

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Can we get a reading of the disclaimers.

>>: We will have our Spanish interpreter come first.

>>: [FOREIGN LANGUAGE].

>>: This meeting is being recording for the meeting minutes. This is a public meeting and subject to the brawn act. Since statements are not visible to people on the phone, the chat function is limited to tech assistance.

There will be no response, forwarding of public comments to the committee members. If members would like to provide comment, please do so during the public comment period for that item or during the general public comment period.

For captions, cart services are available. You may access these by clicking on the stream text link. Scroll to reactions. You will see the raise hand feature. Scroll to more. You will see the raise hand feature. For anyone experiencing tech difficulties, assistance will be provided in the chat.

Phone participants may press star nine to raise hand and star six to unmute. For Spanish, click on the globe icon. Select Spanish. Written public comments are to be subjected to JCOD at LA county.GOV. It should be submitted by 5:00 PM the day before the meeting. These public comments will be shared with the members prior to the meeting and reflected in the meeting minutes. Through the end of the meeting, it will be made public. Advisory members may not have the chance to review these comments.

This ends the reading of the disclosures.

MEMBER ARMSTEAD: Here.

MEMBER CASTILLO: Present.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

MEMBER CYRUS-FRANKLIN: Alternate is here.

MEMBER FERRER: Present.

>>: Present.

MEMBER GARCIA: Her alternate.

MEMBER GHALY: Alternate.

>>: Present.

MEMBER LEWIS: Present.

MEMBER SCHOONOVER: Here.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Present.

>>: Present.

>>: Present.

>>: We have 120 total. Move on with the reading of the land acknowledgment.

We want to recognize those whose land we currently reside. The original caretakers.

[FOREIGN LANGUAGE]. We honor you. We lift you up. We thank you as we continue to do this work in the county of Los Angeles. Can we pull up community agreements? I will start.

Be respect full of the diverse voices.

>>: Prioritize and defer to community throughout this process.

>>: Be mindful of the diverse audiences you are presenting to. Make sure you speak with clarity.

>>: Be collaborative.

>>: Assume best intentions.

>>: Challenge the idea not the person.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>>: Remember why we are here. To center the black, brown, and Indigenous communities.

>>: Defer to community.

>>: Transparency and follow through. Be intentional about allowing space.

>>: Be an active participant.

>>: Let equity lead the way.

>>: May spaces for youth voices.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Allow community members to finish their sentences during public comment.

>>: Amend them as needed.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Begin with a land acknowledgment statement. Can we move to the review and acceptance of the minutes from last week's meeting. One minute. The link is working for me. Minutes were not added to the packet today. I can share my screen. Correct it.

>>: Can I get a packet.

>>: Good to see you. Anyone want to make a motion?

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Motion made.

>>: Second it.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Seconded. Move to public comment.

>>: This commences the public comment. One minute per person. Please use the raise hand feature we will call on you in the order your hand was raised. I will lower your hand once you have completed your comment. Star nine to raise your hand. Star six to unmute.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

Scroll to reactions at the bottom tab. Raise hand feature. Scroll to more at the bottom tab. You will see a drop-down menu. We will now start public comment from the March 30th meeting minutes.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Let us move to vote. I am sorry. You said move to online. I am sorry.

>>: No hands. Back to you.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Let us move to the vote.

MEMBER CARBAJAL: Aye.

>>: Aye.

MEMBER CASTILLO: Aye.

MEMBER CRUNK: Abstain.

MEMBER EARLEY: Aye.

>>: Aye.

>>: Aye.

>>: Aye.

>>: Aye.

>>: Aye.

MEMBER LOBIANCO: Aye.

MEMBER SCHOONOVER: Abstain.

MEMBER SCORZA: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Aye.

>>: Aye.

>>: Aye.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>>: Aye.

>>: Member Ruiz, can you hear me? Up mute.

>>: 17 with a pass.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Thank you. I was listening to what is going on in Tennessee. The reading of the community agreements resonated with me than when we created them. You have members being removed from their seats. Voted in by the people by violation of the quorum.

I find it as a privilege to share space with you all. I appreciate that we read the agreements together. The ad hoc committee came together. Spent two and a half hours to bring together our ideas for the concepts and where we are we focused on the ones in orange.

We are either combining concepts together. Removing concepts and having discussions about why. Or we are changing the amounts you empowered the committee to do this. We can discuss them and hopefully take action. It got us to \$96 million. There was a sheet shared. We finished this last night.

There is the breakdown of how many recommendations there are per area of focus. Any questions about the changes?

>>: The goals are review this, approve.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: And give some guidance to take back.

>>: The next item is to lift up things that were not. When we say approval, when we get to the agenda item number, if there are concepts under 33 percent you want to lift up, that may open the conversation.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

CHAIRMAN STEELE: We wanted to leave room that are this discussion to come behind the changes the committee went for. If we don't get through the discussion today, we can guide the committee to consider these and do that work again. We finished this document last night.

MEMBER LEWIS: Can they drop it in the chat and then send it to us?

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Can you download it and add it? We will review these. Discuss the approval.

>>: Everything the committee has done item by item?

CHAIRMAN STEELE: I will walk through what we did. Give room for people to ask questions. The goal is to accept or not accept what the committee has done.

We did go through to make sure all the members were on the same page with these changes. We all agreed these were the ones to bring forward. Full consensus.

>>: I know (inaudible) was supposed to be in the committee. She transitioned to another entity. We were not able to give the input.

>>: Do you know if she tried to reach out to miles?

>>: She said she e-mails. She was waiting for the information.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: I must of been in a different space than her.

>>: She road by my pad to drop off papers we went over a week before.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: We will look out for that in the future. Anyone else? Anyone in the back? We went through 12 different amendments to these items. This includes the discussions from the past meeting as well.

Combining 129, 131, 106, 45. Centered around mental health and the arts. I had to look at the write ups and try to combine them into one. We have a description here.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

Connections and engagement with the arts to contribute healing, trauma, while providing purpose, self-determination.

Arts instruction and mentorship to help overcome existing barriers to expand access to careers in the creative economy. Offering things like free meals, mentorship, leadership training, mediation. Artistic enrichment. A deep dive. In school or in the community. In looking at the amounts, we saved \$430,000. \$430,097. If you are looking at these concepts in your packet, we did our due diligence to bring them together.

It will be focused on all districts and it will be brought to the county by way of the arts department. This is the first concept combination that was proposed. The second was to look at some of the youth engagement aspects and breaking them out into three different groups.

The other was after school sports programming. Youth development. The third was youth mentorship.

>>: Can you call out the number?

CHAIRMAN STEELE: I am coming back.

MEMBER LEWIS: They are trying to find it.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: First one, out of school enrichment, 140, 44, 51, 59. 140 is on page 1. 44 is on page 6. 51 is on page 19. 59 is on page 20. These are all after school enrollment programs. Focusing on reentry youth. Total was around \$10,110. \$10,110,734. A request to reduce that amount by \$2 million.

>>: It was not just for reentry. Concepts were open.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: I wrote that down wrong. My bad. It was moving the two million to the reentry aspect. Intervention work. I said that wrong. Youth development.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

Description is to come. We have to figure out how to combine them. We did reduce it by \$2 million. Makes it \$8,110,734.

The second combination of concepts. Third was Item 11. On page 10. Item 113. On page 22. 11 and 113. One was focused on the antelope valley. The other was all districts. 113 is working with other smaller based sports programs. Being able to bring that forward. We had a few people talk towards this.

We had written public comment. Not only did the work, the description is to come on this. We raised the total amount was \$4,550,000. We raised it to \$5 million flat for this particular. We want this to go through a third-party administrator. Next combination of concepts. Item 29. Page 15. We took 106 out and moved it to this one.

You saw 106. Item 58. It is on page 22. 29, 106, 58. These are mentoring focused concepts for youth. Description to combine these is to come. The total was \$375,922. We felt that wasn't enough. We brought that up to a \$1 million for this particular combined concept for youth mentorship.

Next set is for youth intervention. This combines 52. That is on page 15. 132 is on page 2. 125. Page 16. These are various programs. More high touch. She did the work to think about these.

>>: More intensive services for the harder to serve. Higher barrier young people. Including reentry for youth.

>>: The two million we took away from the afterschool enrichment section, we moved that to this space. Making it 7,549, (inaudible). Descriptions to come. That is the idea for those. I will skip to the other combination. Down here in 12. Then I will come back to the rest. Those are removals and changes. This combines 102 and 104. Page 7

these items are focusing on business training, certificate programs. We wanted to combine those two concepts into one. \$5,000,800.

>>: Last week we were talking about these. We wanted to key the co-op separate. The number 104. I think we were thinking about combined 102 with 28 on page 20. This is kind of a concierge service.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: 104 is separate. We can talk that through we can come back to that discussion. We will bring it back when we open the floor. Talking about the ones that we reduce or took out starting with the ones we took out. Number 18. On page 12 school funding. Save environment for students.

Healthy meals for kids. It is an important aspect. It was only asking for \$60,000. There should be resources supporting these ideals. We took that one out. We removed Item 54. I want to be clear, we know this was similar to 18. The idea of what it was explaining. It was specific to the native communities. We hesitated on that part. We want to lift up the others. We want to note that the idea is to replace it with something more impactful. 54 is on page 11.

87 is on page 10. Another set that was a bit general. It did not lean to a project area that can be funded by CFCI.

>>: I e-mailed you the handout. Counties should be investing in these things. We can lift that up in the report. We took this one out as well. This is the 100 million dollar one. The billion dollar one didn't make it. 18 removed 16,000 from the line 87 removed \$100 million from the bottom line for this set.

The others are changing dollar amounts. Item 50 on page 3. Let me back up. I will go to 141 first. We reduced it to the amount that helped to support the reframed.

141. Let us go there real quick. Page 13. Expansion. Funded to the tune of 16,426 and \$two. We had a discussion about how much we supported with last year's resources and allocations. Wanting dollars going to people that are not captured in the more specific categories set up. They have other resources that can be used towards them as well.

MEMBER LEWIS: I did participate in the majority of the meeting. For those who don't know, we expanded lead last year. Diversion program. Year two we expanded. We were looking at Item 50. 50 was about rental assistance.

We decided to take 10 million from lee and increase rental assistance. We put money into breaking barriers last year. It was a sliver. There is not a program to scale that provides housing subsidies for people returning home without severe behavioral health needs. We feel like there should be a resource for those that need some support.

We want to create a \$10 million project.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Way better than I could of said it. This part was a good discussion. It sets the tone for how to go about this in a more creative way. We are still supporting lead expansion.

>>: Did a little math. What stuck out to me about that is the resources at 50. The things they say they want do averages out to 21,000 per person. That would only be helpful (inaudible) am I right?

CHAIRMAN STEELE: From the original amount.

>>: I wanted to put that thought process in there. That was a reason the decisions were made. I think that was a good decision.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>>: The state is pushing the Medicaid services a new initiative that would provide rental subsidies for us to six months post release. That is information. There may be additional funding coming. We don't know what the population will be. It has been put forward.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Quick math. The ten million serves over 400 million people. A quick 30 to adding to it. Broadens the scope. Sets the tone for what can be added more to it. There was also, we are keeping 88. Page 3. 24-hour mental health clinics. We had a good conversation about that. Keep 88. Do it through a TPA. I think DMH has a certain way they do business we want to be more creative. Sometimes medical can be restrictive in how the dollars can be used.

We want to broaden our scope. Have it go through a third party to see how to add more creativity to that space. We brought it up to 2 million.

>>: I think it is important that we look at ways in which people can feel comfortable. There is a lot of stigma behind mental health. We want people to have doors that don't have the label or signs of mental health. Last one was Item 84. It is further in the back.

>>: Sometimes when we have these available, it may make it possible for the department to better leverage their resources. We know medical will be an issue moving forward. Did you give thoughts to what types of clinics this would be for? Will they have the capacity to do this?

MEMBER LEWIS: I think that what the ad hoc committees raised is great of a job. There is well documented barriers. There are many mental health programs that are funded by private. There are a lot of mental health supports provided not through

DMH. It would be nice to attach it to the existing structure. We want to try something different.

We can demonstrate how some culturally responsive work can be done. Hopefully take it to scale with the county system. There are lots of mental health programs not connected.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: Let me recommend in any case where we say, we want to make investments in newer strategies that we think about the data to collect, we can determine the efficacy of those investments. I want to acknowledge it. It comes to these types of services. We know how critical they are. We have seen improvements for impacted populations.

I want to notice data is demonstrating that they were able to take advantage more than ever.

CHAIRMAN STEELE: I will come to the front. I have one upfront. It was not a shot at DMH. There is a body of work that already exists. How can we be more responsive to some of the things about how to address it further?

I appreciate you.

>>: I think I will say something similar to what was just said. As a former therapist, there are many things healing that are not therapy. That is the distinction I hear us making.

-- that is the distinction that I hear us making and I think that is more than just any dollars that can be leverage and had I think we need to leverage dollars. The restriction on the funding is who can provide it and there are many folks who is are healers in the communities who not going to meet the credentials and I want to better understand when we are talking about art therapy or ek wine therapy. Which are billable services

depending on who is providing them and then there is not billable because somebody is providing them and I think they are therapeutic in either area and we need to be clear about where we can leverage dollars and where it ends up hurting us to try to leverage dollars.

>> DEREK: Good point. Someone in the back?

>> I think a possible solution is through procurement and leverage points and medical and other. No not much to be effective in the space. (Indistinct).

>> I think wherever possible (Indistinct) we want to leverage the federal. We can make the 2 million, 4 million and I think the point that is important is that whatever the services are that if they are natural, we should be try to go do that and understanding the barriers we are try to go address here.

>> DEREK: When you say match and I am hearing in two different ways and just asking for clarification. Are you talking about matching in services or match dollars?

>> Match dollars. If you deliver a service that is medical benefit in the behavioral health space through the DMH board. Or physical health space. Then can you get up to a 90 percent of it funded -- put 2 million forward and get up to 90 percent of that paid back and so the federal government and (Indistinct). It enhances the m amount of dollars we have available and we want to think through how to do that and yet still make sure that there is flexibility. Variety of services including (Indistinct). And addressing the organizational barrier issue.

>> DEREK: Got you. The thing that comes up for me in the process and I am thinking about the execution of that and execution of match dollars for smaller base

organizations that may be doing items like -- restrictions make it difficult when it comes to match dollars and I think the thinking from the ad hoc committee on this is thinking how we can go beyond some of the restrictions that come with going the route that is we have particularly with federal dollars right?

I think that is the line we are trying to go to with this. Um, and I am open to discussions around how to figure out how to alleviate those things. The thought to ad hoc committee if we have it going a third-party administrator it can reach those and they can take on for lack of better terms the rig maroo that comes with trying to find all of the dollars and all of that. And while the service provider can provide the services. How we go about doing that specifically to leverage the dollars you are talking about I think it is something we should explore.

That brings me to the end of this part of the information and I will open up to the floor and I see comments pop up on the documents as well. I don't know if it came from the folks here or the community. Any have questions or thoughts about what we brought forward today? Please.

>> I am curious if there is an opportunity for us to have a discussion about collapsing some of the job training categories and if that came up during the ad hoc committee. As I go through some of these I think if we collapse some of them, we could do a good job of specifying all of the elements that are in it and a lot of them capture things targeting individuals who are reentering or barriers for employment. Job training and job growth sectors. And some is broad and narrow to tech or health or public sector pathways. Paid work experience. Supportive services in connection to career and I think

there is an opportunity to collapse some to make sure there is county wide opportunity for folks to apply and had not to narrow for an individual provider and I think that is the, I worry about some of these that you can read the provider in the concepts.

For example, if you look at 143. This is the one that sort of captures the elements they describe around focus and high growth sector and I think it could be collapsed with take 143 on page four the built program and job training and high growth sectors and I feel that could be collapsed with 124 on page eight moving on up and as well as with 43 on page 11 for fresh start. And 79 on page 13. Potentially also 135 on page 13.

>> DEREK: 143 on page four. She also mentioned 124 on page eight. Four as well.

>> 42 on page 11. 79 on page 13. 135 on page 14. There is a couple of others that call out specific sectors and I didn't lump those in and those are the ones that I think are more general.

>> DEREK: I was going to mention the centers one. We did have a discussion around how those are different than --

>> Yeah, the ones that call out health department oral tech.

>> DEREK: Yeah. Yes please?

>> VERONICA: You are saying collapse all those into one or say ago group them in a different way?

>> I was, I mean the way they read when I am look at them, they are broad for all of the characteristics. Targeting individuals for high barriers of employment. Job training. Mentorship. Capture occupational training. Work experience and then a connection to

jobs and so for me I feel like if there is an opportunity for folks to apply for funding that sort of captures all of the elements of a good capturing model it might be appropriate and then we can open up county wide.

>> DEREK: Yes.

>> VERONICA: I think that makes senses and I will say something I don't remember what category. Said about collapsing so many things if we do that. You know there is some trusted community organizations that do 1 or 2 of those things and they do them well and they are culturally responsive and my concern especially depending on who procures the contracts or who is allocated the money to administer the contracts is we don't leave those folks out. Right?

Usually, the procurement looks like you got to be able to deliver all of these things and that is why many of the organizations piecemealing and doing things on the ground. Successfully unfunded safety net. Many of the providers who organized to get us here are left out when those things are packaged. I support that and also if you can help with the language with what that looks like and prescriptive at least request revise from the CEO. Otherwise, you package it all usually the eligibility means have you to do all of the things and a lot of the organizations get length of time out that way.

>> I appreciate that point and I agree. How do you open this up for more providers to be able to apply for these kinds of fund who is have good programs and for them to team up and or have some of the services separated and had I agree that is something we struggle with in our department in the public work force system and we put out an RFP that requires you work for CBOs and we know how hard it is and I appreciate that.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>> DEREK: Thank you very much. And any other thoughts towards this? Please?
Member William Is.

>> JOSEPH: Thank you for that and I think last year to be mindful about job trainings. There are tons but the ones focus on job placement talks about it. If we be mindful about that when allocating funds and want to echo the mental health piece as far as the 24-hour clinic and I think the key for me there is people could live there for a bit until they transition which is the key to getting off of the streets and safe affordable housing and I know we haven't talked about that yet and I am looking forward to that conversation and house sg the number one need and going off good faith with the committee and lots of folks spoke up last week in support of native and indigenous programs and we are going to get rid of 54 look forward to what we can replace it with thank you.

>> Can I echo member Williams I think every job training program we fund has to show outcomes for its hiring I agree.

>> JOSEPH: One last thing for the third-party administrator and I don't know if we got data back for how effective it has been and allocations and I you are hesitant about doing it until we get some of that but would prefer that over the entity that you mentioned because I think we got the whole reason we exist is the to do things differently.

>> DEREK: For sure and I want to ask a question in this space toward that is end and had I am glad you brought that up and I think it might be towards JCOD. I know amity foundation is third party administrator for year two but there are others that act as third-party administrators in partnership with the county as well. Is amity the ones that have to

be directly tied to CFCI dollars is that how that works? Can there be other third-party administrators to help administrate the funds other than them. The question is for CFCI if there are third party administrate funds allocated for year three does it have to be amity foundation or can third party administrator be other organization that do facilitate work on behalf of the county in other ways and like CCF for instance or so many ore entities?

>> You want me to address that?

>> DEREK: Sure.

>> There are several ways to know about it. If you are interested in particular area. For instance, if you are interest in youth, you can very well assign the money to an organization like D (Indistinct) say we want this money to go out to the community. To a third-party administrator that are can do X, Y, Z. And you want to do housing and you want to do business development and you can do that. Can you do the same requirements actually there is a benefit to that and also a benefit to that and one is that in places that you can leverage the dollars the departments know how to do that and they also where more funding source are and take dollars and stretch in broader ways and it leads to the conversation from last week I was saying need an opportunity to have space to layer and see where the gaps are and we don't know that we are talking about what priorities we have and what is important and the community and asking what is important and the board also made allocation ins a lot of different ways and the same conversation is happening (Indistinct) and happening in the youth space and a lot of other spaces where there is no English overlaying all of the different vetting sources. Yes, we can design in different ways and my preference is that they can still give some to a single

source crew for another outlining things and still have a single source that goes through the CFCI. Our preference is not to have a bunch of PA to be responsible or responsible for we don't have the staff or capacity. But you can leverage opportunities. Does that make sense?

>> DEREK: It does.

>> VERONICA: That is helpful and I want to caution. The core issue is the county is requiring the third-party administrator to put in many of the same things that county contracts have and they negotiated a lot to try and pare down as much as possible.

>> DEREK: That is the biggest problem.

>> VERONICA: That issue with the third-party administrator that is fine we need the county to get with us in terms of the essence as the why we want it a noncounty funder in the first place. That is the core and let's deal with the core issue and that is one of the core issues that needs to be addressed.

>> Thank you for that member, Lewis. Sorry I missed the reason for the question. But to your point that is very true and I will just be transparent and we have many people who were selected to receive grants. Through the TPA but they didn't have no insurance. No worker liability and had no basic insurance and they were nonprofit and didn't have maybe they didn't have a board that governed and there were a lot of basic things and like you said doing work all of the time and didn't have the infrastructure to be able to do the work and there are things we have to do to help them meet the basic requirements to provide services and to your point there are requirements to the counterparts and we

paired as best as we could. And maybe more pairing opportunities and set aside to ensure everyone (Indistinct).

To that regard it is not the TPA it is basic operational requirements for the actual organization that is required to (Indistinct) keep folks safe, you don't -- I do not want people taking care of children with no insurance or no background and none of the basic piece of it and we have support organizations. We are going to do a more organized way of doing it. (Indistinct). I think to your point I agree a hundred percent and also creating many r opportunities to support the organization (Indistinct). Continue to do this way.

>> MEGAN: Thank you. Something coming up for me is not only ask for community-based organizations to level up and also meet them where they are. It is not they are not able to carry out the work they are carrying out the work despite they are not funded or don't have insurance and whatever the case may be and it is critical work and that is one of the things that I think needs to be centered in the conversation and looking at the contract processes and amity is majority impacted folks are leading this work and when we make requests about what are some of the where is evaluation and some of the things happening there after they are just now getting the funding out of the door. It will be a long time before we receive some of the data back on how these programs are doing because of the contracting processes and some of the bottlenecks and I think it is p important them to center that in the conversation for sure.

>> DEREK: That is frustrating to me too. That means the contracts are shorter for how long it takes to get the dollars out the door. It is not adjusted. It is not? Talk to me.

>> [Away from microphone].

>> DEREK: Miles is talking can you speak into the mic?

>> The other part I think that is something that the balance is even though the county is allocated this money to community there is still public funds and there are still things we have to do by law. Right?

It is not a foundation that doesn't have there is still (Indistinct) funding. I mean there is just a lot of things we have to do and that is the other question we struggle with because (Indistinct) today. Know what is happening and everything. So, we are like how do we balance what we are required to do with public funds and I also make sure we serve the community the way they deserve to be served and two, with um, member Castillo said (Indistinct) for a long time and figure out better ways to serve them. But you know all of the step we had to go through is not because we had to try and change the step but because what we are require to do by law. It is going to get easier and we are trying to go break down as committees (Indistinct). Streamline. Even with that still have to turn the data. Still have to have insurance and still have to have an infrastructure in place and overseeing government body and other things that have to be there. How do we do both and put more money in incubation things and people get grants and (Indistinct) and then once they are ready to go to phase two and I don't know and those are things we should probably think about.

>> DEREK: Can we work on the mic in back. I think we get an echo and it is hard to hear them in the back. I heard what you said and I lift that up. Member Lewis and member Stevens.

>> (Indistinct) wants to say something too.

>> I want to add that judge arm stead and PSRT in particular did support us recommending forward 15 million in funds for the community capacity to build on the incubation academy and those are the types of funds and programs we need to build up capacity organization to get them up to the levels and fund things like the insurance requirements so they can participate in the other things whether a TPA or direct county contract.

>> VERONICA: I think -- equity is at the center of many of the things the county has said and not just individuals but organizations and we are having the equity contracting work forever. I don't think everything is driven by the law. I think that part of what should be said in report is we continue to face barriers related to access for, again I am going to call the unfunded safety net who in many cases has better outcomes than the funded safety net. We can't show you we don't have money the collect the data and know undoubtedly that is what is happening in many cases and I am glad about the 15 million and part of me feels we shouldn't have to take out of t funds but may need allocation for these funds to make sure the folks can access the resources too and I think the academy is amazing. But it can only take a small fraction because of how comprehensive it is. You can take a small fraction of organization. There is another level that doesn't require that level of intensity and commitment and we know what the key pieces are coming from not having a government contract to having one. It is not about insurance. Interpret. Do compliance and data and I don't think it has to be 0 or nothing H. there should be something in place that is a recurring -- capacity building is what I did before I came to direct services. There should be recurring trainings developed and I

have seen that model help organizations grow and if you have organization on the risk, the high risk area they may be require today participate in those things in addition to accessing funds to require the expensive insurance and I think the academy is wonderful but we done have the capacity to do that for the organizations that can access the dollars if we provide some training and king we need to do more of the intensive work and come to different level of support that doesn't require the intensity to capture more organization. Year after year and same doing the work and getting idea from and sometimes county departments latch onto and attach and cannot access dollars and barely hang on year after year and you it doesn't make sense. That is my recommendation we look at another model separate and apart from the incubation model. And once we get past the second part of the conversation today, we consider to demonstrate to county what needs to be done to put the investigation in for the organization that can't afford the eligibility requirements to be able to access those dollars.

>> Can I speak? I just -- is this mic on I want to p be clear there are no CBOs turned away for a lack of insurance. It was a system the county first time did this to supplement and get support for those that needed insurance. There was no CBOs turned away from the process because they didn't have insurance. As judge Armstead said yes there was some CBO operating out of compliance at the time. That did not bar or invalidate them from the process. Took a little while and it was challenge to go make that happen but no one was turned away because they didn't have sufficient insurance.

>> DEREK: Okay. All right. We are good for those every so often. It is okay. Coming back to the work at hand the ad hoc committee has done and I want to move to

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

the action of excepting or declining this body of work since there has not been any amendments to it thus far. And I received your member. But I think separating that out from this set and going to have that as part of the next conversation. Anyone want to make a motion on this?

>> I would like to make a motion.

>> I will second.

>> DEREK: Motion has been made and seconded.

>> I see a question.

>> I have a question if this is for not just the merging but also whether it is through the TPA or county? For all of the recommendations. Because you want to point out we didn't have a conversation about that piece.

>> DEREK: We can discuss that part too if you would like. Because the -- this one is for the arts department. And the 3 through 6 were all TPA and we removed 18 and reduce it had dollars in 141 and removed 54 and removed 85. Go for it.

>> VERONICA: To clarify our ad hoc committee didn't go through and recommend for everything in the three the percent. I think we need do that work and didn't go through each of the ones. That question wasn't on the concept recommendation. We haven't done that work yet. If you want one changes to but you can say that. I thought we were --

>> DEREK: It is not for each of them. For these items here they have been itemized and had your question is for all of them or just these?

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>> It is not for all of them and I want to lift up to the group in case there is other conversation to have on it we were mainly focused on the merging and I don't think there was any conversation about it and maybe everyone feels good and I wanted to raise.

>> DEREK: The ones itemized for TPA in this those were the only ones and the others wen went to different departments and for instance the lead expanse is ODR and conversation about 88. We want TPA for that instead of going to DMH and we had those conversations but with the ones on this list.

>> Most of my question are because you are new and don't understand the process and bear with me. If we approve this the ad hoc committee which did an awesome job, do we have an opportunity to add another project. For instance, I have been reading about this project fatherhood. Is there any way individual member can recommend to be reconsidering the project to be part of the --

>> DEREK: That is the next item on the agenda. For sure. Next on the agenda we will be able to have the conversations and trying to get through this part to get to that.

>> VERONICA: To clarify before you talk a vote that could p mean we have to come back and revisit and now we are moving forward.

>> DEREK: For clarification again in the acceptance of these it gets us to \$96,267,844 and accepting these as is. For what the ad hoc committee did prior to this meeting. More so to and I will come.

>> ROSA: Wondering about the food access and then immediate needs. And the -- where would those go in the categories we selected so far and I know at the last meeting I mentioned this time around there is more of the food security questions and

concept that is came up and we want to make sure there is a conversation around that and those are needs more immediate than the other ones that take a little longer.

>> DEREK: How do they characterize? (Indistinct).

>> That is all thanks.

>> So um, I agree with the comments that were made b about the ad hoc committee and I think it is quality work and makes a lot of sense and rational I can support all of that. And what I am struggle with is how this sit in the bigger picture and it was helpful when you went over the history and I am wondering about the funds that has gone out and how it sits in the community and wondering how this gets added to that and supplement. Is there a document that shows that bigger picture to have a better sense of that?

>> DEREK: Not yet. Miles I know that SLS had started they had a document last year that looked at the break down of dollars for year two.

>> I believe the document that SLS created is based on the project description. Maybe the concepts and remember for the most part when we, again remember these are concepts that are usually the source of open solicitation and for the most part we opened it up and we may have removed certain area limitation for programs and what we did based on what the committee said either year one and year 2 was if your program the way you when you actually provide the proposal for funding if your program served participants in high need areas you got extra points for that. Those are areas prioritized based off I don't know what the correct term is. This committee set as a factor in funding

and that is how it is apply and had I believe that was based off how the applicants presented it on where they wanted to serve. See what I am saying?

>> DEREK: To your question year two hasn't been done. Not yet. Year one we are now from the TPA dollars are going out today. And I think the department has some resources that are going on already and we have to do the analysis and doctor Scorza lifted up a couple of time it is best way to go about how the resources are utilize and had member Lewis?

>> VERONICA: I don't know but whether or not. I don't think it is relevant burr the type of intervention. Right? Nine categories it falls ins and population it is serving and maybe the areas that it is serving and I think that it doesn't matter and maybe the status of it. I think that flushed out with this as an overlay it is what would be helpful and I don't know would do it and we know that information. How does that relate the to this. For the most part outside of lead and adding to youth programs and significantly increasing job development which is underfunded last year. Not a lot of these are funded already and I can tell you that. I no ethe first two years are pretty (Indistinct) it is so many hours and that is a quick snapshot. What you are asking for could be but I don't know who would do it and it is important.

>> Then the recommendations are those included in the motion?

>> DEREK: They are not.

>> VERONICA: Would you be able to help with that. Because this is your expertise would you be able to?

>> I am on the ad hoc agency.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>> DEREK: She is. Anyone in the back? Okay let's move to public comment.

>> As reminder public comment period is one minute per person. Star six to unmute yourself. Computer user scroll reactions on the bottom tab to find the raise hand feature. Smart phone users scroll to more on the bottom tab and select raise hand feature and we will call on you in the order your hand was raise and had remember to state your full name and we will begin public comment regarding the suggested changes of the concept recommendation by the ad hoc committee. Any comments in the room? Moving to online. Hector --

>> Yes, I am with Los Angeles County department of mental health. There is 250,000 people that get service from the department of mental health and we have about a \$3 billion budget which sounds like a lot and it isn't and despite being one of the largest mental health counties it is the least funded and had particularly by the Los Angeles County and so I wasn't sure if the conversation I know we have our director and we have our mental health commissioners here at the table and I wasn't sure if this particular document was about defunding DMH. I am not sure when it happened but if it is about having DMHP sponsoring or the fiscal manager and helping the community to set up the services but I am not sure if it is a defund DMH conversation and I want to clarify.

>> Thank you. No other hands back to you chair.

>> DEREK: The answer to that is no. This is not a conversation about defunding DMH.

>> Member Stevens speaking. That was not the conversation regarding defunding anyone.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>> DEREK: Thank you appreciate that. All right. Motion is on the floor to accept the recommended changes from the ad hoc committee can we please go to vote.

(Voting).

>> We pass at 20 back to you chairman Steele.

>> DEREK: Clap it up everybody. It is a good time. We did it we are moving. I am excited. First iteration of it. Yes. It is a big deal. What we want to do at this point as is mentioned this brings us to \$96,267,834 and I know by way of what is lifted up in this space there is still work to do and first thing I want to do is come to member Williams to talk through some of the items since we moved one down that was specific to native American, indigenous and native Alaska folks and make sure we are lifting you back up and providing an opportunity to not just replace p the one but lift up the other items as well to see how we can add it to mix and to you member Williams.

>> JOSEPH: Thank you chair Steel and thank you committee. There are several important and one of the main things that makes them important they were brought forth by the community through the concept and filling out a lengthy form and outreach that has happened and sacred input that was in from the native American community as I look through the recommendations and I think about 54 and the one that I am seeing that could make an impact in the native community is number 66 and I think that also covers number 31.

>> DEREK: Give me the numbers and I will help you out.

>> JOSEPH: 66. 31 and 66 are pretty important and some that don't and some that are exclusive and want to focus on fairly recognize and had not going to get into the debates where it is going to impact self-identifying native American folks in the community and also, I believe there is something more of an empowerment concept and it is more around the native and indigenous communities and there is a difference. American and Alaska natives are folk that is are here and borders of the United States indigenous folks tend to come south of the border we are all one people and the hemisphere in turtle island. But 128 would be the solution for that. And definitely open for negotiations on the amounts on all of these. But feeling from the impact of the community through surveys and through the listening sessions and I want to give due diligence to it. I can try and find some of the page numbers for you.

>> DEREK: 54, 66, 3 is 1, 128.

>> JOSEPH: Yeah, I feel 31 and 66 is somewhat overlapping.

>> VERONICA: Could describe briefly?

>> JOSEPH: 44.

>> VERONICA: Each of the ones. Because it is not on the screen and public may not have it in front of them.

>> JOSEPH: I will go to the old psychological spread sheet here.

>> DEREK: I want to start out 54 is page 11 and funding for education and that is the one we talked about and we took down and I want to start there. Go ahead.

>> JOSEPH: This is called organization funding and not sure if that is the proper title and summary is help nay tiff American families to address mental and health

disparities and more financial awareness and better communication between organizations and to help with the rent stipends. As I mention before with the housing being the number one issue again this year in the listening session feeling this concept is something that encompass as large section of some of the needs that are there as far as mental health and getting a housing assistance directly for the native American community through rent stipends and if we go to 31. I am not sure what page that is on the orange sheet.

>> DEREK: Page 38 is 31.

>> JOSEPH: It is an American Indian day care center. We need a child care center that follows practices and the child care center should be for working class families and all families and rate should be affordable and king it came in to the tune of a million dollars and like I said I think there is room for possibility 66 and 31 to be combined. And then the last one was 128 and I am not sure what page that is on with the orange ones but it is called (Indistinct). And it was serving certain indigenous communities to connect on resources and recruit parents into action and organizing and activate the community to organize for resources and job placement and the higher education. Page 35.

>> DEREK: Page 35.

>> JOSEPH: What I am thinking about the empowerment piece of communities to be able to organize themselves and get the resource that they need this would probably be it. As I said 27 was cool and five p was nice and I felt like 238, 66 and 31 if I lay my bet down it would be on those. And of course, the amounts are negotiable.

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>> DEREK: Thank you for lifting these up. Would but comfortable with us taking this back to the ad hoc committee?

>> JOSEPH: I don't know how it was designated. I don't know if it is by seat or individual as long as one of us are there, I am good with it.

>> DEREK: You are listed.

>> JOSEPH: I probably am. I didn't get the memo. I assume she is taken in that space she is traditionally the ad hoc representative. Yeah, I am good with her being there we need to prep.

>> VERONICA: Again, chair Steel said we took off 54. Did you support 54 or not?

>> JOSEPH: It was on the list of things I would support. If there was an offering of something more extended, I would be good with taking it off and supplementing with 66 or -- well 66 or 31.

>> DEREK: Okay. Thank you for lifting us up and I want to come back around. I think member Lewis brought up a good point and collapse too many at once. Makes it too general and ends up being that somebody is (Indistinct) it could be one or try to do it all rather than several that can bring it forth. So, are you okay with us taking this back to the ad hoc committee and figuring out how to maybe see which ones make chance to group together?

>> I think it is good to take back to the ad hoc committee with an eye towards making sure the best of all thing is in the collapse and we don't accidentally prevent CBOs from being able to apply to them and I will say the ones I tagged as collapsing had the gam met of things. But I am happy to talk about it and have folks talk about the ad hoc.

>> DEREK: Member Lewis. I want to open up to the rest of the committee, right? As you got a chance to finally become a little more intimate with the concept recommendations and read through them. Are there ones that you want to have lifted up that may not necessarily be in the top 33 percent that are in our set of concept recommendations as they sit after our vote of the last of what the ad hoc committee has done last week. Anything else you want to lift up or anything you want to bring to the table?

>> We have comments in the back.

>> DEREK: Please.

>> Piggy backing on the comments as you take back to the ad hoc committee on the cooperatively owned businesses.

>> DEREK: Can you mention your name?

>> On the support of owned businesses one thing legal assistance. We need to call out legal assistance to support folks going through process.

>> DEREK: Is there an item here in the concepts that could speak to that or you are asking us to add that to ones we have.

>> Under 104 I believe you are taking back to the committee and reword and collapse prompts into each other and I would add legal assistance into the services provided there.

>> I might piggy back further and it might be costly to go through the process and consider that too. As a service. As part of that program model.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: I am going to do two things suggest we vote for (Indistinct) community-based organizations: page 47 item number four. That we do make some invest. Wes found on the American rescue plan act that providing support to CBOs so they can effectively compete and mitigate any of the risk associated with receiving these funds can be addressed and I think we want to ensure the efficacy of the dollars and make sure we uphold support for CBO so they can carry out the programs and services and I am going to point to another program that I think is really important and I won't go into detail but I just had my own personal experiences this week with a family member who is a victim of gun violence and I think it is important that we consider investing in programs because our young folk are walking down the streets and lift up item 12 on page 36 and walking down the streets and whether or not in a local park or in their own neighborhood we got to do more to support students and youth in communities who are under the threat of violence and safety also (Indistinct) and I ask us to lift up 12 as a potential concept. I will tell you that it is important for us to think about about that in this space.

>> DEREK: Thank you.

>> VERONICA: Any of the youth development stuff do any of them address this or you say this doesn't address any of those.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: Thank you for that. Right now, there is stuff going on in the neighbored and it is spring break and stuff is happening now. I would encourage us to have an explicit focus on making sure we make investments because of the likelihood of actual violence occurring.

>> It might require work in the ad hoc committee but 61 on page 29 in the youth development work we did and voted on and even in some of the job training stuff I propose for collapse after reviewing the ad hoc committee we don't talk about youth jobs explicitly and think we should make an investment in youth jobs. 61. Yeah that is the only one I saw that explicitly call out these jobs. I remember having a conversation yesterday about youth jobs specific. Specific system involved youth? The specificity in what we are doing and this one is more general?

>> I think so. This one and the reading through the other ones. Career readiness and exposure is wrap in the full model and might be captured there and maybe lost.

>> DEREK: For youth. Question. If we were to if we were to add the specificity of job placement. Job training and placement into the ones we have would that suffice or you think we need to lift up something all on its own.

>> I think because we didn't have to have the conversation around county or TPA and there are departments (Indistinct). And have a conversation at least.

>> DEREK: Okay. Understood. We are at 12.3 so far. Member Castillo?

>> MEGAN: Something I feel that is important is a gender justice lens and locking at items 65 on page 34 and wanting to uplift the TGI mentorship project I think it is important for us to consider our siblings in this narrative and I don't think we have any investments that are for the TG I community.

>> DEREK: What page you said it was on?

>> MEGAN: Page 34.

>> DEREK: To this point because I am counting in my head, we have mentor ship focused programs if we were to make sure that the specificity was added or even a percentage of the resources for the mentor ship dollars does go to the population of the young folk would that be a way to hit the mark on what you are saying? Or do you think it has to be a specific carve up on its own?

>> MEGAN: I think it would be to our benefit for a specific carve out.

>> DEREK: Okay.

>> Could you share more? Specifically, is it population?

>> MEGAN: I am talk about direct community investment. If we have an RFP that says also the trans and nonconforming siblings can apply, I think it would be more specific and clearer if we have a specific RFP that is for TGI folks.

>> That is a game changer.

>> DEREK: Thank you for that. Anyone else?

>> I want to highlight or bring up the project 49 page 27 it is call project fatherhood and I still have the to do some homework on this. If this is parts of children ins tout program, I will withdraw my recommendation because that is a big organization and they are well funded. I am surprised many of these we don't have much of a foster care focus initiative or anything to do with father, you know, I just, father centric organizations. You know? There is a lot of, I personally have experienced that a lot two occasions that the father says that the system is -- it is geared or set up against them. # I will do homework to sew what the organization is or it is just a concept?

>> DEREK: It is just a concept.

>> If it is a concept I would like to recommend. That is on page 27.

>> This is a point of clarification looking through all of the proposals if p a specific proposal isn't in current mix that doesn't prevent somebody from applying to the larger bucket if it is a related strategy, correct? We have buckets that can connect to. Got it. Thank you.

>> DEREK: Our goal is trying to combine the ones that are, it is like we don't want one that is just -- and the other one. These are arts in particular can we bring those together and that is what the ad hoc committee was trying to do with a lot of the combinations they are bringing forward and for that it made sense because to the point of the conversation happening right now there are specific carve outs that make sense for it to just be the TGI or just be for (Indistinct) you know? So, yes please.

>> I would like to add more work and consider item 136 on page 144 call it had immigration academy and it provides courses to folks while they are incarcerating and had as well as formerly incarcerated. The goal is when they are released, they will continue in the program and it is a pipeline to college or vocational training. I like it and I feel like it is very intentional and feel like it fills a gap. So far recommendation of 17 and a half million dollars of additional items. So, the ad hoc committee does have work to do on this one. Yes?

>> I would be remiss if I didn't say look at the ARDI tools concept as well. Not because -- you know, okay if you say so I will defer to you. Just saying consider it. That is all.

>> DEREK: The number please?

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

>> I want to uplift on page 48 since we are looking at it. 70. Which is feeding the children. A project providing food. Baby formula. Right? 48 and it is 500,000 it says there. Again, it is one of those in bucket of the food security. The other one is number 14 and receive 28 percent for farms which is a project geared towards young people career path develop ago farm to fork natural food company.

>> DEREK: What page was 14 on?

>> 37. If the small business one we have so far. Access to small business. So, we, okay that is something more specific okay. Bring it back to the committee and we will have a discussion about it. It is completely separate.

>> There is one other one related to sort of knew trich and food equity and it is 80 on page 22. I think maybe that one should be considered with the other two that member so to lift up for consideration by the ad hoc committee.

>> DEREK: 80 on page 22. Got you. What I want to do like I mention we are near now the last two added about \$20 million. Before we get to the ad hoc committee and see what consensus we have around some of these. We have a narrow set that we want the ad hoc committee to take an understanding of. Right? I want to come back through really quickly. It is \$23.5 million where we are at now. Thank you very much member Lewis and come back around to some of these to see if everybody is on the same page here. Again, I appreciate that you all have not it has been a personal process. Really try to go make sure we are lifting up things that make sense and getting us to the hundred million dollars. Piece of the puzzle and come back around and start with the ones we left off on. Item 70 and item 80 which are both the farms and knew trich and general health

aspects. My thinking every time you bring it up is seeing if it fits in something else, we have secured that had we have agreed upon so far some of these do not and do we have consensus on wanting to explore that further on either one of these. One is about the farming. T which is item 70 on page --

>> There is a hand up in the back.

>> DEREK: Okay cool. Which one?

>> Just a question I was in the ad hoc committee and saw a lot of work done. And I left it was at 88 and now we are at hundred and something and these percentages that are already on the excel sheet that was done by the community or, that was done by a committee and we did that work and put it had in the orange and what I am trying to understand what did we miss that we are going down in the low percentages and redoing the work not that I you am scare of work I am saying I am trying to understand how do we even get these percentages and now we are saying whoever did the percentages got it wrong and we are going to go back and do that again and then is that going to be revisited? When are we saying okay, we got this and we are moving on from that and not backtracking?

>> DEREK: It is a good question. After the full calculation based on the work we did yesterday. The number that came in today was based off of the work we did yesterday which was 96 million, again I said it a couple of times. No not roughly it was hard. \$96,267,834 that is where we left off yesterday and we came into today's conversation knowing that the representation that we have in this body and many of us are here for various reasons by selection of the offices for the representation of bodies of people from

various parts of the county that, so we want to bring that expertise to the table too. And we open up the floor for people to bring their perspective from why they are here to thing that is might be missing from what we already categorized as to lifting up.

The conversation we are having now member Crunk to your question is to determine out of the things that we missed that you deemed that ewe miss second-degree this some consensus around those ideas to be able to add them to the mix? We only have less than \$4 million left to move and the work that the ad hoc committee will have to do out of the meeting is determine how the to fill in the hundred million and if I am being honest where we are now unless the board of supervisors decides to change it is 88 million but we as a body are operating in guise of a hundred million. That is what we said to community and we are organizing towards. The question is consensus to get to a hundred million dollars. Make sense and answer the question? We have three and a half million to lift up the gap. Making sure we take care of the native community and looking out for the LGBTQI plus community and TGI community to lift audiotape and there is all of the thing that we have to make sure we are looking out for. Member Stevens? Huh? Yeah.

>> I have to support what he is saying because what I am hearing is that the community and we hired SLS to go out and survey and the community and the community wrote concepts and the community is deeply involve and had we asked that we to clearly understand what the community want and had when we went as an ad hoc committee this is what we did. We focused on what the community had uplifted. I think we also need to be clear about the dollar amount because we did not clue the native more than

concept that was before us in that was in the orange. You talked about the reasons as to why.

I hope all of us are thinking about the community and what the community said and even though we are here and we are here and representing your groups. It is really important that we remember to remember the communities' voices. And honor them.

>> DEREK: My thought is not to say we have consensus about the amounts but consensus that is lifted up that we have to think through. Right? And I am starting backwards and the reason why I am doing that is because the ones we started with were member Williams and from the native community and we want to make sure in my mind I want to end there. So that we are not moving away from those things and I want to make sure we are solid there as we try to narrow these things down. Yes please?

>> VERONICA: I was copy and pasting as you were talking and put whose name was by what and I didn't put 54 here because it is something we took out. 54 is one thing that is not here that was lifted up.

>> DEREK: Thank you. All right. Are we in (Indistinct). Do we want to make sure that is added? Anybody got any thoughts to not move that forward? Any thoughts. Yes please?

>> My thoughts are to look at these and see are there other funding sources? Are there other, you know, yeah what are some other funding opportunities? The other piece is gone back and look at SLS response back from the community. There is a lot in youth development and I think housing was second and how does it align with this here and kind of, I don't know I want to analyze a little bit where we are at where there might be

some gaps and see if anybody uplifted those in the projects, they are wanting to add to this.

>> DEREK: For sure. Okay.

>> Or we can say are this expansion or a new concept? Has there be a funding before in the last two years or not? That is another thing. Kind of check mark.

>> DEREK: For sure.

>> I want to thank committee for everything they did and especially now because we are giving them more work it is almost like a double edge sword because have you these priorities that were high on the list by the community and now, we have others and all of this stuff is important and all of it is. I think and your aum going to use one as an example and if I am wrong correct me. I think 137 is in your orange, you know, and it is \$12 million. And I am not sure maybe everybody was privy to this. There are programs going on skid row now. Not saying it doesn't need any money but it is things like that where you might be able to trim some money in order to put some money where we want to put it.

>> I agree too. Especially homelessness. We had a billion-dollar funding by federal government on that too and there is a lot of little concepts that is does it have the funding. The homeless had.

>> VERONICA: As a homeless service provider I will say there is not enough resource but from 137 to your point we funded a safe learning program last year that is not specifically focused on harm reduction per se but there is a harm reasonable care reduction lens and we have made investment and it is for people returning home or people

being released from jail have -- in particular to have somewhere to go and this is different and it is related if you want to reconsider it. But to the point you raised it had \$2 million number. The question you asked. There is a lot especially with the Cal fresh benefits and increase in benefits going away and last month there was a lot of need and a lot of suffering in our systems. They have not supported in way they should have and with all that considered I don't think it should be considered for year three funding and that is my opinion. Should not. Number 80. Which I don't see on the list I am looking at the wrong list. Yes, I don't think CFCI funds should be spent on that this year given the prioritization.

>> DEREK: Additional thoughts on that?

>> There is a hand up in the overflow room.

>> DEREK: I will come back I have one up front.

>> I agree with the assessment and the it is a critical need and I don't think it aligns closely with the intent.

>> DEREK: Got it and the overflow room.

>> Member Crunk again and I want to clarify two things and not sound redundant but number 12 what member SCORZA was talking about and inclusiveness of native American to me is very important. And I do not want it to seem like I am shooting in I particular idea down. But what I am seeing now is we may have got the sequence of the events a little out. I remember there was concern last week to allow uplifting before we went into ad hoc and I think we would be past this point now if that would have happened and all of that would be figure in and that is all I am trying to say to create to where all of the steps are going forward.

>> DEREK: Got it thank you. Yes please?

>> That was my point uplifting those below. One it wasn't a perfect science. We did hire SLS to do a superb job of getting community input and those of us who went to the community meetings realized there was too much for people to vote on the way we put the concepts on the walls it was not a perfect science and I think my thoughts and uplifting the food security ones has to do with all of the points that were brought up about how difficult the, our reality is for a lot of the most vulnerable communities and it is an important area to look at because I think people can't be trained and had they can't go to work and if they are food insecure and have to choose between feeding their children and doing better in their own lives and I think there is a little bit of expertise that we can bring in as the leadership of the table. Right? To discuss that isn't just solidly and I mean the majority of this what is the total 90 something is already identified as priority by those that vote and had it been what we are endorsing and the smaller amount we are looking at to ensure we are covering all of those that are needed such as the TGI and some of the -- and the indigenous partner that is we have discussed earlier and that is my point in bringing those pieces up. There is a bit of expertise that we need to bring into our discussion relate today the reality of what we are seeing in the communities.

>> DEREK: I hear you and I think to this end I put in the category of other things we need to lift up things that need sported and should have resource that county is look to go provide resources towards and the question is CFCI the right source for those resources. In idea of nutrition safety and maternity health is an ongoing thing. The

\$2 million that is offered here the resource that is need today do something that is more robust. Right?

I think of organizations like black women for health. And others who are advocating and doing the work. Again, are these the dollars that we want t to have towards that considering the gravity of all of the other action items we have on the table and you are on the side with member Lewis on this. This is important for all of the reasons we said it is important do we lift up in the conversation.

We will move onto the other one about the farming aspect and I am on the other side of that. I feel like the idea of what opportunities in the environment looks like and community members being a part of that. Farming when it comes to mind you think about the valley and all of that and there is also urban agriculture which is different than urban gardening. I am on the side of figuring out how we provide additional resource here. \$2.5 million maybe not but I still think this is something we should be thinking about and I think of hyper local economies we can create around food growth in our communities and scaling that up particularly with young folks being a part of the process. I am a little bias this is work we do as well but not say from that framework but saying about how important it is.

>> I agree with that appreciate your comment bls any other thoughts on this?
Thank you for the note and I know member Williams has to go and I want to come back to those before he goes just some confidence about what we are trying to do here.

>> VERONICA: You are saying you support it?

>> DEREK: I am saying I support the discussion around how to figure out how to add it. \$2.5 million maybe not but the idea of figuring out how to support it yes.

I want to come to 66, 31 and 128. They v these are all the ones that member Williams brought forward. Right? Should note that all of these are well supported.

I am for keeping these and figuring out how to make these work and have a conversation with the ad hoc committee about.

PLAINTIFF ATTORNEY: Integrating this into the space.

>> VERONICA: Can I ask a question? There is a prevention effort. Curious is there any conversation looking at numbers 31 the American Indian child care center. Do you know. Has there been any conversation around native communities as I relates to all of the conversations and I don't know if any of you from the county can weigh in relate today prevention and child welfare and etc. to be included in the strategic plan and the funding that is attached to it. That is what comes to mind when I see number 31 for the day care center.

>> JOSEPH: Are you are referring to the federal child welfare act?

>> VERONICA: No there is a prevention services task force and all of the conversations around not only for children but it is in many parts centered around children in terms of child welfare and etc. My question for the county department reps ss there a conversation around the native community in those conversations and I think that is a space to support some of this.

>> JOSEPH: I don't know if it is a direct conversation. I got to talk on the mental health. I don't know if it is directly tied together but aim willing to explore that and it is we

identified one of the biggest needs the need for a native American center in LA and there is no one. For everybody. Adults, elders and children and we anchor a lot of our stuff out of home boy industries and we have a good relationship. (Indistinct). Tribal council member. In meantime we are thinking of doing (Indistinct) what the real need is for a bigger space for native American community to be in LA and that could include the child care. Elders.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: I think with the prevention task force I chair the task force. We have not gotten into population level discussions yet. Look at a higher-level approach how the county delivers prevention services and I invite that conversation and we have reach out to the same folks have you mentioned member Williams about the need to deepen the work we are doing for native American and Alaskan community that is reside in Los Angeles County. One of the largest regions where a significant number of populations live.

We have done some of the work in the American rescue plan to make sure we are identifying collecting data so that we are meeting the needs of those populations beyond what the current data says and we know the census bureau didn't capture the needs of many of the populations and our team is working to help gather additional information and I will say it is a part of what is happening and our board of supervisors has more recently called upon the Cowe and ARDI to look at increasing access to members of our community who is need to tap into our resources. That don't meet certain threshold languages and there is work underway and so much more that needs to be done and I would invite in this space a strong focus on meeting the needs of the native American

and American Indian populations period across all of the spaces. When we are not talking about it it is a form of erasure and be clear that no matter what space we are in it is a priority.

>> DEREK: Looking at 128 to what you are saying about needing a center it. I feel like 128 is service oriented. 31 is creating a physical space particularly for youth.

>> There is one. 68 which was a family resource center. That provide more it was categorized as youth development and I don't request quite read as youth development.

>> DEREK: Page 27 is 68. And towards that is end maybe figure out how the address. Maybe you are going to Ned more than that?

>> JOSEPH: 25 is a good concept (Indistinct).

>> DEREK: In the idea 68 with the resources indicated in 31 make more sense or you want to stick toward it is day air care. Care center instead as a higher need --

>> JOSEPH: (Indistinct).

>> We can't hear him.

>> JOSEPH: Sorry. Combining 68 and 31 would be good and thank you for lifting that up it is an important conversation. Indigenous circle of wellness is a huge support if we think about nontraditional and nonwestern types of mental health services and it hasn't been tapped into it is definitely -- there is definitely people who know more than I do. I would love to make the connections. I added just to bring you back. Okay. Got that.

Are you ready to go? Any other thoughts on these items? Okay. Moving onto item I am going to go down the list. Item four. Lifted up the community-based organizations and king in continuation to the conversation we were having earlier with the

JCOD team and those who participated in that part of the discussion are their ways that we can continue to support the small based organizations and coming to a middle ground. Right? Because I feel that we are member Castillo's comment too. We should start where they are. Are there ways to continue to try to figure out how to meet in the middle and that could be a step that direction about too thousand dollars for helping community-based organizations do that work and questions I have what county department is doing this or who is doing this work?

>> We partner with center for strategic partnership. BDO. FMA. To support CBO through the equitable recovery initiate and I've they raised almost \$2 million from philanthropy through a partnership with the center for strategic partnership as well and there is an existing infrastructure that could tap into this and support that work and it would probably be with support with those types of entities. Or like them. Doesn't have to be them. Could be nonprofit finance or other who is are interesting in solicitation. Some is in plan now in the American rescue plan side and some is important to touch base and explore.

>> DEREK: Judge were you going to see a something in the back?

>> I was going to go tag onto what member Hong said earlier. There is funding through the PSRT that is coming in to provide the supports for small r organizations and to give wrap around services and there is an infrastructure there as well. There is also an incubation academy and several organizations within the county that can provide support.

>> DEREK: With that are you making a case for adding four to mix or not to add four because there is other opportunity?

>> I think based on the fact that you are going to have to cut we can figure out how the wrap around in some existing programs I believe.

>> DEREK: Okay. Any other thoughts towards that? If judge Armstead believes she can get departments to do it go for it.

>> It is also \$250,000.

>> VERONICA: I would love to have a conversation around how to make sure the folks the unfunded safety net who are doing the work can access the programs in in a meaningful way and maybe 50 to \$75,000 held for the insurance. Insurance is not the only thing and king the county gets stuck on this. All kinds of development that we know needs to be done and most of the programs will not pay for that stuff just one time support so people can come into compliance in addition to the training and technical assistance and organization and mentoring and I think we need a pot of money unless judge you are saying some of the money can do that to make sure the compliance piece could be supported.

>> When the money comes through, we asked for 7 million there to do the technical support if s r tr organizations and if it comes through, we have the funding for at least the next year or so.

>> DEREK: I think that is fantastic and I am thinking --

>> If it is through PSRT it is funding for the reentry population.

>> DEREK: To that end if we have in this pot, we can ask questions about the accountability of those things because we are supporting in that way based off of what you are saying. If we don't have resources we are asking questions shooting in the dark where there is some level of accountability if it is an item we are supported and to your point. If it is just a pot of money for insurance. We can ask additional question around how the body of work that was put around it is supporting the efforts that we have an as well. I am actually on board with that.

>> With that you can break funding and there will be other infrastructures in place and maybe the funding is earmarked for a particular population and if you braid the funding, you can leverage the other resources pour the money into the organization.

>> Can I ask for clarification on PSRT? Is it just for technical assistance or for the covering insurance or single audits or other things someone might have to put out for in order to apply for a contract and I think that is what member Lewis is talking about.

>> It was broad language and based around whatever the organization needs and provide supports for a minimum of a year. It was mentorship and support and needed to hire a staff member and data and it was broad language.

>> Thank you.

>> Can someone share with us what PSRT stands for?

>> Public safety realignment team it is not advisory body responsible for overseeing AB 109 funding.

>> Thank you. Ta.

PLAINTIFF ATTORNEY:

>> VERONICA: I heard what was said and I also think if it was best way to allow the organizations to access the stuff, they would have made it happen already. I know we are trying to cut but I would support this with expanded language around all of the things cost prohibited and not just insurance. It is the auditing. Obviously if you are over the threshold and some of the other unfunded calls the organizations have not had to have before and just or all capacity building trainings that are ongoing that non-profits can access to prepare themselves to apply maybe in a future round and I support as is in terms of the dollar m amount to allow for flex funds to pay for the urn covered costs.

>> DEREK: Moving onto j project uplift. Specific work toward gun violence and I will move a little faster and looking at the time and I want to make sure we get out on time. Specific language to gun violence we want to make sure we are addressing this is \$5.5 million towards that end and organizations doing this type of work I know we put a significant amount of money toward that is last year. Right? I hear what you are saying and I know what is happening now. But I also want to lift up that we have been thinking about this over time and the reason why we put a significant amount over the last years for the organizations do this work and we have to get themselves out of the door to get funded today do it.

>> There is a way to incorporate into the intervention and speak to community violence intervention element as well. T I might ask for more money on that line item then. It is a win win addressing the community violence piece.

>> VERONICA: We did put a significant amount of money there was a great amount of community support for this last year. I don't know if it was 10 million or 12

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

million at the same time if we are going to fund it is a specific skill set and I would be concerned of it being lost if you add to something else. If for me I don't know if we should keep or not. If we decide to keep it should be stand alone and it can get lost in the procurement process.

>> DEREK: Okay. We will keep it on the list. Go for it.

>> I 100 percent believe especially recent events in LA county we p kind of took a real hit in this area. And I think it should have been in the conversation earlier and didn't see it. I think it stands alone like member Lewis said -- (Indistinct) (get in the trenches and that is going ton to help there is a few organizations that I know of doing that. I do want to say it is categorized as health services and I don't know if that is the right category for it and I don't know what category we can call it. Yeah, I think it is stand alone.

>> DEREK: Got you. Give me one second before you go that way that is going to derail the whole conversation I promise.

I just want to ask necessary sense of time any strong objections to anything else on the list. Work force development piece number 61. TGI mentor ship project. Number 65. Project fatherhood number 49 and reintegration of the county 136 any strong objection to any of the things? Go for it please.

>> (Indistinct).

>> DEREK: The admin funds you mean?

>> We haven't been incorporating certain data tracking?

>> D'ARTAGNAN: I think we are leveraging as much as we could. And I think the CFCI committee receive investments from the American rescue plan act. There is a need

to do the type of work I think the committee is asking to be done to have dash boards and tracking systems to mapping systems it is a real cost. Right? So then only reason I put it in there as a committee we said we want to know what is the efficacy of the spending from years one, to 2 and to 3. And how are we going to track over time. We as a county need to build systems to make that happen and want to demonstrate the success of the work for the long-term argument for the benefit of the funds and approach to spending the goal would be to make the investment and I will say there is not at this time a dedicated source set aside to do that. Unless judge disagrees and I certainly invite a different perspective on that.

>> The county should be responsible for what you are presenting before us here today. We were all excited when ARDI was create and had all it does but let bs real. When do we hold the county of Los Angeles accountable to fund the work in which you are talking about and the I appreciate that this is truly about community. But at the end of the day, we need to hold the county responsible and the county should pay for that.

>> D'ARTAGNAN: I agree but we are asking for things that are specific.

>> DEREK: Are we saying the county should be paying and the macro for them to be tracking everything?

>> There is a million dollars to my understanding if I am not mistake and we were all talking about a hundred million dollars.

>> REBA: We were like whoops wait a minute. It is 99. What is that money doing? That million dollars that was removed from the community. I think it is transparent and being clear and why I am saying that the county needs to pay for it. We don't know what

the county is doing with money they have taken from the small pot of dollars and my question and I will ask now since I am having the conversation. Now it moved to 88. Are we looking at 87. What is going on here with dollars?

>> I will answer the question. It is one pack. If you get 88 it is 80 and -- 800. It is one percent. Of whatever it is. That money pay from the staff that is there full time and all of the AB people and all of the interpreters and it is paying for the consultants and it is paying for all of the people and the services to do the meetings and listening sessions and that is what the funding pays for and within that funding we can figure out how to capture the data and whatever form that you asked and we can work with the CIO office they do that and do it until there is no more money left. So, we can figure out as much possible and I don't know exactly what di in additional tools and you can meet with moils and find what you are looking for and we will try and get it for you and that is what the one percent pays for.

>> I have a question. Judge. The tools you are referring to is it different than this tool? It is different. Okay.

>> Songhai: I do agree that general hi it would be great if the county invested in p so many of the initiatives, they say are important. With reality is because I worked with, they literally are using fellows and stuff and while I don't think it should be a million dollars and I do think the JCO team is to be stretch asked and we need experts that we understand and a lot of stuff that we can do soft things (Indistinct) and I don't think we have the capacity to do and -- I think she should invest in a dedicated team and maybe

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

add some of the official fellows to it. We need something and dedicated team members to do more than we need to do. We are and the whole is to mentor.

>> I will say I support informing in data. It is going to help tell the story of the effectiveness of the committee.

>> DEREK: We can have some accountable too.

>> I want them to echo and think the sustainability of funding over time is in contention of us being able to tell the story and tell it Well and I think Dr. (Indistinct) and ARDI what they are trying to do across the county we can set up what folks' model. I think that is important. How we do this with CFCI can the door to you how it is tracked in other ways and get more specific data. There is a process to narrow down the questions that you are asking. Dedicated funding and a dedicated team to doing that would be helpful.

Since I don't have large objections to anything else that is here and we will bring it to the ad hoc committee to go back through this and comb through what have left and p bring back recommendations to the next meeting since we have empowered them to do so from the last meeting we will do so from this set. We also have -- we are fine. Any questions or objections on that? Any yeses? Move to public comment. General public comment. On item five.

>> As reminder the public comment period is one minute per person to raise your hand telephone users dial star nine and computer users and smart phone users scroll too more. General public comments are within the matters of the jurisdiction of the CFCI advisory committee and now we will begin general public comment and concept

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

recommendations suggested by the committee at large. Beginning in the room any comments? Moving to online hector?

>> Thank you for the earlier clarification. One of the things that I saw missing an advocacy or little ship development and so much more towards advocacy ask goes through sustainability and every year your funding is getting shorter and shorter. The county level and psyche level that are driving the conversations away from the priorities we intended to work here. The MSA has been revamp and had it should include everybody in the room to make sure you are not left out like you have been originally and there is a lot of things happening and you should have that include today I assist you. I agree this stuff. This is the only fully responsible stakeholder event in the entire state and I can say that because attend them and the staff is fantastic and I support this and their work and it pays off.

>> Thank you. Maya?

>> My name is Maya and a resident of district two and member of the reimagine LA coalition and I would like to offer my support for project 104 support for small and cooperatively owned businesses as well as m project 65 the TGI mentor ship project. I would like to uplift the point about holding the county accountable. They have created barriers to understanding the budget of a budget for community casing agency and it is something they have bringing to the board of supervisor for a long time now and I think you are on the right when thinking about holding the account, accountable and we appreciation that support coming from this body and a lot of people in government departments that their titles hold wait and with we could use helping accessing funding

CFCI ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
4/6/2023
CAPTIONED BY TOTAL RECALL, www.yourcaptioner.com

and transparency. Thank you. Brian? This is buying Ron are with the (Indistinct). Part of the coalition and thank you to the body for your work and ensures as part of the community violence we are deferring and their institute is taken into and distracted and I want to uplift the holding the county accountable and all of the basic services should get funded so you don't get it funding. Thank you to all of the members on the board to hold the (Indistinct) and transgender and intersex communities and appreciate your work and efforts op this process.

>> Thank you.

>> I am amazing how I don't know the call of -- I asked to uplift number 77.