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REPORT METHODOLOGY

- Extensive survey of THP-NMD & THP-Plus providers
- THP-NMD & THP-Plus Participant Tracking Systems data
- California Child Welfare Indicators Project
- New! Short survey of THP-M providers
TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PLACEMENT FOR NON-MINOR DEPENDENTS (THP-NMD) AT A GLANCE

Current foster youth age 18-21 (“non-minor dependents”)

Modeled after THP-Plus program

Title IV-E-reimbursable foster care placement

Implemented in 2012 with Extended Foster Care (AB 12)
• 2,023 youth placed in THP-NMD as of July 1, 2019

• 70 licensed providers

• 59 providers operating in 49 counties over FY 2018-19

• 46 counties placed youth in THP-NMD as of July 1, 2019
TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PLACEMENT PLUS (THP-PLUS) PROGRAM
AT A GLANCE

- Former foster & out-of-home probation youth age 18-24*
- Can access for up to 24 months*
- Est. 2001 by AB 427 (Hertzberg)
- CWS Realignment funds, formerly state funded program
- $34.9 M annual budget; additional $8 M in annual state funding made available starting FY 2019-20

* 27 counties offer the THP-Plus extension: youth in school can participate for up to 36 months and/or up to age 25.
• **1,739** youth served over FY 2018-19

• Moment-in-time housing capacity was **1,252** for FY 2018-19

• **55** THP-Plus providers

• Operating **77** programs in **47** counties
DEMOGRAPHICS & NUMBER OF YOUTH SERVED

FINDINGS
After 5 years of consistent growth, the number of youth in THP-NMD has leveled-off.

Number of Non-Minor Dependents Placed in THP-NMD as of July 1st
Nearly 1 in 4 non-minor dependents (NMDs) are placed in THP-NMD.

Proportion of NMDs Placed in THP-NMD, SILPs & Other Placements as of July 1st
THP-NMD participants continue to be more likely to be female and increasingly Latino, with 1 in 6 youth supervised by Juvenile Probation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised by Juvenile Probation</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total number of youth served by THP-Plus and the statewide housing capacity remained relatively consistent with the previous fiscal year.

THP-Plus is close to being at full service capacity: 96% occupied with 1,196 of the 1,252 housing slots filled as of June 30, 2019.
Almost all youth participating in THP-Plus are 21 to 24, a significant change from before the implementation of extended foster care.

**Other trends:**

- Consistently more female participants than male
- Gradual decrease in participation among formerly probation-supervised youth
THP-NMD & THP-PLUS RATES

FINDINGS
The statewide THP-NMD rate increased by 4% as required by statute.
The average monthly rate paid per youth by counties to THP-Plus providers for the single site housing model has increased, for scattered site has remained relatively unchanged, and for host family has decreased.
THP-Plus rates continue to vary considerably across the state.

Santa Clara County offers a parenting rate

- Single Site: $1,819
- Scattered Site: $1,045
- Host Family: $500

- Parenting: $2,400
- Parenting with Child: $2,800
Over the last 6 years, the THP-NMD rate has increased by 19% and the average THP-Plus rate has increased by 12% for the remote/scattered site model.

Survey respondents expressed concern that the cost of housing has outpaced the growth in the rate for both programs.
THP-NMD providers utilize various strategies to operate the program despite the rate not covering the cost of providing the program in certain areas.

### Strategies Utilized by THP-NMD Providers to Manage Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies to Manage or Offset Cost</th>
<th>% of Providers that Report Utilizing these Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Privately fundraise</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offset cost using other contractual resources</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the level of supportive services</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit the number of higher-needs youth</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent housing in areas that are lower-cost</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one of the above strategies</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of youth waiting for THP-NMD increased 65% and the number waiting for THP-Plus increased 53% since the previous year.

Number of Youth on Waiting Lists for THP-NMD & THP-Plus as of June 30, 2019
The remote/scattered site model is the most prevalent housing model in both THP-NMD and THP-Plus.
In THP-NMD, youth were most likely to exit to a living setting where they are not paying rent. In THP-Plus, youth were most likely to exit to a living setting where they are paying rent.

THP-NMD did not have the effect of reducing youth homelessness, however THP-Plus did.
In both programs, the average length of stay is far shorter than the amount of time youth may access the programs.

Average Length of Stay vs. Full Program Duration, Youth Who Exited Over FY 2018-19

- THP-NMD: 13.35 months
- THP-Plus: 15.36 months
More than 1 in 3 youth in THP-NMD and more than 1 in 4 youth in THP-Plus exited the program on an involuntary basis.

Voluntary & Involuntary Exits from THP-NMD & THP-Plus During FY 2018-19

- **THP-NMD**
  - Voluntary Exit: 65%
  - Involuntary Exit: 35%

- **THP-Plus**
  - Voluntary Exit: 73%
  - Involuntary Exit: 27%
The vast majority of youth in both programs entered having already completed high school.

The percentage of youth who have completed high school increases between entrance to and exit from the program, particularly for youth in THP-NMD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>THP-NMD</th>
<th>THP-Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>Entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth has not earned their high school diploma, GED or high school equivalent or higher</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth has earned their high school diploma, GED or high school equivalent or higher</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In both THP-NMD and THP-Plus, youth did not make collective progress in post-secondary education during their time in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Status</th>
<th>THP-NMD</th>
<th></th>
<th>THP-Plus</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending two-year community college</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received AA/AS, certificate or license from two-year community college</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending four-year college/university</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received BA/BS</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In both THP-NMD and THP-Plus, employment continues to be an area where youth make progress during their time in the program. Custodial parents don’t lag far behind their non-parenting peers.

**Employment Rates at Entrance & Exit**
*Youth Who Exited Over FY 2018-19*

- **THP-NMD:** 39% custodial parents employed at exit
- **THP-Plus:** 56% custodial parents employed at exit
Employed youth experienced a 9% increase in hourly wage during their time in the program, however are still earning just above the state’s minimum wage at exit.

Number of Hours Worked Per Week & Average Gross Annual Earnings of Employed Youth at Exit from THP-NMD & THP-Plus Over FY2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>THP-NMD</th>
<th>THP-Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Employed Youth Working these Hours</td>
<td>Average Annual Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full-time (35-40 hours/week)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>$23,397-$26,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time (10-34 hours/week)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$6,685-$22,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part-time (1-9 hours/week)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$668-$6,016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youths’ monthly income from all sources grew by at least one quarter in both programs between entrance and exit.

Increase in Total Monthly Income from All Sources between Entrance & Exit

Youth Who Exited Over FY 2018-19
Less than 4 in 10 youth (39%) are estimated to have filed 2018 taxes across both programs.

There is limited awareness about the California Earned Income Tax Credit (CalEITC) and TAY eligibility among providers & youth.

45% THP-NMD survey respondents and 43% THP-Plus survey respondents unfamiliar with CalEITC.

7% of youth across both programs were estimated to have received the CalEITC.
HEALTH & WELL-BEING
FINDINGS
Almost all youth (99%) in THP-Plus were enrolled in health insurance upon exit from the program.

More than 1 in 5 youth (23%) in THP-NMD and nearly 1 in 5 youth (19%) in THP-Plus were receiving services for mental, physical, learning or developmental disabilities at exit from the program.
In THP-NMD and THP-Plus, a total of 681 children lived with a parent participating in the program.

The proportion of young women who are custodial parents more than tripled between entrance and exit in THP-NMD and increased 38% in THP-Plus.
Nearly 1 in 4 youth experienced homelessness while in foster care, prior to entering THP-NMD.

Experience of Homelessness
Youth Who Entered THP-NMD During Fiscal Year
More than 1 in 3 youth experienced homelessness prior to entering THP-Plus. This has decreased over the last 5 years but remains significant.

Experience of Homelessness
Youth Who Entered THP-Plus During Fiscal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>% Experienced Homelessness between foster care and THP-Plus</th>
<th>% Entered THP-Plus directly from an emergency shelter, homelessness, or other unstable housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At least 1 in 4 youth were accessing some form of public benefits at exit from THP-NMD and THP-Plus.

- Supplemental Security Income or Social Security Disability Income (SSI/SSDI)
- General Assistance
- CalFresh
- California Work Opportunities and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs)
- Special Supplement Nutrition Program for Women, Infants & Children (WIC) and/or Subsidized childcare

25% of youth in THP-NMD and 29% of youth in THP-Plus were accessing some form of public benefits at exit from the program over FY 2018-19.
The majority of youth in both programs are eligible for CalFresh benefits, however few receive them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>THP-NMD</th>
<th>THP-Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligible at Entrance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eligible at Exit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eligible at Entrance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth without custodial children</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth with custodial children</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At exit from the program, less than 1 in 5 youth were receiving CalFresh benefits in THP-NMD and less than 1 in 4 youth in THP-Plus.
TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PLACEMENT FOR MINORS (THP-M)

FINDINGS
TRANSITIONAL HOUSING PLACEMENT FOR MINORS (THP-M) AT A GLANCE

- Est. 2001 by AB 427 (Hertzberg)
- Title IV-E-reimbursable foster care placement
- Foster youth age 16-17
- Only offers single site model
- Rate is set at the county level, although the rate methodology is set in state statute
Since its inception, THP-M has remained a small program: 93 youth in placement as of July 1, 2019.

THP-M is operated by 13 of the state's 14 licensed THP-M providers, all of whom also operate a THP-NMD and/or THP-Plus program.

THP-M housing is dispersed across 17 counties.

A total of 25 counties place youth in THP-M.
THP-M FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS: PARENTING YOUTH

- One in ten youth in THP-M are custodial parents, with nearly all providers accepting parenting youth into their programs.

- 3 of the state’s THP-M providers report utilizing a program model specific to parenting youth, and other providers utilize a range of strategies and practices to meet the needs of parenting youth:

  - Linkages to services and benefits including WIC, First 5, Parent-Child Interaction Therapy
  - Coordinating participation in a range of parenting groups and parenting classes
  - Special budgeting support that takes children’s needs into account
  - Enrollment in a high school with a comprehensive parenting component attached
  - Providing more spacious housing accommodations
  - Increasing staff hours dedicated to working with this population
One in five youth in THP-M have histories of CSE, with nearly all providers accepting this population into their programs.

3 of the state’s current THP-M providers report utilizing a program model specific to CSE youth, and other providers utilize a range of strategies and practices to meet the needs of CSE victims and survivors:

- Providing staff training on CSE & trauma-informed care
- Utilizing case plans that incorporate CSE harm reduction principles and safety planning
- Provider participation in CSE collaborative mtgs with county partners
- Accessing an augmented rate provided by county to offer add’l services & supports
- Partnering with specialized service providers in community
- Legal assistance through monthly workshops on rights, understanding legal system, obtaining ROs
ACCESS TO HOUSING & SUPPORTIVE PLACEMENTS

PRACTICE & POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS
The state should allocate the $8 million intended for THP-Plus immediately, without requiring counties to apply.

- 636 youth are waiting for THP-Plus, as of July 1, 2018.
- SB 80 included $8 million to address youth homelessness, with a priority placed on former foster youth.
- SB 80 states the funding shall be allocated to county child welfare agencies.
The state should establish a rate supplement for THP-NMD to account for the rising cost of housing.

Since 2012:
- THP-NMD rate increased 24%
- Cost of housing increased 64%

As more of the rate goes to housing, less goes to supportive services.

Establish rate supplement using HUD’s Fair Market Rent (FMR)
The state should establish a rate supplement for special populations with higher service and accommodations needs in THP-NMD.

The cost of serving youth varies based on service needs and housing accommodations.

THP-NMD rate does not cover the cost of serving youth with special needs, i.e.

- Parenting youth
- Mental health / substance abuse treatment needs
- Youth with disabilities
- Histories of CSE

Establish a rate supplement for youth with special needs to ensure access to THP-NMD for these populations.
The state and counties should take advantage of current opportunities to bring THP-Plus rates to a minimum standard.

Since 2012:
- Average THP-Plus rate increased 12%
- Cost of housing increased 64%

State: set a minimum rate standard

Counties: utilize portion of $8 M allocation to increase rate
Counties and providers must work together to improve discharge procedures to prevent entrance into homelessness, particularly in THP-NMD.

More than 1 in 3 youth in THP-NMD are involuntarily discharged.

Counties & providers: Ensure that requirements are not being imposed upon youth above and beyond participation conditions of EFC.

State: Include improved discharge procedures in CCL regulations governing THP-NMD, which are currently being amended.
Counties and providers must work together to expand THP-NMD.

- 341 youth on waiting lists for THP-NMD (64% increase since last FY).
- THP-NMD is the placement designed for youth with higher needs.
THP-Plus providers should apply for state funding made available to address youth homelessness through the Homeless Housing, Assistance & Prevention Program.

- AB 101 established the Homeless Housing, Assistance and Prevention Program.
- Funded at $650 million.
- 8% minimum required to be designated to address youth homelessness ($52 million).
- THP-Plus providers can use funding to extend length of program, create a subsidy for parenting youth and expand eligibility.
  - JBAY will be providing technical assistance to THP-Plus providers to utilize this funding.
The Homeless Coordinating & Financing Council should ensure addressing homelessness among former foster youth is included in California’s Strategic Action Plan to Address Homelessness.

**Strategic Action Plan:** identify state strategies to stop the growth in homelessness, shelter the unsheltered, & significantly reduce overall numbers of homeless individuals & families in CA.

Ensure **youth** homelessness prominent part of plan; include strategies to address homelessness among **current and former foster youth**.
ACCESS TO SUPPORT WITH POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION & TRAINING

PRACTICE & POLICY IMPLICATIONS
California should fully implement the SB 12 provision requiring counties to identify a specific individual to assist foster youth with college and financial aid applications.

- Data shows limited achievement in post-secondary education.
- SB 12 (Beall) went into effect January 1, 2019.
- Requires counties to identify an individual to assist all youth age 16 or older apply for college, including financial aid.
- SB 12 social worker toolkit issued in February 2019.
- JBAY will be launching a learning community of counties to support implementation of SB 12 in 2020.
County Offices of Education should implement the California Foster Youth FAFSA Challenge as a permanent program.

- 52 counties participated in 2018-19 academic year.
- Rates of FAFSA completion increased to 57% from 47% in 2017-18 academic year.
- All youth in THP-Plus are independent students are eligible for full financial aid.
  - Pell Grant: $6,195
  - Cal Grant: $7,500 at Community College or $1,697 at CSU
  - Chafee ETV: $5000
- Foster care benefit not counted against financial aid.
Counties should utilize Cal-PASS Plus to understand how many of their youth are going on to post-secondary education.

- Cal-PASS is a data system of the California Community Chancellor’s Office.
- Includes data for all K to 12 students and all community colleges.
- Select number of counties, including LA Unified, utilize Cal-PASS and are able to determine how their foster youth are faring in post-secondary education.
State regulations must emphasize and specify how licensed THP-NMD providers will assist youth in achieving their post-secondary education goals.

- Data show youth are not achieving postsecondary education outcomes in THP-NMD, despite largely entering with their high school diploma.

- CDSS workgroup recommended changes to the THP-NMD regulations (estimated to be issued late 2020).

- These regulations expand what THP-NMD providers are required to provide to better support foster youth in post-secondary education.
Counties should implement training curricula for providers and caregivers to ensure they are equipped with the information required to support youth with post-secondary education.

- LA County has implemented Dreams to Degrees, a curriculum for resource families caring for a middle school or high school student.

- Dreams to Degrees available free, and in Spanish.

- LA County is expanding this training requirement to FFAs and STRTPs.
PREVENTION OF UNINTENDED PREGNANCY & IMPROVEMENT OF REPRODUCTIVE & SEXUAL HEALTH

PRACTICE & POLICY IMPLICATIONS
California should expand the SB 89 provision that ensures foster youth receive comprehensive sexual health education in middle and high school, to include NMDs that have already completed high school.

- SB 89 went into effect July 1, 2017.
- Requires child welfare workers to ensure foster youth receive comprehensive sexual health education once in middle and once in high school.
- Percentage of young women in THP-NMD who are custodial parents doubles from entry to exit.
- Ask for sexual health curricula to be added to the Title IV-E Clearinghouse list of approved interventions for systematic review, to be utilized under Family First Prevention Services Act.
California should expand the SB 89 training mandate to include THP-NMD providers.

- Over 2,000 youth placed in THP-NMD as of July 1, 2019.
- Percentage of young women in THP-NMD who are custodial parents more than triples from entry to exit.
- FFAs, Resource Families and STRTPs are required to be trained on this topic.
- Adding THP-NMD would be an important addition, given the number of youth and likelihood of becoming a custodial parent.
THP-Plus providers should incorporate comprehensive sexual health education (CSE) into their program.

- Many already do this; it can be formalized and intensified. Develop relationships with CSE providers:
  - PREP: [https://www.jbaforyouth.org/statewide-roster-cse-providers/](https://www.jbaforyouth.org/statewide-roster-cse-providers/)
  - Planned Parenthood: [https://www.jbaforyouth.org/plannedparenthoodlist/](https://www.jbaforyouth.org/plannedparenthoodlist/)

- Age-appropriate, medically accurate fact sheets available for THP-Plus providers, free and in Spanish.
THP-NMD and THP-Plus providers should create partnerships with Nurse Family Partnership and Adolescent Family Life Program.

- LA policy requires child welfare workers to refer expectant and parenting foster youth to three important interventions:
  - Expectant and Parenting Youth Conferences
  - Nurse Family Partnership and
  - Adolescent Family Life Program

- Family First Prevention & Services Act will enable new federal funding to be utilized to support these interventions for expectant and parenting foster youth.
Counties should utilize the $8 million in state funding directed to THP-Plus to create a parenting rate.

- 40% of female participants in THP-Plus are parents at exit.
- Cost of serving a parenting youth is higher, given need for additional case management and housing costs.
- Only one county (Santa Clara) has a THP-Plus rate for parenting youth ($2,800).
- A parenting rate can increase support for young, vulnerable families.
The Transitional Housing Placement for Minors (THP-M) should be retooled to ensure that by 2021, it is a well-resourced placement for parenting minors.

- THP-M is very rarely used currently, just 93 youth statewide as of July 1, 2019.

- Those counties that utilize it find that it serves an important role in the continuum of placements.

- Could be an option in the continuum of placements but needs more clarity about what the placement provides and an adjusted rate.
ACCESS TO PUBLIC BENEFITS & TAX CREDITS

PRACTICE & POLICY IMPLICATIONS
Transitional housing providers and others assisting current and former foster youth at age 18 and older, should provide assistance with filing taxes and educate youth about the California Earned Income Tax Credit and its recent expansion.

- Most youth in THP-Plus work and yet still have low wages.
- A sizable population in both programs are custodial parents, many of whom work.
- Given this, the CalEITC is an important program to access.
- It was expanded as part of FY 2019-19 budget.
- JBAY will be working to raise awareness and access to the CalEITC among transition-age youth this tax season.
Counties should establish policies that ensure foster youth receive assistance with applying for CalFresh when they turn 18, and at regular intervals thereafter.

- At Exit, just 19% of youth in THP-NMD and 23% in THP-Plus were receiving CalFresh.

- Some counties taking innovative approaches:
  - Los Angeles County requires child welfare workers to assist youth with applying for CalFresh as part of their 90-day transition planning conference.
  - This includes assisting youth with the application, setting up an appointment for the youth with an eligibility worker, assisting the youth with following up on the status of their CalFresh application while it is pending and to understand and address any Notices of Action the youth receives regarding their application.
QUESTION & ANSWER

TO SUBMIT QUESTIONS, TYPE THEM IN THE QUESTIONS BOX AND HIT “SEND”

• To contact JBAY at a later date, e-mail Simone Tureck Lee at simone@jbay.org.
• Presentation materials and audio will be e-mailed to all webinar registrants and posted at www.jbaforyouth.org under “training archive.”