

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 300
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
PHONE: (916) 323-3562
FAX: (916) 445-0278
E-mail: csminfo@csm.ca.gov



June 1, 2004

Mr. Allan P. Burdick
Ms. Juliana F. Gmur
4320 Auburn Blvd., Suite 2000
Sacramento, CA 95841

And Affected State Agencies and Interested Parties (see attached mailing list)

RE: Adopted Statement of Decision

Cancer Presumption for Law Enforcement and Firefighters, 01-TC-19
Labor Code section 3212.1
Statutes 1999, Chapter 595 (AB 539)
Statutes 2000, Chapter 887 (SB 1820)

Dear Mr. Burdick and Ms. Gmur:

The Commission on State Mandates adopted the attached Statement of Decision to deny this test claim on May 27, 2004.

Please contact Tina Poole at (916) 323-8220 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,


PAULA HIGASHI
Executive Director

Enclosure: Adopted Statement of Decision

MAILED:
FAXED:
DATE: 6/11/07 INITIAL: VS
CHRON: FILE:
WORKING BINDER: _____

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE TEST CLAIM ON:

Labor Code Section 3212.1; Statutes 1999,
Chapter 595, Statutes 2000, Chapter 887;

Filed on June 27, 2002;

By California State Association of Counties –
Excess Insurance Authority (CSAC-EIA) and
County of Tehama.

No. 01-TC-19


*Cancer Presumption for Law Enforcement and
Firefighters*

STATEMENT OF DECISION PURSUANT
TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 17500
ET SEQ.; CALIFORNIA CODE OF
REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, DIVISION 2,
CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7


(Adopted on May 27, 2004)

STATEMENT OF DECISION

The attached Statement of Decision of the Commission on State Mandates is hereby adopted in the above-entitled matter.



PAULA HIGASHI, Executive Director



Date

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE TEST CLAIM ON:

Labor Code Section 3212.1; Statutes 1999, Chapter 595, Statutes 2000, Chapter 887;

Filed on June 27, 2002;

By California State Association of Counties – Excess Insurance Authority (CSAC-EIA) and County of Tehama.

No. 01-TC-19

Cancer Presumption for Law Enforcement and Firefighters

STATEMENT OF DECISION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 17500 ET SEQ.; CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, DIVISION 2, CHAPTER 2.5, ARTICLE 7

(Adopted on May 27, 2004)

STATEMENT OF DECISION

The Commission on State Mandates (Commission) heard and decided this test claim during a regularly scheduled hearing on May 27, 2004, Juliana F. Gmur appeared for claimant, County of Tehama. Gina C. Dean appeared for claimant, California State Association of Counties-Excess Insurance Authority (CSAC-ETA). Jaycee Nitchke appeared for the Department of Finance. Allan P. Burdick appeared for interested party, CSAC SB 90 Group.

The law applicable to the Commission's determination of a reimbursable state-mandated program is article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, Government Code section 17500 et seq., and related case law.

The Commission adopted the staff analysis at the hearing by a vote of 4 to 0.

BACKGROUND

This case addresses an evidentiary presumption given to certain firefighters and peace officers in workers compensation cases. Normally, before an employer is liable for payment of workers compensation benefits, the employee must show that the injury arose out of and in the course of employment, and that the injury was proximately caused by the employment. The burden of proof is normally on the employee to show proximate cause by a preponderance of the evidence.]

The Legislature eased the burden of proving industrial causation for certain public employees that provide vital and hazardous services by establishing a series of presumptions.² In 1982, the Legislature enacted Labor Code section 3212.1, which provided a limited presumption, easing the burden of proving industrial causation for specified firefighters that developed cancer during

¹ Labor Code sections 3202.5 and 3600. Labor Code section 3202.5 defines preponderance of the evidence as **such** evidence, “when weighed with that opposed to it, has more convincing force and the better probability of truth. When weighing the evidence, the test is not the relative number of witnesses, but the relative convincing force of the evidence.”

² See, Labor Code sections 3212, 3212.1 – 3212.7, and 3213.

the period of employment. In 1989, certain peace officers were also given the cancer presumption. In these cases, there was a presumption that the cancer arose out of and in the course of employment, and the employer was liable for full hospital, surgical, and medical treatment, disability indemnity, and death benefits, if the firefighter or peace officer could show that:

- z He or she was exposed, while in the service of the department or unit, to a known carcinogen as defined by the International Agency for Research on Cancer, or as defined by the director; and that
- z The carcinogen is reasonably linked to the disabling cancer.

Labor Code section 32 12.1 further provided that the presumption of industrial causation was disputable and could be controverted by the employer by other evidence that the cancer was caused by non-industrial factors.³

Following the enactment of Labor Code section 3212.1, the courts struggled with the employee's burden of proving that the carcinogen was reasonably linked to the cancer. In *Zipton v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board*⁴, the survivors' of a firefighter, who died at age 39 of metastatic undifferentiated epithelial cancer, were held ineligible for workers compensation benefits because the nature of the diagnosis made it impossible to reasonably link the carcinogens and the cancer, Metastatic cancer is a secondary cancer growth that migrates from the primary site of the disease to another part of the body. The primary site of the disease was unknown.⁵ The court stated the following about the reasonable link requirement:

While the legislative history reveals an intent on the part of the Legislature to ease the burden of proof of industrial causation by removing the barrier of proximate cause, in application a reasonable link requirement is no less than the logical equivalent of proximate cause. Moreover, we discern that the requirement was precipitated by a fear of financial doom [by self-insured state and local agencies], but that this fear may be unfounded.

In summary, it may be that there is no purpose to be served by the reasonable link requirement. If indeed metastatic cancer, primary site unknown, is a common medical diagnosis in cancer cases, and therefore results in a pattern of defeating cancer claims of firefighters and police officers by requiring a burden of proof which is medically impossible to sustain, the Legislature may wish to reexamine the reasonable link requirement.”

³ The courts have described the rebuttable presumption as follows: “Where facts are proven giving rise to a presumption . . . , the burden of proof shifts to the party, against whom it operates [i.e., the employer], to prove the nonexistence of the presumed fact, to wit, an industrial relationship.” (*Zipton v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board* (1990) 218 Cal.App.3d 980, 988, fn. 4.)

⁴ *Zi'ton, supra*, 218 Cal.App.3d 980.

⁵ *Id.* at page 991.

⁶ *Id.* at page 990.

In a case after *Zipton*, the First District Court of Appeal noted that Labor Code section 32 12.1 does not provide the same level of presumption enumerated in other presumption statutes. Rather, Labor Code section 32 12.1 contained a “limited and disputable presumption.”⁷ The court also disagreed with the interpretation in *Zipton* that the reasonable link standard was the same as the proximate cause standard. The court held the following:

We hold that more is required under section 3212.1 than the mere coincidence of exposure and cancer. But a showing of proximate cause is not required. Rather, if the evidence supports a reasonable inference that the occupational exposure contributed to the worker’s cancer, then a “reasonable link” has been shown, and the disputable presumption of industrial causation may be invoked?

Test Claim Legislation

In 1999, the Legislature enacted the test claim statute (Stats. 1999, ch. 595), which amended Labor Code section 3212.1 to address the court’s criticism of the reasonable link standard in *Zipton*.⁹ The test claim statute eliminates the employee’s burden of proving that a carcinogen is reasonably linked to the cancer before the presumption that the cancer arose out of and in the course of employment is triggered. Thus, the employee need only show that he or she was exposed, while in the service of the department or unit, to a known carcinogen as defined by the International Agency for Research on Cancer, or as defined by the director, for the presumption of industrial injury to arise.

The employer still has a right to dispute the employee’s claim, But, when disputing the claim, the burden of proving that the carcinogen is not reasonably linked to the cancer has been shifted to the employer. Labor Code section 3212.1, subdivision (d), as amended in 1999, now states the following:

The cancer developing or manifesting itself in these cases shall be presumed to arise out of and in the course of the employment. This presumption is disputable and may be controverted by evidence that the primary site of the cancer has been established and that the carcinogen to which the member has demonstrated exposure is not reasonably linked to the disabling cancer. Unless so controverted, the appeals board is bound to find in accordance with the presumption.

The 1999 test claim statute also specifies that leukemia is included as a type of cancer for which the presumption of industrial injury can apply.

Finally, the 1999 test claim statute retroactively applies the amendments to section 3212.2 to workers compensation claims filed or pending on January 1, 1997. Labor Code section 3212.1, subdivision (e), states that “[t]he amendments to this section enacted during the 1999-2000 Regular Session shall apply to claims for benefits filed or pending on or after January 1, 1997,

⁷ *Riverview Fire Protection District v. Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board* (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 1120, 1124.

⁸ *Id.* at page 1128.

⁹ Assembly Floor Analysis on Assembly Bill 539, dated September 8, 1999.

including, but not limited to, claims for benefits filed on or after that date that have previously been denied, or that are being appealed following denial.”

In 2000, the Legislature enacted the second test claim statute (Stats. 2000, ch. 887) to extend the cancer presumption to peace officers ““primarily engaged in law enforcement activities” as defined below in Penal Code section 830.37, subdivisions (a) and (b):

- (a) Members of an arson-investigating unit, regularly paid and employed in that capacity, of a fire department or fire protection agency of a county, city, city and county, district, or the state, if the primary duty of these peace officers is the detection and apprehension of persons who have violated any fire law or committed insurance fraud.
- (b) Members other than members of an arson-investigating unit, regularly paid and employed in that capacity, of a fire department or fire protection agency of a county, city, city and county, district or the state, if the primary duty of these peace officers, when acting in that capacity, is the enforcement of law relating to fire prevention or fire suppression.

Prior Test Claim Decisions on Labor Code Section 3212.1

In 1982, the Board of Control approved a test claim on Labor Code section 3212.1, as originally added by Statutes 1982, chapter 1568 (*Firefighter’s Cancer Presumption*). The parameters and guidelines authorize insured local agencies and fire districts to receive reimbursement for increases in workers compensation premium costs attributable to Labor Code section 32 12.1. The parameters and guidelines also authorize self-insured local agencies to receive reimbursement for staff costs, including legal counsel costs, in defending the section 32 12.1 claims, and benefit costs including medical costs, travel expenses, permanent disability benefits, life pension benefits, death benefits, and temporary disability benefits paid to the employee or the employee’s survivors.

In 1992, the Commission adopted a statement of decision approving a test claim on Labor Code section 32 12.1, as amended by Statutes 1989, chapter 1171 (*Cancer Presumption – Peace Officers*, CSM 4416.) The parameters and guidelines authorize reimbursement to local law enforcement agencies that employ peace officers defined in Penal Code sections 830.1 and 830.2 for the same costs approved in the Board of Control decision in the *Firefighter’s Cancer Presumption* test claim.¹⁰

Claimants’ Position

The claimants contend that the test claim legislation constitutes a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution and Government Code section 175 14. The claimants assert the following:

[The test claim legislation takes] an element that once had to be proved by the employee – that the disabling cancer is reasonably related to the carcinogen and shifts that element so the employer must now show that the disabling cancer is not reasonably related to the carcinogen. Further, the employer is only allowed to address the reasonably-related element if the employer can establish the

¹⁰ Exhibit J to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing

primary site of the cancer. The employer must establish both to make use of this defense. And this defense is now the one and only way to defeat the presumption.

The net effect of this legislation is to further encourage the filing of workers' compensation claims for cancer and markedly increase the probability that the claims will be successful. Thus, the total costs of these claims, from initial prosecution to ultimate resolution are reimbursable.¹

The claimants further argue that the "only way to rebut the presumptions [in the test claim statute] is by tracking the employee's non-work hour movements and contacts for a several month period."²

Position of the Department of Finance

The Department of Finance filed comments on August 8, 2002, concluding that the test claim legislation may create a reimbursable state-mandated program.¹³

On April 14, 2004, the Department of Finance filed comments on the draft staff analysis, withdrawing their original comments and agreeing that the test claim legislation does not constitute a reimbursable state-mandated program.¹⁴

Position of the Department of Industrial Relations

The Department of Industrial Relations contends that the test claim legislation is not a reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution. The Department asserts that the presumption in favor of safety officers does not result in a new program or higher level of service for the following reasons:

1. Local governments are not required to accept all workers' compensation claims. They have the option to rebut any claim before the Workers Compensation Appeals Board by presenting a preponderance of evidence showing the non-existence of industrial causation.
2. Statutes mandating a higher level of compensation to local government employees, such as workers' compensation benefits, are not "new programs" whose costs would be subject to reimbursement under article XIII B, section 6.
3. There is no shift of a financial burden from the State to local governments because local governments, by statute, have always been solely liable for providing workers compensation benefits to their employees.¹⁵

¹¹ Test Claim, page 6 (Exhibit A to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing).

¹² Claimants' Response to State Agency Comments, page 3 (Exhibit D to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing),

¹³ Exhibit B to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing.

¹⁴ Exhibit I to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing.

¹⁵ Exhibit C to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

The courts have found that article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution” recognizes the state constitutional restrictions on the powers of local government to tax and spend.’⁷ “Its purpose is to preclude the state from shifting financial responsibility for carrying out governmental functions to local agencies, which are ‘ill equipped’ to assume increased financial responsibilities because of the taxing and spending limitations that articles XIII A and XIII B impose.”¹⁸ A test claim statute or executive order may impose a reimbursable state-mandated program if it orders or commands a local agency or school district to engage in an activity or task.’” In addition, the required activity or task must be new, constituting a “new program,” or it must create a “higher level of service” over the previously required level of service.²⁰

The courts have defined a “program” subject to article XIII B, section 6, of the California Constitution, as one that carries out the governmental function of providing public services, or a law that imposes unique requirements on local agencies or school districts to implement a state policy, but does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state.²¹ To determine if the program is new or imposes a higher level of service, the test claim legislation must be compared with the legal requirements in effect immediately before the enactment of the test claim

¹⁶ Article XIII B, section 6 provides: “Whenever the Legislature or any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on any local government, the state shall provide a subvention of funds to reimburse such local government for the costs of **such** program or increased level of service, except that the Legislature may, but need not, provide such subvention of funds for the following mandates: (a) Legislative mandates requested by the local agency affected; (b) Legislation defining a new crime or changing an existing definition of a crime; or (c) Legislative mandates enacted prior to January 1, 1975, or executive orders or regulations initially implementing legislation enacted prior to January 1, 1975 .”

¹⁷ *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates* (2003) 30 Cal.4th 727, 735.

¹⁸ *County of San Diego v. State of California* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 68, 81.

¹⁹ *Long Beach Unified School Dist. v. State of California* (1990) 225 Cal.App.3d 155, 174. In *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates*, *supra*, 30 Cal.4th at page 742, the court agreed that “activities undertaken at the option or discretion of a local government entity (that is, actions undertaken without any legal compulsion or threat of penalty for nonparticipation) do not trigger a state mandate and hence do not require reimbursement of funds - even if the local entity is obligated to incur costs as a result of its discretionary decision to participate in a particular program or practice.” The court left open the question of whether non-legal compulsion could result in a reimbursable state mandate, such as in a case where failure to participate in a program results in severe penalties or “draconian” consequences, (*Id.*, at p. 754.)

²⁰ *Lucia Mar Unified School District v. Honig* (1988) 44 Cal.3d 830, 835-836.

²¹ *County of Los Angeles v. State of California* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46, 56; *Lucia Mar*, *supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.

legislation.²² Finally, the newly required activity or increased level of service must impose costs mandated by the state.²³

The Commission is vested with exclusive authority to adjudicate disputes over the existence of state-mandated programs within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.²⁴ In making its decisions, the Commission must strictly construe article XIII B, section 6 and not apply it as an “equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding priorities.”²⁵

Issue 1: Does CSAC-EIA have standing as a claimant for this test claim?

The Commission finds that California State Association of Counties -- Excess Insurance Authority (CSAC-EIA) does not have standing, and is not a proper claimant for this test claim.

Government Code sections 17550 and 17551 authorize local agencies and school districts to file test claims seeking reimbursement pursuant to article XIII B, section 6. Government Code section 17518 defines “local agencies” to mean “any city, county, special district, authority, or other political subdivision of the state.” Government Code section 17520 defines “special district” to include a “joint powers agency.”

CSAC-EIA is a joint powers authority established pursuant to the Joint Exercise of Powers Act (“Act”) in Government Code section 6500 et seq. and is formed for insurance and risk management purposes.²⁶ Under the Act, school districts and local agencies are authorized to enter into agreements to “jointly exercise any power common to the contracting parties.”²⁷ The entity provided to administer or execute the agreement (in this case CSAC-EIA) may be a firm or corporation, including a nonprofit corporation, designated in the agreement.²⁸ A joint powers authority is a separate entity from the parties to the agreement and is not legally considered to be the same entity as its contracting parties.²⁹ CSAC-EIA contends that, as a joint powers agency, it

²² *Lucia Mar, supra*, 44 Cal.3d 830, 835.

²³ *County of Fresno v. State of California* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 482, 487; *County of Sonoma v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1284; Government Code sections 17514 and 17556.

²⁴ *Kinlaw v. State of California* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 326, 331-334; Government Code sections 17551, 17552.

²⁵ *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1817; *County of Sonoma, supra*, 84 Cal.App.4th 1265, 1280.

²⁶ Letter dated February 4, 2004, by Gina C. Dean, Assistant General Manager for CSAC-EIA (Exhibit F to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing).

²⁷ Government Code section 6502.

²⁸ Government Code section 6506.

²⁹ Government Code section 6507; 65 Opinions of the California Attorney General 618, 623 (1982).

is a type of local agency that can file a test claim based on the plain language of Government Code section 1 7520.³⁰

Based on the facts of this case, the Commission disagrees.

In 1991, the California Supreme Court decided *Kinlaw v. State of California, supra*, a case that is relevant here. In *Kinlaw*, medically indigent adults and taxpayers brought an action against the state alleging that the state violated article XIII B, section 6 by enacting legislation that shifted financial responsibility for the funding of health care for medically indigent adults to the counties. The Supreme Court denied the claim, holding that the medically indigent adults and taxpayers lacked standing to prosecute the action and that the plaintiffs have no right to reimbursement under article XIII B, section 6.³¹ The court stated the following:

Plaintiffs' argument that they must be permitted to enforce section 6 as individuals because their right to adequate health care services has been compromised by the failure of the state to reimburse the county for the cost of services to medically indigent adults is unpersuasive. *Plaintiffs' interest*, although pressing, *is indirect* and does not differ from the interest of the public at large in the financial plight of local government. Although the basis for the claim that the state must reimburse the county for its costs of providing the care that was formerly available to plaintiffs under Medi-Cal is that AB 799 created a state mandate, plaintiffs have no right to have any reimbursement expended for health care services of any kind.³² (Emphasis added.)

Like the plaintiffs in *Kinlaw*, CSAC-EIA, as a separate entity from the contracting counties, is not directly affected by the test claim legislation. The Legislature, in Labor Code section 32 12.1, gave specified peace officers a presumption of industrial causation that the cancer arose out of and in the course of their employment. The counties, as employers of peace officers, argue that the presumption creates a reimbursable state-mandated program and that the increased costs are reimbursable.

But, CSAC-EIA does not employ peace officers specified in the test claim legislation.³³ **Thus**, while CSAC-EIA may have an interest in this claim as the insurer, its interest is indirect. As expressed in an opinion of the California Attorney General, a joint powers authority "is simply not a city, a county, or the state as those terms are normally used."³⁴ Thus, under the *Kinlaw* decision, CSAC-EIA lacks standing in this case to act as a claimant.

³⁰ Claimants' response to draft staff analysis (Exhibit H to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing).

³¹ *Kinlaw, supra*, 54 Cal.3d at pages 334-335.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ In response to the draft staff analysis, CSAC-EIA states the following: "Indeed, CSAC-EIA is a separate entity comprised of counties to act as a mechanism to protect the counties' fisc. Although CSAC-EIA does not employ peace officers, when it comes to their workers compensation, the buck stops at CSAC-EIA." (Exhibit H, p. 2, to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing.)

³⁴ 65 Opinions of the California Attorney General 618, 623 (1982).

This conclusion is further supported by the decision of the Third District Court of Appeal in *Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Marcos v. Commission on State Mandates* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 976. Although Government Code section 17520 expressly includes redevelopment agencies in the definition of “special districts” that are eligible to file test claims with the Commission, the court found that redevelopment agencies are not subject to article XIII B, section 6 since they are not bound by the spending limitations in article XIII B, and are not required to expend any “proceeds of taxes.” The court stated the following:

Because of the nature of the financing they receive, tax increment financing, redevelopment agencies are not subject to this type of appropriations limitations or spending caps; they do not expend any “proceeds of taxes.” Nor do they raise, through tax increment financing, “general revenues for the local entity.”³⁵

The Third District **Court** of Appeal affirmed the *Redevelopment Agency* decision in *City of El Monte v. Commission on State Mandates* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 266, 281, again finding that redevelopment agencies are not entitled to claim reimbursement for state-mandated costs because they are not required to expend “proceeds of taxes.”

In the present case, CSAC-EIA is also not subject to the appropriations limitation of article XIII B and does not expend any “proceeds of taxes” within the meaning of article XIII B. According to the letter dated February 4, 2004, from CSAC-EIA, “CSAC-EIA has no authority to tax” and instead receives proceeds of taxes from its member counties in the form of premium payments.³⁶ Therefore, the Commission concludes CSAC-EIA is not an eligible claimant for this test claim.

Issue 2: Is the test claim legislation subject to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution? .

The Commission finds that the test claim legislation is not subject to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution because it does not mandate a new program or higher level of service on local agencies within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6.

Labor Code section 3212.1, subdivision (d), as amended by the test claim legislation, states the following:

The cancer developing or manifesting itself in these cases shall be presumed to arise out of and in the course of the employment. This presumption is disputable and *may* be controverted by evidence that the primary site of the cancer has been established and that the carcinogen to which the member has demonstrated exposure is not reasonably linked to the disabling cancer. Unless so controverted, the appeals board is bound to find in accordance with the presumption. (Emphasis added.)

The test claim legislation also extends the presumption of industrial causation to peace officers “primarily engaged in law enforcement activities” as defined in Penal Code section 830.37, subdivisions (a) and (b). Finally, the legislation specifies that leukemia is included as a type of cancer for which the presumption of industrial injury can apply.

³⁵ *Redevelopment Agency, supra*, 55 Cal.App.4th at page 986.

³⁶ Exhibit F to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing.

The claimant contends that the test claim legislation constitutes a new program or higher level of service:

The presumption in the applicant's favor increases the likelihood that his claim will result in money payments from his employer as well as full coverage of his medical costs. The greater the number of successful applicants, the more the employer will pay in workers compensation benefits. Thus the new program or higher level of service is the creation of the presumption.³⁷

The claimant further argues that local agencies are now required to track the employee's non-work hour movements and contacts for a several month period in order to rebut the presumption that the cancer is an industrial injury.

The express language of Labor Code section 3212.1 does not impose any state-mandated requirements on local agencies. Rather, the decision to dispute this type of workers compensation claim and prove that the injury is non-industrial remains entirely with the local agency, as it has since Labor Code section 3212.1 was enacted in 1982.³⁸ The plain language of Labor Code section 3212.1 states that the "presumption is disputable and *may* be controverted by evidence that the primary site of the cancer has been established and that the carcinogen to which the member has demonstrated exposure is not reasonably linked to the disabling cancer."

Under the rules of statutory construction, when the statutory language is plain, as the statute is here, the court is required to enforce the statute according to its terms. The California Supreme Court determined that:

In statutory construction cases, our fundamental task is to ascertain the intent of the lawmakers so as to effectuate the purpose of the statute. We begin by examining the statutory language, giving the words their usual and ordinary meaning. If the terms of the statute are unambiguous, we presume the lawmakers meant what they said, and the plain meaning of the language governs. [Citations omitted.]³⁹

Moreover, the court may not disregard or enlarge the plain provisions of a statute, nor may it go beyond the meaning of the words used when the words are clear and unambiguous. Thus, the court is prohibited from writing into a statute, by implication, express requirements that the Legislature itself has not seen fit to place in the statute.⁴⁰ Consistent with this principle, the courts have strictly construed the meaning and effect of statutes analyzed under article XIII B, section 6, and have not applied section 6 as an equitable remedy:

A strict construction of section 6 is in keeping with the rules of constitutional interpretation, which require that constitutional limitations and restrictions on legislative power "are to be construed strictly, and are not to be extended to

³⁷ Claimants' response to draft staff analysis (Exhibit H, p. 4, to Item 5, May 27, 2004 Commission Hearing).

³⁸ See also, *Ziptosupra* 3 Cal.App.3d 980, 988.

³⁹ *Estate of Griswald* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 904, 910-911.

⁴⁰ *Whitcomb v. California Employment Commission* (1944) 24 Cal.2d 753, 757.

include matters not covered by the language used.” [Citations omitted.][“Under our form of government, policymaking authority is vested in the Legislature and neither arguments as to the wisdom of an enactment nor questions as to the motivation of the Legislature can serve to invalidate particular legislation.”] Under these principles, there is no basis for applying section 6 as an equitable remedy to cure the perceived unfairness resulting from political decisions on funding policies.⁴¹

In the present case, the claimant reads requirements into Labor Code section 3212.1, which, by the plain meaning of the statute, are not there.

This conclusion is further supported by the California Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates*.⁴² In *Department of Finance*, the court considered the meaning of the term “state mandate” as it appears in article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution. The court reviewed the ballot materials for article XIII B, which provided that “a state mandate comprises something that a local government entity is required or forced to do.”⁴³ The ballot summary by the Legislative Analyst further defined “state mandates” as “requirements imposed on local governments by legislation or executive orders.”⁴⁴

The court also reviewed and affirmed the holding of the *City of Merced* case.^{45, 46} The court stated the following:

In *City of Merced*, the city was under no legal compulsion to resort to eminent domain-but when it elected to employ that means of acquiring property, its obligation to compensate for lost business goodwill was not a reimbursable state mandate, because the city was not required to employ eminent domain in the first place. Here as well, if a school district elects to participate in or continue participation in any underlying *voluntary* education-related funded program, the district’s obligation to comply with the notice and agenda requirements related to that program does not constitute a reimbursable state mandate. (Emphasis in original.)⁴⁷

Thus, the Supreme Court held as follows:

[W]e reject claimants’ assertion that they have been legally compelled to incur notice and agenda costs, and hence are entitled to reimbursement from the state, based merely upon the circumstance that notice and agenda provisions are

⁴¹ *City of San Jose v. State of California* (1996) 45 Cal.App.4th 1802, 1816-1817.

⁴² *Department of Finance, supra*, 30 Cal.4th 727.

⁴³ *Id.* page 737.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Id.* page 743.

⁴⁶ *City of Merced v. State of California* (1984) 153 Cal.App.3d 777.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

mandatory elements of education-related programs in which claimants have participated, *without regard to whether claimant's participation in the underlying program is voluntary or compelled.* [Emphasis added.]⁴⁸

The Supreme Court left undecided whether a reimbursable state mandate “might be found in circumstances short of legal compulsion—for example, if the state were to impose a substantial penalty (independent of the program funds at issue) upon any local entity that declined to participate in a given program.”⁴⁹

The decision of the California Supreme Court in *Department of Finance* is relevant and its reasoning applies in this case. The Supreme Court explained that “the proper focus under a legal compulsion inquiry is upon the nature of the claimants’ participation in the underlying programs themselves.”⁵⁰ Thus, based on the Supreme Court’s decision, the Commission must determine if the underlying program (in this case, the decision to rebut the presumption that the cancer is an industrial injury) is a voluntary decision at the local level or is legally compelled by the state. As indicated above, school districts are not legally compelled by state law to dispute a workers compensation case. The decision to litigate such cases is made at the local level and is within the discretion of the local agency. Thus, the employer’s burden to prove that the carcinogen is not reasonably linked to the cancer is also not state-mandated.

Further, there is no evidence in the law or in the record that local agencies are practically compelled by the state through the imposition of a substantial penalty to dispute such cases. While it may be true that local agencies will incur increased costs in insurance premiums as a result of the test claim legislation, as alleged by claimant here, increased costs alone are not determinative of the issue whether the legislation imposes a reimbursable state-mandated program. The California Supreme Court has ruled that evidence of additional costs alone, even when those costs are deemed necessary by the local agency, do not result in a reimbursable state-mandated program under article XIII B, section 6.

We recognize that, as is made indisputably clear from the language of the constitutional provision, local entities are not entitled to reimbursement for all increased costs mandated by state law, but only those costs resulting from a new program or an increased level of service imposed upon them by the state?

Finally, the claimant argues that this claim is just like two prior test claim decisions approving reimbursement in cancer presumption workers compensation cases and, thus, this test claim should likewise be approved. However, prior Board of Control and Commission decisions are not controlling in this case.

Since 1953, the California the California Supreme **Court** has held that the failure of a quasi-judicial agency to consider prior decisions on the same subject is not a violation of due process

⁴⁸ *Id.* at page 73 1.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ *Id.* at page 743.

⁵¹ *County of Los Angeles, supra*, 43 Cal.3d at page 54; see also, *Department of Finance v. Commission on State Mandates, supra*, 30 Cal.4th at page 735.

and does not constitute an arbitrary action by the agency.⁵² In *Weiss v. State Board of Equalization*, the plaintiffs brought mandamus proceedings to review the refusal of the State Board of Equalization to issue an off-sale beer and wine license at their premises. Plaintiffs contended that the action of the board was arbitrary and unreasonable because the board granted similar licenses to other businesses in the past. The California Supreme Court disagreed with the plaintiffs' contention and found that the board did *not* act arbitrarily. The Court stated, in pertinent part, the following:

[P]laintiffs argument comes down to the contention that because the board may have erroneously granted licenses to be used near the school in the past it must continue its error and grant plaintiffs' application. That problem has been discussed: *Not only does due process permit omission of reasoned administrative opinions but it probably also permits substantial deviation from the principle of stare decisis.* Like courts, agencies may overrule prior decisions or practices and may initiate new policy or law through adjudication. (Emphasis added.)⁵³

In 1989, the Attorney General's Office issued an opinion, citing the Weiss case, agreeing that claims previously approved by the Commission have no precedential value. Rather, "[a]n agency may disregard its earlier decision, provided that its action is neither arbitrary nor unreasonable [citing *Weiss, supra*, 40 Cal.2d. at 777]."⁵⁴ While opinions of the Attorney General are not binding, they are entitled to great weight?

Moreover, the merits of a claim brought under article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution, must be analyzed individually. Commission decisions under article XIII B, section 6 are not arbitrary or unreasonable as long as the decision strictly construes the Constitution and the statutory language of the test claim statute, and does not apply section 6 as an equitable remedy? The analysis in this case complies with these principles, particularly when recognizing the recent California Supreme Court statements on the issue of voluntary versus compulsory programs -- direction that the Commission must now follow.

Accordingly, the Commission finds that the test claim legislation is not subject to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution because the legislation does not mandate a new program or higher level of service on local agencies.⁵⁷

⁵² *Weiss v. State Board of Equalization* (1953) 40 Cal.2d 772, 776-777.

⁵³ *Id.* at page 776.

⁵⁴ 72 Opinions of the California Attorney General 173, 178, *fi1.2* (1989).

⁵⁵ *Ricleout Hospital Foundation, Inc. v. County of Yubn* (1992) 8 Cal.App.4th 214, 227.

⁵⁶ *City of San Jose, supra*, 45 Cal.App.4th at 1816-1817; *County of Sonoma, supra*, 84 Cal.App.4th 1264, 1280-1281.

⁵⁷ Because this conclusion is dispositive of the case, the Commission need not reach the other issues raised by the Department of Industrial Relations.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Commission concludes that California State Association of Counties Excess Insurance Authority (CSAC-EIA) does not have standing, and is not a proper claimant for this test claim. The Commission further concludes that Labor Code section 3212.1, as amended by the test claim legislation, is not subject to article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution because it does not mandate a new program or higher level of service on local agencies.

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, the undersigned, declare as follows:

I am a resident of the County of Sacramento and I am over the age of 18 years, and not a party to the within action. My place of employment is 980 Ninth Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, California 958 14.

June 1, 2004, I served the:

Adopted Statement of Decision

Cancer Presumption for Law Enforcement and Firefighters, 0 1-TC- 19

Labor Code section 3212.1

Statutes 1999, Chapter 595 (AB 539)

Statutes 2000, Chapter 887 (SB 1820)


by placing a true copy thereof in an envelope addressed to:

Mr. Allan P. Burdick
Ms. Juliana F. Gmur
4320 Auburn Blvd., Suite 2000
Sacramento, CA 95841

State Agencies and Interested Parties (See attached mailing list);

and by sealing and depositing said envelope in the United States mail at Sacramento, California, with postage thereon fully paid.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on June 1, 2004, at Sacramento, California.



VICTORIA SORIANO

Commission on State Mandates

Original List Date: 7/5/2002
Last Updated: 6/1/2004
List Print Date: 06/01/2004
Claim Number: 01-TC-19
Issue:

Mailing Information: Notice of adopted SOD

Mailing List

Cancer Presumption for Law Enforcement and Firefighters

TO ALL PARTIES AND INTERESTED PARTIES:

Each commission mailing list is continuously updated as requests are received to include or remove any party or person on the mailing list. A current mailing list is provided with commission correspondence, and a copy of the current mailing list is available upon request at any time. Except as provided otherwise by commission rule, when a party or interested party files any written material with the commission concerning a claim, it shall simultaneously serve a copy of the written material on the parties and interested parties to the claim identified on the mailing list provided by the commission. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1181.2.)

Mr. Mark Sigman
Riverside County Sheriff's Office
4095 Lemon Street
P O Box 512
Riverside, CA 92502

Tel: (909) 955-2700
Fax: (909) 955-2720

Mr. Paul Minney
Spector, Middleton, Young & Minney, LLP
7 Park Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95825

Tel: (916) 646-1400
Fax: (916) 646-1300

Ms. Annette Chinn
Cost Recovery Systems
705-2 East Bidwell Street, #294
Folsom, CA 95630

Tel: (916) 939-7901
Fax: (916) 939-7801

Mr. David Wellhouse
David Wellhouse & Associates, Inc.
9175 Kiefer Blvd, Suite 121
Sacramento, CA 95826

Tel: (916) 368-9244
Fax: (916) 368-5723

Dr. Carol Berg
Education Mandated Cost Network
1121 L Street, Suite 1060
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 446-7517
Fax: (916) 446-2011

Mr. Richard Robinson
County of Tehama
County Clerk's Office
P.O. BOX 250
Red Bluff, CA 96080

Claimant
Tel: (916) 000-0000
Fax: (916) 000-0000

Mr. Leonard Kaye, Esq.
County of Los Angeles
Auditor-Controller's Office
500 W. Temple Street, Room 603
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tel: (213) 974-8564
Fax: (213) 617-8106

Ms. Bonnie Ter Keurst
County of San Bernardino
Office of the Auditor/Controller-Recorder
222 West Hospitality Lane
San Bernardino, CA 924150018

Tel: (909) 386-8850
Fax: (909) 386-8830

Executive Director
California State Firefighters' Association
2701 K Street, Suite 201
Sacramento, CA 95816

Tel: (800) 451-2732
Fax: (916) 446-9889

Mr. Keith B. Petersen
SixTen & Associates
5252 Balboa Avenue, Suite 807
San Diego, CA 92117

Tel: (858) 514-8605
Fax: (858) 514-8645

Mr. James Wright
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (A-45)
P.O. Box 944246, Room 1646-9
Sacramento, CA 94244-2460

Tel: (916) 653-7370
Fax: (916) 653-8961

Mr. Keith Gmeinder
Department of Finance (A-15)
915 L Street, 8th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Tel: (916) 4458913
Fax: (916) 327-0225

Executive Director
California Peace Officers' Association
1455 Response Road, Suite 190
Sacramento, CA 95815

Tel: (916) 263-0541
Fax: (916) 000-0000

Ms. Gina Dean
California State Association of Counties
1100 K Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Claimant
Tel: (916) 631-7363
Fax: (916) 000-0000

Mr. Allan Burdick
MAXIMUS
4320 Auburn Blvd., Suite 2000
Sacramento, CA 95841

Claimant Representative
Tel: (916) 485-8102
Fax: (916) 485-0111

Mr. Steve Smith
Steve Smith Enterprises, Inc.
4633 Whitney Avenue, Suite A
Sacramento, CA 95821

Tel: (916) 483-4231
Fax: (916) 483-1403

Ms. Leslie McGill
California Peace Officers' Association
1455 Response Road, Suite 190
Sacramento, CA 95815

Tel: (916) 000-0000
Fax: (916) 000-0000

Mr. Gary J. O'Mara
Department of Industrial Relations
Office of the Director
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Tenth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Tel: (415) 703-4240
Fax: (415) 703-5058

Mr. J. Bradley Burgess
Public Resource Management Group
1380 Lead Hill Boulevard, Suite #1 06
Roseville, CA 95661

Tel: (916) 677-4233
Fax: (916) 677-2283

Mr. Jim Jagers
Centration, Inc.
12150 Tributary Point Drive, Suite 140
Gold River, CA 95670

Tel: (916) 351-1050
Fax: (916) 351-1020

Mr. Todd Wherry
MCS Education Services
1 1 130 Sun Center Drive, Suite 100
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Tel: (916) 669-5119
Fax: (916) 669-0888

Ms. Juliana Gmur
MAXI MUS
4320 Auburn Boulevard, Suite 2000
Sacramento, CA 95841

Tel: (916) 485-8102
Fax: (916) 485-01 1 1

Ms. Ginny Brummels
State Controller's Office (B-08)
Division of Accounting & Reporting
3301 C Street, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95816

Tel: (916) 324-0256
Fax: (916) 323-6527
