1	
2	IN RE:
3	RETURN TO WORK SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM
4	
5	/
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING
12	
13	Held on Monday, December 8, 2014
14	Held at the Department of Industrial Relations
15	1515 Clay Street
16	7th Floor
17	Oakland, California 94612
18	
19	
20	
21	Taken before AMBER EMERICK
22	Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 13546
23	State of California
24	
25	

(Monday, December 8, 2014, 9:47 a.m.) 1 PROCEEDINGS MS. GORMLEY: Good morning. Thank you for 5 coming today. I am Tess Gormley, the Special Advisor to the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations. This is the public hearing for the 8 Return-to-Work Supplement Program. Please make sure you 10 sign in on the sign-in sheet and indicate if you want to 11 testify today. 12 I would like to introduce the honorary DIR staff 13 that are present here today: Fred Lonsdale, the attorney for the Office of 14 15 Director. Nathan Smith, attorney, also from the Office of 16 17 the Director, DIR. 18 And our court reporter today is Amber Emerick. 19 When you come up to testify -- well, I think I 20 already gave the business card to Amber, but please 21 identify yourself. All testimony given today will be 22 taken down by Amber, our court reporter. 23 If you have any written comment -- any written 24 testimony you want to hand in, please, you can give it to 25 me. I will call the names for those who have checked that

they want to testify. I will also check to see if anyone who -- has decided to make a comment.

This hearing will continue as long as there are people who wish to comment on the regulations, but will close at 3:00 p.m. today. If the hearing continues into the lunch hour, we will take at least an hour's break for lunch around noon.

Written comments can be given to me, if you have them, or will be accepted by fax, by e-mail, or our RTWSP offices on the 17th floor of this building until 5:00 p.m. tomorrow.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive comments of the proposed Return-to-Work Supplement Program regulations, and we welcome any comments you have about them. All your comments, both given here today and those submitted in writing, will be considered by the Director in determining what revisions we may make to the regulations.

Please restrict the subject of your comments to the regulations, and to any suggestions you have for changing the proposed regulations. If, also, you could limit your comments to about ten minutes in length.

We will not enter into any discussions this morning, although we may ask for clarification or ask you to elaborate further on any points you are presenting.

Again, reminder: Please make sure you have signed in and checked the box to indicate whether you want to speak or not. When you come up to give your testimony, please identify yourself. And, please, you know, come up to the podium and speak into the mic and identify yourself before speaking.

So we will let -- the first speaker, please come to the mic and introduce yourself. Who wants to come in first? I think Bert or Diane.

MS. WORLEY: Good morning. I'm Diane Worley, and I'm the Director of Policy Implementation from the California Applicants' Attorneys Association. And I was expecting a huge crowd here after attending the State Correlors Meeting earlier this year. So I'm glad to see a few of you out there.

Initially, I just want to say that we strongly support the general framework of these draft regulations. CAAA believes these draft regulations properly implement the intent of the legislature enacting Labor Code Section 139.48.

Specifically, it establishes a simple and expeditious process to provide supplemental payments to injured workers with disproportionately low permanent disability benefits.

The eligibility determination and regulations we

1 also support.

The February 2014 RAND study had two key findings: All workers who have a permanent disability resulting from their work injury experience had significant earning losses. And earning losses are especially severe for those workers who do not return to their old job after their injury.

We submitted written comments this morning by e-mail, setting forth a few suggested recommendations to make the ability to apply to the Return-to-Work Fund equally accessible for all injured workers.

And I attended today with my colleague, Bert Arnold, who is President-Elect of the California Applicants' Attorneys Association. So I am going to let him cover some of the specific recommendations that we have for changes to the current draft.

Thank you.

BERT ARNOLD: Good morning. My name is Bert Arnold. I am -- as Diane said -- President-Elect of the California Applicants' Attorneys Association. And I really would like to acknowledge the government and the work that they've done putting together these regs in a way that we at CAAA really support. This has been done in a manner -- well, the regs suggest a manner that the funds will be available expeditiously, and that we will use the

\$120 million every year to the benefit of injured workers.

There are some things that we have in our comments to the regs for the public hearing purposes, and I would just like to point some of those things out.

The first thing I wanted to address is that the Notice to Injured Workers is on the sixth page of the Voucher notice. And while people such as myself and defense attorneys, claims examiners -- whatever -- we do this every day, and it's second nature to us. But for an injured worker, this should only happen to them one time in their life. And so to bury a notice like that on the sixth page, I have -- we have legitimate concerns that a lot of folks will be entitled to this benefit and never even find out because they may not be astute enough to realize it.

So what we're suggesting is that the Notice be obvious, and that it be on Page 1, or that it be addressed in a cover letter with the Notice.

Like I say, this is just confusing enough for somebody who has never been within the system, and we would like to see it as easy as possible to get through it.

The second thing, and -- again, this is in our comments -- but access to the funds. It's set out where it has to be done by computer, or someone can come down to

the Board, where there's going to be kiosks. And that's going to be really difficult for people who don't have a computer, who live in outlying areas, where they just can't get down to the Board. And it doesn't seem like it would be that difficult to allow access to this program by simply having mail as an alternative.

We've been using mail for a long time. And, yes, we would like to get into the 21st Century and do it as much as possible by computers. It's easy. I understand that. But there are circumstances where somebody just can't do that. And to allow them the opportunity to do it by mail, I feel would be a little bit more fair.

The third thing I wanted to address -- just the language. I mean, there are requirements within various parts of the Labor Code, et cetera, that these notices need to be in Spanish. And there's nothing in these regs that provide that the notices should be in Spanish. So that ought to be considered.

And then, finally, here we are to almost 2015, and there's been no money spent so far, which would suggest that, as I stand here right now, there is \$240 million sitting in this fund, and there will be another \$120 million added right after the first of the year.

So there needs to be a provision to account for

this extra 240 million -- well, not extra, but \$240
million that is within the general fund of this right now.

And how are we going to distribute that long term, according to the way it's set up? Now, there's -- I believe it's \$5,000 that's going to be payable to somebody that applies. But it sounds like there's going to be more money available. That's something that needs to be considered.

I don't know if you want to take the extra \$240 million -- as of January 1st, that will be the amount -- and just amortize that over the next ten years. That money is going to be available, and it's supposed to be spent every year. So something needs to be done to figure that out.

Thank you.

MS. GORMLEY: Is there anybody else who would like to testify today?

MS. FREEMAN: You know what? Actually, I will.

My name is Debbie Freeman. And I work with carriers and employers, trying to get injured workers back to work. That's actually my job. And I agree with the gentleman that just spoke.

My major concern is, right now our injured workers from 1/1/13, and continuing, very few injured workers are even entitled to the Voucher, simply because

of the doctors not filling out the form that triggers the process.

So first of all, I think we need to educate the doctors that fill out the form so the injured workers even get the Voucher to begin with.

And he is right. If you look at the facts about injured workers, and if you look at the SJDB FAQs, and all the FAQs online, there is nothing about the Return-to-Work Fund at all on anything.

So I think the best way to communicate to injured workers, about the Voucher that could be entitled to them, but also the Return-to-Work Fund, is to revise all the facts, revise all the SJDB facts online. And that's probably the best way to me, if your worker -- to educate the injured worker about the benefit that they're possibly entitled to.

MS. GORMLEY: Anybody else?

MR. LONSDALE: We can just wait and see if people show up.

(Brief recess taken.)

MS. GORMLEY: I just want to say that we break for lunch at 11:00 and be back at 1:00.

(Brief recess taken.)

MR. WICK: Can I go ahead and say something? Well, I figured I have to have something; right?

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

My name is Bruce Wick. I am with the California 1 Professional Association of Specialty Contractors, and I 2 3 just want to say one -- hopefully concise -- thing. Employers pay a lot of money for workers' comp. And when you look at how much they pay and how little is 5 left at the end for workers and direct medical providers, 6 it's pretty sad. So I appreciate this fund, and I appreciate this 8 9 alternative versus the others that were outlined; that 10 this -- employers pay a lot of money directly into a fund, 11 and that money goes directly to workers. And there is no 12 administrative or any other money taken away from it. 13 That's why I do support this version versus the 14 alternates that were talked about because we're --15 employers are paying money directly to their workers who have suffered an injury and not been able to go back to 16 work. 17 18 So I support -- as it stands -- the way it's set 19 up. 20 Thank you. 21 MS. GORMLEY: Thank you. 22 (Recess taken.) 23 MS. GORMLEY: Okay. It's 11 o'clock. 24 breaking for lunch. So be back at 1:00. Thank you. 25 (Lunch recess taken.)

```
MS. GORMLEY: It's 1 o'clock. And we're ready
1
    to begin with the afternoon session of the public hearing
    for the Return to Work, if anybody wants to testify.
3
               (Recess taken.)
               MS. GORMLEY: It's 3 o'clock, and no one else
5
6
    will give testimony.
               So we are closing the public hearing for the
7
    Return-to-Work Supplement Program.
8
9
               (Whereupon, the public hearing
10
11
                was closed at 3:00 p.m.)
12
13
14
15
                              ---000---
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	I, AMBER EMERICK, hereby certify that the
4	foregoing proceeding was taken in shorthand by me, a
5	Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,
6	and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting, and that
7	the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true and
8	correct report of said proceedings which took place;
9	
10	That I am a disinterested person to the said
11	action.
12	
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
14	this 16th day of December, 2014.
15	
16	
17	AMBER EMERICK CSR No. 1354
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	