

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

Transcript

April 16, 2025, 4:33PM

P

Public Safety Cluster -Comments 0:04

Steven Edwards, supervisor of a senior district or district.

Good morning.

Karla Coates for supervisor Han Chloe will be joining later.

Not here yet.

Thank you very much and good district right here.

Good morning.

Sandra Coxon for supervisor burgers and I have our fellow with us. Arianna Guthrie.

Thank you very much. Before we begin the meeting, just want to let everyone know since there is a motion on the agenda.

This meeting will be transcribed.

So we just did make note of that.

Our first item is the informational. It is a four letter from the alternate public defender authorizing requesting authorization for the public play, retired accounting play on a temporary basis and grant exception to the 180 day waiting period required by public employees. Pension Reform Act are there.

Any questions for this one business?

All right, seeing none.

Thank you very much.

Are there any public comments for this item?

Please speak up.

I'll raise my hand on teams.

All right, seeing none, we move to board motion car.

Ries, good morning.

So just wanna go through the motion.

Also want to just know.

Between the time that it was posted and now, there's been some suggestions that were provided to our office from County Council CEO Jaycod that I anticipate

accepting quite a few of them.

So there will be a change from what we're seeing here.

But it doesn't change the content of what?

This mostly is asking.

This kind of minor edits here and there and also community provided something back as well.

So as you all heard in the board meeting yesterday and I'm sure each of our offices have received correspondence related to the unspent cfc dollars that were awarded to our county departments. Specifically, we recognize those various reasons for the why that money went unspent.

In some of our departments and.

One of the very key components of the care first community investment is our funding. The allocated directly to community.

And that the investments are in two alternatives into incarceration.

This motion sets out to ensure there is transparency and accountability for those csci dollars awarded by doing a few things. It directs that there will be a written reports to the board with the full accounting of the unspecified csci.

Funds as of April 2025, it directs over and verbal reports to the board in 30 days and then quarterly thereafter on CFCI funding allocated to departments and the status of its use.

In other words, how it would spend or not spent down? It directs that a standardized data collection, reporting and term requirements similar to those of.

That are required by the TPA of Community based applicants.

Be developed and utilized by county departments receiving CFCI funding, such as a submission of a budget spending plan for proposed programs, projects and services. It requires requiring funds awarded to be spent within 36 months of the allocation of both, fund requiring the collection and reporting of Serv.

And Outcome Data monthly to.

CEO.

And then quarterly reports to the board.

And then it directs the development of a public facing dashboard detailing all csci monies that are allocated annually.

And then lastly, it requires all future recommendations from the CEO regarding redistribution of unspent CSI fund from county departments be allocated to programs, projects and services that are consistent with the CSCI Advisory

Committee.

That's kind of the gist of the motion again.

There will be some added.

I appreciate that the CE OS office.

Raised that Jaycod is the entity that covers all of the CFC I funds.

So they should be the person that or entity that be at the front end of this versus the CEO. So that will definitely change in the directive, but we'll take any questions here.

Now I know cod office here jaycod and then I believe the chair of the Csci Advisory Committee.

It's probably on my cell.

Phone everyone.

Thank you for the time.

Hi, Kyle.

I'm kya. Thank you.

I have a few questions.

So first of all, #3 these requirements are those the exact same requirements as CDOs that receive funding through the TPA.

Yes. So all of these are the same.

Yes, OK.

So there's eligibility.

There's there's an application online for CBO. The pine through the CPA on abede.

There's a there is a full document of eligibility requirements before they even can apply.

These are some of the few that are there of course.

All of them don't narrowly focus the same way or would apply, I guess, to the county department the same way they look with the CDO, like certain amount of money, things that you'll, there's other pieces, but I think these these.

Very specific ones were pulled out because they're really based on reporting and data pieces and requirements that are relevant. I would say to the county department.

So the 36 months, that is what is required of the CDO once they are awarded a contract and the grant they have 36 months to spend it down.

Yes, this this language was taken from that.

So my my question is.

If a if a county department.

Because we know a lot of our county departments are not direct service providers, they contract with organizations to provide services.

So if a program that is being run by a county department has to solicit for services.

How long does a solicitation take?

Is it a year?

On average, it depends.

Hi Adam Bettino from Jcod senior deputy director of programs.

So it depends.

Now CfcI has a granted departments special contracting authority, right?

So there's there's specific authority that you can utilize when using CFCI funding that allow the process to be.

Substantially quicker.

Now, that doesn't mean that the program's been designed.

That everything is in place, that a vendor has been identified, right?

So there's all of the regular things that that need to take place in order to to establish a service contract.

However, the contracting component should be quicker than, let's say, a standard request for proposals that we would do for like a giant.

Right service contract the the the standard practice in the county. CfcI has given authority to move a little bit more.

So you still have to, yes.

To answer your question, yes, you still have to solicit for services.

Yes. So could it take six months a year?

Six months.

Six months. Ish. OK.

So I'm wondering cause and I just wanna be clear like I believe that solicitations are a legal requirement in the law, right?

And they exist. That requirement exists for a reason.

Corruption exists in government entities we have seen.

People go to jail and prison for giving contracts to organizations for a non fair reason, that of personal gain, right?

So we have these requirements for public per solicitations when government funds are at play. When a CBO with the TPA has a contract, they've already got that contract, right?

So 36 months, three years to expend the funds is like from when they get the money.

Is there any room for like?

Like 36 months from when the solicitation is finished, if there's a solicitation involved to put.

A county department and the organization that they're partnering with, right, that they're contracting with at an equal playing field as an organization that's partnering with the TPA.

So if I'm understanding you would like the time frame to be similar for a county contract. So county service contract and grant if those are running?

So let's call the grant 36 months. Yeah, right.

And then at the end of the 36 months, something happens, right?

And this is often how grants work you get for a certain amount of time, Grant goes away.

You need to re solicit or reapply for a grant, right?

County departments do this all the time with federal and state grants.

You would like the time frame where you're suggesting that the time frame be the same.

So if if Jaycod enters into a contract using cfc dollars, you would like the term of that contract to be no longer than 36 months.

And then we solicit. Is that what you're suggesting?

No, I think so.

My concern is, and I think this is part of where we got into problem with these carryover plans, right? OK.

Is Csci gave a three-year grant to a county department to run a program?

The county Department needed to go solicit, so they're not starting to spend that money from day one, right?

It takes a year to solicit develop the program, get it by the time they are starting to spend the money. They only have two years left, right?

So then you reach the end of your three-year period, you've only spent 2/3 of that money. We have this leftover that now the county departments are saying we want to carry over csci saying you've unspent these funds. Why haven't you spent that?

So I feel like either the three-year timeline needs to start from when the program like the contract is signed to allow for three of the services or cfc needs to adjust how much money they're allocating, right?

Like if I'm allocating in a three-year time period, but I know it's gonna take you a year to solicit, then I'm only gonna allocate 2 years worth of money for you so that we

don't run out of time.

And then have.

Keyword King was CEO Baja. I think your first example is the interpretation that I believe Jaycod and CEO have both been taking.

So I think the the board's stated intention has been to allow for 24 to 36 months of project administration before there's some sort of an assessment or an evaluation process. And I think in the example that you.

Put out.

If it takes a year or maybe even 18 months to launch a project, either on the TPA side, which does happen or on the department side, if we if we have an arbitrary cutoff at the 36 month mark, that would mean that program a only has eight.

Months of program operations and then they have to go through an evaluation process and I think CEOs goal in working with Jacob to set up Cfcj projects is to be sure that every project.

24 to 36 months timeline so that when Jaycod brings on their evaluation consultant, we have at least two years or more of actual service delivery for the evaluator and for jcod and the Advisory committee to look at and assess and evaluate. So the programs that happen.

To launch later through no fault of their own.

Are held at a disadvantage and have fewer outputs.

There are fewer accomplishments that we can assess going forward.

Hear that you're looking for, I think.

Where our offices and where I'm at is.

Specifically, as it relates to these dollars, given their intention is to be given directly to Community, I would think the best practice for our county departments would be that they have somewhat of a baked up program before they're soliciting before they're requesting the cscj dollars.

So that they're able to come, or if they have, like a program that's already kind of complete in, this would help them kind of expand that program and it's in alignment with what cscj dollars are for that they can come to CSI and say, hey, we have this.

Program we're already doing, we're going to expand it to, I don't know, another area in the county we're going to need this amount of dollars to do so, bringing that kind of scope of work and plan to the committee and saying this is what we'd like to spend.

This dollar bonds and.

I think given that they would know and have the time to be able to meet.

That 36 bottles.

Heats right with more of that pre planning in place versus what which I have heard is that there are some departments who got funds that were told whether it's right or wrong that hey, we can we need to spend down other funding before we get to this C.

Dollar or something that just had the money for working on other project monies that were there and then having that.

I would say hoping that it fold over.

And then some who had some of the really serious things that we're talking about, which is like contracting fees, like I'm working on the project, but I'm not necessarily gonna be able to ramp up and get it done by this time.

Allotted for us for each program. So I think there's different situations for each county department and I think we just have to get into a practice of of the county.

Really. Or thinking before we're grabbing funding versus grabbing the funding?

And now I'm gonna start. That's what.

The intention behind this, but here the the concerns that have heard from all the parties here about the timeline and the differences between and acknowledge that right? Like the differences between the TPA funding that goes out as a grant versus the on the county side where it's kind.

Of like a cost reimbursement model, which takes a lot longer for the reasons that you shared, right?

So just wanted to uplift that here in the space and kind of be intentional.

Yeah, I just like I'm thinking of, you know, odr, right, which is an odr housing existing program.

The desire to expand it means that they still need to get new providers.

They need to get new facilities like apartments. They need to get new contracts, even to expand an existing program. And so that because odr is not directly operated, it is all contracts out, right?

And so that is something that already exists, a desire to expand.

Since the very inception of csci.

And it takes time.

And so I just and I don't know what the answer is here, but I just missed 36 months.

I just wanna make sure you know, maybe it's 36 months from from the contract or like what do you think they provided, OK.

Yeah, let's let's just some of those would be my concern.

And then my other question is number 5.

How does this directive impact this year's unspecified csci funds?

Like the process of that 'cause, I know there's been a lot of conversation about what to do with this year's unspent csci funds, and I'm wondering how Directive 5 impacts those conversations.

So I think that the intention was more for feature, not necessarily this year.

We're going through that at this point, OK?

I will ask anyone here if there's any impact to.

What's going on now? But the intention behind this motion was not for them.

I'm gonna need Skype as well.

Yeah, deputies are key. One King will see you again.

Directive 5, I believe has been redrafted.

I have the old version so the the version that appeared on the agenda.

I believe may have been edited by County Council as well as CEO.

I believe the Charter requires that the board make allocations of CFCI funding, including ongoing N1 time.

And so I'm not sure if the board can delegate that authority to the CEO.

I would defer to County Council, perhaps in the closed session setting, to clarify whether or not.

Directive 5 is doable as written, but this doesn't. I don't think that was the authority, the one he's sharing is the older version, but he changed it before King's agenda, which is a recommendation. Yeah, exactly.

I'm look not that there are many days.

Yeah, yeah.

So yeah, no, I it is for future.

Not the possible right now.

Thank you. OK. And then just my last comment and then I'll stop is just quarterly oral presentations to the board. I feel like that's a lot.

I would support decreasing that.

So our five our meetings are going to go till 8.

Pm. Yeah. And I hear you.

I I feel that there is particularly of this very sensitive.

I think it's super important.

Important that it's very public.

That I think quarterly is doable.

So that we're keeping track of it.

Like, again open to considering.

But but that's the intention behind it is to ensure that, as I'm sure you see, within all the directives, really a way that they're they public.

Accounting of dollars where it's going not to say that it's not going in the right places or anything like that. But just so we.

We all know so the Community know what's going on with these dollars once they've been allocated.

In a word it out.

Great question, but thank you, Kyle.

So can I follow up on on her question?

So then based on how this written, you would expect the first oral report to the board in June.

Yeah, for number 2.

Yeah, yeah.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 18:55

Can I ask a question?

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 18:55

OK.

Is that Tam? Yeah. Hi, Tammy.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 19:00

Yeah. Hi.

I'm sorry. You know, I thought Kyle's questions were really good and I didn't get the answer to the first question about how we level the playing field and the amount of time that a department would have to be able to ramp up and then spend down the Funds. I think that point is very like it's a real, it's a reality.

I know that Jaycod has some approvals to be able to expedite quickly, but that's not the case for all the county departments when they get cfcf funding.

And and to me, what I've always heard throughout all the years is that it takes an RFP about 18 months.

It is not a quick process and for some departments even longer than that, we want to

make sure that the money that we give them, they have the time to spend it down.
I did not clearly understand or hear what the answer was to that.
Are the departments going to get more time?
Is the clock going to start after they finish their solicitation?

P **Public Safety Cluster -Comments** 19:53

Asking me.
I think there's.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 19:56

No.
I'm sorry.

P **Public Safety Cluster -Comments** 19:59

If you're not Tami, then pass it over.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 20:01

I'm sorry to call you. I'm sorry it was.

P **Public Safety Cluster -Comments** 20:02

I can tell you where I stand with it, but I'll pass it over there.

OT **Omoto-Frias, Tamela** 20:05

Well, wait. OK, I'm sorry.
Go ahead, go ahead.
Go ahead.
It was actually the CEO.
But go ahead Natalia.
Time.

P **Public Safety Cluster -Comments** 20:11

No, no, no, no.
I will just burn.
I'll come back around, OK?

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 20:15

Sorry.

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 20:16

Tell me.

Yeah, it's kiwan king with CEO budget again. Yes. So the interpretation that both CEO and JAYCOD have consistently been taking, as we explained in the report, back to the board motion in October of 2023 on cfci spending, is that the the clock starts so to speak.

On the data program launch.

And so that would mean TPA programs for year one.

The budget was approved in July of 2023. The first payments didn't go out until April 1st of July 1st of 2021. First payments went out more than 18 months later, April 1st of 2023, and so for year one the clock started for.

The TPA programs in April of 2023.

Which would push 36 months out to April 1st of 2026 for a county department saying if if DHS had a permanent supportive housing program that they could, they could have ramped up more quickly because they already have the vendors online. Or they have the facilities online. If that project started October 1st of 2021, the first year that.

That funding was available then, that 36 month clock.

Would hit October 1st of 2024 and so it it. It varies by project so you you could call it kind of a staggered start date but I I think in working with jaycal over the last few years that to us seemed most consistent with prior board.

Direction and it seemed the most fair.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 22:02

OK.

So let me let me make sure I understood what you said.

So yes, it starts not at the beginning of the award, but it starts at the at once the project a program is ready to launch, right?

So after the citation for the TPA and the departments, does that mean also that the end date of the funding is staggered too?

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 22:16

Correct.

Correct. So the the end, yeah, the the end date and the evaluation date is also staggered, which is an issue that Jcod has been working with the committee and others to manage because as as you know, there are dozens of projects per year if not you know more.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 22:21

OK, perfect.

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 22:40

Than 100 and it means that there there may be multiple staggered evaluation dates for every year of CFCI funding.

And that's.

Work that Jake had is I know I'm working on right now.

Yeah. And Tim, Tammy, Tammy, this is Adam.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 22:54

OK, good.

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 22:56

So we are working on that as Q1 stated, we are in the process of doing that part of this though I think does highlight some of the administrative.

Lift that this, that this actually is for our team, right? So even even taking the staggered start, it's so easy for us to put these in like year 123 categories.

In reality, it's not as clean of a timeline as that, so we have to look at each program individually.

The directive on reporting the third directive in the motion is helpful.

It's a process that we've already implemented.

We've refined our tools.

I think that the initial e-mail blasted departments and started really coordinating with them like in November. We had a tool previously the data that we were getting was not clean enough, so we've revised the tool.

That will start to tell us a better story.

Of what's going on with these programs moving forward and then it will also feed into one of the other directives.

I don't remember which one about the data dashboard.

It might be 4.

The reason that we refine the tool is so that it would speak on the back end to kind of a data lake that will facilitate those dashboards.

So the dashboards will look similar.

So what we're getting from the TPA, but I mean imagine you have these staggered starts, the TPA is one, right?

It's 400 grantees, over 400 grantees that we're looking at.

And then getting pretty close to contracting for an evaluator for the TPA. And then we also need to really be thinking through how we're going to evaluate all of these county programs on what timeline given the staggered start dates.

And it speaks to also, even though programs have been funded, they may not have even started yet.

So we have some year three programs for example, that haven't even really started because of some of the bureaucratic hurdles that we've discussed.

I think all of this is timing and and when we have the conversation.

IB

Isamar Bonilla 24:52

Sing.

P

Public Safety Cluster -Comments 24:53

About reinvestment in dates, I think this will really speak volumes to how we consider how the committee considers what recommendations they wanna make to the board.

It has to be based on some sort of accounting of what happened in the time. Right now, it feels like we're still looking at like what is the time.

So when did it start and when can we say that this is effectively sort of ended with enough time to do a substantive evaluation?

It's a lot.

It's a lot for our team.

I mean, we're managing it, OK, but it's it's again as we add these reporting requirements and things like this, it's it's something to consider for Jaycott's team in, in our administration of of this entire.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 25:38

Thanks Adam. But so when I look at B2B or 3B, it doesn't.

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 25:39

Program. Thanks.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 25:43

At least the version I'm looking at it says it needs to be spent within 36 months of the funding allocation start date.

That that to me is not consistent with what the response was.

So does this need to be or am I looking at an old version?

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 25:57

Now you're looking at the right version, Tammy. I. There's edits that can be made since I were here, so I'm happy to take those back and determine what makes the most sense for.

OT Omoto-Frias, Tamela 26:14

OK.

Thank you.

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 26:16

You're welcome.

Yeah. Thank you. And I appreciate the conversation.

Those are great questions. I was.

I'm not sure what the right way to say this is, but this is maybe like an expectation setting kind of thing.

Obviously, the CFCI Commissioners have kind of been all over this unspent funding bucket, and I I'm glad to see that because, you know, they're really digging in.

Sometimes we ask a lot from our Commissioners and that's certainly one of the commissions our folks have put in a lot.

Of work to try and understand better how the county works.

So I want to acknowledge that.

How do you all imagine the flow of this process getting back to them and also the

expectations setting piece of it for the departments when they're communicating with the CFC? I committee 'cause, you know, I appreciate the points in three a about budgets and spending plans and sort.

Of laying out projections a bit, but I recognize that might not be exactly the same thing as like telling the cfc folks you know, 'cause, I think some of some of the projects that some of which are in jcos world are kind of bigger long term projects. Begin with and I think we all knew that. But I also think there's a separate piece of that of having our process for the CSCI Commissioners to get an initial expectation setting kind of thing.

Like, here's what we expect to see, or what we expect this process to work like. Here's like the solicitation timeline, whatever, and then some version of being able to come back like OK.

We're here a year ago and here's what we said.

Now we're a year on and this looks a little different.

What do you imagine that to look like?

I think exactly that.

I think the biggest piece of this is.

Ensuring that there is that information.

That's available like right now, it's not clear it's not available.

I mean, we've heard, right.

It's kind of all over the place.

Like, how do we centralized that?

Standardized or standardized that across the board so that it's provided to or could be available?

So it's like a first step, right?

Like so, it's available to not only jcod not only the public, but that advisory committee.

There has been language that's been provided from.

Advisory groups related to adding that piece that it be provided.

So that they're able to do their piece of it, which we're looking at as well.

So I would anticipate that that will be seen in the final version of it, but exactly that, I think the expectation would be that we now have all this information, it's centralized.

It's here that the committee could make decisions based off of kind of where we're at versus kind of.

Where they think they're at, right?

So Adam, if your hands are, yeah, I'll just.

I'll just say, I mean part of the reason the committee has asked for these meetings that we're holding now kind of on AI guess, expedited cadence, right.

We're speeding things up.

We're we're having meetings outside of the regular monthly meeting. Part of that is the committee developed a criteria that was sent to departments.

And the the request has been use this criteria to come and share.

You know.

What's going on with the program and it speaks to a lot of the things that are laid out in this motion, in fact, right?

It talks about when did you get the funding? When did the program start? How much have you spent and what's your plan to get the rest of it spent down?

And then we talk about how comes demographics and things like that.

So it's been sort of in align with in line with your question. I think there there has been a a commitment from the committee certainly to get that information from the county departments and kind of where we are jaycod is presented on our programs thus far.

J sit. Sorry C sit.

It's gonna take me a minute.

C Sit will be presenting on May 1st and we'll kind of take it from there.

DHS will will follow after that.

But there is a kind of defined criteria whereby we want the the departments to come and present.

I I foresee that that will be a regular process moving forward.

That it won't just be kind of a one shot that right now the focus is year one, year 2 will have to come and go through the same process as will year 3.

The difficulty is once a month standing meetings, depending on how we spread that out, that that takes up all the business, right.

And so trying to figure out is there a way to do these town halls on a regular basis so that so that departments can come and have the opportunity to share about what's going on?

Yeah, it's a lot to do.

Appreciate that.

Thank you.

I know. Sorry. Is there another question?

Yeah, I know.

Derrick still, who's the chair of Csci, may be online. I want to make sure he has an opportunity.

Share anything from that perspective.

Hey derth wanna mute?

DS

Derek Steele 30:55

Hey, everybody, how you doing today?

As was mentioned, my name is Derek Steele, the executive director of the social Justice Learning Group, and in this capacity, chair of the Care First Community Advisory Committee.

I am one of first a thank you to Natalya and the team and the office of Supervisor of Holly Mitchell on this particular issue.

As Adam just stated.

Like we are working very diligently.

To to make sure that we are providing contextual understanding of how these resources are being utilized, what the impact is, what the evaluation of those things are and you know.

The allocation process itself, you know we we got down to a science, right.

Like a very real, straightforward identification of learning.

From community about what the issues actually are, using indexes and you know information that has already been garnered by way of community based organizations as well as the county as to like different places where resources should actually be extended. And now in the process of actually pulling pieces.

Pieces together for the evaluation of that work, right?

So there is a deep dive that we are doing in the advisory committee.

That is completely complementary to, you know, the the strategies for the careers agenda and making sure that the Board of Supervisors have the information they need to understand how to how to make sure we continue to steward these resources in the future.

You know the mandate is there, Metroj said.

Exactly what we were supposed to be doing with these resources.

Want to make sure that this happened the way it's supposed to.

The problem is that when we get to.

The nuances of.

Oh well, who's making recommendations?

When it comes to unspent funds, that's where all this got kind of funky, and I don't know how, like we did the due diligence to be ready and you know, and I just spoke to what our planning process is to be ready to be able to respond to.

This finding.

But if we're not even asking the questions that we asked in that space, I don't even know if we're even having a conversation about the unspent funds, right?

You know, and so we had to make the case that we made yesterday and, you know, the response of having a motion like.

This, you know that honors the original vision by putting 4 real steps towards transparency, accountability and equity, and how public dollars are tracked, reported and ultimately spent is a very, very big deal, you know. So this motion really matters to us, and I'll be going to wrap it.

Up here, 'cause, I don't take take up everybody's time, but the first thing is that it affirms the key principles. Since day one, we we gotta help lead decisions where funds go, right.

It also creates the parity.

You know, there's already been some questions that were asked here and and I I want to say Kylie, I think your questions are completely on point, right.

But but the question is and what we need. What this is? This motion is striving to, at least from my point of view, striving to do is to deal with the parity issue that we have here, right?

Like when you think about the evaluation.

SD **Shelley Dominguez** 34:16

Hi Shelly, am I not permitt. There you go.

P **Public Safety Cluster -Comments** 34:20

So, Derek, can you unmute yourself again?

DS **Derek Steele** 34:20

I'm sorry.

Sorry about that.

When, when? When you think about the evaluation piece, the third party administrator, because all those contracts started at the same time, we know the

beginning and the end and we can effectively evaluate what the, what, what the, what the impact of those dollars and and those resources and.

Those programs actually are, if we are arbitrarily giving all the county departments. Their own timelines on when they get started, when they end.

You know it it takes away from being able to paint the picture and understand fully what the impact at any given moment of.

The the the cfc slash Metrojet dollars actually are right.

And when you do that, you end up getting into a situation where it's like, well, you know, we made small impacts here and all small impacts there.

Let's just arbitrarily use these dollars for this down to 3rd.

Like, that's not the the full merit of what measure J was trying to do.

Right. And and we're already starting to see this as is like when you hear supervisors talking about different programs that automatically are are fully aligned with the, the, the, the spirit of measure day like those things that are being recommended not necessarily. So like there are strategies and.

And processes that we went through to make sure that those dollars are going into the right place.

Right. And So what the request was from yesterday and again what I think this motion actually helps us do is to align the parity to make sure that there's real time oversight.

And enables actions in case that there isn't, you know, alignment on where the resources going.

It also has reallocation language that's very strong, right?

I I would make a few recommendations.

We sent them over about how to make sure that they are in alignment with our funding.

Beliefs. But but the motion is a critical step forward and reflects the kind of government and communities that we voted for when we passed measure J.

So, you know, we're not here as a body to try to delay progress.

We're actually here to help make the progress real and emotion gives us the tools to move forward so that we're all on the same page to be able to move with urgency with accountability and and having community lead the way.

The very last thing I will say is that.

You know.

We just want folks to have us be a part of the process and follow our lead, right?

Like you, you empowered us with the with the board motion and selecting us to kind of sit in these seats to do the work.

We don't take it lightly and so we would ask that we don't open Pandora's box by starting an arbitrarily create recommendation processes that are outside the scope of what we've already developed.

Let's work together to make sure we stay in alignment of the recommendations coming from community.

That are that are vetted by CEO to be able brought to the board to effectively make sure that we're making change from alternatives, incarceration also to direct community impacts.

So I'm here to also support in any of the conversation and the answering about what we've been doing in that space because I don't.

I don't even think the Ce OS office has effectively been able to articulate the the the the depth of the work that we've been doing on a month to month basis for the last 3 1/2 almost four years.

And we love to be a part of that process to be able to speak to the work that we're doing, shout out the J cod because they've been, they've been riding, riding this horse with us and it's and it's been bucking sometimes, but you know, but they're they.

Always there to help standardize a lot of this stuff with us. And you know, Charlotte's also the county departments who have gotten in line, who are also sitting at the table with us trying to make sure that we do something different with these resources than the status.

Quo that the county usually has.

Thank you.

Public Safety Cluster -Comments 38:23

Thank you, Darren.

Just wanna open for you all.

Of course, my colleagues have made additional questions.

I have.

You know comments tonight, OK?

So I think I'm new to like the budget stuff, so I just have a. So the money that we're talking about is money that the departments don't have plans for at all.

And there's no solicitation process happening.

Process currently happening for. Is that correct?

Well.

Because what?

What is that?

That's what I'm trying to understand. What is encumbered? Yeah.

That's a good question.

I think you are asking.

You know, what are we talking about?

Unspent and unencumbered.

Yes. So I think there are a number of different.

The funding is unspent for a variety of reasons.

One of them, I explained a few minutes ago in response to kyla's question, for example.

For the TPA in year 1, the allocation was about 18,000,018 and a half million.

That funding was available on July 1st of 2021, when the fiscal year started. Because the board adopted the budget back in April and in June, the spending plan came in and was adopted in August of 2001.

And then we proceeded with the budget adjustment in October of 2001 to move the 100 million from year one to each of the accounts for the departments that were funded.

Once that process occurred, J Cod had to do a solicitation to find the TPA.

They had to negotiate the contract with the TPA.

The TPA had to hire staff.

And then they had to do probably six or eight separate solicitations.

For the different focus areas, so each each chunk of programming, whether it's you know you sports or after school programs, each each type of program requires a separate solicitation. With the TPA, that process also took time and then the TPA had to work with JCOD to draft out.

All of the the reporting obligations, the program metrics get the contracts together and that's why it took more than 18 months in year 1 to get the 18,000,000 contracted out and programs to launch.

What that means is that you know 18×1.5 is about 20 five \$26 million.

That means that that 26,000,000 went unspent for 18 months.

When the contracts started in March.

2023.

J cod.

Use the current year's funding, kind of a second allocation of funding to pay for those ongoing service obligations. And that means that the 2425 million that has been accruing to date is now unspent and is likely part of the 325 and UN.

One time funding that CEO reported out in the final adopted budget.

For last fall and so.

That's one of the reasons.

So if there's a delay in project launch, if it takes a year, then you have a year of underspend.

That's you know that that's a good chunk.

Another chunk is related to project ramp up.

So if you have a, if you have a housing project.

That theoretically starts on a certain date, let's say April first. If we fund 70 beds.

The spending doesn't necessarily start on April first because as departments bring providers on as departments get the referral pathways set up as departments get the service providers on site, you start spending in chunks. And so in month one, you might spend 20% of the budget it.

Might take six or eight months to fully ramp up to 100% spending and what that means is for for that entire time period.

There's there's a.

Is it an amount of underspend every month as the project ramps up for other projects, there may be kind of variable spending from month to month because county departments usually work on a cost reimbursement model and so if your contractor has attrition or turnover or it just.

Takes them time to set up new project sites.

There's always going to be some amount of understand from month to month, from year to year and I think.

Those those factors all kind of contribute to the large amount of underspend that csci year over year.

Per animal like, yeah, some of the programs.

Also, some of the money does have plans, right?

So for example, like the stock program, ACDO recently reached out to me because once again, Cbo's contract with County department.

So it's not just the TPA that is going to Cbo's it's also the county funds that are going to CBO.

They reached out to us that they were concerned that these 400 beds, I think maybe you know more about this item, 400 beds that are direct alternatives to custody through the STOP program.

Are at risk of losing their funding carryover because it's the funds are unencumbered and they're afraid that those 400 beds are going to disappear. And so how then did CEO look at what funds to roll back, whereas is this going to stop a program that's currently in?

Place.

Taking away those funds, I don't. How did you look at which ones to roll back like unencumbered versus unaccounted for and unplanned?

Yeah, I think we are starting the briefing on the csci year for.

Our spending Plan board letter, which will be before this committee in two weeks.

So I I won't go through all of the detail, but I think to to Annabelle's point and to kyla's point.

We.

CEO looked at the underspend that departments themselves reported in their budget status reports.

So the the bsrs are a process that CEO works with all departments on not just csei, not just Jayco.

So we work with departments at multiple points in the year to figure out your allocation is X.

How much of that allocation do you think you'll spend in in the current year?

And so for cfcj projects, what we did was, you know, we're not looking at all at reallocation of ongoing funding.

There's there are no changes there, but we looked at the budget status reports that the departments all submitted through JPOD as of November.

We wanted to be sure that for any reallocation of funding that ongoing operations aren't affected since we're not addressing the ongoing funding.

And departments expectations for one time needs in the current year are also not affected.

So if a reported that they would spend any of their one time funding, that's something that CEO would not look to reallocate.

For example.

I think there was 7.3 million in the budget for a project that LA General Medical Center, because JAYCOD and the Capital Projects Division.

Said that, that funding will be spent.

CEO took that off the table.

So to speak.

Back to on stock beds programmed, that program is funded with one time CFCI funding from year one through the close Mcj project.

I think it was 42,000,000 in year one for the larger project, a portion of that supports the STOP program and what we what CEO has been doing is we have been working with.

County departments including Jaycod, D, Myd and some others who have identified needs for 2526, including for the stop ads, and I think we will continue our conversations to ensure that services aren't interrupted.

Yeah, and. And beds in particular are are something that we know that the board is very interested in maintaining, if not augmenting and so.

From from Ce OS perspective, it it wouldn't really help our careers approach to cut off the funding for the beds, but we are working with not just jcon but you know other county departments as well to ensure that there aren't any service interruptions as a result of some.

Of the some of the unspent funding.

That will be before you in two weeks.

I don't want to get ahead of myself right and back to Annabelle's.

Question also.

The the unspent funding that again we'll talk about in two weeks, I apologize.

One of the issues that we've been working with, Jaycat and the department's on, is that if if a department has underspend, say, from not launching the program for a year, let's say we had a bed project funded and it took 12 months to get the project design.

Process approved and to get the referral pathway set up and you know get the vendors on board and have the the case managers on board.

Jaycod has worked with departments so that they don't ramp up spending to spend down all of their one time funds.

Because if if there's an ongoing service obligation, let's say we fund 30 beds, if we have a year of understand theoretically you could ramp up the 60 beds to spend down to 0. But at the end of that year, you have 30 beds that have no ongoing funding.

Source. And so I think departments and jacod have seen over the course of the last

three or four years.

That if there are, if there's underspend related to projects that launch lane, it is very hard to spend down that underspend amount without creating some sort of an obligation where you know if, if you if you tell your providers to add staff or add slots or add bed.

To spend down the one time once it's all spent down, the departments are in a situation where they have to tell providers to reduce services.

Because they don't have the ongoing funding to sustain and that that addresses I think a lot of what you're asking because it's it takes work to spend down one time funding in a manner that is truly one time and that doesn't create a lot of obligations moving forward.

And I think a lot of departments, including JPOD, have found that as they've looked at their one time balances over the last couple of years.

So before before I know we have a lot more discussion, you know and we have to move along on the agenda.

So we'll have Steven be the last. Yeah. And then and then we'll move on to public comment after commit.

Can I please just get a quick comment before this?

Thank you.

So again, in two weeks we can talk through literally everything that I mean, the staff program, all of the things. And selfishly again speaking just for jaycott, we can spend the next two hours talking through every single.

Program that's at risk and all of our plans to get it spent.

We're a new department.

We needed to staff up pretrial services. Every little courthouse that we open is its own little Kingdom that needs time in order to pilot. You all heard that from me, I think.

Privately at least, and we'll continue to frankly hear that from us.

I just want to clarify something very quickly. When we talk about CEO and Jaycod working together, the information comes to jcod from departments. We're not making any determination or recommendation based on what we receive in the in the 5th month, BSR or anything after that.

It's just information that we're gathering that we sort of share.

Jcot itself is not making a recommendation whether or not any of these programs should continue or not.

I don't I I think that was clear and I just wanted to be like very, very clear that jaycat's not in not mix.

We're just facilitating kind of the the information gathering and then passing the CEO.

I think I'll just follow up my other question because it might take a while.

Thank you.

Can I fill in last name?

Good and I appreciate the conversation. I think that's why it's important that we're bringing items to cluster.

So we can have these broader, bigger conversations in the public.

So I appreciate all of this and the questions from my colleagues just really, I know we've gotten into like a real space of like C HIP CI unstaff fund and that conversation kind of resenting back on the teach motion.

It's really a way to.

Gather information centralized information.

Standardize information so that we're able to make and the Csci advisor Committee is able to make.

Full determinations.

Fuller analysis based off of information that they currently aren't being provided at this point.

It may.

There may be intention to do so in the future, but this would solidify that. So I just wanted to kind of center on that.

But that was my last time that we veered away from the motion.

Yeah, I was like that's it.

I do want to recognize this is not on the conversation.

Yeah, that's two weeks time, right?

OK.

All right. We move dirt to it.

Sorry, yes please.

Is that right? Dirt gonna give you 2 minutes with the comment, OK?

Start your time when you start speaking.

Oh I can.

02 public comments now.

P **Public Safety Cluster -Comments** 52:02

Yes.

DS **Derek Steele** 52:03

OK, cool. Thank you very much.

OK.

Just really briefly, I want to be very, very clear about ongoing versus one time funds or unspent funds.

All the different programs that have already been funded are already in slide for ongoing dollars.

The problem is that yes, there's a lot of programs that have.

Not even ramped up that haven't got started and and I just want to be very clear about this. You know, the conversation started about the TPA.

The TPA has spent down its funds because nonprofit organizations do not have the the opportunity to carry millions of dollars in our coffers for programs that we didn't operate, that they run like if we put, if we submit for the RFP, we have to spend the resources once.

We get get the proposal approved and all the type of stuff and The thing is we got departments that have not done that. And so again it comes back to the parity conversation which I think.

This particular motion.

Looks to to rein in.

Right. So, so I don't wanna. I don't wanna lose that issue. And and I know there was a question of like what does this mean if we if this passes this is working on things that are happening now.

I mean the question that we're asking is advisory body is for us to give us, give us the opportunity to go through our process that we've already done, that we've already started to be able to give you the recommendations. So you know exactly how resources can be re.

Towards programs that even make sense.

All the things that we're getting in our presentations last thought.

We're getting these presentations.

We're taking us proposals.

We're also engaging community to get proposal from community.

We're surveying the community to get a sense of what's happening on the ground so we can be responsive in a way that makes sense with these county dollars, and

we're just asking that you get behind us in the process to do that.

So thank you very much for the time.

Thank you for the conversation and thank you. Holly Mitchell's office for this motion.

You all are amazing. Thank you.

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 53:51

Thank you very much.

Yvette, do you have public comments?

IA Ivette Alé-Ferlito (they/them) 53:55

I do.

Good morning, everyone.

Yvette Alay for Lido with Latha fence and the Reimagine LA coalition.

I want to thank supervisor Supervisor Mitchell and her staff for taking the lead on this motion.

We appreciate SD2's commitment to ensuring effective use of taxpayer resources for county funding.

It is critical that the county address the challenges with funding allocation and spending and address them clearly and accurately.

It is troubling to know that precious cfcf funds are not being spent in a timely manner, as this is a.

To address critical needs and it's important that there is accountability for how county departments manage allocated funds and that any bureaucratic hurdles that they're experiencing are also addressed swiftly.

However, we do have a concern around the motion that it doesn't include adequate community input regarding possible fund reallocation. Measure J was passed to ensure county resources come to the community. The ballot initiative was created and passed by the community and the board established.

A clear process that relies on Community led input on fund distribution.

I just urge you to rely on the process laid out by the board and include input by CFCF advisory body members every time and every step of the way.

It is critical that community voices are part of this process to stay in alignment with the original intent of Measure J, thank you very much.

P Public Safety Cluster -Comments 55:17

Thank you very much.

Next, Karen, do you have a comment please?

So I'm using. We'll start your time.

KT karen they/she 55:24

Yes, I do. Thank you.

Greetings everyone.

My name is Karen Garcia.

I'm with Latifenza and the reimagine LA Coalition and also lifelong resident of SD2.

I want to thank SD2 for presenting this motion and affirming their commitment to ensure cfc dollars are operationalized quickly.

And that the spend on those dollars is clearly communicated to the CFC I body to the Board of Supervisors and most importantly to the public in a consistent manner and in a transparent manner.

County's own contracting processes have gotten in the way of spending these funds.

Everyone knows contracting with the county is an arduous process.

That's why the TPA exists.

And even bringing on Amity Foundation as a TPA was delayed because of county contracting.

It's the county that has to cut this red tape because these funds are urgently needed.

So many of our communities are suffering right now and need critical services, and this is really a matter of life and death.

The advisory body should also be leading the process of reallocation for these unpaid funds.

There are folks in that body who have been participating in this process for years now, and they have the context and they have made concerted efforts to include a Community participation process.

And I just want to remind folks that measure J was meant to increase services for the community through an authentic participatory process.

So it's important to maintain.

That vision.

Thank you.

P

Public Safety Cluster -Comments 56:52

Thank you very much.

Are there any public comments in person?

Seeing none anymore online, please speak up, Rajan Hannon. Teams.

Denver.

Seeing none move to accept item one last comment before we close.

Again, very quickly.

So I think we provided some edits. As second noted, I think from from CE OS perspective, we just want to be sure that jaycod is in the lead position on all the items in the report back since JAYCAT is staffed and has already been doing a lot of.

That work.

We are.

We are happy to help and coordinate as needed.

Except for the last as all are pointing.

We agree, I think, except for the last one, which is about the recommendation of ongoing long term.

Appreciate job.

Thank you.

Next, move to the four letters prior to delay that one.

Oh, sorry, we did that. I'm sorry.

Finalize. Yes. Which one?

May the end of it.

The fire burger, OK.

Yeah, they refused to.

Good morning.

My name is Shamin Mosley and I'm the executive director for the Sheriff's Oversight Commission.

And I'm gonna try to be as brief as possible.

Our next meeting is gonna be scheduled for tomorrow, and that's gonna take place at the Hall of Records. And that's only a temporary meeting location until the Commission is decided. Tomorrow's meeting. How they wanted to see with a permanent location for their meetings.

The Commission will also provide updates on the enforcement of the three subpoenas for the documents and response to the sheriff.

The Sheriff's Declaratory relief action regarding confidential information, as well as an update on the Commission's proposed divisions to chapter 3.79 of the county code after our meeting on March 20th, we received a thumb drive from OCP Office of Constitutional Policing with the case FIL.

For two parties in the subpoenas, however, the information is the same information that is being released to the public on Lesd's website.

As an appointed oversight body.

The Commission should really be receiving unredacted information for it to meet its mandate and provide effective oversight of lesd additionally, at tomorrow's meeting, the Commission may go into closed session to discuss litigation and seek legal advice.

It was agreed that County Council will separate the section in the ordinance that refers to the Commission's ability to go into procession, so the Commission may present only that section to this Committee on April 30th.

And the remainder of the proposed divisions that's in that ordinance at a future meeting.

However, in my attempt to keep the revised ordinance together as one package, I cleaned up the proposed ordinance as well as the board letter this past weekend and submitted that on Monday.

I was also made aware that County Council made their revisions to the section. That relates to the Commission's closed session.

However.

There was a version that was submitted last Friday that is opposite of what the Commission recommended.

And would most likely not be in support of.

So I just wanted to make you all aware of that.

And we know the Commission has been in the news a few times due to the few conflicts regarding the amicus brief as well as the request for confidential information.

So you know, the Commission has been very active in trying to meet its mandates as well as remain active. And so the Commission is urging the adoption of this revisions of the ordinance as submitted so.

It can provide the effective offsite of LASD at tomorrow's meeting. There will also be

a comparison of what Sheriff Luna reported at our last meeting.

On.

On the status of the Commission's 27 recommendations to eradicate deputy gangs and clicks with the Commission's with report card and the oig's monitoring of LE. SD's implementation of the policy Baron Deputies from joining or participating in law enforcement gangs.

The Commission submitted a request for statistics from the OIG as well.

We have several action items on the agenda which includes dissolving inactive ad hoc committees.

The approval of a resolution in support of.

AB847, which adds civilian oversight of law enforcement bodies to.

832.7 so they are exempt from the confidential information protection that's in that law. The state law. The Commission will also create its interview panel, which is an ad hoc committee to begin the process to fill the community at large. Vacancy that's on the Comm.

And decide whether or not to reactivate the nominate and ad hoc committee.

For a lexing of positions on the Commission, there is a requirement in the Commission's ordinance for the Commission to have a process for electing its its chair and vice chairs, and that is done on an annual basis at tomorrow's meeting. The OIG will also give a present.

On body 1, camera on its body 1 camera report that was released on March 25th.

As far as community engagement goes, on March 27th we hosted a community listening session to receive community feedback.

LES DS complaint process and that was done in Lancaster.

We had a good turn out.

We had 65 people who attended, provided public comment and 35 attended virtually.

On April 24th we are hosting a MINI virtual conference to invite Lesd subject matter experts to discuss Les DS complaint process as well.

And the complaints ad Hoc Committee, which was created in December of 2024, will be looking at Lesd's complaint process.

And the commissions, also, the Commission's complaint process. In the meantime, our ad hoc committee and staff are building out the complaint process for the Commission as well as the complaint form that is going to be online and database, which I mentioned previously, to collect data and track.

Complaints received in our office.

We are also planning a virtual town hall which will be hopefully will be hybrid at the end of April.

Or sometime in May to educate members of the public of the public on the Commission its challenges and proposed divisions of 3.79, and we are also, we were also invited to attend some of Atlas D's events, which we've been doing also this year's.

Nacles conference is scheduled to take place in October in Minneapolis.

We submitted a session proposal on Wellness and law enforcement.

So hopefully they would approve that.

And we are also, as far as the vacancy on our within our office, we are in the process of making a decision as to how to move forward with filling the senior staff Allen's position. We conducted interviews and a decision has been made.

So we're hopefully finalizing that this week.

And lastly, the Commissioners mandatory county trainings, they're required to complete mandatory county training.

Such as sexual harassment. However, there seems to be a continued issue of the Commission is not being able to access the trainings and tell it notes, and this has been flagged as an issue with HR.

Our staff is continuing to work with HR to try to get this issue addressed.

This has been long gone for the last several months since I've been here, so hopefully there's a resolution because these trainings are mandated by the state.

As well.

So as far as our deliverables go, we have finalizing the 2024 annual report. It's slated to be released, hopefully.

Hopefully this week, but Giovanna has it so we don't know yet.

I was also recently made aware that the Commission is required to do a self evaluation every three years, but the Executive Office requires its advisory commissions to do these evaluations.

Every four years, there's something I believe there's a sunset for other commissions, but not for this Commission. Our last evaluation was doing 2019 and completed in 2020.

The Commission at that time used PSI as a vendor to conduct that evaluation and it was approximately \$11,000.

We weren't budgeted for this evaluation in this fiscal year, nor did we make the

request for fiscal year 20/25/26.

But this is a mandate in the Commission's ordinance, and that completes the report.

Thanks shermene.

Are there any questions?

OK, sorry. Alright. Go ahead. Very quick for the training that you shared that the Commissioners weren't able to get into.

Is it just sexual harassment or do they have to do AB12? I think it's 1234.

There's there are other ones that they can.

There were other ones that also includes lasd's.

There are modules within LASD that they can be able to use that as you know, for training and guidance also being able to access those lesd trainings are important for our new Commissioners when they go through orientation. That is a part of it. But no, the Commissioners have.

Not been able to log in to the system. Our staff has have been communicating with them and.

Going through the process, it is time consuming.

Because they are volunteers.

But it is.

I guess it's built into town. Works so.

They're trying to help.

All right, Max is online.

Max, do you have anything to add to?

HM **Huntsman, Max** 1:07:29

I have nothing to add, but I'm happy to answer any questions anybody have.

P **Public Safety Cluster -Comments** 1:07:37

All right. Are there any public comments for this item?

Please speak up or raise your hand, teams.

Seeing none, we move to general public comment.

Are there any general public comments?

Seeing none, we adjourn the meeting.

Today we'll move to closed session.

Give us a minute to switch over.

Thank you very much.

Thank you. Thank you.

Anyone else is to use that one?

Yeah, mine. OK. I thought it would be something.

Like on my phone, on the left. Oh, really?

I'll set something.

It's like that's your mind.

Oh my God.

No, I think I'm, yeah.

□ **Dardy Chen** stopped transcription