

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

Transcript

April 30, 2025, 4:46PM

R1 Room 140 1:23

Like a gavel order, right?

Good morning, everyone.

It doesn't.

Alright, everybody, we're gonna go ahead and get started. Meeting starting.

Good morning, everyone.

I'm Jack Arutyunyan from the chief executive office and I'll call the meeting to order now.

Please note that the meeting will be for all participants. You can unmute yourself using the teams app or by dialing *6 if you're calling into the meeting. As a reminder, public comment may be limited in one to two minutes depending on the time. We will now start.

With introductions in this room with the board offices going first.

Hi everyone.

This is Tyler Cash from supervisor barger's office.

I asked her.

Lam was to raise her hands off this Alexandra Peraza's supervisor and Fox Third District.

Thank you. If we could also have folks in the room do a quick introduction.

Public health.

During the partnership with Silver Tmh.

Drops are damaged. Deborah Coleman.

Sorry, dph.

Transfer's.

Rogan dph, almost like AC.

DOHI.

Ina.

Randy Moore County council. Thank you.

Do we have real quickly? I wanted to let my colleague just joined us. Introduce yourself.

Hi everyone.

My name is Leslie Gamino, assistant justice.

Do we have representatives from the first district on the call?

We have representatives from the 2nd district on the call.

LP **Leo, Pamela** 3:15
Yes, good morning.

+14***00** 3:15
Hi, this is.

LP **Leo, Pamela** 3:16
Oh.
Just go ahead.

A **anonymous** 3:19
Level where?

+14***00** 3:20
This is Lorena thorough calling from for Harvard UCLA Medical Center.

R1 **Room 140** 3:22
Thank you.
We're actually doing introductions of the board offices first.

+14***00** 3:29
Oh, OK.

R1 **Room 140** 3:29
The board offices from folks from the first district or the 2nd district.

LP Leo, Pamela 3:35

Yes, Pamela Leo with SD2.

GI Gracian, Isela 3:36

Thank you, Andy. La gracian.

R1 Room 140 3:41

You do.

We have representatives from the Third District Board Office from the third district.

Board offices from the 4th district.

Office represents from the 5th district.

We have CEO budget on the call.

Do we have any other Co staff on the call that I'd like to introduce themselves?

AP Anna Petrosyan 4:04

Anna Petrosian, from Co budget.

R1 Room 140 4:08

Thank you.

Do we have representatives from County Council on the call?

CC Caroline S. Craddock 4:13

Have representatives from both Caroline Craddock County Council excuse me.

Carolyn.

Thank you.

R1 Room 140 4:19

That represents from public health on the call.

We have representatives from medical health on the call.

SK Stella Krikorian 4:29

Yes, Stella Krikorian contracts division.

JB Jaclyn Baucum 4:30

Right. And this is Jacqueline Bachman as well.

R1 Room 140 4:38

Thank you. Have representatives from health services on the call.

OT Ovsanna Thomas 4:41

Good morning, folks. Wanna Thomas?

TB Timothy Belavich 4:44

Good morning.

This is Tim Belovic from Correctional health services.

R1 Room 140 4:51

Thank you.

We have representatives from any associations or organizations on the call that like to introduce themselves.

Have any members of the public on the call that like to introduce themselves?

Right. We will now proceed with the today's meeting. As noted on the agenda, we have 4 information items 3.

Board motions and two presentation items.

It's a pre packed calendar.

We're going to try to move through everything quickly.

The first information item public works DHS dmh Arbor UCLA Medical Center replacement program approve and authorize the Director of Public Works to execute 2 construction change orders.

Any questions from the board offices on this item?

Nope, not in the room.

I don't see any hands.

OK, you will. Any public comment on this item?

You will move on to the second information item for DHS authorized the acquisition of the Endoscopy ultrasound processor for Harbor Utility Medical Center.

Questions from the board offices on this item.

Questions in the room.

I don't see any hands raised any public comment on this item.

Thank you.

We'll move on to the third item for DMH will to extend the existing contract with Tri-City Mental Health Authority, a sole source basis for the provision of specialty mental health services in the cities of Pomona, Claremont and Laverne.

Any questions from the board offices on this item?

You and no hands raised in their virtual setting.

Any public comment on this item?

Moving right along.

Item number four for dmh adopt the Department of Mental Health Mental Health Services Act.

Mid year adjustments for fiscal year 2425. Any questions from the board offices on this item?

I think we got some.

Unhealthy.

I just want a clarification.

So are there three major changes here?

Do you have kaylene Gilbert?

I apologize.

There's there's a couple in this.

Yeah. I think ultimately there are just.

Fiscal actions here and that will change most of the most of the changes here are about just shifting language or moving from one to another.

So we have with the training and technical assistance, there's and some additions with cftn, there's an increase. And then there's also the movement of funds from CSS to wet and cftf.

So that is, that's three I want to make sure I, yeah.

And I had another question on.

Commission letter. I noticed there were two separate ones.

One was sent over to us via e-mail on the 24th and one that was included on the 22nd.

That's from the Behavioral Health Commission. When they heard the.

Your annual update.

In the updated letter from the 24th, I noticed that they inquired about consent funds and getting quarterly report.

Is that something that we'll be implemented in the Commission itself?

I didn't see that addressed in the letter.

In the packet I wanted to see touch on that a little bit.

Sure. So and and we would be bringing, yes, we would be bringing report backs quarterly to the Commission meeting and reporting out either in writing or if they want us to, to speak as well.

Perfect. And would it be possible to also share that with board offices?

Located.

There questions from the board offices on this item.

Virtual hands either.

Any public comment on this item?

Thank you very much.

We will now move on to board motions.

We've got three of them. The first one is SD5 support for Assembly Bill 27 and 28.

I was going to ask if we could take out a order. I wanted to add SD4 go first and then we can just back to 'cause. They I think for SD4's motion we have some of the justice deputies joining us temporarily.

Sure, we'll be fine.

So the first motion will address is the prioritizing dignity in life in the Los Angeles County jails.

D4.

Much and thank you, chair. The colleagues, we have a motion before you and this is addressing I think something that we have all have heard.

We've been on various briefings.

This is an issue that board has discussed very publicly. We've also heard numerous comments from.

Colleagues, or, you know, just activists, advocates, advocacy orgs, but also family and friends of people who have passed in the jails. And so.

You know, as we have seen that there has been an increase in the in custody deaths in the last, you know or the 1st 14 weeks of this year. Mind you, we're only in we're going into May.

18 people have now passed, in fact, two days ago we received another death notification and that marked our 18th death in the first quarter of the year.

We also saw that there were three people who had passed in one day in our county jails. You know, we recognize.

That some of the folks who are coming into our jails might be sicker than maybe general population. However, once they are in our jails, they are in our care. And so I think we need to take a deeper look into.

Into the factors.

Being how we can better have tangible, you know, performance indicators on whether or not we are making improvements on how we are caring for people who are providing services, you know, inside the jails, we know that.

Add medical complaints are probably the number one complaints that we get from people who are incarcerated about delays to care or delays to, you know, refills of medication.

I think there's a slew of doctors going into how we can improve delivery of services or how we can best support our medical professionals who are inside our jails who are caring for people who are incarcerated.

We also know.

I mean, you know, we just heard and we we see this every day that there are going to be major fiscal impacts.

That could impact the delivery of care and services in our medical facilities.

So I, you know, anticipate that we might actually see more either complications.

Of either health services or just, you know, illnesses inside the jails, there could be, you know, increased mortality due to some of the impact of local, state and federal funding. And on the justice front, you know, we with the passage of Proposition 36. Six, I think there is an anticipated or we're anticipating that the population inside the jails might might increase. And so with the increase of jail population, we might see an increase in in death. And so the directives there are two directives, a bunch of subsections, but largely the.

First one is asking DHS CHS or Correctional health services and our Sheriff's Department.

To submit a report back in 90 days.

So not only are report back to the board, but also a presentation.

Preferably a joint presentation with our health and or our health and justice deputies in our cluster, but also with the a supervisors meeting and four supervisors meeting with an implementation plan with indicators and metrics to assess any progress that's being made.

And I and I do want to say, you know, I know CHS understands this is an issue.

That they are, you know, understand that this is important and they are, you know,

trying to make change, you know, within delivery of services. But, you know, I think it's would help the deputies and also the public to see what progress has been made. And I think with.

Having these indicators and metrics, not only are we can we see progress, but we could also see if there's other areas that we as a board can best support.

CHS so that we're not seeing these increase in a custody death.

The other is an analysis on the causes and factors that's leading to these increase of deaths. I think it's one thing to say that people who are coming in are much sicker than general population, but actually to identify what are those factors? Is a delay in medical.

Care, you know, contributing to an increase in death if someone does have, you know, really serious illness, you know, they're a way that we can prioritize or triage how quickly they get seen or medical services before they.

You know, end up getting even more sick or possibly pass inside the jails. Then obviously the analysis of any local, state or federal policy or even budgetary decisions that could impact the level of service or treatment.

That could lead to the increase of in custody deaths and the 2nd Directive is directing our auditor controller and our risk management with support from CHS, the Sherman and our medical examiner and consultation with County Council to.

To audit and evaluate the corrective action plans related to all of our in custody deaths for the last the past five years to see if there's any additional recommendations or best practices for CHS and the Sheriff's Department to improve and address. Obviously the increase in deaths, so those.

Are the you know directives and you know again, just you know emphasizing we see these notifications of the desk, we discuss the corrective action.

Share concerns, but I think there needs to be a more tangible way of how we're addressing and assessing, you know, improvements or gauging if we are making any changes or identifying any areas that we can decrease the number of in custody deaths.

I also think that we need to, you know, this motion also serves to have us think more long term because of any federal that's local state cuts increase in population due to. Position 36, but just again.

You know, if we're missing any trends or operational or systemic weaknesses to make improvements so that we can.

Make sure that people are not dying in our jails at the rate in which they are right

now.

And I will conclude there and address any questions that we might or questions that you all might have.

Thank you, St. 4.

All right.

Do we want to start with some questions from deputies?

Who've? No question.

Are the departments prepared to produce these reports?

So.

More than welcome to answer, but the questions for the departments.

Let's see if the departments have.

As we're thinking about the response, I I believe that they do because you know, these are notifications that we get. CHS always provides us with a report.

Medical examiner also is part of our our corrective action plan. So I do believe that they have some of the documents to produce, but thank you, Tim for being on and.

TB **Timothy Belavich** 17:01

Yep, hi and and helica.

I I couldn't respond because I couldn't fully hear the question.

R1 **Room 140** 17:07

The question is, are the departments prepared for these report backs?

TB **Timothy Belavich** 17:14

Yeah, I I think we will be absolutely, I think I think a lot of it's already work that's been done.

You'll you'll likely see requests that have been deferred as far back as 2021 coming back again.

You know the primary care model, which we advocate for.

The the recent request for universal screening, there's a lot that goes on in the jail in terms of healthcare and.

We have 2000 staff treating our patients, but you know we don't run a hospital level facility.

We depend on on a lot of transfers out.

And so, yeah, I think you'll we will be ready for a report back, but it will be, you know,

report back showing the resources that are needed and some of those are actually I think with you as unmet needs at this point.

R1 Room 140 17:56

Thank you.

Please.

The.

Thank you for that.

Now I'll just ask if I may. In addition to talking about mentioning resources that are needed, which we've discussed over time, but also maybe and I don't have time, but also thinking about resources that currently exist.

And.

TB Timothy Belavich 18:26

You're breaking up just a little bit on a few words.

R1 Room 140 18:30

Yeah, so so I'm asking also mentioning resources that currently exist and what improvements can be made within existing capacity.

TB Timothy Belavich 18:34

Sure.

Yeah, absolutely.

We I think there's AI think sometimes the community also misunderstands the treatment that does occur here.

R1 Room 140 18:45

OK.

TB Timothy Belavich 18:46

For example, everyone who comes into our care receives a comprehensive screening by a registered nurse and then is referred either to medical or mental health based on their previous history and their reports on that screening. And I think, for example, that's something that the community doesn't know about.

And so, you know, I think some education.

You know, for all of us on on what resources?
Is exist is important, yeah.

R1 Room 140 19:11

Thank you.

TB Timothy Belavich 19:12

Sure.

R1 Room 140 19:14

Thank you, Angelica.

Do you have another question down there?

What's questions listen?

Yeah. Thank you so much for bringing this motion forward.

I definitely agree that it's important for us to.

Really analyze the factors of the the jail population coming in.

Was curious to know if we were also thinking if there would be any analysis of the structural concerns in the facilities too and that how that plays a factor into receiving medical care.

I definitely agree with you on on this. Really should be a long term vision.

Of our operating system.

Given the confident.

Confidential nature of this information.

I I do understand that we may have to be mindful of some of the reports.

So do we imagine this coming back to the board in, in, in closed session cluster or open session?

Is there any opportunity for us to get more information?

Merlin, do you want to address that?

TB Timothy Belavich 20:20

Yep.

If you're asking me, I I can tell you that that probably the the information will be providing will be redacted to such a nature that you will be able to share it.

You know we we will redact HIPAA related information and you know we can share aggregate information as well. And I think we've done that before as we do in our

regular monthly meetings.

So I think you'll see some of that, which I think can be shared.

CC **Caroline S. Craddock** 20:53

And if there's.

TB **Timothy Belavich** 20:53

But I also agree also on the structural issues that that's already one of the bullets will be will be hitting on is is the elephant in the room that we all know is men Central jail.

R1 **Room 140** 20:54

Thank you.

OK.

Thank you, doctor Valer.

TB **Timothy Belavich** 21:10

Sure. Thank you.

R1 **Room 140** 21:12

There questions from the other board offices.

Look like any public comment on this motion.

All right. We will move on to the next motion.

We'll start with the first one, which was assembly Bills 7027 and 2018, over to SD5.

Thank you, Jack, and thank you everybody.

So this one is related to a landfill in the 5th District Canyon. Specifically the two bills that were requesting support for.

For alleged affairs team are assembled bills 27 to 28.

Which are authored by the assemblywoman from that region, Pilar Xiaobo, for those of you that don't know the landfill, it's a big 639 acre plot that's up in the Santa Clarita Valley.

It's owned and operated by Chiquita Canyon LLC, and there's an incident up there.

Obnoxious odors have been getting emitted by the landfill due to some burns, and it's caused a significant amount of distress for our constituency.

And and the quality of life for the residents in that region in that community. So that

comes along with a lot of public health concerns and, of course, financial challenges that the residents are having.

People want to leave and move out of that area while this stuff is going on and the landfill is working to what they've what they're doing and in order to help residents that are impacted by this shiabo's proposing these two bills.

AB27 is the first one.

It would be providing some financial relief for the residents.

Who've been burdened by the orders. And you know, it would also work to create an exclusion from gross income for the amounts they received on or after March 1st this past year 2024, as compensation for costs and losses that were related to any of the elev.

Temperatures or odors associated with the landfill and then.

8028, which is the second bill, would increase the accountability and oversight on landfill owners and operators.

It would add some reporting requirements and power local enforcement agencies to be able to take clearer steps to address landfill gas and odor issues.

Emissions this bill specifically would require the operator to continuously monitor the temperature sensors and players at their landfill.

And then share that data publicly on their website to residents and then also.

Local enforcement agencies as well.

There's another thing where they would have operators required to take specific corrective actions if those gas temperatures and odors exceed certain thresholds for longer than a 60 day period.

And then of course, we would, you know, get engaged with multi agency coordination and help resolve.

What's what's going on there?

So those are the two bills that are presented that we would like to ask, CEO Ledge affairs to draft up a letter of support behind.

Questions from the Board of Good.

Operators, will those be funded by? I don't know what agency overseas, like each environmental, health or aqmd, but it's it's mainly my understanding is that all driven from the state level but then locally we do have some limited oversight with the patient.

We have a meeting actually set up with Assembly member.

Pilar and then our doctor for our Public health director.

Discuss this issue a little bit more and I don't know Joshua if there's anything that I'm missing there.

Our our local enforcement agency, which acts on behalf of Cal Recycle, is involved.

I see. OK.

Questions.

On 27 you mentioned there would be some sort of leave.

Mm hmm. Is is that coupled?

Is that is the number what that has to be in the bill, or would there be like an accompanying budget ask?

I would have to follow up on that.

I 'cause I don't think there's anything within the bill as of yet.

It'll become become later.

Sure, we get that before.

Any other questions from the other board offices?

Hands virtually either.

Any public comment on this?

We will move on to the third motion, which is authorized, Joan applications, to participation in the HOMEKEY Plus program.

Thank you.

So yes, this one is similar to another motion that we talked about maybe a month and a half ago, which was asking the county to join in on some homekey plus projects and providing some gap funding just to give a quick little summary, homekey is the.

E State program, which the governor originally champions that allows local jurisdictions and agencies to partner together if they're looking to take current existing properties like motels and hotels, and rehabilitate them with the intent of providing permanent supportive housing.

There were some sites too that provided interim housing.

Home Key was rolled out a couple years ago 2021-2022 I think.

And the initial few rounds of it were predominantly just focus on on homelessness.

And homeless housing now home keepers has been brought around 'cause. There was success with, you know, homekey the original proposal, but plus introduces support supportive housing for populations that experience mental illness as well as veterans. That also includes funding being allocated by the state from some mhsa dollars.

As well to to provide that assistance.

So this motion.

Is bringing back.

An agreement here to allow Lacta, our Los Angeles County Development Authority, to enter into agreements with.

Some of these developers who have identified sites that are wanting to apply to the state for some of the dollars and move forward with these projects to bring housing online for certain populations. There is an attachment to the motion that included those properties. But in summary, there's a.

Site in SD1 that is the developer of applicants, the people concerned.

There's a site in SD4 which developer is Weingart Center.

There's one.

That's gonna be applied.

For an SD2 that's path.

Who's leading that application? And then there's a site in the 5th district up in Palmdale with Desert Sands Village as a developer.

And then there's one property here that is an SE one from the national community renaissance for them. But they're applying as well.

And so those are the five projects right now that are listed that were scored by.

The team over at Lacta after the applications were submitted.

That are being considered here for funding.

So that's just kind of a general overview.

I know we have folks from Dmh here.

CEOHI and then also Lacda, who are specifically responsible for working on getting this project scored, getting the applications in on time and then helping us draft this motion.

Because I know there's a lot of administrative deadlines we need to meet, I think the final application, if I'm not mistaken, is due May 30th.

Right. OK.

So that's it for me.

I don't know if we wanna invite folks from the department sub to answer any questions.

From the board offices.

Yeah.

GI **Gracian, Isela** 29:17

Add.

R1 **Room 140** 29:19

I had a couple questions and I don't know if that's or lacda or hi.

But this the five that are in this motion were the top scoring from the RFP.

OK. And then but the RFP was limited, the amount of local funding.

The RF was the RFP limited to local funding.

So if there was, yeah.

So if there was a request for a capital contribution or rental subsidy, it got a particular.

He did prioritizing projects that didn't include projects that were not seeing.

Had there been more local funding available, we could have could have selected more for the RFP.

Is that accurate?

Is that accurate?

And actually, one of the commitments so Dmh committed \$30 million for capital and we also committed, excuse me \$15 million per year for five years for rental subsidies along with DHS ODR and and SAPSI. And in order to be able to fund, excuse me.

The third project, or one of the projects.

We shifted some of our rental subsidy funds to capital so we could fund, you know, more projects.

So we so yes, you are correct.

Like if we had more capital, we could fund more projects and we already did shift some funds so we could fund another project that needed capital.

And then.

So.

So there are there's 599,000,000 that the state has set aside for the Los Angeles region for this round.

And I know a portion of that is specifically for veterans and then a portion is for other populations.

Besides the five being recommended here, do we know how many other projects from the LA Region city of LA or other cities?

Will be applying.

Yeah, that's a great question.

We've been collecting a list because we were not, of course, the only jurisdiction that could submit.

Projects to the state. Any jurisdiction could.

And so, according to what we understand, there are 13 projects that have been or will be submitted by May 30th to the state. In addition and that was including the GAP funding round which had four city of LA Projects, One County project through LACDA and then one project.

Through this city of Kudahay.

And then through the next round, we understand that hakla.

The Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles is submitting 2 projects.

And then there's these five projects that we have listed here.

And do you know what the total request will be like?

Did anywhere even close to the 599,000,000 like? What's the amount? I do wanna add? Actually LA HD also has one other project that we just learned about very recently.

So that's another. So our understanding of how much funding people are requesting through these projects is \$261 million.

And then as you said, there is 599,000,000 total allocated to LA County 277.9 million for veteran projects and 321 million for other projects. The only veteran project that we are aware of is one from HA.

And all the rest are serving people with behavioral health challenges. OK, so the five that you guys have here, none of these are veterans, right?

So.

You know, I I know that something that my boss, the supervisor's gonna ask is.

You know, are there any ways we can expand?

Our Co applications because at this point, like we're leaving hundreds of millions of dollars on the table when the first motion for the GAAP financing came through and was originally four and then it was just one. I know there was a lot of frustration for why so few.

Projects when there's this. This is like a once in a lifetime bond that was set aside.

And and there's a there's like a huge amount of money available for the region. And it's it's felt it hasn't.

I understand there are very narrow criteria and you know you've talked, you've talked to other jurisdictions and they're having similar challenges as well.

But.

Also.

It's.

Know that my boss will very frustrated.

We don't have more applications and.

What is?

What is going to be our response?

Like, have we, you know, have we talked to the state offices?

Can we talk to our our assembly or state center or legislative partners?

KO

Kristina Oneil 34:21

Uh oh.

R1

Room 140 34:22

On expanding the criteria or or you know because we don't want to happen is the state says, well, we gave you all this money.

Los Angeles and you know, we were only applying for a handful of projects, and so we need to be able to make the case that.

Have projects that we want to fund.

They just don't fit the scenario criteria and So what is?

What is our plan to be able to do that?

I think the question of advocacy is, is an interesting one, and I think you know, in individual meetings, I can say that when the when the state was rolling out this program, they had some listening sessions from counties. And I know that counties gave them a lot of.

Feedback about the challenges and and the criteria for the applications and the timelines that are required.

And based on especially you know jurisdictions that had applied from previous rounds.

Just knowing that meeting the the requirements not only related to getting the applications in, but also just the construction timelines that have to be met and the requirement that any project that goes to the state has to have all of their funding, including rental subsidies and I think.

We, you know, people are hopefully aware that we have a very big challenge with rental subsidies.

Through Section 8 and project based vouchers.

In the county because of limits set by head and which is why we put forward rental subsidies to try to help these projects move forward.

But I think you know, exploring other ways to do advocacy with the state, that sounds like a important strategy.

You gotta be thinking about. I just wanna build and and you and I chat chatted about this earlier this week.

This feedback has been shared with HCD. This team focused on moving us through the solicitation to assess how many projects were viable.

Which projects the county was in a position to sort of absorb on the risk tolerance level.

We know we got a lot of project proposals that were missing.

Critical pieces uh. Per HCD application guidelines. Umm, including some of which?

That didn't, you know, ask for local dollars. But there were other critical components of their applications missing or under.

Under developed, we have those shared this feedback with HCD not not in a structured way, just in conversations.

Our our focus was to provide a slate of of project proposals through the RFP process that we have some confidence in with both would be awarded.

OK, I in in terms of advocacy, I I do wanna point out like.

The supervisors, the elected offices, can also.

It's important for us to know of the challenges earlier before we're like 30 days out from the end of this process.

I don't think there was an update at cluster.

There wasn't one at homeless deputies, and I don't think there was one at La at Lacda deputies.

And so you know, that's that's a place where, you know, our offices could have also. Right to lend support to some of this advocacy.

And I do.

I do wanna ask.

And you know, maybe you don't have the answer now, but we still have.

We still have 30 days until the final applications are due, so is there any way look at projects that applied through the RFP that you know are there other is there other funding if there were like affordable Housing Trust fund money that could go towards the capital could?

There be additional.

MH money that then converts.

To rental subsidies to support additional applications.

Are there projects that?

Since this since local match was not a requirement of this of this of this of the HOMEQE plus program, it's just a bonus are there projects.

That move ahead maybe. You know, in speaking with the ones that applied through the RFP, that could move ahead.

Without local match, even if they don't hit every single one of the criteria.

It sounds like statewide there's a challenge trying to trying to meet these criteria, so maybe there are projects on the cusp or just outside.

That could potentially that the state could consider if it's not going to be super competitive because these criteria are so narrative. This is like this is to say why don't we like why don't we apply for more and let the state tell us no rather than self select.

Only the what?

Think is gonna be the most competitive when there's this huge amount of money still on the table.

So I I know that that will be a request from my boss.

I don't know if other offices feel similarly, but I know there will be concern about much money, and aside that we're not able to take advantage of.

I appreciate the question and reflection. I I would maybe wanna bring in County Council for a question about how to.

Think through awarding projects that are outside of the solicitation process itself, because that criteria was set but you know happy to to talk more.

Thank you.

Just a quick follow up.

How many projects total were submitted that are ineligible?

28 total projects were submitted to the RFP.

We have a question from Isilla.

Oh yeah, online the 2nd district.

GI **Gracian, Isela** 40:04

Hi all.

Thank you for that information.

Thank you, Catherine for for the different points that you brought up.

R1 Room 140 40:07

Thank you, Kenneth, for for that you brought up.

GI Gracian, Isela 40:12

I my main question I I want to hear and understand like the process and what is what have you all as the people who reviewed and put out the Rfp's, the expectation that these applicants have that you all have explicitly stated around community engagement, that's a very.

R1 Room 140 40:13

I.

GI Gracian, Isela 40:33

Important piece for supervisor Mitchell.

R1 Room 140 40:34

Message.

GI Gracian, Isela 40:36

And.

The fact that similar to what Katherine mentioned, that this was not updated to us and I know I proactively asked for updates pretty regularly starting at the end of last year, maybe even before then.

R1 Room 140 40:51

OK.

GI Gracian, Isela 40:53

Because this is so critical.

These are projects that tend to be polemic and.

Our office, our staff ends up, at least for the 2nd district. I won't speak for my colleagues.

I can chime in on their end.

We end up doing significant work and dedicating significant time for in this case, and particularly how this process has gone through and information, you've treated us more as constituents than active decision makers on this process.

So I want to know what's the explicitly stated expectation of applicants on constituent engagement if they get selected.

For.

At large, and if they are within a city jurisdiction, what communication have they already had with those cities?

R1 Room 140 41:49

Believe LACDA is on the phone.

Matt, lest.

ML Matthew Lust 41:51

Yeah, I think I can answer that.

Everybody, it's Matt Luston with the Los Angeles County Development Authority.

So Isola, we did have a community engagement portion of the RFP and we asked for details of how each applicant or proposer would.

Engage people with lived experience and community in which the project is located.

We didn't go into.

The methods of outreach or.

How they were working with local jurisdictions, but that we anticipated would be part of the the next process after these projects were selected and an application was submitted to the state.

R1 Room 140 42:25

OK.

GI Gracian, Isela 42:36

And what communication, if any?

Driving so I don't have to list in front of me that we got yesterday or the day before.

What so are there projects on this list that are within particular City's jurisdiction and have the proposers already have communication with the cities to get a sense of?

Their.

Thoughts on the project?

ML Matthew Lust 43:04

I don't think I had that information in front of me, but we can certainly check and see what was supplied and then get back to you on that.

R1 Room 140 43:12

I can.

I can just chime in. You sell out.

I have the list.

Here it they're all five of them are within jurisdictional boundaries.

There's three within City of Los Angeles, 1 within Torrance and one within Palmdale.

All our independent cities.

GI Gracian, Isela 43:24

Thank you, Tyler.

That I think the other piece too, why I have proactively reached out to understand how.

The thought process on putting the request for proposals, together with that was going to look like is he'll learn from previous home key rounds and how some of our jurisdictions were caught off guard.

R1 Room 140 43:38

Thank you.

GI Gracian, Isela 43:50

Upset projects were tough for to move forward.

And it feels like we're walking into this one with similar steps.

And I would ask the all three of agency department in office to really.

Whoever you need to talk to from the previous home key rounds to understand the nuances and what the challenges were with the different jurisdictions and proactively address and.

Not continue to do the same misstep, so that's an ask.

Additionally, do you wanna understand just overall what was?

The process.

For, you know, letting folks know that this was open because our office learned of the RFP being open from a potential applicant, not from our departments.

So how? What was the pre engagement?

What did that look like?

For this opportunity.

R1

Room 140 44:56

I just want to fill in some gaps around community engagement for a couple of projects. I can't speak to every single one and Maria probably has more to add.

But the city of LA is engaged in a community engagement process.

Excuse the redundancy on its respective projects. We don't have a lot of detail into the timeline or who they're engaging with, but we have been meeting with the city of LA every single week for the last several months.

In addition, the Torrance project that is the Street 4.

That that is located in SC4, the city of Torrance and the developer Wangarat have been.

Has been leading a community engagement process in the city of Torrance for the last six months and we communicated with Torrance's in advance of moving forward with this late. There are some other projects where we need to look into.

What the city engagement and community engagement has looked like on the communication about the RFP.

I completely appreciate with these many departments at play streamlining that communication is, you know, we we can under score in the future how that process is looking on CE oh is side, the RFP was included in its monthly newsletter and then we engage our local jurisdictions to listserv we.

Call it the municipal minutes we also had.

A.

A call or conference to let folks know that the RFP was live.

Might have more to add.

I don't know if Matt has anything to add.

I know in terms of communication.

ML

Matthew Lust 46:29

Yeah, we we also thanks.

We also informed our developer list and we use the counties in the LSED as solicitation websites to announce the RFP.

GI **Gracian, Isela** 46:45

Thank you for City of LA. This is gonna flag that there is the local council district. So if you want to make sure that they are fully informed and engaged in those conversations, and secondly, I think this ties a bit to Katherine's point of like the different maybe other projects and how we can work around you know, I know our office I imagine.

My colleagues as well.

Get outreach to about different projects and I know for home key we were regularly. Getting reached out to like, hey, when is this gonna happen?

R1 **Room 140** 47:17

OK.

GI **Gracian, Isela** 47:19

How's the county gonna approach it?

Or can we do about that?

And it was.

It's definitely a missed opportunity that our offices didn't get that information ahead of time to be able to do that, follow up with the folks that had reached out to us in time or with enough time for them to to submit.

R1 **Room 140** 47:31

Yes.

GI **Gracian, Isela** 47:37

So I'm not sure how many of them did or didn't.

But again, a flag.

This was it feels like a repeat from previous.

And for me, this is landing a little bit harder because I proactively reached out multiple times to get an update on timeline where we're at with the guidelines so that we could engage those folks and talk to them about where their concepts were at and what were the.

R1 Room 140 47:51

Thank you.

GI Gracian, Isela 48:05

Requirements.

And again I link it up to what Katherine mentioned about like what were the possibilities of what somebody proposed and for them to fully maybe more deeply understand or talking with their offices on what the needs in our different districts. Are.

R1 Room 140 48:23

I also wanted to, in response to one of your comments as that the national. Community Renaissance project that is getting awarded is being recommended for being awarded capital and rental subsidies through LACD as process.

Actually also has LA City Council support and approval from the City Council to put that project forward.

So even though the project is getting awarded capital.

No subsidies through our process, the city of La La Housing Department is going to be the lead applicant on that project specifically.

So we know the City Council, you know, has approved that project. And I believe they might have Council approval for another project, but I don't wanna, you know, speak on this week. So, but we can confirm and and talk as, as Alma said, we have been meeting.

Regularly with the city of LA and we can talk to them about the issues you're bringing up about community engagement.

City Council approval.

LP Leo, Pamela 49:25

And can I chime in just as following up to isela for SD2 going forward, which department is going to be responsible for providing regular updates to board offices?

ML Matthew Lust 49:45

Is that on these projects specifically?

LP Leo, Pamela 49:49

Yeah, on homekey plus.

Because I think perhaps one of the issues is that there's several departments working on this and maybe, you know we we need streamlined communication to departments going forward.

R1 Room 140 49:56

Yes.

ML Matthew Lust 50:03

OK, the Lacd would be the.

GI Gracian, Isela 50:04

Just had the the full the full. Sorry Matt.

The full universe of home Key Plus project so 'cause I'm hearing I heard two different distinctions.

One is the list that's before us on this motion, and then a different one around GAPFUND funds.

Am I understanding that correctly?

R1 Room 140 50:18

Yeah.

ML Matthew Lust 50:20

Yes, the lacd would be the lead applicant for both types of projects. So we would include that in our deputies updates.

R1 Room 140 50:34

Real quick, I see there's two other hands online before we do just 'cause it's related to some of the comments he sealed made, which I strongly agree with.

On the obviously the applications were submitted scored.

Is there a window or an open opportunity for revisions to some of the applicants?

Is that window already passed or will there become something even after if these things were rewarded?

I guess because like after we talk about, you know, community engagement, maybe there are some elements to the projects that change and I just don't know what that process is.

And what that would look like?

ML **Matthew Lust** 51:07

So we did open the appeal process which closed.

For so we could assess the the appeals and how that works with each project.

Because this is a formal solicitation, we have some some guidelines that we can't I guess.

Adjust too much because of what we what we put in the RFP, we are looking back through the projects that did not ask for any local.

Subsidy. And then we are seeing if we can push those forward, but honestly a lot of those projects did not score very well because they didn't provide sufficient information that was requested.

So we are taking a look at it after the appeals came in, but I don't know how much leeway we have because of the solicitation process.

R1 **Room 140** 52:02

Right, OK. I'd be interested in following up with you guys afterwards to get in more of the details on what those restrictions are.

ML **Matthew Lust** 52:03

OK.

I'd be interested in following up with you guys afterwards.

Of those.

R1 **Room 140** 52:11

OK, we can go to online.

ML **Matthew Lust** 52:13

Go to online.

R1 **Room 140** 52:13

Yeah, Guadalupe, I see your hand.

ML **Matthew Lust** 52:13

Yeah, Guadalupe, I see your hand.

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 52:16

Yes, good morning, everyone.

ML **Matthew Lust** 52:17

Yes, good morning everyone. In regards to the comments, you know from Catherine and he said I think we we should definitely look and see.

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 52:20

In regards to the comments, you know from Catherine and Isela, I I I think we we should definitely look and see what other projects could be added to not leave any you know funding on the table, right.

ML **Matthew Lust** 52:32

Yeah.

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 52:36

There's definitely more capacity for.

At the state to apply to and we should try to maximize what we can get right and also in regards to engagement.

ML **Matthew Lust** 52:40

At the state to apply to and.

And that's my what that right. And so in regards.

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 52:52

Community engagement is also very key for Supervisor Solis, and I think anything that we can do to ensure that as part of the process, you know, the applicants will have to go through, you know.

ML **Matthew Lust** 52:58

I think that we can.
Front of the house is.

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 53:05
Provide engagement.

KO **Kristina Oneil** 53:06
In my ear and on her speaker.

ML **Matthew Lust** 53:06
Bye.

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 53:09
Oh, I I think someone's speaking. I'm sorry.

R1 **Room 140** 53:12
Roan, if you're not speaking now, can you please mute your mic online?

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 53:15
OK, so I think it'll be very key as well to ensure engagement.

ML **Matthew Lust** 53:17
So I think.

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 53:20
I know with other locked up projects you know that are funded. You know there is some engagement being folded into the process, right?
And so if we can, you know, consider ensure I know the there was some of the city projects have engaged, right?
But it would be important for us.
To make sure all the projects have some.
You know.
Aspect of engagement as part of the you know the projects.
And also you know just in reverse to making sure we have more updates fully agree you know just to work with our offices to have more communication in regards to

these you know what's being proposed you know just very much an agreement to that.

So if.

You could look into all you know those 3 aspects.

Moving forward, we appreciate that.

R1 Room 140 54:24

Wanna echo the point? Well made. I think it's been hard for us to know where to go to to get, like clear answers. And it's it's been like a confusing process overall.

ML Matthew Lust 54:24

Understood.

Yes.

R1 Room 140 54:33

So having more streamlined communication I think will be really helpful.

EM Edward Morrissey 54:34

Go.

R1 Room 140 54:38

And Mathe, I think you're gonna respond to to a little bit, but I have a follow up question that I can ask.

Yes, now I know the State Department's provide technical assistance.

I'm wondering to what extent you've all been encouraging cooperants to seek out technical assistance, particularly since there are so many requirements and criteria and doing it early so that they're prepared.

Has there been any effort to encourage potential applicants to to seek out that technology from the state?

ML Matthew Lust 55:13

So for the application we did ask all applicants before they applied to the RFP to read the state's nofa, because this is really a an RFP to collect.

R1 Room 140 55:14

The.

ML Matthew Lust 55:29

Co applicants for the states nofo.

So it's kind of a, you know, just gets a Co applicants together.

We also will schedule a A pre meeting with HCD before the applications go in to make sure that all questions are answered and that the.

R1 Room 140 55:37

The.

ML Matthew Lust 55:45

The applications are appropriate for HCD so so there are there is a formal process and then we encourage folks to take a more informal process before responding to the RFP.

R1 Room 140 55:58

Are you like?

Are are these other applicants aware that there are opportunities to receive technical assistance?

ML Matthew Lust 56:00

Are you like?

Are these other applicants aware of their?

R1 Room 140 56:04

I understand like they're reading the notes part, but often like the state will provide technical assistance, although they'll like walk applicants through like the process and what is needed and provide support and guidance.

ML Matthew Lust 56:07

Austin and the table.

And provide support.

R1 Room 140 56:14

Like, are you engaging in any of those efforts to connect applicants or potential applicants to to the state to receive that TA?

ML Matthew Lust 56:24

We haven't specifically done that, no.

R1 Room 140 56:24

You have specifically done that.

I wanna make a slight edit and adjustment.

We did share the HCD technical assistance schedule and those folks were providing technical assistance to proposals.

ML Matthew Lust 56:37

The proposals are.

R1 Room 140 56:38

Our partner in this work has been lassar.

For development, what's our consultants?

It's our consultant.

Excuse me, our development consultant.

Sorry, it's our development consultants who have continued to communicate where? Hcd's.

Their developers.

Potential developers.

Can find assistance. Go through the HCD website.

Handling. I don't know if that's a board deputy though, or public comment. Public comment. OK11 last question.

I am really concerned that we don't really have any veteran practice.

And out of the 28 that were ineligible, were there any veteran specific politics in that?

Well, I know that one.

One of the projects.

I don't know.

Matt, do you have an answer to that?

ML **Matthew Lust** 57:43

I don't.

Let me check the list to see which we have.

R1 **Room 140** 57:56

While you're getting that, I wonder why do you think that is? Was there just no interest or did we not do a good job of communicating the opportunity?

Why? Why do you think we've got so little interest?

You know, one of our partners was military and veteran affairs in the meetings that we've had to coordinate and collaborate on homeless, I think we'd probably want to engage them and to be able to answer that question.

Did the lead on the veterans piece of this?

ML **Matthew Lust** 58:25

Thank you.

R1 **Room 140** 58:28

More broadly, just want to note that the absence of capital in this round we've had ARPA in the previous three rounds was incredibly.

What was something that we had to overcome and manage in this round of of hunky plus?

And then there are some very serious changes impacting the VA at the federal level and and everything from vouchers to subsidies, I think is being impacted by that as well.

But to Maria's point, bringing MBA into the room is valuable.

We we did reach out to them and they were unavailable, and in your communications with the state, have you discussed these challenges specifically to the veteran?

Not me personally.

I was speaking to the process more broadly and how ardent it was in terms of requirements and population specific.

Requirements. I didn't speak to HCD specifically about veterans projects.

Ken. Yeah, I think it would be really helpful if you could send us a list of the challenges for both the regular population homk plus and also for the veterans so

that we can also on the board level start messaging some of that before the application is closed.

Because there is concern that.

Any other comments or questions from board offices?

DG **Duran-Medina, Guadalupe** 59:51

Just one one, one question. You know, just the funding, the 500 and you know 99 million, is that do you know if there's going to be other rounds or is this only one round that we know will happen?

R1 **Room 140** 59:51

I hope it doesn't look yeah.

We have put that question to hcda and they don't know yet.

I think some things will be determined by the outcome of this round, but I I I'm not sure.

Yeah, we have Daniella from SU-1. Go ahead.

UD **Urbina, Daniella** 1:00:26

Apologies, I I jumped in late.

So if this question has already been asked, please excuse the repetition but.

R1 **Room 140** 1:00:31

Thank you.

UD **Urbina, Daniella** 1:00:33

Are there?

Is there an appeals process for any applicants that weren't selected and and how is that process moving forward?

ML **Matthew Lust** 1:00:44

There was an appeal process.

R1 **Room 140** 1:00:44

Was it?

ML Matthew Lust 1:00:46

It is closed we have.

Reviewed all the all the projects and we'll be making announcements today on the selection.

So there was an appeal process and during that process the applicants could appeal the score that they got and to determine if there was a material.

Change or oversight on on the scoring part.

So it's it's kind of a standard appeal process for Rfp's and we are making announcements today to those folks who submitted appeals of which there were probably 14 or so.

R1 Room 140 1:01:36

There's no other questions from board offices.

ML Matthew Lust 1:01:37

Another question.

R1 Room 140 1:01:38

Then we can the comment.

All right. We have any public comment on this motion?

ML Matthew Lust 1:01:43

Get any public comment on this motion?

R1 Room 140 1:01:49

That person dropped off the there. Hey.

ML Matthew Lust 1:01:53

OK.

R1 Room 140 1:01:54

We don't have any hands raised, virtually no hands in the room, so we will move on to presentation items.

ML Matthew Lust 1:01:56

Hands free.

Virtually no hands.

So we will undo President.

R1 Room 140 1:02:01

Thank you.

Thank you.

ML Matthew Lust 1:02:01

You you better not.

R1 Room 140 1:02:03

Folks that are not presenting, we're speaking to you.

Thank you.

The.

Presentation item is for Department of Public Health Rule of Ordinance, amend Title 3, advisory commissions and committees Los Angeles County Code chapter 3.75 policy round table for child care and development number 07954.

Good morning, deputies, colleagues and guests.

My name is Deborah Coleman and I am the director of the LA County Office for the Advancement of early Care and Education.

That is part of the Department of Public Health.

I am joined here by my colleague Leeann Drogan, Deputy director of the office.

Is the lead for all of the work of the County Commission that we convene, which is called the Policy Roundtable for Child Care and Development.

She is here to share changes.

This is the first time since 2013 that there have been.

They proposed changes to the ordinance that governs the policy round table for child care and development.

Hi, good morning.

The board letter requests that the board and introduce DRA reading in place on the agenda for adoption. The ordinance before you to amend Title 3 advisory commissions and committees of the Los Angeles County Code chapter, 3.75 policy

round table for child care and development which.

I will refer to as.

It includes enhancements to membership, diversity, clarity and operational roles of the Commission's officers, updated term limits, updated conflict of interest policy, conflict of interest policy to be aligned with the county's conflict of interest policy, and removal of a subcommittee requirement. The policy round table is char.

With developing policy recommendations for the board.

Advising county departments on early care and education programs.

And identifying strategies to secure, coordinate and maximize funding for high quality services.

Its diverse composition ensures a cross section of skills, expertise and experience that fosters interdependent and cross sector collaboration to enhance the quality of life for Los Angeles County residents and communities. Amending the policy round table.

Ordinance will enable the Commission to adapt to evolving needs.

And advances in child care. These changes are intended to enhance the functionality and diversity of the Policy Roundtable, ensuring it remains a robust and responsive Commission. Approval of the recommended amended ordinance would authorize the following replace outdated information and organizations with accurate information.

Update membership expertise and experience categories.

Limits and quorum requirements, conflict of interest and sunset review date. Remove and or add.

Organizations and county departments clarify the number of Commissioners nominated by each board.

Supervisor add additional child characteristics to the list of nominated organizational Rep representatives.

Restructure membership categories remove require the requirement to have subcommittees and correct spelling errors.

There is no net county cost associated with the proposed ordinance changes.

Additionally, the policy round table commissioners are volunteers and serve without compensation.

This time I'm happy.

Deborah and I are happy to take questions.

Questions for the colleagues.

I have a question.

So I'm kind of understanding, it seems like the bylaws of the Commission or the the round table, did they propose these changes themselves? They've been involved in the process.

Yes, very good question. Actually the process to review the ordinance and bylaws. Was about two years the the Commission established an ad hoc and.

And multiple conversations and.

Also consulted with county counselor with.

So yeah, County Council.

Numerous times before.

They voted and approved the changes that they.

Any questions online from colleagues? Do we have anyone still on board office?

Questions from the board offices.

No comment. Any public comment?

On this presentation item.

Any hands raised virtually any room.

So we will move on to the next step presentation, I think.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.

And the last but not least, the dmh presentation approval to execute a new sole source capital project contract with Hedren Community Health Centers Inc.

Develop the children's community care village. Existing legal entity contract. Expand mental health service. Delegate authority to execute future contracts.

It's.

Good morning, everyone.

Name is Kaylee Gilbert.

I'm the mental Health Services Act coordinator for the Department of Mental Health.

I'm here with my colleague Damian Parker, Chief of administration.

So we're here to talk about the children's community Care Village in partnership with Kettering.

This is a proposed new campus in South LA that will offer all patients inpatient housing, community outreach, urgent care.

Residential treatment services for children and youth.

This will be once the only crisis.

It's residential for youth in LA County and of course, outcomes will be tracked as this

is part of an mhsa project.

On the coordination of care, which is the innovation that we are adding to the project, this is a sole source for 90 million.

In one time, capital 2.4 million in service funds for next fiscal year and that includes CFTN at 25,000,000 in innovations at 65,000,000.

I know we're not the only vender of this project.

They also received around 4BH sip forms.

In the amount of 57 million in SD2 has also put forth \$1,000,000.

There are other funding sources as well, but those are the two most.

In capital, funds are expected to be expended in 30th of 2026 and the Innovation Service portion of 2029.

Wanna note, for the sole source, we submitted the sole source notification in October of 2024.

And just a few notes about why we are working, why we're why this project is.

In South LA Why we're working with Kedron first, just regarding the region, I probably don't need to recite a lot of these stats, but I think folks know service Area 6 in particular has the highest rates in SD2 highest rates of child welfare removal, poverty rates higher.

Unemployment rates and one of the highest homeless rates.

In addition, a recent report 2024 report on juvenile justice system graphics by the Oversight Commission over that 26 month countywide come from South LA for children and youth.

Catherine was identified as a partner in the grant to the oversight and Accountability Commission back in November of 2023, and they have the available land, which is a savings of more than 15,000,000. I believe for us in.

They also have the extensive experience in working.

These are color who are most.

Colleagues.

There's a timeline for the project.

The capital build.

I'll speak to the service portion, the service portion and.

Which includes again, that innovative coordination of care that will go through June of 2029.

Yeah. And the capital project should be done by end of 2027.

End of 2027.

Any questions, comments.

Sorry, how many beds total or how many beds with the goal that we'll be able to utilize.

Like how many people served? Will this help?

So we have a for each level of service.

I do.

We do have some details in the actual proposal.

I believe it's 16 crtp beds.

The inpatient unit actually is moving their existing inpatient unit to this campus.

And but they they.

Care.

Forgive me if you want me to get the numbers.

Sorry.

OK.

12 chairs.

So there's 12.

Chairs, got it. These are correct.

The urgent care.

On me right away.

Urgent care, but the outpatient, too, will continue.

I think they're intending to serve.

I remember correct.

It's kinda hard 'cause. I only focus on what I'm paying for.

And that's just to be true.

OK, but I can.

We can pull that and get it to you. OK, provide it.

Yeah, I'm. I'm only gonna give you what I'm actually paying, but I know you.

Want the whole process of get.

Within the proposal that we had shared the OEC, we actually have the details for outpatient for for the urgent care Center for all of our component share that would be.

Missed the numbers.

I got 65,000,000 for a notion.

What was the? How much did we receive?

25,000,000 in Cntn and BH Sip was 57.

Is a response in the chat from.

For the cccv include sixteen crisis residential treatment program ertp beds, 8 crisis stabilization unit, Urgent Care center issue slash UCC beds.

Yep, Yep. Questions.

Hey, what office is online?

Comment on this item.

Hey, thank you very much.

Don't have anything else on the agenda here for items 5:00 and 6:00, we will now move on to item seven. General public comment reminder that general public comment is limited to two minutes.

Please be mindful of this time limit when providing general public comment. Any general public comment on today's agenda.

Have and sudeep.

Go ahead.

NS Nathan Sudeep 1:13:33

Every every line. Can you hear me?

R1 Room 140 1:13:36

Can you hear me? Yes. Mm hmm.

NS Nathan Sudeep 1:13:38

Perfect everyone.

My name is Nathan.

I'm a volunteer case worker with Project Hepsi Connect.

I'm here to encourage continued support for expanding hepatitis C staffing within the Department of Public Health.

We're asking the county to allocate \$441,000 to fund two full time linkage tier positions. Although hepatitis C is curable more than 2/3 of people with hep C in LA County remain untreated.

R1 Room 140 1:13:54

2.

NS Nathan Sudeep 1:14:03

I work closely with these patients every day, many whom are unhoused or struggling with substance abuse, and too often they fall through the crack because there isn't enough staff to keep them engaged in treatment.

This isn't a medical issue.

R1 Room 140 1:14:14

Is it?

NS Nathan Sudeep 1:14:15

This is ingest a medical issue.

It's a public health issue as well. People with untreated hep C can unknowingly transmit the virus to others, including family partners and emergency responders.

R1 Room 140 1:14:20

Yes.

NS Nathan Sudeep 1:14:26

That is why I support the motion passed back in June 2024, which directed the DPH and CEO to expand Hep C staffing.

But to move forward, we need dedicated county funding now.

We hope today's cluster will consider recommending this hep C funding request for inclusion on a future board agenda.

We have the cure for hep C.

Let's make sure we have the staff to deliver it.

Thank you.

R1 Room 140 1:14:47

Thank you.

Do you have any other public comment on today's agenda?

Don't see any hands in the room. Don't see any. Any other hands raised? Virtually.

Thank you, everyone participating.

Enjoy the rest of the day.

We will now adjourn this meeting. Thank you.

Thank you.

● **De La Rosa, Miguel** stopped transcription