

**This document was generated by AI and is not an official meeting record. It may contain errors.**

## Transcript

February 5, 2025, 5:30PM

P

**Public Safety Cluster Host** 0:05

OK.

Good morning, everyone.

Welcome to the February Flint Public safety cluster Vendor review meeting.

First, start with a round of introduction questions from the board offices 1st District.

Good morning everybody. And Laurel Martinez from office. One of my colleagues.

Thank you very much.

2nd district.

Good morning, everyone.

Senior deputy for Supervisor Mitchell and Natalie Romo, and then on line I see Chris Asan from our team.

He's a senior deputy arts and culture and development and.

A melody of Philly who's our assistant? Justice Jeff. Thank you very much.

Alright, and 3rd district. Morning everyone.

Stephen Edwards, senior justice deputy for supervisor of Horvath with me, is my colleague.

Sorry, Sophia sudani, John Emergency Management deputy and I think Nick Wyville will be joining us as well.

Sounds good.

And the 4th is. I'm sorry. Good morning. Kyla and Ally are here for the 4th district.

Thank you very much.

And 5th district.

Good morning, Sandra.

This is Debbie for supervisor barger's office.

Yes, we will have Leslie come in and join us shortly and then we have also Ariana.

Alright, thank you very much for the meeting to order.

There are no information item items this week, so we'll go ahead straight ahead to the motions that were submitted by the board offices. This is our first one this time

and it is submitted by our electric supply on the 4th district.

All right.

Well, thank you everyone.

So this motion is called understanding the fiscal impact of Prop 36 on county programs.

The motion is about understanding the physical impact that prop. 36 will have specifically on programs that have been funded by the California State Neighborhoods and Schools Fund. So as you all know, California voters passed Prop 47 in 2014.

That reclassified a lot of felonies to misdemeanors. Part of that proposition then required that the state cost savings gained from a reduced prison population. Be invested into what was called the California State Neighborhoods and School Fund.

That then was allocating grants across the state for different programs.

Diversion programs.

Victim services programs recidivism programs. But last November, voters in California passed prop. 36 that partially reversed prop.

47 by reverting some of those reclassified misdemeanors back to felonies, so it's anticipated to increase the state prison population again.

So the savings that were previously garnered from a decrease population will probably decrease.

Meaning that there will be less money in the California State.

So this motion is asking CEO and Jay cod together to reach out to all of our departments, our county departments, who have been receiving grant funding from this safe neighborhood and schools fund and the report back to the board with the landscape analysis.

So we're specifically asking how many programs have been receiving the grant funds, how much money they received, what population they serve, and the anticipated state funding.

Reductions from prop.

36 it's worth noting that there is no action item in this motion yet.

It is simply helping us as the board understand what county programs we have that may be impacted by a reduced state fund because of Prop.

36 and then, if there's any action we want to take to move on in the future, we, as the board can decide that. And I do just want to note that CEO requested that instead of

specifying.

CEO layer.

They just asked me to say CEO and J console. I will be making that change.

When I submit this to the board next week, any questions?

Just a brief question for Kylo discussion or comments.

All right, so I think this is great and thank you for being the first stop to come to public safety cluster.

My question is and I don't know if this is like thoughts for if this will be a part of the analysis or if it's something you all were thinking through or have conversation with.

I mean, we're drafting them, but.

It seems to me like this is more focused on the funding specific for programming, like direct service delivery, but I I guess in my mind there's also a lot of financial aspects of Prop 36 that may not be direct service.

I know it's not.

I guess I'm what I'm thinking about is like personnel, right?

Like the outcomes of property tax.

Will require a lot more like.

Public defenders and all of these other pieces.

Is that something you all were thinking about for that?

I know it's not paid for specifically through these pieces, but it is like a a a landscape portion like a bigger piece of the financial landscape.

Yeah. I mean, I think there's definitely a bigger impact to Prop 36 than just this fund, right? If we see increased jail population that's going to need more resources from us, that's going to need more public defenders.

This motion is specifically about the.

California State neighborhood grant fund.

And that fund being decreased, what programs do we have across the county that are going to be impacted by that? Because to be honest, like I don't even know, right? This has been happening for 10 years. I don't know what programs we have that have been getting funding.

From this source, that may now be reduced.

So it's it's just specifically about that is not about the greater impact of property.

'Cause I know this is like the first time iteration of it.

So the boys you anticipated?

Including some of that or no. Like I was not gonna include it in this motion.  
I think that that could potentially be a different motion. I think that's a much larger analysis because that's gonna be more like predictions, right?

Like how much is our population going to increase?

How many more felonies?

How many more public defenders?

So it's more complicated than just. These are the 10 programs that have received funding from this grant. This source now is at risk.

Yes.

Exactly so.

Not that I'm at all against that landscaping analysis, but I think it's different than this.

Yeah. So I mean you could do a motion on it.

I could do a motion on it, but I was not planning to include that in this.

Got it. OK.

That's my question. Thank you.

Any other questions?

Just at least four or four fishermen.

Nothing. Nothing.

No, thank you very much for.

Thank you very much for making the first motion. OK, appreciate it.

Are there any public comments online or in person?

Please speak up or raise your hand.

Facing them, we move.

We move to the presentation items. First one is a board item from CEO amendments to joint occupancy agreement for the Edmond B Edmonds Element.

Ary Juvenile Courthouse and Melbourne Courthouse and transfer agreement for the junior Juvenile Court House.

Michael Rodriguez is not here today, but we do have Michael Shay.

Come up and sure. Thank you.

It's my first time in person. Clusters of all the kind of things.

Good afternoon, everyone.

My name is Michael Che, principal real property agent with CEOs, Chip, executive Office, Realty division.

For your consideration, are three proposed amendments to the joint agreement for chilla between the county and Judicial Council of California of JCC for Edelman

Children's Court.

House Los Katrina. Juvenile courthouse.

The Malibu courthouse, along with one proposed amendments for transfer agreement for those between those courthouse, the trial Courts Facilities Act of 2002, established the other authority for the transfer responsibilities of court facilities from the counties to the state for the Superior Court and states interests are.

Represented by jccc. In doing so, management responsibilities for determined primarily based on which entity.

On title and equity, shares were negotiated for each courthouse based on occupancy cost.

The proposed Edelman Courthouse amendment will memorialize the swapping of space between the county and court.

There was a discrepancy in occupancy in which the court was occupying 4948 square feet of county space and the county.

Was occupying 600 square feet of court exclusive space.

The court has agreed to make the county whole by transferring to the county 4288 square feet, of course, exclusive space on the 6th floor at Edelman Court House to make up the difference.

The proposed joint amendment will achieve space realignment and memorialize space swap with by.

The proposed loss between no juvenile Court House and amendments to show up and the transfer agreement will correct the amounts and shares of the Court and county exclusive use area.

It was discovered both the county and court occupancies were understated in the original agreements.

Jcca equity shares will decrease from 29.32% to 27.64% and county equity shares will increase from 70.68% to 72.36%.

The proposed Nalo Courthouse amendment will establish new HVAC shares to reflect the actual county and port occupancy.

At the courthouse building, previously, the courthouse shared an HVAC system with the library and the public works.

However, the library and public works are now on a separate HVAC systems, which means we need to create a separate HVAC shares for the courthouse building when this building is put back into service.

The Corbin County occupancy of the courthouse building is 17,161 square feet and

1732 square feet respectively.

Correspondingly, the proposed HVAC shares for GCC in county will be 90.59% and 9.41%, respectively. The proposed Jo Amendment will document that all future HVAC improvement and maintenance costs for the courthouse building will be shared by the county and.

Based on the proposed HVAC shares.

OK.

So we're good.

Alright, thank you.

Are you done?

Yes, OK.

I'm sorry about that.

Alright, so we move to. Were there any public comments for Item 4A?

Do we speak up a raise your hand on team? Are you seeing that move to item 4B?

For me is a the monthly briefing from DOC and the Office of Inspector General today.

Obviously when you talk to with us, however, I believe Sarah said.

Yeah. Thank you.

And Eric?

Good morning. Good morning, good morning, good morning.

Do I start Easter OK.

Good morning, everyone.

My name is Doctor Sarah Gongora.

I am a project director for the Probation Oversight Commission.

Happy to be here today while Wendy is out, Jordan, her family has the so.

Wishing a birthday in person all the luck. OK.

So for probation Oversight Commission update.

I wanna start by recapping that we had a town hall meeting on January 22nd.

It was focused on the juvenile motion transfer process, so in plain language, how you can be transferred from the juvenile to adult system?

Just wanna share it with a very rich panel.

He has represented some of the district's attorneys office.

We have representation from the public defender.

There was a lot of discussion about laws that have changed and really walking the public through the process.

It's a really great lesson if you haven't had a chance to let it run in the background

for today as you work.

For upcoming meetings, we have our regularly scheduled actually not regularly scheduled.

Usually we have our meeting on the second Thursday.

We move that up because of the conflict with the SCC.

So we're having our monthly meeting tomorrow, February 6th. We have sent out the agenda posted that some of the items we'll be talking about tomorrow will be.

We'll be getting updates from the probation department on their progress with reaching compliance with the SEC Title 15 and 24 not to bury the lead, but we have received update that Barry Jane Idor is now in compliance.

With both Title 15 and Title 24.

Will be receiving a report on the.

Causes of industrial accident.

And workers compensation claims by staff and regional facilities, we will be hearing reports on probation's progress for board motion, including the financial literacy motion, movement of post disposition use out of juvenile hall and empowering staff and providers to carry Narcan.

Just to share, I've been doing a lot of that work.

We have seen a pretty good compliance, most of the facilities.

Los Padrinos maybe as the lagger at about.

50% of staff carrying Narcan but the other facilities are doing pretty well.

We still have a ways to go with getting the providers Narcan or to be empowered to do so, but lots of conversations are happening around that at the facility level.

We we may still be talking about outstanding data requests and data challenges, but we did post this before receiving some of the requested data from the probation department, including we have received.

Use of force data and a requested population map shop.

We're pretty pleased that we received most of what was asked for in that user force snapshot and we did receive clear explanation for any piece of data not received.

So that's looking good. And then as we do in January, we will be holding our position overseeing officer election.

So please tune in for that.

That'll be tomorrow at 9:00 AM.

Oh, and it'll be at 10:00 AM.

And then separately, since we are beginning of 2025, we are preparing to launch the

2025 annual inspection cycle.

This year we will be adding some additional inspections in.

We're currently in the process of getting in touch with the Office of Youth Community Restoration.

To talk about how we start the process of inspecting law enforcement sites where youth are held and secured detention. In addition to doing those regular.

Annual inspection of probation.

So we will be sharing dates with probation and more information about how that's going with you all as it comes up.

Good morning. Eric Bates, assistant Inspector General. My update is basically.

We're finalizing our quarterly report to the Dj monitor, but aside from that, I think the most interesting thing that's happened since I was here last was I had a meeting with the chief last week and went over a different number of areas and some of those I'll share.

With you first is the first unit, the the Probation first unit which you.

Know as the independent unit that reviews uses of force to make sure there's no systemic issues or patterns, and there was a concern because we were told that it had been disbanded and that's part of the settlement agreement. The DOJ settlement agreement.

So we were concerned that a unit that specifically was part of this settlement agreement was no longer in effect. And so I spoke with the chief about that and apparently it's just been.

Re formatted.

That.

It is still there to look at systemic or patterns of issues and that it's being used in conjunction with their Systems Accountability unit.

So we will continue to monitor that more closely to see exactly how that's done.

What's the process?

Make sure that is consistent with what I believe the attorneys were looking for as far as when the.

Requirement was put into the settlement agreement because again it should not be part of the normal review of uses of force.

It's completely independent and so we want to ensure that that function, that aspect.

Is retained. We also discussed the incident notifications that were sent out to the stakeholders.



As you probably know, the notifications that we've been getting, I can say that I've been getting are pretty generic and vanilla in that I'll get a an incident notification saying there's been a serious incident where youth has been sent to the hospital. But will not have any idea what the underlying circumstances are. Is it appendicitis? Or was there a stabbing?

So he understood that issue. He went over why they changed and it's because of internal information conflict.

But I stressed him the importance of letting the stakeholders know the basis of these notifications, because that's the whole point of being notified and that's why the board went through the motion and passed that certain stakeholder should be notified.

So he assured me that that is going to be looked into and resolved and I will stay on top of that and and report back to you more information as I get it.

We discussed the more recent dlj.

Settlement agreement amendments, which covers our office to review closed caption TV the internal affairs cases that are being referred and open at the probation department, as well as searches. And so we are doing that.

We will have that report where we'll be doing that monthly and so we expect to provide that report to the DOJ monitor.

Next week, possibly the week after.

But more than likely, it'll be next week.

And then lastly, we discussed what everyone heard.

I'm sure that there was a rumor of ice rating the facilities last week and.

Caused some understandable unease with parents and people who care about the youth in the facilities and.

Fortunately, it was just a rumor.

There, there was no basis to it, but it raised the fact, well what?

Would be the approach if it actually does happen.

And so we discussed that and he he told me that he is in the midst of developing that response and it will be consistent with other county agencies.

So they're working on what will happen if ICE does show up at the facilities.

We hope that will not be the case, but.

Who knows in this environment?

So I was glad to hear that.

They're working on a a formal response. If that happens, and once I get that

response, I will update you as well.

And I'm hoping for any questions.

Thank you. Questions.

Kind of going to the notifications in terms of looking for emergencies, like for example when we.

Had a lot of families asking when the hardware happened, wanting information and it was kind of a little bit.

So I was wondering if working on notification system that's good to us but also family or people who are there about the need for in the home.

So just wanted to make sure that.

Not just incident notification.

The notifications that are provided to us, as well as to you all, I believe.

Are separate than the fire type of situation.

I know there are notifications that are provided to the family, even even medical incidents.

I take that back. Even some of the incidents that we do get I see on there that notification was made to the family. So I believe there is a policy in place to notify the families, but I'll let you set up that more specifically.

We do have a process for notification with the fires as we know that was very quick onset. We did begin notifying all of our stakeholders and partners that we could notify via e-mail and then our new communications director Stacy Waters began a chain of frequent notifications at no.

And later in the afternoon. So we're taking a look at that for any other emergency operations for what we may need to change or improve.

Yeah, there was a way for family members or guardians to be able to sign up to also.

My office got a lot of calls because people were worried and it was kind of hard to know where to directly.

Tell them.

And would be happy to report that once everything is reviewed in the assessment and then what's gonna happen going forward based on what we may need to change from that assessment, you're welcome.

Yeah. Thanks.

I have a question about the 50% of staff that was renovated. Why is it so?

Maybe that's cheap as possible.

Maybe it is, but I have to say I'm not sure because some it's volunteer.

It's not mandatory that you're carrying on, but why is that?

Because there's been two motions about staff carrying.

I.

I don't know.

I would have to look into it further.

I wasn't prepared to talk about it today, but I can look into it and certainly come back and report back on it and tomorrow in the POC meeting, you guys are gonna be talking about that, right?

Because there was a motion directed to you guys to oversee that.

Yes. So I will give a little bit more about that.

I mean, I can talk about it definitely here if you'd like, so.

Some of what has come up when I think it's because I'm the person that has been going to the facilities to do many of the checks, sometimes with the Commissioners, sometimes not or another POC colleague.

So it seems like at the facilities they are not aware of the motion and so I have been making it my practice to either forward a link to the motion before the visit or carry the motion with me and just explain what the expectation is and I've taken.

It also a step further by utilizing.

Our last year's annual inspection.

Camp rocky.

The executive or the director there, she made it part of the uniform chat and made it mandatory that way and let staff know, like if you're appropriately dressed, that means our candidates on your belt, right?

And so during these visits, I have been specifically sharing.

These are ways to ensure that people are then turning the Narcan. I have not heard from.

Any probation officers that they thought that it was voluntary.

But what I have heard from some people, especially Les Adreno, those that were not caring was they were deployed and had not been provided at the facility, but they had not received at the facility.

They did not think that they were supposed to bring in their field, issue norcan into the facility, but many of those individuals gave us like, yes, I want it. Give me two.

And so there's definitely a willingness and openness.

From what I've been seeing from people I've spoken to, because kind of my process is to say, are you carrying Narcan on your person and if they're not then I take it a

step further.

Like, have you been trained? And do you have one?

Have you been issued and sometimes people say they have in their backpack or, you know, in their on their belt. But their belts in their car, they're all just.

So typically people are trained, but they're not carrying it or they're like in that deployed situation.

With this thing, they're not clear on bringing it in.

And they haven't been issued one at this.

OK.

Thank you.

Yeah, I'm looking forward to that tomorrow then.

Can you talk about what you're going to be looking for in those inspections?

In our annual inspection.

Just a brief overview, maybe of what those look like and maybe also how they're different from state inspections?

Oh, sure.

So we do these annual inspections every year. We do have a template that really spell out the facility and to probation. What we're looking for beforehand when the POC.

Initiated this process.

They worked with the Bsec to ensure that we are not overlapping and the advice that was given from the SEC is that the POC should consider the environment holistically and from the viewpoint of would this be acceptable if this was your child, your your niece, your nephew, a.

Person you care about, and not only about.

**MC** **Marin, Craig** 29:18

Hello.

**P** **Public Safety Cluster Host** 29:20

These things in the environment, you know, not just about whether the pipes were.

Or the door's locked. But how does it feel to be there?

How do people talk to you and what are the? Is it trauma responses, right?

And so we ask questions about.

How do you feel being there?

What their interactions with Walker life, we ask.

We ask probation officers how they feel like working in that facility and we, you know, we talk to everybody there in facilities.

So we talk to Co located partners as well.

Programming providers like what is it like to be here? Like to provide program? Are you welcome in this environment?

Are you supported in being here?

Kind of like of everybody.

To see like what is the culture and the facility that you have a lot of facilities do function and independently. They kind of have some rebrand to create the environment as they see fit and.

On some on some levels.

So we take all of that. We have some main categories that we're looking for. What does the physical environment look like?

What happens at school?

What happens during meal time?

What happens during programming times?

What's available to young people and then our Commissioners come out, we like spend one full day at a facility.

We gather everything we can into this snapshot and then report it back, and typically the person that is.

Compiling that report and the way that I compile it is or try to write it as though.

Anybody that picks up that report can then have an understanding of what it looks like a day in the life. I want a parent whose child is in that facility or young person who's in that facility to understand.

What it looks like because it is a very limited set of people that have the privilege to enter these facilities and gain that understanding.

So I try to make that really accessible to the public.

My question is going back to my college question about notification.

Do you have talked about?

You all going through an assessment now that that's happened, looking at whether there have been gaps, if there were any, is there any?

Will there be any inclusion of like the public or even the families like a survey or something from them to understand what didn't work on their end and what could have been done better?

Nothing has been discussed, but that's certainly something we can do like most agencies when there's natural disaster or any type of emergency situation, the after action spells that out.

But that's certainly something we can include, OK.

Thank you.

I do have a strong question.

Interpreter report that you said that you were in for parents.

Are those available in multiple languages for parents who are not speak English?

No, I have never written the report.

In Spanish.

But I or other if it would be easily translated, no, we have not translated it.

We have not because we do have no accounting program.

So maybe that's something we should think and talk about further. I think in the past we have done some town halls and we do.

I do present on update and SSR executive director at times during our public meetings.

And if anybody's there that's requesting translation, we absolutely provide that.

We've had some of our staff members.

We have a lot of Spanish speakers on our staff and we've had people come to our meetings who are monolingual Spanish speakers or prefer Spanish and we will, like, have a staff member sit with them and translate the meeting if necessary and but that is a great suggest.

That we'll take that.

Can I come back to point out?

Having having that.

I appreciate that feedback.

And actually can I add so Eric for the notifications to us, I also felt quite frustrated.

It'll be incredibly vague where it's like you may as well send me.

No notification, but a lot of this notification, right?

So I appreciate that you brought that up and are hopefully following up on that.

I just want to add something that I would try and helpful too is when we get a medical notification. Sometimes it's like someone's transferred to the hospital because they think it right and we don't ever get a follow up.

Was it?

A medical issue.

Was it drug related issue? And especially as we look at drug use in the facilities, if it's something that could have been overdosed, I would like to know it was a drug related poisoning or no it was because he had eaten since.

I would love a follow up for something that medical at the time it was unclear what it was. They were transported.

Now we know what it was that would be normal.

We have so many questions, but I'm not gonna leave it there. Thank you all.

Right. Thank you.

Are there any public comments for the assignment?

If so, please raise your hand on the team to speak up please.

Are you seeing that move to the next item? Is our public safety Realignment Report 8109, the semi annual report that we have applied and wants a lot of assistance?

I.

Good morning.

Good morning, Mike. Good morning.

I'm Kimberly.

Chief deputy in probation and oversea operations.

I'm going to provide today's update.

I'm also joined by Mark Delgado, executive director of CCJ JCC, and he will add to the update as necessary.

As you know, Psrt provides a semiannual update to the Board of Supervisors on AV109 matters. The next report will be included on the February 18th Board agenda. Reminder PSSPSRT was established by the board to coordinate 8109 implementation in the county.

Psrt is rooted in statute, which addresses composition and role of in the statute.

What is identified as the Community Corrections Partnership and LA County's equivalent of what is known as accp is the psrt per the statute, the Chief probation officer chairs this body.

As his designee, I service chair.

In addition to the members identified in the statute board offices also appoint members to the PSRT. The Psrt last reported to the board in August, so this report summarizes a key a couple of key activities of the past few months.

This includes submission of the annual report to the Board of State and Community Corrections in December 2004.

Going forward in my presentation will refer to that as the Bsc development and

submission of the 2025.

CCP plan updated for board approval.

I do want to emphasize that last point. The report includes the 2025 CCP plan and will be agendaized for approval by the board.

Annual report to the BSCC the first item covered in the report is the annual report to the BSCC.

This is provided as attachment a. As you may recall, the board the BSCC conducts an annual survey.

Of County CCP for us, psrt surveys are released in November and responses are due mid-december.

This survey response covers fiscal year 2324.

As in previous years, PSRT prepares the content of the survey, which includes an overview of the realignment related goals in the county and progress towards meeting those goals.

Budget information for the 2324 fiscal year.

It also includes the 2024 CCP Plan, a copy of that plan was not included in the report to the board, as the board already received and approved that report in the plan in February 2023, components of the plan are the CCP for.

Us the Psrt plan framework approved by the board in June 2021.

Fiscal year 2020 two 23 AB 109 budget.

Approved by the board, September 2021 fiscal year 2022 twenty three goals, objectives and outcome measures and a list of the PSRT membership and designated alternate the 2025 CP Plan Update. The final item covered in this report is the two. 1023 CP plan update.

I'm going to ask Mark to cover that portion.

All right.

Thank you. Thank you, Kimberly.

So this might.

This is probably going to sound a little bit repetitive because really what this report is doing is just the first part.

It's providing a recap of last year.

And how that would?

And the plan, the plan that was.

Carried out in in 2324 and then the second part of the report to the board is the updated plan that's now going to be proposed for this this current year and they're



very similar both in terms of the components and the content that's being PROV. Here.

Plan from the board that is prepared for submission.

So with that, the 2025 plan that we're referencing is included in the report here.

It's attachment B and again the format. The structure is consistent with what Kimberly outlined before.

The components in that plan have all been approved and this is sort of the full assembly of it.

Most of the components have been approved by the board, so that includes the overall realignment framework that was approved in 2021.

It includes the budget that was approved on supplemental budget in October of this past year.

And then it also includes the goals and outcome measures and the objectives that the PSRT approved in October.

So that's the only part that has not yet come back to the board. That's part of this, this overall plan.

But that's all been fully assembled.

The PSRT approved packaging of it in December for submission to the board.

And that's the second part of this of February 18th report that's being transmitted to the board.

I know that's a lot, but I'll pause there and we're glad to take any questions on anything that we've covered here or anything you've seen in the report.

Thank you. Question.

Hi and thank you for for going over that and preparing.

So I was looking at.

Page.

90 on the.

PDF version of my screen. It doesn't have a page on here, but it starts with a diversion slash alternative to incarceration.

It's a chart with the intercepts at the top.

Not sure if that's at the same page on paper, but.

My question is really around so as I was reading from bear down some of the programmatic and strategic recommendations are missing from there and I wanted to understand why or that was like intentional. For example, on principle, three on alternatives, incarceration, it says like safe transportation, housing, safe.

Childcare.

And then in the programmatic and strategic recommendation, there isn't anything there.

So wondering if that was intentional, if that was maybe a typo or if you could share a little bit about that. And then my second question, which is similar to all of that.

As I was reading through the news, kind of like three different charts related to this. There's that alternative to incarceration and then custody and reentry, and then the. Post release community supervision and I was I was looking through those in the post release community to provision the programmatic strategic recommendations are very detailed about how.

To go about some of those principles. But then when you look at the other two charts and of course this is my opinion, some of them like the custody and rancher are missing some and they're not super detailed.

It's it's like more general.

So I if you could share a little bit about.

Why that is the case? And if that is the case, if I'm perceiving that wrong, and if there's any intention on.

Digging deeper into some of those pieces or sharing a little bit more about those.

Yeah, thank you for that.

I'll, I'll. I'll start and then Kimberly, please jump in here.

I I I don't think there's anything intentional about trying to be vague on on the principles, or rather the recommendations.

This was developed by the committee a few years back in terms of identifying the priorities.

Across the board, ugly alignment. So primarily addressing the PRC as opposed to these community supervision component, the custody and then with the county's priority on.

Alternatives to incarceration and support services for individuals, the different principles and recommendations that they wanted to put forth.

So I don't think there was anything intentional about being more specific in one or the other.

I think at time probably there were certain aspects that were.

Maybe in the works?

And then there were other things that were in development and maybe that just was sort of how they developed in different ways in terms of language here.

But I think it's a good point that we can revisit with the committee to try to look at sort of a just an, an ongoing review of what the recommendations are that the committee wants to put forward in terms of tearing up these principles that were identified as.

As their priorities.

Absolutely. And like I'll just use this one as an example.

So on alternative like #2 you've development resources is the principle and then you look at the programmatic strategic recommendation and it says you've just reimagined, but we we all know that's like a broad big document.

Well, not broad, very detailed document.

So is it like the whole document?

Is it like certain pieces that they're looking at? Or maybe, hey, we're going to start this piece of it and then or the goal is to use that this piece specifically to look into? And then later on look into this piece.

So just you know, thinking through some of that like giving us a little bit more, especially if it's a strategic recommendation, some guidance on like where they're looking at that. I think that would be extremely helpful not only for at least for me, I also for everybody here.

But for me, but also the public and understanding kind of where the committee's direction is. So thank you.

No, I think that makes sense.

I will say this the the areas in the report.

Referencing here are probably a higher level sort of more global view of different priorities that the committee had put forward initially and then later on components. So the three sets of goals and objectives that were developed for the year are really sort of more the specific targets that the committee has identified for its focus areas for the coming year, because I think the the parts are talking about are probably more county wide kind.

Of.

Priorities in a lot of ways, and then.

I should reference what I'm talking about here.

But the last component of the CCP plan, which talks about the fiscal year 20, 2020, 2425 goals and objectives.

So there's a set of three.

Are are really sort of the areas that for the work that psrt is engaged in that they

have identified for as as priorities and focus areas for the year?

And then my other question, sorry.

My other question is just for my understanding or and I'm looking at the recommendations are like 35 tabs over here.

Looking at the funding allocation and recommendations for are are in the document.

For the public safety realignment and like where they went, I guess my I'd like to understand how did the actual allocation compare to what the committee recommending.

Recommended. So is it comparable or like did the committee recommend because I'm looking at a lot of numbers here with regards to like the sheriff's like there's like 319,000.

Per million million, my bad.

There's 2 million.

I have big glasses but can't see but 319 million and wanna know like is that comparable to what the committee or the team recommended or is it different?

Like how much is how.

What is?

How much does it vary from what they're recommending versus what?

Actually, how much or what?

Where funds are actually allocated, right? OK, so I think I mean and I don't know if there's anybody from seal who can help address this, but I would say.

That.

Psrt is not developing funding recommendation for the full \$803 million.

So the 319 that you're referencing for Sheriff's Department and then?

Probably for most of these departments.

Money that's already been allocated there has been done prior and it and it continues as ongoing funding.

So the PSRT funding recommendations, which you all know they make funding recommendations each year, are really more geared towards any additional funding that's become available to the county.

And I do have a document.

Maybe in this folder somewhere, but I do have a document that CEO prepared to show.

So for example, for last year's funding recommendations from Psrt, what was funded and what did not get funded?

But there wouldn't be a corresponding sort of analysis of psrt's recommendations versus this full budget, because psrt is not making a recommendation on the full budget.

OK. And maybe I can clarify that a bit because I was involved in the reimagining of the PSR team many years ago.

There's the two buckets of 8109 and what are they called? Ones like the base funding and one's the the growth, the growth funding or something. And so the base is the statutory realignment funds.

That was from, you know, prisons for sending people to county jails. Until that money goes to sheriff's Pharmac for the additional 8109 and three individuals who are incarcerated.

So that's the base funding.

So the Psrt is responsible for making recommendations for the growth funding, which is the additional. So that's what I think Mark was saying like this 319,000,000 like psrt isn't making recommendations for that because that's the base and we do have an analysis that maybe.

We could share with everyone because it's done awhile ago about before we reimagine the psrt many years ago.

What percent of the growth funding was also going to the Sheriff's Department and the probation department, and it was like.

70% and since the reimagining.

Now it's been reduced to like 10% of the growth.

I don't have to look at it because the PSA team now is making the recommendations to the board or to the CEO. That then gets made to the board. And if I remember correctly, last year the Psrt recommendation were way more than the growth funding was, so C.

Wasn't able either.

They wanted you to meet all of them, right?

So I think if we were looking at a comparison, it was like PSR team made recommendations for \$100 million, but there's only 20 million available, right?

So you will see that discrepancy, but I think the question is like of the recommendations, what did CEO and the county actually end up funding?

That was my question.

I appreciate that, Kyle, for the sake of the public.

I understood that.

I just wanted to understand as we're looking at this broader picture and really more importantly, people.

Or maybe listening appreciate the breakdown, but.

Like where that compares, right?

If the psrt is making recommendations.

And maybe it's not this sheet. And I remember us sitting here and going through the list and talking through which ones are prioritized versus you know, what was presented by the psrc.

So just wanted to understand how that compares and if it's not comparable to this list which I heard you say.

I think understanding.

Matt and it's being clear with everyone like that's what like, that's what they're recommending does not compare directly to this, right?

Yeah, the funding part that they're provided and then from there, what was actually.

What they recommended versus what was actually accepted from the recommendation and and we do have it again, I'll, I'll, I'll send them out.

I'll send this out to you all because we do have documents that CEO has generated in the past that sort of does a comparison of what Psrt did recommend.

And what was funded understanding, as Kyla mentioned, that even the committee knows, for example, last year there was no ongoing funding available in growth, but there were some recommendations made still to signal support for certain programs and approaches so that when funding becomes available, there's already an Indic.

Of what?

The committee and departments are sponsoring these recommendations. Would wanna move forward with.

And that's helpful also even in that process.

Just when there is not funding available because departments then sort of have an idea and the committee knows.

When funding does become available, we're starting in this process. Right now, we could look at previous recommendations that were not funded and say here's something that's already been developed by a department supportive I psrt.

It wasn't funded, but now that there's funding available, can we sort of fast track this to get some funding provided and and we're actually in that process right now with some?

Funding that was unallocated after submitting our budget last year and looking at

some of the things that had not been funded even though they were recommended and whether we could move those into that bucket of now getting funded.

So I'll get those documents out to you to give.

Just sort of a landscape of results on recommendations.

Thank you.

So in the spirit of being clear about what we have before us and what we, the board will be voting on in a couple weeks, we're not. The funding has already been voted on by the board last fall.

So what my understanding based on the presentation is we're voting on or the board will be voting on the goals, right?

The goals that the PSRT has set for the year, are there any other action that the board is going to take on the 18th?

No, no, it's and. And this is a report and there's no, I think you know.

Kim and I have connect.

There's there's not, as in previous reports, there's no presentation or or anything planned for putting in front of the board.

It'll just it'll be a report that's submitted.

And.

If the board accepts, it receives in files it then that plan will have been deemed approved and set as in motion for for proceeding with that for the year.

And we don't see any 109 funds in our budget until supplemental, right?

That is accurate.

The most part, except for the fact that as I was sort of alluding to right now, there was some additional funds that were not allocated this past year. It was \$23.4 million in one time funding.

And so the CEO asked Psrt to develop some recommendations for how to use that 23 million one time funding committees in that process currently and.

With that.

Psr 2 will make recommendations to the CE OS office, and then anything that the CE OS office after their review.

Is going to be funded, will then be included in the mid year budget adjustments. So that would not be in supplemental that would be during one of the upcoming mid year budget adjustments. I think later in February.

And then I forget the second date sometime in May or June.

Do you know when those recommendations will be presented? At the case it.

We have some in December already that were provided CE OS office for the 23 million for the 23 yes. And then there are a number that will be on the next psrt agenda which is February 20th. Yes. Could you send us those along with the stuff? That you're sending us.

Could you send us the December ones?

Yeah, that works on Tuesday.

Any questions?

Before we finish, I do want to address your question.

That Mister Delgado addressed about I'll just say disparity like some of the things being very large, being very vague in the plan.

So that is something that we discussed, I believe if my memory serves me correct, AB 109 hit like October or November 2011.

So you have a plan that's approximately 14 years old and getting up to speed and looking at all of the plans that the county has presented.

Mr. Delgado presented me with a question.

The last time that we touch base is how how we wanna have discussions and guide the group to work with the group because probation obviously chairs.

So I would say that part of those discussions need to include fourteen years later aren't a lot of the goals still the same?

Because a lot of them haven't changed. When you look across 14 years of plan, so is it time to look at that? Are the priorities identified still the same things that they were?

Or what I noticed is some of the things were some are vague or short.

They're addressed in other categories differently, so I thought that that would be the reason it was left that way, like sort of like a place people.

Now, how do you address it as needs emerge?

But maybe it's time to take a look at that.

I appreciate that.

Thank you.

All right. So other questions, are there public comments for this item?

Please speak up or raise your hand on teams.

OK, seeing none, we thank you very much for your presentation.

We move to the general public comment.

Please raise your hand on teams or speak up.

Alright, seeing none, we turn the meeting.



Just a quick reminder, there are the meeting for the 12th next week is cancelled due to budget presentations by the department.

So with that, we will see you in two weeks.

Thank you very much.

We move to close session.

- **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription