

State of California
CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL
PUBLIC MEETING
MINUTES

California



Arts Council

Held Pursuant To Due Notice
March 23, 2005

The Rand Corporation
1776 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90407

ATTENDANCE

CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL

Presiding: Marcy Friedman, Chair

Council Members: Michael Alexander
Eunice David
Malissa Feruzzi
Steven J. Fogel
Barbara George
Dr. Jerrold Hiura
Michael Rubel

(Members not in Attendance) (Annette Bening)
(Jane Boeckmann)
(Phyllis Epstein)

Staff: Muriel Johnson, Director
Juan Carrillo, Deputy Director
Josie S. Talamantez, Assistant Chief of Grant Programs
Mary Beth Barber, Communications Director

Attendees: Approximately 10 supporters and staff from Rand and three members of the general public.

CALIFORNIA ARTS COUNCIL

Summary Minutes

March 23, 2005

Call to Order

Chair Marcy Friedman called the meeting to order and thanked the Rand Corporation for hosting the meeting.

New Council Member, New Term

Chair Friedman then introduced new California Arts Council member Malissa Feruzzi and explained how excited she and the rest of the Council were to have Feruzzi on the CAC. Chair Friedman then had Feruzzi repeat the oath as a member of the California state government. "Now it's official," said Chair Friedman after Councilmember Feruzzi was sworn in.

Chair Friedman also noted that the meeting marked the first of a second term for Councilmember Michael Rubin, who was recently reappointed by Governor Schwarzenegger.

Roll Call

Chair Friedman then had CAC staff Mary Beth Barber call the roll. Friedman also noted that Councilmember Epstein was on medical leave and that the Council wished her well.

Adoption of the Agenda

Director Muriel Johnson suggested that Assemblyman Mark Leno speak as early as possible, followed by Bruce Orr, since both had appointments to attend to mid-day. Agenda was approved unanimously, with amendments.

Introductions

Chair Friedman then introduced Alan Hoffman, Vice President for External Affairs of Rand. Mr. Hoffman explained that while Rand has done research on major topics like the military and health care, a recent study on the Arts entitled *Gifts of the Muse* was their latest project, and the findings would be presented in the afternoon. Councilmember Fogel said he couldn't thank Rand enough, and added that Kevin McCarthy of Rand spent a significant amount of *pro bono* time on a survey a few years ago. Chair Friedman added a word of acknowledgement to Councilmember Barbara George for contacting Rand and setting up the meeting.

Approval of Summary Minutes

Director Johnson requested an amendment to the minutes to include acknowledgements for four individuals who came to the previous meeting in support: Patricia Smith of the *Sacramento Bee*, Jane Hill of the Sacramento Philharmonic, Rod Gideons from the Sacramento Opera and Kerri Warner of the Sacramento Ballet. Minutes approved unanimously, with amendments noted.

Chair's Report

Chair Friedman presented the chair's report and offered thoughts on the direction of the CAC, especially with the direct involvement of the members in ongoing activities and governmental affairs that affect the Council such as legislation. Chair Friedman then turned the floor over to Councilmember Jerry Hiura for the introduction of Assemblyman Mark Leno.

Legislative Report – Testimony from Assemblyman Leno – AB655

Councilmember Hiura introduced Assemblyman Leno. He explained that Assemblyman Leno is from northern California, that his district – Assembly District 13 – is in San Francisco, and that Assemblyman Leno has introduced a piece of legislation that would have a direct fiscal impact on the CAC if it were to become law: AB655. There are 16 bills that the CAC is following because of an effect on the Council, said Hiura.

Assemblyman Leno indicated his longtime support for the Arts. “I was dismayed to see in the late ‘90s when the California treasury still had surplus dollars, which seems like a long long time ago, we had the good sense to reinvest in the California Arts Council to about a dollar per capita which was about \$35 million at the time. It increased our rank among the other states to about 26th or 27th in general-fund funding for the arts.

“But then things went downhill from there.” as a result of the ongoing budget crisis in the state. “We are now 50 out of 50.” Leno said he decided to find new and dedicated sources that wouldn’t rely on the general fund.

The bill would place a 1 percent surcharge fee on every entertainment ticket sold in California. “A \$9 movie ticket sold in California would cost an extra 9 cents. And a rock-concert ticket at \$40 would cost an extra 40 cents. An opera ticket at \$100 would cost an extra dollar.”

Leno then spoke of opposition to the legislation. “I met with the motion picture producers – I guess the MPAA – last year just to let them know this was something we were considering. And they let us know that this would not be something they would look kindly upon.”

Leno then said that the Board of Equalization estimated that the bill would bring us about \$30 million a year if enacted, and explained who would be charged the fee. “Now, as the bill is presently written, it exempts non-profit arts providers. That was not the intent when I first conceived the idea. And so I’m talking to non-profit arts organizations to let them know that we need to include them.”

Leno then went on to explain more about the effect of AB 655 on the movie-theater industry. “The motion picture folks – the theater operators – told me they would not raise their ticket price with anything less than a 25-cent increment. So if [the state] were to impose the one percent [fee] and the ticket price was in the neighborhood of around 9 dollars, they would owe the state 9 cents for every ticket that they sold [and] would probably increase [the ticket price] by a quarter.

“But I learned only recently that this is going to be an unintended windfall for the movie producers, because they get a 50% take on the gross that the theater operators take in. So if they raise the price by a quarter, the movie producer will get an extra 12 ½ cents, with no trouble whatsoever. We would get 9 cents out of the remaining 25 cents and the theater operator would get the 3 ½ cents for their trouble.”

The non-profit entertainment sector needs to understand the political challenge to get AB 655 passed, continued Assemblyman Leno. The bill, as currently written, has been interpreted as a tax and therefore requires a two-thirds vote in the Legislature, while a bill that initiates a fee

would only require a simple majority vote. The difference between a tax and a fee is that a fee has a direct impact on those being charged, and the finances collected do not go into the state's general fund, said the Assemblyman. "But we've been told by legislative counsel that it is written as a tax. We're going to have to amend it to have it as a fee."

Leno emphasized that the opposition was going to be steep. Around sixty percent of the Republicans in the Legislature have pledged to anti-tax groups to never vote for a tax, and the bill would need at least six Republican votes with all 48 of the Democrat votes in the Assembly alone. "With a fee it's a simple majority."

Council Discussion of AB 655

Councilmember Barbara George asked the Assemblyman if the amendments to AB 655 that would make the one percent a fee and not a tax would be in time to put it on the ballot. He answered that he didn't know, and noted that there was a move within the Legislature and in government circles to have a ballot initiative that would make fees require a two-thirds vote in the Legislature as well.

Councilmember Michael Alexander asked the Assemblyman if, because of the flexible nature of the income source, the funds would carry over to the next year in AB 655. Assemblyman Leno said he would review the question, but that the intention is yes, the legislation's intent is for consistency in funding.

CAC Deputy Director Juan Carrillo pointed out that studies show that the public is willing to pay if the funds went directly to the Arts, and then asked the Assemblyman who was the most important adversary to the legislation. "My colleagues are impacted by industry folks," said Assemblyman Leno.

Councilwoman Friedman added that the audience paying the fee is the audience benefiting from the fee, since movies are an art form. Assemblyman Leno agreed, but added that the movie operators are afraid a price increase would mean more people would stay at home and watch DVDs.

Councilmember Eunice David asked how the legislation would ensure that the money goes to the California Arts Council for distribution, and Assemblyman Leno answered that the Department of Equalization that collects the fee would put it directly into the CAC budget.

Councilmember Alexander congratulated the Assemblyman for writing the legislation, for talking to people in San Francisco, and for being at the CAC meeting in the Los Angeles area. "But in my experience it's difficult to get people involved." He went on to note that labor unions are "in both camps", and there are union actors in small theaters, writers, etc.

Leno commented that it would be great to find a high profile director or producer to help. He also wondered whether Councilmember Annette Bening could help, and noted that support would have to come from the movie studios as well. Leno asked them to think about who they knew in their lives who could be helpful, especially for a committee hearing like the one on April 19th.

Leno went on to discuss the difficulty some legislators have because of the political ramifications of term limits. “They are scared of ‘hit pieces,’” he said, specifically of the nature that Councilmember Hiura described.

Assemblyman Leno went on to say that CAC Director Johnson is having a positive influence in the Legislature for the Council. “Muriel, your presence is changing the California Arts Council in Sacramento. It’s a new day.” Director Johnson thanked him and said that there were many more meetings she needed to have with legislators to make an impact.

Assemblyman Leno finished up by noting that one of the members of his staff was going to have a teleconference the following day with a number of people from the non-profit Arts community, many of whom are not happy with the inclusion of the non-profit organizations to be charge the fee. “If we get resistance by the non-profits, it’s dead,” he said of AB 655. “And if [the non-profits] aren’t included, it’s dead too.”

Chair Friedman tabled the rest of the legislative report for the end of the Council meeting.

California Music Project (CMP) – Testimony from Bruce Orr

Councilmember George introduced Bruce Orr, executive director of the ongoing Texas Music Project and proposed executive director of the proposed California Music Project (CMP).

Mr. Orr explained that starting in January he was trying to create the infrastructure to accelerate the changes suggested and taking the plans for the California Music Project “to the street.” The first step was to solicit and enroll board members for the California Music Project’s board. The second step was to preview the intentions of individual arts leaders in the state.

Orr then spoke of a meeting he had with the Los Angeles County Arts Commission (LACAC) executive director Laura Zucker. Mr. Orr said that Ms. Zucker wants to make sure the CMP would participate in the current program at the LACAC, and she asked that some CMP funds be made available to be cross-applied to other arts and not only music.

Orr continued to say that now that he’s met with officials in Los Angeles, he now needs to move to the other parts of the state including San Diego, San Jose, San Francisco, and others including the rural parts of the state. It’s the infrastructure through the creation of a board that will build relationships in the California music community, and then the project can move on towards a signature CD project, which in turn can be a catalyst for other things.

Mr. Orr continued with a list of people who he’s been in contact with concerning the CMP.

Council Discussion of the CMP

TMP History

Chair Friedman asked Mr. Orr to give a brief round-up of the Texas program during the first and second years, including revenues spent on the project, the revenues realized, etc.

Orr started by explaining the Texas project, that in the first year there was \$400,000 generated, with \$100,000 of that realized in *pro bono* work and \$300,000 in money, and that only 5% of all revenue was spent for operating costs or fundraising and 95% went for programs. There was also a successful public awareness program that was estimated to be worth approximately \$600,000 in editorial-based mentions in the media.

Orr then continued describing the Texas project, saying that in 2004 the program distributed money earned in 2003 and money from events in 2004, and was able to distribute grants in the total of \$200,000. The grants were distributed through the Texas Commission on Arts, just as would happen through the CAC under the CMP.

CMP Current Funds and Status

Orr explained that the approved \$100,000 was meant to provide cash flow to the CMP to get started. The breakdown of funds was \$40,000 to Mr. Orr for his work, and then \$60,000 for travel, start-up expenses and a staff person.

Director Johnson asked if the staff person was intended to be a grant writer. Orr indicated that the individual would be part-time. Orr would do almost all the work, aside from the part-time grant writer. Orr noted that he had submitted two expense reports to the Council.

Chair Friedman then asked what would happen if there wasn't a board. Mr. Orr responded that he didn't want the CMP to look like the "Bruce Orr Project," and that he needed a board to be established. Chair Friedman then asked if in Texas there was a "spelled-out" board participation description. Orr answered that there wasn't anything that specific for the TMP.

Councilmember Hiura said that he was an advocate of urban hubs, and that he understood the thinking of many philanthropists, that they want to ensure that the donations come back to their communities. It's hard to raise dollars for projects that go across the state.

501(c)3

Councilmember Hiura then asked if the CAC and the CMP has spun off a 501(c)3 non-profit, tax-exempt organization for the CMP. Orr said that one had not yet been created, but that he has applied to the state, and that in the meantime the TMP was handling the appropriate financial questions.

Councilmember Fogel asked where the money was going. Orr answered to the TMP. Fogel asked why it wasn't going to the CMP, to which Orr answered that using the TMP's 501(c)3 non-profit status was only a temporary measure. Fogel asked if it could be established quickly, and Orr answered that it can take up to a year.

Chair Friedman noted that the CAC can take donations in the meantime, and then roll over the funds to the CMP once the proper 501(c)3 was created. She added that the Council would be in touch with the California Attorney General's office to help establish the proper accounts.

Relationship between CMP and CAC

Orr clarified that money collected under the CMP would go directly to the accounts at the CAC, and Councilmember Alexander responded that the CAC currently has no obligation to have a long term relationship with the CMP, but that with the 501(c)3 the CMP would not act as an independent foundation.

Councilmember Hiura then asked, “So this is more of an accountability issue than control,” to which Orr suggested that there should be a long-term contract between the CMP and the CAC that a certain number of positions on the CMP board would be from the CAC, and that the CMP always turns over the funds to the CAC for distribution.

Councilmember Fogel asked what percentage of the CMP would be from the CAC, and Mr. Orr answered whatever percentage the CAC would feel comfortable with. Councilmember Fogel then expressed his concern that the CAC was the one putting up the funds for the organization, that “we do this all the time,” but that the CAC has no say.

Councilmember Michael Rubel said that when the Council sees entrepreneurial experience and energy, then the Council helps if it can. “I have no interest in thinking of being on the board of directors of one of the thousands of projects” under the CAC, said Rubel. Hiura said, “we’re not in the business of management. I don’t want to control this entity.” He supported the notion that the CAC does not manage individual projects and that the management of the CMP was Mr. Orr’s job.

Support and Concerns

Councilwoman George said that she had been interested “from the get-go” in what Texas had done with the TMP.

Director Johnson said that the CAC needs a timeline, a description of the project, a description of the board and the CD. She said that the CAC couldn’t represent the CMP as only for needy students, because all students need music. Johnson suggested a separate meeting in April, if needed.

Orr indicated at this point that he was uncomfortable with moving forward until he and the CAC knew what the relationship was. He said he needed to reexamine what was approved at the November CAC meeting.

Chair Friedman said that she understood Orr’s concern, but that for some reason the establishment of the program wasn’t clear. She indicated her support for a separate board with CAC influence, and emphasized the Council’s support of the CMP. “I don’t want you to get the feeling that we want you to stop.”

Orr also pointed out that it would be easier to attract grant funding if the CMP board was not dominated by the CAC and that it would have broader influence.

Councilmember Feruzzi noted that for the Special Olympics – an organization she’s worked with in the past – the Christmas CD from them was the largest fundraising project for the organization. She added that she thought the CMP was the kind of thing they should be doing. Orr suggested a conference call during the first week of April.

Lunch Break

Introduction of Guests and Observers

Chair Friedman welcomed the Council and others back from lunch, and asked that the observers introduce themselves. The guests included: Dr. Sam Gilmore, a sociologist at the University of California Irvine who specializes in the Arts; Julia Lowell, an economist at Rand who contributed to *Gifts of the Muse*; a former director of an arts non-profit organization; Bobbie Elliot, a friend of Councilmember George and an active supporter of music education; and Dori Soburn, a docent at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Presentation from Rand – Gifts of the Muse

Chair Friedman then gave an introduction to the presenters from Rand and their report on the Arts entitled *Gifts of the Muse*. She then turned the floor over to Bianca Roberts, director of development for the graduate school at Rand.

Ms. Roberts briefly spoke of the graduate school in public policy at Rand, then introduced Elizabeth Ondaatje, an author of *Gifts of the Muse*.

Ms. Ondaatje explained that she’s a native Californian whose family came to California during the Gold Rush. She discussed the changes in public perception of the Arts, saying that there is a challenge from skeptics from “outside” the art world, but that those inside “get it.”

She started by explaining that since the early 1990s there has been a significant change in how people in the public-policy arena talk about the Arts, that there’s been budget battles and culture wars that have put the Arts “on the defensive.” More recently the Arts community speaks about *instrumental* benefits of the Arts rather than the *intrinsic* benefits of the Arts, using the example of reading to increase vocabulary rather than reading for the joy of reading.

Ondaatje said that the conclusion of the report was that there needed to be a new approach toward the Arts that included the following elements: a continuation of the benefits, a creation of public value, a need to link participation, and an answer to the question of why the Arts are special.

The Rand researchers found limitations to speaking about the Arts simply in terms of instrumental benefits. She said that there is a lack of empirical rigor, exclusion of intrinsic benefits, there’s an oversimplification of links to participation, and the approach ignores the advantage of the Arts themselves and speaks only of the benefits. “There’s a need for a new approach,” one that also emphasizes the intrinsic benefits.

Those who participate in the Arts were often exposed to the Arts at a young age. “Early exposure is the key,” she said.

Council Discussion of Gifts of the Muse

Chair Friedman thanked Ms. Ondaatje and commented that after seeing the presentation that the message in the report is very important. Discussion is very important, especially during a time when there is very little money for the Arts and the benefits are difficult to put into words. She noted that the Council is often asked, “If you had more money, what would you do with it?” She also mused about who in the public arena needed to hear the message behind *Gifts of the Muse* about the intrinsic benefits.

Councilmember Rubel commented that the most interesting portion of the presentation for him was the suggestion to reorder the thinking about the Arts to drive demand rather than supply. “There’s not a lot of conversation around demand,” he said, adding that the mindset would be a spectacular change.

Councilmember Feruzzi commented that there needed to be a change of thinking of the public, especially in relation to Arts for children. “We want to brands this,” she said. Years ago when there seemed to be a need for education for young kids they started the HeadStart program. “Why not an “Art Start”? It’s all about demand, the voter.”

Councilmember Alexander added that early exposure is the key, and through the schools if there’s not the encouragement through family activity. Councilmember Alexander also added that a multi-generational approach is critical.

Councilmember Rubel said that if the same people constantly participate in the arts – “If the same people see the same program” – has the Council met its mission? “I’m not all that worried about the person who is passionate,” he said. “They will find it.” Rather he’d like to broaden the range of Arts participation versus deepen.

Chair Friedman added that Councilmember Feruzzi touched on the question of who in the public demands more Arts. When she’s gone to talk to legislators, she’s been told that they don’t receive letters from their constituents saying it’s important. There are reports that show that the public values the Arts, but the message isn’t getting to the legislators. Director Johnson added that the CAC should have an updated strategic plan, and Chair Friedman agreed and said, “We need to have a voice.”

Councilmember Alexander noted that there is evidence that price is a barrier for some people when it comes to participation. There are enough studies to show that everyone wants culture in their lives, he said. But the Arts needs to become an American value, like libraries. “Art Makes a Good America” was a suggested slogan, he said.

Councilmember Rubel said that he believed that the councilmembers become distracted by “the Legislature thing,” that they spend a tremendous amount of time talking to lawmakers rather than talking to the public. He suggested that the Council have “a singular marketing approach.”

Councilmember Hiura noted that a marketing campaign would take time, and Councilmember Rubel agreed, saying that there are too many budget problems and the Council and Arts world couldn’t expect changes tomorrow.

Ms. Roberts from Rand referred the Council to the marketing book *The Tipping Point* by Malcolm Gladwell and to the marketing campaigns in the book and how they worked.

Deputy Director Carrillo informed the Council that the CAC staff is already thinking along these lines, that they've been working on the "Take Part" campaign that would initially be for Arts Day in October, but that the theme would go 365 days a year. Deputy Director Carrillo said that the budget slated for the campaign was very limited, and Councilmember Hiura responded that it's something that needs to be discussed in the future. Deputy Director Carrillo commented that the CAC is a resource-driven agency, and agreed that it must promote the Arts on the artists' behalf.

Councilmember Hiura added that ethnic communities seemed to have deep feelings about the Arts, but they call it heritage or culture. "They are things they hold sacrosanct."

A Rand employee commented that they were working on a report on art agencies that are working on a "demand" approach, pointing out that Colorado is in a financially difficult spot just like the CAC. Councilmember Rubel commented that he knows marketing experts who might work on this, and "Can we put them into a room with Rand folks?" and was answered in the affirmative by Ms. Ondaatje.

Chair Friedman than thanked the participants from Rand for their presentation and the impetus for dialogue, and wrapped up the discussion.

Medal for the Arts, other Committee Chairs

Director Johnson explained that the planning process for the Medal of the Arts is still in the early stages. Chair Friedman explained that she wanted the CAC to revive the Medal of the Arts presentation and program because it would be a good public-relations move, as well as appropriate for the state to acknowledge excellence in the field. Councilmembers Feruzzi and David will be co-chairs of the committee, with a proposed event in late 2005 or early 2006 that can serve as a model for future Medal of the Arts events.

Chair Friedman also noted that Councilmember George would be the chair of the CMP committee, and that Councilmembers Hiura and Alexander were legislative committee chairs. Councilmember Rubel added that he would gather knowledgeable people together on the branding and marketing ideas.

California Poet Laureate

Director Johnson asked that the Council read the packet in their books explaining the California Poet Laureate process and status, noting that of the 25 very prestigious poets presented to the Poet Laureate panel, the panel would choose three names to send to the Governor's office. She expected the choice and announcement to be made in April or May, and then the Council would provide ideas for events for the California Poet Laureate, locations, and other sources of funding.

Financial Report

Councilmember Hiura noted that there could be an additional \$50,000 to \$100,000 for the CAC budget. "Where will it land?" he asked. Deputy Director Carrillo answered that the Youth Education in the Arts – YEA! – program was ideal, that there was a huge demand for those

grants, and that the funds needed to be put into contract by June 15th prior to the end of the fiscal year.

Retirement of Deputy Director Carrillo

Director Johnson also mentioned that it was very possible this meeting was going to be the last one for Deputy Director Carrillo before he was going to retire on May 17th. “This is a major loss for the state and the staff,” said Director Johnson. “He’s the heart and soul” of the CAC, and has been with the agency for 27 years and is distinguished in the field.

Deputy Director Carrillo explained that it was not easy for him to articulate to Director Johnson about his retirement. He also said that it seems like the world has changed, but hasn’t. “When I came to the Arts Commission in 1978, there were twenty people on staff and a budget of \$3.5 million.” Now years later there are 19 people on staff and a budget of \$3.1 million. “Twenty-seven years later you’d think we’d be in a different place.” He added that in that time period, \$350 million came through the CAC for arts organizations in California.

Director Johnson said that she gave Deputy Director Carrillo one last assignment before he retired – to determine with the CAC staff and the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies (NASAA) the best past and current projects or programs of the CAC, and their recommendations for where the CAC should place future funds as more money becomes available. “Everyone asks me, ‘what would you do if you had \$10 or \$20 million’ for the Arts Council,” she said. “I can’t say, ‘I don’t know.’ I want to be able to answer.”

Director’s Report

Director Johnson listed a number of topics to be discussed at a future time, including: discussions with legal counsel regarding CAC issues; California Arts Day; day-to-day activities of the CAC director; AMI and the Wallace Foundation; and a future strategic plan for the CAC.

Legislative Report

CAC Chief of Programs Josie Talamantez directed the Council to tab E of the packet outlining the different bills in the California Legislature that affected the CAC. AB 655 by Assemblyman Leno had already been discussed, but she reminded the Council that the bill would be presented in a legislative committee on April 19th.

Arts License Plate – funds from personalization

Councilmember Alexander then presented background on SB 691 by Senator Jackie Speier that would ensure that all proceeds from the Arts License Plate would come to the CAC, including funds for personalized plates that currently go to the Environmental License Plate fund within the Resources Agency. The fiscal impacts could be an increase in CAC funding from \$300,000 to \$1.2 million.

Councilmember George commented that during the first ten years, there was more money going to the environmental fund than to the CAC. Alexander added that the environmental community has indicated that there are programs within the Resources Agency that count on the money and there would be opposition from the environmental community. Councilmember George noted

that supporters for the Arts would also be supporters for the environment, and that there would be conflict.

CAC Lobbyist

Councilmember David brought up the subject of a lobbyist from the CAC, and Councilmember Fogel noted that a lobbyist cannot be paid through staff or program funds. One lobbyist, Andrew Govenar, was noted as a potential at \$1000/month for four months. The CAC legislative chairs and Johnson said they would look into the possibility of hiring a lobbyist like Mr. Govenar on their own for Arts-related issues, but not through the CAC. Several councilmembers volunteered funds for a lobbyist.

Digital Art Studio Partnership

Ms. Talamantez then explained other pending bills, including AB 252 for an extension of the Digital Art Studio Partnership. Director Johnson commented that while the program had not been funded and the CAC has little to do with it, by all appearances the program was a CAC program.

Councilmembers Rubel and George both asked for clarification about the project and the administration of it, and Deputy Director Carrillo explained that so far it has been a series of meetings, not a “program,” and the number of youths affected by it is unknown, and that there in essence wasn’t a program in effect. But the CAC’s name continues to be attached to it.

Other Legislation

Ms. Talamantez then discussed other legislation to watch, and Deputy Director Carrillo recommended that the legislative committee decide which bills to support or oppose.

Discussion of Next Meeting and Adjournment

The Council decided to consider May 17th or 18th for the next meeting in Sacramento, and the meeting was adjourned in memory of the late Lalo Guerrero, California musician.