1	GRAY DAVIS, in his official capacity		
-	as the Governor of the State of California;		
2	RITA SAENZ, in her official capacity		
	as Director, California Department of		
3	Social Services; and the CALIFORNIA		
	•		
4	DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES,		
_			
5	Defendants and Third Party Plaintiffs,		
6			
0	DONNA E. SHALALA, Secretary of		
7	Health and Human Services,		
1			
8	Third Party Defendant.		
Ĭ	Time Turty Detendant.		
9			
10			
	INITO		

3

5

INTRODUCTION

This Stipulation settles and resolves the issues in *Mark A. et al. v. Davis* (CIV-S-98-0041) United States District Court, Eastern District of California. The case is a federal civil rights action filed January 8, 1998, on behalf of the named plaintiffs who are foster and adopted children and similarly situated children who are eligible for California's Adoption Assistance Program. Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint called for declaratory and injunctive relief from Defendants' policies, practices, acts and omissions in the administration of the Adoption Assistance Program pursuant to the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act, 42 U.S.C. § 671, *et seq.*, that violate plaintiffs rights under federal law by:

- using a means test, including requiring the use of the statewide median income to
 determine payment amounts and requiring families to produce evidence of income
 and expenses as a condition of receiving AAP benefits upon initial application or
 as part of the recertification process;
- b. arbitrarily and unilaterally reducing AAP payments based on adoptive parents' income or for any reason other than the child's ineligibility because of age, the

©ase 2:98-cv-00041-LKK-DAD Document 105 Filed 11/02/99 Page 3 of 10

parents no longer being legally responsible for, or providing support to, the child, 1 2 or the amount of the payment exceeding the amount which would have been paid 3 for the child in a foster family home; and 4 informing prospective adoptive families that eligibility for adoption assistance c. 5 payments is based on a means test. 6 The Defendants filed a third-party complaint against Donna E. Shalala, Secretary of the United 7 8 States Department of Health and Human Services. 9 RECITALS AND REPRESENTATIONS 10 i. The parties have reached mutual agreement that the terms of this 11 Stipulation constitute an appropriate and acceptable resolution of the 12 named plaintiffs' claims and the claims in the Third Party Complaint. 13 14 ii. The plaintiff class has not been certified. This Stipulation is entered into 15 by plaintiffs' counsel on behalf of the named plaintiffs, by and through 16 their guardians ad litem, and by counsel for the defendants. 17 NOW THEREFORE, the parties hereby stipulate that a judgment be entered which shall 18 incorporate the following terms and conditions: 19 **2**0 **JURISDICTION** 21 iii. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action (28 United 22 States Code §§ 1331, 1343(a)(3), 1343(a)(4), 2201, 2202, F.R.C.P., Rules **2**3 57, 65) and personal jurisdiction over all the defendants to this action. The 24 Court also has the authority to approve and grant all relief included in this **2**5 26 Stipulation. 27 28

PARTIES

- iv. The named plaintiffs in this action are foster and adopted children, by and through their guardians ad litem, who were, or are now, eligible for California's Adoption Assistance Program, administered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 673 and the regulations promulgated thereunder (the "Plaintiffs").
- v. The defendants are Gray Davis, the Governor of the State of California, the California Department of Social Services ("CDSS") and its Director Rita Saenz (collectively the "State Defendants"). The Third-Party Defendant is Donna E. Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services.
- vi. This Stipulation shall be binding on all defendants, their successors, officers, agents, employees, and all other persons acting in concert or participation with them. It shall apply to the named plaintiffs.

DEFENDANTS' OBLIGATIONS

- vii. Defendants Saenz and CDSS agree to cease:
 - a. requiring the use of the statewide median income to determine

 AAP eligibility and payment amounts and requiring families to

 produce evidence of income and expenses as a condition of

 receiving AAP benefits upon initial application or as part of the

 recertification process;
 - b. reducing AAP payments without the agreement of the adoptive parents based on the adoptive parents' income or for any reason other than the child's ineligibility because of age, the parents no

longer being legally responsible for, or providing support to, the child, or the AAP payment amount exceeding the amount which would have been paid for the child in a foster family home; and

- informing prospective adoptive families that eligibility for adoption assistance is based on the income and financial resources of the adoptive parents.
- viii. Defendants Saenz and the CDSS will within 30 days of entry of this

 Stipulated Judgment issue an all county letter and/or notice, which shall
 be approved by plaintiffs' counsel, to every county notifying each agency
 of the terms of this settlement and directing every agency to cease using
 the current AAP application and recertification procedures and to process
 AAP applications and all reassessments of AAP consistent with the
 following requirements:
 - a. There shall be no means test used to determine an adoptive family's benefits under the Adoption Assistance Program, including the use of the statewide median income to determine payment amounts.

 The amount of an adoption assistance cash benefit, if any, shall be a negotiated amount based upon the needs of the child and the circumstances of the family. "Circumstances of the family" means the family's ability to incorporate the child into the household in relation to the lifestyle, standard of living, and future plans and to the overall capacity to meet the immediate and future needs, including education, of the child.

Case 2:98-cv-00041-LKK-DAD Document 105 Filed 11/02/99 Page 6 of 10

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	The state of the s
14	
1 5	
16	
17	
18	
19	
2 0	
21	
2 2	
2 3	
24	
2 5	
2 6	
27	
28	Canada de la casa de l

- b. Once an AAP agreement has been signed, the adoptive parents will continue to receive benefits in the agreed upon amount unless one of the following occurs:
 - 1. The department determines that the adoptive parents are no longer legally responsible for the support of the child.
 - 2. The department determines that the child is no longer receiving support from the adoptive family.
 - 3. The adoption assistance payment exceeds the amount that the child would have been eligible for in a foster family home.
 - 4. The adoptive parents demonstrate a need for an increased payment.
 - 5. The adoptive parents voluntarily reduce or terminate payments.
 - 6. The adopted child has an extraordinary need that was not anticipated at the time the amount of the adoption assistance was originally negotiated.
- c. All families will have the right to have their AAP benefits reassessed consistent with the requirements set forth above in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of this section.
- ix. Defendants Saenz and CDSS will reverse the fair hearing decision upholding the recertification termination of Plaintiff Megan F.'s AAP benefits, notify Santa Clara County of the reversal and terms of this

settlement, and direct Santa Clara County to rescind the AAP overpayment notice issued to her parents and to reassess plaintiff Megan F.'s AAP benefits consistent with the terms of this agreement.

- x. Defendants Saenz and CDSS will Notify Sacramento County of the terms of this settlement and direct the county to process a request for AAP payments made on behalf for Nathan H. consistent with the terms of this agreement. The intent of this provision is to place Nathan H. in the position he would have been in had the policies set forth in paragraph viii. above been in place at the time his parents initially applied for AAP.
- xi. Should an application for adoption and AAP benefits be made on behalf of plaintiff Jimmy C., Defendants Saenz and CDSS will process, and or direct Mendocino County to process, such AAP application consistent with the terms of this agreement.
- xii. If Assembly Bill 390 is passed by the Legislature and becomes law,

 Defendants Saenz and CDSS will submit to the Office of Administrative

 Law emergency regulations to implement AB 390.
- xiii. Defendants Saenz and CDSS will by December 31, 2000 develop and deliver training to all county adoption agencies on the changes in the administration of AAP made pursuant to this agreement and pursuant to AB390 should it become law.
- xiv. Defendants Saenz and CDSS will develop, and/or update, and distribute a statewide publication that describes AAP and incorporates the AAP requirements set forth in this settlement.

Case 2:98-cv-00041-LKK-DAD Document 105 Filed 11/02/99 Page 8 of 10

Defendants Saenz and CDSS will notify all families who have received a XV. 1 notice of action on an AAP application or recertification since January 1, 2 3 1998, of the AAP policy changes made pursuant to the terms of this 4 settlement. 5 ATTORNEYS' FEES 6 xvi. The State Defendants agree that Plaintiffs are the prevailing parties, are 7 entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and costs from the State Defendants, 8 9 and may request from this Court an award if the State Defendants and 10 Plaintiffs are unable to resolve the issue of the amount of such fees by 11 agreement. 12 THIRD PARTY COMPLAINT 13 The State Defendants hereby dismiss their Third Party Complaint against 14 xvii. 15 the Third-Party Defendant with each party bearing its own fees and costs. 16 17 IT IS SO STIPULATED 18 Dated: September 17, 1999 19 MARIA RAMIU **2**0 CAROLE SHAUFFER SHANNAN WILBER 21 Youth Law Center **2**2 Attorneys for Plaintiffs **2**3 24 Dated: 9-28-99 25 26 BILL LOCKYER FRANK S. FURTEK 27 Office of the Attorney General 28 Attorneys for Defendants

Case 2:98-cv-00041-LKK-DAD Document 105 Filed 11/02/99 Page 9 of 10 Dated: 4 22 99 Laude Jeundlu

SHEILA M. LIEBER
CAROLE A. JEANDHEUR
Department of Justice, Civil Division

Attorneys for Third Party Defendant

IT IS SO ORDERED

2

3

5

Dated: 11/1/7/
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Case 2:98-cv-00041-LKK-DAD Document 105 Filed 11/02/99 Page 10 of all 0

United States District Court for the Eastern District of California November 2, 1999

* * CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE * *

2:98-cv-00041

Α

v.

Wilson

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California.

That on November 2, 1999, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office, or, pursuant to prior authorization by counsel, via facsimile.

Carole B Shauffer National Center for Youth Law 114 Sansome Street Suite 900 San Francisco, CA 94104-3820 SJ/LKK

Susan Patricia Underwood Attorney General's Office of the State of California PO Box 944255 1300 I Street Suite 125 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

Carole Jeandheur United States Department of Justice Civil Division PO Box 883 Washington, DC 20044

Jack L. Wagner, Clerk

3Y: