

**NORTH LOS ANGELES COUNTY REGIONAL CENTER (NLACRC)
9200 OAKDALE AVENUE, SUITE 100
CHATSWORTH, CALIFORNIA**

**MINUTES OF THE VENDOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
HYBRID – SANTA CLARITA VALLEY OFFICE / ZOOM
FEBRUARY 12, 2026, 9:30 A.M.**

MEMBERS:

Alex Kopilevich, Jaklen Keshishyan, Jodie Agnew-Navarro, Paul Borda, Andrea Devers, Ute Escorcia, Vahe Mkrtchian, Jen Pippard, Sharon Weinberg, Cal Enriquez, Jason Gillis, Tal Segalovich, David Ebrami, Ricki Macken-Chilvers, Desiree Misrachi

STAFF:

Angela Pao-Johnson, Evelyn McOmie, Vini Montague, Arshalous Garlanian, Silvia Renteria-Haro, Robin Monroe, Belinda Abatesi, Lindsay Granger, Arezo Abedi

GUESTS:

ABSENT:

1. CALL TO ORDER

There being a quorum present, and adequate and proper notice of the meeting having been given, VAC Chair Alex Kopilevich called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. read the NLACRC Civility Code.

2. COMMITTEE MEMBER ATTENDANCE

Members were asked to identify themselves when speaking or making a motion.

3. PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public input.

4. SHARE IMPACT STORY FROM INDIVIDUAL SERVED

Executive Director Angela Pao-Johnson shared an impact story from Jessica Gould, owner of Jay Gould Consulting.

5. CONSENT ITEMS

On a motion made by Jaklen Keshishyan, seconded by Sharon Weinberg, it was resolved to approve the minutes of the Vendor Advisory Committee meeting held on January 8, 2026, as presented. Motion carried.

On a motion made by Sharon Weinberg, seconded by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, it was resolved to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6.1 Review VAC Applications and Vote on Candidate(s) to Advance to Interview (FY 2026-27)

6.1.1 Applicant 1

The Committee moved to Agenda Item 6, Action Items, regarding the review of applicants for the Vendor Advisory Committee for Fiscal Year 2026–2027. It was noted that individual motions would be required for each applicant under consideration.

For confidentiality purposes, applicants were discussed by assigned applicant number only. Committee members were directed to reference their application packets, which included materials labeled by applicant number and a corresponding applicant list.

Applicant #1 was reviewed to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Committee members noted the applicant's strong background, including participation in DDS workgroups, experience as a current service provider, and status as a parent of an NLACRC consumer. It was also noted that the applicant attends meetings regularly and serves all three offices within the catchment area, demonstrating familiarity with the process and broad regional involvement.

On a motion made by Sharon Weinberg, seconded by Jaklen Keshishyan, it was resolved to move Applicant #1 to interview. Motion carried.

ACTION: Applicant #1 will advance to the interview panel.

6.1.2 Applicant 2

The Committee proceeded to review Applicant #2 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel.

During discussion, members raised a question regarding whether the applicant's associated agency/vendor is currently in good standing with the Regional Center. It was suggested that future applicant tracking spreadsheets include a column verifying vendor good standing status. It was clarified that verification of vendor standing would be conducted by the Regional Center, and applicants could be moved forward conditionally pending that review.

A brief interruption occurred due to technical issues with the video feed for remote participants; however, audio remained functional, and the meeting continued.

Following discussion, a motion was made and seconded not to move Applicant #2 forward to the interview panel. Committee members noted that there were multiple applicants under consideration and that the Committee is limited to a maximum of 18 members, though there is no minimum requirement. It was also acknowledged that the applicant may reapply in the future.

On a motion made by Sharon Weinberg, seconded by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, to not move forward with Applicant 2. Motion carried.

6.1.3 Applicant 3

The Committee reviewed Applicant #3 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Members noted the applicant's well-rounded background, including experience related to domestic violence, trauma-informed care, and school-age support, and expressed interest in learning more about the candidate.

During discussion, it was noted that Applicant #3 and Applicant #5 are affiliated with the same agency. Committee members briefly discussed whether to advance one or both applicants for interviews. It was clarified that advancing both applicants was an option, and that the interview stage would allow the Committee to further evaluate candidates. Consideration was also given to providing opportunities for new individuals as well as applicants who have previously served.

A motion was made and seconded to move Applicant #3 forward to the interview panel. A vote was taken, with no objections or abstentions.

On a motion made by Jaklen Keshishyan, seconded by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, to move forward with Applicant 23. Motion carried.

6.1.4 Applicant 4

The Committee proceeded to review Applicant #4 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Members discussed the applicant's experience working as a Client Services Coordinator (CSC) and noted that this background could provide valuable insight and perspective to the Vendor Advisory Committee. It was also noted that the applicant's experience touches on areas where the Committee currently has limited representation.

On a motion made by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, seconded by Vahe Mkrtchian, to move forward with Applicant 4. Motion carried.

Abstain: Sharon Weinberg and Alex Kopilevich

6.1.5 Applicant 5

The Committee reviewed Applicant #5 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel.

On a motion made by Jaklen Keshishyan, seconded by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, to move forward with Applicant 5. Motion carried.

Abstain: Alex Kopilevich

6.1.6 Applicant 6

The Committee reviewed Applicant #6 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. It was noted that the applicant previously served on the Vendor Advisory Committee and possesses strong professional experience that could benefit the Committee. However, members also discussed concerns regarding the applicant's prior attendance record, which had been inconsistent during the previous term. Members noted that, if advanced to the interview stage, the Committee could address this topic and discuss expectations for attendance.

On a motion made by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, seconded by Sharon Weinberg, it was resolved to move forward with Applicant 6. Motion carried.

Abstain: Alex Kopilevich and Jaklen Keshishyan

6.1.7 Applicant 7

The Committee reviewed Applicant #7 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Members noted that they were not familiar with the applicant and had not observed the individual participating in meetings. Based on the application materials, members also observed limited experience with the vendor community. Additionally, it was noted that the applicant serves only one catchment area that already has representation on the Committee.

On a motion made by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, seconded by Sharon Weinberg, to not move forward with Applicant 7. Motion carried.

6.1.8 Applicant 8

The Committee reviewed Applicant #8 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Members noted the applicant's extensive experience and knowledge within the field. It was also highlighted that the applicant is active in the Adult Workgroup and holds certifications as an IF trainer and ACERS-certified professional, which were viewed as valuable qualifications for the Committee.

On a motion made by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, seconded by Octavia Watkins, to move forward with Applicant 8. Motion carried.

6.1.9 Applicant 9

The Committee reviewed Applicant #9 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Members raised concerns regarding whether the applicant is currently employed by a vendor, which is a requirement for VAC membership. It was also noted that the application materials consisted only of a letter written in the third person and did not include a resume, making it difficult to verify the applicant's qualifications and eligibility.

On a motion made by Jaklen Keshishyan, seconded by Vahe Mkrtchian, to not move forward with Applicant 9. Motion carried.

6.1.10 Applicant 10

The Committee reviewed Applicant #10 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Members noted that the applicant serves only one catchment area that already has representation on the Committee. It was also observed that members were not familiar with the applicant's participation in meetings and that the application reflected limited information regarding relevant experience and skill development.

On a motion made by Jaklen Keshishyan, seconded by David Ebrami, to move forward with Applicant 10. Motion carried.

Opposed: Alex Kopilevich
Abstain: Sharon Weinberg

6.1.11 Applicant 11

The Committee reviewed Applicant #11 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Members noted that the application materials were incomplete and did not include all required documents outlined in the application instructions.

On a motion made by Ricki Macken-Chilvers, seconded by Vahe Mkrtchian, to not move forward with Applicant 11. Motion carried to not move forward.

6.1.12 Applicant 12

The Committee reviewed Applicant #12 to determine whether the candidate would advance to the interview panel. Members noted that the applicant had experience in residential services, which could provide valuable perspective for the Committee.

However, members also raised concerns regarding the incomplete application, including the absence of a letter of intent, missing information in the application form, and a missing signature. Several members emphasized the importance of applying the same standards consistently to all applicants when required documentation is not submitted. It was also suggested that the Committee consider implementing a clearer screening process in the future to ensure applications are complete before being brought forward for review. The Committee agreed that this topic could be placed on a future agenda for further discussion as part of refining the application review process.

On a motion made by Vahe Mkrtchian, seconded by Octavia Watkins, to move forward with Applicant 12. During the vote 2 members voted in favor, 6 members voted against, with no abstentions. Motion failed. Applicant 12 will not move forward to interview.

The Committee concluded the review of applicants and summarized the results of the motions taken during the meeting.

The following applicants were approved to move forward to the interview panel: Applicants #1, #3, #4, #5, #6, #8, and #10.

The following applicants will not move forward to the interview panel: Applicant #2, #7, #9, #11, and #12.

A total of seven applicants will proceed to the interview stage.

6.2 Approval of Questions for VAC Interview

Following the review of applicants, the Committee discussed the interview process for the Vendor Advisory Committee and reviewed the proposed VAC interview questions and rating scale to be used by the interview panel. Members confirmed that the format mirrors the process used by the Board of Trustees Nominating Committee, including individual scoring by panel members followed by a discussion after each interview. The interview panel will then make recommendations to the full VAC, with final appointments subject to Board of Trustees approval.

During discussion, a suggestion was made to revise one of the questions regarding VAC meeting attendance to better assess frequency and consistency of participation, rather than whether an applicant has attended a single meeting. It was noted that the questions will serve as a guide to ensure consistent interviews while allowing for follow-up discussion during the interview process.

On a motion made by Sharon Weinberg, seconded by David Ebrami, it was resolved to approve the VAC interview questions and rating scale for use by the interview panel. Motion carried.

7. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

7.1 VAC Applicant Interview Panel

The Committee discussed the next steps for the VAC applicant interview process. Members were reminded that the Vendor Advisory Committee may have up to 18 members, but there is no minimum requirement, meaning the Committee can continue to operate even if only a small number of applicants are recommended following interviews.

Staff will coordinate the interview process, with interviews to be conducted via Zoom to accommodate participants from different locations and to facilitate scheduling. Staff will work with the interview panel and selected applicants to arrange interview times.

7.2 2026 Jynny Retzinger Community Service Award Nominations

Belinda Abatesi provided an update on the 2026 Jenny Retzinger Community Services Award nominations. The Committee was informed that nominations are currently being accepted, and members were encouraged to submit nominations using the nomination link that will be shared with the Committee.

The deadline for nominations is March 1. Additional details regarding the Legislative Breakfast, where the award will be recognized, will be shared at a later date.

7.3 Self-Determination Update

Silvia Renteria-Haro provided an update on the Self-Determination Program (SDP). As of February 1, there are 707 individuals enrolled in the program, including 20 new transitions during the month of February. Participation by office includes 435 individuals in the San Fernando Valley office, 98 in the Antelope Valley office, and 174 in the Santa Clarita Valley office. Participation by age group includes 208 individuals in the school-age category, 266 in the transition-age category, and 233 adults.

Silvia Renteria-Haro noted that vendors experiencing payment-related issues may contact Silvia Renteria-Haro or Robin Monroe for assistance.

During discussion, a question was raised regarding reports that some individuals participating in SDP may be avoiding certain services, such as Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA), due to concerns that those services are not funded through SDP. Silvia Renteria-Haro clarified that behavioral services, including ABA, may be funded through SDP; however, when generic resources such as insurance are available, those resources must be utilized prior to Regional Center funding.

It was noted that the concern had been raised by members of the vendor community. No additional questions were raised.

8. REPORT OUTS

8.1 Legislative Report Out

Belinda Abatesi provided a legislative and budget update. Belinda Abatesi reported that the Governor released the proposed 2026–2027 State Budget on January 9, outlining \$348.9 billion in total spending, including \$21.1 billion for the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) to support an estimated 527,000 individuals in the next fiscal year. Additional highlights included increased costs related to Medi-Cal, an increase in CalFresh funding, and \$33.4 billion proposed for In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) to support more than 875,000

recipients statewide. The proposal also includes \$560 million redirected to affordable housing programs.

Belinda Abatesi reviewed the state budget timeline, noting that the May Revision is expected by May 14, the Legislature typically approves the budget by June 15, and the Governor signs the final budget by June 30.

Belinda Abatesi also summarized several Department of Finance trailer bill proposals, including provisions allowing certain services to be delivered remotely when appropriate and chosen by the individual or family, with vendors required to track remote service use. The proposal also includes ending courtesy vendorization by March 1, 2028, updates to the HCBS complaint and grievance process, and changes related to employment services, including updated terminology and future service standards to be developed by DDS.

Members asked questions regarding the potential impact of the proposed changes to courtesy vendorization and employment service requirements. Belinda Abatesi noted that these items remain proposals and that additional guidance from DDS is expected.

Belinda Abatesi also shared information about the Future of Medi-Cal Commission, which is developing a 10-year roadmap for Medi-Cal, with recommendations expected in 2027. Members were reminded that February 20 is the deadline for bill introductions, after which legislation will begin to be tracked with guidance from ARCA. No further questions were raised.

8.2 Deputy Director Officer's Report

Evelyn McOmie provided several updates and announcements. Evelyn McOmie reported that the Department of Developmental Services has implemented updates to Title 17 related to Special Incident Report (SIR) reporting. The changes are intended to align reporting practices between regional centers and vendors statewide. Additional clarification from the Department is being gathered, and staff will attend an in-person training to receive further guidance. Information will be shared with vendors, and trainings for service providers are planned. Implementation of the new requirements is scheduled to begin May 1.

Evelyn McOmie also reminded providers to encourage families to complete the IPP meeting survey, noting that the survey contains approximately six questions and takes only a few minutes to complete. Providers may assist families with completing the survey if needed. An update on caseloads and staffing was also provided. The Regional Center is currently building three new case management units across the service areas. San Fernando Valley and Antelope Valley will each receive a new school-age unit, and Santa Clarita Valley will receive a hybrid transition/adult unit. This expansion will add 36 staff positions, including 33 service coordinators and 3 supervisors, which is expected to help reduce current vacant caseloads.

Evelyn McOmie also invited service providers to volunteer their program sites for staff tours, particularly in the Antelope Valley. These visits will help new service coordinators learn about the range of services available in the community. Interested providers were asked to contact Community Services Director Arshalous Garlanian to participate. No additional questions were raised.

8.3 Chief Financial Officer's Report

This will be deferred to the next meeting.

8.4 Community Services Director's Report

Arshalous Garlanian provided several updates for service providers. Arshalous Garlanian reminded providers to complete the DDS Quality Incentive Program (QIP) survey for Fiscal Year 2026–2027, which determines eligibility for the 10% incentive. The survey deadline is February 27, and surveys are now issued by vendor number rather than parent vendorization. Approximately 189 vendor numbers associated with North Los Angeles County Regional Center had not yet completed the survey at the time of the meeting.

Arshalous Garlanian also reviewed additional QIP compliance requirements, including Electronic Visit Verification (EVV), HCBS Settings Final Rule compliance, and independent audits. Providers must be registered for EVV or have an exemption on file if applicable. DDS will host an in-person EVV training on March 25 from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., and providers were encouraged to attend if EVV applies to their services. Arshalous Garlanian reported that all North LA providers currently meet HCBS compliance requirements, and providers were reminded that independent audits must be submitted within nine months after the close of the fiscal year to maintain compliance.

Arshalous Garlanian also provided an update on the Direct Support Professional (DSP) Collaborative, a joint effort among the seven Los Angeles County regional centers to support workforce recruitment. The initiative includes a website where providers will be able to post job openings and connect with potential applicants. The website is expected to launch in Spring 2026.

As part of this initiative, a regional job fair will be held on March 5 in Pasadena, and providers interested in participating as exhibitors were asked to register by February 20. Additional regional job fairs are planned for later in the year.

Arshalous Garlanian also announced upcoming NLACRC Vendor Fairs for providers to connect with service coordinators and share information about available services. Vendor fairs will take place April 22–23 at the San Fernando Valley office and April 29–30 in the Antelope Valley. Registration information will be distributed to providers.

8.5 Executive Director's Report

Angela Pao-Johnson provided the Executive Director's Report and shared several organizational updates. Angela Pao-Johnson reported that NLACRC has made significant progress in improving recruitment efficiency over the past year. Applicants are now contacted within approximately two business days, and the average time from application to accepted offer is about 75 days across all positions and approximately 51 days for service coordinator positions. Angela Pao-Johnson noted that this reflects meaningful progress toward industry standards.

Angela Pao-Johnson also reported that NLACRC achieved a 100% compliance rate for completing Lanterman intake timelines within 120 days during a recent reporting period in November. Angela Pao-Johnson noted that the Regional Center consistently performs in the high 90 percent range in this area, compared to a statewide average of 61.5 percent.

Additional departmental updates were provided regarding remote services, proposed trailer bill language, and the Self-Determination Program. Angela Pao-Johnson noted that remote services may continue under proposed guidelines when effective and chosen by the individual or family. Angela Pao-Johnson also shared that the Self-Determination Program waiver is expected to be extended beyond June 30, 2026, although changes are anticipated related to financial management services, budget requirements, and orientation procedures.

Angela Pao-Johnson also highlighted proposed changes to regional center board composition, including a proposed board size of 10 to 15 members, required representation

from the Consumer Advisory Committee, and additional training and professional experience requirements for board members.

Angela Pao-Johnson reported that NLACRC has filled 932 positions and is currently serving approximately 41,400 individuals. Angela Pao-Johnson also highlighted community outreach efforts, including attendance at the Armenian Parent Circle support group in January, where approximately 23 families participated and Senator Menjivar recognized the group's work.

During discussion, a question was raised regarding staff retention, particularly among service coordinators. Angela Pao-Johnson shared that the organization's average employee tenure is approximately six years and that new hires are being supported through regular check-ins to improve retention and job fit. It was also noted that recruitment efforts have become more targeted to identify candidates who are well-suited for case management roles. No further questions were raised.

9. OPEN DISCUSSION TOPICS

9.1 LACSP – Harry Bruell and Donna Feingold

This presentation was provided to the VAC committee earlier in the meeting before the Deputy Director's Report Out.

Donna Feingold provided a brief presentation regarding the LA Coalition of Service Providers. Donna Feingold shared that the coalition is a membership organization consisting of 15 nonprofit providers serving approximately 23,000 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities across Los Angeles County and surrounding areas. The coalition was originally formed in response to system funding cuts and serves as a collaborative forum for providers to share information, discuss policy issues, and hear from guest speakers and system leaders.

Donna Feingold noted that the coalition recently reopened membership after several years of restructuring. Membership includes participation in monthly meetings that function as a CEO forum where providers can exchange information and discuss sector challenges. Donna Feingold also highlighted a recent legislative forum hosted by the coalition, which was attended by nearly 200 participants, including advocates and legislators.

Interested organizations must be nonprofit providers with annual budgets of \$5 million or more and serve the greater Los Angeles County area. Donna Feingold invited interested providers to submit an application and noted that prospective members will be interviewed as part of the membership process. Donna Feingold offered to provide contact information in the meeting chat for anyone interested in learning more. No additional questions were raised.

9.2 Clarification on SIR Guidelines

During open discussion, a question was raised regarding clarification of Special Incident Report (SIR) guidelines related to the recent Title 17 updates. A member noted that under previous practices, providers were required to submit SIRs for incidents that occurred outside of their facilities, such as at schools or day programs. Based on the new guidance, it appears that reporting requirements may be changing in this area.

It was acknowledged that additional clarification from the Department of Developmental Services is still being gathered regarding the updated regulations. Further discussion will take place once additional guidance becomes available.

10. COMMITTEE WORK GROUP INFORMATION

10.1 **Early Start Services**

Jodie Agnew-Navarro provided an update on the Early Start Services Workgroup. Jodie Agnew-Navarro reported that the workgroup met in January and continues to meet every other month. Current discussions include rate reform, clarification on new service subcodes and rates, and the Quality Incentive Program (QIP) survey.

The next Early Start Services Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 19 at 9:00 a.m. via Zoom.

10.2 **School Age Services**

Cal Enriquez provided an update on the School-Age Services Workgroup, noting that the group met earlier in the week and meets on the second Tuesday of each month. The workgroup discussed issues related to authorizations and billing, particularly instances where authorizations are missing required details such as service frequency, which can create challenges for vendor billing and e-billing processes. Jessica Ross participated in the discussion and provided vendors with contact information for accounting and vendor liaison staff to help address these issues.

The workgroup also discussed rate reform and service codes 612, 615, and 616, as some vendors reported that other regional centers have already implemented updated authorizations for those codes. Staff confirmed that rate reform updates have been implemented, and additional clarification will be addressed offline with the workgroup members as needed.

10.3 **Adult Services**

Octavia Watkins provided an update on the Adult Services Workgroup. Octavia Watkins requested an update regarding the Systemic Aging Preparedness Pilot Proposal previously presented by Bob Ariel. It was noted that the request for Bob Ariel to present the proposal to the Board of Trustees has been forwarded to the Board President and Regional Center leadership for review, and the request is currently under consideration.

Octavia Watkins also reported that the Adult Services Workgroup held a meeting in January, although attendance was limited due to the meeting occurring on a holiday. During the meeting, a presentation was provided by Ilya, founder of Alchemy Software, who discussed digital documentation tools for service providers. The presentation highlighted the benefits of transitioning to digital documentation, including improved efficiency, regulatory compliance, audit readiness, and secure data management.

The workgroup also discussed the Quality Incentive Program (QIP) survey extension. The next Adult Services Workgroup meeting is scheduled for March 16 at 11:00 a.m., and interested participants were encouraged to contact Octavia Watkins for additional information.

11. **BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS**

11.1 **Community Relations Committee**

Sharon Weinberg provided an update from the **Community Relations Committee**, which met on **January 21**. Sharon Weinberg reported that the meeting primarily included a series of presentations and report-outs, including updates on regional center social media efforts, Self-Determination Program updates, the Disparity Report, Consumer Diagnostic Report, and intake data. Sharon Weinberg noted that all reports from the meeting are available online.

11.2 Executive Finance Committee

A brief recap of the Executive Finance Committee meeting was also provided. During the meeting, members reviewed contract amendments related to the Hope and Home project, discussed updates to the Board budget, and reviewed several policies that were later presented at the Board of Trustees meeting.

11.3 Nominating Committee

Alex Kopilevich also reported on the Nominating Committee, noting that 12 applications were received for the Board of Trustees, and three applicants were selected to move forward to in-person interviews.

12. BOARD MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

There were no board meeting agenda items.

Under Board Meeting Agenda Items, members discussed adding an item for a future meeting to review the Vendor Advisory Committee applicant process, including whether incomplete applications should be forwarded to the Committee for review. Members also agreed to verify relevant bylaw requirements related to the application review process. No additional board agenda items were proposed.

13. ANNOUNCEMENTS/PUBLIC INPUT

Ashley Tompkins introduced Ashley Tompkins as the System of Care Specialist for NLACRC, serving as the liaison between NLACRC and the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS). Ashley Tompkins supports internal collaboration and assists with complex cases involving both agencies.

Victoria Berry, representing the Family Focused Resource Center (FFRC), also provided updates on family support services. Victoria Berry shared that FFRC operates offices in all three NLACRC locations and currently facilitates eight support groups for families. A new Spanish-language support group for parents, Mamas Latinas, has recently launched in Santa Clarita and has been well attended. Victoria Berry also reported that FFRC offers a variety of workshops, including IEP trainings, Medi-Cal and generic resource workshops, and tax and IHSS workshops for parent providers. Recordings of workshops are available on the organization's YouTube channel.

Victoria Berry also announced an upcoming Transition to Adulthood Resource Fair scheduled to take place in April at College of the Canyons in Santa Clarita, intended to connect families with adult service providers and community resources.

During public comment, a question was raised regarding the proposed elimination of courtesy vendorization and whether the standardized vendorization process would replace it. Staff noted that clarification is still pending as the proposed trailer bill language continues to be reviewed.

Additional comments highlighted recent discussions at the LA Coalition legislative forum, including the possibility of a future DDS directive addressing daily versus hourly billing for day services. It was also noted that service providers will be meeting with California legislators on March 11 to discuss proposed trailer bill language and related policy issues. No further comments were raised.

14. NEXT MEETING

The date of the next Vendor Advisory Committee meeting is on March 12, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. at the Antelope Valley office.

15. **ADJOURNMENT**

On a motion duly made and carried, it was agreed that there was no further business to transact; the meeting closed at 11:14 a.m.