

Children's Planning Council Meeting

January 17, 2007

9:30 a.m.

Room 140, Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California

Present: Chair Yvonne Brathwaite Burke
Victoria Lewis Adams, representing Steve Cooley
Charles Avila
Lauraine Barber
Samuel Q. Chan, representing Marv Southard
Priscilla Charles-Carter
Rabbi Bernard Cohen
Deborah Davies
Teresa A. DeCrescenzo
Duane Dennis
Nancy Diaz, representing Bryce Yokomizo
Jeff Farber
Dorothy Fleisher
David W. Fleming
Chris Floyd
Lisa Garrett, representing Philip Browning
Jan Isenberg, representing Darline Robles
Larry Lue
Penny Markey, representing Margaret Donnellan Todd
Jacquelyn McCroskey
Elisa Nicholas
Dick Pancost
Danny Ramos
José Ramos, Jr.
Marsha Ramos
Richelle Rios-Huizar
Bruce Saltzer
Wendy Schiffer, representing Bruce Chernof
Lari Sheehan, representing David Janssen
Nina Aguayo Sorkin
Beatriz Olvera Stotzer
Anita Vigil, representing Robert Taylor
Sharon G. Watson
Phillip L. Williams

At 9:40 a.m., Phillip Williams welcomed Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke to her fourth term as chair of the Children's Planning Council, following previous terms in 1993, 1997, and 2002. During the Council's early years, she presided over its establishment of the service planning areas—a set of unprecedented common boundaries for planning county services—and the

release of the report *How Are the Children of Los Angeles?*, as well as the development of seven key recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, the most successful of which was enrolling 100,000 additional children in Medi-Cal. That goal, which was surpassed, demonstrated the power of joint coordinated action by public/private partnerships. When Supervisor Burke last served as chair, in 2002, the Council:

- Led a successful community engagement effort to ensure community input into the Cal-WORKs budget process, administering a survey in eight different languages to over 8,500 families that helped shape recommendations to the Board
- Released the 2002 Children's ScoreCard, the first produced solely by the Children's Planning Council
- Led the Safe Haven Task Force, which developed a 12-point plan (unanimously approved by the Board) to improve the effectiveness of the Safe Haven law to prevent infant abandonment
- With First 5 LA and the Los Angeles County Office of Education, co-sponsored a superintendents' forum on school readiness
- Established the Data Partnership for Children and Families, providing the Council with staff for its work on data
- In partnership with the City of Los Angeles's Workforce Investment Board Youth Council, convened a youth engagement task force to develop recommendations and a countywide call to action on engaging youth in civic and community life

Chair Burke brought the meeting to order, thanking Williams and remarking that he, David Fleming, and she had all been part of LA 2000, a group appointed by Mayor Tom Bradley in the 1980s to plan for the region in the new century; the concept of the Children's Planning Council arose from that body. She expressed her pleasure at again serving as chair and seeing many new and familiar faces in the room, and introduced children's deputy Miriam Long. Burke then asked that Council members and the audience introduce themselves.

Approval of the Minutes of November 15, 2006

David Fleming moved that the minutes of November 15, 2006, be approved as mailed. Beatriz Olvera Stotzer seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

Chair's Report: Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

- Members of the Children's Planning Council's Executive Committee met with Burke and her deputies last week to brief them on the work of the Council over the last five years. Burke was delighted to learn that the Council's priorities align with many of her Board efforts:
 - ✓ Ongoing investment and support to the Service Planning Area Councils and the American Indian Children's Council
 - ✓ Encouraging county departments to designate representatives to the SPA/AIC Councils with appropriate skills, experience, and access to management, plus the authority to act
 - ✓ The Council's community-building institute

- ✓ The family economic success plan for Los Angeles County
- ✓ The Council's involvement in the county's prevention agenda
- ✓ The next phase of the juvenile justice report
- Board members from The Children's Planning Council Foundation, Inc., recently met with Chief Administrative Officer David Janssen—who has delayed his retirement a few months until his successor can be identified—with regard to increasing the county's investment in the Council's long-term sustainability. Burke intends to urge the other supervisors to ensure both budget and programmatic support for the Council's work, particularly because of uncertainties about any funds available through First 5 LA.
- Chair Burke wants county departments to work together in addressing the issues about juvenile delinquency included in a recent Department of Justice memo. An amendment giving the county more time to resolve problems at the juvenile halls is being sought. Gang violence is also of concern, especially because of the high numbers of children in foster care—75 in 2006—who become victims of gang violence.

Chief Executive Officer's Report: Yolie Flores Aguilar

- Flores Aguilar congratulated Chris Floyd on his election as chair of the Executive Committee.
- After a request from Supervisor Burke, the Council will present its juvenile justice report—shared at the September 2006 meeting—to the Board of Supervisors in February. Greg Bell, who was part of the September presentation, will help staff form an ad hoc committee to gather qualitative data by talking to youth, families, and front-line workers within the juvenile justice system, then develop recommendations to the Board.
- Last November, the Executive Committee asked staff to develop an implementation plan for the new strategic plan. Consultant Cecilia Sandoval will facilitate that process, and the final plan will be brought to the Council in March.
- Flores Aguilar introduced new staff:
 - ✓ Dr. Cheryl Mendoza, Chief Operating Officer
 - ✓ Marco Ramirez, EITC Coordinator
 - ✓ Jesse Romero, Parent Training Coordinator (developing the community-building institute's curriculum for parent leadership and advocacy)
 - ✓ Alex Marcelino, Executive Assistant to Flores Aguilar
 - ✓ Ileana Abreu, SPA 5 Organizer

In addition, Greg Bell has transitioned from the Youth Community Organizer in SPA 6 to the CBI Youth Trainer, helping with the juvenile justice work and the youth component of the community-building institute, at the Hall of Administration main office.

- Flores Aguilar highlighted materials in member packets:
 - ✓ A *Los Angeles Times* article on the governor's proposed cuts in aid to families on welfare
 - ✓ A *Los Angeles Times* article on educational alternatives, quoting Council colleague Gloria Mamokhin from the Los Angeles County Office of Education
 - ✓ The Council's 2007 meeting dates
 - ✓ A letter from Chief Operating Officer Cheryl Mendoza asking for updates to the Council's mailing list and contact database
 - ✓ Information on the governor's proposed 2007–2008 budget
 - ✓ A membership interest form for Council vacancies, which attendees were asked to help distribute
 - ✓ A flyer on the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority's homeless count in late January, for which many volunteers are needed

Executive Committee Report: Chris Floyd

Chair Burke introduced Floyd, her district's representative to the Council, expressing her appreciation for his accepting the role of Executive Committee chair. Floyd is the director of the Los Angeles Opportunities Industrial Center, a nationwide organization whose mission is to work with at-risk and foster youth to preserve the family unit. In December, the center awarded four community activism awards, including that of 'political champion' to Supervisor Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, and Floyd presented Burke with the delayed award prior to making his report.

- The Executive Committee last week approved the composition of the Nominating Committee, which will develop a slate for seats on the Council that are vacant or whose terms are expiring:
 - ✓ Latino community representative
 - ✓ African-American community representative
 - ✓ University researcher
 - ✓ Business community representative
 - ✓ Foster caregiver
 - ✓ Two youth
 - ✓ Two parents
 - ✓ An individual who has made significant contributions to the work of the Children's Planning Council (member at large)

Phillip Williams moved that the following Nominating Committee be named:

- **José Ramos**
- **Rabbi Bernard Cohen**
- **Anita Vigil**
- **Lisa Cleri Reale**
- **Bruce Saltzer**
- **Bettye Anderson**
- **Miriam Long**

David Fleming seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

Recruitment packets will be available at the end of this week, and applications for the vacant and expiring seats are due on February 20. The Nominating Committee will conduct interviews during the first part of March and meet to discuss candidates during the latter half of that month. Its recommendations will go to the Executive Committee on April 16, and that committee will present a slate to the Council as a whole at the May 16 meeting.

Elisa Nicholas asked if transportation and child care stipends are available to parent representatives to the Council, and Flores Aguilar replied that parents will be provided whatever supports they need to participate, including translation services. (Support services are also available to members of the Strengthening Community Capacity Committee.) Nicholas asked that the information packet and interest forms be revised to reflect that, and José Ramos asked if the forms could be made available in Spanish and online.

- In January 2006, Dr. Jonathan Fielding made a presentation to the Council on the possible splitting out of the Department of Public Health from the Department of Health Services. The Board of Supervisors made that decision last year, and the Executive Committee now recommends that the director of the new department be invited to participate on the Children's Planning Council.

Elisa Nicholas moved that the director of the Department of Public Health be added to the Children's Planning Council ordinance as an ex officio member. Lauraine Barber seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

- Children's Bureau of Southern California, a nonprofit organization founded in 1904, has asked the Children's Planning Council to partner with it as it builds a family support and development center as part of a broader community initiative. One of the grants being sought would pay for a Children's Planning Council staff person or consultant to work with public agencies and Council leadership to promote this comprehensive, place-based strategy as a demonstration of how co-located entities can work together to support families.

Since the Council has never entered into a partnership like this, Executive Committee members felt that a process should be approved to evaluate potential partners and the advantages and risks associated with similar ventures. They suggest that staff draft a policy to be e-mailed to the Executive Committee for review and approval, and then e-mailed to Children's Planning Council members. Floyd opened the floor for discussion of the issue.

An endorsement by the Children's Planning Council, Elisa Nicholas said, would help tremendously in the fundraising efforts of any community-based organization, and she cautioned against opening the floodgates to those requests, thereby making the Council's endorsement a standard. Jacquelyn McCroskey agreed, saying, "It's a much more complicated issue than it first appears," and recommending that the Strengthening Community Capacity Committee plan a full discussion. The results, Chair Burke suggested, could be brought to the Council's next meeting.

The way the Children's Bureau proposal is positioned, it would need to be reviewed by the SCC Committee, the governance body for the system of SPA/AIC Councils. Although the SCC has not considered this specific proposal, José Ramos reported, it has put a lot of time and effort into discussing the issue of allowing the Children's Planning Council's name—or

that of a SPA/AIC Council—to be used in individual agency grants, and decided against it. The SCC can revisit that discussion, Jeff Farber said, but structurally the policy should come from the SCC to the Executive Committee, not the other way around.

Teresa DeCrescenzo concurred with the concerns being expressed, since ‘partnership’ implies obligations on both sides. She expressed more strenuous objections, however, to the idea of the Executive Committee’s fleshing out a policy and e-mailing it, stating her strong preference for a full discussion with everyone in the same room. Deciding when and how to partner can be a slippery slope, Dorothy Fleisher said, especially since the Council must balance being timely and ensuring a thoughtful process. Phillip Williams noted that the sweeping nature of the term ‘partnership’ can give people pause, and moving case by case could prevent the Council’s taking on too much.

On behalf of the Foundation Board, David Fleming asked about the financial considerations in the partnership proposal from Children’s Bureau. Flores Aguilar explained that the Atlas Family Foundation would be asked to provide resources for a person to work with Council leadership and public entities, and that the Children’s Planning Council’s participation would be written into the grant. Chair Burke suggested a statement in the grant that Children’s Bureau intends to work with the Council without, perhaps, calling the relationship a formal partnership. DeCrescenzo objected to building money into a non-Council grant that would force the organization to assign personnel time to a particular project. “It could become a huge boondoggle,” she said, “and it smacks of the unethical.”

Lauraine Barber moved that the Strengthening Community Capacity Committee be asked to develop a general policy with regard to partnering with other organizations (not a response to the specific Children’s Bureau proposal). That general policy would then be reviewed by the Executive Committee and presented to the full Children’s Planning Council for discussion and approval. Elisa Nicholas seconded the motion, and discussion continued.

The Council already has a policy regarding the endorsement of nonprofits, Beatriz Olvera Stotzer said, designed to prevent conflicts of interest. What is its role in the Children’s Bureau proposal, given that the Council is not a service provider? Helping another nonprofit get a grant is not a step that the Council has taken before. Flores Aguilar distributed a summary of the Children’s Bureau’s family support facility, which will test the integration and co-location of services to children and families, with an emphasis on children birth to age five. “This is responding to the Council’s prevention agenda, as well as our advocacy efforts around coordinating and integrating services for children and families, and a focus on economic well-being and community building – something that the Council has been pushing for since its inception,” Flores Aguilar said, “connecting the issues of poverty, child well-being, and community organizing. The Council can help make connections to county departments to rethink policies, waiving old ways and testing new ways of doing work.”

Other organizations are moving in the same direction, Priscilla Charles-Carter remarked, and many other pilot programs exist that won’t have partnered with the Children’s Planning Council. “The Council is open to helping anyone,” she said, “and I certainly understand how a partnership with us could be advantageous. But I don’t see anything in what [Children’s

Bureau] wants to do that calls for a formal partnership or a motion on our part.” According to the position that the SCC has already taken, the committee would be in opposition to the Children’s Bureau proposal, but Duane Dennis suggested asking the SCC to revisit its position, perhaps revising it or perhaps leaving it unchanged. Separating the general issue from the specific proposal is important, Chair Burke said, and differentiating a ‘partnering policy’ from the conflict-of-interest policy already in place, developing something very specific that could be shared with everyone, would be helpful.

“The Children’s Planning Council is all about partnerships,” Flores Aguilar said. “One of our greatest interests is bringing people together, and I’m afraid the message this will send will contradict that. We need to be very careful about saying that we don’t partner.” She recommended the policy’s instead framing the way in which the Council *does* partner, and Olvera Stotzer agreed. “Many family development networks exist throughout the county,” Olvera Stotzer said. “We need to concentrate on how they should be done, and how policies should be changed to improve the lives of all kids.”

As SCC co-chair, Jeff Farber assented to the committee’s revisiting the endorsement policy, but observed that part of its previous discussion had been about membership on the Children’s Planning Council. “As a member of the Council, you can’t come in with a vested interest of enhancing your individual organization’s dollars,” he said. DeCrescenzo stressed caution in what the Council commits itself to, drawing the line between *de facto* and *de jure* partnerships and agreeing with Farber about wearing “only one hat” when she attends Council meetings. Her agency, for example, is looking to do a project for adolescents that is very similar to that proposed by Children’s Bureau, and she admitted that, were it appropriate, she would certainly want the help of the “powerhouses in this room” to help her raise the money needed. Competition among partners for scarce funding resources, as sometimes happens within the SPA/AIC Councils, Celestina Castillo noted, can be a problem.

“We use the term ‘partnership’ loosely,” Sharon Watson said, “but it’s the modus operandi of the Council. The red flag here is the dollar amount involved.” In the policy to be written, she urged spelling out the differences between a program partner and a fiscal partner. Elisa Nicholas mentioned that the Council is already a partner with many community-based organizations, providing them with data and reports, and only the formality of an official endorsement is the issue here. Historically, Flores Aguilar said, the Council has provided endorsements only for its members, on request, but never with regard to specific grants.

The motion on the floor was approved with two negative votes.

Community-Building Efforts and Building Relationships with Institutional Partners to Move to Action for Children: Jeff Farber and Colleen Mooney

At the November meeting, conversations began about the role of Children’s Planning Council members and others in the community-building agenda, with the intent of deepening relationships and knowledge about other members. The Executive Committee later discussed the fact that some attendees left during that segment, citing the lack of an action item to stay for and a too process-oriented session. With the Council’s desire to lead to policy, action, and engagement, committee members agreed to limit the scheduling of presentations for the sake of presentation and move the action agenda forward for children and families.

Today's discussion is meant to highlight how institutions can be part of the community-building effort throughout Los Angeles County, developing relationships and exploring this year's policy decisions on prevention, juvenile justice, and family economic success. The conversation is critical to establishing how the Council's strategic plan focuses on building responsive family-strengthening institutions.

Colleen Mooney urged participants to consider their roles in representing the interests of their constituencies, how they can partner with the work of the SPA/AIC Councils, and these specific questions:

1. What resources do your institutions currently have that could be redirected to community organizing and engagement?
2. What gifts and talents do you personally possess that could connect with this work?

Participants broke out into small groups, reporting back the two most important issues discussed at each table. Among the issues raised were:

- Enhancing communications between the SPA/AIC Councils and institutional partners, making sure communities are aware of the resources already available to them (the county libraries as technology facilities, for instance)
- Supporting the efforts of county departments with regard to the prevention initiative espoused by the Board of Supervisors
- Hearing reports from the SPA/AIC Councils not only on their accomplishments, but on what they need from county departments to function more effectively
- Continued partnerships between communities and institutions, especially through the community-building institute
- Investigating partnerships with higher education to educate future leaders, perhaps through an internship program like that at USC
- Continuing to talk to foundations and government agencies with regard to funding for communities and support for community engagement over the long term
- Creating methods to share vital information and help establish and maintain good relationships between community members
- The structural differences among SPA/AIC Councils, and the resources available to be shared (or needed) by those bodies and the constituent organizations on the Council
- Making sure that the SPA/AIC Council system can identify incremental problem-solving solutions from a policy perspective (reducing the 45 days it takes to approve a Section 8 voucher, for example) that have a positive impact on children and families
- On the roster of Children's Planning Council members, including members' areas of expertise, knowledge, and influence so they can be contacted with specific inquiries

- Developing resources to go beyond traditional information-sharing and provide families with practical strategies for accessing large systems, as some departments are doing with systems navigators and parent advocates
- Exploring the philosophical shift from service provision to community building, acknowledging that children's lives cannot be improved by focusing only on services
- Working with the SPA/AIC Councils to identify gaps in services, coordinate the resources that do exist, and help county departments access community groups as a base for community building
- Attending meetings of the League of California Cities to help elected city officials become aware of and support the work of the SPA/AIC Councils and the Children's Planning Council, especially given most SPAs' large size and numerous cities
- Integrating the work of municipally based community groups with that of the community action groups formed by the SPA/AIC Councils

Jeff Farber thanked participants in the discussion, and said that the Strengthening Community Capacity Committee would use the information to take the process to the next level.

Probation Department Update on Juvenile Justice Reforms: Anita Vigil

The Probation Department's restructuring, announced to the Council in September, is driven by its new mantra of "rebuilding lives in Los Angeles County by embracing evidence-based practices, doing the right thing, and doing the right thing first," said Vigil. At a November community forum, the department pledged collaboration with stakeholders, service providers, and the community. Vigil introduced residential bureau chief David Mitchell, who distributed a handout on the first phase of the redesign of the probation camps, now in progress.

Mitchell characterized the camp redesign as a microcosm of the Probation Department's new direction; it was the centerpiece of the late Paul Higa's plan—now embraced by Chief Robert Taylor—to move the department from a custodial and law enforcement emphasis to one of treatment and caregiving, living by the maxim 'do no harm.' Key changes include the use of a multidisciplinary assessment prior to a youth's being sent to camp, individual camps offering different interventions, and youth being assigned to camps based on risk level, not offense.

The camp redesign's overall goals are to:

- Improve and maintain the physical and emotional safety and security of youth and staff in juvenile camps
- Accomplish positive behavioral change in youth at camp through evidence-based practices
- Prepare youth in camp for a successful reintegration into the community

Ideally, low-risk youth will be identified up-front and served in their communities instead of being incarcerated. If necessary, the department is prepared to return to court and dispute a camp order, since youth are better served by staying with their families and being supported by com-

munity-based organizations. Probation intends to work with SPA/AIC Councils and the community to uncover resources for these youth, and service navigators are planned for all camps to identify the mental health and other service needs of youth being released, developing treatment plans to hand off to community providers.

In the limited time that youth are in camp, Probation will use evidence-based interventions to prioritize services that meet their:

- Criminogenic needs (categorized by areas in the initial assessment—peers, delinquency, individual, family, education, and substance abuse)
- Educational needs
- Mental health needs (including therapy and psychotropic medication)
- Human development needs (art, sports, hobbies, etc.)

The continuum of services begins at the juvenile field offices, where assessments, investigations, supervision, and case plans are done, and the treatment needs of at-risk youth and their families can be met simultaneously. Youth who are not sent home during their probation receive recommendations regarding their cases from the out-of-home screening unit, which may advise referral to foster care, to the state's Division of Juvenile Justice facilities, or to the camp assessment center. That center, located at Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall and opening February 11, houses multidisciplinary teams that formulate case plans based on the Los Angeles Risk and Resiliency Check-up (LARRC) tool, a health evaluation by Juvenile Court Health Services, mental health assessments that include MAYSI (the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument) and other tools, and educational evaluations of math and reading ability, learning disabilities, and other special education needs. The teams share information that result in the most appropriate placement based on all the needs of the youth, including physical limitations. (Depending on their mental health status, youth may be referred to level 12 or 14 residential treatment or to the Dorothy Kirby Center.) When they are sent to camp, youth will follow a case plan of evidence-based interventions, and receive aftercare and transitional planning prior to their entrance into the camp community transition program (or, in some cases, to foster care). Once youth leave camp, most join the 'home on probation' caseload.

Camp Scott and Camp Scudder, in the Santa Clarita Valley, are designed for girls age 13 to 18, and Camp Scudder is reopening on January 21 with 40 girls being relocated from Camp Onizuka (part of Challenger Memorial Youth Center). Staff for these gender-specific camps, along with their supporting community-based organizations, are receiving a nine-day on-site training specifically targeted for juvenile girls. Challenger, which consists of six camps historically used to house juveniles convicted of violent offenses and youth on psychotropic medication, is being repurposed to separate boys age 15 to 18 by risk levels (extremely high risk, medium and high risk, and those transitioning back to the community), introducing a safe crisis management program, evidence-based practices intervention teams, and case management teams.

At present, most youth remain in camp only three months, which the Probation Department feels is not enough time to stabilize them and strengthen their reintegration back to their families. Six-month and nine-month programming is planned, with a possible early return home if positive behavior is evidenced. The Board of Supervisors has approved 182 new positions for the residential treatment services bureau, and 80 employees have already been hired. The staff to minor

ratio is currently between 1 to 15 and 1 to 20, but Mitchell said the department hopes to reduce that to 1 to 10 or, with high-risk youth, 1 to 8. Camp staffing, recruitment, and retention remain critical success factors for the redesign, along with quality assurance, aftercare and transition planning, and the funding for and training in evidence-based interventions.

Teresa DeCrescenzo applauded the redesign plan, saying, "It does justice and honor to the memory of Paul Higa, whose vision this was." With regard to returning to court and disputing an inappropriate camp order, she commented that field probation officers are the "axis on which this wheel turns," since 90 percent of judges' orders mirror recommendations from a youth's probation officer, and inexperienced young staff may not get the level of training necessary to make wise decisions. Although the educational requirements for detention services officers—who work in the juvenile halls—were lowered 15 or 20 years ago to demand only a two-year college degree, rather than a bachelors, Mitchell said they will soon be receiving much of the same training as the camp staff. The Dorothy Kirby Center will return to the umbrella of the residential treatment services bureau so that it can be run more like a level 12 or 14 treatment center.

Greg Bell asked about youth who are known gang members—how does that affect their risk assessments? The factor causes a high score in the 'peer domain' of the LARRC assessment tool, Mitchell said, but that is only one of six areas and would not necessarily dissuade a team from recommending a camp placement. The youth's supportive systems must be looked at, as well as his or her response to possible intervention. Assessments now take place as soon as youth are detained, but the department would like to see them done earlier, before any decisions are made about the case. The legal barriers to that are being discussed, but the courts have clearly indicated that the department may return to the judge if it feels a camp order is inappropriate.

Vigil encouraged everyone to access information on the community collaborative conference and its presenters on the Probation Department's website, and she and Mitchell gave their e-mail addresses for further questions—anita.vigil@laprob.org and dave.mitchell@laprob.org. The Children's Planning Council's ad hoc committee on juvenile justice reform will begin meeting in February, and all those interested in participating were asked to notify Flores Aguilar.

L.A. Care: Dr. Tom Klitzner

Dr. Tom Klitzner, the chief of pediatric cardiology at Childrens Hospital Los Angeles, was designated by the Children's Planning Council four years ago to represent children's health issues on the public board of the L.A. Care Health Plan. He distributed a packet of information and reviewed the history of L.A. Care, which dates back to a Federal mandate to implement managed care within the Medicaid system during the mid-1990s. Plans were developed at the county level, which in Los Angeles yielded a two-tiered model: a publicly accountable health plan (L.A. Care) that serves nearly 800,000 clients, and a private health plan (HealthNet). These share responsibility for managed care within Medi-Cal, California's version of Medicaid.

As a publicly accountable body, each seat on the L.A. Care board of governors is a stakeholder position nominated by important players in the field—in Klitzner's case the Children's Planning Council—and ratified by the Board of Supervisors. Klitzner took over the seat for children's health issues from Elisa Nicholas, who served since the inception of L.A. Care, and is beginning his second term.

The body's overall mission is to provide access to high-quality health care for Los Angeles County's vulnerable and low-income residents, and to support the safety net for that purpose. Three product lines are offered: Medicaid/Medi-Cal, Healthy Families (the state's children's health initiative), and Healthy Kids, an insurance program whose goal is universal health coverage and access for children in Los Angeles County—one of the few counties in the country with a similar scheme. About 45,000 children are currently enrolled in Healthy Kids, and 100,000 additional applicants were screened and found eligible for Medi-Cal or Healthy Families. L.A. Care programs include free and low-cost dental care, an asthma management pilot for parents using the *promotora* model, community clinics, a nurse advice line to forestall emergency room visits, and a large-scale effort to combat childhood obesity.

Klitzner encouraged anyone with questions about L.A. Care to contact Flores Aguilar, who knows how to reach him.

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Children's Planning Council is scheduled for:

Wednesday, March 21, 2007

9:30 a.m.

Room 140, Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles

There being no public comment, the meeting was adjourned at 12:14 p.m.