4:00PM

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Call the meeting to order. Welcome, everyone. I hope you are doing well today. I want to start two things before we get all the way in and get started.

The first thing is housekeeping. We are sharing this space. After we get done, try to make sure that the name tabs are where they are supposed to be. Push the chairs in. Let us help support the team who keeps the places clean.

The second thing, we are about to embark on the most difficult part of the work we do together. This morning, reading the news of what is going on in Florida. School district takeovers in Houston. Things in California. A lot can make you feel like a bit of despair.

I reminded of being able to come into this space with you all today. The hope comes from the fact that we have the ability to come together to support people to the best of our ability.

It is something to be hopeful for. I wanted to say thank you. I appreciate you. The work we do is not easy. It is hard. I think what makes it best is we put our heart into it. I want to say that on the record.

There is a lot to do and get accomplished. Can we please take the roll.

MEMBER ARMSTEAD: Present. Here.

MEMBER CASTILLO: Present.

MEMBER CONTRERAS: Present.

MEMBER CRUNK: Present.

MEMBER CYRUS-FRANKLIN: Present.

MEMBER EARLEY: Present.

MEMBER FERRER: Present.

>>: Present.

MEMBER GHALY: Present.

>>: Is that the alternate? Thank you.

>>: Present.

MEMBER LEWIS: Present.

MEMBER LOBIANCO: Alternate present.

>>: Thank you. Member Nishiyama.

MEMBER SCORZA: Present.

MEMBER SOTO: Present.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Present.

MEMBER STEVENS: Present.

MEMBER VERRETT: Present.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Here. Present.

MEMBER WONG: Alternate present.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Can you do disclosures as well?

>>: Meeting disclosures. Recording. This is being recording for the meeting minutes. By remaining, you consent to being recorded. Chat. This is a public meeting. Subject to the brown act. The members of the public would like to provide comment, do so during the period for that item or during the general public comment period. Captions, cart service is available. You may click on the stream text link after the recording of the disclosures.

Raise hand instructions. Scroll to reactions at the bottom. You will see raise hand feature. When accessing Zoom through the smart phone, scroll through more. You will see a drop down menu. Telephone participation. Online technical difficulties, dial information will be provided for that.

You may press star nine to raise your hand or star six to unmute. Spanish channel. Click on the globe icon. Written public statements should be submitted by 5:00 PM the day before the

meeting. They will be shared with advisory committee members prior to the meeting and reflected in the minutes.

Written comments after 5:00 PM the day before will be part of the record. This ends the reading of the meeting disclosures.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Thank you so much. I will have Member Castillo do the land acknowledgment.

MEMBER CASTILLO: We want to start this meeting by recognizing those whose land we reside. The original care takers of this land. [FOREIGN LANGUAGE].

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Community agreements. It is all good. Thank you. Remain open minded. If you can bring it up bigger.

>>: (Inaudible). Prioritize and defer throughout this process.

>>: Be mindful of the diverse audience. Make sure you speak with clarity. Be collaborative. Assume best intentions.

>>: Remember why we are here. To center the black, brown, and Indigenous communities and other communities that are most impacted by the carceral system. [Reading].

>>: Defer to community.

>>: Transparency and follow through.

>>: Allow spaces for voices to be lifted.

>>: Let equity lead the way. Make spaces for youth voices.

>>: Let community members to finish their sentences during public comment.

>>: Review community agreements before every meeting. Begin every meeting with the land acknowledge. Moving to Item 3, taking appropriate action on the minutes of the CFCI meeting from March 9th. They were added, yes? Let me check. Minutes are not available. I am on the agenda now. The one from today. We will move onto the next item.

Do a review of the CFCI advisory committee attendance policy. Bring that.

>>: This is a quick item. Now that we are in person, it is important for you to please let us know if you will attend, be absent. How you plan to attend. Online or live. It affects the parking. Compensation.

We don't want anyone coming down here with the expectation. Not getting their parking or being able to not participate. Please let us know together so we can avoid difficulties or issues down the line.

Let us know as soon as possible. Work together so everyone is on the same page.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Which e-mail to reach out to?

>>: [Reading]. Feel free to copy myself and we will make sure we get it. We will get it. Thank you.

>>: My alternate was here two meetings ago. I didn't understand what he was saying. What are misses considered? Physically? Zoom and physically? What is a miss?

>>: We are counting this as the slot. You get two exceptions to attend online without having the public with you there. If you are absence but alternate is here, that doesn't count. If you are both count, it is an absent. Make sense? Any additional questions? We will move forward.

We will do the presentation from street level strategies on the survey results.

>>: We are needed some screen share capabilities. I U will introduce our team. Then for those on Zoom. I am with street level strategy. Contracted community outreach organization. With me is Delilah (inaudible). The survey. We have been working with the advisory council and the ad hoc subcommittee since last year.

We are excited to present some findings. I think the screen is up and running now. Next slide. We will start off with the survey methodology. The goal was to give the community a chance to react, prioritize, and provide feedback on the 140 concept recommendations. Under the direction of the ad hoc committee, we developed an approach for ranking.

We adjusted the survey so only ten were ranked at a time. We took out the names of organizations. We included all the CRFs submitted. Kept the original submission. We can keep

the ideas. Took dollar amounts. The community organization names for the members to look at the concepts without feeling like they were looking at dollar amounts. Next slide.

We conducted a mass outreach through phone canvassing, e-mails, advertising. This was based off of the prioritizing neighborhoods. We canvassed 704 communities. We spoke to them in [Reading]. We did mass outreach through social media.

We sent out 5796 e-mails to stakeholders, community leaders, and residents. Next slide. We had over 2200 responses. They came from districts one and two. We see the three and five were pretty even next. The last one was district four. Next slide please. Here into the responses, breaking it down by language. We had over 2100 English responses.

94 percent of the responses were taken in English. Next slide, please. Here we have from these responses, we did pull some responses from the community. This question was what does fairness mean to you? Even distribution of all resources regardless of income status, race, and location within the county. Next slide, please. Survey response breakdown by identification of gender identity.

[Reading]. We have transgender, nonbinary were all two percent of respondents. Last one is intersex and one percent. 75 percent were people of color. More than 70 percent Hispanic or Latinx. Seven percent Caucasian. 70 percent came from community organizations. Third from the top was the phone canvass. Text messages. Surveys.

Also included the technical assistance office hours. We encouraged people to complete it.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: I will stop to see if anyone has questions.

>>: We pulled another community response. It reflects equity, smaller wage gap, universal health care. We can pause. Any questions so far?

>>: Question. On the fourth slide, survey response or breakdown. There is 2 million residents in this district. Is that the right number? To have 10 million. To have 2287, that is not even valid. It means it is nothing.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: I wouldn't say it is nothing. A lot of effort.

>>: I appreciate the work. This is amazing. I am wondering if we need more voices. Bringing households into the conversation. How can we reach out?

>>: Speaking to how we targeted outreach. We targeted areas that were high needs. Hyper localized areas. How we did our listen session outreach. We had around 3000 responses. Roughly on par with the amount of outreach and types of responses we got from last year's survey as well.

>>: Is there a way to ask the supervisors to use their e-mail list to reach out to those people. I see they sent their e-mails.

>>: A few tweeted about it. Used the social media kits to push it out. They did highly promote it. We will get into that in the presentation. It does help. We did do that. The numbers are not reflective. We couldn't agree more. We made sure to hear the communities.

We did a lot of looking to make sure the under resourced communities are reflected. We made an effort to make sure those were the voices you were hearing. We did an extra effort.

>>: I am new.

>>: It used to be advancement project. Now, it is catalyst. Communities that look at chronically divested areas and underutilized. Service index. Thank you. The last thing is we looked at the RD. Put together by LA county. Index down through the COVID-19 efforts. They look at different points from housing to health.

Communities that are heavily impacted by COVID-19 dollars or COVID-19 numbers. RD.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Antiracist, diversity, and inclusion office. A mapping of the resources utilized.

>>: You use this data to identify priority communities through outreach.

>>: Correct.

>>: On the Jenny and Jesse, you identify places where people may be more impacted. The equity explorer was developed to get dollars into communities most impacted by the pandemic.

You can see where communities are vulnerable to housing. There may be hate crimes. A need for more fresh support.

That sounds like what you used to target the communities. Is there a way to examine the relationship between the utilization and survey respondents.

>>: We didn't do it in this presentation. We had done it in a previous one. We are happy to redo that. We zoned out the top 30 areas. We did a tiered system. That was earlier this year. We are happy to reshare that presentation.

>>: That would be helpful to see how the data was utilized. These data were used to map locations. I believe Palmdale and Lancaster were important. A number of neighborhoods in the 4th district that face significant challenges. It would be good to understand, did they come from those neighborhoods? It would be great to see your data.

>>: Absolutely. You will see a map later on.

>>: On slide four, the partnership was stronger with SD1 and 2. That is reflected in the amount of survey responses. We did have great partnerships. We did a cobranded event. We reaped the benefits. E-mail blasts. They connected us with nonprofit organizations. The more engagement we have, the better the results and turn out to the listening sessions.

>>: I will take that comment to the supervisor. She wants the antelope valley to be represented.

>>: Do you have house lists and home lists populations?

>>: We did have a series of questions related. Related to the housing situation. How they have interacted with landlords. Different things like that. We have that information.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Let us keep going.

>>: Digging deeper into the survey, we broke out our trusted messengers by the populations that they serve. What we saw based on the demographics is that respondent populations closely align with trusted messenger populations.

You can see this with (inaudible) LA and the united Indian involvement and trans Latin coalition. They line up with the communities they serve. To the point about where they came from, we see heavy responses from the areas of Landcaster, down the 110.

It is an honest reflection back. They closely align with the community outreach efforts. Another quote is what does fairness mean to you? Having options. Access to resources. The support to make sure one's well-being is taken care of. This gives us a look into the comparisons.

When we look at year 2 and 3, we see increases in the native American and Indigenous respondents. We saw decreases in the Hispanic Latinx community. Comparing last year and this year from a gender perspective. We see similarities overall.

>>: We try to work with the subcommittee as well. We took the direction of trying to find ways for the survey length. Over 140 concepts. Trying to get feedback from each person. We were looking at a three-hour survey. We work with them to try to figure out how to work on time length and make the survey as accessible as possible.

We will talk about the priority areas. Which concepts were most important or ranked as a high priority. That is the second half of this. One of the ways we did that to get as much feedback as possible on all 140 ranking concepts was they picked two priority areas. One random selected area. All the ranking across the different priority needs areas.

Those were the top. They got one random selection. They picked two of their needs. Next slide, please. When looking at priorities, we looked at, you see some differences in the AAPI community, you see youth development ranked the highest.

You see that they did rental assistance the highest needs for native American and Indigenous populations.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Color code.

>>: A heat map. Blue is where the higher number is. Lighter colors are where they rank lower.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Broken down by the area of focus. I am pinpointing this. We want to come back to this for the next item. Take note.

>>: Job training. I see it as resonated. I feel that has to be paired with job creation. It means nothing without jobs. It our responsibility. South Pasadena. They are not just approached it about the labor jobs.

Some of the higher skill opportunities. Engineering. Architecture. Job training does. I feel you 100 percent. We have to tie it together with opportunities.

>>: I don't want to take up too much on this. I am a coordinator in the carpenters' union. The jobs have to be here. One thing, when we talk about helping the community and people off their feet, there are places doing work. Local hire on it. The jobs have to be there. Ties in. I don't know how this hundred million would help that.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: For sure. Please.

>>: Next slide, as you have been hearing, we took some quotes.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Can I ask a question. I love the feedback. I am keeping track of the clock. I don't want to skip over them. I want to make sure we get to the data too.

>>: Just a quote from the community. We could provide the raw data. That could be something accessible to you all. Next slide, please.

>>: Out of the survey ranking, 1743, rental assistance ranked the highest. [Reading]. At many of the listening sessions, we talked to people. Their main concern was risk of homelessness and rental assistance.

Another response we got from what does fairness mean to you. It is access to resources that will help the community to gain self-sufficiency. Next slide.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Can we go back to 17 in ranking here in comparison. What was the difference between the two? You broke down the different types of communities. This is an overarching. One question that asked which area.

>>: This is when we summed up all the rankings that people went through on the survey where they had to drag and drop and put their priorities, that is how many we got out of that process.

All the dragging and dropping. 1743 rankings.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Got it. Thank you.

>>: I want to make a note. I know the PowerPoint was attached. We added a few slides. They will be off by one or two. We provided with the updated slide deck.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: They will e-mail that version out. Thank you.

>>: Next slide. With the idea of ranking the concepts and having members look at which ones, we took the top five from the survey. This is what community picked. You see three from access to funding for small minority owned business. Rental assistance. Youth development. The top ones. You have the project ID. We are not showing dollar amounts. Nothing to do with dollars. We do show what that funding would look like.

Business development section. These are the top three picked. We received three concept recommendations. These were the top three. There is the funding attributed to it. You look at over $7 million.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: These top three were selected the most out of all the ranking.

>>: That category. Business and workforce development. What you see now, workforce and business development, these were the top three. We had three. This is the particular order you are seeing. One ranked the highest out of the three.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: These three. That is the difference. For me, I am looking am 17 versus 19. 17 says rental assistance, job training development. Rental and youth development.

>>: Yes.

>>: What we are looking at in terms of the top rankings is that actual number. How high was that ranking? It consistently got the ones and twos. They came to the top for the most people and the highest. Next slide. We will provide quotes. Next slide.

>>: Moving into housing. These were the top five ranked concepts. Starting with project ID 50 and ending with 85. Totally $11 million.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Slide 19 is talking about out of all the rankings, people clicked five the most. These are the top five housing concepts. This is not about the ranking. This is the top 5.

>> When you say constant. What do you mean?

>> DEREK: The process of this started with community members given the opportunity to provide concept recommendations to bring forth to be funded. In the funding plan. Community members took a time out to come up with what the concept would be to impact the community for the better and gave a number amount and how much money it will cost and there was 143 of those that were collected.

So, the survey that took place that they are talking about right now. These results. Community members had the opportunity to come back and say out of the 143 you have this is what we like and it is not the same people that submitted them and maybe it is. But there is the greater community that had a chance to give input and say I see the spaces and here is the area I want you to spend the money and the types of concepts I want you the to spend the money on. And our job is to take the information and prioritize a hundred million dollars of conceptuses to submit in our spending plan.

>> These are concepts and they are not organizations that do this?

>> DEREK: There are organizations that do the work but our job is give the area and concepts and the departments as well as amity who is our third party administrator and they will come up with the RFP for people the to respond to get resources to do the work of the concept.

>> To add a bit of color how these were present today the respondents. We omitted at any time there was organization names or anything like that and they were looking at the con cements and separate from the funding and didn't have the funding tied to them and the project ID as well.

>> DEREK: Thank you.

>> In the area of justice, the top ranked concept came in at $1 billion driving the total for all f of the justice rankings top five to over a billion dollars.

>> Not to stay on the slide too long. People looking forward and a lot of the community voices are in the quotes. Look for resources and more longevity and that is something reflected throughout and you will see additional quotes and we can move onto the next slide please.

Here we have concept rankings in only health. At the top a million dollars. Concept and project ID 88 and goes down to the top five project ID 98 and these top five it is about ten and a half million dollars. Next slide please. Then we also have the top five ranking in youth specifically and with that we will start with project ID 140 and that is asking for over $500,000 and at the bottom the top five is project ID 131 and that is a little over $300,000 as well and these are ranked only within the youth concepts that were submitted. Next slide.

>> What you are looking at on this slide is top 5-year 3 funding if we take the top five by focus area and supervisory district. What we did with the table is take all of the top five ranked concepts and put together based on the focus area and divided up by the districts that were listed in the concept recommendation forms submitted.

If concept A was in district one and had $500,000 and under the justice area it would be reflected in the sum up total of the district one box.

>> DEREK: Hold on I wanted to make sure everybody followed that.

>> We took top five focus areas. And summed up all of the amounts associated with the concept area and put them here so we can see where the funding is going if we take all of the top five concepts by focus area and supervisorial district.

What we see is community priorities and recommendations from this draft spending is a little bit over a billion dollars for the top five.

>> WESLEY: I have a question. A few slides ago in the second or third slide we identified the top five. It was housing and I thought it was job training and that and it went to health care and I see those and now I see five and of course job training I am going to remember that one. I don't see that here. How is this the same five or did I miss something?

>> You didn't miss anything at all. It is a technical difference. When we bucket the items, we bucket access to funding for small minority businesses and jobs.

>> DEREK: That is a good question.

>> For slide 27 that is on the screen. It looks like I am trying to understand the intent of this slide. Looks like some of the categories are divided up equally among the five districts and others are not. Can you talk about that?

>> Yes, when we are looking at justice per se that one is more or less equal because of the funding that was allocated by the concept recommendation submitters and if they gave a nice round number and a bunch of those who have a nice round number when we divide up based on how the person submitted. When they submit the concept recommendation form and said I want my concept to serve all five districts at $200 million that gets thrown into the pot for this calculation that $200 million is evenly distributed across the five supervisorial districts and that was more or less the case for a lot of concept recommendations and they were not always for one just supervisorial district. Sometimes they are submitted for all five districts.

>> To add there was a few concepts for the supervisorial districts.

>> I am sorry I didn't understand what happened to job training in the last one. You put in the bucket with access to funding. I don't interpret job training as giving money to businesses.

>> Technically you have funding areas and one is access to small funding and business and minority funding and we put that and job training and all f of that in one area. And tried today keep work force and business development in one area. And bucketed to keep the five priorities.

Otherwise, nine priorities are arduous for the community to pick nine funding priorities so we tended to put business and work force development into one.

>> DEREK: That was by way of the community trying to truncate the survey itself. Separating out into nine it would have made it an even longer survey because when you are trying to look at all nine areas and provide ranking by way of doing that way. It becomes easily a two and a half three-hour survey you are trying to fill out.

>> We did similar with justice and put all f of the justice. Pretrial and nonincarceral and same with community based and you have I think two additional for community-based health for funding area and we put those together and did our best to group and same thing with housing and took all of the housing ones us planned and had put them into one.

>> Justice makes sense I would have relabeled that one section. I don't see job training I just see money to support small businesses.

>> DEREK: If we need to break out to see the numbers, we can do that. Real quick I see Kelly with her hand up and I will come back to you.

>> KELLY: This is on behalf of Kelly I am her alternate. For the sake of clarification since we are talking about this and specific to the issue with job development. Job development or training is work force and is that also the same as business development when we see that. All of the terms are interchangeable for focus areas and that is also the same on the slide access to funding for small minority and all of those are in the same bucket okay I wanted to make sure it was clear.

>> We could have done a better job of breaking that out and make sure it is clear. Thank you for the flag.

>> DEREK: I am looking at slide 15 and 15 has all eight. And 17 has 123456. And in this conversation, we are talking about now we are talk about five.

>> Slide 27 looks in the justice category it is evenly divided and had I am not understanding the rational and forgive me maybe I am missing this. Looks like an even division across all five

supervisorial districts and it isn't really an equitable distribution of the funds. Can we understand why it isn't an even division. What is the rational when we see the others, we know the first and second. If we are using the data as we talk about earlier. We know the greatest needed in the first and second district and we know there is specific needs in the fifth and fourth and third district relative to their populations and why is it not showing that financially?

>> If we look at slide 25 that breaks out what is going into the calculation. And the top five ranked concepts each had round numbers for the funding allocated to them by the concept recommendation submitters.

For example, project six had $1 billion associated with it. Concept number ten had $1 million. And 23 at 253 and next one and next one. What you see in the concept requirement submitters forms they allocated those concepts to all five districts meaning when we add up those numbers and divide over all five of the destructs, we get an even distribution of the number across those districts.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: There was a concept submitted for a billion dollars and the submitter said I want an even amount to go to all of the supervisorial districts and when you add up the concepts there is suppose today be an even distribution.

>> Right, this is adding up and showing what it would be DISTRIBUTED amongst all five and that distribution is up the to you all.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: This may not be the role you play. If somebody submits a con accept and says divide by five and we know we have the data to say that is not following the need how is that taking into consideration?

>> DEREK: We do.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: I was wondering was that taken into the consideration in the dialog and outreach in the communication with the community?

>> When we are doing the concept recommendation. This is presurvey and soliciting and getting out reach for folks to submit a concept recommendation and that was a big consideration and I remember having the discussion with the ad hoc committee. This was critical and do they feel their program was for the entire county or did they want to do the program and let's say in the watt's neighborhood. A lot of it is community base organizations were applying and their service needs were in one particular district and submitting a concept while they wanted funding necessarily always having to submit with the intent of funding for the entire county might have been really hard for them and that is part of the rational when we ask the questions in the early phases of the concept recommendation form. Make sense?

>> D'ARTAGNAN: It does. Where is county council being council here or on the phone with us or on zoom?

>> It is Tyson.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: Thank you so much. Here is a clarifying question I have for you. If the committee sets a principle that dollar should follow the need, what action could we take even though we have concept recommendations. What action can we take to make sure these allocations essentially balance out to meet the equity priorities?

>> I think your role as the committee is to make the that decision on how the money is allocated based on the criteria that the committee wants to use and the committee can determine that the most need is here and here for this population and that population. That should be where the money should go and you can put that into your recommendations to the board.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: To codify that language we are targeting resources to the need. Would it be helpful to have some other motion or other action that this committee could agree upon?

>> You can yes. If you want to agenda a motion that the committee should be funding based on need. You can.

>> DEREK: I think item six the way we wrote it is to provide, the next part is taking the next steps to establish the year three spending plan. These types of motion by way of what we are looking at gives us the ability to do that. That is what I am saying we have the ability to take that step and I would say hold that motion.

>> Reminding how the consent September works and CEO -- these concepts are still the source of the open solicitation. How this worked last year is third party administrator priority points based on you showing that your proposed program is going to serve an area of need and that is part of the process and may not be necessarily -- I want to make it clear as the process rolls out and the funds are awarded that is part, I feel like it is going in and out. That is part of the criteria for as far as how funds are actually dispersed.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: Thank you.

>> Thank you for that line of questioning and I think it was similar to what I was getting at and it reminds me of the discussion we had last week about input we get from the community and how we consider that alongside other data or other feedback or other information that we have. And so, I think that I like the idea of building in an agreement across the committee about how we approach that. And it sounds to me like this presentation is focused on input from the community. Straight input and raw data in that way. But that the job of the committee then is to incorporate any other considerations we are relevant to ensure that is closely matches the community need as we can. But the concepts remain given that is what has been lifted up by the community for sure.

>> One more piece. Before the committee determine and had this committee has done that before. And previously this committee determined that CBO with less than $1.5 million operating budget should be prioritized as well as C CBO serving certain areas or CBO serving nongeographically concentrated communities in need and this community has done that before and it is part of the recommendation process. Just a reminder of how and it has been happening thus far.

>> Alternate for Veronica Lewis and I would mention we have been told and recognize by the charts and graphs that most of the information is provided in areas based on the participation of the supervisors and other areas are less represented and therefore the data itself can then become into question in terms of how many people have been given the opportunity to provide it.

>> MEGAN: I think this conversation is important especially as it pertains to the community agreement and point, we are here. The point you are making is focusing on the need and developing the criteria. Part of me wants to uplift and underscore we have determined the criteria and what we are here the to do and I had to write it down. It should be alternatives to focus of incarceration. It isn't about issuing out services for the sake of issuing out services. It should be focus for alternatives to incarceration with an equity lens with primary focus of underserved communities to address outcomes by criminal injustice and equity and continued commitment for economic investment. We need to remember that when looking at the data we are looking at. It can become us just trying the to fund everything. I think if we remember this is about decarcerating Los Angeles County we can better understand what we should be focusing on and I just wanted to uplift that. This is a lot of information thank you all for doing that. I wanted them to group us in that.

>> DEREK: I want to get further through the presentation because we need the to move on.

>> JOEY: Thank you Megan for bringing that lens. I was elected by a 15-member commission of the LA county city native American commission to prioritize. We r started last year and we were not on the survey. If you look at the data, we are 37 percent. I know because I did the listening sessions online and at home. And seeing the 23 percent we now represent of the survey that is how I am making my determinations for on this board for exactly what Megan lifted up us v as us having the highest incarceration rate per capita to make sure the more on the street and don't have housing the more a target to get arrested. Housing is number one. Jobs and education. On this course however we are appointed whatever county heads I was elected by a body member to be appointed to make the allocations and that is what I am prepared to do is make

sure those things are a priority and supporting my black. Indigenous. Latinx and poor white folks. You are one of us too. You just don't know it. And prioritizing that and making sure we get those funding the to where we need to go.

>> DEREK: For sure. I want to make sure and I also lift up in our decision on the deliberation process that we committed last week to leading with at least framing the conversation by way of what the community is offering up to this process. We have the ability to kind of round the rough edges to make sure it makes sense for what we are trying to get at if for the true intentions of measure J and CFCI. We do want the make sure we are lifting up the community voices on that. And I will end with member Castillo and we will move on.

>> MEGAN: I have a question. Can you share insight as to what the context was that was provided to community members when posting listening sessions?

>> DEREK: The next online.

>> MEGAN: Got ya. I am reading the questions. What does fairness mean to you? As a blanket question without the context of why we are here and what CFCI is you can take that anywhere and I would love more insight on that.

>> Those questions were in the survey about the, and we worked a lot with the subcommittee regarding those and we just wanted a few open-ended questions to get communities feel. We felt it was important to get, allow community members the opportunity to write whatever they were feeling at that moment that was important to them at that being at, and so we came up with a few iterations of that question and ultimately, we went with that one for many reasons and one of them is accessibility. And we felt that question and with the going over with the subcommittee felt anybody can answer the question and take in many directions and that is one of the reasons why we chose that question. Next slide.

>> I want to take back to the year two funding and this image might be familiar to some of you who are part of the consideration for the input of t survey and this takes us back to year two

and what the funding was across supervisorial districts and by CFCI focus area. We did see heavier funding and housing and injustice. Next slide.

This one gets fun and it shows us how the average rankings broke out by race and ethnicity and you see as the lower bars and lower numbers means that person ranked those things higher and those were the higher priorities and when we are looking at the A A P I community we see they really prioritize access to funding capital for small minority owned businesses and we also see that they prioritize community based health and rental assistance and we are looking at black respondents they prioritize somewhat of the same things. Community based health. Job training and rental assistance as well and when you see the higher numbers that means that respondent as a whole and as the demographic didn't necessarily rank those things very high. Four meaning they rank close to the top three. Seven meaning they rank that closer to the bottom in a top ten type of sense. Next slide.

>> We are if going to get ready to get into the listening session outreach and break down how we conducted the listening sessions and for the outreach we phone canvas 650 community residents' leaders and stakeholders and a lot of the conversations were in-depth. And we did text banking and 51,566 text messages went out. Social media distributed tool kits in multiple languages for partners and district offices and CEOs. And then we also did a canvassing literature where we submitted fliers and posted on doorsteps. 40,000 fliers were distributed in communities. Next slide.

Listen session engagement. Again, we did a virtual listening session and we also did in-person listening sessions in Compton. Ly wood. Po Mona and long beach and we will get ready to explain the conversation we had. Just to speak the to you we had so many in-depth conversations and one of the ones I remember is a woman explaining how the justice system failed her when it came to mental health and she had mental health issues and wound up in jail. In the listening sessions we had in-depth discussions before we got to the concept so they could have a vision of what they needed in their community.

Continuing on. These in-person listening session were a built in a way that required 8 to 14 SLS facilitators and feedback coordinators at every single session and also assigned experts in each funding area to be available to answer questions on the concepts themselves.

We internally studied the concepts and made sure we had as much information while people are engaging and doing the voting to answer questions as well as we could base on the concepts submit and had gave an overview of the measure J background and speaking to member Castillo's question. The contact setting mimics what we did in year two as well. Went through measure J and the history of how we got here and CFCI committees' role in terms of moving this process through this body and we also discuss this would b end up in a draft spending plan where the committee would begin to look at the funding allocations for these concepts based on community uplifting their preferences for what they would like to vee funded and emphasize in all communications. Digital tool kits. Fliers. Phone calls and text messages. And we did emphasize this was alternatives to incarceration and putting care first and jails last and making sure we are sticking the to the branding that is available to the public on the web site as well. In the listening sessions we emphasize how we got here and beginning with the information sessions and concept recommendation form and how those two works together. The submission process of the CRF as well as incorporated the technical assistance office hours where we sat and walked through specific questions community members had how to complete and submit the concept recommendation form and that led to over 140 concepts were submitted by community and CBO throughout LA county.

We -- after we set the context in group with everyone in the same space, we moved out to break out discussions and discussed to set up a comfortable space for engagement and feedback. Positives in the community and identifying what is working in each community and identifying what is not working. Negatives or identifying gaps in the community. Uplifting existing programs and we do have some specific CBO and specific programs in the community that were named and had we

made a record for those as well for people identifying they are or aren't working based on what community was experiencing on the ground.

Then we moved out after the initial discussion I remember in long beach I was with a group that pointed to the longevity of the programs and wanting to make sure we not only create jobs but job seekers have a little bit of hand holding throughout the process. Maybe check ins after they get a job to make sure there is a long term investment and not a quick fix in term offense what the body was discussing earlier.

When we finish the discussions, we move out to the voting and we posted all of the concepts as you see them with the concept number and the brief summary you were all given that as a hand out. The large hand out. And we printed those on a big poster board that were readily, easily readable. And gave people stickers and they were then able the to allocate their vote by reading each concept in all of the funding areas and all of the 140 plus and they were able the to add the votes to the concepts they wanted to uplift for the body to consider for funding.

>> DEREK: Next slide.

>> I went to the community and I went to two of them and I was there reading then panel boards and listening to everything and talking to communities. First of all, you did a wonderful job of preparing these things and I, and the slides. But I talk to the community. I asked community members how many of you guys are aware of the CFCI? How many are aware of ATI? How many are aware of the concepts going around and the breakout group I sat in. Nobody was aware of anything and in Compton they told me Compton is always forgotten. We receive nothing in Compton. I think it is wonderful work that you are doing but we are doing something wrong if in these community groups that gather for the purpose of providing information in order to assist the community don't even know what is taking place and feel no assistance by what we are doing.

>> DEREK: Going back to the initial questions that is the reason why these areas are prioritized. Historically they are not provided the information or given the opportunity to provide

input. The whole purpose of the way SLS was instructed to go about this in the outreach and their engagement and even doing the listening sessions was to prioritize these areas that normally do not get that input?

I see it as a r starting place not an end point. Things we need to continue to get better at and come back to. Having the messengers as part of the process I think it was helpful at least those organizations who do the work in these areas on a regular basis are bring people to the table to be able to give the input and say what the need is. I hear you and I don't want to disregard what you are saying and you are making an important point. But this is the purpose of why we are doing what we are doing. Right? To elevate those voices to this process. For sure.

>> DEREK: There is several different slides to get to and I am looking at the clock as well. I want to make sure we get to the pieces that make the point. Right? I appreciate the process you went through and explaining to us and everything and let's get to the nitty you gritty what we learned from this.

>> This slide we want to feature the engagement levels and you can see by the numbers of people and go to the next slide can you see the majority of folks are talked about similarly as we hear recurring themes of women, youth and housing. Next slide.

>> When we look at the votes. We see 80 percent were focused on youth health and housing and break out the subcategories that came out of the conversations that happened. Going back to the process we had people in the room jotting down notes and categorizing where the comments came from and for business development, we broke out all of the comments into sub categories and we see in long p beach we really work force development. Majority of the long beach participants supported mentorship opportunities and in the virtual setting we had a lot of support for job training and job availability.

When looking at health mental health came to the top for three main areas. Affordable care and public health and safety. For housing we saw affordable housing interim housing and shelters and home buying assistance came to the top in the listening sessions.

Look at justice a lot of support for reentry support. Legal services. Diversion programs and around public safety and security. Last but not least for we saw a lot of support for after school programs and educational programs and mentorship.

>> DEREK: I want to say to the committee. This week in hindsight I wish I would have been able to vet a little more to get directly to the things we need out of the information. I am even seeing that we may need to come back to this next week so we can get a p fundamental understanding of what the p community is saying so we can add that to the context that we need to add to it to decide how we want to move forward along with what we want t to do as far as prioritizing the areas and as well as the concepts themselves. We will do that work and I wanted to say that.

>> This slide similarly as we were discussing when the survey. These were the top five ranked concepts throughout both the in-person and virtually. And these are the ones that you see and again the community didn't have an idea on funding but if you were to take those funding you get b about 6 million, 6 point $6 million if you were to fund all of those and those are the top across all areas and all locations as well.

>> DEREK: Looks like one is health and two is youth. Three is housing. This is page 48. Slide 48.

>> We don't have those with us and we can go back and add that if you want to just to figure out if it is housing and health and stuff.

>> DEREK: I will work with you this. In comparison to the ones that the survey said verses what is happen ng the listening session we need a comparison.

>> I agree about clarifying how we are compiling all of this. Sounds like we shared the survey results and now we are going through the listening session and I think the next step is to compile all of that into a consolidated what are we getting from community meetings. Okay?

>> If we look at comparing sessions and the survey. If you add that. For listening session and I think this was in the packet slide. Look at youth development and the concepts they rank on that and you get that is the 5 million you get under in the listening sessions and then for the rental housing you get 1.2. In the survey it was a different ranked. Concept that was ranked and for under youth development is one that was for 330 which matches what you -- what we saw earlier. Make sense? You it was a little different you see differences between what is happening in the listening sessions and the survey.

>> DEREK: The listen sessions say youth health and housing and the survey said job training. Rental assistance. And youth development.

>> Even within the youth development the ones that rose to the top were different.

>> I think in the future it would be helpful to ensure kin to see so we can better absorb what feedback is being provided.

>> DEREK: That is what I am saying to take the time to vet further. Tack takes a look at the raw for the deliberation process so it makes sense to make it work. I think we are looking more at raw data looked at in different ways and I think in the decision-making process there is another level of synthesis that needs to happen for us to be able the to use it. I want to come to Michelle.

>> When things change give us a little in advance.

>> For clarity is that identified areas or broader?

>> MEGAN: I know the listening sessions are in specified area and I want to clarify with the survey correct when we did the phone canvassing it was in specific areas and text messaging specific areas and yeah it was targeted communities. One more slide and we are all done. This is showing the actual concepts with the project ID. It is the previous slide just an expanded version of

that. The first one was a very high-level overview and this is more detailed and you see the prompt IDs and funding areas that you get.

>> DEREK: Comes down to 18 million for the top recommended concepts.

>> In both the listening sessions and survey.

>> DEREK: Okay. All right. Any additional questions here? I want to leave space and I know it was a lot of information just now. A lot of information.

>> I want to thank you all for the work you have done to gather this information and I know how difficult it is. And I am excited about the opportunity to review this so we can understand how the to incorporate the feedback. In many ways what I think I hear you saying is there is a lot of priorities and desires and a lot of folks in some ways have competing priorities and agendas and we need to find a way to look for the patterns and consistencies with the data and I would welcome Mr. Chair to have the opportunity to have the discussion amongst the committee.

Also, what I think would be helpful is think about if somebody submits a billion-dollar recommendation. That is an important consideration. An important concept. I think it is also important to understand intent. And what it is we are trying to get out of this and perhaps orient towards the goals as member Castillo has mentioned and there are goals that we have and what might be useful at some point is think about where these concepts fall within sort of the advisory committees' goals and what is the relationship between each concept and thing we are trying to go accomplish and whether or not it has support from the community and I think that is what we are looking for. We want to understand what is the relationship between what people are proposing and how much support there is for that thing and I would welcome and be excited about the opportunity to have the analysis if that is possible. I don't know if there is anything you can share about that or maybe the possibility of organizing the data in that way. Does that provide some context at least?

>> That is the interesting piece. What is fundable. We can look at what was funded last and does that fall within the ATI and that is your discretion. Look at year one concepts and year two. They vary. It is almost like we can do almost a heat map maybe or something where we can kind of show concepts that have been funded last year and this year. Year one and year 2 and look at ways that the possibility of those concepts that closely align with those and what those cost. Right?

>> D'ARTAGNAN: Yeah, perhaps I no ewe are going to get to this and I don't want to get ahead of you. Aligning the data with the advisory committees' priorities. The need and what was previously funded and there is a number of criteria we can consider to match the feedback and concepts too. I will defer to the committee's leadership on this.

>> DEREK: What I intend to do to at least get an understanding of priorities for the community. And the entire goal was to get that information and do our work to actually come up with the amount of money by way of priority as you are saying and, in my mind, I am trying to separate the two. Let's get an understanding of where the community landed and looks like in the last slide, we are looking at now there were three areas that community landed on and I think there is a further I guess analysis of that so we can understand it. That we can do. Now that we have that information it is a r starting place for us to do a comparative am sis based on our goals and meet in middle. That is what the goal is intended to be. Go ahead.

>> WESLEY: When I was looking at the 2700 people and -- that was saying it wasn't a substantial amount for the 10 million people. I am thinking how can we get a better feel of the community without that. Are we taking into account math comparisons on census? Where they have data and are we applying that to this? We know the demographic of homelessness. Just Googling that.

>> I think that is partly what we are touching on. How do we align our priorities as far as this information is concerned. And align that with what our decision-making process is. Our priorities are aligned with the indexes that all of this is based off of and this is part of the fabric of the

foundation making sure we identify where the needs are in the communities and where the services are being placed in the communities and then even going further with what the learning is from what SLS did of being able to bring out what the community is saying towards that end as well. To identify this. This process is a had little different than what we have done in the past where it rely on uses and I think this is what member Lewis was saying last week. Historically our expertise has led the way. But there is always been a call from the community to be able to lift up their voices in this process at the same time. This year's process kind of lend, lean more into that. How can we make sure that we are identifying what the community is saying and adding it to the process? It has now become clear to me know we have to figure out how to bring what we have done in the past to what we are doing this year to match it. You know?

>> WESLEY: Has there been enough time to see how the funding in year two affected these areas.

>> DEREK: That is why she is saying a heat map and figuring out where the priorities are in the community and fill in the gap and how we can fill in the gap too and go farther beyond the areas as well.

>> I will say in terms of the heat map to look at one of the things is definitely for year two I think the funds are still being distributed and that is a big and we don't have that data and that is something to think about. We have year one in terms we can get it from amity where the funds have been distributed for year two, I know that is not the case.

>> DEREK: Yes?

>> I am worried a little bit. And I think community voice is critical. And alternate member -- your point about the conversations that you had with people in Realtime in these meetings who are not privy to the same information and I won't put myself with many of you who are privy to information and I didn't go through the process last year is concerning because they are prioritizing things without necessarily all of the same information that we have. And when I think b

about community engagement, I think that is the first critical piece that we all have the same information and it does make me think of member Lewis's, I believe it was her recommendation that in meetings going forward we incorporate the community in Realtime in providing ratings. Then they are hearing what we are talking about and they have the at no time to have their voices heard and if it is done virtually and we can do ranking then and there we can potentially reach a much more diverse group of people by doing that way.

>> DEREK: I also want to say there is something to providing input based off of lived experience. The lived experience doesn't always have all of the information we are privy to.

I think being able to hear from community in a very real and I guess -- um, reaction to the information they are getting since based off of what they know. That I think and prioritizing that voice does give a different lens to these concepts. You know what I am saying?

>> I agree with the point completely and a well-crafted survey that gets to the needs and relation of the goals to the committee that to me makes a lot of sense. What I was challenged with is what is submitted. The rankings submissions and it is seen with little information about what is coming forth and I would imagine not necessarily clear on what the goals of the committee and I apologize I am using the wrong term. That the committee have. And that is the piece that I am talking about. I think if it is a well-crafted survey and you are getting based on need. I agree 100 percent. That in and of itself has value for us to keep in mind as we are reviewing the proposals.

>> DEREK: I will come to member Castillo. Sorry. Steel. And here and then over to you.

>> MEGAN: You want to affirm what you uplift and had I attended a listening session and this was last year and I had a similar experience which is why I asked the context provided around community members to your point derrick it is important for us to hear. But also, not without context of the initiative or not without context of the goals of this body and I think that is something to, I can't remember who said. But the gaps, right? What are the gaps between information that we are getting and the way we can move forward with the task at hand p I think it is important.

>> I will raise something I think I raised this time last year. I think there is a disconnect in mu mind between the governance of the allocation and what we are hearing. We are getting feedback from the communities. And not from a community and the priorities might be different for each of the communities and I think we have a governance body here that is supposed today vote cross sectionally on 140 proposals that came from multiple different communities and try to prioritize. I think the trouble that I have is it is disconnected and other way to do this I recommended last year. Could you give to a region or community. Like Joey said. The American Indian Alaska native community. You have $10 million or $20 million because we chose that to be the sum based on need or whatever that you should get and that community should meet and educate and decide how to spend that money and prioritize that money. Right? It is a different model. We are told last year that we couldn't do that right? And I think we left the question on the table and as we start to dive into this again and hear the feedback my question it lingers in my head. Do we look and vote on concepts that are proposed or do we let the communities get together, prioritize and make those decisions? And I don't know whether are that is possible again maybe this is bringing the same question back but it is a question that I have. You could say prioritize by geography or population and say we are going to allocate money based on need and let those communities decide how the to allocate some of the funding and maybe it is not all of it. Maybe we put guide rails -- guardrails around how decisions can be made it is just a different approach for me I think the struggle I had in the last two years that I have been involved is lack of alignment what between what we are trying to do and the decision making here. And r part of this may be amity has figured this out and doing it. Not having awareness how they are engaging communities and distributing the funds. I don't have a sense for how aligned that is. Just to comment.

>> I agree the process is important to implement the program. Other aspect is community. This board works for the community. This board also works to implement the process of reacting to what the community is telling us to do. I sat in ATI and I sat in ARTI and I sat in CFCI for two

years and many times I was confused as a public member and didn't know what anybody was talking about when all you guys were talking about these things. This is the first time I have sat on this table and I know that you guys are doing a fantastic job. Or best job that you can do. But the community is the one that needs to be served and had these words process should be that. The process of serving the community. I did 40 years in prison. I did reentry. And now I work in reentry and I serve the community day in and day out. If you are talking about money. We are talking about reentry. The concepts are there. Health. Reentry. And housing.

Make it a priority. You can't spend $100 million and provide throughout the community for every organization. When you talk about amity finding the way. No, they were just given the way. They are doing the same thing your concept was. Give it to this community so this community. All you did was gave it to amity and told amity you give it to the community that you if feel deserves. This board is smart people. It is not a difficult task to give money out to people who need it. We know who needs it. Reentry. Health and housing.

>> DEREK: That will be the last one we got to go to public comment.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: Thank you so much for the incredible comments and I want to see maybe for the benefit of my own thinking and hopefully as a way to think about what we can do ahead of t next meeting --