

LEGISLATION & PUBLIC INFORMATION UNIT

1831 K Street

Sacramento, CA 95811-4114

Tel: (916) 504-5800

TTY: (800) 719-5798 Intake Line: (800) 776-5746

Fax: (916) 504-5807 www.disabilityrightsca.org

April 11, 2017

Honorable Ed Hernandez Chair, Health Committee California State Senate Capitol Building, Room 2080 Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: SB 786 (MENDOZA) - OPPOSE

Dear Senator Hernandez:

Disability Rights California (DRC), a non-profit advocacy organization that advances and protects the rights of Californians with disabilities, **opposes SB 786**. This bill is scheduled for hearing in the Senate Health Committee on April 19, 2017.

The California Community Care Facilities Act provides for the licensing and regulation of community care facilities, including alcoholism or drug abuse recovery or treatment facilities, by the State Department of Social Services. Current law also provides that a treatment facility that serves six or fewer persons, regardless of their relationship, to be considered a residential use of property and excludes the treatment facilities from local zoning ordinances to the extent they are considered anything other than a residential use of property.

By way of background, the six-or-under rule applies to a wide variety of facilities and helps ensure:

1. Integrated community services and residential options for a variety of people with disabilities;

- 2. Compliance with Fair Housing laws; and
- That the state is better able to comply with its obligations under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the <u>Olmstead</u> Supreme Court decision to provide services to people with disabilities in the most integrated setting.

This long-standing exemption has served as a cornerstone of these important treatment and housing and civil rights goals in California. SB 786 veers sharply from these objectives.

The six-or-under rule has long been part of the drug and alcohol treatment continuum of care by ensuring that community-based residential treatment is available in supportive environments. This bill would restrict treatment availability by requiring the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) to deny an application to a facility if there is another facility within 300 feet unless a city or county otherwise authorizes a separation of less than 300 feet.

Siting these facilities is often frustrated by NIMBY community opposition. This bill, like similar attempted restrictions in this legislative session and the past, heightens the problem by creating new barriers to opening and keeping open recovery and treatment facilities. Chipping away at the six-or-under rule, as this bill does, narrows the opportunities for persons with disabilities to live in community settings.

Both the California Fair Employment and Housing Act and the federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 prohibit any discrimination against people with disabilities. Under both laws, recovering drug addicts and recovering alcoholics are persons with disabilities protected from discrimination. (See the federal Fair Housing Amendments Act regulations at 24 CFR 100.201.) This bill imposes significant restrictions and regulations on individuals with these disabilities, and people who associate with or are perceived to be individuals with these disabilities, who choose to live together. No such restrictions or regulations are imposed upon similar individuals not living together who do not have these disabilities.

Fair Housing laws prohibit spacing and location restrictions on housing for persons with disabilities. If the effect of a restriction on housing is to limit the existence of the current housing and the creation of new housing it violates federal Fair Housing law. Requiring that DHCS deny an application

SB 786 (MENDOZA) – OPPOSE Page 3 of 3

for any facility that would be located within 300 feet of another facility unless allowed by the city or county permits the local government to control the location of the facilities and thereby determine the number of treatment facilities that may be available. Prohibiting such a limitation is the cornerstone of Fair Housing laws restrictions.

For these reasons, we oppose this bill. Please contact me if you have any questions about our position on this bill.

Sincerely,

Curtis Child

Legislative Director

Disability Rights California

cc: Honorable Tony Mendoza, California State Senate

Oksana Grabchuk, Office of Tony Mendoza

Honorable Members, Senate Health Committee

Reyes Diaz, Principal Consultant, Senate Health Committee