

CPYP Task Force Practice and Policy Committee Meetings

October 17, 2007

10:00 am to 2:00 pm

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, San Francisco

Next Meeting: January 16, 2007, 10:00 a.m at the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, San Francisco

Practice Committee

Attendees

Kira Bellah, California Youth Connection
Adela Cervantes, Fresno County
Bob Friend, CPYP, Interim Chair
Nita Kenyon, San Luis Obispo County
Kat Lauterback, San Luis Obispo County
Jean Little, Stanislaus County
Bob Malmberg, Orange County
Abby Montano, Fresno County
Katharine Odle, San Mateo County, Note-taker
Veronica Salmeron, Fresno County

Absent

Cyndee Borges-O'Dell, Stanislaus County
Nichole Castanon-Bletz, Fresno County
Kristie Esquivel, Kern County
Crystal Luffberry, California Connected by 25 Initiative
Jessica Macias, Kern County
David Turk, San Francisco County

Policy Committee

Attendees

Craig Harris, California Department of Mental Health
Sophia Isom, San Francisco County
Jill Jacobs, Family Builders by Adoption
Gail Johnson Vaughan, Mission Focused Solutions, Chair
Jude Koski, California Youth Connection
Jonathan Pearson, California Youth Connection
Diane Wagner, Los Angeles County
Julia Waters, California Youth Connection, Contra Costa County

Absent

Robin Allen, California CASA Association
Carol Biddle, Kinship Center

Nenita Dean, Stanislaus County
Amy Freeman, Stuart Foundation
Karen Grace-Kaho, State of California
Karen Gunderson, California Dept. of Social Services
Janice Howland, California Department of Social Services
Fred Jun, Alameda County
Erin Saberi, Casey Family Programs

CPYP Staff

Eileen Johnson
Tina Obinna

Agenda

9:30 a.m. Continental Breakfast

10:00 a.m. Meeting Starts

Welcome and Introductions – Bob Friend and Gail Johnson Vaughan

Split into policy and practice committees

- Group roster
- Purpose
- Interface with other committee
- Priorities

We will break for lunch at approximately 12pm for about 30 minutes
Lunch will be held in the JCC Lunchroom.

1:15 p.m. Come together for wrap-up in Lunchroom

2:00 p.m. Adjourn

Minutes

Welcome and Introductions

Due to bad weather, several people were delayed in their arrival, so the meeting did not begin until about 10:30 a.m.

Bob Friend welcomed the group. Attendees were asked to introduce themselves, give the number of years they have been participating in the Task Force, and tell what they hoped to contribute to the group.

The group included “charter members” of the Task Force, first-time attendees, and others who had been participating for a number of years. In general, people shared that they hoped to:

- implement permanency work more effectively in their respective agencies
- bring about needed policy changes so that best permanency practice can be done
- learn from each other and help each other

Review of Key Agreements - Bob Friend

Bob Friend shared that he was eager to see this new incarnation of the Task Force move forward. When the Task Force first came together, it had a great deal of energy and force. However, as the group increased in size, it became unwieldy and inefficient. Friend hoped that the two committees would be able to regain the initial momentum of the group. He stressed that he wanted to make sure that participants spent their time productively, bringing about positive results in practice and policy.

Friend reviewed the key agreements and proposal from the last meeting:

Key agreements

1. We agreed that the Task Force needed to be refocused so that more work was consistently accomplished; the size of the group no longer effectively accommodated check-ins and updates from around the state.
2. The quarterly county regional meetings have created better forums for ongoing check-in and sharing of practice, and they are logically (at least unofficially) extensions of the Task Force which could become part of a communication/feedback structure.
3. We agreed that the National Governors Association (NGA) Permanency Workgroup was redundant to the Task Force and should be incorporated back into it.
4. We saw the need for the state to periodically interface with the groups, and a suggestion was made to hold an annual statewide convening, recognizing that there were no funds to support such a meeting at this time. This will need more work.
5. The group saw no need for the continuation of quarterly meetings of the Task Force but rather that the Practice and Policy Committees meet regularly (times to be determined).
6. We must find a way for the youth voice to be incorporated into the ongoing work of the Task Force.

Proposal for transitioning the Task Force

1. Create a Policy Committee and a Practice Committee with a chair for each group.
2. Committees will decide on frequency of meetings; meetings will periodically overlap to share perspectives and information.
3. The NGA Permanency workgroup will no longer meet separately, but instead will be incorporated into the committees' structure. (Friend notified the workgroup and invited them to participate in today's meeting.)
4. Committee chairs and the CPYP Director will meet regularly to ensure cohesion between the two groups, planning, and oversight.

Friend then asked for any additional comments or feedback from attendees. No changes were proposed.

College Cost Reduction and Access Act

As part of the discussion following, Gail Johnson Vaughan pointed out that the Task Force was an important part of recently passed federal legislation. The College Cost Reduction and Access Act (HR 2669), the bill that includes the Fostering Adoption to Further Student Achievement Act amendment, makes it possible for teens in foster care to be adopted without losing access to college financial aid. Under this new law, youth who are adopted after their 13th birthday will not have to include their parents' income in the calculations for determining their need for financial aid. Johnson Vaughan noted that getting the legislation passed was not hard to do, once the barrier/key issue was identified. She hopes the Policy Committee can continue with similar successful work identifying and overcoming barriers to permanency.

AB 149 (Bass and Maze) Dependent Children

This is the family finding bill, which was vetoed by the governor. Jonathan Pearson read the veto statement to the group (see attached). Bob Friend noted that the veto reasons (including lack of funding) had nothing to do with the practice of family finding. Even though the state government may believe that "California is an expert already," in reality we are in the infancy stage of permanency work. Friend hopes the Task Force committees can help identify the people who can get this message across: "Even if we (in California) are national leaders, we still have a problem."

The group then separated into the two separate committees.

Policy Committee Minutes

Present

Craig Harris, California Department of Mental Health
Sophia Isom, San Francisco County
Jill Jacobs, Family Builders by Adoption
Gail Johnson Vaughan, Mission Focused Solutions, Chair
Jude Koski, California Youth Connection
Jonathan Pearson, California Youth Connection
Diane Wagner, Los Angeles County
Julia Waters, California Youth Connection, Contra Costa County

Absent

Robin Allen, California CASA Association
Carol Biddle, Kinship Center
Nenita Dean, Stanislaus County
Amy Freeman, Stuart Foundation
Karen Grace-Kaho, State of California
Karen Gunderson, California Dept. of Social Services
Janice Howland, California Department of Social Services
Fred Jun, Alameda County
Ginger Pierce, Monterey County
Jennifer Rodriguez, Youth Law Center
Erin Saberi, Casey Family Programs

CYC developing curriculum on how to maximize effective use of youth on committees, etc. Jude Law will keep us posted of the time line. Committee agreed to stay sensitive to need to explain acronyms and provide history of some practices and initiatives to allow youth to be better included in the meeting and work of the committee.

Committee Composition

Reviewed current committee composition. Jude Law explained that CYC is sponsoring the participation of two youth and recommends at least one more, perhaps from the south. She asked if any of the other organizations could be sponsor, collectively or individually. Diane Wagner said she would look into whether LA county could do that. We also want to inquire is there might be funds in the CPYP budget to sponsor another youth.

Recommended additions to the committee – follow-through from last meeting: Kathy Dressler, Curt Child, and Carrie Womack have indicated interest in joining but were not able to make today's meeting. Jerilyn Borack, Dave Nielson, (Gail Johnson Vaughan to follow-up), Judge Nash (Diane Wagner to follow-up), and Susanna Kniffen, have been contacted but have not yet responded.

The following are still to be contacted (those assigned to contact candidates are listed in parentheses): Marin County CWDA representative; Jim Paulson, Contra Costa County (Julia Waters); Alice Bussiere (Karen) or Jennifer Troia (Robin Allen); someone from Southern

California (Diane Wagner to provide suggestions, perhaps a youth?); Carroll Schroeder (Jill Jacobs); Miryam Choca (Jill Jacobs); Nancy Rubin (Robin Allen); Diana Kalcic, CWDA (Jonathan Pearson); kin provider; Amy Lemly, John Burton Foundation policy staff (Jonathan Pearson); Kim Burton (Sophia Isom); Regina Deihl, (Gail Johnson Vaughan); someone from Women in Philanthropy (Gail Johnson Vaughan). Also needed but not yet identified: children’s attorney.

Goal of Committee:

To identify policies which support permanency that could be implemented statewide that CPYP could build support for. Educate and create awareness across the broad system (CWS, juvenile justice, probation, judicial, mental health etc.) necessary to implement best policies.

Discussion followed to identify policy gaps. It was pointed out that many good policies are in place at various places around the state.

Recommended action: Inventory and disseminate good policies which support and sustain permanency.

What is the best strategy for replicating good policies – mandate?, mentor, influence? We agreed that CDSS has a responsibility to provide leadership in influencing the adoption of good policies and practice. Brief discussion of possibility of statewide convening on permanency issues.

A long discussion ensued on policy gaps needed to support youth permanence. Three dominated our discussion time:

- 1) Funding policy that creates disincentives to permanence – outcomes follow incentives. If agencies only get rewarded for keeping children in care it is unlikely that practice will change to get them into permanent families.
- 2) Need for mental health department policies to assure that permanency competent contractors are included in their group of EPSDT (Early and Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment) contractors, both for mental health services after placement and because much of youth permanency services are EPSDT fundable but youth service providers are not EPSDT contractors.
- 3) Belief system of individual workers and agency cultural belief systems are a primary barrier to successful youth permanence. Policies to identify and address belief systems that create barriers to youth permanence will bring this to the surface and create a starting point for important work.

The following policy gaps were identified. Policy committee members committed to reviewing and adding edit suggestions, comments, and further recommendations. Committee chair committed to emailing the matrix to committee members and to Practice Committee members as well.

Policy gaps

| Policy needed | Impact | Strategy |
|---|--|-----------------|
| All foster children and youth will be provided with a CASA. Not all foster children get a CASA. Long waiting lists. Is there a policy that could promote recruitment and support of more CASA’s | Youth more likely to fall through the cracks without an advocate | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Funding Policy Issues | | |
| Federal funding policies requiring a child to be in care to receive funding for services create a disincentive for permanence. Resources to support agency services end when permanency is achieved through reunification and adoption. | Outcomes will follow incentives. Remove disincentives to permanence and implement incentives and fewer youth will emancipate without connections. | |
| No stable funding streams exists for family finding or for development of permanent connections | Excellent grant funded model pilots are demonstrating effectiveness. Lack on ongoing funding put projects at risk long-term | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many youth permanence service components could be funded by EPSDT. Need more partner with county mental health departments and create EPSDT contracts for agencies doing good permanency work. • Document cost savings of permanence and have counties reinvest savings in additional permanency services |
| No funding to support and sustain new permanent families for youth. Policy needed to provide funding to integrate into standard case management practice | Fragile new placements and relationships are failing for lack of services. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize EPSDT funding to support & sustain families |
| Few EPSDT contractors have permanency-competent clinicians. Policy needed to have all counties include Permanency-competent clinical programs and youth permanence provides in their contracted provider pool | Lack of permanency-competent EPSDT clinical programs deprive eligible youth of services necessary to sustain new family and results in unnecessary disruptions of permanent connections. | |
| Belief System Issues | | |
| Need policies that commit to identifying and addressing belief systems that prevent effective youth permanence practice. | Good youth permanency practice is undermined by well-meaning belief systems of professional within the system. Far fewer youth achieve permanence as a result. | Sensitivity is necessary to respect personal self-assessment process and professional pride issues inherent in identifying one's barrier beliefs. |
| Caseload / Casework Issues | | |
| Need clear policies to prioritize youth permanence activities, and caseload support to allow it. | | |
| Youth Voice Issues | | |
| Policies need to support training on how to engage youth without stigmatizing. | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Professional Training Issues | | |
| Need BSW, MSW, and other professional education programs to integrate permanency issues throughout. Belief that permanency issues impact only a small % of social work activity is false and self-perpetuating. | | |
| From Practice Committee | | |
| Need clarified prudent parent policy vis a vis out-of-state travel necessary to create permanent connections. Also need \$\$ to pay for travel. | | |
| Currently when guardianship is achieved and dependency dismissed, family loses foster care benefits. Need policy to maintain dependency or other way to continue benefits. | | |
| Current policy requires use of deficit focus to qualify children and youth for Med-Cal mental health services. Need policy change to strength-base | | |
| Current policy to allows youth to continue foster care support until age 19 if graduation is likely by that age. This assures that youth with greatest educational needs are the ones least likely to get them met since they are not likely to graduate by age 19. | | |
| Need policy and funding to give each youth an educational liaison as per NGA initiative. | | |

Practice Committee Minutes

Participants

Kira Bellah, California Youth Connection
Adela Cervantes, Fresno County
Bob Friend, CPYP, Interim Chair
Nita Kenyon, San Luis Obispo County
Kat Lauterback, San Luis Obispo County
Jean Little, Stanislaus County
Bob Malmberg, Orange County
Abby Montano, Fresno County
Katharine Odle, San Mateo County, Note-taker
Veronica Salmeron, Fresno County

Absent

Cyndee Borges-O'Dell, Stanislaus County
Nichole Castanon-Bletz, Fresno County
Kristie Esquivel, Kern County
Crystal Luffberry, California Connected by 25 Initiative
Jessica Macias, Kern County
David Turk, San Francisco County

Minutes

Logistics Discussion

- **Note-taking:** Bob Friend informed the group that CPYP staff would be unable to provide this service, particularly if meetings are held in different counties; Katharine Odle volunteered to take notes today; group agreed that this task will be rotated among members at subsequent meetings.
- **Attendance:** Group agreed that core members should try to attend Practice Committee meetings consistently, although substitutes may be sent in place of core members if there are schedule conflicts; substitutes should have a clear understanding of the project and its goals

Review of Key Points from Task Force Meeting on 07/19/07

- Practice Chair: Bob Friend is currently negotiating with management of a participating county so that a staff member can assume this duty; Friend will serve as the interim chair until the ongoing chair can be identified.
- Frequency of Practice Meetings: Group agreed that meetings would be held quarterly.
- Purpose of the Practice Committee: Group agreed that the purpose as outlined in minutes from 07/19/07 were appropriate:
 - Group will be results-oriented, and the purpose will be to take action steps rather than simply share information
 - We will identify topics to learn about and do research on these between meetings
 - We will learn from each other and develop trust among members
 - We will minimize interagency competition, and share accurate information about permanency efforts in our counties
 - We will choose topics for concentrated discussion
 - Agendas will build from previous meetings
 - We will interact with the policy committee to coordinate our efforts
 - We will use the CPYP website (www.cpy.org) to access tools and notes
 - We will share successful administrative practices, especially those that have worked despite the high turnover among administrative leadership within counties
 - We will share permanency implementation and training techniques
- Group Participants: The Practice Group will consist of a maximum of twenty members, although guest-speakers and experts can be invited to attend specific meetings; we will also coordinate sharing of practice-focused information with the various Regional CPYP County meetings.
- Permanency Definition to Guide the Practice Group: CPYP will disburse information regarding the definition of permanency and methods of data collection used by various counties
 - Guardianship: It was agreed that guardianship is viewed as a type of permanency; more work should be done regarding inclusion of non-dependent guardianship youth in Independent Living Program (ILP) services, since current policy is that youth are not eligible for ILP services if they have entered into guardianships and had dependency terminated prior to age sixteen.
 - Age ranges to target: Although every county is a little different, permanency efforts are largely targeted at youth ages eleven and older; some post-emancipation work has been done, including CPYP's Emancipated Youth Connections Project; CPYP will be publishing information regarding this project in order to promote these efforts; many post-emancipated youth have contacted their local ILP and Ombudsperson to request permanency; CPYP promotes permanency efforts for all age groups and in all phases of a youth's involvement with CPS; ILP Redesign in progress, and will include focuses on permanency, education, and employment

- Darla Henry Trainings: Darla Henry is an expert in grief and loss issues, and has established guidelines for permanency services in Pennsylvania and New Hampshire; she is considered an expert in the field of permanency, and her work focuses on helping youth to prepare emotionally to establish permanent connections; she created the 3-5-7 Model to help youth overcome multiple losses and be able to form permanent connections (abstract of this article is available from the CPYP website at www.cypyp.org/Files/3-5-7ModelAbstract.pdf)
 - Darla Henry trainings have been completed, begun, or are in the works in the following counties: Fresno, Bakersfield, Los Angeles, Orange, Kern, San Luis Obispo, San Francisco, Alameda, Contra Costa, and Humboldt.
 - Practice Committee agreed that we need to determine how to incorporate the Darla Henry model into our permanency practice; addressing permanency with youth can bring up serious emotional issues for youth; Fresno County found that it was not effective to address personal experiences with permanency with groups of youth without a support network in place for the youth.

- Other Potential Members of the Practice Committee: Discussion of people to ask to join the Practice Group, or to present at future meetings:
 - Berisha Black: Former foster youth who is currently working with the Los Angeles Ombudsperson; she is connected with CYC, so Kira Bellah said that she would try to contact her through the CYC roster.
 - Darryn Green: CYC member from Kern County; Kira said that she would see Darryn today, and would talk to him about joining the group.
 - Tedji Dessalegn: Los Angeles County; Bob Friend will try to contact her.
 - Parent Leader from UC Davis: today's group was unsure how to contact this person
 - Barbara (Foster Pride Director in Fresno): Veronica Salmeron will speak to her about joining the group or occasionally presenting; Nita Kenyon also suggested that a Foster Pride member from San Luis Obispo could join
 - Greg: Kern County; Bob Friend will speak to Kristie Esquivel about asking Greg to join
 - Title IV-E Coordinator: Bob Friend and CPYP have connections to coordinators at UC Berkeley, San Francisco State University, CSU East Bay, and Cal-SWEC.
 - Private Agency Leadership / Decision Makers: Bob Malmberg suggested the contract provider from Orange County; Veronica Salmeron suggested a leader from Families First; Bob Friend suggested that Robin Allen from CASA could present at some of our meetings (she is on the Policy Committee).
 - Linda Perring: Orange County; per Bob Malmberg, she is now the part-time Executive Director of CASA; she could probably present occasionally.

New Topics of Discussion

- Identification of Policies that Impede Best Practices: To be discussed with the Policy Committee to coordinate our efforts
 - Youth in non-dependent guardianships are not able to attend ILP.
 - It is difficult to obtain permission for facilitation of visitation between youth and out-of-state permanent connections if certain funding codes apply, even if there are separate funding sources; could be related to state vs. federal funding eligibility or ILP-eligible vs. non-ILP-eligible categories.
 - Prudent Parent Law interpretation: social workers/foster parents/group homes often have fears about liability regarding youth visiting non-fingerprinted potential permanent connections, even if county administration has approved these visits based on Prudent Parent Law and even if the visit is to be supervised by the social worker.
 - Requiring fingerprinting of potential permanent connections may lead to refusal to become involved with the youth; and may create unnecessary barriers. (Per Bob Malmberg, Orange County's directive is for staff to take youth to these visits and supervise the visits, but fingerprinting is not required.)
 - ICPC (Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children) issues may be raised when allowing youth to visit permanent connections out-of-state, depending on the other state's ICPC rules and interpretation; the funding issue also may be – there is a need to distinguish between out-of-state visitation vs. placement (per Veronica Salmeron, Fresno currently allows youth to visit permanent connections in other states while accompanied by the social worker; in certain cases, youth have been allowed to travel by him-/herself when they already knew the permanent connection, under the Prudent Parent law).
 - There is a need for permanency efforts to be funded and supported in their own right, rather than counties having to be creative in justifying expenditures and fitting them into existing funding sources; there is a need for specific funding for permanency work (San Luis Obispo currently bills family-finding travel to Redesign; Orange County recently received authorization to pay for travel arrangements in advance; Fresno currently has family-finding/permanency in its budget due to the belief that these efforts will reduce placement expenditures in the future).
 - There is a need for Educational Liaisons state-wide — counties currently have different ways of establishing these positions; not all counties have Educational Liaisons; the National Governors Association (NGA) is currently working on this issue.
 - Training needs/funding issues—per Bob Friend, the Co-Investment Partnership is a collaboration of funders, private organizations, and state agencies that are working on identifying current needs and the resources available; Friend is on the Practice Workgroup, whose focus is to provide training to translate policy measures into practice; the Practice Workgroup will include permanency in its work.

- Permanency Newsletter
 - Purpose: to keep permanency fresh in people's minds and to allow other groups/agencies/states to learn about what we're doing with permanency.
 - Information to include: specific programs, policy changes, youth stories
 - Contributors: members of Practice and Policy Committees, other county staff members who are working on permanency, CYC
 - Format: contributors will e-mail CPYP their finished articles (in a Word or PDF file) to include in the newsletter; CPYP will compile the newsletter which will have a list of the articles and brief descriptions of them, with links to the full articles; all of the information will be stored on the CPYP website.
 - Timeline: Bob Friend will solicit articles from Practice and Policy Committee members in November 2007; the goal is for first issue to be available in December 2007.
 - Targeted audience: CPYP Task Force members, CPYP counties, CYC mailing list, anyone else who accesses the CPYP website

- Practice Areas of Focus for Future Meetings
 - Supporting/engaging permanent connections once they have been identified
 - Utilizing the Darla Henry training throughout the permanency process (share models of implementation being used among different counties)
 - Learning best practices of talking to youth about permanency; helping youth to understand and seek permanency without leaving them in an emotional crisis

Wrap-up

Both committees came back together about 1:20 p.m. Friend asked each committee to present a summary, as well as any items/issues for the other committee to work on.

Policy Committee – Gail Johnson Vaughan

Committee goals:

- To identify policies which support permanency that could be implemented statewide that CPYP could build support for
- Educate and create the necessary awareness across the broad system (child welfare system, juvenile justice, probation, judicial, mental health etc.) to implement best policies.

Johnson Vaughan outlined initial areas of work for the committee:

- Identify policy goals that affect permanency, including an inventory of good policies already in place
- Identify funding disincentives, as funding is a major issue
- Police systems that keep good policy from getting into practice
- Make use of existing mental health funding streams; have permanency-competent staff for EPSDT (Early and Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment)

Action items:

- Johnson Vaughan will be sending a matrix of policy gaps to both Practice and Policy Committee members, as well as those on the Task Force email list, for feedback. Respondents will be asked to prioritize the items listed.
- The committee will continue to work on identifying additional members for their group – who do they want to partner with? Who else do they need?

Practice Committee – Katharine Odle

Identified policy barriers for permanency practice:

- Persons placed in guardianship - more work should be done regarding inclusion of non-dependent guardianship youth in Independent Living Program (ILP) services, since current policy is that youth are not eligible for ILP services if they have entered into guardianships and had dependency terminated prior to age sixteen.
- The prudent parent standard related to out-of-state visits and ICPC (Interstate Compact for the Placement of Children). ICPC regulations can make it difficult for youth to visit newly found family when they are out of state.
- Federal vs. non-federal funding streams
- Fingerprinting requirements for visits when family engagement work is just beginning (i.e. legal permanency has not been discussed yet)
- The use of educational liaisons to make sure youth are on track for high school and higher education. The NGA already has an initiative for education liaisons.
- Lack of funding

The committee will focus on the following core practices:

- What does support look like to develop and sustain connections?
- Methodologies and implementation of Darla Henry's 3-5-7 model on grief and loss (see www.cypyp.org/Files/3-5-7ModelAbstract.pdf for a brief description)
- How to talk to youth about permanency, from the perspectives of both the youth and the social worker

Permanency Newsletter – Bob Friend

To help disseminate information about permanency work, the Practice Committee will be developing a monthly permanency newsletter, focusing on work in California. While the newsletter was discussed in the Practice Committee, it will be inclusive of anything noteworthy in permanency, including legislation and policy. It will be distributed electronically by the CPYP office. Content will include positive stories, challenges being met, legislation, etc. A brief document (one to two pages) will be distributed, with links to the full text, which will be stored on the CPYP office.

Action Item:

In early November 2007, Bob Friend will call on both Practice and Policy Committee members for articles. Material submitted should require little to no editing.

Data

The question was raised as to the tracking of data outcomes. In order to bring about policy change, we need to be able to demonstrate the effectiveness of permanency practice. Bob Friend acknowledged that data was very important; he reported that CPYP is currently working on defining some outcome measures with its 14 counties.

Next Meeting:

Joint meeting with the Policy Committee on January 16, 2008 at 10:00 a.m at the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, San Francisco

Attachments

Governor Press Release- 07 FC Bills Signed (legislative update handed out at meeting)
AB 149 Veto Statement