Pages 1 - 44

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable Claudia Wilken, Judge

V.L., et al.,
)
Plaintiffs,
)
VS.
) NO. C 09-4668 CW

Wagner, et al.,)

Defendants.)

Oakland, California

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff Service Employees International Union United Health Care Workers West:

ALTSHULER BERZON LLP 177 Post Street - Suite 300 San Francisco, California 94108

Thursday, November 19, 2009

BY: STACEY LEYTON
EVE H. CERVANTEZ
STEPHEN P. BERZON
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED BY: Kelly L. Bryce, CSR No. 13476 Court Reporter Pro Tem

Computerized Transcription By Eclipse

| 1 | APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED) |
|----|--|
| 2 | For Plaintiffs IHSS Recipients: |
| 3 | DISABILITY RIGHTS CALIFORNIA Los Angeles Regional Office |
| 4 | 3580 Wilshire Blvd Suite 902 Los Angeles, California 90010 BY: MELINDA BIRD |
| 5 | ATTORNEY AT LAW |
| 6 | DISABILITY RIGHTS CALIFORNIA |
| 7 | Bay Area Regional Office 1330 Boradway - Suite 500 |
| 8 | Oakland, California 94612 BY: FRED NISEN |
| 9 | ATTORNEY AT LAW |
| 10 | For Defendants: OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL |
| 11 | State of California 455 Golden Gate Avenue - Room 11000 |
| 12 | San Francisco, California 94102 BY: GREGORY D. BROWN |
| 13 | DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thursday - November 19, 2009 3:13 p.m. THE CLERK: Calling the matter of V.L. versus Wagner, Civil Action Number C 09-4668. Counsel, please come forward and state your appearances for the record. MS. LEYTON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Stacey Leyton here for the Union plaintiffs. MS. BIRD: Melinda Bird, Disability Rights California, here for the IHSS recipients, and with me also is Fred Nisen from Disability Rights California. MR. BROWN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Gregory Brown, Deputy Attorney General, for defendants. THE COURT: Good afternoon. Well, I guess we have some new information in terms of progress on notifying people. I don't know what the current status is and whether there's anything new that I should know about. MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, my understanding --THE COURT: They filed something today. I presume you saw it. MS. LEYTON: Yes. Yes, Your Honor. understanding is that we have seen some new numbers as of today, which indicate that there's been some progress in terms of updating records over the past week. Although between

yesterday and today, for example, there were only 11 files that were updated and there are still over 900 files remaining.

There was also a declaration filed by the State stating that they were going to send the counties a list of the names of individuals whose records hadn't been updated, but there's no evidence that such a list has been transmitted; and in fact, a number of the counties that are remaining on the list are still telling us that they believe that they've updated all their records. And, so, we are particularly concerned about that.

In terms of the notice to the providers, there's -my understanding is that the State's position is that no notice
is necessary or will be sent; and, so, we have filed some
additional evidence today which -- and apologize for submitting
it the morning of the hearing but it's information that has
just come to our attention, concerning providers who have
received notices that their hours have been reduced or
terminated even though their consumers did not receive notices
of action.

And in the case of one consumer, and that's

Ms. Belzman, had to go through a number of hoops in order to

determine that, in fact, her daughter and her grandson had been

terminated because of the functional index cuts, that their

records had not been restored by Riverside County, and that it

took quite some effort on the part of Ms. Belzman to eventually

ascertain that information.

And I would just call Your Honor's attention to the exhibit to Ms. Belzman's declaration. To the extent there's any question that the timecards that were sent to these providers was a notice of termination, I think that exhibit makes it very clear.

Ms. Belzman received a timecard for her -- for one of her daughters and for her grandson that says, "Records indicate that your eligibility ended 10/31/09." And that is the notice that hundreds of providers have received about terminations and that thousands of providers have received concerning service reductions. And we feel very strongly that corrective notices need to be sent to these providers so they know that these notices were erroneous, and so that they know how they may correct their records, and that they should work the hours for those consumers that those consumers are authorized to receive.

THE COURT: What would be your suggestion as to how the providers should be notified?

MS. LEYTON: Our suggestion, Your Honor, is that the State should send those providers a notice. We've submitted a proposed text in the proposed order that we submitted with our reply brief setting forth that the timecards that they received may have been erroneous, that if it reflected --

THE COURT: I read that. But, I mean, what --

should they, like, mail them today, overnight mail, Saturday delivery? What?

MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, our proposed order suggests that the State begin to pay a fine if they're not mailed on Monday. And the reason that we've suggested that in particular is, with the Thanksgiving holiday coming up, if those notices are not mailed on Monday, they will not reach people until after the Thanksgiving holiday quite likely.

We don't believe that the State needs one week to send that notice out. We're talking about a few thousand notices here. We've already drafted a proposed text. It needs to be translated into three languages and stuffed in a few thousand envelopes.

We can't -- it's difficult to believe that the State could not accomplish that by Monday. All it is, is it's just a matter of person power and putting enough people on it to make sure that the translation happens quickly and that the notices get printed and stuffed in envelopes.

THE COURT: I wonder if we shouldn't just go to one of these claims administration firms that do that sort of thing as their job and just have someone just outsource it and have the State pay for it. Maybe that would be more likely to get it done. I don't know if it's going to get done.

What about phoning them? Do you suppose they have their phone numbers?

MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, we actually think that phoning would be a good idea in addition to sending a mailed notice. We think that a mailed notice does need to be sent to make sure that the exact message is conveyed; and also so that providers have something in hand that they can take to a social worker or to a payroll department and say, "Here, I have this from the State." So that somebody like Ms. Belzman is not told, "Oh, you must have missed a reassessment appointment and you're not going to be put back on for a few weeks."

But if the State were to call the providers, that could take place on a much faster time basis; or if the State could have counties call providers and pay for whatever the costs of that would be, we believe that that would be a good idea in addition to the written notice.

THE COURT: What do you think needs to be done in order to finish the files of these, I guess, 900 people who are still left? What's the best way to get that done?

MS. LEYTON: My understanding, I think the first thing is that the State does need to give a list to the counties of how many records they have yet to update and the names of those individuals.

The State also needs to be in contact with somebody from each county to talk to each county about why there are records that have yet to be updated and what needs to happen in order to make sure that those records updates take place,

because there appears to be a continued problem that counties believe they completed the record updates and those record updates haven't taken place.

My understanding is that the only communication that the State has sent out thus far have been the two generic notices, the electronic mail message that was sent last week after the contempt motion was filed, and the message that was sent last night which tells people that they need to complete updates by today, if at all possible, and that they will be getting a list.

But the State has not sent a list to my knowledge, and has also not made a commitment that it will be in communication with each county that has remaining records to ascertain what the source of the problem is and figure out how to get those records updated.

THE COURT: I had a question about something that the State wrote in a letter attached to the certification of compliance, the all-county letter that they sent. And it says, "Modifications restoring CMIPS," if that's how you say it, "to the functionality that existed October 8, 2009, has been completed."

Do you understand what that means?

MR. BROWN: I do, Your Honor. If I -- I'm speaking out of turn here; but the State, in order to even have the counties reenter the information, the State actually had to go

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

back in the CMIPS, and that was a quick fix they could do but they had to set it up before the counties could go back and reenter the information. And that's what they're referring to in the all-county letter, and that took about two or three days after October 19th. THE COURT: Okay. You were originally saying it would take five weeks to reprogram the computers. MR. BROWN: And that's an entirely separate reprogramming. THE COURT: Right. But the five weeks are up on Monday. Are you just about done? MR. BROWN: Correct, Your Honor. Well, because the counties are doing this, the State has not been reprogramming the computers because that actually would have -- that would have created a whole separate set of problems once that would have gone into place. That would erase everything that happened between October 9th and whenever that was actually implemented. So because the counties were -- because the State decided to have the counties enter this information manually, because that was far and away the fastest way to do this, the State did not have EDS go and write that program. THE COURT: So does that still have to be done someday or --

MR. BROWN: No, Your Honor. As soon as the counties

are done. And we're down to less than one percent remaining.

I believe the count this morning was 927. And yesterday a notice was sent to the counties and I've been told, we can submit a declaration on this, that e-mail notices were sent to the counties of specific lists for each of those counties giving them the names of the people who needed to be updated. So that that's happening.

The counties now have all the information they need to complete it and it should be done very soon. Again, it's hard to put an exact date on it because the State can't control the counties, but we do believe that it will be done very soon.

THE COURT: Okay. So assuming that we don't go back to the cavus -- I know this could all -- this is preliminary, it could be reversed on appeal, and this and that; but assuming that that doesn't happen, you will be able to proceed with the program, with your -- I don't mean the computer program, I mean with the proper payment of these people without doing some sort of five-week reprogramming?

MR. BROWN: Correct. As soon as the counties have completed all 117,000 plus of these manual reentries, everything in the computer system will be set to --

THE COURT: Permanently?

MR. BROWN: Permanently, correct.

THE COURT: Could be done permanently?

MR. BROWN: Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You're not going to come back to me at some future date and say, "Oh, remember that five weeks? we still need it." MR. BROWN: Correct, Your Honor. **THE COURT:** That's not going to happen? MR. BROWN: Assuming the counties can complete everything manually, this will be done. Everyone will be getting their benefits going forward. All providers will be getting their payments. THE COURT: Okay. Well, so you're saying now that each county has been notified already of the names of each provider or of each recipient who has not yet been updated? MR. BROWN: I've been told that that happened yesterday. I can confirm that, and we will submit a declaration on that so we can confirm that. THE COURT: Well, you did submit a declaration today and it didn't say that. MR. BROWN: I was not able to reach Ruben Romero this morning to get confirmation on that. I spoke with him yesterday. It was in process. I spoke with someone else at EDS later this morning. Their understanding was that that went out yesterday. I'll get ahold of Mr. Romero and we'll get a declaration in on that to confirm that; but --THE COURT: So every single county in the state has received a specific list of all the names of the people you

show as not yet being updated?

MR. BROWN: That is my understanding.

THE COURT: Do you have any reason to disbelief that?

MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, I can say that we've spoken with some counties that have said that they have not received such a list. We spoke with them today.

My sense is that the State is not moving quickly on any of this and has not been moving quickly; and, so, the only way that this Court can ensure that the State will comply with this and give the counties what they need to comply with this in a timely way is to institute contempt sanctions if the lists -- I think in the proposed order we've made the deadline tomorrow for the counties to receive those lists and for the State to certify that, and Monday for these notices to go out to providers and for the State to submit evidence that all of the remaining 900 records have, in fact, been updated.

Without those contempt sanctions, I don't think we have any confidence that what needs to take place will take place in a timely way.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, the record shows we've been working absolutely as fast as we can to implement this. Having the counties do this was the fastest way available. We obviously can't control the counties, we can't hold a gun to their head, but we've asked them to move forward. They've

1 been, for the most part, moving as fast as they can; and --

THE COURT: Up to a point they were, but things have kind of ground to a screeching halt at this point and there seems to be some problems with the remaining ones, and those are all real people. Even though there's 900 of them, there's still 900 real people out there.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

THE COURT: And I'm trying to figure out how we can get those people updated and make sure that they are.

You say you've sent e-mails to them. They say they haven't got them. I just -- I don't know how to deal with it.

Maybe you need to call each one of them and speak with human being to human being in each of the counties and confirm that they got it and ask if they've done it; and if they haven't done it, you're going to have to do it manually.

Like the Sonoma situation or the San Francisco situation, if they can't fix it for some glitch-type reason, then the State is just going to have to go in and do it manually without a computer. Just handwrite these people a letter if you have to and mail it to them.

So how are we going to deal with these last 900 people?

MR. BROWN: I know things have been moving quickly in the last few days. My understanding is that they're being dealt with as we speak.

But, again, these lists were sent to each county or each of the counties that has people left received a list, I believe it was yesterday -- I'll confirm that and I'll submit a declaration on that -- was sent yesterday, that the counties have been asked to finish by today, that they've been moving forward.

THE COURT: But you're saying you can't make them do it. What if they don't or, more likely, what if they can't because there's some computer glitch? They try and it doesn't take and they call your help desk and it doesn't work, what are you going to do about that?

MR. BROWN: Again, my understanding is when -- I think they've been referring to an e-mail they sent about some computer glitches. Again, I spoke to my client. They're not seeing those glitches. They spoke with EDS. EDS was going to contact the three counties that said they've been having those glitches. They say they're not aware of those glitches, and their understanding was that they thought it was a county error.

I don't know what else to say except that we're monitoring it. We're on top of it. The counties have assured us they're going to be able to do this. Again, per your order, the State is going to pay the counties for their costs of implementing this. We haven't had any county show resistance and say, "We're not going to finish." The counties --

THE COURT: Well, apparently many of the counties 1 think they have finished. 2 MR. BROWN: Correct. And, again, the notices that 3 went out yesterday are going to give them the list that say, 4 "These are the people you have not finished. This is what you 5 need to do." So there's no reason to think that this is not 6 going to get done and in a very short time. 7 THE COURT: Well, I do think we need to have notices 8 go out to all the providers who got erroneous notices, and I 9 would like it to reach them before Thanksgiving. So what's 10 11 your proposal on that? MR. BROWN: We would object to sending those notices 12 13 for reasons stated in our papers; namely, the whole point of 14 the notices --THE COURT: They're going to be sent. 15 16 MR. BROWN: Okay. 17 THE COURT: So the question is: Will you send them; 18 or shall I have the plaintiffs send them; or shall I have the plaintiffs hire a firm, one of these claims-administration-tech 19 20 firms, to do it? I want you to give the plaintiffs, as well as the 21 22 counties, the contact information for all of the people who got 23 those notices as well as for all of the people who haven't had their files updated yet. 24

MR. BROWN: And we object to that on the grounds

that that's confidential information.

THE COURT: Not anymore.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

THE COURT: I just ordered it.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Okay.

THE COURT: They're class members. They're union members. I'm ordering immediate discovery of that information with the order that they be used only for purposes of contacting them for this litigation to make sure that their records are updated, and not to give it to anyone else or to disclose any information about them to anyone else; and that whatever is sent to them needs to be worded carefully so that they don't feel like their privacy has been violated. But with that, yes, that information will be given.

So my only question really is, I'm thinking in terms of FedEx, overnight mail, Saturday delivery, something like that. And if you say -- it seems like some places you say you only have four employees. Maybe you're not able to do that sort of thing and we might have to have someone other than you do it unless you think you can do it.

MR. BROWN: Our preference would be certainly to do it ourselves. I think we can certainly pledge to do it as fast as possible. I don't know that we can put a specific timeline on that. We're going to have to get the notices translated, printed, and mailed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, they could go untranslated first and then they could be sent again translated. Certainly English and Spanish could go out. If you have trouble with the others, you could send a second mailing if you had to, but I don't want to delay all of the mailings just to get some of them translated. But if you don't know how long it will take, then that isn't really a good recommendation for your services. might have to hire someone who does know how long it would take. MR. BROWN: Well, based on Ruben Romero's declaration, he thinks approximately one week to get everything done. THE COURT: Well, that's not good enough. So if that's the best you can do, then I quess we'll have to have -can you find a firm that could do it if you had the addresses? MS. LEYTON: Yes, Your Honor. Yes, we could. THE COURT: Don't you think that would make more

sense?

I would imagine that we could get MS. CERVANTEZ: notices translated and have a firm get them out perhaps tomorrow, but certainly by Monday as we requested, and probably get -- I'm certain we could get Spanish translation. I'm not sure if it's as easy to find Armenian translation, for example.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, if a week is the best you

can do, then I think we better have a private firm do it and 1 have the State pay for it. 2 3 MR. BROWN: Okay. And to clarify, Your Honor, these are to the providers who are remaining on --4 **THE COURT:** No. To every provider who got a notice 5 that they were being cut, all that was 2000 some odd people who 6 you hadn't fixed by the date the timecards went out; and the 7 date the timecards went out, they went out with notices that 8 said, "For your next pay period you're cut off," or, "For your 9 next pay period you get less, " and that was wrong. 10 11 shouldn't have happened. And all those people who got those need to be told as quickly as possible that that was wrong and 12 how to fix it. 13 14 So those people as well as the 900 people, which may 15 just be a subset of those 2000 people, would also get a notice 16 saying the same thing. 17 MR. BROWN: Okay. And the 900 would be a subset 18 then? 19 THE COURT: Yeah. 20 MR. BROWN: Okay. And.... MS. LEYTON: So, Your Honor, in order to accomplish 21 22 that, I think we would need the information from the State in 23 electronic form of which providers did receive those incorrect timecards. 24

And we've also asked that there be a number that the

State gives out that providers can call if they're having any difficulty with -- any difficulty fixing the records essentially.

And we've asked also we would need to get from the State supplemental timecards that we can send to the providers. I think those could be blank time sheets; but, so, that the providers can fill those out if they did not submit the hours that they were entitled to submit in the earlier part of the month.

MR. BROWN: And, Your Honor, the supplemental timecards will be sent by the counties as well as supplemental payments for everyone once the files are corrected. So those are already going to be going out.

THE COURT: You want supplemental timecards to send in this mailing that we're going to do tomorrow or Monday?

MS. LEYTON: Yes, Your Honor. There's no indication from the counties that they plan to submit -- to send timecards automatically once the records are updated. The State has not instructed them to do that, and we would prefer that -- there's no reason why a blank timecard couldn't be included with the notice that tells them, "You can still work these hours and fill out those hours and put them on this time sheet."

THE COURT: So where do we get blank timecards?

MS. LEYTON: Well, it's normally the State that sends the timecards to the providers. It is true that when

there are problems, counties do sometimes send supplemental 1 timecards; but the timecards that go out to providers normally 2 go out with their paychecks, so I don't see any reason --3 THE COURT: So you want just 2000 blank timecards? 4 MS. LEYTON: Or a timecard that is blank that we 5 could copy and providers could fill out and that would be 6 7 recognized as a legitimate timecard for them. 8 THE COURT: Well, what would be the best way to do that? 9 MR. BROWN: Assuming the plaintiffs are going to be 10 sending this out, I think we could send them like a blank 11 timecard, a .pdf copy, or something along those lines. 12 13 I would make one other request. If in the event 14 that I talk to my clients and they say, "You know what, we can 15 do this by Monday, " I would request that the State be allowed 16 to send these notices and that we not have to provide the 17 provider list to plaintiffs. 18 THE COURT: You're going to provide the provider list no matter what; but in terms of sending out the notices, I 19 20 just don't know how to feel confident. 21 MR. BROWN: Right. Right. THE COURT: I mean, I want them to go out. I prefer 22 23 them to go out more cheaply; and if the State can do it more cheaply, ideally that would be preferable, but I just don't 24

know how to feel confident that that would happen.

MR. BROWN: Okay. So if we can --

THE COURT: I mean, I guess we could say if you actually -- well, I don't know. Because they have to arrange with someone. They can't wait around and see if you're going to do it. So it makes it sort of difficult logistically.

MR. BROWN: I can contact my clients --

THE COURT: Is there anything that would make you believe that they would do it? If we took a break and they phoned and said, "We promise to do it tomorrow," would you think that was reasonable?

MS. LEYTON: The only thing that would make me confident at this point is if this Court were to order that if the State does not complete the mailing by the date that they've said they would complete it by, that there would be contempt sanctions.

THE COURT: Well, I'm reluctant to order taxpayer money to be spent on sanctions. I'd much rather have it go to the recipients. So I really am quite reluctant to do that, and I'd rather have the things go out than have fines paid. So I'm really more interested in figuring out a way to make sure these notices go out.

MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, I certainly understand that. We haven't requested contempt sanctions in an effort to be punitive or to punish the State for any noncompliance prior to now.

Our position would be that if we are going to send these notices out in a timely way, we would need the electronic version of the addresses and names by tomorrow morning so that we could make arrangements.

And if the State says this afternoon that they can get these notices out tomorrow, we would like this Court to -if the State is saying that it can do it by a certain date,
then I don't see any problem with the Court stating that if the
State doesn't accomplish it by that date, it would then have to
pay civil contempt sanctions in order to give the State an
incentive to make sure that it completes the mailing on that
date.

THE COURT: Well, maybe we'll take a break and you can call your people and ask them if they want to get it done tomorrow really; and then if they didn't, you could still do it on Saturday or Monday.

Maybe you should give them all the addresses and the timecard this afternoon, and you could at least talk to a firm that could do it right away. And then you can call your people right now and ask them if they'd rather do it themselves, and if they can commit to doing it tomorrow; and if they do, we'll give them a chance to do that.

MR. BROWN: If I commit to doing it, having them mailed out by Monday or mailed out tomorrow?

THE COURT: Mailed out tomorrow.

MR. BROWN: Mailed out tomorrow. I can --1 THE COURT: Because if they don't do it, then I want 2 to be able to have them go out on Monday. 3 MR. BROWN: Right. I can pretty much tell you here 4 that getting them mailed by tomorrow is going to be next to 5 impossible. 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. Well, then, we'll just go ahead 8 and have the plaintiffs do it. And I guess -- well, I guess we should take a break 9 and have you call your person and see whether these e-mails 10 11 actually went out to every county. And then I quess what I'd like is to have somebody 12 13 from the State call every county and actually ask them, "What 14 have you done about this? Do you think you have updated all 15 these? Are you having some computer problems?" 16 And let's just say that anybody whose file isn't 17 updated by tomorrow, the State fixes it themself. They can do 18 that. It's going to be 900 at the most. 19 MR. BROWN: Right. 20 THE COURT: They can do that by hand. They can type 21 up letters on a typewriter if they have to. 22 MR. BROWN: That is going to be a very slow and 23 time-consuming process if the State does it itself because, as they said in their declarations, we have four people. They 24

don't routinely do this.

THE COURT: They're not going to be doing it on the 1 They're just going to be writing out a letter, 2 computer. putting it in the mail saying whatever it is they have to do. 3 I mean, if there's computer glitches, it's going to 4 have to be done manually. 5 MR. BROWN: Right. And that's -- well, I guess I'm 6 not following. In terms of a manual letter going out to each 7 recipient or provider or -- because we're --8 THE COURT: Recipients and providers. 9 MR. BROWN: -- because we're going to be sending 10 11 providers notices now. So you're talking about additional 12 notices? 13 THE COURT: Whatever it is. I don't know exactly 14 what you're having the computer do; but the computer, perhaps, 15 isn't doing it in a few cases for some reason that no one 16 understands. And if the computer can't be made to do it, then 17 it's going to have to be done some other way. 18 MR. BROWN: The computer can be made to do it. What's happening is there were a hundred seventeen plus 19 20 thousand files that each one by one had to be updated on the computer one by one, and that's the 927 of those files left to 21 22 be updated on the computer. 23 To my knowledge, there hasn't been any computer glitch preventing the remaining files from being updated. 24

Where there have been glitches, it's been between the counties

knowing which files to update. 1 THE COURT: No. Because they're several counties 2 that have said, "We've updated all of them"; and you say, "No, 3 you haven't." 4 5 MR. BROWN: Correct. Our understanding is that that's where the counties did not have a complete list of the 6 7 names or, perhaps, misentered the information so they need to 8 go back and reenter it. So that's why we sent them the names, so they can go back to those people's specific computer files 9 10 and update them. 11 THE COURT: Right. But how am I going to know that's going to happen? I mean, how am I going to fix it if it 12 13 doesn't? 14 MR. BROWN: I mean, like I said, at some point the 15 State can do this, but I just need to state on the record that 16 that's going to be extremely time-consuming. The fastest way 17 by far is going to be to have the counties continue to fix it, and it looks like they're going to be able to very quickly. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Shall we take a break and have 20 you call the person and come back, and then you can come back tomorrow at 1:30 and report on how well it's gone? 21 MR. BROWN: Sure. I actually have another hearing 22 23 tomorrow at 1:30, so I could --**THE COURT:** Where is that? 24

It's in San Francisco.

MR. BROWN:

settlement conference. I could appear telephonically at a different time or see if someone else from my office is available.

THE COURT: Then what else do we have that needs to get done? I mean, I guess I should say, and maybe you want to address this, but it seems to me that the State is in violation of the order if only because, after being told not to cut off people, these notices went out to providers saying that their recipients were cut off. So that was number one, cutting people off when they weren't supposed to be cut off.

And, number two, that constituted a notice to the providers that their recipients were cut off. And while it shouldn't have been done at all, seeing as it was done, it was a notice that needed to be remedied and it should have been remedied as soon as it was realized that it was done and notices should have gone out to these people under the term of the preliminary injunction that said that anyone who gets a notice or directive that they're cut off needs to be notified that that was in error.

MR. BROWN: We respectfully disagree with that assessment. We believe we're in full compliance with the injunction. If we've misinterpreted it, I think it should be clarified to state exactly what we need to do.

THE COURT: I think it was clear, and I will clarify even further. And what I'm ordering you to do now is in part I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

view as contempt sanctions and in part further preliminary injunction that has become necessitated by the fact that things didn't go well the first time around. So it's both of those things. MR. BROWN: Okay. And I just reiterate what's in our briefs. There's no basis for contempt sanctions here, and we've been working absolutely as fast as possible to implement To the extent that not everything has been updated -this. THE COURT: Well, you say two different things, which sort of lacks some credibility I have to say. On the one hand you say you're not in violation. On the other hand you say you've done the best you could but you couldn't really do it. So the latter --MR. BROWN: And possibilities is a defense to contempt, Your Honor. THE COURT: Oh, is that what -- oh, when you're saying you're not in contempt, it's because you couldn't comply --MR. BROWN: First, we believe we have complied. THE COURT: -- or are you saying you think you did comply? MR. BROWN: What the injunction said is to take all steps to ensure that no recipients are denied their benefits, and there is no evidence that any recipient has been denied any benefits. There's no evidence that any provider has had a late

payment. Those are the key things in the injunction.

As far as what already happened prior to

October 19th, we had to go back and undo that as fast as we

can, and we've been doing that. And the injunction

specifically authorized us to go back and do it in a method

that would not have been completed until this coming Monday.

THE COURT: Well, that's another thing that I find quite disingenuous. What the injunction said was that you could require the counties to do it or you could restore the backup; and you're choosing to interpret that or claiming to interpret it as being an implicit statement that what you could really do was go this five-week, write a new program, EDS route, and that the Court was essentially saying, "It's okay with me if you don't do this for five weeks." That's not what "restore the backup" meant.

What I could never understand through all of your papers, until I got the implementation briefing, was if you made this big computer change that was going to take five weeks to fix, isn't there a backup tape; and finally in the implementation briefing it came out that, yes, there was a backup tape. There was a system backup that could be reinstalled.

It had a problem because any changes that had been made by counties since October 8th when the backup tape was made would have to be reentered, but that would have been 5,000

reentries instead of 117,000 reentries. So it occurred to me that that might have been a better way to go, and that was what was referred to in the notion of restoring the backup, not a five-week new reprogramming.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I think there was something lost in translation because that would have been the five-week process. Reimplementing the backup tape, that's what EDS said. They don't have a program. They cannot just flip a switch to put in the backup tape. That's where they would have to develop a whole new program, test it, and then put it in.

THE COURT: That's just not true. That's not what a backup program is. A backup is a backup. You back stuff up every day. They back it up every day and they could reinstall their backup from the 8th or from the 7th or from the 6th, or whatever.

What you said they wanted to do was write a new program. That's a different beast. Writing a new program is not the same as restoring a backup.

MR. BROWN: But restoring -- they don't have a program to restore the backup.

THE COURT: Of course they do. All computers have a program. It's not a program. You just restore the backup. If your computer crashes and everything's gone, you restore the backup.

MR. BROWN: I'm not a computer person, Your Honor --

Well, I am. 1 THE COURT: -- but I can only tell you what's in the 2 MR. BROWN: declaration from EDS. 3 THE COURT: Yeah. I read it. 4 MR. BROWN: And they told us they could not --5 THE COURT: Am I wrong? 6 7 MR. BROWN: -- do this in less than five weeks, or 8 approximately five weeks. MS. LEYTON: That's my understanding of what a 9 backup means, yes, Your Honor. 10 11 THE COURT: Yeah. You need to talk to your computer 12 people some more. 13 MR. BROWN: We talked to them extensively, 14 Your Honor, and that's what they told us. 15 THE COURT: Well, maybe next time if you want to say 16 something like this, you should bring one with you, because 17 that just doesn't make any sense. 18 But, anyway, that's what I was referring to, that they could have restored the system backup as of October 8th; 19 20 and had they done that, they would have had to only make 5,000 changes instead of 117,000 changes. So I don't know quite what 21 22 they did, but.... 23 MR. BROWN: I would just reiterate, Your Honor, there's no date set in the order, and we have done this as fast 24 25 as possible and I don't know what more we can do.

I believe we're, A, in compliance with the injunction; b, to the extent anyone believes we're not, certainly there's not any specific and definite provision in there that we're in violation of. And even if you thought we were in violation of that, impossibility would certainly be a complete defense to any contempt on that basis.

MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, we would just ask that if this Court is not inclined to institute contempt sanctions, that the best way to proceed would be to have specific deadlines and instructions as possible. For example, that the State would need to get us these addresses in electronic form as well as a blank time sheet no later than tomorrow morning, and that the State would need to do -- I believe it would be warranted to have us required to appear tomorrow and Monday so that this Court can verify that the records have been updated by the counties and to ascertain whether there are any remaining computer glitches or other glitches that are preventing the remaining 900 individuals from having their eligibility restored.

So I just think that that kind of specific order with daily reporting in person would make sense.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know why they couldn't e-mail you the addresses today. Why wait until tomorrow?

MS. LEYTON: That's true.

THE COURT: It's 10 to 4:00.

MR. BROWN: We'll do it as fast as we can. 1 THE COURT: Well, as fast as you can isn't good. 2 Let's do it by 5:00 o'clock today. And if you can't do that, 3 then at 5:00 o'clock today file a detailed explanation saying 4 why it's impossible for you to e-mail these names and addresses 5 by 5:00 o'clock today. 6 7 MR. BROWN: Okay. 8 THE COURT: We don't have pay phones anymore, but I'm sure you have a cell phone. You can get on the phone and 9 call someone and get that done. And the blank time sheet can 10 11 be .pdf'd by 5:00 o'clock today. And, then, I also want a declaration filed today 12 13 verifying your statement that the names and addresses of all 14 the -- is it the 900 people --15 MS. LEYTON: Your Honor --16 **THE COURT:** -- that haven't been updated go to each 17 of the counties? 18 MS. LEYTON: Oh, yes. Yes. The 900 people to the 19 counties. 20 THE COURT: Okay. So a declaration as soon as you can get ahold of this gentleman; and if he's not at his office, 21 22 get his home phone or his supervisor or his supervisor's 23 supervisor and find out what happened. Then I'm thinking we should just have a phone call. 24

If the counties can't reach someone at the State to find out

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what's going on, maybe we should just have someone at the State call each county and have a realtime connection as to comparing the status of these people. MS. LEYTON: Yes. We believe that's appropriate, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. So tomorrow we should have someone from the State call -- do they know who to call? MS. LEYTON: My understanding is that they would, yes. MR. BROWN: I would assume so. THE COURT: -- the appropriate person to call at each county and actually have a realtime conversation with them, "Did you get our e-mail of the 'X' number of people that we think aren't updated yet? Have you tried to update them?" And then you check your records and see if it took. Is that how it works? They update it and then you have to look at it to see if it took? Is that how it works? MR. BROWN: They update it and then we get reports from EDS off of the CMIP system telling us basically -- I think they can give us different types of reports. The ones we've been getting are showing just a list of how many have been updated and how many are left. THE COURT: Where is EDS? How do you get those reports? MR. BROWN: I believe that they're --

I mean, this is all done electronically. THE COURT: 1 I believe they're e-mailed to us. 2 MR. BROWN: 3 THE COURT: So --They're e-mailed to me. 4 MR. BROWN: 5 THE COURT: Okay. So, then, tomorrow we'll have a realtime phone conversation between someone in the State and 6 7 someone in each county who can confirm that that county did receive all of its names, that that county has or has not tried 8 to update all of its names; and if for any reason that county 9 10 hasn't succeeded in doing that, then the -- then you need to 11 find out the names of the people that they were unable to update, and the State can update them themself tomorrow 12 13 afternoon. There shouldn't be very many if what you're saying 14 15 is correct. So it shouldn't be too burdensome. 16 And if the counties have already tried and weren't 17 able to or won't do it, then you can just do the rest of those 18 and those should be done by the end of the day tomorrow. 19 And then you all will have your addresses and you 20 can send mailings out maybe tomorrow or Saturday, which should easily get there by Thanksgiving; and all you need is the 21 22 addresses, the time sheet, and the letter that you've got. 23 MS. LEYTON: Yes. We would also like a number to give to providers to call. 24

THE COURT: Oh, the number, yeah.

Is there a phone number that they can put, an 800 number, they can put in their letter where the people can call to the State if they have trouble?

MR. BROWN: I guess it depends what type of information would they be wanting at the other end of this 800 number.

MS. LEYTON: Our concern is that, for example,
Ms. Belzman, when she attempted to get her problem fixed, she
contacted payroll and payroll sent her to the social worker.
And, so, in each county it may be a different entity that needs
to fix a problem when a provider didn't get paid for their
hours or got an incorrect time sheet. So we would like a
central number that they could call where somebody at the State
could say, "You're from Riverside County, we'll report your
problem to Riverside County," or help the person take care of
it.

Because otherwise, you know, providers who speak different languages and may be, more or less, aware of the various issues or more or less persistent, may not be able to push through all the different mechanisms within their county to figure out how to get it corrected.

THE COURT: Would the State know how many hours they were supposed to get?

MS. LEYTON: The State should be able to look that up in the CMIP system, yes, once those records are corrected.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So it would be somebody in the State. Where does this happen, in Sacramento? MR. BROWN: This is information that's typically going to be at the county level in terms of --THE COURT: But you know it because it's in your CMIPS computer. MR. BROWN: Well, we can ask EDS to call it up and get it for us, and that's process. So I don't think we can --THE COURT: You e-mail them and they e-mail it back. MR. BROWN: Yeah. And, so, to get it in realtime, I think if people contact the counties, they're going to get this information much, much faster because this is something the counties routinely handle is people calling and saying, "My benefits" --THE COURT: But you tell me I can't rely on the counties, so I have to rely on you. I can't give them 94 different numbers. I don't know how many counties they have. MR. BROWN: Well, each recipient would already have the number for their county person. THE COURT: We need a number in the State that they can call if they don't understand it, or they don't know how many hours they're supposed to get, or they don't get any help from the county. MR. BROWN: I think that would honestly, Your Honor,

just cause more confusion for the recipients and providers

because I don't see how this State number would really provide them with anything further than essentially referring them back to the county.

THE COURT: No. I want the State person to be able to send an e-mail to EDS and say, "What is John Doe's situation?" And get an e-mail back from EDS. Maybe you need to have somebody on call at EDS for a few days who can run those queries for you when the calls come in.

Do you have an 800 number up there?

MR. BROWN: I don't think we have one set up. We can certainly look into setting one up. I just don't know that this is going to be anything that's actually going to benefit anyone. I think it's going to be incredibly cumbersome on both the State and EDS, which I think is going to hinder the ability for the State to go back and enter any more information into CMIPS, which sounds like we might have to do after tomorrow if the counties aren't done.

So my real concern is sort of putting an impossible burden on the State that's not going to be helpful to recipients or providers and that the State is just not physically going to be able to comply with.

THE COURT: Well, let's give it a try. Maybe there won't be a lot of calls. I don't know how quickly they can get an 800 number. You want to put a number in there. If they don't have one, maybe we just ought to give them their regular

phone number. 1 MS. BIRD: Your Honor, when these cuts -- Melinda 2 Bird here -- were being implemented, we set up 800 numbers for 3 people to call us, Disability Rights California. You can have 4 an 800 number set up in a matter of hours. 5 **THE COURT:** Oh, really? 6 MR. BROWN: And, Your Honor, I also believe tomorrow 7 8 is a furlough day, so there might be some real difficulties with the State having people available tomorrow to, I just 9 realized, to make these calls to the counties. 10 11 THE COURT: I thought the furlough days were 12 Wednesdays. 13 MR. BROWN: Furlough days are Fridays, at least with 14 the Department of Social Services. So I think that could 15 present a real problem in terms of the things that are supposed 16 to get done tomorrow. They might not be able to get done until 17 Monday. THE COURT: So you're saying the DSS is on furlough 18 19 tomorrow --20 MR. BROWN: Correct. 21 **THE COURT:** -- and nobody will be working? MR. BROWN: Nobody expect -- yeah. I think the 22 23 office is closed tomorrow. You can typically reach at least

in-house counsel on his cell phone, but that's about the best

contact I have. I think most people are not going to be at

24

work tomorrow.

MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, there's still one hour in the day where the State could try to reach all these counties and make sure they got their list and find out what the remaining --

THE COURT: What about supervisors? Is everybody furloughed?

MR. BROWN: My understanding is everybody is furloughed. My understanding is actually Governor Schwarzenegger effectively ordered them to basically close the office except under extraordinary circumstances.

MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, I believe a Federal Court order could be a circumstance that would justify having a few people. I believe that these are high-level officials who are putting in the calls to the counties because they're people who have the knowledge and the authority to be able to fix problems and work things out, and --

THE COURT: Yeah. Somebody's going to have to call. You know, if it's the Attorney General's staff, I guess you could do it. You could have a list of names and call the counties and read off names to them. EDS isn't furloughed, so you could e-mail to EDS.

MR. BROWN: I'll pass along to my client and we'll do what we can. I just want to warn the Court now that we might not have people available tomorrow.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, you're going to have to I'm afraid, because we need these things checked out tomorrow. I'll ask my client to do what they can. MR. BROWN: THE COURT: Okay. And we're going to see you at 1:30. MR. BROWN: As I said --THE COURT: We're not going to see you. MR. BROWN: I'm not available. **THE COURT:** Who are you in front of? MR. BROWN: It's a private mediator in San Francisco. I don't have his name in front of me. through the San Francisco Superior Court Early Settlement Program. THE COURT: And you're lead counsel in that case? MR. BROWN: Yes. The only counsel on that one at present. THE COURT: Okay. Well, why don't you call and ask if you could be there at 2:30 instead of 1:30? You could come here at 1:30, get on BART, and be over there by 2:30. Or you want me to call them? Who is it? Oh, you said you didn't know. MR. BROWN: I don't know if I brought his name. I'll see what I can do and I'll let you know, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Then if not, then I quess you'll have to send someone else in from your office. Are you in

Sacramento?

MR. BROWN: No. San Francisco.

THE COURT: You're in San Francisco.

Okay. Well --

MS. LEYTON: Your Honor, one other question is that you mentioned overnight mail, and I had a request that we be authorized to send these letters overnight mail. I just wanted to confirm that that was what Your Honor intended.

THE COURT: I guess so.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I believe that would be an unnecessary expense, particularly with the State's current budget crisis. Overnight mail is quite expensive. Regular mail within the state of California is usually going to get there the next day or two days later at the latest anyway. So I don't know that anything is gained and it's going to cost the State an extraordinary amount of money.

THE COURT: Well, why don't you check into it and see. Sometimes it's like \$40 to send overnight mail. I don't want to spend \$40 apiece.

Find out when it would get there if you didn't send it overnight, and make a conscientious decision as taxpayers whether it's really worth it depending on when you get the names and how long it takes.

I would like it to get there before -- on the Wednesday before Thanksqiving. So if you can get it there

without extraordinary expense, that would be better.

So is there anything else specific that you think we need to set dates and times for?

MS. LEYTON: My understanding is that the Court will contact us if the date and time changes; but, otherwise, we should prepare to be here at 1:30 tomorrow?

THE COURT: Well, I hate to make all of you come in.

You could phone in. I mean, it's really the State we need to hear from. You can come if you want to.

I'm in trial and my trial ends at 1:30, so I'll have a reporter and it will be easy for me to have people come in and tell me what's going on; but I hate to have five people spend their hourly rates, which, by the way, I am going to order the State to pay for today's proceeding in terms of attorneys' fees. And in the future if more enforcement is necessary because of failures to comply, then the State will be paying those fees.

MR. BROWN: And we object to that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right.

So, yeah, we'll do something at 1:30. If you can go late to your other thing, that would be good. If absolutely necessary, you could call in and appear by phone. Sheilah can give you the CourtCall number. We could have a CourtCall, or you could send somebody else, and then on Monday at 1:30 as well.

And we better break so he can call and get those 1 people's addresses e-mailed over. 2 MR. BROWN: And are we just taking a short break or 3 are we done? 4 5 THE COURT: No. I quess we're done. Okay, Your Honor. 6 MR. BROWN: 7 THE COURT: I want you to file a declaration saying 8 what actually has happened so far in terms of the e-mails going out to each of the counties. I want you to get the addresses 9 to them, get the timecards to them by the end of the day. 10 11 And then I want the counties called and the people updated tomorrow, and I want a report at 1:30 as to how many 12 13 counties have been called and how many people are still to be 14 updated and how many have been updated. 15 And then we'll speak again on Monday by which time 16 one can only hope that all of the counties will have been 17 called and all of the 900 people will have been updated even if 18 it has to be done manually, and that should bring us up to 19 date, I guess. 20 I believe that would, Your Honor. MS. LEYTON: Yes. 21 THE COURT: And you can submit your attorneys' fees 22 declarations. You're going to need to be efficient and lean on 23 these attorneys' fees. I don't want to have the State paying

MS. LEYTON: Understood.

five people to do everything.

24

```
1
                 THE COURT: And they can all come if they want to,
      but they can't all bill.
 2
                 MS. LEYTON: Understood.
 3
                 THE COURT: Okay.
 4
                 MS. LEYTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
                 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
                    (Proceedings adjourned at 4:03 p.m.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, KELLY BRYCE, Court Reporter for the United States

Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the

foregoing proceedings in CR 09-4668 CW, V.L., et al versus

Wagner, et al., were reported by me, a shorthand reporter, and

were thereafter transcribed under my direction into

typewriting; that the foregoing is a full, complete and true

record of said proceedings as bound by me at the time of

filing.

The validity of the reporter's certification of said transcript may be void upon disassembly and/or removal from the court file.

Kelly Bryce, Court Reporter

Friday, November 20, 2009