to much question and the Department of Social Services did not have an established track record, but since then has come aboard very strongly and has provided excellent

leadership and technical assistance to service providers, public and private, throughout the State. The Employment Development Department by contrast, has a record of noncooperation in finding jobs for refugees or new Americans. As an example in Orange County, whose refugee form I share, there have been only two occasions in the past year when any representative of EDD has been present at a meeting of the forum or at a committee meeting of the forum. That's a record of non-participation. EDD has not had an effective or enviable record of job placement for refugees partly due to inappropriate regulations such as requiring refugees to sign-up with WIN and so forth. Another concern is the possible nullification of the RFP process which was carefully designed with broad citizen input this year so as to meet the needs effectively and so as to effectively to coordinate the delivery of services and then, of course, the final concern under that is the additional administrative costs that can be entered into by bringing a new agency or new department aboard for social services to refugees. Increasing administrative costs and decreasing services available to the clients. Therefore, I would come to my recommendations. First, keep the process open. I accept what Assemblyman Agnos said about having to live with the budget control language for this year, I don't think that will cripple us but I think that if the process is kept open I think that a continued effective delivery system can be maintained, such as allowing the State Department of Social Service's plan to be modified according with the regulations that are already established such as having the State Advisory Council provide input for that in a public manner so that there can continue to be coordination of service delivery. That really seems to be the key to cost delivery, coordination

of services so that there's not duplication and there are not wide gaps in the service delivery. The second recommendation is to retain the flexibility and interpretation of the budget control language so that there is enough discretion maintained in the administration of that budget control language to make it work. And the third area is, in light of the problems of priorities of services to various ethnic groups, it could be unevenly apportioned through the budget control language rather than simply looking to budgetary constraints. I hope those responsible for administering these programs will retain a focus also that the dollars will retain a focus on equity and justice in service delivery. Thank you very much.

STEVE COOK: We have prepared a statement that I would just like to read into the record if I may Gentlemen.

USCC welcomes this opportunity to provide input to the implementation of the budget control language for refugee services and trusts our contribution will be given due consideration. It must be stated that USCC has stood in strong opposition to the budget control language since it's inception. Our objection to the budget control language however is based specifically on the Employment Development's role in the language. It is our belief that the effectiveness will be to thrust EDD into a domain traditionally the responsibility of the voluntary agencies. As is very clear in the VOLAG contracts with the State Department, VOLAG's are contractual mandated to provide resettlement and related services to the refugees. These court services include employment services. The VOLAG's feel strongly that the provision of employment services are rightly and contractually within their service provision, jurisdiction and should so remain. The VOLAGs are confident that based on a 6 year successful

track record that they are best suited to provide basic resettlement services including employment. In their endeavor to involve State agencies in the world of the VOLAG contracts, it is confusing and wasteful of every diminishing refugee resettlement monies because:

(1) Refugees have always and will always relate primarily to their sponsoring VOLAG; (2) As VOLAGs have had successful job programs for six years we feel best qualified to continue providing employment services for refugees and; (3) With limited and diminishing funds we question the motive of involving EDD in a world in which it has demonstrated abject failure for 6 years. The voluntary agencies, of which USCC is the largest, should be identified as the case managers for the refugees. It must be recognized that only VOLAGs resettle refugees and public sector involvement needs to be in support of that effort. Therefore we strongly request that job development and job placement programs remain the responsibility of the VOLAGs through a subcontracting mechanism in those areas of the State where EDD will operate the employment preparation programs. In this era of limited financial resources funds should be placed with a task that can be accomplished in the most effective, efficient manner possible. It is USCC's firm conviction and policy that the most effective, efficient and rapid vehicle for refugee resettlement is via integration into the American work force as soon as possible. The USCC believes this policy is in the best interest of the refugee and crucial to the future of the refugee program in general. The American public and legislators cannot be expected to support the continuance of a major refugee program if it adds hundreds and thousands of refugees annually to the public welfare rosters, thus employments in the shortest possible period of time is the cornerstone of USCC's

resettlement policy. We regretfully acknowledge the passage of the budget control language and the fact that funds for social services will be reduced. Therefore we reluctantly support the items in the budget control language pertaining to a 35% cap on County Welfare Department spending and a priority placed on employment services. Services such as health, mental health and social adjustment services, as important as they are, must out of necessity take a lesser priority to employment services VOLAGs are contracted to provide.

STEVE THOMPSON: I think that you and Father Davis have made the same point that you really didn't object to the policy that was contained in the control act as much as to the manner in which you were anticipating it to be implemented. Is that a fair statement? Joan, would you like to respond to the last two people?

JOAN BISSELL: I think the observations that you made about the history needs some corrective action, which our director also perceives as a substantial issue, that is why in January he issued a directive list required for office directors to be attending the local forum meeting and I'm very disturbed to hear the observations that you both offered. We will immediately take some corrective action to be sure that things are not continuing to fall through the cracks. The subcontracting which you propose to do, intends to be doing that. The process is going to be one that is based on demonstrated effectiveness and building upon existing capabilities. I think the best thing for us to do at this point would be to make sure that we, as well as the Department of Social Services, intend an open process in the implementation. As such, I'd like to make a commitment and I'm sure that Jo, on behalf of Marion, would make the same commitment, that we schedule a time in the near future at which we run through

the proposed implementation before it is finalized and get your input at each step.

STEVE THOMPSON: The next person to speak is Terrence Wiley, from the Long Beach Department of Public Health.

TERRENCE WILEY: I've brought with me some prepared testimony that goes into much more detail than I'll be able to give here. I'll also alter some of the things I wanted to say in order to save time since some of the points have already been made. Basically, one of the issues that was raised earlier by Mr. Woods was regarding the fact that the criteria of heavily impacted areas was not used, rather priority of services provided was. However, the dilemma that the Long Beach Department of Public Health faces is that it is only one of two facilities within Los Angeles County that has the charge of providing health care for incoming refugees. Long Beach Health Department alone, has charge of about 10% of all the refugees in the State of California. Now we have received or presented a health services grant for direct health services or preventive disease control. However, if we are not supplemented in terms of health support service money we don't believe that those monies can be spent effectively because without adequate interpretation we are already extremely heavily impacted seeing 900 to 1000 refugees per month. We don't believe we can adequately deliver service without translation and support service to speed up that process. Some mention has been made of health education needs and other needs. Today I can also speak as an instructor of ESL at Cal State Long Beach. I know what it is to be inside an ESL classroom, what kinds of curriculum is there and I know that the self-sufficiency needs of refugees will not be met simply through ESL or vocational English

as a second language. We are seeing very serious problems just in terms of health education and social adjustment. Cases come in everyday regarding a refugee who has tried to bathe a baby in Tide or wash their hair with it. There is a tremendous need for social adjustment. Also, underscored earlier is the need for the issue of communicable diseases to be addressed. Basically, communicable diseases can be controlled if the money is there. There is no health problems as long as the money is there. If the money is not there, if it is pulled back, then I don't think we can make that guarantee. We're already using the support of U.S. Public Health Service and any additional cutback might make it more difficult for the Public Health Department to carryout -- the question of cutback is not a speculative one -- it's a real one, so that's no longer an issue, the issue that really would be helpful from our perspective is given that reality -- if you want to spend your money effectively to service refugees then if you have one program such as the preventive health program; don't pull away the link that makes it work. So, you are disagreeing with the priority that this contains in the budget control. I'm still uncertain as to what the priority on health is because there's been some ambiguity in the way it's been presented. That's all I have to say.

SOMBOUN SAYAFANE: Thank you ladies and gentlemen. I'm Project Director of the Lao Lane Sang Association. I'm here representing the Laotian people in Northern California. We understand that the budget for the next year is cut. This will increase the problems with the Laotian people because the lack of the culture and the background of the Laotain people is quite different from Vietnamese and Cambodia. We would like to say that these few -- that is in the long run to make that Laotian, to our denying of our financial

aid for the coming fiscal year. You are creating our need for the welfare over a longer period of time. Let our productivity and contributions to the U.S. economy increase. Anti-social behavior will increase. The problems in expenditures will raise lack of activity and anti-social behavior. Thank you very much.

STEVE THOMPSON: The next person to speak is Thai Nguyen Khoa from the University at Berkeley bi-lingual program.

THAI NGUYGEN KHOA: Thank you ladies and gentlemen. I should have one correction to make. I am a grad student at UC Berkeley. I am also a teacher at the Unified School District of Berkeley. I am very saddened today, to say the least, of the nature of the budget control language. I think that the priority area presented by Mr. Marion Woods is grossly misplaced because so many things that happened to the refugee on the flight to the, to the United States cannot be described. Words alone do not speak up for their traumas and their experiences that they have to undergo. I could give you all kinds of facts and figures but I do not prefer to do that now because I don't want to aggravate anymore of the pain and suffering that my people or the newly arrivals or the new Americans or whatever you want to call them, have undergone. I would like to point out one fact that neither employment nor the training nor the ESL program can be effectively carried out once the refugee is not given consideration to their mental problems. Should I recall to you a rape right in front of her husband with the children aged 3, 9, and 12. Should I recall to you the 14 year old girl with a crushed leg because of the high powers on the rush to look for gold and other valuables would repeatedly take to the -- and -- more than 20 some men. Should I also recall to you a mother who has to witness the drowning of her

husband as he is pushed overboard by Thai pirates also has to watch her 2 year old son die in her arms because she is running out of milk or shall I tell you of a woman who is herself raped more than a dozen times and the sole survivor out of 18 companions in her boat. I myself witnessed 4 of my students burst into tears when they were asked by a Berkeley school counselor how come they did not put their mother's name down and you know what happened to the mother. She is no longer alive today. I also want to tell you that 3 of these students could not gain employment because they were so disturbed, they also dropped out of the ESL program. I want to tell you of the percentage, which 92% of the Indochinese students who fail the written part of the senior test, the high school proficiency test they started 4 years ago, because they are so saddened with all their problems and the traumas in their escape to America. I would like to impress Miss Joan Bissell, representative of EDD, it pains me that you can search all you want to meet and to find the answer for the biggest challenge but you will not find it by giving priority to just health problems. What is health, can a person be really healthy with a disfunctional mind? Do you know what the kind of scar that would meet these kind of people in a new life in the so-called promised land if their psychological and mental problems are not attended to? With that I would like to see the priority areas to be reconsidered that mental health should be made the number one priority because without it the ESL nor any job related endeavors cannot be attained. Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: The next person to testify is Chanthan Choa with the Indochinese Service Center in San Diego.

KAREN SONODA: Steve, I'd like to say something first. I

want to thank you for coming up and sharing with us and I want to let you know that on behalf of the Speaker that your words are heard and they are appreciated and I agree with you about what you've said. I think the cut off points that we're talking about are arbitrary. It's like saying that we're only going to have 2/3's of a human being. I'm not promising any particular thing but I know jobs are important to people, I know ESL is important to people but you just can't take part of a human being and say this is only part of a wage earner which is the philosophy I see coming down here. You have to have an entire human being with all of the components, the health needs, the emotional needs, everything else. It may not happen here today but we will see it happen. I do promise you that. In some form it will happen.

BOK LIM KIM: My name is Bok Lim Kim. I am the Director of the Indochinese Center in San Diego and here with me is Mr. Chantan Choa who is the supervisor of the same agency. Today, however, we are here with our own time and private funds. Our agency services our new arrivals within 90 days of their arrival in San Diego. We provide health related, mental health and social adjustment and after the very moving testimony I don't think I need to say anything about the issues and problems that we're talking about. I'll simply make some recommendation statements about this and Mr. Choa will basically dictate the illustration as to support the point. I think we have heard and I think we are convinced the problems and needs of the refugees are experienced by everyone with the family members. They have the same need for service although it may vary according to the age and the depressions and the problems and heartaches experienced. As I recall last year, this country had a White House conference and

everybody was convinced that the family had to be strengthened. That was the cornerstone of this country. Now I think the individualized approach they are proposing is rather shortsighted and not cost effective. When one member of the family is depressed or debilitated, I don't think the wage earner could concentrate on ESL or employment. The point that I want to make, is since our needs are more fragmented, I am proposing that we have some essential service available and that service be provided in a coordinated manner. I would like to have Mr. Choa to present the case of our own service case load to illustrate this point.

CHANTHAN CHOA: Thank you. I like to prove that the budget control language alone will not work...the case is a Cambodian family -- 5 children. They've been in San Diego about 7 months...They get the cash assistance from welfare, therefore the husband had to go to employment and ESL classes. One day when the husband was in school one of the children got burned and the mother, who is also pregnant, didn't know what to do. She just cried, she was homebound, and she spoke no English. She cried and ran to these American neighbors, tried to ask for help, but the American neighbor didn't know what was going on. She calmed down and got a hold of my agency and talked to me asking to find out what's going on. After I talked to her she couldn't even explain to me what's happening in her own language. I had to calm her down over the phone before I could find out about the incident. I arranged to have an ambulance to take her and the kid to the hospital and take one of my workers to the hospital for translation. The husband when he got back home didn't see his wife except for 4 children crying with the neighbor who was around to watch them. They can't even communicate even though he's been in

school a few months. He still can't understand why his wife is not there and why his child is not there. With anxiety and frustration he didn't go to school for 5 days. He was so confused, the school called my agency again and we have contacted the school to do the follow-up. I make home visits and try to provide some counseling support or ideas, opinions and then he arranges with one of my case workers to provide transportation for his wife and the children to the hospital for treatment. After that we also have some of our workers go to the house to explain about how to use the phone and what to do in case of an emergency. Then the husband feels better, more secure and comfortable about our support services that he can go back to school and feel that our agency can provide the support the...instructor has related translation, interpretation, transportation to his wife and children at home. This is just one of the cases that we have in our agency in San Diego County. I present this case just to prove that we need more support instead of just employment alone, we need help, we need home management, we need mental health and social adjustment. In conclusion on behalf of all Cambodian members in the San Diego County, I recommend that there must be health related social adjustment mental health and services which will enable refugees to make maximum use of employment and ESL services. These services should be funded in areas wherever there is a concentration of refugees. The problem of social service can take a leadership role in an integrated service for refugees which would support their part of refugee funding to become economically and social self-sufficient

Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. If you have any written testimony, if they would leave it with the sergeant it would help.

The next witness is Xuyen Le, from the Vietnamese Community in Sacramento. The next witness is Nilda Rimonte from the Center for the Pacific Family in Los Angeles. She had to leave too. The next witness is Daniel Le, the Director of the Indochinese Mental Health Clinic in Los Angeles County.

DANIEL LE: I'm a Vietnamese refugee. I have the Chinese mental health clinic of the Department of Mental Health. In my working with the refugees in the last 2 years it is my experience that the mental health needs of the refugees are increasing and becoming more critical. I don't want to repeat what the other speakers have mentioned to you but I believe that we are just beginning to see the tip of the iceberg in regard to the mental illness and the social issue of refugees. The refugees are suffering from cultural shock, a delayed mental depression reaction. (Inaudible, defective tape)

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. The next witness is Royal Morales, who is the Project Director of the Asian American Referral Mental Health Training Program in Los Angeles.

ROYAL MORALES: I have a written statement (see Attached) so I will not go into it, I will just deliver it. But I want to make a few points in regard to mental health on what has been said by the gentleman from Berkeley and Mr. Daniel Le and his son Diego... (Inaudible)...and also a little bit about the battered women. (Inaudible)...couldn't make it but she wants to express her interest in the relationship to services to children and family because that is their concentration. Based on documented needs and experiences of our project, there are five points that I want to add to what has been said.

Indeed, there is a need for trained and sensitive Southeast

Asian mental health workers, professionals and non-professionals. I think it was indicated by the Doctor from the Department, that in the projects that they had funded, they've shown the success as well as the sensitivity, of these workers who have been trained through these 11 projects in California. Which leads to the second point, that if you eliminate mental health, and I think Dr. Le addressed that, you would aggravate the current situation of the lack of funding of the (Inaudible) County, as well as the base programs that are funded through the State system. Then the question is, what is your transition? What is your plan? What is your direction to get rid of 11 programs with 2,800 a month being served by this program. And that would be the challenge that I want to give to the panel here and whoever is making the transition. When you eliminate the 11 programs, the County will then have to pick up the tab or the City or whoever. That's the question and I don't know the answer. You will have to answer that. There is a need for adequate training for 12 - 18 months. That is the time needed to get the qualified, culturally sensitive mental health workers and social workers to get into the system and help out. The training of the graduate students and our trainees that went through some of these programs have successfully shown that most of them are now qualified, employed, taxpayers and contributing to society in itself. We also need to support some of the MAA's role in the provision of services. Let me just say that refugees have as much right to quality mental health as well as quality training in providing services.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. I think I'd like to ask Dr. Barton to briefly respond to your query; what are the options available assuming all 10 programs were unfunded. And perhaps you

might comment on the capacity of the Short-Doyle system to absorb those in a down funding year.

DR. BARTON: I think that very important question is one of the reasons that we are here today. I don't want to deceive anybody by saying that we have a plan, because we don't. I think that we're in the process of continuing to negotiate with the Department of Social Services around the funding of these projects. As I indicated when I made my remarks earlier, that if that is not a possibility then we are going to have to look at what the other options are. And, frankly, we did about as well in the budget this year as anybody did, which was terribly. And, so, there aren't going to be a lot of additional resources. However, I think that what will be lost, even if we say the Short-Doyle system has the capacity to absorb these people, what will be lost is the special nature of the project. That is, these projects have been training Indochinese, Vietnamese mental health workers to work with their own people. There aren't very many Short-Doyle programs in this State that have that capacity. It's not just the language barrier; it's the cultural barrier. And, somehow or other, that is an important dimension that's going to be lost. Ninety days is not a lot of time to do the planning for transition into a system that is already overburdened and has a problem in terms of responding to special population. One of the reasons we have a section to deal with special populations and programs is because we recognize that there are special needs and that they cannot be met by the mainstream mental health programs. If this goes, it's going to create a real strain on the system and, I think, a strain on the people who will not be getting the services.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. The next witness is Vinh Luu

from the Interfaith Service Bureau. Then following him would be Nguyen Quyen from the Indochinese Psychosocial Counseling Program.

NGUYEN QUYEN: My name is Nguyen Quyen from Indochinese Psychosocial Counseling Program and I am here again to put my emphasis on the need for mental health services among the Indochinese refugees. After hearing the stories told by the young man about the seven attacks by the sea pirates to the guns of Thailand on the boat people, I think, ladies and gentlemen, that you are convinced there is a real need of...(Inaudible)...and counseling service among the refugees. Besides the trauma of escape endured by the majority of Indochinese refugees resettling in this country, the awesome expense, the long confinement in squalid refugee camps in Southeast Asia, and now, in their everyday life activity, we confront patients with an alien culture and society. This is a long and very mental fact. Combine it with the separation from family, loss of one's own natural resource support, the feelings of deep personal frustration, helplessness and general depression. Furthermore, based on many cases handled by our counselors, there is an increasing incidence of serious family problems caused by depression, stresses accompanying the mental ailment, sets of changes in terms of national conflict, and, of course, lack of language skills. These problems are compounded with the feeling of loneliness and homesickness. So, our program has been in operation only since the beginning of the year. Our program is a small program and relatively new. And, I hope you, ladies and gentlemen, will not kill our program and I strongly urge you to continue funding for our mental health services which are vital for Indochinese refugees in their effort to be self-sufficient. And, I hope,...(Inaudible) ...mental health,...(Inaudible)...health and social service will be

refunded. Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. The next witness is William Vitiello, from the Linda Vista Health Care Center in San Diego.

WILLIAM VITIELLO: Hello. I am William Vitiello. I am representing the Linda Vista Health Care Center. I am a psychiatric social worker and I am involved in the training of Southeast Asian Mental Health Counselors. I have a brief statement and I have a couple of concerns.

Our agency sees approximately 200 clients per month who are experiencing depression, anxiety, isolation, marital and familial dysfunction, psychosomatic illnesses, psychotic reactions and suicidal gestures. Because we interpret mental health needs broadly, we not only provide direct mental health services which are culturally relevant; we also provide consultation and cultural awareness presentations to health care services as well as education services to the Southeast Asian community to recognize, treat, and make use of available services. We have developed programs to preserve the art forms of the distinct cultures which provide necessary socialization. We further target our services to meet the mental health needs of the aged through sponsoring senior citizen groups. And at the same time, take a preventive stance in focusing on problems of youth. In response, we have earned the endorsement of the mutual assistance associations. The advantages of mental health problems such as ours are that they prepare an individual to undertake language and employment training programs. They reduce costly psychiatric hospitalization. They also reduce the misuse of physical health care services, and in effect, reduce welfare costs. It is common knowledge to those of us here that the mental health needs of the

individuals must be met before they can utilize language and employment training programs. Because the budget control language has omitted mental health services, this does not mean that the mental health needs of Southeast Asians do not exist. We urge your support in appropriating funds for these necessary services. To do otherwise would be irresponsible, not only in terms of human rights, but also movement away from the American tradition of taking care of its new arrivals as well as being fiscally irresponsible in the sense of creating more welfare costs in the future. I have a couple of concerns which I would like to address to the representatives of the Department of Social Services and Mental Health.

It seems to be that as we come up for renewal funding, that the budget control language has been imposed after the fact that these renewals have been written. I wonder if you see some process to deal with that?

Secondly, as the question has been raised about the Short-Doyle system's capability of meeting the mental health needs of the Southeast Asian refugees, because of overall cutbacks I question that system's ability to absorb the trained mental health counselors that has been done.

Lastly, I ask what do you need from us in the negotiation process between the two departments to ensure that mental health services are funded?

JOAN BISSELL: The request for proposal process starts usually in February or March with the drafting of what the priorities are going to be for the following year. The budget control language was passed in late June. The request for proposal was out on the streets and proposals were in by the time the budget control language

was, indeed, passed. However, because we did know that there were discussions about the priority being employment and ESL, we put in a cover letter, as well as let the State Forum know and the Citizens Advisory Committee, State Advisory Committee as well as the County Welfare Director's Association. All of those organizations knew that, indeed, the budget control language was being considered. The only thing that we could do in order to make sure the proposals did in fact come in on time, recognizing our time frame, was to put a clause in the cover letter saying you need to be aware the Legislature is considering putting priorities on the social services money for refugees, and that priority would be employment and I believe it said employment and ESL. Doug, do you remember?

It was in the RP as well as in the cover letter.

Yeah. So what we did was try to let people know that this was being considered without knowledge of whether or not it was going to pass.

DOUG: The RFP investigation of self-sufficiency has a broader pattern than does employment.

JOAN BISSELL: That's right.

DR. BARTON: I want to make a couple of comments. One, your Center is very well known and considered to be an excellent Center and I understand that you're about to be visited by the Federal Government because your Center has been so successful in accomplishing some of these objectives in terms of helping people become better able to seek work. You ought to be commended for the excellent job that you and many of the other programs are doing. I think I share with you some of your concerns about the ability of the Short-Doyle programs to deal with this special population. And

I think it is complicated because no matter how many people we train to become mental health workers, if they can't get hired within counties that are laying off people and since laying off lists work so that the last hired are the first fired, it becomes very difficult to provide this kind of quality service to this population. So that you're going to be thrown into a system where there are mental health services available but, in fact, they may not be utilized because of the language and cultural barriers. In terms of what you can do to help in the process, I really see part of the process being to convince people that the priority must include the priority for mental health services because they are directly job related. What you're saying is we're going to take that group of people who don't have any mental health problems and don't have any physical problems, and we're going to concentrate our efforts on that group of the population and we can let all the rest of this population go. But, I would contend that it is very difficult, first of all, to decide who those folks are and I would suspect that the incidence of anxiety and emotional disturbance at various points during this adjustment period to be very high among all of these people. I don't think it is a small percentage. So that, to ignore the real mental health needs and health needs is really, as somebody suggested, that we're only looking at a part of the person and that is going to result in a partial success.

WILLIAM VITIELLO: I wonder what you see as the time frame for the negotiations between Social Services and Mental Health and when we might expect some news.

DR. BARTON: Well, it will definitely be before September but I think it's got to be before that because if, in fact, the

current decision which is to not fund these programs is a final decision then we've got to have that 90 day period of time to work with programs toward other options and other possibilities. Dr. Loeb has written a letter to Marion Woods suggesting that they get together as soon as possible to discuss some of these issues and I think that will take place in the very near future. Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: The next witness is Antonino Catanzaro from the UC San Diego University Hospital.

ANTONINO CATANZANO: (see Attached) I have to commend you on pronouncing the more traditional minority groups better than you've been doing with the Indochinese. I really want to echo the complaint about the RFP and even though that escape clause is true, what we're witnessing today is really turning the whole thing around and I don't think that if you read the RFP objectively that you could come up with the kind of picture we're facing today. I realize that, more than likely, that the Department of Social Services didn't really realize that either, so I don't point a finger at the Department of Social Services but rather the whole system. We keep talking about the tracking, the timing, and how long it takes to plan things in and the same thing is true of the agencies. I'm sure you're well aware of that. But here we are at the 11th hour wondering about which programs are going to be funded and which are not going to be funded and to what level; and we're almost to the point where we've a lot of employees out giving their 30 days notice, and we still really don't know. I realize it is the whole State process. it's not the Department of Social Services but it really is rather ridiculous.

As I said, my original introduction was going to be that

I represent...I am the Director for the Center for Indochinese Health Education from UCSD but my constituency is really a good deal broader. It's the UCSD Medical Center and the health care system in San Diego. I really started my action in this area with the Lung Association of California in the TB Committee. And I think that some of the experiences that I've had over the past couple of years in that area are very germane to this problem. The aura of concerns and fears about tuberculosis in the Indochinese refugees were with us actually before the Indochinese came. And that's when I began to get involved in what could we do to ensure that our TB control program could deal with the problem. And it very quickly became apparent that you couldn't really focus on TB control; that there are many interrelated problems that cannot be addressed by addressing one problem alone. I think the same thing is true when we are addressing the issue that is before us now and that is employment. All of us want to foster the new Americans entering the job market but the question is how can they do it or how can we help them do it. I don't think we can do it by simply putting on job training programs and I am very pleased that Jo Fredericks made the comment that screening programs will be part of the plans for the next year and I am very pleased about the comments about linkage with the existing system. If those things can in fact be implemented, then I think we'll be in good shape. Frankly, I have some real concerns because of the magnitude of the problem. At the Center we did a study of 500 refugees within a month of when they arrived in San Diego. We found that 47% had positive tuberculin skin tests, indicating they had the germs that caused tuberculosis. Fourteen percent had abnormal chest X-rays,

62% had intestinal parasites, 33% had anemia, 14% had the hepatitis virus, 11% were positive for VDIL, suggesting they probably had a syphilitic infection and psychological and mental problems were merely universal. This degree of pathology, I have never experienced in my life as a physician, none of the health care systems have. I have never read a paper anywhere that described this incidence of pathology in any group and now we have it in San Diego. And we have it, for that matter, up and down the State. The health care system has to deal with that fact that we have a population in our environment which has a lot of diseases. Not only that, but now you're going to be asking them to forget about all that; learn how to speak English and get to work and I don't think it's possible. I don't think it's humanly possible. So while I fully endorse the idea of job training, I think that health has to be first. It has to be the first priority. It is my opinion that health, or physical and mental health have to be first. You can't ask people, where 1/3 of them are anemic for example, to sit and listen and learn English. They can't do it. It's not humanly possible. Hopefully, the screening program which Jo Fredericks has alluded to will identify those people who will get them to treatment centers. But I'm at the treatment center and I don't know if I can treat them. I really don't know. Beverlee Myers told us Medi-Cal, which is where most of these people get their funding from, will pay for the tests. How do I decide what tests to do other than by asking them various questions, and if I can't speak to them I guess I could order a whole bunch of tests but everybody knows that's very expensive. Besides which, then I've got to give them medication and how do I do that. Or I could put them in the hospital and that way the nurses could administer

by injections. I don't think they want to do that. The other problem I have a great deal of concern about, is what do we do in a hospital when we have, for example, someone who is involved with a job training program who develops an illness and who comes in and has a translator at the same time someone else comes in and is bleeding and they're not involved in the employment training program. Do we say, well we can't ask them any questions because this translator is working in this program and never mind that. I know that you're not going to ask us to do this but on a broader basis, how are we going to function? How can we function without the support services that the Department of Social Services has been funding this past year. It's only been \$2.4 million and I, frankly, am utterly amazed at how much good it has done. To think of doing without it, I don't know how I can practice medicine under those circumstances. I realize that the problem is that there is difficulty with developing an integrated approach that addresses the significant health problems, the resettlement problems, and the preventive health program and the fact that we keep trying to shift the responsibilities and the funding really between the local, the State and the Federal jurisdictions. Now we're at the State and we're complaining to you and I know that much of the problem is not of your making but we have to deal with it at the local level and when this funding disappears or is markedly reduced, I really don't know how we're going to do it and I have to pass the buck back to you as the people who run the State. How are we going to do it?

MASAKO DOLAN: I am very disturbed about your statistics because I think it really reflects a breakdown in terms of who was supposed to come into this country and the various roles that the

Federal Government is supposed to do in terms of both protecting the refugees and the citizen population. Now when the Refugee Act was reconsidered, we asked very strongly in terms of the State Legislature to set aside money for counties and for public health systems so people could be screened. I think that what you described ...you know all the problems that have been described here...you have passed the buck in terms of the allocations that the State is trying to figure out what are the priorities. I think those statistics that you have developed need to be disseminated at the federal level because I think it's a real breakdown. The Department of State makes the contracts, is supposed to do the screening and...you're right. We're all subject to that failure of that system.

ANTONINO CATANZANO: The data that I gave was developed in San Diego but the Center for Disease Control for the Federal Government has been developing data which is not at all dissimilar to what we've been doing.

DELORES CHURCHILL: Our agency has provided the three services; Social Services, Public Health Services, and Mental Health Services. So that the thought of looking in a total block, rather than kind of separating it out, doing that we basically support the priority for employment services. What we really do not support, and we have difficulty with, is the omission or perhaps the ambiguity after hearing today's remarks. Maybe a better word is the ambiguity of the language. If indeed the funds are limited, it makes more sense to us that those priorities are put in right after the employment. Masako in her earlier statements of this morning talked about differing characteristics of the requisite...(Inaudible)...

They are causing more problems, more health problems, and

to disregard that does not make any sense. It looks as if the money will not be well spent because there will be...(Inaudible).

PHIANE SAYARAD: ...(Inaudible)...ESL and most of our (Inaudible) only receive an average of three months treatment so I hope -- this is just statistics but I don't want to become emotional because I know that mental health services are really important. We're talking about the human suffering. If you want to put an emphasis on employment, that's fine. I do not have anything to put (Inaudible) about that. But if you are talking about a person who just came out from all the trauma, if lives have perished as with the Boat people, it's like not giving water to a person in the desert, but giving him a \$1 million job. But they wouldn't accept it because what they need is something to satisfy their suffering. So, I do not have anything against employment but I think that right now it is not appropriate to put all the money to employment. Thank you very much.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. The next person to testify is Hantho Touneh, Special Project Officer in the Governor's Office. Then, Christopher Brown from the Santa Clara County Public Health Department.

CHRISTOPHER BROWN: I have no prepared statement at this time. I would only like to indicate that Santa Clara County will have its number one priority to be health related services in the administration of this refugee resettlement program in Santa Clara County in the next fiscal year, and that we have successfully integrated the preventive health program with our refugee resettlement funds and hope to continue to do so in the future fiscal year.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. You've been busy in your

health department down there in the last few days. The next person to testify is Beyene Hegewo. The next person to testify is Roger Hoffman. He was here earlier and left. Nancy Farwell. Shelly Rodgers. Sister Sheila Walsh has already testified. Audrey Doughty with the International Institute in San Francisco.

AUDREY DOUGHTY: ...(Inaudible)...in the interest of your mental health but there are points that haven't been made I think...

STEVE THOMPSON: Actually, the physical health.

AUDREY DOUGHTY: Physical and mental. (The polling that was done yesterday to determine the)... (see Attached). Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. The next person to testify is Soc Hua Mu.

SOC HUA MU: Thank you. I am here to speak as a refugee and as a woman, and I can't see you so I'm going to have...(Inaudible). What I was going to say has already been covered by my colleague from San Francisco, Cathleen and Cathy Cox so I won't say it again, but I'm left with a question for all of us. Do we not want to assist refugee women, refugee children and elderly refugee because they are not the cream of the crop? One last comment.

As far as I am concerned, the priority services set up in the language was not set up by someone who knows anything about a refugee family. Thank you. (Applause)

STEVE THOMPSON: Actually, the whole legislative process makes decisions on that basis. Don't feel you're being singled out. The next person to testify is Van Hoa Chang from the Chinese Indochina Benevolent Association again in San Francisco.

VAN HOA CHANG: Ladies and gentlemen. My name is Hoa Van Chang. I am the Chairman of the Chinese Indochinese Benevolent

Association. (The testimony of Mr. Chang is inaudible, please see Attached testimony).

STEVE THOMPSON: Mr. Chang, could you leave your testimony with the Sergeant. Is that possible? Thank you very much. The next person to testify is Michael Huyuh.

MICHAEL HUYUH: What needs to be said my brothers and sisters already said it all. They did so well and it was so true. I felt deep respect for you. What I dare to do today is to beg you to consider this. It's true, maybe what you should do right now is to conduct research to see what services the refugees need, what services they have to go through before they seek employment services, and develop a formula from there. And then use that formula to distribute the funding. I think that is the fairest way and I hope you will consider that. Thank you very much.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. Tan Nguyen from the Asian Community Mental Health Service in Oakland.

TAN NGUYEN: I have already testified.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. Frank H. Winston, Vietnamese Association of the Friendship Mutual Assistance in San Francisco.

FRANK WINSTON: Mr. Chairman, we would have a refugee presenting this testimony but unfortunately our refugee personnel are all either employed or working on projects and I don't think Jo Fredericks and the auditors would favorably view their coming up here on State time. I am the Planning and Development Director of the organization. Like Soc Hua Mu, I have great respect for Vietnamese ladies. I'm married to one. But I would like to toss a couple of things out for your organization. Michael suggests research to find out the services refugees need. I might suggest

that the Office of the Secretary of HHS in January of 1981, recognized this need, also, and went to the two most populace counties in California for the refugee point of view, Orange and Los Angeles, to conduct an in-depth service delivery assessment. I was a little bit shocked when Mr. Wood presented some of his figures a short while ago. Number 1: I was very pleased upon seeing a 2,400...I wasn't pleased to see how many of the 2,400 refugees are being put to work by training programs in California during this fiscal year. However, I was rather pleased to realize that our project achieved of the Vietnamese Association of Friendship and Mutual Assistance in only the first 9 months of the fiscal year had contributed 5% of that quota. It may be there are only 20 vocational training projects going in the State at the present time, but of a quota of 100 for the entire fiscal year, we had already completed 120 successful job placements. I question the most important thing below social services, being employment services. I question it because to quote from the Los Angeles Report that was submitted to the Secretary, the problem does not appear, we're referring now in Los Angeles County, to groups being placed in employment. Nearly all of the refugees who had indicated it was helpful or positive. However, counseling programs probably play a marginal role in the process of getting jobs for refugees when compared to the major variables of English language facility and training for the job slots. The language in the Orange County report was a little bit stronger when we got into this question. I quote from it first, "To the extent that the refugees are not trained in job skills, they will remain, in many cases, on public assistance programs such as general relief, rent subsidy, food stamps, etc. If trained and provided with language skills, however."

Now notice that's "trained and provided with language skills, however they can be integrated into existing labor markets and reduce their dependence on public programs." That quote was coming from one member of the Board of Supervisors in Orange County who had spent considerable time researching refugee programs.

Another section of the report: "In terms of the priority of factors that lead to self-sufficiency, the following was clear cut and agreed to by all respondents. (1) Mastery of the English language; (2) A level of vocational skill; (3) Availability of jobs; and (4) The accessibility of jobs and adequacy of transportation." Once again, English and job training. I'm wondering if these priorities that we were looking at a few moments ago, were realigned a little bit and the question of employment services was dropped down, if we couldn't get closer to taking care of the entire person. If we couldn't get mental health in, if we couldn't get a better health screening program in. Going a step further, the same report. "More emphasis should be given to combining English training with job training, or by gearing the English training more specifically to words and phrases needed on the job. Some felt that this would hasten entry to jobs and also provide motivation to some refugees to learn faster." We have found this is very true in our program where a refugee will spend 1 - 2 hours learning a job skill and 1 - 2 additional hours then in vocational English; going back for the third hour or second and third hour in the job skill and then back for more English to round out the 6 hour day and it may be everyday English at that point. We try to divide it 2/3 vocational English and 1/3 everyday English. There's just one more point that was made in this report. How effective are job counseling programs?

"The counseling tended to be either assistance in job placement or instruction in work habits -- punctuality, employment expectations, etc. And there was no evidence of placement in our sample." Now, they're talking about a sample taken in Orange County and this was not taken by an organization that decided to go in and look at something but rather by a skilled service delivery assessment team. They then talked with Orange County government..."The County feels that the Indochinese are more aggressively seeking vocational training compared to other low-income minority groups." They want the vocational training; they want the vocational English. I think in view of the fact that it is a desire we should look possibly at a realignment of the first 4 priorities listed by Mr. Wood and see if at that point, we can't get a more integrated, overall program worked up that will take care of the mental health problems; that will take care of a little bit more of the orientation program and at the same time, place the employment services in their perspective. There is a structure in most vocational training programs today; there is a structure in many of the English second language programs that do not offer vocational training for job placement. I'm wondering if we aren't creating now another infrastructure when we look at something like the separate employment services operation within an agency that will do nothing but employment services, as has been suggested for example in the San Francisco area. If we're going to see that, aren't we going to dilute the effectivity of some of the current training programs; aren't we going to dilute the effectivity of some of the English programs because it will take away under current programs or current plans being discussed, the opportunity for placement to take place at the local level.

Just as one last point. They refer to new arrivals receiving high priority immediately after time expired refugees. My question is: Is a refugee within his first year in this country considered a recent arrival? If he is not, if you are saying people immediately arriving should get priority then it is going to be a waste. The average refugee arriving today needs to receive a minimum of 6 months of English training before he is ready for any meaningful vocational training. Once that 6 months is received, then meaningful vocational training can be given with vocational English. But if you're saying by a recently arrived refugee, you want somebody fresh off the boat to go into a job or into a vocational training program, all you're going to do is create more frustration and more need for mental health programs, quite frankly. I want to thank the Speaker for setting this program up. It's refreshing to see that the body politic is beginning to recognize that there are going to be refugee voters in the very near future and a heck of a lot of them by 1986. Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: Well, that wasn't really the motivation for today's meeting. I think that exhausts the names that were on the witness list. Is there anybody in the audience that wants to add anything?

VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: My name is (Inaudible)...I (Inaudible) ...of Northern California...(Inaudible) Oakland this year. And I also got involved in mental health programs in Oakland. I am concerned that the mental health program and social services are being cut off. I am concerned because I work with my people and live with them everyday that they have suffered with cultural and social adjustments, social...(Inaudible). I am sure that my people are not liars (Inaudible)

They sit up in their theatre class for 1-2 years. And they get nothing. They even drop out of the class, refuse to look for job and refuse to re-register for a class. They just walk around and play around. I think that ...(Inaudible)...to maintain the mental health services to provide ...(Inaudible)...I hope that you will work through the ESL class, through the job training program and how to handle a job, they look at you. Everybody talk and I think... (Inaudible)...desire to thank you that...(Inaudible)...half hour everyday. Thank you.

STEVE THOMPSON: Thank you. I think I would like to conclude at this point, and I would like to make a couple of comments. Today's hearing wasn't called simply to allow people to air their grievances. It was also intended to learn more about a problem that the State is going to have to take increasing responsibility for because of the lack of federal funding this year and next.

The issues that were discussed today, in my opinion, center around three. With declining resources, what are the proper priorities, what are the effective uses of those resources? The Senate language was not intended to be punitive, to exclude services to the inclusion of others, but in an era of declining resources, was intended to place emphasis on those resources that were thought to be those that would be most effective in relieving dependence on State and local revenue. Whether that was a good decision or not is a matter of speculation. Even within that language, and this has been mentioned by a number of the witnesses, there is a great deal of flexibility as to how the emphasis on employment priorities can be implemented. I think that within that language the comments and the feelings of perhaps the priorities being misplaced could be

realigned. The administrative decisions on priorities are not yet in concrete and I think that at least the Speaker of the Assembly intends to involve himself further in how those priorities are established and administered.

Lastly, the Legislature comes back into session on the 10th of August. If, through the processes of working with the members of the administration there is continuing conflict in the conflict, you must understand it is conflict that will take place in a reduced dollar area, so that the Legislature is going to be very hard pressed to find great new amounts of State money. All of you have read and in fact most of you have worked in programs with the area of diminishing resources becoming quite real. Nonetheless, there is an opportunity for legislative redress and if that opportunity were necessary to be exercised, it would be exercised in the form of a bill in the 6 week session between the 10th of August and the middle of September. Those of us who are representing both the Speaker and Mr. Agnos intend to pursue these issues and be prepared to respond legislatively if required and I really say if required, because I'm not sure that within the language we have as large a problem perhaps as the perception, but all of you should be in touch with Karen and Pam, Pam is representing Mr. Agnos' subcommittee which deals with dollar decisions and Karen represents the Speaker's office in this regard to find out the progress as to the further deliberations. It's obvious to me that we learned a lot from this hearing. I think the representatives of the various State agencies involved also learned and thus within the language there is flexibility to do things perhaps people didn't think were possible previously. I'd like to take the opportunity to thank everyone for attending,

the administration, all the departments who sat through a long day, Masako Dolan who worked very hard on this issue in the Senate and all of you who came and appeared at your own expense. I would like to thank you all on behalf of the Speaker and on behalf of Mr. Agnos and I want to assure you that your time was not wasted here today. Thank you very much.